THURSDAY, ... 1860

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1860. VOLUME XI—NUMBER ...

Daily Appeal.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEMOCRAT AND BRECKINRIDGE—WHAT IT IS.

EDITOR APPEAL: The question which divides the parties of this country is the Territorial question, or the question of slavery in the Territories. Upon this question there are three doctrines promulged by three different political organizations.

First, The Black-Republican party teach and hold the doctrine of "Intervention by Congress against slavery in the Territories, in every case, whether the people of the Territories want it or not.

Third, The Democratic party teach and hold the doctrine of "Non-Intervention by Congress—to leave the people of the Territories to have slavery or not to have it, as they think best for their own interests." To this last doctrine I believe most of the members of the Opposition party, or the "Constitutional Union party" hold. Though it is a doctrine taught by the Democratic party, who are now the leaders of this constitutional party, such as ex-Governor Hunt, of New York, and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts.

The Black-Republican party is a sectional party, as the holding of their doctrine would of necessity make it sectional. The dividing line is that which divides the slave States from the non-slaveholding. In the non-slaveholding States this sectional party exists.

The Administration party is a sectional one, as the holding of their doctrine would of necessity make it sectional. The dividing line is that which divides the slave from the non-slaveholding States. In the slave States, this party exists—of this party I will speak in this article. I have nothing to say of Black-Republicanism, or its leader, Abe Lincoln. Whether Lincoln or Breckinridge should be successful, it would be the same; they stand in principle on the same bottom, and I prefer to speak of Breckinridge as the least offensive of the two. Breckinridge is now the Administration candidate for the presidency, and as the leadhorse to the doctrine of intervention by Congress in the affairs of the people of the Territories, and specially intervention for slavery.

By the record, I will prove two charges against Breckinridge. *First*, That he never held the doctrine of intervention till the day he was nominated the candidate of the Administration party; and, *Secondly*, That by the same record, he is now outside of and opposed to the Democratic party.

On the 21st day of December, 1859, in the city of Frankfort, Kentucky, and in the hall of Representatives before the legislature of the State, the Hon. John C. Breckinridge delivered a speech, in reply to a letter signed by members of the legislature, asking his views upon the questions which divide the parties of the country.

On the 6th page of the speech, he thus remarks upon the express of 1856: "It became my duty, at the request of political friends, to visit the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Pennsylvania, and to address the people; and I avail myself of this occasion to declare that in all these States I proclaimed the same principles, which I have ever uttered in the commonwealth of Kentucky, and am ready to utter again. It had been charged that the Democratic party desired to employ the Federal Government to propagate slavery. I denied it. It had been charged that the Democratic party, not content with the guarantees of the Constitution, had erected itself into a great proslavery organization. I denied it, and declared that the national Democracy was neither a pro-slavery nor anti-slavery party, but was a constitutional party; and I repeat the declaration here to-night. I urged earnestly against the renewal in Congress of agitation upon the question of slavery in the Territories. By the Kansas bill the people were left free to mold their institutions, subject only to the Constitution."

Does all this sound like the cry of the successionists? Does he say a word about protection for slavery? Don't he say that the national Democratic party is a constitutional party—neither for or against slavery in the Territories or States? And so it is; and all who are either for or against slavery in Slave States or Territories by congressional action or intervention, don't belong to the Democratic party—don't belong to that great constitutional party, but are outside of it and opposed to it. Breckinridge is now for congressional intervention for slavery. He asserts the doctrines of Yancey, Rhett, Davis and Brown. He is the candidate of those men for the Presidency—their leader. To say nothing about the Charleston or Baltimore conventions, and the action of the bolters, upon principle Breckinridge has not himself home from the Democratic party. He is now arrayed against it, and I repudiate him. He belongs to a party which is opposed to the great constitutional party of the country.

On page 7, of the same speech, he says: "In this connection I do not hesitate to say that the aim of every good citizen should be to keep the question of slavery out of Congress. Its agitation there has been productive only of evil to me, and that continually. *In the present condition of public affairs I can see no motive to thrust the territorial question on the congressional arena. Not has it origin in a feeling of loyalty to the Union. At present, the slavery question, or this aspect of it, is not before Congress.* No southern Senator (except Senator Brown, of Mississippi, who can't get any one to second his resolution,) or representative proposes legislation upon it. No complaint of violated rights comes from any Territory. No evidence is offered that the Constitution, the laws and the courts are not competent to protect personal right and private property. Hence, while I would never abandon a constitutional right, especially after it had been judicially determined, I never would promiscuously raise any question to distract the country when no voice demands it North, South, East, or West."

