

From the Nashville Patriot.

### To Mary.

Thou art fair and beautiful as thought;  
With thee no Peri might compare;  
Thine eyes the light of love hath caught;  
Thy cheek—how bright the roses there.  
Thy hair of raven glossiness,  
In ringlets twisted, half veils thy face;  
Thy lip the Arcturian might reverse,  
And love like Andalusian grace.  
Thy soft voice in gentle words,  
As Eden music thrills mine ear;  
Tis like the song of forest-birds,  
Which in the glad Spring time we hear.  
But not alone of face and form  
Hast thou a beauty half divine;  
A happy heart all pure and warm  
Is shrouded in those blue eyes of thine.  
And thy young mind is richly fraught  
With poetry's pictured forms of light,  
And with an ardent wealth of thought,  
And faculties beautiful and bright.  
Thy smile is a delight to all  
Who meet thee in thy happy home;  
For where thy silvery accents fall,  
Bright joys spring up like April dews.  
I have not asked—I have not dared  
To pray that heaven will bless thee now;  
For angel shapes will always guard  
And guide a being as pure as thou.

SEAS 18, 1850.

### SPEECH OF

JAMES R. CHILMERS,  
OF MISSISSIPPI.

Delivered at Exchange Building, Memphis, on  
Wednesday night, the 30th of May.

### Fellow Citizens of the State of Tennessee:

For more than thirty years the question of African slavery has disturbed the public mind, and its agitation has increased in fierceness until one by one the various organizations that were occasionally have been torn asunder, and the peace and safety of the Union itself placed in jeopardy.

Commencing in the church, and having its origin in religious fanaticism, the Methodist Episcopal Church was the first to dissolve the connection between its Northern and Southern members, and other religious denominations are rapidly following in its footsteps.

As the anti-slavery sentiment grew in favor at the North, the founders of the party were stoned by the demagogues of the stump, who infused its poisonous teachings into the ranks of party politics, until a separate Abolition party was organized—the old Whig party demoralized and compelled to separate, and in its ruins and out of its Northern wing, the Black Republican party sprang into existence.

And now the great Democratic party, whose history is the history of Constitutional liberty, whose achievements are written in a nation's prosperity, the last vestige of a national organization, the last hope of the Union itself, is trembling on the brink of dissolution.

The gallant ship which we all once loved, freighted as she was with all the dearest hopes of genuine liberty, has been seized upon by a piratical crew, who are straining every nerve to drive her into unknown seas and troubled waters, far from her ancient harbors; they have tossed her on board compass to the waves, and set sail at random, in search of spoils and plunder alone. They have hoisted the black banner of faction and squatter sovereignty—have raised the battle cry of Douglas, who still cling to the old Democratic creed, of principles, not men—who are wedded to no man's fortunes—to give up every principle of our lives, and surrender at discretion to the great king of the squatter sovereignty, and we are threatened with Abolitionism—with Secession and the irrepressible conflict if we dare to disobey.

A rampant freesoil Democracy is making the demand, united with greedy office-holders and hungry expectants of the South, who are howling around us like famished wolves despoiling of their prey, and denouncing us as disunionists if we insist on what they are themselves compelled to admit are our Constitutional rights.

The prospect is indeed dark and gloomy before us, and the true men of the South are everywhere assembled for consultation. At your request I have come from your sister State of Mississippi, to take counsel with you of Tennessee; and though the odds seem fearful against us, yet I take courage when I remember another day when Mississippi and Tennessee stood side by side and shoulder to shoulder against overwhelming numbers, before the towering forts and strong-walled battlements of Monterey, while the deafening cannon hurled the swift messengers of death through their unwavering ranks. I point you to the glittering sword of McClung, glancing in the sunlight on Monterey's walls, as the Mississippians sealed its heights, and to the deep-toned voice of your own gallant Campbell, as the Tennesseans rushed on the charge, and I predict that we are victorious to our own efforts if we are only true to ourselves.

For the first time in the history of Democracy the claims of one man have been made paramount to the good of the whole party, and our Convention at Charleston has been unable to nominate a candidate. The friends of a single aspirant refused to adopt a sound and explicit platform, because their favorite, who had previously issued his pronouncements and dictated his terms, had declared in advance that he would stand upon no platform but one susceptible of his doctrine of Territorial Sovereignty.

