Nashville Union and American
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

J. O. GRIFFITH & CO.
(Successors to E. G. Eastman & Co.)
MRS. E. G. EASTMAN. | J. O. GRIFFITH. | F. C. DUNNINGTON. | JNO. C. BURCH

DAILY $8; TRI-WEEKLY $5; WEEKLY $2.
INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

National Democratic Ticket.

FOR PRESIDENT,
JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE,
OF KENTUCKY.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,
JOSEPH LANE,
OF OREGON.

ELECTORAL TICKET.

For the State at Large.
LANDON C. HAYNES, of Washington.
W. C. WHITTHORNE, of Maury.

For the Congressional Districts.
I A. G. WATKINS, of Jefferson.
II JAMES D. THOMAS, of Claiborne.
III D. M. KEY, of Hamilton.
IV THOMAS B. MURRAY, of Warren.
V WM. B. BATE, of Sumner.
VI GEORGE GANTT, of Maury.
VII N. N. COX, of Perry.
VIII ANDREW EWING, of Davidson.
IX J. D. C. ATKINS, of Henry.
X H. S. BRADFORD, of Haywood.

THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1860.

INSTEAD OF BREAKING UP THE UNION, WE INTEND TO STRENGTHEN AND TO LENGTHEN IT. — JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE.

THE BEST AND CHEAPEST
PAPER!
UNION & AMERICAN
FOR
BRECKINRIDGE AND LANE

FOR THE CANVASS, Single Copy.....60 Cents
" " " Clubs of five or more.....50 "

WEEKLY, $2 00 a year; TRI-WEEKLY, $5 00 a year; DAILY, $8.
Cash in all Cases for Clubs and Annual Subscriptions.

☞ Democrats and County Committees, Especially, are Requested to Read and get up Clubs.

LET EVERY TENNESSEAN READ
THE UNION AND AMERICAN.

☞ Please get up Clubs, and send up the Names and Cash as early as possible. Address,

J. O. GRIFFITH & CO.,
Nashville, Tenn

Disunion.

On the 4th of June CHARLES SUMNER of Massachusetts delivered in the Senate of the United States an elaborate and carefully prepared oration on "The Barbarism of Slavery." All the energies of Mr. SUMNER's richly stored mind had been for months, perhaps for years, constantly engaged in preparing for that occasion. He had carefully cultivated his naturally rich voice that he might delight the ear, if not convince the judgment of his auditory. All the graces of gesticulation had been assiduously studied, that he might enrapture the gaze of those who beheld him, even though his sentiments might excite their utmost contempt and indignation. All of the meretricious aids of art and all the fruits of cultivated genius were tributary to the effort which, in Mr. SUMNER's estimation, was in future years to place him on the historic pedestal, side by side with DEMOSTHENES and CICERO. In his opinion DEMOSTHENES on the Crown, CICERO against CATILINE and SUMNER on the Barbarism of Slavery, were to be regarded as the three great triumphs of Oratory. Mr. SUMNER in opening up his subject says:

> The *Barbarism of Slavery* appears: first in the character of Slavery; secondly in the character of Slave-masters. Under the first head we shall naturally consider (1) the Law of Slavery and its Origin, and (2) the practical results of Slavery as shown in comparison between the Free States and the Slave States. Under the second head we shall naturally consider (1) Slave-masters as shown in the Law of Slavery; (2) Slave-masters in their relations with slaves, here glancing at their three brutal instruments; and (3) Slave-masters in their relations with each other, with society, and with Government; and (4) Slave-masters in their unconsciousness.

In order to establish the Barbarism of Slavery, Mr. SUMNER quotes extensively from statistical tables to show the more rapid increase of population in the Free States, to show the excess in the value of property, real and personal, in the Free States, to show our Southern inferiority in agriculture, commerce, in railroads and canals, in the value of churches, in the amount of voluntary charity contributed, in the number of colleges, professional schools, academies, and private schools, free schools and public libraries. The greater circulation of newspapers and periodicals in the North is statistically stated to establish Southern ignorance. The malignity of the Senator not being content with such recitals he clips from some Southern paper a notice of a runaway negro, of one for sale, and takes from a Yankee book of travel a story of a Southerner breaking a negro of running away by pulling out his toe nails by the roots. An advertisement from the West Tennessee *Democrat* of a man who lived near Bolivar, that had two bloodhounds to track runaways, is produced, and especial pains is taken to hunt up all the intemperate language ever used by Southern men when smarting under the insults of Abolitionists. He refers to the difficulty in the Senate between GOV. FOOTE and COL. BENTON, when GOV. FOOTE drew a pistol on COL. B. He refers also to a difficulty between HON. JERE CLEMENS when in the Senate, and MR. RHETT. In order to make these gentlemen as obnoxious as possible in anti-slavery circles, he calls one "a slave master from Mississippi," and the other "a slave master from Alabama." He quotes from the speech made by GOV. FOOTE in the Senate in 1848, in which, alluding to JOHN P. HALE, the Governor says:

