J. J. BRUNER,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS

Single copy, $2.00
Five copies, $8.00
Ten copies, $15.00

Clubs exceeding ten, in the same proportion $1.50 each. Payment always in advance.

BLANKS

The following Court and miscellaneous BLANKS are kept on hand for sale, at this office. Can be sent by mail to any part of the country, at usual expense.

Civil Warrants,
Claim & Bonds,
Writs, C. & S. Court,
Executions, C. & S. C.
Subpoenas, C. & S. C.
Witness Tickets, C. & S. C.
Jurors' Tickets,
Prosecution Bonds, C. & S. C.
Bail Bonds, civil cases
Bail Bonds, crim. "
Attachment Writs,
Delivery Bonds,
Administration, &c.
Bastardy, "
Appeal, "
Gen. Intake Dupe. C. & S. C.
Apprentice Indentures,
Letters Testamentary,
Letters of Administration,
Sheriff's Deeds &c.
Marriage Licenses,
Do. Certificates,
Various Equity Blanks,
Do. Indictments,
Trust Bonds,
Deeds in Trust,
Sheriff Deeds,
Equity do.
Notes of Hand,
Notes to Bank,
Blacksmith

And many other forms of less frequent use.

Orders executed on short notice.

From the Raleigh Register.

SPEECH OF
STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS,
IN RALEIGH.

We publish below a verbatim report of the speech delivered in this city on Thursday last by the Hon. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. This report was taken down by the Private Secretary of Judge Douglas, an excellent phonographist, word for word as it was uttered by Judge D., and furnished to us for publication at our request. The audience was very large, a number of ladies being present, and much enthusiasm prevailed. The positions assumed by the speaker seemed to meet the hearty approbation of his auditors.

DR. FOX, on introducing JUDGE DOUGLAS said:

Fellow-citizens of North Carolina, I have the pleasure and the honor of introducing to you—the great embodiment of Democratic principles, the nominee of the Democratic National Convention, of Baltimore, for President of the United States of America, the friend of the South, the Constitution and the Union, Hon. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. (Three cheers for DOUGLAS.)

MR. DOUGLAS said:

Mr. President, I am conscious that you have in the enthusiasm produced by the circumstances with which you are surrounded to-day, done me more than justice in your presentation to this audience.—I thank you, sir, sincerely for the kind terms in which you have been pleased to speak of me. It is a matter of pride and pleasure to be presented to the people of the Old North State, by a representative from Mecklenburg. (Cheers.) History will always preserve the fact that in North Carolina the first Declaration of Independence was proclaimed to the world, and that Mecklenburg has the honor of being the county where that glorious deed was done. Carolinians have a right to be proud of that great event in her history, but while you pride yourselves upon it, you must remember, that the sacred obligation rest upon you and your children to maintain inviolate the principles which that Declaration was intended to perpetuate. What was the grievance of which North Carolina complained, when she proclaimed to the world her separation from the British crown? What the grievance of which all the colonies complained, and what were the objects they intended to accomplish by the Declaration? Independence was not their motive. They did not desire separation from England. On the contrary, the first Continental Congress that assembled, and each successive one, until the declaration was put forth, adopted an address to the crown, and to the people, and to the Parliament of England, affirming their devotion to the British people, their devotion to the British Constitution and their loyalty to the Crown of England. They did not desire separation from the Mother country. They demanded a redress of grievances under the British Constitution and while they remained a part of the British empire. What were those grievances? You will find them in the bill of rights, put forth by the first Continental Congress, which assembled in 1774. In that bill of rights, the colonies proclaimed to the world their desire to remain a part of the British empire; they acknowledged the right of Great Britain in Parliament to make all laws which affected the general welfare of the empire, without interfering with the local and internal concerns of the colonies; they acknowledged the right of the British government to regulate foreign affairs, to make war and peace, to regulate commerce and do those things which affected the general welfare of the empire of Britain; but they declared in that bill of rights that the colonies possessed the sole and exclusive power of legislation in their colonial legislatures over their domestic polity. That was the point upon which they were prepared to sacrifice life if necessary—the right of self-government in each colony so far as it affected their local and domestic concerns. Great Britain refused to recognize that right, and before our fathers would surrender it, they determined that they would resort to force and even carry force to the point of a separation from, and an entire Independence of, Great Britain. It is important to bear this fact in mind, in order to determine precisely the principles upon which our system of government is founded. The British Parliament denied the right of the American colonies to regulate their internal affairs, because they said that those colonies possessed no other right than those which the Prince of England had granted to them in their charters. Washington, and Jefferson, and Hancock, and the heroes of that day, told the King that they did not get their right from the Crown, and they denied the power of the King or Parliament to take those rights away. The colonists claimed that the right of local self government was inherent in the people, derived from the Ruler of the Universe, the only power and jurisdiction of Kings and Parliaments. Upon this point the Revolution turned—This right of local self government as being inherent in the people was affirmed by the American Revolution. The Constitution under which we live was made for the purpose of confirming and perpetuating the liberties achieved by the American Revolution. The question now arises whether we will maintain at this day those principles for which our fathers fought and which were secured to us by the sacrifices of the revolution.

