

TO SUBSCRIBERS. Our friends at a distance must remember, we forward no paper...

TO PROFESSIONAL MEN AND MERCHANTS. The Standard is a good medium through which to circulate information...

SOUTHERN RIGHTS SPEAKERS FOR THE DISTRICTS. The following speakers were appointed by the State Southern Rights Meeting...

First District—Roger Barton, J. W. Matthews, T. J. Ward, John W. Thompson...

Second District—Wm. S. Barry, Reuben Davis, Gen. E. L. Ape, Wm. L. Harris...

Third District—P. W. Tompkins, O. R. Singleton, C. R. Clifton, E. C. Wilkinson...

Fourth District—Henry Munger, J. J. McRae, T. Jones Stewart, Hiram Cassidy...

Mr. B. E. LITTLE, Mobile, Ala., is an authorized agent for the Standard. He is fully authorized to receive money and receipts for subscriptions...

The Secretaries of the various State Rights Associations throughout the State are requested to forward the proceedings of their Associations to the "Standard" for publication...

In the course of a few weeks we shall commence the publication, and shall continue from week to week, to present the opinions and views of all the distinguished advocates of the doctrine of State Rights...

Will our friends of the Press call the attention of their readers to this, and oblige us.

A Public Meeting

Of the citizens of this county, who are alike opposed to the ultraisms of those who advocate immediate secession, and of those who love the Union...

It is believed by the friends of the rights of the South, that the State by prudent, peaceable and constitutional legislation, has it in her power to render herself independent of the North...

Those who disapprove of the Wilmot proviso and the "compromise" proviso, or "final adjustment robbery, (measures precisely equal to the same thing, and to one another,) and who agree with views here expressed, are earnestly and cordially invited to meet at Columbus, on the first Monday of Court, so to organize that they may be enabled to express their voice in the important State Convention called by our legislature, to meet on the first Monday in November next.

Preparatory to the general meeting, it is proposed to hold meetings in the different portions of the county, for consultation and arrangement, among the friends of the South, that time may be given for reflection and for sober and discreet action.

The following gentlemen will address the people at the times and places hereafter named, on the subject embraced in this call:

GEO. H. YOUNG, JOHN F. JACK, JAS. WHITEFIELD, BEV. MATHEWS, THOS. I. SHARP, W. L. HARRIS, W. H. D. CARRINGTON I. HARRISON, Jr., Columbus, on Monday the 10th March.

Barton, " Tuesday " 11th " Caledonia, " Wednesday " 12th " Snell's Shop " Thursday " 13th " Crawfordville " Saturday " 15th "

The Sliding Scale of the Unionists.

We have been not a little perplexed to locate the precise principles, of those who have so zealously sought the euphonious name of "Union," to designate the organization as a party.

Before the meeting of the convention at Jackson, under the auspices of Mr. Foote, such was their filial devotion to that distinguished Senator, and to the Union, that the very idea of "resistance," to any cause, seemed to beget in their minds an instinctive respect for their old remedy, to quell the refractory spirit of freemen—the "Sedition Law."

Traitors, treason, hemp and the gallows, were pet phrases, handed about among them with such velocity and spirit, that men of ordinary nerve scarcely dared utter a complaining grunt, at the pains and injuries inflicted on the South. We were prepared, therefore, for the most cheerful and laudatory commendations from their convention, upon Gen. Foote and the Union,—Siamese twins—upon the compromise bills, and the fraternal spirit of our Northern brethren.

We did not expect to see the "glorious union" about to be formed between old enemies, laying down a platform, the very elements of which contained six causes, upon the happening of any one of which, they threatened the destruction of the "union,"—constitutional, as well as party—within the North. But so it was, that while they seemed perfectly content with securing to the four slave States adjoining the non-slaveholding States, a law for the protection of fugitive slaves—and threatened secession, fight or suicide, if their rights were not respected—they calmly "acquiesce" in an outrage to their own friends and neighbors, even more insulting and degrading than the refusal to pass a fugitive slave law, or to execute it when passed.

