



"TO THINE OWN SELF BE TRUE, AND IT MUST FOLLOW, AS THE NIGHT THE DAY, THOU CANST NOT THEN BE FALSE TO ANY MAN."

BY ROBT. A. THOMPSON.

PICKENS COURT HOUSE, S. C. SATURDAY, AUGUST 28, 1858.

VOL. X.—NO. 6.

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES L. ORR,
Delivered at Craytonville, S. C., on Thursday
the 12th of August, 1858.

My FRIENDS: The warm and generous tribute you pay me to-day is the greatest triumph of my life. My heart is touched with the deepest emotions of gratitude for such manifestations of friendship from you, the companions of my boyhood. I am standing to-day upon the soil that gave me birth surrounded by the friends of early youth—surrounded by the friends of my venerated parents—those who have known me longest and who have known me best; and to be esteemed by you worthy of such an ovation as greets me is indeed the highest honor I have ever won. I can find no language that will truly tell you how profoundly grateful and thankful I feel for this crowning manifestation of your affectionate devotion to me. I thank you; and if you could look into my heart you would see how much of the feeling of the soul it conveys.—Through life I shall cherish the memories of this day as the brightest and most honorable of my existence.

I propose to-day to speak to you, of a few of the leading measures that engaged the attention of Congress at its last session—of the Slave Trade, and of the power and purpose of the Democratic party to preserve the Constitutional rights of all sections, and to maintain the Union of these States.

The most exciting topic of the late session was the proposition to admit Kansas as a State into the Union under the Lecompton Constitution. The Territorial Legislature of Kansas had by law authorized the election of delegates in June, 1857, to frame a State Constitution. The delegates were chosen—many of the voters of Kansas not appearing at the polls, but it was their own fault that they absented themselves. The Convention met and organized in September, but adjourned over for some weeks when it re-assembled, adopted a Constitution and ordinance, and adjourned *sine die*. A clause was inserted in the Constitution in effect making Kansas a slaveholding State. This clause was submitted by the Convention to the qualified voters of the Territory, on the 21st of December; if a majority voted for the clause, it was to remain a part of the Constitution—if against it, then it was to be stricken from the Constitution before that instrument was submitted to Congress. On the 21st of December the voting took place, and the returns showed that some six thousand votes had been cast, a large majority of which were in favor of retaining the clause referred to. It was alleged that many more votes were returned than were actually cast and I am of the opinion that the allegation was not altogether groundless. At the election in October last, for members of the Territorial Legislature, the "Free State" party elected a majority of their representatives, and after the Convention adjourned, Mr. Stanton, the acting Governor, called an extra session of that Legislature prior to the 21st of December. It passed a law to submit the whole Constitution to the people for adoption or rejection early in January. At that election some ten thousand votes were returned against the Lecompton Constitution and very few in favor of it. It was alleged that many more votes were returned at this election than were cast, and I have no doubt that the allegation was true. The truth is, the Free State men did not attend the polls in December nor the pro-slavery men in January and I apprehend that both parties were guilty of gross frauds in making the returns.—If the Convention at Lecompton was a lawful body, (and its legality is abundantly established from point to point, from its inception to its adjournment,) then a Territorial Legislature, by an act passed subsequently, could not alter, change or modify the proceedings of the Convention. The convocation, therefore, of the Legislature by Mr. Stanton, to do an act which was clearly illegal—namely, to submit the whole Constitution at another time, when the Convention had submitted only the Slave clause, on the 21st of December, was unwarranted and culpable—so unjustifiable that the President promptly removed him. The vote against the Constitution in January could not then be recognized as possessing any valid force, because it was not in conformity with the ordinance of the Convention—a legal body.

One of the clauses of the ordinance—and the ordinance was as valid and binding as any part of the body of the instrument—provided in effect for appropriating in round numbers 25,000,000 of acres of the public land for educational and internal improvement purposes, when Congress had never given any other State more than 5,000,000 of acres on admission for those purposes. The Constitution was communicated by the President to the Senate late in the winter, and a bill was there introduced providing for the immediate admission of Kansas into the Union, without any condition precedent, but requiring that the Legislature of Kansas should by act release to the United States the excess of 20,000,000 of acres of the public land claimed in the ordinance; and here let me say, suppose the bill had become a law, and Kansas had omitted or refused to make the release, how would the rights of the United States have been enforced? Could you have turned her out of the Union, with her Senators and Representatives, upon such omission or refusal? If the United States had attempted to exercise rights of ownership,

