THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN & DILL. MEMPHIS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1860. VOLUME XI.—NUMBER 181.

Daily Appeal.

SPEECH OF MR. COLEMAN OF LOUISIANA, AT NEWPORT, KY., AT A DOUGLAS AND JOHNSON RATIFICATION MEETING.

The Slavery Question—Proceedings of the Baltimore Convention—Regularity of Douglas' Nomination.

FRENCH CITIZENS: It is with great pleasure that I avail myself of the invitation to address the people of Newport on the political topics of the day. Just thirty-eight years ago, then a very young man, and a candidate for Congress, I had the honor of addressing the citizens of this place, then a small village for the first time. There are but few now here who favored me with their presence on that occasion; yet the years are some, and many of the sons of others.

Being a native Kentuckian, and standing on that portion of the gallant State where I first put forth my aspirations, and where my earliest and most pleasing associations were formed, I can but cordially repeat the sentiment of the poet:

"Loves there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This my own, my native land?"

I am here, my fellow-citizens, to speak on subjects of grave importance and deep interest to the people of the United States. A crisis in the political affairs of our country is rapidly approaching, if not already upon us, and I feel that it is the duty of all to take a part and exercise some influence in the contest. Having passed the meridian of life, I had supposed that no circumstance would transpire which would draw me from that quiet retirement which circumstances had prompted me to seek and enjoy. I fled in otherwise. The great national party on which, in my restless devotion, I had confidently relied for preservation of all our rights, under the Constitution and in the Union, is threatened with imminent danger and disruption. The Union itself is, in my opinion, much nearer dissolution than ever before—now, when there is *less* cause for strife between the North and South, on the existing subject of slavery, than there was in 1850, or at any period of our history since that date.

After the adjournment of the late Baltimore convention of the Democracy, with equal surprise and mortification, I perceived that many of the public journals, North and South, (I mean those Democratic and adherence to Democratic usages I had esteemed of the highest regard, were openly advocating the election of Messrs. Breckinridge and Lane, upon the ground that they were the regular nominees of the national Democratic party. It is to me a matter of surprise that any sound-minded man should state such a fact, or, if he should be deluded, that any Democrat would avail himself of a misrepresentation for the accomplishment of any purpose, much less for the purpose of defeating the regular nominees of the party.

Men may advocate the election of Mr. Breckinridge upon the grounds of superior qualifications, superior integrity, superior firmness, superior experience, if they honestly believe that he is superior in all these respects. But no man can truthfully say that he is the nominee of the national Democracy. No man can say that at any time during the sessions of the national convention at Charleston or Baltimore, he was the favorite of even a respectable minority of the party.

The convention at Charleston was composed of six hundred and six delegates, having the right to cast three hundred and three votes, being the whole vote of the electoral college. The committee on platform were divided. A majority, seventeen (the committee was composed of thirty-three, one from each of the States represented) of the committee, prior to 1856, with several explanatory resolutions. The Cincinnati platform was, out and out, non-intervention by Congress with slavery in *State or Territory* and in the *District of Columbia*. But the explanatory resolutions asserted the right and duty of Congress to intervene and protect slavery in the Territories. So that, while the main resolution was non-intervention, the explanatory resolutions, if anything, were intervention, or a slavery code by Congress.

The minority (fifteen) of the committee reported the Cincinnati platform simply, with a resolution, "that all questions in regard to the rights of property in States and Territories arising under the Constitution of the United States are political in their character, and the Democratic party is pledged to abide by and faithfully carry out such determinations of these questions as has been or may be made by the Supreme Court of the United States."

Mr. Butler made a report himself of the Cincinnati platform alone; so that the committee stood nearly equally divided—17 to 16. Mr. Butler objected only to the resolution of the minority declaring that the party was pledged to stand by the decision of the Supreme Court.

The convention approved of and adopted the minority report—the Cincinnati platform—and for that act the eight cotton States bolted, and after seceding and withdrawing from all connection with the deliberations of the body, entered into another distinct convention, elected another presiding officer, adopted the platform, changed the name of the party, and finally adjourned to meet at Richmond, after inviting the other States to appoint and send delegates to the Richmond convention.

