Congressional.

In Senate, Wednesday, June 27.

Mr. CASS offered a resolution directing the Committee on Military Affairs to enquire into the expediency of prohibiting any military officer from exercising civil jurisdiction.

The bill making a donation of public lands to the State of Mississippi, for constructing a railroad from Brandon to the eastern border of the State, was taken up and referred.

An act supplementary to the act for taking the 7th census, which provided for additional pay for the marshals in Oregon and California, was taken up and referred.

Mr. FOOTE'S resolution of inquiry, calling for information in relation to the formation of a State Government in Mexico, was taken up, and after being amended, at the suggestion of Mr. Rusk, so as to ascertain whether a State Government had been actually formed in opposition to the claim of Texas, was passed without debate.

A bill providing for the printing of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, on commerce and navigation, was taken up, and after discussion between Messrs. Davis of Massachusets, King, Dickinson, and Hunter, was read a third time and passed.

The Senate then, at 12 o'clock, resumed the the consideration of the Compromise bill, the question being on Mr. Soule's amendment.

Mr. WEBSTER addressed the Senate at some length in reply to Mr. Soule. He dwelt on the expediency of admitting California at once. He then proceeded to reply in detail to the various objections urged by Mr. Soule against her admission. He argued to show that the authorities cited by the gentleman from Louisiana, did not apply in this case. He denied that California possesses the public lands. They should belong to the United States. They (the United States,) could sell them as they did their other lands. The Supreme Court had decided that the public lands belonged to the United States without the security of any compact. Many States had been admitted without any compact with them as to the public lands. He argued in reply to every point raised by Mr. Soule, and hoped to be soon able to emerge from the darkness, and see light.

Mr. FOOTE then addressed the Senate to show that the bill contained the non-intervention doctrine, and Mr. Calhoun was the real author of that doctrine. He read various extracts from Mr. Calhoun's speeches to prove that he sustained the non-intervention doctrine.

Mr. BARNWELL then addressed the Senate, denying that Mr. Calhoun's position was such as was stated by the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Foote.) He referred at some length, to the institution of Slavery; showed that it entered very largely into Southern interests. He would not be satisfied with the bill, when it was well known that the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) had avowed openly and expressed opinion that slavery was abolished in the new territories by the Mexican laws. Therefore, it was, that the South demanded the repeal of those laws. He contended for the right to carry slaves wherever the flag of the United States floats—whether on the land or on the sea.

But as a measure of compromise, he would consent to a division of the territory. He would be satisfied with the Missouri Compromise line, with positive recognition and protection of slavery South of it. But he did not want ambiguity about the matter. He wanted every thing clearly understood.

Mr. FOOTE said that he scorned all protection of the General Government, when he knew that the right was a constitutional ope. The argument of the Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Barnwell] amounted to this, "that the South were so weak, so feeble, that the authority of the Senator from Kentucky overwhelmed them. He would not acknowledge that the South were reduced to that state of things. He scorned the protection of the General Government. He did not want it. The Constitution had already guaranteed their rights, and by the Constitution he would abide. He read again from Mr. Calhoun, to show that his doctrine was non-intervention.

Mr. BUTLER said that Mr. Calhoun's acts were on record, and no explanation or interpretation could change or alter them. In the language of the Senator from Massachusetts, "there they are; let them speak for themselves." He denied, however, that Mr. Calhoun advocated the broad doctrine of non-intervention, as it had been explained on that floor. His non-intervention was to allow the people a territorial government, and let them come in with or without slavery, as they desired. It was not to allow them, by a sort of spontaneous organization, to make a government for themselves, shutting out one half the States without the authority and consent of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Missouri, from the beginning, thought that this bill could not be so amended as to receive his support. He had, therefore, refrained from saying anything on the subject. But the remarks of his colleague, [Mr. Foote] to which we were in some measure apprehensive, rendered it necessary for him to say a few words.

Mr. FOOTE disclaimed all intention of being offensive.

Mr. DAVIS did not doubt his intentions. He then went on at some length, and denied that Mr. Calhoun's doctrine was that stated by his colleague. He wanted the non-intervention of Mr. Calhoun; not this bill. He wanted nothing ambiguous, but something tangible and plain.

Mr. FOOTE again took the floor and argued to show that Mr. Calhoun's was non-intervention.

Mr. DAVIS of Mississippi, then obtaining the floor, gave way to Mr. Hale, who moved an adjournment; which was agreed to—yeas 34, noes 20.

And so the Senate adjourned.

In House of Representatives.

Yesterday, immediately on coming together, the House took up the Iowa election case, and were addresed for an hour by Mr. McGaughey, in favor of the claim of the contestant. He held there was no dispute as to the legality of the Kanesville votes for Mr. Miller, thrown out by the Iowa judges; and that not to count their votes, because they were by mistake cast in a county not laying directly east of their residence, (for which the Iowa law provides) would be to disfranchise legal votes; as he went on to show. Instead of their being fraud on the part of Trueman Smith, Fitz Henry Warren, and the movement leaders, Mr. McG. argued to prove that it was all on the side of the friends of the sitting member. He maintained that Mr. Thomson was himself responsible for the loss of the missing roll books.

When Mr. THOMPSON, of Iowa, rising to a personal explanation, rehearsed the history of that affair; affirming that, being in Washington when the election occurred, he knew nothing of the whereabouts of the books for twelve months after the time in question. Then they were placed in his hands for safe keeping, he being the person most directly interested in the matter.

