Nashville Union and American

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

J. O. GRIFFITH & CO.,

(Successors to E. G. Eastman & Co.)

J. O. GRIFFITH. F. C. BUNNINGTON. JNO. C. BURCH. LEON. TROUSDALE. THOMAS B. 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 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.

I ANDON 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 GANTT, 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.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1860.

"When a man is before the people for public trust, a great deal depends on his personal character and antecedents. Much then depends on the fact whether I am a disunionist. Born within sight of this spot where are met, known to many of you for nearly forty years, your representative in the Legislature of Kentucky, in the Congress of the United States, and other stations of public trust, I invite any one to point to anything in my character or antecedents which would sanction such a charge or such an imputation. I will not degrade the dignity of my declaration on this subject by epithets; but I proudly challenge the bitterest enemy I have on earth to point out an act, to disclose an utterance, to reveal a thought of mine hostile to the Constitution and Union of the States.

"No, my friends, the man does not live, in or out of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, no matter how exalted his station or character, who has power enough to connect my name successfully with the slightest taint of disloyalty to the Constitution and Union of my country."—*Breckinridge's Lexington Speech.*

"No man loves the Union more than I do, and no one would make greater sacrifices to maintain and preserve it. I would do it at the moment when the country requires it, at the expense of every drop of blood."—*Gen. J. Lane.*

Let Justice be done though the Heavens fall.

The *Patriot* of yesterday attempts to create the impression that the supporters of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE in Pennsylvania are endeavoring to prevent a fusion between all the opponents of LINCOLN by their exhorbitant demands, and thus give the State to LINCOLN. The *Patriot*, we regret to say exhibits lamentable ignorance of the subject upon which it writes. We would be loth to suspect intentional misrepresentation. In order to sustain its charge that the friends of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE "demand such terms as will insure their rejection," it quotes the following from the card of R. S. HALDEMAN, FORNEY DOUGLASITE:

"The undersigned having in full view the disasters to the country which would result from the election of Lincoln and Hamlin, have resolved to recommend a Union Democratic Anti-Republican Electoral ticket, to be informed in the following manner, to-wit: The twelve electors of THE READING TICKET, which are assented to by all branches of the Democratic party; ten electors selected by the friends of Bell and Everett; five additional electors from THE READING TICKET, to be assented to by a majority of the undersigned, in all twenty-seven, to the committee of the several organizations to which they belong.

Now the *Patriot* knows or ought to have known that after the disruption at Baltimore, a JOINT ELECTORAL TICKET was agreed upon by the friends of BRECKINRIDGE and DOUGLAS, and the manner in which the vote was to be cast by that ticket was agreed upon at Cresson. Upon that ticket there were twelve or more avowed friends of the DOUGLAS FORNEY and a few other Semi-Republican friends of DOUGLAS repudiated the Cresson arrangement. Mr. DOUGLAS himself did it justas he has repudiated every other arrangement that squinted at fusion with the friends of BRECKINRIDGE. But the entire BRECKINRIDGE strength and the mass of the DOUGLAS men in Pennsylvania still adhere to the Cresson adjustment. The FORNEYITES held a Convention at Reading two or three weeks since, at which Mr. DOUGLAS was, and at which he made a speech, and at which a *straight out* DOUGLAS electoral ticket, from beginning to end, was nominated. This was weeks after the Cresson meeting. Upon the Reading ticket the FORNEY-ites place the twelve DOUGLAS men that were already on the Cresson ticket and put on fifteen other DOUGLAS men thus forming their straight out Reading DOUGLAS ticket. Now let us examine the proposition of Mr. HALDEMAN, the rejection of which causes the *Patriot* to accuse the BRECKINRIDGE men of demanding "such terms as will insure their rejection." In order to form "a Union Democratic anti-Republican ticket HALDEMAN proposes ten electors selected by the friends of BELL and EVERETT; "*twelve electors of the Reading ticket which are assented to by all branches of the Democratic party*" that is the twelve DOUGLAS electors on the Cresson ticket; "five additional electors from the Reading (DOUGLAS straight out) ticket, to be assented *to by a majority of the undersigned*," that is to be assented to by HALDEMAN, DOUGLAS-ite, and H. M. FULLER, BELL-EVERETT. That is the proposition, the rejection of which causes the *Patriot* to charge the supporters of BRECKINRIDGE with demanding "such terms as will insure their rejection." A BRECKINRIDGE man is not proposed to be put upon the ticket, and even the DOUGLAS men, that they are to be permitted to vote for, are to be selected by DOUGLASITES, *assisted by the Chairman of the Bell Committee.* This is the proposition of the FORNEY faction of DOUGLAS men, after the adjustment at Cresson. The Cresson ticket is supported by the friends of BRECKINRIDGE and the mass of DOUGLAS men. The FORNEY leaders are trying to break it up. They cannot succeed. The ticket will be elected. Then let the disorganizing leaders stand from under.

