SOUTHERN STANDARD.

VOLUME I. COLUMBUS, LOWNDES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1851. NUMBER 23.

The Southern Standard

IS ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY

CHAPMAN & SMITH,

At three dollars per annum, in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS—First insertion (ten lines or less) $1,00; for each subsequent insertion, 50 cents. The number of insertions must be specified on the face of the copy furnished, or it will be published until forbid and charged as above.

All articles of a personal character will be charged double the above rates—*cash in advance when admitted.*

Political circulars or public addresses for the benefit f individuals will be charged as advertisements.

On yearly advertisements, a liberal discount will be made. The privilege of yearly advertisers will be limited to their own immediate business; advertisements sent in by them embracing other matter, will be charged for by the square.

☞Letters on business connected with the office must be post paid to insure attention.

COLUMBUS:

Wednesday Morning, July 2, 1851.

Southern Abolitionism

It is strange that in this enlightened age and generation so much bigotry and personal selfishness exists, and when the progress that the sciences and arts are making is considered, it is remarkable that so little is done to expel that spirit of Pharisaism which finds ...er and countenance under the altars dedicated to the Almighty. It is true that bigotry and selfishness ..., and probably will continue to exist, as long as man has a being; but that both should be covered by religion made eminent by its success against other less corrupting, and surely less unsocial, is to us, phenomena inexplicable. We shall put a case covering the proposition we propose commenting on.

...hat is Southern Abolitionism? It is to believe slavery as existing under our institution is morally, socially, or politically an evil. There is a class of those who believe slavery a moral evil—that is, it is regarded as violative of the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. There is another class who believe it a social evil; or in other words, that its existence tends to corrupt and enervate society. A third class deny its existence on the ground that it is a political evil. It is unnecessary to amplify these points, for the intelligent man would require that at our hands, and there is one of those who believes there are few individuals who live amid the institution of slavery without having clear perceptions as regards its moral, social and political tendencies.

Take for instance the man who professes to hold that slavery is a moral, or religious evil, and who yet not only aids, but absolutely supports the institution in his own person, by holding slaves. Put the proposition thus: Here is an institution opposed to the fundamental principles of religion; but yet, from mercenary, selfish motives, it is sustained. If it is opposed to the divine laws there can be no excuse to continue it, for God requires no man to uphold any institution, practice, or creed, inimical to these laws. If inimical, it is clear that its continuance inflicts a serious wrong upon the slave by depriving him of the heritage designed him by God, but which the slaveholder has robbed him of by holding him in bondage. The evil does not stop here. The owner who holds the doctrine indicated is guilty of transgressing a fundamental principle of the religion he professes to believe, and of course, is a sinner not only by commission but by omission. He omits to liberate the slave whom he believes it an evil to hold in bondage—he commits a sin in not complying with his religious faith, and in this sense, if a member of a church, he is a hypocrite. How is it possible a man who believes slavery an evil, and who holds them, can bend his knee before God and ask pardon for his sins, yet retain his grasp upon his slaves? Is such a man a christian or a hypocrite? Can a church prosper and winks at hypocrisy so manifest?

It is true that this is a free country, and men are answerable to no law for holding or propogating their opinion. But is it prudent to nourish men holding opinions so jesuistical, or a party that produces such men? The institution of slavery is now as it has for seven years past been a common point of assault. In its own land the greatest intellects of the age have aimed at its extirpation, and the weapons used were worthy neither the minds nor the position public opinion has assigned them. Detraction the most foul has been heaped upon the institution—means the most unfair have been resorted to to render it odious in our country and abroad, and all the chicanery which the ingenious as well as the disingenuous could apply, has been liberally used to arouse party spirit in the Southern States. Thus, under these divisions, commit spoliations on our rights. With these facts before us, what is the plainest duty of the South, or what ought those men who hold contrary opinions, do? The creed of free speech is a sacred creed with us. Men should be permitted to speak freely, being, as we hold, responsible only to the community and the usages that there exists. If the opinions are detrimental to the interests or the safety of the community, there is a remedy within the reach of order and of law. Let that remedy be applied with an inexorable determination, and if it is necessary, push it to social ostracism. We are for no mobocracy. Believing that society has the means of protection against incendiarism that it has against other moral evils within itself, we are for using those and none other.

