

TERMS OF THE GLOBE. Per annum in advance \$1 50 Six months 75 Three months 50 A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

Political. SPEECH OF HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, Democratic Candidate for President, Delivered at the Great Barbecue held in Jones' Woods, on Wednesday, 12th inst., in the presence of over 50,000 People.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF NEW YORK: I appear before you to-day, for the purpose of making an earnest appeal on behalf of this glorious Union. [Loud cheers, and cries of "Good boy."] There can be no Disunionists—there can be no enemy of this Union in the Empire City of America. [A voice—"That's so," and loud applause.] New York is not Northern, nor is it Southern, nor is it Western, nor is it Eastern—but she is Continental and Metropolitan. [Loud cheers.] New York is the great commercial centre, the great monetary heart, of the American continent; and as such, every New Yorker ought to sympathize with every State with every Nation, and with every people in the whole Union. [Applause.] Now, I ask your attention as to the mode in which this glorious Union is to be maintained and perpetuated forever to our posterity. There is but one mode, fellow-citizens, in which this can be done.

There is but one mode in which this glorious country can be permanently preserved. That mode is by maintaining inviolate every provision of the Constitution, as our fathers made it. The Union, under the Constitution, and in conformity with its guarantees is the greatest blessing ever transmitted to a free people. [Vehement cheers.] I care not whether you like or dislike all its provisions, yet every American and foreign-born citizen rests under hereditary obligations to fulfill its provisions. Every naturalized and adopted citizen has taken an oath of fidelity to the Constitution; and he who is not willing to carry out, in good faith, every clause, every word, every letter of the Constitution; is a traitor in his heart to his country. [Bravo, and tremendous applause.] I tell the Abolitionists that they are bound, as honest men, to carry into effect that clause of the Constitution providing for the surrender of fugitive slaves, just as much as any and every other clause. [Cheers, and "That's so."]

A gentleman in the crowd asked me about secession. I will answer him. I tell you that, when you have performed all your duties under the Constitution, when you have carried into effect every provision that the instrument contains, there is no excuse, no pretext whatever for secession. [Applause.]—But I am prepared to return a more definite and specific answer to the inquiry. When I landed at Norfolk, Virginia, the head of a Breckinridge electoral ticket, proposing to me the question whether the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States would be a justifiable cause for breaking up this Union. [Shouts of "Never," "never."] I answered him thus, as I have answered everywhere in America where I may go to address my fellow-citizens the election of any man by the American people according to the provisions of the Constitution, is no pretext for breaking up this Government.—[Loud cheers.]

I should regret the election of Lincoln, as a great national calamity. [Applause, and a voice, "So would I."] I know him well—very well. I have had good reasons to know him, and he has still better reasons to remember me. [Laughter and loud cheers.]

A voice—"Douglas you're not gone yet."—He will know you better by and by." [Applause.]

Mr. Douglas. I have no word of unkindness, or of personal disrespect to say to him, [Mr. Lincoln] but I do believe that he holds political opinions which, if carried out, would be subversive of all the principles of the American Constitution. [Loud cheers.] I was also asked at Norfolk, Va., and other places, whether, in the event that any of the Southern States should secede from this Union when Lincoln was elected, I would go for the enforcement of the laws of the United States. I tell you, as I told them, that whoever may be President, he is bound by his oath to carry out the laws to their faithful execution. I also tell you that it is the duty of every law-abiding man, I care not what may be his politics, to aid and assist in the execution of the law. [Loud cheers.]

And if Lincoln shall be elected, which God forbid [loud cheers, and cries of "He never will be"] if Lincoln, should be elected, he must be inaugurated, according to the Constitution and laws of his country; and I, as his firmest and most strenuous and most irreconcilable opponent, will sustain him in the exercise of every constitutional function. [Applause.] But if, after that shall have been done, he shall attempt to subvert the Constitution, violate its provisions, or make war upon the rights and interests of any section of this Confederacy, I will aid, to the full extent of my power, according to the Constitution and laws, in hanging him higher than Virginia hanged John Brown. [Tremendous cheers.]