More Help.

The Constitution is the name of a new Breckinridge and Lane paper just started in Tuscumbia, edited by A. M. BARCLAY and R. T. ABERNATHY. It is a healthy looking sheet, and its articles are forcibly written.

The Auburn *Sketch Book*, an able paper, hitherto occupying an independent position politically, now openly advocates the election of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE.

The Mobile *Mercury* of the 21st inst., says:

We have the pleasure of announcing, by authority, that Mr. Robert Armistead and Dr. Nott, both of this city, who have hitherto been supporters of Douglas, have, within a day or two past, avowed themselves as supporters of Breckinridge and Lane.

The Jacksonville *Democrat*, of the 19th inst., defines its position in the following words:

We have this day run up at our mast-head, the names of Breckinridge and Lane, as our choice for President and Vice President of the United States. We have delayed doing so, not from a desire to shrink from responsibility, but to advocate the cause of him whose prospects are brightest to triumph over Black Republicanism. We think our only hope is on this ticket, and we think at a time like this, we should lay aside all party feeling at home.

"Nail our colors to the mast
And stand by our country to the last."

It is now a death struggle with us, the very salvation of the government depends on this election. If Breckinridge is elected she old ship of State will right, and sail dead ahead. The affairs of the government will be judiciously administered, and all things will work together for good. But if on the contrary, Black Republicanism reigns triumphant, and the chair of Washington is disgraced by an abolitionist, then the South may say,

"Farewell! a long farewell to all my greatness."

There can be no possible chance for either Bell or Douglas, and we are pursuing a suicidal course to support them. Let the South throw them both overboard and rally under the flag of the only one that will carry them safely through stormy sea.

Mr. D. H. Mason intends issuing this week in Rome, Ga., *The True Flag*, a weekly journal, to support Breckinridge and Lane.

We have also received the first number of a new Breckinridge and Lane paper from Vernon, La., the name of which we do not remember, &c.

The Britton Proposition.

Many of the DOUGLAS leaders in the State having from the first boldly stated their willingness to see the State go for BELL rather than BRECKINRIDGE, it was feared that they would reject the proposition of Mr. BRITTON to withdraw the DOUGLAS ticket and let the entire Democratic vote of the State be cast for the BRECKINRIDGE electoral ticket with the understanding that the vote of Tennessee was to be cast in the Electoral College for whichever, BRECKINRIDGE or DOUGLAS, might need it to defeat LINCOLN or BELL. It is certain that both of them cannot need it. There are one hundred and three electoral votes. One hundred and fifty-two are required to elect, that being a majority of the whole vote. Tennessee has twelve votes. In order to need the vote of this State to elect, either candidate must have one hundred and forty other votes. BRECKINRIDGE and DOUGLAS cannot both have that number. If they should, that would make two hundred and eighty, to which add the twelve votes of Tennessee making 292 and you have left but eleven votes for LINCOLN. No one doubts his receiving many more than that, and if he does, BRECKINRIDGE and DOUGLAS cannot both get one hundred and forty votes; and if they cannot both get that number, they cannot both need the vote of the State to make an election. The most enthusiastic devotee of DOUGLAS has not the remotest hope of electing his electoral ticket in this State. They know that their policy can only tend to aid Mr. BELL. In refusing to acquiesce in Mr. BRITTON's proposition, they reject with all their might the only possible chance that there is for Mr. DOUGLAS to get the vote of the State if he should require it to secure his election. They talk much of their principles. The vote of Tennessee for Mr. DOUGLAS would not damage their principles, and yet they refuse their assent to the only possible mode of securing it for him. We do not ask them to endorse our principles or our candidates. We do not endorse theirs. Bad as we think Mr. DOUGLAS, we think him better than Mr. BELL or LINCOLN. In a contest between those three, we should prefer DOUGLAS. All that we ask of the DOUGLAS men is to say as much of BRECKINRIDGE. But as was feared, the DOUGLAS managers in this State indignantly reject, and bitterly denounce the BRITTON proposition. The Chairman of the DOUGLAS State Central Committee in this city, was called upon by a member of the BRECKINRIDGE State Central Committee, to see if the DOUGLAS Committee would confer upon the subject, and the DOUGLAS Chairman informed him that the DOUGLAS Committee would not confer upon the subject. The DOUGLAS organ in this city utterly and indignantly rejects the proposition. It says of the friends of BRECKINRIDGE, "We are ready to receive them after due acknowledgement of error; certainly not without." HOPKINS, of Chattanooga, DOUGLAS Assistant Elector for the State, says: "*My voice is for war.*" ANDREWS, DOUGLAS Elector for Sixth District, says:

"No, sir; let the conservative men act together, and not have a fusion of Union with disunion—non-intervention with intervention. But if fusion is to come, (AND IT IS THE HOPE OF MY HEART THAT IT MAY COME, AND NOT ONLY COME BUT PROVE TRIUMPHANT,) LET IT BE WITH THOSE WHO, LIKE OURSELVES PROCLAIM—THE UNION, THE CONSTITUTION, THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAWS, and non-intervention."