After the secession, how stood the case? Eight States withdrew, casting fifty-one votes; twenty-five States stood firm, casting two hundred and fifty-two votes. The convention then proceeded to ballot. On the first the vote stood:

Douglas	145½
Hunter	42½
Lane	20
Hoover	28½
Johnson	12
Davis	7½
Disclaimed	1
Total	252

On the thirty-second ballot:

Douglas	152½
Hunter	47½
Disclaimed	3
Hoover	28½
Johnson	11
Lane	14½
Davis	5
Total	252

On the fortieth ballot:

Douglas	151½
Hunter	66½
Disclaimed	3
Hoover	16
Lane	14½
Total	251

Thus it was shown that Douglas was first, Guthrie second, and Mr. Breckinridge not named, although all of the Southern States except the seceders were present and co-operating. Finding it impracticable to make a nomination under the two-thirds rule, the convention adjourned to Baltimore with the following resolution:

Resolved, That when this convention adjourn to-day, it adjourn to meet in Baltimore on the 18th of June next, in order to afford the *States and now represented* an opportunity to fill up their delegations.

So matters stood when the convention reassembled at Baltimore, when new difficulties sprung up from the conduct of the seceders. Not content with the effort and failure to break up the convention at Charleston, the bolters from all the seceding States except South Carolina and Florida, made their appearance at Baltimore, and asked permission to resume their abandoned seats. The ground was well taken that new conventions had been held in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas, and that new delegates had been elected in place of the seceders, or new appointments and new instructions given to the old ones.

The first business, therefore, at Baltimore was to settle the question of their titles to seats. The following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the credentials of all persons claiming seats in the convention made vacant by the secession of delegates at Charleston, be referred to the committee on credentials.

After a patient examination the committee reported in favor of the new delegates from Alabama and Louisiana, to the exclusion of the seceders, and in favor of both delegations from Georgia. The convention sustained the report of the majority of the committee as to Alabama and Louisiana, and as the action was the *pretense* for the secessionists at Baltimore, I beg leave to state the case of my own State—Louisiana.

It will be remembered that the Louisiana delegates seceded at Charleston on the 30th day of April, after the adoption of the Cincinnati platform. It is just to say that two—Charles Jones and James A. McCallum—did not leave the convention, and did not approve of the secession at the time, although they preferred the majority platform.

The secession took the following language to the president: "The convention, by this vote, (the vote on the platform,) refused to recognize the fundamental principles of the Democracy of the States we have the honor to represent, and we feel constrained, in obedience to a high sense of duty, to withdraw from its deliberations, and unanimously to order our solemn protest against its action." We ask that this communication may be spread upon the minutes of the convention, and beg leave to express our appreciation of the courtesy and dignity which have characterized your action as a presiding officer"—a formal renunciation of the convention and its deliberations and a ceremonious leave-taking of the presiding officer.

These gentlemen entered into the seceders' antagonistic convention, and co-operated in all its proceedings, including the adjournment to Richmond, all of which was in violation of the rights of the Democratic party, and calculated to destroy its efficiency and its usefulness. The question now arises, were they justified in such conduct by the facts and circumstances of the case? Let us examine them.

As before stated, the committee on platform was composed of thirty-three, one from each State. The majority platform was presented by seventeen, and the minority, or Cincinnati platform, by sixteen.

No rule of the party, nor of right reason exists, nor can exist, which makes it obligatory on the convention to adopt a report of a majority of a committee. If there were such a rule the majority of a committee—in this case seventeen men—would substitute six hundred and six members. In other words, six hundred and six chosen delegates would have to succumb to seventeen, which is not by any means a sound Democratic principle. Yet the seceders of Louisiana declared that the convention, by refusing to adopt the report of the seventeen, thereby refused to recognize the fundamental doctrine of the party in Louisiana.

Here, fellow-citizens, I beg leave to state that the Cincinnati platform was, in 1856, received with universal approbation in Louisiana, and its doctrine of non-intervention was then, and is now, acknowledged to be the fundamental principle of the Democratic party on the subject of slavery. We desire no slave code by Congress for the Territories; but insist that Congress shall keep its hands off that subject altogether.

We deny the right of Congress to legislate slavery into a Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject to the Constitution only, and the decision of the Supreme Court in all questions that may properly arise.

Such was one of the doctrines of the compromises of 1850—to which I felt an opposition, but to which I submitted, because it contained the doctrine of non-intervention—and to which I became more and more reconciled, as non-intervention became more and more the established doctrine of the party, in the platforms of 1852 and 1856.

This doctrine of non-intervention should not now be surrendered by the national Democracy, at the instance of a few factious and treacherous politicians; nor will it be surrendered.

But to the action of the convention. The vote on the resolution adopting the Cincinnati Platform was 272½ ayes, 15 noes. Here is the resolution:

Resolved, That the Democracy of the Union, in convention assembled, hereby declare our affirmance of the resolutions unanimously adopted and declared as a platform of principles by the Democratic convention at Cincinnati, in 1856, believing that Democratic principles are unchangeable in their nature, when applied to the same subject matter.

