DAILY APPEAL.

MEMPHIS.

THURSDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 26, 1857.

GOV. WISE'S LETTER.

Much of our space this morning is devoted to a very able and characteristic letter from Gov. Wise, of Virginia, addressed to the editor of the Richmond *Enquirer*. Its length should not prohibit any one from giving it a calm and dispassionate perusal. For many years past, we have been accustomed to look upon Gov. Wise as a safe and trusty pilot over the troubled sea of politics, and on touching the questions now before the country, we regard his positions in this letter as thoroughly orthodox.

THANKSGIVING.

The Executive of Tennessee having, by Proclamation, recommended this day as one of Thanksgiving and Prayer, it is due to the religious sentiment of our nature, and to the manifest and manifold blessings which have been vouchsafed to us, as a people, that our community should duly observe it as such.

All classes in the community are under obligations to participate in this observance—not as a burden, but as a blessing—not by way of reluctant and grudging formality, but as a cheerful offering to the Almighty Sovereign of the Universe, whose gracious hand provides for the wants of all his creatures and who spreads out the table of his bounty to all the world. The rich and the poor alike—the righteous and the wicked—the great and the lowly should stand together and send forth from thankful souls the acknowledgment of untold mercies and the prayer of continued blessings. They who tread saloons where art and taste preside and where wealth has exhausted itself in ornament, who woo pleasure with unceasing devotion and give no serious thought to the earnest realities of human life may not safely forget Providence, because even their ends are shaped by Him, and a mutation held in store for them of which they little dream, amid their gilded playthings and the deceitful smiles by which they are surrounded. Let them cease their revels and their roaster awhile, and give their minds to sober contemplation, to cheerful thanksgiving for the bounties of Heaven with which they are specially blessed. They may "cut" a plain or disagreeable acquaintance whose externals do not match their own—they may even turn their back upon a "friend in need," they may jeer the humble and throw contempt upon the honest hour, but Heaven they can not "cut"—Providence and His ways they can never ignore.

"Nothing so becomes" the tenant of lofty halls—the proud proprietor of immense estates, as "modest meekness and humility," courtesy and respect, and genuine loyalty to his brother in humanity, and a lowly faith in, and practice of, christian virtues, which include sincerity, truth, honor and a thankful heart.

But poverty and toil can claim no exemption from these same duties. Whence does the poor man derive his strong muscle, his stalwart limbs, his cheerful will to toil, his honest frankness and his sturdy strength? After all, it is a problem which has puzzled philosophers, whether magnificence and wealth are not greater evils than abject poverty. The prayer of one of God's worthies has come down to us, "Give me neither poverty nor riches." Riches has its cares, its temptations, its bitter disappointments, its exhaustions, its surfeits, its cruel mockeries of which the careless world never dreams. The great, too, have scenes and trials far more poignant and intense than falls to the lot of ordinary men. The bread of toil is sweet. The affections of the poor man are sanctified by his sacrifices. The sweat of toil hallows the brow of him who thus cheerfully obeys the first great law enjoined upon our sinning parents. Corruptions are found in courts, and in the palaces of the rich. The honest poor should be thankful for this exemption, and rejoice if they escape the snares of poverty—if they eschew envy and violence, fraud and dishonor—if they learn to live happily within their sphere, and deal honestly with their fellows.

But sermons are not our sphere, albeit we may now and then drop a hint to the readers of the APPEAL, that we know will fall upon "good ground." We shall have attained our end if we succeed by these brief observations, in enforcing the observance of a day of Thanksgiving, as a practical duty of all men.

SOCIETY, AS AFFECTED BY BANKS.

The *Eagle* is fond of working upon its idea, or rather upon the idea of the New York *Tribune*, that banks and civilization, and hard money and barbarism, go together. It says in its issue of yesterday that the Asiatic tribes, the Crow and Camanche Indians have no banks. We confess that we are somewhat at loss how to understand this mode of reasoning. Our neighbor must be a little more specific. We cannot tell whether he means that banks are the necessary result of civilization, or that civilization is the necessary result of the establishment of banks. If he means the former, then we might answer that the most refined rascality, the shrewdest tricks of trade, the most subtle chicanery, to say nothing of the lower order of vices, are always found in their fullest development in what are called the most refined, enlightened and civilized communities. May not the trick of making pictures on paper and calling it money be one of these refinements.

On the other hand, if our neighbor means that civilization is the result of the establishment of banks, then we recommend the plan to our Missionary Board. They have for many years been endeavoring to civilize the "Asiatic tribes," as well as many tribes of the Indians. They have spent years of assiduous labor and toil, and millions of money in the laudable enterprise, but the idea of our neighbor seems never to have struck them. Just let them establish a brood of shinplaster banks, and civilization at once springs out like Minerva from the brain of Jove. We care not which horn of the dilemma our neighbor may take. His premises are defective and of course his arguments are worth naught. California and Texas, and some two or three other States, have no banks, yet this does not argue that their citizens are barbarians or savages like the Crow and Camanche Indians. We observe that Oregon in her new Constitution, also, has prohibited banks, and we look with hope and expectation that most, if not all the new Territories, will embody the same principle in their Constitutions. In this event, the time is not far distant when an anti-bank wave will set in from our Pacific coast that will, to some extent, counteract the bank sentiment of the Atlantic States.

