NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE.

BY GREELEY & McELRATH. OFFICE, TRIBUNE BUILDINGS. FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

VOL. VIII. NO. 109. NEW-YORK, TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 15, 1848. WHOLE NO. 2289.

NEW-YORK TRIBUNE.

THE NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE IS PUBLISHED EVERY MORNING (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED),

At The Tribune Buildings, corner of Spruce and Nassau streets, opposite the City Hall,

And delivered to City Subscribers for 12½ Cents per week; or, when they prefer, they can pay in advance at the Desk for six months or a year at the same rate. Single copies Two Cents. Mail subscribers Five Dollars per annum, in advance, and the paper in no case continued beyond the time for which it is paid. Subscriptions taken for six months. Three Dollars in advance required in all exchanges with Country Newspapers. Daily papers received at this office whose terms are higher than those of The Tribune, are not allowed any difference.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING—*(In Advance).*

FIVE LINES, or less—First insertion, 25 cents; *Inside*, subsequent insertions, 12½ cents; *Outside*, subsequent insertions, 18 cents.....TEN LINES, or over five—First insertion, 50 cents; *Inside*, subsequent insertions, 25 cents; *Outside*, subsequent insertions, 38 cents.....OVER TEN LINES—First insertion, 5 cents a line; daily subsequent insertions, 2 cents a line; once, twice, or thrice per week, 3 cents a line; daily, every day, once, twice or thrice per week, 4 cents a line.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES and FUNERAL NOTICES, *not exceeding Ten lines*, 50 cents.

All advertisements inserted in this paper appear both in the Morning and Evening Editions.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE

is published every *Wednesday* and *Saturday* morning. Price $2 per annum. Two copies for $3.

NEW-YORK WEEKLY TRIBUNE,

A VERY LARGE PAPER FOR THE COUNTRY, a published every *Saturday Morning* at the low price of $2 per annum, in advance. Ten copies for $15, or twenty copies for $24.

GREELEY & McELRATH Publishers.

NEW-YORK TRIBUNE.

OREGON ORGANIZED!

The Struggle and the Triumph.

Special Correspondence of The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Sunday, Aug. 13.

The House of Representatives having by a majority of 39 refused to concur in the Senate amendment, to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean, the Senate had the bill under consideration from 10 A. M. on Saturday, and continued in session until 10 o'clock on Sunday morning.

It having been ascertained that a majority in the Senate are disposed to pass the bill as it came from the House, Senator FOOTE and others of his ultra friends attempted to force an adjournment over to Monday and then by talking against time defeat the bill. The friends of the bill remained firm and refused to yield. So the talkers continued in session and threatened to sit out the Session till the hour of adjournment on Monday noon, when both Houses adjourn the Session. But at half-past 9 on Sunday morning the minority yielded and the vote was taken, 29 for and 25 against concurring. So the bill passed.

If the President signs it, the Territorial Government will be organized, under the restriction of the Wilmot Proviso. It can only be prevented by his vetoing it, or by pocketing the bill.

The Senate was full, excepting the two vacancies in *Iowa*. The vote stood for insisting on the extension (in this bill) of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific—(all from Slave States) 25

For receding and passing the bill—Free States 26
Slave States ..... 3—29

The three voting with the Free States were SPRUANCE of Delaware, BENTON of Missouri, and HOUSTON of Texas.

Absent.—CLAYTON of Del. (attending a sick child), STURGEON of Pa. who retired from the Senate Chamber an hour before the test vote was taken.

KING of Ala. paired off with ATHERTON of N. H.

Passage of the Oregon Bill through the Senate.

Correspondence of The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Sunday, August 13.

The Oregon bill as it passed the House a few days since, passed the Senate this morning between the hours of 9 and 10 o'clock. "There are no Sabbaths in Revolutionary times"—and these times, according to Mr. CALHOUN, *are* revolutionary.

The first amendment to the House bill, which made it the duty of the Governor of the Territory to transmit to each House of Congress copies of any bills he may veto, with his reasons therefor immediately after each session of the Territorial Legislature, and which was adopted in the Senate on Thursday, was given up to-day by a vote of 31 to 23.

The second amendment, which directly confers the veto power on the Governor of the Territory, and provides that in such cases the bill shall not become a law unless approved by Congress, was relinquished without a division.

The third amendment, which provides

"That the line of 36° 30′ of north latitude, known as the Missouri Compromise line, as defined by the eighth section of an act entitled 'An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories,' approved March 6, 1820, be and the same is hereby declared to extend to the Pacific Ocean; and the said eighth section, together with the Compromise therein effected, is hereby revived and declared to be in full force and binding for the future organization of the territories of the United States, in the same sense and with the same understanding with which it was originally adopted, and"

was after the struggle of hours, finally receded from by a vote of **29** ayes to **25** nays, as follows:

AYES—Allen, Baldwin, *Benton*, Bradbury, Breese, Bright, Cameron, Clarke, Corwin, Davis of Mass, Dayton, Dickinson, Dix, Dodge, Douglas, Felch, Fitzgerald, Green, Hale, Hamlin, Hannegan, *Houston*, Miller, Niles, Phelps, *Spruance*, Upham, Walker, Webster—29.

