Nashville Union and American
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

J. O. GRIFFITH & CO.,
(Successors to E. G. Eastman & Co.)

J. O. GRIFFITH, F. C. DUNNINGTON, JNO. C. BURCH, LEON. TROUSDALE, THOMAS S. MARR.

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

"Instead of breaking up the Union, we intend to strengthen and to lengthen it."—JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE.

"The Constitution and the Equality of the States! These are the symbols of everlasting union. Let these be the rallying cries of the people."—JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE.

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.

First District	—	A. G. WATKINS, of Jefferson.
Second "	"	JAMES D. THOMAS, of Claiborne.
Third "	"	D. M. KEY, of Hamilton.
Fourth "	"	THOMAS B. MURRAY, of Warren.
Fifth "	"	WM. B. BATE, of Sumner.
Sixth "	"	GEORGE GANNT, of Maury.
Seventh "	"	N. N. COX, of Perry.
Eighth "	"	ROBT. W. HAYWOOD, of Davidson.
Ninth "	"	J. D. C. ATKINS, of Henry.
Tenth "	"	H. S. BRADFORD, of Haywood.

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1860.

JOHN BELL:
His
Past History Connected with the Public Service."

The very great favor with which this document has been received by the people of Tennessee and other Southern States, has entirely exhausted our first edition. We will however have ready for distribution in a day or two a second edition. In looking over the first edition we have found quite a number of typographical errors; some of them in the references to the records. On page 24, second column, 21st line from bottom, instead of "Cong Globe, Vol. 17, 217," it should read "Appendix to Cong. Globe, 2d Session, 29th Congress, p. 217." On page 25, first column, where reference is made to the speech of Mr. BELL to be found in Appendix to Congressional Globe, 1st Session, 30th Congress, instead of "middle column of 90th page," it should be "middle column of 190th page." The third line of the second column of the 25th page should be omitted entirely. There may be other errors of a similar character which we have not yet detected.

President Polk and Thomas Ritchie on the Question of the Territories, and the Equality of the States.

Few men in their time have exercised greater influence upon their party, or done more to deserve its confidence and respect, than JAMES K. POLK, and the editor of the Metropolitan organ of his Administration, THOMAS RITCHIE. These men, like Mr. JEFFERSON, foresaw the dangers with which Northern sectionalism had long threatenened the country, and which were daily and hourly increasing. Therefore it was that upon the immediate acquisition of our Mexican Territories they industriously exerted themselves, in their respective spheres, to have some basis *agreed* upon that would settle the question of slavery in relation thereto. They united with Senator BRIGHT and other conservative statesmen, North and South, to have the Missouri Compromise line extended to the Pacific. Failing in this, they came zealously to the support of the proposition of Mr. CLAYTON, a Whig Senator from Delaware, organizing the Territories, and submitting all constitutional and legal questions to the decision of the Supreme Court. While they did not express their individual opinions upon these questions, they did not hesitate to make them known, and to insist upon some settlement that would be in accordance with *fair dealing and the equality of the States*. Their views thus expressed are in striking harmony with the policy and principles of their party at the present time, as shown by the resolutions adopted by the Convention nominating BRECKINRIDGE and LANE.

The last great act in the illustrious administration of Mr. POLK was his annual message to Congress of Dec. 5, 1848. It might be appropriately termed his farewell address to his countrymen. With reference to these territories and the questions growing out of them, he said:

"Our gallant forces in Mexico, by whose patriotism and unparalleled deeds of arms we obtained these possessions as an indemnity for our just demands against Mexico, were composed of citizens who belonged to no one State or section of our Union. They were men from slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, from the North and from the South, from the East and the West. They were all companions in arms and fellow-citizens of the same common country, engaged in the same common cause. When prosecuting that war, they were brethren and friends, and shared alike with each other common toils, dangers and sufferings. Now, when their work is ended, when peace is restored, and they return again to their homes, put off the habiliments of war, take their places in society, and resume their pursuits in civil life, surely a spirit of harmony and concession, and of equal regard for the rights of all, and of all sections of the Union, ought to prevail in providing governments for the acquired territories—the fruits of their common service. The whole people of the United States and of every State contributed to defray the expenses of that war; *and it would not be just for any section to exclude such, or from participation in the acquired territory.* This would not be in consonance with the just system of government which the framers of the constitution adopted.

"The question is believed to be rather abstract than practical, whether slavery ever can or would exist in any portion of the acquired territory, even if it were left to the option of the slaveholding States themselves. From the nature of the climate and productions, in much the larger portion of it, it is certain it could never exist; and in the remainder the probabilities are it would not. *But however this may be, the question, INCLUDING AS IT DOES A PRINCIPLE OF* EQUALITY OF RIGHTS *of the seperate and several States, as equal co-partners in the confederacy,* SHOULD NOT BE DISREGARDED.

