



# The Organiser.

BENJAMIN F. DILL, WILLIAM DELAY,  
Editor, Printer and Publisher.

OXFORD, MI.,

Saturday, April 20, 1850.

**ELECTION FOR SECRETARY OF STATE.**—We call the attention of our readers to the proclamation of the Governor in this week's paper, ordering an election for Secretary of State. The election takes place on the 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE NEXT.

Our thanks are again due to our delegation in Congress for valuable public documents. We are particularly obliged to Gen. Foote for his attention.

The Committee of Arrangements, raised at the celebration of the 22d of February last, in this county, are in receipt of a letter from ELSHA WHITNEY, Esq., general agent for the Washington Monument, acknowledging the contribution of thirty-five dollars and forty cents, on the part of our citizens. The Monument, we learn, is progressing rapidly towards completion.

Monday week the Circuit Court commences its session at Oxford.

The rumor which reached this place via Columbus, of the death of Gen. Foote is, in the language of a good old woman, "all a fraud and a hoax." Gen. Foote was in the Senate on the 9th inst. (the day after he was reported to have been killed in a duel) exerting himself to bring about a compromise on the slavery question. He may talk about a compromise with Benton, for that is a personal matter; but we deny his right to speak the word compromise for the people of Mississippi. It is necessary that he should be informed of this, and therefore we request that the press of the State, giving voice to the will of the masses, should speak out, frankly and without hesitation, on this subject.

**ANOTHER RICHMOND IN THE FIELD.**—Dr. Washington Rossman, of Hinds county, is a candidate for Secretary of State. He is a clever man, a competent man and a sound democrat, and all over Southern in his feelings.

Read the article copied from the Memphis Enquirer, a good whig paper. The Enquirer has showed a determination worthy of all praise, to cut loose from party shackles on the momentous slavery question. It is emphatically a southern paper, and should be extensively patronized.

**RETURN OF A COMET.**—Lieut. M. F. Maury communicates to the National Intelligencer some interesting astronomical news. He states that a letter from the Rev. Mr. Jenkins, of Georgetown College, who sailed from Rio in October last, contains the following item:

On October 28th, at 7 1/2 P. M., we saw distinctly a comet to westward, nearly in the track of the sun, and about 14 degrees above the horizon, as measured with the quadrant; the nucleus very distinct, and about large in appearance as Mars; the tail curved and pointed towards the South, (S. W.) quite bright, and nearly a degree in length, as visible to the naked eye but much larger when viewed with a spy-glass. It was seen by all the crew for twenty minutes when a cloud intercepted it, and never more was seen.

It is thought that this may be the great comet of 1664 and 1556, the return of which astronomers are expecting about this time.

**MR. CALHOUN'S SEAT.**—The vacancy in the U. S. Senate occasioned by the death of Mr. Calhoun was tendered to Ex-Gov. Hamilton, by the Governor of S. Carolina, but owing to some misunderstanding in reference to his residence, it was declined—so the place is still vacant. Who is to fill the vacancy? Who can fill it?

**DEEDS WORDS OF MR. CALHOUN.**—The following were the last words of the patriot Statesman. Love of country was the passion strong in death:

"I cannot avoid thinking of the political affairs of the country. If I could have but one hour to speak in the Senate, I could do more good than on any previous occasion of my life."

Ex-Gov. Braxton died on the 29th ult in Wilkinson County.

**FROM WASHINGTON.**—Our dates from Washington City are up to the 9th inst.—Mr. Clay, according to the Union, had made a great pacific speech on the Slavery question. "He expressed the opinion that the mode which most promised success was to combine the admission of California and the settlement of the boundary of Texas in one bill, with the establishment of Governments for the new territories. He believed that was now the most practicable and certain of success, and he was in favor of adopting it."

An adjustment on this territorial basis will give but temporary peace to the country. No substantial benefit to the South or permanent reconciliation can be effected by it. Like the Missouri Compromise it may give quiet for a while, but cannot, in the very nature of things, in this progressive age, out-live the present generation. Difficulties between the free and slave States will be constantly recurring, and the same agitation and excitement will be reproduced in every fresh collision. The North and South must come to some better and more perfect understanding, or the stealthy step of abolitionism will ere long invade the States themselves, our homes, our firesides. We are, therefore, opposed to all compromises on this question. The South claims nothing which is not clearly reserved in, and granted by the Federal Compact, and if she looks to her interest, she will not modify her demand. She claims that the compact shall be construed and administered according to its clear intention and obvious import, in honesty and strictness. This is the length and breadth of her demand; for it is believed that the Constitution gives ample security to slavery in the District, Territories, and States. If it does not, the Southern States should demand this protection, and require as a *sine qua non* to the continuance of the Union, the introduction of a stipulation in the Constitution which will make slavery secure to the South in all time to come.