I had supposed that there were no loyal citizens—no friends of this country—who could find fault with these sentiments; but I discover in the newspapers of to-day a protest against my Norfolk speech, signed by Mr. Keitt, of South Carolina, and some forty or fifty other disunionists, declaring that these sentiments must be repelled and resisted, and calling upon the American people to repudiate me in order to repudiate those sentiments. I mean no disrespect to the gentlemen who have signed this protest, but I have as much reason to protest against their treason as they have against my loyalty and devotion to the Constitution. [Loud cheers.] They assert in their protest that I treat the Union as a perpetual bond, to be acquiesced in and obeyed in all future time by the weaker section towards the stronger. They misapprehend totally my position.—My position is this; that this Union is a perpetual bond, demanding and requiring inviolate obedience to the Constitution and laws by every good citizen not by the weaker section towards the stronger but obedience from every honest man to the Government under which he was born, and which he has sworn to support. [Loud cheers.] But they assert in this protest that they have a right to secede from this Government. I tell you, as General Jackson told the Nullifiers in 1832, that secession is but another name for revolution.

WILLIAM LEWIS, HUNTINGDON, PA., SEPTEMBER 26, 1860. VOL. XVI. NO. 14.

The Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS, HUNTINGDON, PA., SEPTEMBER 26, 1860. VOL. XVI. NO. 14.

placit obedience to the Constitution and laws by every good citizen not by the weaker section towards the stronger but obedience from every honest man to the Government under which he was born, and which he has sworn to support. [Loud cheers.] But they assert in this protest that they have a right to secede from this Government. I tell you, as General Jackson told the Nullifiers in 1832, that secession is but another name for revolution.

If these gentlemen combine together to break up this Government, and are determined to carry their reasonable projects into effect, let them take upon themselves the responsibility of their conduct. I tell you that revolution is never justifiable until the evils of submitting to the laws are greater than the horrors of civil war and disunion. These Disunionists, who protest against my Norfolk speech, who have such a horror of the galleys in the event they carry out their purposes, talk in their protest about making war on the sovereign States. I desire them to understand that sovereign States never commit treason. [Cries of "Good," "Good," and cheers.] Individuals may do—but States, never. It is a principle in this Government, that the laws have to be enforced against the individuals who violate them. Why those nullifiers and Disunionists seem to think that we are still living under the old articles of Confederation. That old system was abandoned in 1787, merely because it proved impracticable. The great defect in the old system of government was that the Federal Government had no power to execute its own laws. They abolished that Government, and adopted the Constitution under which we live, conferring on the Federal Government all the power necessary to carry its own decrees into effect according to the Constitution.

Whenever any one of these Abolition States set up their unconstitutional laws as an excuse for resisting the Federal authorities, we will hang them higher than Haman for treason.—And, my fellow-citizens, it will not do for the Abolitionists to set up the plea that we are making war on the sovereignty of any State of this Union; merely because we are carrying into execution in good faith, the Constitution and laws of our country. So on the other hand, when the State of South Carolina, in 1832, attempted to resist the laws of the United States for the collection of the public revenue, Old Hickory told them that they must and they should obey. [Tremendous applause.] I wish to God we had Old Hickory now alive.—[loud cheers]—in order that he might hang Northern and Southern traitors on the same gallows.

[A scene of great confusion here followed. Hundreds of Democratic voices shrieked for three cheers for Stephen A. Douglas, our next President.] They have determined to make the election of a Black Republican President that pretext and hence the real Disunionists favor the election of Lincoln, so that they may accomplish the disunion of the Union. If Lincoln is elected it will be brought about by the agency of those who are now opposing the regular Democratic party. [Cheers.] In other words, his election will be brought about by the influence of those who seceded at Charleston, and again at Baltimore.

Now, my fellow-citizens, I was about saying to you that there is a scheme to break up this glorious Union. A voice.—They can't do it. The pretext for doing so is to be the election of Mr. Lincoln, and those who are genuine disunionists desire his election. [Uproar and cheers.] But silence, my friends, if you please. I do not charge all the Breckinridge men in the United States with being Disunionists. [Cries of "Good," "Good."]

I do not charge Mr. Breckinridge himself with being a Disunionist, but I do express my firm conviction that there is not a Disunionist in America who is not a Breckinridge man. [Applause.] And now, permit me to inquire of them, that while they put these questions to me, whether the election of Lincoln would be a bad cause, of disunion, why do not they propound the same questions to their candidate? My answers to these interrogatories at Norfolk, Va., were published in Kentucky, and Mr. Breckinridge's special attention must fall to them six or eight days before his Lexington speech. In that speech he answered the charge that he was in favor of pardoning John Brown. [Tremendous cheers and laughter.] He answered the charge that he was in favor of self-government in the Territories. He professed great attachment to the Constitution and the Union. But I have yet been unable to learn whether or not he would enforce the laws against those who would attempt to break up the Government.