"In organizing governments over these Territories, no duty imposed on Congress by the Constitution requires that they should legislate on the subject of slavery, while their power to do so is not only seriously questioned but denied by many of the soundest expounders of that instrument. Whether Congress shall legislate or not, the people of the acquired Territories, *when assembled in Convention to form State Constitutions,* will possess the SOLE and EXCLUSIVE power to determine for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits. If Congress shall abstain from interfering with the question, the people of those territories will be left free to adjust it as they may think proper when *they apply for admission into the Union.*

"If Congress, instead of observing the course of non interference, leaving the adoption of their own domestic institutions to the people who may inhabit these Territories; or, if, instead of extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, shall prefer to submit the legal and constitutional questions which may arise to the decision of the Judicial tribunals, as was proposed in a bill (the Clayton Compromise) which passed the Senate at the last session, an adjustment may be effected in this mode. If the whole subject be referred to the Judiciary, *all parts of the Union should cheerfully acquiesce in the final decision of the tribunal created by the Constitution for the settlement of all questions which may arise under the Constitution, treaties and laws of the United States.*"

It will be observed that in the opinion of this cool and dispassionate statesman, this question relating to the Territories, owed its importance mainly to the fact that it involved "*a principle of equality of rights of the separate and several States as equal copartners in the Confederacy,*" and therefore, "*should not be disregarded.*"

It will further be observed that he expressed it as his opinion, that the time at which the people of the Territories would be authorized to determine the question is, "when assembled in Convention to form State Constitutions," and "when they shall apply for admission into the Union." But if nothing could be agreed upon that would harmonize the North and the South, and the "whole subject be referred to the Judiciary," he said "*all parts of the Union should cheerfully acquiesce* in the final decision of the tribunal created by the Constitution for the settlement of all questions which may arise under the Constitution."

What would Mr. POLK have thought then if told that upon the future decision of this question, by this tribunal, a new doctrine would be espoused by Mr. DOUGLAS and his friends, that whatever the Supreme Court may decide, determining the right of the Slave States to emigrate to these Territories with their property, yet by "unfriendly legislation," they may be "rightfully" deprived of the enjoyment of that property? Could he have believed that any man, originating and advocating such a heresy, could ever be seriously thought of by any honest portion of the people of Tennessee for the responsible and dignified position which he then held? To think so would be to question his confidence in the intelligence or integrity of the people.

Few men in the history of our politics have contributed as much—and none have contributed more—to the maintenance of sound Democratic constitutional principles, and to the preservation of the Union, than THOMAS RITCHIE, an editor from the days of JEFFERSON to the days of POLK, and who had been justly styled the "NAPOLEON of the Press." When contemplating the refractory course of Mr. BELL, and the eight Southern Whig members of the House, who, under his influence, were induced to co-operate with the free-soilers in defeating the Compromise measure introduced by Mr. CLAYTON, a Whig Senator from Delaware, he said through the Washington *Union*, of August 2, 1848.

"What can the eight Southern Whigs expect? Are they waiting until the next census shall make it more difficult to effect any compromise at all with the citizens of the North? *Will the South yield everything?* NEVER. *Will they acquiesce in the inequality and degradation which they would sustain from being denied their fair participation in the Territories of this great partnership?* NEVER. This temporizing policy which Stephens (of Ga.,) preaches us, only serves to postpone the struggle until the passions have become more excited, and the difficulty of an amicable adjustment increased. In this fermentation of the passions the Union itself is in danger."

If the gray-haired veteran who wrote these admonitory words in 1848 was living and should reiterate them in 1860, he would be denounced, in company with PIERCE, CASS, DICKINSON, TOUCEY, HALLET, BRIGHT, BUCHANAN, BRECKINRIDGE and LANE, as a "Yanceyite," a "Fire-eater" and a "Disunionist." Yes, THOMAS RITCHIE, who devoted the best energies of a long life to the preservation of the government on sound principles, would be denounced by WM. H. POLK, BAILIE PEYTON, HARVEY M. WATTERSON, ANDREW J. DONELSON, JOHN BELL & Co. as a "Disunionist" for daring to say that the South "*will never* acquiesce in the *inequality* and DEGRADATION which they would sustain from being denied their fair participation in the territories of this great partnership."

We defy such malignant partizan recklessness. It will only serve to expose their unpatriotic purposes, and to excite the general contempt of the old guard of Democracy who followed the lead of JAMES K. POLK in 1844, and to make them the more jealous of the great principle of "Equality of Rights of the separate several States, as equal co-partners in the confederacy," which he enunciated in the closing message of his eventful administration, and Which THOMAS RITCHIE declared the South would NEVER surrender.

A Business Transaction.

