Brenville Mon.
February 13, 1860

My Dear Sir,

Supposing that you would like to know how matters stand in relation to political matters & yourself. I take great pleasure in saying that at least two thirds of the people are for you. Your last speech on your resolution has done much for you. In this section of the State, the democrats here were highly gratified to learn that our much esteemed Senator, Green was the first to congratulate you after you had concluded your speech. I regret very much that our mutual friend Mr. Blair, was not elected Speaker of the House. A atory meeting was held here yesterday, I was not present but told that there was but little business present. They had a good time of it. I have been residing here for the last two years & I may go to the Charleston Convention there will be a Democratic meeting held here on the 4th of March for the purpose of appointing delegates to the State Convention to be held at Jefferson City on the ninth of April. I presume I will attend. The Convention. The Democrats here are more united this time than they have been for several years. Please let me hear from you. With, Ever, Henry
Math & Albert
Boonesboro
Feb 13, 1860

Misouri Politics
Nashua, N.H., Feb 13, 1860

Mr. L. C. Douglas

Dear Sir,

Some two weeks since I wrote you in regard to your coming here to address the Democracy previous to our annual election in March. I think that perhaps you did not receive it, I again take the liberty to write you. I wish you would please write me whether it will be convenient for you to spend a few days in this State between the 13th and March next. The Democrats of this city are quite anxious you should come if you will, but I have my doubts about my propriety of it - although I have no doubts at all but it would help us in our State election.
And in regard to the Presidential Election, you can judge better than myself —
A longing to hear from you.
I remain as always,

Yours,

[Signature]

[Address]
C. P. Brown
Nashv. A. B.
Feb. 12, 1860

Has before written
I more as if
Judge L. com
write A. R. Jones
I have in aid
of coming election
before I. March
next.

C. P. Brown
Feb. 17, 1860

Closes here will
present to J. A.
Lowell, Feb'y 13th, 1860.

To Hon. S.A. Douglas,
Dear Sir,

Nearly one year ago, I had the pleasure of congratulating you on your election to the United States Senate from that gallant State Illinois. The only State this side of the Rocky Mountains where the Democracy have control of both branches of the Legislature.

Now I congratulate you on the success that has been achieved in the different States in choosing so large a number of delegates to the Charleston Convention who have sustained you in the straight forward cause you have taken. The Democratic portion of the people consider it as one of the greatest triumphs of the age. Especially considered when it was known that you was a doomed man by a Democratic Administration the like never was known before in the history of the Democratic Party where the Administrative
Never has been used against any one of his members but what they have been crushed out within one year after the election that gave us it is gratifying to all true Democrats that the cause you have pursued you have lost the prestige of all the States of the Democracy I never knew such a high-handed course of provocation that has been carried on against every man that was known to sympathize with Stephen A. Douglas. That has been the cause of the leading men that were appointed in this State by President Buchanan. Men that always voted and acted for twenty five or thirty years with the Democratic party were denounced as abolitionists for no other reason than they sympathized with Stephen A. Douglas. But when our state Convention convened last fall it was then made evident that the delegates who were from the voice of the people not only sympathized with Stephen A. Douglas but believed the cause he had taken was right. As soon as it was announced by the head leader mentioned above the arm of the people of their fellow after the fact found the delegates of the people were about ready to chastise them. They then closed fraud and undertook to break up the Convention. But the day of retribution had come. The leader has been shown of his official power. There is much anxiety all through the New England States on the cause that the Charter Convention will pursue. It will require a great amount of wisdom and forethought on the part of the delegates to place the Democracy in the right attitude before the country. The closer of this vote to A. Lincoln of this city out of our most worthy member of the Democratic party one you can implicitly confide in. And in conclusion you have my best wishes and regards for your prosperity and happiness through life.

Yours Respectfully
Otho Ballard
Ohio Ballard 
Fowles — 
May 13, 1860.

Introducing 
S.B. Brewer, Esq.
May 12

Monday 13th July

Sen. Com. Room. For Relations.

Dear Sir,

I received from Mr. Cobb the Manuscript Memoir upon the policy of Confederating the Gulf States of Texas with the United States.

Should you have leisure to read it or hear it read, I will be glad to submit it to you.

As a distinct plan of settlement, and harmonious union, I should be gratified if you would give it your consideration.

Regd. yr. W. W. Burwell.
Mr. W. Barnette
Ch. Com. For. Relations
Senate,
Feb. 13, 1860.

Solicit opinion
of manuscript
accompanied
Monroe ILL Feb 13 1860

Hon. S. A. Douglas

Dear Sir:

The Assembly of this County (5th Cou[ty]) are now engaged in organizing Democratic Clubs in each Township (in McComb & Co.) and desire you send me bulk, for to distribute any documents Speeches etc. Which you may deem useful to the cause.

