INDIANAPOLIS, APRIL 4, 1850.

To Correspondents.

B. F. C., Connersville. Yours was duly received, but you are mistaken in your supposition. It came up in course of "trotting out" "the colts!" Thank you, and hope to hear from you often, if not oftener.

Something Rich---Bausman vs. Clayton.

Our Whig friend Wm. Bausman, late editor of the Lafayette Journal, is out in the Washington Union in an address of a column and a half, "to the President of the United States," in which he gives Mr. Secretary Clayton "thunder." He recites, with a stately pomposity which would do credit to Gibbon, that in January last, he filed with the Secretary of State, (or rather with his door keeper, for the Secretary himself could not be seen,) his application "for a commission of the consulate at Tangier, Morocco." Why this particular spot of "all the world" was selected in preference to the habitations of "the rest of mankind" as the scene of his glory, does not appear. Notwithstanding our friend B. was backed by "recommendations of such an honorable and complete character as are seldom or never presented by applicants for office," he was destined to see his laudable ambition to serve his country nipped in the bud. —utterly squashed! Mr. Bausman says he waited for "several weeks" to see the effect of his recommendations, but becoming impatient, "sought *eight* different occasions, during the hours assigned by cabinet etiquette for an audience with the honorable Secretary," but "on eighth different occasions was doomed to disappointment!" Then Ned. McGaughey tried it *eight* different times, and he could'nt come it either! At the eighth round Mc. "gave it up," but not so with the pertinacious Bausman. At the "ninth (auspicious number) attempt, his labors were actually crowned with success," and he looked upon the prodigious great man which it had taken him about 34 hours to get sight of! Clayton told him he had examined the numerous recommendations, and found them of "a very excellent character," had spoken to the President on the subject, &c., who said he designed making no change in the office in question at present, but would inform the Secretary when he desired to do so, &c. But what was Bausman's surprise a few days after to see it announced in the newspapers, that the identical "consulate at Tangier had been conferred upon a Mr. Brown of New York!" Bausman says "well authenticated private rumor asserts, that among the applicants for this office besides myself, were Mr. Brown and Mr. Porter, at present in the city. Mr. Porter was refused the appointment at Tangier, because, as the honorable Secretary stated, he had '*promised* it to a *personal friend of his*' —this Mr. Brown. 'But,' continued the Secretary, 'I confer upon you the consulate at Tripoli, with like salary, in the same dominions, in consideration of a long standing acquaintance with your father,' or some like unjustifiable reason."

Then Bausman proceeds to discuss Clayton's "malversations and duplicity in office," holding him up to "merited public indignation," calling him a "falsifier and paltroon," &c. He says:

"The general course of the Secretary of State, in the exercise of the appointing power, has been such as to cover him with shame, to bring reproach upon your administration, and to scatter the whig party into such minute fragments as to deprive it even of a nucleus for a rallying point. His chief delight has appeared to be, to overlook the claims of the masses, to confer his rewards upon broken-down politicians, who have been twice, thrice, and irretrievably condemned by the people—to bestow the patronage of the government upon *great men's sons*, who have no claims but those derived from distinguished parentage—in fact, to subserve his own personal ambition at the expense of your reputation, and to the detriment of the whig party."

Bausman ventures to remind old Zack that the "power behind the throne" is sometimes "greater than the throne itself," and that he obtained laurels as a General which I am afraid are withering on the brow of the Executive!" "It may be," he says, "that Indiana has no claims on the patronage of the government, as she failed, for want of numerical whig strength, to succeed—on the suggestion of a prominent Connecticut politician—in sending a strong enough whig delegation to Congress to secure her any fair proportion of that patronage. She was not wanting in volunteers, however, when a requisition was made upon her to fight the battles of Mexico."

Now all this comes, be it remembered, from a sworn friend of Taylorism, from one who "wasted" himself to secure its advent, even to the spending of "his whole substance."

Oh! Bausman, Bausman, your friends will surely have to give you another *public dinner!*

SHOCKING, IF NOT FATAL, ACCIDENT.—A shocking accident occurred at Scipio on Thursday last. A lady, accompanied by her husband and an infant came on board the railroad cars from Madison, and were to land at Scipio. The train stopped about four minutes, as we are informed. Several passengers had landed, among whom was the husband of the lady, who left her and the infant. Just as the signal was given to start, and the train had begun to move, the woman appeared on the platform of the car with her infant; and on being asked if she wished to get off, and replying affirmatively, she was told to hold on till the train was stopped. As the breakman turned to reach the bell rope, she stepped down one step, and was immediately caught between the car and platform, and fairly rolled into a narrow space of not exceeding ten inches. The motion of the car was stopped, but not until she had been *ground* the entire length of the car. She was caught just above the hips. When the train left, she was still alive, but none supposed she could live half an hour. This is the most correct statement we can get from those who witnessed the scene.

This is a fitting occasion to notice a complaint which is getting general, namely: that on stopping, either to receive or discharge passengers, the cars are put in motion again without allowing sufficient time to see that the object is safely accomplished. It is more especially so at regular stopping places. We hope that the proper authorities will see that no further cause for these shall exist. We would also caution those who are not familiar with riding on such conveyances, to be more careful. It is strange that so many appear so perfectly ignorant of the laws of motion and gravity as daily to risk their lives; and it is wonderful that more accidents do not happen. This very ignorance, however, should make those having control, not only cautious but diligent, *and doubly so*. May this be a warning to all concerned.

