Daily Appeal.

MEMPHIS.

TUESDAY.....MARCH 20, 1860.

Reading Matter on Every Page

Largest Circulation in the City.

CIRCULATION OF DAILY APPEAL.....1,824
CIRCULATION OF SUNDAY EDITION.....2,206
CIRCULATION OF TRI-WEEKLY.....528
CIRCULATION OF WEEKLY.....3,600

FIRST AND FOURTH PAGES.

FIRST PAGE.—Letter from Hon. O. B. Fickling; North Carolina State Democratic Convention; The "Crisis" in the United States; Bishop Miles.

FOURTH PAGE.—Cotton Planting; Clippings; Poverty not so great a Curse.

THE "MEAN AND MISERABLE DOGMA OF SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY."

"We endorse every word of Gen. LANE's speech at Concord, as there is nothing in it that gives to the people of the Territories an unlimited license to exclude slavery."

The foregoing is the language of the Memphis *Avalanche*, which has exhausted its vocabulary of "abuse" against Senator DOUGLAS, for advocating the doctrine that the people of the Territories are entitled to control their domestic affairs, (slavery included) "subject to the Constitution of the United States." Now we invite the *Avalanche*, its readers and supporters to a close and candid scrutiny of the following extract from the speech of Gen. LANE at Concord, every word of which the *Avalanche* endorses:

Gentlemen, I desire to say to you, that the principle incorporated in the Kansas-Nebraska bill is the very principle in defense of which your forefathers entered the service of the country in the revolutionary war; for the American colonies, two years previous to the Declaration of Independence, ASSERTED THEM-SELVES SOVEREIGN; we now find incorporated in the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

We here pause a single moment to solicit attention to the next sentence which explains what *this same principle* is that is incorporated in the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Gen. LANE proceeds:

Upon an examination you will find that the Declaration of Rights, made October 14, 1774, *asserts that the people of the several colonies "are entitled to the free and exclusive power of legislation* IN THEIR SEVERAL PROVINCES, in all cases, either internal or external policy." [!] This was refused by the crown, but reasserted by our forefathers. Upon this issue the battles of the revolution were fought, by the blood of our forefathers the principle of self-government was established. This right, refused by the king, was secured, consecrated, and established by the blood of men that ever flowed in the veins of man. Would you now refuse to the people of the Territories the rights your noble sires demanded of the crown, and for which their blood was shed? Would you now refuse in opposition to the right of self-government in the Territories, thereby occupying the very position toward the Territories that George III did to the colonies? The simple question involved here is "are the people capable of regulating their internal affairs, or must Congress regulate those affairs for them?" It is entirely the doctrine of congressional intervention, for the right of the people to regulate their own affairs, that this, as the first step, we contend, if it is true that the American people are capable of self-government, then the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill are right, and opposition to that bill is wrong, unnecessarily, dangerous to the best interests of the country.

* * * * * * *

Now, if Gen. LANE does not mean in this extract to assert that a territorial legislature, which is the counterpart to the Federal Government, is the "provincial legislature" under the British crown, is entitled to "free and exclusive powers of legislation" in all cases of internal policy, of which domestic slavery is one, then it is impossible to tell what he does mean, and we challenge the *Avalanche* to give a more intelligent construction of his language.

And if STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS has ever claimed wider or more "unbridled license" for the Territories, then we call upon the *Avalanche* to point it out, or forever hereafter hold its peace.

Perhaps, however, our neighbor will answer by saying, as it once did of SEVERAN A. DOUGLAS, "*We cannot read it in our heart to assail!*" JOSEPH LANE.

The doctrine he advocated at Concord, New Hampshire, in February, 1856, is the same he advocated in his recent speech in the Senate of the United States, when he said, etc.—*Avalanche.*

In his speech at Concord, New Hampshire, Gen. LANE used the following language:

The question of slavery is a most perplexing one, and ought not to be agitated. We should leave it with the States, where it constitutionally exists, and the people of the Territories to prohibit or establish, as to them may seem right and proper.

On the other hand in his recent speech in the Senate of the United States, Gen. LANE said:

I do not believe the people of a Territory have a right to exclude, or establish, or abolish slavery. No such right is conferred on them by the Constitution.

Can any two expressions, from the same source, be more antithetical? We feel certain that if the *Avalanche's* wholesale indorsement of both of these speeches should fall under the eye of the gallant "Marine of the Mexican war," he will "raise his hands to heaven," and, in the language of the Chinese Mandarin, exclaim, "SAVE—oh! save me from my friends."

RHODE ISLAND IN THE CHARLESTON CONVENTION.

The inquiry has been frequently made of us by gentlemen from other States, says the Providence (R. I.) *Post*, for whom will the Rhode Island delegates vote in the Charleston convention. We presume it will be sufficient answer to this inquiry to say that, is our opinion, at least four-fifths of all the Democrats in the State are in favor of Judge Douglas, and that, so large is the number of Americans and Republicans who express their determination to vote for him if he is our candidate, much confidence is felt that the State may be carried for him in November.

