THE COMPROMISE BILL.

Tuesday in the Senate was a great day. Votes were given, then, which, if we mistake not, will seal the political fate of not a few members from the North.

The question pending was the amendment of Mr. Bradbury, providing a Board of Commissioners to settle the controversy respecting the Texan boundary.

Mr. Dawson, of Georgia, moved a proviso, restricting the Government to be framed by the bill for New Mexico, to the territory west of the Rio Grande. This amendment was agreed on previously in caucus by the friends of the bill, and it was necessary in order to secure the votes of the Texan Senators. Recollect, a main object of the bill was, to provide territorial Government for New Mexico, and one of the principal arguments in favor of it was, that it would prevent New Mexico from being absorbed by Texas, or prevent a bloody collision between the United States and Texas, should the former attempt to resist the claim of the latter. Now, the amendment of Mr. Dawson proposed to restrict the Territorial Government to the country *west* of the Rio Grande, and to leave without Government, open to the claim of Texas, to absorption by Texas, or to the chances of a *bloody* conflict between the United States and Texas, [illegible] continue in possession of New Mexico, all east of the Rio Grande—that is, the real New Mexico, the New Mexico which is inhabited and needs Government. For the part of it on the west side is a mere ribbon of territory, with no population at all. In other words, the amendment of Dawson was a proposition to give up everything to Texas, which Texas had claimed.

We have great faith in the capacity of Northern men to bear Southern exactions, but really we did not think it possible that this infamous amendment could find many supporters among them. We were disappointed. The question was taken, and Dawson's amendment was adopted—30 to 28!—Cooper, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Jones, Phelps of Vermont, voting for it, Cass dodging. Mr. Phelps owes his constituents an explanation of his vote. Had he voted nay, the abominable proviso would have been lost.

Next came the vote on Bradbury's amendment as amended, and it was adopted—yeas 30, nays 28!—Bright, Cass, [illegible], Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Jones, Norris, Shields, Sturgeon, Walker, Whitcomb, voting for it. General Shields voted nay at first, but changed his vote to the affirmative, and so passed the amendment.

Will the editor of the *New York Tribune* please inform us how the bill, as it now stands, will save New Mexico from being throttled by Texas—from being absorbed, swallowed up by Texas?

The bill, we presume, will pass the Senate, but will it go through the House? We shall try to be on hand to mark the Northern men that shall put through such a bill—a bill abandoning New Mexico to the tender mercies of Texas.

Before the votes were taken on these amendments, Mr. Walker of Wisconsin moved to lay the whole bill and amendments on the table. The vote on this motion stood—

Yeas		Nays	
8	Southern	20	Southern
" 17	Northern	" 12	Northern
25		32	

We have constantly admonished our friends that we could not trust to the opposition of all the Southern members who made war on the bill—and sure enough, Messrs. King, Berrien, Clemens, Sebastian, and Morton, put down as opposed to the bill, voted nay on the motion to lay on the table. The complexion of the vote shows the complexion of the measure.

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE ERA.

STATISTICS OF CHOLERA IN CINCINNATI.

Cincinnati, *July* 24, 1850.

To the Editor of the National Era:

The cholera has been prevailing among us as an epidemic, to a considerable extent, for nearly a month, as had been anticipated by many qualified to form an opinion, judging from its return the two summers next succeeding its first appearance in 1832, and the signs of its presence in various parts of the West, for some months past. Yet though it is here, carrying off some of our population every day, the most incorrect and exaggerated reports have gone abroad as to the extent of its ravages, through the country papers and the telegraphic despatches to the Eastern journals. An idea has been received and propagated through the interior, that Cincinnati has been almost prostrated by the breath of the pestilence, and thousands have thus been kept from visiting us for pleasure or trade. Our hotels and business places show the effects of this panic. The extreme hot weather we have had the present month, the absence of the farmers, who are busy with harvesting, and of many of our citizens who go abroad at this season for health or recreation, the sickness which *does* exist, and the exaggerated rumors which have gone out—all contribute to make the city dull; though it cannot compare in this respect with the melancholy stillness which reigned through our streets in the memorable days of July, 1849.

For the information of those at a distance from us, it may be well to give a statement of the actual mortality of the city for three weeks past. The Board of Health made their first bulletin on the 1st of July, and the same week the new ordinance making provisions for regular reports from sextons and undertakers, the results to be published in a table weekly by the city clerk, went into operation. Statistics of this kind, showing the weekly mortality, the age of the deceased, disease, nativity, &c., have long been made up with accuracy in the Eastern cities, but have not heretofore been collected in this place. From these reports for three weeks, closing July 20th, corroborated and corrected by the daily bulletins of the Board of Health, I find the deaths to have been as follows:

Week closing July 6.	Cholera	-	190	
	Other diseases	71—		261
Ditto 13.	Cholera	-	206	
	Other diseases	216—		422
Ditto 20.	Cholera	-	185	
	Other diseases	233—		418
Total				1,101

The report for the first week was very imperfect, and no doubt below the truth, at least in regard to the number of deaths from other diseases than cholera. As the matter becomes systematized, and the provisions of the law known, we shall have reports as reliable as those of any other city. I find that of the deaths in the above table, somewhat less than one-half (about 4-10ths) were of persons born in foreign countries.

The mortality in our city for the corresponding three weeks in July, 1849, was—

Week ending July 9th	-	1,022
Do July 16th	-	950
Do July 23d	-	512
Total		2,484

which any one can see at a glance, is more than double the mortality of the present season.

Since the weekly report of the 20th, the deaths have been—

	Cholera.	Other diseases.
Sunday, July 21st	26	25
Monday, July 22d	28	33
Tuesday, July 23d	24	25

The epidemic is gradually subsiding, and during the coming month will doubtless, as in last year, leave us.

