

SALUTATORY.

We deem it not inappropriate, in the commencement of our enterprise, to mark out some of the principles and rules of conduct by which we purpose to be guided.

In politics, we belong to the Democratic party; and as far as we can, consistently with the interests of the country, and of the slaveholding States especially, we intend to strive for the unity and success of that party. But when our rights are jeopardized, and a domineering majority, refusing to recognize the great doctrine of equality of rights in the common Territory, and making principles secondary to individuals, would exclude half the States from their birth-right, and seal against them forever the blossoming fields won by their arms and consecrated by their blood, our allegiance to party will be thrown aside, and we shall stand on our own to defend the right, and do battle for the sunny land which gave us birth, to stand with her or to fall with her.

It is our design to make the INTELLIGENCER a reliable general newspaper. But it shall be our special aim to give as much local and county intelligence as possible, so as to make our paper particularly valuable to subscribers in the county. We shall endeavor, also, to make it a valuable family paper, by excluding from its columns every thing which could offend the feelings of the most fastidious, and by inserting only such matter as is entertaining and instructive.

In regard to questions of domestic policy which may incidentally arise, our course will depend upon circumstances, always keeping in view the great principles of truth, and the fundamental doctrines of right.

Above all, it shall be our earnest effort to avoid dogmatism and strife. We are firmly convinced that a good cause loses nothing by extending courtesy to an opponent, and we are sure that a newspaper is not a fit arena for the settlement of disputes. We shall attack no one. We shall attempt to pull no one down.

Such conduct does not, in our opinion, comport with the decency and dignity of the Press. The right is not to be built up by such means. People are not to be moved, by tirades of abuse, to take the part of a scold; and they pay little heed to reasoning which is clothed in the language of angry villification. A constant exhibition of petulance seems to us indicative of mental weakness, of anything but the vigor to which it pretends; and as the shallow brooklet, which cannot conceal the rocks in its channel, rushes on, vainly brawling as it goes, to be swallowed up in the placidly moving depths of the great river below.

To the citizens of this county, we are comparatively a stranger. We therefore think it but proper that we should speak some few words about ourselves. Born near La Grange, in Tennessee, but brought among the wigwags of the Chickasaws of North Mississippi before we had learned the sweet word, MOTHER, we have grown with the growth of the State, till manhood has summoned us to the battle field of life, and Mississippi has increased in greatness to be a leader among the confederated States.

Reared in a printing office, having free access to the political history of the day, familiar with all the stirring events in the History of our State since its formation, we are imbued with the deepest admiration and respect for her institutions and policy, and our soul is full of love for her valiant, generous and hearted people. MISSISSIPPI! our heart is with pride when we hear the name, and memory of her love-lit homes, and sunny skies, and bright fields stretching far away, has sent many a thrill of pleasure through our veins, when we were "wandering on a foreign strand." MISSISSIPPI! thoughts of brave hearts, in a "glorious land, beneath the sulphury canopy of war," and amid the thundering tramp of advancing foes, dauntlessly facing a more numerous force of the enemy, and hurling them back in discomfiture, the sheets of their lances dimmed by defeat—such thoughts crowd upon us at the mention of the name, and something of the old feeling comes over us, and we find ourself involuntarily joining in the shout of triumph which they sent toward Heaven through the smoke of their rifles, as Boena Vista was won.

MISSISSIPPI! the very name is synonymous with all that is noble and good; intelligent, generous, high-minded, gallant, with souls as open as the day, and passions whose strings are never tired, wherever country, or church, or friend, or any child of want, prefers a claim. And the women or Mississippis!—God bless them!—pure as the star-beams, fair as the dawn, true as the needle in its "mystic faith with the mariner," intelligent and good, fit to be mothers and wives of such men. The homes of Mississippi are lighted with their presence; they infuse their own calm courage into many hearts, and urge them on the way that leads to rose and happiness.

If we shall ever so far forget our duty as to prove recreant to our State and false to her people, may a just Heaven frown upon us, and shower upon our devoted head all the calamities which such a treason would deserve.

HOWARD FALCONER.

We send copies of this number of our paper to various gentlemen, to whom we suppose it respects has not been presented, in order that our enterprise in their attention and to stir their subscriptions. If they do not like the present number, they need not return it; we shall regard no one as a subscriber who does not direct us to place his name upon our list.

Our engagements elsewhere are of such a nature, for the present, that we are enabled to send only a comparatively small portion of each issue to Oxford. After the 31st of the present month, however, we shall be permitted to remove to the scene of our new duties, and devote all our time and energies to the INTELLIGENCER. Nonwithstanding, our readers, we doubt not, will readily overlook such incidental shortcomings as result from editing a paper "at long distance."

"Squatter Sovereignty a Mere Abstraction."