With which party do we find these Southern Abolitionists acting? There is a significance in this question when closely scanned. Are they acting in any way with the State Rights party? If they are let us enquire if they are acting with any party, and if with any party—which one? We find them doing what is called the Union party of the South, and this Union party claims to be a "National party," it is proper to see of what material this "National party" is composed. In Massachusetts there is Sumner, Cantoul, Adams, Allen, Davis and Webster, and no honest, intelligent man will deny that they are abolitionists. In New York, there are the two Van Buren's—father and son—Seward, Duer, Granger, Fish, Greeley, Weed, Webb, and all the masses nearly. Ohio has Chase, Wade, Giddings and nineteen twentieths of the people. Vermont is nearly unanimous—Pennsylvania is divided unequally, the North having the numerical strength. In short the free States are all opposed to slavery, and it is strange to see a party at the South pretending to be faithful to the institution of slavery shaking hands and affiliating with the Van Burens, Sewards, Sumners, Hales, Wades, &c., of the North. So it is. And in the very front rank of this Southern Union party, we find Southern Abolitionists. Let the South beware of such men—they are infinitely more dangerous to the safety of the South than all her foreign enemies; they are lepers in the house of God—worshippers of Mammon, for they sacrifice their ...onscience that they may profit by an institution they denounce.

From the Mississippian.

Another Card.

Not long since I published a card relative to a personal matter between Gen. Foote and myself. Since that time two statements in his defence have been made, one by his friend, Maj. F. S. Hunt, the other by the Senator himself. I would not notice this matter further, if General Foote had not denied several of the statements made in my card. And in doing so, I hope to exercise as much "christian commiseration for human frailty" as the gentleman did in remarking upon my card.

General Foote, says:

"I told him I desired this statement for the purpose of basing upon it a friendly demand upon Governor Quitman for an explanation in writing of what he had actually said."

Major Hunt, says:

"He, (General Foote,) wished General Bell's statement *in order to* show that a portion of the audience might have misunderstood the matter."

General Foote, says:

"I feel certain that I used no positively insulting language."

Major Hunt, says:

"Gen Foote approached very closely, and said, do you want to fight? and remarked that he, (Gen. Bell, *should* give him a statement."

General Foote, says:

"If Mr. Bell uttered any language that night of an insulting character in his interview with me, I certainly did not hear it; *and I am the more confident on this point, because* I am somewhat in the habit of resenting language personally insulting in its nature at the instant of its employment, and it would seem that I did nothing of the kind on this occasion."

Major Hunt, says:

"General Bell, at this remark, also became very much excited, and said, in a very loud, angry tone, that if he (Gen. F.) expected to force him to give a statement, *he had mistaken his man, and used other violent and abusive language.*"

General Foote, says:

"Mr. Bell says that he supposed that I was armed when I came to his house. Never was this gentleman more seriously mistaken:—*I had not even a pen knife in my pocket.*"

Major Hunt has stated to myself and others that after he and General Foote left my house, Gen. Foote showed him *a small knife*, and told him it was the only weapon he had.

General Foote, says:

"I knocked at the outer door on reaching it, and Bell's voice invited me to enter."

Major Hunt, says:

"General Foote alighted and walked into the room where General Bell was sitting, I fastened the horse, &c." A gentleman in such haste, to enter a room as to leave his friend out fastening his horse, might be mistaken about this matter.—As to hearing my voice, the gentleman ought to doubt his own recollection on this point, as he never heard that "*violent and abusive language*" which was uttered "in a very *loud angry tone*" as declared by his friend, Maj. Hunt.

According to General Foote's statement, he knocked at the door—I invited him in—he was not in the room where my family were—saw no member of it but myself—is certain that he used no positively insulting language—and if I used any he never heard it.

According to Major Hunt's statement, General Foote asked me if I wanted to *fight*—I used *violent* and *abusive* language—he interposed and begged us to desist—General Foote apologised in the most ample terms—and next morning told Major Hunt "*to inform me that he deeply regretted it,*" *and to make any other apology, in his name that was necessary or honorable.*

General Foote says:

"*It is not true* that when I called at Mr. Bell's house, on the night of the 17th ultimo, I found him sitting in the room with his sick family." *As a man of honor, I solemnly aver that I found him in a room, sitting alone,* calmly reading newspapers, and that I saw no one of his family during my stay at the house but himself."

