Montgomery County Sentinel.

One Dollar and Fifty Cents, if paid in advance. DEVOTED TO PARTY, NOT INCONSISTENT WITH THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS. Two Dollars, if not at the end of the year.

By M. Fields. ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND, FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 17, 1860. Vol. VI.—No. 2.

COUNTY DIRECTORY.

Dr. C. A. HARDING,
Practicing Physician,
NEXT DOOR TO THE "SENTINEL" OFFICE,
ROCKVILLE, Md.
mar 30—tf

WASHINGTON HOTEL.
ROCKVILLE Maryland.
PERRY TRAIL, Proprietor.

THE undersigned having leased the above establishment, which is now undergoing thorough repair, would respectfully solicit a continuance of the patronage heretofore so liberally bestowed upon it. He assures his friends and the public generally, that every effort, on his part, will be made to contribute to the ease and comfort of all who may favor him with their patronage.

HIS TABLE will always be supplied with the best the market affords; and at the Bar will be found the choicest brands of Liquors and Segars.

THE STABLING attached to the house is large and commodious, and as none but attentive ostlers will be employed, persons stopping at his house may rely upon their horses being well attended to.

☞ His charges will be very moderate.
feb 10—tf PERRY TRAIL.

GOOD EATING & CAPITAL DRINKING
—AT—
KILGOUR'S SALOON,
Rockville, Md.

THE subscriber returns his sincere acknowledgments to his numerous patrons for the liberal patronage bestowed upon him from the opening of his establishment, and respectfully solicits a continuance, assuring them that no pains will be spared, on his part, to merit it. [illegible] inform his friends and the county in [illegible] has refitted his establishment, [illegible] style and comfort, will vie with any house of the kind in the cities.

Lovers of GOOD OYSTERS will always find at his establishment the best the markets afford, and his Bar will always be stippliied with the best of Wines, Liquors, Malt Drinks, Segars, Tobacco, &c.

☞ His charges very moderate.
feb 18—tf JOHN A. T. KILGOUR.

SERVANTS WANTED.

THE subscriber wishes to purchase any number of SERVANTS, of both sexes, that are young, sound and healthy, for which he will, at all times, pay the very highest market prices, in cash. Persons having servants for sale, will find it greatly to their advantage to give me a call before disposing of them.

☞ LIBERAL COMMISSIONS paid for information; and all communications strictly confidential.

Letters addressed to me at Rockville, Montgomery county, Md., will receive prompt attention. BENJ. COOLEY, Agent.
feb 10—1y

NEGROES WANTED.

THE subscriber wishes to purchase any number of likely YOUNG NEGROES of both sexes, for the Southern market, for which he will pay the highest prices.

Having purchased the establishment in Alexandria, Va., recently owned by Mr. George Kephart, he is prepared to receive negroes in care at the usual price of board.

Owners of slaves will find it to their interest to consult him before disposing of their negroes.

☞ WM. T. HICKMAN, of Medley's District, in this county, is my authorized Agent for the purchase of slaves.

CHS. M. PRICE.
Rockville, Md., Feb. 10, 1859.

CARPENTERING & UNDERTAKING.

THE citizens of Rockville, and the public generally, are informed that the undersigned still carries on the above business, at his old stand in Rockville, nearly opposite the Methodist Parsonage, in all its branches.

He will attend to all work pertaining to the CARPENTERING and HOUSE-JOINING Business, which he guarantees to be done in the best manner, and most fashionable style, and on terms that cannot fail to please.

Having furnished himself with a new Hearse, and the best materials for manufacturing COFFINS, he will attend to Funerals in any part of this county.

He returns his thanks for the partonage heretofore extended, and humbly asks a continuance, pledging himself that nothing on his part shall be left undone to render satisfaction.
feb. 26—1y WM. E. PUMPHREY.

C. F. WALLIS. B. F. CRIMES.
WALLIS & CRIMES.
CARPENTERS,
CONTRACTORS AND BUILDERS,
SENECA, Montgomery County, Md.,

TAKE this method of informing the citizens of Montgomery county that they are now prepared to do all kinds of work in their line, at the shortest notice, in the best possible manner, and on the most reasonable terms.

☞ All orders left with Mr. M. CONNELLY, at the Union Hotel, Poolesville or at their shop, at Lee's Quarry, Seneca, will be promptly attended to.

By strict attention to business, we hope to merit a liberal share of patronage from the public.
mar 9—y

BUTCHERING.

THE subscriber having located himself about half a mile above Rockville, on the Frederick road, and erected a slaughter house, would inform the citizens of Rockville and the county, that he will at all times be prepared to furnish them with

Fresh Meats,

on very moderate terms, FOR CASH. He will bring meats into the village every Tuesday and Friday morning.

Persons having Beeves, Calves, Muttons, Lambs, &c. for sale, will always find a market for them at his place, and the highest cash price paid. THOS. J. GARDINER.
mar 16—tf

AUCTIONEERING.