> I invite the Senator to the State of Mississippi, and will tell him beforehand, in allusion to my friend, that he could not go ten miles into the interior before he would graze some of the tallest trees of the forest with a rope around his neck, with the approbation of every virtuous and patriotic citizen, and that, if necessary, *I should myself assist in the operation.*"

The profane language of HON. BAILIE PEYTON when a member of Congress, in relation to a Mr. WHITNEY, who was a witness before a committee of which Mr. PEYTON was a member, the language of Governor WISE on the same occasion, the words used by BARKSDALE and STEGLETON, of MISS., BOYCE and ASHMORE, of S. C., GARTRELL, of Ga., and MARTIN, of Va., in the House of Representatives during the excitement produced by the recent Abolition harangue of OWEN LOVEJOY, are all set forth with studied particularity, to establish conclusively Mr. SUMNER's proposition of the barbarism of Slavery. There is no Southern man who has read that speech that has not arisen from the perusal filled with scorn, contempt, loathing and disgust for its author. There is no Northern man, whose reason or whose prejudices have not made him a traitor to his country and a disgrace to his age, that believes the picture of Southern life, Southern society, Southern morals and Southern intelligence, presented by MR. SUMNER, to be a true picture. Let the rest of the civilized world be the judges, and the South has not suffered from the delineation of MR. SUMNER. And yet a great political party, whose organization is based upon anti-slavery fanaticism, struggling formidably, struggling for the mastery in our Republic, has had this speech of MR. SUMNER's printed in pamphlet form, and is now busily engaged in giving it a gratuitous circulation throughout the entire North.

The *Patriot* of this city, in the service of a ticket which stands upon a platform that raises no issues with either of the other political parties, that pretermits an expression of opinion upon any of the points of difference, in an effort to prove that the Democratic party is a disunion party, follows the course pursued by MR. SUMNER, in his effort to establish the barbarism of slavery. We can say without any disparagement to the energy, industry, genius and learning of the *Patriot*, that in each and all these respects MR. SUMNER is their superior. Hence it is not astonishing that the futile efforts of the Senator from Massachusetts should be even more plausible than the *Patriot*. We are not prepared to deny that such newspaper advertisements as MR. SUMNER parades are real, that such language as GOV. FOOTE, COL. CLEMENS, COL. PEYTON, and other distinguished Southern gentlemen is word for word correct, yet what Southern man will say this is evidence of the barbarism of those gentlemen, much less of Southern Society. So we are not prepared to deny that the language attributed by the *Patriot* to the gentleman therein named, is not substantially true, but what unprejudiced mind will hold that this establishes that the Democracy are for disunion. The deductions of MR. SUMNER and the *Patriot* are equally false. Again and again have MR. SOULE and the DOUGLAS candidate for the Vice-Presidency used language of the extremest import. MR. SOULE favored resistance to the Compromise Measures of 1850. GOV. JOHNSON, of Ga., said in substance, that if the South submitted to those measures, she ought to wear the chains she imposes on her slaves. The *Southern Confederacy*, one of the leading DOUGLAS papers in Georgia, but very recently said:

> But if the worst does come, if Lincoln is elected, *let us with one heart and mind forget the past*, AND GO OUT OF THE UNION TOGETHER. If we permit the blacks to come into power, and allow them to govern us, they will in four short years inflict a moral sting upon slavery from which it will never recover. We must not permit it.

If the files of the Columbus *Georgia Times* during the editorial management of that paper by JOHN FORSYTH, now of Mobile, were at our disposal, whole columns of the fiercest fire-eating sentiments penned by that distinguished leader of the DOUGLAS fortunes, now the editor of the Mobile *Register*, might be reproduced, and yet we presume that the *Patriot* will not charge the DOUGLAS men who are aiding in the effort to cast the vote of Tennessee for MR. BELL with being disunionists.

The *Patriot* in the conclusion of its lengthy editorial yesterday, alluding to what it calls "this infamous conspiracy" of Southern men to dissolve the Union and establish a Southern Confederacy gives a glowing prospect of the "burning of our homes and the destruction of our households." The *Patriot* continues:

> Mr. BRECKINRIDGE *himself is aware of these facts and in assuming to uphold the secession banner, he is responsible to the country and to posterity for all that may be done under it through his instrumentality.* That he is aware of it, and *sympathizes with it*, we have his own words.

