New Orleans Daily Crescent.

DOUBLE SHEET.

NEW ORLEANS:

MONDAY MORNING, JULY 27, 1857.

University of Louisiana.

The annual examination of the pupils in the Collegiate Department of the University of Louisiana, passed off on Thursday and Friday with equal credit to teachers and taught. Many of the pupils displayed high attainments for their years—some excelling in one branch, and some in another—and afforded the liveliest gratification to those of their relatives and friends who honored the examination with their presence.

On Saturday evening the commencement exercises took place in the College building, at the corner of Common and Baronne streets. A large audience, composed about equally of ladies and gentlemen, filled the hall and its approaches, and, notwithstanding the oppressiveness of the weather, remained, interested and gratified, to the end. The programme of the occasion was well worth seeing through. There were speeches and orations delivered by Masters Edward Hogan, Joseph Knapp, Paul Lemonier, Alphonse Lauve, Antoine Bozonier, Arthur Claiborne, Charles Gaudin, Arthur Simon, L. Soniat, Leon Gussman, Wm. Valloft, J. Breaux, James Chalaron, —— Calhoun and Sargent A. Claiborne. The exercises were agreeably diversified by musical intervals, given by Professor Schonbeit and his superb brass band. It was down in the programme, also, that the Hon. Christian Roselius would deliver an address on the occasion; concerning which one of yesterday's daily papers contained the following: "An address was delivered by the Hon. Christian Roselius, which was, it is needless to say, all that could be desired." We were present, but neither saw nor heard the distinguished orator; and, on inquiring into the matter, were credibly informed that he was out of the State at the time. Mr. Roselius, however, has a loud voice, and it may be that he stood over at Mississippi City and delivered his address—it hardly being beyond the scope of probabilities that the far-reaching ear of our neighbor met the far-reaching voice of the speaker at the Bigolets, and was enabled to speak of the speech in advance of all cotemporaries. But "to our mutton:"

We were hardly disappointed in the absence of Mr. Roselius; for some of the boys delivered addresses that held the audience in breathless attentiveness, and won the loudest manifestations of applause. Foremost of these we must mention Master James Chalaron, who read the "Address of Spartacus to the Gladiators" in a manner which we had never before witnessed in a boy of his years. It was to this boy that, in the distribution of prizes which followed, the "Burke Medal in Elocution" was awarded by certificate; the medal being still unfinished at the jeweler's. The medal is described as a massive and beautiful affair, with appropriate inscriptions—being the prize which Glendy Burke offers annually to the greatest proficient in elocution. Master Chalaron carried off a number of other prizes, in different branches of study. He was unquestionably the lion of the occasion.

Next in excellence came Master Leonce Soniat, to whom was awarded, by certificate, the "Touro Prize in Ancient History"—a handsome golden affair, with inscriptions, worth twenty dollars—besides several minor prizes.

Mr. J. A. Breaux delivered, in fine style, an original address on "The Love of Home," which drew forth great applause. At the proper stage of the proceedings, he was presented with his diploma, conferring upon him the degree of Bachelor of Arts; together with a gold medal. He was the only pupil who graduated on the occasion. G. W. Race, Esq. presented the prizes in a graceful manner, in the absence of the President of the University.

Masters Wm. Valloft and Charles Gaudin were awarded certificates of their fine progress toward graduation.

It is the privilege of the boys in the University, prior to each annual commencement, to elect from themselves who shall receive the prize for deportment and general improvement in study. Master Arthur Simon was called forth as the honored choice of this year's election, and presented with his prize amid the most tumultuous manifestations of his school-mates. It was highly gratifying to see a whole school thus honoring one of their number.

It is the privilege of the boys, also, to elect who shall receive the first prize in the grammar department. This year they were unable to decide to whom to award the prize, Thomas Bellow, or his brother, Honore Bellow. In consequence of their inability to decide between the two, they elected both to the honors; and the brothers stepped up together and received their prizes, amid another stormy manifestation of their schoolmates and the audience.

In English, first division, Master Valloft took the first prize, and Master Lewis A. J. Lewis the second; in the second division, Master Labatut took the first prize, and Master J. B. Levert the second. A large number of other pupils received prizes proportionate to their merits, several of them carrying off four and five prizes each. We regret that we cannot spare the room to give a full list of the prizes awarded. All the prizes, except those named as medals, were books of elegant exterior and fascinating interior.

At the conclusion of the delivery of the prizes, Professor Sears announced the exhibition as closed, and the audience dispersed to a final strain from the band, satisfied of having passed a pleasant evening in one respect, but a very sweaty and disagreeable evening in another respect—the heat being much too oppressive for general comfort.

SPLENDID PRINTING.—Our friends, Messrs. Clark & Brields, of the Crescent Job Office, have latterly turned out some jobs of printing which, if they could be seen by old Faust or Guttenberg, would cause them to swear that their pet art had passed from the hands of men and become the pastime of fairies. Letters, each a picture, robed in the colors of the rainbow and the glitter of the caves, and so tastefully arranged as to impart to a steamboat bill the fascination of a landscape—and other displays equally pretty, embodying the very perfection of the typographic art, decorate the walls of Messrs. C. & B.'s office.