Those in Italics are from Slaveholding States.

NAYS—Atchison, Badger, Berrien, Butler, Calhoun, Davis of Miss, Downs, Foote, Hunter, Johnson of Md, Johnson of Geo, Johnston of La, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Metcalfe, Pearce, Rusk, Sebastian, Turney, Underwood, Westcott, Yulee—25.

Every Representative of a Northern State voted against retaining the invidious amendment, *even Dickinson*. The Demonstration at Buffalo has made him sick at heart.

The absentees were Messrs. ATHERTON, CLAYTON, KING and STURGEON.

Messrs. ATHERTON and KING of Alabama, paired off early in the morning, exhausted by the protracted session.

Mr. CLAYTON is still in Delaware, summoned and detained there by a domestic calamity.

The reason of Mr. STURGEON'S absence I did not learn.

The night was consumed in speeches, not for conviction but delay. After Mr. WEBSTER'S speech at 9 o'clock in the evening, nothing was said but had been better omitted.

A little sparring unfortunately took place between Judge BUTLER of S. C. and Col. BENTON,—Senators of their high position and public service should subdue by conduct and bearing the younger and more undisciplined members of the Senate,—not serve as precedents for outbursts of vulgar passions.

Judge BUTLER in the course of the evening made a motion for an Executive session. Some member of the Senate, he said, had been guilty of violating the seal of secrecy which is supposed to control the proceedings of closed doors. It was not apparent from his remarks that any one Senator was intended to be designated.

It seemed otherwise to Col. BENTON. He made a reply, not in Senatorial language, and certainly not in good taste. To talk of "cramming the lie down the throats of persons" is coarse. Something, it is true, can be pardoned to anger arising from an unjust aspersion; but to meet a charge by intemperate abuse or by denunciation is not always the easiest way of establishing innocence or of gaining sympathy.

If the quarrel had stopped *or stops* at words, however violent, there had been (or will) be less to regret. But from the character of the conflict such is not to be expected, unless from the ardent interference of friends. Blows (as I learn from report) would have been interchanged in the very Senate, but for the rapid and determined conduct of Senators near by the heated adversaries.

It is unpleasant to allude to such an occurrence. The person who records it seems to share a portion of the guilt of the actors. It should never be mentioned but as a warning—as a means to prevent a repetition.

The distinguished gentlemen will undoubtedly early regret the intemperate heat into which they have been betrayed, and deplore the consequences too likely to follow in the Senate from the example they have set.

Gen. HOUSTON, gratified at the oratorical display of the morning, took the floor during the night-session again. He made a second hit like the first.

He passed an encomium upon Mr. CLAY for his services in concocting and carrying successfully through Congress the Missouri Compromise. His remarks hereupon drew plaudits from the spectators in the gallery, and came very near drawing the spectators themselves from the same place: a motion being immediately made "to clear the galleries," which however, after some very proper remarks pro and con, was finally very properly withdrawn.

Gen. FOOTE made a speech in which he praised Mr. WEBSTER—who, however, at the time being temporarily absent from the Senate, lost it all.

This morning the Senators had a jaded look—a spiritless expression. But they have all the day before them for repose.

By Telegraph to the New-York Tribune.

WESTERN ELECTIONS.

ILLINOIS.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill. Aug. 12.

Scammon, the Whig candidate in the Fourth Congressional District, has 50 majority over his opponent, Mr. Wentworth, the present Loco-Foco Representative in Congress.

Another Account.

BUFFALO, Monday, Aug. 14.

From Illinois we have intelligence that JOHN WENTWORTH, the present Member from the Chicago District, is reelected.

In the Galena District, Col. BAKER, Whig, is elected.

The Sangamo or Springfield District, now represented by ABRAHAM LINCOLN, Whig, is still doubtful, but LOGAN, Whig, is reported to be elected.

We have reports also that MARSHALL, Whig, is elected in the IIId Congressional District, now represented by Orlando B. Ficklin, Loco.

INDIANA.

VINCENNES, Ia. Sunday, Aug. 13.

The Whigs have carried the Counties of Delaware, Rush, Franklin, Clay, Vermillion, Parke and Monroe Counties; all gave Loco-Foco majorities in 1847. The Loco-Focos have carried Hamilton, Floyd, Dearborn, Scott, Madison, Montgomery and Fountain Counties. Of these Counties, Hamilton, Floyd, Scott and Madison were carried by the Whigs in 1847. As far as heard from, the Whigs have elected 31, and the Loco-Focos 22 Members of the Legislature. The result is still doubtful. The *Journal of Commerce* publishes the following dispatch:

INDIANAPOLIS, Saturday, Aug. 12.

