THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1860. VOLUME XI—NUMBER 61.

Daily Appeal.

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES.

An enthusiastic meeting of the Young Men's Democratic association of the first Congressional district, Philadelphia, was held on Saturday last, to ratify the proceedings of the Pennsylvania State convention. The following, among other resolutions, was passed:

Resolved, That for the coming crisis we believe that with such a candidate for President as Hon. James Guthrie, of Kentucky, the Keystone State would give 30,000 majority for the Democratic ticket.

The parish convention of East Baton Rouge, Low sians, at its late meeting, unanimously instructed the State convention, instructed for Vice-President Breckinridge, and adopted a resolution, by one majority, of opposition to Mr. Slidell.

The three great parishes of the second Congressional district, Louisiana—Lafourche, Assumption and Ascension—which cast over two thousand Democratic majority, have passed resolutions unqualifiedly indorsing the representation in Congress, Hon. Miles Taylor, and the great statesman of the West, Judge Douglas.

In the parish of St. Mary, La., a meeting of twenty-seven Democrats, friends of Slidell, was held, and resolutions passed condemnatory of Hon. Miles Taylor's indorsement of Mr. Douglas, and delegates appointed to the State convention. A subsequent meeting of the Democracy of the parish was held, at which Judge Baker, a gentleman of high character, standing and intelligence, was called upon to preside, with which he complied, and delivered an elegant eulogium upon Judge Douglas and Miles Taylor. The following resolutions were adopted:

1. That we cordially approve of the course pursued in the present session of Congress by the Hon. Miles Taylor, and that our confidence in him is undiminished.

2. That we see no reason for believing that Stephen A. Douglas occupies a different position from that occupied by him in 1858, but believe that now, as then, he stands upon the Cincinnati platform.

3. That we consider Stephen A. Douglas to be the best candidate for the Presidential chair, believing, as we do, that he is no sectional man, but devoted to the welfare of the Union, and desirous that every citizen of the United States shall be protected in his rights."

The Athens (Alabama) *Herald*, merely to avoid the usual habit of saying afterward "we knew so," puts on record, in advance, its prophesy of who will be the nominees of the Charleston Convention. Hard they are:

FOR PRESIDENT,
HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS,
Of Illinois.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,
HON. BENJ. FITZPATRICK,
Of Alabama.

DOUGLAS' REPLY TO TRUMBULL.

In the recent debate in the Senate, Mr. Douglas having replied to Mr. Swanzy, Trumbull endeavored to get up a scene. He spoke at Douglas, and was thus replied to promptly and officially.

I have not a few words to say in reply to my colleague; and first on the question, whether Illinois was a slave territory or not; and whether we ever had slavery in the State. I dislike technical denials, conveying an idea contrary to the fact. My colleague well knows, and so do I, that, practically, we had slaves there while a Territory and after we became a State. I have seen him dance to the music of a negro slave in Illinois many a time, and have danced to the same music myself. [Laughter.] We have both had the same negro servants to black our boots and wait upon us, and they were held as slaves. We know, therefore, that slavery did exist in the State in fact; and his denial relates exclusively to the question whether slavery was legal. Whether legal or not it existed in fact. The master exercised his dominion over the slave, and those negroes were held as slaves until 1847, when we established the new Constitution. There are gentlemen around me here who know the fact—citizens who have moved by slaves to Illinois. No man familiar with the history of Illinois will deny the fact. The quibble is that the territorial laws authorizing the introduction of slaves were void, because the ordinance of 1787 said slavery was prohibited.

Notwithstanding that ordinance, the old French inhabitants, who had slaves before the ordinance, paid no attention to it, and held slaves still. Slaves were held there all the time that Illinois was a territory, and after it became a State they were held till they all died out, and their children became emancipated under the constitution. It is a fact; we all know it. That gentleman has seen many of these old French slaves, who were held in defiance of the ordinance. Whether they were lawfully held or not, the territorial legislature sustained the rights of the master. Not only were slaves held by the French before the ordinance, but the territorial legislature passed a law in substance to this effect: any citizen might go to Kentucky, or any other State or territory, where slavery was held, and bring slaves into the territory of Illinois, take them to a county court, and in open court, after taking an indenture by which the slave and his posterity were to serve the master a certain number of years, and in the event that the slave refused to enter into the indenture, the master should serve a certain time to take him out of the State. The Senator now says that law was not valid. Valid or not, it was executed; slaves were introduced, and they were held; they were used; they were worked, and they died slaves. That is the fact. I have had bended to me a book showing the number of slaves in Illinois at the time of the national census, from which it appears that, when the census of 1830 was taken, there were in Illinois 168 slaves; in 1840, 331; in 1850, 331; and in 1857, 117. In 1850 there were none, for the reason that, in 1848, we adopted a new constitution, that prohibited slavery outright, and by that time they had nearly all died out. The reason why that at some time there were as many as a hundred slaves, and at all times the descendants of the master was manifested in 1857.