We might stop to inquire of the *Patriot* if the acceptance of a nomination tendered by gentlemen from Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and other States, who are every whit as patriotic as its own standard-bearer, if the endorsing of a platform which the *Patriot* dare not attack, is "*assuming to uphold the secession banner?*" But we proceed. The *Patriot* attempts to establish, by extracts from MR. BRECKINRIDGE's Frankfort speech, used in a most unfair manner, to employ the mildest term, that MR. BRECKINRIDGE "*is aware of, and sympathizes*" with a conspiracy to dissolve the Union. The *Patriot* says:

> In a speech delivered at Frankfort, Ky., on the 21st December, 1859, he said:
>
> "Fellow-citizens, I propose now to offer you some reflections on another aspect of public affairs. We have been speaking of questions that concern Kentucky no more than the other States; but we may soon have to meet questions that come nearer home—fireside, hearthstone questions. I disclaim the spirit of an alarmist or a demagogue, yet, since I have been acquainted with public affairs there never was a time when the interests of this Union were in so much peril, or when the feelings of the people were so much alienated as at this hour. Certainly, if the aspect of affairs at Washington is in the slightest degree indicative of the feelings elsewhere, this statement is mournfully true."
>
> There the *Patriot* stops that extract. We will give the sentences immediately following the above extract:
>
> The *danger* springs from the character and purposes of a political organization in this county *called the Republican party.* I do not think that we yet fully realize the aims of this party; I mean what it intends, and the probable consequences of its success in the United States; nor do I think that the masses of the Northern people at all realize the consequences which will be sure to follow any attempt to execute its proclaimed purposes. At first it seemed to limit its aims to the exclusion of slavery from the Territories; but like all aggressive organizations, its course has been continually onward. The rear rank of the Republican army marches up and encamps on the ground occupied by the advanced guard, months before, while the advanced guard has been marching steadily forward. To claim only those rights guaranteed to slaves by the Constitution, which is the bond of the American Union. Among the clearest of them are the right to the return of fugitives from labor, and the right to live in peace with our domestic institutions, after the manner of our fathers; and it is as clear a violation of the constitution to refuse these rights as if the instrument were torn into fragments. It is the purpose of the Republican party to abolish slavery in the United States. I know that many men of worth and ability in its ranks do not propose to press the issue to this conclusion. But they cannot control the party, and soon they must fall into the ranks and imbibe its spirit or sever their connection with it forever.
>
> Then after devoting four pages of his speech to the aggressions of Black Republicanism, he says immediately before the next extract of the *Patriot*:
>
> Hence, I repeat that the spirit and purposes of the (Black Republican) party are strictly at war with the Constitution and the great objects for which it was formed. If that instrument is allowed to remain permanently violated in any of its vital provisions, what hope have we for our institutions and liberties? Broken in one important part, it must soon fall to pieces. The triumph of these principles would subvert South-ern society, and would eradicate one of the fairest regions of America; while, in the end, it would be equally disastrous to all parts of the Union. The Republican masses do not realize the actual condition of things, nor the convulsions that may ensue. Perhaps even the leaders do not, for they laugh derisively at our remonstrances. And yet these aggressions cannot be consummated.

In the extract used by the *Patriot*, MR. BRECKINRIDGE emphatically says: *Kentucky, while a single ray of hope penetrates the thick darkness, will resist under the Constitution and* WITHIN THE UNION. And yet language such as this is urged to prove that MR. BRECKINRIDGE sympathizes with a conspiracy to dissolve the Union. Such an argument can but record of those who use it. Alas, that the tactics of CHARLES SUMNER should ever be practised in Tennessee.

Extracts from our Business Correspondents.

A sterling JACKSON-POLK-Democrat, writing us from Tuscumbia, Ala., sending a club of 4 Tri-weekly subscribers, says: "Send us the true principles of the ancient Democracy, as expounded by the National lights of our party. We are working here for our noble standard bearers, BRECKINRIDGE and LANE, and we believe in the way you battle for them against the BELL-DOUGLAS factionists."

Our valued friend W. J. D., at Beech Grove, sending us a club of 16 new subscribers to our Weekly, adds, "Democracy is doing good work up here. Send plenty of your papers, and all will be O. K. in November next. BRECKINRIDGE and LANE are all the go here." Push along the ball and keep up the fires, and another glorious victory will be achieved for our time honored principles.

From North Camden, Ohio, a good Democrat writes, saying, "send me the WEEKLY UNION AND AMERICAN, as I want to drink in the pure, genuine article, as it distils fresh from the true Democratic fountain, the Tennessee Democratic central organ." That's the right kind of talk, and we expect to hear similar views from thousands throughout the country, North and South, during this canvass.

That excellent friend, B. A. M., at Red River, has our thanks for another handsome club of subscribers at this office. He says, "The people here are all alive for B. & L., and want your paper. One of the subscribers is in Missouri, and wants the best political paper in this State, and you see I send for yours." That is decidedly complimentary, friend M., and if you will just continue to work for the spread of the true doctrines, we will send you a fine BRECKINRIDGE and LANE present, some of those cool days.

What does it Mean!

