

Bedford Gazette.



Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

WHOLE NUMBER, 2915.

VOL. 4. NO. 3.

VOLUME 57.

NEW SERIES.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 17, 1860.

THE BEDFORD GAZETTE
 IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING
 BY B. F. MEYERS,
 AT THE FOLLOWING TERMS, to wit:
 \$1.50 per annum, in advance.
 \$2.00 " " if paid within the year.
 \$2.50 " " if not paid within the year.
 No subscription taken for less than six months.
 No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher. It has been decided by the United States Courts that the stopping of a newspaper without the payment of arrearages is prima facie evidence of fraud and is a criminal offence.
 The courts have decided that persons are accountable for the subscription price of newspapers, if they take them from the post office, whether they subscribe for them or not.

Political.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

DOUGLAS IN THE NORTH.

His reception and speech at Concord.

Senator Douglas in Concord.

MAGNIFICENT RECEPTION—IMMENSE GATHERING OF THE PEOPLE—GREAT SPEECH AND GLORIOUS ENTHUSIASM.

[From the Concord (N. H.) Patriot.]
 At half past ten o'clock yesterday (Tuesday) morning, the Committee of Reception, which consisted of Messrs. H. P. Rolfe (Chairman), T. P. Treadwell, O. L. Sanborn, J. V. Barron, J. S. Abbott, Nelson Hill, J. E. Lang, G. H. Davis, and several other gentlemen, left the Concord depot for Canaan, in order to meet and escort the Hon. S. A. Douglas to Concord. The train reached the appointed place at half-past one o'clock, and the cars from the North soon arrived. The committee entered the car in which Mr. and Mrs. Douglas were seated, and were severally introduced to the distinguished Senator and his lady.

Mr. Douglas left Montpelier, Vt., in the morning, and at several places on the route found large crowds of people assembled at the depots to do him honor. This was especially the case at Northfield, Roxbury, White River junction, Franklin, Webster Place and Fisherville. At several places in New Hampshire the train received an accession of numbers, for many earnest democrats were anxious to avail themselves of the opportunity to hear the able and eloquent exponent of their principles. Mr. Douglas spoke his thanks to those waiting at the depots, but made no political remarks.

On the arrival of the cars at Concord, an immense crowd was waiting to welcome him, and loud were the hurrahs as the illustrious visitor left the cars and proceeded to the carriage in waiting for him. A salute was fired as the cars entered the depot. A procession was formed, preceded by a band, in which Mr. Douglas, Mr. H. P. Rolfe and Mr. Bailey, of the Boston Herald, rode in an open carriage drawn by four horses. They were followed by the members of the committee and friends, in a long string of vehicles of every description, and by four or five bands. The procession passed along Main street, Washington street, State street and School street to the State House, the band playing and the people cheering heartily all the way. The marshals of the procession were Messrs. Elazer Jackson, J. L. Clough, C. H. Hill, J. B. Sanborn and J. B. Clifford.

A platform had been erected in front of the State House, which was occupied by the committee and friends. The people, numbering several thousands, filled the yard in front of the building. Mr. D. was escorted to the platform.