WM. W. ALLEN, Auctioneer, will attend to sales in any portion of the county, and respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. His charges are moderate. All orders left at the "Sentinel" office, or directed to him at Rockville, will be promptly attended to.
dec 16—tf

Political.

SPEECH OF I. I. STEVENS,

OF WASHINGTON TERRITORY,

At the Democratic County Convention, held at Rockville, August 4, 1860.

Mr. Chairman and Fellow-citizens:

This may be called the commencement of your canvass for the election of a President and Vice President of the United States. This canvass commences under circumstances differing very much from all former canvasses.—Heretofore, when we have come before the American people as a party, we have come before them united as brethren, standing upon a common platform, and moving forward under a common banner to victory. We have found, looking back into times past, that the Democratic party has always been prepared to make sacrifices in order that there might be union and harmony. We have found, when meeting in convention, that if there was a respectable portion of members of the party having strong objections to the nomination of a particular individual, that man's name was withdrawn, and a man was presented upon whom all could unite. It is not so during the present canvass. Our party, it is said, is disrupted and divided. There are, as it were, two antagonistical forces striving against each other, and not directing their warfare against a common enemy. There is a division, fellow-citizens, in the Democratic party; or rather there is the Democratic party, and there is a party calling itself the Democratic party, who are now halfway between the Democratic party and the Republican camp! [Cheers.] Its great leader said at Hartford: "We stand midway between the disunion party of the South and the disunion party of the North." What is that disunion party of the South? It is a party which has for its motto the quality of the States. It is a party which has for its rallying cry, that all the States are equal and are entitled to equal rights. It is a party which united under its glorious standard-bearers, BUCHANAN and LANE, is appealing to all patriots, North and South, to rally in defence of the Constitution, and discarding all personal feelings, to move forward as our fathers did when they united to rescue that Constitution from the grasp of the spoiler. Is that a disunion party? Is a party which stands firmly and defiantly upon the Constitution of the country a disunion party? Is a party which invokes the faith of the fathers a disunion party? Is a party which appeals to the patriotism and disinterestedness of the American people a disunion party? Not so! It is the old Democratic party; it is the strong, lion-hearted Democracy; and this middle party is a party which has moved forward halfway to the Northern camp of disunion and sectionalism. [Applause.]

Fellow-citizens, in 1856 the Democratic party met in convention at Cincinnati, agreed upon a platform with entire unanimity, presented candidates and went before the people; and after a most severe struggle of four months, they elected their standard-bearers as President and Vice President. We found even then, that two interpretations were given to the Cincinnati platform, and we were reproached with hunting coveys up our principles and having so construed it but platform as to have one meaning at the North to get votes, and another meaning at the South to get votes. But a most eminent statesman of the North drew up that platform—I refer to a gentleman of my own native State, Hon. Benjamin F. Hallett, of Massachusetts. That gentleman stands by you to-day; and in a speech which he delivered in the city of Washington after the nomination of Breckinridge and Lane, he gave his construction of the platform of which he was the author. And he gave it the construction which is given generally through the South, and by many Democrats at the North. He gave it a construction which agreed entirely with the majority platform of our own recent convention. But, fellow-citizens, we find the attempt to incorporate heresies in that platform. We find spurious interpretations put upon that platform; and that is the cause of all our troubles. You will recollect that in the Kansas-Nebraska act, and in the Cincinnati platform, it is declared that the people of the territories shall be at liberty to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, *subject to the Constitution of the United States.* That great fundamental law is placed over all, to govern and control all laws; and all enactments of a statutory character, whether State or Territory, are subordinate to the Constitution of the country, as expounded by the Supreme Court of the United States. It was well known, it was boldly avowed, it was always conceded by every Democrat, that the Supreme Court having once given its decision, it should be binding upon all Democrats. The Court did give its decision. The Court did declare the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional. The Court did declare that a Southern man had a right to go to the territories with his slaves as property. The Court declared that a Southern man was entitled to the protection of that property, equally with the protection of all other property. The Court declared further, that no legislature could interfere with that right. Now what is the heresy incorporated into this matter, which has been the prolific cause of all our difficulties? It is this: that never mind what the Supreme Court may declare, the legislature of the territory could by lawful means expel slavery through unfriendly legislation. That is the heresy, and I will read from the record. Here is what Mr. Douglas said, during his famous contest with Lincoln in Illinois:

"It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question, whether slavery may or may not go into a territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce or exclude it, as they please."

He then gives his reasons for this opinion, and concludes thus:

"Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a slave territory or a free territory is perfect and complete under the Nebraska bill."