Mr. McGAUGHEY, resuming his argument contended that by his own admission, Mr. T. had made himself, subsequently, a party to the fraud. His views concerning the Kanesville question were applicable to that of the votes of Boone township cast in Dallas county, which had been given there by mistake as to the geographical position of their residence.

Mr. HARRIS, of Tennessee, then urged that this was a question to be decided according to the law and the evidence, not by personal prejudices or political preferences. Even if it was admitted that Mr. Miller had received a majority of the legal votes, he held that he (Mr. M.) had not received such a majority, cast according to the law and constitution of Iowa.

Here Mr. H. explained at length the requirements of the constitution and laws of Iowa in the case in point. A vote there, to be legal, must be cast in the county in which the voter resided. Or, if he resided in unorganized territory, then, to make his vote legal, it should be given in a county lying directly east of his residence. As Kanesville was situated north of the southern boundary of Monroe county, the voters, in that point, voting under the organization of the Monroe county commissioners had voted illegally; and their ballots were therefore not to be counted. Had they voted in Mathaska county—under the organization of that county, they would have been entitled to be counted.

He next argued to prove that the election at Kanesville was altogether illegal; the commissioners for Monroe county having no authority to organize a precinct there.

Mr. LEFFLER remarked that unless he participated in the debate, he should ill-discharge his duties to the constituents of the sitting member, his colleague, who, he knew well, believed in that gentleman's right to the seat. The Constitution of the United States, and that of the State of Iowa, should alone be looked to in addition to the facts involved, in deciding the case. These, as Mr. L. proceeded to explain, made certain things necessary to give legality to votes cast in Iowa; the constitution of the State declaring what should be necessary; while that of the United States authorized Iowa to make those provisions. In this case it was clear that those throwing the rejected votes had not complied with the requirements of the election law of the State.

The Kanesville vote was illegal; but admitting that, and throwing out the vote of Boone township, which was manifestly illegally cast, and the sitting member was elected by fifteen votes.

But Mr. L. contended that the Mormons of Kanesville were in no respect citizens of Iowa. They were a portion of the emigrants from Nauvoo; refugees from justice, literally. Mr. L. here recounted the history of the crimes, &c., which being committed by individuals protected by the Mormons of Nauvoo, had forced the people of Illinois to drive that community forth from their State. As the Missourians had determined that they should never cross their State as a banded community, they (the Mormons) had been compelled to seek the Far West by passing over the southern part of Iowa. Thus, arriving at Kanesville in the fall, the severity of the approaching season had made them cantoon there. When the spring opened, such of them as had the necessary means, continued their journey to the Far West. The poorer of them dreading the difficulties of the trip across the 2000 miles of desert, still remaining (temporarily) behind. At the opening of the following spring, another band (who in the meanwhile had recruited their means,) started for the Salt Lake from Kanesville. And, again, in the following spring the rest left. But on arriving at the edge of the 2000 miles of wilderness, a portion of this band found themselves unprepared for the difficulties of the trip across; and, halting, were warned off by the authorities. They then returned to Kanesville, and shortly after they had crossed the Mississippi on their return to that point, they gave the votes which were now in question. They were in no manner entitled to exercise the elective franchise in Iowa, having never been citizens of that State, and never designing to make it their home. They had paid no texas, and the laws (courts) of the State had never taken jurisdiction over them.

They had no more right to vote there, Mr. L. held, than if they had been a band of volunteers recruited in New York to suppress the Indian troubles in Oregon (in 1847.) If the President, in pursuance of law, had marched such an army to Kanesville on their way to Oregon, and if such volunteers had arrived at that point in the fall, they would have been compelled to remain over there until late in the spring—for full six months. He desired to know whether any member believed that they would, under such circumstances, have been entitled to vote there?

Mr. L. entered next into a historical account of the election system of Iowa, to show that these Mormons had been organized into a voting community, by a law which had been superseded, wherever the State had jurisdiction, for full eighteen months, which he held, was another good and sufficient bar to the reception of their vote. The gentleman from Iowa, continuing, said that at the time of the election in that State in 1848, it was (there) he believed that the result in that State would determine the presidential election.

This made it a matter of great importance with the Whigs to carry the State.

F. H. Warren, now the second assistant Post Master General, was the chairman of the Whig Executive Committee at that time, and managed matters on the part of his political friends. In so doing he sought the aid of an individual named Pickett, "a jack Mormon" from Missouri, where he had been made the subject of fifteen criminal indictments. Through Pickett, Warren had also obtained the aid of Orson Hyde, and by giving him a letter to Trueman Smith, on which he obtained the means of buying a printing establishment, Hyde had helped Warren to get the votes of the Kanesville Mormons for the Whig candidate.

Mr. F. here read a copy of the letter from Hyde to the Mormon leaders at Kanesville, requesting them to vote according to the advice of Mr. Warren, when, his hour expiring,

MR. EVANS, of Maryland, taking the floor, replied. Mr. E. urged that Mr. L. was wrong in contending that the Kanesville voters were not bona fide citizens of Iowa. They had erected mills, opened farms, built houses, villages, &c., and were giving every possible evidence of a determination to remain there. In answer to the allegation that they were urged by the Whig party on that occasion, Mr. Evans reviewed at considerable length the history of the connection of the Mormons at Nauvoo with the democratic organization, and then read a letter from Judge Chas. Mason, of Iowa, a distinguished democrat, urging that they (the Mormons,) should send delegates to the Iowa democratic state convention for the spring of 1850.