The Abolition party of the North some years ago, attempted to violate this great principle of self government in the territories of the United States, by the application of the Wilmot proviso. They introduced into Congress a law for the purpose of prohibiting slavery everywhere in the territories of the United States, whether the people wanted it or not. The whole South, with a large portion of the Northern Democracy, resisted the Wilmot proviso as a violation of the right of self government, at the same time that it was usurpation of power by the federal government. In the discussion which took place, we who opposed the Wilmot proviso appealed to the Revolutionary struggle as furnishing the grounds upon which we ought to resist the interference by Congress with the domestic affairs of the people of the territories. We reminded the people then, that the first serious point of controversy which ever arose between the American colonies and the British government, was upon the slavery question. For more than seventy years previous to the Declaration of Independence, the colony of Virginia asserted her right to control the question of slavery through her colonial Legislature. During the early portion of that period the Virginians passed laws to encourage the introduction of slaves and to protect slavery in the colony; but after a while they found the number of slaves increasing in a greater ratio than the white people, and being surrounded by large bands of hostile Indians, they became alarmed, lest the savage Africans, just introduced, should unite with the savage Indians surrounding the settlements, and exterminate the whites. In order to prevent a calamity so fearful, the colony of Virginia passed laws adverse to the introduction of slaves into that colony. The British merchants then engaged in the African slave-trade appealed to the King to annul the legislation of those few adventurers in the colony of Virginia. They set forth that they had a right as British subjects to move from England, and carry with them their slaves as well as their other property, and hold them in the colonies, without reference to the legislation of the Colonial Legislatures. The King in council, sustained that claim, annulled the local legislation of Virginia, and instructed its Governor not to allow any more laws to be passed in the colony adverse to the slave trade; but as late as 1772, Virginia, by four years before the Declaration of Independence, the Legislature of Virginia adopted a memorial to his Majesty, telling him that unless he granted to the colony of Virginia the right to control this question according to the interest of their own people, he would lose his dominions in America.—Thus we find that the controversy on the slavery question in the territories began seventy years before the revolutionary war, reached down to the beginning of the war itself, and led into the very contest which produced the final separation. Each of the other colonies passed laws and regulating the question of slavery. You did it in North Carolina. Some of your laws protected it, some encouraged it, and others discouraged it, just as you believed, or rather your ancestors, that the interests of this colony required at the time. So it was with each of the New England colonies. Some protected it, some invited it, others excluded it altogether, and others regulated it with a tendency rather against its encouragement; but the principle involved in that whole contest was the exclusive right of the people of each colony in their Colonial Legislatures to regulate all their domestic affairs to suit themselves, without the interference of the British government. I presume that no person present will controvert the correctness of this historical proposition.

I have resisted the Wilmot proviso from the time of its first introduction into Congress down to this day upon the grounds that it violated the principle upon which our fathers fought the Revolutionary war. (Cheers.) If British subjects in the colonies before the Revolutionary war, were entitled to the inherent right of self government over their domestic affairs, I cannot see why the same right should not be guaranteed to the people of our territories since the revolution. (Applause.) I have never yet claimed for the people of the American territories any other right or higher right, than our fathers maintained at the point of the bayonet for the colonies prior to the revolution. (Applause.) If an American citizen of North Carolina, moving to a territory of the United States, is not entitled to as many rights of self-government there as a British subject before the revolution, let me ask what did you gain by the sacrifices of that revolution? (Voices, "good" and applause.) Why are the people of the territories, (ha, they are not capable of self-government? You do not doubt that your citizens of North Carolina are entirely competent to make laws for your own government. You do not doubt but what the right of self-government is an inherent right in North Carolina. If it be an inherent right in this State, let me ask you, when you emigrate to Kansas, at what point of time do you forfeit that right? Do you lose all the sense, all the intelligence, all the virtue you had upon the way, who while emigrating in a territory of the United States? No man doubts your capability while you stay at home to decide for yourselves what kind of laws you will have in respect to negroes, as well as to white men. Are you any less capable after you have left your native land, and gone to a territory? Is there anything in the character of the men who emigrate from their native valleys to the plains and prairies of the North-West, that renders them less fit for self government than those who remain where they were born? Those of us who, in early life, left the Old States, who penetrated into the wilderness, secured our own houses, made our own farms, erected school houses, and churches, made our own fences and split our own rails, (laughter,) think that we know what kind of laws and institutions will suit our interests quite as well as you who never saw that country. (Voices—"Right," and applause.) We have quite as much interest in the laws under which we are to live as you have, who never expect to go to that country, and there love, have no concern about our laws. These are the opinions of a North-Western man, a man who has spent his whole life upon the frontier. You cannot convince us that we are not as good as our brothers who remain in the Old States. I know there is something in the human mind that leads every one to suppose that his own birth place is the very centre of civilization, and that there is nothing good beyond the range of his infant vision. When I was a child, I thought that the mountains which surrounded the valley in which I was born were the confines of civilization. my vision was bounded by them, and I hardly reached their boundary there was nothing but border ruffians and outside barbarians. When, however, I crossed them and got into the next valley, I found there were just as good people there as I had left behind me, and so with the next and every step I took, from the sun towards the setting sun, and I loosened and shook off unjust prejudice. Ignorance has fitted around other people prejudices similar to those I then had. We in the North-West have much more respect for you than you have for us. We love you better than you do us. We love the union better than you do, in consequence of the circumstances which surround us. You go into one of our new settlements—in Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, or any of them—and there you will find that a North Carolinian has settled down by the side of a Connecticut farmer, with a Virginian next to him, a New Yorker, a South Carolinian, and representatives from every State around him, the whole union being represented on a prairie by the farmers who have settled on it. In the course of time the young people of this society begin to visit, and in a little while the North Carolina boy sees a Yankee girl he likes, and his prejudices against her people begin to soften. (Laughter.) In a few years the Carolinian and the Connecticut people are united, the Virginian and the Pennsylvanian, the Yankee and the slaveholder are united by ties of marriage, and blood, and friendship, and social intercourse; and when their children grow up, the child of the same parents has a grand father in North Carolina, and another in Vermont; and that child does not like to hear either of those States abused. That child has a reverence for the graves of his grand-father and grand-mother in the good Old North State, and he has the same reverence for the graves of his grand-father and grand-mother in the valleys of Vermont; and he will never consent that this Union shall be dissolved so that he will be compelled to obtain a passport and get it viséed to enter a foreign land to visit the graves of his ancestors.