There is the heresy which has been attempted to be thrust into our platform of principles. The Supreme Court has declared that the legislature of a territory cannot interfere, by unfriendly legislation or otherwise, with the right of a Southern man to enjoy his property in slaves in a territory. That, by previous agreement, has been admitted by all true Democrats, as the interpretation of the Cincinnati platform. Mr. Douglas, standing alone, says, "No! no matter what the Supreme Court may say"—or in other words, "I defy the Supreme Court!"—in other words, "down with the Supreme Court!"—in other words, like Mr. Seward, "there is a higher law, and under that the people of a territory can introduce or exclude slavery despite a territory, in its territorial condition." Fellow-citizens, that is the heresy thrown into our midst by a gentleman who had been all the time taking the ground that the discussion of the slavery question ought to be excluded from the halls of Congress forever by all true Democrats; and I refer to these matters in order to impress all true Democrats with the fact that Mr. Douglas is no longer a safe leader. Much as I deplored some of Mr. Douglas' acts, it was not until he launched out this heresy in his Freeport speech, that I, for one, felt that he must be abandoned as a leader—that he was no longer the wise and discreet statesman I had thought him to be—that either from passion or prejudice, or a desire to obtain votes through his intense wish to get a seat in the Senate again, he had abandoned principle and fallen upon a course of argument in order simply to adapt himself to the abolition feeling in the State of Illinois. We all know that Mr. Douglas is a gentleman of many high qualities—a man of great eloquence, a man of great will, a man of fine social qualities, a man who attaches friends to him, a man of infinite perseverance and resource. He had fought many valiant battles for the Democracy; he had borne their standard through fierce conflicts; he had led them on to victory, and those friends could not easily desert him, and I honor them for it. But when this gentleman found that in the Senate he had but one supporter; when he found that in the House of Representatives he only had six to twelve; when he found that nearly every Democratic State was against him, including all the Southern States, and the States on the western coast; when he found also that the President of the United States, and his cabinet, were against him, why could he not have paused? Why could not his friends have paused and said, "Let time pass away; we will waive his claims for the present; we will go into the ranks and fight as good soldiers; we will vindicate our Democracy by the heavy blows we will strike for you in the coming contest, among the rank and file." Not so—not so fellow-citizens; but an appeal was made to all persons in the country. The most assiduous efforts were made to organize a Douglas party. The press was subsidized; the telegraph was employed; letter-writers were sending missives in all directions, and the most herculean efforts were made to manufacture public opinion, with a view to secure his nomination at Charleston. In the cars, in the hotels, in all your towns, in the saloons of your cities, the whole talk was Stephen A. Douglas. But no one thought of talking to the old farmers. You were minding your own business; you were engaged in tilling your soil, and raising those great staples upon which, to such an extent, our prosperity as a nation depends. No account was taken of you; but in the saloons and public places of your cities, and on the cars and steamboats, the friends of Mr. Douglas were busily engaged in advocating his claims; and in the estimation of many gentlemen, they were looked upon as the great mouthpieces of public opinion. Very many good men, very many able men, who did not know the process by which this thing was done, were deceived. They conceived from all this, that Mr. Mr. Douglas was the favorite of the American Democracy. They conceived that while in all possibility he had done wrong in leaving the Democratic party, and lending his aid to the propagation of heresies, yet the leaders of that Democratic party, and especially the President of the United States, had treated him with great disdain. It was said that they had persecuted him; that was the cry, and his friends went to Charleston with a rankling feeling, and a determination to obtain control of the convention so that they could nominate him—that whatever the consequences might be, Stephen A. Douglas should be the nominee of the Democratic party. They knew that looking to the great South, to those fifteen Southern States where the Democratic banner was floating proudly in victory—they knew that not one of those States was in favor of the nomination of this gentleman. They knew, looking across the Rocky mountains and those mighty wildernesses, that neither of those two States on the Pacific coast was in favor of the nomination of this gentleman. They knew, too, that the old Keystone of the arch, as well as New Jersey, the State of the battle fields, where was spilled some of this best blood of the revolution, was against his nomination; and they knew that in order to win, in this contest, we must depend on the votes of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. They went there determined that a candidate whose principal strength was to be found in hopelessly Republican States, should be thrust down the throats of the States upon whom mainly we must depend for the election of our President. And they showed great determination, fellow-citizens, in their purpose. They never relaxed their object for a moment. They pressed forward in the race as St. Paul did; and would to God it had been a race as holy as St. Paul's was. If they had come to Charleston with a feeling of self-sacrifice, with a feeling that no man was to be nominated who could not command the confidence and receive the votes of the entire Democratic party in the South, we would have had some great statesman now nominated, either our own candidates, Breckinridge and Lane, or some other good men who would have united the entire party, and it would have been comparatively easy to annihilate or drive into obscurity the Black Republican hordes. [Cheers.]

