THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1859 VOLUME X.--NUMBER 221.

Daily Appeal.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY CREED.

(From the New Orleans True Delta.)

Stephen A. Douglas is resolved that no one shall replace him upon his own peculiar ground. Above all he is determined to stand fair upon the record touching the slavery issue in the Territories, so that neither North nor South may be able to assume him of reticence or duplicity in regard to it. Animated by these views, he has recently published in a northern magazine a very lengthy review of the entire subject under the caption of "The dividing line between federal and local authority. Popular sovereignty in the Territories."

In this searching, powerful, and purely logical examination of the subject, Mr. Douglas has exhausted the argument, and shown in terms to our mind perfectly conclusively the constitutional impregnability of his position, and the political necessity, under his view, of sustaining it. He believes, and so states, that the Constitution of the United States neither establishes nor prohibits slavery in the States or Territories beyond the power of the people legally to control it, but "leaves the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

In the belief of the eloquent and able western statesman we cordially accord; it is, in our opinion, the only reasonable ground any man sufficient for the maintenance of the Union can occupy in the question, and it seems to us now, as it ever has done, that if the South should abandon it for the purpose of accepting the Freesoil stand ground of its enemies in former years, and demand congressional interference in behalf of slavery in the Territories, it will not be long before the same interference will be invoked to overthrow the institution there and everywhere else. To establish this allegation, Mr. Douglas produces a resolution from the platform of the Republican party, adopted by it in Philadelphia, in 1856, which we think is conclusive on this head. It is in the words:

"That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that it is the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery."

It will then be seen by our readers that the Freesoil Convention, of 1856 took exactly the same ground that many southern Democrats now assume, namely, the right of Congress to exercise sovereign authority in the Territories, the latter for the establishment and maintenance of slavery, the former for its discouragement and prevention. Douglas takes the opposite ground, and in a manner that cannot, we think, fail to carry conviction to every candid and reasonable mind, establishes the constitutionality of his views. He says:

"It is difficult to conceive that any person who believes that the constitution confers the right of property in the enjoyment of slave property in the territories, regardless of the wishes of the people and of the action of the territorial Legislature, can satisfy his conscience with such a view of fidelity to the constitution as will challenge such Congressional legislation as the exigency of the case may demand under such right under the constitution. Under this view of the subject it is impossible to resist the conclusion that if the constitution does establish slavery in the territories, beyond the power of the people to control it by law, it is the imperative duty of Congress to supply all the legislation necessary to its protection; and if the opposition to the right of property in slaves should be so strong as to impede such legislation, it would necessarily result that the constitution either establishes no protection to slavery any where, but leaves the question of such protection to the territorial authority, free to form and regulate their domestic affairs in our dominions, without the intervention of Congress, any other power whatsoever."

This seems to us a fair and frank running up of the matter in controversy, either the constitution does or does not entitle the citizen to the enjoyment of slave property in the Territories, regardless of the wishes of the people and of the action of the territorial Legislature, or it necessarily results that the Constitution either establishes or prohibits slavery anywhere, but leaves the people of each State and Territory entirely free to form and regulate their domestic institutions, under his view, of sustaining it. He believes, and so states, that the Constitution of the United States neither establishes nor prohibits slavery in the States or Territories beyond the power of the people legally to control it, but "leaves the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

In the belief of the eloquent and able western statesman we cordially accord; it is, in our opinion, the only reasonable ground any man sufficient for the maintenance of the Union can occupy in the question, and it seems to us now, as it ever has done, that if the South should abandon it for the purpose of accepting the Freesoil stand ground of its enemies in former years, and demand congressional interference in behalf of slavery in the Territories, it will not be long before the same interference will be invoked to overthrow the institution there and everywhere else. To establish this allegation, Mr. Douglas produces a resolution from the platform of the Republican party, adopted by it in Philadelphia, in 1856, which we think is conclusive on this head. It is in the words:

"That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that it is the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery."

It will then be seen by our readers that the Freesoil Convention, of 1856 took exactly the same ground that many southern Democrats now assume, namely, the right of Congress to exercise sovereign authority in the Territories, the latter for the establishment and maintenance of slavery, the former for its discouragement and prevention. Douglas takes the opposite ground, and in a manner that cannot, we think, fail to carry conviction to every candid and reasonable mind, establishes the constitutionality of his views. He says:

"It is difficult to conceive that any person who believes that the constitution confers the right of property in the enjoyment of slave property in the territories, regardless of the wishes of the people and of the action of the territorial Legislature, can satisfy his conscience with such a view of fidelity to the constitution as will challenge such Congressional legislation as the exigency of the case may demand under such right under the constitution. Under this view of the subject it is impossible to resist the conclusion that if the constitution does establish slavery in the territories, beyond the power of the people to control it by law, it is the imperative duty of Congress to supply all the legislation necessary to its protection; and if this