They were determined in advance that Douglas, and Douglas alone, should be nominated. They strained every nerve to the accomplishment of this object—and many there were who announced that they would ballot on until the next election, before they would surrender their claims. And when they found that this could not be accomplished, they broke up the Convention itself, and adjourned to meet in a colder clime, where the cries of the South, as she was shrilled in the house of her pretended friends, might, perchance, be less distinctly heard, and where her executioners might more easily escape from her indignation and outraged sons. And yet, these men are the first to assert that we are responsible for the disruption of the party, and that the friends of selfish politicians broke up the convention for selfish purposes. They admit that Douglas stood as the only obstacle in the way of a nomination—they, indeed, assert the fact themselves, and with strange absurdity, charge that he was only an obstacle because he was an object of envy and jealousy to Southern Statesmen.

If the South had been united on any one man, there might be some pretence for such a charge. But when she had no such man; when she was ready to shoot over Hunter, Guthrie, Breckinridge, Davis, Johnson, or even to have crossed the line and taken the "Marion of the Mexican" or any other man who was ready to give her protection to liberty and property in the

Territories, or wherever the Federal jurisdiction extends, such a charge is absurd, and when uttered by Southern men, is worse than absurdity. It is but another evidence of the truth of the principle, that "there are some men who are ever more fierce in their assaults, when they know they can be assailed for the same thing. They seem to delight in dragging others down to their own level, and to have a concealed joy in thinking that others partake of their own deformity."

But this is not the only unfounded charge which the Douglas men have made against us in connection with the Charleston Convention. It is said that we are seeking to inculcate new doctrines, to interpolate new principles and new planks into the party platform; that we are the men who are seeking to deprive the old party Democracy of its old-time glory. If by this they mean that we asked a definite and distinct explanation of the true intent and meaning of certain portions of the platform which are vaguely expressed, and which experience has shown are susceptible of two constructions, then we confess the charge; and "the head and front of our offending bath this exhibit, no more."

But is it an offense? If so, then every Democratic Convention which has ever assembled has been guilty of the self-same crime. To truth, the present platform of our party is but the accretion of great truths and principles which time and circumstances, in the onward march of our great republic, have eliminated. We had a party platform prior to the Convention of 1848; and yet, in that convention, a new plank was added, having reference to the power of Congress over the question of slavery. Gen. Cass was placed upon that platform and defeated.

The next convention met in 1852, and a new plank was again added—a plank which was intended as an explanation of those previously adopted; it was not, as is declared upon its face, to show that "the foregoing proposition covers and was intended to embrace."

In 1855 we again met in Convention, and again new planks were added to the platform to suit the then position of affairs—and in order, in the language of the platform, "that we may more fully and more justly meet the views, in which a national party subsisting exclusively on slavery, agitation, rivalry, &c."

From these facts, from this history of our platform, it is most evident that the mere effort to introduce a new plank into it, and that was simply explanatory of the true intent and meaning of what was doubtfully expressed in it, was not a departure from Democratic usage, it was in strict accordance with the practice and principle of the party. But it is further charged that our object was not simply to add a new and explanatory plank, but that we were asserting a new doctrine and a principle which we had surrendered and bound ourselves not to assert. Both of which propositions I most emphatically deny.

1st. Was the doctrine new? I refer, gentlemen, to the history of our country, to the legislation of Congress when Monroe was President, and your own loved Jackson, Governor of Florida, to show that Congress then interfered to prevent what was regarded as unjust legislation in the Territory of Florida.

2d. Was it an act to relieve the people of Florida from certain burdens? It is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That an act passed on the 22d day of July, eighteen hundred and twenty-one, by Major General Andrew Jackson, Governor of the Province of Florida, entitled "an ordinance by the City Council of St. Augustine, on the 25th day of October, 1821, imposing and levying certain taxes on the inhabitants and all other persons, residing or residing in the Territory of Florida, or on the lands or on the property of the said Territory, be and the same are hereby repealed and declared null and void—U. S. Statutes, 4 Vol. P. R. Stat., at large.

But this was simply an interference with an ordinance passed by the Governor and not by the Legislature of Florida, I now call your attention to the same Territory, which comes next in order to the issue presented. It is hereby seen, and overthrows the doctrine of Mr. Douglas, that the Territorial Legislature can discriminate by taxation and by "unfriendly legislation" keep out slavery from the Territories. The citizens of Virginia desired to send their slaves into the Territory of Florida, and work them there without themselves removing to the Territory. The inhabitants of the Territory were opposed to this, and by "unfriendly legislation," by imposing taxes on the slaves of the Virginians, they sought to put a stop to their introduction in this manner. Upon a petition from the citizens of Virginia, Congress passed the following law:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That all acts or parts of acts passed by the Legislative Council of the Territory of Florida, as may impose a higher or greater tax in slaves or other property of non-resident citizens, than is imposed in the slaves or other property of resident citizens, said Territory be and the same are hereby repealed and declared null and void.