P. S. The woman died shortly after the accident. Her name was Ashworth, and she was from Kentucky.

☞Mr. Webster is positively opposed to any enactment in accordance with "the will of God." That would be inconsistent with his notion of consistency in whiggery, we suppose; but if the will of the *Devil* comes in question, he would have "no objections" probably!

☞A new and handsome paper has just been commenced at Connersville, Ia., entitled "Fayette and Union Chronicle." It is edited by C. W. Cottom and John S. Reid. Both are gentlemen of ability, and Mr. Reid especially is one of the finest writers in this State. He is the author of "Gulzar" and other poems of merit. We wish the new enterprise great success, in every respect.

☞The Homestead Exemption Bill has passed the General Assembly of Ohio, and is now a law.

Indiana State Sentinel.

Published every Thursday.] INDIANAPOLIS, APRIL 4, 1850. [Volume IX::::::Number 44.

The Georgia Lands.

We publish, with pleasure, the following communication from Governor Dunning, relative to the statements of the New Albany Bulletin and the Richmond Palladium, in regard to the Georgia Lands. And we commend it to the careful consideration of our readers, who we are sure, have no desire to condemn any party hastily or unheard.

MESSRS. CHAPMANS & SPANN:—I had placed in my hands by a friend a day or two since whilst attending court at this place, your paper of the 20th instant, containing an article from the "New Albany Bulletin," in relation to the sale, by me, of the Georgia Lands, to Martin R. Green, Esq., during the time I held the office of Governor of this State. I should have noticed this matter immediately had not my business in court prevented until this day. My object, at the present time, is barely to give a brief explanation of the matter, which I think will satisfy every intelligent and candid mind, that there is nothing wrong on my part. On the 5th of March last, or thereabout, I sold to Mr. Green the lands commonly denominated the "Georgia Lands," for the amount named in the Joint Resolution of the Legislature, to-wit: $1,000; between the 25th and 30th of September, 1849: he paid me between four and five hundred dollars, which I paid over to Mr. Hannah, late Treasurer of State, as will appear from the following receipt:

Indianapolis, Oct. 1, 1849.

Received of his Ex. P. C. Dunning, four hundred and twenty-five dollars, to be applied to the payment on account of Georgia Lands.

SAML. HANNAH, *Treasurer.*

On the Thursday before the meeting of the Legislature, Mr. Green came to Indianapolis, and paid me the residue. At this time I had on deposit with Mr. Hannah, a larger amount of money of my own, (to say nothing of a balance due me on my salary, and one or two other claims which I had allowed officially, and was requested and authorized to settle with the Treasurer,) than would cover the amount paid me by Mr. Green. Immediately preceding the meeting of the Legislature, I was very busy, and did not go and settle with Mr. Hannah, supposing there was no great hurry required about the matter. Very early, however, in December, I did call upon Mr. Hannah and tell him, that if he would hand me the money of my own deposited with him, that I would hand him out of it what I supposed would pay off the amount of the $1,000 for the Georgia Lands, after including the balance due me, and the accounts alluded to above. I told Mr. Hannah my object, and that I would call at some convenient time, and we would settle the whole matter. Mr. Hannah took the money, and told me the accounts could be settled at any time. I did not ask him for a receipt, nor did he give me any. All these facts, and many more, were stated before the committee of ways and means during the session, in presence of Mr. Hannah, to which he gave his assent, as the committee will well recollect. On the 22d of January, I called upon Mr. Hannah, as I was about to leave Indianapolis, with a view of making a final settlement, when Mr. Hannah returned me $160 of the money I had handed him in December, saying that the money was good, but was at a small discount. I took it back, and told him I had not funds enough to pay it all off, having loaned two or three friends some money, and not expecting the money to be returned by him. He remarked that it made no difference, that he would receipt to me for the residue due on the Georgia Lands, and I could send up in February by the Treasurer of my (Monroe) county. I replied that I would not trespass upon his kindness so far, that he might just receipt me for what there was in money, excluding the $160 and the account, and that I would either send it up by the county treasurer, or come myself; he did so, and General Drake has the receipt in his possession at this time. According to promise, I was at Indianapolis on the day my county treasurer left that place, and tendered my receipts and the residue of the money to General Drake, whose written statement of that fact I have in my possession, and likewise as Gen. Drake, Mr. Hannah, and myself know, paid $500 more to Gen. Drake, for a gentleman to whom I agreed to loan that amount, and who received an advance from Mr. Hannah of $250 on my word that it should be refunded to him by Mr. Abel, the Monroe county treasurer, with an offer to advance the whole $500 if I said so; if Mr. Hannah and Gen. Drake do not bear me out in every statement I have made, I will surrender the question. As to any *fraud in the sale*, I simply refer to the report of the committee of ways and means of the last House of Representatives, to which that portion of my message was referred, and which you will find by reference to the House journal. In reply to the statement of the value of those lands, contained in the article from Senator Holloway's paper, I will say that Mr. Bright reports, during the time he was Agent of State, that he had offered the lands for sale and could not get a higher bid than $500, and that the lands are utterly worthless. Mr. Collins, the late Agent of State, in his report to the Legislature in 1848, says that the lands are wholly worthless; and in a letter written to me in October last, from New York, he states, that he had lately conversed with the Agent, long ago appointed by the late Gov. Noble, and that he pronounced the lands wholly worthless without a very large expenditure of money, and even then, the value of the lands is very questionable, and expressing the opinion that the purchaser will not make anything on the purchase. Any correspondence I have had with Mr. Collins, (whom I esteem as a gentleman,) is of a public character, and of course, I am very willing that it shall be published. I have also his letters to me, and will publish them so far as it may be necessary to defend myself. I will here say, however, that they contain nothing that I know of in the least derogatory to him as a man or an officer. So soon as the Brown circuit court is over you shall hear from me again upon another branch of this question. Before closing this communication, already too long by a minute detail of facts, which I desire your readers to know, to understand the whole question. In justice to Mr. Hannah I must be permitted to state, that I presume he did not know the precise language of his receipt at the time the Legislature called upon him for information, as he has not seen it since he gave it to me. I will make a fuller explanation of this matter in my next. I will add, that during my term of service, I always found Mr. Hannah gentlemanly and accommodating. I have deposited with him for safe-keeping of my own, but mostly for the Professors in our State University, (whose quarterly payments I have drawn during a part of the time) thousands of dollars, and that there never was one cent counted or recounted between us; and I am proud to say, that there was no time at which, in my opinion, he would not have receipted to me for the full amount of the Georgia Lands, had I intimated to him that it was my wish.