To this resolution I give my hearty assent, though the Louisiana delegates at Charleston decided in consequence of its adoption. Virginia voted for it 14 to 1, Missouri 7½ to 1½, Tennessee 10½ to 1, Maryland 3 to 3, Delaware 2 to 1, North Carolina and Kentucky unanimously.

South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas, *the eight Cotton States*, voted against it unanimously, and bolted, and now *modestly* ask the Democratic party to ratify their action, and to declare that the Charleston convention *forced upon the party* a platform of principles which is violatory of the fundamental doctrines of the Democracy.

In consequence of the secession at Charleston Louisiana held two State conventions. The Central committee, on the 14th day of May, issued a call to re-assemble the old convention, which had assembled on the 5th day of March previously, and after performing its duties, had adjourned *sine die*. On the 4th day of June about one-third of the former delegates met in convention at Baton Rouge, and a majority of them passed resolutions approving the secession and instructing the old delegates to go to Richmond and consult, then to Baltimore to resume their seats in the Democratic convention, and demand a change in the platform which had been adopted at Charleston by a vote of 237½ to 65, and, in case of failure, again to secede and repair to Richmond as delegates to that convention, and then operate against the Baltimore convention.

Now, fellow-Democrats, I say that this whole proceeding was a gross violation of every principle of common sense, and every usage of the Democratic party, and incontestably proves that the seceders and the Baton Rouge convention were determined to force the party in Louisiana to sustain them and rule the party, or to ruin the Democratic organization altogether.

The convention of the 5th of March had adjourned *sine die*, and was dead to all intents and purposes. No power, except that of the people, could call it again into existence. The central committee could not elect delegates to a State convention. It could only appoint a time and place, and recommend primary meetings of the Democracy to elect delegates. This can not, and I trust will not, be denied by any true Democrat. It was, therefore, a bold and reckless usurpation of power by the committee, which has been equaled in effrontery only by the Institute convention at Baltimore, in declaring themselves to be the *national Democratic convention*. Both usurpations are the fruits of the daring and distempered ambition of a desperate clique of ultra-official functionaries, and which loudly call upon the people for repudiation and reform. Because the seceding delegates from Louisiana were illegally attended, I refused to co-operate. Not more than one-third of the original convention of the 5th of March were in attendance. Others were the regular Democratic delegates, who, protesting against the reassembling of a dead body, and preparing delegates for a new convention, to take into consideration the new and vital issues which had sprung up at Charleston.

Before I take leave of the Baton Rouge convention, allow me to remark that the plans of a northern lecture and the Cincinnati platform, proposed designs of such men as Mr. Yancey were understood in Louisiana. The circumstances of the secession and double convention at Charleston, the conduct of the Louisiana seceders in recommending the Richmond convention, and the singular call of the central committee to reconstitute the same convention, which had adjourned, to consider of the act of secession, created an alarm throughout the State, lest an attempt was being made to precipitate Louisiana into what other States into such a position in reference to the integrity of the Union as the Democracy would not choose to occupy.

This very remarkable, anti-Democratic, roving commission issued to the old delegates, with new and specific instructions, well calculated to create confusion and heart-burnings in the ante-secession portion of the party, and the terrible Richmond convention evidencing a show of adherence to Democratic usages at Baltimore, and a squint toward disunion at Richmond, were not calculated to allay the public apprehensions.

A few days after the Baton Rouge convention a new convention was held at Donaldsonville, composed of delegates fresh from the people of the party, elected in primary meetings after the secession, representing a majority of the party, coming from twenty-four parishes and five sixths of the Democracy. The city of New Orleans is about one-third the State, in all respects, and elects twenty-four of the ninety-eight representatives in the legislature.

This convention was assembled at the suggestion of the Democratic people, the legitimate source of Democratic power, by a call from two Democratic associations in New Orleans, and by a call of the Louisiana member of the national executive committee, Dr. Cottman; and these calls were responded to by the people, forming a numerous and intellectual delegation.

It was a large and enthusiastic assembly, purely Democratic in its sentiments, as its proceedings and resolutions will demonstrate. They resolved that the Cincinnati platform was the orthodox creed of the national Democracy. They condemned the act of seceding from the Charleston convention as a step toward the disruption of the party and its sectionalization, with a strong tendency toward disunion, and they resolved to stand and abide by the nominations of the Baltimore convention, whoever they might be.

The regularity of this convention was doubted by the seceders, but Mr. Breckinridge was named, although all of the Southern States except the seceders were present and co-operating. Finding it impracticable to make a nomination under the two-third rule, the convention adjourned to Baltimore with the following resolution:

Resolved, That when this convention adjourn to-day, it adjourn to meet in Baltimore on the 18th of June next, in order to afford the *States and now represented* an opportunity to fill up their delegations.