No, our neighbor must seek other reasons and other arguments before he can convince the people that the absence of banks presupposes a state or condition of barbarism. Gold and silver is the only currency known to the Constitution of the United States, and the only one known to its framers. Our neighbor, we presume, would hardly call them a set of barbarians. The States are expressly prohibited by the Constitution from issuing "bills of credit," and it is believed by many, if not by most of our learned jurists, that the issuance of bank notes is a violation of this clause of the Constitution.

As evidence of this fact, we submit the following extract from the "Federalist," a book written before the States had acted upon our present Constitution, and with the view of prevailing on them to accept it. Most of the papers were written by MADISON and HAMILTON. It has always been regarded as the best contemporaneous construction of the Constitution now extant. In the forty-fourth paper will be found the following extract, from which it will appear that the States, as understood by the writer, have no more power to issue or authorize the issue of bills of credit or bank notes, than they have to coin money and regulate its value.

"In addition to these persuasive considerations, it may be observed that the same reasons which show the necessity of *denying to the States the power of regulating coin, prove with equal force that they ought not to be at liberty to substitute a paper medium, in the place of coin.* Had every State a right to regulate the value of its coin, there might be as many different currencies as States; and thus the intercourse among them would be impeded; retrospective alterations in its value might be made, and thus the citizens of other States be injured, and animosities be kindled among the States themselves. The subjects of foreign powers might suffer from the same cause, and hence the Union be discredited and embroiled by the indiscretion of a single member. *No one of these mischiefs is less incident to a power in the States to emit paper money than to coin gold and silver.* The power to make anything but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts is withdrawn from the States, on the same principle with that *of issuing a paper currency.*"

COL. BENTON.—Col. THOMAS H. BENTON has published a long communication, in a Washington paper, on the banks and the currency. It is designed to meet the suggestions in favor of the establishment of a national bank, which have appeared in the public journals since the commencement of the existing financial revulsion. The Colonel still cherishes his ancient enmity to bank notes, and warmly advocates the "strict drop" currency.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE.

(Correspondence of the Memphis Appeal.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 20, 1857.

Nothing farther has transpired as to the whereabouts of Gen. Walker, but in the meanwhile the Administration has negotiated a treaty with the Nicaraguan Minister, Mr. VARGANA, which is of deep interest to this country. By the terms of this treaty the Nicaragua transit and its free enjoyment by our citizens, it is hoped, as it is believed, has been guaranteed. Sir Wm. Gore Ousley, Agent of the British Government to this Government, relative to the settlement of Central American affairs, and especially with regard to indemnification of British subjects for property destroyed by the bombardment of Greytown, arrived here after the treaty was negotiated. It is said that the matter was hurried up in consequence of his expected arrival.

The Mormon rebellion has been fully confirmed, and the question now is, in the present state of affairs, what will be done? Owing to the lateness of the season, no successful attempt can be made at present to throw additional force into the Territory, consequently the expedition will either have to accept Brigham Young's proposition, as promulgated in his proclamation, or beat a retreat. The indications are, the latter course will be pursued. Such being the case what is to be the policy of the Government for the suppression of the rebellious spirit manifested by this band of polygamists? Shall we wage a war of extermination, or adopt some other mode more consistent with humanity? It is very evident that a rigorous and stringent course should be adopted, and that at once.

The Constitutional Convention of Kansas has adopted a schedule relative to slavery or free State, and the vote is to be taken thereon on the 21st of next month. The ballots cast at said election shall be endorsed "Constitution with slavery," and "Constitution with no slavery," and if a majority of the ballots cast are for the former, then the State will be pro-slavery; if a majority are of the latter, then otherwise. There is no doubt but a majority of the votes cast will be for a free State, as it is well known that many Southern men who went to Kansas with different views and objects, are anxious to make a free State of it. How such a result has been brought about I cannot say, but in this matter it is evident that the South has received her most fatal blows "at the hands of her friends." It is surmised and heralded forth that this will settle and allay all excitement relative to the Kansas question. This depends altogether upon the result of the election next month, and the development of events that now bear an ominous aspect.

The controversy between Pillow and Scott has thus far resulted very favorably to the former, but as the latter has had the "last say" and Gen. P. has promised to reply as soon as he returns from his farm in Arkansas, his card is looked for very anxiously.

A few members have already arrived and taken rooms for the session, and everything begins to wear a more lively aspect. A large number of members are looked for during the course of the coming week. J.