The census is now being taken, at a very unfortunate time for our city. At no other time in the year are there so many of our citizens usually absent; and owing to the large number who have left in the last two months for health and recreation, and from fear of sickness, who will return with the revival of health and business in the fall, our population will appear in the returns from 10,000 to 20,000 less than it ought to be.

The solemnities to be observed on account of the death of President Taylor have been postponed until the first Thursday in August. It is not designed to have a formal and imposing procession, as has been usual on such occasions; there are, instead, to be services in the various churches in the morning, and in the evening, at Wesley Chapel, an oration by John L. Miner, Esq., an original ode by William D. Gallagher, an original hymn, and other appropriate exercises. The bells of the city to be tolled, and all places of business and public institutions to be closed. It is thought by some that an earlier day ought to have been fixed upon for these solemnities, before the first gush of sorrow and sympathy had had time to die away; but under all the circumstances—the heat of the weather and the state of the health of the city considered—I cannot but think that the committee having the matter in charge acted wisely. The mode of the celebration and its impressiveness and profit to all who participate in it, will, no doubt, be more in keeping with the sentiments of a republican and Christian people, than the most costly and gorgeous funeral pageant. Yours, P.

CONGRESS.

THIRTY-FIRST CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

Wednesday, July 24, 1850.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill of the Committee of Thirteen.

Mr. Foote withdrew his amendment for the present.

Mr. Bradbury submitted the following amendment:

"That the President of the United States be and he is he hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint three commissioners, who shall have power to agree with such commissioners as may be appointed under the legislative authority of the State of Texas, upon a line of boundary between the territory of the United States and the [illegible] commencing at the point where the Red river is intersected by the 100th degree of west longitude, being the southwest angle of the Indian Territory, and running to a point on the Rio Grande, to be agreed upon by the said commissioners; and also to agree upon the terms, conditions, and considerations, upon which such line shall be established; and the proceedings and agreements of the said commissioners shall be, as soon as possible, transmitted to the President of the United States, to be by him submitted to Congress, with such recommendations as the circumstances, in his opinion, may require, for the approval and action of Congress thereupon; and the said agreement, when approved by the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the State of Texas, shall be obligatory upon the parties."

Mr. Rusk moved to amend the amendment by striking out all after the first word "that," and insert "the boundary of the State of Texas is hereby admitted to extend to the Rio Grande, as defined in the statute of limits of the late Republic of Texas, passed in the year eighteen hundred and thirty-six."

The question was taken, and Mr. Rusk's amendment was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Barnwell, Berrien, Butler, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Turney, and Yulee—18.

Nays—Messrs. Badger, Baldwin, Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Felch, Greene, Hamlin, Jones, Mangum, Miller, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Upham Wales, Walker, and Whitcomb—34.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the amendment.

A general debate arose, in which Messrs. Rusk, Butler, Dayton, Berrien, and Hale, participated.

Mr. Benton said that since the present subject had been before the Senate the sun had crossed the equator, leaving capricorn behind, and approached cancer. It was now on its way back from cancer to the equator, and will be back to capricorn before we are done, at the rate at which we have been progressing. That is what the sun has done, sir. He has come forward, and he is now on the back track. And we are also retrograding, sir, and, at this speed, we shall not only retrograde to capricorn, but to Cape Horn. The proposition now was to strike from the bill all that part of it relating to Texas; so far the motion was right and proper. But it proposed to insert in it that which was a nullity, or something worse.

On the 29th of January, a resolution was introduced in the Senate, declaring that it was the duty of Congress to fix the western boundary of Texas, up to the southern boundary of New Mexico, taking no part of New Mexico, &c. This was the starting point on this subject. It was then proposed to take a greater part of New Mexico; to take over 70,000 square miles of New Mexico, and add it to Texas. This was going far enough from the starting point. It was now proposed that the whole of New Mexico should be given to Texas. This was retrograding a little faster than the sun.

He pointed out the difficulties arising from the amendment to any settlement of the question. The commissioners to be appointed on the part of Texas would be men who would be required and demanded by their State, and who would insist on a line running to the highest waters flowing into the Rio Grande. This they would insist upon positively. How were the others to be selected? Were they to be chosen with a view to their opinions on the subject, or were they to be chosen as men who have no opinions on the subject? He contended the difficulty of settling the subject would be no ways avoided by this mode. It would break out again when the President appointed, and the Senate were called upon to confirm, the commissioners. Their confirmation would depend upon the result of inquiry as to their sentiments on the subject.

He said that it would appear, from the fact that the amendment was considerably entertained, that the Omnibus bill—its soul and its life, this Texas boundary question—was gone. The bill was dead. This combination of measures was justified on the ground of settling this Texas boundary; and that being now a failure, the bill was dead. First, we had the prescription of thirteen doctors; and that being a failure, we were now called upon to go into the commission business. The commission business was one which a man generally took up after having failed in others, and when he had neither credit nor capital of his own to proceed upon.

The amendment proposes that these commissioners shall run a line commencing at the point where the Red river is intersected by the one hundredth degree of west longitude. Where was the line to be run? To a point on the Rio Grande to be agreed upon by the commissioners. Where would that point be? It may be at the mouth, or at the head of the Rio Grande. They may run a line, for no chart or guide is laid down for their government, which will absorb all New Mexico, and throw her into the jaws of Texas. Texas may be allowed to swallow all of New Mexico, not only the feet and legs, but the body, the arms, and the head—just as the boa constrictor swallows the ox, not leaving even the horns.

Mr. Bradbury of Maine said that he was in no way responsible for the union of California with other measures, or for the joining of any of them. He did not agree, however, that any greater progress would have been made had they been kept separately. Nor was he responsible in any way for the great consumption of time. He had proposed no amendments but this one, and had made but few speeches.