The convention which selected delegates to the Charleston convention did not instruct the delegates to vote for any particular candidate. It is not a Rhode Island practice to send delegates under instructions. The sentiment of the convention, however, was unmistakable, declaring its preference for Mr. Douglas, words have been unanimously adopted. Probably one reason why it was not offered may be found in the fact that no misapprehension as to this preference seemed to exist anywhere. We certainly no doubt whatever that this preference will be respected by all the delegates, whether Mr. Douglas is their own first choice or not.

But while saying this, we feel compelled to say that, not for a single hour has the Rhode Island Democracy swerved from a cordial support of the present Democratic administration. The Democratic party in this State has made war upon its measures, or will make war upon them. We stand by the party and the party's representatives, and with all the more firmness in the hour of their peril. Even now we take no part in the controversy touching Mr. BUCHANAN's successor! The nominee of the party is our neighbor, and in saying what we have said above, our whole position has been that of a single fact which is well enough understood at home, but does not seem to be abroad.

We presume that what is true of Rhode Island, is true of New Jersey, of the New England, and indeed of nearly all the Northern, Middle and North-western States. If the secret of Mr. DOUGLAS's popularity at the North is called for, it may be found in the hearty attachment of our people to the doctrines of the Kansas-Nebraska act, as they were presented in 1854 and 1856—in the indomitable firmness, and energetic and marked ability of Mr. DOUGLAS, as especially displayed in securing the passage of that bill, and in his Illinois campaign in 1858—and last of all, in the unkind treatment which *many people think he has received at the hands of Democratic Senators at Washington.*

FAIR PLAY.

The tone and sentiment of the following, which we copy from the Washington *Star*, will commend it to every national and right-minded Democrat in the Union:

We have not indicated our preference for a Presidential candidate, for to us the satisfactory reasons that we do not belong to any one of the candidates named, have no personal antagonism to either of them, and prefer the success of the Democratic party to the gratification of the personal ambition of any man in the Union. While occupying this position of neutrality toward the candidates, it is perfectly consistent with our policy to insist upon fair play for each, and if some newspapers, in our space than another, it is because that one is more unjustly and generally assailed, and not because of personal and political partiality merely. That man who inspires the greatest fear in the Black-Republicans, the greatest love in his compeers, and the greatest hatred in his rivals, is of course the most conspicuous object of assault. It is not necessary to say that that man is Stephen A. Douglas.

No man living has drawn upon himself so vindictive an opposition as he has way from the Abolitionists by his bold and manly defense of the rights of the South; and not Southern Democrats alone, but every Democrat who is the recipient of his being opposed to southern rights, is thus put down as a traitor. He cannot be right, and one party of his assailants must be wrong—willfully, cruelly, and vindictively wrong. The Abolitionists call him "a fraud and a traitor," and exhaust their ingenuity and their malice in devising schemes for his overthrow. Why? Because they regard him as the most formidable obstacle to their success—the only Democrat they can hate; they acknowledge in all their acts toward him that the success of Douglas is the death of Black-Republicanism. In the face of these well-known facts, there is a constant effort to discredit Mr. Douglas in the South. A Washington correspondent of the North Carolina *Standard* says that the feeling is gaining ground that if Douglas were to be nominated at Charleston they would be a new "constitutional party" formed at the South, which would divide the vote of the Southern States, and that the apprehension of this danger leads them to look for other candidates."

Now, who or what prompted such a suggestion but the rivalry of other candidates? Is there a man of ordinary intelligence who believes that the nomination of Mr. Douglas would lead to the formation of a new party at the South—and to what end? In what practical principle would that new party diverge with Mr. Douglas? It would oppose Congressional interference with slavery; so would he. It would sustain the fugitive slave law and the Dred Scott decision; so does he. It would die in the last trench in defense of all the rights of all the States; so would he. What could they ask which he has not, through his political life, demanded in their behalf? The only difference between Mr. Douglas and any other Democrat is that the people of the Democratic party of the South is not one of the least practical importance—it is simply a question of time, whether the people of a Territory may exercise certain prerogatives one day sooner or later—the practical solution depending upon conditions of soil and climate over which neither Congress nor the people could exercise control.

The concerted and systematic effort to place Mr. Douglas in a false position before the Democrats of the South, and frighten from his support the Democrats of the North, is not limited to any one class of men. It is alleged by some of the friends of the Territories as well as the friends of Mr. Douglas, that his efforts against any prominent and influential Democrat only tend to weaken the party and increase the chances of the Opposition. We shall condemn all such efforts without regard to their source or their object.

DOUGLAS IN GEORGIA.