THE LATE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN KANSAS.—The Washington *Union* of Wednesday has an article on the late Constitutional Convention in Kansas, in which it warmly approves of the action of the convention in submitting the question of slavery to the people for their decision, and says that all serious trouble and danger about Kansas affairs are now over, and that "another State will soon be added to our Republican constellation." Among other things, it says:

"The members of the convention are entitled to be held in everlasting remembrance for adhering to the great truths of the Democratic creed in the midst of temptations which the virtue of most men would have been too weak to resist. They were exposed to the attacks of ultras on both sides. The persuasions of friends and the taunts of the other were alike intended to influence them in favor of a wrong decision. It is not of so that a representative body is found pursuing the right when its friends and enemies are both inviting it into the wrong. There are at least one hundred and fifty men who shall delight in honor."

WHAT IS TO BECOME OF UTAH?—In the correspondence of the Washington *States* of the 20th inst., we find the following:

"The President will recommend, in his message, some legislative action, with a view to the suppression of the Mormon rebellion. The Territorial act may be, and ought to be, abrogated, and the Territory partitioned among the contiguous States and Territories. Perhaps mere Territories may be formed out of Utah, some of the Mormons as well as others. Mormondom. The Territorial laws of Utah, a copy of which Brigham Young presented to Colonel Alexander, must not be allowed to have a legal existence.

"Efficient military arrangements must be authorized for the subjugation of the rebels, or their expulsion from the Territory. For the present, nothing can be done; and the army under Colonel Johnston is to go into winter quarters on a branch of the Green river."

MORMON BULLET.—The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia *Argus*, under date of the 13th inst., says:

"Elder John Hyde, a seceder from the Mormons, delivered a most interesting and instructive lecture here last evening, before a very large auditory, his subject being 'The Tenets and Doctrines of Mormonism.' He is an exceedingly good story teller, enunciates clearly and distinctly, and exhibits fine oratorical powers. Although but twenty-four years of age, he was for seven years connected with the Mormons as a missionary. In his lecture he stated that every proselyte was pledged by the most awful oaths to swear constant and eternal hate to the United States, that they must inculcate it to their children, that they must disobey their authority, and take every opportunity to embarrass and injure, in pursuit of their doctrine of the church is that our Savior is the son of Adam, and that Brigham Young is a God, his authority coming from greater Gods than himself, and that he received 'inspiration' from the Holy Ghost. What horrible sacrilege!"

MURDER BY WHOLESALE.—The Philadelphia *Press*, of Friday last, says:

"Another shocking and cold-blooded murder was perpetrated in this city, between one and two o'clock this morning. The scene of the tragedy was in a house in Swanzey alley, a house of prostitution, No. 27 Water street, kept by a man named Mark Driscoll. Two men, who appeared to be Spanish sailors, came into the place about half-past one o'clock, and commenced a dispute with one of the girls of the house, and presently drew their knives. A man named Andrew McManus interfered in behalf of the girl, when one of the sailors turned upon him, and plunged his knife into his breast. McManus fell to the floor dead, and then the sailors commenced an indiscriminate onslaught on all in the room. The bar tender, a young man named Richard Barrett, was stabbed in the left side, the wound penetrating inwards and upwards. A man named as Sailor Charlie" received three several stabs in the right side, the knife each time glancing from the ribs, so as not to reach a mortal part. Susan Dougan, a female girl, nineteen years old, was stabbed in the abdomen, just as she was coming down stairs, the knife penetrating to the intestines. The Coroner thinks the attempt to murder Sellers in Pearl street, the murder of Vincent in North William street, and this wholesale slaughter, were all perpetrated by the same gang of desperadoes."

WALKER'S EXPEDITION.—The Washington correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun* says:

"Walker and his comrades are now beyond the reach of pursuit or capture. They will not deem it advisable to run under the guns of any United States steamer, and can outrun any United States sailing vessel. When they have landed, no matter where, they are beyond the reach of the laws and officers of the United States. The question now is, what will be the facilities for furnishing Walker with men and supplies from this country, in order to enable him to maintain any ground which he may recover? St. Francisco can furnish him with any number of men. The precedent furnished by the United States authorities at New Orleans will probably be followed at other ports, and filibusterism will be revived with great eclat and success. If Walker is to renew operations upon the line of the Nicaraguan transit, as heretofore, it is necessary that he should open it, forcing the blockade on both sides of the isthmus. Leaving these both closed against him, if he marches once to the Costa Rican capital, San Jose, with such an accomodatable force, as he may now be able to command, his career will probably be there terminated. But he may have gone to Campeachy, there to receive and organize a force for further operations in Central America.

BANK MEASURES.—A bill has been reported by the Committee on Banks, in the lower House of the Georgia Legislature, to the following effect. "That from and after the 1st day of January, 1858, it shall not be lawful for any person to pay away, or in any manner circulate in this State, any bank bill or bank note issued by any bank or corporation out of the State of Georgia, of a less denomination than five dollars. Any person who shall violate the provisions contained in this section of this act shall be liable to pay for every such violation a fine of one hundred dollars, to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction, and to be paid one-half to the informer, and the other half into the Treasury of the State."