Mr. LEFFLER (explaining) urged that this letter was written as late as February last; after the increasing emigration to California had so increased the prices of provisions and transportation around Kanesville, as to force the Mormons to change their determination to go the Salt Lake, under which they acted in 1848.

Mr. EVANS continuing, then reviewed the circumstances connected with the missing poll book, found in the possession of the sitting member, whose right to hold it for an instant, he denied. Had that not been withheld from the canvassers of this election, the return would surely have been in favor of the contestant.

Mr. ASHE, closing the debate of the day, explained at considerable length the circumstances which had impelled him to differ in the committee room on some points from his political associates. They had voted that the Kanesville ballots should not be received, because Kanesville was situated six miles north of the southern boundary of Munroe county. But he did not conceive that fact to afford sufficient ground for the rejection of those votes. There was a wilderness of one hundred and fifty miles broad between Munroe county and Kanesville, and the authorities of that county, being themselves deceived, had led the people of Kanesville into the mistake of estimating their position to be on a meridian six miles south of its true position. They had voted in good faith. Of this fact there could be no question; for Whigs and Democrats, Mormons and anti-Mormons, the testimony of all examined as to this point, proved that they believed, when voting on this occasion, that they were west of Monroe; not of Neathaska county.

Like reasons induced him to vote in the committee room in favor of counting the vote of Boone county thrown in connection with the Polk county organization. But, with him, the decisive point was the Boone township question. It was clearly proved to the committee, that 42 citizens of that township had gone to Dallas county, 15 miles distant, to vote for Mr. Miller, knowing that Dallas was not the county in which they were entitled to vote.

Under these circumstances, he thought the law should be strictly applied to them; their intention being fraudulent, as to throw out their votes, would elect the sitting member by 15 majority, he (Mr. A.) should vote to declare that gentleman entitled to the seat.

Mr. DISNEY next having obtained the floor,

The SPEAKER laid before the House an invitation from the Washington Monument society, requesting the House to participate in the society's celebration of the 4th of July;

And then the House adjourned.

For the Southern Press.

Messrs. Editors:—As words often become things in the progress of discussion, and the array of parties arising therefrom, it is a matter of some interest to discover the meaning of certain terms which have been of late much employed. In the investigation of the slavery question, and the interest involved in the relations which connect that great issue with the welfare of the country, we have been rendered familiar with certain words which have performed a most important function, and the true meaning of which it is necessary for us to understand. It was some time before the peculiar propriety of renaming the result of the labor of the Committee of Thirteen occurred to the advocate of that scheme. It was discovered that it had been improperly called a compromise, and ought to be called an adjustment. This important element in the business was argued with all the acuteness displayed in the great case of Stradling *vs.* Stiles, reported by Swift, as well as I remember. We were instructed that it was no compromise, but a mere settlement, the character of which all men were left to judge of for themselves. We suppose that the distinction between the meaning of the two names, to wit: *Compromise* and *Adjustment*: has been made so clear by the venerable editor of the *Union*, that no doubt can ever invade the public mind in relation thereto in future. He had spoken of the necessity of conciliation and concession, which would make the ingredients of a compromise, all of which were promised the public as the result of the investigation of the Senate's committee. When that report was made, either there was too much concession and too little conciliation, or so much of both, that compromise conveyed no adequate idea of the merits of the scheme, and *adjustment* was the word which should be used to recommend it to public favor. An old maxim was found to be untrue. It was ascertained that a rose would not smell as sweet by some other name, and this same rose now throws its fragrance around us, and none but the initiated dream that it is a rose at all.

We read much of ultra men North and South. Fanatics North and South; agitators and disturbers and sectional and national politicians. Now it is profitable to know what they mean. An ultra Northern man is supposed to refer to an out and out Abolitionist, the enemy of the institution of slavery; who, whilst he may not be inclined to interfere directly with the institution in the States, yet the purpose of whose politics is indirectly to assail it, and render it intolerable to the white race, and break down African Slavery. He is ultra, whilst those who vote for the exclusion of slavery from the territories, who, like Mr. Clay, declare that they will vote for no measure which looks to the extension of the institution of slavery into the territories, are called moderate and practicable men. Those who vote for all measures of the Abolitionists only decline to do so because they believe the measure necessary to secure the desired object, who uniformly pursue a policy which excludes Southern slaveholders from the occupation of the territories, are called patriotic, moderate, and enlightened friends of the South. They rebuke fanaticism but vote for its designs—they say kind words to the South but give them none of the land—"they tread no steps backwards" in their progress in the anti-slavery crusade. From this it would seem that kind words and patriotic effusions, soothing discourses, which quiet men restless under a sense of plunder—Chloroform, administered to the patient who is to wake up, after a while, minus some of his limbs, or at least, the greater portion of his rights, are the elements of moderation, and entitle those who have them to the character of patriotic men who love the Union and the Constitution, and are upon the whole national in their charcter.

A Southern ultra is supposed to be one who demands all that the Constitution secures to him or his people. One who is so green as to believe that political equality was intended to be secured by his ancestors in the Constitution. I believe no Southern man, whether editor or statesman, has ever said that the Southern slaveholders have asked too much, or more than they were entitled to by the compact. This is admitted, but it is ultra and disoganizing to demand it. Others are in possession of their inheritance, and it produces agitation to make a claim for their own. They have a bond for an ascertained amount, and are called ultra because they are unwilling to take one-half of the claim. They have a right to the land equally to others, to all the territorial domain; and because they are willing, by the line of 36 degrees 30 minutes to give up more than half, they are called ultra and disorganizing. Whilst Southern men who are contented to give up to the rapacity of the North, either hoping for peace, or satisfied that they are whipped, and that it is the best that can be done, or aspiring to national reputation, and national popularity, and national nominations, are moderate, patriotic, enlightened friends of the Union and of liberty.