Mr. Rolfe, Chairman of the Committee said: Mr. Douglas, I have the honor, sir, to be the organ of this vast concourse of your fellow citizens and friends who have come up from their farms and workshops, their counting rooms and merchandise, to greet you and extend to you a cordial welcome to the capital of our State.—(Applause.) Very few of us, sir, have the pleasure of your personal acquaintance, and it is gratifying to us, you will not regret that you have made it. So long have you been in the national councils, so able have you advocated their cause, that the democracy of New Hampshire claim you as their champion, and we rejoice in this opportunity of testifying to you that your eminent services are held by us in grateful remembrance. We acknowledge to you our gratitude for that constant support which you have given to the great principle of popular sovereignty—the foundation stone upon which our institutions rest. (“Good.”) From a statesman we have received, so much—and all at low me to say to you what may not be so satisfactory a reflection—from none is there so much expected. The realization of the past gives assurance of the future. For the gallant resistance which you made to the Lecompton scheme, which it consummated would have been a great crime, we thank you. In the noble and successful struggle which you made in 1858, in your own State, against a brave enemy in the front and a cowardly troop of camp followers in the rear, you had our sympathies and rejoicings and in that brilliant personal defence which you recently made in the Senate against that “lump” of Senators who exalt the rights of property above the personal rights of freemen, we have awarded you the prize so much coveted by statesmen—the jewel of consistency. (Cheers.) In the life of eminent men there is no period to which parental hearts turn back with so many sweet and affectionate recollections as to that of infancy and childhood; and while the North-west claims you as her man, and the nation as her statesman, New England cherishes you as her child. (Cheers.) Sir, this is an occasion to me fruitful with suggestions; but I am admonished by the impatience of this assembly that this is not my benefit, so I forbear. Permit me, in conclusion, to tender you assurances of the sincere pleasure which your presence affords us. My fellow citizens, I will detain you no

longer. I have now the honor to present to you the distinguished American statesman.—(Continued cheering.)

The Hon. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS was greeted with loud cheering as he arose to address the vast assembly. He said:—

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FELLOW CITIZENS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—You will receive my grateful thanks for the kind terms in which you have been pleased to welcome me; and you will accept my grateful acknowledgments for the cordiality with which you have endorsed those sentiments of welcome. For the first time I visit the capital of your noble State.—When I wanted to make a brief trip through Vermont and New Hampshire, on my way from Saratoga to Newport, R. I., I did not expect any public demonstration.—My object was to make a quiet visit, a pilgrimage to the grave of my father and to the scenes of my childhood.—From the moment I trod the soil of Vermont I found I was welcomed by the population *en masse*. Men of all parties joined in the reception. It filled my heart with gratitude, and rendered it impossible for me to discuss any of those political topics about which the assemblage differed in opinion. I had supposed that when I left the borders of my native state, I would be welcomed only by a few friends as I passed along the road. Imagine my surprise at this vast assemblage, this imposing reception, which exceeds in its magnificence and grandeur anything I have previously witnessed. From the bottom of my heart I thank you for this demonstration of your good will. You have been pleased, Mr. Chairman, to refer in terms of approbation to my course upon the Lecompton constitution. While I have ceased to discuss the merits of that question since it was finally discarded by the people of Kansas, yet I will not refrain from a slight allusion to it. I do not think my silence might be misconstrued. I did fight that