THE PANIC EXTENDING.—We see no reason to recall the opinion we have heretofore expressed that a general commercial revulsion in Europe is not at all unlikely. Every year the relations between this country and Europe are becoming more and more intimate. A great disaster cannot sweep over one and leave the other unharmed. It takes time to show its full extent; and we shall not be surprised if, before winter is over, all the great commercial cities of Europe shall be plunged into a condition of financial distress hardly less severe than our own.

SLAVE QUESTION IN VERMONT.—A bill was recently introduced into the Legislature of Vermont which was intended to disfranchise any person who should assist in the capture of a fugitive slave. On the seventh instant it was thrown out of the House by a vote of 121 to 76.

LETTER FROM GOVERNOR WISE

RICHMOND, VA., Nov. 16, 1857.

To the Editors of the Enquirer:

GENTLEMEN: You have seen proper to interrogate me, though the "Enquirer," as to the position I occupy touching the election of a Senator of the United States; and, believing that they are in good faith, fair and not unfriendly, I promptly reply to your questions as publicly as they are put.

For more than twelve months rumors have been circulated that it was my desire and design to roust Mr. Hunter, if I could, from his seat in the Senate of the United States; and my name in that connexion has been bandied about in conversation and by the press, with a licence which assumed the air of authority. By whom, with what motive, to what end, these rumors were started, it is not my purpose now to discuss. My object is to allay excitement and present division in the Democratic party of Virginia; and to that end I aver, that these rumors are unauthorized by anything said or done by me, that they are without foundation, and I defy the production of the proof or evidence that I have ever expressed or manifested the imputed *desire or design.*

After my arduous struggle in 1855 for the salvation of the Democratic party, I fondly hoped to have the sympathy and support of all its sections in Virginia, and to be able to act with all in equal confidence, and to serve all in the office I now fill. I regret to say that in this I was disappointed. A short time only elapsed, after entering upon my duties, before a jealousy and a distrust were seen where I most expected confidence and friendly aid and counsel. I did my best, by turning away from this, to avert both its cause and its effect. But, inopportunely for harmony, the contest for the nomination for the Presidency came on early in 1856, and my preference for Mr. Buchanan, entertained for many years, was again made known. I adhered to his nomination, for reasons which must be too obvious to every candid and conservative patriot and Democrat, to need either argument or excuse. No other nominee of the party could, probably, have been elected. There was not one of his competitors for whom I would not cheerfully have voted. I had, in fact, aided, among other friends of Mr. Buchanan in 1852, in nominating Mr. Pierce, and in 1855, had intimated my approval of other candidates. But, having for the eminent abilities and services preferred Mr. Buchanan in 1844, 1848, and 1852, and deeming him the only available candidate in 1856, I cooperated zealously with his friends in securing for his nomination the vote of Virginia. But no effort was made, nor would I have by any means, to secure this, which could justly be complained of by his rivals and their friends. He had, without effort, comparatively, two-thirds of the delegation of Virginia at Cincinnati, and that majority did not fully represent the constituency which preferred him. I was interrogated, during the attempts of those opposed to his nomination, to destroy the prestige of Virginia by attempting to split her delegation in the Convention, and, in fact, to nullify a majority by a minority, by dividing her strength as well as the State, and to count the Old Dominion naught in the nomination, her delegation stood firm as it had done at Baltimore in 1852, when thirty-four successive ballots were cast for James Buchanan, and the vote of Virginia decided the Convention in his favor. The election proved how pre-eminently popular he was in this "good old Commonwealth." Thirty thousand majority proclaimed him the choice of Virginia, by far more than twelve-thirths of not four-fifths of the Democratic voters. A majority of the politicians in place preferred others, but the people preferred him by an overwhelming, almost unanimous voice.

The election was marked by extraordinary manifestations. The contest was: whether sectionalism, caused by the foreign influence of old England and Canada, operating in the form of Black Republicanism upon New York and the New England States, and upon the lake borders of other States, should invade us further South; or our own nationalism of Democracy should drive it back further North.

Pennsylvania decided the issue; but for a time it was extremely doubtful. And in the midst of that doubt there was heard a low muttering in the South of a subdued, but sullen discontent among some few of those who voted even for Mr. Buchanan's election. The feeling, grumbled rather than openly expressed by them, was of a hope that the Black Flag might be raised over us, to rouse the Southern people to a revolution which would throw off the bonds of the Union. It is well known and now openly admitted that, had that flag been hoisted over the Capitol of the United States, under the open proclamations of this election, I for one, would have waited for no other "overt act" of aggression or oppression; but I would, therefore, the more anxious to secure a Democratic triumph, to prevent revolution and to preserve the Union. This separated me from the extremists of the South.