One of the most extreme yet honest proslavery men in the South is James N. Bethune, the editor of the Columbus (Ga.) *Corner-Stone*. He will be remembered as having been recently nominated for public printer in the House of Representatives by Gen. Bonham, of South Carolina. Mr. Bethune in the last number of his paper, appears to have become disgusted at the cruel and senseless war waged on Douglas by heated partisans at the South, whose zeal outruns their discretion, and comes to his rescue in an able and spirited article. We make room for the following extract:

But to Douglas. He is to-day the strongest man in this nation. That is, he has more individual, personal strength; he is the first choice of more men than any one man. First, because he is a Democrat; second, because he has, so far as the power of Congress over the subject of slavery is concerned, always stood square up to the South; third, because he is opposed to the Black-Republicans; fourth, because he believes in the doctrine of squatter sovereignty for while this is the great objection to him at the South, it is unquestionably an element of strength at the North.

And what is squatter sovereignty? It is, in our opinion, an exercise of power by the territorial legislature which is unwarranted by the Constitution; perhaps it is unfortunate that it is so. A retreat from the full meaning and intention of the compact is demoralizing, our opinion is, that its only practical value is to furnish politicians a subject to quarrel about. We have just as much right to make one slave State, more or less; it would carry negroes to Nicaragua, if we had it just as it will keep them out of Kansas.

Of what use is it to the people of the South? What are they going to make out of it? Just what they will make out of it, we know not. Every one of them, we know, is trying to see what could get ahead in abusing the odious doctrine of squatter sovereignty, and now they find that they have made a mistake, and they don't know exactly how to get away from it. We hear men abusing Douglas with the greatest bitterness, who are in the same breath lauding Fillmore to the skies, for regretting the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. In the same breath they are denouncing Douglas for holding that the people of the Territory shall decide the question of slavery (this they denounce as nonsensical and impossible) and for "trampling on the rights of the South," and lend Fillmore to the skies for holding that Congress has the right to pass a law which did not even permit the people of the South to have a chance to make the question in the Territory. And southern Democrats, too, who supported Mr. Polk in and defended him for sanctioning the Wilmot proviso, are vociferous in calling Douglas a traitor.

Last year, too, almost every press and every politician of both parties were in a contest to see congressional legislation for slavery, and which should threaten most strongly to dissolve the Union upon the election of a Black-Republican President. Now the contest is who shall be the most conservative Think man. Then they were all for the South; now they are for the Union.

The Charleston convention meets in April. Our opinion is that it will nominate Douglas, and the great mass of the Democracy of the South will support him, of course, and so will a great many of the Opposition.

It is a great pity that so fully generally for those who belong to a party to say in advance they will not support this or that man if he is a candidate. In these days men belong to party either from the force of habit, the force of leaders; the great mass of the people have prejudice and passion mixed up in it. The same feeling drives men into blind obedience. Men whose hopes and fears depend upon party, soon lose all sense of independence of thought and action.

If Douglas should be nominated, we shall see before fall many a man driven in and working in the most kindly, who now swears there is no difference between him and Seward. We expect to look on and see the fight, and perhaps strike a blow occasionally for amusements.

WASHINGTON ITEMS.

WASHINGTON, March 16.—The Senate, in Executive session to-day, reviewing its action of yesterday, and placed the Nicaragua treaty in a position for consideration. Three hours were spent thus consumed. By unanimous consent, and at the suggestion of Nicaragua, the Senate struck out the 8th paragraph by which the United States agreed to use all its moral and effective force to prevent hostile expeditions against Nicaragua. The other parts stricken out yesterday were restored. They are in substance, that in the failure of Nicaragua to afford protection, the United States may, with the consent of or at the request of Nicaragua, instruct its ministers at Washington, or legal authorities thereof, employ such force as may be necessary for the purpose and no other, in the exercise of its right of interference, or where there is danger to the lives and property of American citizens, the forces of the United States are authorized to be used without previous consideration. The treaty was rejected by the following vote, two-thirds being necessary for its ratification—Yeas 21, nays 26.

The injunction of the Secretary was removed from the proceedings. It was known that both France and England had made similar treaties with Nicaragua, backed by the government of land and naval force, etc., but they have not yet been ratified.

An informal meeting of the joint committee on arrangements for the two Houses of Congress was held this morning. Messrs. Fitch, Shorter, Haskin, and Gurley were present. They had under consideration Mr. Gurley's bill for a Government printing office.

Several amendments were agreed to as additional checks and guards against abuse. It is the opinion of some gentlemen, as well as Mr. Demick, another member of the committee, that the remedy for the serious evils of the present system is to be found in a Government printing office.

Mr. Gurley says he can demonstrate a saving to the Government thereby of over $10,000 per year.

The telegraph convention is still in session in this city. To-day it was resolved that the several companies of the North American telegraph association are recommended to furnish the Smithsonian Institute, the national observatory, the naval observatory of the coast survey and the associated press, during the present year, with brief daily meteorological reports from prominent points in each section of the United States, as a contribution to science and as a means of demonstrating the great ability of telegraph in that department of knowledge.

