DAILY APPEAL.

MEMPHIS.

THURSDAY MORNING·····FEB. 5, 1857.

INDIANA UNITED STATES SENATOR.

The telegraph furnishes us with the gratifying intelligence that Hon. JESSE D. BRIGHT has been elected to the United States Senate for six years from the 4th of March next, by the Legislature of Indiana. Hon. Mr. FITCH has been also elected to the United States Senate. He fills the short term of a verity. Indiana is redeemed from the thraldom of Know-Nothingism and Black Republicanism. All hail the Hoosier State!

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CONVENTION.

After consultation with some of our Democratic friends, we feel authorised in naming Monday, the 2d day of March, as the time for the meeting of the next Democratic county convention upon which will devolve the duty of appointing delegates to the State and District conventions. There are three District conventions to be held, viz: a Congressional, a Senatorial and a Floating Representative convention. We cannot see why our Democratic friends may not, at the same county convention proceed also to nominate candidates for the Legislature from Shelby county. This, however, can be considered hereafter, if there should be objection to this course.

The first Monday of May has been suggested by some of our Hardeman friends, we understand, for the meeting of the Congressional District convention, and we think that the time named, will be acceptable to the Democracy of the whole District.

GOV. BROWN'S SPEECH—"SOUND SENTIMENTS POWERFULLY SPOKEN."

No reader of this paper should fail to carefully peruse the able, eloquent and convincing speech of Senator BROWN, of Mississippi, in which the Black Republican party is so severely excoriated by the potent weapons of truth and reason, and the Southern position is so powerfully vindicated.

We have rarely read any speech with more pleasure, says the Richmond *Enquirer*, than that delivered by Senator A. G. BROWN, of Mississippi, in the U. S. Senate, on the 22d December, 1856. The first portion of this excellent speech is devoted to a masterly vindication of President PIERCE's last message against the violent assaults of HALE, WILSON, SEWARD and other Black Republican leaders. President PIERCE is assailed for having intimated a pupose in said leaders and their associates party to attack slavery in the States. Senator BROWN exposes the sneaking hypocrisy of the Black Republican champions, who, cowering before an indignant public sentiment, seek to cover up their treasonable assaults upon the rights of the States. He quotes with telling effect their officially recognized public addresses, proves the correctness of the President's position and drives the temporizing Black republicans to the wall. We wish that we could find space for these withering denunciations and demonstrations from the lips of the eloquent Senator from Mississippi.

We are compelled to confine ourselves to the conclusion of Senator BROWN's speech, which so manfully, truthfully and patriotically presents the attitude of the South and of Mr. BUCHANAN, the President elect. During the canvass we published, with commendation, a letter from Senator BROWN, describing a visit to Wheatland and setting forth the reasons, formed after a full and free conversation with Mr. BUCHANAN, why Mississippi and the whole South should sustain Mr. BUCHANAN for his entire soundness on the constitutional question in which the South was so deeply interested. The election came on; the whole South, with the exception of the little bigot-ruled Maryland, rallied to BUCHANAN and BRECKINRIDGE, and, in consideration of the views so powerfully urged by Senator BROWN, the whole South should continue to stand up and sustain the incoming administration, as the only safe guard against the traitorous designs of Black Republicanism. With these brief remarks we cordially commend to the consideration of all good men, North and South, Senator BROWN's admirable speech.

TREATY WITH THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

The Reciprocal Convention, negotiated by Secretary MARCY with the Sandwich Islands, and before the Senate for ratification, is said to be of great importance to the United States. It is understood by its provisions (says a correspondent of the *Herald*,) that lumber, coal, fish, and flour, the same being the growth or produce of the United States, are to be admitted into all the ports of the Sandwich Islands free of duty. There are also other articles of minor consequence. The trade in the leading articles on the free list is increasing rapidly, and is principally with California, Oregon and Washington Territory, and they are receiving great advantage from it. The important articles to be received into our ports free of duty are the growth of the Islands, such as sugar, molasses and wool; but at the present importation is very small. It is, of course, the belief of the Islanders that the free admission of those articles into our ports will give a stimulus to their production. It is said that some portion of the sugar produced there is of a very superior quality and so is their coffee. The wool, being much coarser, as it is in all trophical climates, cannot compete with our fine qualities in the least, but will rather promote their consumption.

The improvement of that group of Islands is especially important to the navigation and commerce of the country. Their situation is peculiarly favorable for the accommodation of the navigation of the Pacific, not only for the navigation of the great whaling fleet, but for all other vessels bound for the west coast of America to China and India, and those passing between San Francisco, Oregon and Puget's Sound, and Australia and the Pacific Isles. Aside from this home trade—which is very important to ship-owners—there will be a very important trade with the west coast of the United States. All this business is now very largely in the hands of Americans; and so is the sugar growing and grazing—and any advantages extended to the Islands, must result very favorably to our own people, who reside or do business there.

☞ A man named CHARLES KRAUSS committed suicide at St. Louis on the 29th ult.