If you are in the neighborhood (and I know you are) I hope you ride over to the Chicago Convention and I feel authorized to say this Convention shall give at least 800 or 1000 Majority for the Democratic ticket without a "Terrible"

We intend to do all in our power in the election but will use all the means money & labor in our power. From this time you can rely on me. I wish you would send me your Speeches I need N. Paper reports which am not full.
I have four volumes of Speeches of Speaker of Senate & Rep. in Congress and
wish to make a fifth volume of the Speeches and for that purpose and for the
use I may make in the case for the War. I hope to be at Charleston on the 23rd
of your birth day and then declare the day you were born as good as elected President.

Yielding friend

James M. Campbell
Ja. M. Campbell
Macon
Feb'ly 13, 1860
Political
Hon. S. A. Douglass Esq. M.E.,

My Sir—If not too much trouble would you favor me with your autograph to place among many others of the distinguished men from my country.

Your compliance will be a great favor highly appreciated.

With much respect,

Thomas H.

Farming Bank

Troy—N.Y.
Utica, Feb. 13th, 1860

My dear Sir,

I learn from the newspapers that a caucus of Democratic Senators has been held for the purpose of allying the difficulties in their party by forming a platform for its adoption at Charleston. What modification of the Cincinnaute platform it is proposed to make I have not learned. It is to extend to resolve the doctrine of "Popular Sovereignty" and with the slavery question from the Indians, it will be an irreparable blunder, for were the Charleston Convention to adopt such a platform, a National Democratic party at the North would cease to exist. With me it has ever been a matter of indifference whether slavery did or did not exist in our territory, provided the people immediately interested were satisfied; but if it is proposed to force
Having any wish against their work, en and within the sanction of your highest Judicial Tribunal, acquire, cause on the part of National Democrat, of the North will be required and any attempt to coerce them into submission will tend to create an agitation, failure and in the entire edging of Black Republic common. When they wish to destroy, they first make mild” and do Southern Democracy really wish to annihilate the Democratic Party at the North? Do they desire to meet a platform on which it can not stand and combat with any hope of success? In 1848 the free soil movement in the State, under the lead of Horace Greeley, came very near also destroying the Southern Democracy. But for the firm resistance of the North, the avalanche of free soil men would have overwhelmed us all, and New York would have been not only almost but altogether a solution in its political character.

When you return last year to Illinois, you were asked the only comment to which a victory by Democrats is to be won there or nowhere in any Southern State. The Democratic Party of New York watched the contest with intense interest, and I shall state to you, not any, Dear Sir, because I personally care whether Southerner are allowed to take their slave, into our town and keep them there that I occupy the position I do on the subject, but that I know our Party will be abandoned by the masses if it take any other ground than the Cincinnati platform. It all North and South stood up for that in our last Presidential Campaign. Why make a new one? Will it give greater strength to our cause and more certainty to the
defeat of its opponent. Platform we
nor did and never will control the
action of a party. It is impossible
to make one to meet all exigencies,
and the most we can expect is that it
will furnish general landmarks by
which the people may guide. But what
do our Southern friends desire? The
first great object to accomplish is
to shut the black Republicans. That
done, the north will be conquered
by the Democracy, and the Constitu-
tional rights of the south will be
soon where it pleased. We have a com-
mon interest in the struggle that is be-
fore us. And, regarding all past
issues among ourselves, I trust we may
in a spirit of patriotic devotion to our
country deny all prejudice and animosities,
and rally in support of those who is
most certain to lead us to victory. Being
one of the alt. deleagtes at large it in my
valutio to be at Charleston andurtle
standing the apparent difficulties that
exist in a perfect agreement among
D'moral, I anticipate most con-

Fiderly, that wise and prudent com-
del will prevail there and govern
the action of the convention.

Very truly yours,

A. L. Daubry.

Nov. 1. A. Douglas
S. C. Klumly
Utica, N.Y.
Feb'y 13, 1860

The Senate Caucuses on platforms of
Democratic Party
Repealment
Westfield, Mass Feb 13 1860
H. S. A. Douglas
Dear Sir,
Please send me a few copies of your speech delivered in the Senate a few days since and such others as is convenient.
I ask this favour because I believe the great principles set forth in this and in your former speeches will stand the test of time and bind these Independent States in a bond that cannot be broken.

Yours truly,

J.M. Ely
This - Feb 13th 1860

Hon. Stephen A. Douglas
Washington DC

Dear Sir,

If you will send me further documents I have been forcibly distributed. I have written to my friend Col. J. H. Forney with a similar request.

Yours Truly,

W. H. Blitchcraft

29 1/2 6th St

Chi
H.C.

W. H. Stedman

Phil. Pa.

Feb 7th 1860

Dear for distribution.

[Handwritten numbers and notes]
St. Paul, Minn.
July 13, 1860.