HARVEY M. WATTERSON, DOUGLAS State Elector, is for "No Fusion." W. H. CARROLL, DOUGLAS Assistant Elector for the State, is for "No Fusion." The Memphis *Appeal* (DOUGLAS) says:

"Whilst we have no authority to speak for the party at large in Tennessee, we give it as our earnest individual convictions, that but one kind of coalition between the friends of Messrs. Douglas and Breckinridge can be made. If the latter will withdraw their electors now in the field and support the national nominees, we are perfectly willing that the disposition which the UNION AND AMERICAN suggests shall be made of the electoral vote in case the ticket should triumph."

R. M. EDWARDS, of Cleveland, one of the DOUGLAS State Committee, "is decidedly opposed to putting BRECKINRIDGE men in the Electoral College." Thus have the DOUGLAS managers spoken in this State. From what we could learn of their feelings towards the friends of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, we feared that such would be the result. The question now arises, will the rank and file of DOUGLAS men in this State, who are either at heart for Mr. DOUGLAS, or who prefer BRECKINRIDGE to BELL or LINCOLN, follow the dictation of such advisers, or will they reject such leaders, and act for themselves? The next few weeks will determine.

John Bell in Massachusetts.

We have hitherto shown what different sentiments were entertained of Mr. BELL's record, North and South. At the recent Massachusetts BELL-EVERETT State Convention held for the purpose of nominating an Electoral ticket and candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, Hon. J. THOMAS STEVENSON of Boston, was the principal speaker. He said to the Convention in reference to the charge that Mr. BELL was a pro-slavery man:

"Whoever, therefore, whatever his purpose may be, deliberately declares that the party, which you to-day represent, is composed of "pro-slavery men," in any legitimate acceptation of the term, is either a monomaniac, or he means to deceive.

John Bell of Tennessee, an exponent of pro-slavery! His record, which is open without a blot on it, puts to shame the allegation.

He who has stood up with Roman firmness for a generation in a steady opposition to the heresies of ultra men in his own section and among his own constituents for the defence of the equal rights of the North and of the South; *he who stood, like the man that he is, beside John Quincy Adams through all his struggle for the right of petition; he who opposed with a glowing eloquence the annexation of Texas for the same reasons which you did it, till opposition was in vain; he who stood up before the Senate to denounce the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, as a violation of good faith towards his Northern brethren, till his own constituents were blind enough to call him home; he who to-day finds opposition in the South only on the ground that he is too friendly to northern interests, may well wonder when he is described as a pro-slavery candidate.*"

At that Convention AMOS A. LAWRENCE was nominated as the BELL-EVERETT candidate for Governor. That night a Ratification Meeting was held. Mr. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the son of the original Hartford Convention Blue Light Federalist, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and who does Mr. EVERETT's correspondence, as Chairman of the Massachusetts BELL-EVERETT State Committee, this Mr. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL spoke. The reporter of the Massachusetts BELL-EVERETT organ, the Boston *Courier*, says:

* * * * * * Our friends at the South have to defend John Bell from the charge of being an anti-slavery man, and they have more reason, because they say, he stood manfully by John Quincy Adams in his defense of the right of petition, and he battled against the Southern extremists for the support of the Missouri Compromise, and against its repeal. Mr. S. concluded his forcible remarks by a warm eulogism upon Everett, and a hearty and emphatic endorsement of the State ticket which the Convention had to-day presented to the voters of Massachusetts.

Hon. GEO. S. HILLIARD, the leading BELL orator of that State, and one of the delegates, we believe, that nominated Mr. BELL, was present at that ratification and also made a speech. In reference to their candidate for Governor, he said:

"AMOS A. LAWRENCE, the candidate who had been selected to-day, he had known from his youth up, and he could say to the people he was one of the purest, one of the most honest, one of the most upright of men; and not only that, THERE WAS NO MAN IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WHO HAD DONE MORE FOR THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM, WHO HAD DONE SO MUCH, WHO HAD CONTRIBUTED MORE MONEY FOR KANSAS, THAN HE HAD.

