

SOUTHERN PATRIOT.

MARTIN & KENDRICK,

"BE SURE YOU'RE RIGHT, THEN GO A-HEAD."—Crockett.

Proprietors.

VOL 4.

HOUSTON CHICKASAW COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, AUGUST 29, 1849.

NO 11

SELECTED POETRY

THE WIFE.

She clung to him with Woman's love,
Like ivy to the oak,
While o'er his head with crushing force,
Earth's chilling tempests broke.
And when the world looked on him,
And slight hung o'er his name,
She soothed his cares with Woman's love
And bade him rise again.
And never did that woe decay,
Or one bright flower wither,
For Woman's love o'er nourished them;
And they might bloom forever.
'Tis ever thus with Woman's love,
True till life's star in has passed,
And like the vine around the tree,
She braves them to the last.

POLITICAL

From the Washington Union.

Votes of Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer.

Upon various abolition propositions, during the 29th and 30th Congress, of which they were members of.

PROPOSITION TO ADOPT THE 21ST RULE.
The question being upon the adoption of the rules of the former session.

Mr. Chapman of Alabama moved to adopt the rules of the first session of the preceding Congress.

Mr. McDowell inquired of the chair what rule prevailed during the former part of the last session which did not prevail during the latter part of it?

The chair directed the clerk to read the 21st rule, prohibiting the reception of abolition petition as follows.

"12. No petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or territory, or the slave trade between the States or Territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever."

On the motion of Mr. Chapman, the effect of which would have been to adopt the 21st rule, the yeas and nays were taken, Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voting in the negative, and against the rule.—Blair & Rives's Congressional Globe, page 16, 39th Congress, 1st session.

VOTE AGAINST THE ADMISSION OF TEXAS.
On the 10th of December, 1845, Mr. Adams offered a remonstrance of certain citizens against the admission of Texas into the Union as a State.

Mr. Boyd of Kentucky moved that it be laid upon the table.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Blair & Rives's Cong. Globe, 29th Con., 2d ses., p. 41.

Again: The bill for the admission of Texas being pending, and the previous question having been moved, on the question, shall the main question be now put? Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Id., p. 61.

The main question having been ordered—which was, shall the bill be read a third time?—on this question, Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Id., p. 61.

The main question having been ordered; which was, shall the bill be read a third time? on this question Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Id., p. 62.

Thus these two worthies voted against the admission of Texas into the Union, after it had been annexed in conformity to the joint resolutions of Congress, passed at the previous session.

SLAVE TRADE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

On the 11th day of December 1846, Mr. Calver of New York presented memorials from Washington county, New York, praying the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Boyd of Kentucky moved that the memorials be laid on the table.

On this question the yeas and nays were ordered, and Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Id., p. 43.

COLORADO CITIZENS OF MASSACHUSETTS.
On the 15th of December, 1846, Mr. Adams presented the resolutions of the Legislature of Massachusetts in relation to the wrongs alleged to have been suffered by the colored citizens of Massachusetts in the States of South Carolina, and Louisiana.

Mr. Burt of South Carolina moved to lay the resolutions on the table.

On motion the yeas and nays were ordered, and Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Id., p. 53.

On the 3d day of March, 1847, we find the following record of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in Blair & Rives's Congressional Globe for that session, page 573:

THE THREE MILLION BILL.

The House resolved itself into committee of the Whole, on the State of the Union. (Mr. Cobb in the chair) and took up the three million bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. Wilmot moved to add to the bill the clause generally known as the Wilmot Proviso, in the following words:

Provided, that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any territory on the continent of America which shall hereafter be acquired by or annexed to the United States by virtue of this appropriation, or in any other manner whatever, except for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted; Provided, always, that every person escaping into such territory from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the United States, such fugitive may be lawfully claimed and conveyed out of said territory to the person claiming him or her service.

Mr. Graham moved to amend Mr. Wilmot's proviso by striking out after provided, and insert:

If any territory be acquired by the United States from Mexico, the Missouri Compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min. shall be extended direct to the Pacific Ocean; that is, slavery shall be prohibited north of that line, and allowed south of it.

"Disagreed to—ayes 64, noes 96.
"The question recurred on the proviso moved by Mr. Wilmot, and it was agreed to—ayes 90, noes 80.

"The committee then rose and reported the bill.

