THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1859. VOLUME X.—NUMBER 225.

Daily Appeal

ADDRESS OF THE HON. JEFFERSON DAVIS,

BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION IN THE CITY OF JACKSON, JULY 4, 1859.

(CONCLUDED.)

But now, when the matter in controversy, which has so long intended and perverted the action of Congress, has been finally decided according to the provisions of our fundamental law, there are those who seek to revive the controversy by bringing in question by the obligation of the General Government to give efficacy to constitutional rights which have been established, if beyond the limits of legislation to decisional. What would be the result when the reply to our appeal for adequate protection, though you have gained the end in the issue we joined and in the manner agreed upon, yet we can not consent that you should have whatever remedies are available secure the future enjoyment of the right you have established?

The government which withholds all practicable rights of protection to its citizens forfeits its claim to allegiance and support. To establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and provide for the common defense are the great purposes for which our Union was formed. I, was in the discharge of these great duties, which he whosoever to defend the Constitution, may find sanctioned in its preamble, that we waged the war of 1812. To protect our commerce from detention and search upon the high seas, and to defend our citizens, native and naturalized, from impressment, we inscribed on our banner "free trade and sailors' rights;" and, all unprepared as we were, threw the wager of battle to the mistress of the seas.

In your resolutions you have well denied that we are engaged, from demanding protection by acquiescence in the doctrine of non-intervention with the institution of slavery in the States, Territories, or District of Columbia. I will not undertake to define the new doctrine of "non-intervention" shadowy and variably, it may be classed with what a preacher termed the third division of his subject, that of which he knew not what, and which he hoped could not possibly understand. It may be assumed that if the non-intervention which you now deny had been used with the proposition to the people of Massachusetts they never would have acquiesced in it.

The doctrine had its origin in worthy motives, and was used for a good purpose—to check the Emancipation which sprung from hostile agitation, which is continually rolled the "Wilmot process." Though a feeble barrier, it was, perhaps, not wholly useless, and may have served to gain time for recovery for the people to reflect and rally. But he statesman himself who appeals to the legislation of 1850 to sustain the modern construction, which denies the right of Congress to do anything in relation to slave property either in the Territories, States, or District of Columbia. Among those means so called the Compromise, there was one which, in the place of an abstract question of boundary, transferred territory from the slaveholding laws of Texas to those of New Mexico; another to give to the Supreme Court of New Mexico an appeal in all cases involving titles to slaves, though the amount should not be equal to that which was required in other cases; another to give more efficacious remedy for the recovery of fugitives slaves found within the limits of the States; another which affixed emancipation of the slaves as a penalty upon the citizen who should bring them into the District of Columbia, and there keep him with intent to sell him at somewhere time and at some other place. It needed not the penal evasion to make us feel the offense of the last cited act. In other times and places I have said hard and thought harder things of those who thus estranged our equality in the central territory ceded for the seat of government, and whose only excuse, non-intervention we might pray to be delivered.

If the questions were fairly submitted to the intelligent minds in our portion of our country, shall the General Government have the means which are needed to give adequate protection to the rights and property of American citizens on the high seas, and wherever the land it has jurisdiction, I will not doubt what the answer would be. And this confidence is felt notwithstanding the clamorous outcries against non-intervention, which are daily repeated by resorts to proscribe, such as "the enactment of a slave code by Congress," "no fate or security for the coming people," and others as false in fact.

Our assertion of a right to protection does not necessarily involve the enactment of additional laws, but we do claim that our security unless they were honestly administered.

The position so long held by the South that the constitution, as the supreme law of the land, carries its own protection and as the recognized property in slaves as an incident their introduction into the territories—the common property of the States—is now sought to be forced by the Supreme Court. The decree of public, and contingent law, which inhibited slavery and the territory acquired from Mexico, was the result of the action of the Federal Government, but the Supreme Court of the United States but of the value of preceding, remained unchanged, then the repeal of the Missouri Law would be unlawful. Now the Supreme Court has decided that it is not so, and the question is now to be settled