With this pretence many honest and well-meaning men have been led astray. In the very nature of things, abstract principles must first be established before we can safely proceed to reason upon any of the practical affairs of life; and the failure in life of "unfortunate" individuals, like the failure of ill-devised governmental measures, may usually be traced back, with unerring certainty, to errors of opinion respecting some principle or doctrine which, in the outset, was overlooked or disregarded, because it was supposed to be too abstract a nature to deserve the consideration of "practical" men.

Our revolutionary fathers went to war with the Mother Country upon a mere abstraction. The British Parliament had repealed the odious stamp act, of which the colonies complained; but that repeal was accompanied by an assertion of the principle, that the colonies were unconstitutionally subject to the legislative power of Parliament. It was opposition to that detested principle which precipitated the struggle of the revolution. Assent to an abstraction, whether such assent be given expressly or by implication, necessarily involves assent to every conclusion and consequence that may legitimately result from the principle originally admitted; and it is because of this fact that we should always be cautious about yielding our assent to abstract doctrines.

It is now urged, with great plausibility, by the apologists for "Squatter Sovereignty," that, at the present moment, there is no Territory to which the doctrine can be practically applied, and, therefore, that the South, inasmuch as she cannot immediately lose anything through its operation, is contending for a mere abstraction when she demands that the doctrine shall be repudiated and condemned. Precisely the same argument was addressed to the pro-revolutionary patriots. They were told that they were not then called upon to pay any stamp duties, and, therefore, that they were making a great and needless outcry about a mere abstraction, which was wholly without the slightest present importance or significance; but they replied that a great vital principle was at stake, and so important did they consider it to be, that they solemnly pledged to its maintenance, in an hour of darker peril than the present, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Had they weakly yielded to the soft persuasions of those who whispered "peace" and prated of "abstractions," these States, it is not unlikely, would to-day have been in the condition of colonial vassalage to England.

If we now admit the doctrine of "Squatter Sovereignty," we must admit it with all its logical results in the future. Whenever, within the wide limits of our present possessions, a new Territory shall be organized, we must expect to see the emissaries of "Emigrant Aid Societies" flocking thither, like birds of prey to a field of carnage, until their numbers shall enable them to dedicate the land to the purposes of anti-slavery; by applying the doctrine of "Squatter Sovereignty;" and another slave State will ever be carved out of the public domain which we now hold; for that doctrine, just as certainly as the Wilnot proviso, or the Ordinance of 1787, will crush out slavery in all the Territories.

Moreover, when our people, obeying their instinct for territorial acquisition and expansion, shall have made themselves masters of Cuba, Central America and Mexico, those regions, too, will be overrun by the hordes of anti-slavery sent forth by the over-peopled free States upon the special mission of excluding slavery by means of that doctrine which is now characterized as "a mere abstraction." When such things could be done, by what other tenure than that of sufferance would slavery retain its existence in any of the States? And how long would the paper barriers of a constitution continue to restrain those ravenous creatures, greedily and thirsting for its life-blood, whose final spring is only now delayed by physical force?

But we are told that we must never swallow Squatter Sovereignty, because we might otherwise be charged with inconsistency, and because our repudiation of the doctrine would render it difficult, if not impossible, to carry the Democratic ticket in some of the Northwestern States. In that remarkable specimen of special pleading which was recently delivered in Washington by a Senator from Illinois in reply to Mr. Davis, the distinguished speaker carefully confined himself to an attempt to prove that he had been verbally consistent, and that the majority of Southern States and statesmen had been verbally inconsistent, in reference to what he termed the doctrine of non-intervention. With all his boldness, he dared neither assert that the South had ever ratified his construction of the Cincinnati Platform of 1856, nor deny that the South might just as well abandon, explicitly and at once, all her interest in the common Territories, as to accept the Squatter Sovereignty interpretation of that platform. He proved himself to be a skillful player upon words, and nothing more. No man, who remembers the canvass of 1856 in Mississippi, will pretend, we think, that Squatter Sovereignty then met with any favor in the eyes of our people; and our delegates at Charleston left the convention the other day because a factious majority refused to place upon the Cincinnati platform the same construction under which our people voted for Mr. Buchanan four years ago.

