POETICAL.

WE'LL MEET AGAIN.

We'll meet again! how sweet the word—
How soothing is its sound!
Like strains of far-off music heard
On some enchanted ground.

We'll meet again! thus friendship speaks,
When those most dear depart,
And in the pleasing prospect seeks
A balm for the bleeding heart.

We'll meet again! the lover cries,
And oh, what thought but this,
Can e'er assuage the agonies
Of the last parting kiss?

We'll meet again! are accents heard
Beside the dying bed,
When all the soul by grief is stirr'd,
And bitter tears are shed.

We'll meet again! are words that cheer
While bending o'er the tomb;
For oh! that hope, so bright and dear,
Can pierce its deepest gloom.

We'll meet again! then cease to weep,
Whatever may divide:
Nor time nor death can always keep
The loved ones from our side.

For in the mansions of the blest,
Secure from care and pain,
In Heaven's serene and endless rest
We'll surely meet again!

MISCELLANEOUS.

MESSRS. CLAY AND BENTON.

The Republic contains a fuller report of the scene between these two Senators on Thursday, which will interest our readers. Seward charged the friends of the Adjustment with having caused all the delay in the legislation of Congress. Mr. Clay replied, explained the facts and showed, that, if any body was to blame, it was the Senator from N. York and those who acted with him, and not the committee of thirteen and the majority in the Senate. Mr. Benton followed and denounced Mr. Clay for inconsistency in having in February last opposed the combination of other subjects with the single admission of California, and in now lecturing the minority for not changing their opinions with him. Mr. Clay said:

He had not commenced the subject. The Senator from New York had declared that this bill delayed the public business. He had defended the majority, and placed the charge where it properly belonged.

The Senator had alluded to his change of opinion on this subject. Was there no change in any of the Senator's opinions? He had heard it said that during the canvass in the State of Missouri last summer the Senator had taken the ground that the admission of California was unconstitutional. He did not know that the Senator had done so, but he was informed that such was the fact. If the fact be so, then it was as great a change of opinion in the Senator as the one imputed to him. A similar change had taken place in the Senator's opinions as respected the admission of Texas. The Senator had then opposed the admission of Texas by joint resolution as unconstitutional, and afterwards had voted for the joint resolutions of annexation.

If such changes as these took place in the Senator's constitutional opinions, he should have a little more charity when alluding to changes by another.

He had been in favor of admitting California as a separate and distinct measure, and had frequently urged it as such. But after a few weeks he had become satisfied that the speediest way of obtaining the admission of California was by a combination of measures. And if the Senator had taken the trouble to examine some other of his speeches he would have seen that it was with that view alone he had agreed with the suggestion to combine her admission with other measures.

He then repeated the reasons why the committee had not filled the blank in the bill with the sum proposed to be paid to Texas.

Mr. HOUSTON then addressed the Senate in support of the claim of Texas, and in reply to Mr. SEWARD.

Mr. BENTON said that it was unfortunate that any Senator should feel himself called upon to retail in the Senate, and make part of the parliamentary history of the country, what had been said of another Senator at home among his constituents. Many things were said of a man at home by persons from various motives, and it was unfortunate that it should be repeated in the Senate. If, however, there was a necessity for so doing, the person who felt called upon to do so should be cautious in first getting at the truth of what he was going to repeat. On the 21st of March last, he had written a public letter to his constituents, in which he had replied to a similar charge. In that letter he had used these words:

"It is not true that a few months ago I was opposed to the admission of California, but it is true that I have been in favor of such admission from the night that Congress adjourned, (March 3d., 1849,) without giving to California a territorial government, sending officers there at the same time to collect revenue from the people, and to transport them to Oregon and Louisiana for the trial of alleged offences. I was for the State government from that night; and gave my opinion to Mr. Clayton, Secretary of State, to that effect, at the time, at his lodgings on Capitol Hill, before he removed to the west end of the avenue, and with a view to encourage him in promoting the establishment of such a government in California. All my talk, public and private, in Missouri and out of it, when I spoke to that point, was to that effect; and when I heard that the people of California were proceeding to the formation of such a government, I put it into a public printed speech, that the Wilmot proviso was *dead* and *rotten*."

One person had been referred to at that time as authority for such a statement, but that person never came foward to sustain it.

Mr. B. then entered into an argument to sustain the constitutionality of the admission of California.

Mr. CLAY said that he had only alluded to the matter to show that, if the fact were so, quite as important a change had taken place in the Senator's opinion as the Senator had imputed to him. He had stated that he did not know the Senator had said that the admission of California was unconstitutional, but simply that he had been so informed.—The Senator's own denial was sufficient for him. He wanted nothing more than this.

The letter written by the Senator to his constituents, and which he has just read, is dated 21st March. He (Mr. C.) held in his hand a letter dated May, after this letter of the Senator had been written. It had, with other papers, just been given to him. It was dated at Independence, Missouri, addressed to a member of the House, and was signed by a Mr. —— Reed. Mr. C. then read the letter. The writer said, that when Col. BENTON was in that State, they had frequent conversations on the subject of California and governments for the Territories; that in those conversations Col. B., in speaking of the scheme of the President to establish a State government in California, said that to form a State government for the purpose of avoiding the Wilmot proviso, was a cowardly policy; that California was not fit to be admitted as a State; that such an act was in violation of all precedent, &c.; that he was in favor of establishing territorial governments without the Wilmot proviso, &c.

This letter, said Mr. C., was read simply as a justification for having made the statement, and he was perfectly satisfied, from the Senator's denial, that there must be a mistake about the matter. The Senator's denial was sufficient for him.

Mr. BENTON told the Senator he had better have the letter entered on the Journal.

Mr. CLAY said that he did not desire any thing of the kind.

Mr. BENTON said that the Senator should not get off in that way. No man should get off from him in that way. The Senator had charged the minority with having delayed the public business. In reply to that charge he had read to the Senator his own speech, for the purpose of showing that in February last he stood upon the same ground which that minority now occupied, and for maintaining which they were denounced; also to show that the very delay which was now charged on the minority had been predicted by the Senator as the inevitable result of that course which the Senator was now pursuing. That speech the Senator had not denied; he could not deny it. He then turned round and charged him (Mr. B.) with a distinct matter, having no connexion with the matter in question, and now, after repeating the charge, put it to him to deny it. He could not get off in that way. The Senator had placed the matter in the Senate to be recorded in the parliamentary history of the Senate.—He had by reading that letter made it a charge of his own, and as such was legally and morally responsible for it. The author does not come forward; he would therefore proceed against the publisher. The Senator was the publisher of that letter. He had arraigned him upon a charge before the Senate; where did he get the right to arraign a Senator?—He had presented this letter and arraigned him before the body; he might as well have prepared an indictment at once.

He denied the right of the Senator to arraign him there on any such charge. He would say, as he had before, that if any man desired to arraign him, let it be done elsewhere than in the Senate, and where the charge could be properly and suitably met. This manner of arraigning a Senator before the American Senate was not proper. Let it be done elsewhere. He would read now what he had written when this charge was made before; he then held the publisher responsible. No man who made such a charge against him could get off by standing behind another. He would hold the publisher responsible when the author was not forthcoming. On that occasion he had written, and he repeated it now: "I have nothing to do with his informant—nothing to say to the letter he read or to its writer. He is the publisher, and that makes him the author, both legally and morally. He is the endorser, and that makes him the same as the principal. He is the gratuitous publisher, and the gratuitous endorser, with gratuitous comments," &c.