PARIS C. DUNNING.

Martinsville, March 24th, 1850.

INDIANAPOLIS AND BELLEFONTAINE RAILROAD.—We learn that the President and Treasurer of this road have recently made such arrangements in the city of New York, as will enable the Company to commence laying the heavy T rail on their road by the first of May next, and to press the work vigorously. We notice that the work is progressing rapidly through the south-east part of our city on the Union track from the Madison depot, towards the Bellefontaine depot, preparatory to laying the rail. From the interest enlisted in favor of this road at home and abroad, and the energy with which the work is prosecuted, there seems to be no doubt of its construction at an early day, through our State; while Ohio and Pennsylvania are progressing energetically with their respective links in the line that is to connect us *directly* with Boston, New York and Philadelphia.

☞William Brown, a cooper, was recently killed, while hunting, near Fort Wayne, by the accidental discharge of his gun.

Banking in Pennsylvania.

A general banking law has been introduced into the senate of Pennsylvania. It requires the deposite with the auditor general of Pennsylvania stocks; four-fifths of said stock to bear interest of at least five per cent. per annum, and not to be taken above its par value. One-quarter per cent. semi-annually on these stocks is retained by the State for the extinguishment of the public debt. The amount of circulating notes not to exceed four-fifths of the amount of securities. Capital not to be less than $50,000. No personal liability is involved.

The Pa. Ledger comments upon the proposed law as follows. Some of its suggestions may be useful to our people, for whether we retain our present system, or not, no doubt some modifications will be attempted. If any changes be made, they should be of the right kind, and not the wrong.

"A general banking law is now before the Legislature of Pennsylvania, which, if no material amendments destructive of its conservative provisions should be introduced, cannot fail to operate beneficially on the trade, currency and credit of the State. Among its provisions are several for which the Ledger has always strenuously contended as necessary precautions against public fraud, individual plunder, and successful swindling. First, it makes the stockholders individually liable for all the debts of the concern, pro rata; second, it interdicts any bank from paying out any but its own bills on those equal to specie; third, it interdicts the issue of any bill under $10; fourth, it prohibits the circulation of all foreign bills under $10, after the 25th August, 1850. These are sound and useful provisions. Why one other of its useful provisions was rejected, we are at a loss to imagine, especially as it was so beautifully conceived in the spirit of honor and justice, as to startle with incredulity one half of the community, while it extorted from the other half unqualified approbation, at what appeared to be the reviving virtue of past ages. This clause provided that no person should act as director, president, cashier, or officer of any bank in this Commonwealth, who had ever taken the benefit of any bankrupt or insolvent law, or who at the time was indebted to any person whatever. Surprise and approbation, however, were both soon hushed by an announcement from Harrisburg, that on taking the yeas and nays on this clause of the bill, it was rejected by a large majority. One of the newspapers in making its comments on this fact, claps its wings with the ecstacy of an over-fed rooster, crows as loud as Chapman did for the success of his party, and rejoices that this proscription of the unfortunate has been defeated! God forbid that any government should persecute the unfortunate; but we should like to know what chance there is of any unfortunate man ever attaining to the Directorship, Presidentship, or Clerkship of a Bank? To be unfortunate, in the general sense of the term, is to be poor. But the rejected clause of the bill does not exclude poor persons, but specifies distinctly persons who have availed themselves of laws to cancel the obligation of contracts, as forbidden by all our constitutions. Nor does it follow that such persons are poor. On the contrary, those who pay debts become impoverished, while those who cancel them by laws, from the very nature of the operation, can neither be called poor, nor unfortunate. Inability to pay a debt is vastly different from its repudiation, and from the reading of the proviso of exclusion, it is very apparent that the Legislature only wanted to exclude repudiators from having the management of moneyed corporations, on whose good faith and sound and just management the wages of labor, the savings of industry, and the prosperity of trade so fundamentally rest. The proviso itself, therefore, was pre-eminently honorable to the justice of a Pennsylvania Legislature, and its rejection a commensurate insult to the honesty of the age and the virtue of the people. But this question is so plain and simple, as to defy sophistry to confound its wholesome ethics. Are those fit persons to contract debts with the public? And this is the sole business of banks, who have never paid their own individual obligations. Will it increase the usefulness of banks to have repudiators in their management? The Legislature have but to consider whether they promote or damage the public good by deviating from a high standard of morals, in paper money makers, or adhering to the principle of good faith and sound ethics, as established by the Constitution and the Bible."