You cannot sever this Union unless you cut the heart strings that bind father to son, daughter to mother, and brother to sister in all our new States and Territories. (Cheers.) Besides the ties of blood and affection that bind us to each of the States, we have commercial interests and pecuniary interests that we are not willing to surrender. Do you think that a citizen of Illinois will ever consent to pay duties at the custom house when he ships his corn down the Mississippi to supply the people below? Never on earth!

We shall say to the Custom-house gate keepers of the Mississippi river that we furnish the water that makes that great river, and we will follow it throughout its whole course to the Ocean, no matter who or what may stand before us. (Cries of "that's good.") So with the East—we are bound to the people of the East by the same ties of blood and kindred, and you can not sever the Union without blasting every hope and prospect that a Western man has on this earth. Then, having so deep a stake in the Union, we are determined to maintain it, and we know but one mode by which it can be maintained; that is to enforce rigidly and in good faith every clause, every line, every syllable, of the Constitution as our fathers made it and bequeathed it to us. (Cheers.) We do not stop to enquire whether you in Raleigh or the Abolitionists up in Maine like every provision of that Constitution or not. It is enough for us that our fathers made it. Every man that holds office under the Government, is sworn to protect it. Our children are brought up and educated under it, and they are early impressed with the injunction that they shall at all times yield a ready obedience to it. I am in favor of executing in good faith every clause and provision of the Constitution—(loud cheers)—and of protecting every right under it, (cheers) and then hanging every man who takes up arms against it. (Continued cheering.) Yes, my friends, I would hang every man higher than Haman who would dare attempt to resist by force the execution of any provision of the Constitution which our fathers made and bequeathed to us. (Loud cheers and voices—"that is Southern enough for us"—"Yes, sir, that it is." A gentleman behind me says that that sentiment is Southern enough for him and for you.—I do not go for the Constitution because it is Southern or Northern, not because it is Eastern or because it is Western, but I go for it because my allegiance to the Constitution, my oath and my duty, my love for my children and my hope of salvation in the future, makes it my sacred and bounden duty to vote for it and maintain it. (Loud cheers and hurrah for Douglas.) I claim no rights for my State that I will not concede to you and defend for you and for the whole South. (Cheers.) I will accept no privileges for Illinois that I will not permit to North Carolina, and I claim no right in the territories for my citizens or for my property that I will not guarantee for every other State in the Union. I believe in the absolute and unconditional equality of all the States of the Confederacy. (Applause.) But I claim that I have the right to go to the territories and to carry my property with me and hold it there, and to have it protected on the same terms that you have in the slaveholding States. ("Good.") But upon what terms, I ask, can I carry my property into the territories? I carry it there subject to the local law. If I am a dealer in cattle, in horses, in sheep, in stock of any kind, I carry my property subject to the local law. If I am a dealer in dry goods, I go to the territories subject to the local law. If I find the local tax heavily on peddlers than on the regular merchants, I must either pay the tax or quit peddling. ("Good, that's right.") If I am a dealer in groceries and liquors, I must carry my liquors there subject to the local law, and I had better enquire what that local law is before I start and if, on enquiry, I ascertain that the Maine Liquor Law is in force there, I think I had better carry my liquor somewhere else, and seek a better market for it. (Good.) The Northern man goes into the territories with his property subject to the local laws of the territories as the people may have made those laws through their local legislatures.—Are you not willing to go upon the same terms? (Cries of "yes, we were always willing—we never asked more.") Do you claim more than is granted to us? (No, no.) You may go there also and carry your slaves with you subject to the local laws in the same way that I can carry my goods. Equality of rights is the principle, and obedience to the local law is the only condition upon which any man can go into the territories of the United States with safety. I know that there are politicians who are in the habit of telling you that Congress will not grant you protection for your slave property in the territories, and Congress will not. When did Congress ever pass a law to protect any particular class of property in the territories? Congress never yet passed a criminal code for an organized territory on the American continent. Murder is a crime in the territories, not under any act of Congress, but under the territorial law. Horse stealing is a crime, not by an act of Congress, but by the territorial law. And so with every crime against the person or property of a citizen, no matter where. You are told that this is Squatter Sovereignty. Just such Squatter Sovereignty as was established in North Carolina by the men who put forth the Declaration of Independence, and drove the agents of George III from the continent.