As in that case he had charged the publisher as the author of the letter, so he did now. He charged the Senator from Kentucky with being the publisher, and, therefore, he made himself the author of that letter. He considered the Senator as the author of the letter; and, considering it as his letter, he stamped it as an infamous calumny; [cries of "Order, order;"] and with that brand upon it, deep as if made with a burning iron, he desired it to go into the parliamentary history of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT repeatedly called the Senator to order.

Mr. BENTON said that it appeared that no person was out of order but him. Every person was allowed to get up and make charges against him, and he was to be called to order for defending himself.

Mr. CLAY said that he repelled with scorn and indignation the charge of calumny, if intended for him; he threw it back upon the Senator, and bade him place it in his casket of other calumnies.

Mr. BENTON. Oh, you may throw it back; but you got it upon you first.

Mr. WEBSTER said that he regretted that the two Senators should have permitted themselves to be led into such a scene as this. He thought the Chair should always interfere and keep the debate confined to the matter before the Senate. He did not approve of this course of bringing into the Senate charges of having changed opinions and reading them in the Senate; they had nothing to do with the business before the Senate. He regretted that the two distinguished Senators who had so long occupied seats in this body should have been the parties to such a proceeding.

The VICE PRESIDENT said that a greater part of the debate had taken place during his temporary absence from the Senate, and he did not know much of what had been said.

Mr. HALE said he would like to know how old a Senator must be to be entitled to protection from having letters containing charges against him read in the Senate. A few days ago a letter had been read of such a character, and Senators, instead of calling the Senator who was reading it to order, sat very complacently and said, "Hear him," "go on," "go on." He thought the Senate should establish a rule regulating the age at which Senators should be exempt from this thing.

Telegraphed for the Baltimore Patriot.

WASHINGTON, June 15—P. M.

It is given out that there will be two new propositions for compromise, on the California and slavery questions, offer- next week, making four propositions, supported by what be called four arties.

RICHMOND ENQUIRER.

SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 15, 1850.

"Resolved, That it is the duty of Congress to provide a government for territories, since the spirit of American institutions forbids the maintenance of military government in time of peace, and all laws heretofore existing in territories once belonging to foreign powers, which interfere with full enjoyment of religion, freedom of the press, trial by jury, and all other rights of persons or property, as secured or recognized in courts of the United States, are necessarily void, so soon as such territories become American territory. It is the duty of the Federal Government to make early provisions for the enactment of those laws which may be expedient and necessary to secure to the inhabitants and emigrants to such territories the full benefit of their constitutional rights."

The above is the third of the series of resolutions adopted by the Nashville Convention, whose elevated and dignified bearing, moderation and professed devotion to the Union, under the guaranties of the Constitution, have falsified the predictions of its bitterest enemies, and are well calculated favorably to impress the public mind in behalf of the position of the South in the present fearful struggle. It is deeply to be regretted, that but a small portion, and not the whole of the South, were represented in such a Convention, for then we might have easily obtained what we asked for; the present painful issue, the inevitable and oft-predicted fruit of Southern dissensions and timidity would have been avoided, and the country move on in its career of peace, prosperity and glory—all sections the more closely knit together by a clear understanding and proper appreciation of the constitutional rights and guaranties of each, and of the unspeakable blessings of our noble Constitution, interpreted and carried out in the spirit of its venerable founders. That the South is now floundering in a slough of trouble and difficulty, is beyond doubt attributable to the untimely course of a large party in her midst. Never did we feel this more keenly than when on Wednesday last, in the House of Representatives, we heard the free-soil, flour-faced Baker of Illinois (the unworthy guest of Virginia with Old Zack in February last, as his subsequent conduct showed him to be) taunt Mr. Stanton of Tennessee with the "abortion" of the Nashville Convention—alleging that the North scorned all, declarations of secession or disunion, as empty vaporing and pointing to the failure at Nashville as proof that the people of the South would not stand by the words of their representatives!

We have quoted the above resolution of the Nashville Convention, for the purpose of cordially endorsing it, and as an additional argument why we acquiesce in the adjustment now before the Senate. It is clearly "*the duty* of Congress to provide a government for territories," and this solemn requisition of the Constitution, in our conviction, can alone be carried out by the Senate bill. That bill plainly repudiates the Wilmot Proviso as applicable to Utah and New Mexico, and employs the identical language of the Clayton Compromise (which the South sustained) in regard to the powers of the territorial legislatures on the subject of slavery. On that point, then, the bill grants what the South has asked for and is in strict conformity with "the duty of Congress," as pointed out in the above resolution. If the bill fails, we shall certainly see California admitted by herself, according to the Cabinet policy, and the territories of New Mexico and Utah either left without government, a prey to anarchy and free-soilism, or saddled with the Wilmot Proviso, to the insult and degradation of the South. That such will be the probable fruit of the defeat of the Adjustment bill, is clearly intimated by the course of its Northren opponents. One of its bitterest enemies is Senator Dayton of New Jersey, who has stepped forward, at the challenge of Mr. Clay, to take up the championship of the President's *non-action* policy. Mr. D. was peculiarly coarse and violent against Southern rights, and was most handsomely rebuked therefor by Senator Foote. Mr. Dayton launched forth upon the Texas boundary—said dogmatically that the title of Texas to the territory proposed to be ceded to the United States was "worthless, not worth a rush," and indulged in much other declamation, in the spirit of Col. Benton, who asserted, upon the authority of Humboldt and other distinguished geographers, that the well defined limits of New Mexico included 70,900 square miles of the identical territory now ceded to Texas by the bill of adjustment. Mr. Dayton went further and commenting on Mr. Cass' declaration that the Wilmot Proviso was dead, spoke thus emphatically:

"How dead? He would ask, did that senator base that assertion upon a certain vote taken in the House? He certainly must be aware that the vote, under the circumstances, was no test of what would be the result of the question when directly presented in a territorial bill. The proviso had only been scotched, *not killed*, and scotched by the President's recommendation of non-intervention in the territories. It was quiet now, because there was nothing to call it forth—but let them enter its domicil, and stir up this monster hydra, as it has been called, and *it would be found as full of life and vigor as ever*. The instructions of the legislatures of Northern States were not to continually press this matter; but whenever the occasion should arise, representatives were to see that the ordinance of '87 was respected."

With this bold threat, that no territorial governments should be formed without the curse of the "monster hydra," and with the perfect conviction that the defeat of the Adjustment bill will defeat all territorial governments, disembarrassed of the Wilmot Proviso, and nullify "the duty of Congress" to give governments to the territories, now suffering the pangs of anarchy and savage persecution—how could we hesitate to acquiesce in a measure which, though distasteful in many respects, will alone enable the people's representatives to execute the solemn injunctions of duty?

We have said that Mr. Clay had boldly thrown down the gauntlet to any champion of the President's policy, and that Mr. Dayton had accepted it. This obdurate defiance of the powers that be, raised a fierce storm with the Northern supporters of the Cabinet. A writer in the Boston Atlas described Mr. Clay as having been, on that occasion "excited and irritated;" as "scornful, impatient, overbearing, dictatorial;" as having "towered and declaimed as usual;" as "having lowered the dignity of the Senate and his own dignity." Such are some of the outpourings of the faithful Taylorite. Hear him:

"We involuntarily asked, where is the great expounder now? Now is the hour, and now we want the man who can hurl thunderbolts upon this dogmatic, insolent, intolerant, insufferable superciliousness of tone, this dictatorial lordliness of manner, this intolerable tyranny of demeanor, this arrogant, bullying, braggart spirit of *Compromise*."

