

Bedford Gazette.



VOLUME 57.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

WHOLE NUMBER, 2921.

NEW SERIES.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 19, 1860.

VOL. 4, NO. 12.

THE BEDFORD GAZETTE
IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING
BY B. F. MEYERS,
At the following terms, to wit:
\$1.50 per annum, cash, 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 arrears are paid, unless at the option of the publisher. It has been decided by the United States Courts that the stoppage of a newspaper without the payment of arrears, is *prima facie* evidence of fraud and is a criminal offense.
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.

LETTER

FROM
HON. AMOS KENDALL,
TO
HON. JAMES L. ORR,
OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 10, 1860.

HON. JAMES L. ORR—*My Dear Sir:* Your letter of the 15th ult., reached Washington while I was absent in the North.

Though I did not contemplate when I wrote to you on the 9th ult., anything beyond a limited private correspondence, yet, having no opinion on the portentous condition of public affairs which I have a motive to conceal, or am assumed to avow, I cheerfully comply with your suggestions.

You quote from my former letter the declaration that "my mind is equally clear that the South has long had a peaceful remedy within her reach, and has it still, though impaired by the recent conduct of some of her sons," and you ask me a full explanation of my opinions on that point as well as "the remedy to be resorted to by us (the South) should the Government in November, pass into the hands of a party whose declared purpose is to destroy our property, amounting in value, at the present time, to not less than three billions, one hundred and fifty millions of dollars." You ask, "Can it be prudent, safe or manly in the South to submit to the domination of a party whose declared purpose is to destroy such an amount of property and subvert our whole social and industrial policy?"

In a subsequent part of your letter you call my attention to certain grievances endured by the South, and conclude your commentary on them as follows, viz:

"Is it wise, if we do not intend to submit to such consequences, to allow a Black Republican President to be inaugurated, and put him in possession of the Army, the Navy, the Treasury, the arsenals and arsenals, the public property—in fact the whole machinery of the Government with its appendages and appurtenances? If the South should think upon this subject as I do, no Black Republican President should ever execute any law within her borders unless at the point of the bayonet and over the dead bodies of her slain sons."

I shudder at such sentiments coming from one whose sincerity I cannot doubt. The time was when 150,000 men tendered their services to the President to aid him in executing the laws of the United States; the time will be when 200,000 men will be volunteers for a like purpose, should resistance be made to his legitimate authority, no matter by what party he may be elected.

There seems to me to be in the course recommended to the South, in the event of Mr. Lincoln's election to the Presidency, a faintly little short of madness. Would you pull down the canopy of heaven because wrong and crime exist beneath it? Would you break up the earth on which we tread, because earthquakes sometimes leave it and pestilence walks on its surface? This Union, sir, is too precious to the people it protects, North and South, East and West, to be broken up, even should a Black Republican be elected President next November. Should the attempt be made, a united North and three-fourths of the divided South would spring to the rescue. No, no, the remedy for the evils of which you justly complain is to be found within the Union, and not among its bloody ruins.

I admit that the grievances which you enumerate are hard to be borne; but a few Southern men are not without responsibility for their existence. The general sentiment of the country, North and South, at the close of the Revolutionary war was Anti-Slavery. It has changed in the South, but remains unchanged in the North. There, however, it has been roused to unwanted activity, by the preachings of fanatics and the denunciations of political demagogues, aided not a little by the arts, the language and the violence of Southern disunionists.

It is needless to give in detail all the causes which have brought the politics of the country to their present deplorable condition. Suffice it to say that you have long had in the South a small party of able men whose aim has been to destroy the Union; that, as a preliminary to their main design, they have sought to break up the Democratic Party; that their means for accomplishing this end were to act with it, and force upon it every possible issue obnoxious to the general sentiment of the North; that they have dragged after them the true Union men of the South, partly through their fears of being considered laggard in their devotion to the Southern interests, and partly through ambition for political distinction; to make the Democratic party as odious as possible at the North, they became the advocates of slavery on principle, justified the African-Slave-trade, and denounced the laws prohibiting it. By these acts and frequent threats of disunion they enabled the enemies of the Democracy in the North to denounce them as Pro-Slavery men, and to all this they added occasional taunts that they were no more to be relied upon for the protection of Southern rights than their opponents. By these means the Democratic Party was reduced be-

fore the last Presidential election to a minority in most of the Northern States, and in the residue had the utmost difficulty in maintaining their ascendancy. In the meantime, the Union sentiment, particularly in the border slave States whose interests in its preservation is pre-eminent, sought expression through the American party. To such an extent had the Democratic Party been weakened by the insidious policy of their Disunion allies, that they had the utmost difficulty in electing an old practical statesman over a young man who had nothing to recommend him beyond a few successful explorations of our wilderness territory.