Sec. 2. And he it further enacted, That if any person shall attempt to enforce any of the acts or parts of acts passed by the Legislative Council of the Territory of Florida, as above said, by demanding or receiving any tax, imposition or assessment, authorized or pretended hereby, such person, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine not exceeding ten hundred dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding ten months, or by both said punishments."—U. S. Statutes, 4 Vol. p. 740.

But here let me call your attention to what Mr. Calhoun said upon the subject of protection, in his address to the Southern States, in reply to Mr. Benton.

"Such is clearly the character and object of the general Government, and of the power and authority conferred on it. Having for its object the more perfect protection and promotion of the rights of each and all, it is bound to protect by its rightful power, the safety the right, the property and the interests of the citizens of all, wherever the authority extends. That was the object for conferring whatever power it might have, and it is safe to affirm that, it falls to perform the duty for which it was created. It is enough for it to know that it is the right, interest or property of a citizen of one of the States, to make it its duty to protect it, whenever it comes within the sphere of its authority, whether it be, or it be not, on the high seas, or anywhere else. Its power and authority were conferred on it not to establish or to abolish property, or rights of any description, but to protect them."

From these extracts it will be seen at once, that it is no new doctrine, at least, that Congress should interfere to prevent unjust and discriminating legislation upon the subject of slavery by a Territorial Legislature. But we have still more—still later—and so far as the Douglas men are concerned, I might say still higher authorities for the interference of Congress with the acts of a Territorial Legislature.

It will be doubtless recollected by you all, that the pro-slavery men were the first to get into the Territory of Kansas. They succeeded in electing the first Legislature, and that legislature passed laws which made it a felony for any man to talk anti-slavery doctrines in the Territory. They enacted that no man should hold office or vote, who would not first swear that he would support the fugitive slave law and various other laws which were denounced as unjust and barbarous. And

then the advocates of Territorial sovereignty—the men who now hold up their hands in holy horror at the idea of any interference by Congress, with the enactments of a sovereign Territorial Legislature, were the very men who advocated and voted for a repeal of those laws by Congressional intervention. Just listen how they then talked about the Territorial legislature and the civil government through the Supreme Court. Mr. Cass then said:

"Now, there is no doubt that some of the States passed by the Legislature of Kansas, are a disgrace to the age and to the country. I repeat the strong expression—a disgrace to the age and the country. Such is my firm conviction. Heavy penalties are imposed to prevent the people from applying what is almost an abstract right. Now, I ask you, how have the people of Kansas, full liberty to pass laws establishing their domestic relations for themselves, if they are not allowed to defend them. It is inconsistent with the organic act."

Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, the right honor of Mr. Douglas, the second in command—who is now striving to hold the field in the Senate from which his great leader has fallen—then used the following argument:

"Now, what is the power of the Legislature under this act? As the Senator from Delaware well said, it extends to all 'rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act.' What are the provisions of this act? That the people of Kansas Territory, whether during the Territorial form of government, or afterwards, when they come to form a State Constitution, certainly at some period, shall be permitted to debate, to discuss, and to decide whether that shall be a slave-holding or a non-slaveholding State. That is the purpose of the act, and that act of the Legislature which prevents the people from deciding the question, is a violation of the organic law. My friend from Mississippi says that being the case, why not appeal to the courts of justice? Sir, there is no appeal given in such a case. It is provided that from the final judgment of the Territorial District Courts, where there is a single judge, you may have a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the Territory to the Supreme Court of the United States in any such cases."

It amounts to this: Shall a majority, succeeding in the election of one Legislature, when, perhaps, the people may change their opinion, have the right to perpetuate their power, inflicting penalties on their opponents? Sir, it is impossible. Nothing more, but nothing less, can be made out of it. To say that, because one party had triumphed in the election in Kansas, at the election of this Legislature, it is to no avail to their opponents so that they, the opponents of the majority, shall have the power in the Legislature.

As my friend from Michigan, (Mr. Cass) well says, the idea is, that a man is to be compelled to travel through all the Territorial Courts, at the expense of the United States, to establish his right to vote, and when he has established it by a nominal verdict of a few dollars against the election officers, another Judge releases him the right, and he has the glorious privilege of bringing another suit, but I cannot see how he can ever get his vote, and therefore, I ask my friend from Mississippi to tell me the judicial remedy. I say again, I appeal to legal gentlemen to tell me how the law can be enforced. There is no other. You must either admit that the first body of settlers—five or six thousand of them—who have cleared the first 100,000 acres, may directly prevent all future settlers from voting, or you must pass the amendment of the Senator from Missouri."