Mrs. Swisshelm of the Pittsburgh Vister, switches Mr. Clay in this style:

"Mr. Clay insists that *all the men* in the North are in duty bound to aid in catching runaway slaves. We are glad he does not include the women, for we should hate to be called out in a frosty morning, with a department of the kennel, and sent on the track of some poor old woman with a baby in her arms, or any other half starved, ragged wretch who might be running for that liberty we would not exchange for a considerable number of lives such as the one we have. We hope our male friends will all get nice, new, brass collars fastened on their necks, with their owners' names engraved thereon, when they have acknowledged the obligations, and assumed the duties of pointers and setters."

For the State Sentinel.

My attention has been directed to an article transferred from the Greenville, O., Banner, to the columns of the Indiana State Journal, with comments, in relation to the *guage* of the track of the Indianapolis & Bellefontaine Railroad. About the *motives* that dictated the article, I have no desire to say anything. I will however take the occasion to say a word to the stockholders and the public on the subject of the *guage* of our road. It is true that we have conformed to the *guage* of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road, and so far as I am informed, to that of the other roads of the State. It is also true that Ohio has fixed by law a different guage for her roads; while still different guages are maintained in most of the States east of Ohio, no two of them, I believe, having the same connecting guage. Why then did *Ohio* fix her guage different from those of the roads east of her? Why have not the other States regulated their *guages* by those of adjoining States? These questions involve the merits of the article transferred to the Journal. Men of much more experience than I have in these matters, have answered these questions, that in *practice*, the system of sending cars beyond the jurisdiction of the State, where they are liable to accidents and the ordinary casualities of the road at remote points, requiring repairs, creating confusion of accounts, and delays in transportation, would more than counterbalance any inconvenience growing out of transfers, at the State line, from one line to another. So thought *Ohio*, *Pennsylvania* and *New York*. Be this as it may, as it is a matter only to be *satisfactorily* tested by *experience*, our charter provides that we shall "*intersect*" the Madison and Indianapolis road at Indianapolis. Suppose, however, that we are not restricted by the charter as to our guage, would it be good policy for our company to cut loose from all the other roads centering at Indianapolis, deprive ourselves of the benefits of all these connections, merely to be enabled to send our cars out of the State, where they may not be cared for, and where they must be subjected to the casualties of other roads at remote points. This question when standing alone has been decided, as I have said, in the negative by men of experience in other States. Our position however, removes from my mind all doubts as to the correctness of our policy. If the companies connecting with us in Ohio, see proper to ask for a law to change their guage, they have of course a perfect right to do so. I am at all times thankful for advice, in the management of the concerns of our company,—at the same time, those having the matter immediately in charge, ought to be presumed to know something about their own affairs.

O. H. SMITH.

☞The correspondent of the Journal of Commerce says, that "Mr. Senator Foote has frequently declared that, if Mr. Webster carried his compromise through, it would make him President by the votes of the South West." Perhaps it may, but doubt it somewhat.

By Telegraph.

Congressional.

WASHINGTON, March 25, 1850.

SENATE.—Mr. Webster rose to make an explanation, for the purpose of defending his recent speech from the charge of being inconsistent. He said that some person had been edifying the Senate by sending round a piece of paper quoting from the two speeches. He would not undertake to say now that if any body could make these quotations for the purpose of showing any inconsistency, he either did not understand the subject or was not candid. There was no inconsistency. He had never voted for any increase of slavery or slave Territory. He would carry out the compact made with Texas. Having resisted unsuccessfully the making of the compact, he would not now violate it after it was made.

Mr. Hale replied that the compact was made in '45 and was just as much a reality in 1848 as it was in 1850, and it seemed that under the circumstances there was an unwarrantable difference of sentiment.

Mr. Douglass from the Committee on Territories reported a bill to admit California, and a bill organizing a Territorial Government for New Mexico.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the special order, being the President's California Message.

Mr. Hunter addressed the Senate at length upon the slavery question, maintaining the right of the South to take their slaves into the territories. He said the Union could not be preserved by any patched up compromise, but was ready himself to do anything that promised peace, if consistent with the constitutional rights of his State.

HOUSE.—The bill to supply the deficiencies in the appropriations of the present fiscal year was taken up, and the question was on the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments voting $9000 for a Minister to Russia and $4,500 for a charge to Austria, were concurred in—yeas 114, nays 72.

The amendment appropriating $200,000 for the subsistence of the Florida Indians was concurred in, yeas 105, nays 75.

Other amendments were concurred in and the bill passed.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the California question.

Mr. Thurston said he was the first Representative from Oregon on that floor. He came here not as a party man. He had been grieved to hear California slandered, because she had dared to protect herself and ask for admission. His opinion was that California should be admitted into the Union without plucking a single hair from the golden locks of her golden constitution.

WASHINGTON, March 26, 1850.

Some sensation was caused in the House by an implied imputation, by Mr. King of N. Y., that the Speaker had unwarrantably caused a false entry to be made in the Journal, touching a motion in regard to the California question. The matter was referred, after debate, to a committee of nine.