Mr. A. M. Hridy, one of the delegates from this State to Charleston, has gone to Washington, if there now perhaps. He formerly was N. M. Rice, Man, but has been lately denounced at the same time, was formerly Ninebogen Indian agent, in some embarrassment. In my Secretary, Cumming & 103. Charged on entering from his agency, with being a defaulter to the amount of $50 thousand dollars, pay some unsettled accounts at Washington perhaps thinking this a good time to extricate himself, I will come to see you.

I need not tell you what to do. In professions for you have been very decided. Some of our friends have a suspicion of your fidelity under the above circumstances. Our friends would not think it necessary to say a word to you but for my former close & very intimate relations with Rice. If these on duty would help you, it accomplishes the design. If not, well thought it could do no harm.

Truly yours,
W. A. Gorman

Hon. A. H. Douglas
W. S. Senate
Washington, D.C.
W. A. Garman
St. Paul Min. Feb. 13, 1860
"Private"
Wm. Judge
R. of J. M. Fricley
Bloomville, Seneca Co.
Ohio Feb 13 1860

Dear S. A. Douglass

Your truly is mine although a stranger to you personally.
But you are not to me as I have been to hear you.
Address an audience of fellow Democrats in the Phineus "Ph". Dear Sir, I hope you will not think that I mean to letter you when I say that your course in political life meets the entire approbation of our democratic friends in this section, and I shall ever be so lucky to be nominated at Charleston.
There are a
number of Old Line Whips
of Conservation. Help them
that I stand committed to me
that will support your
stand and see the results on
coming out strong support
for your, which is cheering
indeed.

My dear Sir, Mr. New
are at a loss for one
in the 7th C. But as the
Hon. John C. I have not
heard of or noticed, does
not dare to send us any
one, therefore we are likely
to call on some of our C. E.
friends out of our O. P. to
send us one. My friend the
Hon. J. C. Peabody has been
here Sunday, Mr. O. R. But
there are some that I

Write to him for, that he
stated to me he had now
left, for instance the Report
of the Consideration of the
Pacific Rail Way.

If not too much please
send me the above Report
of a Round Table at Concord.

With, Respect and Regard,

I remain your O. T.

Samuel Gross

P.S. I have two Bros. in
different warm friends of your
Queen Co. Their names are
Henry Gross Jr.

Phil. W. Gross
Sam'l [illegible]
Bloomville
Ohio
Feb'y 13, 1860
[illegible]
Rumney, N.H. July 13th, 1860

Hon. Stephen A. Douglas,

Dear Sir,

I take the liberty to address you, with the expectation that you will remember me and the interview I had with you, in the Senate Chamber, and at your house the last of March 1858. While more than three fourths of the Democracy of N.H. honestly believe the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, as you explain it, I therefore believe you are right, still I am the only man in N.H. (we well know) who has took active side with you against the President and your opponents— I have refused in any way to mingle with that kind of democracy that denomine your views on the course you taken in all your acts— For this reason and its connection I have an anxious solicitude for you, and a perpetuation of the principles that keep me busy at work— I have declined all offers of preference, and also declined to address any political body for the year past.
But I have used all private means to secure the advancement of one principle and also to secure delegates to the Christian convention favorable to Mr. Seward. I gave my nomination for President with what was had and the plan to openly aware any other. Such delegates are chosen perhaps wholly, all though there may be few who are not satisfied only one year of any delegation being for you. I think that is the underground work. Gen. Pierce if so you may call it. I have always been a Political and Personal friend of Pierce, but I fear he is now in the field for President again. I will use his influence with our delegation toClaire with the effect, exactly what way, is not sure, whether to use his influence to prevent them from voting for you on the first ballot, so as to keep your plurality small, or to have them vote for you to keep from a nomination by a split, until he shall be brought forward. Pierce is no doubt hard after the nomination. This I do not like. For two reasons: one that we do not know how he will be on the two weeks of the party and the other is, to memorize him or any other Man. (but you) is a sure defeat; for if you are to be ignored a defeated at Charleston, it will look to all

Popular Sovereignty New like abandoning the principle, and all the free states will not be divested by the professions of any other man, will therefore vote against the further voice of instruction of slavery in the Territories, against the wishes of the people. There needs since ye spent some time in Vermont to see how it stands there I talked with various men among them, Peck & Edgington, once Democratic Members of the lower House of Congress and they feel as ye do. That you must be the candidate, or the people will be lost, and our party gone forever. I want to see finally of 27 who is Chairman of the Democratic National Committee but he was gone but I was told by those who knew that he would write to you at least. But here again ye see Pierce is a Judge, you see Pierce is a Judge and joined the party. Gen. Pierce was out of the way you could hold as long as the Committee lasted, at least 3/4 of all your Life. Your delegate—My Serene Rumble you 1/4 will be devoted to your nomination from now until you shall get it, 2/3 from then until your election. The President—The private you will be in confidence and if you will suggest any thing for me to de
it shall be faithfully done. In confidence

If I could see you. It would be easier talked over & matured them in writing — I don't wish you to look upon this as idle, immaterial. But from one who feels it & will work to do it.