☞ The office of the Pittsburgh *Post* was partially destroyed by fire on the 28th ult.

☞ The village of Meigsville, Ohio, was totally consumed by fire on the 23d ult.

☞ On the 18th inst., the dwelling of Dr. J. H. KNIGHT, at Hickman, Ky., was destroyed by fire.

A SINGULAR MARRIAGE.—In Allen county, Kentucky, on the 15th ult., Mr. JOHN ASHFORD, over seventy years of age, was married to Miss JULIA ANN SHIRLEY, aged eighteen. The same ceremony made a daughter of the old man the wife of another person.

A VETERAN PREACHER GONE.—Rev. THOMAS LASLEY, who has been a faithful laborer in the M. E. Church for 52 years, died in East Tennessee on the 20th, in the 75th year of his age. He was on a visit from Greensburg, Ky., to his son-in-law, MOSES M'MILLIN.

FIRE AND LOSS OF FIFE.—The Fayetteville *Journal* of the 22d says, that Mr. DANIEL SMITH, on Swan creek, had his kitchen burned on Monday night, and two negroes, a boy and girl, were burned to death. Another girl was badly burned but got out.

FROM WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, January 27.—*Senate*—Mr. Wilson presented a petition from a Committee of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, asking Congress for a grant of a boat and mortar stations on the coast of that State.

Mr. Wilson said this was the oldest society in the country, they have twenty life-boats and five mortar stations and several buildings for the safety of ship-wrecked seamen.

Mr. Broadhead presented a memorial of Horatio Hubbell, of Pennsylvania, showing that in 1849, in connection with Col. John H. Sherburn, he caused to be presented to Congress a paper, showing how a submarine telegraph could be consummated, and where it could be carried through. He now prays that nothing be done unless his rights as projector are fully secured by his being made a member or director of the company, or in some other way. As the submarine had passed from the Senate, the memorial was laid upon the table.

Indian appropriation bill debated. Amendments made, adjourned.

House.—Mr. Campbell, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported an amended tariff bill, perfecting the former one so far as the majority of the Committee are concerned. Mr. Campbell stated that the bill would reduce the annual revenue fourteen millions of dollars.

The Committee on the Post Office decided to-day to report in favor of Dr. Rainey's line of steamers between New York and the West Indies, touching at Savannah, Georgia. The steamers are to touch at St. Thomas, Barbadose, and Demerara, and each way, at Savannah, for the receipt and delivery of mails, under a penalty of $2,000 per trip. It is said that our commerce with the regions developed by this line, is, for 1856, $94,000,000, or one sixth of the entire American commerce.

The committee also ordered a bill to be reported in favor of the line of Bleeker and others between Panama and Valparaiso, and in favor of the line of Harrison's between New York and Gluchstadt, via Rotterdam and North Europe. These are considered important pioneer advances into large and undeveloped fields of American enterprise.

The House discussed the bill giving each branch of Congress the entire control of its contingent fund, without revision of the accounting officers of the Treasury.

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, saw no necessity for the bill passing, conceiving it would be unconstitutional.

Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, said the House have not sunk so low as to refuse to review the act of the First Comptroller, who had undertaken to lecture the House, not only for increasing the salaries of their offices, but their own.

Mr. Jones inquired whether Mr. Cobb ever heard of any case where the Comptroller refused to allow the vouchers of the clerk of the House, when certified by the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. Cobb replied that if the Comptroller never so refused, the evidence is conclusive that the Committee on Accounts have discharged their duties, even to the satisfaction of the Comptroller. [Laughter.]

Further consideration of the bill postponed till to-morrow.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the tariff bill.

Mr. MAXWELL defended the position of the President in his annual message, and vindicated the principles of the Democratic party.

Recess till 7 o'clock, for the purpose of debating only.

House—Evening Session.—About a dozen members were present.

Messrs. Scott and Perry severally indicated that they wished to review the President's message, but had obtained permission to finish their speeches.

A journed.

☞ During WASHINGTON's administration three new States were admitted into the Union—two slave and one free. And WASHINGTON's immediate successors admitted all that applied, without pausing a moment to inquire into the domestic habits of the people. It was none of their business. If such was the practice of those illustrious patriots, why should we depart from their paths to follow such creatures as SUMNER, WILSON, GIDDINGS, Parson BEECHER and the Devil?

A NEW COUNTY.—The Savannah *Republican*, of the 26th inst., says:

"A public meeting of citizens from Thomas and Lowndes counties was held at Grooverville, on the 17th inst., for the purpose of petitioning the next Legislature for a new county, to be formed of portions of the above named counties."

☞ We find the following dispatch, dated Philadelphia, January 29th, in the St. Louis papers of the 30th ult.:

"A fire commenced last night in the property owned by the city, on Chesnut street, above Third, which consumed three upper stories occupied by Dubosque & Carrow, jewelers; John Rowl, jeweler; John H. Harper, importer of watches, and E. Gaskill, bookbinder. The stores below were occupied by T. B. Peterson, and by Goodyear's India rubber establishment. Both were damaged by water. Dubasque & Co.'s stock amounted to $100,000, and was mostly in safes, and Harper's stock to $35,000, insured for $10,000.