We republish below the letter of Dr. BROWNLOW to Col. N. G. TAYLOR last fall, in relation to "*a business transaction.*" The letter is referred to by our correspondent from Bean's Station. "*The friendly and conservative relation to the Republicans*" occupied by Col. N. G. TAYLOR is noted by Dr. BROWNLOW. Does the BELL party of Tennessee occupy the same "friendly and conservative relation to the Republicans" that their Elector for the State at Large does? Or will the organs of the party repudiate Col. TAYLOR, as the *Patriot* repudiated EX GOV. BEBB?

HEALING SPRINGS, Bath Co., Va., }
August 26th, 1859. }

BROTHER TAYLOR: Yours of the 20th inst., was forwarded to me from Knoxville, and received to-day. I think your chances for the Clerkship are very good; at least fair enough to justify an effort on your part to obtain the position.

If Etheridge were elected Speaker—of which I think there is not much prospect—it would only militate against you in this respect—as one of the three great offices conferred by the House, Clerk, Speaker and Printer, would be given to a Tennessecan, they would consider it sufficient patronage for one State. The Democracy and the Southern Opposition will be unable to elect the officers of the House, as I understand it, but the Southern Opposition and the Republicans can do it. It will, therefore, require an *agreement* between them, and a *division* of the offices. Some of the Southern men will feel reluctant to act with them. I would not, for differing with them, and denouncing their abolitionism, I would regard the division of the offices as a *business transaction.* No one party in the House can elect without the Southern Opposition vote, as they hold the balance of power—therefore to elect at all, the Opposition must vote with one of the parties.

Before God, I honestly believe the Democratic party, both North and South, to be soulless, truthless, treacherous, corrupt and unprincipled, and ready at all times, for the sake of office and plunder, to sacrifice their principles and their party, their country and their God if it were possible. Believing the Republicans *no worse* than this, I would not hesitate to act with them in *a matter of business.*

If Underwood is a candidate—and I had not dreamed of it before I received your letter, he will be a dangerous competitor. I know him well. He occupies the same *friendly and conservative relation* to the Republicans that you do, and having served a long time in Congress he will have the advantage of an extensive acquaintance. But the way to manage that thing is this: let the Clerkship be given to the Southern Opposition, and then let the Southern Opposition delegation meet and agree on their man. This would give you the nomination. You would have Tennessee and North Carolina to start upon, and these twelve votes would save you. Vance, Leech and Gilmer would carry the North Carolina delegation for you. Our votes would all go it for you with a hearty good will.

But for my bad health, and the dreadful climate of the District of Columbia, I would go with you to Washington and help you out. I know Leech, Gilmer and Vance well, and some of the Marylanders. All I can do by writing letters I will certainly do. I will propose you editorially next week, as I write my editorials and send them home by mail.

Let your friends urge your claims on the Republicans on the ground that you were slain by the Democracy for your course on Kansas. The enclosed document I cut from the Mobile *Mercury*, a Whig paper. Yours, &c., W. G. BROWNLOW.

GOOD FOR YOU.—Ex-GOV. WASHINGTON HUNT who presided over the Convention that nominated BELL and EVERETT, and who is the leading man of the BELL party, is pitching into GREELEY for his present conduct towards Mr. BELL. Gov. HUNT says:

"You now pretend that Mr. Bell is as objectionable as Mr. Breckinridge. How is it possible that you can say this? What did you mean by the felicitous alliteration, in your widely circulated journal, of 'Bell, Bates or Botts,' as proper candidates—repeated, if I mistake not, in your celebrated speech at Ossawatomie, in the very heart of Kansas? More than once within a twelvemonth you have placed the name of Mr. Bell among those whom you would be willing to accept as a compromise candidate to unite the Opposition. You know he voted against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, under a heavy fire of denunciation from his own section, and that he never favored any aggression on the rights of the North."

That is right, Governor, give it to him! HORACE is a naughty boy for *pretending* that Mr. BELL is as objectionable as Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, he is naughty. What did you mean, HORACE, by "the felicitous alliteration," "BELL, BATES OR BOTTS, as proper candidates;" repeated right in the very heart of bleeding Kansas, at JOHN BROWN's old place, Ossawatomie? Yes you did. "More than once within a twelvemonth you have placed the name of Mr. BELL among those you would be willing to support as a compromise candidate to unite the Opposition." You know you have. Mr. BELL "voted against the repeal of the Missouri compromise, under a heavy fire of denunciation from his own section." And you invited him to eat dinner with you. You remember, HORACE. "He never favored any aggression on the rights of the North." Now, HORACE, you know all this, you know it easy; and yet you *pretend* Mr. BELL "is as objectionable as Mr. BRECKINRIDGE." You ought to ask Governor HUNT's pardon for talking that way about his nominee. HORACE, behave yourself before folks.

Japhet and Stephen.

It is rumored that the nearest lineal descendant of the author of "JAPHET IN SEARCH OF HIS FATHER" is to arrive in the next steamer from Europe for the special purpose of preparing the anxiously expected work of "STEPHEN IN SEARCH OF HIS MOTHER." It is said that the work is to appear first in the columns of the Cincinnati *Enquirer* and Louisville *Democrat*, copy righted, with permission for the Memphis *Appeal* to publish from the proof sheets at its leisure.

