THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN & DILL. MEMPHIS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1860. VOLUME XI.—NUMBER 197.

Daily Appeal.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH.

ITS DOCTRINE—DESTRUCTIVE OF THE RIGHTS OF THE SOUTHERN PEOPLE.

EDITOR APPEAL: I see it stated that many thousand copies of the speech recently delivered by Mr. Buchanan at the executive mansion are to be printed and distributed throughout the United States. The *World*, a high-toned and independent paper, published in the city of New York, thus speaks of the circumstances under which it was delivered:

"To exhibit this ensemble Chief Magistrate, on whose prudent policy so many good men had anchored their hopes, making a partisan speech, in the last year of his administration, from the balcony of the presidential mansion. He is not giving counsel to the great and united Democratic party by which he was borne into office. He is no more uttering words by which an unfortunate division might be mediated and healed. This party, no longer the bulwark against sectionalism, has been itself torn into sectional fragments, and he is making a speech as the champion of one of the two hostile factions. He, himself, sowed the seeds of this division. He has ripened the bitter feud between him and Mr. Douglas into a sundering of the party, and finds it consistent with his high position to make a hustings speech in favor of the anti-Douglas faction.

It is a pressing of doubtful propriety for the first magistrate of a great nation to make a party speech at all, it is not doubtful that a trusted party chief signalizes his want of wisdom when he is found hat-ingling one of the fragments into which he has rent his own party. It seems like a double descent. Having sunk from the proud position of President to hat of the head of a party, thus ignoring his relations to half the nation which he rules, he splits even that party into hostile segments and takes his stand with one of them, ignoring again his role now to half of his own party, which, as a whole, was only a fraction of the nation which he had been called to govern.

The only fault with the foregoing is that it pictures the thing "too severely true." This speech, designed to have such a vast circulation, and delivered under such circumstances ought to be scrutinized closely by the American people, before they subscribe to its prejudiced sentiments. The President, according to the *World*, having made a double descent, places himself in a position where he becomes one of the people, and consequently is not entitled to that respect and courtesy which is due from a citizen to the man who occupies the exalted position of Chief Magistrate of the Republic. Notwithstanding this forfeiture the President has made, yet I shall endeavor to restrain myself with that respect and deference which would be due to the President, if, as it, in making it, he had made no descent at all.

Before proceeding to notice those parts of the speech to which I intend to take exception, I will call attention to some statements a few of which, it will be seen, are wrong, and others right. He says:

"FELLOW-CITIZENS: I thank you from my heart for the honor of this visit. I cordially congratulate you on the preference which you have shown for the Vice-President and General Lane as candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency of the United States over all competitors."

He does not say there are not the candidates of the national Democratic party, for the simple reason, I suppose, that he knew they were not.

It may be proper to state that the extracts I shall make from the speech in question are taken from a copy of it in the Bristol (Tenn.) *News*, a Breckinridge and Lane paper. He says again:

"Equality is equality." After giving us this lucid exposition of the term equality, he proceeds to say: "Liberty and equality are the birthright of every American, at least. Very true, and always have been, but Mr. B. says further:

"And just as certain as the day succeeds the night, so certain will this principle of democratic policy prevail at last. [Applause.] It must prevail."

He says this as though they never had prevailed in our country, and do not prevail at the present time, yet our legislators are constrained under the Federal Constitution. So far as the principle of equality is concerned in the organization of the Democratic party, I will show hereafter that Mr. B. has but little, if any, veneration for it; but to proceed. Mr. B. then says:

"Before I speak further upon this subject [and I by no means intend to do so, if you begin] I wish to remove one stumbling block out of the way."

Perfectly right to remove the stumbling block, but he never removed it. He stumbled over it—fell down on the other side—but the President soon recovering his equilibrium, stalked ahead, reeling, bowlering, with stumbling blocks all about him, and, notwithstanding his ability to remove them, stumbling and falling over them as usual. This stumbling block was the two-thirds rule. Speaking of this rule he says:

"It has been destroyed at Baltimore, and the national convention has stumbled into ruin as a national convention. . . . This two-thirds rule, then, has been practical—and there is nothing in the way of any Democrat rallying for Breckinridge and Lane in the proceedings of the assemblage at Baltimore."