and it had been resisted by Kansas, would we not have been compelled to vindicate our rights by Federal bayonets? Who would not look with painful solicitude upon such a collision between the United States and one of its members? This view, in my judgment, makes the Conference bill, which finally passed, preferable to the original Senate bill, especially as the former recognized every vital principle contained in the latter, and in addition guarded against this grave difficulty which has greatly magnified the longer I have contemplated it. The Senate bill led to a masterly debate in that body. The Republicans opposed the admission on the ground mainly because the Constitution recognized slavery, and Mr. Douglas and his friends on the ground that no State should be admitted until the Constitution was ratified by a popular vote of the people. It was replied by the Democrats that the Congress could only inquire whether a State asking admission had a republican form of government, and that every territory seeking admission had the right to enter the confederacy whether it established or repudiated slavery, and that it was not for Congress to admit or reject on any such ground. They replied to Mr. Douglas that the Lecompton Constitution had the legal, fundamental right to submit or withhold all or a part of the Constitution from popular ratification—that it had refused, whether wisely or unwisely it is not necessary to discuss, to submit any other than the slavery clause, and that their decision must be final, if the legal existence of the body was not wholly repudiated. It was answered to those who objected that the Constitution did not embody the will of a majority of the people of Kansas, that even in popular Governments like ours, to avoid anarchy and complete demolition of the social fabric, that the popular will must be ascertained pursuant to the requirements and provisions of law—that the people of Kansas were authorized to express by ballot whether they desired a Convention or not—a majority of those voting said they did; they were authorized by law to elect delegates—they did elect delegates, and those delegates framed a constitution; that the delegates submitted the slavery clause to a vote, and a majority of those voting were in favor of retaining it; and that after all these opportunities to express their opinion legally through the ballot box, it could not be claimed by them that the Constitution did not reflect their sentiments. If it did not, who was at fault? Who was to blame? None but themselves, when they refused to go to the ballot box, but preferred faction and discord to the legal and peaceable settlement of the disputed issues.

The bill passed the Senate, but failed in the House, and was amended by the substitution of a new proposition by Mr. Montgomery, of Pennsylvania. His amendment provided in substance that the Lecompton Constitution should be submitted to the people—the slavery clause included, and that if a majority of the bona fide inhabitants of Kansas should vote for its ratification, upon that fact being certified to the President of the United States, he should by proclamation declare Kansas admitted as one of the States of the Union. If a majority voted against it, then the Lecompton Constitution was defunct. The objection to the Montgomery amendment was two-fold—first, it asserted a power in Congress to override the Convention which represented the inchoate sovereignty of Kansas, by submitting the instrument for popular ratification, when the Convention representing the people in the only legal form in which they could speak, repudiated such ratification; and secondly, it devolved on the President the power by his will and in his discretion to admit a new State when the Constitution of the United States conferred the power of admitting new States only on "the Congress" of the United States, and not on the President.

The vote on this amendment developed however, the most anomalous tergiversation in the professed principles of the Abolition-Republican party—the baldest abandonment of long cherished political tenets that I ever saw, heard or read of; and if its effects are not greatly to demoralize their organization, then their rank and file are less honest than I supposed them to be.—One of the cardinal articles of their political faith in the Presidential election was uncompromising opposition to the admission of any more slave States—it was the plank of their platform, and in two brief years the leaders of that party actually vote to admit Kansas as a slave State with the slavery clause in the Constitution under their very noses, if a majority of her people favored the Lecompton Constitution. The principle they voted was all that the South claimed in the ten years' contest upon the slavery issue. The doctrine of the South and of the "constitution is, that a State is entitled to admission in the Union with or without slavery, just as a majority of the people making the application shall decide. The Republicans, despite their protestations have succumbed, and stand upon the record committed to the very principles on this point which they have so fiercely assailed the northern Democrats for maintaining, nor can they escape from the consequences of that vote by pretending that it was given to defeat the Senate bill; if the Republicans of the House had voted alone on the amendment, there might have been some plausibility in the excuse, but every Republican in the Senate (except

Durkee) also voted for it, when they knew that such a vote would not defeat the Senate bill. Knowing with absolute certainty that a vote for the amendment would not and could not defeat the original bill, why did the Republican Senators vote for it? How did they vote for it, as it was not even with them a choice of evils, without a complete renunciation of their principles?