But this is not what we would particularly set forth. Messrs. Clark & Brields have the material and facilities for executing every description of plain printing as well as fancy—books, pamphlets, briefs, circulars, banking and mercantile blanks of all kinds, cards of all kinds—every thing, in fact, that type can be put to. And what is more, they execute their orders quickly, and charge at the most moderate rates. In all respects, as job printers, they have no superiors in the South, and few, if any, equals. We would advise our friends who want printing done to call at No. 70 Camp street, third story, and leave their orders.

NEW GROCERIES AT THE GEM.—Mr. E. L. Bercier has received some fresh supplies of groceries and provisions whose merit consists in their freshness, and of wines and liquors, whose merit consists in their age. All kinds of plain and fancy groceries—everything, in fact, necessary to the complete and sumptuous stocking of the family larder, are to be had of Mr. Bercier. We have sampled his good things and found perfect satisfaction, and would advise our friends to do likewise.

SOUTHERN FURNITURE WAREROOMS.—Those in want of furniture should, before they think of purchasing elsewhere, just go and take a look through the establishment of Mr. C. A. Stewart, Nos. 171 and 173 Canal street, between Bayonne and Dryades. If they cannot find, in Mr. Stewart's stock, all that can gratify their nicest tastes and their general ideas of beauty, luxury and economy, we can safely assert that nothing will gratify them. A man may there select a furniture outfit for his house, to suit either his taste or his purse; the furniture being various in material and pattern, and all cheap according to its kind. The latest style parlor and chamber sets are to be seen there in the most fascinating array, and it will do any housekeeper's heart good to look at them. Again we say, remember Stewart if you want anything in the furniture line. See his advertisement in another column.

STATIONERS' HALL, NO. 54 CAMP STREET.—Messrs. D. Felt & Stetson have as large and variegated a stock of blank books, paper, and fancy and staple stationery, as was ever got together in the South. Their long standing in the community, and the steadily increasing patronage which has fallen to them, enable them now to stand unsurpassed in their business both in respect to the variety and quality of their goods and the low prices at which they sell them. Few persons, not engaged in that business, can have any conception of the variety of goods that now rank under the head of "blank books and stationery." A glance at Messrs. Felt & Stetson's advertisement, in another part of our paper, will give the reader a tolerable idea of it, however. In connection with their store, it should be borne in mind, Messrs. F. & S. have a job printing office and bindery, by which they can promptly turn out to order any thing in their line that may not be instructed in their present stock. Merchants, steamboat men, and business men generally, will find Messrs. Felt & Stetson's a famous place to lay in their supplies.

FRENCH WINES, SWEETMEATS AND BLANKETS.—Messrs. Gratian, Commagere & Co., No. 20 Customhouse street, have just received large consignments of the above articles, to which they call the attention of the trade. See advertisements.

DOLBEAR'S COMMERCIAL COLLEGE, NO. 100 CANAL STREET.—All who wish to be ready for full business, should begin this week. Penmanship, book-keeping, mathematics, German, French, Spanish, English, etc., are taught. Special appointments and professors for each branch. Ladies and gentlemen are invited to call and judge for themselves.

BUCHANAN-WALKER TREACHERY IN KANSAS.

OPINIONS OF LEADING SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC JOURNALS.

Let the Masses of the People Hear, Think and Act.

We have given, heretofore, numerous denunciations of the Buchanan-Walker Treachery in Kansas, by means of which the South has been sold and betrayed, and cheated out of all chance of ever participating in the advantages which would enure from the admission of Territories into the Union as States—as slave States. Most of these denunciations have been from Democratic sources. As Americans, and as Southern men—Southern from the crowns of our heads to the soles of our feet—we have sought to place the question fairly and candidly before our constituents, without distinction of party, and to do this have quoted mostly from political opponents instead of political friends.

To show more fully to the public of Louisiana and of the Southwest what the leading Democratic journals, statesmen and State Conventions of the South think of Governor Walker's infamous conduct in Kansas—and the endorsement of that conduct by the administration of President Buchanan—we append extracts from influential Democratic papers. All we ask is that our readers read, think and act for themselves, as the proofs of the sale of the South to the Freesoilers by Walker and Buchanan, we are about to present, shall suggest. We seek nothing more than an impartial and ingenuous consideration.