And this is the way the President reels over the stumbling block. He says it has been destroyed, but proves his assertion erroneous. In order to do this, I will quote largely. Messrs. Rhett, Keitt and Miles, in their letter of the 7th of August, signed "Curtius," (who rides in the lists the chosen) which, upon examination and reference to the authorities, I find all correct. I will here state that Mr. B. says:

"This two thirds rule was first adopted in 1832, and required a *two-thirds vote of all the votes cast*, and not a *two-thirds vote of the entire electoral college*. Pursuant to this rule, Mr. Van Buren was nominated on the ninth ballot. In 1835, Van Buren was the nominee for President and Richard M. Johnson for Vice, the latter receiving more than two-thirds of the votes cast, yet less than two-thirds of the entire electoral college. In '40, Van Buren was unanimously nominated for President. No Vice-President nominated. In '44, Polk was nominated on the eighth ballot of the votes cast. In '48, the final ballot was as follows: Cass, 179; Woodbury, 28; Buchanan, 32; Worth, 3—Cass receiving two-thirds of the votes cast, which was declared the nominee, although he wanted 14 votes of having two-thirds of the electoral college, which consisted of 290 votes. In '52, Pierce was declared if nominated, having received two-thirds of all the votes cast. In '56, Buchanan, (who, on that to have him 'against this time know he was nominated,) received on the first ballot 135; Pierce, 122; Douglas, 33; Cass, 5. The six south stood thus: Buchanan, 108; Douglas, 12; Cass, 6.

At this stage, as "Curtius" (and he is right) Mr. Douglas telegraphed to his friends to withdraw his name, whereupon, without another ballot, Buchanan was unanimously declared the nominee, although he lacked more than 20 votes of having two-thirds of all the votes cast. He had received but 168 votes, whereas he should have received 192 in order to entitle him to the nomination according to the way he thinks Douglas ought to have been nominated. But his friends, without sending another ballot, nominated him to be declared the nominee by acclamation, and it was done.

In '60, on the second ballot, Mr. Douglas received 181½—24 more votes than Gen. Cass received before he was declared the nominee by acclamation, *and she's and a half votes more than Buchanan received before he was declared the nominee by acclamation*. And yet in the face of all this Mr. B. undertakes to make the question in his late speech: "Was there anything done at Baltimore to bind the political conscience of any sound Democrat, and a protest him from supporting Breckinridge and Lane?" ["No," and applause.]

After the wonders left, there was in the convention 2124 votes all told—594 more than two-thirds of the votes cast for President—Douglas received 1874, which was 474 more than *two thirds of all the votes cast*, when it was moved he be declared the nominee by acclamation—if he had received more than enough votes to nominate him, and not before, as was done when Buchanan was nominated. If it be objected there was not a full convention, then in '56 Mr. Buchanan was not the nominee for seven States were unrepresented then in '48, thirty-seven votes were absent from the convention when Cass was nominated. In '52, thirty-one were absent from that which nominated Pierce. The convention that nominated Douglas did not adjourn to meet anywhere else until after the nomination was made. The order of business was adopted without a single dissenting voice. Can they take advantage of their own wrong and say the nomination of Douglas is void, when they themselves made it so, or, if not so, they themselves made it so, and Mansfield and Brougham, and Marshall and Scott know nothing of the principles either of justice or of equity.

Thus it will be seen that Mr. Buchanan has utterly failed to remove the a stumbling block, to say nothing of having proven himself to be without either magnanimity or a "political conscience."

Mr. B. asserts at the outset of his speech that "Every citizen of the United States is equal before the Constitution and laws of the United States; and why should not the sovereign States of this Union *preserve and enjoy that perfect equality which one of their citizens under the Constitution enjoys?* [Applause.] This is good Democratic doctrine, he tells us, in another part of his speech: "It was believed at the time, for I was part and parcel of the movement, that in the two-thirds rule there would always be a majority of Democratic States satisfied with the nominations and ready to rush in to the contest, to elect the candidate.