These are the meaning of the terms ultra men North and South, and the meaning of the terms agitators and disturbers, and moderate and patriotic men. In order to understand the full import of national politeness and national character, something more is necessary. To acquire a national reputation, a man from the non-slaveholding States has only to speak kindly to the South—admit that they have some rights under the Constitution; be very sorry that their Northern constituents will not allow the full recognition of their rights in their laws; abandon the name of the Wilmot Proviso when it can be as effectually secured by the humbuggery of the Mexican laws; but take especial care to giveno vote in favor of the rights of the slaveholders which may be offensive at home, and be very sorry that the state of things at home forbids them from doing what they desire. And especially so to arrange it that the propertime has either passed by, or has not arrived, for them to make a just settlement for the South. Add to this a due reverence for caucus nominations, party allegiancce, and party nationality, and the requisites for high national political character are named. One thing is indispensable—he must never vote for any thing substantially just to the South, as this will prevent his re-election.

To be a National Southern politician it is necessary that party allegiance and caucus nominations should be distinctly acknowledged, and scrupulously observed and respected. "Individual opinion and sentiment on all subjects are tolerated, but those who make war upon party usages, principles, and candidates, are regarded as enemies, and driven from the ranks."*

The moderate, patriotic, national statesman, must stand on Southern soil and lean North. He may denounce abolitionists fiercely, and perhaps it is prudent to do so, for it gives him capital for the next Presidential election. He must speak much about Northern allies, and the propriety of sparing those Northern friends who speak kindly and vote adversely to the South, but be extremely fierce against those who are so indiscreet as to avow their purposes against the institution of slavery.—Denounce Giddings, Hale, Seward, and others, but speak kindly of those who vote with them; all this is necessary to the integrity of the great national party. He must expressly denounce territorial legislation, by which is understood the obligation of a representative to take care of the interest of the district which sent him here. He must consider himself the representative of the whole country, and feel and practice the duty of liberality in making concessions. Scold Southern men who are impatient under a sense of oppression. Conciliate Northern men whose coin is soft words. Magnify the indiscretions of Southern statesmen. Apologize for those of the North. Take anything the North may give which seems to cover a point of honor, and take all the land. But above all consider the Presidential campaign as of the highest consequence, and the securing Northern and Free-Soil votes in the Baltimore Convention, for President and Vice President, as vitally important. Keep an anchor to the windward here, and the Southern politician is decidedly, eminently national.

There is one difference, however, which it is well to notice, distinguishing the National Northern from the National Southern politician. The Northern National conciliates in soft words, concedes in kind wishes, but gives no advantage, compromises no claim of his section. The Southern National conciliates by yielding, concedes by sanctioning all that he was sent here to save; the sectional interests of his constituents, and his only hope of recompence is that mess of pottage *party favor*, which more than one Esau has wept over in vain.

M.

* *Union.*

The way they do things in Ohio.—One of the Ohio papers shows the way they serve faithless lovers in that region.

A warning to treacherous Swains.—Miss Amanda Bobo recovered of Isaac Grubbs, during the present session of Franklin Common Pleas, the sum of *eight hundred dollars*, in an action for a breach of marriage promise. The case excited much interest in Court, and was argued by Messrs Webster & Galloway for the plaintiff, and Swayne & Backus for the defendant. The case was clearly made out, and was of an aggravated character. The damages were not so heavy, we learn, as they would have been, had the defendant been a man of property. *Our verdict is, served him right!*

A palpable hit.—The *Mobile Tribune* thus shows up Northern philanthropy:

"We yesterday showed that the average length of life at Lowell, the head quarters of the cottonocracy is very short.

We learn now that there are more "hums" there than those made by the spinning-jennies. It has been said that the great object of fostering these mills was to encourage labor. The Lowell Advertiser, right on the spot, shows how this is done: 'The policy of the owners of the Lowell factories has been,' (says that paper,) 'to get their work done by the cheapest labor they could find. Acting upon that policy *they have introduced foreign laborers to the exclusion of Americans, until the Americans do not number over one-third of the operatives of Lowell.*' "

An Act of Devoted Heroism.—The following incident is recorded of a pilot of the steamer Griffith, who fell a victim to his own heroism:

Mr. Holly, of Missouri, informed us that when the flames were making rapidly toward the pilot house of the Griffith, he heard some one, the mate, he thinks, inquired of the man at the wheel if he would "stand to his post." The man gave a hearty response of "I will." This directed his attention to the wheelman; and he watched his bearing; when the boat stopped, he stood there unmoved, firmly grasping the wheel, completely enveloped in flames. Mr. Holly supposed he must have been burned up; but, it appears, after the boat ceased to move, he passed through the flames and overboard. His body was found badly burned. It was brought to this city, and buried in Oakland cemetery. This noblest of heroes, who could thus stand by his post and voluntarily throw away his own life in the hope of saving others from death, was Richard Mann, long a resident of our city and vicinity. No tomb deserves a nobler monument than his.