Democrats of Bradley. Your Attention.

Mr. J. N. DUNN, in a communication published in yesterday's *Banner*, says:

Mr. Editor, our candidates will get the highest vote of any ticket that will be voted for in this county, which has heretofore given 400 against us.

Democrats of Bradley, you hear the Know Nothing boast. You know Mr. DUNN, and you know BELL and EVERETT. See that the old Democratic flag is borne aloft to victory, despite the efforts of the BELL men and their allies.

A BALTIMORE BELL ORGAN.—The Baltimore *Patriot* says:

"We have advocated and shall vote for Messrs. Bell and Everett. To that end they ought to be elected, and to that end, *if they cannot be*, we accept the election of Mr. Lincoln, according to the Constitution, and the mode pointed out by the laws, *as better than any Democrat.*"

What say the BELL organs of Nashville? Do they believe the election of LINCOLN better than that of BRECKINRIDGE or DOUGLAS?

The Baltimore *Patriot*, in an article on the approaching election for Mayor of that city, says:

The success or failure of Bell and Everett in Baltimore will depend, in a great measure, on the result of the municipal election in October.

It would seem that the *Patriot's* hopes of Know Nothing success depend entirely upon Plug Ugly rule.

DOUGLAS HITS BELL A HARD LICK.—In his speech at the Rhode Island "Clam-Bake" the other day, Senator DOUGLAS said:

If my object was to get the Presidency by any means, rather than vindicate the truth, perhaps I would be willing to play mummy and put a padlock on my lips for fear I might utter an honest sentiment and lose a vote by it. [Applause.] I would scorn to receive any man's vote under false pretenses."

VIRGINIA.—Hon. WM. SMITH and Senator MASON have both taken the stump in Virginia for BRECKINRIDGE and LANE. It is said that Senator HUNTER and Mr. WISE will also do so shortly. With such an array against him, Mr. DOUGLAS, as well as the BELL people, will have a hard time in Virginia.

The San Antonio *Herald* (Texas) says that, of the newspapers of the State 39 support BRECKINRIDGE, eight are for HOUSTON; one for BELL, while DOUGLAS has not an advocate among them all.

THE CANVASS.

Haynes, Peyton and Polk at Fayetteville.

[SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE UNION AND AMERICAN]

FAYETTEVILLE, August 31, 1860.

Messrs. HAYNES, PEYTON and POLK addressed a crowd of six or eight hundred persons here to day. The appointment was not generally known through the county, and hence the slim attendance.

Col. HAYNES opened the discussion to-day, first referring to parties as they have existed since 1800, and showing by historical facts that the Democratic party have been the true friends of the Constitution and the Union in every crisis through which the people have passed; that to the wisdom and foresight of that party, the country is indebted for much of its present greatness; that it was under Democratic administrations that we acquired Louisiana, and Florida, and Texas, and California, and that by acquiring the three first-named, was the South strengthened and its area extended. Col. HAYNES then proceeded to show that it was owing to the course pursued by the parties opposing the Democratic, that the Union was menaced with the danger that now threaters it, from the triumph of a purely sectional party. The sentiment of the Democratic party had always been the Union and the Constitution, and the rights of the States under the Constitution. It was no new thing to hear the Democratic party charged with disunion—it was so charged in the days of JEFFERSON—but it was a note-worthy fact those who made these charges could not point to a single act of the party that would give even a coloring to their charges. The sentiments of isolated individuals could only be brought forward, but he wished his hearers to bear in mind that the party had never, by word or act, endorsed these sentiments. Such charges were, therefore, the "idle pipings" of men who, for the want of argument, presumed upon the intelligence of the people.

Col. HAYNES said he disliked to have to speak of Mr. DOUGLAS. He respected his great abilities and remembered his former gallant services in behalf of Democratic principles with gratitude, and would prefer to speak of him in words of praise. But the advocacy of Mr. DOUGLAS by his friend Maj. POLK, made it necessary for him to show that the candidacy of Mr. DOUGLAS could only result in crippling the Democratic party and enure to the benefit of one or the other wing of the Opposition. It could not be claimed that Mr. DOUGLAS came before the country with the prestige of availability about him. What State, North or South, could he carry? He felt sure that the vote of not a single Southern State would be given to him; and notwithstanding Mr. DOUGLAS' friends claimed that he would carry a few Northern States, he sincerely doubted their judgment. In Tennessee Mr DOUGLAS might possibly take 5,000 or 6,000 votes from Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, but, in his judgment, he could do no more here. If, however, he should receive a larger vote, he could at best do nothing more than give the State to Mr. BELL, who has for years been waging a most bitter war against the Democratic party. With this result staring them in the face, Col. HAYNES appealed to those Democrats who profess to be the peculiar friends of Mr. DOUGLAS to know whether by voting for him they were willing to thus aid indirectly in giving the State to Mr. BELL, who has done more than any other man in the State against their party.