Verily (says the Boston Post) the galled jade of whiggery—of two-faced Whiggery—now winces! But this is not all, nor the half. Mr. Clay called on the champions of Gen. Taylor to appear. If the administration had a friend in the Senate, he said, let him meet him face to face! And not one was ready to meet him—no, not one! This was the unkindest cut of all. Hear the writer again:—

"We indignantly repel the offensive assumption that the President's policy cannot and will not be sustained in open argument on the floor of the Senate, even against the impetuous rhetoric and pretentious dogmatism of Mr. Clay.—We hope to see no such humiliating spectacle as the manifestation in the Senate of the United States of a cowardly fear of the great Kentuckian. If any scour away at his approach to hide and shield themselves, like chickens at the approach of a hawk, we trust they may be punched from all their holes. Are Senators but rabbits in a warren, to be frightened by a dog's bark? We do not believe it has yet come to this. And we are ashamed of Mr. Clay, that he intimates such a presumption on his part. Who is the man to be silenced by this prospective anathematising? If the true spirit exists in that body, Mr. Clay will be made to repent of his temerity. Instead of his passionate objurgations and furious railings, frightening Senators out of their power of speech, it would seem to us that they should give tongues to the dumb. Such a provocative as Mr. Clay has offered, is enough to make instinct with life and garrulous with speech, a Senator as dead as Lot's wife, who has stood a pillar of salt on the banks of the Dead Sea for thirty-five hundred years."

There! The writer must have been relieved some after this delivery. But where was honest John Davis—where honest Truman Smith—where senator Seward—where the defenders of the hero of Buena Vista? were they like rabbits in a warren? What's the matter with them?

We are on the eve of rich events. This, be it remembered, is a complete family quarrel. This non-action policy is now cracked up as the policy of *the party*. President Taylor's plan is now the *Whig* plan; it is openly avowed that its success is vital to the existence of the party. How miserable a policy it is let the candid, intelligent, the patriotic answer.—Let Henry Clay's speech answer. It is not merely impracticable—it is impossible. It cannot be carried out. The boundary line between New Mexico and Texas must be settled or there will be civil war there. Who can doubt this? All this is brought to bear with withering force upon the Cabinet by Henry Clay. The faithful feel the weight of his blows, and, as they sink under them, cry out in their distress, when is the great expounder to help us?—Let not the whigs lay the flattering unction to their souls that the expounder will help them *do nothing*. Mr. Webster—if we understand him—is in favor, as every body is, of the admission of California, but he is also in favor of fulfilling our obligations to Utah and New Mexico by giving them territorial governments.—If ever a party deserve the distress they suffer under the mighty castigation the cabinet are receiving at the hand of Henry Clay, it is the whig party. The conviction is growing every day stronger that Zachary Taylor, cannot administer this government properly, if at all, until he has something in the shape of statesmanship to back him.

We have spoken of Mr. Dayton as having stepped forward to champion the President's policy. But there is another Senator whom we may expect to see enter the field, with his lance poised in defence of the Regency. We refer to the notorious Seward, the man of law "higher than the Constitution." The Washington correspondent of the Wilmington (N. C.) Recorder, a Whig paper, thus speaks of the coalition formed between Seward and Gen. Taylor to defeat the Adjustment bill, and also of the controlling influence possessed by Seward over the Administration. While the infamous abolitionist Seward thus bends all his energies to defeat the bill, can the measure be regarded as such a treacherous abandonment of the South, which some of its opponents have so indiscreetly represented it to be? If it were really so, would not Seward be among the first to *sustain* it?

"That arch-demagogue Seward is in the ascendant, his cunning has triumphed, and he now holds this Administration in the palm of his dirty hand. My God, what a shame! How disgraceful! That a thing of his appearance (were there no other reasons whatever) should for one moment have the control of our honest, good disposed, gallant President. How unfortunate that Gen. Taylor should be estranged by the intrigues of such a man from those who could only advise him to noble and patriotic deeds! How infinitely better would it have been for the country if the Vice President, Fillmore, had been the confidential friend and adviser of the old patriot. But he has fallen in evil hands indeed! May Heaven guard and protect him. Seward's toadys exult in a manner almost insufferable; he is really the main pillar of Abolitionism, and he and his followers would sing hosannas to-morrow if they could have the throats of every slave owner in the Southern States cut, and be themselves free from danger. I cannot think, write or speak of Seward with a fair share of patience or temper, for I look upon him as an enemy of the Constitution and of the South; unscrupulous, sneaking, and with talents sufficient to make him not only very villainously mischievous, but absolutely dangerous."

Unprecedented excitement seems to rage in both Houses of Congress. Even the Senate is not free from its influence, as witness the violent scene between Messrs. Clay and Benton. On Monday we heard Benton's harangue, which was a disgraceful compound of mincing affectation, coarse and silly buffoonery, and brutal bullying. Mr. Clay was in his seat and suffering from indisposition—but a smile of scorn wreathed his face, in listening to the ridiculous fanfaronade of the Missouri free-soiler. But for the violent scene on Thursday, we doubt not he would have hereafter lashed Benton *ad nauseam* with his keen whip of sarcasm and ridicule.

The country is sick of these painful demonstrations in the highest legislative bodies, and would rejoice in an adjustment of the question.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.

The public days at this Institution will take place on the 28th and 29th of June, as usual. On the 28th, the Valedictory Address before the four Literary Societies—the Jefferson, Washington, Philomathean and Æsculapian—will be delivered by members of each. The Society of Alumni will commence its annual session.

On the 29th, the doors of the Rotunda will be thrown open at an early hour for the admission of ladies. At a stated time the Board of Visitors, the Professors in other Colleges who may be present, Faculty, Alumni and students, having first formed, will enter and take their assigned seats. The doors will then be thrown open to the public generally.

A band of music engaged in this city will perform at intervals. After prayer by the Chaplain, the academic exercises will proceed, and the honors be bestowed. Addresses by some of the Masters and Bachelors of Art.

The Annual Address before the society of Alumni will be delivered by Muscoe R. H. Garnett, Esq., of Essex.

An Address to the several Literary Societies, (who united in the invitation,) will be delivered by Ex-President Tyler.

The Ball, contemplated to have been given in the Rotunda, will not take place.

It gives us pleasure to hear from every quarter, of the general good order and decorum which has prevailed among the students during the services about to close. There were 329 students, and out of this large number there were, we are told, but 2 cases upon which the faculty were called on to act by separating the parties from all communion with the University. This is the 25th anniversary of the institution, and we would, in view of the usefulness and prosperity it has achieved at the end of the first quarter of a century, respectfully urge as many of her Alumni as can make it convenient to be present on the occasion. The *cordon de fer* of the Central Rail Road is already stretched to a point within three miles of that noble dome under which they have, in by-gones, received some of the most solid preparation for the duties of life. Those who reside in this vicinity may leave their homes on Friday morning, 28th, see and hear all the proceedings, both days, and be back to Richmond, in time for Church, on Sunday—and at a cost, for travelling and tavern bills, of less than $10.

And here let us add a word in relation to the refreshing scenery they will witness so soon as they touch the red lands. From the exit of the curve at Gordonsville, over the entire route to Charlottesville, they will be delighted with the succession of fine farms, under good tillage, which will meet their eyes on either side. The crops of wheat never showed to better advantage at this season from the slopes of the South Western Mountains up to "*The Farm*," in hearing of the dinner bells of Charlottesville. On the 28th June, 1849, several gentlemen from this vicinity passed through the section of country of which we are speaking, and saw the wheat harvest progressing on most of the farms. This year, when the season is a little later, we may promise such of our friends as may go up, the sight of more teeming fields still, waving in all their golden luxury. The "horn of plenty" is on the land.

VIRGINIA WASHINGTON MONUMENT.