Ohio River.—At Pittsburg, on Tuesday, there were 3 feet 6 inches water in the channel, and falling.

From the Southern Christian Advocate.

Resolutions of the Quarterly Conference of Columbia, S. C.—At a quarterly meeting Conference of the M. E. Church, held for the Columbia station on the 8th June, 1850, the following preamble and resolutions, offered by Andrew Wallace, Esq., and seconded by Robert Bryce, Esq, were unanimously adopted and ordered to be sent to the Southern Christian Advocate for publication in that paper.

Whereas, at the recent session of the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, an effort was made by the delegates from the So. Ca. Annual Conference, in conformity with an unanimous vote of that body, to have the ninth section of the Book of Discipline "on slavery" expunged; and whereas a majority of the said General Conference did by their vote refuse to exscind or expunge it; and whereas the ground taken by the Southern Church, all along, has been that Slavery is a subject belonging to the civil and not to the ecclesiastical power; and inasmuch as this section of the Book of Discipline has been the occasion of much excitement in this State, threatening serious injury to the best interests of religion; therefore be it

Resolved, That this Quarterly Meeting Conference heartily approves the course pursued and the vote given by the delegates from the South Carolina Conference on this subject.

Resolved, That any new edition of the Book of Discipline which may be published containing this obnoxious section, ought not to be circulated within the bounds of the South Carolina Conference.

A true extract from the minutes.

Bobert Bryce, Secretary.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM OUR BALTIMORE CORRESPONDENT.

Baltimore, June 26, 5 p. m.

The President and the New Mexico Movement.—Sentences.—Arrest for Murder.—Mr. Bulwer.—The Forrest difficulty.—Commercial Affairs. &c.

The proclamation of Colonel Monroe to the people of New Mexico, under direction of the President and the news subsequently received by telegraph from Santa Fe, of the meeting of the Convention, the adoption of a State Constitution, and the preparations goingon to elect a Governor and members of the Legislature, together with U. S Senators and members of the House of Representatives, has caused considerable surprise in this city, and is universally regarded as a most impolitic and improper movement on the part of the Administration. The Texas papers describe the excitement in that State as almost beyond control, on hearing of the proclamation issued by Col. Monroe, but on hearing of their "hot haste" in carrying out its purposes, a real storm may be anticipated.

Capt. Wm. K. Gardiner, of the brig Frances Jane, and his mate William Humphreys, convicted a few days since of having killed the colored cook, George Thomas, during the last voyage from Porto Rico, by the most inhuman and tyranical tortute and beating, were this morning sentenced by Judge Heath to three year's imprisonment in jail, with a fine of $1,000 each, and the costs of prosecution; to stand committed also, until the money is paid. This is the full extent of the punishment for manslaughter, under the U. S. law, by which they were tried, which classes the offence as a misdemeanor.

A negro named Major Harrod was arrested this morning and committed for trial, on the charge of being the man who struck young Watkins on the head with a brick, on Monday night, causing his death.

A letter from New York states that Mr. Bulwer, the British minister, left that city for Washington yesterday. He returns in a few days to take up his permanent abode for the summer at his new residence at Clifton, Staten Island. He will bring his family with him.

The manifesto put forth by the Philadelphia Pennsylvanian yesterday in defence of Mr. Forrest for "knocking" Mr. Willis, with its announcement that new and startling testimony relative to the infidelity of Mrs. Forrest will be brought out on the trial, has renewed the excitement in New York on the subject. The Pennsylvanian has always been Mr. Forrest's organ in his all troubles and rejoicings. Mr. Forrest denies having struck Willis from behind.

There was sales of 200 bbls. fresh ground Howard street flour in the Baltimore market today at $5.12½. Quotations of wheat are nominal. Sales of yellow corn at 61 a 63; and of white at 59 a 60. Sales of oats at 42 cents; whiskey is dull at 25½.

At New York, this morning, holders of cotton were waiting for their private letters before operating to any extent. Common State flour has declined, and sales of Southern were making at $5.50 a $5.62½. Sales of yellow corn at 61 a 63. No change in stocks.

Toronto, Canda, June 25.

Republicanism in Canada.—Last night, in the Legislative Assembly, they had under consideration a set of resolutions proposed by Mr. Boulton; in detail a complete scheme of republican government. The debate was the most exciting one that has claimed the attention of that body for some time. It being put to vote, the House voted Republicanism and Revolution! The vote stood forty-six to thirteen!

Cincinnati, June 25.

Destructive Fire at Cincinnati.—On Saturday night a fire broke out in the extensive planing mill of Messrs. Hughes & Foster. Owing to the inflammable nature of the materials, the building was soon entirely destroyed. The loss is estimated at $25,000. No insurance. Several men were injured by the falling walls, three of them seriously, if not mortally.

St. Louis, June 25.

Highly Important from Santa Fe.—Advices have been received from Santa Fe to the 25th May. A Convention of Delegates had been called and held, which formed and promulgated a Constitution for the government of the State of New Mexio. The Convention assembled at Santa Fe on the 15th of May, and lasted eight or nine days—during which a Constitution was formed, which would go into operation on the 1st of July. The boundaries of the State were defined, and Slavery prohibited. [Another despatch says the boundaries of the State were left for future adjudication, which is the most probable.]

The constitution was adopted on the 25th of May. In fifteen days afterwards an election was to take place for members of the Legislature, two U. S. senators, and representatives in Congress would soon be elected. Mr. St. Vrain, Judge Otes, and Henry Connelly are prominent candidates for the Government, and Capt. A. W. Reynolds and Major R. H. Whitman for the Senate. It is supposed that Hugh N. Smith, the present delegate in Congress, would be elected to the House of Representatives.