I doubt whether they would all have followed me to the length I would have gone, had cause for revolution been given; but whilst I was for warding off extreme issues by electing a conservative Democrat who could unite all patriots and save the Union, there were and very exclusive cliques, bent for driving us upon revolution—reluctantly supported the Democratic nominee, and at least some disappointed at the Democratic triumph which saved us from all—to be assured—the severest reprobation. The hosts and rider of Black Republicanism were overthrown, but in the general rejoicing there was no shout from the hearts of the exclusive extremists. They, however, honest, were sad, and their countenances were to show that dismal in the midst of general congratulations and smiles that the national Democracy had saved our country once more from extreme peril.

Soon after the election of President, and during all of last winter and spring, that which was at first a whisper became more and more audible, until it broke out into a loud and openly uttering voice—"that there was a plot to supplant Mr. Hunter in the Senate by Governor Wise and his friends." Knowing that there was no foundation for this to aught I had said or done or authorized to be said or done, and the hypothesis presenting itself that there might be enemies to both Mr. Hunter and myself who were trying to sow tares between us for their own selfish and sinister ends, I still awaited my mind from other definite conclusions respecting the authors and the extent of these reports, and continued to remain silent. But the time came for the organization of Mr. Buchanan's cabinet. It was arranged by himself, to his own liking, on his own responsibility, to suit his own confidential relations to office, and was composed of a majority of Southern men of all sections of Southern Democracy, preferring no clique, and of a cast designed to harmonize all elements in the party, North and South, East and West. It was organized on the National Platform of the Cincinnati Convention. As the head and representative of the party, he generalized as well as could the personnel and material of the great Democracy of the United States. This was what a President of the United States should have endeavored to do. It might not please all, individually or sectionally, but it was *for all* and *not for a part.* And the great mass of the party was in content and generally acquiesced in the organization. But the French mission hardly been inaugurated, had but just taken his seat, had said nothing and done nothing, besides his inaugural address and selection of his cabinet, defining or indicating a policy—had not been in office sixty days—not thirty—when a Senatorial cupino Opposition raised a quill at every point of policy and at every man of personnel in the Administration, and the attempt was made to arraign the whole Democratic party, North and every Southern man who trusted them, with doubt or distrust or outspoken denunciation. An affiliated press was found organized from Richmond to New Orleans, which opened its batteries at sweeping, indiscriminate and vindictive opposition, denouncing certain members of the cabinet, and especially certain Southern members misgiving as to the foreign, and exciting suspicion as to the home policy—warning against conspiracy and treachery—sneering at faith of some friends—disparaging others—not sparing the President himself—and especially denouncing a National Democracy. And all this was begun and published too before Gov. Walker was ever sent to Kansas. We were to be betrayed before we were betrayed! The Northern Democracy were not to be relied on! The President himself was of that Democracy!!

Now, gentlemen, prior to the campaign of 1856, there were but two lines of political division in the United States—the Mason and Dixon, and the Missouri Compromise lines. They were geographical, partly, in their character, and were well defined and understood. Many civil conflicts had arisen between the past, and could be in the future, guarded against. But, in 1856, another and more ominous line was disclosed, obliterating all others. It was not defined upon the earth, but revealing itself by that sailors call a "Sun-Dog" in the sky, it awed superstition like an angry comet portending evil, and shot a dull black and white gloom looming through the mists of the Arctic iceberg—striking from over Old England, by the Newfoundland banks, cutting off New England and New York, and passing midway through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and, indefinitely, Westward. All north of that was Black Republican, and all south of it was what was called Kansas.

What did this mean? What portend? Why, it was a sign in the very heavens of the wisdom of Washington's Farewell Address—*to beware of Foreign Influence and Sectional Strife.* The constant commercial and social intercourse of New England and New York with Old England, and the immediate neighborhood of the lake border with Canada, had let in the wolf of English feeling and prejudice and serves jealousy and fanaticism and influence into our fold against the institutions of the whole United States, as established by our Constitution of Government. It is the most insidious foe which has ever invaded our country. It is English influence, operating socially, undermining our institutions, and threatening our peace and safety, bound up in the cords of our National Union. In this sense it is *this* nation—this whole nation—our nation against its old enemy—English influence. And who met that influence and backed it from off our nation's soil, past the Mason and Dixon and past the Missouri line, as far North as the "Sun-Dog" line which divided Black Republicans from Egypt?

It was Democracy—Northern Democracy—National Democracy! The same true sort of patriotic Americanism—of Brother Jonathanism—which fought at Erie and Plattsburg and Lundy's Lane, and drove John Bull back into Canada! That is the sort of Nationality I love and cherish, as I love and honor my country—my whole country. With true devotion, in the midst of non-slaveholding passions and prejudices—with cities or associations of their own slavery, except National—with Fanaticism thundering Church anathemas and excommunication over their heads—hey, the Northern Democracy, whether in majorities or proscribed minorities, with strong ties, with steady and unwavering faith, taxed themselves with heavy contributions, and raised the National Flag of protection over our Constitution of Government, over our property of every sort, over good faith among men, over State rights and State equality, over popular self-government, over the States separately and united, over the United States, and battled for us and for all, and drove back the lustrious and foreign foe to the Sun-Dog line, where it yet glooms in defeat. Nothing is so fatally sure to kindle the pale and sickly beam of that "blue light" line of sectionalism into a lurid flame of fire to devour our country, as for Southern Democracy to doubt, distrust or denounce Northern Democracy, after such noble sacrifices as those they made in the campaign of 1856. The Southern Democracy never has done this, and never will, until Nationality, in the sense of American patriotism and devotion to the Union of the American States, ceases to burn in American bosoms every where North and South.