Thomas Crawford, Esq., who designed the Monument now being erected by Virginia to Washington, is at present in Richmond, with a view to close the contract with Gov. Floyd for the execution in bronze of the Equestrian Statue of Washington (16 feet high) and the six other statues (11 feet high) which stand around the pedestal. Mr. C. has brought full and detailed working drawings and has left with the Governor a beautiful oil-painting of the Monument, which has been amended and improved in several important particulars—among others, in the addition of six bronze eagles on pedestals around the base, and in the introduction of an iron staircase in the interior, by ascending which to the foot of the horse, a magnificent view may be enjoyed by the visitor.

The granite foundation of the Monument (directed by Mr. Rand) is about being completed and the structure will soon rise upon its platform. The material is a fine granite obtained from the State quarry on James River and will harmonize admirably with the bronze statuary and mouldings.

To allow Mr. Seddon's constituents to see his position on the vexed question of the day, we republish below his five-minutes speech (under the rule) on Tuesday in favor of applying the Missouri Compromise line to the California Bill. On Wednesday Mr. S. offered two other amendments and made two other five-minutes speeches on the same subject, which we shall publish when received. Messrs. Bayly, Millson, Averett, Bocock, Meade and McMullen also made spirited five-minute speeches on the same subject:

Mr. Seddon moved to amend the amendment of Mr. Green, by inserting after the word "effected," the following, viz:

"Making practically a partition between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, as to the privilege of settlement."

Mr. Seddon said,

I concur, Mr. Chairman, in the amendment offered by the honorable gentleman from Missouri, (Mr. Green,) and I have suggested a verbal addition, to enable me briefly to present a view which may serve to show its compatibility, at least, with the spirit and provisions of the Constitution of the U. S. and thus remove some objections to its adoption. I belong myself to that class of State-rights politicians who have generally been supposed to be opposed, on constitutional grounds, to the Missouri compromise. I have seen it conjectured in relation to myself, and I am aware that it is the case with some southern members, that constitutional scruples may interpose difficulties to the support of this amendment;—of such southern men, I venture to ask an audience and consideration to this view.

I think it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that the Constitution did not contemplate distinctly, in the enjoyment of the common property of the confederacy, that there should be partition or severalty in use among the States or sections of the Union. It was not framed upon the supposition that there would be any such antagonism or incompatibility of interest between the States or sections of the Confederacy that equality of enjoyment and free participation to all could not be obtained by community of possession, and the privilege of general settlement by the citizens of all, with their property, in every portion of the joint domain. The fundamental principle—the primary end, however, of the Constitution in relation to this matter, was equality of right and privilege among the people of the different States, in the use and enjoyment of the common territory of the Union. Freedom of general settlement was but one (and, as must be confessed, the most natural and easy) mode of accomplishing this primary object of equality and right. But if, from after events, or the development of latent causes then existing, such antagonism or incompatibility of interest arose between the States or sections of the Union that there could not be free participation and equal enjoyment under community of possession and settlement, then to attain the primary end, and give to all equal participation, some other mode than that of joint holding must be devised and resorted to. The natural, as well as equitable resort would be to partition—a division of the common territory that could not be jointly settled, and an assignment of just proportions to each of the States or sections having such incompatible interests. Would not this be not only consistent with, but actually demanded by the spirit and intent of the Constitution, and, in the case supposed, of incompatible interests, be the only just plan of carrying out the provisions of the Constitution? This was exactly, as I understand, the ground of principle on which the Missouri compromise was originally adopted. It was alleged that between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States there could not be community of settlement and equality of enjoyment while the territory was open to all, for that the admission of the slave was the exclusion of the white laborer. I determine not the fact whether this was so in reality—in my opinion it was not, and therefore, on that ground, as well as because of the grossly inequitable partition made for the South, I have always deemed the Missouri compromise a most disastrous and unfortunate adjustment, and had I been at its adoption a member of this House, I think I would have been found among its sternest opponents. Its principle, however, I am now dealing with, and that, although unequally applied, was, on the supposition of incompatibility of joint enjoyment and settlement, just and constitutional. It was the principle of partition—of joint owners dividing and assigning to each a part in severalty. In principle and in fact, whatever was the mere language of the compromise, the territory north of the line was assigned to the North and its institution; that below it, to the South and her institutions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this principle is again invoked under even stronger circumstances. The former division has increased and made much more clear the alleged antagonism of interests—the incompatibility of joint occupancy and joint settlement. To attain the primary end of equality of right and privilege, under the Constitution, division between the opposing sections or States must be had. It is now sanctioned by previous precedent, recommended by the peace and fraternal feeling it once restored, and assimilated by use and acquiescence in the minds of the people to fundamental law. Let it be again resorted to, but on the principle of just partition and with a recognition of the rights of the opposing States in the parts severally assigned, as is here practically done; and I trust all of present agitation may yet redound only to the permanency and glory of our Union.

THE KHAISI CATTLE.

The two Damascus cattle presented by Lieut. Lynch to the State of Virginia, were exhibited by Col. Castleman in Winchester on Monday, 3d inst. They are beautiful animals, lightly and delicately formed, and standing about *fourteen and sixteen hands* high respectively. The bull is but twenty-three months old, and weighs 1190 lbs.; the heifer, 2 months younger, weighs 700.

☞ UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.—PUBLIC DAY.—The exercises of the Public Day at the University, will take place on the 29th June, commencing at an early hour. The several Literary Societies will be addressed by Ex-President Tyler. The Annual Address before the Society of Alumni will be delivered by Muscoe R. H. Garnett, Esq. of Essex. The public are respectfully invited to attend.

For the Enquirer.

MR. MASON'S SPEECH.

Messrs. Editors:—I wish to call the public attention, through your columns, to the able speech delivered by our Senator, the Hon. James M. Mason, on May 27th, upon the compromise scheme. I trust that you will soon publish it at large; meantime, I propose briefly to review some of its remarkable facts and arguments, and I will take the same opportunity to notice a few other points, which seem to be important.

This Compromise—(I think Mr. Foote says it must be called *Adjustment*, and a rose, by any other name, would smell as sweet,)—this *Adjustment* then, is contained in three distinct bills. The first relates to the territories acquired from Mexico and the Texas boundary; the second regards the delivery up of fugitive slaves; and the third prohibits the trade in slaves in the District of Columbia.

In reference to the last of these bills, it is evident in the first place, that any change in the present laws must be a concession to Northern feeling, or rather fanaticism. Does the slave trade in the District injure any portion of the South? Does it offend our moral feelings *there*, while it is daily carried on *here* in Virginia? On the contrary, it is clear that this bill is wholly for the North; nay, it is a plain right, which we are asked to give up. Suppose our Legislature were to prohibit the slave trade, (as it is called) at our Court Houses and in Richmond, would we not feel it an intolerable outrage upon our rights? Is not the right to sell a slave for debt or misconduct, or any other reason, an essential incident of the right to hold him, just as the right to sell a part of any other property? and if so, how is that sale to be made, except through the intervention of this *slave trade*? Do we not all know that the prices of slave property would be materially reduced, if the present facilities for its sale were diminished? and if such are the rights and interests of slaveholders here, what makes them different in the district? Mr. Soule justly remarks upon the iniquitous operation of this bill. He puts a case:

"A debtor in an adjoining county of Maryland or Virginia owes debts in the District or at home, beyond his means of payment. His entire property is in slaves. He honestly resolves to part with them in order to meet his liabilities.—At fair prices, they might pay all; at home prices, not fifty cents in the dollar. He brings them here for the honorable purpose of paying all; but this bill converts the purpose into a heinous crime, and forfeits his slaves to his own ruin and that of his creditors! Is that just to either—or to the people of the district, or to the State of Maryland, or the slave-holding States? Is not that discriminating against slave property with a vengeance! Congress could not forbid his bringing any other property here to pay his debts; and where does the constitution confer a power on Congress to legislate upon one species of property more than upon another? Such a discrimination saps the foundation of all equality in the rights of property, as well as of its *protection*, and, of course, of all equality in the rights of the States, and opens widely the way to all further aggressions upon the rights of slaveholders *anywhere* and *everywhere*."