In the Senate, Foote made a most outrageous personal assault upon Benton, in connection with the California question. The declarations of Foote would be disgraceful to any doggery.

WASHINGTON, March 27.

SENATE.—After the reception of petitions, Mr. Benton rose to a personal explanation. He charged Foote with incorrectly reporting himself yesterday, and denied the right of any Senator to modify any of his expressions in a personal matter, as reported.

Foote was represented to have said that Benton was shielded by his age, and his open disavowal of the obligations of the laws of honor. This was false; let any man offer him (Benton) an insult when it could be properly chastised and he would soon learn his age. He would now give notice to the Senate that if it failed to protect itself from the use of language which would not be used in the veriest brothel, he would henceforth protect himself, cost what it might.

Foote said he had made no unjustifiable alterations, and avowed the report as his own. In conclusion he wanted to know if Benton considered himself amenable to the laws of honor, and if he does not let him say so.

Benton made no reply, but indulged in a contemptuous laugh.

The Senate then resumed the special order of the day, being Clay's resolutions.

Mr. Chase resumed his remarks, declaring himself in favor of the admission of California, and concluded with a strong expression of devotion of the West to the Union.

Mr. Foote's resolution for a select committee of thirteen was made the special order for to-morrow afternoon.

After a brief executive session, the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE—Mr. Winthrop took the chair, at the request of Mr. Cobb.

Mr. Holmes asked and obtained leave, that the committee of investigation appointed yesterday on King's charge of mutilating the Journal of the House, that the committee sit during the session of the House.

Mr. Conger's motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill to extend Woodworth's patent for a planing machine was referred to the committee of the whole, was taken up and adopted.

The bill was then laid on the table, and

The House went into committee of the whole on the California Message.

Mr. Ashmun having the floor, spoke in favor of the admission of California. He said he should vote for it. He believed the views of the President were founded on patriotism and wisdom, and demanded the admiration of the country. Mr. A. said, wisdom and patriotism dictate that we should stand by the President.

Everett accused the President of having interfered in the affairs of California, and was proceeding to show that we were in the midst of a revolution, when he gave way to a motion for the committee to rise, which prevailed.

The Speaker *pro tem.* laid before the House a message from the President, enclosing a report of Thos. Butler King on the condition of California, which was ordered to be printed.

ST. LOUIS, March 25, P. M.—The trial of the Montesquoins commenced this morning. Fifty jurors were empannelled, and only three selected. The court ordered a venira for two hundred, returnable to-morrow morning.

There was an arrival at Independence on the 15th inst., in twenty-two days from Santa Fe. There is no news of especial interest. McCarty's train was robbed on the Arkansas, of all their animals, returning from Santa Fe.

PHILADELPHIA, March 23.—Gov. Johnston submitted yesterday to the two Houses of the Legislature resolutions of the Virginia and Georgia Legislatures complaining of the aggressions of the North. Johnston in his message denies that Pennsylvania has ever failed in her duties, constitutional or otherwise, to her sister States of the South. A historical summary which the message embraces sustains the Governor in his vindication of the fidelity of Pennsylvania.

NEW YORK, March 25.—The Crescent City arrived from Chagres this afternoon, she brings eight passengers, and no later California news. The Ohio sailed on the same day. The Unicorn was the next steamer due at Panama and would arrive on the 28th inst.

MOB IN WISCONSIN.—A State Senator residing in Milwaukie, by the name of J. B. Smith, having rendered himself odious to a portion of that community by his agency in a law in relation to the sale of ardent spirits, his house was attacked by a mob of some three hundred persons, and considerable damage was done in the heat of passion.

☞The trial of Prof. Webster for the alleged murder of Dr. Parkman, is now progressing at Boston. The testimony is strong against the accused. The false teeth, and marks on the body are identified positively. The trial occasions great interest.

Slavery in the Territories.

Speech of Hon. W. A. Gorman,

In the House of Representatives, March 12, 1850.

In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

Mr. GORMAN said:

MR. CHAIRMAN: In proposing to offer my views to the committee upon the subject under consideration, I must necessarily touch very briefly upon the topics now agitating the public mind, and alluded to in the President's message now before us. Therefore, without further introduction, I propose to give the views of myself and a large majority of the constituents I have the honor to represent. I need not remark, that almost every State, in which African slavery is tolerated as an institution, has declared, by legislative resolves, by and through the messages of their several Governors, and by expressions of their feelings and sentiments in primary meetings, that the Congress of the United States has no constitutional power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the States or Territories. This fact is universally known, through the medium of the press. These States have, in the most solemn manner, declared their determination never to submit to further aggression upon what they deem their constitutional rights. This leads me to inquire whether the institution of slavery exists in any of the territory lately acquired by the treaty with Mexico. We of the free States have held, and now hold, that African slavery, or involuntary servitude, does not exist there. In proof of this position, we say, that when a Government acquires territory, inhabited by people, that all laws, not strictly political, remain in full force, until they are altered by the new sovereign. Here we admit, if a country is discovered by the people of a nation, in this instance, the laws of the Government to which the discoverer owes allegiance are brought with them, and are in force until they are altered by some other legitimate power.

"It is a settled principle in the law and usage of nations, that the inhabitants of a conquered territory change their allegiance, and their relation to their former sovereign is dissolved; but their relation to each other, and their rights of property, not taken from them by orders of the conqueror, remain undisturbed."—5 *Rob. Rep.*, 106.