The fact is, that the people of the Territory of Illinois, when it was a Territory, were almost all from the southern States, particularly from Kentucky and Virginia. The southern end of the State was then nearly part of Virginia—that part called Egypt—because it is the land of lotus—and of plenty. Civilization and learning had originated in Egypt. The northern part of the State, where the political friends of my colleague now preponderate, was then in the possession of the Indians, and there were neither Indians, nor northern Old Fogies, and a Yankee could not get to Illinois at all, unless he passed through Virginia and Kentucky into Tennessee, and through Kentucky. The consequence was that ninety-nine out of a hundred of the settlers were from the slave States. They carried the old family servants with them, and kept them. They were told, "there is an ordinance of Congress passed against your holding them." They said, "what has Congress to do with our domestic institutions? Congress had better attend to our own business, and let us alone; we know what we want better than Congress," and these they caused this law to bring them in and make them indentured. Under that, they established slavery and held slaves as long as they wanted them. When they assembled to make the Constitution of Illinois, in 1818, for admission into the Union, nearly every delegate to the convention brought along with him his negro to black his boots and shoes, to brush his wait upon him, and take care of his young. They had a jolly time there; they were dancing people. Irishmen, poodle, people who enjoyed life. They had the old French habitants. Slaves were just as thick there as blackberries.

But they said "Experience proves that it is not going to be profitable in this climate." There were no scruples about it. Every one of them was nursed by it. His mother and his father held slaves. They had no scruples about its being right, but they said, "We cannot make any money by it, and as our State runs off north, up to these other old crown, perhaps we shall gain population faster if we stop slavery and invite in the northern population;" and, as a matter of political policy, State policy, they prohibited slavery themselves. How did they prohibit it? Not by emancipating, setting at liberty, the slaves then in the State, for, I believe, that has never been done by any legislative body in America, and I doubt whether any one will ever arrogate to itself the right to divest property already there; but they provided that all slaves then in the State should remain slaves for life; that all indentured apprentices should fulfill the terms of their indentures. Nine-tenths the years was about long enough, I reckon, for grown persons, at least.

All persons of slave parents, after a certain time, were to be free at a certain age, and all born after a certain other period, were to be free at such period. It was a gradual system of emancipation. Hence, I now repeat, that so long as the ordinance of 1787, passed by Congress, said Illinois should not have slavery, she did have it; and the first day that our people arrived at that condition that they could do as they pleased, to-wit: when they became a State, they adopted a system of gradual emancipation; but still slavery continued in the State, as the census of 1830, the census of 1840, the census of 1850, show, until the new Constitution of 1847, when nearly all those slaves died out, and probably there was not half a dozen alive. That was the way slavery was introduced and expired in Illinois. Whatever quibbles there may be about legal construction, loyal right, these are the facts.

Look into the territorial legislation, and you will find as rigorous a code for the protection of slave property as in any State; a code prescribing the control of the master, providing that if a negro slave should leave his master's farm without leave, in the night time, he should be punished by so many stripes, and if he committed such an offence he should receive so many stripes, and so on. A more rigorous code ever existed in any Northern State of this Union. Not only that, but after the State came into the Union, the State of Illinois enacted that code, and continued it up to the time that slavery died out under the operation of the State Constitution.

I dislike, sir, to have a controversy with my colleague about historical facts. I suppose the Senate of the United States has no secular interest in the early history of Illinois, but it has become obligatory on me to vindicate my statement to-day.

Now, sir, a word about the repeal of the Missouri compromise. I have had occasion to refer to that before in the Senate, and I am sorry to have to refer to it again.

My colleague arraigns me as chairman of the committee on Territories against myself as a member of the Senate in 1854, upon the Nebraska bill. He says that, as chairman of the committee, I reported that we did not see proper to depart from the example of 1850, that as the Mexican laws were not then repealed in terms, we did not propose in terms to repeal the Missouri restriction, but—there the Senator stops, and there the sources of the report begins—but, the report added, the committee proposes to carry out the principles embodied in the compromise measures of 1850 by giving the people the right to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, and leaving the question of slavery for themselves, and will report a bill giving them that power.

But inasmuch as the power to introduce slavery, notwithstanding the Mexican laws, were confirmed at the territorial legislatures under the compromise measures of 1850, the right to introduce it into Kansas, we without repealing the Missouri restriction, was also proposed to be conferred without expressly repealing the restriction. The legal effect was precisely the same. Afterward some gentlemen said they would rather have the legal effect expressed in plain language.