This is the only statement which the Senator has sought to sustain "*by his solemn averment as a man of honor.*" It is well for him perhaps that it is. For if there is one statement more than another unfounded in fact in his card; it is the one in question. Hence perhaps the reason he has resorted to his "solemn averment on honor" so properly calculated to arouse suspicion in the detail of simple facts. *The truth is* the room which General Foote first burst into, was my private chamber—the truth is my family were there sick when he entered, and if he knew it not, or knows it not now, it can only be attributed to some high excitement, the same which could induce him thus ruthlessly to outrage every rule of common propriety and decency.

One prominent feature in the Senator's card must not go unnoticed. He *insinuates* that I have made myself busy in a "matter of a highly delicate nature" between Gov. Quitman and himself. It is false in every or in any sense. The two gentlemen had been engaged in a *public discussion.*—Hundreds spoke of it. So did I. There were different opinions as to what was said in debate.—Major Hunt does not pretend that Foote called on me to raise any difficulty over anything I had said, but merely to get my statement as to what had occurred in debate. I did not give it as readily as his honor required. He flew into a passion, and attempted to bully. *He failed.* Such is a plain statement of facts. Had I been treated as a gentleman, there would have been no cause of quarrel, but Senator Foote is unfortunate in not knowing that a true man would not brook insult or insolence, come from whatever quarter it may. His sneers and his sarcasm I hold as lightly as I do himself. In my limited sphere I have striven to do my duty, and humble as it may be, I feel a prouder satisfaction than had I, as a recreant Senator, betrayed my constituents and sold my section in the Congress of the United States.

Now, if the gentleman has any of that "christian commiseration for human frailty" of which he speaks, I would modestly suggest that a small portion might not be entirely inappropriate in his own case, just about this time. The Senator's card is not only illustarred but "*illtimed,*" but charity would plead that he surely penned it *before* he saw the card of his friend and companion, Major F. S. Hunt.

The statements in my card were literally true, and are borne out almost to a line by Maj. Hunt. The Senator's denials can go for their true value; with their author, they are before the public by whom I know justice will be done.

Why the Senator alludes to my clerical character I am unable to conceive, as that has nothing at all to do with the matter. It is true I have been a minister for more than twenty years, and altho' I possess my share of that "*human frailty,*" of which the gentleman speaks, yet I can assure him, that I have never been guilty of the weakness of being ashamed of the station. And it affords me much gratification to know that during the whole period, amidst the many duties of various public stations, not so elevated as that of the Senator, however, to which my fellow-citizens have thought proper to call me, I have maintained my integrity as a minister of the church to which I belong; and my simple statement of a fact has generally been taken without being driven to "*solemnly aver as a man of honor.*" Ministers are peaceable men—and ought to be so; and there are a few men in this world who knowing that fact, take the privilege of passing insults and making remarks in regard to them, that they would not presume to make about men who were differently situated.—Yet I believe it is granted that ministers are entitled to the common civilities of life, and the right of showing some degree of resentment at an insult, although it should be offered by an "honorable" Senator of Congress—backed by a "national reputation."

JO. BELL.

From the N. O. Delta.

More Deception of the Compromise.

There is not in our annals, certainly, and we doubt if there be in the history of other nations, a parallel case to the imposture, bad faith and deception on the one hand, and the blindness and tame submissiveness on the other, which were displayed in the circumstances connected with the measure called the compromise Bill. Every day developes some new facts in proof of this allegation. It did not require the admission of Northern politicians to satisfy us that the pretended compromise was a mere surrender of substantial rights on the part of the South, to a mere empty show of the execution by the North of a constitutional guaranty. But we have such admission, such exultations thrown in our faces daily, to add to the mortification of our position. We read daily in their speeches and editorials, the North has gained everything by that compromise, and the South has gained—a shadow, the very pursuit of which is more costly than the substance would be valuable.

