THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN & DILL. MEMPHIS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1860. VOLUME XI.—NUMBER 188

Daily Appeal.

Hon. Robert Toombs Thinks there is no Regular Nominee of our Party.

From the Augusta Constitutionalist.]

We regret that business engagements prevented us from hearing the Warrenton speech of this great orator.

He professes to abide by his Lexington and Augusta speeches; and so far as he does that, he is right now.

He also says that Mr. Douglas is as sound on the slavery question as he is, and we admire the noble candor which compels him to tell the truth of a political adversary.

But of the following report of part of his Warrenton speech, as given by the editor of the *Dispatch*, he has been misled, he is mistaken, as we will proceed to show:

Mr. Toombs said the Democratic party had presented no candidate, according to the usage of that organization. The party had not presented Judge Douglas—there was no regular nominee. He then represented the votes at Charleston and at Baltimore, where Douglas got one hundred and seventy-one votes on the first ballot, and one hundred and eighty-one and a half on the second. Told declaring that there was no election; and when the vote was carried by acclamation, there were one hundred and nineteen and a half votes in all, which was not the regular two-thirds vote. Mr. Breckinridge got one hundred and five votes, and therefore he was not regularly nominated—and really the party had represented none having the claim of a regular nomination.

We take the above extract from the *Dispatch*, because that paper is recognized as the organ of that party, and because of the usual accuracy of Mr. Atkinson's reports.

The "usage" of the party is, that two-thirds of the votes, of all the delegates voting, shall be necessary to the choice of a candidate, and no man knows this better than Senator Toombs.

It we are not much mistaken, the very words of the rules of the convention are, that "two thirds of the votes cast shall be necessary to a choice;" and because it has so happened that some States have heretofore cast their votes, there is no responsibility on the convention if a part neglect or refuse to use their privileges.

The argument, however is, that as a quorum of the disagreed left, the majority must go home without doing anything. Such a game has been played in our State legislature, and the other glory of Mr. Toombs is, that he never would go such a chince.

But let us analyze the Senator's logic. Our State conventions are generally composed of delegates from about one-half of the counties, sometimes, on very extraordinary occasions, we have also two-thirds of the counties, wholly or partly, represented.

We remember of none where all the counties were represented.

Therefore, if a convention of the State adopted the two-thirds rule, and if, as usual, two-thirds of the counties were not represented, Mr. Toombs would hold that the party could not "present" a "regular nominee" for Governor!

How very reasonable!

Mr. Toombs was not in the convention, but we were, and we give the statement of the facts, as endorsed by ex-Gov. King, in a late speech at Carrollton, Missouri.

The resolution, and the official report, agree fully with his statement.

After the questions in reference to the admission of delegates was settled, the best thing in order was the 2/3-eighth ballot for President, having balloted fifty-seven times at Charleston. On the fifty-eighth ballot, being the first at Baltimore, Mr. Douglas had gained twenty-six votes, receiving that ballot one hundred and seventy-three and a half, Mr. Breckinridge fifty-two, Mr. Guthrie nine, Mr. Seymour one, Mr. Russell one, Mr. Wise one, Mr. Dickinson one, and twenty-one votes declined to be cast for any one, making in all two hundred and twelve votes. These were represented by four hundred and twenty-five delegates regularly accredited to the convention, who had not seceded; and whose names, and the States from whence they came, are signed on the records of the proceedings, and now published to the world.

On the announcement of this vote, Mr. Church, of New York, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That Stephen A. Douglas having received two-thirds of all the votes cast in this national Democratic convention, is, according to the rules of the convention, the nominee of the Democratic party, declared nominated for the office of President of the United States.