Nationality in opposition to Democracy or State rights, I oppose. I oppose all that sort of Federal Nationality which would consolidate us into one centralized despotism. I loathe that sort of Nationality which proposes and adopts compromises of any sort, of the Constitution or for the Constitution. But the Nationality of Democracy, which supports and defends the Constitution and its strict construction, which maintains State rights and State equality and keeps the faith of compacts, which guards the Union and the country against foreign and domestic foes, I honor and cherish and glory in! And this is the National Democracy which this opposition, openly developed as early as April last, in the South, assails. If this be stricken down, what have we to rely on or to ally with in the North? And, yet, it was to strike at this—it was to follow up, not to begin the blows, that the moment a Governor was sent to Kansas, and he moved in his office, his speeches were seized on as a pretext to assail the Northern Democracy and the Administration and its friends. Denunciation in these, and then the riot of rain would begin. It was then that conservative Democrats began to ask: is this opposition or not?—If this be what is called the backing of friends, what is the opposition of foes? Is this opposition dangerous or not? Whose is it? Who are responsible for it? Who have to answer when it comes?—to what end? It was no time to stop and dally with the minor matter of Mr. Walker's stump speeches—delivered with what motive, to what end—pro or con slavery—with good or bad design—no one could fairly decide, without knowing all the surrounding circumstances and difficulties in which he was involved. He had been a Mississippi Senator. He had been honored and trusted by the South. He had done more for the annexation of Texas than any Southern Senator. He had been Secretary of the Treasury under a Southern President, and had done more for Free Trade than any man before or since his time in the Cabinet. Surely the President could trust him not to betray the South which he had thus served and which had thus honored and trusted him, and not to betray the North which had borne him. And he is an able and sagacious man, too, whose judgments are to be weighed and his judgment not on the spot as to the best and most politic movements.

But whether he acted wisely or foolishly, sagaciously or had blundered, or his intentions were good or bad, his acts and motives were nothing compared with the weightier matters of the country involved in this sudden and insidious opposition which gave no time for developments, or for dispassionate examination and proof, or even time for just condemnation of him, if he had done wrong—but begun a hot and heavy war upon him as a corrupt "*intrigue,*" a felon traitor! This could not but reflect upon the Administration and the party which appointed and retained him in place. It was not generous to pretend to discriminate between the "President and the Governor of the Territory." "Like man, like master." If he was criminal, Mr. Buchanan was bound to know it, and if he knew it, he was no honest, no, he cannot, of course, desire to expect the opposition thereto to succeed. Saying that he knows of no practicable ends at this time, which would bring him into collision with the Administration, he distinctly disclaims, for myself, I can see at present, both the intent or will and the spirit or purpose of the opposition. He, in a word, ignores responsibility for this opposition, which has risen so suddenly and which is growing on the country. With this declaration of his, so understood, I have no issue with Mr. Hunter.

It is true that he seems to be opposed to the submission of the Constitution of Kansas, by her convention, to the Republican and other legal voters of that Territory. He takes the ground, that if the people are silent, about the power of the convention in this respect; that the convention was not expressly restrained from submitting whatever form they adopt; and that, in the absence of the State, then they have the power to proclaim it, and to send it to Congress, without submitting it to the people. I know of no such precedents for this exercise of power by the convention, but they are numerous in their inception exceptionable cases, and the doctrine which upholds them is, in my humble opinion, anti-Democratic. The true doctrine is, that the power not delegated by the people to the Convention to them. They retain that power to the convention; but if not granted, it is reserved, that a Constitution, formed and proposed by a convention, which is but a representative body, shall be submitted to the people, who are the sovereigns. The convention to form a Constitution is not sovereign or supreme. The act of making a State is the highest act of sovereign power, and is the act of humanity, next highest to that of living, in the exercise of the elective franchise. Other than to create a sovereignty itself. As a Democratic Republican, then, I would never delegate conventional powers to any body of agents to create a State, without requiring them to submit it to the people, for their ratification. In 1776, an unauthorized body of patriots assembled at Williamsburg, constituted themselves a convention, and formed and proclaimed a Constitution for Virginia, without submitting it to the people, and it was adopted by the people, and began in that way. There was no time and no opportunity to poll votes, in a moment of rebellion, under the domination of British arms.