Further Intelligence by the Niagara.

England.—The debates in Parliament, present no new feature. The Ministers have again been beaten.

A bill having for its object the exemption from sale of all estates in Ireland, not mortgaged to a certain amount has been introduced in the House of Lords.

France.—The country is tranquil. The bill for granting pensions to the families of those killed and wounded in the affair of February and June has been rejected.

The bill for legalizing the transportation of political offences has been passed entire.

In a recent tour throughout the Provinces, the President was everywhere well received. His speeches were somewhat remarkable for their appeals for popularity among the working classes.

It appears that in framing the new Electoral Law the President made a great blunder. He never intended it is said, that the proposed changes should extend to the election of President as well as representatives, but it is so, and it is only now that he sees his mistake. Another project of law for fettering the press by a stamp duty at present is engaging the attention of Government.

M. Thiers has left Paris to visit Louis Phillippe in England. The ex-minister arrived on Thursday and was well received by the diplomatists and statesmen of St. James. It is said that his visit has a deep political change in view; he had an interview with the President before leaving Paris. A union of the two houses of the Bourbons is said to be the object of M. Thiers' visit to the ex-King at London.

Girardin has been elected to the Assembly from the lower Rhine, by a large majority.

In regard to the pending difficulty with England, a well informed Paris correspondent says: "It is expected every thing will be arranged before Monday next, in order that Palmerston may be able to reply victoriously, by facts, to the threatened motion of Lord Stanley."

The Globe's correspondent writes that Lord Normandy's efforts to bring the Minister of Foreign affairs to some positive decision, had failed, although matters were, and are still regarded as virtually arranged.

General Lahitte's party appears to be waiting for more favorable advices from Russia.

It is stated, on French authority, that the Russian Government has addressed a political note to the English Cabinet, repudiating the notion that British subjects living in Tuscany or Naples during the late revolt, have any just claim for indemnity for the losses they incurred during those disturbances. The Russian Minister observes that the St Petersburg Cabinet completely identifies itself with the principles which have served as the basis of the conduct of the Cabinet of Vienna.

Thursday.—Paris 5s opened at 94, and closed at 93 a 95.

The War Budget of 1851 is less than the last by upwards of 13,000,000 francs.

The Heraldo publishes a letter from Centa, of 31st ult., stating that a Moorish army, commanded by two Pachas—the one white and the other black, was marching towards the frontier of Algiers with hostile intentions towards the French.

Rome.—Latest accounts from Rome state that the Pope is wholly absorbed in religious ceremony, to the exclusion of all attention to his temporal government. The people are said to evince a very uneasy state of feeling, and nothing but the presence of foreign troops restrains a popular demonstration against the government.

Denmark and the Duchies.—Several proposals for the settlement of the difficulties have been published by the Schleswig Deputies. Preparations for hostilities continue.

The Duchies.—The several proposals of the Schleswig Deputies, as the basis of negotiations, have been published, but are considered as wholly inadmissable.

Baron Neyendorf had returned to Berlin, from Warsaw, and the Emporer of Russia is said to have fully approved of all that has been done by Denmark, and united with that cabinet in the opinion that, if force alone is to solve the question, its adjustment must not be protracted.

The Holsteiners have fired upon a Danish man-of-war, cruising off the port Hieleghaven, the head-quarters of the Danish troops in Jutland. Koldnig, the Swedish general, and his troops, have received orders to be in readiness to march.

The preparations for hostilities continue upon a great scale in Prussia. The King seems to be fast recovering from his wound. The papers lodged by Goethe with the government have been examined, and the correspondence between Goethe and his brother poet Schiller has been found, and will be published forthwith.

Prussia.—Nothing of moment. The King is fast recovering, and may be considered out of danger.

Baltimore, June 27, 5 P. M.

Conviction for Smuggling.—Important Case.—The New Mexico Movement—Free Soil and Hunker Compromise—The Western Markets.

A trial for smuggling took place yesterday in our United States District Court, which has excited much attention in our commercial community. It appears that a few weeks since ten casks of succory (a substitute for coffee) arrived in the ship Schiller, shipped by the house of A. F. Leydenroth & Co., consigned to Messrs. Spilcker & Alberti, a German importing house of this city; and one of the casks, on being examined at the Custom House, was found to have concealed among the succory a tin box, containg 54 dozen of silk ornamented purses, and several paper packages containing nine pounds of sewing silk, and 39 dozen white kid gloves. The value of the casks of succory is about $24, on which there is a duty of ten per cent, and the concealed articles are valued at $600, on which the duty is 30 per cent. The firm of Alberti & Spilker claimed the succory, but denied all knowledge of the concealed goods. One of the firm, Mr. Alberti, is now in Europe, and the other, Mr. Spilker, was arrested and held to bail in the sum of $5,000. He was yesterday tried, and found guilty; but since the rendition of the verdict, cannot be found. An indictment is also standing against Mr. Alberti.—The penalty for the offence is two years' imprisonment, and a fine of $5,000, besides the forfeiture of the goods. They are both wealthy, and have been regarded as among our most respectable merchants.