It is the simple right of every people to make their own laws, and establish their own constitutions according to their own interests, without interference from any person outside their own borders—that is all it is. Is not that a sound principle? Why there are two classes of politicians who tell you that it is very unsound. Who are they? First the Northern Abolitionist and Black Republican think it very unsound. They assert that it is the duty of Congress to prohibit slavery wherever the people want it. That is the doctrine of the Abolitionists. They are in favoring of Congress prohibiting it wherever it is necessary, and they say that wherever it is not necessary the people do not want it, and that there the people will exclude it themselves. Hence it is only necessary to say they are for Congress to prohibit and exclude slavery wherever the people do want it. There is another class of politicians who are in favor of Congress interfering in favor of slavery wherever necessary. They are not for intervention, however, except when necessary. When do they hold intervention necessary? Why it is clear that it is unnecessary to protect slavery where the people are in favor of it, for in that case they will pass laws to protect it themselves. For instance, New Mexico was in favor of slavery, and hence the people, two years ago, passed a law in their local legislature establishing a very efficient slave code, protecting slavery in the territory. Hence, it is not necessary, in the estimation of Southern fire-eaters to protect it there, for the people want it and will protect it themselves. It is only necessary, they say, for Congress to interfere and protect slavery wherever the people do not want it, and therefore will not protect it themselves. Thus you find that in this country there are two parties in favor of federal intervention. The Black Republicans of the North and the Secessionists and Disunionists of the South agree in respect to the power and duty of Congress to control the slavery question in the territories. They agree that Congress may control it and that the people of a territory ought not to be permitted to do so. Agreeing that far, they differ on this point, as to what way Congress ought to control it. While the Northern fanatics say that Congress must control the question as against the South, the Southern Secessionists say it must be controlled as against the North. Each party appeals to the passions, the prejudices, the ambition of his own section, against the peace and harmony of the whole country. Now, suppose you acquiesced in the demand of this Southern Secessionist party and allowed them to rally the whole people of all the Southern States under a Southern intervention banner, and suppose we Democrats of the North should be craven-spirited enough to yield to the demand of a dominant majority in our own section, and join in the cry of Northern intervention against slavery, and then rally every Northern man under that banner. Then you have two sections of this Union separated, with a broad line between them, every Southern man on one side, and every Northern man on the other, both abusing each other. Now, what is your Union worth after that is accomplished? Remember that the Union cannot survive the affections of the people, upon whom it rests. Whenever you have alienated the Northern and Southern men, whenever you have separated them so far that they cannot belong to the same political party and the same church, and cannot commune in the House of God at the same communion table, your Union is very nearly dissolved. This sectionalism has reached this point. It has reached the House of God, and separated the members of the same church. That good old church within which I was born and reared, the old church in which my father and mother, my grandfather and my grandmother, and my ancestors for many generations were in the habit of communing, separated into a church North and South, and when we travel from one side of the line to the other, we are not permitted to go to the communion table. And what has produced this estrangement? It is the agitation of the slavery question in the halls of Congress. What good has been accomplished for any body by the agitation? what benefit has been conferred on the white man? what benefit has been conferred on the black man by this agitation? It has alienated friend from friend; you have rallied section against section by it; you have spread mischief, and dissension, and heart-burnings, without any redeeming or counterpoising advantage. What is the remedy for this state of things? I answer, the remedy is to banish the slavery question from the halls of Congress, commit it to the people of the territories and of the States. Let the people make just such laws as they choose, so that they do not violate the Constitution of the country. If they should pass a law in violation of the Constitution, the Supreme Court is the only tribunal on earth that can ascertain and decide that fact. (Applause.) If you go to a territory, and when you get there you do not like their laws, and you think that a particular statute is unconstitutional, all you have to do is, so to make out a case under the law as to have the question tried in the territorial courts, appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, and there get your case decided, and if the court decide that the law is unconstitutional, there is an end of it—it cannot be enforced. On the contrary, if a be decided that the statute complained of is constitutional, it must stand till the people of the territories get tired of it, and have sense enough to change it. If the people of the territories make bad laws, let them suffer under them till they get wise enough to make good ones. If they make good laws, let them enjoy all the advantages of those good laws. Let us act upon this principle, and there can be peace between the North and the South. I affirm to you that the Democratic party is pledged by its home, its organization, its platform and its principles, to this doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the territories. (Applause.) What man will be bold enough to deny the fact that every Democrat in America up to the present year, was pledged to the doctrine of non-intervention? Read the platform of the party that nominated Cass in 1848, Pierce in 1852, and Buchanan in 1856. There you find the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the territories of the United States. Is not this so? What then has produced this sudden change? Non-intervention was a good doctrine four years ago—intervention is necessary now. Four years ago there was no intervention with the slavery question in America, except among the Black Republicans of the North. I appeal to you, my fellow citizens of North Carolina, without distinction of party, to tell me whether every Democratic speaker in the State did not tell you that your rights, your honor, your equality as the Union, depended upon maintaining the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with the question of slavery, as affirmed in the Democratic platform? Now they tell you that this doctrine, which they taught you to believe, and making you believe, to carry the State by a large majority for Buchanan, they now tell you that this doctrine, taught and preached four years ago, is a little better than Black Republicanism. I stand to-day where I stood when these Secessionists eulogized me as the best friend the South ever had. ("That's so.") I defy them to show where I have changed a hair's breadth, and when I have heretofore defied them face to face to show it, the only answer they could make was that I was too consistent and would not change. (Laughter and applause.) No, I would not change merely because presidents and caucus, backed by extensive patronage, said that I