The masses never did make a revolution, never will, never can. They rally and follow, sacrificing few must ever take the initiative and lead the first movements of resistance. It required a Patrick Henry to seize the powder of the old magazine, and the Convention of 1775 snatched liberty for the people, rather than a constitution from them. In such times *inter arma silent leges. The salus populi* was then the plea and the justification. But what does the salus populi call for in piping times of peace, when there are none to make us afraid at the polls of a Republic? Why a very different rule and order of proceeding, when there is time and place and opportunity of consulting the people—of deliberating and proceeding in their assemblies and votes. Accordingly, when Virginia formed a Constitution a second time, in 1829-30, and a third time in 1850-51, the form adopted by the Convention was in both instances submitted to the people for approve, more, to the new voters created by the new form before itself was adopted. That the people shall of right judge for themselves, at the polls, of their own organic law, unless they expressly authorize agents to make and adopt a Constitution for them, is a principle for which, as a member of the last Convention of Virginia, I would have contended as strenuously as I did for any other principle of popular sovereignty or of self-government. There was no such authority delegated by the people to the Convention of Kansas. Yet, if upon precedent, the Convention of Kansas adopts a Republican form of State Government, and reports it to Congress, without submitting it to the people, I agree with Mr. Hunter in accepting it and voting to receive Kansas as a State—slave or free—into the Union. And why? Because, first, of precedent, and especially, whether it be accepted or rejected, it has to be submitted or is subject at least, in either event, to the popular will. If a majority do not approve of the Constitution, they may organize another Convention immediately, and adopt any republican form, after they process a State, without submitting it at all to Congress.

The question now is, then, not whether Congress should adopt or reject the Constitution of Kansas, submitted to the popular vote or not, but whether it ought not to be submitted to the people before it is submitted to Congress? Which is the better policy for the pro-slavery party to pursue? to submit the Constitution at once to the people, and have an end of the agitation, or to continue the shrieks for freedom a while longer? If a majority of the legal voters are opposed to the plan of government proposed by the Convention, their voices ought to prevail; a constitutional form ought *not to be imposed* upon them, and cannot be but for a day, and their sovereign power ought not to be snatched away from them even for a moment. If Congress should aid and abet a Convention in defeating, or, would not Congress be intervening against non-intervention? And if a majority is in favor of the form proposed, they will prevail, and the controversy will end. If strict impartiality, justice and fairness are observed, the people will not be incensed; but if a minority shall abuse the adventitious advantage of an organized Convention to send their Constitution to Congress, without first submitting it to the people, they will be goaded by indignation to acts of violence, they will tear the Constitution into tatters and trample it into the dust, and upbraid the pro-Slavery party with a willingness and attempt to rule *per fas and nefas*, and they will organize more stringently, doubtless against slavery, than they would ever have done at first. Again: if the Constitution be submitted to them first, it must be submitted to Congress afterwards, to see that its provisions are republican, and it must pass in review of the Representatives in Congress as well as in the Territory. But, if not submitted to the people in the first instance, and Congress accepts it, and then the people of Kansas change and adopt another, and, it may be, a worse Constitution, this latter will not have to be, and will not be submitted to Congress at all. Aiming then at the same end, to protect the equal rights of slaveholders, and to end the excitement and strife sooner and safest, which is the better policy, to appeal to the people at once, in a peaceful, fair and just mode, or to be obliged at last to abide by their anger and resentment, after impairing our own moral attitude before the country? Are we not in danger of having our attitude impaired by another question which has arisen since Mr. Hunter's letters were written?

If Gov. Walker did not go behind the returns which he proclaims were "fraudulent and simulated" on their face—and whether they were so or not, we have, as yet, no means of determining which were no returns—in a word, if this be true, he did right, of course, in disregarding and setting them aside. He usurped no authority, if his report be true, and but did his duty in repudiating FRAUD UPON THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE, and in spurning the insult which demanded that he should give it his official sanction and countenance. An executive has no judicial or legislative power, and must not dare to usurp either; but it is something more than merely ministerial authority, and has the right of protecting itself from fraud and imposition. The ministerial officer of the Returns Board, in this case, was guilty even has that power. Forms were made to preserve the substance of justice and truth, not to aid fraud and imposture, and falsehood and injustice. Slaveholders and the people of slaveholding States are too high in their moral tone, to consent to owe the establishment of slavery anywhere to means like these. And yet some of the sublime opportunists who professed to despise treachery in Gov. Walker, in this age of lawlessness and violence, do not hesitate to array expediency against justice, and to arraign a Governor of a Territory because he dared to refuse to be *particeps criminis* in what he knew to be a gross and patent fraud! Mr. Hunter, I am sure, will not countenance such immorality as this. And a difference on the other points, where we do not agree, shall not divide me from him. He is eminently right in one particular:—that Congress has no right to prescribe the elective franchise for the voters of Kansas on the adoption of their Constitution. The *bona fide inhabitants*, by their Legislature or Convention, must prescribe that for themselves. By this I am far from reflecting upon the Rockinghamian resolutions; for I understand them to mean and to express the same thing. I know not by whom, or where, they were written; heard not of the meeting before it was held, and the resolutions were published some days before I saw them or knew of them; but judging from themselves alone, they seem to me to agree with Mr. Hunter in contravening the ideas which were at first started by his own friends, that only a particular class of voters, at first defined by act of Congress, were to be allowed to decide upon the adoption of the Constitution, if submitted to the people. Mr. Hunter takes ground with the *Enquirer* from the start on that point, though, I think, he had no occasion to take it in commenting the Rockinham resolutions which don't contravene it at all, but, on the contrary, contend for the principle of the Kansas bill itself—that the people must be left to govern themselves, without the intervention of Congress or any other power.