It must be observed that the bill, in prohibiting the owner from carrying his slaves to the District to be sold, is not content to remand them, and either fine the owner for the present offence, or require security, that he will not repeat it in future, but openly defies all the feelings, interests and policy of the South, by *emancipating them*. Mr. Soule well remarks that the next step will be to emancipate those who are brought to the District for any purpose; then to forbid their removal, and finally, to emancipate those already there. For if the South submits now, and thus acknowledges the power, why should the North fear her resistance hereafter?

In regard to this bill, Mr. Mason confines himself to reading the resolution of our General Assembly, passed last Winter, instructing our Senators to vote against any measure "in any manner interfering with the rights of the slaveholders in the district," and he justly adds that one of those rights is the trade in slaves. He also quotes the resolutions of January, 1849, which are still unrevoked or rescinded, which solemnly declare that "we regard a law by the Congress of the United States, abolishing slavery *or the slave trade in the District of Columbia*, as a direct attack upon the institutions of the Southern States, to be resisted at every hazard."

In one word, the present laws as to slavery in the District are agreeable to the rights and policy of the South; the bill changes the *statu quo*, abridges the rights of the slaveholder, and is the entering wedge for abolition.

Nor can we regard the next bill for the recapture of fugitive slaves as an equivalent. For if we concede a clear right by the former bill, we must expect a compensation from the North in the shape of a surrender of an equally clear right. But this bill only proposes to fulfil what all the wisest men of both sections grant is a plain constitutional obligation. The last bill does, or pretends to do, what the Constitution indisputably orders: it simply attaches a remedy to an *existing* acknowledged Southern right: the former abolishes an existing Southern right by a doubtful stretch of constitutional authority. But the bill for the recapture of fugitive slaves, it must be borne in mind, originated with the Judiciary Committee, of which Mr. Butler is Chairman, at the last session of Congress. It was again introduced early this Winter, with some amendments, by Mr. Mason, for which the Abolitionists are now pouring their vials of wrath upon his head. It was of this bill, as amended by Mr. Mason, that Mr. Webster said in his famous speech, (March 7th,) "my friend, at the head of the Judiciary Committee, has a bill on the subject now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, *with all its provisions, to the fullest extent.*"—(The Italics are our own.)

These strong remarks of Mr. Webster, and indications of similar opinion from various Northern quarters, alarmed the free soil party, and they adroitly endeavored to avail themselves of the known reverence for trial by jury to defeat the South. It was with this view that they insisted that no Recapture bill should be passed which did not secure to the fugitive slave a trial by jury in the State where he was captured. Mr. Badger, and other Southern Senators, showed conclusively that such a provision would be a denial of all justice to the Southern master—that it would add insult to injury, and that its absurdity was only equalled by its hypocrisy. It soon became plain that on this point Mr. Webster and his friends would have a severe battle to fight at home, but that they could sustain themselves if the South would back them by her firmness. Now, in this state of things, what does the *Adjustment* Committee do? but report, in the second of their bills, an amendment to Mr. Mason's bill—that bill to which Mr. Webster had already assented, requiring security of the master that he will give his slave a trial by jury in his own State! It is true that there is a vastly important difference in giving a trial by jury here in the slaveholding country, and there, in a free State, where the sympathies of the people are against the law. But the *principle* is nevertheless surrendered; we are asked to abandon the clear, indisputable ground of the Constitution, and go to sea upon, I know not what, frail raft of *Adjustment*. For the whole gist of the matter is in these few words of Mr. Mason:

"By the Constitution the fugitive slave is to be delivered up on claim of the party, and *it is in derogation of this right to deliver him up only on condition.*"

The bill to prohibit the slave trade in the District takes away a plain right that we now enjoy: this bill for the delivery up of fugitive slaves, upon condition of giving them a trial by jury, annexes an unconstitutional condition to the execution of an imperative and indisputable mandate of the Constitution in our favor. What is the consequence? Mr. Webster sees himself about to be deserted, even by the South, whom he offered to defend, and, obeying the great law of self-preservation, he retreats from his former bold position, and a few days since, on June 3d, introduced a bill respecting these runaway slaves, which requires that *they* shall have, if they demand it, a trial by jury *in the State where captured.*

But, whatever be the merits or demerits of the amendments of Mr. Clay's committee to the fugitive slave bill, it stands apart from the rest of their scheme. For, suppose the bill, now under debate, in regard to the territories, is passed, what security have we that this fugitive slave bill will also pass? Had it been designed as any part of the compensation to the South—had it been considered (as it should have been,) an essential portion of the *adjustment* of all our pending controversies, it would have been joined on to the territorial bill, so that the whole scheme, what was conceded to the South as well as what was given to the North, might share one common fate. But the committee thought otherwise, and the territorial bill must, therefore, stand on its own merits, to a discussion of which Mr. Mason's speech is chiefly devoted.

In the contest, let us understand distinctly what the territorial question is. Mexico ceded to us rather more than 526,000 square miles of territory West of the Rio Grande.—The North contends that we shall not carry our slave property into this common conquest; that the Mexican constitution abolished slavery there, and that our constitution has not superseded the Mexican in this respect; but that, whether it has or not, to make the matter certain, Congress shall prohibit us from emigrating, with our property, to this territory. On the other hand, we claim that we are entitled to the same right and facilities for there enjoying our property which we would have possessed, if we were not in the Union and had made the conquest alone; that we did not relinquish any of these our rights, in ratifying the Constitution of the United States, and that it is the duty of our common agent, the Federal Government, to do all to secure us the enjoyment of those rights, which, but for the Union, we might have done for ourselves. I have no where seen the rights of the South on this subject more forcibly or concisely stated than in Mr. Mason's speech:

"It is the right of the people in all the States to go into any territory, as the common property of all the States, and to take with them any or all of their property, and to reside there and enjoy it, under the protection of the laws and constitution of the United States.

"If this be true, and I apprehend there are none to question it, then it follows, that if there be any hindrance to this right existing in the territory, whether it has its origin in the laws or customs of such territory before it became the property of the United States, or whether it has been created since by any unauthorized act of the first occupants of such territory, it is the *duty* of the United States at once to interpose to remove such hindrance.

"This is our right, clear and unequivocal, and none can say that we refuse terms of compromise unless we refuse any modification or abatement of it as thus strictly defined."

Such is our right under the Constitution, and while we need ask for nothing more, we might well refuse to take less. But, for the sake of peace, we have more than once offered to surrender something of our strict right. Our own Legislature indicated their willingness to divide the whole territory, by the arbitrary line of the Missouri compromise, between the North and South. The Southern Democracy, two years since, agreed to the Clayton compromise. The South then said, "We believe that the Mexican laws abolishing slavery were themselves abolished by the operation of our Constitution when the treaty of cession gave us this territory; you believe that they still exist. Now, we will agree to leave this question to the Courts; if they decide in our favor you may still be content, for you believe that this country is naturally unfit for slavery; if they decide in your favor, we think it will then be the constitutional duty of Congress to remove these Mexican obstacles to our equal enjoyment of our conquests, but, for *compromise*, we will not demand the execution of that plain duty, but abide the consequences of the existing law, Mexican or American, as the Courts may decide."

Such were the terms to which we were willing to submit, two years since. What does Mr. Clay's committee propose now?