It was not at all probable, if this amendment were adopted, that the commissioners would run a line to the mouth of the Rio Grande, nor was it probable that Texas would assent to it. Neither did he think that there was any prospect that any absurd line, jeoparding the interests of the United States, would be agreed upon by the commissioners, or receive the sanction of Congress.

After some further discussion, the Senate adjourned.

Thursday, July 25, 1850.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the Omnibus bill.

Mr. Hale modified his amendment, so as to read—"And the rights both of the United States and of Texas to the territory in dispute shall remain the same as they were at the date of the exchange of the ratification of the treaty of Gaudalupe Hidalgo, and neither party shall be prejudiced by anything which has subsequently occurred, nor shall either party take any further steps to reduce those rights to possession until after said commissioners shall have been appointed, and the duties devolved upon them by this act shall have been executed and performed, and Congress and Texas shall have acted definitely thereon."

The question was taken on this amendment, with the following result:

Yeas—Messrs. Badger, Baldwin, Benton, Berrien, Bradbury, Clarke, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dodge of Wisconsin, Douglas, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Norris, Pearce, Seward, Shields, Spruance, Underwood, Upham, Wales, and Walker—23.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Barnwell, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Phelps, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Sturgeon, Turney, Whitcomb, and Yulee—30.

On motion of Mr. Bradbury, the following amendment to his amendment was adopted:

"And the proceedings and agreement of the said commissioners shall be, as early as practicable, transmitted to the President of the United States, to be by him submitted to Congress for its action thereupon."

And the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Benton moved to add to the amendment as amended, the following provision:

Provided, That in agreeing upon said boundary line between the territory of the United States and the said State of Texas, the said commissioners shall agree upon no line which does not exclude every portion of New Mexico, whether lying on the east or the west side of the Rio Grande, from Texas, and which they do not believe to be the true and legitimate boundary between New Mexico and Texas.

Mr. Baldwin, in a very able speech, supported the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. He examined the whole subject of the respective titles of Texas and New Mexico, and maintained that Texas had no lawful right to the territory in dispute.

After a tedious discussion by several Senators, Mr. Clarke moved that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. Clay asked the yeas and nays on the motion, and they were ordered.

And the question being taken, resulted in the negative, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Phelps, Seward, Soulé, Turney, Upham, and Yulee—25.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, and Whitcomb—31.

The question was then taken on the amendment proposed by Mr. Benton, and it was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, [illegible] Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Phelps, Seward, Smith, Upham, and Walker—16.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Shields, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales, Whitcomb, and Yulee—38.

Mr. Benton moved an amendment, but withdrew it to allow Mr. Mason of Virginia to offer an amendment of similar character.

The amendment was read, and was as follows: strike out all of the amendment of Mr. Bradbury, after the word "Texas," where it first occurs, and insert, "upon the western boundary of the State of Texas, as it was when she was admitted as a State into the Union."

Mr. Mason supported his amendment in a speech.

Mr. Turney moved an adjournment.

Mr. Clay called for the yeas and nays, and the motion to adjourn was lost—yeas 26, nays 26.

Mr. Mason so modified his amendment, as to designate the "western and northern boundaries."

After some discussion, Mr. Davis of Massachusetts alluded to the apparent intention of the majority to force a vote upon the bill; and to the fact, that this being a great measure of compromise and harmony, it should not be pressed to a vote while two States were but half represented on the floor. The vacancies from those States would be filled in a few days, and then a fair vote could be had.

A motion to adjourn, made by Mr. Yulee, was rejected—yeas 25, nays 27.

Mr. Mason modified his amendment so as that the words to be inserted would read, "to run the western and northern boundaries of the State of Texas."

And the question being taken, the amendment was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Sebastian, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Upham, Walker, and Yulee—25.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, and Whitcomb—29.

Mr. Rusk proposed to add to the amendment, that the said State of Texas is hereby declared entitled to all the rights she had in and to the territory east of the Rio Grande, which she had or which she may have had at any time, since the ratification of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

Mr. Benton spoke of this bill being a compromise, a measure of peace, a measure to restore paternal feelings throughout the country. It appeared as if it was to be a forced measure; a measure to force people to love and embrace one another. A species of forced generosity.

Mr. Turney moved that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. Clay called for the yeas and nays, and the motion was decided in the affirmative, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Phelps, Sebastian, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Underwood, Upham, and Yulee—28.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pratt, Rusk, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Wales, Walker, and Whitcomb—25.

And the Senate at 5 o'clock adjourned.

Friday, July 26, 1850.

The subject was resumed, the question being on Mr. Rusk's amendment.

Mr. Hale was surprised that gentlemen, who had voted down an amendment securing the rights of both parties to the controversy, should now bring forward an amendment to secure the rights of one party. After considerable discussion,

Mr. Bradbury asked the Senator from Texas to modify his amendment so that it would read: *Provided*, That in the mean time the rights of Texas and the United States, respectively, shall remain unaffected by anything contained in this bill.

Mr. Rusk declined accepting the modification.

Mr. Mason opposed the amendment.

And the question being taken, the amendment of Mr. Rusk was rejected by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Barnwell, Dawson, Downs, Houston, King, Mangum, Morton, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, and Yulee—12.

Nays—Messrs. Badger, Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Felch, Foote, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Mason, Miller, Phelps, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Upham, Wales, and Walker—35.

Mr. Mason moved to strike out all of Mr. Bradbury's amendment, and insert as follows:

"And it being incumbent on the United States, pursuant to the 'joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States,' approved 1st March, 1845, to preserve to Texas all the territory to which that State is entitled, the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby authorized to appoint three commissioners, any two of whom may act, and who, with such commissioners as may be appointed with like authority under legislative act of Texas, shall have power to ascertain and determine 'the territory properly included within and rightfully belonging to' that State on the western and northern borders thereof, since or under the treaty with Mexico signed at Guadalupe Hidalgo, and to provide boundaries accordingly. And the proceedings of said commissioners shall be, as early as practicable, transmitted to the President of the United States, to be by him transmitted to Congress; and the same, when approved by Congress and the Legislature of Texas, shall be obligatory on the parties."