must. (Applause and cries of "good"—"that's right.") It is as much my right and duty to think and judge for myself as it is for the President to do it for himself. ("Right.") I do not recognize the right of the executive department to interfere with the action or speech of any member of the Senate or member of the House of Representatives. (Applause.) So long as the President chooses to confine himself to the performance of his duties in obedience to the Constitution, I will sustain him to the utmost in his right to free and independent action. But whenever the Executive is permitted to say to a senator or a representative of a sovereign State, abandon your convictions, betray your constituents, do as I say, or I will remove you from office, and behind every friend you have in office throughout the country; whenever it is permitted to do that with impunity, then the Republic is but a sham and a mockery. (Applause.) There is no freedom, there can be no liberty, when the representative of the people is not responsible to his constituents instead of to executive power. (A voice, "It is despotism.") Yes the worst of all despotisms is when the Executive can say to a man, violate your conscience, betray your constituents, and follow me, or I will remove from office every friend you have got, and defeat you at home through executive patronage. I speak with some feeling on this subject. (Applause.) I have had some experience. I have been under the necessity in my lifetime of fighting Abolitionists and Black Republicans, aided and supported by a Democratic administration with all its power and patronage. For three years every federal office-holder in Illinois has been required to oppose the Democratic and support the Black Republican ticket, as a condition to holding his office, and even yet in the Northern States, and from one end of the land to the other, every office-holder is removed, unless he works against the regular organization of the Democratic party. You are told now that there is danger of Mr. Lincoln being elected President, and that his election would be such a calamity that it would become your duty to dissolve the Union rather than submit to his domination. What hope of an election has Mr. Lincoln? None on earth, except through the assistance rendered by the Seceders at Baltimore. (Cheers and cries of "good.") After I was nominated there according to the usages of the party, by two-thirds of all the votes cast, there being present two-thirds of the electoral college not objecting, these men bolted and got up a new convention. Now let me ask you, is there a man in America who doubts that I would have beaten Lincoln, if the Breckinridge men had acquiesced in my nomination? (Applause.) Nobody doubts that Lincoln could never have carried but two States in the Union, Vermont and Massachusetts, but for that secession. What was their object in bolting? Was it not to beat me? (Voices "yes".) If it was did they not know that the only way to do it was to divide the Democratic party in the Northern States and allow Lincoln to carry each one of those States by a minority vote? The secession took place for the purpose of defeating me and by the division in the party electing Lincoln. There was not a man of them engaged in the scheme who did not expect that his act was to elect Lincoln. There could be no other expectation, no other motive, no other hope, and I have never seen a man yet who would risk his reputation by defying that Lincoln would have been beaten but for this division and that the danger of his election grows out of it. Then how do they justify their course? Why they say it is better to have Lincoln elected than Douglas. Why? Why, they do not like Douglas. They do not like his platform. Why do they not like the platform? Because I stand now on the very platform on which they stood four years ago. And what confidence can you have in the integrity, in the truthfulness, in the honor of a man who will abuse the Charleston platform now, after he supported it four years ago? Were they cheating you then? Were they deceiving you at that time to get your votes? If they were, how much confidence should you place in them now? (Cheers.) If they were honest then, it does not become them to abuse those of us who do not change quite as rapidly as they have done. (Great applause.) I stand now where I then stood; I stand where I stood when I brought forward the bill to repeal the Missouri restriction and organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. They cannot and do not pretend that I have changed. But they have started a story. I have since I got down here that I went home and explained the Nebraska bill in a different way from what I had South, and said that it was the best abolition bill ever got up to prohibit slavery everywhere. I have tried to find out where I ever made such a speech, but those who made the charge do not name the place. I now say that no honest man will ever make such a charge. (Cheers.) It is an invention of the enemy, and has been circulated by the mean author who knew it to be false or had no reason for believing it to be true. (Applause.) I will tell you what explanation I have made in every Northern State of my manner for passing the Nebraska bill and repealing the Missouri Compromise. I have sustained that act by the argument that if slavery was right South, it was right North; if it was right to leave the people to do as they pleased South of the Missouri Compromise line, it was right North of the line. My object was to allow the people to do just as they pleased both sides of 36 deg. 30 m. I assert that if the people of a Territory want slavery they have a right to it; if they do not want it, no power on earth should force it on them. I go further and say that whether the people will want it or not, depends solely upon the climate, the soil, the productions and the self-interest of the people where it exists. In a hot climate where the white man cannot work in the open air, where Rice, the Cotton plant and the Sugar cane flourish, there, you must have negro slaves to work them or you must abandon the country to the crocodile. In a cold climate where you have almost perpetual snow and where the negro could not produce by his labor half as much as would feed and clothe him and furnish him wood to take his fire-side at night, you cannot force slavery to exist, because it will not pay for itself. Slavery, therefore, does not depend on the law. It is governed by climate, soil and production, by political economy, and you might as well attempt to pass laws by Congress compelling Cotton to grow on the summit of the Rocky mountains, or rice to flourish on the granite hills of New Hampshire, (Laughter and applause,) as slavery to exist where it cannot possibly exist. (Applause.) I tell you that wherever climate renders slavery necessary, there it will go, and furthermore, the people of a territory will be the first to introduce it and pass all laws for its protection; but wherever the climate renders it unprofitable and no money can be made out of it, there you cannot force it to go, I care not how many laws you have, or how many armies to enforce their laws. Hence I said in my Freeport speech that no matter how the Court might decide the abstract act, that practically slavery will not go where the people do not want it, for it would not be practicable. That is what I said, and that has been tortured into a declaration that I would not obey the decisions of the Supreme Court of the U. States. I like to be charitable, but I have not sufficient charity to believe that he, let him be who he may, who has represented me as saying I would not obey the Dred Scott decision, or any other decision of the Supreme Court, did not know that he was perverting and misrepresenting my whole life. (Cries of "good" and applause.)