I ask you to mark the argument, and say if you are not the same which we now make. The anti-slavery men must be protected by Congress in their right to proclaim their doctrine, otherwise, he would not have a fair chance in settling the institutions of the country. And we now say, that the slaveholder must be protected in his rights of property in the Territory, otherwise he cannot remain until the formation of a State Constitution, and cannot have an equal chance in settling the institutions of the country.

But our authority does not stop here. Our right to protection to property in the Territories grows out of the fact that they are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and stand upon the same footing with our right to protection on the high seas—where no local laws exist—on the timeless billow, which bids defiance to all human law, and I now point to say that our right to protection has been fully recognized. The ill-fated owners of the *Conestoga* and *Buenos Aires* received compensation from the British Government, and in the case of the *Argo*, the great Statesmen of Massachusetts compelled the acknowledgment of our rights, and the British Government was compelled to pay for the slaves which were stolen from their decks. And yet, in the face of all this history, we are told that this is a new and startling doctrine, and, therefore, the majority at Charleston refused to recognize our right to protection either in the Territories or upon the high seas.

Most clearly then, it is neither new nor is it an unjust doctrine.

2d. Have we surrendered it and bound ourselves not to assert it?

If so, when and where? Was it in the canvass of 1848?

It is true that we supported Gen. Cass, and that we all know now that Gen. Cass made the Squatter Sovereignty in his Nicholson letter, but did we know it then?—did we not most bitterly deny it and denounce the doctrine? I cannot speak so well for Tennessee, for I was young then, but I will remember that every Democratic speaker in Mississippi denounced the doctrine, and one of them, Gov. Fiske, proclaimed on every stump that he had "private assurances" from Gen. Cass that his letter meant no such thing. And notwithstanding all this, in our State, where we have a majority ranging from eight to twenty thousand, Gen. Cass, from the double existing in the public mind of this question, only carried the State by about 800 votes. And in the great Democratic State of Alabama, he had, I believe, a majority of only 700.

Did we surrender the doctrine in the discussion of the Kansas Bill? I call your attention to the remarks of Senator Brown upon that subject, and he speaks the voice of the whole South on that occasion. On Feb. 9th, 1854, when the Kansas bill was under discussion, he said:

"From day to day we have heard Senators, in terms more or less distinct, declare, without limitation, that this bill gives to the people of the Territories the right to exclude slavery; in plain English, that it recognizes the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty; as the new theory has been termed. I do not think so, and if I did, I would withhold from the bill the sanction of my vote. I utterly deny and repudiate this whole doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty. That Senator (Mr. Cass) is the acknowledged author of the doctrine known, in common political parlance, as Squatter Sovereignty. From this doctrine I have always dissented, and I dissent from it to-day. I asserted then (June 3, 1848) as I assert to-day, that whoever legislates for the Territories, whether it be Congress or a Territorial legislature, is as much bound to give protection to my property as to the property of any one else.

By yielding the 'right to regulate domestic

institutions," I understand we yield the right simply to regulate, not destroy. To regulate is one thing; to destroy is another and a very different thing. Domestic institutions, such as, I admit, the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant. But I deny that the right to regulate carries along with it the right to destroy. The right to regulate the relation between master and servant no more entitles the regulating power to destroy that relation, than does the power to regulate the relation between husband and wife authorize the destruction of that relation. As well might the Territorial Legislature take a wife from her husband, under pretence of regulating their relations, as to take a servant from his master, under pretence of regulating that relation."

Did we surrender it in the doctrine of non-intervention? Those who know the history of that expression, and of that doctrine, must admit that it grew up in reference to, and in opposition of the Wilcox Provision, and by the fair rule of construction, which the Courts always give to doubtful words, in a contract, it must be construed in connection with the circumstances surrounding the parties at the time. And by that rule of construction it appears most manifestly that by non-intervention was meant that Congress should not intervene to prohibit slavery in the Territories.

But there are some who profess to despise all resort to construction, and say that they take words in their plain and ordinary meaning. To such I would say, go read the Declaration of Independence; it is there written that "all men are created free and equal," and the Black Republican tells us that we in the most solemn compact ever entered into by the American people, admitted that the negro was the equal of the white man. And we have been compelled to look at the surrounding circumstances at the time to find the true meaning of the words, and to show that the men who made the declaration were themselves slaveholders, and could have meant no such thing; and without this construction we must yield to the Black Republicans.