So matters stood when the convention reassembled at Baltimore, when new difficulties sprung up from the conduct of the seceders. Not content with the effort and failure to break up the convention at Charleston, the bolters from all the seceding States except South Carolina and Florida, made their appearance at Baltimore, and asked permission to resume their abandoned seats. The ground was well taken that new conventions had been held in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas, and that new delegates had been elected in place of the seceders, or new appointments and new instructions given to the old ones.

The first business, therefore, at Baltimore was to settle the question of their titles to seats. The following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the credentials of all persons claiming seats in the convention made vacant by the secession of delegates at Charleston, be referred to the committee on credentials.

After a patient examination the committee reported in favor of the new delegates from Alabama and Louisiana, to the exclusion of the seceders, and in favor of both delegations from Georgia. The convention sustained the report of the majority of the committee as to Alabama and Louisiana, and as this action was the *pretense* for the secessionists at Baltimore, I beg leave to state the case of my own State—Louisiana.

It will be remembered that the Louisiana delegates seceded at Charleston on the 30th day of April, after the adoption of the Cincinnati platform. It is just to say that two—Charles Jones and James A. McCallum—did not leave the convention, and did not approve of the secession at the time, although they preferred the majority platform.

The secession took the following language to the president: "The convention, by this vote, (the vote on the platform,) refused to recognize the fundamental principles of the Democracy of the States we have the honor to represent, and we feel constrained, in obedience to a high sense of duty, to withdraw from its deliberations, and unanimously to order our solemn protest against its action." We ask that this communication may be spread upon the minutes of the convention, and beg leave to express our appreciation of the courtesy and dignity which have characterized your action as a presiding officer"—a formal renunciation of the convention and its deliberations and a ceremonious leave-taking of the presiding officer.

These gentlemen entered into the seceders' antagonistic convention, and co-operated in all its proceedings, including the adjournment to Richmond, all of which was in violation of the rights of the Democratic party, and calculated to destroy its efficiency and its usefulness. The question now arises, were they justified in such conduct by the facts and circumstances of the case? Let us examine them.

As before stated, the committee on platform was composed of thirty-three, one from each State. The majority platform was presented by seventeen, and the minority, or Cincinnati platform, by sixteen.

No rule of the party, nor of right reason exists, nor can exist, which makes it obligatory on the convention to adopt a report of a majority of a committee. If there were such a rule the majority of a committee—in this case seventeen men—would substitute six hundred and six members. In other words, six hundred and six chosen delegates would have to succumb to seventeen, which is not by any means a sound Democratic principle. Yet the seceders of Louisiana declared that the convention, by refusing to adopt the report of the seventeen, thereby refused to recognize the fundamental doctrine of the party in Louisiana.

Here, fellow-citizens, I beg leave to state that the Cincinnati platform was, in 1856, received with universal approbation in Louisiana, and its doctrine of non-intervention was then, and is now, acknowledged to be the fundamental principle of the Democratic party on the subject of slavery. We desire no slave code by Congress for the Territories; but insist that Congress shall keep its hands off that subject altogether.

We deny the right of Congress to legislate slavery into a Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject to the Constitution only, and the decision of the Supreme Court in all questions that may properly arise.

Such was one of the doctrines of the compromises of 1850—to which I felt an opposition, but to which I submitted, because it contained the doctrine of non-intervention—and to which I became more and more reconciled, as non-intervention became more and more the established doctrine of the party, in the platforms of 1852 and 1856.

This doctrine of non-intervention should not now be surrendered by the national Democracy, at the instance of a few factious and treacherous politicians; nor will it be surrendered.

But to the action of the convention. The vote on the resolution adopting the Cincinnati Platform was 272½ ayes, 15 noes. Here is the resolution:

Resolved, That the Democracy of the Union, in convention assembled, hereby declare our affirmance of the resolutions unanimously adopted and declared as a platform of principles by the Democratic convention at Cincinnati, in 1856, believing that Democratic principles are unchangeable in their nature, when applied to the same subject matter.

To this resolution I give my hearty assent, though the Louisiana delegates at Charleston decided in consequence of its adoption. Virginia voted for it 14 to 1, Missouri 7½ to 1½, Tennessee 10½ to 1, Maryland 3 to 3, Delaware 2 to 1, North Carolina and Kentucky unanimously.

South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas, *the eight Cotton States*, voted against it unanimously, and bolted, and now *modestly* ask the Democratic party to ratify their action, and to declare that the Charleston convention *forced upon the party* a platform of principles which is violatory of the fundamental doctrines of the Democracy.