RECEIPTS OF COTTON AT CHARLESTON.—The *Standard* of 25th inst., says: We have been favored with the opportunity of making extracts from the books of the South Carolina Railroad, which give some desirable information upon the subject as to the sources from whence comes the supply of cotton to Charleston. From these we compile the following table, which comprises the receipts from the places indicated, to the 1st of January, 1855 and 1856, respectively:

	1855 Bales Cotton.	1856. Bales Cotton.
From Columbia	52,826	46,379
Through Columbia & Greenville Railroad	61,297	50,430
From points short of Columbia and Augusta	35,573	45,420
From Augusta	108,166	102,361
From Hamburg	58,564	24,728
Through Augusta	64,781	50,361
Total	350,374	319,297

By an examination of the above table, it will be seen that the receipts of cotton by the South Carolina Railroad, during 1855, were greater, by 30,777 bales than during 1856. It will also be seen that, of the 319,597 bales received last year, 167,527 were from points within the State of South Carolina, while 152,722 were from points beyond.

BELLIGERENT.—The following appears in the Laurensville, (S. C.) *Herald*:

LAURENS C. H., S. C., Jan. 6th, 1857.

TO COL. J. H. LANE: Having seen your challenge to Col. A. W. Doniphan, and Col. A. G. Boone, of Missouri, to settle the vexed question of Kansas, and save her from further outrage, and being one of those engaged in the recent troubles in the territory, I accept your proposition and will meet you upon the plains of Kansas, upon the terms and under the conditions mentioned by you.

Now, "lay on Macduff, and damned be he who first cries hold, enough."

Yours, A. C. JONES,
Of South Carolina.

☞ We copy the following from the Cincinnati *Enquirer*:

"The Ohio *State Journal* says that the Hon. John Bell, of Tennessee, told the editor that three hundred negroes voted for him when he first ran for Congress, in Tennessee. As this fact will doubtless be used by the Black Republicans in our Legislature, in support of the proposition already introduced, to extend the suffrage to "black," and to exclude white naturalized citizens who have not been in the State twelve months since they were naturalized, we desire to call the attention of the Tennessee constituents of Mr. Bell to this assertion, and ask for the refutation of what we believe to be an atrocious calumny."

GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATES IN GEORGIA.—The Georgia prints, says the Macon *Telegraph*, are already beginning to bring forward gubernatorial candidates for next fall. The Democratic papers mention Messrs. David J. Bailey, of Butts; Wm. H. Stiles, of Chatham; John H. Lumpkin, of Floyd; and Col. James Gardner, of Richmond. The Know-Nothings propose B. F. Hill as an "independent" candidate. We never shall hear of another Know-Nothing candidate in Georgia. They will all be independent till a new name is adopted, the old one will no longer serve.—*Montgomery Advertiser.*

A SUCCESSFUL HUNTER.—Mr. John B. Stanley, an intelligent and wealthy planter, residing near Newnansville, East Florida, is probably, the most successful hunter in the State. Besides his almost daily presence on his plantation during the last twenty-five years, he has killed at least ten thousand deer, one hundred wolves, sixty panthers and twelve bears!

An East Florida correspondent of the *Georgian and Journal* communicates the foregoing.

DOUBLE MURDER.—Two persons, man and wife, named Haney, were found murdered on Saturday morning, the 17th inst., at Salisbury, N. C. The man was found dead in his house, and the woman upon the ground about seventy-five yards distant. An axe, lying near and covered with blood, was probable the instrument used in committing the murders. No clue has been obtained of the perpetrators.

SPEECH OF HON. A. G. BROWN,
OF MISSISSIPPI,

On the Slavery Question—Delivered in the Senate of the United States, December 22, 1856.

[CONCLUDED FROM YESTERDAY.]

Mr. Brown. If that was the idea of the senator from Massachusetts when he wrote the letter, he is certainly the most unfortunate man that ever took up a pen to express an idea. While I certainly shall not undertake to say that the senator's interpretation of his own language is not the true interpretation, I do undertake to say, and appeal to the intelligence of the Senate and the world, whether any other man would put that interpretation on it. When the senator declared: "Three millions of bondmen, groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall cease to reproach one another, and that we labor for their deliverance," he used language which would teach every man who read it to believe that he was ready for any scheme which looked to the emancipation of slaves in the States. There are no three millions of slave anywhere else groaning under nameless woes, not enjoying the highest degree of human felicity, or any intermediate state of misery or happiness between the two; the only slaves on this continent to which the senator could have alluded, were the three millions of slaves in the States; and when he said to Wendell Phillips: "You and I, your friends and my friends, must labor unceasingly for the deliverance of those three millions of bondmen," he must have meant—at least, the human mind will conclude, in the absence of any denial that he meant—the slaves in the States. He says he did not so mean, and I am bound to believe him; but I am sorry to trust his candor at the expense of his understanding.