I said, "If you want a repealing act, have it; it does not alter the legal effect." I said so at the time the debate shows; and hence I put in the express provision that the Missouri act was thereby repealed. It did not change the legal effect of the bill; but the variation of language has been the staple of a great many stump speeches, a great many eloquent quibbles of country court lawyers, a great many attempts to prove inconsistency by small politicians in the country. Be it so. The people understand that thing. The object I had in view was to allow the people to do as they pleased. The first bill accomplished that; the second bill accomplished it. Whether that was the object of others or not, is another question. That was my object. The two bills, in my opinion, had the same legal effect; but I said if any one doubts it, I will make it plain. Some said, "we doubt whether that gives the right." Then I made it plain, and brought it in in express terms, and he calls it changes of phrase, without changing the legal effect, a change of policy. My colleague is welcome to make the most out of that. I have had that arrangement over and over again.

The Senator has some doubt as to whether I am in good standing in my own party; whether I am a good representative of northwestern Democracy. I have neither time nor inclination to discuss that question. I will allow the people to speak in their corrections on that subject. Whether I represent the Democracy of Illinois or not, I shall not say. The people understand all that. There is no controversy here about that. I can only say that I have been in the Democratic party all my life, and I know what our Democracy mean. My colleague indorsed and approved the compromise measures of 1850. He was a Democrat in those years. Even in 1856, he declared, I believe, that he could not vote for me, if nominated, but he would vote for Mr. Buchanan; but, after the nomination, he did vote for me. I suppose he did so because he thought I was the better Democrat of the two. I have no objection to that; it is all right enough, never intended to taunt him with inconsistency, but I do not think he is as safe and as orthodox a Democrat as a portion of the Republican party as the senator from New York. The senator from New York says that a state that does not allow a negro to vote on an equality with a white man is a slave state. I read his speech here to-day. I suppose the Senator from New York is a pretty good Republican. I thought he spoke with some authority for his party. I did not suppose those neophytes who had just come into the party were going to unsettle and shake the foundation and establishment of the party so quickly, and prescribe a platform that would rule out the Senator from New York. I meet no heretical, therefore, in take the authority of the leaders of the party from those who are kept in the rank and file until they had served an apprenticeship.

The Senator from New York says it is slavery not to allow the negro to vote. Well, sir, I had that that is political slavery. If you disfranchise a man, you make him a political slave. Deprive a white man of a voice in his Government, and, politically, he is a slave. Hence the inequality you create is slavery to that extent. My colleague will not allow a negro to vote. He lives too far south in Illinois for that, decidedly. He has to expound down in Egypt. They have other expounding up North. The creed is pretty black in the north end of the State; about the center it is a pretty mixed mixture, and it is almost white when you get down into Egypt. It assumes paler shades as you go South. The Democrats of Illinois have one creed, and we can proclaim it everywhere alike.

The Senator, my colleague, complains that I renounced his party to be in favor of negro equality. No such thing, says he; "I tell my colleague he lies (both) if he did not so." There is something very fearful in the manner in which he said it. Senate knows that he is a dignified gentleman and he says things in a manly way, and I shall be very cautious how I reply. But he says he does hold that by the law of God the negro and the white man are created equal—that is, he says, in a state of nature, and, therefore, he says he indorses that clause of the Declaration of Independence as inalienable right. I do not know, sir, that I do not think I mistake my colleague. He thinks that clause of the Declaration of Independence includes the negro as well as the white man. He declares, therefore, that the negro and the white man were created equal. What does that Declaration also say? "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." If the negro and the white man are created equal, and that equality is an inalienable right, by what authority can we say to the people of a Territory, where slavery is held, and before a slave goes into the territory of Illinois, take them to a county court, and in open court, after taking an indenture by which the slave and his posterity were to serve the master a certain number of years, and in the event that the slave refused to enter into the indenture, the master should serve a certain time to take him out of the State? The Senator now says that law was not valid. Valid or not, it was executed; slaves were introduced, and they were held; they were used; they were worked, and they died slaves. That is the fact. I have had handed to me a book showing the number of slaves in Illinois at the time of the national census, from which it appears that, when the census of 1830 was taken, there were in Illinois 168 slaves; in 1840, 331; in 1850, 331; and in 1857, 117. In 1850 there were none, for the reason that, in 1848, we adopted a new constitution, that prohibited slavery outright, and by that time they had nearly all died out. The reason why that at some time there were as many as a hundred slaves, and at all times the descendants of the master was manifest in 1857.