Lecompton constitution with all the energy and with all the power that I could command. (Cheers.) Reluctant as I was to differ in opinion or action with a President that I had used all my efforts to place in the Executive chair, yet duty was paramount to any personal fealty or obligation. (Cheers.) I stood pledged as every democrat in America stood pledged by his vote for James Buchanan, in 1856, to maintain the right of the people of every State and every Territory to form and regulate their own domestic institutions. (“That’s it.”) In my opinion the attempt to force upon an unwilling people a constitution which they did not like, was not only a violation of the democratic creed, but it violated the American creed.—(Cheers.) It violated the republican creed.—It violated the creed of all free men in all free countries. (Applause.) I did not oppose the Lecompton constitution on the ground of its provisions in respect to African slavery.—I held then, as I hold now, that if the people of Kansas wanted a slave State that had a right to it. (“That’s good doctrine.”) If, on the contrary, they did not want slavery, no power on earth should force it upon them. I opposed the Lecompton constitution because it was not the act and deed of the people of Kansas. I proposed that the question should be referred back to the people of Kansas, with the privilege of voting for or against it; and if a majority of all the legal votes of Kansas ratified it, then Kansas should come into the Union with that constitution. If, on the contrary, a majority voted against it, the people of Kansas might proceed to make a new constitution, with or without slavery, just as they pleased, and come into the Union. I rejoiced from the bottom of my heart when I saw every republican in both houses of Congress voting for that proposition. (Laughter and satirical cheers.) Having heard the republican party pledge themselves so often against the admission of any more slave States into the Union, it did rejoice me when I saw them, every man in the Senate, and every man in the House, voting to allow Kansas to come in as a slave State if the people should so decide. (Laughter and cheers.) And I will say to you, now, my fellow citizens, that it is a matter of sincere regret that I find the republican party now denouncing me for advocating the identical principle that they then voted for. All I ask of them is to carry out in future, and apply to every new Territory and new State, the identical principles for which they all voted with me in that Lecompton controversy.—(Cheers.) The President of the United States, during that Lecompton controversy, put forth a claim, which I, as a Senator, could not recognize. I conceded his right to recommend the Lecompton constitution if he believed it to be the act and deed of the people, and I should never have quarrelled with him on that question had he not claimed the right to control my vote and compel me to vote against my conscience. I hold that a President has no more right to control the vote of a Senator than a Senator has to dictate to a President. The President told me that if I did not obey him and vote to force the Lecompton constitution upon the people against their will, he would take the head off of every friend I had in office. I told him, in reply, that my friends were as dear to me as those of any other man could be to him, but that if I had a friend who was not willing to lose his office, rather than degrade me into a tool of executive power, he did not deserve to be my friend.—(Applause.) Here permit me to say that the great contest between the Executive and myself was this: he claimed the right to control the vote of a senator in opposition to the wishes of his constituents. I claimed that the representative of the people is independent and should always act independent of executive power.—(Cheers.) When you permit the executive to direct a representative how he shall vote, you convert this republic into a despotism. (That’s so.) Why elect a Congress, if the President has a right to tell the members how they are to vote? There is an end of representative government whenever the Executive is permitted to use or abuse his power, by controlling the representative against the wishes of his constituents and of his individual conscience. Hence