The Richmond (Va.) South is one of the truest, ablest and most influential Democratic journals in the glorious old commonwealth of Virginia. In its issue of the 10th instant, it says:

A PRECEDENT IN POINT.—The telegraph reports that a Democratic Convention in Kansas has signified its approbation of Walker's policy. No doubt this circumstance will be employed by the apologists of Walker to extenuate his treachery to the South; but all sensible persons will see that it only shows the success, instead of relieving the odium, of his anti-slavery operations. With such effect has the Governor of Kansas wielded the combined influences of blandishment and intimidation, that within two short months after his first presence in the Territory, the pro-slavery party are incapable of even a semblance of resistance to his Freesoil enterprise! *Is this a thing for Southern men to exult over? Rather let them hang their heads in shame or else prepare to avenge the atrocious sacrifice of their rights.*

But we shall be told that, if the people of Kansas approve of Gov. Walker's policy, it is no business of ours to find fault with his conduct. Is it so? Is Kansas under the absolute dominion of squatter sovereignty; and may its political condition be determined for all time by a handful of impudent sojourners of a place? Has the South no property in the Territory, and no interest in its destiny? Is it nothing to us if Kansas be thrown into the scale of anti-slavery, and be made the means of Abolition aggrandizement? Are we concerned only with the manner in which the Territory is wrested from the South, and altogether indifferent to the essential fact of the sacrifice of our rights and our interests? When Robert J. Walker was appointed Governor of Kansas, everybody acknowledged that the pro-slavery party had control of the territory. At this moment it is confessed with equal unanimity *that the Abolitionists are in the ascendant, and that Kansas is irretrievably lost to the South.* These are the great facts which weigh upon the mind of the Southern people, and they are not to be lulled into stupid insensibility by any nice distinctions between twoedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

In this Kansas business we only have a repetition of the California farce. In the latter instance it was no mitigation of the atrocity of the outrage that the *people* of California ratified the usurpation of the Governor, and delivered the Territory into the power of the Abolitionists. For all that, the Legislature of Virginia, representing the universal sentiment of the South, proclaimed that the admission of California would justify a violent resistance. And so, in the case of Kansas, it matters not at all whether Gov. Walker's usurpation is approved or repudiated by the people: no subsequent ceremony of ratification, be it never so imposing, can excuse his undeniable violation of principle, or indemnify the South for the loss of Kansas.

From another article in the same number of the South, we quote:

If the Democracy assume the responsibility of Walker's conduct by signifying their approbation of his policy, it would be a flagitious abandonment of principle for which there could be no apology. In the administration of the Government the party professes to be controlled by certain fixed principles, and its integrity can be maintained only by a rigid adherence to those fundamental tenets of political faith.

The men whom it selects as the instruments of its purpose are, in honor bound, to observe the obligations imposed by its trust. If they betray its confidence, the party must repudiate them *or else be held justly accountable for their delinquencies.* In our apprehension it is impossible to separate a party from its principles. The former is only the means of carrying the latter into practical operation. When it fails to accomplish its purposes, or is converted into a mere machine for elevating this or that aspirant to this or that office, *then it deserves the reprehension of all honest men and true patriots.* We intend to remain true to the Democratic party as long as the party is true to its principles. Upon their faithful observance, in our opinion, depend the constitutional rights of the South, and with them the preservation of the Federal Union. To this extent only do we recognize the obligations of any party so far as it fulfils the objects of its organization. When the true State-Rights Democracy of the South falter in their allegiance to the doctrines of the early fathers, then we will leave them without the ceremony of a formal expulsion for insubordinate behavior.

But we have no apprehensions of such an event ever happening. Far from it. The Southern Democracy to-day are, if possible, more confirmed and determined than ever before, and upon this Kansas controversy, whatever be the final determination of the administration, they will present an unbroken phalanx of hostility to the iniquitous policy announced by Robert J. Walker. Sustained by them we have no fear of the consequences. But if it were not so, if we stood alone in our present attitude, we should continue to declare our individual opinions with the same fearless zeal, and to denounce Robert J. Walker and his abettors with all our powers of indignant invective.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Then the South has gained nothing by the election of Mr. Buchanan, upon the faith of his pledges to enforce the principle of non-intervention! So, indeed, it seems. If the Kansas bill has failed in its objects, it is because of the treachery of those who have been entrusted with the management of the Territory.

In another article the South says:

THE ABOLITIONISTS APPLAUDING THE ADMINISTRATION.—Does any man say we attach too much importance to the approval of Walker's conduct in Kansas by the Federal administration? Does any man deny that in this act slavery receives a blow, which, if not repaired, will send it staggering to inevitable and speedy downfall? Does any man counsel the South to submit in silence to this last and greatest outrage on its rights? If there be such a man who professes a loyalty to the institutions of the South, let him read the following article from the last issue of the New York Evening Post, (the leading paragraphs of that article have already been published in the Crescent,) and be admonished of the delusion which enthrals him. We offer no comment, for none is necessary to illustrate the significance of this remarkable manifesto.