The fact is, that the people of the Territory of Illinois, when it was a Territory, were almost all from the southern States, particularly from Kentucky and Virginia. The southern end of the State was then nearly part of Virginia—that part called Egypt—because it is the land of lotus—and of plenty. Civilization and learning had originated in Egypt. The northern part of the State, where the political friends of my colleague now preponderate, was then in the possession of the Indians, and there were neither Indians, and northern Old Fogies, and a Yankee could not get to Illinois at all, unless he passed through Virginia and Kentucky into Tennessee, and through Kentucky. The consequence was that ninety-nine out of a hundred of the settlers were from the slave States. They carried the old family servants with them, and kept them. They were told, "there is an ordinance of Congress passed against your holding them." They said, "what has Congress to do with our domestic institutions? Congress had better attend to our own business, and let us alone; we know what we want better than Congress," and these they caused this law to bring them in and make them indentured. Under that, they established slavery and held slaves as long as they wanted them. When they assembled to make the Constitution of Illinois, in 1818, for admission into the Union, nearly every delegate to the convention brought along with him his negro to black his boots and shoes, to brush, wait upon him, and take care of his young. They had a jolly time there; they were dancing people. Irishmen, poodle, people who enjoyed life. They had the old French habitants. Slaves were just as thick there as blackberries.

But they said "Experience proves that it is not going to be profitable in this climate." There were no scruples about it. Every one of them was nursed by it. His mother and his father held slaves. They had no scruples about its being right, but they said, "We cannot make any money by it, and as our State runs off north, up to these other old crown, perhaps we shall gain population faster if we stop slavery and invite in the northern population;" and, as a matter of political policy, State policy, they prohibited slavery themselves. How did they prohibit it? Not by emancipating, setting at liberty, the slaves then in the State, for, I believe, that has never been done by any legislative body in America, and I doubt whether any one will ever arrogate to itself the right to divest property already there; but they provided that all slaves then in the State should remain slaves for life; that all indentured apprentices should fulfill the terms of their indentures. Nine-tenths the years was about long enough, I reckon, for grown persons, at least.

All persons of slave parents, after a certain time, were to be free at a certain age, and all born after a certain other period, were to be free at such period. It was a gradual system of emancipation. Hence, I now repeat, that so long as the ordinance of 1787, passed by Congress, said Illinois should not have slavery, she did have it; and the first day that our people arrived at that condition that they could do as they pleased, to-wit: when they became a State, they adopted a system of gradual emancipation; but still slavery continued in the State, as the census of 1830, the census of 1840, the census of 1850, show, until the new Constitution of 1847, when nearly all those slaves died out, and probably there was not half a dozen alive. That was the way slavery was introduced and expired in Illinois. Whatever quibbles there may be about legal construction, loyal right, these are the facts.

Look into the territorial legislation, and you will find as rigorous a code for the protection of slave property as in any State; a code prescribing the control of the master, providing that if a negro slave should leave his master's farm without leave, in the night time, he should be punished by so many stripes, and if he committed such an offence he should receive so many stripes, and so on. A more rigorous code ever existed in any Northern State of this Union. Not only that, but after the State came into the Union, the State of Illinois enacted that code, and continued it up to the time that slavery died out under the operation of the State Constitution.

I dislike, sir, to have a controversy with my colleague about historical facts. I suppose the Senate of the United States has no secular interest in the early history of Illinois, but it has become obligatory on me to vindicate my statement to-day.

Now, sir, a word about the repeal of the Missouri compromise. I have had occasion to refer to that before in the Senate, and I am sorry to have to refer to it again.

My colleague arraigns me as chairman of the committee on Territories against myself as a member of the Senate in 1854, upon the Nebraska bill. He says that, as chairman of the committee, I reported that we did not see proper to depart from the example of 1850, that as the Mexican laws were not then repealed in terms, we did not propose in terms to repeal the Missouri restriction, but—there the Senator stops, and there the sources of the report begins—but, the report added, the committee proposes to carry out the principles embodied in the compromise measures of 1850 by giving the people the right to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, and leaving the question of slavery for themselves, and will report a bill giving them that power.

But inasmuch as the power to introduce slavery, notwithstanding the Mexican laws, were confirmed at the territorial legislatures under the compromise measures of 1850, the right to introduce it into Kansas, we without repealing the Missouri restriction, was also proposed to be conferred without expressly repealing the restriction. The legal effect was precisely the same. Afterward some gentlemen said they would rather have the legal effect expressed in plain language.