in my opinion, I was fighting a greater battle in Illinois in 1858 than the mere question who should be Senator. (Applause.) In my person the question was submitted to the people of Illinois, whether or not their Senator should be the mere tool of executive dictation. (They decided it right.) Yes, they did decide it right, in opposition to an unholy alliance between the republicans and the federal office-holders. (Cheers.) It was hoped that when that Lecompton controversy had been settled by the vote of the people of Kansas against it, that the warfare in the democratic party would cease.—But instead of that, the war was kept up, and now we find on the national theatre the same game being played that was played in Illinois in 1858. Now you find the question submitted whether or not the executive of this nation is to be permitted to dictate his successor in office. It is said that Mr. Buchanan naturally feels mortified and wounded to have a man nominated by his own party in opposition to his wishes. (Laughter.) Whether he thus feels mortified or not, it would have been well for him to have considered when he became a candidate in 1856 in opposition to General Pierce, who was then President and candidate for reelection. Suppose Gen. Pierce had then pursued the same course which Mr. Buchanan is now pursuing—that is, using the power and patronage which the democratic party had placed in his hands, for the purpose of defeating the nominee of that party. What would every Democrat in America have said of Franklin Pierce if he had tried to divide and defeat his party merely out of mortification and chagrin at not getting the re-nomination? What would have been said of General Pierce in such a contingency must be true of James Buchanan now. (Cheers.) I should not have referred to these things at this time, nor did this canvass, but for the fact that the President of the United States has taken the stump, making public harangues, for the purpose of dividing and defeating the party which elected him President. (Applause.) What are the reasons assigned by the President for endeavoring to divide and break down the democratic party? He does not assign the personal reason that he don’t like the nominee. But he puts it upon the ground that he don’t like the plan adopted by the party. What is there in that platform to which James Buchanan hasa right to take exception? It is the identical platform upon which James Buchanan was elected President, and without which he never could have been elected. There isn’t an honest man in all America that will deny that James Buchanan and John C. Breckinridge, in 1856, were pledged to the doctrine of non intervention by Congress with slavery in the Territories.—(Cheers.) I made speeches from this stand with John C. Breckinridge in 1856, when he was advocating his own claims to the Vice Presidency, and heard him go to the extreme lengths in favor of popular sovereignty in the Territories. Then again, if I recollect right, the democrats of Hampshire held an immense mass meeting at this capital, in February, 1856, previous to the nomination at Cincinnati, at which Howell Cobb and Joseph Lane and James L. Orr of South Carolina, made speeches; and in every one of those speeches they advocated sputter sovereignty in its broadest sense. (Applause.) I appeal to this audience if these facts are not true, (I have the speeches in my pocket.)—That gentleman has the speeches in his pocket. They were written out by the speaker after they returned to Washington, and published in pamphlet form by the national democratic committee, as a true exposition of democratic principles. (“Yes, and in the Boston Post.”) A gentleman says in the Boston Post, “I believe, in every other democratic paper in America that had the space to spare in political speeches. In other words, fellow citizens, I stand now where every democrat in America stood four years ago, advocating the right of the people of every political community to make their own laws, to establish their own institutions to suit themselves. I claim peculiar credit for advocating these principles.—That principle of popular sovereignty as old as free government itself. It was this principle upon which every battle of the Revolution was fought. Remember, for ornament, what was the cause that led to the revolutionary war. What was the demand upon our revolutionary fathers, the denial of which produced the war? It was not independence. In the beginning of that controversy our revolutionary fathers did not desire independence. In every petition to the crown, in every address to the Parliament and people of England, our fathers set up and protested their dotion to the British Constitution, and their loyalty to the Crown of England. (“This God’s truth.”) Of course it’s God’s truth, I should not have said it. (Applause.) Then were our fathers contending for, if it was not independence? They were contending for the right of self government in the colony. They demanded the right in their own local legislatures to pass all laws which affect the local and domestic concerns of their respective colonies. They did not deny the right the British Parliament to pass laws on subjects which were imperial and not colonial. They did not deny the right of the British government to do all acts and things which affected the welfare of the empire without interfering with the local and domestic concern of the people of the colonies. But they demanded the right of self government in each colony in respect to everything that was local, anternational, and not imperial. And our fathers forth the Declaration of Independence, or when they found they could not get local government without it. They submitted to independence as a necessity, in order to get a self government. They established the independence of these colonies only as a means of acquiring the rights of local self government.—Thus you find that the revolution was justified only upon the ground that the people of the colonies had a right to govern themselves