It proposes to sanction the exclusion of slavery from the whole Pacific coast, an area of 158,500 square miles; it proposes to provide Territorial governments for the other 367,000 square miles of the territory, without the Wilmot Proviso, but it gives no security, and can give none, that the very next Congress will not pass it; and it finally proposes to pay several millions of dollars to Texas for 125,000 square miles of her surface to add to one of these same territories.

Let us consider these propositions in their order. In regard to California, we all know that the question of her admission, as a State, addresses itself entirely to our views of expediency. Her area, large as three of our largest sized States, occupies the whole coast of the Pacific, 970 miles long, and stretching back 212 miles to the mountains. The origin of her pretended government is stained with the grossest fraud and usurpation. By the military authority, her inhabitants were summoned to elect a convention; the same power determined who was to vote, and prescribed all the forms. While we were prevented from carrying our slaves there by the threatened Wilmot Proviso, and while the gold mines had gathered a motley crowd of Northerners, Europeans, Mexicans, and South Americans, Chinese, and liberated felons from Botany Bay, this vagrant population, scarcely entitled to be called *inhabitants*, much less *the people*, was invited by the Executive to relieve us of the difficulty of settling our disputes, and legislating for our territories, by occupying the whole country, and adopting such a constitution as would be agreeable to the Northern majority in Congress. On all these facts, Mr. Mason throws much new light. It is vain to say that the Executive did not order Gen. Riley's first proclamation; did it ever disavow, or reprove it? did it not tacitly adopt it? did it not sanction Riley's second proclamation of Dec. 20th, 1849, by which he "relinquished the administration of affairs in California to the Executive of the Government organized under the provisions of the Constitution," &c.? Mr. Mason says:

"And thus, without warrant of law, in violation of the plain letter of the Constitution, and of the not less plain Executive trust, was the dominion of the U. S. over a large and valuable Territory, the property of all the States, quietly handed over to the first occupants who went upon it, and who were incited and stimulated to take it; and, as if in sport with so grave an occasion, the General ends the matter by agreeing to defray all the expenses of the convention out of the public money in his hands. (See his letter to "the Hon. C. T. Botts, chairman," &c., dated at Monterey, Sept. 13, 1849.")

The time has been, Messrs. Editors, when "such flagrant usurpations of power" would have aroused the whole nation; shall our indignation now be less excited, when their object is to defraud us of our rights? For, as Mr. Mason justly says, the report of the debates of the California Convention shows "that the polar star which guided their deliberations on all the great questions to be determined was, so to adjust them as would best ensure a speedy admission of their State into the Union. On the question of boundary, of domestic servitude, and of the exclusion of the African race altogether from California, every thing seems to have been effected, and to some extent controlled, by a belief in the necessity of propitiating the majority in Congress on the subject of African slavery." Mr. Mason adduces many extracts from these debates in proof of this assertion; amongst others, he quotes Mr. Semple, the President of the Convention, who says, that he had conversed with Mr. Thos. Butler King, (the avowed agent of the Executive) on the subject of boundaries, and that Mr. King told him, "For God's sake, leave us no territory to legislate upon in Congress." He then went on to state that "the great object in our formation of a State Government was to avoid further legislation."

It does not appear, after all, that the population felt any great interest in this military drumming up of a constitutional Convention. Mr. Botts asked in the Convention, (as quoted by Mr. Mason,)

"Do you know, sir, by what vote of my constituents I sit upon the floor? I will tell you—I received ninety-six votes. My colleague, it is true, received some twenty or thirty more, and as for the remainder of my colleagues, I believe they are even worse off than I am."

"Randolph of Roanoke" has already shown in your paper, Messrs. Editors, that the people, South of 36 deg. 30 min. were much opposed to being included in a State Government, and that they preferred a Territorial organization. Mr. Mason repeats the fact, and presents abundant evidence. The meetings this spring in Southern California prove that their feelings are still unchanged.

Now to sum up in Mr. Mason's words, as to the pretended right in the inhabitants of a portion of the territory of California: "They have no authority whatever, none in law and as little in justice, to assemble themselves upon the property of the Government—the common property of all the States—and to pass a law, which shall interdict from that territory the citizens of one-half of the States of this Union, unless they leave their most valuable property behind them, and that very property which of all others would be most valuable to them in the territory." It follows, that "whenever the Constitution of California is ratified by Congress, the clause prohibiting slavery will become law by the act of Congress, and it alone." None would advise Congress to ratify such lawless usurpation by admitting California, but as a means of settling the slavery question; and is that a reason to recommend the measure to Southern favour? It is such a peace as in its effects reminds me of what Tacitus says of the conduct of the Romans in their conquests, "*ubi solitudinem faciunt, ibi pacem vocant*," which may be freely translated, "where they leave no room for a solitary slaveholder to enter, they call it an *adjustment*."

The first proposition in Mr. Clay's territorial bill is therefore neither more nor less than the adoption by Congress of this military usurpation; it is for the Congress of all the United States to sanction, confirm, and take for their own act, this "Executive Proviso"—this masked Wilmot Proviso—and thereby exclude slavery from 158,500 square miles, and the whole Pacific coast. As Mr. Seddon says, the labor of the Southern States is the only labor in the world excluded!

Surely if we give up all this, we shall find some compensation in the next proposition. And yet what does it give us? or what does it call upon the North to give up? *Absolutely nothing!* View it in its best light, and it only amounts to the "Clayton bill" applied, not to the whole territory, but to the more barren portions, while slavery is interdicted in all the richer part, and the access to the sea closed up! Here, at least, we should have had the full measure of our rights—of all that we claim under the Constitution. If we give up the gold mines, all the land known to be rich, all the sea coast, and permit ourselves to be fraudulently ousted from their enjoyment, and our slave property excluded, here at least we might justly demand that the North shall in her turn surrender her claims, that Congress shall fulfil its duty under the Constitution, and remove every obstacle to our free emigration with our property, by abolishing the local or Mexican laws, if any such exist since the conquest. The North could the better afford this single compliance with what we believe our strict right, because she professes to think that nature herself has interdicted slavery in these regions. But she refuses, or rather Mr. Clay's Committee refuses for her; and though she is willing for the present not to pass the Wilmot Proviso, because, as the report of that Committee says, it is *useless*, yet she is ready, the moment the Courts decide that the Mexican law did not survive the conquest, or it appears that slave labor is going there, to enact the prohibition. Mr. Mason's quotation from Mr. Winthrop's speech, and other indications, prove that such is her design.

If the compensation offered the South in the second proposition is thus delusive, the third is actually monstrous. It proposes to convert 125,000 square miles of Texas, now slave territory beyond any sort of controversy, into debateable land like the rest; and for this privilege of creating new free soil out of her own limits—of buying a new quarrel—the South is to pay her share of 12 or 15 millions of dollars—a share, which could not itself be less than 10 or 12 millions! Can anything be more outrageously insolent than such a proposition?

What then is the sum of the whole bill? To sanction all the injustice and unconstitutionality involved in the precedent of the Executive Proviso, and interdict slavery on the whole sea coast, and in 158,500 square miles of the best land and richest mines; to leave the rest of the territory exactly where it is already, as far as the slavery question is concerned; to open 125,000 square miles of country, now slave territory, to free-soil agitation, with the chance of its making two new free States of the largest class on the North and West of Texas; and for all these *boons*, the South is to pay twelve millions of dollars!

I have always understood that a *compromise* went upon the *give and take* principle: that it was a bargain in which each party gave up something they thought was their right and profit. If so, Mr. Foote very properly objects to this scheme being called a *compromise*. His name for it—*adjustment*, is much more suitable, for it implies nothing more than a settlement; a dispute may be *adjusted*, when one party gets all the profit, and the other all the dishonor.