It is not satisfactory to me that a man says he is in favor of the Union. I have heard Barnwell Rheht make the same declaration. I have heard W.L. Yancey declare his devotion to the Union. I have heard all the leaders of the Disunion party make the same protestation, but they all admit that while they are favorable to the Union, yet there is a "contingency" upon which they would dissolve. Now, I desire to know of Major Breckinridge whether the "contingency" stated by his electoral friends in Virginia in their inquiries to me, is the one upon which he would dissolve the Union.

I am in favor of a cordial union of every Union man, every constitutional man, every man who desires the preservation of the Union and the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws in every and all contingencies.—[Loud cheers.] If Major Breckinridge is in favor of enforcing the laws against Disunionists, seceders, Abolitionists, and all other classes of men, in the event the election does not result to suit him, then I am willing—[great applause]—but I tell you that I am utterly opposed to any union or any fusion with any man or any party who will not enforce the laws, maintain the Constitution, and preserve the Union in all contingencies. Now, if my excitable friend wishes to know whether his man Breckinridge is inside of the church, he must get an answer from that gentleman himself through the Norfolk questioners. [Renewed laughter.] When he answers, and pledges himself to enforce the laws

in the contingencies named in the Norfolk interrogatories to me, it will be time enough to talk about it and I fusing or coalescing. [Three cheers.] Believing that this Union is in danger, I will make any personal sacrifice to preserve it. [Cries of "Good," and three cheers.] If the withdrawal of my name would tend to defeat Mr. Lincoln I would this moment withdraw it [Voices—"You shall not do it!" "No!" "Never!"] more especially if such an act of mine would insure the election of a man pledged to the Constitution, the Union, and the enforcement of the laws. [Cheers.]

The Democratic party is a great political party. Its proud achievements will be found recorded on every page of American history, and every great reform introduced into our civil policy has been mainly owing to its power and efforts. Every extension of our territory has been a Democratic measure, and all those great commercial enterprises for which the U. States have become renowned are Democratic triumphs. But still adhere to the old Democratic party within whose ranks I was born, more for its capacity to do good in the future than for its great achievements in the past.

I believe that this Union can only be maintained by putting down all sectional parties. It is not enough if you put down Northern Abolitionism, unless you crush out and bury in the same grave Southern Disunion. ["Good" and cheers.] The great political question now involved is that of intervention and non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the Territories. The Northern interventionists demand that Congress shall prohibit slavery wherever the people want it; the Southern Secessionists demand that Congress shall pass laws to maintain and protect slavery wherever the people do not want it. Thus you find that both of them are advocates of Congressional intervention—the one in favor of the South, the other in favor of the North; the one for slavery, the other against it. They agree in principle, but they differ only in the application of that principle.

Democratic principles are the same in Georgia as in New York, they are the same in Virginia as in Illinois, [applause,] and whenever the time comes that I cannot visit the land of my birth and the graves of my ancestors, and carry my political principles with me, I shall come to the conclusion that there is something wrong in my creed. [Cries of "good boy," and cheers.] I see it stated in one of the newspapers of this city, on the authority of an intelligent correspondent, that a few weeks ago Mr. Lincoln told them that he was anxious to visit the grave of his father in Kentucky, and the grave of his grandfather in the valley of Virginia, there to explain his political opinions, but was fearful of personal violence if he did so. [Cheers.] I have very recently visited the grave of my father in a free State, and the birthplace of my children in a slave State, and in both places I avowed the same opinions. [Cheers, "Good boy," and I have done more. I have made a good sound Democratic speech in the Old Tenth Legion of Virginia, close by the grave of Abraham Lincoln's grandfather. [Cheers.] Enthusiastic individual. I hope you will make it over his own grave yet. [Immense applause.]

Mr. Douglas. My friend, there would be no more patriotic duty on earth more grateful to my feelings than to make one over Mr. Lincoln's political grave. [Tremendous cheering.] I do not make the remark out of any unkindness to Mr. Lincoln, but I believe that the good of his country requires it. [A voice—"He is dead, and he is buried."] I have recently visited the grave of my father in a free State, and the birthplace of my children in a slave State, and in both places I avowed the same opinions. [Cheers, "Good boy," and I have done more. I have made a good sound Democratic speech in the Old Tenth Legion of Virginia, close by the grave of Abraham Lincoln's grandfather. [Cheers.] Enthusiastic individual. I hope you will make it over his own grave yet. [Immense applause.]