Indiana has gone for the Loco-Focos. The Senate will stand 27 or 28 Loco-Focos to 23 Whigs. In the House, 52 Counties show a Loco-Foco majority of 29, being a gain of 16 members.

SOUTHERN ELECTIONS.

NORTH CAROLINA.

PETERSBURG, Monday, Aug. 14.

One County to hear from—MANLY, the Whig candidate, 350 ahead. Most likely a tie in the Legislature.

Steamboat Explosion—The Factory Excitement.

PITTSBURGH, Monday, Aug. 14.

The steamer Robert Wrightman burst her boiler below Wheeling, by which one person was killed, and three others fatally scalded.

The Factories, by an arrangement with some of the strikers, go to work in Pittsburgh this morning. The Sheriff called out hundreds of police and citizens to protect them in so doing from the dissentients.

Only three feet water in the river.

Baltimore Markets.

BALTIMORE, Monday, Aug. 14.

In the Baltimore market there have been no transactions since the steamer's news. Flour remains stiff at last prices.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE ILLUMINATED PICTORIAL DIRECTORY OF NEW YORK. By JONES, NEWMAN and J. S. EWBANK, No. 1. Price 25 cents.

This publication represents a continued series of colored elevations of all the dwellings, stores, and public buildings fronting on the principal streets. No. 1 includes both sides of Broadway from the Battery to the site of the old Grace Church. The work is expensively got up.

☞ The LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW for July treats of Painting, Chemistry, the Jesuits, Rome and Italy, Walpole's Letters, and Fowell Buxton's Memoirs; also of Socialism and Labor, and the new French Revolution in a manner most congenial to the Tory Aristocracy of Great Britain. The Herald and Express must be edified and strengthened by it. (L. Scott & Co. 79 Fulton-st.)

"ILLUSTRATED BIBLE."—We have just received Part 71 of the "Devotional Family Bible." The illustration in this number is a representation of Marshill at Athens—a very fine engraving. Geo. Virtue, 26 John-st. 25 cents per number.

VERMONT.—JOHN S. BUCK of Northfield is the Whig candidate for Congress in the IVth District, now represented by Lucius B. Peck, Loco.

ELIJAH CLEVELAND of Coventry is Whig candidate for Elector in the same District.

☞ Hon. GEO. N. ECKERT, Whig Representative in Congress from the XIVth District of Pennsylvania, declines a reelection.

☞ W. E. ROBINSON, Esq. of this City, and W. H. MITCHEL, brother of the "Irish Felon," were to speak on Ireland in Rochester on Saturday, and in Syracuse yesterday. To-Day they will be in Troy or Albany, and on Wednesday they will pass through Springfield to Hartford on their return to this City, to address a meeting there on that evening.

☞ The Philadelphia *Spirit of the Times* complains that 'some miserable wretch' is in the habit of stealing copies of that paper dispatched to regular subscribers. The fortunes of that thief must be desperate indeed.

FROM BERMUDA.—By the arrival of the ship *Susan*, of Boston, we have received the *Bermuda Herald* of the 4th, which, however, contains no news of importance.

☞ It is said that Gen. Santa Anna intends to take up his residence in Havana, because in Jamaica there is no society, no theatre, no kind of amusement.

☞ The *Savannah Georgian* (Cass), has the following extract from a Cassite in this City:

"Cannot your Southerners see the matter thus? If not, our Northern Democrats can say, and *will* say, after the Whigs have *swept the South*, this Fall: 'We have stood by the rights of the South through good and through evil report; *for so doing* we have been reviled at home, and destroyed by anti-slavery factions, revolting in the bosom of our own party. *Cass was nominated for the South.* If the South elect Taylor now, do not we all support farther. The South will have betrayed itself. *The election of Taylor dissolves the Democratic party.* That dissolution dissolves the Union. You don't know the feeling we have to contend with here."

MORE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.—The following notice appears in the *Charleston Mercury*:

The Democrats of Charleston District who are opposed to the nominee of the Whig Convention for the Presidency of the United States, and are now prepared to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, are invited to assemble at the Charleston Theater, on Thursday, 17th inst. at 8 o'clock P. M.

STAMPEDE AMONG THE SLAVES.—The *Lexington* (Ky.) *Atlas*, of Tuesday, Aug. 8, has the following account of the departure of a large number of colored emigrants from that city and vicinity, supposed to be in quest of 'Free Soil:'

The city yesterday morning was filled with rumors and excitement, on account of a concocted and well-laid scheme for a wholesale absconding of the negroes in this vicinity. Rumor states that the number ascertained to have left this neighborhood on Saturday night, is between fifty and eighty. We have no certain information as to the *precise* number missing, but we know of at least *thirty* who are certainly gone. They left by the way of the Russell road, in a northern direction.—It is supposed that they have been persuaded off and are under the care of the abolitionists. One owner states they were seen going down the Versailles road, firing pistols, whooping and singing songs and ditties. There is no doubt but that white men have had a hand in this matter. Five thousand dollars reward has been offered by the owners of the runaways, for their apprehension.

