THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, August 13, 1850.

ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

The Senate having under consideration the bill to admit California as a State into the Union, a debate ensued which was necessarily omitted yesterday morning. The question was on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. I do not propose, Mr. President, at this stage of the bill, and in the known temper of the Senate, to enter into any argument upon its merits or demerits. Although there is a wide field of facts not yet explored, it is not my purpose to enter upon it. I feel that it would be useless. More than that; I should fear to expose myself to an exhibition of that restlessness which has on this question marked the majority of the Senate, and which I do not wish to encounter. But I ask why, and among whom, is the spirit of impatience manifested? Does it proceed from a desire to provide a government for California? No, sir, the records deny that. This impatience is most exhibited by those who, at the last session of Congress, refused, unless with the slavery restriction, to unite with us to give the benefits of a territorial government to California—such a government as was then adapted to their condition; nay, more, such a government as is best adapted to their condition now. Then, sir, among that class of Senators the great purpose of giving a territorial government to the people of California was held subordinate to the application of the Wilmot Proviso to the bill. Then, and for that reason, Congress failed to give the protection to this people which they had a right to expect at the hands of a just Government, and which they had a right to demand under the treaty of peace with Mexico.

Now, sir, when the people inhabiting that Territory have formed a Constitution, one of the clauses of which prohibits the introduction of slaves, those who refused to give a government under the circumstances just named, and as we have a right to infer, for the reason stated, are now found most earnest in pressing upon us, in violation of all precedent, the admission of this State into the Union. Then are we not compelled to conclude that their policy, both then as now, was governed by the single desire to exclude slaveholders from introducing that species of property into any of the recent acquisitions from Mexico? Is that in accordance with the provision of the Constitution, which secures equal privileges and immunities to all the citizens of the several States of the Union? Is it in accordance with the principle of even-handed justice, if there had been no constitutional obligations? These acquisitions were made by the people of the whole United States, and we are bound to remember that those whom this bill proposes to exclude, contributed more than their fair proportion, both of blood and treasure, to obtain that territory? No, sir, the Constitution forbids, justice condemns the course which is pursued, and patriotism and reason frown indignantly upon it. Is it then a matter of surprise that we, the suffering party, have shown resentment and made determined opposition? Is it not rather a matter of surprise that that indignation which has blazed throughout the Southern States should have been received with such calm indifference by the majority of Congress; that Congress has not only refused to listen, but has treated with scorn the appeal which has been made? Such, sir, has been the history of this debate.

But if the motive be denied, then I ask, if not for the reason I have given, why are Northern senators pressing with such eagerness the admission of California? Is it to secure a benefit for their manufactures or navigation? No, sir. They know that when the people of California come in they will be a people in favor of free trade, and that their policy will be to invite the shipping of the world, and secure for themselves the cheapest transportation. It is not then for purposes of their own interest that they seek her admission. Is it to preserve their political rights under the Constitution? No, sir. Now they are in the majority, and they need no addition for such a purpose as that. Then we are forced to conclude that it is for the purpose of aggression upon the people of the South—that it is an exhibition of that spirit of a dominant party which regards neither the Constitution nor justice, nor the feelings of fraternity which bind them to us, but treads with ruthless and relentless step over all considerations which should govern men, wise, just, and patriotic.

And this, is the evidence of that love for the Union which is constantly presented to us as a reason why we should abandon the rights, why we should be recreant to the known will of our constituents, why we should disregard the duties we were delegated to perform, and submit to aggression such as freemen have never tamely borne. But, Mr. President, is this the way to avoid danger from the indignation which has been aroused; is this the way to avert the danger of disunion, if such danger exist? That indignation, and that danger, so far as it has been excited, is the offspring of injustice, and this is the maturing act of a series of measures which lead to one end—the total destruction of the equality of the States, and the overthrow of the rights of the Southern section of the Union. We, sir, of the South, are the equals of the North by compact, by inheritance, and the patriotic devotion and sacrifices by which the territory from which it is proposed to exclude us was acquired. And when such an outrage excites a manly remonstrance, instead of bringing with it a feeling of forbearance and a disposition to abstain and reflect, it is answered by the startling cry of disunion, disunion! What constitutes the crime of disunion?

This, sir, is a Union of sovereign States, under a compact which delegated certain powers to the General Government and reserved all else to the States respectively, or to the people. To the Union the South is as true now as in the day when our forefathers assisted to establish it; against that Union they have never by word or deed offered any opposition. They have never claimed from this Federal Government any peculiar advantages for themselves. They have never shrunk from any duty or sacrifice imposed by it, nor sought to deprive others of the benefits it was designed to confer. They have never spoken of that constitutional Union but in respectful language; they have never failed in aught which would secure to posterity the unincumbered enjoyment of that legacy which our fathers left us.