"Mr. Rathbun moved the previous question, which was seconded, and the main question was ordered and put, viz: Will the House agree to the amendment reported by the committee of the whole? (the Wilmot Proviso.) It was decided in the negative by yeas and nays."

Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the affirmative, and in favor of the Wilmot Proviso.

TO ABOLISH THE SLAVE TRADE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

On the 21st day of Dec., 1847, 20th Congress, 1st session, Mr. Giddings of Ohio presented a memorial from certain citizens of the District of Columbia, representing:

"That the slave trade is now carried on in the District of Columbia to a large extent. Your petitioners therefore ask that all laws authorizing or sanctioning such trade within said District may be repealed.

William Flaberty, William Blanchard, George Savage, J. C. Grier, B. Milburn, C. S. Fowles, T. M. Milburn, Charles C. Moon, Joseph Scholfield, Columbus McLeod, William Green, John T. Whitaker, James Handley, Martin Buell, J. F. Calton, H. Taylor, Thomas P. Vial, Thomas Pitman."

A motion was made to lay the memorial on the table, on which the yeas and nays were taken—Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voting in the negative.—Blair & Rives Cong. Globe, p. 60.

On the 13th day of December, 1848, (30th Congress, 2d session,) we find the following record of the proceedings which took place in the House of Representatives, on the subject of

"SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT

"Mr. Palfrey asked leave to introduce a bill, of which previous notice was given, to repeal all acts or parts of acts of Congress establishing or maintaining slavery or the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Holmes of South Carolina objecting.

"The question was then stated on granting leave.

"The yeas and nays were ordered and taken."

And Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in favor of granting leave to introduce a bill to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.—Blair & Rives's Cong. Globe, p. 38.

FUGITIVE SLAVES.

On the 8th of January, 1849, Mr. Meade of Virginia offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby instructed to report a bill to this House, provided effectually for the apprehension and delivery of fugitives from labor, who have escaped, or may hereafter escape from one State into another."

The yeas and nays being ordered, Truman Smith and Jacob Collamer voted in the negative.—Blair & Rives's Cong. Globe, p. 188.

At this time Truman Smith indulged hopes of being a member of the cabinet, and therefore, as did some other aspiring whigs from free States, began to skulk from and dodge the votes upon the question of slavery. Up to this time he had voted with Giddings, Palfrey, Root and Goot, for every abolition proposition presented to the House. Mr. Collamer, whose aspirations did not then rise higher than a bureau, continued to vote for all abolition propositions, including the insulting resolution offered by Mr. Goot of New York, proposing that negroes and slaves should be permitted to vote on the question of the abolition of slavery in this district.

Yes one of these men now holds a seat in the cabinet of a slaveholding President, and the other is engaged in the dishonorable and base business of misrepresenting and slandering prominent democrats and the democratic party. This man who is an abolitionist throughout, and has voted for nearly every abolition proposition offered in the House of Representatives while he was a member, has the brazen impudence to falsely charge upon the democratic party a coalition with the abolitionists, and to falsely malign and slander, in pamphlets sent under his frank to be secretly circulated at the South, prominent democrats representing them to be Wilmot Proviso men and abolitionists, when in fact they are directly the reverse, and have voted in Congress in opposition to him on similar abolition questions—"a work for which he receives from the corruption fund in this city a compensation at the rate of eight dollars a day.

How can a man filling the high station of Senator of the United States, guilty of such acts as these, hold up his head among honorable men? Yet he is the confidential adviser and associate of Gen. Taylor and his cabinet. He is also the ally of southern slaveholding whigs, & freesoil engaged by them to aid them in the elections now pending in the Southern States. Is now such a coalition as disgusting as it is unprincipled and shameful? Comment upon such conduct is unnecessary.

At a future time we shall continue our investigation into the votes of Postmaster General Collamer.

The whigs are pouring it down upon Col. Reuben Davis, because he exercised the right of withdrawing from being a candidate for Congress. Before his withdrawal the whigs were patting him on the shoulders with promises that they would stand up to him. To what perfidious deception has arrived.—Montgomery

A man without money, and none can be borrow, little is his credit and great is his sorrow.

We never sleep to conquer.

Note to Gen. Foote's, letter to Hon. Henry A. Wise.