THERE WAS NOT A REPUBLICAN IN MASSACHUSETTS WHO COULD CONSISTENTLY REFUSE TO VOTE FOR MR. LAWRENCE. He hoped that, all over the State, the case would be put calmly and dispassionately, without any of that vulgarity and clap-trap which have become so much the staple of political missionaries.

Mr. Cherrington, of Boston, next took the platform and gave, briefly, his reasons for leaving the Republican party, in whose camp he reposed only three weeks ago. He was Republican still, but a Republican for the Union and the Constitution."

We clip the facts which we have presented to-day not from a BRECKINRIDGE, LINCOLN or DOUGLAS paper, but from the Boston *Courier*, the BELL-EVERETT organ of the State of Massachusetts. We ask our readers to notice the vast difference between the BELL-EVERETTS of Massachusetts and the South. All of them base their opinions of Mr. BELL's position upon their views of his "past history connected with the public service," and how wide the difference.

The Black Republicans for Bell.

The notorious John Sherman, the candidate of the Black Republican party for Speaker of the present Congress, the indorser of Helper's "impending Crisis"—and against whom the whole of the Southern members of Congress voted—made a speech in Philadelphia a few days since, from the report of which, as found in the New York *Times*, we cut the following:

"Mr. Sherman took off his hat, waved it, and said: "Yes, three cheers for John Bell!"—that he knew that distinguished man well, and approved highly of his whole course of public life, but he had not the ghost of a chance for the Presidency.—(Great laughter and cheers.)"

Yes, Mr. Sherman approves of the *whole course of Mr. Bell's Public life!* From this, we would infer that Mr. Bell is a pretty good (or bad) black Republican.

What says the *Advertiser?*

If Cas. Clay is good authority on one side, John Sherman is at least as good on the other. Isn't he? *Mobile Mercury, Sept. 22.*

Mr. Bell in Virginia--The Mexican War.

The Bristol *News*, giving an account of a recent discussion at that place between Col. PRESTON (BELL) and Mr. DUNN, (BRECKINRIDGE) Electors for the State at Large, says:

"In reply to Col. Dunn's expose of John Bell's record, *Mr. Preston admitted that he did not endorse his course in regard to the Mexican war, but claimed that he was not bound to defend Mr. Bell's political course.* As a Bell elector, a portion of his audience wondered what he was bound to do."

GOV. JOHNSON AT WINCHESTER.—We understand that ample accommodation will be made by the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, to take all who may wish to go to Winchester to hear GOV. JOHNSON speak on Saturday.

LETTER TO HON. GEO. W. JONES,

In Review of his recent Address to his Friends and Former Constituents.

CONCLUDED.

The Kansas-Nebraska act of 1854 was framed upon the same great principle of "non-intervention" on the part of Congress *in establishing* or *prohibiting* slavery, but leaving the Territory open to the people of all the States to emigrate thereto with their property, providing Courts and Judges and a Territorial Legislature, and extending the Federal Constitution and all Federal laws, not locally inapplicable, over it, as the means of *protection* to those who should go there, in their Constitutional rights to life, liberty *and property*, and expressly repealing the old Missouri Compromise restriction which prohibited slavery, declaring that it was, the true intent "and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereat perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, *subject only to the Constitution of the United States.*"

You well know, and will, I am sure, have the candor to admit, that among the supporters of the Nebraska-Kansas bill, different shades of opinion existed as to *when* and *how* the people of a Territory could prohibit Slavery. Some believed with Mr. DOUGLAS, that a Territorial Legislature could do so. Others contended that the Territorial Legislature would have no such power. That Congress having no such power, could not delegate that which it had not to its creature, a Territorial Legislature. That the Territories were the common property of all the States, held in trust for them by their agent, the Federal Government, and that the citizens of all the States had a right to emigrate thereto with their property, (whether negroes or spinning jennies,) and that the only powers of a Territorial Government were, not to establish or distroy rights, but to protect all who should go there, in whatever rights they possessed, and that it was only when they should be authorized to organize a State Government, and should assemble to form a Constitution, that they would have the power to say by which it property in Slaves. This difference, however, was not regarded as practical for the time, for the reason that it was a question for *judicial construction*; while all could agree in giving to the Territories *government*, and the exercise of all rights thereunder *consistent with the constitution* leaving what those rights were to be determined by the Courts, as the disputed points should arise. This fact was well understood, admitted and explained on all hands during the pendency of the Nebraska-Kansas bill. Mr. Douglas states it in clear and concise terms two years after in the debate in the Senate, July, 1856. He then said:

"My opinion with regard to the question (as to whether a Territorial Legislature could prohibit slavery,) which my colleague is trying to raise here, has been well known to the Senate for years. He tried to do, two years ago and last year, to ascertain what were my opinions on this point in the Nebraska bill; *I told him it was a judicial question.*