I said, "If you want a repealing act, have it; it does not alter the legal effect." I said so at the time the debate shows; and hence I put in the express provision that the Missouri act was thereby repealed. It did not change the legal effect of the bill; but the variation of language has been the staple of a great many stump speeches, a great many eloquent quibbles of country court lawyers, a great many attempts to prove inconsistency by small politicians in the country. Be it so. The people understand that thing. The object I had in view was to allow the people to do as they pleased. The first bill accomplished that; the second bill accomplished it. Whether that was the object of others or not, is another question. That was my object. The two bills, in my opinion, had the same legal effect; but I said if any one doubts it, I will make it plain. Some said, "we doubt whether that gives the right." Then I made it plain, and brought it in in express terms, and he calls it changes of phrase, without changing the legal effect, a change of policy. My colleague is welcome to make the most out of that. I have had that arrangement over and over again.

The Senator has some doubt as to whether I am in good standing in my own party; whether I am a good representative of northwestern Democracy. I have neither time nor inclination to discuss that question. I will allow the people to speak in their corrections on that subject. Whether I represent the Democracy of Illinois or not, I shall not say. The people understand all that. There is no controversy here about that. I can only say that I have been in the Democratic party all my life, and I know what our Democracy mean. My colleague indorsed and approved the compromise measures of 1850. He was a Democrat in those years. Even in 1856, he declared, I believe, that he could not vote for me, if nominated, but he would vote for Mr. Buchanan; but, after the nomination, he did vote for me. I suppose he did so because he thought I was the better Democrat of the two. I have no objection to that; it is all right enough, never intended to taunt him with inconsistency, but I do not think he is as safe and as orthodox a Democrat as a portion of the Republican party as the senator from New York. The senator from New York says that a state that does not allow a negro to vote on an equality with a white man is a slave state. I read his speech here to-day. I suppose the Senator from New York is a pretty good Republican. I thought he spoke with some authority for his party. I did not suppose those neophytes who had just come into the party were going to unsettle and shake the foundation and establishment of the party so quickly, and prescribe a platform that would rule out the Senator from New York. I meet no heretical, therefore, in take the authority of the leaders of the party from those who are kept in the rank and file until they had served an apprenticeship.

The Senator from New York says it is slavery not to allow the negro to vote. Well, sir, I had that that is political slavery. If you disfranchise a man, you make him a political slave. Deprive a white man of a voice in his Government, and, politically, he is a slave. Hence the inequality you create is slavery to that extent. My colleague will not allow a negro to vote. He lives too far south in Illinois for that, decidedly. He has to expound down in Egypt. They have other expounding up North. The creed is pretty black in the north end of the State; about the center it is a pretty mixed mixture, and it is almost white when you get down into Egypt. It assumes paler shades as you go South. The Democrats of Illinois have one creed, and we can proclaim it everywhere alike.

The Senator, my colleague, complains that I renounced his party to be in favor of negro equality. No such thing, says he; "I tell my colleague he lies (both) if he did not so." There is something very fearful in the manner in which he said it. Senate knows that he is a dignified gentleman and he says things in a manly way, and I shall be very cautious how I reply. But he says he does hold that by the law of God the negro and the white man are created equal—that is, he says, in a state of nature, and, therefore, he says he indorses that clause of the Declaration of Independence as inalienable right. I do not know, sir, that I do not think I mistake my colleague. He thinks that clause of the Declaration of Independence includes the negro as well as the white man. He declares, therefore, that the negro and the white man were created equal. What does that Declaration also say? "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." If the negro and the white man are created equal, and that equality is an inalienable right, by what authority can we say to the people of a Territory, where slavery is held, and before a slave goes into the territory of Illinois, take them to a county court, and in open court, after taking an indenture by which the slave and his posterity were to serve the master a certain number of years, and in the event that the slave refused to enter into the indenture, the master should serve a certain time to take him out of the State? The Senator now says that law was not valid. Valid or not, it was executed; slaves were introduced, and they were held; they were used; they were worked, and they died slaves. That is the fact. I have had handed to me a book showing the number of slaves in Illinois at the time of the national census, from which it appears that, when the census of 1830 was taken, there were in Illinois 168 slaves; in 1840, 331; in 1850, 331; and in 1857, 117. In 1850 there were none, for the reason that, in 1848, we adopted a new constitution, that prohibited slavery outright, and by that time they had nearly all died out. The reason why that at some time there were as many as a hundred slaves, and at all times the descendants of the master was manifest in 1857.