The vote was an important one, if looked to only as a party triumph for the Democracy; but it was infinitely more important as signifying the repulsion which had occurred in the Northern mind against the extreme sectional doctrines of the Republican party. The conservative people of the North who united with that party in 1856, and aided in bearing the flag of Fremont, have had time for sober, calm reflection—they have made up their minds to repudiate the extreme sectionalism of the Philadelphia platform, and the vote on the amendment was a concession by the leaders to the moderate men of the party.

The amendment was defeated in the Senate, and a Committee of Conference appointed by the two Houses. The Committee reported what is now called the English bill, which finally passed both Houses, and was approved by the President. The English bill is, in my judgment, open to fewer objections than the original Senate bill. It recognizes the validity of the Lecompton Constitution, including the slavery clause—recognizes the right of a State to secede into the Union with slavery—recognizes a pro-slavery Constitution, a Republican form of Government under the Constitution of the United States, and actually admits Kansas on a condition which has heretofore been applied to Iowa and Michigan—a condition precedent and not subsequent, as the original bill did. The bill requires that the assent of the people of Kansas to a reduction in the quantity of land as claimed in their ordinance, so as to conform in quantity with lands donated to other new States shall be given before admission, and avoid the difficulty in the Senate bill already referred to; and it has consequently been referred to the people to decide in effect, "will you consent to reduce the amount of land claimed from twenty-five to five million of acres?" If a majority vote aye, Kansas is one of the States of the Union—if nay, she is remanded to her Territorial condition, there to remain until a census shows her to have a population equal to the ratio of representation, now fixed at about 93,000. The Constitution is not submitted to the people for ratification—only the change in the ordinance is to be passed upon by them. Many may vote against the change because they object to other features in the Constitution, knowing that such vote will defeat admission, but the change of ordinance is the only question submitted.

Some scattering returns of the election held the first Monday in this month indicate the rejection by the people of the proposed change by a decisive majority, and such, I doubt not, will be the result.—Whilst I believe there is no prospect of making Kansas a slave State, and have so believed from the organization of the Territory, I do not concur with our able and distinguished Senator, Mr. Hammond, that the Kansas-Nebraska bill was a cheat and a humbug. I do concur in most that he said in his late admirable speech at Beech Island—a speech which is conservative, dignified and statesmanlike, maintaining that high reputation for ability which he so justly and properly enjoys.

During the pendency of the Nebraska bill every Senator and every Representative from the South who expressed any opinion on the subject, except Gen. Atchison, of Mo., admitted that slavery would not go into Kansas; and the only chance which has since existed, had its origin in the impertinent interference by the Emigrant Aid Societies in forcing a population there that would not have, under the usual laws of emigration, removed to the Territory. It aroused an interest in the South which would not have existed, and carried thousands of Southern men there who would not otherwise have gone. But the bill was important, because it wiped out that odious Missouri restriction which degraded us from a just equality with the free States, in permitting us the privilege of removing to the common Territory of the Union with our property, and restored the true principles of the Constitution in the organization of territorial governments. It has settled the policy of the Government on this subject—no interference by Congress with slavery in the territories—the people, when they form a State Constitution, are to determine the question for themselves. The decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case protects our rights during the existence of the Territorial Government. Although we have not added another slave State by the Kansas bill, we have secured an important principle which is to result most beneficially in preserving the rights and securing the tranquility of the country in future legislation.

Another question gave rise to an animated debate, especially in the Senate, and some of the speakers, in their earnest denunciation of the right of visitation and search exercised by British vessels upon our merchant marine, nearly forgot to temper their indignation with dignity. The exercise of this right by Great Britain had already produced one war, and the treaty of Ghent was negotiated, leaving the original cause of quarrel undisturbed. This country has maintained a fixed purpose never to

submit to the exercise of the right of search by any power, and when our vessels reported that they had in numerous cases been stopped by British cruisers on the high seas and searched, it fired the whole country with indignation, and assumed a most threatening aspect. Mr. Buchanan, through his Secretary of State, took prompt and decisive action on the premises and required a disavowal or an apology for the conduct of her officers by the Government of Great Britain, and an unequivocal notice that if the exercise of the right was insisted on, that it would inevitably lead to a collision between the two countries. The British Cabinet promptly disavowed the acts of her officers, and submitted the question to the crown officers, (their legal advisers) whether the right was sanctioned by international law. They have furnished a response, and decide that no power can exercise the right of visitation or search on the high seas in time of peace. The British Ministry accept their interpretation of international law, and have most honorably renounced all pretension to exercise a right which they claimed, and which even a war failed to extort from them a relinquishment.—The conduct of the Ministry has received the approval of both Houses of Parliament, and the war cloud no longer threatens us.