The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, of the 29th of June, published the following in relation to Kansas affairs:

The convention to assemble in September for the formation of a constitution, preparatory to the application of Kansas for admission as a State, will, we suppose, determine and declare who may and who may not vote for the rejection or ratification of the constitution. If, in accordance with the mischievous suggestions of Governor Walker, it should be submitted to all the inhabitants who are in the territory at the time the vote is to be taken, there will be neither fairness, nor justice, nor legality in the proceeding; *and whether approving, ignoring or condemning slavery, if accepted under such circumstances, Congress should unhesitatingly close the doors of the Union to the people of Kansas, until they come with a constitution fairly ratified by the free and full sense of those, and none but those, who, according to the legitimate territorial laws, are entitled to exercise the elective franchise. That Gov. Walker is transgressing the authority entrusted to him by the Administration, we need no other evidence than the antecedents of the President and the Cabinet, their patriotism, their political principles and their nationality.*

From an exceedingly able and spirited article in the Blue Ridge (Va.) Republican, we cull the following extract:

The two great principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, upon which the South fought and won the last Presidential election—non-intervention and popular sovereignty—are at stake in this Kansas struggle. Mr. Walker has violated the first, in his own person, by prescribing rules to the approaching Territorial Convention, and prejudging its action, and, indeed, the action of Congress itself. He has made a stab at the vitals of the second, by proposing to place the most sacred of all laws, the organic law, in the embrace of that freelest of all political harlots, squatter sovereignty. He would have the convention frame not a convention to form a constitution, and another, and a totally different constituency, to pass upon its adoption—a proposition sufficiently absurd in itself, but more so when it is considered that the people who chose the delegates to the convention, (representing their peculiar views and wishes) might, and probably would, when the day for voting upon the adoption of the constitution arrived, by the influx of adventurers and squatters, be in a decided minority. Should Gov. Walker, therefore, succeed in carrying out his idea he will add to his other misconduct the violation of a law, which, though not statutary in its character, has the sanctity of custom. *But if it is done, in the name of common sense and common justice, let the same constituency which elected the convention pass upon the instrument of its adoption.*

The Independence (Va.) Patriot, July 1st, while exonerating the administration, is emphatic in its condemnation of Walker. It says:

As to Walker, viewing his declarations in this light, stern truth compels us to say that, in his eagerness to conciliate Northern favor, he has overstepped his instructions, and occupies, in consequence, a position incompatible and irreconcilable with an honest sense of his duty. But, that conciliation is not his purpose, we could clearly show, had we the space for other portions of his speech, in which he thought proper to fling, very unnecessarily, we think, the climatic barriers to the permanent existence of slavery in Kansas. With the evidence before us, we are left to reckon Gov. Walker in the category of Kansas traitors.

From the Wheeling (Va.) Argus, July 7:

Kansas is about to form a new Constitution—first fruit of the recent conflict. The people, under the sanction of law, have elected a Convention to frame a Constitution.

At this juncture the Hon. R. J. Walker is sent to Kansas as Governor. He commences his career by threatening to oppose the Constitution about to be formed unless it shall be submitted to a vote of all those who will inhabit the territory at some future day. The practical effect of such a measure would probably be to stimulate the "Aid Societies" to flood the Territory at the appointed time with a horde of spurious "inhabitants" to checkmate the will of the actual citizens.

From the same paper of the 9th July, we quote the following:

Now, so far as the public are yet informed, the administration has not authorized the censurable proceedings of Governor Walker. The instructions which he quotes as his authority merely direct him to see fair play when the Constitution shall be submitted to a popular vote—thus anticipating that the Convention will, or may, submit it to such a vote, but not attempting to control the action of that body in any respect. Gov. Walker, in going further and threatening to oppose the admission of Kansas in the Union, unless the constitution shall have been submitted to a vote of the "inhabitants" at a future day, appears to have exceeded his instructions. Certainly his action in this regard seems unjustifiable. What justification of it he may have offered to the administration, or what notice the latter may have taken of it, has not transpired to the public. We await the development with an abiding confidence in the rectitude and wisdom of the President.

The Martinsburg (Va.) Republican of the 4th July, in reply to an article in the Richmond South, says:

While we unite with the "South" in condemning the conduct of Gov. Walker in the particulars indicated, as unjust to the Southern people and to the advocates of slavery in Kansas, we are not prepared to take up the language of severity and denunciation with which it assails his character and his motives in the premises. * * * We dissent utterly, as at present advised, from his recent demonstrations, and earnestly hope, with the "South," that they do not meet with the entire approbation of the administration.

The Berkely (Va.) Constitution of the 3d of July says:

In order to conciliate the Abolitionists of Kansas, he (Walker) told them that unless the Convention submitted the constitution to the people for ratification, he would join them in opposing its adoption, and that the Cabinet at Washington would do the same thing. Our opinion is, that as Governor, he had no right to express such an opinion. We are informed that he has also predicted that Kansas would come in as a free State. This, if true, was a great blunder, and ought to be condemned by the South. Non-intervention and non-intermeddling is the duty of Congress, as well as of Gov. Walker; and whenever we see any breach of this cardinal rule, we oppose it.