—We mean, the refusal to pass laws in the Territories to punish interference with the slaves of Southern men who go there, when they admit and boast that slavery cannot get there, or find protection without such legislation. Their affections—contrary to the natural laws of attraction—are stronger and most intense, towards objects at a distance. Their sliding scale has no respect for the laws of either cohesion nor repulsion—but it is rather graduated upon the theory of the electric fluid which is both positive and negative, and may be made to shift its active position to either extreme, to suit the taste of the operator. Now they explode on the

negative side; and then—as from the mouth of the illustrious dead—their machine cries out, "The Federal Union—it must and shall be preserved," "by the Eternal." But all of a sudden, Ritchie and the Richmond Enquirer and our Union friends, learn that a Virginia negro has escaped to a free State, and they seize their new instrument, screw their sliding scale to the opposite pole, and then explode—and thunder secession, revolution; the rights of the South, they must and shall be preserved. Then, at all the intermediate points between unconditional submission to degrading infamy and inequality, and violent, imprudent rashness, they seem equally at home. We talk with some of them—they advocate the very measures we advocate—State resistance to the compromise measures, by wise and prudent legislation, retaliatory in its operation while it is encouraging to our citizens—and yet in the same breath, they are for "acquiescing" in the same measures and against all resistance. We shall see where they fall.

Why are the Submissionists anxious to organize a Disunion Party?

Men with limited capacity sometimes are ambitious; they take up an idea that they were intended by their creator for some sublime and extraordinary purposes, and when they fail to reap the harvest their ambitious aspirations have conjured up, they denounce their luck, their misfortunes, and sometimes the blindness of the people in not seeing and rewarding in them those peculiar elements of genius and greatness with which they believe themselves endowed. The fact that they are at fault, or that the people should have failed to discover in them those elements of greatness, or their peculiar adaptation for the public service, never enters their bright minds. To be told plainly that their services can be dispensed with is a great insult under any circumstances; but to be told that their services are altogether useless, if not detrimental to any cause, is in every sense, an insult not to be acquiesced in, though they are willing to acquiesce in wrong and injustice politically, if acquiescence will but place them in power. There is a remarkable blindness, if not perversity of intellect, manifested upon all subjects but those that promise prospectively, and vice versa.

"Wire in and wire out," and asservate at each angle of their snake like course, that they are consistent. And yet they will coincide partially, with all men in opinion.

Such men, and it is now about the only class that are insisting upon it, declare that those who are for interposing State action to check aggression are disunionists. It is as firmly fixed in their minds as it is in their belief in their own capacity for any public station, that there is a disunion issue in Mississippi. Any attempt to convince them to the contrary would prove as futile as an argument to show them that they were very ordinary mortals. With just penetration enough to teach them that the public mind is aroused, and native ability sufficient to show them that the Union is the strong side, because all declare for the constitution and the Union of our fathers, they beat out, Union or disunion is the issue.

What a splendid prospect for the gratification of ambition is here presented—the secret yearnings of years—the study of days and the dreams of night, may now be satisfied, and "I'm now a union man, and any who have the audacity to opposed me—myself—who am just now the embodiment of Unionism—is a disunionist—that's undistinguishable."

Just to gratify that ambitious and worthy class of insignificant demagogues who hang on the sides of party like leeches, it is proper to say to them that their windings have waxed ridiculous, and their songs have sunk into contempt. No one believes them now, and if they were a class to learn wisdom from experience, they would silence their tongues, and quietly draw off so as to permit the people to forget that they had ever attempted to mislead them by their slanders and misrepresentations.

What prevents Southern Merchants establishing direct trade with Europe?

It is a fitting juncture in the present condition of the South to bring forward and urge with some hope of success any measure that promises practicability and relief. It is not our intention to go into a discussion now of the importance, we might say necessity, of direct trade with Europe to the South. At an early day we intend to present some facts and figures bearing upon this question of a character irrefutable. For the present, we intend merely to glance at one or two points immediately on the surface, believing that they will arrest attention and operate to the advantage of the general issue, by obtaining talkers for it.