Now, I ask, why should we submit to such an *adjustment*? Am I told we can get nothing better? I answer, *we can get nothing worse*. We have Texas already; who can take away near one-third of her territory without our consent? and why should we ever consent? Even the North would blush to attempt to *force* us to that. And for the rest of the territory, California can be but admitted with her present boundaries; that is the worst, and that *worst* is a part of the *adjustment*. As for Utah and New Mexico, we do not receive a single new security for our rights—right to introduce our slaves.

Am I told that it is useless to resist, because California must be, by nature, a free territory; that slavery cannot flourish there? I dispute the fact.

I am one of those, Messrs. Editors, who believe that slave labor is more profitable than free, and that every advance in the science of agriculture enhances its superiority. It is always said to be least suitable to a grazing country; yet Australia is chiefly a grazing country, and the British journals concede that its great prosperity has been due to convict labor; but what is convict labor but slave labor? I think history proves that it would be this day existing and flourishing in the North-Western States, but for that fatal ordinance of 1787. But apart from these considerations, I never could understand how slave labor could be so unprofitable on the Pacific in the same latitudes in which it flourished most on the Atlantic, especially when I considered the admitted fact that the Western coast is much warmer in the same parallels than the Eastern. Fremont says we can form no just idea of its genial softness and warmth. These doubts were confirmed when I read the same author's Geographical description of California. He says that its wretched condition at the time of the conquest is no test of its capacities; that in 1792, Vancouver found in "latitude 34 deg. 16 min., apples, pears, plums, *figs*, *oranges*, grapes, peaches, and pomegranates, growing together with the plantain, banana, cocoa nut, *sugar cane* and *indigo*, all yielding fruit in abundance, and of excellent quality. Humboldt mentions the olive oil of California as equal to that of Andalusia, and the wine like that of the Canary Islands." Surely these are the productions of climates and soils suitable to slavery.—The lands of North California are very productive in Wheat, and I think none who are acquainted with tide-water Virginia—I may say, none who have studied the statements of Mr. Edmund Ruffin, or Mr. Newton's farming—can doubt that slave labor will pay very high profits in the wheat culture. But hear what Fremont says of South California: "*Tobacco* has been recently introduced, and the uniform summer heat which follows the wet season, and is uninterrupted by rain, would make the southern country well adapted to *cotton*." Mr. Butler King says that it is a great mistake to suppose irrigation is necessary to a large product, (and, by the way, Emory tells us that irrigation can never be successfully practised without *peonage*, that is, white *slavery*;) Mr. King also says that rice is raised in certain parts of California, and that the valleys of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, "would, undoubtedly, be capable of producing any crops, except Sugar Cane, now cultivated in the Atlantic States," and we all remember that cotton is one of the crops cultivated in the Atlantic States. My opinion of the profits of slave labor in California was ripened into certainty by the discovery of the gold mines. All the world over, slave labor has been accounted best for mining. The celebrated Russian gold mines, the most profitable in the world, except the Californian, are worked by convicts and serfs. Many in our Southern States are worked to advantage with slaves, and do not our coal pits annually hire a large number of such laborers? Mr. King estimates the earnings of a gold-digger for six months at $1,000. Now suppose for a moment that the Southern emigrant could take his negroes with him; who would not do so? I put the question to you, gentlemen, and to whoever may do me the honor to read this communication; if you were about to go to California, and were *certain* that you could keep your slaves there with as much facility as you do here, would you hesitate to carry them? Under your care, and guided by your intelligence, they would make more than the present average of the unassisted free laborer, and you would soon clear more than their value. The Californians were so conscious of this, that they proposed to prohibit the introduction of any blacks, for fear "California would be inundated with free negroes. Because, so valuable would be their services to their masters, that the owners of slaves would take them by thousands and thousands, upon condition that they would serve them one or two years and then be manumitted. It was said (in the California Convention, and without contradiction) "that, by adopting this course, each slave would be worth from two to five thousand dollars a year to his master." (See Mr. Mason's speech.) I hear opinions of the same character from various persons, who have visited California. I verily believe, Messrs. Editors, that if slavery were firmly established by law in California, our slaves would be worth a price too extravagant to name. And such it soon would be, could we summon up the resolution to stand by our rights.

Now consider these facts in connection with the great reluctance of the inhabitants South of 36 30 to be included in the State government, and the irresistible conclusion is that, the whole California Constitution, and especially the anti-slavery clause, is the result of the free soil agitation, and a compliance to what was known to be the indispensable condition of admission into Union. North of that line—the old Missouri line—it was well known to be useless to think of introducing slavery, for it would never be permitted by the Northern majority in Congress. But South of 36 30 the inhabitants had some hope that the South would ultimately prevail, if the question was not foreclosed upon her by a State government. This is an answer to the objection of curtailing the present boundaries of California, that it would make two free States; the strong probability is, that we would have a slave State North of 36 30. And at best we gain but slight delay, for Mr. Mason shows that the intention had already been avowed to divide this large State into several others, as soon as there is population enough, and slavery forever excluded. Besides, do not those who reason thus, say that if South California would make a free State, by a still stronger reason would all the rest of the territory, Utah and New Mexico, be naturally free soil, and therefore the South gains nothing *substantially* whatever by the adjustment!

And, finally, am I told that resistance is useless—that we can never get clear of the California juggle,—that we cannot even hope for the Missouri line! Are we then indeed reduced so low? At least, let us try. If those who have throughout stood by the Southern cause now lose heart and surrender, because they have not been supported as they should have been, then our cause would indeed be hopeless. In a great struggle like this, there must be ebbs and floods in the tide of fortune. We cannot conquer unless our hearts bear us bravely through the night as well as the day. Let us have faith, and hope, and firmness. It is true the Southern people have been guilty of great weakness and want of statesmanlike foresight in their divided support of the Southern Convention. This, however, is due to the delusive hopes of compromise—to Webster's speech, fine in tone but [illegible] in substance, and from which he already retreats,—and, above all, to the fatal old man of the sea, Henry Clay. Why should we trust him? I will grant his patriotism, honesty and sincerity, but is not that a reason to believe him, when he tells you that "no earthly power shall ever make him vote to plant slavery where it does not already exist?" Did he not lately propose to abolish it in Kentucky? Does he not, on all possible occasions, avow his immutable opposition to it? The South has been losing ground ever since the introduction of his resolutions in the winter; the Southern republicans then received them with derision and scorn. What change has now come over the spirit of our dream? Wherein do the Clay bills of *adjustment* differ from the Clay resolutions? The latter contained two declarations of opinion; one for us, that slavery ought not to be abolished in the District; the other against us, that the Mexican laws prohibiting slavery are still in force in the territories. It was acknowledged that both were perfectly nugatory beyond what moral force there might be in the opinions of a bare majority of Congress. There was nothing positive or binding in them. Well, such as they were, they are omitted in these bills. There is the whole, the entire difference. I ask again, why should we accept now what, four short months since, we refused with hot indignation? No, gentlemen, let us take ground on our constitutional rights; we ask nothing more—let us accept nothing less. Or, if we are to compromise, let us, as Mr. Mason advises, take the Missouri line as our ultimatum. It has, at least, the consent of our Legislature and the sanction of thirty years acquiescence. It secures us something now, and all that the future can ever add to the Southern limits of our country—all the uninhabited wilderness of Northern Mexico, which, whether we will or no, must some day be ours.

When this adjustment is rejected, as it certainly will be, and the North is forced to do what Mr. Winthrop said he wished to avoid—"to show her hand"—the South will again unite, and to unite is to conquer. The darkest hour is one before day.