The Jeffersonville (Va.) Advocate says:

We hope the policy of Walker is not the policy of the administration. If it be, save us forever from any further trust in a Northern President for the protection of the rights and interests of the South. What, shall the South hang to the North simply as a ward hangs to his guardian, for the purpose of protection? The South must have some other voice in the confederacy than the voice of a minor calling for guidance and guardianship. She must stand up and assert her rights and share in prescribing the bounds to aggression, or ere long her power, her influence and her wealth, will be but the allies of her enemies. Let us wait and hear the policy of the administration.

The Winchester Virginian says:

The South, and some other Southern papers, charge that Gov. Walker "is a Southern man with Northern feelings," and that he is laboring to make Kansas a Freesoil State. We have not been an inattentive observer of the evidence adduced in support of the charge, and, we regret to say, that we have *fears* that Gov. W. is about to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors, Reeder, Geary & Co., who started to Kansas with many pro-slavery protestations on their lips, which were soon falsified by their acts. Gov. W. is not a dictator, with the powers of a Russian emperor. We approved his appointment, and regret that we are constantly forced to entertain fears that he is, for reasons unknown, about to unite his fortunes with Freesoilism.

The same paper (July 1st) says:

There is now but little if any difference between the South and ourselves in reference to Gov. Walker's course in Kansas. We condemn it—decidedly condemn it—*believing that, whatever his intentions or motives are, his course is in favor of Freesoilism.* We do not, however, *at this early stage of the question*, hold the President "responsible" for the objectionable acts of Gov. W. referred to.

The Alexandria (Va.) Sentinel of the 24th ult. says:

We have read the inaugural address of Governor Walker, of Kansas, and also the report of the speech delivered at Topeka just previous to the assembling of the late Free State Convention and Legislature. Gov. Walker, in trying to advise a mode of pacification for the people entrusted to his government, seems to have acted on the assumption that those who have arrayed themselves against law in Kansas would be conciliated by concessions, or at least silenced by disarming them of all their projects. In this effort thus to draw them out of their rebellious attitude, he made some advances to them which we read with no pleasure, and which are not sustained by the quotations he makes from the instructions given him by the President. He now finds his propositions scouted and repelled by those which they were expected to silence.

From the Staunton (Va.) Vindicator, July 4:

If Gov. Walker has violated his instructions (*as he has done,*) by advocating measures violative of the doctrine of popular sovereignty, why not join the Democratic press in denouncing Gov. Walker instead of the President? If Walker has proved himself a traitor, it is no reason that the President should be one. It is not a fact that the pro-slavery men have all the power in their own hands, and that they would frame a constitution establishing slavery in Kansas. Much as this may have been desired, it is undeniable that much of the difficulty in the way has been increased by the course of the opposition press. It is too late now, we fear, to remedy the evil.

The Petersburg Democrat, July 13th, says:

We have observed in several quarters a disposition to criticise harshly the proceedings of the Georgia and Mississippi Democracy, condemning the course of Gov. Walker in Kansas, and, in some instances, this spirit has developed itself in the application of the severe epithets of "factionists" and "secessionists" to the gallant men in those States who have deemed it proper to pursue this course. Such a feeling, coupled with such language, is unusual with some of the papers in which it appears.

When the two large democratic Democratic State Conventions take occasion, by a vote nearly approaching unanimity, to solemnly pronounce an opinion on a question of public interest, it becomes a matter of important concern, and a fact of deep significance. It exhibits a feeling in the public mind not to be allayed by menaces or epithets.

From the Lynchburg Republican, June 13:

We think the Washington Union is inconsistent in its views upon the conduct of Gov. Walker in Kansas. It thinks the latter has not said or done anything of which the South should complain, or which the administration should not sanction, and yet it proceeds to condemn Walker in the most positive terms.

Walker declares that the constitution of Kansas should be submitted to a vote of all the inhabitants of the Territory for adoption or rejection, and that if it be not so submitted, Congress *will* and *ought* to reject it.

The Union, on the other hand, declares that the constitution should only be submitted to such persons whose "*bona fide*" intention to remain in the Territory is tested by a *previous residence of sufficient length.*

Now, if Walker is right, the Union is clearly wrong. If the Union is right, then Walker is wrong.

The truth is, Walker has acted very badly, and his conduct cannot be excused without an utter abandonment of the principles of the Kansas act, and of the Democratic party, and the Union ought to have the boldness to say so. It is a weakness in that journal to put forth one set of principles as its own, and commend a directly opposite set announced by Walker; and so far from its course commanding the respect, it will only excite the ridicule of the South and all impartial men.

It was none of Walker's business whether the Constitution of Kansas was submitted to the people or not. He was not sent there to make laws or direct how they should be made. He was not sent there to say what Congress would or ought to do in a given case. He was not sent there to make Kansas a free State or a slave State. He was not sent there to dictate to the convention what it should or should not do. *And it is for this impertinent dictation that the South with one voice condemn him!* He has not only said that the constitution must be submitted to the people, but he undertakes to say what people—namely, all the inhabitants of the Territory at the time of voting! With such abominable sentiments as these emanating from the highest official in Kansas, is it strange that the South should rise up as one man and condemn it?