Before an explanation, however, was made, and when it appeared that it was the design of Great Britain wantonly to assert this controverted right, the people everywhere had made up their minds to resist it, if necessary at the point of the bayonet. The loyal spirit which it evoked was truly refreshing; it gave indubitable proof that the sectional strife and discord which has for years so seriously preyed upon us had not banished all patriotism, and that men did not stop to inquire whether the indignity was heaviest on the North or the South—it was an insult to our common flag, and was to be redressed by every true son of America.

The prudence and good sense of the American and British Cabinets promptly terminated the contest, and good fellowship now exists between the Lion and the Eagle. In his last annual message to the Legislature of this State, Gov. Adams, branched the subject of reopening the African Slave Trade. I deeply regretted to see the subject mooted, knowing the scheme was wholly impracticable, and believing it to be impolitic, if practicable. Its only effect was to produce division and discord among the Southern people. If the scheme should have sufficient vitality to form even a small party, it could serve no other purpose than to carry one portion of the South against another, when perfect unanimity was so desirable.

To demonstrate its impracticability (the laws prohibiting it are Federal) a few days after the message was published, I introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives, declaring "that it was the policy of the United States to repeal the laws prohibiting the African Slave Trade," which was adopted with but eight dissenting votes—seven of whom subsequently declared themselves opposed to reopening the trade. Is it not folly, then, to agitate the question, when the only power that can open the trade expresses so unanimous an opinion against it?

The recent Commercial Convention at Montgomery, of Georgia to advance and promote the commercial interests of the South, in utter obliviousness of its mission, devoted most of its time to a discussion of the Slave Trade and the Conference bill, and whilst there was prudence and wisdom sufficient even in that inflammable body to table reports and resolutions, it cannot be disguised that some persons are determined to agitate the question, and if possible divide and distract the South on abstraction. Who believes that the laws prohibiting that trade will ever be repealed, so long as this Government exists? Who is so credulous as to believe that a majority of the Representatives of the South will ever vote for their repeal? Does it not take a sanguine man to persuade himself that a single county in any State would elect a representative to the State Legislature on such an issue? Why agitate, then? Is it to furnish Black Republicans with material to keep up a counter-agitation in their section of the Union.

But if the trade could be opened, it would be ruinous to all the Southern States East and North of Mississippi. It is assumed that we want labor, and for what? To make more cotton, so that the price may be reduced for the benefit of the Eastern and European manufacturer, and the consumer of cotton goods. The rich alluvial soils of Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas will remunerate the planter for his capital and labor better at five cents per pound for cotton than the lands of South Carolina at 10 cents, because in the West the same labor will produce double the quantity. Now, if Africans are introduced in such numbers "as to enable every man to buy a slave," what number of bales will be annually produced by this increased labor? The average crops now are about 3,000,000 bales, and the price for a few years has averaged 10 cents per pound—the supply keeps pace very nearly with the demand. If the increased labor would make 4,500,000 bales, to what price would it descend? Would it command five cents, and if not, what District in South Carolina could afford to grow cotton at that price?

If the Northern or English manufacturer were advocating this scheme, I could understand it; but why Southern planters should be urged to adopt a policy which is to depreciate their productions for the benefit of the consumers, is to me inexplicable. A few years since when we were opposing the Wilmot proviso, one of the dangers most to be apprehended, we were told, was that our slave population would soon become so numerous by natural increase that they would become valueless; now that event is sought to be hastened by pouring in upon us a horde of wild Africans.

Look to the effect it is to have on our slaves themselves. Will you not be placing the instruments of insubordination and rebellion upon every plantation? Our present slave population has been for several generations reeling that point of civilization and subordination which they have attained; they

have learned from their very infancy that the white man is their superior, and that his word and will is their supreme law; nor are they restive or impatient under his domination. All fears of insurrection have vanished, and we sleep in the assurance of perfect security in the densest slave districts. How was it a hundred years ago? Go to your statute book, and you will find that for the purpose of preventing or promptly quelling insurrection among the slaves—many of whom at that time were recently from the wilds of Africa—that every white male inhabitant was required to carry with him his fire-arms and a certain number of cartridges to church under a penalty. Do you desire to see such a state of affairs revived in this country? If you do not, keep from contact with our slaves, these fierce savages, who have known nothing but war and rapine, and who will not quietly brook the restraints which our security would require us to impose on them.