If the success of the Democratic party really depends upon the recognition of the heresy of Squatter Sovereignty, we are much disposed to doubt the permanent value of any success that may be thus achieved. When the King of Cyprus exclaimed, in reply to those who congratulated him upon the signal victory he had obtained over the Romans, "Another such victory would ruin me!" he expressed just such a feeling as would weigh down the heart of any clear-sighted and sagacious Democrat who should survey the field after the party had achieved a nominal victory under the battle-cry of "Squatter Sovereignty!" The trophies and fruits of such a victory would consist only of a few laurels, withered ere they were plucked, and a few carrons "spoils" engendering a wide-spread corruption through the camp. Our forces would be so thoroughly debauched, through the demoralizing doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, that there would be little to choose between them and as many straight-out Black Republicans. Not a vote—not one—can be obtained by us in any Southern State by means of that doctrine; and, in the Northern States, every recruit that doctrine brings us will be a Black Republican at heart. It cannot be otherwise. The conservative Democrats of the free States are with us already. The Black Republican leaders tell the people that the one idea upon which they have banded themselves together, is to prevent the further spread of slavery. This end they propose to accomplish by prohibitory Congressional legislation. The Squatter Sovereignty orators in the free States desire to have it in their power to go before the people and say—"We are just as much opposed to the further extension of slavery as our Republican friends; and, knowing that you are also opposed to it, as well as to the system itself, we assure you that you can as certainly accomplish your purposes of opposition to slavery in the ranks of the Democratic party, through the practical workings of the ingenious device of Squatter Sovereignty, as though you were affiliated with the Republicans." Latter-day Democracy of that sort would, in all probability, soon accomplish the feat of swallowing the entire Black Republican party, and thereby, itself, become thoroughly abolitionized. Then it would address itself to the task of extinguishing slavery in the States; and we should find, when it was all too late to profit by the knowledge, that the once despised "abstraction" had proved itself to be a fearful practicality.

Black Republican disregard of Constitutional obligation. The Constitution of the United States, in the second section of the fourth article thereof, provides that "A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on the demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime." The language of this provision is too plain and explicit to admit of any evasion of its terms. No room is afforded for construction; and, therefore, there is no excuse for its violation, under any pretence. We learn, from the Memphis papers, that one Kennedy, who had there stolen some negroes and fled to Ohio, was "charged," in Tennessee, with the theft he had committed; whereupon, Gov. Harris, of that State, issued his requisition upon the Governor of Ohio, demanding, in the terms of the Constitution, that the latter functionary should surrender Kennedy, as a fugitive from justice, to be removed to Tennessee for trial. To this demand, the Black Republican Governor of Ohio (Dennison) responded that "property in slaves was not recognized by the laws of Ohio, and therefore it was no crime, by said laws, to steal them." Upon this ground, he refused to issue his warrant for Kennedy's apprehension. Before Gov. Dennison entered upon the duties of his office, he took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. He now shows his sense of the solemn obligation then assumed, by shamelessly disregarding one of the plainest provisions of that instrument. No more flagrant breach of faith disgraces that long record which will perpetuate the infamy of Abolitionism. Each State, in virtue of her sovereignty, possesses the clear and undisputed right of creating and defining offences against herself; and when a criminal flees from justice, and takes refuge within the limits of another State, whose criminal laws do not happen to coincide with those which he has violated, this accidental circumstance can constitute no reason why the compact between sovereign States, looking to the extradition of fugitives from justice, should be nullified. It matters not whether the offence, with which the fugitive stands charged, is, or is not, an offence under the laws of the State to which he has fled. It is sufficient that he stands charged with an act, which, according to the laws of the State where it was committed, was criminal in its character. That isolated fact being once established, the functionary to whom the requisition is addressed has only to obey it. If he refuses, he incurs the guilt of moral perjury, dishonors that Constitution which he was sworn to uphold and support, and deserves, as he will assuredly receive, the unmingled scorn of every honorable mind. There was a time when the Constitution was respected and observed, throughout the length and breadth of a united land; and the Union, cherished by all our people in the same spirit in which our fathers framed it, was the pride and boast of every citizen. But those days have long since passed away; suspicion has taken the place of mutual confidence, and hate now rankles where once existed only kindness. The origin of all this change of feeling is as plain as the sun at noon-day. The Constitution was framed by the people of the several States, in order, among other reasons, "to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, and promote the general welfare;" and, so long as its provisions were honestly regarded, those purposes were all subserved; but a race of men grew up who professed to be wiser than the fathers, and greatly wise above what is written, and they have proceeded to expound and construe the Constitution in a manner never dreamed of by those who were its authors, and have thus perverted its meaning and prostituted its powers, until they have made it, to the extent of their ability, an engine of fraud, and wrong, and sectional aggrandizement. They hope yet to make it a weapon of conquest. All the benefits of the compact they have ever and rigorously insisted on. All its burdens they have systematically repudiated. Gov. Dennison has simply carried the principles of his party a little in advance of the main body. None of his co-workers will condemn his conduct, which will only serve to add a little more fuel to that flame of indignation, which, if a return sense of justice does not soon overtake the people of the free States, will consume the last vestiges of that love for the Union, upon which alone it can repose in safety.