There were those who foresaw that longer affiliation with Southern Disunionists would inevitably destroy the ascendancy of the Democratic Party, and a feeble and fruitless effort was made to induce the President to lay the foundations of his Administration on the rock of the Union, and cut loose from those who were seeking to destroy it. For reasons, no doubt patriotic, but to me inexplicable, the reverse of that policy was pursued. The support of the Leocompton Constitution, which the country generally believed to be a fraud, was made a test of the Democracy; one leading Democrat after another was proscribed because they would not submit to the test, and as if to deprive Northern Democrats of the last hope of successfully vindicating the rights of the South, an act of Congress was passed for the admission of Kansas into the Union at once, provided she would consent to become a slave-holding State, but postponing her admission indefinitely if she refused.

In your published letter you justly condemn the Seceders from the Charleston Convention, who, you think, ought to have remained, and prevented the nomination of a candidate who is obnoxious to the South. Do you not perceive, sir, that the secession was a part of the programme for breaking up the Democratic Party?—And is it not palpable that after absolutely vacating their seats at Charleston, they went to Baltimore for the mere purpose of more effectually completing the work of destruction by drawing off another detachment? I, Sir, entertain no doubt that the secession was the result most desired by the disunionists; that the object of the new issue then gotten up was merely to form a pretext for secession, and that its adoption was the last thing they desired or designed.

Glance a moment at a few facts: Alabama, led by an open disunionist, went to Cincinnati, in 1856, under instructions to secede unless the equal rights of all the States in the Territories should be conceded and incorporated into the platform of the Democratic Party. The concession was made, and they had no opportunity to secede.

They came to Charleston under the same leader, again instructed to secede unless the Convention would put into the platform a new plank, the effect of which, if adopted, would be further to disgust and alienate the Northern Democracy. In this instance the *sine qua non* was not complied with, and the Disunionists floated off on the rejected plank into an unknown sea, unfortunately carrying with them a large number of good and true Union men.

And what is this principle, the non-recognition of which has riven asunder the Democratic Party and apparently threatens the dissolution of the Union? It is that, it is the right and duty of Congress to legislate for the protection of slave property in the Territories.

Now, I take it upon me to say that a more latitudinarian and dangerous claim of power in Congress never was advanced by Federalists of the Hamilton school. Look at it in a constitutional and practical light: If Congress have the right to legislate for the protection of slave property in the Territories, they have a right to legislate for the protection of all other property; and if they have a right to legislate for the protection of property, they have a right to legislate for the protection of persons. The assumption that they can legislate for the protection of slave property leads, logically and inevitably, to the conclusion that they have power to legislate for the Territories in all cases whatsoever. If you can put your finger on the grant of this power in the Constitution, please put it also on its limitations, if any can be found. Upon this principle, Congress may acquire an empire outside of the organic States, over which it may exercise unlimited power, governing it as the Roman Senate did their conquered provinces. And this under a Constitution which jealously restricts the exclusive power of legislation by Congress to a few spots of land purchased, with the consent of the States, for specified objects, and grants no power of general legislation over a territory whatsoever.

To verify these positions we need only advert to the Constitution. Among the grants of power to Congress is the following, viz:

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district not exceeding ten miles square as may by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States; and to exercise like authority over all place purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings."

Mark the jealousy with which this power is restricted. For the protection of the Government even it is limited to a Territory not exceeding ten miles square, and it cannot be exercised over the "forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings," situated within the States, unless the land on which they may be located shall be first purchased with "the consent of the Legislatures" of those States. Is it conceivable that the wise men who restricted the exclusive power of legislation in Congress to a territory not exceeding ten miles square, did, by any indirection, grant that power broadly enough to cover the whole continent outside of their organized States,

should it be annexed by purchase or conquest?