And the question being taken thereon, it was rejected by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Mississippi, Hale, Houston, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Rusk, Sebastian, Seward, Shields, Soulé, Turney, Upham, and Yulee—20.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dawson, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Felch, Foote, Greene, Jones, Mangum, Miller, Phelps, Pratt, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, and Walker—29.

Mr. Seward moved to amend the amendment by prefixing thereto:

New Mexico shall, on proclamation by the President of the United States, be admitted as a State into this Union on an equal footing with the original States: *Provided*, That the President, before issuing such proclamation, shall be satisfied that the Constitution recently framed by the Convention of New Mexico has been approved and ratified by the People of New Mexico in the election held for the purpose of considering it on the 20th of June last.

Mr. Seward addressed the Senate at length in support of the amendment. He argued that Congress was bound by treaty to admit the people of New Mexico to the rights and privileges enjoyed by citizens of the States of this Union.

Mr. Pratt said that he was satisfied that the Senator from New York would stand alone on this amendment. He did not expect such a proposition would have been submitted in the Senate, and he was certain that it would have proceeded from no other quarter than the Senator from New York. He would undertake to show that the amendment was of the same character as that which would likely result from a recognition of the "higher law," which the Senator had asserted to exist, and to be above the Constitution. He maintained that the oath to support the Constitution of the United States was the pre-requisite qualification to entitle a person to hold a seat in the Senate. If a person presented himself as a Senator, and refused to take an oath, he would not be admitted to a seat in the body. The Senator from New York had sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, or else he would not have been admitted in the Senate.

But in the second speech delivered by the Senator in the Senate, he had taken the ground that there was a law higher than the Constitution, and when they conflicted, he must obey that higher law. That is, if this higher law required him to do an unconstitutional act, he would do so, regardless of the oath which he had taken. That is, if a law were introduced interfering with slavery within the States of this Union, which was an admitted unconstitutional act, the Senator would, because of his obligation to this higher law, vote for such an act, and that too after having sworn to support the Constitution.

Mr. Seward denied having, at any time, or in any place, ever uttered any of the sentiments attributed to him by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. Pratt said that the Senator had expressly asserted that there existed a law higher than the Constitution, which he was bound to recognise and obey, even if that law was in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. Seward denied having said so.

Mr. Pratt said that he had heard the Senator say so, and such was the universal understanding of the Senate.

Mr. Seward said that he had nothing to do with what was the universal understanding.

Mr. P[illegible]ator assert as to the obligations of this higher law, and maintained that his conclusions, as to the Senator's course, drawn from the application of that recognition of a law higher than the Constitution, were correct.

The Senator from New York had sworn to support that Constitution, and, when he came here to take his seat, had it been known that he did not regard that Constitution as the supreme law for his government here, there is not a Senator who would not object to him as a member. After that speech in which he had asserted his duty to obey a law higher than the Constitution, he had said to friends that the Senator had obtained admission, under a concealment of his views, and should be turned out of that body.

Mr. Seward said that he had never made any proposition, here or elsewhere, which he was not willing to stand by and support. He was prepared to meet the responsibility of any act of his. He would not engage in any personal remarks. He did not think there was any man in the country whose personal remarks were worthy of five minutes of the time of the Senate. He had spoken of a higher law, which we are bound to obey, higher than the Constitution, which regulates our authority, and devotes it to the noble purposes of justice, and not in violation of, but in harmony with, the Constitution.

He examined the objections to the amendment. It was said that Congress knows nothing of the Constitution of New Mexico. Every Senator had a copy of it. He had one in his hand, received from a delegate in the convention which framed it. He was as satisfied that that was the Constitution of New Mexico, as he was that the Senator was elected, when his credentials were read. It was objected that the Government of New Mexico might be a regal one; the Constitution itself refuted that position.

In the preamble to that Constitution, the people of New Mexico say:

"We, the people of New Mexico, in order to establish justice, promote the welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the *Sovereign Ruler of the Universe, and imploring his aid and direction in its accomplishment, do ordain and establish the following Constitution*," &c.

Here there was a power higher than the Constitution of the United States acknowledged, and its aid implored to their direction in the accomplishment of their object. Such a recognition was considered a heresy by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. Pratt asked if the Senator meant to say that he (Mr. P.) considered that a heresy?

Mr. Seward said that because he had alluded to the same Sovereign Power, he had been denounced as guilty of a heresy by the Senator.

Mr. Pratt said the Senator said that which was untrue.

Mr. Hale called the Senator to order.

Mr. Pratt begged pardon for having said that which he had; but when a Senator did not state things correctly, he thought it perhaps the better course to say nothing.

Mr. Seward said that it was of little consequence to him whether the Senator said anything or not.

He then continued his remarks in defence of his amendment, and said that he had acted independently in submitting it; and, whether he stood alone or with others, he would stand by his proposition.

Mr. Hale opposed the connection of this bill with the admission of New Mexico as a State. He then proceeded to comment upon the remarks of Senators concerning "a higher law," &c.

Mr. Pratt said that the Senator from New Hampshire had made one of his usual speeches. The same smooth phrases and words were used to-day that he used on all occasions. The Senator had applied his remarks to a state of facts that did not exist, and that was the usual mode in which the Senator met an argument. The Senator had, as he always did, assumed a state of facts to suit his standing set of phrases, and had not adapted his language to the facts as they existed. The Senator knew that he had done this; the Senator knew that the facts of the argument were not as he had stated them. He was replying to the position that there was a law above the Constitution, and which was to be obeyed when they came into conflict. This the Senator knew was what he had replied to. Yet the Senator had addressed the Senate, assuming that he (Mr. P.) had denied all obligation to the Sovereign Power of the Universe.