Mr. Douglas. My friend, there would be no more patriotic duty on earth more grateful to my feelings than to make one over Mr. Lincoln's political grave. [Tremendous cheering.] I do not make the remark out of any unkindness to Mr. Lincoln, but I believe that the good of his country requires it. [A voice—"He is dead, and he is buried."] I have recently visited the grave of my father in a free State, and the birthplace of my children in a slave State, and in both places I avowed the same opinions. [Cheers, "Good boy," and I have done more. I have made a good sound Democratic speech in the Old Tenth Legion of Virginia, close by the grave of Abraham Lincoln's grandfather. [Cheers.] Enthusiastic individual. I hope you will make it over his own grave yet. [Immense applause.]

Mr. Douglas has retired amid nine cheers, but returned to the front of the stand immediately, with Governor Moorehead, of Kentucky.

Mr. Douglas at Auburn and Syracuse.

SYRACUSE, Sept. 17.—Mr. Douglas spoke at Auburn, and in this city to-day. His audience at this point numbered from 35,000 to 50,000 persons. He explained the difference between popular sovereignty and squatter sovereignty. The latter was outside the Constitution, and in rebellion to the Federal Government, while the former is inside of the Constitution, and in obedience to the Federal authority. He also replied fully to a question put by a Republican, as to what were Jefferson's sentiments as to the ordinance of 1787, stating that Mr. Jefferson was minister to France when the ordinance was adopted in New York, and knew nothing of it till afterwards. He gave Mr. Jefferson's plan for the government of the Territories, as adopted in 1784, which was the fullest recognition of the right of the people to popular sovereignty ever made in the United States.

GREAT SPEECH OF HENRY D. FOSTER, At a Mass Meeting in Philadelphia, on Monday Evening Sept. 17th.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF PHILADELPHIA:—A few months ago I did not anticipate, and could not have anticipated, that I should have the pleasure, under these circumstances, of addressing so large a concourse of citizens. I did not then dream that I should be selected as the standard-bearer of the party to which I have all my life belonged—that I should be chosen their candidate for the Governorship of the great State of Pennsylvania. I never desired it. I was always willing to fight in the ranks with you, and the rest of my fellow-citizens of Pennsylvania as a private and not as a captain of soldiers. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, seventy-three years ago, on this very spot, by a little band of bold and patriotic men, a great work was performed—a work that has challenged the admiration of the civilized world. A system of government was then adopted by those patriotic men, representing the States of this Union, the equal of which the world has never seen, and you are here to-night to attest your fidelity to that organic law which they framed, and to say whether any ruthless arm shall tear it down, and expose us to all the horrors and the destructive results which might flow from it.—Gentlemen, you can maintain inviolate that Constitution which spreads itself all over this great country, and protects all men alike, in only one way, and that is, by inculcating the spirit of those who framed it. Keep that spirit alive. Never let it die out; for if you do, you will find your personal liberty, your security, your rights of property, and everything that you value, without safeguard and without protection.

What is the danger, then, that this state of things will bring about? and from whence does it come? There is now in this country, I am sorry to say, a great political organization, the tendency of whose principles, whatever its members may say, is to sow dissensions between the States, and to destroy our Union. They declare that they are opposed to the extension of slavery in the Territories. To prevent that extension is their avowed purpose; but let me tell you that there is lying behind and underneath that purpose something deeper and far more destructive—a principle that endangers the existence of the Union itself. They declare that their purpose extends no farther than to protect the Territories of the United States from the spread of slavery; but I tell you that that statement is delusive, and by it many of their own party are deceived.

Who is the great head of that party? Mr. Seward, of New York. He is its head, and soul, and life. He gives its laws; he shapes its destinies. And he has not yet disguised the fact that the purpose of this organization is to go far beyond what they now declare to be their object—to prevent the extension of slavery into the Territories. Mr. Seward, in his Rochester speech, has declared that there is an "irrepressible conflict" between the system of free labor and that of slave labor, and that the United States "must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a free-labor nation or entirely a slaveholding nation."—Gentlemen, do you believe that? [Voices—"No, no."] Again, speaking in the Senate in regard to the progress of the anti-slavery sentiment, Mr. Seward said, addressing the men of the South: "You may, indeed, get a start under or near the tropics, and seem safe for a time, but it will only be a short time. Even there you will find States only for free labor to maintain and occupy. The interest of the white race demands the ultimate emancipation of all men. Whether that consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with needful and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, or be hurried on by violence, is all that remains for you to decide."