"Those who do me the honor to read the above letter, will observe that I have not entered at all upon the discussion of the constitutional question involved in the Wilmot Proviso. It would have been aside from the object which I had immediately in view to have done so. Besides, I have been for some time of opinion that the time had gone by for mere argument in reference to a point upon which so many powerful speeches have been made in and out of Congress. A man who has read Mr. Pinkney's great speech on the Missouri question, Gen. Cass' Nicholson letter, and the speeches of Mr. Berrien, of Georgia, at the two last sessions of Congress, & yet suppose Congress to have constitutional authority to legislate upon the subject of slavery anywhere, either in States territories, or in the District of Columbia, either directly or indirectly, must be a madman. If there were no other fact connected with the question which might serve to convince an unprejudiced mind that it was not designed by the framers of the constitution to allow Congress to intermeddle with slavery anywhere, it would be sufficient, it seems to me, to show that the constitution would not have been established without the fullest guarantees upon this whole subject; to have it proved to be not only true that the constitution would not have been agreed to and ratified without these guarantees, but that it would not have been made, or ratified, unless the States had been allowed to import additional slaves from the coast of Africa, to be protected in the same way, and to the same extent, as those that were here at the period of the adoption of that sacred instrument.

Those who will read Mr. Madison's account of the debates in the federal convention touching these matters, will find the facts alluded to not conclusively established. I will here, for the advantage of those who have no opportunity of examining Mr. Madison's writings, append a few extracts from his account of conventional debates, vouching most solemnly for the accuracy of the quotations.

Mr. Patterson. He could regard negro slaves in no light but as property."

Mr. King said "eleven out of the thirteen states had agreed to consider slaves in the apportionment of taxation, and taxation and representation ought to go together."

In the debate upon the proposition to allow the southern States representatives on account of their slaves, in order more effectually to guard their right of property in them.

Gouverneur Morris said: There can be no end of demands for security if every peculiar interest is to be entitled to it. The eastern States may claim it for their fishery, and for other objects."

To this Mr. Butler of South Carolina replied: "The security the southern people want is that their negroes may not be taken from them, which some gentlemen within or without doors have a good mind to do."

Mr. Gouverneur Morris, speaking of the part of the constitution guaranteeing slavery to the southern States and allowing them to go on importing from Africa, said: The admission of slaves into the representation, when fairly explained, comes to this: That the inhabitants of Georgia and South Carolina who go to the coast of Africa, &c., "shall have more votes in a government instituted for the protection of the rights of mankind than the citizens of Pennsylvania or New Jersey, &c."

"He would add, that domestic slavery is the most prominent feature in the aristocratic countenance of the proposed constitution. * * * * * And what is the proposed compensation to the northern states?" &c. "They are to bind themselves to match their militia for the defence of the southern States," &c. "On the other side, the southern states are not to be restrained from importing fresh supplies of wretched Africans, at once to increase the danger of attack and the difficulty of defence; nay, they are to be encouraged to it by having their votes in the national government increased

in proportion; and are at the same time to have their exports and their slaves exempt from the contributions for the public service." Such was Mr. Morris's view of this part of the constitution, as afterwards actually adopted.

Upon the question whether the importation of slaves should or should not continue to go on, Mr. Rutledge said:

"The true question is, whether the southern States shall or shall not be parties to the Union. If the northern States consult their interests, they will not oppose the increase of slaves which will increase the commodities of which they will be the carriers."

"Mr. Ellsworth was for leaving the clause as it stands: let every State import what it pleases. The morality or wisdom of slavery are considerations belonging to the States themselves. What enriches a part enriches the whole, and the States are the best judges of their peculiar interest. The old confederation had not meddled with this point, and he did not see any greater necessity for bringing it within the policy of the new one."

Mr. Pinckney. South Carolina can never receive the plan if it prohibits the slave trade. In every proposed extension of the powers of Congress, that State has expressly and wofully excepted that of meddling with the importation of negroes.

Mr. Sherman was for leaving the clause as it stands. He disapproved of the slave trade; yet, as the States were now possessed of the right to import slaves, as the public good did not require it to be taken from them, and as it was expedient to have as few objections as possible to the proposed scheme of government, he thought it best to "leave the matter as we find it," &c.

Gen. Pinckney declared it to be his firm opinion, that if himself and his colleagues were to sign the constitution, and use their personal influence, it would be of no avail toward obtaining the assent of their constituents. South Carolina and Georgia cannot do without slaves."

Mr. Sherman said, "it was better to let the southern States import slaves than to part with them, if they made it a sine qua non."

And so the right to import slaves from the coast of Africa was retained by the States respectively until the year 1808, and Congress was not bound by the constitution even then to prohibit it.