in their local matters without the interference of the British Parliament. We are now told by the republicans of the North, and by the disunionists of the South, that the principle of non-intervention and popular sovereignty is very well in the States, but is all wrong in the Territories. (Laughter and cheers.) They tell us that a Territory is not sovereign, and therefore has no right to exercise a sovereign power or establish its own institutions. Let me ask them if the colonies were sovereign when our fathers demanded the same right of self-government? Our fathers demanded the privilege, not for sovereign States, but for independent colonies, for provinces, for Territories, while they were dependent and remaining in a colonial and territorial condition. (Cheers) Our fathers demanded this privilege under precisely the same circumstances that we democrats now claim it for the people of the Territories. We democrats acknowledge the right and duty of Congress to pass all laws which are federal, and not local or territorial in their character. We don’t deny the right of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to make war, to collect revenue, to perform those general acts which are federal and not local in their character. But we demand that the people of a Territory, the same as those of a colony, shall be permitted to make their own laws and establish their own institutions to suit themselves. (Applause.) The republicans of New Hampshire will tell you that the people of the Territory have no right of self-government until they become a State. Have no right. Why not? Because, they say, Congress has not given them that right. I have yet to learn that an American freeman, whether in a State or a Territory, derives his rights from Congress. Cheers. I am aware that the Tories of the Revolution took the ground that the people of the colonies had no rights except those which the King of England granted to them in their charters. And they said that, inasmuch as the colonies obtained their rights from the crown, why, of course, the King could take them away whenever he thought proper. (Laughter.) What did Washington, and Jefferson, and Hancock, and Molly Stark say to that doctrine? (Laughter and cheers.) They told the King of England and the British Parliament that they did not get their rights from the crown, and hence that the crown could not take them away. They told the King of England that they obtained their rights from God Almighty, that he alone could take them away. The doctrine of the revolutionary war was, that the right of local government was inherent in the people; and that hence all rightful government must emanate from the people, and be established by and for the benefit of the people. That was the doctrine in the times of the Revolution. But we are now told that this inherent right of self-government only pertains to States, don’t belong to Territories, nor colonies, nor provinces, as it did in 1776. Let us examine this claim for a moment. I suppose that you, citizens of New Hampshire, without distinction of party, all claim the inherent right of self-government. (“Yes, yes.”) You think it is an inherent right that no power on earth dare take from you.—Well, I suppose that democrats and republicans agree so far. But the republican tells you that the moment a citizen of New Hampshire (who possesses the inherent right of self-government so long as he stays here) crosses a State line and enters a Territory of the United States, he forfeits the right. (Ironical cheers.) Is it true that a citizen of New Hampshire forfeits his inalienable right of self-government when he moves to a Territory? (“No, Sir,” and laughter.) What provision of the constitution of the United States works that forfeiture? (“None.”) Then upon what ground is it that an American citizen is deprived of his rights when he goes in to a Territory under the constitution and the American flag? Will it be said that the people of the Territories are not capable of self-government? Who are the people of the Territories? Where did they come from? Many of them are your sons, your brothers, who left the granite hills of their native State and went to Kansas. They were capable of self-government, were they not, when they left home? When did they lose their capacity to govern themselves? (Laughter and cheers.) Were they any less capable of self-government after they got to Kansas than they were when they started? Did they lose their sense and intelligence and the virtue they possessed while on the ferry boat crossing the Missouri river? (Laughter.) Where and when, I ask, did the native-born citizen, who was capable of self-government when he started, lose that capacity? (“He aint lost it yet.”) I will not pretend to say what may be the opinion of the people of New Hampshire as to the capacity of the people of the Territories and of the new State to govern themselves. I will only say that we, who have spent a whole manhood on the frontier, do think that we are capable of self-government. We will never admit that you are any wiser, better, or more capable of self-government than ourselves. We have a great respect for you of the old States. I think we love you better than you do us. (Laughter.) And I will give you good reasons for it. I am a native of New England, and I left the land of my birth, the scenes of my childhood, the grave of my fathers, and went to the extreme North-west. And yet New England is my native land, and I love her on that account. Illinois is not your native land, and you don’t love her therefore, as much as I do, who live there. Hence I say to you that the people of the North-west who emigrate from New England, from Virginia, from the Carolinas, from any of the old States, remain loyal in their affections to the States from which they removed, while they love still dearer the States where they have planted their wives and children. Yet we think we are just as capable of self-government after we get out there as we were before we started. With all due respect, we think we are