What is said above by the Democratic press of Virginia against Governor Walker is applicable to Mr. Buchanan, as Mr. B. and his Cabinet have since approved the course of Walker. We have many more extracts before us from the justly indignant Democratic press of that State which we cannot now possibly find room for.

The Raleigh (N. C.) Standard, of the 15th inst., says:

The Mississippi and the Georgia Democracy are quite as sound as those of Virginia; and we hazard nothing in saying that they are as true and as sound as Gov. Cobb, or as Jacob Thompson himself, upon whose political escutcheon (*we mean Mr. Thompson*) not a breath of suspicion or distrust has ever been cast.

Other Democratic papers in North Carolina take the strongest ground against Walker, and consequently against the administration which sustains him, but we cannot now find room for further extracts.

So far as our knowledge extends, the entire Democratic press of South Carolina inveighs bitterly against the infamous Kansas treachery of Walker, in which he is endorsed by President Buchanan.

The Sumter (S. C.) Watchman, discussing the Kansas question, says:

Since the above was penned, we think that indications and developments, sufficiently clear and full, have reached us to leave the matter no longer in uncertainty as regards the position of Mr. Buchanan and his administration with reference to Walker's Kansas policy. It is now but too palpable that the Federal Executive—the wise, the just, the *conservative* and *constitutional* standard-bearer of the Democratic party—the political prince of Cincinnati constitution and elevation—he in whose praise and at whose election, but a short time since, exultant shouts were borne upon every Southern breeze, has betrayed the South—has endorsed the traitorous outrages of Walker to wrest Kansas from the South and deliver it over, bound hand and foot, to the myrmidons of Abolitiondom.

Speaking of the endorsement of Gov. Walker by the administration, the Cheraw (S. C.) Herald says:

'Tis some gratification, however, to know that while Mr. Buchanan seems to be placing a *new* construction upon the Cincinnati resolutions, or else abandoning ground taken only to secure his election, portions of the Democratic party are repudiating his construction and rebuking both him and his double-faced Governor for their desertion of the principles upon which they rode into power. Georgia and Mississippi have but led the way in which we expect to see the whole Southern wing of the Democracy follow. For this they are said to be "*ungracious.*" The most ungracious thing we can imagine is, to see men carried into power because of their professions of fidelity and sincerity, and when they have gained all they sought after, turn upon their friends and benefactors to heap upon them injuries and insults such as these. After securing their own elevation to power and place by such vile deception, and then treacherously use that power to crush those who have conferred it upon them, they think it exceedingly "ungracious" to be reminded of broken pledges and violated oaths.

The Charleston (S. C.) News says:

The Administration and Walker.—The telegraph now announces that the administration actually approves, instead of disapproving, as it previously reported, the course of Walker in Kansas, and thinks, forsooth, the Georgia and Mississippi resolutions ungracious. This news, if it be true, does not take us by surprise, as there was no confirmation of the first report, as Walker persistedly asserted that he followed the instructions of Mr. Buchanan, as all the Democratic Northern press were graciously smiling at the prospect of Kansas becoming a free State.

The administration approves? Does this mean Mr. Buchanan or the Cabinet, which Southern *nationals* boasts have in it four Southern men to three Northern? or the whole eight, inclusive of the President, assuming to embody the opinion of their party, the National Democrats? Did Mr. Cobb give a casting vote in favor of party, as against the South with his own State? Did Mr. Jacob Thompson, a native of Mississippi, Flourney of Virginia, and Brown of Tennessee, submit to Walker's violation of the Kansas organic act, of the rights of the Territorial government, and of those of the South?

Is this the banquet of treachery to which the South was invited, when it was seduced by political delusion into the National Convention of a party which lends all its power and influence to prevent the extension and protection of Southern institutions, and in whose national caucus the Democracy of the North held, and will hold, a controlling majority? Was it for this that South Carolina herself was put in party limbo by her national politicians?

We have already published articles from the other Charleston papers denouncing the Buchanan-Walker-Kansas policy. If Mr. Buchanan was a candidate for re-election, we do not believe he could carry a precinct in the State, so deep seated is the feeling of indignation against him.

It is well known that the Democratic State Convention of Georgia demanded the immediate recall of Walker—that Judge Brown, Democratic candidate for Governor of that State, unqualifiedly sanctions the proceedings of that Convention—and that its action is sustained by the people generally. We shall re-publish a few specimens of Georgia thought and action.

