

is not the property of the punctilious few, or of one man, but of the people; and can scarcely be separated, from its essential interests. It will not only be jealous, but just; and can never disregard the great object of all association in government—protection to property, liberty, and life. Remember, what our ancestors endured in our Revolution, and still more signally, in 1812, from this very nation, before they appealed to arms. If I had heard from the South, this extraordinary enunciation of our honor being implicated in the measure proposed, I could, in some measure, comprehend it. Our last war, which they forced on, was with them, a war for honor, and nothing else. But to hear it from the North, and the Northwest, where the word is scouted as equivalent to murder, is very surprising. Here are gentlemen, who would hang as a felon any Southern gentleman, who should appeal to the duel to redress an insult; and yet, for no insult at all—for no wrong, or alleged wrong—they would plunge two of the greatest nations in the world into war, “to maintain the nation’s honor!” They act, I suppose, on the principle, that “one murder makes a villain—millions a hero.” Sir, I am no advocate for private war; but I am at a loss to understand, how gentlemen can so recklessly urge on and defend a great public war, and yet condemn private war. If insult, cannot justify violence in the individual, neither can it justify it in a nation composed of its individuals. Matters seem to be strangely reversed. It is the South now, that is dead to national honor! The North—the religious and moral North—in its fiery impatience at even imaginary wrong, is for rushing into war; and, with its panting chivalry, taunts the tame reluctance of the South to vindicate “the honor of the country!” Sir, I have no imputations to make against the North or West, in this fury for strife and carnage; but I hope, I may be pardoned at least for saying, that the South needs no defender here against charges, express or implied, of indifference to the honor of the Union, or of readiness to maintain it. Whilst history exists, she needs no other vindicator. But she will not, without cause, take offence when none is intended; nor rush into a war, when it cannot be shown, that either the interest or honor of the Union, requires its stern alternative. But if, against her judgment and will, she is overruled in the common council, to which, by the Constitution, all such matters are entrusted, she will abide the issue. As heretofore, she will take her part in the struggle; and where the battle is hottest and thickest, there she will be found.

Mr. Speaker, I regretted to hear a colloquy which passed yesterday between the gentleman from New York, (Mr. KING,) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLASS.) It seems, that the gentleman from Illinois