Mississippi Has Spoken. We publish, to-day, the proceedings of the Democratic State Convention, which was held, last week, at Jackson; from which it will be seen that the Democracy of this State have approved and ratified, by acclamation, the accession of our Delegates from the late Convention at Charleston, and have re-affirmed, with a distinctness which leaves no room for doubt, evasion, or misconstruction, the great and fundamental doctrine of the right of the people of the several States to go into the common Territories and be there protected, with every description of property they may choose to carry with them, against all illegal interference. The old Delegates have been re-appointed; but a few vacancies had to be filled, on account of the inability of some of the former Delegates to leave the State at this juncture. They are accredited to Richmond and Baltimore, and authorized to act according to their own discretion. If the other Southern States but emulate the firmness and unanimity displayed by Mississippi, we doubt not that the demands of the South will be promptly and unhesitatingly conceded at Baltimore; but timid counsels, or attempts to compromise, will be fatal to our cause.

The Past and the Future.

No intelligent man can have given even a superficial attention to the history of American politics, for the period which has elapsed since the conclusion of peace with Great Britain in 1815, without perceiving that this history has derived its tone and color almost wholly from the operation of a single underlying cause—the hostility, secret or avowed, of one portion of the confederacy, to the industrial system provided by God and nature for the well-being of the other. It is known of all mankind, that hardly a single important question has divided political parties in this country since the century began, in which, on the whole, the North has not been on one side and the South on the other. This tendency to sectional division became apparent long before the period to which we have just alluded. It was really at the bottom of the great struggle between the democratic and the now defunct federal party, which resulted in the election of Thomas Jefferson to the presidency in 1801. The North was for centralization, limited electoral franchise, alien and sedition laws, and Adams; the South was for State sovereignty, popular equality, freedom of the tongue and pen, and Jefferson. The same difference shortly after manifested itself no less strikingly, in connection with the war measures of the succeeding administration. The North espoused the cause of Great Britain, burned blue lights, and held her famous (or infamous) Hartford Convention. The South demanded the freedom of the seas, protection for the persons of our seamen, and the vindication of the honor of our flag against the persistent insults of British arrogance.

It would require no very profound analysis of the springs of human action, to trace these early divisions between the North and South, to the same cause which has manifestly produced those of more recent origin—that is to say, to the differing industrial systems of the two sections. But if we descend the current of history a little further, the latent element of discord comes to the surface of itself, and speculation is unnecessary. The question which arose on the admission of Missouri to the Union in 1820, presented the first point in which northern hostility to negro slavery—an institution vital to the prosperity of the South—found opportunity to manifest itself in a form distinctly aggressive. The South had come into the Union, with the distinct stipulation, confirmed by a written constitution, that she should preserve unimpaired, within the confederacy, all those rights and powers which she might have enjoyed out of it; with the sole exception of the few specifically defined powers, which both North and South consented equally to relinquish to the general Government, for the common good. One of these reserved rights was the right to the unmolested enjoyment of her own favorite institutions at home. As yet, this has never been directly infringed—never at least by any political organization. Another was the right to carry with her, her institutions, into any unoccupied territory to which she had possessed a previous title, or of which she might become, with her sister States, subsequently, a joint proprietor. It is in the attempt to exercise this right, in every respect as clearly and as positively here as the former, that she has, for the last forty years, been systematically resisted at every point at which resistance was practicable. The struggle which arose over this question on the application of Missouri for admission to the Union, convulsed the country from one end to the other, and well nigh severed the federal compact at the end of the thirty-first year of its existence. Peace was at length purchased by an expedient, which, though at times with some immediate happy results, our more recent and sadly distracted history proves to be eminently ill-chosen. A mere conflict of interests may be settled and set at rest by compromise; but a compromise involving a principle is not only a mistake in itself, but, as a means of ending controversy, is totally unavailing. There are few men in the slaveholding States to-day, who will not admit that it would have been better, had the Union split asunder in 1820, than that the crevices in its walls should have been repaired and smoothed over by the fair-showing but fragile cement of a compromise.

The immediate effect of the Missouri compromise was indeed to remove for the moment the agitation of questions touching slavery from the political field. But though the North and the South were no longer avowedly divided upon this particular matter, still the North and the South continued to be divided. A protective tariff at one time, or a national bank at another, might be the ostensible bone of contention; but whatever happened to constitute the momentary test of party allegiance, there always remained outstanding the remarkable fact, that one side was invariably regarded as the Southern side, and the other the Northern.