Those who endeavor to sap and undermine the Constitution on which that Union rests are disunionists in the most opprobious understanding of that term, such being the crime of disunion I ask by whom, and how is this spirit of disunion promoted? Not by those who maintain the Constitution from which the Union arose, and by adherence to which it has reached its present greatness; not those who refuse to surrender the principles which gave birth to the Union, and which are the soul of its existence; not those who, claiming the equality to which they were born, declare that they will resist an odious, unconstitutional, and unjust discrimination against their rights. This, sir, is to maintain the Union by preserving the foundation on which it stands and if it be sedition or treason to raise voice and hand against the miners who are working for its overthrow, against those who are seeking to build upon its ruins a new Union which rests not upon the Constitution for authority, but upon the dominant will of the majority, then my heart is filled with such sedition and treason, and the reproach which it brings is esteemed as an honor. But, sir, if gentlemen wish to preserve the constitutional Union, that Union to which I and those whom I represent are so ardently attached, I have to say the way is as easy and as plain as the road to market. You have but to abstain from injustice, you have but to secure to each section and to all citizens the provisions of the constitution under which the Union was forced; you have but to leave in full operation the principles which pre-existed, created and have blessed it. Then, sir, if any ruthless hand should be raised to destroy the temple of this Confederacy, with united hearts and ready arms the people will gather around it for its protection; then, sir, it would be indeed a Union of brethern, and not that forced Union which it is sought now to establish and maintain by coercing sovereign States at the point of the bayonet, and reducing the free spirit of the people to submission by the terror of marching armies. By virtue, by confidence, by the unpurchasable affection of the people, by adherence to fundamental principles, and under the direction of the letter of compact and Union, this republic has grown to its present grandeur, has illustrated the blessings, taught to mankind, the advantages, of representative liberty. As a nation, it is, though yet in the freshness of youth, among the first Powers of the globe, and casts the shadow of its protection over its citizens, on whatever sea or shore, and however far they may wander. When we see a departure in the administration of the Government from the fundamental principles on which this Union was founded, and by adherence to which it has thus prospered, we have reason to believe the virtue and wisdom of our fathers have departed from the people, or that their agents are unworthy of those whom they represent.

We stand on the verge of an act which is to form an era in the history of our country. Now, for the first time, we are about permanently to destroy the balance of power between the sections of the Union, by securing a majority to one in both Houses of Congress; this, too, when sectional spirit is rife over the land, and when those who are to have the control in both houses of Congress will also have the Executive power in their hands, and by unmistakable indications have shown a disposition to disregard that constitution which made us equals in rights, privileges, and immunities. When that barrier for the protection of the minority is about to be obliterated, I feel we have reached the point at which the decline of our Government has commenced, the point at which the great restraints which have preserved it, the bonds which have held it together, are to be broken by a ruthless majority, when the next step may lead us to the point at which aggression will assume such a form as will require the minority to rise in forcible resistance.

Such are the momentuous consequences which is foreseen as possibly flowing from this event; nor are these forebodings, in any degree reduced, or these injuries at all tempered by the spirit in which it is done. They are rather aggravated by the concurrent declarations which are made; the scoffing superiority assumed towards those who are your equals in every constitutional sense; the foretaste which has been given us of the arrogance of political supremacy. It is this which has served to create, and which has fully justified the extreme opposition exhibited by Southern Senators. I was prepared to go to any possible limit in opposition to this measure, because I felt and feel that the fate of my country might depend upon it, and therefore, as a patriot, as one devoted to the Union, here as readily as elsewhere, I was and am ready to sacrifice myself in such a cause. It is not therefore, for want of will, but for the want of power, that I have not offered further opposition than I have.

In that temper to which I have alluded, as manifested on this occasion, we are forewarned of the fate of the minority when the South becomes such permanently in both Houses of Congress. In that spirit of aggression and reckless disregard of the rights of the minority when the power is possessed to execute its will; I believe we may see, like the handwriting on the wall, the downfall of this Confederacy. The occasion, therefore, to my mind, is one which may well justify all the feeling which has been exhibited, and claims of the patriot whatever sacrifice may be demanded. For myself, actuated by such motives, and controlled by such opinions, I required nothing to prompt, nothing to justify, nothing to direct me to the opposition I have made. But, if I had needed any or all of these they were at hand in the expressions of popular will, by primary meetings and legislative action. The Legislature of my State have instructed me to resist this bill for the admission of California, under the circumstances of the case, by all proper and honorable means. The same Legislature made an appropriation of money to enable the Governor to offer proper resistance to the Wilmot Proviso, if it should be passed by Congress and approved by the President. And in this bill, as it is proposed, I see nothing in any essential degree differing from the Wilmot Proviso. What matters it to me whether Congress has declared that within certain limits of the old territory of California slavery shall be prohibited, or whether Congress shall give validity to an act of an unauthorized people within that territory, and thus exclude us from it? If there be any difference, it would be in favor of the action of Congress; because the injustice and oppression would be the same—certainly no greater—without having added thereto the outrage of a revolutionary seizure of public domain, under the expectation of finding favor by declaring hostility against the extension of the limits of slave property, it would be the fraud or usurpation of an agent, by which we would be deprived instead of the seizure of another subsequently sustained and justified by the agent.