But I wish to detain you a few moments while I dwell upon the proceedings at Charleston. It was a melancholy event in the history of parties; it was a melancholy event in the history of the workings of human nature. It shows how men who have done good service, sometimes allow themselves to be influenced and carried away by personal feelings, and are led to do gross wrongs to their party and their country. I will refer briefly to the unit rule, by means of which the apparent strength of Mr. Douglas was increased some twenty odd votes; so that while his real strength was 125 votes, he actually got 152½. The unit rule which was adopted at Charleston declared that where, by the State convention, no particular mode of voting had been provided for or directed, each delegate should be allowed to vote according to his own preferences. The former rule had been that the delegation of each State should determine how its vote should be cast, as a uniform rule. This has been departed from at Charleston; and it was done by a disreputable trick, for when the committee met, this rule was proposed, and it was voted down by a considerable majority. The business of the committee was finished, and nothing was to be done but the signing of the proceedings by the chairman of the meeting, for which an informal meeting was to be held. But contrary to this understanding, a formal meeting was called and notice thereof was given to all the gentlemen who were in favor of the rule, but to only a portion of those opposed to the rule. In consequence of which some six or eight members opposed to the rule were not present; and thus by a partial meeting of the committee, the proceedings of the full meeting were overruled, and this obnoxious rule was introduced. The effect of it was this: There were seventy delegates from New York; thirty-seven of them were for Mr. Douglas, and thirty-three were against him. Their State convention had instructed them to vote as a unit; they did vote as a unit, every vote being given for Mr. Douglas, and thus the thirty-three anti-Douglas delegates, casting sixteen and a half votes, actually, voted for Mr. Douglas, though they were against him. In Ohio, by the same rule, the twelve delegates opposed to him cast six votes, every vote being cast for Mr. Douglas. In Indiana there were nine delegates casting four votes and a half, whose votes were cast for Mr. Douglas, although they were opposed to him—making twenty-seven votes which were actually against him, and yet were compelled to be cast for him by this tyrannical unit rule. There was also one delegate from Vermont, making half a vote thrown for Mr. Douglas in the same way. This makes 27½ in all. Now you will recollect that as for Pennsylvania, its State convention having given no rule upon the subject, the Douglas delegates could cast their votes in their own way, and the delegation could not control them. It was the same case in New Jersey; it was the same case in Maryland; it was the same case in Massachusetts. To be sure, by the application of that rule, we would have lost a few votes in Maine and in Connecticut; but if there had been an uniform rule for the several State delegations according to the old plan, each man voting as he pleased, or if it had been laid down as an uniform rule that the delegations themselves should have the control of that matter, Mr. Douglas would have had on no ballot over 126 or 127 votes, and that was his real strength in the Charleston Convention, although under the operation of this rule his vote finally rose to 152½.

Gentlemen, there were two platforms presented to that Convention. The Committee on Resolutions, consisting of one delegate from each State, making a committee of thirty-three members, were divided, 17 to 16.—Seventeen members presented a majority report—the report which was adopted by your Convention at the Maryland Institute in Baltimore; and the other sixteen were divided, and presented two reports.

Fellow-citizens, I wish very briefly to call your attention to this majority report. I do not do it in order to convince you that that report is right. That is a matter that you yourselves have examined; you have made up your minds; you know it to be right, and need no argument from me. But I desire to do it in connection with the public sentiment at the North. I assure you that there are large numbers of Democrats at the North who agree in sentiment with you in regard to the soundness of that majority platform. This appeared in the deliberations of your committee; it appeared in the deliberations of the convention at Charleston. It was shown in the amendment proposed by the New York delegation, and in the amendment proposed by the Pennsylvania delegation, standing essentially upon the platform of the majority; but in the discussions in the Committee on Resolutions, it appeared most signally. Said one gentleman from the North, "these resolutions meet my hearty concurrence; they stand on the right; they stand on the Constitution of the country; you men of the South ask nothing but what you are entitled to have, and two-thirds of the Democratic voters of my State agree with you and agree with me, but the other one-third do not; they are tender upon this point, and I am afraid if we adopt these resolutions and platform in our convention, we cannot rely on retaining their votes, but many of them will go over into the Black Republican ranks, and we shall therefore lose the vote of the State." Another gentleman said, "you do not go far enough, you men of the South; for many years I have thought that the principles contained in these resolutions were right; you do not go far enough; but our State is a very important State. Can't you sacrifice principle a little for the sake of expediency? Can't you put off the dread moment of enunciating your principles until 1864? What is the harm? We must have votes, and we shall lose them if we adopt this platform. Nearly all our voters are right, but there are some who are tender-footed; and we must do the best we can in order to get the majority in our State." A delegate from another State told me very nearly the same thing about his State. A delegate from a fourth State, who did not speak, but who sat by my side, said to me, "these resolutions are right; I would like to go for them—what do you think?" Said I, "I am not your conscience-keeper—vote for yourself. I mean to vote for them—I have no fears, and I come from farther North than you do." He could not stick his courage up to this point, though he believing in this platform, and the great body of the Democratic voters of his State believed in it, as the 10th of next November will show. Now all this was said in committee openly and above board. We had appeals from nearly every one of the delegates in that committee from the North-western States—appeals to us in the most beseeching terms, not that our principles were not right—not that we did not stand upon the immutable and invincible truth, but they opened their bosoms and pointed to their scars; they talked of the battles they had fought and the disasters they had incurred; they seemed to be bleeding in every pore, and they appealed to our humanity to let this cup pass from them—to adopt some soft resolutions, so that they might rise in the North-west, stay the hands of the of the Black Republicans, and rear to the skies the flag of the Democratic faith. Our reply was, "we honor you for your wounds and your scars; we want to bind up your bleeding members, but we say to you, we have your own admission that this platform stands upon the Constitution of the country, and if you wish to fight, fight on the rock of truth; in that way can you overthrow your enemies; in that way can you rear the Democratic standard; in that way can you recover the great North-west, and wrest it from the grasp of the infidel and the spoiler." You may well imagine that these appeals from good men, while they excited our friendly regard, did not shake our determination much, to stand upon a right platform and present right principles. Every word said in that committee by Northern men, simply strengthened the confidence of every gentleman in favor of the majority report—in the propriety of that report and in the truth of its principles. Ah! there rub was, fellow-citizens, the squatter heresy thrusting the Democratic creed, or attempted to be thrust into it; many good men having great confidence in their leader had hastily adopted it, and they could not see their way clear to retreat from it. Even Mr. Douglas himself had declared that he would not accept a nomination for the presidency except standing upon this squatter heresy; and he brought his friends and the people who were backing him up—he brought them all to his standard and held them there.