It is a singular fact, that just in the mere fabric of manufactured cotton, the South purchases annually of the North, from 2 and a half to 3 million dollars worth; and that while we sell England one million and a half to a million 700 thousand bales of cotton, the North purchases from 4 to 600 thousand bales only of us.—There is another little point worth notice here as indicating the extent to which the South is made subservient to Northern interest and shrewdness. The Revenue collected at the port of N. York, in January was only a fraction under \$14,000,000, and this sum is but a fraction less than the entire revenue collected at Mobile in three years. In this connection we remark that the North has not sent half a million dollars worth of manufactured cotton goods to Europe in five years, and that in the same time not less than 70 or 80 million dollars worth of cotton has been sent forward to Europe from Mobile. It appears unnatural that N. Y. should collect as much revenue in one month as is collected at Mobile in three years, and when we remember that the latter city sends forward to market each year so much of actual capital it is natural to ask, in what channel does it return? Reflection shows in what channel it returns, and our merchants can answer, if they would, whether it is practicable to have the proceeds return through the same port that the cotton crop was shipped. They can tell us whether it is necessary to employ Northern merchants to purchase goods in Europe with the proceeds of our cotton, ship them to N. York, and thence South, thus adding extra commissions and extra expense by double transportation, insurance &c.—they can tell us whether all this is necessary, legitimate, economical, or even business-like. For ourselves we have advocated direct trade for years, because we could never see the necessity of paying people to do what we ought to do, and in addition to this, we have contended for ten years that the South was riviting more closely every year the bonds of commercial vassalage. She is hopelessly dependent upon the North now, and unless we arouse the mercantile interest to their duty, the North will continue to fatten upon Southern labor.

There is no obstacle in the way of direct Southern trade with Europe unless it be incapacity or lack of energy. Is it the former? We shall be slow to believe it. There is as much business capacity to be found among our business men as can be found elsewhere. They are as shrewd, as calculating and as cautious as the Northern merchant—in fact a majority of them are Northern men with Northern business alliances, and of course opposed to any measures tending to break up their peddling and auction business—and it is for the lack of that speculating and curious propensity, denominated as Northern peddling energy, that has interposed to prevent direct traffic. Where-

er this direct trade doctrine has been brought forward, it has been denounced by the Jew and the Gentile—and the mtung peddler in connection with the calico vender who cries his remnants from the auction stand and the tape and needle dealer who travels with his pack, join in denouncing with a curse, every thing that looks towards drying up the channels of their trade. If three or four of our merchants, men of enlarged minds, will but take the step, and show the people that they do not lack the sagacity nor the energy for a bold operation, there would be no hazard in saying two years would work a revolution in trade every way favorable to us as consumers.

This subject will be carried to the public rostrum this summer, and the facts laid before the people with force and energy. It shall be made an issue, and as far as this press is concerned it will enforce the necessity on candidates to debate it. We are not for blinking any issue, and if we arouse the hatred of the whole peddling band it will be a signal triumph for us. The South must throw up her defenses around the institution of slavery, with the demonical curse of the cold blooded abolitionists before, and the insincere and traitorous intrigues of plotting demagogues and political knives behind her. The structure if irregular and put up by piece-meal, must, yet, when completed, be capable of resisting internal as well as external assaults. Amid the clashing interests and jarring passions that now whirl the minds of men to extremes, there should be those occupying conservative grounds busily employed in putting one stone upon another, and cementing the whole by toll free from passion and guided by the experience gathered from the History of the Past. If the South would escape the incendiary appeal and the plausible plaints of the assassin she must hunt down the demagogue as she would a beast of prey; if she would escape from future despotism and servile slavery, let her give no ear to acquiescing in present injustice; if she would be free, let her become independent by adopting such measures as will insure independence; if she would be prosperous, let her cease paying tribute to a people that have waxed rich upon her bounty—in short, let her trade upon her own capital and let the North do the same.

The Duty of the Conservative Press of the State.