But the effect of an act of Congress would be less permanent; it might be repealed, and might more probably than the provision of a State Constitution, be reversed by the decision of the inhabitants of the territory. It can bring no soothing to me to say the act is that of the people. There was no organized permanent body of persons, such as constitute a people. Those who acted but registered the well known will of the majority of Congress on the subject of slave property, and if their unauthorized acts are approved, breathed into life by this government, it will be because they have served its purpose in excluding the South from equal participation in the territory.

There is a great difference between the organized inhabitants of a territory, a political community authorized by legislative action, and the assemblage, however large and respectable, of an unorganized mass of adventurers. The former could not, without the consent of the United States, erect a State out of the territory of which they were the people, and, unauthorized, assume to themselves sovereign power over it. But if this be doubtful, it cannot be claimed that, without any such organization, without any evidence as to numbers or qualifications, an unorganized band of adventurers can set at nought the sovereignty of the United States, convert the public domain to their own use, and claim therefrom the right to be admitted as a State into the Union; that gold hunters or fur traders, fishermen or trappers, may rush on to newly acquired domain, and for purposes general or special, temporary or permanent, appropriate the territory which belongs to the United States to their own exclusive benefit, or to that of a particular section, with an insulting discrimination against one-half of the people of the Confederacy to whom the territory belongs.

But the case presented to us is even worse than this. The people thus found as sojourners or adventurers on the territory, were not themselves the prime movers in this matter. They were prompted to it. It is a fact, sir, which has come to my knowledge, that the military governor who succeeded after the peace of Queretaro sent out messengers to ascertain whether the people of California desired to have a civil instead of the existing military government; and that he received such an answer as caused him to refuse to issue the proclamation previously prepared. That the proclamation remained until his successor, who issued it, came into power, when, with a few additions and slight modifications, it was sent forth. There had been no material change in the state of the country. It is true there was an additional influx of population, and an additional reason to suppose that a Territorial government would not be provided for them, but the population was as unstable as before, and not much better prepared to support a State government. Under these circumstances, this Governor sent out his proclamation, calling on the people to meet and hold a convention to form a constitution for their own government. The last sentence of the proclamation expressed the hope that it would be acceptable to the people. The paper itself bore internal evidence that it was not the action of the people, but the prompting suggestion of a military governor, claiming to exercise civil authority over them.

I say the case is worse than if the transient inhabitants should, at their own volition, claim to snatch the territory from the United States and appropriate it to themselves. It was not dignified by the impress of popular purpose. If the consequences which are likely to result from this movement were not so grave, we should look upon all the action which occurred anterior to the assembling of that convention, the manner in which the elections were conducted, and in which the ratification of the constitution was expressed, as a farce. In that series of letters, thought to be worthy of being incorporated into a book, written by Bayard Taylor, we are informed that while travelling in one district just before the election, he came near being seized on and elected to the convention *nolens volens*—like Teague O'Regan, the hero of modern chivalry. That which was intended as a satire on our popular elections might here have been verified.

I do not propose to detain the Senate by entering into evidence of that kind. These and graver facts are abundant, but I know it is useless to produce them. My purpose now, Mr. President, is to make a serious appeal to the Senate against the act which there is but little doubt they are about to perform. In the name of equality, of constitutional right, of peace, of fraternity, I call upon the majority to abstain.—I utter no menace, I foretell no violence; now, as heretofore, I refuse to contemplate or speak of disunion as a remedy. But, sir, "in sorrow rather than anger," I solemnly warn the majority that they do not look to the South as a field on which victories are to be won without cost, and where the emoluments of conquest are to be obtained without sacrifice. We, sir, are the descendants of those who united with the men of the North in the revolutionary struggle upon what was to them an abstract principle; we are the descendants of those who cast behind them considerations of safety and interest—who looked danger in the face, and united with your fathers because they were oppressed. Then, sir, unless it is believed that we are degenerate sons of our glorious sires, in that fact should be found a warning against presuming too far upon the loyalty which, by the sons as by their sires, has been exhibited to the Union. That loyalty is to the Union as established by the Constitution. Sir, they are not bound to the mere form that holds the States together. If I know their character, and have read their history with understanding, they would reject it as worth less weed whenever the animating spirit of the Constitution shall have passed from the body.

Then, Senators, countrymen, brethren—by these, and by other appellations, if there be others more endearing and impressive than these, I call upon you to pause in the course which, pressed by an intemperate zeal, you are pursuing, and warn you, lest blinded by the lust for sectional dominion, you plunge into an abyss in which will lie buried forever the glorious memories of the past, the equally glorious hopes of the future, and the present immeasurable happiness of our common country. It is not as one who threatens, nor as one who prepares for collision with his enemies, but as one who has a right to invoke your fraternal feeling, and to guard you against an error which will equally bear on us both; as one who, having shared your hopes and your happiness, and who is about to share your misfortunes, if misfortunes shall befall us; it is as an American citizen that I speak to an American Senate—it is in this character that I have ventured to warn you; it is with this feeling that I make my last solemn appeal.