It is not the meaning of all this that you must pass the limits of the Constitution of the United States; that you must go into the States where slavery exists and wipe it out, regardless of all the guarantees of that instrument, and of the rights which it secures to the States? Such is beyond doubt the real tendency of these doctrines, although such may not be the sentiments of all the members of the Republican party, because I believe that many honest members of that organization would give no countenance to such doctrines, if they conceived their real result.

What have been the fruits of this sectional agitation upon the subject of slavery? As the result of that agitation, we have seen an armed invasion of the State of Virginia, and innocent men have been shot in order that slaves might be made free. The Republican leaders may tell you that they do not intend any such results. Let me tell you that the leaders preaching the doctrines which they do, cannot control the results. The leaders could not control John Brown and his party when they made their assault upon the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, when they invaded the dwellings of Virginians, dragging them at midnight from their homes. [A voice—"Gov. Wise controlled them."]

There is but one way to secure the tranquility and safety of the States, and that is by maintaining the guarantees of the Constitution. This Union is not to be preserved by arms and navies; it can be preserved only by cultivating that spirit of fraternity under the inspiration of which our Constitution was framed. If that spirit be not cultivated—if you excite sectional prejudices, and alarm citizens of sister States for the safety of their property and their lives—the Union is practically dissolved, the heart of the Union is broken, and nothing but the bonds remain. Gentlemen, in this contest, you, the descendants of those patriotic men who have given to us the freest and the best Government in the world, are to determine whether this great legacy, which you have received from your ancestors as trustees for posterity, shall be handed down untarnished, as it was bequeathed to you. It is for you now to determine whether this great instrument under

which we have lived, and under which every man's rights have been secured, shall now be torn in tatters, and the Union broken up.—[Cries of No, no, and applause.] I tell you, gentlemen, that is now the issue which, disguise it as you please, is forced upon us.—Now let me say one word in regard to the slavery question. But I wish to speak of one of the planks in the platform of the Republican party—that in reference to the extension of slavery into the Territories. That party contends that Congress has the power to do, what? Not to legislate generally upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, but that they have the power and right to legislate upon one side of that question—that they ought to say to the Southern States, "although you are joint owners, with us, of these Territories, you shall not go there with your property." The Republicans demand that Congress shall prohibit the institution of slavery in all the Territories of this Union. Where does Congress derive any such authority from? What power to legislate upon Congress the Constitution, they can say, may go into a certain Territory, they can say it may go there. I say that Congress has no right to interfere with the matter all. [Cries of "good, good," and long-continued shouts of applause.] There is no such power in Congress, and I will tell you why. The Congress of the United States legislates upon all questions under express grants of power contained in the Constitution. Wherever there is no grant of power Congress does not possess the right to legislate at all. Now, I challenge any man of the Republican party to show me where, in all that instrument, Congress is authorized to say that Slavery shall not exist in the Territories. No such authority can be found.

But it is argued that a Government having the right to acquire territory, either by conquest or by purchase, the right to govern that territory is incident to the right to acquire it. I agree that in ordinary cases, this is the fact, but it is only so where the power acquiring a territory is supreme—where there is no limitation upon its powers—but when the Government of the United States acquires new territory it will not be contended that the Congress of the United States has an unlimited power of legislation over that territory—an unlimited sovereignty. It is by virtue of their sovereignty that they acquire the territory; but so far as concerns legislation in regard to the territory, they are restrained by the limitations of the Constitution upon their power. Now, I maintain that the clause of the Constitution which is claimed as a source of authority to Congress to legislate for the Territories does not confer this power in regard to slavery. Our opponents urge, as their authority, that clause of the Constitution which declares Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States.