That portion of the public Press of the South which refuses quietly to submit to the gross injustice of the late action of Congress falls, according to our construction, under the head of Conservative. To those presses we address ourselves, and while we are prepared to acquiesce, and sustain in an humble way, all prudent means of obtaining redress for the past and security for the future, we shall oppose those extreme measures advocated by but few, not only as injudicious now, but, in our honest opinion, beyond the reach of success. We are not inclined to hazard the future safety of the South by testing the strength of the Union so long as one plain and practical hope of obtaining justice is left untried. When that hour shall arrive, and we are of the number who believe that the sun of peace between the North and South will sink to rise no more within the circle of two decades, we shall be found, if alive, amid that band of men who stand to the Sovereignty of the State, as the second post of duty among republican freemen. But now, while there is hope of wringing from cupidity, redress for the past and security for the future, we cannot lend countenance to projects that look toward disunion. If disunion or secession shall spring from demanding protection to slave property in the territories, or from the interposition of State authority in taxing the manufactured goods of the free States, thus discriminating in our commercial intercourse, we are prepared to meet it. If either event under the action suggested should happen, the question will be Northern in its origin, and the South will then be forced to acquiesce in open, un concealed and degrading insult, or meet the issue boldly. While then we submit to the late laws of Congress as laws subversive of right and justice, we reserve the right to denounce them as sectional, and therefore injurious, and we shall advocate all legitimate measures looking to their amendment as necessary to preserve our equality in the Union.

If we are met with the denial of equality, and slave property denied protection by law as being a species of property not recognized in the territories by the constitution, an issue will have been made that the South, in justice, in honor, must meet. If such an issue is made it will not be by the South.

We confess to an ardent attachment to the Union, but however much we may venerate, there is a higher claim upon us. Justice and equality are inseparable in our political chart, and a denial of either, is, in our opinion, a just cause for asserting inherent, original rights.

We have been thus explicit in order to show our contemporaries just how far they may rely upon the action of this press now. We shall not confine ourselves exclusively to the two points indicated above. They are prominent, and we know that the submission party in this county, Monroe, Chickasaw, and Oktibeha, cannot start a respectable ticket intellectually, against them. It is because they address themselves to the reason of the people and are so safe, plain and practicable, that they are generally espoused. Men who have occupied no particular position—who could not go with the secessionists, and would not go with submissionists—take the safe, prudent and efficacious ground we stand upon.

If the press would be influential, let it be sincere.—If old party ties are to be obliterated and harmony obtained, there must be a settled and fixed position upon to which all moderate men may march. If the State is to be placed in an attitude that will command respect, it can be compassed only by a union of parties, and that can be secured alone by presenting practicable issues for the people to act on. If the conservative presses differ with our views we ask them to present others more practicable and less objectionable. We are in harness and can pull some anywhere. But we desire that our labor be profitable labor. We are not disposed to be obstinate; on the contrary we will accommodate ourselves to labor with all men of all parties so that the honor and the political equality of the South be the paramount object. We seek unity. If one county take the disunion ground, another the secession ground, and so divide our strength upon impracticable questions now, the State will be degraded by abandoning her present noble position—by backing out from her own high resolves. We cannot consent to such a policy, whatever others may do.

We are for exhausting all legitimate means to secure our rights before a final appeal is made. Argument was long since pronounced as inefficacious—appeals have failed—will continue to do so unaccompanied by positive assurances, other and more expensive measures will be resorted to unless justice is done. We are apprised that reasoning with fanaticism is "as powerless as the most beautiful array of colors on the eye of the blind." But that sort of reason with the fanatic which touches the pocket—that reason that sends to a miserable hovel half famished men, women and children, or casts them upon the charities of a cold world, possesses something more potent than simple words. Fanaticism must eat, and you cut off the supply of the pantry and you stop its breath. But feed it well and you have a clamorous bevy of whelps in full cry.

Our contemporaries of the Mississippi, speaking of the non-intercourse doctrine, say: "Let us not discard it altogether, however; but let us first address our sister States, as sisters, but as sovereigns also, demanding nothing but what is right, and determined to submit to nothing worse."

Very well! This is a species of tactics that we have

long since worn out, and it has been cast aside" as utterly useless. Our friends most truly assert that to reason with fanaticism is like passing a beautiful array of colors before the eye of the blind, and what they hope of justice to obtain of the Northern States by "addressing them as sisters," or even "sovereigns," is past comprehension—at any rate an interest in the patrimony of justice obtained from the Northern States by appeals and addresses, can be purchased for a pinch of good rags. If reason, appeals, and even threats have failed to obtain justice up to the present time, it is possible that by calling the Northern States "Sisters,"—Sovereign Sisters," may brush from their eyes the cataract, and wipe off of their understandings the blots of fanaticism. A free people should never too long improve in the language of entreaty for that which is due from plighted faith or rational justice—when that which is due is not readily yielded, the appeal should be carried to the interest or fears of the party in fault, and if still denied, let the sword of justice avenger be used. We are for action not by mere resolves, but by works—we go for measures that are to be felt as well as seen. We are against any more resolves—give us taxing laws in their stead. We are against appeals and addresses and all that sort of fustian—they are useless, and the position of chief justice Sharkey proves how ridiculous they may sometimes make men.