The north has gained the whole territory for which the South shed its blood and expended its treasure. It has taken it all, and the States which stood ten to three when this constitution was formed,—who could have controlled and shaped its character, but who were content with a few clearly expressed guaranties, find themselves excluded from that equality of rights which constitutes the basis of our government,—without which it had better at once crumble into disorganization. This great achievement was accomplished through the new guise of "non-intervention." The Wilmot proviso was, comparatively, a frank and open avowel of their intent to rob the South. We saw its purpose,—understood its character, and the whole South resented it manfully. It was discovered that there was a more effectual mode of gaining the same object, than by this bold procedure.

The new plan went much further than the proviso ever proposed to go. That aimed at the limitation of slave territory,—at heming it in between certain metes and bounds. But the new idea of non-intervention aimed higher; it contemplated the positive prohibition of the admission of slave territory into the Union. The workings of this system were happily illustrated by Mr. Benjamin, and other whig orators in this State, in their strictures upon Gen. Cass' Nicholson letter. Gen. Cass proposes, they said, to leave this question to the decision of the people, who are now, or shall hereafter settle the new territory. Well, with the Mexicans and Indians already there, and with the influence of the Emigrants from the free States, and the restraint upon emigration from the South, caused by the apprehensions of the application of the proviso, this non-intervention actually appropriates this whole country to the exclusive use and benefit of the North. It is far worse than the proviso. That gave us a chance for some of the territory, but *non-intervention* shuts us out from all.

Despite these arguments, non-intervention carried the day. It constituted the chief elements and characteristic features of so-called compromise. Southern politicians fell into the snare, some blindly and stupidly, others willingly and contentedly. We cannot, they said, dispute the rights of a people to select and regulate their own political institutions—so we will give up all California to the few thousand adventurers who have gone to dig gold in that new El Dorado; We will give up New Mexico to the Indians—half-breeds, &c.; we will surrender Utah to the Mormons; but we do so on the ground of the right of the people to establish their own governments. This is taking the question out of the power of the General Government, and killing the Wilmot proviso, that execrable suggestion of abolition.

Such liberal concessions as these could not well be refused by the North. They might well waive *pro tempore* the proviso, when there was no need for it. Indeed, if the South was willing to give up the whole territory, why should the North apply a rule which would still allow the South a share in it? And yet, when all this was done, the south rejoiced that it had got rid at least of the Wilmot Proviso! It consoled itself, too, with reflections that the docirne of non-intervention might, some day or other, turn to our advantage. There might be slave territory to annex to the Union, and then we would claim the application of this rule, of this precedent. The north has got all it can get, and we shall have the next claim.

Such were the views of the Southern compromisers; but what were the intentions of the Northern parties to this bundle of concessions? Let one of the most moderate and able of their politicians answer. Let one speak who has been applauded here as an illustrious friend of the South the prop and mainstay of the Union, has attracted an unusual share of censure, reproach and insults from the violent anti-South politicians at the North. Let Daniel Webster speak! Here are his words as they fell from him in the hearing of the President, his cabinet, and the people:

"*If the South wished any concession from him they would not get it, not a hair's breadth.*

* * * * * * *

"*He had always contended that any measure calculated to add to the slave territory of the United States was unconstitutional. He never would consent that there be one foot of slave territory beyond what the old thirteen States had at the foundation of the Union. Never! Never!! Never!!!*

And thus we repeat, has the grand scheme of deception, injustice, wrong and fraud, received its capsheef, and the South stands before the world a pitiable subject of folly, delusion, blindness and degrdaing submission.

Census of 1850.

We have on hand tables of the census of 1850, which we have been trying in vain to find room for. They present a very interesting subject for study. The whole white population of the slave States, including the District of Columbia, is 6,306,756; the slave population is 3,210,112; free negroes in the south 418,573—of which, Maryland has 73,943, or nearly as many as slaves, and Virginia has 23,909. The total population of the south is 9,750,159.

The population of the free States, including negroes, 13,533,328—exclusive of the territories. The colored population of the free States is 184,882.

The total population of the whole Union is 23,397,311.

The representative population is 21,832,521, and according to the late appointment there will be 233 representatives in congress—namely, 144 from the free and 89 from the slave States. The increase of representatives in the free States over those in the south is four. The former in 1840, had a majority of fifty-one; now it is fifty-five.—Alabama will have seven delegates, instead of her present number, which is six.