Mr. Wilson. Without interrupting the speaker too much, I wish to say that Mr. Phillips and Mr. Phillips' friends did not so understand it. They know my precise and exact position. The letter was probably hastily and carelessly written to a friend; but the construction the senator puts on it, no man in Massachusetts ever put on it.

Mr. Brown. I expect the senator has been explaining it there as he has here. [Laughter.]

Mr. Wilson. The question was never raised there at all.

Mr. Brown. When he wrote the letter to Wendell Phillips, the Abolitionists no doubt expected the co-operation of the senator and his friends; but when he became startled at his own position, and commenced, as he is doing now, to fall back on what he considered to be a more impregnable position, I dare say Wendell Phillips said, "Well, my dear Wilson, you have not spoken as candidly as I thought you did." If, however, the language had been left without explanation in his speeches here or elsewhere, I venture to say Mr. Wendell Phillips, and all other men, would have put the same construction on it that I do.

Mr. President, I have already noticed the speeches of two Senators at greater length than I had intended. The material before me is not half exhausted; but if I go on I shall be compelled to overlook some of their associates—I have a word for each of them. The senator from New York I regard as the very Ajax Telamon of his party, and the senator from Massachusetts may, I think, be fairly considered their Jupiter Fonans. I had, therefore, to devote some time to them; but I beg the others not to consider themselves slighted; I will come to them after a while.

I must, before leaving the senator from Massachusetts, even at the risk of being tedious, say a word in reply to the speech pronounced by him the other day. Almost in the outset of his speech he pronounced in measured, studied phrase, "those twin sisters of barbarism, slavery, and polygamy."

Mr. Wilson. That was a quotation.

Mr. Brown. Well, sir, quotation or original thought, for what purpose was it introduced into the Senator's speech? If he means, as he says he does, to accomplish his ends by moral suasion, by finally raising up a party in the south to co-operate with him in the great work of overturning slavery, let me ask, are men persuaded by this sort of denunciation? Is the southern slaveholder to be persuaded by being told that he is the *confrere* of the citizens of Utah—that the man in Mississippi who owns his fifty slaves was morally corrupt as he of Utah who has his fifty wives? If the Senator meant anything, he meant precisely that. If the Senator expects to make converts by that species of preaching, he will have to preach to some other people than those whom I represent. Let me say now to the Senator and all who sympathize with him, that I love the Union; those whom I have the honor here to represent, and in whose name I speak to-day, love it; but if we are to live together in peace, this sort of denunciation must cease. All the species of reviling, these taunts, these insults levelled at every slaveholding family in fifteen States of the Union, must come to an end, or we cannot live together in peace and quietude. I say no more.

The senator denies all association with Garrison, and politicians of that school; but when I allude to what Garrison said, the senator is quick to spring to his feet for the purpose of putting in a vindication. I am always quick, I hope to vindicate my friends, but very slow to vindicate my enemies. If they have no sympathizing friends here, they can send their vindication through some other channel than myself. But in the very act of vindicating his friend, Garrison, from the charges which I made, the senator admitted all that I said. My declaration was, that Garrison had declared, in the last canvass, that if he had a million of votes to dispose of, he would give them all to Fremont—of course I meant to say in the contest going on, in the election then pending between Buchanan, Fillmore, and Fremont. I did not say that he preferred Fremont to all other men; but that, as against the other two, he would give his million of votes for Fremont. My object was to show the bond of sympathy existing between the Republican senators here, and the Garrisons, Fred. Douglas, and Wendell Phillips school elsewhere. I think I made my point clear at the time; but, if I failed to do so then, I trust the senator appreciates it now. It was, and is, the same old story, Garrison's partiality, such the partiality of his extreme Abolition crew, that if they had millions of votes to give, they would, in that contest, give them all to the Republican candidate. Garrison would give a million of votes to Fremont, and, in return, Fremont would no doubt give a million of votes to Garrison; and the senator, I suspect, would give his million to either of the two, or to Gerrit Smith, or to his friend, Wendell Phillips; and I half suspect that if Fred. Douglas was on the ticket it would make no serious difference with him. [Laughter.]

I made the charge the other day, and to it there has been no denial from the other side of the chamber, that in the very height of the conflict for the presidency, Fred. Douglas, the free negro editor and orator, took down the name of Gerrit Smith and put up the name of John Charles Fremont. Why not that denied? My point, as all must have seen, was to show the tie that binds the Republicans on this floor to the extreme Abolition party out of doors. I wanted to show how they were being knit together—how, being drawn into close companionship, they will, by and by, constitute but one party—and then if the extreme Abolition element prevails, as it most likely will, the party must become, *par excellence*, the Abolition party. I believe that thousands of good men now in the Republican ranks, will abandon them if they come to understand the designs of the leaders. I meant to expose these designs—to show that there was a plan on foot to Garrisonize the whole party; and if I have done anything towards accomplishing this end I am satisfied.