Enquire of all the delegation in Congress from N.H. whether to believe me, all things Republican. They well know me — and that you may not distrust my position to do + my acquaintance with N.H. Politicians. I then send you one of my Speeches in the Senate. I would be glad to have you see one which was published in February 1858 in relation to the political affair of the County — I want to make it one of the things of my life, to establish Popular Sovereignty, and to elect you President. It will then be easy. And I want you to judge everything which you think will tend to accomplish that result. I am not rich but I will spend one thousand dollars + all the time from now until election day to bring about this thing.

Will you suggest any thing —
I do not feel as though I could speak, vote, or act for any other man. And I wish to belong to the party that I have always acted for, and the more, but if you are not nominated there can

yet be any Anti-Secession Democrat go for the President, views as given in his last Message— "I may be to part, but I do not suggest it now, but if you are not nominated, a National Democracy ought to be formed. I cannot go the South, or the North, on the Slavery issue Protection & Prohibition— Allwhisper now!

Allow me to say that your Resolution to the Senate to protect states

& Territories will do you good, both North & South— Republicans fear it. and they believe as we do, that no Democrat beside you can be elected. They therefore strike hard against you— It is well settled in my mind that no Republican as such, will be nominated at Chicago, but they must take a new National Man. & Bates stands the best chance— you can carry N. H. Ill., Ind., Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota, and New York, for N. Y. & Penn. if Homey is with you

Now is Homey?— A blame for new boys.
States if fairly contested. Now will the South go? Will they support you if nominated? I fear you will not carry all the South. They are not headed and I see there is a chance for them to turn two ways, one of which would be favorable to the other against you. Which of these will occur I do not hardly decide in my own mind. You have an opinion.

I am interrupted by lessons and therefore will close, saying that I wish to hear from you. If you are worthy —

I will be obliged to you for your speech on the Revolutionary speech of alone, and other, declamations and speeches.

Reply.

Your Samuel Herbert.

P.S. Pardon my egotism in sending and speaking of my speeches and all that occurs that comes in my letter.
Saml. Herbert
Newbury, N.H.
Feb'y 13, 1860.

Political
Endorse Speech.
Swears Judge
W. of G. Prent
Plenary Po
SPEECH
OF
SAMUEL HERBERT, ESQ., OF RUMNEY,
ON THE RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO KANSAS AFFAIRS AND THE
ATTACK ON SENATOR SUMNER, DELIVERED IN THE NEW
Hampshire House of Representatives, July
1860.

It is with some reluctance, Mr. Speaker, that
I enter into the discussion of these resolutions.
I enter upon it with feelings different from
those expressed upon the other side—all
grown up from those of the gentleman
who last spoke. (Mr. Bellows of Concord.)
He stated, what is often stated in this House,
that he entered into the discussion without any
party feeling, and not as a party man—not as
a whig, democrat, free-soiler or any other party
man. In this particular I differ from him.
I am not one of that class who have changed so
often as to be ashamed to own what party they
belong to, or that they belong to any party at
this time. I enter upon the discussion as a
Democrat, never having changed my position,
always having voted with that party from the
day in which I was old enough to vote up to
the present time.

I hope, too, that what I say will be said with
due respect to party feelings, and with due
respect to candor, and without going to the
extent of making assertions without considera-
tion or the exercise of my best judgment.
I shall be compelled to go over considerable
ground and to present some considerations
which will involve relations to the government
of our country for a long time past. You will
notice first the language of the first resolution.
It declares that all subsequent events have
confonnity with the provision in the act
organizing the Territories of Kansas and
Nebraska, of the prohibition against slavery,
which formed a part of the compact known as
the Missouri compromise, was not, as was
alleged by the supporters of the measure, for
the purpose of recognizing and enunciating
a great political principle, but was to strip
the territory of its defense and open it to slavery,
&c.

You will perceive that here is a charge, di-
rect and positive, upon the Democratic party
—a charge of unfairness and dishonesty, a
charge of designed, wilful falsehood. In order
to wipe this away, it will be necessary to go
into an examination of the Missouri compro-
mise, so called. You are aware that for the
last forty years, when any new territory has
been acquired by our government, by conquest
or purchase, this very question has arisen, to
which section shall this new territory belong?
The South has at all times claimed a portion
of it, and the North always has claimed all or
a part for free territory. Here has originated
the discussions. The South, under the Con-
stitution, have a right to hold slaves. The
North, not holding slaves, want to do away
this right, and the right to extend slavery—
Consequently, when any new territory has
been acquired, this matter has taken three-
fourths of all the time of Congress for nearly
forty years.

The Democratic party is charged with
changing its position, and we have been refer-
ted to resolutions passed in 1847, 1848 and
1849. Now, I say the position of the Demo-
cratic party has not been changed in this par-
ticular. When the question has come up,
shall slavery be extended or not? the answer of
the Democratic party in connection with
all other parties at the North, has been No.