The following provision is the only one in the Constitution which has been chiefly, if not exclusively relied upon to sustain the position that Congress has any power whatsoever to legislate over the territories, viz:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States."

The word "Territory" used in this provision obviously means land and nothing else. The United States, at the time when the Constitution was adopted, owned an immense amount of land north of the Ohio River, and these lands Congress was authorized to "dispose of." That the word "Territory" means property is conclusively shown by its connection with the words "and other property." "Territory and other property." The territory spoken of, therefore, is property in lands.

"Rules and regulations" are a grade of legislation somewhat below the dignity of laws; but admitting them in this case to have the same effect, on what are they to operate? Simply on the property of the United States, not on any other property, nor on persons, except so far as they may be connected with the public property. To this extent, and no further, is the power of Congress to legislate over a Territory granted to Congress, and whenever all the lands and property are disposed of, the "rules and regulations" become obsolete, and the power of legislation granted in this clause, is thenceforth in abeyance.

Moreover, this grant of power extends as well to property within a State as within a territory. In a State the general power of legislation is in the State Legislature; yet the power of Congress to make "rules and regulations" respecting the public property, is the same in a State as in a Territory. The scope of the grant can, of course, be no greater in a Territory than in a State, and it necessarily follows that this clause of the Constitution confers on Congress no general power of legislation, either within States or Territories.

It is not a satisfactory reply to this argument to say that such a power has, to some extent been exercised. Is it better to acquiesce in and extend the usurpation than to put a stop to it, as in the case of the United States Bank, by bringing the Government back to the constitutional test? Which is safest for the South, the constitutional principle that Congress shall not legislate for the Territories at all, or the adoption of a principle unknown to the Constitution, which, in its general application, would not only defeat the object it is advanced to promote, but would enable the Free States majority to surround the Slaveholding States and encircle the Union with an empire outside the organized States, over which that majority should exercise the power of unlimited and exclusive legislation? If such an idea be chimerical, the apprehension is not chimerical that the Black Republicans, should they acquire the control of all branches of the Government, will use the claim now set up for Congressional legislation over one species of property in the territories, as an apology for assuming the power of general legislation, involving the power to destroy as well as to protect.

The Constitution of the United States was not made for Territories but for States, as its name implies. It has, by strict rules of construction, nothing to do with the Territories outside of the States united, beyond the protection and disposition of the common property therein. It seems to contemplate that the Territories shall be left to themselves until they have a population adequate to the formation of a respectable community, when their independence should be acknowledged and their admission into the Union granted on the sole condition that they adopt a Republican Government.

But if there be a doubt as to the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories, is it not safer, and far more consistent with Democratic principles to deny the power than to assume it? Some of the original States when admitted into the Union, had not the population of a third-rate city of the present day, and no harm would be likely to arise by leaving the Territories to themselves until they double the population of Delaware or Rhode Island in 1789. But would it not be incomparably better to admit them into the Union as States, with a much less population than to leave them to be a bone of contention among demagogues and disunionists, disturbing every essential interest of the country and jeopardizing the union of the existing States?

Let us briefly consider the practical workings of the remedy for Southern wrongs, which you suggest, in case a Black Republican is elected to the Presidency. You ask, "is it wise, if we do not intend to submit to such consequences, to allow a Black Republican President to be inaugurated," &c., and you say, "if the South should think upon this subject as I do, no Black Republican President should ever execute any law within her borders unless at the point of the bayonet and over the dead bodies of her slain sons."

I know there are men in the South who would sacrifice their lives and endanger the communities in which they live, upon a point of honor, and that such men often fire up with unwonted fierceness if reminded of the probable consequences of their own rashness. But the time is come when consequences should be looked in the face, not for purposes of defiance, but that we may consider whether the policy which would lead to them is required by Southern interests or honor.