It was impossible, however, that the lurking feeling of hostility to the South, constantly cherished by northern politicians and by the northern people, should long go on thus working silently. It was inevitable that it should very shortly come to be known by its right name. That name is anti-slavery; and under that name the feeling itself began, during the last term of the administration of Gen. Jackson, to manifest itself as a distinct element in our national politics. It would be a weary task to undertake to enumerate the various forms of aggression upon Southern rights, upon Southern security, and upon Southern forbearance, which this spirit has prompted in their inception and animated in their prosecution. One of the earliest was the flooding of Congress with petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. Another was the obstinate attempt to attach to every law organizing a new territory, the insulting and unconstitutional Wilnot proviso. Another was the determined opposition to the annexation of Texas. Another still, the violent denunciation of the war into which we were precipitated, without any choice of our own, with our unquitted and troublesome Mexican neighbors. And still another appeared in the determined, and, for the time too successful, resistance made to the just claim of the South, to share in the conquests obtained in that war; and obtained too, mainly through the valor and the lavish blood of her own sons.

To pursue this enumeration through the more recent period—to dwell upon the Northern opposition to the acquisition of Cuba—or on the bitter struggle over the Kansas Nebraska bill, and the repeal of the Missouri compromise—or on the insults heaped upon the highest judicial tribunal in the land for interpreting the Constitution of the Union in the sense which its framers designed it to bear—or on the scenes of disgraceful violence and civil strife which attended the early settlement of Kansas, and the hardly less disgraceful scenes in Washington which followed the application of that territory for admission into the Union—our, or, finally, on the organization of a great political party pervading all the non-slaveholding States, and binding together, with the original abolition fanatics, every scattered fragment of every broken down political organization which has gone before it, whatever their diversities of creed upon all properly political questions, in one common bond to make war upon the South—to dwell and enlarge upon these things is entirely unnecessary, since they constitute a part of the immediate history of the day.

Now throughout all this period of continued and continually renewed wrong, it is manifest that there has been but one real question involved. The struggle has taken a hundred apparently differing shapes; because at each succeeding trial of strength, there has been a sort of tacit understanding that the general principle in controversy should be tested by a special issue. This principle is the right of the people of the South, no less than those of the North, to the protection of their property as well as their persons, in every part of the common domain to which the Constitution extends.—Examine as we will, every single special issue enumerated above, contains within it this general issue; and every one of these special issues which has been decided in favor of the South, ought to have been sufficient alone to dispose of the subject forever. The original disposition of the Missouri question was a mistake, because it was not a decision. The prohibition of slavery in one part of the common territory, and the permission of it in another, was not effected by the exercise of an admitted power in Congress; but by a concession on the part of the South, made in the vain hope of peace. But the abrogation of that arrangement, deliberately made after thirty years' observation of its uselessness, ought to have been regarded as so distinct a recognition by Congress of the equal rights of the South in the territories, as to put an end to agitation.

When Gen. Cass, in 1848, in his famous Nicholson letter, broached the doctrine which is now substantially advocated by Mr. Douglas, there can be no doubt that he was himself sincerely favorable to the protection of Southern rights, nor that he honestly believed that the universal recognition of that doctrine would secure those rights. There were even then sagacious men enough among our people, who perceived the fallacy of this expectation; but it cannot be denied that many Southern men agreed with Gen. Cass. The doctrine will not do, because it will not bring about the practical result which it is undoubtedly designed and expected by its originator to secure. Mr. Douglas merely wastes his breath uselessly, when he demonstrates how consistently he has held this doctrine, or how numerous have been its adherents among those who reject it now. The South have not been contending for a doctrine; they have been contending for a thing. Had the doctrine brought with it a substance, (and its plausibility deceived many into the belief that it must do so) it might have served; but being proved, in its practical working, to be only a means of cheating the South, it can no longer be accepted or pass current, any more than the note of a broken bank would so.

The experience of the past then, has brought with it some lessons for the future, which, in conclusion, we will briefly suggest: First, the conflict which has been going on for the past forty years, between the North and South, cannot be set at rest by the decision of any partial or special issues. The fundamental principle, that the South is entitled to, and shall have, secure and ample protection for the persons of her people, and for their property of every kind, slave property no less than any other, in all the territories of the Union, by all the authorities, legislative, executive and judicial, of the general government, must be unconditionally insisted on, and must be conceded in explicit terms, or there can be no more peace. Secondly, there is, as yet, no serious reason to despair of the Union, nor of the attainment of that right speedily—of our just and equal rights within the Union. Notwithstanding the violence and clamor with which, for ages, the South has been assailed in the Northern States, and by Northern men in Washington, yet, in the partial issues which have been tried between her and her enemies on the floor of Congress, the justice of her cause has, after all, been repeatedly acknowledged; but because those issues were but partial, they have not yet sufficed to prevent the reopening of the controversy in a new shape. Yet when those decisions were made, they were supported by the parties to them to carry with them the final settlement of the strife. There is no reason, therefore, at present, to despair, that what has in intent and spirit been already conceded by the country, in more than one instance, will yet again, now that the absolute necessity is apparent, be conceded, beyond the possibility of mistake, to the letter.