I could, if I had time, exhibit to you the views of some of the ablest minds of our country, all concurring in the opinion that that clause of the Constitution treats the Territories as property, and does not give to Congress jurisdiction to govern the people inhabiting that Territory, and to control their private property. The words of that clause are "that Congress shall have power to dispose of it." Now, it cannot be maintained that they have the power to dispose of the people, as they may of the land. Congress may sell the land, may control it, may give it away, if you please, but they cannot the people or give them away. Upon this subject we have the highest authority in the country maintaining that the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories is not derived from that clause of the Constitution. Our opponents are compelled, then to fall back upon the idea of the sovereignty of the Government that organizes the Territories, and when they are driven there, they have no foundation for the position that Congress has the right to legislate upon this question in the Territories. I say, then, gentlemen, that this is a question not political, but judicial. The tribunals constituted by the Constitution must determine these questions; and I, in common with all law-abiding citizens, am willing to submit to the final arbitration of the tribunal appointed by the Constitution to interpret that instrument.

Now, gentlemen, if I have not detained you too long—[Voices—"Go ahead."]—I will advert to a question in which the people of Philadelphia, as a manufacturing and commercial people, feel great interest—a question on which they have the right to know the opinions of the candidates presented for their suffrages. In this very city, not more than ten days ago, the casting-vote of the Republican party made an assault upon me, declaring that I am a free-trade man; that the record of my life, public and private, exhibited the fact; that I am and always have been in favor of free trade and against protection to American industry. I refer to the speech made by Col. A. K. McClure, chairman of the Republican State Committee of this Commonwealth. Now, Mr. McClure is doubtless a gentleman of veracity, and this mis-statement I can attribute to nothing but profound ignorance of my history. Mr. McClure charges that, from the earliest period of my political life, I have been opposed to the doctrine of protection. He charges that I have voted for free-trade Governors, free-trade judges, and free-trade Presidents.

Gentlemen I had the honor of being in Congress in 1854. We then had a tariff satisfactory to the manufacturing interests of Pennsylvania. It was a highly protective tariff; it was just the sort of tariff demanded by the industrial interests of Pennsylvania. In 1844, whilst I was in Congress, a bill was introduced to repeal or modify the tariff of 1842. When this great question of protection to American industry thus came up in Congress, there sat beside me, in that body, no less a man than Hannibal Hamlin, who is now the Republican candidate for Vice President of the United States. Whilst I recorded my vote for the protective policy, Hannibal Hamlin recorded his vote against it! [Laughter and applause.]

Let me state another fact on this subject. At the period I mention (1844) that bill for the repeal of the tariff of 1842 did not pass. In 1846, the proposition was renewed, and then it was that the law was passed striking down almost entirely the protective policy, because it substituted *ad valorem* duties for specific duties. Let me tell you that the great question in regard to this matter of the tariff, is between specific duties and *ad valorem* duties. The moment you abandon the principle of specific duties, there is no protection. In 1846, when the bill came up repealing the tariff of 1842, and adopting a universal *ad valorem* principle, Mr. Hamlin and Mr. Willmot were still members of Congress. That bill was passed; and both those gentlemen voted for it, while I voted against it! [Laughter and applause.] Yet, I wonder whether Col. McClure and his friends will not support Mr. Hamlin for Vice President of the United States. I wonder, also, whether they will not vote for Mr. Lincoln, whose opinions on this question neither they nor anybody else know any thing about.

Col. McClure charges me with voting for free trade Governors; and, on that subject let me mention a single circumstance. At the period to which I have just alluded, one of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States was David Willmot, who, a few years since, was the Republican candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania. Mr. Willmot was the only member of Congress from Pennsylvania that voted against the protective policy! Yet that gentleman, when running for Governor of Pennsylvania, was voted for by Col. McClure and Col. Curtin, and all these zealous advocates of protection! [Laughter and applause.] They voted for a free-trade Governor, and now they ask you to vote against me because, as they allege, I am for free trade!

Let me state another fact on this subject. At the period I mention (1844) that bill for the repeal of the tariff of 1842 did not pass. In 1846, the proposition was renewed, and then it was that the law was passed striking down almost entirely the protective policy, because it substituted *ad valorem* duties for specific duties. Let me tell you that the great question in regard to this matter of the tariff, is between specific duties and *ad valorem* duties. The moment you abandon the principle of specific duties, there is no protection. In 1846, when the bill came up repealing the tariff of 1842, and adopting a universal *ad valorem* principle, Mr. Hamlin and Mr. Willmot were still members of Congress. That bill was passed; and both those gentlemen voted for it, while I voted against it! [Laughter and applause.] Yet, I wonder whether Col. McClure and his friends will not support Mr. Hamlin for Vice President of the United States. I wonder, also, whether they will not vote for Mr. Lincoln, whose opinions on this question neither they nor anybody else know any thing about.