Since writing the above, we learn that it has been ascertained that *sixty-six* slaves have been missing. We learn several have run away from Woodford and Franklin. We also learn by a telegraphic dispatch that a good many escaped from the Counties of Bourbon and Mason on Saturday night. We never heard of such wholesale running off of negroes before. It is all the work of the abolitionists.

HON. SAMUEL A. BRIDGES.—We regret to learn that this gentleman, the Representative from the Vth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, lies dangerously ill at Washington. The *Allentown Democrat* says that letters received by his family during the past week state that his attendants have been unable to remove him in his bed for nine days, in consequence of the enfeebled condition to which disease has brought him.

"NO EXTENSION OF LOCAL SLAVERY."

"No Increase of Slave Representation!"

MR. WEBSTER'S GREAT SPEECH

ON THE

OREGON BILL.

Delivered in the Senate on Saturday Evening last.

[*Reported Expressly for The Tribune, by Dr. Houston, Stenographer to the Senate of the United States.*]

The question being on the motion by Mr. BENTON that the Senate recede from its amendments, to which the House had refused to agree:

Mr. WEBSTER rose and said: I am very little inclined to prolong this debate, and I hope I am utterly disinclined to bring into it any new warmth or excitement. I wish to say a few words, however, first, upon the question as it is presented to us as a parliamentary question; and secondly, upon the general political question involved in the debate.

As a question of parliamentary proceeding, I understand the case to be this: The House of Representatives sent us a bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Oregon; no motion has been made in the Senate to strike out any part of that bill. The bill purporting to respect Oregon, simply and alone, has not been the subject of any objection in this branch of the legislature. The Senate has proposed no important amendment to this bill affecting Oregon itself; and the honourable member from Missouri (Mr. BENTON) was right, precisely right, when he said that the amendment now under consideration had no relation to Oregon. That is perfectly true; and therefore the amendment which the Senate has adopted and the House has disagreed to, has nothing in the world to do with Oregon. The truth is that is an amendment, by which the Senate wish to have a public, legal declaration, not respecting Oregon, but respecting the newly acquired territories of California and New-Mexico. It wishes now to make a line of Slavery for those new Territories. The amendment says that this line of the "Missouri Compromise" shall be the line to the Pacific; and then goes on to say, in the language of the bill as it now stands, that the Ordinance of '87 shall be applicable to Oregon; and therefore I say that the amendment proposed is foreign to the immediate object of the bill. It does nothing to modify, restrain or affect, in any way, the government which we propose to establish over Oregon, or the condition or character of that government or of the people under it. In a parliamentary view, this is the state of the case.

Now, Sir, this amendment has been attached to this bill by a strong majority of the Senate. That majority had the right, as it had the power, to pass it. The House disagreed to that amendment. Well, if the majority of the Senate who attached it to the bill are of opinion that a conference with the House will lead to some adjustment of the question by which this amendment, or something equivalent to it, may be adopted by the House, it is very proper for them to urge a conference. It is very fair, quite parliamentary, and there is not a word to be said against it. But my position is that of one who voted against the amendment—who thinks that it ought not to be attached to this bill, and therefore I naturally vote for the motion to get rid of it—that is, "to recede."

So much for the parliamentary question. Now, there are two or three questions arising in this case which I wish to state dispassionately—not to argue, but to state.

The honorable member from Georgia (Mr. BERRIAN,) for whom I have great respect, and with whom it is my delight to cultivate personal friendship, has stated, with great propriety, the importance of this question. He has said that it is a question interesting to the South and to the North, and one which may very well, also, attract the attention of mankind. He has not stated all this too strongly. It is such a question. Without doubt, it is a question which may well attract the attention of mankind. On the subjects involved in this debate, the whole world is not now asleep. It is wide awake; and I agree with the honorable member, that, if what is now proposed to be done by us who resist this amendment, is, as he supposes, unjust and injurious to any portion of this community, that injustice should be presented to the civilized world, and we, who concur in the proceeding, ought to submit ourselves to its rebuke. I am glad that the honorable gentleman proposes to refer this question to the great tribunal of Modern Civilization, as well as the great tribunal of the American People. It is proper. It is a question of magnitude enough—of interest enough—to all the civilized nations of the earth, to call from those who support one side or the other a statement of the grounds upon which they act.

Now, I propose to state, as briefly as I can, the grounds upon which I proceed historical and constitutional; and will endeavor to use as few words as possible, so that I may relieve the Senate from hearing me at the earliest possible moment.