There was an adjourned meeting of Congressmen from Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina, to-night, in connection with the projected meeting of a southern convention to be held in June.

South Carolina, it will be remembered, initiated the movement. Virginia declined to participate in it, and Mississippi and Alabama approved it, and arranged for the appointment of delegates. It is understood that the object of the meeting was to agree upon some plan by which such alliance from the Lower Gulf State can be secured, although no formal proposition was adopted. The majority inclined to the opinion that the governor of South Carolina should assemble the legislature of that State to select delegates, and all this he will probably soon be informed.

Charleston Convention.

WASHINGTON, March 12.—The Democratic national committee, operated upon by the public sentiment created by the apprehensions in regard to the health of Charleston, at certain seasons of the year, at its last meeting adopted an early period as the time for the assembling of the convention, and it is even now believed that, if a quorum fail to be present with great violence at Havana, it may not be entirely safe for northerners to go to Charleston on the 23d of April next. But the difficulty suggested in one of the letters from this subject which is creating the most feeling at present, is the prospective incapacity of Charleston to accommodate the large crowd which will unquestionably be drawn into that city from the 20th to the 23d of next month. Nearly every body here identified with the Democratic party intends to go to Charleston. I have seen, within the last week, gentlemen from all parts of the country, and with few exceptions, they are looking forward to the meeting of the Democratic national convention as an occasion full of interest to themselves, either politically or personally.

Those who recall the excitement at Baltimore in 1844, 48, and '52, and that which prevailed at Cincinnati in 1856, need not also be reminded of the immense masses of people congregated at these two points, or of the necessity of obtaining accommodations, as well as the exorbitant charges of landlords and others. Imagine an army of from twenty to fifty thousand people poured into a city not much larger than Rushville, in your State, surrounded by an unproductive country, and by no means fortunate in conveniences for travel, and, first of all, for a sudden incursion of hungry and thirsty men. Speculators are already on the qui vive to make money out of the necessities of the case. Even the chivalric sons of the South anticipate that, whatever the Charleston convention may do as to nobles, money will flow into empty coffers from those who may be attracted hither by the great game which is to be played out at that point.

Would it not be well for your enterprising fellow-citizen, Alexander Heron, Jr., Esq., whose line of steamers between Philadelphia and Savannah are the most formidable obstacle to their success—the only Democrat they can hate; they acknowledge in all their acts toward him that the success of Douglas is the death of Black-Republicanism. In the face of these well-known facts, there is a constant effort to discredit Mr. Douglas in the South. A Washington correspondent of the North Carolina *Standard* says that the feeling is gaining ground that if Douglas were to be nominated at Charleston they would be a new "constitutional party" formed at the

LETTER FROM A. J. HAMILTON, OF TEXAS.

In Reply to Hon. P. B. Fouke, of Illinois, on the Political Questions of the Day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 8, 1860.

HON. A. J. HAMILTON—*Dear Sir:* The present being a period in political affairs which arrests the attention of every patriot in this great republic, you will pardon me for this unusual and somewhat abrupt communication. Passing events (such as that the time has arrived when every good and true man who is in any wise impressed with the momentous consequences which are to flow, for good or for evil to our common country, from the election of a President) to preside over the destinies of this nation, should declare boldly his sentiments in regard to the distracting questions which at this time agitate the public mind. I take it for granted that you, sir, will not hesitate, in such critical times, to give your views upon the policy that should be pursued by the Democratic party to roll back the tide of fanaticism which seems at present to threaten the peace and quiet of our country, and the safety of the Southern States. It is needless for me to add that the "Old Guard" of the Northwest will be found in the ensuing campaign, as they ever have been found, with their faces toward the enemy, battling for the Constitution, and the rights and interests of every State in this great Confederacy. Much, perhaps too much, has been said about the possible course that the Southern Democracy, and particularly that Texas, will pursue in regard to the Charleston convention. The intimate relations maintained between us, although we have enjoyed but a brief acquaintance, assures me that you will not hesitate to communicate, freely and frankly, your views in regard to the measures which have heretofore disturbed the harmony of the Democratic party, and the best mode to heal the dissensions which we all deplore; and finally, how will the name of the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, the great champion of popular sovereignty, be received by the people of your gallant State as our standard bearer in the great conflict upon which we are about entering with the "irreparable conflict" of party of the North? With a hope of receiving an early answer, I remain

Your friend, sincerely,

P. B. FOULKE.

WASHINGTON, March 10, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: Your note of the 8th inst., is before me. No apology was necessary for calling on me to give my views upon the present aspect of political affairs. Not that my opinion, separately considered, are or can be of much moment to the country, but in a government like this it is individual opinion that makes up the great aggregate of public sentiment. Hence, I do not feel at liberty (and if I did, do not desire) to withhold any that I may entertain.