Col. HAYNES said that, as to the claim set up by Mr. DOUGLAS as to the regularity of his nomination, it at was a mere assertion, and he demonstrated that such was not the case. As to regularity, neither Mr. DOUGLAS nor Mr. BRECKINRIDGE had been nominated according to the usage of the Democratic party. The withdrawal of those delegates who nominated Mr. BRECKINRIDGE left the DOUGLAS convention without the power to make a nomination according to the usage of the party. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE came before the country with the endorsement of the delegates from the Democratic States, and the great body of the Democracy was for him, and it remained to be seen whether a very small minority of the party would so cast their votes as to give this or any other Southern State to Mr. BELL.

Col. HAYNES then took up the question of non-intervention and popular sovereignty, as enunciated in the Cincinnati Platform and the Kansas-Nebraska act, and showed to the entire satisfaction of every fair man that the Democratic party still adhered to these principles, and clearly demonstrated that the popular sovereignty enunciated in the Cincinnati Platform and advocated by the Democratic party in the Presidential election of 1856, was a very different principle from that advocated by Mr. DOUGLAS and familiarly known as "squatter sovereignty"—the one being a constitutional principle, while the other was licentious and revolutionary.

The Opposition party give as a reason for not adopting a platform at Baltimore, that platforms were made to mislead and deceive the people. Col. HAYNES was willing to admit that the assumption was true as to that party, but not as to the Democratic party. They knew whether they had made platforms to deceive the people, and had a right to speak for themselves on that subject. He suspected, however, that one reason why they did not make a platform this time, was because they wished to dodge the negro. If they made a platform for the negro, they would drive off their Northern friends, and if against the negro, the Southern wing would have rebelled and the party would have fallen to pieces. It was to catch all shades of opposition that they made a platform, which ignored the vital issues which agitate the country. LINCOLN and HAMLIN could stand on their platform, for they have declared that they are for the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws. It was due to Col. BELL, said Col. HAYNES, to say that he refers to his record for his position on the slavery question, but he would defy any man to take up Mr. BELL's record, and determine what was his position upon that grave question, so far as it affected the territories. He called upon Col. PEYTON to state what was Mr. BELL's position on the question of slavery in the territories. He was with the Abolitionists on the subject of abolition petitions and the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; he had voted to admit California with an anti-slavery constitution, and had voted against admitting Kansas with a constitution recognizing slavery. How were the people of the South, then, to satisfy themselves that he was with them on this momentous question? He repeated his desire that Col. PEYTON should explain Mr. BELL's position.

After Col. HAYNES had "ventilated" Mr. BELL's position on a number of questions of the highest moment as exhibited in his record, he passed to the candidates of the National Democracy, whose claims to the confidence and support of the people he presented in a truly eloquent and forcible manner. Throughout he was listened to with the most marked attention. It is seldom the people of Lincoln county have the opportunity of listening to a speech which made so fine an impression as that of Col. HAYNES. It was the theme of admiration with all parties—with the BRECKINRIDGE men for its able and manly vindication of their cause and their ticket, and with the Opposition for the fairness, the ability and the eloquence with which he discussed the issues of the canvass.

Maj. POLK, although still suffering from his severe indisposition of yesterday, came forward at the conclusion of Col. HAYNES' speech, and stated that it was his intention to prosecute the canvass to the close, if his health would permit. He declared in the outset of his remarks that the BRECKINRIDGE Democrats and the Black Republicans were advocating the same principle with regard to Popular Sovereignty, but with different aims; that Mr. BRECKINRIDGE was nominated for the purpose of securing the election of LINCOLN, and that the party had been turned over to the Disunionists through the efforts of Mr. YANCEY and a few others.

He then "pitched into" Mr. YANCEY and belabored him most unmercifully, and if Mr. YANCEY is as bad a man as Maj. POLK represents him, it is a wonder he finds a civilized community in which he will be permitted to reside. But Mr. YANCEY was not here to defend himself.

Maj. POLK charged that the BRECKINRIDGE men had invited the DOUGLAS men to join them in a guerilla war upon Mr. BELL, and that the action of "the seceders," as he calls them, had given Mr. BELL his whole strength, and that but for their action, he would not have stood the ghost of a chance in Tennessee or any other State. Wonderful logic for a Democrat! He will next discover that Mr. BELL is still an adherent of Gen. JACKSON.

Maj. POLK devoted his hour and a half mainly to such *arguments* as form the staple of Opposition speeches, and wound up by declaring that he was prepared to prove by a telegraphic dispatch—an irresponsible sort of testimony that will prove any thing—that BRECKINRIDGE and LANE were nominated by the Richmond convention an hour before they were at Baltimore.