In the first place, to view the matter historically: this Constitution, founded in 1787, and the Government under it organized in 1789, does recognize the existence of Slavery in certain States, then existing in the Union; and a particular description of Slavery. I hope that what I am about to say may be received, without any supposition that I intend the slightest disrespect. But this particular description of Slavery, does not, I believe, now exist in Europe, nor in any other civilized portions of the habitable globe. It is not a Predial Slavery. It is not analogous to the case of the *Predial* Slaves, or Slaves *glebæ adscripti* of Russia, or Hungary, or other States. It is a peculiar system of personal Slavery, by which the person who is called a Slave is transferable as a chattel, from hand to hand. I speak of this as a fact. And that is the fact; and I will say farther—perhaps other gentlemen may remember the instances—that although Slavery, as a system of servitude attached to the earth, existed in various countries of Europe, I am not at the present moment aware of any place on the globe in which this property of man in a human being as a Slave transferable as a chattel, exists except in certain States of this Union and the West India Islands. Now, that existed at the formation of this Constitution, and the framers of that instrument, and those who adopted it, agreed that, as far as it existed, it should not be disturbed, or interfered with by the new General Government. There is no doubt of that.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes it as an existing fact—an existing relation between the inhabitants of the Southern States. I do not call it an "institution," because that term is not applicable to it; for that seems to imply a voluntary establishment. I have been here so long that when I first came here it was matter of reproach to England, the mother country, that Slavery had been entailed upon the Colonies against their consent, and that which is now considered a cherished "institution" was then regarded as, I will not say an entailed *evil*, but an entailment on the Colonies by the policy of the mother country against their wishes. At any rate, it stands upon the Constitution. The Constitution was adopted in 1788, and went into operation in 1789. When it was adopted the state of the country was this: Slavery existed in the Southern States; there was a very large extent of unoccupied territory—the whole North-west—which it was understood was destined to be formed into States; and it was then determined that no Slavery should exist in this territory north-west of the Ohio. I gather now, as a matter of inference from the history of the time, and the history of the debates, that the prevailing motives with the North for agreeing to this recognition of the existence of Slavery in the Southern States, and giving a representation to those States, founded in part upon their slaves, was based on the supposition that no acquisition of territory would be made to form new States on the Southern frontier of this country, either by cession or conquest. It is plain that taking the history of the times together, the reason why the slave-representation was allowed, was that since the North-west Territory was destined by ordinance to be free, and since nobody looked to any acquisition by conquest or cession for the creation of Slave States at the South, there was an insisting on the part of the South to suffer Slavery where it did exist, and to be represented according to the principles and provisions of the Constitution, inasmuch as it was limited by these two considerations: first, that there was to be no Slavery in the Territories; and second, that there was not the least anticipation of the acquisition of any new territory. And now, Sir, I am one, who, understanding that to be the purpose of the Constitution, mean to abide by it.

There is another principle, equally clear, by which I mean to abide; and that is, that in the Convention and in the first Congress, when appealed to on the subject by petitions and all along in the history of this Government, it was and has been a conceded point that Slavery, in the States in which it did exist, was a matter of State regulation exclusively, and that Congress had not the least power over it, or right to interfere with it.—Therefore, I say that all agitations and attempts to disturb the relations between master and slave, by persons not living in the Slave States, are unconstitutional in their spirit, and are, in my opinion, productive of nothing but evil and mischief.—I countenance none of them. The manner in which the Governments of those States where Slavery exists are to regulate it, is for their own consideration, under their responsibility to their constituents, to the general laws of propriety, humanity, and justice, and to God. Associations formed elsewhere, springing from a feeling of humanity, or any other cause, have nothing whatever to do with it. They have never received any encouragement from me and they never will. In my opinion, they have done nothing but to delay and defeat their own professed objects. I have stated, as I understand it, the state of things upon the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. What has happened since? Sir, it has happened that, above and beyond all contemplation or expectation of the original framers of the Constitution, foreign territory has been acquired by cession, first from Spain and then from France, on our Southern frontier. And what has been the result of that? Five Slave-holding States have been created and added to the Union, bringing ten Senators into this body, (I include Texas, which I consider in the light of a fore gn acquisition also,) and up to this hour in which I address you, not one free State has been admitted into the Union from all this acquired territory;—not one!

Mr. BERRIAN (in his seat)—Yes—Iowa.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Iowa is not yet in the Union. Her Senators are not here. When she comes in, there will be one to five—one free State to five Slave formed out of new Territories.—Now, it seems strange to me that there should be any complaint of injustice exercised by the North toward the South. Northern votes have been necessary, they have been ready, and they have been rendered to aid the formation of these five new slaveholding States. These are facts; and as the gentleman from Georgia has very properly put it as a cause in which we ought to present ourselves before the world for its judgment, let us now see how we stand. I do not represent the North. I state my own case; and present the matter in that light, in which I am willing, as an individual Member of Congress, to be judged by civilized humanity. I say, then, that according to true history, the slaveholding interest in this country has not been a disfavored interest; it has not been disfavored by the North. The North has concurred to bring in these five Slave-holding States out of newly-acquired territory; which acquisitions were never at all in the contemplation of the Convention which formed the Constitution, or of the people when they agreed that there should be a representation of three-fifths of the Slaves in the then existing States.