In consequence of the secession at Charleston Louisiana held two State conventions. The Central committee, on the 14th day of May, issued a call to re-assemble the old convention, which had assembled on the 5th day of March previously, and after performing its duties, had adjourned *sine die*. On the 4th day of June about one-third of the former delegates met in convention at Baton Rouge, and a majority of them passed resolutions approving the secession and instructing the old delegates to go to Richmond and consult, then to Baltimore to resume their seats in the Democratic convention, and demand a change in the platform which had been adopted at Charleston by a vote of 237½ to 65, and, in case of failure, again to secede and repair to Richmond as delegates to that convention, and then operate against the Baltimore convention.

Now, fellow-Democrats, I say that this whole proceeding was a gross violation of every principle of common sense, and every usage of the Democratic party, and incontestably proves that the seceders and the Baton Rouge convention were determined to force the party in Louisiana to sustain them and rule the party, or to ruin the Democratic organization altogether.

The convention of the 5th of March had adjourned *sine die*, and was dead to all intents and purposes. No power, except that of the people, could call it again into existence. The central committee could not elect delegates to a State convention. It could only appoint a time and place, and recommend primary meetings of the Democracy to elect delegates. This can not, and I trust will not, be denied by any true Democrat. It was, therefore, a bold and reckless usurpation of power by the committee, which has been equaled in effrontery only by the Institute convention at Baltimore, in declaring themselves to be the *national Democratic convention*. Both usurpations are the fruits of the daring and distempered ambition of a desperate clique of ultra-official functionaries, and which loudly call upon the people for repudiation and reform. Because the seceding delegates from Louisiana were illegally attended, I refused to co-operate. Not more than one-third of the original convention of the 5th of March were in attendance. Others were the regular Democratic delegates, who, protesting against the reassembling of a dead body, and preparing delegates for a new convention, to take into consideration the new and vital issues which had sprung up at Charleston.

Before I take leave of the Baton Rouge convention, allow me to remark that the plans of a northern lecture and the Cincinnati platform, proposed designs of such men as Mr. Yancey were understood in Louisiana. The circumstances of the secession and double convention at Charleston, the conduct of the Louisiana seceders in recommending the Richmond convention, and the singular call of the central committee to reconstitute the same convention, which had adjourned, to consider of the act of secession, created an alarm throughout the State, lest an attempt was being made to precipitate Louisiana into what other States into such a position in reference to the integrity of the Union as the Democracy would not choose to occupy.

This very remarkable, anti-Democratic, roving commission issued to the old delegates, with new and specific instructions, well calculated to create confusion and heart-burnings in the ante-secession portion of the party, and the terrible Richmond convention evidencing a show of adherence to Democratic usages at Baltimore, and a squint toward disunion at Richmond, were not calculated to allay the public apprehensions.

A few days after the Baton Rouge convention a new convention was held at Donaldsonville, composed of delegates fresh from the people of the party, elected in primary meetings after the secession, representing a majority of the party, coming from twenty-four parishes and five sixths of the Democracy. The city of New Orleans is about one-third the State, in all respects, and elects twenty-four of the ninety-eight representatives in the legislature.

This convention was assembled at the suggestion of the Democratic people, the legitimate source of Democratic power, by a call from two Democratic associations in New Orleans, and by a call of the Louisiana member of the national executive committee, Dr. Cottman; and these calls were responded to by the people, forming a numerous and intellectual delegation.

It was a large and enthusiastic assembly, purely Democratic in its sentiments, as its proceedings and resolutions will demonstrate. They resolved that the Cincinnati platform was the orthodox creed of the national Democracy. They condemned the act of seceding from the Charleston convention as a step toward the disruption of the party and its sectionalization, with a strong tendency toward disunion, and they resolved to stand and abide by the nominations of the Baltimore convention, whoever they might be.

The regularity of this convention was doubted by the seceders, but Mr. Breckinridge was named, although all of the Southern States except the seceders were present and co-operating. Finding it impracticable to make a nomination under the two-third rule, the convention adjourned to Baltimore with the following resolution:

Resolved, That when this convention adjourn to-day, it adjourn to meet in Baltimore on the 18th of June next, in order to afford the *States and now represented* an opportunity to fill up their delegations.

So matters stood when the convention reassembled at Baltimore, when new difficulties sprung up from the conduct of the seceders. Not content with the effort and failure to break up the convention at Charleston, the bolters from all the seceding States except South Carolina and Florida, made their appearance at Baltimore, and asked permission to resume their abandoned seats. The ground was well taken that new conventions had been held in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas, and that new delegates had been elected in place of the seceders, or new appointments and new instructions given to the old ones.