Excuse this long communication, Messrs. Editors, for the sake of the feeling that prompts it. I observe that you rather incline to the *adjustment*, on grounds of expediency, but I know your devotion to the South, and I know that your liberality will be glad to give all "true men" speech through your columns. Let me beg you, in justice to all, to those who yet doubt, to those who are for and those who are against this *adjustment*, to publish Mr. Mason's speech at an early day. Its condensed and forcible argument, its interesting facts, its high tone, are all worthy of our distinguished Senator. The Old Dominion may well feel proud of her representative.

RAPPAHANNOCK.

*See his speech of February 21st, 1850.

[We cheerfully give place to the above. Though we dissent from his view of the Adjustment bill, we are always ready to publish arguments on both sides, which respect the motives of opponents. We hope to find room, at an early day, for Senator Mason's speech.—*Enquirer.*]

Telegraphed for the Baltimore Sun.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION.

NASHVILLE, June 1[illegible]

The Convention yesterday opened with prayer by the Rev. J. B. McFerron.

The Secretary proceeded to call the States, when Mr. Dawson of Georgia, offered a resolution advising the formation of all parties in the South into a new party, to be called the "Southern Republican Party," and adopting as its motto "The Union of the South, for the sake of the Union." Mr. Dawson said he desired the resolution should be acted upon without being referred to the general committee.

Mr. Rhett objected, and Mr. Dawson thereupon withdrew his resolution.

Mr. Matthews of Miss., presented an address to the people of the non-slaveholding States; which, without being read, was laid upon the table.

Mr. Foreman of Florida, offered a resolution, proposing to take a vote at 12 o'clock to-day, on the adoption of the address reported by the general committee.

The resolution was declared out of order.

The address and amendments coming up in order, Mr. Tucker, of Virginia rose to address the Convention, hoping to be able to quell the excitement; he could not hope, with his manner and voice, to win plaudits from the gallery, but he would speak—as became his years—words of truth and soberness. He said he desired to respond to a question asked by Mr. Gholson, last evening, whether if the compromise bill before Congress should be amended and passed, he would go for a dissolution of the Union! If he was allowed to amend the compromise bill he would not go for a dissolution. He would amend it to suit himself.

Had the question been put to him, as to whether he would go for a dissolution, if the compromise bill should be passed without amendment, then he could not have answered. That was what brought them here. It was because the South saw dangers ahead that the convention had assembled to devise means to avoid them. He passed on and alluded to the position of Virginia, which had taken her stand, and said that she would resist the Wilmot Proviso to the last extremity. In relation to the address, he said, if he had access to the ear of the gentleman from Mississippi, who proposed amendments, he would have persuaded him not to offer them; but he was for harmony; and if the amendments would produce harmony, he would vote for them. If the address without the amendments, would promote harmony, he would vote for that—would vote for anything to secure that object.

He spoke of Daniel Webster's assertion, that the Union could not be dissolved without bloodshed, as a raw-head and bloody bones in connection with this subject. He referred to the present union between Clay, Cass and Webster; declaring that when such men unite, it was time for the people to beware, as there is mischief brewing. He reviewed the character of each of these gentlemen, in turn, in a most sarcastic vein—each of them he avowed was for himself, and the devil take the hindmost. He discussed the question of disunion, and showed that if the event should come to pass, the South could sustain itself.

After he had concluded, Mr. Wilkinson addressed the convention.

Judge Sharkey of Miss., addressed them in favor of the amendments proposed, stating that unless they were adopted he would be compelled to vote against the address.

Mr. Hammond, of South Carolina, replied, and when he had concluded, the previous question was called and sustained.

The main question was then put, and the address adopted unanimously, the delegations voting by States.

On motion, the roll was called, for the purpose of permitting each delegate to enroll his name for or against the address.

The following gentlemen voted against the address: Messrs. Davis, Abercrombie, Murphy, Judge Byrd, Hunter of Alabama, Gholson of Virginia, Foreman of Florida, and Sharkey, of Miss.

The resolutions reported on Monday, by the committee in relation to the boundary of Texas, were adopted.

Resolutions were offered by Mr. Dawson of Ga., for the formation of a new party in the South, and recommending support to the "Southern Press" newspaper, to be established at Washington, which were laid on the table.

Various resolutions of thanks to the officers of the convention, &c., were passed.

The President, Judge Sharkey, and the Vice President Mr. McDonnel, then took leave of the Convention in appropriate remarks.

The Convention then adjourned, to meet again six weeks after the adjournment of the present session of Congress.

MR. MANN AND MR. WEBSTER.

The Hon. Horace Mann has published a letter in the Boston Atlas, four and a half columns long, in reply to Mr. Webster's little paragraph in his late pamphlet referring to him. He gets into Judge Story's boots, and tells Mr. Webster that the passage in his former letter, which W. had criticised with so much severity, lamenting "to see a public man of Massachusetts so crude and confused in his legal apprehensions, and so little acquainted with the constitution of his country, as these opinions evince Mr. Mann to be," was taken, word for word, from the commentaries of the late Judge Story.

In his former letter, Mr. Mann had said that "a man would not lose his horse [his property in a horse] without a right to trial by jury." Mr. Webster's comment is, that this case, "if it have any analogy to the matter" (the arrest and return of fugitive slaves) means, that if a man's horse "stray into his neighbor's field, *he cannot lead him back without a previous trial by jury to ascertain the right.*"

In relation to this Mr. Mann retorts that the Senator has made his sentence pitch a somerset. He goes on to accuse Mr. Webster of childish criticism, of being "ill tempered," of being a man of "puerility," a "maligner of Judge Story," a blind "Polyphemus," etc. He then argues the question of Jury trial, and undertakes to show Webster's construction of the constitution in reference to this subject, is contradicted by the published views of the members of the convention which framed it, by the state convention which adopted it, by the Congress of '89 which passed the Judiciary act, and by President Washington. He undertakes to show also, that by a decision of the Supreme Court, the claim for a fugitive is "a suit at law" in the meaning of the constitution, and that no person can be delivered to an alleged master, until the validity of that master's title is clearly proved in a court of justice.

Mr. Mann, in addition, represents himself as David against Goliah, the spirit of Good against the spirit of Evil, and after all concludes with expressions which favor to some extent Mr. Webster's fugitive slave bill, though he would prefer to have it amended so as to enable the slave to procure witnesses and get indemnification in case he establish his freedom. As this bill secures the trial by jury, though in the slave State, he thinks Mr. Webster has now, contrary to his own declaration, made a "step backward" in reference to which the Boston Courier says:—

"Mr. Mann! lay not that flattering unction to your soul. Mr. Webster's bill was prepared in February last, and has lain on the table, word for word, as then written. The fact has not only been well known to the public for some time, but it was expressly stated by Mr. Webster in submitting the bill to the Senate. Mr. Mann will in vain plead ignorance."

TOBACCO.—Kentucky papers of the 6th inst. state that the prevailing dry weather had proved very disastrous to the young plants all over the State, or at least within a range of 200 miles.

MARRIED.

MARRIED, in Winchester, Virginia, on the 11th instant, by the Rev. Warren B. Dutton, the Rev. HUGH A. BROWN, of Charles[illegible]ty, to Miss MATILDA C., daughter of the late James Little, Esq. of Winchester.

MARRIED, at Willow Grove, Tazewell County, on the 6th instant, by the Rev. George W. S. Brown, JAMES S. FRENCH, Esq., of Old Point Comfort, to Miss LAURA J., daughter of Col. [illegible] George.

DIED, on Sunday, the 16th inst., after an illness of one day, the infant son of William M. and Cornelia C. B. Fulton.

Philadelphia and New Orleans papers will please copy.