REMARKS OF Mr. CLEMENS,

ON THE CALIFORNIA BILL.

IN SENATE, TUESDAY, August 13, 1850.

Mr. CLEMENS. I must ask a few minutes of the time of the Senate to express my opinions on the subject now under consideration. I know, sir, that this bill is to pass; I know that any thing I can say here will have no effect to prevent its passage; and, under these considerations, I had determined to content myself with giving a silent vote against it. Some of my friends, however, have this morning suggested that a few remarks from me might not be altogether out of place.

In obedience to their wishes, I propose to state, rather in the form of a protest than a speech, the reasons why I object to the passage of this bill. Those reasons have been heretofore stated and argued at length by myself and others. I shall do nothing more to-day than recapitulate the main points, reserving for another time and another theatre, any lengthened discussion of topics which cannot now be otherwise than wearisome here.

I object to the passage of the bill because there has been no census taken of the inhabitants, either by Federal or Territorial law, and this Senate has no evidence that at the formation of the constitution there was a number of free inhabitants within the limits of California sufficient to entitle her to one representative, much less two. I object to it because no Territorial government was ever established in California by law. I object to it because there was no law of Congress fixing the boundaries, and no law authorizing the formation of a constitution and State government. Above all, I object to it because it is the offspring of Executive usurpation. The convention was called together, organized, and completed its sittings under military auspices. That clause of the constitution which prohibits slavery was notoriously adopted expressly to exclude one-half of the States of this Union from an equal participation in the fruits of a war in which Southern and Northern blood was freely mingled, and Southern and Northern treasure was lavishly expended.

These objections are not now stated for the first time. I urged them long ago. And in all the debate which has followed, I must be permitted to say, they have not been answered. On the contrary, they have been admitted. The force of them, however, is sought to be evaded by the assertion, that, although many irregularities have unquestionably attended the application of California for admission as a State, yet these irregularities may be, and ought to be overlooked in consideration of the extraordinary circumstances of the case. That Congress having failed to provide a government for California, it was the right of the people to establish one for themselves, which we are now bound to recognize. This argument would not be altogether without force if California and the majority in Congress were the only parties in interest. If the rights of no one else were affected, the majority might atone for a former wrong by dispensing with the usual guards and securities. Such, however, is not the case. There are, unfortunately, two interests in this Government—a Northern and a Southern interest. It becomes necessary, therefore, to know which one of these interests perpetrated the first wrong, and which is to be benefited by that now proposed. If it be true that both sections are equally to blame for refusing to give a territorial government to California, or if it be true that the Southern States alone are guilty, then, sir, we would have no right to complain if that wrong should be urged as an argument against us now. The record, however, shows that such was not the case. In addition to that record, if more were needed, we have the published declarations of the senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD) that he himself was mainly instrumental in causing the defeat of the territorial bill. The Northern interest denied a government to California, and now, when they are to be benefited by the admission of California, this outrage is converted into an argument, and we are gravely asked to assent to the doctrine that two wrongs make a right.

The failure to give California a government was no fault of ours. Upon what principle, then, is the North to be *rewarded* for a sin she did commit, and the South punished for earnestly endeavoring to prevent its commission? Sir, I feel bound to say that Loyola never had more ingenious or more unscrupulous disciples than those who reason after this fashion. A wrong was done to California and to us, in refusing a Territorial government. Now another wrong is to be heaped upon us because of the first. The story of the scapegoat, to which we listened not long since, has found its prototype in the history of the Southern people. We have been dragged to the verge of a precipice, and are about to be hurled down backwards for the sins of others, not our own.

It is necessary that I should refer here, Mr. President, to a few remarks which were made by the senator from Michigan yesterday, and I regret that the honorable senator is not now in his seat; but as this is the only opportunity which I shall have of adverting to those remarks in connexion with this bill, he must pardon me for disregarding the usual courtesy extended to absent senators. He told us yesterday that the people of California had a right to establish a government, with or without our consent; that we having failed to establish a government for them, they had an inherent right to establish one for themselves. This, sir, is not the doctrine which I learned from a of speech that senator, delivered a few years ago. I propose to read what were his sentiments in 1847. I read from his speech on what is called the three million bill:

"But no territory hereafter to be acquired *can be governed* without an act of Congress providing for the organization of its government."

Now, sir, this is precisely my doctrine, and the doctrine of the South. We believe that an act of Congress is indispensable to the government of any territory, and when we find that no such act has passed in relation to California, we can recognize no government established by those who may happen to be upon her soil as legitimate.

Again the senator says:

"That is the very first step in its progress, in the new career opened to it. *Till then* no legitimate authority can be exercised over it."