Our dispatches inform us that DANIEL ULLMAN and other prominent leaders of the FILLMORE party in the State of New York in 1856, held a meeting in the city of New York, on Monday evening. It is much to be regretted that MR. FILLMORE's influence cannot keep his party in his own State together for MR. BELL, whose friends in Tennessee worked so hard for MR. FILLMORE in 1856. Republicans are ungrateful things, and so are many of the FILLMORENES.

The Vote of Delaware.

The Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, a LINCOLNITE, says, under date of July 16th:

> Unless the Bell and Lincoln parties come to a better understanding, Breckinridge will get the vote of that vast State. (Delaware.)
>
> Bayard, Whitely and Saulsbury seem to own the Democracy in Delaware, just as John M. Clayton, in former days, carried the Whig party in his breeches pocket.

Documents.

We have received requests for certain documents which we have yet been unable to prepare, but will have them ready before very long.

The Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune* under date of July 13 says:

> Reliable information received here states that no Bell and Everett ticket will be run in Indiana. The whole Opposition will concentrate their strength upon MR. Lincoln, instead of frittering it away by unprofitable divisions.

GREELEY in speaking of the Southern Democracy calls them "CALHOUN Disunionists." HORACE has forgotten that MR. CALHOUN is dead and YANCEY is the name by which the Southern Opposition now attempt to fright the souls of fearful adversaries.

MARSHALL OF DOUGLAS.—MR. MARSHALL, in his speech at the Baltimore ratification meeting, said "he regarded MR. DOUGLAS as a tender to the LINCOLN locomotive; he therefore cut his connection with him."

From his well known fire-eating and volcanic propensities the Douglasite candidate for Vice President has been named the HON. HERSCHEL VESPUVIUS JOHNSON.

The Governor of the State of Mississippi (PETTUS) is a private in a volunteer military company in Jackson, and drills regularly and punctually in the ranks.

It was currently reported up the streets yesterday that the *Banner* is going to drop DOUGLAS and take up BELL.

Within the last eight years Ireland has lost nearly one-tenth of its population by emigration.

Breckinridge vs. Douglas.

DOUGLAS and BRECKINRIDGE are a long way apart upon the Territorial issues. We place in juxtaposition extracts from DOUGLAS' Freeport speech, and BRECKINRIDGE's Frankfort speech of December last. They need no comment:

EXTRACTS FROM DOUGLAS' FREEPORT SPEECH.

Lincoln's Question.—Can the people of the United States Territory, in any lawful way, against the wishes of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution?

Douglas' Answer.—The next question propounded to me by Mr. Lincoln is, can the people of a Territory in any lawful way, against the wishes of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution? I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times from every stump in Illinois, that in my opinion the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution. (Enthusiastic applause.) Mr. Lincoln knew that I had answered that question over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska bill on that principle all over the State in 1854, in 1855 and in 1856, and he has no excuse for pretend ing to be in doubt as to my position on the question. It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question, whether slavery may or may not go into a Territory under the Constitution; the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere, unless it is supported by local police regulations. (Right, right.) Those police regulations can only be established by local legislation, and if the people are opposed to slavery, they will elect representatives to that body who will by unfriendly legislation, effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a slave Territory is perfect and complete under the Nebraska bill. I hope Mr. Lincoln deems my answer satisfactory on that point.

EXTRACT FROM MR. BRECKINRIDGE'S FRANKFORT SPEECH, LAST DECEMBER.

Mr. Breckinridge had been speaking of the Dred Scott decision and continued as follows:

> Well, that being the case, and it having been authoritatively determined by the very tribunal to which it was referred, that Congress had no power to exclude slave property from the Territory, and judicially determined that the Territorial Legislature—authorities created by Congress—had not the power to exclude or confiscate slave property, I confess that I had not anticipated that the doctrine of unfriendly legislation would be set up. Hence, I need not say to you that I do not believe in the doctrine of unfriendly legislation; that I not believe in the authority of Territorial Legislatures to do by indirection what they cannot do directly. I repose upon the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, as to the point that neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislature has the right to obstruct or confiscate the property of any citizen, slaves included, pending the Territorial condition. (Applause.)
>
> I do not see any escape from that decision if you admit that the question was a judicial one, if you admit the decision of the Supreme Court, and if you stand by the decision of the highest court of the country.
>
> The Supreme Court seems to have recognized it as the duty of the Courts of the Union, in their proper sphere, to exact this constitutional right, thus adjudicated by the Supreme Court in the following language. In speaking of the acquisition of Territory, they pronounce it a political question for Congress to determine what Territories they may acquire, and how many. Now mark the words of the court:
>
> [Here follows a quotation from the decision.]
>
> So that in regard to slave property, as in regard to any other property recognized and guarded by the Constitution, it is the duty, according to the Supreme Court, of all the Courts of the country to protect and guard it by their decision wherever the question shall be brought before them. To which I only add, that the judicial decision in our favor must be maintained—those judicial decisions must be sustained. (Applause.)
>
> If present remedies are adequate to sustain these decisions I would have nothing more done. I, with many other public men in the country, believe they are adequate. If they cannot be enforced for want of the proper legislation to enforce them, sufficient legislation must be passed, or our government is a failure. (Applause.)
>
> Gentlemen, I see no escape from that conclusion.