And again on the same page: "It should be cause of congratulation to every patriot that the territorial question is nearly fought out. It is fought out. No man of sense or observation ever supposed that the institution would penetrate into Minnesota, Nebraska, and other Northern Territories. As to the Territory south of a certain parallel of latitude, where slave property is really profitable, I do not doubt that climate, interest, the proximity of the slave States, the Constitution and the courts, will sustain it there in all its rights, and that we will have Southern States out of southern soil."

But now Mr. Breckinridge don't think that Indiana had enough determine the question of slavery. And does he really believe that slavery can exist for one hour anywhere unless slave property is profitable? Why, then, call upon Congress for a territorial slave code? Are you determined to force slavery, by an act of Congress, into Territories where it is not profitable? Or, in short, do you belong to a pro-slavery party? "In the event that the people of the Territories do not want slavery, and will not provide by law for its introduction and protection, and that fact shall be ascertained judicially, then Congress is to pass laws to force the Territories to have slavery. So long as the people of a Territory want slavery, and say so by their legislation, then Congress s' all not interfere; but the moment the people say they do not want slavery, and will not have it, then Congress must intervene, and force the institution on an unwilling people." Mr. Breckinridge, as late as the 21st of December, 1859, spoke otherwise. He was then of the national constitutional party—the Democratic party—he now belongs to a separate organization—the Administration party.

On page 12 of the same speech, he charges "that the present and ulterior purpose of the Black-Republican party are: to introduce the doctrine of negro equality into American politics, and to make it the ground of positive legislation hostile to the Southern States. To exclude the slave property of the South from all the territory now in the Union, or which may hereafter be acquired; to prevent the admission, in any latitude, of another slave-holding State; to repeal the fugitive slave law, and practically refuse to obey the Constitution."

After enumerating the purposes of the Black-Republicans, Mr. Breckinridge closes his charge against that party by the following: "And, finally, by the Executive, by Congress, by the postal service, the press and all other accessible modes, to agitate, without ceasing, until the Southern States, without sympathy or benefactors in the Union, were thrown by the mere force of numbers, into a position of isolated rights cause from any Territory. No evidence is offered that the Constitution, the laws and the courts are not competent to protect personal right and private property. Hence, while I would never abandon a constitutional right, especially after it had been judicially determined, I never would promiscuously raise any question to distract the country when no voice demands it North, South, East, or West."

And again on the same page: "It should be cause of congratulation to every patriot that the territorial question is nearly fought out. It is fought out. No man of sense or observation ever supposed that the institution would penetrate into Minnesota, Nebraska, and other Northern Territories. As to the Territory south of a certain parallel of latitude, where slave property is really profitable, I do not doubt that climate, interest, the proximity of the slave States, the Constitution and the courts, will sustain it there in all its rights, and that we will have Southern States out of southern soil."

But now Mr. Breckinridge don't think that climate had enough determine the question of slavery. And does he really believe that slavery can exist for one hour anywhere unless slave property is profitable? Why, then, call upon Congress for a territorial slave code? Are you determined to force slavery, by an act of Congress, into Territories where it is not profitable? Or, in short, do you belong to a pro-slavery party? "In the event that the people of the Territories do not want slavery, and will not provide by law for its introduction and protection, and that fact shall be ascertained judicially, then Congress is to pass laws to force the Territories to have slavery. So long as the people of a Territory want slavery, and say so by their legislation, then Congress s' all not interfere; but the moment the people say they do not want slavery, and will not have it, then Congress must intervene, and force the institution on an unwilling people." Mr. Breckinridge, as late as the 21st of December, 1859, spoke otherwise. He was then of the national constitutional party—the Democratic party—he now belongs to a separate organization—the Administration party.

On page 12 of the same speech, he charges "that the present and ulterior purpose of the Black-Republican party are: to introduce the doctrine of negro equality into American politics, and to make it the ground of positive legislation hostile to the Southern States. To exclude the slave property of the South from all the territory now in the Union, or which may hereafter be acquired; to prevent the admission, in any latitude, of another slave-holding State; to repeal the fugitive slave law, and practically refuse to obey the Constitution."

After enumerating the purposes of the Black-Republicans, Mr. Breckinridge closes his charge against that party by the following: "And, finally, by the Executive, by Congress, by the postal service, the press and all other accessible modes, to agitate, without ceasing, until the Southern States, without sympathy or benefactors in the Union, were thrown by the mere force of numbers, into a position of isolated rights cause from any Territory. No evidence is offered that the Constitution, the laws and the courts are not competent to protect

[illegible] Democrat party, and Senator Douglas, the leader of the Democratic party, and Senator Douglas, the leader of the Democratic party, and Senator Douglas, the leader of the Democratic