The first business, therefore, at Baltimore was to settle the question of their titles to seats. The following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the credentials of all persons claiming seats in the convention made vacant by the secession of delegates at Charleston, be referred to the committee on credentials.

After a patient examination the committee reported in favor of the new delegates from Alabama and Louisiana, to the exclusion of the seceders, and in favor of both delegations from Georgia. The convention sustained the report of the majority of the committee as to Alabama and Louisiana, and as this action was the *pretense* for the secessionists at Baltimore, I beg leave to state the case of my own State—Louisiana.

It will be remembered that the Louisiana delegates seceded at Charleston on the 30th day of April, after the adoption of the Cincinnati platform. It is just to say that two—Charles Jones and James A. McCallum—did not leave the convention, and did not approve of the secession at the time, although they preferred the majority platform.

The secession took the following language to the president: "The convention, by this vote, (the vote on the platform,) refused to recognize the fundamental principles of the Democracy of the States we have the honor to represent, and we feel constrained, in obedience to a high sense of duty, to withdraw from its deliberations, and unanimously to order our solemn protest against its action." We ask that this communication may be spread upon the minutes of the convention, and beg leave to express our appreciation of the courtesy and dignity which have characterized your action as a presiding officer"—a formal renunciation of the convention and its deliberations and a ceremonious leave-taking of the presiding officer.

These gentlemen entered into the seceders' antagonistic convention, and co-operated in all its proceedings, including the adjournment to Richmond, all of which was in violation of the rights of the Democratic party, and calculated to destroy its efficiency and its usefulness. The question now arises, were they justified in such conduct by the facts and circumstances of the case? Let us examine them.

As before stated, the committee on platform was composed of thirty-three, one from each State. The majority platform was presented by seventeen, and the minority, or Cincinnati platform, by sixteen.

No rule of the party, nor of right reason exists, nor can exist, which makes it obligatory on the convention to adopt a report of a majority of a committee. If there were such a rule the majority of a committee—in this case seventeen men—would substitute six hundred and six members. In other words, six hundred and six chosen delegates would have to succumb to seventeen, which is not by any means a sound Democratic principle. Yet the seceders of Louisiana declared that the convention, by refusing to adopt the report of the seventeen, thereby refused to recognize the fundamental doctrine of the party in Louisiana.

Here, fellow-citizens, I beg leave to state that the Cincinnati platform was, in 1856, received with universal approbation in Louisiana, and its doctrine of non-intervention was then, and is now, acknowledged to be the fundamental principle of the Democratic party on the subject of slavery. We desire no slave code by Congress for the Territories; but insist that Congress shall keep its hands off that subject altogether.

We deny the right of Congress to legislate slavery into a Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic insti-

The Memphis Appeal.

PUBLISHED DAILY, TRI-WEEKLY AND WEEKLY BY JOHN B. M'CLANAHAN.....BENJAMIN F. DILL. Under the style and firm of M'CLANAHAN & DILL, To whom all Letters on Business, or otherwise, should be Directed.

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 DAY.	2 DAYS.	3 DAYS.	4 DAYS.	5 DAYS.	6 DAYS.	1 WEEK.	2 WEEKS.	3 WEEKS.	1 MONTH.	2 MONTHS.	3 MONTHS.	1 YEAR.
1	2 00	4 00	5 00	6 00	8 00	10 00	12 00	15 00	18 00	25 00	35 00	45 00	75 00
2	4 00	6 00	7 00	9 00	12 00	15 00	18 00	25 00	30 00	40 00	50 00	60 00	100 00
3	6 00	9 00	10 00	12 00	16 00	20 00	25 00	30 00	35 00	50 00	65 00	75 00	125 00
4	8 00	10 00	12 00	14 00	20 00	25 00	30 00	35 00	40 00	60 00	75 00	90 00	150 00
5	10 00	12 00	15 00	18 00	24 00	30 00	35 00	40 00	45 00	70 00	85 00	100 00	175 00
6	12 00	14 00	17 00	20 00	28 00	35 00	40 00	45 00	50 00	80 00	95 00	110 00	200 00
7	14 00	16 00	19 00	22 00	32 00	40 00	45 00	50 00	55 00	90 00	105 00	120 00	225 00
8	15 00	18 00	20 00	25 00	36 00	45 00	50 00	55 00	60 00	100 00	115 00	130 00	250 00
9	15 00	20 00	25 00	30 00	40 00	50 00	55 00	60 00	70 00	105 00	125 00	140 00	275 00

One square, twenty-four hours, per square, $40.00
" " " twice a week, " 30.00
" " " three times a week, " 35.00
" " " twice a week, " 50.00

All advertisements for the Appeal must 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, CHARGED AS NEW EACH DAY, and in third page, at double the usual rates.