In the first extract Mr. B. speaks of the equality of the States, in the latter of *Democratic States*; meaning that those States had a better right to say what was what in the convention than those States that did not happen to be Democratic, thereby denying the equality of the States when assembled in convention, yet when considered in relation to property in the Territories, they are all upon a perfect equality. If all the States stand upon an equality at one time, they do at another, and at all times; and there is no rule of justice or equity that will not do to administer it when made between a Dem-crat of an anti-Democratic State, and a Democrat of a Democratic State. The discrimination Mr. B. teaches ought to be made. After making them anti-Democratic States by his unusual policy and unpopular measures, he stigmatizes them as being incompetent and unfit to associate on an equality, in convention, with the Democratic states! The States which are anti-Democratic now were not always so, and policy as well as wisdom would dictate that they be listened to with attention and respect, and that their views be adopted—if consonant with the established usages of the party—so that the causes which made them anti-Democratic may be removed if possible, as it is they that know best what these causes are, and the best remedy for their removal. The following table will show with what justice the anti-Democratic States merit the reproaches of James Buchanan. It shows at a glance the number of times each State has voted the Democratic ticket, and also the ticket in opposition to the Democratic party by whatever name it was known. Since the election of John Adams in 1796, the States have voted fifteen times for President. The first vote was cast in 1800, the last in 1856.

States.	Dem.	Opp.
Maine	9	6
New Hampshire	3	6
Vermont	2	13
Massachusetts	2	13
Rhode Island	3	12
Connecticut	3	12
New York	15	2
New Jersey	9	6
Pennsylvania	12	1
Delaware	4	9
Maryland	7	8
Virginia	15	1
North Carolina	11	4
South Carolina	10	
Georgia	11	3
Alabama	10	
Mississippi	8	1
Louisiana	6	3
Kentucky	8	7
Tennessee	9	6
Ohio	10	5
Indiana	9	6
Illinois	10	5
Missouri	8	7
Arkansas	4	1
Michigan	5	4
Florida	3	1
Texas	4	1
Iowa	3	1
California	2	
Total	228	135

Minnesota and Oregon not yet voted.

Mr. B. says: "The two-thirds rule, then, was the main pillar of the national convention."

Of course it was, and as it was not destroyed in the convention which nominated Douglas, the overthrow of Yanceyism was secured, and the dictation of sectional candidates and executive preferences spurned.

I might show that Mr. Breckinridge is not the nominee of the Democratic party, but it is not necessary, as Mr. B. admits it when he says:

"The convention that nominated him, (Breckinridge) although it was composed of nearly all the Democratic States, did not contain two-thirds."

He says the convention did not contain two-thirds, but he makes no such assertion in regard to the convention which nominated Douglas. By this, Mr. B. admits that two-thirds of the votes were in the Douglas convention. As Mr. Douglas got them all unanimously, of course he got a two-thirds vote, and therefore, according to Mr. B.'s own admissions, Mr. Douglas is the regular nominee of the great national Democratic party. Any Democrat who does not want to vote for Douglas, might as well vote for Dickinson or Yancey, as either of them is just as much the nominee as Mr. Breckinridge, and Yancey is by far the best embodiment of the views of the opponents of the Friends of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the territories.

I now come, Messrs. Editors, to that part of the President's speech to which I work especially to direct attention. His speech is so disjointed and without order that I am driven perforce to go nearly to the end to get what is the natural commencement. Mr. Buchanan says:

"We have been told that non-intervention on the part of Congress with slavery in the Territories is the true policy. Very well. I most cheerfully admit that Congress has no right to pass any law to establish, impair or destroy slavery in the Territories; and this principle of non-intervention he extended to the territorial legislature, and in it he declared that they in like manner have no power to establish, impair or destroy slavery, and then the controversy is in effect ended. This is all that is expected at present, and I verily believe all that will ever be required. Hands off by Congress, and hands off by the territorial legislature [Loud applause.] With the Supreme Court of the United States, I hold that neither Congress nor a territorial legislature have any power to establish, impair, or abolish slavery in the territories