Maj. POLK has no word of reproach for Mr. BELL, nor had he any fault to find with the party that supports him. The people of Lincoln could scarcely realize that this was the same bold, defiant POLK who, in 1856, hurled his denunciations at Mr. BELL's party. They remembered that in the Legislature of 1857–8, Maj. POLK denounced Mr. BELL as *an Abolitionist*, and they were not prepared to listen to-day to a harangue from Maj. POLK that was to result only in aiding this same Mr. BELL. His speech was, of course, highly gratifying to the Opposition, as was evidenced by their frequent applause—for they alone applauded—and that applause, strange, though it may sound to Democrats, tickled Maj. POLK.

When Col. PEYTON arose to address the crowd he expressed himself as highly gratified that no war had been made upon him or his candidate by Maj. POLK. Col. PEYTON told the people yesterday at Winchester that he stood between two Democratic fires, but it seems he got out of that uncomfortable position even before he got into it, except in imagination, and now he and Maj. POLK are playing that game on Col. HAYNES.

Col. PEYTON took the Democracy—those present—by surprise when he asserted that he commenced his political career with old Hickory, and that he was still a JACKSON Democrat! When they remembered with what bitterness Col. PEYTON warred on Gen. JACKSON but a few years back they could but smile at this innocent attempt of the Colonel to get into the Democratic fold.

Col. PEYTON expressed himself very decidedly opposed to conventions, which he regarded as enabling tricksters and wire-workers to cheat the people. That was "a left-handed compliment" to his own candidate, who it has been charged was nominated by a trick, as Gen. HOUSTON was to be the man, so some of the Opposition say at least.

His defense of Mr. BELL's votes in favor of receiving Abolition petitions was a "most lame and impotent conclusion"—that the right way to treat such fanatics was to kill them with kindness.

When Col. PEYTON came to denounce Mr. YANCEY, he found to his dismay, that Maj. POLK had stolen his thunder, and he floundered for some time in his efforts to coin hard words to throw at YANCEY, as boys throw stones at frogs, "just for the fun of the thing," and finally came to the conclusion that he was a traitor, and if OLD HICKORY was alive he would have him hung before six weeks. Col. PEYTON seems to labor under a sort of monomania in regard to Mr. YANCEY, and it must be contagious, for Maj. POLK is already seriously affected by it.

It is remarkable that Col. PEYTON made no new points to-day, nor did he attempt to defend Mr. BELL against the galling fire which Mr. HAYNES poured into him. His whole speech to-day was devoted to outside issues—issues which can be brought to bear upon the present canvass by the most forced construction. Perhaps the best description of his speech that can be given is the remark which several gentlemen were heard to make to-day, that "he makes a mighty rambling speech." It is quite certain that Col. PEYTON has not kept pace with the politics of the country, but this may be accounted for by the fact that he has for several years been a resident of California, where, it is said, he took to "running after strange (political) gods."

Col. HAYNES answered Col. PEYTON's "argument" in regard to the disunion tendencies of the Democratic party because YANCEY and a few other disunionists support BRECKINRIDGE for the Presidency, very pointedly. He said that if the support of the Democratic ticket by a few disunionists, whose sentiments the party had never endorsed, made that a disunion party, by a parity of reasoning he could prove the party supporting Mr. BELL a disunion party. The Hon. WM. L. SHARKEY, of Mississippi, who was an avowed disunionist, and was President of the Southern Convention at Nashville, was a delegate to the Baltimore convention and voted for Mr. BELL. Mr. BELL, himself had uttered sentiments as strongly tinctured with disunion as anything Mr. YANCEY had said. He also read an extract from the Nashville *Banner* of the 4th of November, 1858, one of Mr. BELL's home organs, which declared that the election of SEWARD would be sufficient cause for a dissolution of the Union. These facts produced a telling effect upon the audience.

Col. HAYNES sustains himself nobly against his two Opposition competitors. I have never seen a people better pleased with a speech than the citizens of Lincoln were with Col. HAYNES' to day.

The reports which have been circulated in regard to the defection in this county greatly exaggerate the facts. Several of the best informed and most reliable gentlemen in the county informed me to day that if the election was to take place now, DOUGLAS would not get one hundred votes, and that by the time the election takes place, his vote will not exceed fifty. The Hon. GEO. W. JONES is doing nothing for DOUGLAS, and I hear he says he will do nothing in this contest that will prevent him from acting with the Democratic party hereafter. SEWANEE.

Haywood, House, and McCann in Stewart.

STEWART COUNTY, Aug. 30, 1860.