Mr. President, what is the result of this? We stand here now—at least I do, for one—to say that considering that there have been already five new slaveholding States formed out of newly acquired Territory and one only at most non-slaveholding State, I do not feel that I am called on to go farther; I do not feel the obligation to yield more. But our friends of the South say, You deprive us of all our rights—we have fought for this Territory, and you deny us participation in it.—Let us consider this question as it really is; and since the honorable gentleman from Georgia proposes to leave the case to the enlightened and impartial judgment of mankind, and as I agree with him that it is a case proper to be considered by the enlightened part of mankind, let us consider how the matter in truth stands. What is the consequence? Gentlemen, who advocate the case which my honorable friend from Georgia with so much ability sustains, declare that we invade their rights—that we deprive them of a participation in the enjoyment of territories acquired by the common services and common exertions of all. Is this true? How deprived? Of what do we deprive them? Why, they say that we deprive them of the privilege of carrying their slaves, as slaves, in to the new territories. Well, Sir, what is the amount of that? They say that in this way we deprive them of the opportunity of going into this acquired territory with their property. Their "property!"—what do they mean by that? We certainly do not deprive them of the privilege of going into these newly acquired territories with all that, in the general estimate of human society, in the general and common and universal understanding of mankind, is esteemed property. Not at all. The truth is just this: They have in their own States, peculiar laws, which create property in persons. They have a system of local legislation on which Slavery rests; while everybody agrees that it is against natural law, or at least against the common understanding which prevails as to what is natural law. I am not going into metaphysics, for therein I should encounter the Hon. Member from South Carolina, and we should wander in "endless mazes lost" until after the time for the adjournment of Congress. The Southern States have peculiar laws, and by those laws there is property in Slaves. This is purely local. The real meaning, then, of Southern gentlemen in making this complaint, is that they cannot go into the territories of the United States carrying with them their own peculiar local law—a law which creates property in persons. This, according to their own statement is all the ground of complaint they have. Now here, I think, gentlemen are unjust toward us. How unjust they are, others will judge—generations that will come after us will judge. It will not be contended that this sort of personal Slavery exists by general law. It exists only by local law. I do not mean to deny the validity of that local law where it is established; but I say it is, after all, nothing but local law. It is nothing more. And wherever that local law does not extend, property in persons does not exist. Well, Sir, what is now the demand on the part of our Southern friends? They say: 'We will carry our local laws with us wherever we go. We insist that Congress does us injustice unless it establishes in the Territory into which we wish to go, our own local law.' This demand I, for one, resist, and shall resist. It goes upon the idea that there is an inequality, unless persons under this local law, and holding property by authority of that law, can go into new territory and there establish that local law, to the exclusion of other law, Mr. President, it was a maxim of the civil law that between Slavery and Freedom, Freedom should always be presumed and Slavery must always be proved. If any question arose as to the *status* of an individual in Rome, he was presumed to be free until he was proved to be a slave. So, I suppose, is the general law of mankind. An individual is to be presumed to be free until a law can be produced which creates ownership in his person. I do not dispute the force and validity of the local law, as I have already said; but, I say, it is a matter to be proved; and therefore if individuals go into any part of the earth it is to be proved that they are not freemen, or else the presumption is that they are. Now, our friends seem to think that an inequality arises from restraining them from going into the territories, unless there be a law provided which shall protect their ownership in persons. The assertion is, that we create an inequality. Is there nothing to be said on the other side in relation to inequality? Sir, from the date of this Constitution, and in the councils that formed and established this Constitution, and I suppose in all men's judgment since, it is received as a settled truth, that slave labor and free labor do not exist well together. I have before me a declaration of Mr. MASON, in the Convention that formed the Constitution—to that effect. He says that the objection to slave labor is that it puts free white labor in disrepute; that it makes labor to be regarded as derogatory to the character of the free white man, and that he despises to work—to use his expression—where slaves are employed. This is matter of great interest to the Free States; if it be true, as to a great extent it certainly is, that wherever slave labor prevails, free white labor is excluded or discouraged. I agree, that slave labor does not necessarily exclude free labor, totally. There is free white labor in Virginia, Tennessee, and other States.—But it necessarily loses something of its respectability, by the side of, and when associated with, slave labor. Wherever labor is mainly performed by slaves, it is regarded as degrading to free men. The free men of the North, therefore, have a deep interest to keep labor free, exclusively free, in the new territories.