Advertisements directed to be displayed, or set in type, charged double rates.

Yearly advertisers will be charged extra for a regular space over contract, and when LARGE TYPE is required to be used, or the advertisement kept on inside of paper.

Quarterly advertisers will be charged extra at regular rates, for Waste, Rects, Removals, Co-Partnerships, Notices, To Consignees, etc.

Transient Advertisements must be paid for in advance.

No advertisement will appear in the Weekly paper unless by special contract.

Special contracts to be inserted in the Weekly paper only, or at irregular intervals in either of the papers, will be charged $1 per square for each and every insertion.

Announcing Candidates for State, County and Municipal offices, $5 each, to be paid in advance by every candidate.

Marriages and Deaths are published as news; but Obituaries, Tributes of Respect and Funeral Invitations are to be charged as advertisements.

All legal and transient advertisements will be charged for the regular rates.

Editorial notices in local column will be charged double per line.

No deduction or variation will be made from the foregoing rates.

M'CLANAHAN & DILL.

Cheering News to the Afflicted.

GENTLEMEN of science may speculate and theorize, but facts are worth more to the afflicted than all the theories the world ever produced.

DR. A. G. GOODLETS *Improved Houck's Panacea*,

is acknowledged by all who have given it a trial, to be one of the best medicines ever used for the cure of all diseases arising from a disordered stomach, or impure state of the blood. The wonderful cures performed by the "Panacea" in the city of Nashville and vicinity, and the testimony from other parts of the country, has been unbiassed, is a significant guarantee of its efficacy.

The Rev. J. C. Bowden, of McMinnville, Tenn., speaks thus:

DR. A. G. GOODLET—Dear Sir: It may be gratifying to you to hear that Houck's Panacea, prepared and sold by you, is doing its good work on the relief of your fellow men. I have used it in my family for several months in Middle Tennessee. I have often met those who have used the "Panacea" in other places. It is the best remedy I have ever used." It has been very useful to me in spheres of usefulness, and I cheerfully recommend the open air and laboring in restoring. Please make an agent in this place. Very sincerely,

J. C. BOWDEN.

G. W. JONES & CO., 229 Main street, 4 GOODLETT & CO., 38 Front Row, Memphis, Tenn.

R. E. GOODLETT & CO., Nashville, Tenn.

Jeld-daiwtw

FOREST RETREAT!

A BEAUTIFUL SUMMER RESORT,

Two miles south of the city, on the Horn Lake road.

J. C. JACOBI, Proprietor.

Is now open for the reception of visitors, both LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.

THIS resort is delightfully located in a beautiful Forest, and will at all times afford a pleasant retreat for a few hours from the city. my24-3m

For Sale.

I OFFER for sale my little Farm in Crittenden county, Arkansas, containing 160 acres, 80 in cultivation, and three miles below Hopefield. Four hundred and seventy-one acres in the front, and about one hundred and fifty in a good state of cultivation. Fronts high, and well protected by the levee from the river. So say on what is the best cotton lands, this place offers excellent inducements. The land is rich and convenient for market purposes, and can be reached from Memphis at any time in one hour. The buildings are nearly all new, with a large cistern on the premises.

For further particulars see J. B. Walker, Memphis, or call on me at my residence, near the city.

jy18 3m ELI HAYNER.

DR. J. B. WASSON, Dentist,

HAVING located permanently in the city of Memphis, respectfully solicits the patronage of all who may desire his professional services in any of the various branches, and warrants satisfaction to all who may favor him with their patronage. All operations performed in the most approved and skillful manner. Teeth inserted, from one to an entire set, on suction or atmospheric pressure, thereby dispensing with the use of clasps or bands attached to the natural teeth. Plates will be used, or other kinds of artificial base if desired. Special attention given to the treating of all diseases of the mouth or teeth, and all operations warranted to stand 12 months, or which are being lost annually for want of a little skillful and judicious treatment. Teeth extracted without the aid of local anæsthetics, and without pain and suffering. Office on Main street, below Union, No. 357, in Jones & Tate's new block. jy14-tf1w4w1y

THE "UNION CHEMICAL PAINT."

An Artificial Marble,

MANUFACTURED AND SOLD BY THE

MEMPHIS PAINT COMPANY,

In Grand Oil Works Building, Navy Yard, Memphis, Tennessee.

Price List—Net Cash: For kegs 12½ lbs., 25 lbs., 50 lbs., 100 lbs., $6 per hundred. Inducible Oil $1 per gallon. A liberal discount from the above prices to wholesale dealers.