Unfortunately, fellow-citizens, no action of a definite character was had at Charleston, and the convention adjourned to Baltimore. There we met; and if possible, the bitterness and determination of the friends of Mr. Douglas was greater there than it was at Charleston. The delegates from the Gulf States, from Delaware, from Arkansas, and from South Carolina, who for reasons for which they were accountable to their constituents alone, and not to the National Convention, had withdrawn from the convention, came back again to Baltimore, accredited by their respective States, and demanded re-admission into the convention. They asked that re-admission under the very invitation of the convention at the time of adjournment at Charleston, when the convention by express resolution offered an invitation to all the States whose delegations in whole or in part had seceded, to return to the convention at Baltimore with their vacancies filled. That resolution was offered by Mr. Russell, of Virginia. It was well matured by him. The construction he put upon it at the time, and the construction that the convention put upon it, was not that the Southern delegates by leaving the convention had thereby practically resigned their seats—nothing of that kind; they were still members of the convention, although not seeing fit to exercise their powers as such; but the construction put upon it was an offer to the several States to supply whatever vacancies might occur before the reassembling of the convention, in order that each State might be fully represented there. They came, therefore, to the convention at Baltimore, and claimed their seats. Their claim was referred to the Committee on Credentials; that committee made its report, and the convention in general terms adopted that report, and thereby drove out of that convention several of the sovereign States of this Union. That convention was held in the Front Street Theatre; and it was a theatrical convention. Sovereign States were pawns and playthings; and they were swept from the board and trampled under foot.

Fellow-citizens, in the whole history of parties, and of conventions, nothing has ever occurred exceeding in tyranny, exceeding in atrocity, the action of the Front Street Theatre convention in rejecting the regularly accredited delegates from Alabama, Louisiana, and from a portion of Arkansas. They admitted the Texas delegates, where no convention whatever had been held; and they admitted the Mississippi delegates, where a convention of the people had been held and which had sent them to Baltimore. They admitted the Delaware delegates, where the old convention had been brought together; and they rejected the Louisiana delegates, although endorsed by the old convention.—They admitted the Charleston delegates from Georgia, although they came to Baltimore with precisely the same credentials as the delegates from Alabama, which were rejected by them. They acted on all sorts of rules—they acted against all kinds of rules. They had no principle—no plan to guide them; the idea was simply to get votes for Stephen A. Douglas. Let me call your attention to the case of Georgia. A very large convention was called—after the Charleston Convention had adjourned—of the Democrats of the State of Georgia—a convention called by the Democratic Central Committee of that State. It was a large convention, numbering nearly four hundred members. When it came to retain test resolutions, they were carried by a vote of 299 to 41. This 41 was the whole strength of the convention—about one tenth—against the action of the delegates at Charleston—against their being accredited to Baltimore—against the adoption of the majority platform. These forty-one members, after participating in this action, immediately left the convention and called another convention; and they sent delegates to Baltimore. The Committee on Credentials at Baltimore made a report recommending that half of each delegation from Georgia should be admitted, and that each should be allowed equally half the vote of the State. It gave the same weight to the forty-one bogus and bolting delegates, who came over to the city of Baltimore with the flag of revolution and insurrection in their hands, as it gave to the three hundred delegates who were called regularly by the State committee. That is the idea of the Douglas party organization; they care not whether the organization be regular or irregular, the mere question they ask is, "how shall we get votes for Mr. Douglas?" That was the rule at Baltimore, and that was the only rule; but they found that that was too nauseous and bitter a pill for even this convention to swallow. The New York politicians—who have been so well described by Gov. Dickinson as a set of stock jobbers and gamblers—even they could not swallow the pill. It even offended their immaculate purity; and the convention finally voted in the Charleston delegates from Georgia at Baltimore. But whom did they vote out, and whom did they brand as bogus, in this way? No less a person than their candidate for the Vice Presidency, Herschel V. Johnson. They kicked him out of the convention; in order, I suppose, that they might crown his brow with the laurels of the Vice Presidency! [Laughter.]