Turn to the Constitution, and we there find the celebrated words, "We, the people of the United States," from which the Federalists argued that ours was a national, and not a federal government, and the States Rights men, with Jefferson at their head, were compelled to resort to construction—to look to the surrounding circumstances, and see that the Colonies were independent sovereigns, and that they adopted the Constitution by separate States, and not as one mass. Look to the Constitution again, and you find the words, "Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories," and from this the Black Republican argues that Congress has power to prohibit slavery therein. And we have been compelled to resort to construction—to look to the whole clause—to show that it had reference to the Territories as held property, and not as local governments. And these are but fair and logical constructions, and in strict accordance with the rules of law. Did I am willing to lay aside any considerations as to surrounding circumstances, and take the words of the Cincinnati platform itself, and I say that we do not surrender it there.

I call attention first to the words, "We recognize the right of the people of all the Territories," &c. Now, "the people," in politics, is a technical term; it does not mean squatters, nor inhabitants, nor legislators, but it means the people in their sovereign capacity—in convention assembled—when they are preparing to take rank as a distinct people, and be admitted as a sovereign State. And I insist that by the use of the words "the people," in the platform, so far from recognizing the Territorial sovereignty we did the reverse.

I call attention to the resolution which recognizes the right of the people to settle this question at the time, "whenever the number of their inhabitants is sufficient to form a State Constitution," &c. It is true that we do not say they cannot do it at an earlier period, and this was one of the doubtful clauses which made an explanatory plank at Charleston necessary, but the well known rule "expressio unius est exclusio alterius," we have all insisted, and I think, rightfully, that then, and then alone, could they exercise this power.

But let us now, fellow-citizens, to the words upon which the Douglas men have peculiarly plumed themselves, and which they have so often flung into our faces—"Non-interference by Congress in State and Territory, or the District of Columbia." They certainly will admit that the non-interference is to be precisely the same in each—no more and no less. Then what is it in the District of Columbia? Slavery has existed there since the formation of this government, and is now protected by Congress. So that non-interference in the District of Columbia is not inconsistent with protection. But again, Mr. Douglas in his Harper article, in attempting to break the force of the Supreme Court's decision in the *Dred Scott* case, where it says that "the only power which Congress has over the question of slavery, is the power coupled with the duty of protecting the owner in his rights." He says that refers to slavery as it exists in the State, and under State law, and there he admits that the Federal Government is bound to protect it when necessary. Here then, we see that non-interference is not inconsistent with protection in the States, and if this be true of the District of Columbia, and of the States, and if the Territories are put upon the same footing, how, I ask, can non-interference be inconsistent with protection of slavery in the Territories?

I assert that we never have surrendered the doctrine—that it is not new—that it is right and just, and that our delegates were bound by their instructions, by their sense of duty to themselves and their country, to have insisted that it should have been acknowledged, beyond question or cavil, in the platform at Charleston, and yet they have been denounced as disunionists and disunionists for having dared to maintain it. Just here let me say one thing upon the charge of disunionists. Gentlemen tell us that we are demanding an abstract right. That we know it will be refused by an Abolition Congress, and that our only remedy will be dissolution of the Union, and therefore we are disunionists. In answer to that, I say if you yield an acknowledged right to Abolitionism because it refuses to grant it, that you are assisting a power that will never cease in its demands until its irrepressible conflict doctrine has made every State free, and therefore, by this logic, you are an Abolitionist. And if any man shall ever so disunionist because I assert my right, even though an Abolition Congress should deny them, I hurt back upon him, that if he surrenders his rights because they refuse them, he is a practical, and a cowardly Abolitionist.

I have heard it said that we have been called traitors and our delegates at Charleston compared to the blue light Federalists of the Hartford Convention. To such men I would say that they, least of all, should speak of traitors in connection with the Charleston Convention. That Convention and the Southern men who there stood up to battle for their rights, against the overwhelming cohorts of the North, has reminded me of the great battle of Thermopylae, where the states of Greece fought for liberty against the countless army of Persia. Strongly fortified in the narrow pass, they stood unmoved like the rock in the ocean, against which were after war dashes itself to pieces, until traitors to Greece stole into the Persian camp, and told them how they could surround and destroy them. And so it was at Charleston. Had the South been united the advancing waves of Squatter Sovereignty would have rolled harmless over their heads, and Douglas and his minions would have been driven back in defeat.—But the moral strength of her resistance was broken by the baseless gasconading of the few Douglas men of the South, and there were found men who crept at midnight into the camp of the enemy, and taught them how, by the unit rule, they could break our phalanx, and perhaps destroy us.