Editors of the Union and American: Yesterday was a glorious day for the Democracy of old Stewart. It was a day to which the Democracy looked with no little anxiety, expecting that our young champion would be *chased* up by the *great* HOUSE, whose eloquence we were told could not be equaled. At 10 o'clock, A. M., Mr. MCCANN took the stand and violently beat the air for one hour and a half, attempting to prove little *Steve* the regular nominee, and BRECKINRIDGE a tool in the hands of *raw head and bloody bones* YANCEY. But we noticed that during the whole course of his labored effort he never had anything to say against Mr. BELL—his charges were directed for Mr. HAYWOOD to answer. But as every thing must have an end, so Mr. MCCANN at last came to a close. At the close of his remarks the BELL men (for there are no DOUGLAS-ites here,) tossed up their hats and seemed well pleased at the effort.

Then came Col. HOUSE. He pursued the same course that all of their speakers do, *i. e.*: fraud, corruption, disunion, YANCEY! YANCEY! YANCEY! but never alluded to DOUGLAS or LINCOLN. His charges were also directed for Mr. HAYWOOD to answer; thus you see our gallant BOB has both to fight, and he does it most nobly and with a telling effect. When Mr. HOUSE closed, Mr. HAYWOOD took the stand, and we never heard a more successful vindication of the National Democracy. It was a noble, convincing, eloquent, crushing argument for one hour and a half. Mr. HAYWOOD was cheered throughout the whole course of his speech, frequently wringing applause from his political enemies, by his stirring eloquence. He answered Mr. HOUSE upon his charge of extravagance, corruption, disunion, most successfully. The BELL men are now wearing very long faces about here. If you mention the discussion of yesterday to one of them, his answer is, "*Oh, McCann whipped both House and Haywood.*" This, Messrs. Editors, is a significant fact.

But we will close by stating that our banner is in safe hands. "*Our Bob*" is doing masterly service for our cause.

On the 28th instant the Democracy of Dover planted a hickory pole at the court house, ninety-one and a half feet in length. The banner of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE floats at its top. You may listen for a good report from old Stewart in November.

Speaking at Rogersville.

ROGERSVILLE, August 27th, 1860.

EDITORS UNION AND AMERICAN: To-day the candidates for elector for the State at Large were here, and addressed one of the largest crowds that was ever assembled in Rogersville. We expected that the Opposition would make a grand demonstration in the way of bell ringing, as we were informed that they had been for several days collecting all the bells in the country, in order to have a *general ringing* to-day; hoping by this, no doubt, to arouse the energies of their party. But although the sky was cloudless and the sun shone brightly, yet no sound of bells broke in upon the ear, save one that was drawn in, suspended over a barrel of cider and a basket of cakes, whose melancholy sound now and then chilled the nerves of the BELL-er-ers.

The hour for speaking came on, and Col. TAYLOR having the lead, mounted the stand, and after shrugging his shoulders as if he feared the task, began by preaching a short sermon upon the death of the old Whig principles, and upon this subject the Col. grew warm. He then continued by saying that there was now but one question before the people, and that was the "*Nigger Question;*" that this question had been thrust upon the people by the Democratic party; that the Democracy were responsible for the slavery agitation; that the North had been true to the compromise measures of 1850, and that the South, led on by the Democracy, violated these compromises, aided by a few Whigs *who left* the party in the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska, *out of which sprang* the Black Republican party; and that the North observed in good faith the Missouri compromises, but the South, led on by the Democratic party, was *false* to its pledges. He then attempted to vindicate the political record of John BELL by saying that BELL never conceded to Congress the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, "and that he himself believed that Congress had no such power." The Col. had forgotten what he had said at Dandridge, not very far from here, that he believed, as any other man must believe that will read the Constitution, that Congress has the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and has never until to-day taken, as I learn, any different position, although he has been lashed with it every day since; his explanation having been that he meant to say when he made the above concession, that Congress had the power to abolish the *slave trade* in the District of Columbia. When he sees the article in the *Patriot* and campaign BELL paper, published by their Executive Committee, referred to by you in your paper of the 23d, he will again maintain that Congress has power to abolish it in the District. He then commenced the cry of disunion, and said that the Democratic party was a disunion party, because W. L. YANCEY was one of its supporters. Next he eulogized the DOUGLAS party; spoke of their "gallant and patriotic leader", and of their patriotic and national principles. He made no war upon the DOUGLAS party, but to the contrary, one would have thought that he was an elector on the DOUGLAS ticket. He then concluded his speech with a short review of the question of disunion, in which he spoke of the bloody horrors of civil war; by this, no doubt, he aimed to *scare* the people into the support of his candidate for the Presidency, but the people are too well accustomed to this method of political discussion, and expressed no fears at his terrible pictures of fancy. Since the Colonel and his party fooled the people so bad about the Pope's coming over, his terrible pictures about what will happen when the Democrats are elected, do not frighten anybody. Col. WHITTHORNE then came upon the stand, amid the shouts of his friends, and in his bold and eloquent style, went into the discussion. He boldly announced the platform and principles of the Democratic party, showing that there was now but one issue before the people, and that is the equality of rights under the constitution; that this had been the great principle of the Democratic party ever since its first organization and was the same to-day. He then traced the history of the slavery question from the very formation of the constitution down to the present, and then in reply to Col. TAYLOR's positions, said, "I will accept the issue tendered by my competitor, which is involved in the proposition to be deduced from his arguments:

1st. He said that the North had observed in good faith the Missouri Compromise.