The whole increase of the United States population for the last ten years is 6,198,045, of which 5,497,931 are whites, 692,234 slaves, and 32,880 free colored. As compared with the whole present population, says the New York Commercial Advertiser, this is 27.78 per cent. increase among the whites, 21.77 among the slaves and only 7.48 among the free colored.

The Commercial Advertiser regards this small increase of the free blacks as a thing so striking "as to challenge investigation as to the course of so singular a variation from the general law governing population in this country."

In the south, where this subject has been more scientifically and sagaciously investigated, it is not considered at all as very remarkable. The cause of it has been found in the unhappy condition of the free blacks—their viciousness, and the severity of the climate at the north. The increase of population is generally considered by statistics as a measure of the happiness or naturalness of condition, and the argument from this postulate is that the condition of the free blacks is not natural, or favorable to longevity or propogation.

Small as is the percentage of increase in the free blacks, it is not a fair estimate of it, for a large number of this increase has been made by freed slaves.

The increase of the free States since 1840, has been 3,891,531, including runaway negroes and all—that of the whites of the slave States is 1,674,116—which is only a fraction less than the increase of the whites of the free States.

When it is taken into consideration that the increase at the north since 1840 has been swelled by one or two millions of foreigners, it will be seen that the white increase of the south has greatly exceeded that of the north.

The natural increase of the slaves will be found to be greater than that of the whites, when the foreign increase of the latter is excluded, and the runaways and emancipated negroes are added to the former.

The slave population is now 3,210,112: in 1840 it was 2,486,226.—*Mobile Tribune.*

Letter from President Fillmore.

The President of the United States, Millard Fillmore, has written the following letter to the Boston Common Council, which was read before that body on the 12th inst. We have printed certain portions of this letter in *italics* in order to draw to those portions the particular attention of our readers. The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 6, 1851.

Hon Francis Brinley, President of the Common Council of the city of Boston.

SIR: When I had the pleasure of meeting you and your associates of the committee from Boston, in New York, and you did me the honor of inviting me to visit your city, and kindly tendered me on behalf of the common councils, its hospitalities I fondly hoped that I should be able, during the present month, to accept your invitation. But I regret to say that I find it inconsistent with what I deem my public duty to indulge in this gratification; and, therefore, while I am profoundly grateful for the distinguished honor implied by the invitation, I feel reluctantly compelled to decline it.

My personal acquaintance in your city is but slight—but slight as it has been, it has left many pleasant recollections, and I should have been extremely happy to have renewed and extended it at this time. I have long entertained a high respect for the intelligence and patriotism of the great mass of your citizens, and recent events have not impaired that respect. *You have been, and I trust ever will be, a law-loving and law-abiding people.* I know that your devotion to this great principle has had a severe test in your recent efforts to execute the law for the return of fugitive slaves. *Slavery in any form is repugnant to your feelings and education, and the fugitive naturally and inevitably excites your deepest sympathies.* Nothing but a stern sense of duty, founded upon a rational, solemn conviction, that a constitutional and legal obligation must be obeyed, at any and every sacrifice, could have insured the execution of law in a case like this. But for myself I never doubted that the law would ultimately triumph.—Good faith is the foundation of all morality and all social security.

The free States have pledged themselves by the constitution to the performance of this duty. The slave States had a right to insist, and did insist, upon its performance. There was then no alternative but to break our faith, forfeit our word of honor, and thereby trample the constitution of our country in the dust, and run the hazard of a civil war, or else to admit the obligation like honest true-hearted men, and do all in our power to comply with it, *still hoping and trusting that in due time should be devised,* by those who have the constitutional power to abolish slavery and who are most deeply interested in its final extinction, *to get rid of the evil* without destroying the fairest fabric of freedom mortal hands have ever raised, and in its ruins extinguishing the last hope of humanity for self-government. Permit me to say, that this government has cost Boston too much to be given up or hazarded for slight and trival causes. Some of the patriots of the revolution still linger among you, and the monumental pillar of your grateful recollection of the Heroes who fell at Bunker Hill, would seem to be a mockery, if their sons could so soon forget that this Constitution cost the heart's blood of their sons.