I will not weary you, fellow-citizens, by going into further details; but the very principle which caused that convention to receive the delegates from Georgia, required of them to receive the regular delegates from Alabama. The principle which caused them to receive the delegates from Delaware, called upon them to receive the regular delegates from Louisiana, and also the regular delegates from Texas. They refused to receive the entire Charleston delegation from Arkansas, but admitted into the convention the delegates from the Northern district, called by no proper authority, where two or three hundred persons got up a mass meeting in some of the Northern counties in that district. They gave them the same weight that they gave the Southern district. Now, fellow-citizens, when bodies of men show such a disposition to tyrannize as this—when they reject the principles of Democratic usage—when they evince a disposition to put the yoke of inequality upon others—when they undertake to violate both a platform of principles and a candidate to the Southern States, I say that the time has come to brand such schemes as disorganizing and revolutionary; the time has come for action; and, thank God, we had men with wisdom and nerve enough to see it and to leave that den of corruption, the Front Street Theatre, and re-organize a convention at the Maryland Institute. The rump, nominated Stephen A. Douglas, two or three hours before we nominated Breckinridge and Lane; and they got hold of the telegraphic wires, and sent it off all over the country that Stephen A. Douglas was the regular nominee of the Baltimore Convention, having received a two-thirds vote; and thus they have entrapped many unwary persons, who seeing this announcement, and not hearing the truth stated, really suppose that Mr. Douglas was nominated by a two-thirds vote. Mr. Douglas never did receive a two-thirds vote in that convention; there were never in that convention two-thirds of 303 votes, including bogus delegates and all. Yet the Douglas Central Committee, or the National Executive Committee as they call themselves, have stated that Mr. Douglas received 212 votes. If you look at the proceedings of the convention, you will find that on both the first and second ballots Mr. Douglas only received 181½ votes. On the second ballot there were 14½ votes against him, which were thrown for Mr. Breckinridge and Mr. Guthrie. That was the total number of votes cast, both on the first and second ballot—(196 votes.)

There were present in that convention gentlemen from several of the States who previous to the balloting had risen from their seats and declared that they would take no further part in the proceedings of that convention—that they would not be bound by its acts, but reserved for themselves the right to act as they might hereafter think proper. The whole number of votes cast in the convention, including bogus votes, was therefore 196—181½ of which were thrown for Stephen A. Douglas. After two ballots, a resolution was passed, declaring him the unanimous choice of the convention. No man was allowed to speak; the gag law, as the records will show, was put upon every man's mouth; no one had a right to rise in his place and object to such a resolution. The resolution was put; there was of course a storm of ayes, and the President declared it carried; no negative vote was taken, and then the music struck up and drowned all voices.

Now, fellow-citizens, it is contended by the friends of Mr. Douglas, that those gentlemen who were present in that convention, and did not vote, were bound by this resolution, notwithstanding they declared openly in the presence of that convention, that they should take no further part in its proceedings, and would not be bound by its action.

Gentlemen, it is well to pause and weigh this matter. Mr. Douglas never received over 181½ votes, including all the bogus votes; and there were nine bogus voters from Alabama, six from Louisiana, one from Arkansas, one-half from Massachusetts, and one-half from Missouri; that makes seventeen. But there were more bogus votes still; the vote of Minnesota was counted as four, although three members from Minnesota rose in their seats and declared that they would take no further part in the proceedings of that convention, nor be bound by its action. Take one and a half from Minnesota, and add it to seventeen, and it makes 18½. Then there was Massachusetts. The Massachusetts vote was counted as ten in this theatrical convention, although Massachusetts had but ten delegates there, and sixteen were in the Maryland Institute Convention. The vote of Massachusetts should therefore have been counted as five instead of ten. Add five to 18½ and it makes 23½ bogus votes. Compare the votes of Massachusetts as counted at the Front Street Theatre Convention, and the way it was counted at the Maryland Institute. Although our sixteen delegates counted but eight votes, they counted their ten as ten votes; you may judge from that which was acting according to honest rules. Deducting therefore all these bogus votes, the whole genuine vote of Mr. Douglas in that convention was only 158 votes, and the whole number of *bona fide* votes in the Convention was only 173½. Therefore there were not two-thirds present, and Mr. Douglas did not receive two-thirds of the votes of the electoral college, according to all our usages; and he is not therefore the regular Democratic candidate for the presidency.