I have made more speeches than any living man in defence of the Dred Scott decision as pronounced by the Court, and I am as ready as any man to enforce the decrees of the Court and to put the bullet around the neck of all men who wish to resist the constituted authorities of the land. (Great applause. A voice, "Hurra for Douglas.") I do not desire to be misunderstood on these questions. I am being hunted down by a body of men who four years ago endorsed me, every man of them knowing that I held the same opinions then that I do now. There is not a living man with more intelligence enough to turn away from home alone who does not know that I have held these sentiments for years. (Cries of "good," laughter and applause.) I have come down here now to meet you face to face and utter these opinions just as I expressed them in the Northern States; and in order to prevent them from misrepresenting me any more, I have invited a friend of mine to take down every word and syllable as it falls from my lips and without any revision or my seeing it, to hand it over to your papers here, if they will publish it, in order that the people North and South may see whether I do not explain my doctrines in the South precisely as I have explained them in the North.

A Voice. We have no organ here but you.

Mr. Douglas. It is stated that my friends have no organ here, but one.

I do not care how often I may make speeches in the Senate correcting the misrepresentations, they are never published here. Why? Certain gentlemen have made charges to the contrary, and it would convict them if it acquitted me. I hold no opinions on these public questions that I wish to conceal anywhere, for I hold that so long as I live under a constitution which is common to all the States of the Union, any political creed is radically wrong which cannot be avowed alike in all the States of this Union.

Why cannot you of the South and the North live in peace together under the constitution as our fathers made it? The only reason is that there is an attempt to create uniformity through action of the Federal Government in the local and domestic institutions of the States. Mr. Abraham Lincoln, now the Black Republican candidate for the President, when some two years ago a candidate for the United States Senate against me, announced his opening speech with this proposition: I will try to give his precise language, or as near as I can from recollection, and I believe I have quoted the passage a thousand times. He said, "that a house divided against itself cannot stand; this government divided into free and slave States cannot permanently endure, that either slavery must be extended to all the States or it must be placed in the course of ultimate extinction in all the States; they must become all free or all slave."