Facts for the people.

It is a fact that a majority of the whigs in the United States Senate, in 1848, voted for putting the Wilmot Proviso in the Treaty, by which we acquired California and New Mexico.

It is a fact that not a single whig paper, North or South, condemned them for that odious and damnable vote. By their silence, they approved of the act.

It is a fact that a majority of the Whigs in both Houses of Congress have always voted for the Wilmot Proviso, and for every other measure calculated to injure the South on the slave question. Notwithstanding these things, the whigs of this state have the IMPUDENCE—the BRAZEN AFFRONTERY, to speak of the whig party as the friends of the South. Again we say to the people that the whig party are traitors to the South. Trust them not, they are your enemies.—Jacksonian.

The Yates county (N. Y.) Whig thus defends Gen. Taylor against the charge of being friendly to slavery:

A new office has been established at Fellowsville, Preston county, Va., a place at which the illustrious Cave Johnson refused to open an office.—S. Heermans, editor of the Fellowsville Democrat, a whig paper is the Postmaster. Mr. Heermans is strongly anti-slavery in his sentiments, and he constantly advocates, through his columns, non-extension of slavery, and emancipation where it exists, and especially in Virginia. If Gen. Taylor means his Administration to be pro-slavery, it seems to us he might have found a man of corresponding views for Postmaster in Fellowsville."

A friend in need, is a friend indeed

More Evidence against Gen. Taylor.

When Gen. Taylor formed his cabinet, he manifested his friendship for the South and for the feelings of slaveholders, by appointing Jacob Collamer, of Vermont, P. M. Gen. This man, last winter, voted for the following Preamble.

"Whereas, the traffic now prosecuted in this metropolis of the Republic in human beings, as chattles is contrary to natural justice and the fundamental principles of our political system, and is notoriously a reproach to our country, throughout Christendom, and a serious hindrance to the progress of republican liberty amongst the nations of the earth."

By voting for the above, Collamer said that every slaveholder is a dishonest man. Gen. Taylor, by giving him a seat in his cabinet, sanctioned the odious sentiments contained in the Preamble. Are the whigs of Mississippi pleased with Collamer? Can they conscientiously praise and endorse the President for placing at the head of the Post Office Department, such a man as Jacob Collamer? Can they, without blushing, ask their neighbors to vote for candidates for Congress who, if elected, will go to Washington to sustain Gen. Taylor, in making such appointments? They cannot, if they are really friends of the South.

Jacksonian.

Hypocrisy of Southern Whigs.

The whig papers in the South have of late had much to say about coalitions, because in some of the Northern States efforts are being made to heal the divisions in the Democratic party that have arisen on the slavery question.—This is done to keep the people from thinking of the unholy deeds of the whig party. The following pointed article on this subject, from the "North Carolina Standard," is worthy of particular attention:

"You talk about 'Coalitions,' and you expect to be shocked, because the Democrats in some of the non-slaveholding States are uniting once more and voting together—you talk about these things! Is not the mere fact that they divided on the slavery question, proof conclusive that we have friends among them? How could they coalesce, if they had not separated? And how could they separate, if they had all thought alike? You reproach us because Barnburners and old Hunkers are uniting! Can you point to the first whig from a free State who ever voted against the Wilmot Proviso or for the Missouri Compromise? Have you, among all your Whig brethren from Maine to Ohio, any man, big or little politically, who has ever taken such a stand for the South and for the Constitution, as Messrs. Cass, Buchanan, Douglass, Dickinson, Burbe, Crosswell, and Forney, have done? Who did you vote for, last fall, for Vice President? And who is it that now sits 'cheek by jowl' with old Zack in the cabinet at Washington? Ewing and Collamer, abolitionists notoriously—the union of the Southern planter with the free soiler of the North! Have you ever thought of that.

The Institution of Slavery.

The following extract in favor of slavery, is from an Oration by Owen Van Vaeter, at Oakland College, Miss. in April last.

"The institution of slavery, then—however reviled by ignorant and unprincipled—is a social and political blessing, and rests, for its morality, on the highest authority. Its commencement was announced by an oracle of the Most High in the prophetic sentence against the unfaithful Ham: 'Cursed Ham—a servant of the servants shall he be unto his brethren.' And its continuance is foretold in the vision of St. John, when, through the vista of coming centuries, he saw the end of the world, and beheld 'bondmen' and 'freemen' alike present at the closing scene of time.