Is this the Douglas Spirit!

From the Baltimore Republican.

The Harrisburg *Telegraph* has an account of a speech delivered in that place on Thursday last, by Mr. W. S. GITTINGS of this city. It will be remembered that Mr. GITTINGS was one of the delegates from this State to the National Convention, where he gave his vote for Mr. DOUGLAS, (contrary, many believe, to the known sentiment and wishes of the district which he in part represented.) The *Telegraph* says:

> His denunciation of the Breckinridge wing of the party was terrific and scathing. In the course of his remarks he alluded to the "compromise" tendered them by that faction, and emphatically declared, "I spit upon the compromise." This was received with mingled cheers and hisses by the audience. The speaker further said that he would "rather see the party sunk to hell" than compromise with such principles would subvert Southern society, and would eradicate one of the fairest regions of America; while, in the end, it would be equally disastrous to all parts of the Union. The Republican masses do not realize the actual condition of things, nor the convulsions that may ensue. Perhaps even the leaders do not, for they laugh derisively at our remonstrances. And yet these aggressions cannot be consummated.

The editor of the Douglas Central Executive Committee against any co-operation with the Breckinridge Democracy is followed by another from Mr. Haldeman, the Pennsylvania member of that committee, to the same effect; and Mr. Douglas himself has authorized the statement that he fully concurs with those of his friends who resist all propositions for coalition or union with his Democratic opponents. The efforts made in Pennsylvania towards a common action of Democrats are, therefore, to a great extent, paralyzed. In New Jersey and in Missouri the policy of co-operation will be sustained. In New York all efforts of the kind may fail. It may now be assumed, however, that every Southern State, and the two States on the Pacific, will vote for Breckinridge and Lane. There will be wanting only twenty-five votes from other States to secure their election. It is quite possible that these twenty-five votes will be obtained, even without Pennsylvania and New York.

Certainly the Opposition must be very hard run for something to talk about. A few days ago the Nashville *Banner* published a statement that at a Breckinridge ratification meeting, held here on the 2d of July, a vote was taken, showing the strength of the various parties in that meeting. There was no ratification meeting, and neither was there any vote taken.

The same paper on Sunday, publishes a statement that a Mr. W. C. Breed, local editor of this paper, made a Bell and Everett speech in this place last week. This is also inaccurate in the following particulars: There is no such man in this county as W. C. Breed, and never was, and we have no local editor, and have not had for a considerable length of time. With these trifling exceptions, the *Banner's* statement is correct.—*Jeffersonian.*

HON. WILLIAM A. RICHARDSON.—We learn from a gentleman, formerly in Congress from Pennsylvania, that the Hon. Wm. A. Richardson, of Illinois, does not hesitate to proclaim openly that as between the election of Breckinridge and Lincoln, he prefers the latter. We make this statement with pain; because, from Mr. Richardson's antecedents, we had hoped that he would have been the last of all the Northern supporters of Douglas who would willingly affiliate with the Republican party. We have frequently taken occasion to point out the fact that Douglasism is but one of the roads to Republican party-ism, and this proclamation of Mr. Richardson's proves unmistakably the correctness of that impression.—*Washington Star.*

THEATRICAL WARDROBE AUCTION.—BURTON's theatrical wardrobe was sold at auction in New York a few days ago at ruinously low figures. The well-known costume of "Toodles" was obtained for five dollars and seventy-five cents, after a spirited contest. Lot 5, "Bottom, ass's head and all, only realized four dollars. "Aminidab Sleek," No. 13, caused some sharp bidding, and was finally knocked down for seven dollars and a quarter. Mr. FOX purchased "Toby Twof" for seven dollars, but poor "Paul Pry," that had caused roars of laughter with his hoping "he didn't intrude," was bought by Mr. PHILLIPS for only one dollar. The best sale effected was that of a Greek costume, formerly the property of Lord BYRON, who purchased it in Greece a short time before his lordship's death. This was a fine costume, and realized fourteen and a half dollars. The quality of the material of which many of the costumes were composed was of the first class, the coat of one originally costing more than ten times the amount realized for the whole suit.

A Letter from a Country Clergyman to Senator Sumner.

From the New York Times.

TO HON. CHARLES SUMNER—*Dear Sir:* I presume I am indebted to the fact of my name being on a clerical list for the reception of a document franked "C. Sumner," which, on opening, I find to be a copy of your late speech on slavery, in the Senate of the United States. I had previously read that speech in the New York *Times*, which, as usual, gave an excellent report. Before reading it, your name was in my memory as an unjust sufferer; now I cannot think of you otherwise than as a man who has nursed wrath four years, and at last taken his revenge. I do not believe you have improved your position, added to your personal comfort or increased your influence.