"The cession or conquest of a territory does not affect the rights of property."—*Vattel, b. 3, ch. 13, sec. 200.*

"Again: in the case of the United States against Percheman, 7 Peters U. S. Rep., 51; Michell *vs.* The United States, 9 Peters U. S. Rep., 711; Strother *vs.* Lucas, 12 Peters, 410, 438."

"*The laws, usages, and municipal regulations, in force at the time of conquest or cession, remain in force until changed by the new sovereign.*"—*Calvin's case, 7 Co. 17; Campbell vs. Hall, Cowp. R. 209; 9 Peters U. S. Rep., 711, 734, 748, 749; Strother vs. Lucas, 12 Peters, 410.*

"There is no doubt of the power of the sovereign to change the laws of a conquered or ceded country by a mere declaration of his will."

But the sovereignty of the American States rests in the people, and is promulgated through their representatives, in the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Government; and before the laws that, by the usage and custom, are repealed or altered by this Government, they must be governed by the laws in force at the time of the cession. And no one pretends that they have been altered. This principle was well illustrated in New York, in the case of the Canal Appraisers *vs.* The People, 17 Wendell R., 584, 588. When the English acquired the possession of New York by force, in 1664, the charter granted in that year to the Duke of York, contained an explicit declaration of the King's will, that the laws of England should be the established laws of the province. And this put an end to the operation of the Roman-Dutch laws imported from Holland. The illustrations above alluded to, of the sovereign power of the conqueror over the laws of the conquered countries, appear in the case of the northern barbarians, who overrun the south of Europe during the fifth and sixth centuries. They neither adopted their own laws entirely, nor retained those of the conquered countries to their full extent.—*Savigny's History of the Roman Law, vol. 1.*

"The conquest of Gibraltar, Trinidad, Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, Louisiana, &c., all show that the old laws remain, or the laws of the conquering nation, in whole or in part, are substituted at the mere will and pleasure of the conqueror."—*Note to 1st Kent's Com.*, p. 178.

The next question to be determined is, has African slavery been abolished by any legitimate act of the Mexican Republic? We of the West say it has—first, by the decree of 1829; second, by the act of the Mexican Congress of 1837, to which decree, a distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. Rusk) has taken exception, as not being legitimate. This decree is as follows:

"*Day 15.—Decree of the Government in virtue of extraordinary powers.*

"*Abolition of slavery in the Republic.*—1. Slavery is abolished in the Republic. 2. Consequently those are free who until now, have been considered as slaves. 3. When the circumstances of the treasury permit it, the owners of slaves shall be indemnified in the manner prescribed by the laws.

"The decree of the 15th September, 1829, gave liberty to the slaves then in the Republic, with indemnity to their owners or possessors, that property might not seem to be attacked; and finally, in April, 1837, a new law had been published on the abolition of slavery."

He assumes that they have no binding force, because they were promulgated while the Government was in a state of revolution, and by a dictator.

This might have some force, if it were not for the act of the Mexican Congress, acting within their legitimate sphere, passed in 1837, solemnly affirming the decree of 1829. If even this act of the Mexican Congress had not been fully legitimate, all doubt must be dissipated, when the constitution of 1843 absolutely abolished slavery, as the following extract will prove:

"No one is slave in the territory of the nation, and any introduced shall be considered free, and shall be under the protection of the laws."—*Const.* 1843.

The two preceding propositions being affirmed by most of the free States, and denied by part of the South, both sections can, and ought, to settle this vexed question of slavery by the old, time-honored doctrine of the Democratic Republican party—non-intervention; and should a slaveholder emigrate to this territory, or any part of it, we affirm that he will find, staring him in the face, the laws now in force prohibiting slavery. Then we have a constitutional tribunal to test the legal question, which will necessarily then arise, whether his negro is a bondman or freeman? Here, then, I present a peaceable, constitutional remedy for both the North and the South, without resorting to dissolution or prohibition. Will the South accept this non intervention platform? Will the North accept this constitutional and peaceable platform? Will the South trust the Supreme Court? Will the North trust the Supreme Court? If they will, this question can be settled in peace and concord. The legal minds of the South must have been strongly impressed with the belief that slavery did not exist there under or by authority of law; therefore it has been that this species of property has not been taken there, as a general thing, by the southern people.

I now propose to inquire, whether a slaveholder would venture to take his slave there as property? If a citizen of Georgia proposed to emigrate to Louisiana, the first inquiry would naturally be, "Can I hold my slaves as property by the municipal laws of that State?" He is answered, yes. But suppose there is also a law upon the statute books of Louisiana, which declares that all negroes—slave children—born after the year 1852, should be free. I ask the honorable gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) if he could evade the force of that law, by declaring that the Constitution of the United States recognized the institution as existing in Georgia—therefore, he had a vested right to his slave, as property—and being the owner of the mother, that he had a right to the offspring—and that no municipal law could deprive him of it? I presume, as a lawyer, he would not hesitate to say, that he must submit himself and his property to the laws of Louisiana. I ask him whether the municipal law of a territory has not the same binding force upon the inhabitants as it has in a State?