Now, that was his proposition. I replied to that speech the moment I got home. I took bold issue with him, and made the canvass of Illinois on that proposition and one other. The other was, he assailed the Supreme Court decision, in the Dred Scott case, and I defended it. These were two issues, upon which we fought that battle. Mr. Seward made his celebrated Rochester speech four months afterwards, in which he put forth the doctrine of the irrepressible conflict, borrowing it from Lincoln, who was the author and enunciator of that principle, that the Union cannot exist, divided into free and slave States, but must become all free, or all slave. The Black Republican party is based on the theory of making them all free States; the Secession party, is based on the theory that the Territories and consequently the States must all be slave, whether the people want them so or not. I hold to the doctrine that uniformity in the domestic institutions of the different States is neither possible or desirable. Slavery may be good in one place and bad in another. It may be necessary in one State, and unnecessary in another. And so with every other domestic institution. Our fathers knew when they made this government that in a country as broad as this, with such a variety of soil, of climate, and of productions, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of interests requiring separate and different laws in each locality.—They knew that the laws which would suit the granite hills of New Hampshire would be unsuited to the free and tobacco plantation of the Carolinas. They knew that the regulations necessary in a mining district like California, would be unsuited to the wheat and corn fields of Illinois. Hence they provided that each State should retain its own sovereignty, with a Legislature of its own, in order that each might have just such laws as it chose. This right, therefore, of each State to have laws different from every other one, lies at the very foundation of our system of government. Uniformity, regardless of the wants and condition of the people, is the worst despotism you can inflict upon any people.

Well, the Abolitionists of the North and the Secessionists of the South, admit that this doctrine of the right of each State to regulate and decide for itself, is a good doctrine in the States, but will not do in the Territories. They admit that in the States you have an inherent right to govern yourselves, but you lose it when you go to the territories. Why not allow a Territory to do it as well as a State? Why, they tell you that a Territory is not a sovereign power, and therefore cannot do it; that none but sovereign powers have a right to exercise the privileges of self-government. Our fathers of the revolution did not think so. The revolutionary struggle began in defence of the right of dependent colonies, dependent territories, dependent provinces, to exercise the right of self-government as well as sovereign States. None but the Tories of the revolution ever contended before that the right of self-government was to be restricted to sovereign States. George the Third and Lord North, his Minister, and his Tory friends on this continent, all denied the right of the people of these colonies to regulate their own affairs. They all said that the people of the colonies had rights except those the King granted them in their charter. The same old doctrine. Our fathers of the Revolution told the Tories that they did not get their rights from the King, but they got them from God Almighty. (A voice, "a better source." And the people of the Territories will be likely to tell you that they do not get their rights from Congress, they get them from a purer source. (Laughter and applause.) From what I have said you will see that unless I am right in maintaining this principle of self-government for the people of the territories, our fathers of the revolution must have been wrong in that struggle.—There is no one argument used by the secessionists against "squatter sovereignty," as they term it, that they have not copied from the texts of the revolutionists on almost its identical language. (Voices, "good," and applause.) But of course these gentlemen are very clamorous in denouncing this doctrine of non-intervention by Congress. I wish these gentlemen would tell me how they can justify their course in joining with the Black Republicans in passing laws by Congress compelling Cotton to grow on the summit of the Rocky mountains, or rice to flourish on the granite hills of New Hampshire, (Laughter and applause,) as slavery to exist where it cannot possibly exist. (Applause.) I tell you that wherever climate renders slavery necessary, there it will go, and furthermore, the people of a territory will be the first to introduce it and pass all laws for its protection; but wherever the climate renders it unprofitable and no money can be made out of it, there you cannot force it to go, I care not how many laws you have, or how many armies to enforce their laws. Hence I said in my Freeport speech that no matter how the Court might decide the abstract act, that practically slavery will not go where the people do not want it, for it would not be practicable. That is what I said, and that has been tortured into a declaration that I would not obey the decisions of the Supreme Court of the U. States. I like to be charitable, but I have not sufficient charity to believe that he, let him be who he may, who has represented me as saying I would not obey the Dred Scott decision, or any other decision of the Supreme Court, did not know that he was perverting and misrepresenting my whole life. (Cries of "good" and applause.)

I have made more speeches than any living man in defence of the Dred Scott decision as pronounced by the Court, and I am as ready as any man to enforce the decrees of the Court and to put the bullet around the neck of all men who wish to resist the constituted authorities of the land. (Great applause. A voice, "Hurra for Douglas.") I do not desire to be misunderstood on these questions. I am being hunted down by a body of men who four years ago endorsed me, every man of them knowing that I held the same opinions then that I do now. There is not a living man with more intelligence enough to turn away from home alone who does not know that I have held these sentiments for years. (Cries of "good," laughter and applause.) I have come down here now to meet you face to face and utter these opinions just as I expressed them in the Northern States; and in order to prevent them from misrepresenting me any more, I have invited a friend of mine to take down every word and syllable as it falls from my lips and without any revision or my seeing it, to hand it over to your papers here, if they will publish it, in order that the people North and South may see whether I do not explain my doctrines in the South precisely as I have explained them in the North.