Our friends will not think us unkind in our notice. As their position is not well defined an opportunity is offered to them to present their points. If their positions promises a larger measure of success, more speedy and efficacious remedies than those we have thrown forward, we will meet them on their own ground.

Union Logic.

It is amusing to note the logic of the Mississippi Union Submissionists. There is a native manner, an off-hand-don't-care-pinch-of-smuff-sort of spirit in all the proceedings that have met our eye, as humorous as they are unique. The dedication convention—or the November Union convention that pledged so many "lives, fortunes and honor" to the cause of Union, presents six points, the non-observance of either of which, would justify the State, in the opinion of the assembled wisdom, in exercising the right of secession. There is a beauty in this solemn farce, for the Union convention was a rich farce, that deserves notice. The submissionists declare that if Congress repeals or modifies the Fugitive Slave Law, that then they are for disunion or secession. This is excellent doctrine and splendid logic. These submission men must be

"Such as do build their faith upon The holy text of pike and gun; And prove their doctrines orthodox By apostolic blows and knocks,"

for they are savagely inclined to burn gun-powder any how, and like the gentleman in the play, they want only a provocation—yes, provocation.

Let us ask these fire-eaters if Congress has not the same right to repeal or modify as to pass the reclamation law? It is not unconstitutional to do either of these, and yet our savage submissionists have pledged their "lives, fortunes and honor," to dissolve the Union, or do something else very terrible, if Congress shall do what it unquestionably may do. This is the logic of submissionism. But this reclamation law is of no value to this State, for the reason that few if any of our slaves escape into the free States. Its value inures almost wholly to the border States, and it is for their benefit it was passed. But our submissionists swear they'll fight if it is repealed. Will they fight for a law to protect the slave property of the Mississippi slaveholder in the territories belonging to all the people of all the States? Will they do it! And yet the reclamation law is not one whit more necessary to slavery than one to protect it in the territories. Congress is as much bound to "protect" as to "arrest fugitives from labor"—in fact the same obligation to protect exists that there is to arrest; and the submission presses are unnecessarily excited when they declare for disunion or secession, because there are those who propose either to modify or repeal the law.

Will Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, or even Maryland fight, if the slave owners of Mississippi, Louisiana, or Texas fail to obtain a law to protect their property in the territories? This is a practical question, and it is put to the submissionists soberly. Shall Mississippi plunge into disunion or secession because Congress repeals or modifies a law that is ten thousand times more valuable to Virginia than to her, when Virginia will not raise one voice in the national congress in advocacy of a law to protect the property of the Mississippi planter? If there is a reciprocity between the slave States, this is the time to prove it. As it is considered lawful to seek protection by all legitimate and rational means, it would subserve as an auxiliary in a rousing Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia and Maryland, to organize a party demanding the repeal of the reclamation law unless those States demand protection to slave property everywhere where Congress possesses the power for that purpose. This is a sort of logic that will address itself to the understanding of submissionists. It fits their capacity admirably, and if they do not embrace it in a resolve soon, we may well fear that disunion is their real object however much they may disavow it.

Notice that the press South comments with great severity on the recent rescue of a fugitive slave from the custody of the federal officers at Boston. It is what will and must happen frequently; the laws resting for their faithful execution upon a correct public sentiment, must be but inefficiently enforced in that community where the moral feelings are outraged by their enforcement. We are told that the moral feelings, or rather the philanthropic-fanatical propensity predominates in the Northern States, and that Massachusetts is, next to Vermont, the purest State in the Union, and that the moral sentiments of her people are so sublime and heavenly, that the shadow of slavery stains the souls of all upon whom it falls. This sentiment seeks support in the "higher law" doctrine, but where the poor woman who make two dozen shirts per week for 37 1/2 cents seeks support, that heavenly philanthropy and "higher law" takes no account of. Its very reasonable to suppose, however, that any community that will permit cupidity to wring from wretchedness and squalid poverty labor worth \$12 for 37 cents, is prepared to resist laws and commit robberies. We are prepared to see such a community contribute its thousands of dollars to aid and defend negro thieves, to resist laws, and to send its maids and matrons to brothels to eke out by loathsome prostitution sufficient means to preserve life. This all naturally grows out of the "higher law" doctrine that teaches men to get all they can honestly, and then aid in stealing the rest.