quite as competent as you are; and I will give you a reason for that. I think the New Hampshire boy who moves to the West when he is twenty years of age, is just as capable of self-government as the brother that remains behind. Just cast your eyes round this neighborhood, and find an old gentleman who had two sons.—The one was an ambitious, restless, energetic, daring boy; the other was an amiable, kind, lazy, good fellow. (Laughter.) Which of these boys do you think went out West?—Which stayed at home, and lived with daddy and mammy? (Laughter.) The bold and ambitious young fellow went and dug up the prairie; or in the wilderness he carved out his own fortune, made his own farm, put up his own fences and perhaps spit his own rails. (Laughter and cheers.) He cultivated his own fields, erected a school house and a church—yes, and made his own cabinet work, too. By that time I reckon the wild boy had sown his wild oats pretty well, and was fully as capable of self-government as the one that stayed here and acted under father’s and mother’s advice. And what more? Very likely that young fellow, after he had made a home for himself in the West, found himself a little lonesome and concluded to come back and see the old people. If he did, ten to one that he put his eye on the prettiest girl that could be found in the neighborhood, and took her out West with him, thus taking away from the old New England State not only the smartest boy, but also the prettiest girl in the district. (Laughter and Cheers.) Now, are you going to tell me that such people are not capable of self-government, merely because they live in a Territory? (“Not we.”) I hold that every political community, State and Territory alike, has, under our system of government, the right to govern itself in all things that are local and domestic, and not federal. And, what is more, Mr. Buchanan thought so in 1856. The republicans all thought so when they voted for the Crittenden bill in the Lecompton controversy. (Cheers.) The democratic party thinks so now. (Applause.) This principle of popular sovereignty and non intervention is a cardinal plank in the democratic platform. Every democrat has heretofore declared and considered it a fundamental article of his creed. But here I must be just to other parties. We democrats are not entitled to the exclusive claim and exclusive credit of this doctrine of non-intervention and popular sovereignty. In 1852 it was adopted as a plank in the whig platform by Clay and Webster established it in the compromise measures of 1850. General Pierce was nominated upon it in 1852, and elected upon it. I remember well that in the contest between Pierce and Scott, in 1852, the whole controversy was which party was entitled to the most credit in the adoption of the compromise measures of 1850. The whigs were in the habit of claiming the exclusive credit, because their great leader, Henry Clay, was the author of the measure, because their godlike Webster made the argument to vindicate the measure, and because their model President, Fillmore, approved the bill after Congress had passed it. On the other hand, I was in the habit of denying that the whigs were entitled to all the credit, or to more than half of it, for the reason that while I admitted that the whig party furnished the generals, we furnished the soldiers that voted and passed the measures through Congress. But it cannot be denied that both the whig and democratic party, in 1852, stood pledged by the platform, in this principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the Territories of the United States. Will any man deny the truth of these facts? (“No.”) How then does it happen that so many old whigs, so many old democrats, have strayed away from the path where both parties used to tread in peace and harmony. Whigs and democrats were in the habit of quarrelling about the distribution of the public funds and the specie circular; but at the same time they agreed on the slavery question. Non-intervention was a plank common to both parties. You whigs agreed to stand by that, and so did we democrats. I want to know whether you, old whigs, are going to jump off the only plank remaining in the platform merely because you find me standing on it? I give you fair notice that I never intend to abandon it, if I find every whig in America on it. (Laughter and cheers.) So it was with the American party in 1856.—You Americans and we democrats differed about other matters, but agreed on non-intervention. Remember the twelfth article in that celebrated American creed, in which you “pre-terminated” the slavery question.—“Pre-terminate” was the word used. Now I want to know if you are not willing to pre-terminate it now? Pre-termining, I reckon is about the same as non-intervention. Let every old line whig, every democrat, every American, every conservative man, rally on this principle of non-intervention by the federal government with slavery in the Territories, and you will have peace and harmony all over this land. Remember, there has never been sectional strife in this country except when the federal government attempted to take power over the local and domestic institutions of the people. So long as Congress has confined its acts to those few objects specified in the constitution as being federal, and not local, there has been peace. But now you find this country threatened with sectional strife, and why? Because you are now realizing what the Father of his Country, in his farewell address, cautioned his countrymen against. You now find this country divided into two sectional parties, one North and another South. The republican party appeal to passions, prejudices, and the ambition of the North against the South and her institutions. Secessionists of the South appeal to passions, prejudices, and to the ambition of the sovereign people against the North and our institutions. The republicans demand that the federal government shall take charge of the slavery question. The Southern secessionists also demand that the federal government shall settle that question.—The republicans want the federal government