The Senator from New Hampshire had placed him in the position of having denied all obligation to the Divine law, or the precepts of the Bible. He had as much regard for the Supreme Power, whose name is so frequently desecrated here, as that Senator.

Mr. Hale called the Senator to order.

Mr. Rusk asked that the words be taken down.

Mr. Hale read the words for which he called the Senator to order, as follows: "That Supreme Power whose name is so frequently desecrated here by that Senator."

After some remarks by Messrs. Chase, Butler, Hale, and Pratt,

The Chair said that he did not understand the Senator as having used the words written down, or he would have interfered. The language now before the Chair was certainly out of order.

Mr. Pratt said that he had in the first instance confined himself to commenting, not upon the existence of a sovereign power of the universe, but upon that higher law which would justify a man in swearing to support the Constitution, while mentally reserving the right to obey another law, even in violation of the Constitution.

He regarded the higher law of which the Senator from New Hampshire spoke, instead of authorizing a man to swear to support the Constitution with a mental reservation, as making the obligation to support that Constitution doubly strong in consequence of that oath. The Senator from Connecticut understood the Senator from New York to speak of a law higher than the Constitution, which was in harmony with the Constitution. This was the law of Heaven, which made the obligation to support that Constitution inviolable. But that was not the higher law spoken of by the Senator from New York; that Senator spoke of a higher law which, when it conflicted with the Constitution, he was to obey, regardless of the Constitution and his oath to support it. For the assertion of such a law he had alluded to the Senator from New York, and had suggested that, having come into the Senate under a supposed obligation to his oath, now that he acknowledged none as against this higher law, he should be expelled. And if the Senator from New Hampshire held similar doctrines and positions, he would cheerfully unite him with the Senator from New York in the expulsion.

Mr. Baldwin read from Mr. Seward's speech the only sentence in which he had alluded to the "higher law." It was to the effect that there was a law higher than the Constitution. That the Constitution devoted the public domain to the purposes of justice, defence, welfare, and liberty, and that the law higher than the Constitution regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes.

Mr. Seward said that the speech as read by the Senator from Connecticut was verbatim as he had delivered it.

Mr. Davis of Mississippi said that he had been absent from the Senate for a few moments. When he went out an amendment was pending on which he was prepared to vote, as he had been on all propositions connected with this bill. But on his return he found the Senate engaged in a theological disquisition, and his mind was not prepared to vote upon it at present. He wanted at least one night for reflection, and as the debate had closed with a prayer by brother Baldwin, he moved that the Senate adjourn. [Laughter.]

Mr. Clay asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered; and, the question being taken, the Senate refused to adjourn, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Upham, and Yulee—23.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Jones, King, Mangum, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, and Whitcomb—28.

Mr. Chase and Mr. Foote continued the debate on the "higher law," expulsion, &c.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. Seward, and it was rejected by the following vote:

Yea—Mr. Seward—1.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Greene, Hunter, Jones, King, Mason, Morton, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Smith, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb, and Yulee—42.

Mr. Berrien moved that the Senate adjourn; and the question being taken, was decided in the affirmative, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Baldwin, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dayton, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Sebastian, Seward, Shields, Smith, Soulé, Spruance, Turney, Underwood, Upham, and Yulee—30.

Nays—Messrs. Badger, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Jones, King, Pratt, Rusk, Sturgeon, Walker, and Whitcomb—19.

Saturday, July 27, 1850.

The credentials of the Hon. Thomas Ewing, appointed by the Governor of Ohio, Senator, in the place of Mr. Corwin, resigned, were presented by Mr. Davis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Douglas of Illinois introduced a resolution for the application of the Previous Question in the Senate. Laid over till Monday.

The death of Hon. Daniel P. King was announced; the Senate adopted the usual resolutions, and adjourned.

Monday, July 29, 1850.

The report of the Committee of Thirteen was taken up, and the question being on Mr. Bradbury's resolution, Mr. Dayton moved to strike out all after the word "that," and insert a provision for the settlement of the controversy respecting the boundary of Texas by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Rusk denied the jurisdiction of the Court over the case, and protested against the delay attending proceedings before it. Mr Benton supported the motion. Mr. Clay opposed it. Mr. Cass was opposed to it; he enlarged upon the dangers of a collision with Texas, and sustained Mr. Bradbury's amendment. Mr. Hale had no doubt that the United States would eventually be obliged to succumb to Texas, and he thought the mode proposed by Mr. Dayton about the most graceful way of doing it. For himself, viewing the geographical composition of the Court, he had no doubt as to what its decision would be. The question was taken on Mr. Dayton's amendment, with the following result:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Phelps, Seward, Smith, Turney, Upham, and Walker—18.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Whitcomb, and Yulee—39.

Mr. Benton moved to amend the amendment by adding thereto the following:

Provided, That no person shall be appointed a commissioner under this act, who shall have formed or expressed an opinion on the subject, and who shall not be impartial or disinterested in the event or question; and the said commissioners shall make a protocol of each conference which they shall hold upon the subject, and shall report the same to the President of the United States, to be by him submitted to Congress; and the said commissioners shall be duly sworn to the faithful discharge of their duties.

The question being taken thereon, it was rejected by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Chase, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Hamlin, Mason, Miller, Seward, Upham, and Walker—12.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Ewing, Felch, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, and Whitcomb—33.

The question recurring on the amendment of Mr. Bradbury, it was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Felch, Foote, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, and Whitcomb—28.

Nays—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Houston, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Phelps, Rusk, Sebastian, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Upham, and Yulee—28.

Absent—Messrs. Douglas, Borland, and Walker, and one vacancy.