The resolutions upon the Journals of this
House show that: and if the question were
this day taken whether any territory shall be
slave or free territory, there is not a Democrat
in New Hampshire who would not vote in fa-
vor of freedom. But that is not the question
as it now stands. The question is whether
this agitating subject shall be taken out of
Congress, to let the people act for themselves.

As to popular sovereignty, as it is called, the
Democrats are a unit on that question. They
desire not only this question, but all others
relating to the domestic affairs of the terri-
tories, shall be taken out of Congress. I say
then that the Democratic party has not chang-
ed upon this point. They have only gone so
far as to say that the people of the territories
shall govern themselves, not only in reference
to slavery but every other domestic institu-
tion—which is only giving them State rights.

It was stated by the gentleman from Con-
cord that the Democratic party is in favor
of slavery, and as a party, in favor of wip-
ing out the Missouri compromise; and he
claims that his friends have been in favor of
that line, and the Democratic party against it.
In 1820, when the act was passed, was the
party which is now against its repeal, then in
favor of that compromise? There were but a
few men from the Northern States who were
then in favor of it. Why is it said that the
North wanted it at the commencement, and
has always lived up to it, and that it was a.
great violation of national honor and national faith to repeal it? Do not gentlemen know that one of the Senators in Congress from New Mexico, whom we call Mr. Johnson, by the name of Parrott, was hung in effigy because he voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, on the part of his party who now think it is too sacred. How does it tell on that question, when the same party who hung him in effigy in New York in 1854 did it, and is he not taking the same course for his cause in favor of its repeal? It is the party that claims consistency, and charges us with breaking our pledges. Let us come down a little after the passage of this act, and see how these people stood—In 1860, the administration created the Union, with a constitution tolerating slavery, how did they stand? That was exactly equal to what those people stood in 1848. After the passage of that law, he had a right to come in with slavery, and the North had no right. Here the first attempt to carry out the compromise was resisted and voted against by the very party at the North who are now so ingenious about its doctrines! They said they did not agree to this division between free and slave territory, and that Arkansas should not be admitted as a slave State. Here was a direct violation of that instrument which they are so fond of quoting at a convenient time.

What was the next opposition, at a later period in the history of this matter? There was then no question of extending this line of partition through to the Pacific Ocean. And how was it settled? Who were the men who stood head and shoulders in favor of that line of partition, John P. Hale, what did he say? He said, when the proposition was made to extend this line to the Pacific Ocean, that it should have its vote; he never would do any thing to extend that line to the Pacific Ocean, and the proposition was voted down by Northern Whig and abolition Senators. Where, then, is the consistency, the claim, that this is a measure of your party, and one that the Democratic party has violated? Hale stood precisely where Mr. North stood, and stood precisely in regard to the States in the United States, where both spoke and voted against this line of partition. John P. Hale stood thus. The Mexican war, there was a proposal in regard to New Mexico and Utah, to extend this line of partition down to the frontiers of the States; and again they said they would not live up to this compromise. Thus, after what had been tried to carry out this compromise over and over again, it came up again in 1850, and there was the same discussion with regard to free and slave territory, in connection with the organization of the Territory of Utah. After the question had been discussion in Congress, they settled down upon this very principle of non-intercourse, which we are acting upon to-day. The Democratic party stands upon the principle which was settled there forever, as they did upon the occasion that Daniel Webster made his great speech, 7th March, 1850, which will cause him to be honored for ever for his love of the Union and his efforts to settle this question which had agitated the country so long. That question was then supposed to be settled in favor of the people of the South. If this principle was admitted, it would prevent the extension of slavery. In discussing the Kansas-Nebraska act, it was precisely the same, at that very point, and he showed how, on that very ground, it would prevent a further extension of slavery and the extension of slavery over the South, and the result would be that all that territory would be free and no more slavery allowed there. He was the one in 1850 who said that was the way in which most individuals looked upon this matter. Is it not true that the people of the North are more disposed to migrate, and do they not go into the territories and settle in overwhelming numbers, and if left to themselves, would they not make the territories free? The compromise of 1850 was a settlement to be acquiesced in in all future time, and one on which the last Presidential campaign was carried. When it is charged that Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Johnson violated his principles, to his former practice and profession, if we go back to that time we shall see that he stood precisely on the same ground as Mr. Johnson. That was precisely on the platform of 1852, which was that there should be no interference in Congress, that Congress should put their own concerns like the States, that the people of the territory have the right in their sovereign capacity to manage their own government. Is there any thing in the Kansas-Nebraska bill that makes this impossible? If it is proposed to you, as to politicians, as to men, is there any thing in the Kansas Nebraska bill that makes it impossible for the people to organize according to the principles? It will be remembered, that it was said the Mexican War was carried on for the extension of slavery, and nothing else; and a great hue and cry was raised, and they charged all individuals being lovers of slavery, and engaged in a war to propagate it. We now say that Mr. Taylor was engaged in that war. He was charged with being subservient to the slave interest, as a man who had fought to preserve the Union, because he was engaged in it. And what did the papers say? Why they said he was raising babbles for the South, and for the Union, and I mention this for the benefit of the party which claims all the religion and all the benevolence in this State and throughout the United States, and what was the result, what became of this? Mr. Taylor. Oh, just as this year turned round and voted for the South, for they took it. Mr. Taylor and made him President—the very party that had called him every name under heaven. How many laws did he pass, and they turn upon his character, public and private? I ask again, is it a characteristic of this party? [Answer] “ Goes to the tomb with Gen. Taylor.”