The fact is, that the people of the Territory of Illinois, when it was a Territory, were almost all from the southern States, particularly from Kentucky and Virginia. The southern end of the State was then nearly part of Virginia—that part called Egypt—because it is the land of lotus—and of plenty. Civilization and learning had originated in Egypt. The northern part of the State, where the political friends of my colleague now preponderate, was then in the possession of the Indians, and there were neither Indians, and northern Old Fogies, and a Yankee could not get to Illinois at all, unless he passed through Virginia and Kentucky into Tennessee, and through Kentucky. The consequence was that ninety-nine out of a hundred of the settlers were from the slave States. They carried the old family servants with them, and kept them. They were told, "there is an ordinance of Congress passed against your holding them." They said, "what has Congress to do with our domestic institutions? Congress had better attend to our own business, and let us alone; we know what we want better than Congress," and these they caused this law to bring them in and make them indentured. Under that, they established slavery and held slaves as long as they wanted them. When they assembled to make the Constitution of Illinois, in 1818, for admission into the Union, nearly every delegate to the convention brought along with him his negro to black his boots and shoes, to brush, wait upon him, and take care of his young. They had a jolly time there; they were dancing people. Irishmen, poodle, people who enjoyed life. They had the old French habitants. Slaves were just as thick there as blackberries.

But they said "Experience proves that it is not going to be profitable in this climate." There were no scruples about it. Every one of them was nursed by it. His mother and his father held slaves. They had no scruples about its being right, but they said, "We cannot make any money by it, and as our State runs off north, up to these other old crown, perhaps we shall gain population faster if we stop slavery and invite in the northern population;" and, as a matter of political policy, State policy, they prohibited slavery themselves. How did they prohibit it? Not by emancipating, setting at liberty, the slaves then in the State, for, I believe, that has never been done by any legislative body in America, and I doubt whether any one will ever arrogate to itself the right to divest property already there; but they provided that all slaves then in the State should remain slaves for life; that all indentured apprentices should fulfill the terms of their indentures. Nine-tenths the years was about long enough, I reckon, for grown persons, at least.

All persons of slave parents, after a certain time, were to be free at a certain age, and all born after a certain other period, were to be free at such period. It was a gradual system of emancipation. Hence, I now repeat, that so long as the ordinance of 1787, passed by Congress, said Illinois should not have slavery, she did have it; and the first day that our people arrived at that condition that they could do as they pleased, to-wit: when they became a State, they adopted a system of gradual emancipation; but still slavery continued in the State, as the census of 1830, the census of 1840, the census of 1850, show, until the new Constitution of 1847, when nearly all those slaves died out, and probably there was not half a dozen alive. That was the way slavery was introduced and expired in Illinois. Whatever quibbles there may be about legal construction, loyal right, these are the facts.

Look into the territorial legislation, and you will find as rigorous a code for the protection of slave property as in any State; a code prescribing the control of the master, providing that if a negro slave should leave his master's farm without leave, in the night time, he should be punished by so many stripes, and if he committed such an offence he should receive so many stripes, and so on. A more rigorous code ever existed in any Northern State of this Union. Not only that, but after the State came into the Union, the State of Illinois enacted that code, and continued it up to the time that slavery died out under the operation of the State Constitution.

I dislike, sir, to have a controversy with my colleague about historical facts. I suppose the Senate of the United States has no secular interest in the early history of Illinois, but it has become obligatory on me to vindicate my statement to-day.

Now, sir, a word about the repeal of the Missouri compromise. I have had occasion to refer to that before in the Senate, and I am sorry to have to refer to it again.

My colleague arraigns me as chairman of

The Memphis Appeal.

PUBLISHED DAILY, TRI-WEEKLY AND WEEKLY AT
JNO. A. M'CLANAHAN.....LEONIDAS TROUSDALE,
BENJAMIN P. DILL,
Under the firm and style of
M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL.

To whom all Letters on Business, or otherwise, should be addressed.

PRICE OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Daily (in advance) per annum.....$10.00
Tri-Weekly " " 5.00
Weekly " " 2.50

☞ All Daily subscriptions will be considered due and payable half-yearly in advance.

☞ The foregoing terms will be strictly and rigidly adhered to.

DAILY RATES OF ADVERTISING

For one square of ten lines or less, one insertion.....$1.00
For each additional insertion of same.....50