Fellow-citizens, I have detained you long, and as I am to be followed by my distinguished friend, the representative from Arkansas, who is far better able than myself to discuss these questions, I must say a few words as to the consistency of Mr. Douglas, and the reasons given for his nomination, and then I have done. It is said, in the first place, that he is the only man who can beat the Black Republicans. Without stopping to show that this is untrue, let me ask of what profit it will be to us to surrender our constitutional rights for such a purpose. Mark me, fellow-citizens, it is but a trick, an artfully devised scheme, to rob us of our rights. A distinguished gentleman of my State, Judge Thompson, of the Seventh Judicial District, has so aptly illustrated this attempt to reduce us from our rights, that I must borrow his illustration. There was a time when the liberties of Rome were threatened by one whose grasping ambition sought the imperial diadem of the Imperial city—one who had done much and achieved great victories for Rome, and now another great contest was impending over her. There was a death-struggle to be made against the Partisans, that terrible and warlike people of the East. The soothsayers were consulted, and they reported that the Partisans could not be conquered except under a king. When the report came in, concerted as it was by the friends of the aspirant, a friend across in the Roman Senate, and moved that Caesar be made king to whip the Partisans.

The rights and liberties of Rome to be surrendered—the imperial crown of kings to be restored, to whip the Partisans. And so we are asked to acknowledge that we are not the equals of Northern men—that we are not entitled to equal protection on the high seas, or in the Territories, to bow our necks in submission, to make Douglas President, to whip the Black Republicans. Shame upon such craven-hearted policy.

Shame upon such craven-hearted policy. I trust not the tale 'Ne'er shall the South a doctory meet Shall cheer itself—no doctory shall be told. The hereditary nobles be stowed in their gear Like the sea-worm heaped on the surf-beaten shore.

The South, still undaunted by fight or by chains, With her bleeding life in her own hands remains Shall cheer itself—no doctory shall be told. With her back to the field and her feet to the foe; And her hand in battle to stain her garments, Locking itself to heaven from the death-bed of shame.

No, my fellow-citizens, we will never submit to such degradation. We have no desire to escape the clutches of Black Republicanism by reading into the embrace of one whose doctrines are proclaimed, by Mr. Thayer, as better than the Wilcox Provision for his purposes.

If we must die, let it be by a slow and painful process. If we are to die, let us die when the frame is full of life and vigor. Let us not wait until our whole system is poisoned and worn down, and our hearts best blood grown thin with disease. If death must come—let it come on the battle-field, in an open field and a fair fight, let it come quick, like the lightning flash which gives the mighty oak—but, oh God, let me not die by inches.

The question of Mr. Douglas's consistency has been too often traveled over, to need comment from me. If he believed in 1854 that the Territorial Governments were sovereign, why did he labor so hard to prove that Congress had a right to govern them, and decided that power from the right to admit new States? Why did he wish to repeal laws passed by the Kansas Legislature? Why did he not, in the amendment to give them power to elect all their officers, vote for it? Why did he insist, in the *LeCompton* debate, on the necessity for an enabling act to form a State Constitution, and why did he vote against the admission of Kansas with a slavery Constitution formed by the people themselves? Why did he not boldly proclaim, from the first, that they could exclude slavery? Why stop at the half-way house, and say they could do it by non-action and unfriendly legislation? But that he did not so believe is manifest from his whole record, and that he never entertained that doctrine until he wrote his Harper article, is beyond dispute.

The report which he made to the Senate, in 1856, on the Topeka Constitution, enunciates a very different doctrine from that of the magazine article.

"The sovereignty of a Territory remains in abeyance suspended in the United States, in trust for the people, until they shall be admitted into the Union as a State. In the meantime they are admitted to enjoy and exercise all the rights and privileges of self-government, in subordination to the Constitution of the United States, and in obedience to the organic law passed by Congress in pursuance of that instrument. These rights and privileges are all derived from the Constitution, through the act of Congress, and must be exercised and enjoyed in subjection to all the limitations and restrictions which that Constitution imposes."

The letter which he addressed to a Philadelphia meeting, in February, 1858, is more explicit:

"Under our Territorial system it requires sovereign power to establish and ordain Constitutions and Governments. While a Territory may, and should enjoy all the rights of self-government, in obedience to its organic law, it is not a sovereign power. The sovereignty of a Territory remains in abeyance, suspended in the United States, in trust for the people when they become a State, and cannot be withdrawn from the hands of the trustee, and vested in the people of a Territory without the consent of Congress."