We were told the war was carried on for the purpose of extending slavery. What has been the result? Why, the acquisition of California, Utah and New Mexico was made. This slavery was extended anywhere in consequence of the war. Was it true, then, that this was the object of the war? Have not the allegations of this party always been to the effect that the war was to protect slavery? They say that the Democratic party is to extend slavery, that the influences of that party are so great that we believe that seven-eighths of the States are to be subjected to that influence, and we believe which I do not believe—that we are all the time doing all we can to extinguish slavery in the Territories. If we look at the situation today, we find that Nebraska is under the same organization, and the latter is capable of being divided into free and slave territory. And Kansas slave territory, no other part of the United States will be. Take into consideration that Utah, New Mexico, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington and Nebraska Territories will be free territories, and how do we stand? Why we stand there as one, when our territory is all organized against slavery. Again, it is asserted that the ratio of the slave population is increasing over that of the free. I find, however, that in 1850, the ratio of slave to free was about seven to seven, with some fractions. How, then, can gentlemen argue that the ratio of slave to free increased, when it was seven to seven, with fractions? Where is the truthfulness of this party that makes these charges and declarations? It has been charged that there has been gained which has been asked for by this party, that Congress should interfere to exclude slavery from the Territories; that if it would amount to? There is not a lawyer who will deny the position that if all the territory of the United States was organized as free territory, and should come into the Union as free States, the people of each would have a right to turn them, and after it was admitted, is not that a well settled principle, according to the country of every State if they choose? Then what is to be gained by excluding slavery from the Territories? Kansas? Nothing more, for the reason that they are free. Where is the truthfulness of the party which I have stated, and nobody will controvert it.

The gentleman from Concord (Mr. Bel lows,) whom a lawyer and a gentleman, I respect, though he does not, is known to have so lowered his reputation as a lawyer; that if the principle that slavery may be excluded from the Territories is to be the same principle come into New Hampshire. If Congress refuses to interfere in the Territories, and the number in favor is greater than that in favor of freedom, and slavery
Is thereby carried into the Territory, does it follow that New Hampshire is to be subjected to the slave power? I do not understand it to be so. I am not among those who would not understand this principle. It is a part of the Constitution; and it should be brought home to your own bosoms, and the legislatures of the Southern people. It would bring slaves with them when they came to the watering places, and if they could do those things which have been so fraudulently said upon New Hampshire? That is the deduction, and nothing more. We know that the Missouri Compromise was not such a thing. If it is done, and so should have supposed that if there was anything in his argument as to the Constitution, and the doctrine that slavery was in violation of the Constitution. If that be the case, there is no moral or moral political right to exist. This is not the case in the slave states. And if, at a convention in New York, a few days ago, they boasted that that was the largest assembly that they ever assembled, and when the people of the South, and the North, and the abolitionists, who were on the ground, and would, if they could, have seen their men on the ground of Wendell Phillips, Garrison, Abby Kelly, and the other leaders in the matter.

I come now to the next resolution, which declares that there is no law, no governments in Kansas. I propose to review some of the history of that territory. When the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed, there was a law made for the organization of that Territory. Under that organization, the first election was held, and a delegate to Congress chosen, Nov. 29, 1854. That election was held according to the provisions of the law, and had removed over 2000 votes, and all others a little over 500. If there was fraudulent voting there, it was the duty of the party, not to cast a vote, and give it to any man; Why did they not petition the Governor on the subject of illegality? There were 500 voters against it, and 450 in favor of the law, and said this was an illegal election. There was then no such idea that all these voters were from Missouri, and were there with their pistols and bowie knives to vote. At the first election, there was no such charge.

The next resolution was in March, 1855, for members of the Legislature. That matter is the foundation of the whole argument for members of the Legislature. How is it that we have in the Constitution of the United States and then went on to try to abolish slavery under it. He says the constitution is a barrier against the curate to the country, and should be disregarded; and said he said "that rebel Washington" had been respected! He turned round to that constitution of the Legislature, and had been respected. I said. "If the laws of Kansas is a legal body. If we take them, we take them on the ground that they was removed because they were not fit for doing acts which he had no legal right to be engaged in. We may not be allowed to do those things in the same way. Those laws are so absurd that they have not attempted to enforce them. There are laws that they cannot bring into effect."