Boston is no exception to the rule. New York and Ohio, will sustain Massachusetts, and if the South expects any aid in asserting her rights, she need not look towards the North for it. It is wrong to expect the people of the North to enforce any law favorable to slavery unless they are paid for it. Mayor Biglow and city marshal Tukey do not manifest any anxiety for the enforcement of the law when informed that "We have got a nigger." [See Tukey's letter in another column.]

The fact is the resistance made to the rescuers is all gain—if the marshal feared resistance, and it appears that he was fully apprised of the gathering of a great crowd, it was his duty to call to his assistance as many citizens as he needed to prevent a rescue. He failed to discharge his duty like a man, and permitted a slave to escape from his custody in consequence of neglect. We shall now see what will be the result of this case; the President will send into Congress a special message

of course, denouncing the mobites for special purposes. It may be that Riley, the federal officer, will be put through the forms of a trial for neglect of duty, but we have no idea that a penalty will be enforced against him. The President's duty is clear, and we are willing to await his action before expressing opinions.

The sentiments of the people are sometimes to be gathered from their public men, and as indicating the sentiments of the people in Massachusetts in regard to the fugitive slave law, we quote a sentence from a letter written by a member of Congress from that State.

"The law to which you refer is such an abomination of various iniquities, that it is impossible within the brief compass of a letter suitable to such an occasion, to analyze it and lay open its manifold wickedness."

P. S. Since the above was in type, the special message of President Fillmore has reached us. It shall appear next week.

The President says "I regard this flagitious proceeding as being a surprise, not unattended by some degree of negligence." Mr. Riley says that he did inform Mayor Biglow and city marshal Tukey, that "We have got a nigger," and the worthy mayor says he is sorry for it, and consequently, the President thinks the case a "surprise." Very likely it was. The Craft case was a surprise too, we suppose. By the way, the good people of Boston are great on surprising federal officers.

The artful Dodgers—The thimble-riggers Game.

The custom of the old English law, which is frequently distinguished by a merciful spirit as peculiar as it was wise, contains a maxim, that men whose trades habituate them to shedding the blood even of brutes, should be excluded from juries in cases of life and death. This maxim is to be revived in similar form but applied in a new direction. Men who claim equality in the confederacy and protection for their dearest rights, are now to be excluded from asserting the one or demanding the other, because, forsooth, it "is resistance."

These men who are and have been fastening upon the spoils of office; these men who by a most palpable and outrageous fraud have robbed the slave States of their interest in one of the most splendid empires ever won by valor, turn with a sneer upon those who dare assert their equality, and say: "You are for resistance—you are for disunion—you are for blood, and the old maxim excludes you from the right of judging—stand aside." This is cool, if not, impudent. But the impudence of this party ceases not here. It goes so far as to denounce those who assert their equality in the confederacy and demand simple protection of their property, as disunionists, consequently, according to their logic, traitors to the Union.

We are for resisting these pious falsehoods. The holy band of Unionism has enjoyed an unlimited power of emission, and its issue of false coin has been equalled in extent but by two eras in the history of the country. It is to meet the propagators of these false issues and expose them and their designs, that imposes on us labor, duty to the cause we advocate, will not permit us to let pass unretorted.

A neighboring print says that "The Monroe Democrat under its old editor and its late one, cried out for resistance."

Another writer, apparently speaking by or with authority, says: "There is but one issue, and that is 'union or disunion,' attempt to disguise it as they may."

The first writer says that the old editor of the Aberdeen Democrat, advocated resistance, and the other writer declares that the party with which that "old editor" now acts, are disunionists, because there is but the one issue, "union or disunion."

