THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN & DILL. MEMPHIS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1860. VOLUME XI.—NUMBER 211.

Daily Appeal.

SPEECH OF HON. S. A. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS.

Delivered in the City of Petersburg, Aug. 28, 1860

INTRODUCED BY CHAS. F. COLLIER, ESQ.

Chas. F. Collier, esq., in introducing Senator Douglas, said:

Fellow-citizens of Virginia: By the invitation of the national Democracy assembled at Staunton, the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas visits the commonwealth of Virginia, and by the invitation of the Democracy of Petersburg he is here to address you to-night. I have the honor to now introduce to you Stephen A. Douglas, the national candidate of the Democracy for President. [Three cheers were here given for Douglas.]

THE APPEARANCE OF JUDGE DOUGLAS.

Senator Douglas said:

Gentlemen: I fear that I will not be able to make myself heard to this vast audience, in consequence of the strong wind that is now blowing, and which must materially affects my voice. Since the President and Vice-President of the United States have taken the stump in opposition to the organization and nominees of the party which elected them to power, I have no hesitation in responding to the invitation of the Democracy of Virginia, to vindicate the organization, the platform, and the principles of the national Democratic party. [Cries of "good," and applause.]

DEFENDS THE SAME PLATFORM WITH HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS.

I stand to-night on the same platform of principles on which Cass was nominated in 1848, Pierce in 1852, and Buchanan and Breckinridge in 1856 [applause], and I construe the platform of the party now precisely as they understood and construed it then. [Cheers.]

In his letter of acceptance, in June, 1856, Mr. Buchanan declared that the people of a Territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits, and in his speech at Lexington, Kentucky, in which he accepted the nomination for Vice-President, Mr. Breckinridge expressed the same doctrine. During the whole canvass of 1856, the creed of the party, as to the question of slavery was unhesitatingly and explained in the same way in every Northern State by northern and southern men. When the abolitionists denied that that was the true construction of the Democratic platform, eminent southern men from all the different South-ern States were invited to canvass the Northern States, in order to assure the Northern people that Buchanan had placed the true construction upon the Cincinnati platform in his letter of acceptance. In response to this invitation distinguished southern men came to this state to canvass the Northern States; and, as I have already remarked, it has never yet passed a law for the protection of any species of property, either in the Sta es or Territories, which was not unanimously called into existence the territorial governments, in order that their people may elect their own legislatures, and then make their own laws for the protection of all kinds of property, as much as any as broad as this, with such a variety of climate, of soil and of population, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of interests, requiring institutions and legislation in each locality adapted to their wants and circumstances. For this reason our fathers, in erecting our system of government, retained the separate legislatures of the States with sovereign power over all that is local and domestic, while they conceded to the Federal government all powers that were affected to the general welfare of the whole country. Our fathers knew, when they made this government, that the laws and institutions which were well suited for the hills and valleys of New England, were illy adapted to the rice, tobacco and sugar plantations of the South. They knew, therefore, that there must be in each locality different laws, which would answer the wants, the condition, and the circumstances of each community. Hence, you observe, that notwithstanding all the care with which our fathers framed the Federal Constitutions is neither desirable nor possible. Our theory of government is based upon the opposition that the interests of no two States would be precisely alike. The framers of the government well knew that the laws and regulations that would suit the mining regions of California, would not suit the prairies of Illinois; and hence this complex system of government, by which each community may have its own section of law and its own institutions.

I believe that our political opponents forbode and acknowledge the justice of the principle in respect to the Territories of the United States. [Cheers.] They contended in 1856 as between the doctrines of intervention on the one side and non-intervention on the other. The Abolitionists, who were then represented by Mr. Fremont as their candidate for the President, were pledged to the doctrine of Congressional intervention upon the subject of slavery, and asserted the right and duty of Congress to control the slavery question in the Territories. On the other hand, the Democratic party stood pledged to the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with slavery, either in the States or Territories of the United States. [Cheers.] We Democrats then told you, and we believed it to be true, and we said it, that it was not safe to trust the question of slavery to the Congress of the United States. [A voice, "That is right, sir." We said then, and we now say, that the Federal Government possess no powers except those specified in the Consti utions, and that the powers granted to Congress do not include the power to interfere in that instrument, and as all others federal, and none of them domestic.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS.

Congress can declare war, make peace, raise a revenue, coin money, maintain armies, establish navies, and do all other things are federal and not local, but the Federal Government has no right to interfere between husband and wife, or parent and child, or guardian and ward, or master and servant, or any other matter which is domestic and not federal in its character. [Cheers.]