Mr. Church went on to explain the position of New York. She had been willing to yield all except personal honor, and the honor of her constituents, to conciliate and harmonize the Democratic party. Mr. Hoge, of Virginia, hoped that there would be another ballot. Mr. Gelting, of Maryland, requested Mr. Church to withdraw his resolution and let there have another ballot, that there might be two-thirds of the electoral college here, and if gentlemen voted who had declined to vote, Mr. Douglas would be nominated by more than two-thirds of the electoral college. Mr. Church withdrew his resolution; a second ballot resulted in one hundred and eighty-one and a half for Mr. Douglas, seven and a half for Mr. Breckinridge, and five and a half for Guthrie. On the announcement of this ballot, Mr. Clark of Missouri, and Mr. Hoge, of Virginia, neither of whom had been voting for Mr. Douglas, obviously moved that the nomination be made unanimous and by acclamation, and both made most patriotic remarks in support of their motion. Others, who had not been supporting Mr. Douglas, made very fine and eloquent addresses.

John C. Mason and Mr. Reed, of Kentucky, addressed the convention, and hoped the nomination would be unanimous. It was plain to be seen that a better spirit was prevailing. John L. Dawson, the distinguished chairman of the Pennsylvania delegation, said that, in the fifty-nine ballots which had taken place, had given no vote to Mr. Douglas—he, too, asked on behalf of himself and the Pennsylvania delegation, that the vote be made unanimous. Then Mr. Shepley, of Maine, Mr. Cochran, and Mr. Seymour, of New York, neither of whom had been supporting Mr. Douglas—the two last named the nomination be made unanimous. I have been this particular, gentlemen, in giving you the details of the balloting, and I do it from the reported proceedings of the convention, which I have before me, for the reason that those who did not witness those scenes are engaged in efforts to deceive the people. None of the four hundred and twenty-five delegates present, nor of the thousands of spectators, will gainsay the correctness of what I have stated. And if every seceding delegate had been present and voted against the nomination, Stephen Douglas would have been nominated, having received more than two-thirds of the whole electoral college. Every State in the Union was represented by delegates regularly accredited to the convention, except South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Texas, California and Oregon, and none of these were debarred by any act of the convention.

Upon all these motions the question was put, the nomination made unanimous and by acclamation, and that, too, in the presence of near three thousand spectators, composed of men of all parties, not one of whom has ever set forth to the world an intimation even that there was a dissenting voice to the nomination, and yet, in the face of all this, it is said that Mr. Douglas has no nomination according to the usages of the party. What more, I ask, has been violated? On the contrary, what usage is there of the party that has not been more than complied with? He received ten and a half electoral votes more than two-thirds of the whole electoral college of the Union, and sixty votes more than two-thirds of all the votes cast; which last, according to the uniform usages of the party, entitled him to the nomination.

There are two other possible objections yet unanswered.

First, that the States represented in the National convention, do not give Democratic votes.

We answer that, by the "usage" of the party, all States are entitled to equal representation; and further, the delegates from the North represented nine million, two hundred and twenty-six thousand three hundred and fifty-two votes which Buchanan got there in 1856; while if the southern States had not seceded and joined the bogus convention of the seceders, they would have represented only the six hundred and eleven thousand eight hundred and eighty of the South—that is, about one-third of the party!

Second: "All the votes for Douglas were not regular, some were bogus delegates;" that is not true, for the resolution at Charleston provided for the return of delegates, but said; "fill the vacancies."

Alabama and Louisiana did that by regular conventions of ex-regulars, the Georgia minority delegation not being strictly regular were ruled out.

We ask Mr. Toombs to refute these facts, or support the regular nominee, or acknowledge that his brief Democratic career has terminated.

Mr. Toombs is right in saying that Mr. Breckinridge is not the regular nominee, for no nominee was ever thought of.

Mr. Toombs complains of irregularity, but supports the equal that caused it.

The party repudiates Breckinridge, as it did Martin Van Buren in 1856.

We have thus proven Mr. Douglas to be the regular nominee. Mr. Toombs proves him sound, why not support him?

The Good Time Coming.