But, Sir, let us look farther into this alleged inequality. There is no pretence that Southern People may not go into territory which shall be subject to the Ordinance of 1787. The only restraint is that they shall not carry slaves thither and continue that relation. They say this shuts them altogether out. Why, Sir, there can be nothing more inaccurate in point of fact than this. I understand that one half the people who settled Illinois, are people, or the descendants of people, who come from the Southern States. And I suppose that one-third of the people of Ohio are those, or descendants of those, who emigrated from the South; and I venture to say, that in respect to those two States, they are at this day settled by people of Southern origin in as great a proportion as they are by people of Northern origin, according to the general numbers and proportion of people, South and North. There are as many people from the South, in proportion to the whole people of the South, in those States, as there are from the North, in proportion to the whole people of the North. *There is, then, no exclusion of Southern people; there is only the exclusion of a peculiar local law.* Neither in principle nor in fact is there any inequality.

The question now is, whether it is not competent to Congress, in the exercise of a fair and just discretion, to say that, considering that there have been five slaveholding States added to this Union out of foreign acquisitions, and as yet only one free State; whether, under this state of things, it is unreasonable and unjust in the slightest degree to limit their farther extension? That is the question. I see no injustice in it. As to the power of Congress, I have nothing to add to what I said the other day. I have said that I shall consent to no extension of the area of Slavery upon this continent, nor any increase of slave representation in the other House of Congress.

I have now stated my reasons for my conduct and my vote. We of the North have gone in this respect already far beyond all that any Southern man could have expected, or did expect, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. I repeat the statement of the fact, of the creation of five new States out of newly acquired territory. We have done that which, if those who framed the Constitution had foreseen, they never would have agreed to Slave representation. We have yielded thus far; and we have now in the House of Representatives, twenty persons voting upon this very question, and upon all other questions, who are there only in virtue of the representation of slaves.

Let me conclude, therefore, by remarking that while I am willing to present this as presenting my own judgment and position, in regard to this case—and I beg it to be understood that I am speaking for no other than myself—and while I am willing to present this to the whole world, as my own justification, I rest on these propositions:—*First*: That when this Constitution was adopted nobody looked for any new acquisition of territory to be formed into slaveholding States. *Secondly*: That the principles of the Constitution prohibited, and were intended to prohibit, and should be construed to prohibit, all interference of the General Government with Slavery as it existed and as it still exists in the States. And then, that looking to the effect of these new acquisitions which have in this great degree enured to strengthen that interest in the South by the addition of these five States, there is nothing unjust, nothing of which any honest man can complain, if he is intelligent; and I feel there is nothing which the civilized world, if they take notice of so humble a person as myself, will reproach me with, when I say, as I said the other day, that I had made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances would I consent to the farther extension of the area of Slavery in the United States, or to the farther increase of Slave Representation in the House of Representatives.

Land Reform—Letter from Rev. Mr. Foote.

Rev. C. C. Foote of Michigan, is the candidate for Vice-President, of the 'Liberty League,' which first nominated Gerrit Smith for President. The Land Reformers, who have also nominated Mr. Smith, but who have now no candidate for Vice-President, have written to Mr. Foote for an expression of his views, and received the following answer:

LETTER FROM MR. FOOTE.

MONTE CLEMENS, (Mich.) August 2, 1848.

ALVAN E. BOVAY, Chm. Nat. Exec. Com. Industrial Congress.

SIR: Your communication of July 6 reached me the 31st. This delay was caused by your non-compliance with my post-office address. You solicit my signature to your Pledge, and a full exposition of my views upon the question of Land Reform. With the first request I cordially comply, and affix to the Pledge my humble name. But with the second, multiplied calls (with which I am daily complying) for lectures on Land and other Reforms, will not permit me to comply. A mere synopsis must suffice. I owe an acknowledgment to your Association for first calling my attention to the question of Land Reform. So absorbed was I with the greatest of all wrongs imposed upon our colored brethren, that I had given but little thought to the question, "*What place shall they occupy*, when they are disenthralled?" The National Reformers called my attention to this question by urging on my consideration the righteous claim—the HOLY RIGHT of our landless *caste* brethren to an inheritance on the bosom of our common mother earth. I thank them for this. You suggest that a knowledge of my views may affect considerable number of National Reformers. Alas! I feel that a knowledge of my views will lead not a few National Reformers to despise me. See the mournful position of Wm. S. Wait of Illinois, in refusing to suffer his name to run on the same ticket with Gerrit Smith—Heaven's anointed friend of the poor—a refusal that has effaced his name from a monument more durable than brass. It is with no hope of securing the suffrages of those who have no higher views or sympathies than those of William S. Wait, that I make, for your disposal, the following brief statement of the views entertained and inculcated by myself. I hold, then,

I. That men cannot own property in the soil: First, Because, as a general rule, it has no value in its primitive or virgin state. The labor of clearing and subduing it, quite equals its value when ready for service. The property, then, is in the improvements, and only there. Second, The Creator of the world affirms the land to be his, (Levit. xxv. 23,) and its inhabitants but tenants at his will, denied the right to a quit-claim deed. Not until men can present a bill of sale from the Almighty, then, can they claim property in the soil.