This was deemed sound Democratic doctrine only four years ago, and what is now the condition of things in this country? We find the country convulsed by the action of two sectional parties—the one advocating the doctrine of intervention, and the other of southern non-intervention. [Applause.] The country, so far as the slavery question is concerned, is divided into two parties, sectional and anti-non-interventionists. The southern interventionists are sub-divided into two grand divisions—extreme southern rights men and moderate southern rights men. The southern interventionists are known as Black Republicans or abolitionists, and they demand that Congress shall prohibit slavery wherever it is one slave. [A voice, "That's so."] It then becomes important to inquire what is it necessary for Congress to prohibit it? Why they tell you it is not necessary for Congress to prohibit it where the people are opposed to it, for the reason that in such case, the people will prohibit it themselves. The abolitionists also deem it necessary to prohibit slavery where the people are in favor of it. On the other hand, I ask southern rights democrats who seceded from the Charleston and Baltimore conventions, tell us that Congress must interfere to protect slavery when necessary. When do they tell us it is necessary for Congress so to interfere? Why, they say that as long as the people are in favor of slavery they will protect it, but if they shall become opposed to it, then it will be necessary for Congress to interfere, but that wherever the people are opposed to slavery, they have the right to exclude it. Thus we see that the Black Republicans and southern rights democrats agree that Congress must interfere, and for them to have it. [Cheers.]

From these remarks you will observe that the Republicans of the North, and the seceders of the South agree in the doctrine that, first, that it is the right and duty of Congress to control the question of slavery in the Territories, and secondly, they agree in rejecting the doctrine of non-intervention and popular sovereignty; and thirdly, they agree in overruling the will of the people in the Territories with respect to their local and domestic affairs.

Agreeing on the question of power then, they wish to apply their action in opposite directions.

The northern secessionists, or abolitionists, appeal to northern passion and to where prejudice, and northern ambition, against the southern people and their institutions. The southern secessionists appeal to southern pride and southern passion, and southern ambition, against the northern people and their institutions. Each endeavors to rally the people of their own section under one sectional banner, against the other. Suppose these two sectional parties succeed and rally every man in each of the Ohio river under one banner, and every one north under the other, and thus force a presidential election to take place on a geographical line? What would be the result? Why, it would be the result to your interests, or to the peace and safety of this Union? [Cheers.] I need not tell you what the result will be, when the presidential election is decided by geographical lines. If ever sectional parties shall control this country, it is very evident that the strongest section will carry the result.

THE ORGANIZATION OF SECTIONAL PARTIES DEPRECATED.

As a northern man, belonging to the strongest section, I deplore the organization of sectional parties. [Great applause.] I desire to see this Union maintained forever, and I know of no mode of preserving it except by observing, with religious fidelity, every provision and every obligation of the Constitution, as our fathers made it. [Cheers.] The constitution of our fathers is good enough for me, and I demand that every man, north and south, wherever he may be found under the American flag, shall yield obedience to every provision of the Constitution, and if he does not do it, then I would use the power of the government to make him do it. [Cheers.] So long as we live under a Constitution which is common to all the States of this Union, we must secure to the people of every State equal rights under it. [Cheers.] And I ask what is the doctrine of equality of rights applies to the Territories as well as the States of the Union.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS IN THE TERRITORIES.

You are told that a portion of the Democratic party believe it to be treason to vote of moving to the Territories with your property and holding it on an equality with other citizens. I tell you that so far as my knowledge extends, I do not know of any one Democrat in all America who is supporting the regular organization of the party, who does not concede equality of rights in the Territories to all citizens of the States. For one, I affirm that equality, and intend to maintain it at all seasons and everywhere. You have the same right under the Constitution, to go and carry your property into the Territories that I have mine. You have the same right to carry your slaves, or your mules, or your horses, that I have to carry any property that I possess. When you get there, you and I stand on a footing of exact equality under the law. You have just as much right to go and settle in the local law, and [Bring mine with me subject to the same local law. The misrepresentation on this point concerns in the assertion that Congress protects the northern man in his property in the Territories, but will not protect the southern man in his. I am willing to believe that those gentlemen who make this statement believe it to be true, but I have more respect for their candor than their intelligence if they profess to so believe.

Congress never yet passed a law for the protection of any species property in Territories. Every man who goes to a Territory with his wife, his children, his servants, and his property, is subject to the local law, as relies upon local law for protection.

INTERVENTION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The rain which had been for sometime threatening, now commenced falling rapidly, and Mr. Douglas remarked:

My fellow-citizens, in view of the storm now raging, I submit to you whether shall not bring my remarks to a close, rather than expose you to the inclemency of the weather by going on?

Many voices—No, no; go on.

Mr. Douglas—Well, as you have given a very unanimous vote on the subject, I feel bound to keep the floor until the storm passes. [Great laughter and cheers.] Every one, I repeat, in a Territory, must rely upon the local law, as enacted by the territorial government for the protection of his person and his property of every description, the same as in the States. Upon this point the action of the government, from the foundation of the Constitution, has been uniform.

ADJOURNED TO PHOENIX HALL.

The rain here poured down in torrents, and the chairman, Mr. C. F. Collier, was obliged to adjourn the meeting to Phœnix hall, to which place the crowd wended their way through the furious storm. Hither Mr. Douglas and the committee soon repaired, and as he mounted the platform he was greeted with a long and hearty cheering.

ADVOCATES THE SAME PLATFORM WITH HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS.

I stand to-night on the same platform of principles on which Cass was nominated in 1848, Pierce in 1852, and Buchanan and Breckinridge in 1856 [applause], and I construe the platform of the party now precisely as they understood and construed it then. [Cheers.]