A Voice. We have no organ here but you.

Mr. Douglas. It is stated that my friends have no organ here, but one.

I do not care how often I may make speeches in the Senate correcting the misrepresentations, they are never published here. Why? Certain gentlemen have made charges to the contrary, and it would convict them if it acquitted me. I hold no opinions on these public questions that I wish to conceal anywhere, for I hold that so long as I live under a constitution which is common to all the States of the Union, any political creed is radically wrong which cannot be avowed alike in all the States of this Union.

Why cannot you of the South and the North live in peace together under the constitution as our fathers made it? The only reason is that there is an attempt to create uniformity through action of the Federal Government in the local and domestic institutions of the States. Mr. Abraham Lincoln, now the Black Republican candidate for the President, when some two years ago a candidate for the United States Senate against me, announced his opening speech with this proposition: I will try to give his precise language, or as near as I can from recollection, and I believe I have quoted the passage a thousand times. He said, "that a house divided against itself cannot stand; this government divided into free and slave States cannot permanently endure, that either slavery must be extended to all the States or it must be placed in the course of ultimate extinction in all the States; they must become all free or all slave."

Now, that was his proposition. I replied to that speech the moment I got home. I took bold issue with him, and made the canvass of Illinois, on that proposition and one other. The other was, he assailed the Supreme Court decision, in the Dred Scott case, and I defended it. These were two issues, upon which we fought that battle. Mr. Seward made his celebrated Rochester speech four months afterwards, in which he put forth the doctrine of the irrepressible conflict, borrowing it from Lincoln, who was the author and enunciator of that principle, that the Union cannot exist, divided into free and slave States, but must become all free, or all slave. The Black Republican party is based on the theory of making them all free States; the Secession party, is based on the theory that the Territories and consequently the States must all be slave, whether the people want them so or not. I hold to the doctrine that uniformity in the domestic institutions of the different States is neither possible or desirable. Slavery may be good in one place and bad in another. It may be necessary in one State, and unnecessary in another. And so with every other domestic institution. Our fathers knew when they made this government that in a country as broad as this, with such a variety of soil, of climate, and of productions, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of interests requiring separate and different laws in each locality.—They knew that the laws which would suit the granite hills of New Hampshire would be unsuited to the free and tobacco plantation of the Carolinas. They know that the regulations necessary in a mining district like California, would be unsuited to the wheat and corn fields of Illinois. Hence they provided that each State should retain its own sovereignty, with a Legislature of its own, in order that each might have just such laws as it chose. This right, therefore, of each State to have laws different from every other one, lies at the very foundation of our system of government. Uniformity, regardless of the wants and condition of the people, is the worst despotism you can inflict upon any people.

Well, the Abolitionists of the North and the Secessionists of the South, admit that this doctrine of the right of each State to regulate and decide for itself, is a good doctrine in the States, but will not do in the Territories. They admit that in the States you have an inherent right to govern yourselves, but you lose it when you go to the territories. Why not allow a Territory to do it as well as a State? Why, they tell you that a Territory is not a sovereign power, and therefore cannot do it; that none but sovereign powers have a right to exercise the privileges of self-government. Our fathers of the revolution did not think so. The revolutionary struggle began in defence of the right of dependent colonies, dependent territories, dependent provinces, to exercise the right of self-government as well as sovereign States. None but the Tories of the revolution ever contended before that the right of self-government was to be restricted to sovereign States. George the Third and Lord North, his Minister, and his Tory friends on this continent, all denied the right of the people of these colonies to regulate their own affairs. They all said that the people of the colonies had rights except those the King granted them in their charter. The same old doctrine. Our fathers of the Revolution told the Tories that they did not get their rights from the King, but they got them from God Almighty. (A voice, "a better source." And the people of the Territories will be likely to tell you that they do not get their rights from Congress, they get them from a purer source. (Laughter and applause.) From what I have said you will see that unless I am right in maintaining this principle of self-government for the people of the territories, our fathers of the revolution must have been wrong in that struggle.—There is no one argument used by the secessionists against "squatter sovereignty," as they term it, that they have not copied from the texts of the revolutionists on almost its identical language. (Voices, "good," and applause.) But of course these gentlemen are very clamorous in denouncing this doctrine of non-intervention by Congress. I wish these gentlemen would tell me how they can justify their course in joining with the Black Republicans in passing laws by Congress compelling Cotton to grow on the summit of the Rocky mountains, or rice to flourish on the granite hills of New Hampshire, (Laughter and applause,) as slavery to exist where it cannot possibly exist. (Applause.) I tell you that wherever climate renders slavery necessary, there it will go, and furthermore, the people of a territory will be the first to introduce it and pass all laws for its protection; but wherever the climate renders it unprofitable and no money can be made out of it, there you cannot force it to go, I care not how many laws you have, or how many armies to enforce their laws. Hence I said in my Freeport speech that no matter how the Court might decide the abstract act, that practically slavery will not go where the people do not want it, for it would not be practicable