He would be inaugurated here or elsewhere in spite of you. Well, suppose you then attempt to secede from the Union and resist the execution of the laws? Every lawyer in the South knows that every citizen of every State is as much bound by the laws of the United States constitutionally enacted as by the laws of his own State, and that it is as impossible for the State to relieve its citizens from allegiance to the United States as it is for the latter to relieve them from allegiance to their own State. And it is the sworn duty of the President to take care that the laws of the U. States shall be faithfully executed upon every citizen of every State, and as long as we have a faithful President, they will be executed if the Courts, the Marshals, the Army and the Navy remain faithful to their respective trusts.

I know that much has been said in the South about reserved rights of nullification, secession, and not coercing a sovereign State, &c., when in fact the Conventions representing the people of the several States which adopted the Constitution, made no such reservations, but bound their constituents, one and all, to allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, as firmly as similar Conventions bound them to the State Constitutions. And although the General Government cannot technically, coerce a State, it can rightfully coerce all the citizens of a State into obedience to its constitutional laws. The pretended reserved rights of nullification and secession, therefore are in effect, nothing more nor less than an outspoken right of rebellion when wrong and oppression become intolerable. But when the crisis comes, there are two parties who must necessarily decide, each for itself, whether circumstances justify the act—the seceders and the Government of the United States. And do you conceive that the mere election of a President entertaining obnoxious opinions, or even entertaining hostile designs against the institutions of the South, checked, as he must necessarily be, by a Senate and Judiciary, if not a House of Representatives, without any overt act, can justify any portion of the South even to their own consciences in an act of rebellion?

There is one notable feature in the attitude of the South. The cry of disunion comes—not from those who suffer most from Northern outrage, but from those who suffer least. It comes from South Carolina, and Georgia, and Alabama and Mississippi; whose slave property is rendered comparatively secure by the intervention of other Slaveholding States between them and the Free States, and not from Delaware, and Maryland, and Virginia, and Kentucky, and Tennessee, and Missouri, which lose a hundred slaves by Abolition thieves where the first named States lose one. Why are not the States that suffer most loudest in their cry for disunion? It is because their position enables them to see more distinctly than you do at a distance, the fatal and instant effects of such a step. As imperfect as the protection which the Constitution and laws give to their property undoubtedly is, it is better than none. They do not think it wise to place themselves in a position to have the John Browns of the North let loose upon them with no other restraints than the laws of war between independent nations construed by reckless fanatics. They prefer to fight the Abolitionists, if fight they must, within the Union, where their adversaries are somewhat restrained by constitutional and legal obligations.

No, Sir; Delaware, Maryland and Virginia do not intend to become the theatre of desolating wars between the North and South; Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri do not intend that these peaceful channels of commerce shall become rivers of blood to gratify the ambition of South Carolina and Alabama, who at a remote distance from present danger, cry out disunion.

I have said that the South has all along had a peaceful remedy and has it still. The Union sentiment is overwhelming in all the Middle and Western States, constituting two-thirds of the Republic. Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois are as little inclined to become frontier States as Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky. Had the present Administration cut loose from the disunionists, instead of virtually ministering to their designs, and planted itself firmly on Union ground, the secession at Charleston and Baltimore would never have occurred, and the "Constitutional Union Party" would have been an impossibility, the Democracy would have recovered its ascendancy in the North, and a united party, embracing two-thirds of the North and of the South, would now have been marching to certain victory next November. What ought to have been the preventive, must now be the remedy. Should Lincoln in November next secure a majority of the Electors, patriotic men, North and South, without waiting for his inauguration, irrespective of party lines, and throwing aside all minor considerations, must band together for the triple purpose of preventing any attempt to break up the Union, checking the Republican party while in the ascendant and expelling them from power at the next election. Let the toast of Gen. Jackson, "The Federal Union—It must be preserved," become the motto of the party, while strict construction of the Constitution and a jealous regard for the rights of the States shall be its distinguishing principle and unwavering practice. Let the constitutional principle be adopted of no legislation by Congress over the Territories, or throw aside altogether the mischievous issues in relation to them, of no practical utility, gotten up by demagogues and disunionists, as means of accomplishing their own selfish ends. Let them inflexibly refuse to support, for any Federal or State officers, any man who talks of disunion on the one hand or "irrepressible conflict between Freedom and Slavery" on the other. Throw aside all party leaders except such as "keep step to the music of the Union" and are prepared to battle for State rights under its banner.