Again, sir, I agree with the senator, and I am happy to be able to quote his high authority against the new doctrine of squatter sovereignty which is beginning to pervade the land. The right of a few individuals to seize upon the public domain, and erect themselves into a sovereignty, is something which, in my judgment, cannot be too strongly reprobated. If I had no other reason for opposing the admission of California, this alone would be sufficient, and I might appeal to the senator from Michigan to go with me in that opposition, if he still adheres to the opinions I have quoted.

Mr. President, other senators have spoken of the probable action of the States they represent upon the passage of this bill. I do not know what Alabama may do. That her action will be characterized by wisdom and firmness I have not the least doubt. I am not here to indicate to her what she ought to do. I am the servant, not the leader of her people. Whatever they do, I shall do in despite of Executive menaces, and of all the bloody pictures other hands may exhibit to our view. Born upon the soil of the State while it was yet a Territory, we have grown up together. Time after time she has committed her honor and her interests to my hands. Again and again she has trusted and promoted me, and I recognize no allegiance to any power higher than that I owe to her. Whenever she commands I will obey. If she determines to resist this law by force, by secession, by any means, I am at her service in whatever capacity she desires to employ me. If this be treason, I am a traitor—a traitor who glories in the name.

I know, sir, that the President, in his late letter to the Governor of Texas, has assumed the right of the Government to coerce a sovereign State. I deny that there is any thing in the Constitution—any thing in the laws, to justify such an assumption. The law is plain and clear—individuals, not States, are the subjects of coercion. If any State should secede, let him, if he dares, attempt to employ military force to compel her return. He will soon find, in that event, that he has more than one State to deal with, and that the powers and resources of this Government are wholly inadequate to the task he has undertaken. The federal doctrine that all power lodges here has been somewhat widely repudiated, and the denial of State sovereignty, either North or South, can bring to the Executive nothing but contempt.

I hold that my first allegiance is due to my State, and that treason cannot be committed against any power while obeying her mandates. Such opinions have recently been unsparingly denounced, but let me warn those who resort to such weapons, that they may be used by more than one side. There are more traitors than traitors to the Union. Sir, I impugn no man's motives who lets mine alone. I question the purity of no man's conduct who does not provoke retaliation by assailing others; but when men intimate that obedience to the mandates of my State is treason, they must expect to hear in return that, in my opinion, there are those in this land, and about this capitol, who would sell their souls to Satan for the privilege of having a hand in President making, Cabinet making, and the consequent distribution of the public offices. There are those who would sell their Saviour, were he again upon earth, for half the price that Judas accepted to betray him. Denunciations, sir, are weapons that two can use, and if any one expects to employ them against me with impunity, he miscalculates sadly the character of the man he assails.

I have said all I think it necessary to say. I did not mean to argue the bill here. I shall, if necessary, argue it at home.

PROGRESS OF FREE-SOIL SENTIMENT.—The Hon R. M. T. Hunter, in his recent able speech in the United States Senate, depicts, in a striking light, the advances which have been made by the abolition sentiment during the last thirty years. A most forcible illustration of this truth is furnished in the history of the Missouri Compromise. In 1821, when the peace of the country was not less seriously threatened by this slavery agitation, than it is now, the Missouri Compromise was tendered to the South, and became a law over the heads of the Southern representatives. It was acquisced in, however, by the South, as an extreme concession for the sake of the Union. To-day, the South offers to settle our differences on the principle of the concessions then made, and those who advocated it are denounced as *ultras*. The North was then ready to hang us if we did not accept the Missouri Compromise; now it is ready to hang us if we demand it. To-day we are denounced for not accepting Clay's Compromise, which deprives us of still greater rights, and if we accept it, in ten years we shall be equally denounced if we insist even on its feeble guarantees.

But the history even of this session of Congress, is not without proof on this point. At an early day of the session, Mr. Clay introduced in the Senate a series of resolutions, which were intended as a basis of compromise for our troubles. Those resolutions met with almost universal denunciation at the South, and even the warmest admirers of that senator dared not utter one word in approval of them. Mr. Clay himself was unhesitatingly denounced as a traitor to the South, and his former mouth-piece did not venture even a vindication of him.

Well, what were those resolutions! One was to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and prohibiting a deposite of slaves therein *for purposes of sale*. Another was to admit California with *suitable boundaries*. Another was to form Territorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico, and another was to enact a law for the more effectual recovery of fugitive slaves. Later in the session the committee of thirteen introduced a compromise, which is now known as the Clay Compromise, and, as we shall see, very properly so called. This Compromise embraces several features, which are, 1st, the abolition of the slave trade in the District, prohibiting a deposit of slaves therein for purposes of sale, and also, *prohibiting their deposit there for transportation*; 2d, to admit California with *her present bound ries*; 3d, to provide Territorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico, and 4th, to provide more effectually for the recovery of fugitive slaves. How has this Compromise been received at the South? We venture the assertion, that not one of the papers in this State which now cordially embraces this bill, (perhaps the Augusta Chronicle & Sentinel excepted) said one word in commendation of it, in the first issue after it was known what that Compromise was. It met with the unqualified execration of some, and the favor of not one public journal in Georgia. Now, on the contrary, we find at least four influential presses in this State, boldly advocating its adoption. Let it be remembered that this Compromise differs but little from Mr. Clay's resolutions, and every one of those differences is against the South, and that while no one in this latitude endorsed the latter, many are clamorously in favor of the former, and some idea may be formed of the fearful progress which abolition sentiment is making even at the South.—*Columbus (Ga.) Sentinel.*