The argument so flippantly repeated by its advocates that it will better the physical and moral condition of the African to transplant him here as a slave, does not satisfy my mind that it would be just or right. Are we to constitute ourselves the judges of what will improve the condition of other nations, and proceed to execute that judgment, against their consent? If the argument is worth anything for the African, would it not apply equally to the European or the Asiatic? How many of the sons and daughters of Europe and Asia would be elevated in their moral and physical condition if they were transplanted, even as slaves, in this country?—Could they be numbered by less than hundreds of millions? Would it be right to constitute ourselves their judges, and then become the executioners of our judgment, to make them slaves? Away with such doctrines and principles! They have no foundation in humanity, philosophy, morality or religion.

I now proceed to consider the power and purpose of the Democratic party to uphold the Constitution and preserve the Union. I was gratified to see that Senator Hammond, in his late speech, declared that he did not perceive the significance of the term "States Rights Democrats" and "National Democrats" at the present time. The organization of the party is upon certain declared principles—they are general, and address themselves to the confidence of men who subscribe to those principles residing in all sections, and if the party is designated as the "National Democracy," it is because its tenets are not restricted to any section, but embrace the whole Union, and not because any of its principles are centralizing or consolidating. It has outlived the Whig party, the Know Nothing party, and I trust it will survive the Republican party. My observation teaches me that those in the South who are most bitter in their denunciation of the "National Democracy" (as they are pleased to designate it) are either know nothings or *per se* disunionists, and as I have no principles in common with either of them, I have for years been content to receive their strictures and animadversions with patient pleasure.

I say to you, fellow-citizens, that the Democratic party is entitled to your cordial sympathy as well as your zealous support. It is the only exponent of the principles you have cherished for many long years, and is the only party willing and able to maintain your rights in the Union. When it is defeated or disintegrated, you must choose between a submission to sectional fanatic domination and a dissolution of the existing Government. Its principles have received the sanction of judgment from my earliest manhood, and since 1852 I have acted in full harmony and fellowship in its organization, and why? There had been in 1850 and 1851, in most of the Southern States, a contest between what was called the States Rights and Union parties, growing out of the passage of the Compromise measures. It resulted in a determination on the part of the South to acquiesce in it, and when the convention met at Baltimore in June, 1852, to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, I found there (as a spectator, and not as a delegate) both wings of the Democracy—the States Rights and Union. They affiliated in making the nominations, and both heartily united in adopting a platform of principles. The contest of '50 and '51 had revived into a living issue the old States Rights doctrines of '38 and '39. Except, perhaps, in Virginia and South Carolina, previous to that time they had nearly become obsolete. The States Rights men insisted that these resolutions should be incorporated in the platform, and became a vital article in the Democratic creed. It was unanimously conceded, and the resolutions of '38 and '39—the very corner-stone of the highest exposition of States Rights, was incorporated in the platform. It made the Democratic creed perfect, and from that moment, I determined upon a hearty and cordial affiliation with the party in its organization. In 1856, at Cincinnati these principles were re-adopted, and the Democracy from Maine to Texas, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, pledged in the most solemn manner to the support and maintenance of the strictest reading of the States Rights doctrines. Every man, therefore, of that faith must affiliate with the Democracy if he expects aid in enforcing his views on the administration of the Government. The Democratic party, if it continues true to its creed and principles, is as good as States Rights party as I desire to associate with. I go further: no conscientious man can be a Democrat standing on that platform who is not a States Rights man. With these undeniable facts before us, does not the assumption of a few persons in the South that they are *par excellence* the States Rights Democrats rest upon a narrow basis? The feud between the two wings was buried at Baltimore in 1852 by all uniting on a common platform; the treaty of amity and friendship was re-affirmed at Cincinnati in 1856, and is it good faith in either of the former wings to make a peculiar appropriation of any of the tenets of the common party. If Madison and Jefferson are authority, then the Democratic party is imbued with all the elements of State Rights. If their views are considered too moderate for any modern statesman, then such may except to the creed of the Democracy; but believing as I do, that it is the only principle upon which this Government can be safely or justly administered, I am perfectly content to take the position of the able and patriotic

men who formed the Constitution, and who elucidated its principles during the administration of Mr. Jefferson.