Be this your "platform" let the South rally upon it as one man, and I would pledge all but my life, that at least one-half of the North

will join you in driving from power the reckless assailants of your rights and institutions.—But whether the united South come up to the rescue or not, I foresee that in the natural progress of events, the central States from the Atlantic to the far West, will band together on this ground, leaving the Abolitionists of New-England and the Disunionists of the South to the harmless pastime of belching fire and fury at each other at a safe distance, protected by the patriotism and good sense of nine-tenths of their countrymen, against the evils they would bring on themselves.

Can you doubt the success of such a reunion? Not an advocate of disunion under any probable circumstances can be found among the candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency.

The supporters of Bell to a man, the supporters of Douglas to a man, and more than three-fourths of the supporters of Breckinridge, are staunch friends of the Union, and staunch adversaries to Northern interference with Southern institutions. When, convinced of the folly and madness of their warfare on each other as they will be after the election if not before, they band together in a common cause, and that cause, the preservation of our glorious Union and its invaluable Constitution, with their attendant blessings, will they not be irresistible?

How much more hopeful and cheering is a prospect like this than the contemplation of standing armies, grinding taxes, ruined agriculture, prostrate commerce, bloody battles, ravaged countries and sacked cities. This Continent like the Eastern world, is destined to have its "Northern hive." Shall its swarms be repressed by the strong hand of the States united, or are they, by a dissolution of the Union, to be let loose upon the South, like the Goths and Vandals upon Southern Europe? True, their blood might, in that event, fertilize your desolated fields, but your institutions like those of the Roman Empire, would sink to rise no more. These are the thoughts of an old man whose only political aspirations are, that when he dies he may leave his country united, happy and free. With sincere regard,

AMOS KENDALL.

DEMOCRACY IN 1856.

It is well to turn back and see how southern men understood the Cincinnati Platform in 1856. The following testimonials are but few among the thousands uttered by them:

"The right to prohibit slavery in any Territory belongs exclusively to the people thereof.—Jackson (Tennessee) Resolutions Reported by C. F. Jackson, March 20, 1849.

"That the power under the Federal Constitution to regulate slavery in the Territories, exists in the SOVEREIGN PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIES.—Resolue of the General Assembly of Missouri, Session of 1846.

The people of a Territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves, whether slavery shall, or shall not exist within their limits.

JAMES BUCHANAN.

I am connected with no party that has for its object the extension of slavery, nor with any to prevent the people of a State or Territory from deciding the question of its existence or non-existence with them for themselves.

JNO. C. BRECKINRIDGE.

The majority of the people, by the action of the Territorial Legislature, will decide the question, and all must abide the decision, when made.

HOWELL COBB.

The great and leading feature of the Kansas Nebraska bill was to transfer the slavery question and all other subjects to the Territorial Legislatures.

JAMES L. ORR, of S. C.

I am willing that the Territorial Legislature may act upon the subject when and how they may think proper.

ALEX. H. STEPHENS, of Ga.

The principle of self-government in the Territories enables us to banish from the halls of Congress another fertile source of discontent and excitement.

J. P. BENJAMIN, of La.

It is the right of the people to govern themselves, and they alone shall exercise it, as well within a territorial condition as in the position of a State.

Geo. W. JONES, of Tenn.

The people of the Territories are expressly authorized to legislate upon all subjects whatsoever, slavery included. They may either establish or abolish it, at their pleasure.

J. PETIT, of Ind.

I believe that under the provisions of this (Kansas) bill, and of the Utah and New Mexico bills, there will be a perfect carte blanche given to the Territorial Legislatures to legislate as they think proper.

A. P. BUTLER, of S. C.

Under the Kansas act, citizens from the slaveholding States may go into the Territory with their slave property; citizens of the free States may go there holding no such property; and when they get there and meet in common council, as a legislative body, they may determine whether the institution shall prevail.

J. M. MASON, of Va.

If the people of the Territories choose to exclude slavery, so far from considering it a wrong done to me or to my constituents, I shall not complain of it—IT IS THEIR BUSINESS.

Geo. E. BADGER, of N. C.