* * My answer then was and now is, that *if the Constitution carries slavery there, let it* AND NO POWER ON EARTH CAN TAKE IT AWAY; but if the Constitution does not carry it there, no power but the people can carry it there; whatever may be the true decision of the Constitutional point, it would not have affected my vote for or against the Nebraska bill. I should have supported it just as readily if I thought the decision would be one way as the other. He will also find that I stated I would not discuss the legal question, *for by the bill we referred it to the Courts.*"

From this statement of the condition of the question it will be seen how myself and others could vote for you, notwithstanding our differences of opinion as to how the Courts would decide this question when brought before them. And we little supposed that you would understand us as concurring with you upon this deferred question, merely because we continued to give you our confidence and support. In 1848 Mr. Buchanan wrote his Sandford letter, repudiating the doctrine of "Squatter Sovereignty," called by you "Popular Sovereignty." In the face of that letter you entered zealously into his support for the Presidency in 1856, and I ask you with what justice could I assert from that fact that you were endorsing his opinions upon this then unsettled question?

The same kind of "popular sovereignty" and "non-intervention" that was laid down in the Clayton Compromise of '48, in the Territorial bills for New Mexico and Utah in '50, and in the act organizing governments for Nebraska and Kansas in '54, was asserted in our platform at Cincinnati, and reasserted again by the Baltimore Convention that nominated Breckinridge and Lane, with a distinct repudiation of the construction that had been placed upon it by Mr. Douglas, and an equally clear affirmance of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Now what has brought about this change? Why is it that you and me, equally honest—for I know you too well to question your sincerity—cannot act together in the future, as we have done in the past? In my opinion there is no valid reason. For once in your life I fear you have permitted a mere obstinacy of opinion and a mistaken notion of consistency to carry you too far. One false step always leads to others, unless speedily retraced, until the unfortunate adventurer most frequently finds himself in the wilderness and quagmires of inextricable absurdities. There is no reason why you and me should not continue side by side in the good fight for that Democracy which we both believe is the essential support of Republican institutions; for after all that you have said the only real difference between us on this Territorial question is: has Suprem Court decided this question against you and against Gen. Cass, Daniel S. Dickinson and others, who contended in your behalf? I think it has. Gen. Cass and Mr. Dickinson admit that it has, and yield obedience to that decision, and are earnestly supporting Breckinridge and Lane. You think the Court has *not* decided the question; but I know you too well to suppose for a moment that you will not readily acquiesce in that decision whenever you are satisfied that it has been made. *let that decision be what it may.* Knowing you to be honest in these convictions, then, and that they were not encouraged by any feeling unfriendly to slavery or to the rights of your own section, I would not question your Democracy or your right to public confidence for this difference as to what has been decided. You well know that the great body of the Democracy of Tennessee are in a hand to hand struggle with their old enemy, the Federal Opposition, whom you have characterised to me as a "guerilla party," encouraging the Black Republicans. You further know that Mr. Douglas is not in fact a party to the Presidential race in Tennessee, and that the only possible effect which your support of him can have will be to increase the chances of giving the State to Mr. Bell. But you say in your letter that you must do this in order to adhere to the principle of "popular sovereignty," the right of a Territorial Legislature to prohibit slavery. In this you are not consistent, in my judgment, from the fact that not a month before the meeting of the Charleston Convention you stood side by side with me declaring as your preference, if we went North for a candidate, for Joseph Lane, of Oregon, whom you said from personal observation you knew to be honest and competent. And yet Joseph Lane, who but a few months ago, you preferred for President over any other Northern man, stood then as now opposed to your construction of "popular sovereignty," having declared in the House, of which you and he were members, in a speech delivered March 27, 1858, that—

"Congress cannot interfere with the subject of slavery; and the people living under a Territorial government cannot do, under an organic law framed by Congress, that which Congress itself could not do. It (slavery) does nominally exist, and must always exist, in the Territories, until they come to form their State governments, and then it is their right to regulate the matter as they please. I appeal to gentlemen, then, Northern men and Southern men, to *maintain* and PROTECT the rights guaranteed by the Constitution."

This speech was made in favor of the proposition to admit Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, in opposition to the efforts of Mr. Douglas, Mr. Bell and the Black Republicans. You were standing with Gen. Lane on that question. If a few weeks before the meeting of the Charleston Convention you preferred Gen. Lane, who had expressed such sentiments in the House of which you were a member, why can you not support Joh C. Breckinridge whose only offense is that of holding the same sentiments—in a contest in Tennessee where the only effect of withholding your vote will be to increase the chances of Bell?