It is not, however, my intention now to treat your speech with personalities. It may or may not be of importance to you to know the opinion a country parson holds; nor will it, perhaps, interest you to learn that he is a New England man, with all his native love of liberty, and native admiration of fearless, free speech. It further may not affect one of your intellect, which must be above the weakness of accounting for a man's views by his accidental social or political surroundings, to say that I have no personal interest in the profits of slavery, or, at least, none, except such remote ones as necessarily belong to a citizen of a country in which slavery exists and acts as an element of production.

My only object now is to present one point which your speech wholly overlooks; and which, to my plain reason, vitiates the whole argument. Your title is "The Barbarism of Slavery," and your subject is only "The Barbarism amid Slavery." It is not necessary to say to such a mind as yours, that between those two little words is a difference of meaning which wholly alters the aspect of the question. Establish your point that Barbarism is of Slavery—that is, a natural consequence and necessary fruit of it—and you have a position, towards which the quiet multitudes of honest and earnest men which underlie and sustain our body politic, would surely if slowly come; while their presence with you would simply be the victory of your cause.

But, sir, your speech does not touch this essential point. It contains many shocking recitals, presented in artistic order, argued with indisputable skill, stamped with eloquence, and sealed at the end of paragraphs with ringing blows of—*earnestness*, your friends would say,—*passion*, such as I,—and *malignity*, your enemies. To what, however, do all these recitals and their adjuncts amount? Simply to the fact that barbarism exists where Slavery is in our Southern States; not that it pervades this whole community—not that it has grown up in that community, but only that cases of it can be found there, which are capable of being wrought with telling effect into tales and speeches.

Who, in this sense, ever thought of denying this fact? Who could expect anything else from the importation of thousands of barbarians? Savages of the lowest type were the ancestors of these slaves and what more natural than that they should retain even yet some of their ancient traits? Who wonders or denies that they cannot do otherwise than as a man who has spent his life among his own character, and are themselves suffering the consequences, now those children are grown. If you had multiplied your instances a thousand-fold, you would only at last have shown, not that the system of slavery as existing in the Southern United States tends to barbarism, but simply that it has not yet succeeded in curing and eradicating the barbarism which all our ancestors joined in importing.

There are faults enough in Southern character, and evils enough in Southern society, but they do not so manifestly preponderate on that side that Northerners can all afford to be hurling stones. There are others besides Octoroons, who succumb to the powers of social evil, and live and die in shame. The Northern apportionment of capital and labor, accompanied by Northern license of opinion, act upon personal liberty, honor, and purity, with a deadly pressure that the mere formal assertion of individual freedom does not remove nor effectually lighten. I mention this comparison, not as an argument that the social order of the North is no better than that of the South; on the contrary, it is evidently much to be preferred. It is only for the purpose of showing that evils exist everywhere, and is the reason why I speak before them. To which I only add, that the judicial decision in our favor must be maintained—those judicial decisions must be sustained. (Applause.)

If present remedies are adequate to sustain these decisions I would have nothing more done. I, with many other public men in the country, believe they are adequate. If they cannot be enforced for want of the proper legislation to enforce them, sufficient legislation must be passed, or our government is a failure. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, I see no escape from that conclusion.

Is this the Douglas Spirit!

From the Baltimore Republican.

The Harrisburg *Telegraph* has an account of a speech delivered in that place on Thursday last, by Mr. W. S. GITTINGS of this city. It will be remembered that Mr. GITTINGS was one of the delegates from this State to the National Convention, where he gave his vote for Mr. DOUGLAS, (contrary, many believe, to the known sentiment and wishes of the district which he in part represented.) The *Telegraph* says:

> His denunciation of the Breckinridge wing of the party was terrific and scathing. In the course of his remarks he alluded to the "compromise" tendered them by that faction, and emphatically declared, "I spit upon the compromise." This was received with mingled cheers and hisses by the audience. The speaker further said that he would "rather see the party sunk to hell" than compromise with such principles would subvert Southern society, and would eradicate one of the fairest regions of America; while, in the end, it would be equally disastrous to all parts of the Union. The Republican masses do not realize the actual condition of things, nor the convulsions that may ensue. Perhaps even the leaders do not, for they laugh derisively at our remonstrances. And yet these aggressions cannot be consummated.

In the extract used by the *Patriot*, MR. BRECKINRIDGE emphatically says: *Kentucky, while a single ray of hope penetrates the thick darkness, will resist under the Constitution and* WITHIN THE UNION. And yet language such as this is urged to prove that MR. BRECKINRIDGE sympathizes with a conspiracy to dissolve the Union. Such an argument can but record of those who use it. Alas, that the tactics of CHARLES SUMNER should ever be practised in Tennessee.