We are willing to submit all this to the Nashville Convention, having the most unbounded confidence in the delegates sent to it; still, we will not pledge ourselves to adopt or abide by what that body may do. We never surrender our right to judge for ourselves of the acts of public servants.

**JUDGE SHARKEY'S LETTER.**—The publication of this letter, a long and able one, prevents us from writing out our own thoughts on the same subject.

**COTTON at Memphis,** on the 17th, was selling (middling) 104 to 104 1/2; at New Orleans on the 13th, 11 to 11 1/2, having declined 1/2 in consequence of the news brought by the Europa. The receipts since the 1st of September are 714,057 bales, against 551,352 at the same time in 1849, and at all the U. S. ports there is a decrease of 551,601 bales—Planters hold on to your cotton if you can.

**SUBMISSIONISTS READ AND HANG YOUR HEADS.**—A bill has passed one branch of the Ohio Legislature, making it a penal offence for any citizen to aid in the arrest of a fugitive slave from another State. Suppose all the free States pass the same law, as they undoubtedly will, sooner or later, what course will the submissionists then recommend to preserve this glorious Union? A Southern Convention cannot then save it, nor will it be worth preserving to the South. Forewarned, forearmed, the South must if she be not blinded and demented, absolutely fool—struck, see the course of events, and now is the time to provide for our safety. This is no time for procrastination or indecision, and the man who recommends either is in our judgment a most unwise and unsafe counsellor.

**THE CALIFORNIA FRAUD—ANOTHER WITNESS.**—Last week we published an article that so completely exposed the disgraceful attempt to force California upon the Union as an independent and sovereign State, that we doubt whether any man in his senses, can sincerely press her claim, to sovereignty and nationality, still the Abolitionists and Submissionists may pretend to require more light on the subject. We have it in our power this week to introduce a new witness to establish the gross fraud of the California Constitution. The following is extracted from a letter published in a late number of the Columbus Democrat. The Democrat states that it is from the pen of an intelligent man, formerly a citizen of this State—one, who may be relied upon in every particular:

The State government has been formed here and the constitution prohibits slavery. The representatives to Congress are abolitionists, and the Senators are Southerners; Dr. Gwinn of Mississippi and Col. Fremont of South Carolina. I am glad the country has got two Southerners in her delegation. The citizens manifested great indifference about the election. They generally voted the first ticket they got hold of; in the mines the weather being inclement, not one third of the peo-

ple voted at all. At last he election was ended, and the result given, and the paper in giving the result states so many votes for the constitution and so many against it. Of course the majority was greatly in favor of the constitution. I did not see any thing on the tickets, to inform a person which was and which was not a constitution ticket. All I know is that two abolitionists were elected, and their election was declared the adoption of the constitution. It is my impression that when the matter becomes generally known there will be a flare up, as the voters against the constitution were but few, and I know there are quite a number of Southerners in California, who will not abide by it in silence. It is my impression that agriculture will be the main staple here, although gold is still plenty, and as long as there is a particle to be had, white men are not going to till soil; therefore I think it a good idea to introduce a few Mississippi and Louisiana negroes here.

**THE CUBA EXPEDITION.**—The Americans are proverbial for rushing into wild schemes, but this expedition against Cuba is the wildest of all. It is at the present time impracticable—wholly impossible, for the authorities of that Island are on the alert, and ready at any moment with twelve thousand troops, to battle their invaders. Wait a while longer—there is a time for all things.—*Memphis Express.*

We know what we say, when we declare that nine out of ten, of the Cuba Patriots, are ready to strike for their independence. What then, is to prevent success? Let them, the blow be struck, the sooner, the better. Who knows but Cuba may be annexed to the U. States before California?

From the Mississippiian.  
**Letter from Chief Justice Sharkey.**

JACKSON, Miss., April 4, 1850.  
Editors of the National Intelligencer.

GENTLEMEN: Your number of the 14th of March contains an article headed "The proposed Remedy for the Evil of they Day Examined," which does gross injustice to the members of the Convention which met in this place in October last.—The part which it was my fortune to take in that Convention, makes it necessary that I should forego inclination, and appear before the public to repel an unfounded calumny. That article is but the sequel of several which preceded it of less boldness. The public journalist owes it to the country to deal candidly and fairly with the conduct of others, and departing from this duty he is like a swift witness: he betrays his partiality at the cost of his integrity.