INTERCOURSE SUSPENDED.—Our readers will remember that in consequence of what the General Assembly considered an unwarrantable interference on the part of the General Association of Massachusetts with our opinions and course of action, as a church, in relation to domestic slavery, the following resolution was passed by the Assembly:

Resolved, That our delegate to the next general Association of Massachusetts, be directed to inform that venerable body, that this General Assembly must consider itself the best judge of the action which it is necessary to take as to all subjects within its jurisdiction, and that any interference on the part of that General Association, with its action upon any subjects upon which this General Assembly has taken order, is offensive, and must lead to an interruption of the correspondence which subsists between the Association and this Assembly.

At the late meeting of that Association, the action of the Assembly was reported by their delegate, Rev. Mr. McClare. A Committee was raised and a report presented on the subject, which called forth much discussion. After amendment the report was adopted; the closing resolutions of which are as follows:

Resolved, That while we receive this resolution with surprise and regret, being unwilling to suspend the friendly correspondence that has so long existed between us, and being in doubt whether the action of the General Assembly was designed to do this, we wait to be informed of their meaning, and when the usual degradation is sent to us, it shall be kindly received and cheerfully reciprocated.

4. *Resolved*, That this action of our body be communicated by our Secretary, to the Moderator of the General Assembly, to meet in St. Louis in 1851.

Thus it will be seen that both these bodies having declined to appoint delegates, and the Association having resolved to wait for explanations, the intercourse between them is suspended. The probability is, that it will remain so; at least so long as the Association retain their present disposition—that of taking upon themselves the guardianship of other people's business.—*Southern Presbyterian.*

THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1850.

☞ A letter from Col. MANCY GREGG of South Carolina to Gen. FOOTE, will be found in our columns to-day. A reply from Colonel CHESNUT has also be en received, and shall appear to-morrow.

We leave these gentlemen to speak for themselves, which it will be seen, they are very capable of doing effectually.

Moral Condition of Blacks.

One of the principal charges against Slavery made in the North by women in pants, and men in petticoats, is that it violates the marriage relation and establishes promiscuous intercourse.

Well, we saw recently in a Northern Abolition paper, a letter from WILLIAM WELLS BROWN, a fugitive slave, who has become an agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

The standing of this man was called in question on account of his deserting his wife—and the letter was his defence. He said that soon after his escape, he married, we think, in Rochester, New York, we suppose among the upper crust people of color. He states that soon after his marriage he discovered that his wife's mother lived with a man called her second husband, whilst her first was still living—that her sister had one or two children without being married at all, and that her brother was in the New York Penitentiary—and that his wife soon began an intrigue with another man, which he attempted to break off, but in vain—and separated from her.

Mr. William Wells Brown could have fared no worse than this in the most immoral family of slaves in the South—while in the great majority of them he might have done much better.

In Hayti, however, the negroes have their own way, and we commend the following to the attention of modern philanthropy:

MORALS IN HAYTI.

The New York *Journal of Commerce* says:

"In the official part of a late number of the 'Moniteur Maytien' is a document giving the number of births, deaths, marriages, and divorces, during the first quarter of the present year, in the following named towns: *In the Province of the West*, Port au Prince, Jacmel, Croix des Bouquets, and Arcahart; *In the Province of the South*, Miragoane, Petit-Trou, and Torbeck; *in the Province of the North*, Cape Haytien, Fort Liberte, L'Acul du Nord, Limbe, Plaisance, Jean-Rabel, Port Margot, Limonade, and Plaine du Nord. In these towns the whole number of children born in these months was 1,863, of whom 1,700 were born out of wedlock, and only 163 were legitimate. Such a monstrous disproportion between these two classes of children exists in no other country, we venture to say, on the face of the earth where the marriage institution is recognized. In the same towns the deaths in that period were 406,65 marriages, and 1 divorce. In Port au Prince alone, the capital of the Empire, there were 413 children born, and only 29 of them in marriage; 77 deaths, and 20 marriages."

☞ The *Intelligencer*, after having been in eclipse during the Administration of General TAYLOR, shines out again under the new one.

Now is the winter of its discontent,
Made glorious summer by this *son of York*.

Under TAYLOR the *Republic* took the lead as organ. The *Intelligencer* saw the Whig party was divided, and did not know which wing would prevail. It therefore kept dark on the questions in dispute—was silent about the President's plan and Mr. CLAY's plan.