That your citizens have acted wisely and patriotically in sustaining the law I cannot doubt.—their conduct has been governed by the highest sense of moral and political obligation; and for this noble example I feel constrained, as the Chief Magistrate, whose especial duty it was to see that the laws were faithfuly executed, to return the citizens of Boston my warmest acknowledgements—and I should have been most happy to have done this in person, were it consistent with my official engagements to leave this city.

With my thanks to you, and through you to the citizens of Boston, for this kind invitation, and I have the honor to be your friend and fellow-citizen,

MILLARD FILLMORE.

Here we have the President of the United States excusing the sympaties of the people of Boston in favor of escaped slaves, and speaking of slavery itself as an '*evil*' of which it is the duty of the Southern people to rid themselves in due time! Nay more, he thanks the people of Boston because they did not trample the constitution and the laws under foot, and withhold from a southern man his property by force!!

Does a citizen of this country deserve credit and consideration because he refrains from committing the crime of treason? Mr. Fillmore seems to think so. *The President of the United States declars slavery to be an 'evil'* and steps beyond the limits of his duty by expressing the "hope" and the "trust" that the people of the South will in due time, *abolish this 'evil.'* We regard this letter as most significant and extraordinary. This cant about the 'evils' of slavery has at length reached executive chair of the United States, and this letter of compliments to a notorious abolition City has been made the medium for conveying it to the whole country. We say *cant*—aye, *hypocrisy pharisaism* that spirit which is so pure itself that it can perceive all kind of sins and moral blemishes in others, and which thanks God that it is "not as other men are"—that spirit now speaks from the seat of Washington!

Mr. Fillmore is the choice of the Raleigh Register for the next Presidency of the United States. Will that paper tell its readers and tell us what right Mr. Fillmore has, as President of the United States, to express the opinion that Slavery is an 'evil?' Is he not, in so doing, throwing the moral power of his high position against it, and giving aid and encouragement to those fanatics who brand slavery as a sin and a crime?

At the present time, it may not be inappropriate to publish the following extract from the annual message of that firm and distinguished southern patriot, GEORGE M. TROUP. The boldness of his predictions, the earnestness of his appeals and the severity of his denunciations alarmed, at the time, the whole country. By some, he was considered a mad-man, and by others a hot-headed enthusiast. We now see that there was much method in his madness. The predictions of 1825, are realities in 1851. The south failed to take the advice of *Troup.* She "temporized" with "*the fanatics.*" She failed to resist the "*first movement of Congress*" or the *abolition question,* and "*all was lost.*" We now "stand stripped and desolate, under a fervid sun and upon a generous soil, a mockery to ourselves." What is still our duty? We must defend the *rights* and the *equality* of the states. We must protect our own peculiar institutions—we must uphold our system of slavery. "It may be our physical weakness—*It is our moral strength.*" When the "argument is exhausted," we have nothing to do, 'BUT TO STAND BY OUR ARMS.' HANCOCK.

Extract from Gov. TROUP's message of 1825:

"Soon, very soon, the United States government, discarding the mask, will openly lend itself to a combination of FANATICS for the destruction of *everything that is valuable in the southern country.* ONE MOVE OF THE CONGRESS UNRESISTED BY YOU, AND ALL IS LOST. TEMPORIZE NO LONGER.—*Make known your* resolution, that this subject shall not be touched by them but at their peril. But for its sacred guarantee by the constitution, we never would have become parties to that instrument. At this moment you would not make yourselves parties to any constitution without it. Of course you will not *be a party to it from the moment the general government* shall make that movement. If this matter be an evil, it is our own.—If it be a sin, we can implore the forgiveness of it. To remove it, we ask not either their sympathy or assistance. It may be our physical weakness—*It is our moral strength.* If, like the Greeks and Romans, the moment we *cease to be masters* we are *slaves*—we thenceforth minister, like the modern Italians, to the luxury and pleasures of our masters. Poets, painters, musicians, and sculptors we may be—the *moral qualities* however, which would make us the fair partakers of the grandeur of a *great empire would be gone.* We would stand *stripped and desolate* under a fervid sun and upon a generous soil, a mockery to ourselves, and the very contrast of what, with a little firmness and foresight, we might have been. *I entreat you therefore, most earnestly, now that it is not too late to step forth, and having exhausted the argument,* TO STAND BY YOUR ARMS."—*Tribune.*

The Hampton Massacre.