But, thirdly, should this reasonable hope be disappointed, it is quite manifest that it would be useless, and would indeed be the height of folly, to protract the struggle longer. If this conflict is really, as Mr. Seward says, "irrepressible" within the Union, it is certainly not so without it. If, once for all, the South cannot, now at last, obtain an absolute

Letter from Hon. Jacob Thompson, Secretary of the Interior.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 25, 1860.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter, inviting me to attend and address a mass meeting of the Democracy, to be held in Memphis on the 30th inst., has been received, but I regret that my official engagements render my attendance an impossibility. It were otherwise, I should, at this important crisis, most cheerfully mingle my counsels with yours, because I am deeply impressed with the importance of the subjects which call the people together, and anxiously desire our friends everywhere to reach and adopt the wisest and most practical conclusions.

You state that the meeting is called for the purpose of endorsing the action of the seceding delegates at Charleston, and sending delegates to the proposed Richmond Convention. The delegates who withdrew from the Charleston Convention acted on a principle. They may have subjected themselves, in so doing, to misrepresentation and denunciation. Yet the sequel will show that they have acted wisely. The principle for which they contended is most clearly right; and as soon as the Democratic party ceases to be the party of the Constitution and the Union, it should be dissolved; it ought not to outlive its principles.

The principle for which those delegates risked so much is embodied in the declaration that this is a Union of co-equal States, and that the citizens of each have equal rights—an abstraction, it is true—but as vital as that of our fathers, who declared "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." To refuse such a declaration, when it was respectfully asked, was a mockery upon Democracy.

The principle for which they separated from the council of valued friends has been distinctly laid down and approved by the Supreme Court; it has been repeated and endorsed by the present Chief Magistrate; it has been approved and adopted by thirty-five of the thirty-seven Democratic Senators, as will appear from the published proceedings of the Senate yesterday. It is well known to be maintained and advocated, with few exceptions, by the entire body of Democratic Representatives in Congress; and, finally, it was recommended to the adoption of the Convention by seventeen sovereign States. That it did not receive the sanction of a majority of the Convention, is due to the novel and unjust device by which the delegates of some States were required to vote as a unit, while the delegates of others were required to vote individually. I cannot then, withhold from those men, standing as they were, by the refusal of the Convention to recognize the principle for which they were contending and despairing, as they did, of preserving a sound national organization, the expression of my approval of the firmness and decision displayed in the course they have pursued.

My only regret is, that the whole South failed to unite and act together. The cause was the vindication of truth and justice. Had the South been united—had they acted in concert, I am satisfied the true men of the North would most cheerfully have joined hands with them; and I am convinced that the party North would have proved stronger than ever before, because the love of truth would have driven every conservative man in that whole section into its support.

While thus speaking, I have no word of reproach for those of our friends who, more hopeful, still remained in their seats, struggling to the end to preserve our national organization, and to place it on a sound basis. Your own delegation acted manfully when they submitted their ultimatum; and New York acted firmly and patriotically when she pledged herself to meet Tennessee and Virginia and Kentucky on a platform of equality in the sisterhood of the States.

The Tennessee proposition is not as full as I could desire, but I conceive that it most unequivocally negatives the heresy of Squatter Sovereignty, which some of our Southern friends have most unjustly attempted to identify with the doctrine of non-intervention. Had the Convention at Charleston adopted Mr.

Howard's resolution. I think the seceding delegates could have returned to their seats with honor, and should have done so.

And if, or something equivalent thereto, be not yet adopted, I should consider Tennessee, Virginia and Kentucky dishonored if they do not join the seceding delegates. The course most advisable, in my judgment, for you to pursue is this. Approve the Cincinnati platform, as it has been interpreted by the President of the United States in his inaugural address and in his several messages; as it has been expounded in the late resolutions of the Senate; and as it was recommended to the Charleston Convention by every certain Democratic State; express sympathy in the movement to sacrifice their party affinities, and, if need be, themselves, in defence of a great truth, and encourage them not to despair of a sound national organization, but to return to Baltimore; avow your entire confidence in the Tennessee delegation, and urge and sustain them in the advocacy of the right, and thus, if possible, secure the union of the South and the integrity of the Democratic party. With a proper spirit of forbearance, and a patriotic devotion to principle, a platform may be obtained upon which all Democrats may stand, and candidates will be selected who will command the cordial support of the lovers of constitutional liberty in every part of the Union.

If, however, blind devotion to the fortunes of a favorite, or fear to join the general issue with the Black Republican party of the North, shall rule the hour, the day is lost before the battle is begun, and thick gloom will shroud the hopes of the patriot. But, on the other hand; if we unite with a hearty good will, defeat is impossible. The family jar will be succeeded by increased love and devotion, and the confident expectations of the enemies of Democracy, based on our internal dissensions, will eventuate in sickening disappointment.