There are other points in the senator's speech, to which I will reply briefly. He and others have denied that there was anything of sections in the late contest; and their denial is based, if I understand them correctly, on the ground that the mere fact of their candidates for President and Vice President being from the same section of the Union, did not establish sectionalism in the ticket. The senator cited the fact that Mr. Calhoun was upon the same ticket with General Jackson, and yet, he said, there was no charge of sectionalism then. Let me say to the senator, those but the feeblest mind could ever have pretended that the mere fact of both candidates being from the same section afforded evidence of sectionalism. I can select a ticket from Vermont and Massachusetts to-day—and surely it would be as hard to get it there as anywhere else—which would be purely national; and so I could select one from the South which would be purely sectional as against the South. Why, sir, suppose Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky were nominated for the Presidency, and Francis P. Blair, of Maryland, for the Vice Presidency: does any one doubt that such a ticket would be a sectional ticket? It would be a ticket hostile to the South, although both the nominees reside in slaveholding States? Surely I need not say to the senator that it is the sentiment of the party, and of its candidates, that constitute its sectionality, and not the residence of one or both its nominees.

Are your sentiments national? Were not the sentiments which you avowed in the late canvass confined exclusively to the favor of one section? Were they not uniformly hostility to the other? Does not the country so recognize them? The senator himself, in the progress of his speech, and while uttering his complaint that we of the South did not tolerate speakers who entertain his opinion, gave us the best evidence of the sectionalism of his party. "Why," said he, "did we not have advocates in the South?" "Because," he answered, "you would not let the friends of our ticket speak there." Why did we not let them speak? Was it because they were national in their sentiments? Was it because they came to advocate sentiments equally acceptable to the North and to the South, equally favorable to the one section as to the other? No, sir, the senator knows this was not the reason. The senator knew perfectly well that the reason why orators of his party were not allowed to speak in the South was simply this: that they came to speak against our institutions, against our domestic peace against our domestic quietude, against our domestic safety—at least against what we believe to be our domestic peace, safety and quietude; and for this we simply claimed to be the best judges. The charge that we have stifled debate or attacked the freedom of speech is not true, and those who make it know it is not true.

But, sir, the object of the Senator in introducing this point was to complain of the want of liberality in the South. "Why," said he, "your Southern people will not permit Northern men to go there and express their honest sentiments. When they do go, you get up mobs and drive them out." Let me say to the Senator, that when he or his friends come to the South to utter national sentiments, they will be heard with attention and listened to with deference. But when they come to preach such sentiments as a Senator on this floor has been heard to utter within the last week, they may deem it fortunate if they escape the fury of an outraged people. When any man, whether he be a Senator or a private citizen, comes to tell our slaves "that they have a right to murder their masters, and that he will not advise them not to do it," we consider it no breach of hospitality, no violation of the freedom of speech, to say that such sentiments shall not be expressed in our midst. If the Senator shall ever come to Mississippi, and say there what I understand he has recently said in this city, he will be treated, if, indeed, no severer punishment shall be inflicted on him.

Mr. Wilson. Do I understand the Senator from Mississippi to state that I have said in this city anything of that kind—that I would advise the slaves to cut their masters' throats, or in any way whatever commit any violence?

Mr. Brown. I undertake to say, not what the Senator has said, but what I understand he has said, from gentlemen who come to me avouched as men of character, namely: that he did say, in a public hotel in this city, in the last five days, that the slaves had a right to kill their masters, and that he would not advise them not to cut their masters' throats.

Mr. Wilson. Mr. President, I desire to say here now, that in this city, or out of this city, I never harbored a thought of that character, and never gave it utterance—never at any time, or upon any occasion. If I could speak to the slaves of the South, I would utter no voice of that character; I would advise no violence whatever. I do not believe in it; I would not advise it; on the contrary, I believe that any insurrections, nay, acts of violence, on their part, can only end in one way, and that is in their own injury.

Mr. Brown. Mr. President, I shall certainly make no question as to the veracity of the Senator. I have repeated what I have heard. I have repeated what I have in writing from a man whose profession and the very highest character assure me is a man of respectability and honor. He told me that he heard the Senator say so; and he asserts, likewise, that there were other witnesses present, whose names he gave me. If the Senator denies the charge, of course his denial ends the controversy. I am not to stand up in the face of the Senate and on any proof insist that a Senator has spoken falsely. It is not my duty to do so. I will have no question of that sort with the Senator from Massachusetts, or any one else; but if he desires to know upon what authority I made the statement, I am prepared here, or upon a private call, to produce the evidence.

Much has been said, Mr. President, of an irritating character, on both sides of this slavery question. I do not know that the breach between the north and the south can ever be healed. But it is very certain that those who desire peace should throw their oil on the water and not into the fire. While, therefore, I shall always hereafter refuse to make unmanly concessions, I will abstain from saying any thing that is irritating or unnecessarily severe. I am not ashamed to say that I want peace.