There is no record of his public life that affords any knowledge of his views upon this question. [Applause.] Mr. Lincoln is held up as the friend of the protective policy, yet you cannot find a vote he ever gave, or a speech he ever made, wherein he favored the doctrine of protection at all. My record on this subject is that which was made years ago, when I no more dreamed of being a candidate for Governor than I dreamed of being made a cardinal. [Laughter.] You cannot find a word or vote of mine, during the whole period of my service in Congress, in which I did not advocate, with all the zeal and ability I possessed, the doctrine of protection to American industry against foreign competition. [Applause.] Let me, Hamlin, be a better tariff man than I am! [A voice, "Over the left!"]

Let us examine the position of Mr. Hamlin a little further. In 1855, a proposition was made in the Senate of the United States to remit for three years the payment of duties upon railroad iron in bond at the custom house. Our Senators, Messrs. Bigler and Brodhead boldly and fearlessly charged upon Southern men and New England manufacturers a combination between them to strike down the iron interests of Pennsylvania.—Mr. Hamlin, then a United States Senator, arose and inquired of Mr. Brodhead what he meant by that declaration, "for" said he, "I am a great deal of a free-trade man myself, and I intend to vote for this bill." And he did vote for it!

Let me give you another instance illustrating the insincerity of that party on this question of the tariff. Under the tariff of 1840, although our manufacturers languished, still they lived. The laborers received employment though their wages were not so remunerative as they ought to have been, because the profits of the manufacturers were greatly diminished. But in 1847 a bill was passed which still further reduced the duties of the tariff of 1840. How was that bill passed?—Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts, was then Speaker of the House, a Republican of the blackest dye. [Laughter and applause.] On the organization of the House he appointed a Republican Committee of Ways and Means.—That committee reported the bill of 1847—a bill more destructive to our industrial interests than any that ever passed the Congress of the United States—a bill that affords no protection at all to the manufacturing interests of Pennsylvania. How was that bill passed? There were fifty-six Republican votes cast in its favor, and it passed the House of Representatives. Going to the Senate, it was amended and sent back to the House.—The amendments were not concurred in, and the bill was sent to a committee of conference, whom Mr. Speaker Banks appointed on the part of the House. Did he appoint a single man who was in favor of the protective policy? No, not one. The members of that committee were Lewis D. Campbell of Ohio, Mr. Do Witt of Massachusetts, and Mr. Ritchie of Virginia—all of them Republicans, and the whole three known to be in favor of the passage of that bill. Into such hands it was sent. That committee, jointly with the Senate committee, reported that bill, and it was passed. It is now the law of the land, and while it remains the law, let me say, your manufacturing interests never will revive.—They cannot revive. More than that, William H. Seward, the captain of the Republican party was a member of that committee of conference, and signed the report.

Now, gentlemen, I wish you to understand my views upon this question. I said before that, there can be no tariff beneficial to our industrial interests, which does not proceed upon the principle of specific duties. The meaning of that is this: If a ton of foreign iron is imported, it pays us so many dollars and so many cents according to the specific principle, but according to the *ad valorem* principle, it pays so much per cent. upon the value of the article abroad, according to the foreign invoice. Under this specific principle the American manufacturer has exactly what he wants—steadiness in the market; steadiness in the duty—which he does not have under the *ad valorem* principle. You will observe that the act of 1857 proceeds entirely upon the *ad valorem* principle. The duty is levied upon the price of the foreign article abroad. When that price is high, the duty rises just at the moment when the American manufacturer does not need the increased duty, but when the price of the foreign article falls in the foreign market the duty goes down, just at the time when the American manufacturer needs a higher duty on the imported article; therefore, I say that there is no protection without specific duties.

Let me now say a few words in regard to this slavery agitation which so disturbs the country. This agitation, gentlemen, must be stopped or the Union must be dissolved.—They make an outcry about slavery in the Territories. Why gentlemen, there is no territory now belonging to the United States where slavery can exist. Talk as you may, there are laws higher than acts of Congress higher than the Constitution, that control and regulate this question. Wherever free labor can go with advantage, slave labor must retreat before it. But the Northern man cannot go into the rice swamps and cotton fields and sugar plantations of the Southern States; the white man cannot work there and live; consequently the cultivators of the soil must