Mr. Bradbury subsequently offered substantially the same amendment, and Mr. Rusk moved a proviso that

"The orders of the military commander at Santa Fe, for the formation of a State or Territorial Government, with all action which has been taken under said orders, be, and the same is hereby, declared null and void.

And the question being taken thereon, it was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Butler, Clemens, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Houston, Jones, King, Mason, Morton, Rusk, and Turney—12.

Nays—Messrs. Badger, Baldwin, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Ewing, Felch, Foote, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Mangum, Miller, Norris, Pearce, Phelps, Pratt, Seward, Shields, Smith, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Upham, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb, and Yulee—42.

Mr. Mason moved to amend the amendment by striking out all after the words "the limits of the same," so as to leave it a provision to ascertain and define only the true and legitimate limits of Texas.

And the question being taken, the motion was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Houston, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Phelps, Rusk, Sebastian, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Upham, and Yulee—29.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, and Whitcomb—29.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the amendment by striking out the words "or at any period since that date." And the motion was rejected by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Seward, Smith, Upham, and Walker—15.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Ewing, Felch, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales, Whitcomb, and Yulee—41.

Mr. Turney moved to amend the amendment by adding thereto as follows:

Provided, That in the event of the Commissioners failing to determine the true line, no pecuniary consideration shall be given to reconcile either party to a departure therefrom.

Messrs. Foote and Turney debated this amendment, and the question being taken thereon, it was rejected by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dodge of Wisconsin, Hale, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Seward, Soulé, Turney, Upham, and Yulee—20.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Ewing, Felch, Foote, Hamlin, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, and Whitcomb—32.

Mr. Hale moved, and the Senate then adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Wednesday, July 24, 1850.

Mr. Potter, from the Committee on the Post Office, reported a bill to reduce the rates of postage. Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. Brown, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported a bill granting land to the District of Columbia for school purposes. Referred to Committee of the Whole House.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state the Union. The Chairman (Linn Boyd) announced the business in order to be the President's California message.

Mr. Bayly moved to lay it aside, and take up, instead, the West Point Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. Preston King demanded tellers, and tellers being ordered, the motion of Mr. Bayly was agreed to—yeas 93, nays 60.

After a good deal of discussion, which turned chiefly on the California question, on motion of Mr. Butler of Pennsylvania the Committee rose, to enable Mr. Bayly to submit the usual resolution to terminate debate on the West Point bill.

After agreeing to close it half an hour after going into Committee, the House resolved itself again into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Messrs. Burt and Marshall both submitted amendments, the Committee rose, and the House adjourned.

Thursday, July 25, 1850.

Mr. Young, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported back, with an amendment, the bill to encourage agriculture, by giving to any man or woman, the head of a family and a citizen of the United States, and who may cultivate the same, a quarter section of land, without cost.

The bill having been read, the question was [illegible]

Mr. Johnson of Tennessee said that the bill was of more importance than any other which had been presented to the consideration of the House, and, save one measure, any that could be brought forward. Five years ago he introduced this proposition, or the principle on which it was based. He knew that it was then said it was intended to catch votes, and was demagoguism; but since that time various measures had been introduced to dispose of the public lands; and he asked, in the name of those who toil and sweat, that they may be permitted to participate in the bounties of the Government. We go over the water to extend our sympathies. When a little revolution breaks out, we hear from every mouth about opening our doors to the sufferers, and inviting them to this country, and tendering to them land. But the poor men at home, citizens of the United States, who, when the tocsin of war is sounded, are ready to sacrifice their lives and shed their blood, are little cared for. He caused to be read three authorities, as the substratum on which to erect his little edifice on this occasion. The first was that of Moses, namely, "the land shall not be sold forever. The land is mine, for you are strangers with me;" the next was that of Vattel, in argument of the free tillage of the soil; and the third on the authority of General Jackson, in [illegible] settlers, at a cost barely sufficient to reimburse the United States for the cost of survey and the extinguishment of the Indian titles. We have got too much land as a whole people; as individuals, not enough. He asked where the Government obtained the right to withhold the soil from the producer. It was not derived from the Constitution; it was not derived from any great principle of nature, and there should be no more restriction than on air, light, or water. Carry out the principles of the bill, and our resources would be increased, and the population of the country be made better and happier.

He wanted all to stand on the great platform of equality, and that every man may have a home—a fireside. Nineteen out of twenty of the people are better than their rulers. He was for serving the people, who had made him what he was; and God willing, so long as he lived, and had a tongue to speak or a vote to give, he would stand by the people. They are entitled to honest and fair representatives, and their wishes should be known and acted upon.

After speaking for an hour in favor of the bill, he gave notice of his intention to submit an amendment.

Mr. Bayly stated that after the bill now before the Committee was disposed of, he would move to take up the other annual appropriation bills in the following order, namely: the Revolutionary Pension, the Navy Pension, the Indian, the Fortification, the Post Office, the Civil and Diplomatic, the Navy, and the Army bills. He asked that general debate be not indulged on the first five, and that gentlemen would reserve their discussion for the last three. If this suggestion be acquiesced in, in a short time all the bills but these would be disposed of.

Mr. Stanton of Tennessee wished to know at what time Congress would be ready to adjourn, if this course be pursued.

Mr. Bayly replied that Congress would be ready to adjourn when the appropriation bills are passed, and that would depend on the manner in which business is transacted here. If his suggestion should be acquiesced in, the bills could be passed in a fortnight.

Mr. Bissell inquired, if the bills are passed, and Congress then adjourn, what would become of California? If an acquiescence in the suggestion would throw her out, he was opposed to it.

Mr. Bayly said that he had made a suggestion only as to the bills which he had in charge. The admission of California would depend on the House and the Committee. He then replied to the remarks of Mr. Marshall, delivered yesterday.

Mr. Crowell inquired whether the California bill will again be before the Committee after this shall have been disposed of.