In his letter of acceptance, in June, 1856, Mr. Buchanan declared that the people of a Territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits, and in his speech at Lexington, Kentucky, in which he accepted the nomination for Vice-President, Mr. Breckinridge expressed the same doctrine. During the whole canvass of 1856, the creed of the party, as to the question of slavery was unhesitatingly and explained in the same way in every Northern State by northern and southern men. When the abolitionists denied that that was the true construction of the Democratic platform, eminent southern men from all the different South-ern States were invited to canvass the Northern States, in order to assure the Northern people that Buchanan had placed the true construction upon the Cincinnati platform in his letter of acceptance. In response to this invitation distinguished southern men came to this state to canvass the Northern States; and, as I have already remarked, it has never yet passed a law for the protection of any species of property, either in the Sta es or Territories, which was not unanimously called into existence the territorial governments, in order that their people may elect their own legislatures, and then make their own laws for the protection of all kinds of property, as much as any as broad as this, with such a variety of climate, of soil and of population, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of interests, requiring institutions and legislation in each locality adapted to their wants and circumstances. For this reason our fathers, in erecting our system of government, retained the separate legislatures of the States with sovereign power over all that is local and domestic, while they conceded to the Federal government all powers that were affected to the general welfare of the whole country. Our fathers knew, when they made this government, that the laws and institutions which were well suited for the hills and valleys of New England, were illy adapted to the rice, tobacco and sugar plantations of the South. They knew, therefore, that there must be in each locality different laws, which would answer the wants, the condition, and the circumstances of each community. Hence, you observe, that notwithstanding all the care with which our fathers framed the Federal Constitutions is neither desirable nor possible. Our theory of government is based upon the opposition that the interests of no two States would be precisely alike. The framers of the government well knew that the laws and regulations that would suit the mining regions of California, would not suit the prairies of Illinois; and hence this complex system of government, by which each community may have its own section of law and its own institutions.

I believe that our political opponents forbode and acknowledge the justice of the principle in respect to the Territories of the United States. [Cheers.] They contended in 1856 as between the doctrines of intervention on the one side and non-intervention on the other. The Abolitionists, who were then represented by Mr. Fremont as their candidate for the President, were pledged to the doctrine of Congressional intervention upon the subject of slavery, and asserted the right and duty of Congress to control the slavery question in the Territories. On the other hand, the Democratic party stood pledged to the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with slavery, either in the States or Territories of the United States. [Cheers.] We Democrats then told you, and we believed it to be true, and we said it, that it was not safe to trust the question of slavery to the Congress of the United States. [A voice, "That is right, sir." We said then, and we now say, that the Federal Government possess no powers except those specified in the Consti utions, and that the powers granted to Congress do not include the power to interfere in that instrument, and as all others federal, and none of them domestic.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS.

Congress can declare war, make peace, raise a revenue, coin money, maintain armies, establish navies, and do all other things are federal and not local, but the Federal Government has no right to interfere between husband and wife, or parent and child, or guardian and ward, or master and servant, or any other matter which is domestic and not federal in its character. [Cheers.]

This was deemed sound Democratic doctrine only four years ago, and what is now the condition of things in this country? We find the country convulsed by the action of two sectional parties—the one advocating the doctrine of intervention, and the other of southern non-interventionists. [Applause.] The country, so far as the slavery question is concerned, is divided into two parties, sectional and anti-non-interventionists. The southern interventionists are sub-divided into two grand divisions—extreme southern rights men and moderate southern rights men. The southern interventionists are known as Black Republicans or abolitionists, and they demand that Congress shall prohibit slavery wherever it is one slave. [A voice, "That's so."] It then becomes important to inquire what is it necessary for Congress to prohibit it? Why they tell you it is not necessary for Congress to prohibit it where the people are opposed to it, for the reason that in such case, the people will prohibit it themselves. The abolitionists also deem it necessary to prohibit slavery where the people are in favor of it. On the other hand, I ask southern rights democrats who seceded from the Charleston and Baltimore conventions, tell us that Congress must interfere to protect slavery when necessary. When do they tell you it is necessary for Congress so to interfere? Why, they say that as long as the people are in favor of slavery they will protect it, but if they shall become opposed to it, then it will be necessary for Congress to interfere, but that wherever the people are opposed to slavery, they have the right to exclude it. Thus we see that the Black Republicans and southern rights democrats agree that Congress must interfere, and for them to have it. [Cheers.]

From these remarks you will observe that the Republicans of the North, and the seceders of the South agree in the doctrine that, first, that it is the right and duty of Congress to control the question of slavery in the Territories, and secondly, they agree in rejecting the doctrine of non-intervention and popular sovereignty; and thirdly, they agree in overruling the will of the people in the Territories with respect to their local and domestic affairs.

Agreeing on the question of power then, they wish to apply their action in opposite directions.

The northern secessionists, or abolitionists, appeal to northern passion and to where prejudice, and northern ambition, against the southern people and their institutions. The southern secessionists appeal to southern pride and southern passion, and southern ambition, against the northern people and their institutions. Each endeavors to rally the people of their own section under one sectional banner, against the other. Suppose these two sectional parties succeed and rally every man north of the Ohio river under one banner, and every one south