Space	1 d.	2 d.	3 d.	4 d.	5 d.	1 w.	2 w.	3 w.	4 w.	1 m.	2 m.	3 m.	6 m.	1 y.
1 sq.	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	9.00	12.00	15.00	20.00
2 sq.	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	10.00	14.00	18.00	25.00
3 sq.	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	12.00	16.00	20.00	30.00
4 sq.	2.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	14.00	18.00	25.00	35.00
5 sq.	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	12.00	16.00	20.00	30.00	40.00
6 sq.	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.50	8.00	9.00	10.00	12.00	14.00	18.00	25.00	35.00	45.00
10 sq.	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	12.00	15.00	18.00	20.00	25.00	30.00	40.00	50.00	75.00
15 sq.	6.00	8.00	10.00	12.00	14.00	18.00	20.00	25.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	50.00	75.00	100.00
20 sq.	8.00	10.00	12.00	14.00	16.00	20.00	25.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	50.00	60.00	80.00	125.00
30 sq.	10.00	12.00	14.00	16.00	18.00	25.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	50.00	60.00	75.00	100.00	150.00
40 sq.	12.00	14.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	50.00	60.00	75.00	90.00	125.00	175.00
50 sq.	14.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	22.00	35.00	40.00	50.00	60.00	75.00	90.00	100.00	150.00	200.00
75 sq.	16.00	18.00	20.00	22.00	25.00	40.00	50.00	60.00	75.00	90.00	100.00	125.00	175.00	250.00
100 sq.	18.00	20.00	22.00	25.00	30.00	50.00	60.00	75.00	90.00	100.00	125.00	150.00	200.00	300.00

☞ One square, reckonable weekly, per annum, $40.00
☞ Two square, reckonable weekly, per annum, 60.00
" " " " " " " half a week, " 40.00
☞ All advertisements for the Appeal should be handed in at the Clerk's desk.
☞ All Transient advertisements must be marked for a specified time. When not thus marked, they will be charged for one week, and discontinued at the end of that time.
☞ All advertisements required to be kept on second page, CHANGED ATLEAST ONCE EVERY DAY, and on third page, ONCE EVERY WEEK, extra rates.
☞ Advertisements directed to be displayed, or set in some peculiar manner, charged double.
☞ Yearly advertisers will be charged extra for a reasonable number of changes, if they require it, and entitled to be read, or the advertisement kept on inside of sheet.
☞ Yearly advertisers will be charged extra at regular rates for Wagon, Book, Benevolent, Co-Partnership, Auction, Lottery, Concert, etc.
☞ *Transient Advertisements must be paid for in advance.*
☞ No advertisement will appear in the Weekly paper unless by special contract.
☞ Advertisements to be inserted in the Weekly paper only, or of interest to interests in others of the papers, will be charged $1 per square for each and every insertion.
☞ All Obituaries, Resolutions of State, County and Municipal Societies, or bodies, to be paid in advance in every instance.
☞ All advertisements for charitable institutions, Benevolent Societies, and other public meetings, to be charged half price.
☞ Marriages and Deaths are published as news; but Obituaries, Tributes of Respect and Resolutions are as all other advertisements.
☞ All legal and transient advertisements will be charged by the insertion.
☞ Editorial notices in local columns will be charged 20 cents per line.
☞ No deduction or variation will be made from the foregoing rates.

M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL.

French Soft Hat.

WE have just received some soft and beautiful styles of the FRENCH SOFT HATS, great importation to which we would call attention at No. 289 Main street.
feb28 FRANCISCO & CO.

JUST OPENING
AT
ARNOLD & BROTHER,
348 MAIN STREET,
SPRING STYLE BONNETS,
Complete assortment of
MILLINERY GOODS,
Ladies' Toilet Articles, Fancy Combs, Nets, Head Dresses, Comfs.

Laces and Lace Setts.

☞ Needlework, in all its branches, at very low prices.
m16

Rags! Rags!

WANTED—Every month, 20,000 pounds of rag stock of all kinds, for which the highest price will be paid in cash, or exchange for paper, at the Memphis Paper Mills. Our wagon will be found at the Steamboat landings, and our agents in the country.
M. H. MIULER,
Proprietor Memphis Paper Mills.

Notice.

PARTICULAR attention paid to Storage, Sales, Commission, etc. All orders and business entrusted to our charge will be promptly attended to.
Rear Carpenter and Builder, Corner Fourth and Madison streets.

HATS! HATS! HATS!

SPRING STYLES!
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.
WE are now receiving all the fashionable Spring Styles of Molesskin Hats, viz:
DORBAY,
BROADWAY,
SOUTHERN,
and NEW ORLEANS STYLES.
M. H. MIULER,
Fashionable Hatters,
Opposite Court House.

$50 REWARD.

RUNAWAY from my plantation on the 20th of January, my mulatto boy CHARLEY. He is about 22 years old, 5 feet 10 inches in height, stoutish, and speaks very slow in dress. He is a blacksmith carpenter, and will probably try to make his way to Memphis, and will also try to attempt to reach that place. I will pay $50 to any one who may deliver him to me in this place, or lodge him in any jail so I can get him.
A. M. WADDILL.
Lake Providence, La.—feb14-1m

SILVER PLATED WARE.

Egg and Mustard Stands,
Ice and other Pitchers,
Tea Setts, Trays,
Spoons, Cakes, Fruit Baskets,
Butter Coolers, etc.etc.