When Gov. Walker's nomination shall be made to the Senate of the United States, if made at all, it will go before Mr. Hunter as one of the Senators who are to try its fitness and propriety. And, if upon a full and fair examination of his course and conduct in Kansas, he finds that the Governor has exceeded his authority, has violated his oath of office or his trust in office, or has betrayed the high and sacred trust reposed on him to see that laws and especially the Kansas bill, faithfully executed, and to see that all the people from all sections were alike, equally and impartially protected—then Mr. Hunter will be reprehensible, indeed, if he does not vote to reject the nomination, and to rebuke the maladministration. If Gov. Walker has really attempted to dictate to, and to threaten the Convention or the people of Kansas, in any form or to any extent, he deserves the severest reprobation. But, before he is condemned, he ought to be heard by his *judges*, who are to sit officially upon his acts. If I am not greatly mistaken in the ability and motives of the man, he may be found upon trial, that the severest of his speech, quoted by Mr. Hunter, are capable of a far different meaning, and are anything but unfriendly to the South or to slavery. He may have meant to throw upon Topeka partisans and their responsibility of not voting, so that if pro-slavery Constitution should be sent to Congress, the plea could not be put up that the people were not implored to vote and decide the issue for themselves. And, instead of meaning to defiance or to threaten, his strong words quoted may have meant simply to remind the Convention that their work was to be submitted to a body—Congress—which had solemnly settled the principles, that the *people* of the Territory were to adopt or reject their civil institutions for themselves, without intervention from any quarter.

This may have been and seems to have been an awkward way of conveying the meaning, as it is so easily misunderstood; but if that turns out to be the true meaning, Mr. Hunter might find he had mistaken a friend for a foe. But, surely, it is not expected of Mr. Hunter or myself, at this distance, with the want of correct information as to his motives or measures, to condemn the Governor of Kansas with a purpose prepense to reflect on the Administration, and to damn all who honestly doubt and defer judgment to a fair hearing. I know Mr. Walker very well, and have seen his nerve tried. I would have preferred that he had *acted* in his office rather than have made speeches on the stump, but he will, in due time, I suppose, merely—for I am not informed of his intentions—make his defense, and then we shall know better how to find our verdicts. If he be guilty, as charged, I shall join strongly in his condemnation. And if I find him void of offense, clear in his office, I will respond "*not guilty,*" without fear, favor or affection, so help me, when I ask for justice, in spite of all political clamor, though I shall stand alone on the panel. I have been too long tried in my truth to the South, and to slavery, to fear any false imputation upon my motives, though my judgment in the case may be erroneous when rendered. It is not rendered yet.

So, then, these points being, though material, open; some of them to a fair difference of opinion, and others to further investigation and proof; and Mr. Hunter disclaiming the spirit and purpose of opposition, by expressing the desire and expectation to be able to support the Administration in the main, I make no issue with him; and with my understanding of his pledges, I cannot allow myself to impute to him and divide the Virginia Democracy in opposition to his re-election. I can have no personal issue with Mr. Hunter; our relations have ever been too friendly to admit of any other acts on my part than those of kindness. He is an eminently able and long-experienced statesman, and cannot be well spared, by the Democracy of the State, as long as he desires and expects to support the party which it so triumphantly put into power against the united hosts of foes. And the South needs, at this time especially, to be united, and cannot afford a division on immaterial or personal issues. Whether there be a disposition to sacrifice me or not, I am ready to be made a victim, if it will unite the South, blind to our affection and confidence the true patriots of the North, defend the Constitution and State Rights, preserve the Union, and keep in power the country to the bonds only of an equal and amicable confederacy.

You say right, in saying that I am not responsible for the editorials of the "Enquirer," as is the *Enquirer* responsible for my opinions or course. No paper has been authorized to speak for me on the subject of this letter. I have organized no presses, and I have exacted or asked for no pledges of candidates for seats in the Legislature. Much that I have seen in your paper I do, and some things do not approve. Some of your editorials have rather too sweepingly denounced "secessionists" and "free-staters." You have explained what you meant, but I wish you had called other names than those with which your humble servant himself has ever been denounced. I am one of those who believe in the rightful remedy of a separation from the Confederacy, whenever the exercise of that State right is demanded by good and sufficient cause. And, if the exercise