A letter from New York says that the news from Santa Fe created an intense sensation in that city. It is thought that the erection of a State Government there, under the circumstances, will drive the South to extremes, and embarrass if not indefinitely postpone the admission of California. There are many who think that Texas will immediately make war on New Mexico, and few indeed are there who have now any belief in the passage of the "Omnibus bill."

The Free-soil and Hunker Democrats of New York, met again in convention at Tammany Hall last night, to see if they could not arrange for a more permanent and harmonious union than exists at present. They had another warm time of it, but harmony and union seemed to be as distant as ever.

The ivory statue of Christ, which was sent to this country, and exhibited by Mr. Edward Lester, whilst Consul at Genoa, is advertised to be sold at auction at New York on Monday next.

In our market, this morning, there were sales of 1,100 bbls. Howard st. flour at $5 12½. City Mills are held to-day at $5 37½. Sales of white corn, at 59 a 60; and of yellow at 61 a 62; oats, 42 a 43; whiskey 25 cts. per gallon in hhds.

At Philadelphia, this morning, the stock market was dull. Flour is inactive, and common shipping brands are held at $5 19 a $5 25; prime white wheat sells at 130c, and yellow corn at 63c.

At New York, Fancy Stocks are buoyant. No change in flour, and corn has declined slightly. Cotton has declined one-eighth, with sales.

Arrival of the Niagara at Boston.

Boston, *June 26th*, 5½, P. M.

The steamship Niagara, from Liverpool, via Halifax, has just reached her dock. She left Halifax at 3½ o'clock, yesterday morning. Her mails will reach you on Friday morning.

Sailing of the Canada—Boston Markets.

Boston, *June* 26.

The royal mail steamship Canada left her wharf at noon, with 92 passengers, 79 of whom are for Liverpool and 13 for Halifax. She has also $27,000 in gold dust on board. Among the passengers were Hon. Rufus Choate and the late Mayor of Havana.

The market for flour is dull. Corn rules heavy with moderate sales. Provisions are in limited request at steady prices.

The "Paine" Light.—The Worcester Spy says: "Henry M. Paine requests us to state on his behalf, that the proposed lighting of the Astor House in New York, is purely a matter of *business* not of *experiment*. A party of New Yorkers made certain propositions to the proprietors of Mr. Paine's invention, the basis of which was the lighting of the Astor House. These propositions were modified by the owners, and sent back for the concurrence of the New Yorkers, and the acceptance of them is yet to take place.—Mr. Paine has been in readiness to meet the test for days, and if the terms are accepted in time, will light the Astor House on the Fourth of July next."

Peaches.—It is said that the peach crop will be immense, this year. The dealers in this delicious article are down in the mouth at the prospect of having a heavy crop on hand. To meet this difficulty, some of the peach men in the vicinity of the SandHills are erecting very large and extensive drying sheds, calculated to cure fifty bushels at a time. The lovers of peaches may felicitate themselves on the prospect of abundance, if the dealers are a little fearful of their profits. The quality of the fruit is of course likely to suffer from overloading of the trees.—*Trenton Gazette.*

A Gem.

There's not a heath, however rude,
But hath some little flower
To brighten up its solitude,
And scent the evening hour.
There's not a heart, however cast
By grief and sorrow down,
But hath some mem'ry of the past,
To love and call its own.

On Waltzing.

What! the girl I adore by another embraced!
What! the balm of her lips shall another man taste!
What! touch'd in the twirl by another man's knee!
What! pant and recline on another than me!
Sir, s he's your's. From the grape you have pressed the soft blue!
From the rose you have shaken the tremulous dew!
When you touch you may take! Pretty waltzer, adieu!

Man's Weakness.

What mock'ries are our most firm resolves!
To will is ours, but not to execute.
We map our future like some unknown coast,
And say, "Here is an harbour, here a rock—
The one we will attain, the other shun;"
And we do neither. Some chance gale springs up
And bears us far o'er some unfathomed sea.
Our efforts are all vain; at length we yield
To winds and waves, that laugh at man's control.

To the Editors of the Southern Press:

Messrs Editors: As it is your purpose to make the experiment whether a political journal at the seat of government can sustain itself, in making the discussion of grave matters of state and public justice a preferable object to the ignoble wranglings and vituperations of party, it is presumed you will cheerfully afford space for the following extract from the report of the minority, of the Committee on the Territories, made at the last session of Congress, on the subject of the title and boundaries of Texas.

The extract comprehends that part of the report which relates to the legal construction of the resolutions of annexation. Five typographical errors of a purely verbal and immaterial character have been corrected.

EXTRACT.

It is a notorious fact, apparent from the journals of proceedings in both branches of the Federal Legislature, and from numberless other sources, that the scheme of annexation was greatly embarrassed by the question, whether the United States should take a cession of the public domain of Texas, and, in consideration, assume the payment of her public debt, or leave her debt in her own hands, and also her territory, as the means of payment.

It was considered by many that, as the United States deprived the Republic of Texas of the resource of impost duties, they were bound to assume her debt. But it was thought by others that the large amount of territory secured by annexation to Texas would be an equivalent for the loss of her impost system, and would constitute ample means of discharging all her debts.

The latter view ultimately prevailed in the Congress of the United States. Texas retained her debt and her public domain, and no one can be found to deny that, in estimating the value of the security afforded her by annexation, in preference to the maintaining of her title to her public domain; and, in considering the means she would have left to discharge her liabilities, after yielding her impost system to the United States, the entire domain east of the Rio Grande was had in contemplation; nor will any one dispute the proposition, that if the United States, as at one time was intended, had assumed the debt of Texas, and received from her, in consideration thereof, a cession of her unappropriated territory, they would have regarded such cession as covering the whole territory east of the Rio Grande; and Texas would never have had the hardihood to question the fairness of the claim.