I am ardently attached to the Union of these States, and, as a means to an end, I am ardently attached to the Union and harmony of the Democratic party. For the preservation of the one and the continued ascendancy of the other, I am ready to make any sacrifices which do not involve honor or principle. Yet I do not believe that either will survive a refusal or failure to maintain and protect the citizen in the full enjoyment of all his rights, both at home and abroad.

The absurdity of the assertion that in agreeing to non-intervention with slavery in the States, Territories, or in the District of Columbia, we agreed to surrender any of our rights guaranteed by the Constitution, is too palpable to need serious refutation. If this be the meaning of non-intervention, then we yielded our right to demand of Congress an effective law for the restoration of our fugitive slaves; and we are bound, if not to advocate, at least not to complain, of the repeal of the laws which have been enacted for this purpose. If that construction is accepted, a few settlers upon the public land in a Territory may rightfully punish you or me for entering a common Territory with one of our slaves, by confounding our property.

The precise point in controversy is this: Have you the right, under the terms of the Constitution, to remove to a Territory with your slaves, and there enjoy your unmolested, unimpaird right of property? The Republicans deny this right. They assert that slavery exists only by virtue of local law; and that as soon as you pass the boundary of the local municipal jurisdiction and enter a common Territory with your slaves, he becomes free, because, as they contend, the Constitution of the United States does not recognize property in slaves. The Democracy, on the other hand, deny the power in Congress to establish or prohibit slavery in the Territories. It was agreed, on all hands, that when the people of a Territory met in convention to form a constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union, they had the indefeasible right to adopt or reject slavery, and to claim admission under their constitution, as framed. But a difference existed whether the Constitution, *proprio rigore*, recognized and protected the right of property in slaves in the Territories. This question was left to be settled by the Supreme Court, to whose decision all Democrats agreed, in good faith, to submit. Until this decision was rendered, the Democratic party could not have interfered with propriety. The Supreme Court, however, has decided, and there are the words of Chief Justice Taney: "Every citizen has a right to take with him into the Territory any article of property which is the Constitution of the United States recognizes as property." "The Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and places the Federal Government to protect it." "The act of Congress prohibiting a citizen of the United States taking with him his slaves when he goes to the Territory in question, to reside, is not warranted by the Constitution."

With powers not exceeding those which Congress itself, by the Constitution, is authorized to exercise over the citizens of the United States in respect to their rights of person or right of property. Good faith now requires the Democratic party, unhesitatingly to march up to the antislavery exposition of the Constitution. A triumph for the Republicans without this avowal, is an empty victory. The agitation of this question of slavery will never cease till this is done, and I am firmly persuaded that the Democratic party of the North will not condescend to ally themselves with this so-called conservative avowal, than they would to be themselves skulking from the issue.

Howard's resolution. I think the seceding delegates could have returned to their seats with honor, and should have done so.

And if, or something equivalent thereto, be not yet adopted, I should consider Tennessee, Virginia and Kentucky dishonored if they do not join the seceding delegates. The course most advisable, in my judgment, for you to pursue is this. Approve the Cincinnati platform, as it has been interpreted by the President of the United States in his inaugural address and in his several messages; as it has been expounded in the late resolutions of the Senate; and as it was recommended to the Charleston Convention by every certain Democratic State; express sympathy in the movement to sacrifice their party affinities, and, if need be, themselves, in defence of a great truth, and encourage them not to despair of a sound national organization, but to return to Baltimore; avow your entire confidence in the Tennessee delegation, and urge and sustain them in the advocacy of the right, and thus, if possible, secure the union of the South and the integrity of the Democratic party. With a proper spirit of forbearance, and a patriotic devotion to principle, a platform may be obtained upon which all Democrats may stand, and candidates will be selected who will command the cordial support of the lovers of constitutional liberty in every part of the Union.

If, however, blind devotion to the fortunes of a favorite, or fear to join the general issue with the Black Republican party of the North, shall rule the hour, the day is lost before the battle is begun, and thick gloom will shroud the hopes of the patriot. But, on the other hand; if we unite with a hearty good will, defeat is impossible. The family jar will be succeeded by increased love and devotion, and the confident expectations of the enemies of Democracy, based on our internal dissensions, will eventuate in sickening disappointment.

I am ardently attached to the Union of these States, and, as a means to an end, I am ardently attached to the Union and harmony of the Democratic party. For the preservation of the one and the continued ascendancy of the other, I am ready to make any sacrifices which do not involve honor or principle. Yet I do not believe that either will survive a refusal or failure to maintain and protect the citizen in the full enjoyment of all his rights, both at home and abroad.