2d. He says that the North were true to the Compromise Measures of 1850.

3d. That the South, under the lead of the Democratic party, violated these Compromises, aided by a few Whigs who *left the party* in the passage of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, out of which grew the Republican party.

Now, I deduce from this argument that if my competitor is right in these propositions, then the logical conclusion is that the existence of the Black Republican party was proper and right to vindicate 'good faith' and resist the violation of the Compromises. Against these propositions I take issue, and accept the defence of the South." He then from the history of our country, history of parties and churches, and the testimony of Gen. ZOLLICOFFER, a leading member of the Whig party, showed that Col. TAYLOR's positions were not true, and that the South had been true to these compromises, and has acted in good faith to all of her pledges. After having thus ably and successfully controverted the positions of Col. TAYLOR, he showed up the record of JOHN BELL in its true colors, and then challenged his competitor to take issue with him upon the Democratic platform, or upon the record of the candidates for the Presidency. He concluded his speech, which was the ablest ever delivered here, by appealing to the people to rally to the Democratic standard, for in it alone could we hope for the perpetuity of our Union. Each of them then made their replies, and as Mr. WHITTHORNE closed the discussion in his usual happy and triumphant style, bouquets of the rarest flowers came showering in upon him from the ladies, amid applause that made the welkin ring.

We have never seen a more glorious day for the Democracy. The great principle of equality of rights under the Constitution was victorious. The effect of this day's work will tell on the election day. HAWKINS.

Whitthorne and Taylor in Grainger.

BEAN'S STATION, TENN., August 28, 1860.

MESSRS. EDITORS: To-day the discussion between WHITTHORNE and Taylor came off, at this place, in the presence of a large number of the freemen of Grainger and surrounding counties. Those of the Opposition who were advised of the result of the meeting the day previous, at Rogersville, acknowledged the inability of Col. TAYLOR to cope single-handed with Mr. WHITTHORNE, by their endeavor to smuggle one of their DOUGLAS allies into the help of their champion.

Think of it, Democrats. These Know Nothing Opposition National Union supporters of JOHN BELL, through a prominent member of their party in Grainger county, attempted to pass themselves off upon Gen. WHITTHORNE as DOUGLAS men, and negotiating with him for a division of time for a DOUGLAS speaker. But this trick was exposed by a Democrat who was mistaken for one of their own "kith and kin," and was assured by the above gentleman, the DOUGLAS negotiator just alluded to, that "we BELL men had use for a DOUGLAS speaker to help TAYLOR fight WHITTHORNE," and acknowledged that he had confessed himself to be a DOUGLASITE; but then said he, "I meant for this day only!"

However, the DOUGLAS speaker not caring to be *used* for such purposes and by such a party, I suppose, did not appear upon the stand, and the discussion, at twelve o'clock precisely, was opened by WHITTHORNE, who held the crowd noiseless, (save when shaken by irrepressible bursts of applause,) attentive, and it almost seemed *spellbound*, for one hour and a half. A more telling, a more convincing, a more complete vindication of the Democracy from the foul aspersions that are heaped upon it by its open as well as covert assailants, it is impossible to conceive. In the short space of a letter I deem it unnecessary to present a synopsis even of the points made in the discussion, farther than to say that Gen. WHITTHORNE charged and showed that Mr. BELL has been found upon both sides of every prominent public measure that has agitated the public mind for the last twenty-five years; and since he is the candidate of a party with out a platform and which has even ignored the very God that made them (by repudiating their former platform which declared that "an humble acknowledgement is due to the Supreme Being for his protecting care, &c,") he asked, in the name of reason and common sense, how does any man know where to place Mr. BELL now.

He showed that BRECKINRIDGE and LANE stood upon a platform which their revilers themselves could not and dared not assail. He showed that they were the only candidates before the people who in time of danger had shown their devotion to the Union and the land of their fathers by marching to its defence upon the plains of Mexico.

He showed that the Democracy had ever maintained and defended the rights and privileges of the people and that they were doing the same thing still.

TAYLOR arose at the conclusion of Gen. WHITTHORNE'S speech and occupied the hour and a half of his time solely and exclusively in presenting the claims of Judge DOUGLAS to the support of the country, and excepting, in one instance alone, made no allusion to Mr. BELL whatever. And that solitary moment was devoted to apologizing for the course of his candidate in voting for "those extravagant and abominable appropriations of the people's money," as they are in the habit of terming them, which the HON. NATHANIEL G. TAYLOR says were so corrupt that the man in