Your article is lengthy, and I shall content myself with noticing such portions of it as place the convention in the most prominent point of view. Your title seemed to give promise of discussion, but your essay begins and ends in assertion and denunciation.—You prove one thing however, which may have not been generally known, an entire identity in feeling with the North in its high claims of power on the subject of slavery. Your Northern readers will doubtless feel gratified at your devotion to their favorite measure, but they will not be much enlightened by your argument.—Your Southern countrymen can no longer regard you as neutral. I am not willing that the Convention shall be judged by the open enemies of the South, and still less willing that it shall be condemned on evidence and inferences not found in, or warranted by, its own declarations; and I assert, in the most solemn manner, that motives have been ascribed to the members which they did not entertain.

Your allusion to the Hartford Convention is an artifice which requires no comment to show its object. Its history is given at length, and you conclude from the "mode of composition, and the objects," the Nashville Convention is more deserving of odium. This is condemning it prematurely on assumed grounds. The Convention has not met; its composition cannot be known, or at least but partially known. Its objects are just what the convention of Mississippi expressed them to be. When men have openly and fairly declared their object, it is unjust to ascribe to their motives which they did not express unless the charge can be sustained on more conclusive evidence. My purpose is with the Mississippi Convention, and if you had dealt as fairly by it as you have by the Hartford Convention, no vindication would have been required. The history of one is given at length, but not so with the other. The Hartford Convention pronounced an innocent affair on the strength of the declarations contained in its proceedings; but the Mississippi Convention is not judged by the same rule; its declarations are disregarded, and motives ascribed to which were not expressed. One of its members, and its proceedings were kept secret, at a time when we were at war with a powerful foreign enemy, which had been opposed to the justice of which had been denied by a portion of our people; yet its motives are determined by the journals of its proceedings. The other is with open doors, published its proceedings to the world, and invited discussion; yet it is condemned on what it did not say.

You next allude to the Mississippi Convention, and after setting out its resolutions, say, "these resolutions, certainly, upon no sufficient ground in their averments, the essential part of which, [contained in the second resolution] none but political fanatics (and hardly they) would be found to dispute, but faintly outline the purpose, of which late discussions in and out of Congress hardly leave a doubt, through the instrumentality of the proposed convention, to unsettle the foundations of the Government of the United States. They set out, indeed, with professing a devoted and cherished attachment to the Union, but they beg the question of aggression by the non-slaveholding States, in order to suggest the idea that they (the people of Mississippi) desire to have it only such as they desire." Here is a direct charge of a design to unsettle the foundation of the Government. It is utterly denied that any such purpose was designed. It is denied that any member of the Mississippi Convention had any such object in view; and it is asserted that every member there assembled is a friend to the Union.—The great, the leading object in calling it was to preserve the Union. It is asserted by you that the resolutions but faintly outline the purpose to unsettle the foundations of the Government, but the picture is filled out by the aid of a perverted imagination on the evidences furnished by "discussions in and out of Congress." Why did you not judge the Hartford Convention by "discussions in and out of Congress?" The Mississippi Convention also asks to be judged by its own acts and by its own acts only.

But in the foregoing extract it is also asserted that the essential part of the resolutions is contained in the second, which you say "none but political fanatics would be found to dispute." This is not true; the third resolution is far more important. It denies to Congress the power to legislate on the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia, or prohibit the slave trade between the several States, or to prohibit the introduction of slavery in the Territories of the United States. This is the very gist of the dispute, and yet it is passed over as of no importance. This is the controverted question of right, asserted on one side, and denied on the other, out of which all the danger to the Union has arisen. On this ground the Convention is charged with having "begged the question of aggression by the non-slaveholding States, [I wish the South to mark your language,] for this is the immediate cause of quarrel. We conscientiously believed, and still believe the North claimed too much; that Congress has no power over the subject of slavery in the Territories, the common property of all the States. We believe that the exercise of such power would endanger the Union and to prevent this catastrophe we met. If we have begged the question of aggression, we shall continue in that category. We were sincere in our expressions of attachment to the Union. I believe the whole South is attached to it, and no secret designs are entertained against it in that quarter. You, and others like you, do most to unsettle the foundations of the Government, by claiming for it power which it does not possess—by trying to build up a consolidated fabric on the ruins of State sovereignty, and of the constitution. And if, unfortunately, the future historian shall be compelled to deplore the ruin of the Government and to trace its cause, you and your class of politicians will stand conspicuous in the foreground on the canvass which shall represent the great drama.