You do me justice in supposing that I feel a deep interest in the issues now pending; and in the results that are to follow the next Presidential election. The struggle is to be one which may, and which many believe will decide, for many years to come, the destiny of our government or determine its speedy dissolution; and in this light I myself am disposed to view it. The questions which enter into the contest are, or should be, those which divide the Democratic and Black-Republican parties, and not those which now so unhappily distract the members of the Democracy, North and South. The great distinguishing feature of the two parties are broadly marked, and cannot be mistaken. Whatever internal dissensions we may have among ourselves, or whatever questions of minor importance we may chance to differ in opinion upon, surely there can be but one thought, one feeling, and one aim as to the one great issue before us.

This issue, in my judgment, is not involved in any of the recent questions growing out of our territorial relations, upon which Democrats have differed.

These differences—which have been magnified greatly beyond their real importance—resolving from the various constructions of the Nebraska-Kansas act, and the conflict of opinion as to the extent and extent of the power to legislate for the people of a Territory, have been, and are to-day, the only breakers ahead of our bark of hope in the great political voyage of 1860.

I am well aware that many true and earnest—but I think misguided—Democrats in the South feel disinclined to favor any platform or constitution upon these questions—perhaps are determined that none shall be effected, unless by the unqualified acknowledgment by the Charleston convention of all the correctness of their views. That this cause of hope, all must admit. What then can be done? Obviously, but one of two courses is left. These extreme views must be yielded up, or the convention prove a failure. Suppose the latter should be the alternative, what are then our prospects? We are in that case probably committed to the chance of a sectional race, with sectional candidates, and with a certainty of either defeat in the electoral college, or, at best, the poor privilege of protesting the contest in the House of Representatives, with scarce a hope of success.

I have never appreciated either the cause or character of this writer's extreme party, and in some quarters by Lecompton against Anti-Lecompton Democrats. Nor have I been able to perceive how the institution of slavery is to be protected, and advanced, by the adoption and enforcement of the views of those who clamor for Congressional protection for it in the Territories. There is not only nothing practical in the suggestion, but it seems, in my judgment it is one of those propositions that never can have a practical application to an existing state of affairs in any portion of the Territories now belonging to this government.

"I feel confident that the settlement of the question—let, of the power of a Territorial government to deal with the subject of slavery, and, 2d, of the power and duty of Congress to protect slavery in the Territories, however they may be settled and acted upon, can never make either a slave or non-slave State.

But there are other questions growing out of the institution of slavery with which we will have to deal, and which are of much more importance that we should husband all our strength to meet them, rather than waste it by childish bickerings upon subjects artfully kept before us by a cool and unscrupulous party.

It is worthy of remark, that just at this time hot little, if anything, is being said by the Black-Republican presses and leaders upon the power of Congress to deal with the question of slavery in the Territories. Let it not be supposed, however, that the question will sleep if they shall attain the control of the government in the coming election. It will be pressed energetically, and with a determination to enforce it practically. But this is not all. There is still another question, not perceptible upon the verge of the political horizon, of still greater magnitude.

We are told by the Republican party that they do not intend to attack the institution of slavery in the States, so long as they (the States) are protected by the Constitution. This is very well. But what will be their course if they shall attain the ascendancy, relative number of free States (which will soon happen) until they have the requisite majority for amending the Constitution so as to meet their views? Will they deny that they intend to use it this right, and, if they be permitted to exercise the power, whenever they can, of thus overturning the institution everywhere within the United States? Should the attempt will be made, if so-called Republicanism shall acquire sufficient strength, I cannot doubt. That such a proposition would be without its parallel in the history of the Republic, but providing for its own amendment, and destructive of free government, would be no barrier to a party madly bent upon the destruction of an institution with which the destiny of the South is irrevocably bound.

It requires no argument to bring in view the consequences resulting from an attempt further to press these doctrines upon a people already goaded to madness by persistent assault and injury through a long course of years. One or two things will take place—either the anti-slavery party must be annihilated, or government be dissolved. No power, moral or physical, can prevent its disruption, unless the warfare upon the institution of slavery ceases. The South has ever been loyal to the Union; but she is loyal to herself, and will seek safety out of the Union when she despairs of justice in it. The threat that she is to be coerced to remain in, scarcely deserves a moment's consideration.

But can the Democratic party by any course avert the danger?

I believe it can be done. But it cannot be done by the South's assuming a position which, in effect, denies to the Democracy of the North and North-west the right to participate with them in the coming struggle. United we were in 1856, we can again triumph. We the same union cannot be had now, without sacrifice of principle, I cannot perceive. It was known, too, and was in vain, to all, that Democrats differed upon questions arising out of our territorial relations. But they were not then thought to be of such importance as to justify elimination and recrimination. If they have grown in importance since, it is, I think, simply because they have been talked of and discussed in the public prints—never, however, as far as I have seen, so luridly as to solve them to the satisfaction of the public mind.