The following is the resolution of the Georgia Democratic State Convention alluded to above:

Resolved, That the inaugural address of Governor Walker, in prescribing the terms on which Congress should admit Kansas into the Union, and in attempting to dictate the submission of their constitution for ratification, and to what class of persons, constitutes a presumptuous interference in matters over which he has no legitimate control; and that the same address, in expressing his official opinion that Kansas would become a free State, and in presenting arguments to support that side of the question, is a gross departure from the principles of non-intervention and neutality which were established by the Kansas bill; and that *the convention has full confidence that Mr. Buchanan will manifest his fidelity to the principles which carried him into office by recalling Gov. Walker.*

The following is taken from the letter of Judge Brown accepting the Democratic nomination for Governor of Georgia, under date "Canton, Ga., July 9, 1857:"

I have examined carefully the platform of principles laid down by the convention, a copy of which you did me the honor to enclose, and I have no hesitation in saying that the principles adopted by the convention *command the approbation of my judgment and will receive my cordial support.*

In a speech delivered by Judge Brown in the town of Canton, Cherokee county, Ga., on the 7th of July he said, according to the report of the Atlanta Examiner:

He went at some length into the history of the Missouri compromise, and of the course taken by the Northern States in refusing to extend the line to the Pacific ocean, and to carry out the compromise in good faith. He said the restriction contained in that act had been repealed by the Kansas-Nebraska act, and had also been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case. The people had sanctioned the principles of non-intervention contained in the Kansas-Nebraska act. *They were the free principles, and upon them Mr. Buchanan had been elevated to the Presidency;* and that he believed that the President would still adhere to them and carry them out. *Justice, to say nothing of gratitude to the South, required this at his hands.* He regretted to see that Gov. Walker, of Kansas, by his late inaugural address and his Topeka speech, *had disregarded those principles, and had attempted by the exercise of his official influence to turn the scale against the South.* The Governor, in his opinion, should not have uttered a word in Kansas for or against slavery; nor should he have done anything to influence votes one way or the other, but should have left the people as the Kansas bill left them, perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way.

The Columbus (Ga.) Times and Sentinel, in its issue of the 15th inst., sternly rebuking the Washington Union, says:

"THE EXTREMISTS OF THE SOUTH."—Such is the designation cavertly applied to the Democracy of Georgia and Mississippi, by the ill-informed, and, as we suspect, the inexperienced editor of the Washington Union, for the excuse they have seen fit to take on Kansas affairs. Now, the Democracy of Georgia are not extremists, are not sectionalists, are not disturbers of the public peace, but true and loyal national Democrats, anxious for the success of the administration, and devoted to the principle of non-intervention by the Federal Government, in all its branches, with slavery in the territories. It is false, therefore, as charged by the Washington Union, that they will oppose the admission of Kansas into the Union, "if slavery is not recognized by her constitution as one of her domestic institutions." That is a question for the people of Kansas, and the Georgia Democracy will not tolerate any interference with it from any quarter, and have confidently expressed the opinion that the President of their choice will see to it that they will be protected in the full, free and undisturbed enjoyment of this great right, and will rebuke the impertinent intermeddling of Gov. Walker with questions ever which he has nothing to do.

The Democracy of the South have not made any issue with the Administration. They claim no advantage over their Northern brethren in the territories. All they require is even handed justice in the administration of the Government. They have demonstrated a clear and palpable departure from the Democratic platform by an Executive appointee. They know they are right, and confidently appeal to the National Democracy to sustain their cherished principles. *Bluster and epithets will not deter them from pursuing the path of duty. They stand on the Cincinnati Platform—Walker is off of it, and off he must go. Walker are off of it.* And yet the Georgia and Mississippi Democracy are held up before the country as extremists—as secessionists—as enemies of the administration—by the Washington Union. What is their offence?

We cannot afford any more space to the indignant Democracy of Georgia just now. We could fill columns. What we have given shall answer with all honest and patriotic men.

We now come to the Democracy of unflinching Alabama. Col. Stallworth is the Democratic candidate for Congress in the Mobile district. He delivered a speech lately at Cahawba, in the course of which, according to the report of the Selma Sentinel—a rabid Democratic journal—he said:

Col. Stallworth then said that he believed that Gov. Walker, of Kansas, was guilty of officious intermeddling with affairs strictly belonging to the people of Kansas, and therefore had been guilty of *violating the very first principles and objects* of the territorial bill—this he censured, but before repudiating the administration, he wanted to see palpably that Mr. Buchanan countenanced this unusual and extraordinary conduct of Governor Walker—he was yet disposed to believe that Mr. Buchanan was true to the Constitution, the principles of the Kansas Nebraska law, but should it prove unfortunately to be true that Mr. Buchanan should endorse the conduct of Walker, thereby violating the great principles promulgated by the Democracy through the Kansas Nebraska law, *he would repudiate Mr. Buchanan, and urge the Southern people to rally as a unit in demanding their rights in the Union if they could, but out of it if they must.*

The Mobile Register says:

FRESH DEVELOPMENTS.—If any doubt existed heretofore of Gov. Walker's undisguised treachery to the South, and his shameless abandonment of that neutrality which the responsibility of his official station clearly imposed, it is removed by his speech at Topeka, Kansas, on the 9th instant, as reported in the Kansas Statesman. He not only assures the Freesoilers of his cordial co-operation with them in case the constitution is not returned for ratification, but asserts his power to compel this course or secure its rejection by Congress. He goes farther, and insolently intimates that Mr. Buchanan will support their cause. It is needless for us to say that we believe this declaration to be utterly false, a mere menace, intended to intimidate the members of the convention, or a contemptible piece of roguery, designed to mislead and subsidize the Free State party.