Now to the facts. Is the party with which this paper acts, a disunion party? The same doctrine announced by the "old editor of the Democrat" is now inculcated and enforced by the Standard. It is the doctrine of "resistance," plain, simple, and wholly constitutional. It is a mode of resistance that will prove as effectual in righting the South, as it is proper and legitimate. It is a resistance by law—constitutional law—not to resist the law of Congress by the law of the State, but by the enforcement of a tax upon all the manufactured articles of traffic sent from the free to the slave States. In short, it is giving the preference to our own artisan labor by taxing that manufactured in a free State, and encouraging our merchants to sever their commercial intercourse with the North, and open up for themselves a direct trade with Europe. If it is possible to show that the merchants of the South are inferior to the Northern trader, and that they are incapable of conducting a foreign trade, we shall not insist upon this as one of the remedies; but, if they are capable, and we ask the question, are they not? we shall insist upon our mode of "resistance." The broad allegation that the "old editor of the Democrat" was for "resistance," without stating what that "resistance" contemplated, covers a species of demagoguism worthy of the party forced to sustain itself by the propagation of just such slanders. Our opinions are too freely and too plainly given to become the subject of misrepresentation unless from design. When, as in the above instance, men resort to tricks more becoming the thimble-rigger than a candid and frank opponent, we shall denounce them in terms such as the occasion demands. The writer of the above sentence knew that the "old editor of the Democrat" never advocated "resistance" by force of arms—that while he acquiesced, or in other words, while he submitted to the outrage because it was perpetrated in the form of law, he yet would exercise his right to denounce it as unjust, and advocate amendment or modification. His "resistance" never extended to the point of secession, even; and why it was thrown forward in a form calculated to impress upon the public mind the idea that he would "resist" by force of arms, or nullify the laws of Congress, is evident. These Union men must make out a case against the advocates of Southern rights and independence, and to be plausible they must misrepresent, and to be witty, lie a little for fun.

Wherever we have found a man bold and reckless enough to declare the issue to be "union or disunion," we have been forced to say, there goes one whose wish "is father to the thought." It is singular, though it is true, that the men who have been hunting place for years, and hitherto without success, are ranged under the Union banner, and their continual cry is: "Union or disunion is the issue." What a text for a sermon on the wonderful capacity of man's inventive genius is here presented. Men whose native capacity has assigned them a station in the world from beyond which they have not been able to travel, because they have failed to obtain the confidence of the public,—a sort of cold, calculating thing; very slow to understand, and not a rewarder of native genius—are now such fierce and unrelenting advocates of the people's rights, that they refuse to make any but a "disunion issue." Well, as they have been without supporters and backers to obtain for them that public confidence, without which they must remain in obscurity, it is now certain that they must forego the delights of serving the "dear people," for none but those who are made adder blind, not by frost, but by a desire to be in public office, can find a party in Mississippi making "union and disunion the only issue," or even an issue at all.

We are apprised that many excellent gentlemen in our State have placed their hopes upon the issue of "Union or disunion." They know that without such an issue their names would be unheard of, and even with it, their impotency might obtain for them some little consideration, but no respect for their talent and capacity whatever.

The issue is not "union or disunion," in Mississippi,

and those who assert it, manifest as little regard for the intelligence of the people as they do for the truth of history. Men who purposely mistake the bold and confident language of recitade for the insidious breathings of treason, are fully prepared to play the part of traitors and sell the freedom of the people for power and place.

Several names have been suggested to us as candidates for the November Convention. Intending to avoid the least appearance of attempting to color public opinion in regard to candidates for that responsible position, we shall step aside so far in this instance, as to name publicly one gentleman who has been suggested in connection with others for that position. Mr. JAS. T. HARRISON, long a resident, deeply interested both socially and politically in the affairs of the South; a gentleman of clear, enlarged and perspicacious intellect, forcible and ready in speech, and eminently fitted by his legal readings to draw the distinctive line between the federal and State powers, and to show where the one ceases and the other is operative. As the Convention will attempt by prudent and peaceable means to interpose the authority of the State, and by legislation place the artisan and manufacturing industry of the South upon a basis of equality with the North, and recommend the encouragement of direct trade by trading with Southern instead of Northern cities; and demand protection to all the property of all the citizens of all the States alike; as these matters involve great national and State interests, men of prudence should be selected by the people.

Personally we know nothing of Mr. Harrison's views on the questions of the times; but if he is sound, it is unnecessary to say he would meet at our hands, were he the candidate of the People, a warm and earnest support.