The absurdity of the assertion that in agreeing to non-intervention with slavery in the States, Territories, or in the District of Columbia, we agreed to surrender any of our rights guaranteed by the Constitution, is too palpable to need serious refutation. If this be the meaning of non-intervention, then we yielded our right to demand of Congress an effective law for the restoration of our fugitive slaves; and we are bound, if not to advocate, at least not to complain, of the repeal of the laws which have been enacted for this purpose. If that construction is accepted, a few settlers upon the public land in a Territory may rightfully punish you or me for entering a common Territory with one of our slaves, by confounding our property.

The precise point in controversy is this: Have you the right, under the terms of the Constitution, to remove to a Territory with your slaves, and there enjoy your unmolested, unimpaird right of property? The Republicans deny this right. They assert that slavery exists only by virtue of local law; and that as soon as you pass the boundary of the local municipal jurisdiction and enter a common Territory with your slaves, he becomes free, because, as they contend, the Constitution of the United States does not recognize property in slaves. The Democracy, on the other hand, deny the power in Congress to establish or prohibit slavery in the Territories. It was agreed, on all hands, that when the people of a Territory met in convention to form a constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union, they had the indefeasible right to adopt or reject slavery, and to claim admission under their constitution, as framed. But a difference existed whether the Constitution, *proprio rigore*, recognized and protected the right of property in slaves in the Territories. This question was left to be settled by the Supreme Court, to whose decision all Democrats agreed, in good faith, to submit. Until this decision was rendered, the Democratic party could not have interfered with propriety. The Supreme Court, however, has decided, and there are the words of Chief Justice Taney: "Every citizen has a right to take with him into the Territory any article of property which is the Constitution of the United States recognizes as property." "The Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and places the Federal Government to protect it." "The act of Congress prohibiting a citizen of the United States taking with him his slaves when he goes to the Territory in question, to reside, is not warranted by the Constitution."

With powers not exceeding those which Congress itself, by the Constitution, is authorized to exercise over the citizens of the United States in respect to their rights of person or right of property. Good faith now requires the Democratic party, unhesitatingly to march up to the antislavery exposition of the Constitution. A triumph for the Republicans without this avowal, is an empty victory. The agitation of this question of slavery will never cease till this is done, and I am firmly persuaded that the Democratic party of the North will not condescend to ally themselves with this so-called conservative avowal, than they would to be themselves skulking from the issue.

Howard's resolution. I think the seceding delegates could have returned to their seats with honor, and should have done so.

And if, or something equivalent thereto, be not yet adopted, I should consider Tennessee, Virginia and Kentucky dishonored if they do not join the seceding delegates. The course most advisable, in my judgment, for you to pursue is this. Approve the Cincinnati platform, as it has been interpreted by the President of the United States in his inaugural address and in his several messages; as it has been expounded in the late resolutions of the Senate; and as it was recommended to the Charleston Convention by every certain Democratic State; express sympathy in the movement to sacrifice their party affinities, and, if need be, themselves, in defence of a great truth, and encourage them not to despair of a sound national organization, but to return to Baltimore; avow your entire confidence in the Tennessee delegation, and urge and sustain them in the advocacy of the right, and thus, if possible, secure the union of the South and the integrity of the Democratic party. With a proper spirit of forbearance, and a patriotic devotion to principle, a platform may be obtained upon which all Democrats may stand, and candidates will be selected who will command the cordial support of the lovers of constitutional liberty in every part of the Union.

If, however, blind devotion to the fortunes of a favorite, or fear to join the general issue with the Black Republican party of the North, shall rule the hour, the day is lost before the battle is begun, and thick gloom will shroud the hopes of the patriot. But, on the other hand; if we unite with a hearty good will, defeat is impossible. The family jar will be succeeded by increased love and devotion, and the confident expectations of the enemies of Democracy, based on our internal dissensions, will eventuate in sickening disappointment.

I am ardently attached to the Union of these States, and, as a means to an end, I am ardently attached to the Union and harmony of the Democratic party. For the preservation of the one and the continued ascendancy of the other, I am ready to make any sacrifices which do not involve honor or principle. Yet I do not believe that either will survive a refusal or failure to maintain and protect the citizen in the full enjoyment of all his rights, both at home and abroad.

The absurdity of the assertion that in agreeing to non-intervention with slavery in the States, Territories, or in the District of Columbia, we agreed to surrender any of our rights guaranteed by the Constitution, is too palpable to need serious refutation. If this be the meaning of non-intervention, then we yielded our right to demand of Congress an effective law for the restoration of our fugitive slaves; and we are bound, if not to advocate, at least not to complain, of the repeal of the laws which have been enacted for this purpose. If that construction is accepted, a few settlers upon the public land in a Territory may rightfully punish you or me for entering a common Territory with one of our slaves, by confounding our property