The report which he made, in the same month, from the Senate Committee on Territories, is equally distinct, and rather more emphatic against his new doctrine.

"This Committee in its reports have always held that a Territory is not a sovereign power; that the sovereignty of a Territory is in abeyance—suspended in the United States in trust for the people, when they become a State; that the United States, as trustee, cannot be divested of the sovereignty, nor the Territory invested with the right to assume and exercise it, without the consent of Congress. If the proposition be true that sovereign power alone can institute governments, and that the sovereignty of a Territory is in abeyance, suspended in the United States in trust for the people when they become a State, and that the sovereignty cannot be

Manufactures in England.

We quote the following article from the *Bury (England) Guardian* of May 12:

"Wanted: Hands, heads, and hearts. If a sign of the remarkable spirit of enterprise which is abroad among us was required, the fact that the factory district in which Bury is situated is increasing the number of its mills at the rate of six a week at the present time would be significant enough. On every side we have bustling industry, new mills are rising, new companies are forming. The shillings of the working men are being clabbed together, and are competing with the rich man's pound. The manufacturing fever has seized every class. Within a small circle thirty-nine large chimneys are being raised to tell by their smoky penants the bustling industry which exists by their side. Joint-stock and co-operation companies are being formed on every hand. Vast sums of money are monthly deposited by the working classes in these concerns. In the meantime a strange and unlooked-for problem will have to be solved. Human hearts must beat, heads must think, and hands work by the side of the thrabbling machinery. Wages are high, as every one wishes they should be, but a want is being felt of persons to receive those wages. Already the people of Rosendale have been obliged to obtain labor from a distance, and at the present rate of increase the want is likely to be severely felt. Where are the additional hands to come from? On the southern downs of England, by the pastures of Dorsetshire, in the glades of Devonshire, or tending the kine in Wiltshire are the people we want. They are existing on a pittance, while the younger branches of the family are a burden rather than a blessing. It is estimated that 10,000 additional hands could be absorbed by Lancashire at the present time, and that 30,000 or 40,000 will be needed. Whence are they to be supplied? In Ireland the people are panic-stricken. They are hastening from their green fields and crystal rivers to other lands. The tide of emigration has set in, and the best of the peasantry are leaving for America. In the west and midland counties there are hundreds of girls who toil over the 'sewed muslin' work for ten or twelve hours a day for a wretched wage. Will no kind Samaritan help them to quadruple their earnings in a Lancashire factory? A Manchester agent says that he could find employment for 1000 hands among his correspondents alone. Look also at the supply of domestic servants. The demand has long ago exceeded the supply, and the wages paid are greatly in excess of other parts of the United Kingdom for a much less intelligent domestic. We are glad to know that those who 'toil and spin' are thus rewarded, and we hope that arrangements will be speedily made so that the industrial life of the community will not be crippled for the want of 'hands, heads, and hearts.'"

Valuable Philtre.

The recent reconciliation of a French couple affords a new version of an old story. Madame was fiery, and Monsieur was not long-suffering, and so "it fell upon a day" that the tongue of Madame so excited Monsieur that it fell not lovingly upon the cheek of his spouse. The lady was greatly mortified—a blow, and so soon after marriage! It was bad, but it might become worse; and so she went to consult a "cunning man," of whom there are plenty in Paris, in spite of the police, and who, notwithstanding that France takes the lead in civilization, have so many clients that the latter, not to miss their turn, are obliged to accept numbers, as they would for an omnibus on a holiday. The "cunning man," in this instance justified his title; he gave Madame a philtre, and from that time, six years ago, to the present, the spouses have lived on the best of terms. One day lately the husband was having a chat with his wife on their early marriage days. "You don't know, my love, how much you have changed since then," said Monsieur X—; "you were always nag, nag, nagging." "Not at all," replied Madame; "on the contrary, it is you who are changed—You were so brutal so—Don't you recollect you one day gave me a blow? As I could not endure this, I went to a fortune-teller, who gave me the means of rendering you quiet as a lamb!" "Stuff and nonsense!—what means?" "A philtre; and here it is," answered the lady, showing him a phial. "Every time I was likely to have a discussion with you I left the room, put a few drops into my mouth, and kept them there for a quarter of an hour. When one wishes used I ought another." The philtre might be applied with advantage on both sides of the water.

Night Air.