But General TAYLOR died, Mr. FILLMORE succeeded, began to use his influence in favor of the Omnibus—and the gallant editor of the *Intelligencer* stept into that vehicle with great sagacity—just as it broke down! The *Intelligencer* crawled out from the fragments, rubbed its shins, scratched its head, and *waited*. But as soon as the Senate commenced its present career of outrage by passing the Texas, and California bills, the *Intelligencer* is itself again. The long devotion to ultra Northern politics—to Federal usurpation, and its hatred of the South for a resistance to these, heretofore more or less successful, breaks out. The *Intelligencer* was silent and sad, whilst there was a chance of defeating the scheme of Southern spoliation. But when the prospect of preventing it *in Congress* grows dim, when the Executive draws the sword—when Texas is in arms, when Georgia is in commotion, when Alabama, Mississippi and Florida, are moving "like a deep sea wave," when South Carolina stands "with forward step and fiery look," then the *Intelligencer* like

"The joyous wolf from covert drew."

The prospect that Southern rights and Southern men will perish, and that the stench of fallen and decaying liberty will pollute the political atmosphere, prompts the *Intelligencer* to plume its wings, and soar like that bird of prey that seeks the deep blue sky, only when the taint of carnage and carrion sweeps along the air.

☞ The *New York Tribune* thus rejoices over the recent action of Congress. Its approval of those proceedings affords the best proof of the correctness of our comments thereupon.

Although different parties may oppose the same measure through very different motives, yet assent to the same propositions must be based on an identity of sentiment and feeling. The advice to the House is identically the same as that tendered by the *Republic*; both counsel the majority to "*sit out*" the California measure against all plans of parliamentary frustration:

"It is something to rejoice over (says the *Tribune*) in these days of factious obstruction and fruitless legislation, that the Bill providing for the Admission of California into the Union yesterday passed the Senate by the decisive vote of 34 Yeas to 18 Nays—almost two to one. The warnings of Mr. Jeff. Davis and the contingent threatenings of Mr. Clemens served to postpone but not to prevent this triumph. The House will of course take up this bill when it next goes into Committee on the subject, and we trust it will meantime have so amended its Rules that a small minority can no longer stop the wheels of legislation. That done, two consecutive night-sittings ought to see the bill through to President Fillmore, where it will not long be detained. Friends of California in the House! you are disgraced beyond explanation or oblivion if you consent to adjourn before California is a State *in* the Union."

Meeting of the Southern Members of the House of Representatives.

At length we have to congratulate the South on the attainment of greater unity among her representatives than has yet been known.

At a meeting held a few evenings since, the following members were appointed a Committee on Resolutions:

ROBERT TOOMBS, of Georgia, Chairman.

Messrs. A. Burt, of South Carolina; H. W. Hilliard, Alabama; Jacob Thompson, Mississippi; E. Carrington Cabell, Florida; Volney E. Howard, Texas; Robert W. Johnson, Arkansas; Isaac E. Morse, Louisiana; J. S. Greene, Missouri; J. A. Seddon, Virginia; T. L. Clingman, North Carolina; James H. Thomas, Tennessee; C. S. Morehead, Kentucky; John W. Houston, Delaware; R. I. Bowie, Maryland.

We understand that the deliberations of the Committee resulted in almost entire unanimity, and accordingly—

Mr. TOOMBS, Chairman of the Committee of Fifteen, reported the following resolutions, which were adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That no citizen shall be deprived of his life, liberty or property, except by the judgment of his peers, and the laws of the land, and that the common law, as it existed in the American Colonies on the 4th of July, 1776, and the Constitution and laws of the United States applicable to our territories, shall be the fundamental law of said territory.

2. *Resolved*, That in the event that the non-slaveholding States object thus to put the life, liberty, and property of American citizens under American laws, we will insist upon a division of the country on the line of 36. 30, with a distinct recognition and protection of property in slaves.

3. *Resolved*, That we will not vote for the admission of California unless the Southern boundary be restricted to the parallel of 36. 30 north latitude.

4. *Resolved*, That we will not agree to any boundary between Texas and New Mexico, which proposes to cede to New Mexico any portion of territory south of the parallel of 36. 30 north latitude and west of the Rio Grande, prior to the adjustment of the territorial questions.

5. *Resolved*, That the representatives of the slaveholding States will resist by all usual legislative and constitutional means, the admission of the State of California and the adjustment of the Texas boundary, until a settlement of the territorial questions.

6. *Resolved*, That the true boundary of Texas is that defined by the act of the Texas Congress of December 19th, 1836; and it is the duty of the South to maintain the same, unless a satisfactory adjustment of it is had by the assent of the State of Texas.

7. *Be it further Resolved*, That the powers and duties of the Committee of fifteen be continued until the further action of the meeting, and that the Chairman of that Committee, by the concurrence of any three members thereof, may at any time call a meeting of the representatives of the slaveholding States.

For the Southern Press.