As to the first of these questions—that is, the power of a territorial government to prohibit slavery—it is very generally conceded, I believe, by all parties to have been adjudicated by the highest judicial tribunal in the land in the Dred Scott case. There, then, let it rest. So long as the decision stands it is the law of the land, and should be respected and enforced. The judicial element of the question cannot be unsettled by political agitation.

The question of protection to slavery in the Territories by Congress is, it seems to me, totally calculated to do harm to those whom it proposes to benefit (than any other could be which has as little in it. It is likely to do the institution of slavery infinite injury by adding in the disruption and consequent defeat of the Democratic party. But if the Democracy were as much in its favor, and we should to-morrow, by an act of Congress, provide law for the purpose, what would be effected? Would slavery go into any of the Territories? Does any one believe that the effect of such laws would be to make any one of the Territories now existing, or that may hereafter be created out of our present existing domain, slaveholding States?

We have seen and heard much in the So th of late in favor of reopening the African slave trade. Why? Because it was asserted that we had not enough of slave labor by one fourth to develop the rich slope and rolling lands of the South. This is true; and, being true, can it be supposed that slave labor will ever be diverted from so fertile a field as the cotton and sugar region of the South to the great plains of the West and Northwest.

But it is said that this protection will be at least the sanction of a concrete principle in proper case. To a I shall not deny. But I do deny that it is the business of Congress to occupy its time in legislating for the mere glory of displaying its power in the passage of laws which are to have no practical application in the administration of government. And least of all should Democrats insist upon such a course, when its effect is obviously to strengthen the enemies of the Constitution.

As to what course Texas will pursue by her delegation in the Charleston convention, I can only say that I suppose their action will depend upon the action of the State convention, which is to assemble on the first Monday in April. I hope they will go to the convention uninstructed, so far, at least, as concerns the man for whom they shall vote. And I could also wish that they might be unhampered as to the questions already referred to, and which have already so much disturbed the harmony of the Democratic party. But whether this hope will be realized time only can determine.

Whatever dissensions or differences may have grown up in the party in Texas within the last year or two, I feel warranted in saying that, if the Charleston convention shall act as becomes the representatives of a national party, and nominate a national rather than a sectional candidate, then Texas, with her full Democratic force in close order, will rally under his standard, and there remain until the fort is lost or won.

Many names have been mentioned for the nomination at Charleston, most of whom, I have not a doubt, would be acceptable to Texas. But there is one name (and not the least among them) in whom I know you feel more than ordinary interest, who is not at this time, as he once was, a favorite with the Democracy of Texas. I allude to your distinguished Senator, Judge Douglas. This alienation of feeling has resulted from his course upon the Lecompton Constitution of Kansas, and his published views upon the question of popular sovereignty in the Territories. For the last twelve months or more, he has been denounced here in the leading presses and politicians of that State.

It is well known at home that I did not sympathize with those who thus denounced him in Texas or elsewhere; but on the contrary, on all proper occasions, so far as I could, have defended him from these assaults. I could find nothing in his course to condemn. His views upon popular sovereignty in the Territories are now precisely what they were in '50 and '54, and as I explained them in '56, pending the Presidential contest of that year. If any have been deceived upon the subject, the fault rests not with him. No one who has read attentively the debates of '54, upon the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, could doubt his position.

And yet long after this he was perhaps the favorite of the Democracy of many portions of the South. And now he is condemned, or sought to be condemned, without the change of a position or the desertion of a principle. Two years ago his name was hailed with a shout of high when his potent voice was raised in the Senate in defense of our constitutional rights. That same voice is still heard in our defense now as then—ever ready to rebuke aggression and denounce sectionalism on the one hand, and on the other to defend the Constitution of our country. The storm against him has blown fierce; but I believe it has spent its force. Time has enabled the people to inquire into the causes of his denunciation, and they are doubtless much astonished to find that his sin has been consistency.

I believe Judge Douglas would administer this government, as President, with eminent success. That he has a statesman of the first rank in our country, all admit. He is intrepid and prompt. In the prime, the very zenith of his manhood, and could do as much, or more, than any other man to reconcile the jarring elements the stability of the government than any other man that could be selected.

I believe, too, that he is the most available man in the Democratic ranks. Should he be selected as a candidate of the Democracy, I, for one, will with alacrity and pleasure contribute my humble all to bearing him triumphantly through. And though I have never sought authority, yet I have not a doubt, that the Democracy of Texas will do him justice should he be the nominee. And, moreover, I cannot but believe that the great State of Texas will rally to the support of any national Democrat who may be presented, whatever may have been said or resolved to the contrary. Ever since the formation of the Federal Union on the other, I will not doubt her prompt decision in favor of the latter.

This is a long letter, but I write succinctly as I could well do, the inquiries embraced in your note. If I have not done so satisfactorily, I trust, at least, that I am understood.

Time is fleeting, and I must receive your sure limited only by the little importance which is attached to any opinions which I may entertain or express. I shall content myself with the reflection that the right which I have exercise is as dear to me, and the duty as imperative as though my views were in universal favor.