Our stock of the above is large, and intending to reduce it we will sell at greatly reduced prices.
A. J. WARNER & CO.
feb22-newdw

COTTON GINS!
TO THE PLANTERS.

THE undersigned take this method to make known to the planting community, that they have made arrangements with A. Street, Esq., of this city, as will enable them to supply the great demand for their Ballard and Cleaning Eclipse Cotton Gins.

They have removed their manufactory to the Navy Yard, where they will always keep a supply of the materials on hand.

They respectfully invite all in want of Gins to give them a call before purchasing elsewhere.

For this Gin they have obtained letters patent, and are now prepared to furnish planters with the best Gin ever invented. See for further particulars, circulars to the following planters:

Col. Jas. Brown, Oxford, Miss.; Col. F. H. White, Memphis, Tenn.; Dr. J. M. Diddell, Jackson, Miss.; Gen. S. Watson, Bear Lake, Miss.; Col. James L. Alcorn, Grenada, Miss.; Hon. Geo. R. Adams, Clear Lake, Miss.; Ware & Wakefield, Memphis, Tenn.; Col. Jas. Clark, Shelbyville, Ky.; Col. H. H. Chambers, Sun Flower Landing, Miss.; Col. Chas. G. Rose, Shelbyville, Ky.; Col. Thos. Spencer, Talladega, Ala.; Lieut. Col. Thos. G. Rice, Durhamville, Tenn.; Col. J. A. Rodgers, Sacramento, Tenn.; Maj. R. P. Harrison, Weakleville, Tenn.; Col. Robert T. Webb, Osceola, Ark.

We guarantee the Eclipse Gin to give full satisfaction. All communications addressed to
WILMER & PAYNE,
mr13-3m-dw-w-w25 Memphis, Tenn.

Memphis and Charleston Railroad Stock Dividend.

THE Stockholders in this company are hereby notified that a dividend of ten per cent, or $5 per share, payable in cash, was declared by the board of directors on the 20th February, 1860. The above dividend will be paid on and after the 20th March, 1860, upon presentation of the stock certificates at the treasurer's office.
GEO. ROBERTSON,
mr1-d1w-w1m Secretary Western Division.
[Avalanche, Bulletin and Enquirer copy.]

WM. G. SOUTHWORTH, W. R. NANCE,
SAM'L W. PARTHAN, Late of Memphis, Tenn.
Lately Doughs & Co., Nashville. J. C. BRADLEY,
Or Brother, Wilson & Co., N. O.

HAVE ASSOCIATED THEMSELVES TOGETHER TO DO AN WELCOME

WHOLESALE

DRY GOODS

—AND—

CLOTHING TRADE,

IN THE CITY OF

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.

UNDER NAME AND STYLE OF

SOUTHWORTH, NANCE & CO

AT 163 MAIN STREET,

And will make it in the interest of Merchants of the surrounding country to deal with them.

SOUTHWORTH, NANCE & CO.,

Keep for sale at prices comparing favorably with any market in the United States,

FANCY & STAPLE DRY GOODS

OF

FOREIGN

AND

DOMESTIC MAKE!

White Goods,
Plantation Goods,
Hosiery,
Notions,
Wrapping Paper,
Umbrellas,
Hoop Skirts,
Bonnets,
Bloomers, etc.

163.....MAIN STREET.....163

Between Worsham House and Overton, Hotel,
feb26-dw3m MEMPHIS, TENN.

INTIME

AT THE

Calhoun Block,

MARCH, 1860.

We have now ready for sale in the CASH DEALER, a superb stock of

Spring and Summer, Staple and Fancy

DRY - GOODS,

HOSIERY, LACES

Embroideries, Wrappings

LADIES' FURNISHING GOODS, ETC.

It is only necessary that the city or country dealer should inspect our styles, prices and qualities of the different departments, to prove to all the advantages of giving our new and now COMPLETE stock an early call.

F. W. BOYSTER & CO.,
mr6-3m Corner Main and Monroe Streets.

DeSoto Farm for Sale.

I PROPOSE to sell my place lying in DeSoto county, Mississippi, within five and half miles of the Mississippi and Tennessee River, and twenty six miles from Cold Water depot, which is thirty miles from Memphis, containing 800 acres, 300 in cultivation; twenty acres fresh, balance in timber; good bottom and some uplands. The whole place is in a fine state of cultivation and due improvement.

Refer to P. Lanz & Co.
feb28-2m* W. H. WYNNE.

PRINCE IMPERIAL CHAMPAGNE!

FROM EPERNAY,

DeVenoge & Co. FRANCE.

To all respectable dealers thro