TO THE HON. H. S. FOOTE, U. S. SENATE.

COLUMBIA, S. C., August 12, 1850.

SIR: I beg leave to call your attention to a few little perversions of truth, used by you lately to impart facetiousness to the remarks, with which, in your capacity of bully, buffoon, and bore to the Senate, you were pleased to honor me.

I have been waiting to see your report of yourself in the Union; but not having been able as yet to obtain it, I am obliged to refer to other papers.

You attributed to me the solemn declarations (I refer for convenience to a sort of summing up in the report of one of your innumerable and intolerable speeches, made on the 3d of August, and published in the Southern Press and other papers) "that if Congress shall undertake to admit California into the Union at all, South Carolina will secede from the Union—and seize upon California—upon the mouth of the Mississippi—and blockade the Western States."

I made no such declarations. The report of my speech at Camden, which served you for a text, contained no such declarations. And you, of course, knew perfectly well that you were perverting the truth.

The report of my speech was prepared without consulting me by the Secretary of the meeting at Camden, was never seen by me until after its publication, (which was unexpected to me,) and being brief, has encouraged you to use your petty artifices of distortion. But the report in its actual state is sufficient to convict you of disingenuous practices, as was rendered evident by the correction made by a senator from Missouri, of a misstatement into which, trusting to your version, he had inadvertently fallen.

What I did say on these points was, in substance; this:—

That if California, with its pretended constitution and usurped boundaries, should be admitted by Congress as a State, or should be left in its present condition, excluding the South from all share of the territory, the slaveholding States ought to secede from the present Confederacy, and form a Southern confederacy. That if forced into a war by the injustice of the North, the slaveholding States might rely on sure elements of success, amongst which would be the power, by closing the Mississippi against the commerce of the north-western States, to bring that section to terms; and that the injustice practised by the non-slaveholding States, in attempting to exclude the South from all share of California, and to rob Texas of its territory, would justify the confederacy of the slaveholding States in taking possession by force of the whole, or of any part of California.

The Northern man who denounces this as treason, I would meet simply with defiance. The servile Southern sycophant who raises the cry, provokes inexpressible scorn.

By way of apology for undertaking to arraign me before the Senate, you asserted (according to a report which I find in the Baltimore Clipper,) that it seemed to be rendered necessary by the very particular mention I had made of you. This is not merely a perversion, like the statements alluded to above, but a fabrication of your fancy. I did not say a word about you in my speech, that I remember. At all events, there is not a word about you in the report of it. But, perhaps, with the instinct of Scrub, in the play, you felt that if I *had* spoken of you, it must have been in terms of contempt.

Permit me now, sir, as you are in the habit of lecturing senators and citizens, in or out of place, (but I must retract a part of the expression—I do not believe that you have ever had sufficient sense of decency to do it *in place*,) to offer you a very short lecture for the amendment of your manners.

To pervert the language of others into a sense not intended by them, is not regarded as reprehensible in a clown at a circus, or a jester over a convivial bottle. But it is not very becoming to use this trick for effect on the floor of the Senate, even in these days of senatorial decline, when Scrub may be a senator. I have pointed out your perversions of the language in which my speech was reported You will make the proper acknowledgements, or not, according as you may have any regard for truth left, or as you may among the compromises to which you are addicted, have compromised away what little of the quality you ever possessed.

You bantered a senator from South Carolina with the offer that you would, if invited, come to Charleston or Columbia, to discuss the questions which have been before the Senate.

When South Carolina desires instruction in the doctrines of the federal and consolidation school, she can send for some statesman worth listening to—Mr. Webster, for instance—who could perform the task with some ability.

But it would not be generous to hold you to your offer. You will need to exert all your powers, such as they are, including your acknowledged power of brass, to excuse or palliate to the people of Mississippi, the deliberate treachery of your State and to the South, so long premeditated by you, and for a time concealed under the disguise of violent Southern feeling, impelling you to brawl loudly with the Abolitionists, and to bully Col. Benton, until he turned upon you and out-bullied you.

With the hope that this letter may prove an acceptable addition to your curious epistolary collection on the subject of the Compromise,

I have the honor to be, Sir, &c,

MANCY GREGG.

P. S. Not being quite sure that you will understand an allusion above, I subjoin for your gratification the passage referred to.

Scrub. "Ay; he and the Count's footman were jabbering French, like two intriguing ducks in a mill-pond; and I believe they talked of *me*, for they laughed consumedly."

The Randolph Epistles on the Right of Secession.

No. II.

Fundamental Condition of the Union—Slave Representation and Fugitive Slaves—The South's remedy were these rights denied—The right to fight, and the right to do wrong—"Black Cockade Federalism revived"—The right of Equality another Fundamental Condition of the Union, &c.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, MILLARD FILLMORE,
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR—It is admitted on all sides, that the Constitution contains certain principles which are sacramental, embracing conditions so vital and fundamental, that without their adoption, the Constitution and the Union could never have been formed. Conditions of this nature