Mr. Pierce placed himself on this platform of 1852; when he accepted the nomination. Did not every act of his Administration exhibit unswerving fidelity to its principles? Mr. Buchanan did the same thing in 1856. In what single act of his Administration has he repudiated the platform, or ignored any article of the State Rights creed? So it will be in 1860, and will continue as long as the Democratic party maintains its organization. It could scarcely be otherwise—the Executive, upon his nomination, solemnly pledges himself to his friends and opponents that he will administer the Government in strict conformity to the principles laid down by his friends; if those principles do not reflect his sentiments, and he cannot carry them into execution, every sentiment of honor would impel him to decline the nomination. When he accepts, to prove faithless to his pledges, would entail on him such deep dishonor as to drive him in shame from the face of society; and I undertake here to say, that no man who will ever become the standard bearer of the Democracy for the Presidency will have the temerity to traitorously abandon the principles and platform upon which he is elected. What has the Democratic party done to manifest its faith by its works? The statute book of Congress will show that all your constitutional rights are now more fully recognized, and more effectually protected—that your cherished principles are more intimately incorporated in the laws and policy of the Government than they have been for forty years and you are indebted to the Democratic party for it all. It has done much, very much to restore the principles that signalized the Republican Administration of Mr. Jefferson. It was the Democratic party that crushed the Bank, that reduced the Tariff, and placed it upon a revenue basis—that wiped out the bankrupt and distribution acts. It annexed Texas; and here let me say, that important as was its acquisition to the whole country, to the South it was indispensable for her safety, foreign and domestic, and yet the elections which resulted in the triumph of that policy, when Polk and Clay were the candidates, showed a larger relative vote in favor of annexation by the North than the South. Mr. Clay, who was opposed to it, received a larger *pro rata* vote in the South than he did in the North; and Mr. Polk received a larger *pro rata* vote in the North than the South. The issue was made in the platform of 1844, and the Northern Democracy maintained it with a noble energy that crowned our common efforts with success. It annexed California, Utah and New Mexico. It strangled the Wilmot Proviso—adopted the policy of non-intervention in organizing Territorial governments; repealed the odious Missouri restriction, and restored to our rights in the territories—planted itself upon the doctrine that slave States had equal rights to admission in the Union with free States, and as a party voted to admit Kansas as a slave State under the Constitution. It passed the Fugitive Slave Law, and will require Cuba for us at the earliest practicable day. Every measure detrimental to your rights and violative of your interpretation of the Constitution that has been defeated, has been defeated by the Democratic party. In saying what I have said for that party with reference to slavery, I do not intend to convey to you the impression that it is a pro-slavery party. It does not profess any such thing—many, perhaps most of its members, are opposed to slavery in the abstract, and opposed to introducing it in their respective States; but what I intend to assert and maintain is, that as a party in its platform and votes it recognizes all our Constitutional rights on the slavery question, and the Northern portion of it, notwithstanding their abstract opinions, with manly courage and catholic patriotism, sustain and enforce those rights by their votes in the State and Federal councils. We have never asked more of them—we have never asked the Government to use its power to extend slavery. All we have claimed has been that the guarantees which the Constitution gives us shall not be broken, and the Democratic party have steadily maintained them and will continue to maintain them. It is the only party that meets and combats the sectionalism of Republicanism, and the only hope of keeping it prostrate, is the Democratic party of the Union, North and South. We have true, brave, gallant friends in the North—men who have bared their bosoms in many a hard-fought battle when the issue was the defence of your Constitutional rights. Will you give them your sympathy—will you cheerfully and cordially affiliate with them in their war upon abolition? It is in my judgment a matter of duty for every Southern man to sustain the only party that sustains our interpretation of the Constitution.

Nor should our confidence be destroyed in the fidelity of our associates in the North because some may falter and others desert. You might as well repudiate religion, because the churches oftentimes cherish in their bosoms hypocrites, or repudiate all friendship, because occasionally base ingratitude follows kindness. The course of a distinguished Senator from Illinois, Judge Douglas, on the admission of Kansas, excited surprise and regret. The hostile attitude he assumed towards the Administration and the body of the party, created an apprehension that he was paving the way into

the hands of our enemies in the North because some may falter and others desert. You might as well repudiate religion, because the churches oftentimes cherish in their bosoms hypocrites, or repudiate all friendship, because occasionally base ingratitude follows kindness. The course of a distinguished Senator from Illinois, Judge Douglas, on the admission of Kansas, excited surprise and regret. The hostile attitude he assumed towards the Administration and the body of the party, created an apprehension that he was paving the way into