Col. W. S. Featherston will accept our thanks for public documents. In justice to our representative we take pleasure in saying that he has adopted a most excellent rule, one for which he deserves great credit. He has sent to the Probate clerk of each county in his district, one complete copy of the bound Congressional Globe and Appendix, containing the full proceedings of both houses of the 30th and 31st Congress. As these records are important, embracing the political history of the times, and as they are always accessible and the people are to be benefited by their preservation, we do him the justice of stating that he was the first member from this State adopting the practice.

We have received the first number of the Chickasaw Banner, a submission paper recently established in Houston, Miss., by Messrs. Lindsey & Denison.—The Banner is edited with a considerable degree of ability by our young friend Lindsay, and the mechanical department is neatly executed. Success, pecuniarily.

State Independence.

We resume this subject to-day, continuing our reference to Judicial decisions, with the view of persuading our readers to adopt a policy, which has been too long neglected in the South. When the idea was first suggested, it was denounced by the friends of the North as unconstitutional. It was affirmed that the State could not by legislation, discriminate in taxation within her own limits, so as to encourage the labor and industry of her own citizens, against the products and manufactures of other States; that this would violate that clause in the Constitution granting to Congress the power to lay duties, taxes and imposts—and also the clause prohibiting the States from laying duties on imports. It was urged also that the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and between the States, &c., granted to the Federal Government, was in its nature, exclusive, and that the States could not therefore by any discrimination in taxation, give to her own citizens any advantageous encouragement over the citizens of other States. To satisfy those who made those objections, of their utter falacy, and to convince our readers not only of our right, but of the duty of our State to adopt a policy in itself correct, and in its action and results calculated to secure us that respect and equal justice from our sister States which have been so long denied us—we have put ourselves to some trouble to exhibit the authorities, both historical and Judicial, which bear upon this question. Those heretofore cited we deem ample for the purpose. We cite, however, some additional cases to-day, and are informed that many of a like character might be cited from the State courts of the various States.

The last case we shall cite from the Supreme Court of the United States, is to be found in Howard's U. S. Reports, v. 7, p. 283—known as "the passenger cases,"—in which it is determined by five Judges against four dissenting, that the statutes of New York and Massachusetts, imposing taxes upon alien passengers, arriving in the ports of those States, were contrary to the Constitution and laws of the United States, and therefore null and void. This case, though certainly at war with a previous decision of the same Court, and rendered worthless as a precedent, by the powerful opinions and reasoning of Messrs. Taney, Woodbury, Daniel and Nelson—composing really the mental strength of the Court—fully sustains the doctrine that after the "passengers" have come within the limits of the State, they are subject to taxation and such other legislation as the State may impose upon citizens or classes.—We extract from the opinion of Chief Justice Taney, the following conclusive argument:

"Undoubtedly the ship, although engaged in the transportation of passengers, is a vehicle of commerce, and within the power of regulation granted to the general government; and I assent fully to the doctrine upon that subject laid down in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden. But it has always been held that the power to regulate commerce does not give to Congress the power to tax it, nor prohibit the States from taxing it in their own ports, and within their own jurisdiction. The authority of Congress to lay taxes upon it is derived from the express grant of power, in the eighth section of the first article, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, and the inability of the States to tax it arises from the express prohibition contained in the tenth section of the same article.

"This was the construction of the Constitution at the time of its adoption, the construction under which the people of the States adopted it, and which has been affirmed in the clearest terms by the decisions of this Court.

"In the thirty-second number of the Federalist, before referred to, and several of the preceding numbers, the construction of the Constitution as to the taxing power of the general government and of the States is very fully examined, and with all that clearness and ability which every where mark the labors of its distinguished authors; and in these numbers, and more especially in the one above mentioned, the construction above stated is given to the Constitution, and supported by the most conclusive arguments. It maintains that no right of taxation which the States had previously enjoyed was surrendered unless expressly prohibited; that it was not impaired by any affirmative grant of power to the general government; that duties on imports were a part of the taxing power, and that the States would have had a right, after the adoption of the Constitution, to lay duties on imports and exports, if they had not been expressly prohibited.

"The grant of the power to regulate commerce, therefore, did not, in the opinion of Mr. Hamilton, Mr.