to wield its power against slavery everywhere. And the secessionists want the federal force wielded for slavery everywhere. Thus you find an irrepressible conflict produced between those two sectional parties. The one is the antipode to the other; and yet the one is necessary to the existence of the other. The republicans of the North and the secessionists of the South occupy precisely the same relation to each other as the two blades of a pair of shears. They both turn on the same pivot, but cut in opposite directions. (Laughter and cheers.) Interference by Congress with slavery in the Territories is the pivot on which both turn. The republicans tell us that Congress must prohibit slavery wherever the people want it—no matter about prohibiting it where the people don’t want it.—they prohibit it themselves. Hence, the republicans want Congress to prohibit slavery wherever and whenever the people want to have it. The secessionists on the other hand, demand that Congress shall maintain and protect slavery wherever the people don’t want it. They say that they are going to have it protected by Congress wherever necessary, and that is not necessary so long as the people want it, for if they want it they will protect it themselves. It is only necessary when the people don’t want it, and that is the only time they are going to interfere to protect it. Thus, both of those parties rest their respective claims on the doctrine of intervention by Congress with slavery in the Territories, in opposition to the right of the people in all cases. The democratic party, on the other hand, proclaim the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with the domestic institutions of the people everywhere. (Applause.) We say to the federal government, “Hands off! Touch not the local affairs of the people!” We say to the federal government, what our fathers said to the British Parliament, “Mind your own business.” (“That’s right.”) Passing through Vergennes the other day, a gentleman in the cars called my attention to an old piece of Continental money. “Did you ever mind those words—“Mind your own business.” Another gentleman in the cars called my attention to an old Massachusetts coin, on the reverse side of which was, “Mind your own business.” (“That is a very good creed.”) That was the creed of our fathers in the Revolution. That was what they said to the British Parliament when they attempted to force slavery on the colony of Virginia, against its will. That is what our fathers said to the British government when it attempted to control our people in their local and domestic affairs, and to dictate what kind of paper they should write on. Our fathers said to the British government, “Hands off! Mind your own business.” And in order that they might perpetuate that motto, and render it familiar to their children, they placed it upon their paper money and on their coin, in order that every child should learn to read it. Let us now act on that principle. Let us say to Congress, “Mind your own business, and let the Territories alone.” I have a word more to say to you, and then I have done. I presume that many of you have business before Congress of some kind or other. Perhaps one of you has a claim for a pension. It so, ask your representative, when he comes home, what became of your bill. He’ll tell you that he did the best he could for you, but that it was lost for want of time. (“Why lost for the want of time?”) “Oh, Congress occupied the whole time in discussing the slavery question, and there was no time to pass your pension bill.” Another may have an interest in the French Spoilation bill. Ask your representative what became of that bill. (“Lost for want of time; slavery question occupies the whole time; no chance for anything else.”) Ask your representative why they did not remodel the tariff in order to raise money enough to defray the expenses of the government without borrowing twenty millions of dollars a year. They will tell you the only reason that the bill was lost was want of time. The negro question occupies the whole time; no chance for the tariff. Ask them why they did not pass a Pacific Railroad bill; and at the same time remind them that Fillmore was pledged to a Pacific railroad when a candidate in 1856, and Fremont was pledged to it, and Buchanan was pledged to it—all three parties pledged to it. Yet the very bill, the very measure to which all parties were pledged, could not get a majority in either house of Congress. Ask your representative—Why? (“Lost for the want of time; the negro question takes up all the time, and there is no time left to attend to the material interests of the country.”—at least to the interests of the white folks, as my friend in the crowd says. In my opinion, the government of this country is the white man’s government. It was made by white men for the benefit of white men, and ought to be administered by white men. (Cheers.) And I think the white men have a right to a small portion of the time, at least, so that their business may be attended to. You never will have appropriate legislation on any of these questions before Congress—and I am not discussing the question as to what the legislation ought to be—but you never will have the subjects considered and acted upon until you banish the negro question from the halls of Congress. Let us banish that question from Congress forever. Remand it to the people of the Territories who are interested in it. Let them do as they please, subject to the constitution of the United States, and there will be no cause of controversy between the North and the South. Maintain the doctrine of non-intervention and there will be peace and harmony between all sections of the country. Why can we not now live in peace as we did in former times? You will all remember that during the Revolution the Northern army was commanded by a Southern general, and the Southern army by a Northern general; and on the battle field Southern and Northern men fought shoulder by shoulder in a common cause, poured out their blood in a common battle, in order that they might transmit a common inheritance to their children. Why