Extracts from our Business Correspondents.

A sterling JACKSON-POLK-Democrat, writing us from Tuscumbia, Ala., sending a club of 4 Tri-weekly subscribers, says: "Send us the true principles of the ancient Democracy, as expounded by the National lights of our party. We are working here for our noble standard bearers, BRECKINRIDGE and LANE, and we believe in the way you battle for them against the BELL-DOUGLAS factionists."

Our valued friend W. J. D., at Beech Grove, sending us a club of 16 new subscribers to our Weekly, adds, "Democracy is doing good work up here. Send plenty of your papers, and all will be O. K. in November next. BRECKINRIDGE and LANE are all the go here." Push along the ball and keep up the fires, and another glorious victory will be achieved for our time honored principles.

From North Camden, Ohio, a good Democrat writes, saying, "send me the WEEKLY UNION AND AMERICAN, as I want to drink in the pure, genuine article, as it distils fresh from the true Democratic fountain, the Tennessee Democratic central organ." That's the right kind of talk, and we expect to hear similar views from thousands throughout the country, North and South, during this canvass.

That excellent friend, B. A. M., at Red River, has our thanks for another handsome club of subscribers at this office. He says, "The people here are all alive for B. & L., and want your paper. One of the subscribers is in Missouri, and wants the best political paper in this State, and you see I send for yours." That is decidedly complimentary, friend M., and if you will just continue to work for the spread of the true doctrines, we will send you a fine BRECKINRIDGE and LANE present, some of those cool days.

What does it Mean!

Our dispatches inform us that DANIEL ULLMAN and other prominent leaders of the FILLMORE party in the State of New York in 1856, held a meeting in the city of New York, on Monday evening. It is much to be regretted that MR. FILLMORE's influence cannot keep his party in his own State together for MR. BELL, whose friends in Tennessee worked so hard for MR. FILLMORE in 1856. Republicans are ungrateful things, and so are many of the FILLMORENES.

The Vote of Delaware.

The Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, a LINCOLNITE, says, under date of July 16th:

> Unless the Bell and Lincoln parties come to a better understanding, Breckinridge will get the vote of that vast State. (Delaware.)
>
> Bayard, Whitely and Saulsbury seem to own the Democracy in Delaware, just as John M. Clayton, in former days, carried the Whig party in his breeches pocket.

Documents.

We have received requests for certain documents which we have yet been unable to prepare, but will have them ready before very long.

The Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune* under date of July 13 says:

> Reliable information received here states that no Bell and Everett ticket will be run in Indiana. The whole Opposition will concentrate their strength upon MR. Lincoln, instead of frittering it away by unprofitable divisions.

GREELEY in speaking of the Southern Democracy calls them "CALHOUN Disunionists." HORACE has forgotten that MR. CALHOUN is dead and YANCEY is the name by which the Southern Opposition now attempt to fright the souls of fearful adversaries.

MARSHALL OF DOUGLAS.—MR. MARSHALL, in his speech at the Baltimore ratification meeting, said "he regarded MR. DOUGLAS as a tender to the LINCOLN locomotive; he therefore cut his connection with him."

From his well known fire-eating and volcanic propensities the Douglasite candidate for Vice President has been named the HON. HERSCHEL VESPUVIUS JOHNSON.

The Governor of the State of Mississippi (PETTUS) is a private in a volunteer military company in Jackson, and drills regularly and punctually in the ranks.

It was currently reported up the streets yesterday that the *Banner* is going to drop DOUGLAS and take up BELL.

Within the last eight years Ireland has lost nearly one-tenth of its population by emigration.

FARMERS' COLUMN.

The Advantages of Soiling.

It will be a long time before the advantages of the system of feeding in yards and lots with green clover, and other such food raised for the purpose, will over-ride the old system of fencing and grazing. By bearing in mind, however, the advantages to be derived from such a change in a great many cases, we may work a gradual amendment in this respect. There are very many to whom such a change is not, from peculiar circumstances, to be desired, while very many others may find themselves in a position to adopt it in part or in full to very great advantage. We are indebted for the following hints to a correspondent of the *Maine Farmer*:

THE SIX BENEFITS OF SOILING.

The advocates of soiling claim to have established the truth of these six propositions:

1. The saving of land.
2. The saving of fencing.
3. The economizing of food.
4. The better condition and greater comfort of the cattle.
5. The greater product of milk.
6. The attainment of manure.

To offset these advantages, we have the labor of raising and cutting the food, and the feeding and care of the stock.

THE GREAT SAVING OF LAND.