Senators on the other side of the chamber, and their sympathizing friends all over the country, deplore the condition of the black man in the south. I shall not pause now to contrast his condition there with what it is in his native country. If the Christian religion be a reality (and in its sublime truths I am a firm believer) I am at a loss to understand how any man can pretend that the barbarian and cannibal, standing on the shores of Africa, and blessed with freedom, is better off than the civilized and evangelized slave on a southern plantation, cursed with bondage. Allowing all you say of the horrorr of slavery to be true, they are more than compensated by the moral and religious elevation of the African in this country. But what you say is not true, and all the world knows it is not. One thing I may mention that is true beyond all controversy, and that is that those most familiar with the institution, see the least of its horrors. I speak not alone of those who live in the south, and who see it every day in all its forms; but of those in the free States most contiguous to it. The people in southern Illinois and the eastern part of Indiana live almost in sight of slavery, and mingle with it almost every day in Kentucky and Missouri. The people in these localities, more than any others in the free States, trade to the south; they visit the plantations, and mingle freely with the slaves and with their masters. The result is that they discard the sickly sentimentality so freely indulged in by those who know nothing of slavery except as they see it in Abolition newspapers and Black Republican speeches. Fourteen counties in southern Illinois gave Buchanan fourteen thousand votes, and Fremont less than four hundred. I suppose the mob did not drive the Republican orators out of that country as they did from the southern States; or if they did, I hope it is not to be charged to the account of the slaveocracy. The simple truth is, Mr. President, there is not one man in a thousand, who knows any thing of slavery practically, that does not believe it to be the normal condition of the negro race. Seen through the interstices of Uncle Tom's Cabin, Garrison's Liberator, or one of the senator's speeches, it is, I grant you, a frightful outrage on humanity.

The senator alluded, the other day, to certain speeches made by leading statesmen in Virginia, which he assured us were more or less favorable to his side of this question. Does the senator know why such speeches are not made now? Does he know why the ameliorating process in the condition of the slave, then going on, has ceased? Does he know why there are thousands of slaves in bondage to-day who might otherwise have been free? Does he know why the slaves are not educated; why their liberty is restricted, and their bondage made to sit more heavily upon them? If he does not, I will tell him. It is because of the impertinent intermeddling of himself and his friends with matters that did not concern them.

The senator told us, the other day, on what terms we could get his sympathy. Let me tell him on what terms he can get our respect and the gratitude of the slave. He can get both by simply minding his own business. His present policy is annoying to us and detrimental to the slave. I use those words in their proper sense. He may annoy and vex the master; but if he lets slavery alone in the States, as he says he will, he will do him no harm. He may damage the slave by vexing the master; but if he leaves the slave in bondage he will do him no good. If you do not mean to overthrow slavery in the States, quit talking about it, quit exciting the fears of the master without a cause, and quit arousing the hopes of the slave without a purpose. That is my advice, and I charge nothing for it.

There is one point of attack against slavery which seems to be a favorite with all its assailants in the Senate, and out of it—and that is, its enervating and destroying effect on the people and States where it exists. The Senator from Massachusetts went out of his way, the other day, to tell us that slavery perverted Mount Vernon into a jackass! Those charges are made and dwelt upon, which brings us into this council house, discriminates against the property of the fifteen southern States of this Union? Do they pretend that there is anything in that Constitution which denies to our property equal protection in the Territories with the property of the other sixteen States of the Union? I undertake to say that it is the only article of property which is clearly and distinctly recognized by the Constitution. Take anything else, merchandise, live-stock, anything you please, and you can find nothing in the Constitution which specially and specifically looks to its recognition as property. The Constitution does recognize persons held to service (slaves) as property, and it recognizes nothing else by name. Every other kind of property is left to the protection of local or State legislation. Not a word is found in the Constitution about merchandise, live-stock, or money as property. Persons bound to service (slaves) alone are mentioned. Then with what pretence of justice is it said, that this property is under the ban of the Constitution, or that it is not equally entitled to protection with any other kind of property?

The southern States, Mr. President, have been accused of violence in the maintenance of their rights under the Constitution, as they understand them. Our people are set down as lawless, and are constantly charged with attempts to carry their points by force. A stranger would be very apt to conclude from the accounts given us, that every southern man was a walking citadel. I shall make no defense against charges like this—our States and our people stand on the defensive. Never, sir, never since the government was founded, has the north had reason to complain that either the southern States or the southern people have interfered with their domestic concerns. I have no reproaches to utter; but can our northern friends say as much? Can they say that they have never interfered with our domestic affairs?

When the Kansas bill was passed, we hoped there would be an end of this controversy. It was intended to take the question of slavery out of Congress, and transfer it to the people of the Territory where it properly belonged, and who, as we all agreed, had the right *of the proper time* to settle it for themselves. What the proper time may be was a subject left open for discussion; and to this point I will recur presently.