An extraordinary fallacy is the dread of night air. What air can we breathe at night but night air? The choice is between pure night air from without and foul night air within. Most people prefer the latter. An unaccountable choice. What will they say if it is proved to be true that fully one-half of all the disease we suffer from is caused by people sleeping with their windows shut? An open window most nights in the year can never hurt any one. This is not to say that light is not necessary for recovery. In great cities night air is often the best and purest to be had in the twenty-four hours. I could better understand shutting the windows in towns, during the day, than during the night, for the sake of the sick. The absence of smoke, the quiet, all tend to make night the best time for airing the patient. One of our highest medical authorities on consumption and climate, has told me, that the air in London is never so good as after ten o'clock at night. Always air your room, then, from the outside air, if possible. Windows are made to open, doors are made to shut—a truth which seems extremely difficult of apprehension. Every room must be aired from without—every passage from within. But the fever rages there are in a hospital the better.—*Flourish Nightingale.*

The Discovery of the Mosaic.

Among the many ethnographs which have been issued, referring to the present state of political affairs, one just out is particularly striking. It represents Senator Sewall struggling in the water, and about sinking from fatigue. Mr. Raymond, standing upon the dock in the garb of a policeman, has just grasped Mr. Greeley, charging him with having pushed Senator Sewall over; Mr. Greeley, trembling with fright, ejaculates: "Oh! no, sir, I didn't; he went too near the edge and fell off;" while Mr. J. W. Webb stands behind, urging Mr. Raymond to secure his prisoner, and asserting that he saw him push the Senator off.

The fitness of Mr. Raymond is capital, those of the other persons ordinary.—*N. York Commercial Advertiser.*

An elderly gentleman, accustomed to "indulge," entered the room of a certain inn, where sat a grave friend by the fire. Lying a pair of green spectacles upon his forehead, rubbing his inflamed eyes, and calling for hot brandy and water, he complained to his friend that "his eyes were getting weaker and weaker, and that spectacles didn't seem to do them any good." "I'll tell thee, friend," replied the Quaker, "what I think. If thou wast to wear thy spectacles over thy mouth for a few months, thy eyes would get sound again."

The Virginia University Catalogue for the present session has just been issued, showing that the number of students in attendance upon the various schools is six hundred and six; of these three hundred and thirty-nine are from Virginia. Other States are represented as follows: Alabama 40, Maryland 28, South Carolina 27, Mississippi 27, North Carolina 25, Georgia 19, Louisiana 19, Texas 15, Kentucky 10, District of Columbia 10, Tennessee 7, Missouri 7, Delaware 5, Florida 5, Arkansas 5, Pennsylvania 5, Ohio 2, New York 1, Massachusetts 1, Peru 1.

Boys reach manhood by a rather roundabout way.

"I'll be with you in a crack," as the rifle ball said to the target.

It is a good rule always to back your friends and face your enemies.

The only late which we all hear with christian patience, is the hate of those who envy us.

No one, by merely conversing with a fish, ever succeeded in drawing him out.

Success is the key of prudence and the sanctuary of wisdom.

The best way to humble a proud man is not to take any notice of him.

Do not be deceived by a facile exterior. Tender men sometimes have strong wills!

Memory is not so brilliant as hope, but it is almost as beautiful, and a thousand times as true.

Manners require tone, as nothing is more vulgar than haste. Hurry is for slaves.

In all probability the breach of promise case between Miss Carstang and Mr. Shaw has been brought to an end. Last Thursday Judge Reice overruled the motion for a new trial, and an appeal to the Supreme Court is the only course left for the plaintiff.

A quack advertises a compound that will cure everything, from a bad character to a bad temper.

A lady's home dress ought to last a long while; she never wears it out.

Mrs. Martin, of Monroe, Green county, (Wis.) was killed by lightning on Monday. The bolt entered through the window, breaking several panes of glass, and killing her instantly.

Boys reach manhood by a rather roundabout way.

"I'll be with you in a crack," as the rifle ball said to the target.

It is a good rule always to back your friends and face your enemies.

The only late which we all hear with christian patience, is the hate of those who envy us.

No one, by merely conversing with a fish, ever succeeded in drawing him out.

Success is the key of prudence and the sanctuary of wisdom.

The best way to humble a proud man is not to take any notice of him.

Do not be deceived by a facile exterior. Tender men sometimes have strong wills!

Memory is not so brilliant as hope, but it is almost as beautiful, and a thousand times as true.

Manners require tone, as nothing is more vulgar than haste. Hurry is for slaves.