In our route to Spartanburg Court House the other day, we passed by where occurred in the Revolutionary war a bloody massacre. The bodies of General Wade Hampton's father, mother and brothers lie buried in Spartanburg District, on the waters of Tyger river, where they were treacherously murdered by the Cherokee Indians at the commencement of the Revolutionary war. Anthony Hampton, the father, with his wife and daughter, Mrs. James Harrison, and her sons, Preston, Henry and Edward, moved to Spartanburg District about the year 1774. At the commencement of the troubles between the colonies and the mother country, it was a matter of deep concern to the inhabitants on the frontiers of South Carolina, that the Cherokee Indians should not engage in the war. In order to secure their peace, Preston and Henry Hampton made them a visit and formed an acquaintance with their chiefs and head men. But they had already been seduced by the British Government, and about the time that Henry Clinton and Sir Peter Parker made their attack on Charleston, they commenced their incursions on the frontiers of the state.

The Indians approached Mr. Hampton's house, and some of the head men were recognized by Preston Hampton. As he extended to them the hand of friendship they slew him to the ground, and immediately afterwards they killed Mr. Anthony Hampton, his wife and a little grand child, the infant of Mrs. James Harrison. A lad by the name of John Bunum, was taken by the Indians from Mr. Hampton's and adopted as their son.—He remained many years with them, and was restored under the treaty of 1777.

Immediately after this massacre, Col. Williamson raised a large body of militia and marched into the Cherokee Nation and destroyed a large number of their towns and settlements. Henry Hampton killed, with his own hand, an Indian warrior who had his brother Preston Hampton's coat on in the engagement. Edward Hampton, at the time of the massacre was at Baylis Earle's on Packolet, whose daughter he married. In this way he escaped the massacre, but was himself afterwards shot by the "bloody scout" in his own house. Edward Hampton was a bold cavalier, and one of the best horse-men of his age in South Carolina General Wade Hampton was, at this time in North Carolina.—*Greenville Southern Patriot.*

A Cheap Pair of Lamps.

The Pennsylvanian, informs the public of the manner in which a gentleman in Philadelphia, obtained a pair of splendid mantel lamps at a very low price. It says:

"Mr. Lemuel Tucker is a gentleman of thrifty and economical habits, and is particularly fond of a bargain. On coming home to dinner yesterday, Mr. Tucker met a man of unprepossessing appearance in his entry, and inquired rather ungraciously what had procured the honor of such an untimely visit.

The person to whom this inquiry was addressed, after a moment's hesitation, took from under his ragged roundabout a pair of handsome cut glass lamps, and informed Mr. Tucker that being a little "hard up," at present, owing to the scarcity of silver, he was willing to sell the "thingumbobs for what they would fetch.

Mr. Tucker's eyes sparkled at the prospect of a good trade, but like a cunning man of business, he professed to have no use for any article of that sort; there are "more lamps in his house already than he knew what to do with," but as he had a feeling for any one that was "hard up," he proposed to pay one dollar for the illuminator, which he judged to be about a fifth or sixth part of their value. The offer was accepted, the money was paid, and the lamp seller, taking leave of his customer, disappeared like the shadow of a fleeting cloud propelled by the vernal breeze.

Mr. Tucker was in rapture with his bargain, and called Mrs. Tucker down to partake of his felicity.

"Here's a treat," said Mr. T. to his lady, "the cheapest pair of lamps ever bought in this city.—The fellow stole them, of course, but what is that to us. If we did not buy them somebody else would. I got them for one dollar."

"You are joking, Mr. Tucker," said the lady.

"Joking? not a bit of it. I tell you I gave only four Spanish quarters for these superb lamps," cried Mr. Tucker.

"How you talk!" answered Mrs. T. pettishly; "don't you know that we gave six dollars for them last summer?"

"You are dreaming, Mrs. Tucker," exclaimed the astonished man of business, "I tell you I bought them, not ten minutes ago from a ragmuffin here in the entry; and the fellow must have stolen them, or we never could have got them for such a price."

"You are right, Mr. Tucker, calmly replied the matron, "the fellow *did steal them from the center table in our back room!*"

Tucker shot out, like an arrow, after the audacious rogue, but alas! like his distinguished namesake, "Daniel," our Tucker was behind time.—Complaint was made at the police office, but all to no good purpose.