It certainly was not contemplated by any of us that violence was to be used by any party to coerce a decision in Kansas. The people there, those who were *bona fide* citizens of the Territory, were to be left perfectly free to settle their domestic affairs in their own way, subject to but one influence, and that the benign and peaceful influence of the Constitution. No sooner had this bill passed than a concerted and powerful effort was set on foot here, and rapidly taken up in the New England States, to colonize the Territory with a vagrant population. Men were enlisted and sent there, not to cultivate the soil, not to erect work-shops and carry on the mechanic arts—no, not for these purposes. They went not with the artisan's tools or the implements of husbandry in their hands, but with rifles, bowie knives, and other deadly weapons. Their object could not be mistaken. Instead of colonizing the country, and making for themselves benificent and wholesome laws—laws under which they meant themselves to live—people went to Kansas for no higher purpose than to fan the flames of discord, and to make laws from which they meant themselves to flee. They went for mischief, and they got it; they sowed the whirlwind, and reaped the storm. They were sent to Kansas to make Kansas a free State *solens volens*, and the Missourians were inflamed to madness by their conduct. It was not, sir, that these men went, or the State from which they went, that stirred the blood of Missourians, but it was the purpose for which they went. When the Kansas bill passed, very few of us expected Kansas to become a slave State, and very few of us cared much whether it did or not. But when we saw an attempt made by the enemies of slavery to plant on the borders of a slave State a freesoil colony, with no higher purpose than to harass that State—when we saw an attempt made by strangers to enslave the *bona fide* white settlers in Kansas, by forcing on them, not a Kansas but a New England government, our people rose *en masse*, and swore, by the God that made them, these things should not be.

The senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Hale] the other day paraded before the Senate a handbill—and he did it with a flourish of trumpets that would have done honor to the fair knight when he claimed the credit of killing Hotspur. The handbill spoke of Buchanan and Breckinridge, and *Free Kansas*. The senator evidently thought he had made a grand discovery. I certainly do not mean to approve of that handbill. It probably suggested an erroneous idea to many who saw it. It may have suggested that the Democratic party was for Kansas free, as the senator from New Hampshire understood the word "free"; and if it did, it suggested a falsehood. The Democratic party, as a party, is neither for free Kansas nor slave Kansas, as the free-soilers understand the words "free" and "slave." The Democratic party is for leaving Kansas *free*, at the *right time*, to settle the slavery question for herself, restrained only, as we all are in our action, by the provisions of the Federal Constitution. In this sense the Democrats are for FREE KANSAS. The senator's idea, if I understand him, is to make Kansas free by releasing the black man from the authority of his master, and then force a government on the white people in the Territory through the agency of New England emigrant aid societies. His free Kansas makes the negro free by enslaving the white man; but my free Kansas makes the white man free, and leaves the negro where the Constitution left him—subject to the authority of his master.

I was somewhat surprised, Mr. President, the other day, to hear the senator from Illinois, [Mr. Trumbull,] in chatechising the senator from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Bigler,] who was then addressing the Senate, raise the question as to how far we, on the Democratic side of the house, concurred in opinion upon the mooted point of squatter sovereignty. I suppose the object of the senator, in introducing that point, was to make mischief—to stir up strife between senators on this side of the chamber. If that was the purpose, let me say to him that he fell, and he will fall, every time he tries his skill at his mark. That there may be shades of difference in our opinions is very likely; that I do not, on every point, concur with my distinguished and venerable friend from Michigan, is probable; but that there is any difference between us which can by possibility prevent our acting in harmony for the accomplishment of certain great purposes which the national Democracy have in view, I utterly deny. I should prefer to have my friend agree with me, as he may prefer to have me agree with him; but our difference is not such, a I shall presently show, that we may not, without sacrifice on either side, act together on practical issues.

But, sir, how comes it that the senator from Illinois, how comes it that other senators on his side have all of a sudden found something so monstrous in this doctrine of squatter sovereignty? When had we the first evidence extended to us of the fact of squatter sovereignty on this continent? Excuse me, sir, but I undertake to say, that the first exhibition of it was in the State which you have the honor solely at this moment to represent on the floor of the Senate, [Mr. Weller in the chair.] When the people of California assembled in convention, and undertook to frame a State constitution for themselves, they were all squatters; they were in the country without authority of law; there was no law authorizing them to do so. When they assembled in convention on the high mission of making a State constitution, they assembled there to perform an act of sovereignty; when they made the constitution and set up a State government in all its forms, it was an act of sovereignty performed by squatters and by nobody else.