Is a fact established by concurrent testimony everywhere. To what extent this saving has been carried, we will show by introducing a few witnesses. QUINCY says:

> "European writers assert that the saving which results is as one to three; others say, as one to seven; others still, that the saving is yet greater; that is, one acre kept for soiling, will go as far as three or seven, or more, kept for pasture, in the support of stock. On farms where the whole soil is capable of being ploughed, the economy of soiling is great.
>
> "It may be, however, useful to observe that the reason for the diversity of statement, in relation to the degree of saving, results from the different ways in which the land used for soiling is cultivated for the purpose of raising food. Some satisfy themselves by manuring the soil very much in order to obtain a great yield. In either case the economy is sufficiently great."

The maximum product of an acre of land has nowhere yet been determined. The amount obtained often surprises us.

From a report of a committee of the British Parliament, showing the condition of small farmers, we find much of interest in the result from exact and high cultivation, and much that bears directly on the above proposition.

In one case, of a man who held an allotment of four acres; in one year he obtained forty-two bushels of wheat, two hundred and fifty bushels of potatoes, and ten bushels of barley land kept two cows and four pigs. The cows were kept entirely on the products of the four acres. A portion of this was not arable. Its some trees were growing upon it.

An inquiry was made of the occupant of a small allotment, "how it was possible to keep two cows, and maintain a family of five persons, on only three acres of land?" He answered:

> "The statement you saw was very true; half an acre of pasture, half an acre and eight rods in wheat, and one-quarter of an acre in oats; the other part was green food for the cows, such as tares, clover, mangolds, turnips, and Italian rye grass."

This is a pretty strong case; where it is shown that two cows were kept the whole year on the produce of eight rods less than one and three-fourths acres of land, with only the additions of a half acre of pasture, and the straw from four-fifths of an acre of grain, abating the vegetables consumed from the same land, by a family of five persons.

In a communication to the British Board of Agriculture, it is said that thirty cows, one bull, four calves, and five horses, were fed through the summer, from fifteen acres of clover sown the preceding year. The labor of four persons was sufficient to tend them; and the net produce of the same season in butter, from June to October, was £19 15s—over $95 per cow. Forty animals in fifteen acres, gives sixty square rods (three-eighths of an acre) to each. Sixty square rods in clover producing a net income of over $95!

After twelve years' experience with the system, MR. Quincy writes;

> "From my own experience, I do not hesitate to state that three cows may be kept during the summer season, in full milk and high condition, on a single acre."

Adam Anthony, of North Providence, R. I., entered upon a farm in 1826, of the extent of seventy-five acres of land, suitable for tillage but much was very sandy; and the crops of that year were five tons of hay, two tons of oats, two hundred bushels of potatoes, two hundred of turnips, some fruit, and garden vegetables; worth, including pasture feeds, $385. He adopted the soiling system. In 1848, he reported his farm as keeping forty-five hundred tons, by estimate, of green food for soiling, one hundred tons of hay, twenty-five tons of millet, seventeen tons of corn fodder, six hundred and forty bushels of potatoes, seven hundred and fifty bushels of Indian corn, fruit and garden vegetables, the value of which was $3,575; nearly ten fold increase in the production of the farm. The stock consists of about forty head, of which thirty-six are usually cows.

Similar testimony might be very much extended, but it is unnecessary.

THE SAVING IN FENCING.

The present American system of farming involves a prodigious expenditure of human energy for fencing. I have seen it estimated that the cost of fencing in the United States is more than six hundred millions of dollars ($600,000,000.) Whether more or less than this enormous sum, it is so much invested in human toil, a large portion of which might have been saved and applied to better and more ennobling purposes, had our early system of custom and laws been what it ultimately must be.

One-half of all farm fences are interior; and aside from an occasional fence, necessary to make a permanent distinction between arable land and a piece that nature designed for a pasture, they are worse than useless.

Adopt a single principle, that no beast shall be permitted to range on lands adapted to the plough and scythe, and you are prepared to wipe off from the face of our fair country much that disfigures it, and abolish, at once and forever, a vast item in your annual taxation.

The most false of anything that assumes the name of economy, is the practice of pasturing mowing lands. Interior fences, that were erected and are maintained for the sole purpose of enabling the proprietor to pasture his mowing lands, have cost the farmers of Maine a very large sum. To call in the aid of arithmetic, it will be read in this wise: The improved lands in the State may now be set down at two and a half millions of acres (2,500,000.) Taking the estimate to be very good authority, of ten rods of fence, at one dollar per rod, for each acre of improved land, gives us for fenceing in the State, the sum of twenty-five millions of dollars ($25,000,000.) Half of this sum, $12,500,000, we will set down for interior fences on farms. It may be fair to assume for annual erections, while the present system continues, for changes and repairs, ten per cent. of this sum, or one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($1,250,000,) which the farmers of the State are annually paying as a direct tax on their resources, and on which very few have heretofore had the courage to raise their voices in complaint. Improved with the truthfulness of figures, estimates, who can for another year remain quiet and see a system of husbandry continued, so blighting to the general prosperity?

By the last census, we find that the whole number of our domestic animals of all ages, reducing the