

terpreted or misconstrued. But to any one who has ever studied the constitution of human nature, and the politics of our neighbours across the lines, it will appear plainly that that question was not approached in a proper manner. Human nature is so constructed that we must always expect a difference of opinion between individuals. But that difference in opinion, instead of being injurious to a State, is, on the contrary, highly beneficial. But to be beneficial it should be promiscuous. I mean that it should be general or national, not local. For wherever a territorial line of demarcation exists between persons holding different opinions; whenever the citizens of a State array themselves as the champions of the laws of their respective localities, it becomes sectional and unhealthy. The only means which then exist to purify, to calm, the political atmosphere, are to come to a settlement on some basis of principle, either by mutual concessions—a declaration of rights—or *separation*.

If the North had acted in a different manner toward the South, there is no doubt but this difficulty would have never taken place, and much carnage would have been spared on both sides.

In the years 1828 and 1832 South Carolina asserted the doctrine of state rights in bold and intelligible language on the subject of the tariff which was declared to be unconstitutional, and a hardship to the South. The Government, however, acted promptly, and the matter of difficulty was allayed. The North at that time pressed upon the South; the same rights which the Northern States claimed for themselves in 1812, when they considered themselves subjected to oppressive taxes, they refused to their Southern fellow-citizens in the years 1828 and 1832. Then the