But there are other and stronger reasons why you should reconsider your declared purpose. What respect can you have for the professions of Stephen A. Douglas, or of his support of your favorite doctrine of "non-intervention?" Who knows better than you do that he was the *first* to lead the Black Republican cohorts in an unholy crusade upon that doctrine, trampling under foot the Lecompton Constitution, arrogating to himself the right as a Senator to go behind the regular proceedings and learn what was and what was not the will of the people of Kansas—intervening to have a Constitution framed according to *his* wishes and aiding in defeating the admission of Kansas into the Union, at a time when you, by your vote, given under oath, said she was entitled to admission.

I remember well the incidents of that day of treachery. I chanced to be in Washington. Great alarm and anxiety was manifested on the part of Democratic members of Congress—in fact, on the part of all national men—on account of the threatened division in our ranks, which Mr. Douglas was about to occasion on this question, arising from his bitter personal dislike to the President. A feeling of depression weighed heavily upon the hearts of all of you. In conformity with the usages of our party, a caucus meeting was called to devise some means for preserving the harmony and unity of the party. Through the kindness of one of the Tennessee members, I was secured admission as a spectator to that caucus. You will remember the deep and solemn feeling which seemed to pervade that meeting, in contemplation of the threatened desertion of Mr. Douglas and his followers, and of the evils which such an accession to the Black Republicans would bring with it. Lecompton and anti-Lecompton Democrats came to that family meeting, with the anxious hope of devising some compromise that would preserve the harmony and strength of the party. But Mr. Douglas did not come—he sought no compromise, he asked no peace, he desired no harmony; and the next morning upon the Avenue he was found denouncing, in undignified terms, those whom he thought he had a right to command, but who had dared to go into that Democratic caucus and seek for harmony and peace. I am satisfied that you will bear witness to the truth of these assertions, however widely we may differ in our present line of policy. Mr. Douglas immediately identified himself and his followers with the Black Republicans on that question, and some whom he led off into their ranks stand there to this day. His associations in a great measure changed. He was glossted with Seward, with Greeley, with Colfax, with Blair & Co. Seward gave way, and he became their leader for the time. He and they were successful, and John Brownism triumphed in Kansas. It is a matter of public history, which no one will deny, that, for this good service, a portion of the leaders of the Black Republicans insisted that he should be re-elected to the Senate from Illinois. You will remember that a respectable correspondent from Washington to the Black Republican organ at Chicago, the *Journal*, had stated that Mr. Douglas made great boast to him of "what he had done in the party to stop the progress of slavery and to advance freedom, and of what he proposed doing in the future to destroy the intentions of the slave power"—that he repeated many things to convince his Black Republican associates "that he was earnestly and honestly on the side of the North against the slave power, and should be found fighting in the ranks of the great Northern party in 1860"—and that when enquired of if he knew where the course he was then pursuing would lead him, he replied: "I do, and I have checked all my baggage and taken a through ticket"—that "this character of conversation, so frequently employed by Mr. Douglas with those with whom he talked, made the deepest impression upon their minds, called them in his behalf, and changed in almost every instance, their opinion of the man." You remember the statement of Blair—at that time the Black Republican member of Congress from St. Louis—to the effect that the letter which he wrote to Brown, the editor of the Black Republican organ of St. Louis, urging him to desist from his attack on Douglas, on the ground that Douglas would ultimately be with them, was written at his, Douglas' request—that the interview sought by Mr. Douglas with Blair was for this purpose, as was testified to by Mr. Colfax, through whom the interview was asked. You will also remember the statement of Judge Kellog in the House, and a more recent statement of Senator Trumbull, to the effect that at the time of the attempted passage of the Lecompton Constitution through Congress, "Mr. Douglas called on Mr. Covode, a Republican member of Congress from Pennsylvania, and requested him to go to Senator Trumbull and get him to agree that he, Mr. Douglas, should be returned to the Senate by the Republicans of Illinois, and in consideration thereof he would fight the Republican battles in 1860." I suppose you have seen a report of a recent speech of Anson Burlingame, (the same that eulogized Mr. Bell in the House of which you were a member, for his vote against Kansas,) delivered recently at Bangor, Maine, in which, appealing to the friends of Mr. Douglas to support Lincoln, he says: "Colfax, Blair and myself have had frequent private interviews with Mr. Douglas in his own house. On those occasions Mr. Douglas freely made use of expressions of the deepest indignation against Southern dictation." For these additional reasons I must again insist that there is no consistency in your support of Mr. Douglas.