Now, Mr Chairman, I propose to make a brief reply to many assaults which have lately been made upon the Democratic party. The honorable gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) has charged upon the Democratic party North and South, that, by their united efforts, they acquired Texas, the re occupation of Oregon, California, and New Mexico; that, for his part, he "has but one record—and that was, against the acquisition." To this charge, I, in behalf of the gallant Democratic district which I have the honor to represent, plead guilty. It was the Democratic party who stretched out their arms to their Texan brethren, and bid them welcome back to their old mother. It was the Democratic party who sympathized with her cause, and mourned for the loss of her noble sons, who laid down their lives in the cause of liberty; and it was the Whig party that opposed her cause. It was the Democratic party who was for the war with Mexico, brought on by the shedding of American blood upon American soil; it was the Whig party that opposed it, with a few noble exceptions. It was the Democratic party who declared that this war was begun by the act of Mexico; it was the Whig party who said, that it was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the act of the President. It was the Democratic party who acquired California and New Mexico, with her inexhaustible mines of gold and silver,—and other precious metals—thereby opening a new and extensive trade on the Pacific; it was the Whig party who opposed it. It was the Democratic party that obtained the reoccupation of Oregon, with her vast agricultural resources, her noble rivers, and her harbors; it was the Whig party who opposed it, with a few honorable exceptions. The honorable gentleman from Georgia should have gone further, and told his Whig friends that it was the Democratic party that acquired Florida from Spain, and Louisiana from France; both of which acquisitions have opened new channels of commerce and wealth, and given an outlet to the great valley of the Mississippi, for her inexhaustible agricultural productions; it was the Whigs that opposed it. It has been the Democratic party, who have always advocated the progress of human liberty throughout the world; it has always been the Whig party who opposed it.

Sir, I now propose to say a few words about the hackneyed phrase of northern and southern aggression. The fanatics of the North—I mean the Abolitionists—and their co-laborers, in the work of agitation, charge that the South have succeeded in carying every measure before Congress. Why is this so? I answer, (if it is true,) that the heavy body of the Democratic party has generally been south of Mason and Dixon's line, and that they have had most of the Presidents—a Washington, a Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Polk. These illustrious men always maintained the doctrine of a strict construction of, and a firm adherence to the Constitution of the United States, and that Congress should exercise no power not granted in the Constitution, except it be a necessary incident thereto, to carry into effect some expressly delegated power. Each of these illustrious patriots left their impress upon the age in which they lived and ruled. They transmitted to their posterity their pure republican principles, which have been beacon lights to the Democratic party ever since. With those republican doctrines, many of the northern States and nearly all the western States, have deeply sympathized, as the only safe doctrine for the perpetuity of American liberty. For many years past, the South alone have not had the numerical strength to pass any law without assistance from the North and West. The Democratic party, North and South, have invariably resisted the doctrine of protecting the manufacturing capital of the North and East, at the expense of the great agricultural interest of the country; and I very much fear, that this agitation of the slavery question has its foundation in a desire to get rid of any further association with this republican sentiment of the South; and finding the Southern people sensitive upon the subject of slavery, have seized upon that question as a pretext to cover up the real motive. But, Mr. Chairman, what do the South ask? I answer, nothing, but to be let alone. If I understand her statesmen, and those who profess to speak for her upon this floor, they do not propose to extend the institution of slavery by any act of Congress. The Democratic party of the South, in most of the States, have passed resolutions, declaring the doctrine of non-intervention as the only constitutional ground that can be taken on the subject of slavery in the territories. Resolutions were adopted by the Democratic party of Georgia and Mississippi, in 1848, substantially as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the people of the South do not ask of Congress to establish the institution of slavery in any of the territory that may be acquired by the United States. They simply require, that the inhabitants of each territory shall be left free to determine for themselves, whether the institution of slavery shall, or shall not, form a part of their society."

Upon the platform laid down in the above resolution, the Democratic party went into the political contest in 1848. Upon that platform, the great body of the Democratic party yet stand firm; and had the honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] been found doing battle in the cause of that distinguished patriot, Lewis Cass, and brought that gallant little State of Georgia into the Democratic ranks, he would not now be under the necessity of raising his voice in defence of the constitutional rights of the South. He would then have had at the helm of Government a man, pledged to veto any unconstitutional restriction upon the rights of the people; but he chose to continue chained to the idol of party, and what has been his reward? I might leave him to answer; but I propose to tell him what he has done. He has a President, who recommends masterly inactivity upon the subject of the territories. He tells Congress, in the message now under consideration, to leave these people without government, without American laws, or without the protection of the American Constitution, until they form a State Constitution, and then admit them into this Union—that is, he tells the gentleman from Georgia to slumber on quietly, and wait until the enemy have taken possession of the fortress; and then tells him, he must surrender at discretion. Again, Mr. Chairman: The Whigs of the slaveholding States have had much to do in making friends to this slavery agitation. Your Letchers and Metcalfes of Kentucky, came to Indiana, and told our people that General Taylor, if elected President, would let the will of the people, as expressed through their Representatives in Congress, become the law of the land; and that he would not exercise the veto power against the passage of the Wilmot proviso. Upon these declarations and pledges, the North relied, and voted for General Taylor. In the South, General Taylor was held up as a Southern man, identified with the institutions of the South by all the ties of birth, education, locality, sympathy, and pecuniary interest; that he was the owner of slaves himself, and that he never would desert the South. In this dilemma General Taylor now finds himself. He is now the President of the Republic, and under the Constitution is compelled to recommend, from time to time, such measures as he may deem necessary to promote the public welfare.—And thus we have the message now before us, to extricate him, and save him from the calamity which must necessarily befall him and his administration, should he be compelled to approve, or disapprove the Wilmot proviso. And, sir, I can well imagine the difficulty he will have to encounter by doing either. At this juncture, the honorable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Stanley] comes to the rescue; and it almost seems to me, sir, that I can see the old soldier, struggling like Cæsar in the Tiber, with raised arms, and hear him cry to the honorable gentleman from North Carolina, "Help me Cassius, or I sink!" while faithful Cassius flies to the rescue, and boldly charges the Democratic party with a design to break down General Taylor's Administration. He says, (I quote from memory,) "that party is at the bottom of all this 'agitation; that we have had a southern man for President, 'southern Speakers of the House of Representatives, and 'Democratic majorities in this House and have never manifested opposition heretofore, but have reserved all our assaults, until General Taylor became President." To this, I have only to say, that when we have had Democratic majorities, there was no danger of breaking over constitutional barriers, and invading the domestic institutions of the South. Sir, until lately, the Democratic party has been but slightly infected with this fanatical spirit of agitation. But the whole Whig party of my State, with a few honorable exceptions, sympathized with this abolition, and free soil movement, until General Taylor's nomination for the Presidency. If any of that party from my State can give any information, I leave the task for them.