I cannot conclude with the expression of the hope, that in the event of a failure of the Charleston Convention to make a nomination, on account of the dissensions alluded to, or any other cause, that the people which I represent in the Union who are willing to make one last struggle for the Constitution and the Union will call upon some one who properly represents their sentiments to be their standard bearer. In such a contingency Texas can and will furnish the man for the emergency.

Very respectfully and truly, yours,

A. J. HAMILTON.

Hon. P. B. Fouke.

TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1860.

Wednesday's Proceedings—Continued.

HOUSE BILL ON THIRD READING.

No. 39, (obligatory on the attorney general of this State to defend the State's interest in the Le Grange and Memphis railroad company.

Mr. Payne offered an amendment, providing that any tax paid to the employer of said road be protected, and indemnified by the adoption and enforcement of the views of those who clamor for Congressional protection for it in the Territories. There is not only nothing practical in the suggestion, but it seems, in my judgment it is one of those propositions that never can have a practical application to an existing state of affairs in any portion of the Territories now belonging to this government.

"I feel confident that the settlement of the question—let, of the power of a Territorial government to deal with the subject of slavery, and, 2d, of the power and duty of Congress to protect slavery in the Territories, however they may be settled and acted upon, can never make either a slave or non-slave State.

But there are other questions growing out of the institution of slavery with which we will have to deal, and which are of much more importance that we should husband all our strength to meet them, rather than waste it by childish bickerings upon subjects artfully kept before us by a cool and unscrupulous party.

It is worthy of remark, that just at this time hot little, if anything, is being said by the Black-Republican presses and leaders upon the power of Congress to deal with the question of slavery in the Territories. Let it not be supposed, however, that the question will sleep if they shall attain the control of the government in the coming election. It will be pressed energetically, and with a determination to enforce it practically. But this is not all. There is still another question, not perceptible upon the verge of the political horizon, of still greater magnitude.

We are told by the Republican party that they do not intend to attack the institution of slavery in the States, so long as they (the States) are protected by the Constitution. This is very well. But what will be their course if they shall attain the ascendancy, relative number of free States (which will soon happen) until they have the requisite majority for amending the Constitution so as to meet their views? Will they deny that they intend to use it this right, and, if they be permitted to exercise the power, whenever they can, of thus overturning the institution everywhere within the United States? Should the attempt will be made, if so-called Republicanism shall acquire sufficient strength, I cannot doubt. That such a proposition would be without its parallel in the history of the Republic, but providing for its own amendment, and destructive of free government, would be no barrier to a party madly bent upon the destruction of an institution with which the destiny of the South is irrevocably bound.

It requires no argument to bring in view the consequences resulting from an attempt further to press these doctrines upon a people already goaded to madness by persistent assault and injury through a long course of years. One or two things will take place—either the anti-slavery party must be annihilated, or government be dissolved. No power, moral or physical, can prevent its disruption, unless the warfare upon the institution of slavery ceases. The South has ever been loyal to the Union; but she is loyal to herself, and will seek safety out of the Union when she despairs of justice in it. The threat that she is to be coerced to remain in, scarcely deserves a moment's consideration.

But can the Democratic party by any course avert the danger?

I believe it can be done. But it cannot be done by the South's assuming a position which, in effect, denies to the Democracy of the North and North-west the right to participate with them in the coming struggle. United we were in 1856, we can again triumph. We the same union cannot be had now, without sacrifice of principle, I cannot perceive. It was known, too, and was in vain, to all, that Democrats differed upon questions arising out of our territorial relations. But they were not then thought to be of such importance as to justify elimination and recrimination. If they have grown in importance since, it is, I think, simply because they have been talked of and discussed in the public prints—never, however, as far as I have seen, so luridly as to solve them to the satisfaction of the public mind.

As to the first of these questions—that is, the power of a territorial government to prohibit slavery—it is very generally conceded, I believe, by all parties to have been adjudicated by the highest judicial tribunal in the land in the Dred Scott case. There, then, let it rest. So long as the decision stands it is the law of the land, and should be respected and enforced. The judicial element of the question cannot be unsettled by political agitation.

The question of protection to slavery in the Territories by Congress is, it seems to me, totally calculated to do harm to those whom it proposes to benefit (than any other could be which has as little in it. It is likely to do the institution of slavery infinite injury by adding in the disruption and consequent defeat of the Democratic party. But if the Democracy were as much in its favor, and we should to-morrow, by an act of Congress, provide law for the purpose, what would be effected? Would slavery go into any of the Territories? Does any one believe that the effect of such laws would be to make any one of the Territories now existing, or that may hereafter be created out of our present existing domain, slaveholding States?

We have seen and heard much in the So th of late in favor of reopening the African slave trade. Why? Because it was asserted that we had not enough of slave labor by one fourth to develop the rich slope and rolling lands of the South. This is true; and, being true, can it be supposed that slave labor will ever be diverted from so fertile a field as the cotton and sugar region of the South to the great plains of the West and Northwest.