Again: the chief difficulty with you is our assertion of the doctrine of Federal protection to our rights in the Territories. How came this feature in our platform? Who suggested the necessity which occasioned it? You should remember that it comes in answer to the new and novel doctrine of Mr. Douglas, conceived and promulgated by him for the first time in his canvass with Lincoln in Illinois, of "unfriendly legislation." The Supreme Court had then but recently delivered the "Dred Scott" decision, in which his theory of "Squatter Sovereignty" was thought to have been overthrown, and it was in view of this state of facts, and in answer to Mr. Lincoln, that he said: "IT MATTERS NOT WHAT MAY 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. Those police regulations can only be established by the local Legislature; 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 in their midst." This was a higher lawism but little better than the higher-lawism of Mr. Seward, and I am sure you do not endorse it. Yet the position you occupy has led to that appearance. What matters it with him if the Supreme Court has decided against his favorite theory of "Squatter Sovereignty?" He would teach the people to disregard the Courts. When might makes right, the Constitution becomes a myth.

We had boasted throughout the country that there was a great conservative principle in the Kansas bill, which, if endorsed and sustained by the people, would settle this question upon just and honorable terms; which principle was to organize the Territories upon a plan that would secure to the free States and the slave States every right to which they were respectively entitled under the Constitution; those rights to be determined by the Courts, and when determined to be acquiesced in by all parties. Mr. Douglas violated his plighted faith, and became champion of "unfriendly legislation." His intimate relation to the Kansas bill, when that measure was pending before Congress and the country, gave great importance to his new doctrine, and the national Democracy throughout the country were called upon to know what they had to say to it. The Democracy of Tennessee, when they assembled in Convention the following March, 1859, adopted in their platform the following fourth resolution as their response:

"That we are satisfied with the views announced by the Supreme Court of the United States in the celebrated case of Dred Scott on the rights of slave holders and the status of slavery in the Territories, and are willing to abide by the principles announced in that decision. Slavery and the rights of slave holders are protected by the Constitution of the United States, and by an appeal to the sages of the judicial tribunals of the Union, until the formation of a Constitution by the people of a Territory, and then the State must decide for itself on that as well as other legitimate subjects of government."

Upon the committee who drafted this resolution was Geo. W. Bridges, Douglas elector for the third district; L. H. Cardwell, Douglas Elector for the fourth district; and J. Knox Walker and B. H. Williamson, prominent supporters of Mr. Douglas from the 10th district. Everywhere throughout the country this doctrine of Mr. Douglas was repudiated, except by his followers in a few Black Republican States, and the principle declared illegal, for that "unfriendly legislation," in disregard of the Constitution and the decision of the Supreme Court, it would be the duty of the Federal Government to furnish protection, whenever necessary. Preparatory to the meeting of our National Convention, when the Democracy of Tennessee had assembled in Nashville to appoint delegates thereto, I think it has Gen. Cass and Mr. Dickinson admit that it has, and yield obedience to that decision, and are earnestly supporting Breckinridge and Lane. You think the Court has *not* decided the question; but I know you too well to suppose for a moment that you will not readily acquiesce in that decision whenever you are satisfied that it has been made. *let that decision be what it may.* Knowing you to be honest in these convictions, then, and that they were not encouraged by any feeling unfriendly to slavery or to the rights of your own section, I would not question your Democracy or your right to public confidence for this difference as to what has been decided. You well know that the great body of the Democracy of Tennessee are in a hand to hand struggle with their old enemy, the Federal Opposition, whom you have characterised to me as a "guerilla party," encouraging the Black Republicans. You further know that Mr. Douglas is not in fact a party to the Presidential race in Tennessee, and that the only possible effect which your support of him can have will be to increase the chances of giving the State to Mr. Bell. But you say in your letter that you must do this in order to adhere to the principle of "popular sovereignty," the right of a Territorial Legislature to prohibit slavery. In this you are not consistent, in my judgment, from the fact that not a month before the meeting of the Charleston Convention you stood side by side with me declaring as your preference, if we went North for a candidate, for Joseph Lane, of Oregon, whom you said from personal observation you knew to be honest and competent. And yet Joseph Lane, who but a few months ago, you preferred for President over any other Northern man, stood then as now opposed to your construction of "popular sovereignty," having declared in the House, of which you and he were members, in a speech delivered March 27, 1858, that—

"Congress cannot interfere with the subject of slavery; and the people living under a Territorial government cannot do, under an organic law framed by Congress, that which Congress itself could not do. It (slavery) does nominally exist, and must always exist, in the Territories, until they come to form their State governments, and then it is their right to regulate the matter as they please. I appeal to gentlemen, then, Northern men and Southern men, to *maintain* and PROTECT the rights guaranteed by the Constitution."

This speech was made in favor of the proposition to admit Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, in opposition to the efforts of Mr. Douglas, Mr. Bell and the Black Republicans. You were standing with Gen. Lane on that question. If a few weeks before the meeting of the Charleston Convention you preferred Gen. Lane, who had expressed such sentiments in the House of which you were a member, why can you not support Joh C. Breckinridge whose only offense is that of holding the same sentiments—in a contest in Tennessee where the only effect of withholding your vote will be to increase the chances of Bell?