She therefore demands no more in relation to territory than the United States would and ought to have insisted upon in case the resolutions which ceded her territory to the United States had been adopted by Congress in lieu of those that were adopted.

The authority of the United States in reference to the question of boundary between Texas and Mexico was derived from the provisions of the resolutions of admission into the Federal Union, and conformable to a power vested in the Federal Government by the constitution. But what is this power? It is a power to act by *treaty* and not by *legislation*. We deny the right of Congress to divide or reduce the territory of a sovereign State without its consent. The Constitution is express upon this subject. Whatever power the United States may possess in cases of this sort rests with its *treaty-making* authorities.

The treaty making authority is applicable only to questions to which foreign States are parties. The present question does not concern any foreign State, or involve any foreign relation whatever. It is a question between the Union and one of the sovereign States of the Union, and while the treaty-making power is, from its very nature, wholly inapplicable to it, the Constitution has invested the Congress, the Legislature of the Union, with no power to legislate upon the subject. Nor do the resolutions of annexation concede such a power, even were it legitimate to look to such a source for the derivation and origin of legislative authority.

If the Rio Bravo be not the western boundary of Texas, then she has no western boundary, and any one imaginable line might be indicated as well as any other. And if Congress may assume to exercise a power conceded and belonging to the treaty-making authorities of the Union, Texas is liable to be reduced to the smallest conceivable dimensions. It is in vain to say that Mexico refused to treat; for, though reluctantly, yet in the end she did in fact treat. And the late treaty by which she ceded California and New Mexico to the United States ought to have designated and settled the boundary of Texas. And the fact that the United States omitted to prescribe a boundary in the only way in which they were authorized to do, shows conclusively that they meant to acquiesce in the one claimed by Texas. And Congress, the law making authority, cannot assume to say what the treaty-making authority ought to have done, and to found a claim to reversionary power upon the imputed neglect, oversight, or delinquency of the treaty-making authority.

That the late treaty did not disturb the boundary of the Rio Grande, did not prescribe any other, shows that the Executive and Senate meant to acquiesce in that boundary; and the resolutions of annexation fully commit Congress to the same boundary, should the treaty-making authority agree upon it. In not prescribing a different boundary, the Executive and Senate practised no bad faith towards the Legislature of the Union. They neglected nothing they were commanded to do, but only omitted what they were permitted to do or not to do upon their own free discretion. The only ground; upon which Congress could insist upon a different boundary, would be that the treaty-making authorities intended that a different one should be fixed upon. But where is the proof that a different one was intended? Can it be found in the fact that the one claimed by Texas was not disturbed?

The controversy in relation to boundary was not between Texas and this Union, but between Texas and the Republic of Mexico. And if Mexico refused to treat, the forfeiture of claim should fall upon her, and not upon Texas, who stood at all times submissive to the treaty-making authority. Contrary reasoning would be strange indeed!

In submitting the question of boundary to the United States, Texas hoped to avail herself of the friendship and advocacy of the United States. She set a high value upon the advantage of having the moral force of so powerful a government in favor of her pretensions and claims. But if this friendship and advocacy are to be displaced and substituted by adverse and rival pretensions—if this moral force is to be brough to bear against her, if she has only exchanged a controversy with Mexico for one with the U. States, then it would be better for her had she kept her destinies in her own hands, and stood up single-handed against her former adversary.

The power conceded by Texas to the United States, in acceding to the resolutions of annexation, was not a power to institute and ordain arbitrarily the limits and extent of her territory, as though she had been a new State about to be formed and admitted into the Union, having no determinate claim to any definite limits or extent of territory. Instead of such, it was a mere *judicial* power to ascertain a boundary previously existing, and to which Texas laid a definitive claim.

The power did not cover the whole matter of boundary and territorial compass; if it did, the United States might claim to unsettle every boundary of the State—east, west, north or south, and reduce it to any shape or size they might please; they might cut off a portion of her territory as well south, or east, as west or north.

The subject of boundary, as a substantive matter, was not meant to be placed under the jurisdiction of the United States; but only were "*questions of boundary*" submitted to their arbitrament.

There was pending at the time of annexation a question of boundary between Texas and Mexico, and this *question* relating to boundary was the whole foundation and final cause of the authority vested in the United States; and it was the solemn duty of the United States, by their treaty-making authorities, to adjudge and determine this question in a manner as favorable to Texas as Mexico might, by all the lawful means of negotiation, be induced to acquiesce in.

But this *question* ceasing to exist, all authority dependant upon its existence must also cease.

Naval Intelligence.—The following vessels of the Mediterranean fleet were at Naples on the 20th of May. The frigate Independence, bearing the broad pennant of Com. Morgan; St. Lawrence, Capt. Paulding; Cumberland, Capt. Latimer; and the ship Erie, Capt. Porter. The steamer Mississippi, Capt. Long, had gone on a cruise, and the frigate Constitution, Capt. Conover, was at Spezia. The Independence was to sail for Lisbon on the 21st, and the St. Lawrence a few days afterwards, for a short cruise. The Cumberland left on the 20th, for a cruise in the Adriatic; and the Erie left on the same day for Palermo, to disinter the remains of the late Capt. Gwinn, of Philadelphia, and deliver them to his family.