II. Human government is the agent, servant, or minister of the Divine Government, (Rom. xiii,) holding the unoccupied soil in trust, for the benefit of the landless-born, and unborn, and to prevent usurpations. This arrangement of trusteeship originates in human necessity.

III. Every man has a natural, and consequently a moral right to occupy a portion of the earth's surface, sufficient in quantity for his comfortable subsistence. This natural right has a three-fold foundation—oneness of origin, nature and necessity.

These three propositions being true, it follows, of necessity:

1. That Government should guarantee to all who desire it, a farm.

2. That this Farm or Homestead cannot be alienated to liquidate debt. It is sacred.

3. Government transcend their right, and become usurpers, when they make sale of unoccupied land to non-residents and land-speculators.

The following propositions I cherish, and hold to be equally as true and righteous as the preceeding:

I. Having proclaimed Liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof. (Lev. xxv. 10,) Government should furnish the amplest means to the emancipated peasantry to emigrate to, and settle upon such portions of unoccupied soil as may best suit their preference. This should be done, not as a boon on the part of the Government, but as a sin-offering for protracted and highly criminal neglect of duty.

II. The many thousands of poor families and persons in our large cities and in other parts of the land, whose strength is hunger-bitten (Job xviii. 12,) desirous of farms, should Government aid in removing to and settling upon those farms, so long and so cruelly withheld. Nor should this be regarded as a charity, but as a remuneration in part of the governmental wrong of withholding from these poor their natural right to land, on which to live and move and have their being.

III. All unmarried women over eighteen years old, so desiring, should Government furnish with a small plot of the richest and most easily cultivated land in its trust. So should they have an honorable, healthful, and more certain means of livelihood than the many thousands of unmarried females in our own factories, cities and large towns. The pastoral lives of Rebecca and Rachel—the agricultural lives of Ruth and the Maidens of Boaz are honorable and bright examples of such a mode of livelihood.

For the attainment of these most desirable ends, it shall be mine to labor by seeking the ascendancy of that party, which will not only unfetter the soil, but which will *unfetter* MEN also—that party which goes for ALL POLITICAL RIGHTS OF MANKIND. I close with the inquiry: Why should National Reformers be in favor of a Free Soil, and not in favor of free men to occupy it?

Yours, etc. CHARLES C. FOOTE.

[PLEDGE.]

"I the undersigned, a candidate for the office of Vice-President, at the coming election, desirous of restoring to Man his natural right to land, will hereafter use all my influence, whether in or out of office, to prevent all farther traffic in the Public Lands of the United States, and to cause them to be laid out in farms and lots of limited quantities for the free and exclusive use of actual settlers, not possessed of other land." (Signed,) CHARLES C. FOOTE.

Will of the late Daniel Wadsworth.

Correspondence New Haven Palladium.

CITY HOTEL, Hartford, Aug. 10, 1848.

The disposal of the property of the philanthropic Daniel Wadsworth, by will, has been the subject of considerable discussion in your city. His valuable collection of pictures and statuary are given partly to personal friends and the Wadsworth Atheneum. Among the number are some of the most finished and valuable paintings which have ever been produced in this country by American artists. Perhaps half of the collection is given to the Atheneum. To Benjamin Silliman, Esq. he gives $2,000. To Mrs. W. of New-York, $5,000. There are other legacies to a small amount. All the residue of his property, real and personal, is given in trust to Hon. Thomas S. Williams, Hon. Joseph Trumbull, and Hon. Francis Parsons. All the real estate is to be sold, and the proceeds to be invested by the trustees and paid over to the children of the late Gen. Terry, in annuities varying in amount from eight hundred to one thousand dollars. On the death of all the children of Gen. T., the property is to be divided among their heirs at law.

The estate is estimated at from $250,000 to $300,000. It will not fall greatly short of the first named sum. No mention is made in the will of the Tower property, or of any other piece of real estate. There are sundry provisions relative to annuities to be paid to the children of his nephews, &c. after arrival at majority, which have no particular interest, except to the parties concerned. The will bears date April 10, 1847, and has but a single codicil disposing of some plate, and is dated the same day with the body of the will. The late Gen. Terry had eight children, who or their widows are made annuitants under the will. Two of your most respectable citizens receive $1,000 per annum under the will. Of course Mr. W.'s princely mansion in Prospect-st. will be sold.

Mr. Fillmore and M. H. McAllister.

We published some time since and commented on a charge of Abolitionism preferred by M. H. McAllister, a Georgia Loco-Foco, against Hon. Millard Fillmore, based (as we understood) on a Speech made *in this City* by Mr. Fillmore in 1844. We reprinted in this connection our report of that Speech, issued the morning after its delivery, in which no shadow of all