It has been urged that inasmuch as he received a majority, other men ought to have withdrawn their names, to enable him to receive a two-thirds vote. Was this done in 1844, when Mr. Van Buren was the prominent candidate? Mr. Van Buren received some twenty votes more than a majority, but yet his name was withdrawn, and Mr. Polk received the nomination and succeeded in reuniting the party, and won the victory over that great and gallant champion, Henry Clay. The delegates therefore, who were determined to stand by the sovereign rights of the States withdrew from this convention and assembled in the hall of the Maryland Institute; they assembled there under a deep feeling of the solemnity of the occasion—with a feeling that upon their action depended the question whether we should have a pure, honest, constitutional Democratic party. They went there determined to face the storm—with selfish considerations to impel them, but with a spirit of patriotism, endeavoring to do their best for the country. They there adopted the majority platform of the Charleston Convention, and they nominated candidates in whom you can with confidence put your trust. They nominated candidates who have not been seekers for the office of President and Vice President; they have not been soliciting all persons, and using all agencies and appliances to accomplish their nomination. John C. Breckinridge, as you know peremptorily had his name withdrawn at Charleston. When his name was mentioned as a candidate for the presidency, he at once protested against its use. Although but a young man, his name is known to the entire American people. You cannot point out an ignoble thought or an ignoble act of his life. He is a man who seems to be a beautiful exemplification of the youth of American institutions. He is a man raised in the mighty West, and has had large experience in various fields; and in the early prime of manhood he possesses a ripeness of judgment and largeness of experience so much needed in the exalted station of President of the United States. A gentleman said of him the other day, that he was a phenomenon in history; for go where you would, through this extended country, among people of all parties, there could not be found his enemy, but there was a universal feeling of respect and confidence in him. He seems to be the glorious fruit of the illustrious generations who have preceded him, and seems to have been prepared by the Great Maker of all things to rule this nation and guide it through the trials of the present day. [Applause.]

But when I think of that old hero, Gen. Lane—when I think of the early backwoodsman of the flat-boatman, of the credit with which he served twenty odd years in the Legislature of Indiana—in that Legislature taking strong ground against the repudiation of the faith of the State—when I think of his transcendent services in Mexico, where he struck such gallant blows against the enemy that he acquired the name of the Marion of that war—when I think of his course in maintaining the rights of the far-off people of Oregon—(for I know how his heart has sympathised with the sufferings of that people, and how his breast has been exposed to all sorts of dangers and perils for their good)—when I think of the potency of his name among those Indian tribes who call him father—Indians who have met him upon the war path and have met him in the councils of peace, and yet all call him father—when I think of the services of that man, a man who possesses all the qualities of the pioneer, the soldier, the statesman and the hero, I say he is a person, take him all in all, the like of whom could not be presented, if we searched the country from one end to the other. [Cheers.]

Fellow-citizens, John C. Breckinridge is known to be a scholarly man; exceeding, it is said, most men: but it is said of Gen. Lane, that he is illiterate—that he spells a certain word with two *r's*, or used to, when it ought to be spelled with only one. It is true that Gen. Lane did not have the early advantages of education, which it is the good fortune of many to enjoy; but he never said or did a foolish thing; and those who corresponded with him, and those who, holding familiar intercourse with him, know that he writes with great force, clearness and strength. His letters and his reports will compare favorably, as I personally know, with those of any of our statesmen.

Why should we be discouraged in this contest, fellow-citizens? What is there in our candidates or our principles to make us afraid? I am happy to meet a population like that among which I was raised. I was raised at the ploughshare; I was born among a farming people, and many of my relations are farmers; and I am more glad to meet and address the population with which I grew up, than to speak in our large cities and listen to their responses. It is upon you that the weight of this battle is going to fall. You are not office seekers; you care nothing for office, but what you want is an honest government; you want a frugal government; you want a government which shall stand equally upon the rights of all the citizens of each State, and that you will have. You have confidence in principle, and when your mind is satisfied that principles are right, when you can feel confidence in the candidates presented to you, you feel that the battle is won already. You feel that you can fight—you can press forward in the race. Now what is there in our platform that you should object to? I desire to call your attention to it very briefly. Our platform declares, as an interpretation of the Cincinnati platform, that the government of territories is provisional and temporary; and that when the people of a territory comes to form a State constitution, they can then determine the question as to whether slavery shall be an institution of the State or not. It furthermore declares, that the rights of property of the citizens of each of the States of this Union shall be protected in the territories and elsewhere, by all the powers of the Federal Government. These are substantially the resolutions. Now, fellow-citizens, is not the government of a territory a provisional and temporary government? So all our legislation shows. Congress has always reserved the veto power over the territories; and has frequently had occasion to exercise it. Is it not to be endured, that the few squatters who first go to the territories shall control everything, even to the denying of their fellow-citizens who follow them to their plainest rights. The people of the South have the same right to go to the common territories that the men of the North have. You are equally under the protection of the law; you are equally under the egis of the Constitution.