Every thing seems to indicate that the financial crisis of 1858 is like the late comet—its body has disappeared below the horizon, and nothing now remains visible but a small part of its tail. That, too, will soon be gone, and we shall be once more sound as a dollar and ready for a new spurt. Never before has nature been so bountiful in her gifts of the earth. The cultivators of the soil, who are the foundation of every nation's prosperity, have their cribs and their barns filled, and their hearts where to stow what is yet maturing. To wheat there is hardly a limit when measured by the bushel; and to the corn in prospect, the memory of the oldest inhabitants harks to revellution of the like. The oat crop and the hay crop are not behind that of the wheat and corn; and the potato and the onion can keep pace with either; while the fruit crop is amply abundant for all the home purposes. Nor is there any likelihood that these abundant productions of the soil are likely to spoil for the want of consumers, or be allowed to remain housed without purchasers. The foreign demand promises to be active, and already every article of trade is becoming lively and animated through the desire of supply and demand to keep up an active correspondence.

All branches of business feel the impulse that immense crops have imparted to trade. The shipping interest was never more lively, nor freights better. Railroad horses are beginning to feel their oats again, and all branches of mechanical industry are experiencing an upward tendency; for when the farming interest is prosperous every other branch of industry shares in its success. As a natural consequence, money is becoming plentier, as the phrase is; that is, there is more of it in circulation, and it is easier to be got than before. We heard an experienced banker remark a few days since that money would be cheaper next year than it had been for the previous quarter of a century. Extravagance and speculation will of course be the consequence, and we need not tell what they will produce in the end. The advice we give to all is, not to try to run down the locomotive, but take it moderately, and lay up for a wet day.—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

BRECKINRIDGE AND LANE ON SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY.

Extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Breckinridge, in Lexington, Mo., July 4, 1856:

"Upon the distracting question of domestic slavery, their position is clear. The whole power of the Democratic organization is pledged to the following propositions: That Congress shall not intervene upon this subject in the States, or the Territories, or in the District of Columbia; that the people of each Territory shall determine the question for themselves, and be admitted into the Union upon a footing of perfect equality with the original States, without discrimination on account of the allowance or prohibition of slavery."

Speech of the speech of Gen. Joseph Lane, of Oregon, at Concordia, Mo., September 1st, 1856:

"Gentlemen, I desire to say to you that the principle incorporated into the Kansas-Nebraska bill, is the very principle in defense of which your forefathers entered into the service of their country in the revolutionary war for the American colonies two years previous to the Declaration of Independence, asserted this same principle we now find incorporated in the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

"Upon examination you will find that the Declaration of Rights, made October 14, 1774, asserts that the people of the several colonies, are entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their several provincial Legislatures in all cases of internal policy." This was refused by the Crown, and re-asserted by our forefathers. Upon this issue the battles of the revolution were fought; by the blood of our forefathers this principle of self-government was established. This right, refused by the King, was secured, consecrated, and established by the best blood that ever flowed in the veins of men. Would you now refuse to the people of the Territories the rights your noble sires demanded of the crown, and won by their blood—thus placing yourselves in opposition to the right of self-government in the Territories, thereby occupying the very position toward the Territories that George the 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 strictly the doctrine of non-intervention. Now, if that doctrine is the correct one—if it be 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; criminally dangerous to the best interest of the country.

"I only desire to say to you, further, gentlemen, that I hail from the shores of the Pacific. I come from a territory where the people are capable of regulating their own domestic affairs. I come from a country where they would not thank the people of New Hampshire, nor the people of any other State of the Union, for interfering in their local and domestic affairs. I come from a territory that had been cursed, yes, her, in her organic act, the Wilmot proviso. I went out under the law of Congress as the first governor of Oregon, and the only word I heard uttered against that law was, that Congress should not have interfered in any of our affairs.

"Why, it was asked, should Congress prohibit in Oregon exercising our judgment in relation to slavery, or any other local question? The question of slavery is safe with the people, and it is no more restricted by the Wilmot proviso than it would be without it, for slavery is a thing that will regulate itself.

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

THE REASON WHY.

From the New Orleans Commercial Bulletin.]

We imagine that some of the conservative and Union-loving people of Louisiana would like to know the reason why some of the Breckinridge and Lane papers in the South support that ticket, as the said papers themselves state it. The reason is, in some instances, the question of the Union is secondary to the question of slavery." The reason is, in some instances, the question of the Union is secondary to the question of slavery." The reason is, in some instances, the question of the Union is secondary to the question of slavery."