Now, sir, I ask senators on the other side of the chamber, whether they did not sanction that proceeding? I pray you, gentlemen, were you not one and all, in favor of admitting California under her squatter-sovereignty constitution? Was not the senator from Illinois the advocate for the admission of California under the constitution thus formed? Was not the senator from New York, and he from Massachusetts, and he from Ohio, all around the chamber, wherever they are, were they not friends of the admission of California under her squatter-sovereignty constitution? Then what right have they to complain of squatter-sovereignty? And then who was the first representative of squatter-sovereignty on this floor? When California was admitted, there were already at the door of the Senate two gentlemen asking for admission. One of them was John Charles Fremont. He came here as a senator, the first who presented himself from California, and he was the very embodiment of squatter-sovereignty. He had no constituency but a squatter-sovereignty constituency. He came from no State but a State brought into being by squatter-sovereigns. These gentlemen, to a man, advocated his admission. They not only went for the admission of the State, but for admission of her senators. Thus they endorsed the whole proceeding up to that time. I suspect that they, and all their class of politicians, are very much like one I heard speaking lately. He said he was for squatttr-sovereignty if it worked out in his favor, and against it if it did not.

In my opinion, squatter-sovereignty is a misnomer, and territorial sovereignty a humbug. I understand, sir, what is meant by State sovereignty, and in my opinion there is no other kind of sovereignty existing in this country. Squatter-sovereignty, territorial sovereignty, and popular sovereignty, (when applied to the Territories,) all belong to the same category, and they are all political absurdities in my opinion. But I am not going to *bore* the Senate by giving the reasons why I think so.

We agreed to let Kansas and all other Territories manage their own affairs in their own way, *subject only to the Constitution*. We differed as to what a Territory might rightfully do under the Constitution. My friend from Michigan [Mr. Cass] thought, and still thinks, a territorial legislature, such as that in Kansas, has the right, under the Constitution, to exclude slavery. I think differently. He is not seeking to have his ideas enacted into a law by Congress; nor am I. He admits that if the legislature of Kansas has not the right under the Constitution to exclude slavery, Congress cannot confer it; and I know, if the legislature has the right Congress cannot take it away. Therefore, neither of us propose that Congress shall do anything. We voted together on the Kansas bill, and agreed then to refer all our difference of opinion to the Supreme Court of the United States—the only tribunal on earth competent to decide between us. When that decision is rendered we both stand solemnly pledged to abide by it. I speak not now of what a sovereign State, in the exercise of her reserved rights, may do—that is a subject for future decision. Now, sir, the difference between my honorable friend and myself is precisely the difference between Democrats who believe in squatter-sovereignty, and Democrats who do not believe in it.

If an unorganized Territory, such as California was in 1849, such as Kansas was in 1853, such as the Indian Territory outside of Arkansas now is, shall undertake to exclude slavery, the Senator from Michigan and myself agree that it undertakes to do what it has no right to do. But if an organized Territory, like Kansas or Nebraska undertakes, through its legislative council, to exclude slavery, the senator thinks they have the right to do it. I do not think so. This he calls popular sovereignty. I call it the assumption of a right not conferred by the Constitution, and therefore not existing in the Territory. He may be right. I think he is not. But neither of us desires or expects Congress to decide between us.

The senator from Illinois, [Mr. Trumbull,] the other day interrogated the senator from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Bigler,] as to what Mr. Buchanan's views were on this point. My friend from Pennsylvania declined to reply, because he had no authority to do so. The friends of Mr. Buchanan were satisfied with his position on this point before they nominated and elected him, and they are not likely to fall out with him now on account of any suggestion coming from his enemies, secret or open. That he will hold the scales of justice in equal balance between the North and the South, I have no doubt; and if he does, his friends North and South will adhere to him. They were strong enough to elect him; and if he fulfils their hopes, as I am sure he will, they will show themselves strong enough to carry his administration through in triumph. Mr. Buchanan may laugh his enemies to scorn. He has only to feel the inspiration that moved the hearts of his friends at Cincinnati, and stand firmly on the platform laid down by them, and they will throw over him their arms, and build around him a rampart that will defy the power of the Black Republicans and all their allies.

But, to return the Territories: We of the Democratic faith all agree that they may, at the proper time, settle the slavery question for themselves. Some think it may be done sooner; but we all agree that when the people of a Territory meet in convention to frame a State constitution, they may, in that constitution, admit or exclude slavery, as they please; and we agree, further, that their decision is final. If Kansas comes here with a constitution made by her *bona fide* people, free from all outside influences, excluding slavery, there is not a Democrat in either House of Congress who will not vote for her admission; and if, on the other hand, she comes with a constitution similarly made tolerating slavery, there is not a Democrat who will not vote for her admission. Break up your emigrant aid societies at the North, and all interference from the South will cease. Then Kansas, being left perfectly free to regulate her domestic affairs in her own way, may assemble her people in convention, frame her constitution to suit herself, admit or exclude slavery as she pleases, and she will be welcomed into the Union with open arms by every friend of free institutions from the Aristook to the Rio Grand, and from the Atlantic to the far off Pacific. Sir, the Democracy has stood for fifty years, like our own ocean-bound Republic. The waves of faction have beaten upon it, and they have broken, in harmless rip