So you see the free state men have gone in for violating all these laws, no matter how they do so, as long as they can get away with it. I say the laws are bad and cannot be sustained. They have been quoted wrong and the deductions from them have been stated wrong in argument and in conversation. I do not defend these laws, but I argue that they are binding until they are repealed. I do not think a man who writes or prints anything against slavery, shall be imprisoned. That is the matter of whether there is a constitutional law. And the judge of that law is a declaration that there is no such law in Kansas, and he shall be punished. You may say that the Legislature is wrong that enacted it, and you may go into a discussion in relation to it. It is only when you deny that that law exists there, under which they have a right to hold slaves, that you do not agree with the right to hold slaves. So when we are told that nothing can be said against the institution of slavery in Kansas, it is not true. We are also told that a juryman who holds slavery illegal, cannot sit on a trial of a slave for his freedom. Is that a new point? Does not every man know that this law, or the same principle, is carried out in New Hampshire, that a man shall not sit as a juror in any case where he has made up an opinion for or against? How is it with regard to the law of capital punishment? If a man has come to the conclusion that capital punishment is wrong, he cannot sit as a juror in a case involving the death penalty for murder. The same is true in many other cases. That law in Kansas is precisely the same. I say the law is only saying it is agreeable to the Constitution, and is like the law in other States. If a man takes up his residence in Kansas, he is taken to be a juror. If a juror has made up his mind that slavery is unconstitutional, he cannot sit as a juror. Then what is the matter brought in, here for the purpose of decrying men who do not understand this matter, and making them believe that there is no law elsewhere in the United States?

Now mark, these free state men say these laws are damnable in the eyes of freemen, and should not be obeyed; and on that pretense they claim to disobey every law of the Kansas Legislature, no matter what it is. Has there ever been any attempt to enforce these laws to which I have referred? Not that I were aware of, no such pretense is made here. Why should free state men violate these laws, and say they have no laws there in Kansas, and that they are not to be obeyed? These laws are so absurd that they have not attempted to enforce them. There are laws that they cannot bring into effect.

But we are told that the laws are bad and cannot be sustained. They have been quoted wrong and the deductions from them have been stated wrong in argument and
of this Territory, and that they have determined that no process in the hands of the Sheriff shall be executed. I am this moment addressing them as the Sheriff, that while conveying a prisoner to Lecompton, whom he has arrested by virtue of a process of a warrant, he met thieves who had just murdered a man, who took said prisoner forcibly out of his possession, and bid defiance to the execution of all law in that Territory.

So this is the way in which you are to talk about the border ruffians, and turn round and tell about the border ruffianism. At the point of the bayonet, they resist the laws of the Territory, and the Constitution of the United States.

"These men replied that they knew no law but their guns.

"And the peaceful men who come up here and charge the Democratic party with a desire to extend slavery for the sake of it — those are the men who come up and charge the Democratic party with sustaining those who voted when they had no right to do it. Now I do not agree that all those who have acted contrary to the laws, have been guilty of rebellion and should be punished. They should all be tried alike, whether pro-slavery or free state men, who have resisted the laws of the Territory. But I believe that some of them should be punished."

The Governor of Kansas, Governor J. P. Hale, was also present in the meeting. He expressed his opinion that the laws of the Territory were being disregarded. He said that if the laws of the Territory were not enforced, the future of the country would be in danger. He believed that the laws of the United States were more important than the laws of the Territory, and that the people of Kansas should support the federal government.
to bear in carrying out these principles; that there shall be no rebellion in any of the territories, whether excited from abroad or near by; and that all the states of Massachusetts or Missouri.

I have just received the substance of the provisions embodied in Mr. Douglass' new bill in relation to Kansas, which are, that five counties are to be organized to make out a check list of the voters in the several counties, to be printed, circulated, and posted up; that all persons voting twice, or in any other form, that the Union shall be abolished; and that all those whose names are on the lists shall vote, that all whites who are residents of the states of Kansas, the 4th of July, and all who have been inhabitants, then absent, but shall return by the 1st of October, shall be voters; all tests, and in fact all the objectionable laws be adopted; that on the day of the presidential election, legislators shall be elected by those voters, who shall assemble in convention, and form a state constitution, if they desire to do so, and that Kansas shall be admitted as a state with such constitution.

Mr. Spenser and gentlemen, are provisions designed to carry into effect the principles which have characterized the Democratic party, for the recovery of property and every other means. Can anything more be asked for? If so, I answer, it is before we are through this discussion. This shows the position which Mr. Douglass himself has always taken, and which he has always held, that the Democratic members of Congress have held, in opposition to interference with the right of voting, from Missouri or any other place. I was glad to receive another communication, too, that, although there has been a House of Representatives against the administration, they have refused to endorse the acts of the free state party, by their own choice. This you will be glad to know; for it shows that you are coming to vote for the freedom of your country, by your silence, and that your votes will not be lost, as the party of freedom and of distant states, to abstain from unautho

Then we have settled that matter, not only as a Demo

The Kansas laws are being enforced, and the free state men in Kansas are hereby known to be void and illegal, by your Union Government, and not by your

I will further read from the President's pro-

This is the principle upon which the act has

I have just read from the President's pro-

The President has taken the chair, there has been

I will further read from the President's pro-

It did not interfere in time! Do you know that

The President was to interfere in every quarrel in every state and territory, there would be a headman everywhere.