The Huntsville (Ala.) Democrat concludes a long article as follows:

Governor Walker has thrown his influence as far as he dare do it, against the South, and deserves its execration, and, we think, the sooner the administration can relieve itself from the responsibility of his acts the better for it. By the time he has run the gauntlet of the next Congress, we feel confident he will wish he had observed, at least, "an armed neutrality" in Kansas affairs, and left his isothermal theory unbroached.

On another occasion, the Mobile Register said:

The Union of the 9th inst. talks about "extremists North and South," "impudent intrusion," etc., etc., as if it had forgotten that the South was silent and acquiescent until Gov. Walker obtruded these issues upon her, or as if the sovereign States of this Union were not the owners of the Territory and entitled to see that their interests were properly protected in it. But we forbear further comment. The South is as honest and earnest in her condemnation of Governor Walker as she was in her support of Mr. Buchanan; and while she acts "more in sorrow than in anger," there will be no division among her people on this subject. *Alabama will take position by the side of Georgia and Mississippi, and one by one the band of Southern sisters will gather under the same standard.* If we surrender the doctrine of non-intervention, the Kansas-Nebraska act is worthless, the Dred Scott decision a nullity, and there is no protection for us in the arm of the Federal Government. We believe that we shall have said no *other than the sentiments of a large majority of those who elected Mr. Buchanan to the Presidency*, who are loyal to his administration and will support its measures, so long as they can do so in justice to the South. We regret that anything has been done or said to produce embarrassment or division, but we of the South are innocent. Those who hurled the fire-brand must be responsible for the conflagration. Duty leaves us but one alternative.

Here we are constrained to close our Alabama extracts. We have given enough to show the position of the Democracy of that State in regard to the Walker-Buchanan treachery.

In Louisiana the course of Gov. Walker has been severely criticised by the New Orleans Courier, Baton Rouge Advocate, Shreveport Gazette and other leading Democratic journals. We quote from the Shreveport Gazette of the 11th July:

GOV. ROBERT J. WALKER.—The unexpected duplicity of the new Governor of Kansas; (as set forth in his lengthy *Inaugural Address*) his base betrayal of the rights of the South, together with his cunning and unlucky plot to surrender to the free State fanatics of the territory the advantages of the victories they have gained and to bring Kansas in a *Free State* into the Union, should call down upon him and his posterity the most bitter and unrelenting execrations known to an enlightened, intelligent and free people. On a subject of such a character there should be but one voice (in every State south of Mason and Dixon's line) and it should be loud, long and emphatic in *condemning all such traitors to the administration of justice and equal rights.* The legal representative of a great Government that will condescend to play second fiddle to *freesoilism* with a view to his own elevation *should at once be removed from office*, and required (by the people) to remain in the shades of an endless oblivion. Walker's vaulting ambition has overshot the mark, which will finally leave him nothing but the stinging consciousness of guilt. We cannot for a moment suppose that Gov. Walker has the least authority to identify (which he impudently does) Mr. Buchanan and his *cabinet* with his *infamous and unveiled for policy.* With an air of complacency, impertinent as it is false, he also affirms that the next Congress will support his cause and will beyond doubt reject *Kansas* from admission into the Union unless her citizens conform to his views.

This, in our opinion, will prove a base falsehood, and his assertions, as regards Mr. Buchanan and his cabinet, are just as groundless. From present developments, we consider Walker totally unworthy of public confidence or belief, and we deeply regret to see the Washington Union, as well as other important papers of like calibre, comparatively silent on a subject of such grave and vital importance to the whole country. While we are conciliatory in our views, and decidedly conservative on all subjects touching the great interests of the Union, we do not hesitate, for a moment, to denounce any set of *men* or *measures* that have for their object the injury or destruction of the South.

Just here we will say that the South *has an undoubted right to demand the immediate recall of Walker.* Had it not been for the unanimity of action in the late Presidential election, Mr. Buchanan could not have been elected; therefore, he is at least under obligations to see that her constitutional rights are properly guarded and well protected. We fully endorse the Georgia and Mississippi resolutions condemnatory of Walker, and sincerely hope they may *have sufficient weight to effect his speedy removal.* The legitimate and constitutional rights of the South demand that a propagandist of abolitionism should not preside over the destinies of a territory where her interests are nearly or quite supreme.

We will now proceed to glance at our sister State of Mississippi. The Democratic State Convention of Mississippi assembled in the city of Jackson on the 22d of June last, and continued in session two days. The select committee, to whom was referred a resolution in relation to the inaugural address of Gov. Walker, of Kansas, made the following report, which was received and adopted. We quote from the official journal of the Convention, as it appeared in the Jackson Mississippian, of the 1st inst:

The committee to whom was referred the resolution relative to the inaugural address of Gov