Office at G. W. Jones & Co's., wholesale and retail druggist, No. 229 Main st. Address letters to

J. N. NEWMAN, Agent.

jy24

R. A. LINDSEY. C. L. FICKLEN.

LINDSEY & FICKLEN,

COMMISSION MERCHANTS,

AND WHOLESALE DEALERS IN

Flour, Grain and Feed,

No. 5 Howard's Row.

MEMPHIS, TENN.

KEEP on hand a well-assorted stock of FLOUR, and are constantly supplied with CORN, OATS, HAY, BRAN, SHORTS, and MEDLING, which they offer at low prices.

Having good facilities for the purchase of stock, and a determination not to be undersold in our articles of trade by any legitimate dealer in this city, we respectfully ask a share of your orders, and solicit a share of public patronage. [aug1-dly] LINDSEY & FICKLEN.

GARDENERS,

AND THOSE DESIRING A BEAUTIFUL RESIDENCE LOT IN THE SUBURBS, ATTENTION!

IF there is a gentleman who called at our office a few days since, in search of a small plate in the vicinity of the city for a market garden, will call again, we think we can show them an opportunity for purchasing lots or fifteen acres of land, such as seldom offers.

We have for sale on the Hernando plank road, near the State Penitentiary, and in the best neighborhood in the vicinity of Memphis, fifteen acres of very superior land, on which there are some elegant building sites, which we will sell at a much less price than any other property in its vicinity can be had for.

We mean exactly what we say, and will prove our assertion to anybody who will call upon at our office, No. 276 Main street, over G. B. Williams's, near the corner of Madison street.

jy14 YOUNG & WELD.

LOOK TO YOUR INTEREST!

J. & M. FLAHERTY,

Have on hand and are daily receiving, a large assortment of most elegant

Furniture,

PIANOS, CARPETS,

OIL CARPETING, ETC.,

At No. 41 Union street,

And invite their friends and all others to call and examine their stock before purchasing elsewhere. jy12

PAPER WAREHOUSE.

CULVER, PAGE, HOYNE & CO.,

159 MAIN STREET.

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.

WRITING Papers, Ledger Papers, Cap Boards, Manila Papers, Envelopes, Blank Books and Office Stationery. ap76

Flour.

200 SACKS EXTRA FLOUR; 50 bbls. Extra Flour; 50 bbls. Superfine Flour; Just received and for sale by

LINDSEY & FICKLEN.

Fresh Meat.

JUST RECEIVED per steamer C. E. Hillman, a large lot of Fresh Rolled Oats Meal, and for sale low by

O'FLANAGAN & CRAWFORD,

jy26 No. 11 Front Row.

Professional Cards.

E. S. HAMMOND,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, Memphis, Tenn. Office No. 5 Exchange Block, corner Main and Monroe streets. Will attend to business entrusted to him in West Tennessee and North Mississippi.

Refer to Messrs. Brown, Green & Co., Memphis, Tenn.; Messrs. Bridges & Marshall, Memphis, Tenn.; Mr. Tiffee, Petersburg, Real Estate Broker; Messrs. Green & Swinkin, Attorneys, Richmond, Va.; Messrs. Jordan & Hillsman, Attorneys, Richmond, Va.; Messrs. Jordan & Hill, Murfreesboro, Tenn. jel6-1y

W. D. BEARD,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, Memphis, Tenn. Office No. 262, in Proctor's block, Main street.

Refer to J. M. Proctor, Hon. Jacob Thomas, Stratton, McDowell & Co., and Falls & Cash, Memphis; Col. J. W. Pitts, Tom. Wm. T. Wood, L. Lovering, Wonder, Cassidy & Co., Memphis. jel6-6m

T. P. CARPTHERS.—E. M. YERGER.—HORN WHITE.

Carpthers, Yerger & White,

ATTORNEYS AT LAW, Memphis, Tennessee.—Office in Skyles's Building. jel6-1y

J. A. WILLIAMS, M. D.,

HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN,

CORNER Main and Jefferson streets, over Lehman & Co.'s store, Memphis, Tennessee.

Office hours—From 9 to 11 A. M., 3 to 5 P. M. Residence, second house west of St. Mary's church, north side of Poplar st. jel6-1y

NO CLASPS! NO CLASPS!

DR. Wm. W. MORGAN,

SURGEON DENTIST,

OF PHILADELPHIA.

HAS permanently located in MEMPHIS. In presenting his services for another business season, he wishes to perform ALL DENTAL operations in a satisfactory manner. His PRICES are as LOW as the LOWEST, for the same styles, operation and material. Some eight years ago, Dr. M. abandoned the use of CLASPS altogether in the insertion of their Artificial Teeth, preferring the natural teeth (