Now this question is a very serious one in his proclamation. If there is any getting away from that fact, I have never seen it; and if I am not wrong, I am sure that I am glad to have gentle

Your next reference is to the fourth resolu-

Resolved, That the responsibility for the deprivations, imprisonments, and murders, which have been committed in the territories of Kansas, and in the whole of this country, at the hands of the property and persons of the people of Kansas, belong to us, and we are concerned to say, as well as upon the President of the United States, as upon the influenced and misguided men who have been the actors in the perpetration of these crimes.

It is said that this responsibility rests upon the President. There was an amendment of the to this resolution, that this portion be struck out. I know the amendment was going to be presented, and I did not have the least doubt that it would be accepted. I thought they would go to the territorial legislature, and say, "You have a bill on the table, and you know that the President has been vigorously in the way of a careful in

What was the argument against striking it out, in the same sense that you charge him with

You charge him with acting in violation of the treaties, but indirectly, as being done officially! Oh, shame, shame on such an argument as that! Who ever heard that an executive officer was liable because he signed a bill! Not long ago, a strike was made against the Governor of Michigan, and a manda
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For the honor of every one here, if it were not for the political bearing given to them, they would give their lives to save this House. I never heard of but one man who approved the attack on Mr. Sumner. I was disappointed at what you did, as to the free speech, up to the time the amendment was offered to include persons on the other side. I thought you would join us, and change your views. But, as it is all to be wiped out this year, I have re
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To this end we demand, 1st. That no more slave States or territory shall ever be ad-

Newly-appointed regular troops are being formed in the beginning on purpose to make party capital—on purpose to use the great power which the Federal Government has at its disposal to go shielded throughout the whole United States. It is the way New Hampshire has got to be transmuted. When I learned that
they meant to fix these resolutions for this purpose; I learned that they did not mean any thing but party, in any act of theirs. Now I wish to say that if there is any unfair ness in this. I don't want you to stand up like a political corporation with a cloak around you, to protect you individually, as men, is there any honesty in this? (A voice cries, no, not an atom. I did not expect I had all my countrymen to deal with.—[Renewed laughter and applause.] No. I am prepared for the free discussion. I expected it. I have been here before you. I know why. Last year you did ten times as much; you gog ged and roused the people. It was a mois tenous or a good word. You cannot do it this year; you have not got enough majority. If you had I would have said the same in the way in which we are to be met here. You have got a majority, but not enough, as last year, to win popular applause.

Let us see how the case of assault upon men for opinions expressed a few years ago, by a party who are now so loud in epigrams upon men for attacks. James Hill was a member of the United States Senate, and a member of the House, that consisted in the N. H. Patriot, Mr. Upham, the Whig nominee for Governor, with whom we were associated. In the House, Mr. Hill, for a member, was defeated. In the N. H. Senate, Mr. Upham, the Whig candidate, was defeated. Mr. Hill, the Whig, was defeated. Mr. Upham, the Whig, was defeated. Mr. Upham, one of the leading men of the party, said, “If we shall have two more of our leaders, gentlemen of our party, we will do better in the next election.” Now, I ask what is the difference between the case of a man killed by a Whig or killed by a Democrat? What is the difference between the Whig who is killed by a Democrat or the Democrat who is killed by a Whig? It is all the same. The same law of the country is applied, and the same law is applied in the same case. The same law is applied to all men, and the same law is applied to all cases. The same law is applied to all cases, and the same law is applied to all cases. The same law is applied to all cases, and the same law is applied to all cases.

We are told this is a peculiar time, both in the country and in New Hampshire; that there is a crisis at hand. If a man could not not vote for four years, he would suppose there never was such a state of things. I think most of you can remember something of the same sort. I can remember that the same things were said in reference to the tariff; that if we did not alter the tariff which the Demo cretic party had made, all our villages and factories would go down, our government would be over, and England was to furnish all things to the country. There was a great panic then, but it settled all away. The Demo cretic tariff stands as a monument of human glory. That wave which was in the past, that wave which was in the past, that wave which was in the past. What is the difference between the Whig who is killed by a Democrat or the Democrat who is killed by a Whig? It is all the same. The same law of the country is applied, and the same law is applied in the same case. The same law is applied to all men, and the same law is applied to all cases. The same law is applied to all cases, and the same law is applied to all cases. The same law is applied to all cases, and the same law is applied to all cases. The same law is applied to all cases, and the same law is applied to all cases.
Enclosed in letter of
Samuel Herbert
Feb. 13, 1860