The Chairman replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Crowell asked whether it would be in order to lay the bill aside, with a recommendation that it be reported to the House.

The Chairman replied: Not while amendments are pending.

Various amendments were acted on, and debate indulged.

The Committee rose without coming to a conclusion on the bill; and, at four o'clock, the House adjourned.

Friday, July 26, 1850.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the bill granting land to landless men. Mr. Brown of Mississippi supported the policy of the bill. It was then referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. Mr. Moore moved a reconsideration of the vote so referring it, and on this motion he took occasion to denounce the bill, and charge its advocates with demagoguism. An irregular discussion took place, which was cut short by a motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The West Point Appropriation bill was then taken up, the amendments were agreed to, and the bill was reported to the House, which concurred in some amendments, rejected others, and finally passed the bill.

The House then adjourned.

Saturday, July 27, 1850.

The death of Mr. King, a member from Massachusetts, was announced by Mr. Rockwell. Appropriate remarks were made respecting the deceased, by Messrs. Rockwell, Winthrop, and Chandler, the customary resolutions were adopted, and the House adjourned.

Monday, July 29, 1850.

Various motions were made to fix upon some time for adjourning both Houses, but they failed.

The House in Committee of the Whole rejected the motion of Mr. Bayly, to lay aside the California message, by a vote of 86 to 83, and that subject was then taken up. Various amendments were moved—five minutes' speeches were made—the Committee rose, sometimes finding itself without a quorum—calls of the House were made—the yeas and nays were frequently ordered, on various motions, which had no object but delay; and at last, after a useless session, the House near six o'clock adjourned.

THE CABINET MINISTERS.

Of the seven Cabinet Ministers heretofore announced as having been appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, the following have accepted their appointments, and being here present, have been duly commissioned, viz:

Mr. Webster, the Secretary of State.
Mr. Corwin, the Secretary of the Treasury.
Mr. Hall, the Postmaster General.

Of the remaining four, it is understood that the following accept their appointments, but have not yet reached the city, viz:

Mr. Graham, Secretary of the Navy.
Mr. Crittenden, Attorney General.

LYNCH LAW IN VIRGINIA.

In Culpeper county, on Wednesday last, a lawless mob assembled at the Court House, and, though resisted by the sheriff at the jail door, entered the jail and took therefrom by force, William Grayson, a free negro, charged with the murder of David W. Miller, and hung him by the neck until dead. The Superior Court of Culpeper had twice convicted Grayson, and the General Court had twice granted him a new trial. In the last opinion the General Court said, "Upon the whole case, we are of the opinion that the testimony is not only not sufficient to prove the guilt of the accused, but that *it is hardly sufficient to raise a suspicion against him*. The judgment must therefore be reversed and a new trial awarded." This infuriated mob, consisting, as we regret to learn, in part of justices of the peace and of members of Christian churches, have thus by violence reversed the decision of the highest criminal tribunal in the State, and been guilty of a foul, cowardly, and fiendish murder, and that, too, of a helpless free negro, with none to defend him nor avenge his wrongs. Grayson, we learn, avowed his innocence on the gallows. One minute was given him in which he was told he was to confess his guilt; this he refused to do, and told them to execute him at once, which they did.

This first attempt at Lynch law in this Commonwealth should be rebuked with firmness and punished with severity. Unless speedily checked in its course, it must overthrow all government, and render life, liberty, and property, without protection. It rests with the legally-constituted authorities of Virginia to wipe off this foul blot from her character. We trust in God's name they will not fail to do it.—*Fredericksburg Recorder*.

Springboro', Ohio, *July* 16, 1850.

Dear Sir: We, the undersigned, are Free-Soilers. We advocated the election of our Representative, Mr. L. D. Campbell, believing him to be true in his opposition to the increase of Slavery and the Slave Power. Lately, a newspaper in our district has repeatedly denounced him as a "Doughface." In justice to Mr. Campbell, as well as to ourselves, we desire you to state, briefly, whether his course in Congress has shown him to be *a trusty friend of the Wilmot Proviso, and of the Cause of Freedom*, or whether it has been such as to warrant the charge that he is a "Doughface?"

Respectfully, yours,
Mahlon Wright,
Alfred Thomas,
E. G. Potts,
[illegible]
Josiah Wright.

G. Bailey, Editor of the National Era.

We answer with a great deal of pleasure, that Mr. Campbell is "a trusty friend of the Wilmot Proviso, and of the Cause of Freedom," and that he has done nothing since he took his seat in Congress, to "warrant the charge that he is a Doughface."

On all the questions at issue between Slavery Freedom, as they arise in Congress, he is true to himself, to his constituents, to the cause of Human Rights—and he is able as he is faithful.

Ed. Era.

THE COUNTESS OF OSSILLI.

The Philadelphia *Bulletin* has the following notice of the gifted lady who met an untimely death last week by the wreck of the brig Elizabeth, on the shore of Fire Island:

"The Countess of Ossilli—better known as Margaret Fuller—was the daughter of Hon. Timothy Fuller, a lawyer of Boston, but nearly all his life a resident of Cambridge, and a Representative of the Middlesex District in Congress from 1817 to 1825. She was the first born of six children, and early displayed great talents, which her father, with more regard for her mental than her bodily health, stimulated by incessant study. The early death of this parent left Margaret to depend on herself for a livelihood. Accordingly she applied herself to teaching as a vocation—first in Boston, then in Providence, and afterwards in Boston again. In 1844 she abandoned teaching and assumed the critical department of the *Tribune*, where her articles attracted much attention. The following year she visited Europe, as a correspondent of the same paper, and continued to reside abroad, where she had married until a few weeks prior to her death. She was the author of two noticeable works—'Summer on the Lakes,' and 'Woman in the Nineteenth Century;' besides numerous shorter articles, the best of which were collected by Putnam, in 1846, under the title of "Papers on Literature and Art."