But it is said that this protection will be at least the sanction of a concrete principle in proper case. To a I shall not deny. But I do deny that it is the business of Congress to occupy its time in legislating for the mere glory of displaying its power in the passage of laws which are to have no practical application in the administration of government. And least of all should Democrats insist upon such a course, when its effect is obviously to strengthen the enemies of the Constitution.

As to what course Texas will pursue by her delegation in the Charleston convention, I can only say that I suppose their action will depend upon the action of the State convention, which is to assemble on the first Monday in April. I hope they will go to the convention uninstructed, so far, at least, as concerns the man for whom they shall vote. And I could also wish that they might be unhampered as to the questions already referred to, and which

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 16, 1860.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The House resumed the consideration of senate bills on their second reading, as follows:

Senator Thompson's, 229, to incorporate the Rome and New Middleton and the Rome and Rawl's creek turnpike company, to amend the charter of the Memphis and Ohio railroad company, and to authorize a consolidation of the Mississippi and Tennessee railroad company, and to amend the act consolidating the Memphis and Ohio and Memphis, Clarksville and Louisville railroad company, were passed the second reading.

SATURDAY, March, 17, 1860.

TO ADJOURN SINE DIE.

Mr. McCabe's resolution, adjourning the legislature *sine die*, coming up in order, it was rejected.

MEMPHIS COAL COMPANY.

The motion to reconsider the vote rejecting senate bill 217, to incorporate the Memphis coal and mining company was agreed to, the bill amended and passed the second reading.

CONCERNING RAILROADS.

Mr. Trewhitt's bill (H. R. 497) for the better security of the lives of passengers, was read, and after debate thereon, was rejected by yeas 25, nays 32.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The house proceeded [Mr. Harris in the chair,] to the consideration of senate bills on their second reading. The following were passed [informally] to the third reading.

Senator Payne's, 213, to define the qualification of jurors in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Senator Hunter's, 318, to incorporate the Cotton Factory' bank in Memphis.

XXXVI CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

WASHINGTON, March 16.—*Senate.*—The Chair presented a message from the President communicating additional documents in reference to the alleged hostilities on the Rio Grande. They were laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Latham introduced a bill to create a separate district for the inspection of the boilers and machinery of steam vessels.

The bill authorizing the sale of the public arms to the States, and to regulate the appointment of the superintendents of the national armories, was taken up.

Mr. Hunter said that strictures had been made, the other day, on the superintendent at Harper's Ferry, which did injustice to him. He was a good officer, who faithfully performed his duties.

On motion of Mr. Davis, an amendment was adopted that the sales in each year shall not exceed the increased manufacture which may result from said sales, and if the whole number to be sold is less than the quantity made, they shall be divided among the States applying pro rata, as the arms furnished by the United States are now distributed.

Mr. Simons moved to strike out the first section of the bill, which provides for the distribution of the arms. Not carried—30 to 28.

Mr. Davis moved to strike out the second section, changing the mode of superintendence from civil to military.

The Chair stated the motion was not in order, as the Senate had already voted on that question.

Mr. Hale moved to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. Anthony moved to postpone further consideration of the bill and to take up the private calendar.

Hence, Mr. Pendleton offered a preamble, that—WHEREAS the chairman of the public printing stated on the floor that the prices for composition now allowed by law are too large, and half pay would be abundant and more than sufficient; and whereas, that by the terms of a resolution heretofore adopted as a preliminary to the election of a printer, the House reserve the right to reduce the compensation at any time; therefore,

Resolved, That the committee on printing be instructed to report a bill by which the prices of composition now fixed by law be reduced half that amount.

Mr. Washburne, of Maine, objected if the resolution would lead to discussion.

Mr. Houston preferred it would be an objection if the resolution were changed into the form of an inquiry.

Mr. Pendleton preferred to let the resolution stand as it is. He took it for granted that the views of the chairman were those of the entire committee.

Mr. Washburne objected, saying that unanimous consent was necessary for its introduction.

The House went into committee on the amendment to the rules.

The amendments were acted on and reported to the House, nearly all of which were concurred in, several were reserved for special votes.

Mr. Davies gave notice that on Monday he would call up the contested election case of Williamson against Lamar.

Adjourned till Monday.

The News from Charleston.

The Cleveland *Plain Dealer* says:

The agent deputed to visit Charleston and engage quarters for the Ohio delegation, has returned and made his report. A hall large enough to accommodate the delegations from the whole Union, is to be erected, and has been engaged at $200 per day for ten days—$2,000; board and lodging for the forty-six Ohio delegates at $3 per day—$828 00. This may be regarded as rather costly, but it is the necessary result of forcing a large crowd to quarter upon a small town. The Baltimore Conventions in 1844 had not over 1,500 spectators in their pandemonium, in 1848 the crowd was somewh