In this extract there are two propositions—that Congress cannot establish slavery, and that the territorial legislature cannot establish slavery. And it will be noticed also that Mr. B. holds that this is the position of the Supreme Court. This doctrine is in perfect accordance with the position of Mr. Breckinridge, in his letter of acceptance, where he says, "the friends of constitutional equality do not and never did demand a congressional slave code, nor any other code by the national legislature, which would be the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress, or by a territorial legislature, either to establish or prohibit slavery." Thus, it will be seen, they are identical in the ground they occupy. The word "establish," used in the above extract, must be understood to mean protect, else it would be without meaning at all; for every one knows that slavery already exists in all the Territories by virtue of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme court in the Dred Scott case, wherein it was decided that a slave taken there was not free, and could by no possibility become so lawfully, unless by consent of the owner, or when the Territories was admitted as a State with the consent of the people, and, of course, it would be nonsense, then, to talk about establishing slavery in a Territory. The question is, how can it best be protected? For my part, I maintain that Messrs. Breckinridge and Breckinridge's plan affords no protection at all. They say that Congress shall not protect, and yet they say it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect. No people can be had without law. Congress is the law-making power of the Federal Government; and yet they say Congress shall not make the law necessary to protect. We can no protection, then, from this quarter. They say the territorial legislature shall not intervene, shall not protect, shall make no slave code, nor any other code for the protection of property in the Territories. Now, why this discrimination and every other slave State have a slave code, as well as other codes for the protection of their property? Because good laws are necessary and absolutely requisite for the protection of the property as well as the lives and liberty of our citizens. And more especially in this true in regard to slave property. Therefore, if a slave code is so necessary to the protection of slave property, why not allow the people of New Mexico and Arizona, through their legislature, to make such laws as they deem? And whenever they make one in conflict with a decision of the Supreme court, let it be declared null and void by the courts. Let a law be made in conflict with a decision to make a law to protect, to the fullest extent, slave property in the Territories; but to prohibit slavery it would; for the Supreme Court has decided that slaves are property, free in the Territories. It cannot be shown that a law for the protection of slavery in a Territory is unconstitutional; for if the Federal Government, through the Supreme court, decides, can protect slave property in a Territory, how does it come that a territorial legislature cannot do the same thing? If the Supreme Court has decided it to be constitutional, why is not the territorial law constitutional also? Does the law become unconstitutional because made by a cer ain power? Then the question would be, not, is the law constitutional? but, is it constitutional for the territorial legislature to make the law—i. e., one to protect slavery? If they have not that right, then the doctrine of the American colonists at the commencement of the revolution was correct, for, at that time, they had no representative in the Parliament of England, they claimed that their legislature had the right to legislate in regard to their lives and domestic concerns. Slavery is a local and domestic institution. The Territories are not represented in Congress. Parliament prescribed governors for the colonies, and Congress prescribes governors for the Territories; and if the colonial legislatures claimed the right to legislate in regard to the local and domestic affairs of the colonies, who found for years to maintain it, how does it come that a territorial legislature (which stands in the same relation to Congress that the colonial legislatures did to the British Parliament) cannot legislate in regard to the domestic and local institutions of the people of a Territory? The fact about it is, as I candidly believe, that James Buchanan, and Messrs. Jefferson Davis and Wm. L. Yancey, are wrong, as was the British Parliament and the tories of the revolution; and Stephen A. Douglas, together with Washington and the men who fought the battles of the revolution, right. The men of the revolution were right, and God gave them the victory; Douglas is right, and I believe he will yet triumph.

Leave the slave codes of New Mexico and Arizona in force, and those Territories remain permanently slave, but pronounce them unconstitutional, as Messrs. Buchanan and Breckinridge do, and the slaves will become free, and no possibility become so lawfully, unless by consent of the owner, or when the Territories was admitted as a State with the consent of the people, and, of course, it would be nonsense, then, to talk about establishing slavery in a Terri ory. The question is, how can it best be protected? For my part, I maintain that Messrs. Breckinridge and Breckinridge's plan affords no protection at all. They say that Congress shall not protect, and yet they say it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect. No people can be had without law. Congress is the law-making power of the Federal Government; and yet they say Congress shall not make the law necessary to protect. We can no protection, then, from this quarter. They say the territorial legislature shall not intervene, shall not protect, shall make no slave code, nor any other code for the protection of property in the Territories. Now, why this discrimination and every other slave State have a slave code, as well as other codes for the protection of their property? Because good laws are necessary and absolutely requisite for the protection of the property as well as the lives and liberty of our citizens. And more especially is