JACKSON, 21st June, 1850.

Editor of the Southron:

DEAR SIR: An opinion expressed by me in a letter to the Hon. H. S. Foote, approving the plan of compromise introduced into the Senate by the committee of thirteen, is being used as an evidence that the South would be content with the terms of the compromise. That opinion may receive an undue weight from the circumstance that I was chosen President of the Nashville Convention, and the inference may be drawn that a majority of the delegates concurred in approving the compromise. The reverse, however, is true; the compromise had but few friends in the Convention. And that no opinion of mine may be used to destroy in any degree, the force of the action of the Convention, a further explanation may be necessary. The letter was written at a time when it was believed by me, as well as by others, not only here, but elsewhere, that the convention movement would result in a total failure; some of the States declined to appoint delegates, it was believed the delegates appointed by others would not attend, and everywhere great opposition was manifested towards the measure. It seemed impossible to rally the South in vindication of her rights. The advices from Washington City seemed to dispel any hope of a creditable Convention, and a failure could have no other effect than to encourage the aggressions on the South. It was also believed that the compromise was the best that could possibly be obtained; so indeed I was distinctly informed. Under such circumstances, I wrote the letter referred to, in reply to one which contained but a syllabus of the compromise, not having seen the details of the measure. But, in expressing that opinion, I did not intend to admit that the South was entitled to nothing more. My opinions on the subject of our rights are too well known, I trust, to be the subject of doubt. I have repeatedly declared that the South was entitled to an equal portion of the new territories. Since that letter was written, the Nashville Convention has met. Its enemies have been disappointed and its friends gratified. It is now seen that the South is alive to her interests and her rights. The Nashville Convention was called for the purpose of enabling the Southern States to consult together, and to know each other's sentiments. After full deliberation, the Convention, by an undivided opinion, resolved that the South was entitled at least to claim to have the Missouri Compromise line extended to the Pacific, which would give her part of California. *This plan received my cordial support. It was the only one for which I indicated a preference before I left for the Convention. It recommends itself, by its entire justice.* In this the South is yielding more than ought to be demanded of her, but for the sake of harmony, she may with propriety accede to it. I did not go into the Convention with any other motive than to preserve our rights by acting in concert with others, and was fully prepared to act in a spirit of compromise; and whatever opinions I may have entertained or expressed, I am now under obligations to carry out the views of the Convention. *Every man who went into it, was at least impliedly bound to abide by its action;* and this obligation is the more cheerfully admitted by me, as all its measures seemed to have in view a due regard for the Union and the preservation of the Constitution. And I trust the whole South will unite, in a spirit of firm determination, to insist upon the line of compromise which we have recommended. *This shall be my course,* and I hope by pursuing it, to accomplish the preservation of the Union unimpaired. It is proper to state that my opinions were freely communicated not to vindicate myself against the charge of inconsistency—I am wholly indifferent on that subject—but solely for the purpose of placing the action of the Convention in its true light.

Your obedient servant,

W. L. SHARKEY.

Let those who doubt the loyalty of the Northern people, and also those who question the assurances of the Southern Whigs that the fugitive slave law will be faithfully executed, read the following paragraph from the St. Louis Republican, a whig paper. Such evidences of Northern loyalty to the laws, the Constitution and the *Union,* are getting to be as plentiful as they are truly overwhelming and convincing.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE CASE AT CHICAGO.—The case has terminated, as we have all along expected it would, in the discharge of the slave, although the proof of his identity is admitted, by the Chicago Daily Argus, to have been "full and complete." It could hardly have been otherwise, for we have understood that the agent in this case had long known the slave, and knew him to be the property of the claimant. But we have been long satisfied, that it is not the intention of the Abolitionists and law-defiers of Chicago to permit the law to be executed under any circumstances whatever. The prating of the Journal, that "the law has been honored, and yet human sympathies have not been outraged," and of the Argus, that "the laws have been sustained by the people, in a manner worthy of all praise," are singularly at variance with the facts of the case, which show that the law was set at defiance and grossly outraged. A broader farce, as it seems to us, has never been enacted in any trial of equal interest.

St. Louis Repub., 11th inst.