The Hon. Thomas Ewing (late Secretary of the Interior) has been appointed, by the Governor of the State of *Ohio*, to be Senator of the United States (until an election is made by the Legislature of that State) to succeed Mr. Corwin, resigned.

We are pained to hear that a telegraphic despatch was received just before the adjournment of the House yesterday, by Mr. Winthrop, announcing the death of the Hon. Daniel P. King, Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts. He died at his residence in Danvers, on Thursday afternoon, where he happened to be on a visit to his family, having left this city in good health but a few days ago.

Mr. King has ably represented his district in Congress for many years, and was highly esteemed by all who had the pleasure of his acquaintance.—*National Intelligencer.*

NOTICE.

A regular meeting of the Washington Society for Free Debates will be held at Temperance Hall, on Friday evening, August 2d, at 8 o'clock. Subject for discussion, "Can any act of Congress justify an attempt to dissolve the Union?" The public are respectfully invited to attend.

By order: JOHN M. McCALLA, *President.*
H. G. McCUTCHEN, *Secretary.*

TO PERSONS DESIROUS OF EMPLOYMENT.

Young men, and youths even down to fourteen years of age, of a fair common school education, and who can write a tolerably good hand, residing in any part of the United States, will, by addressing a letter (post paid) to "Box No. 3,069, New York Post Office," receive information of a mode in which they can be employed with pecuniary profit to themselves for a few weeks, or, in case of success, permanently, while at the same time they will aid an extensive plan for the improvement of education throughout the country. Editors friendly to education will please copy this notice.—*New York Tribune.*

OAK HALL, BOSTON.

The largest stock of Children's Clothing to be found in New England is kept by George W. Simmons. Those going to the City of Notions should make it a point to visit his elegant sales room, and make their purchases.

☞ *FOWLERS & WELLS, Phrenologists and Publishers*, Clinton Hall, 131 Nassau street, New York. Office of the *Water Cure* and *Phrenological Journals.*

JUST PUBLISHED.

REPLY to Remarks of Rev. Moses Stuart on Hon. John Jay, and an Examination of his Scriptural Exercises, contained in his recent pamphlet entitled "Conscience and the Constitution." By William Jay. An octavo pamphlet in a neat cover. Price 6 cents. For sale by
Aug. 1. WM. HARNED, 61 John street, N. York.

CINCINNATI NATIONAL ERA AGENCY,
No. 239 Main street, a few doors below 6th, west side.

THE National Era is delivered by a carrier in any part of the city at $2 50 a year, *free of postage*. Those who prefer it can be supplied by the month, at 25 cents per month. Single copies can also be had. Price by mail, $2 per year.

Subscriptions also received for the Friend of Youth, edited by Mrs. M. L. Bailey, *free of postage*, delivered in any part of the city, at 75 cents a year, or 50 cents by mail.

Subscriptions and advertisements received, and any business connected with these papers attended to, by
JOHN KIRMAN,
S. N. PEIRCE,
Aug. 1. *Agents for National Era.*

PHYSO-MEDICAL COLLEGE, CINCINNATI, O.
FACULTY. Tickets.

A Curtis, M. D., Professor of Institutes or Principles of Medicine	$12 00
J. Courtney, M. D., Professor of Practical Medicine and Obstetrics	12 00
E. H. Stockwell, M. D., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology	12 00
E. M. Parritt, M. D., Professor of Chemistry and Medical Jurisprudence	12 00
J. Brown, M. D., Professor of Botany, Materia Medica, Pharmacy, and Therapeutics	12 00
J. A. Powers, M. D., Professor of Surgery	12 00
E. H. Stockwell, M. D., Demonstrator of Anatomy	5 00

J. BROWN, *Dean.*

Winter Session of 1850

Will commence on the first Monday of November, and continue seventeen weeks, (the last week devoted to the candidates for graduation.) The expense of tickets, $72; matriculation, $3; graduation, $20. Board, from $2 to $3 per week.

One hundred dollars, in advance, will secure a certificate that will entitle the purchaser (or his assignee) to as many courses of lectures as he may require for graduation; or it will entitle the subscriber to a share in the College ground and buildings. Aug 1—1m

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

CONTENTS OF No. 325.—Price, twelve and a half cents.

1. Recent Arctic Expeditions.—*United Service Magazine.*
2. Acoustics for the Houses of Parliament.—*Spectator.*
3. Letters from Jamaica.—*New York Evening Post.*
4. The Spanish Beauty.—*Bentley's Miscellany.*
5. Episodes of Insect Life.—*Eclectic Review.*
6. Deborah's Diary, Part IV.—*Sharpe's Magazine.*
7. Phantasies of Walpurgis Night.—*Zschokke.*
8. Our Old Dressmaker.—*Chambers's Journal.*
9. An Ideal Woman.—*Ladies' Companion.*
10. The Great Salt Lake.—*National Intelligencer.*
11. Does Nature Provide a Compass?—*Rochester Advertiser.*

Washington, *December* 27, 1845.

Of all the Periodical Journals devoted to literature and science, which abound in Europe and in this country, this has appeared to me to be the most useful. It contains indeed the exposition only of the current literature of the English language; but this, by its immense extent and comprehension, includes a portraiture of the human mind in the utmost expansion of the present age.

J. Q. ADAMS.

Published weekly, at six dollars a year, by
E. LITTELL & CO.,
Corner of Tremont and Bromfield streets, Boston.

☞ For sale by JOSEPH SHILLINGTON, corner of Four-and-a-half street and Pennsylvania avenue, Washington.

FERDINAND MOULTON,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,

WILL practice in the several courts in the District, and attend to the prosecution of claims against Government.

Office, corner of E and Seventh streets, opposite the General Post Office.

Refers to Editor of National Era, and Members of Congress from Maryland, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. July 18.