But there are other and stronger reasons why you should reconsider your declared purpose. What respect can you have for the professions of Stephen A. Douglas, or of his support of your favorite doctrine of "non-intervention?" Who knows better than you do that he was the *first* to lead the Black Republican cohorts in an unholy crusade upon that doctrine, trampling under foot the Lecompton Constitution, arrogating to himself the right as a Senator to go behind the regular proceedings and learn what was and what was not the will of the people of Kansas—intervening to have a Constitution framed according to *his* wishes and aiding in defeating the admission of Kansas into the Union, at a time when you, by your vote, given under oath, said she was entitled to admission.

I remember well the incidents of that day of treachery. I chanced to be in Washington. Great alarm and anxiety was manifested on the part of Democratic members of Congress—in fact, on the part of all national men—on account of the threatened division in our ranks, which Mr. Douglas was about to occasion on this question, arising from his bitter personal dislike to the President. A feeling of depression weighed heavily upon the hearts of all of you. In conformity with the usages of our party, a caucus meeting was called to devise some means for preserving the harmony and unity of the party. Through the kindness of one of the Tennessee members, I was secured admission as a spectator to that caucus. You will remember the deep and solemn feeling which seemed to pervade that meeting, in contemplation of the threatened desertion of Mr. Douglas and his followers, and of the evils which such an accession to the Black Republicans would bring with it. Lecompton and anti-Lecompton Democrats came to that family meeting, with the anxious hope of devising some compromise that would preserve the harmony and strength of the party. But Mr. Douglas did not come—he sought no compromise, he asked no peace, he desired no harmony; and the next morning upon the Avenue he was found denouncing, in undignified terms, those whom he thought he had a right to command, but who had dared to go into that Democratic caucus and seek for harmony and peace. I am satisfied that you will bear witness to the truth of these assertions, however widely we may differ in our present line of policy. Mr. Douglas immediately identified himself and his followers with the Black Republicans on that question, and some whom he led off into their ranks stand there to this day. His associations in a great measure changed. He was glossted with Seward, with Greeley, with Colfax, with Blair & Co. Seward gave way, and he became their leader for the time. He and they were successful, and John Brownism triumphed in Kansas. It is a matter of public history, which no one will deny, that, for this good service, a portion of the leaders of the Black Republicans insisted that he should be re-elected to the Senate from Illinois. You will remember that a respectable correspondent from Washington to the Black Republican organ at Chicago, the *Journal*, had stated that Mr. Douglas made great boast to him of "what he had done in the party to stop the progress of slavery and to advance freedom, and of what he proposed doing in the future to destroy the intentions of the slave power"—that he repeated many things to convince his Black Republican associates "that he was earnestly and honestly on the side of the North against the slave power, and should be found fighting in the ranks of the great Northern party in 1860"—and that when enquired of if he knew where the course he was then pursuing would lead him, he replied: "I do, and I have checked all my baggage and taken a through ticket"—that "this character of conversation, so frequently employed by Mr. Douglas with those with whom he talked, made the deepest impression upon their minds, called them in his behalf, and changed in almost every instance, their opinion of the man." You remember the statement of Blair—at that time the Black Republican member of Congress from St. Louis—to the effect that the letter which he wrote to Brown, the editor of the Black Republican organ of St. Louis, urging him to desist from his attack on Douglas, on the ground that Douglas would ultimately be with them, was written at his, Douglas' request—that the interview sought by Mr. Douglas with Blair was for this purpose, as was testified to by Mr. Colfax, through whom the interview was asked. You will also remember the statement of Judge Kellog in the House, and a more recent statement of Senator Trumbull, to the effect that at the time of the attempted passage of the Lecompton Constitution through Congress, "Mr. Douglas called on Mr. Covode, a Republican member of Congress from Pennsylvania, and requested him to go to Senator Trumbull and get him to agree that he, Mr. Douglas, should be returned to the Senate by the Republicans of Illinois, and in consideration thereof he would fight the Republican battles in 1860." I suppose you have seen a report of a recent speech of Anson Burlingame, (the same that eulogized Mr. Bell in the House of which you were a member, for his vote against Kansas,) delivered recently at Bangor, Maine, in which, appealing to the friends of Mr. Douglas to support Lincoln, he says: "Colfax, Blair and myself have had frequent private interviews with Mr. Douglas in his own house. On those occasions Mr. Douglas freely made use of expressions of the deepest indignation against Southern dictation." For these additional reasons I must again insist that there is no consistency in your support of Mr. Douglas.

Excu