Mr. Chairman, I now propose to show the spirit that animates the Abolitionists, and most of the Free-Soilers in the North. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] has been denounced all over the North, through the press, and elsewhere, for sentiments uttered during the heated excitement existing here, pending the election for Speaker—sentiments, sir, that I did not approve, and never expect to. The honorable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hilliard] has been arraigned by the honorable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Stanley,] for uttering sentiments, and proposing resistance to any further encroachments upon southern rights: these were uttered during the heat of debate, and can, and ought to be, by honorable and fair men, partially excused.

But, sir, I beg you to listen to the deliberate and cool language of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. Mann.] He says: "In conclusion, I have only to add, 'that such is my solemn and abiding conviction of the character of slavery, that, under a full sense of my responsibility to my country and my God, I deliberately say, better 'disunion—better a civil or a servile war—better anything 'that God in his providence shall send—than an extension of 'the bonds of slavery."

Who from the South was ever heard to use such language? Who from the South ever implored disunion and civil war rather than the non-extension of slavery? Who from the South ever uttered so treasonable a sentiment? I answer, none. Let us reverse this deliberate declaration of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and put it into the mouth of a gentleman from a southern State, and then view it in all its wicked and immoral tendencies. "Better disunion—better 'a civil or a servile war—better anything that God in his 'providence shall send, than that we shall not get slavery 'extended to California or New Mexico." What would the northern press, the northern Representatives have said to such a sentiment? It would have been denounced as most wicked and despicable. And it must be recollected, that this is not the language of a gentleman of the Garrison school of Abolitionists—he will not consent to be classed in the category—but it is from a genuine Whig of the North.

Mr. Mann rose, and said: Will the gentleman from Indiana allow me to explain?

Mr. Gorman. I do not yield the floor. The gentleman has written out his remarks, and I deal with nothing else.

Mr. Mann. That is the spirit of his remarks—a misrepresentation, and then a refusal of explanation.

Mr. Gorman. Then I will read from the printed speech—(reading the precise words as quoted) I ask the gentleman if he acknowledges that to be a part of his speech?

Mr. Mann. I made a speech in which I used these words, and expressed those sentiments.

Mr. Gorman. Then I have not misrepresented the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Mann. Will the gentleman allow me to explain?

Mr. Gorman. If the gentleman will not be too long.

Mr. Mann. I made a speech, in which the sentiment read, occurs—that is my sentiment. But the gentleman from Indiana uttered something relative to Massachusetts, to which I wish to reply.

Mr. Gorman. I cannot yield for that; but if I uttered one sentiment derogatory to that old State, it was altogether unintentional.

Mr. Mann. If the gentleman from Indiana would allow me, I wish to say one word?

Mr. Gorman. I cannot be interrupted any further unless the gentleman says that this (holding it up) is not a fair copy of his speech.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Mann] says, "Our share, therefore, of the calamities of a civil war, will be mainly of a pecuniary nature."

Yes, Massachusetts will suffer but little from civil war. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, they will do as the turtle, draw in their heads—and say, as they did of *old*, Massachusetts never goes beyond the confines of her own State to fight. No, Mr. Chairman, the great West will be the losers by a dissolution of this Union, or by civil war. Indiana is on the border of a slave State; and I suppose the gentleman from Massachusetts will call upon *us* to fight it out, while they receive no damage but "of a *pecuniary nature*." But, sir, in this contemplated dissolution, where are we of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, to go? God forbid, and save us from any such destiny! The life's blood of my people depend upon their trade upon the great waters of the Mississippi; and, sir, we as naturally go there with our produce, as a child goes to its mother's breast for sustenance and support. We never will be cut off from it. Some of the precious blood of my people, yet living, was poured out upon the battle-fields of the South, to secure to their children the free navigation of its waters; and they are bound to that section of this Confederacy by hooks of steel; and they are resolved never to be deprived of its advantages.

How can you expect, gentlemen of the South and North, to continue in harmony and peace, when this spirit of fanaticism is constantly telling our southern brethren that they are tyrants, and are tyrannizing over a portion of their fellow-men, and using toward them epithets of every disreputable