We intend that the actual settlers in the Territories shall be protected in the full exercise of all the rights of freemen, and shall legislate for themselves while they have a Territorial government.

R. TOOMBS, of Ga.

The bill (Kansas and Nebraska) provides that the legislatures of these Territories shall have

power to legislate over all rightful subjects:

R. H. HUNTER, of Ga.

Rather Tough.

Cuff was a gentleman's gentleman, down in old Virginia, and a darkey of most undoubted honesty and truth; but he would sometimes tell tough stories. He met "Kernel Johnsing's nigg," as he called him, the other day, and after cussing and discussing various matters appertaining to the masters, they fell into the following conversation:

SAM.—"Well, Cuff, how was you?"

CUFF.—"Oh, I isn't no wuss."

SAM.—"How is all de folks down at de house?"

CUFF.—"Oh dey is able to be around 'cept de ole man's darter; she had de doctor de other day. He came in, looked at her, an' says she was bilyus, and gav her a box of ingine, waightable pills. When de doctor go, she up an' trow de pills out de window. She wouldn't take no pills, no sah! Wal, de ole turkey cock cum an—greedy cuss—he gobbled down de pills, box an' all, wid de whole dreckstuns, in four different langwages. Next day we had kumpny, an' had to kill dat turkey cock, yer see. Brought him on de table biled wid oyster sass; massa flourish his knife, an' try to cut him up—couldn't git de knife into him.

"Cuff," says he, how long did yer bile dis-turkey?"

"Bile him an hour sah."

"Take him away and bile him anoder hour."

"So I took him away and biled him anoder hour."

SAM.—"Did de kumpny wait?"

CUFF.—"Oh, fyes de kumpny 'waited. I brought de turkey in, and massa flourish his big knife again, and try to cut him, but he couldn't do it, no sah!

"Take him away and bile him anoder hour!"

"So I took him down in de kitchen agin, a- noder time."

SAM.—"Did de kumpny wait?"

CUFF.—"Of course dey waited. I brought in de turkey agin and massa try to cut. But it was no go, massa git mad. He say, "take him and bile him a week."

SAM.—"Did de kumpny wait?"

CUFF.—"Oh, yes, de kumpny waited! Dey were bound to see de lun out you know. Wal, in a week I brought in dat turkey. Massa thought he got him dis time—see. But he couldn't cut a hole in him—de ole cock wasn't to be cut. Massa send for de doctor to hab de turkey examined. De doctor come, look at de turkey—look all over him. Says he— "It's no use—you can't bile dis turkey; for he has took a box of dem ingine waightable pills and dere is't any bil- in him!"

Hon. Eli Thayer.

Perhaps no Congressional district in the Union has lately excited more attention than that represented in the present Congress by Hon. Eli Thayer, of Massachusetts. His experience in Kansas having induced him to believe that Popular Sovereignty was a better and fairer plan for the adjustment of the slavery question in the Territories than Congressional intervention, he has ably and boldly sustained his opinions, and for this reason a resolute effort was made to prevent his re-nomination, which proved successful. In a recent letter, however, in reply to a request of five hundred Republicans to permit the use of his name as an independent candidate, after complaining of unfairness on the part of some of the party managers of his district, he says:

"With me, neither party ties nor party discipline have any authority or respectability, when they come in conflict with truth and justice. As I stood upon the floor of Congress in defence of my own convictions, and in defence of the authority of party, so I will do here and everywhere, now and always, a free man. I confide in a free people.

"I do, therefore, with my whole heart, accept the nomination, coming as it does from the sovereign power, and therefore of higher significance and authority than any nomination made by the servants of a party organization. This is a nomination of the very highest authority, and is wholly congenial to my political principles and ideas. If the people desire me to represent them longer in Congress they will prove it by their votes. Whatever be their decision, I shall be content with it as an expression of that popular sovereignty which I contend is the birthright of American citizens."

An animated contest may evidently be anticipated.

Women require more sleep than men, and farmers less than those engaged in any other occupation. Editors, reporters, printers and telegraph operators, require no sleep at all. Lawyers can sleep as much as they choose and keep out of mischief.

Picture of despair—a poor pig with its nose through a garden fence, almost touching a cabbage stalk.