Now what was government instituted for? What is the object of government? We find in all governments armies, navies, forts, persons, postal service, customs, collection of taxes, &c. We govern ourselves to create these things? You and magnificent governments abroad, which cost each four or five hundred million of dollars and expend that amount. Is the object of government, to raise money and to spend it? No, fellow-citizens; government has but one object, and that is, the protection of persons and property. That is its sole object, and armies, navies, custom-houses, forts, palaces, legislative halls, magnificent capitals, &c., are simply the instrumentalities by which this great end is achieved. We keep up our government sends forth its armies to protect the persons and property of its citizens. We know that our government sends most of its army to our territories. Where is your army now located? Why, in my own Washington and Oregon; in the territories of Arizona, New Mexico and Utah. The army is sent there to protect the lives and the property of its citizens. Whenever a government refuses to perform that duty, it practically refuses to be a government; it is simply a sufferance and a despotism. Now, that is the clear meaning of that resolution—that a Southern man who goes to a territory with his slave, shall be protected in his property in that slave; and if the territorial legislature shall not afford that protection, or if it shall by unfriendly legislation interfere with this right of property in that slave, the government is bound to interfere by vetoing these unconstitutional acts, so as to maintain this right. Each branch of the government—the Courts, Congress and the Executive Department—acting in its appropriate sphere, is bound to protect persons and property—slave property as well as all other property.

Gentlemen and fellow-citizens, I am glad that our party has come up to the full measure of its duty—that it has dared to stand upon this platform without qualification. We have a platform which can never have two constructions; it is not a platform for shaky, weak-kneed, weak-backed men; let them retire, or if they wish, let them find more congenial company in the halfway house to abolitionism, or with the abolitionists themselves. [Great Applause.]

I recollect, fellow-citizens, that in Mexico where I had the honor of serving, we had a New England regiment. The captain of one of the companies, (afterwards Gen. Bodfish) was a very stern, sterling man. He did not like the conduct of one of his officers at Cherubusco; he thought he was not quick enough on one occasion, and the next day he said to him, "You cannot train in my company any longer—just go off!" So I would say to these limber-backed people, we do not want you to train in our company until after election! [Laughter and cheers.]

Fellow-citizens, it is no time for timid counsellors. I would have their votes if they choose to give them to us; but I want no timid counsels—you want no timid counsels. It was not by timid counsels that our fathers fought through the war of the revolution. There there were weak and timid men; then there were men who held the opinion that the power of the king was next to that of the Almighty. But there were your Washingtons, and your Jeffersons, and your Henrys, and your Otises, and Hancocks, and Adamses, all standing firmly and reliably upon principle, who said, "No! we will fight it out to the bitter end, and the God of battles, who giveth victory, will take us and carry us through!" [Cheers.] Fellow-citizens, you have that determination. I know, looking to my own heart in this canvass, if I feel that I am acting with a party that is determined to make its way defiantly, persistently, and with the feeling that victory will perch upon our banners, I feel in my own heart, for one, that I have a thousand hearts; I feel that I can fight; I feel that I can face any clamor or any opposition! [Applause.] But let timid counsels prevail, and I feel that it is no place for me—my mouth is shut—I cannot utter a word.

Fellow-citizens, I see no reason to be discouraged. I verily believe that we are bound to elect our ticket by the people next November. From all the information that we can get, which comes from good sources in various parts of the country, I consider every Southern State safe. You know about your own Maryland, and you can tell me; but I cannot believe but that Breckinridge and Lane will have a fine majority in the State of Maryland, provided you continue to do what you are now doing—press forward in the race—press forward with all your might until next November—press forward defiantly, boldly, standing upon your principles. I know you will do it; there are others at the South who will do it in the other States, and as to the North, my own portion of the people among whom I was reared, I know them to be honest, although many of them mistaken; but I tell you that there is a body of conservative, constitutional Democrats there that will astonish your enemies next November. We hear the warning cries of the battle coming up from Vermont; from New York, led on by their great leader, Dickinson; from Ohio, from Indiana, from Illinois, and every State. Why, at this very moment a majority of the Democracy of Vermont are for Breckinridge and Lane; they will assemble in that State on Monday a thousand freemen in council, and proudly set up their banner. In Indiana last month twenty thousand persons assembled in council—men every one of them for your ticket and standing upon your platform. They are organizing in Illinois; there is the same thing in Iowa and Minnesota. I tell you that by September we will have fire from one end of the country to the other; in the northern tier of States camp-fires will be burning and trumpets sounding, and their speakers will be in the field. Our reserves will come from the South, gallant men and true men—not disunion men, as is falsely charged, but men true to the Union. They will come up to the support of our people through all the central States—in New Jersey, in Pennsylvania, in Kentucky; and the result will be that Breckinridge and Lane, having the votes of New Jersey, and having the votes of Pennsylvania, will be triumphantly elected by the people. [Enthusiastic applause.]

Fellow-citizens, I would only add, in conclusion, that so far as I can examine the field our friends all over this country are actuated by motives which are bound to carry them to victory. We do not find in assemblies of the people an exuberant enthusiasm; we do not find our candidate for the Presidency parambulating the country in all directions. He has gone to his quiet home in Kentucky