But your greatest alarm for the safety of the Union has arisen from a portion of the address prepared under the direction of the convention. That is regarded by you as a full development of the object—a southern confederacy. The language alluded to is this: "Besides, and beyond a popular convention of the Southern States with the view and the hope of arresting the course of aggression, and, if not practicable, then to concentrate the South in will, understanding and action, the convention of Mississippi suggests, as the possible alternate resort, the call, by the Legislatures of the assailed States, of still more solemn conventions, such as should be regularly elected by the people of these States, to deliberate, speak and act with all the sovereign power of the people. Should, in the result, such conventions be called and meet, they may lead to a like regularly constituted convention of all the States, to provide, in the last resort, for their separate welfare, by the formation of a compact and a union that will afford protection to their liberties and their rights. This you call 'the project of a Southern Confederacy confessed—openly and apparently without compunction avowed, and coolly recommended to the con-

sideration of the Southern States." This is an unfair construction. The secondary is made the primary proposition. The accident is made the substance—the alternative, the primary object. The contingency on which a Southern Confederacy was alluded to, has been entirely overlooked—kept out of view. It was spoken of in the address only as a last resort in the event of a failure in "the hope of arresting the course of future aggression." The address did not authorize you to say that a Southern Confederacy was the object; it avows attachment to the Union as did every expression of the convention and as do the whole people of Mississippi. No men live who more desire the perpetuity of the Union than do the signers of that address, if they can have it unimpaird. But they believed with the entire South, that the North had been pressing, and would again endeavor to press, the exercise of power not delegated to Congress by the constitution, and they believed moreover that the South would not submit. Their first hope was to avert the evil by a timely declaration of their rights, but if that should fail, it was natural to look to consequences and to provide for them. The convention did not, as you say, "act under the influence of excited feeling." They met as men who had reflected well; who knew and felt the solemnity of the occasion. In surveying the whole ground, it was but natural—it was prudent—that they should look to the possibility of a failure in their fondest hope. And it was only on that contingency that a single thought was turned to a Southern compact as a means of security, not of choice. I repeat, that we desire no Southern confederacy—we desire the perpetuity of our present Union; but it can only be preserved by keeping every department of the Government within its constitutional limits. And your assertion is without proof.

I quote further from your "examination." You say: "It is no longer matter of inference. There exists a disaffection to the Union, more deeply seated than we had supposed—engendering designs against it, which the mass and body of the people of the South are as little aware of, as we were three days ago; the first germination of which is this project of a Nashville Convention." I am greatly mistaken if the "body of the people of the South" are not fully aware of all the "disaffection of the Union" which exists here, and fully aware too, of the causes of that disaffection. You have imparted no information to them on that subject. The first "germinations" of disaffection grew out of an attack upon their rights. It is singular that you do not undertake to account for this disaffection, and to show us whether it is well or ill founded. Perhaps it may be justifiable. It is said that motive is the impulse to human action, and oppression is the main spring of revolutions. When men desire a change of government, an enlarged liberty is the great object, and changes are never desired when the form of Government is the best that can be established. As ours is of that description, we can have no motive to change it; the attempt to abuse it is what we complain of. If we are disaffected towards the Union [which I deny,] perhaps there may be cause for it, which if removed, would restore harmony. You have seen that there was deep seated discontent on the subject of slavery, and as friends to your country, it was your duty to allay the excitement, if possible. You but provoke the quarrel by taunting the South with infidelity to the Government. If you wish to preserve the Union from danger, tell your Northern friends to press us no further; to forbear. That is the safe course, even if the power be doubtful. They claim to exert it—we deny their right. If they act, they may violate the Constitution, but if they are passive they cannot. By that means peace will be restored. A free government must command the voluntary homage of the people, and whatever tends to weaken their attachment, endangers its existence.

In the further progress of our examination, you array the proceedings of South Carolina, and Virginia Legislatures. These figure before your vision as most appalling proofs of disloyalty to the Union. They are but further developments of the plan, the first "germinations" of which appeared in Mississippi. I see nothing alarming in them beyond a firm determination to maintain their rights; and if there be a secret intention beyond that, I leave you and the movers to settle it.

In your alarms for the safety of the Union, it is matter of wonder that you had not discovered unfriendly indications from other quarters. You have even heard petitions for the dissolution of the Union presented to Congress from the North. You have witnessed an open, palpable infraction of the Constitution by Pennsylvania and other States, by the passage of the laws annulling that provision in the Constitution which secures to the owner the right to recapture his fugitive slave. You have heard it proclaimed in the Senate by a Senator from the North, who was sworn to support the constitution, that a certain clause of that instrument which protects us, was immoral, and, therefore, not binding. You have heard the terrors of dissolution of the Union described by the picture of a vast gulf between the North and the South, "filled and heaped high with the slaughtered bodies of our countrymen," yet this revolting sight would be endured—the reality witnessed, by a member of the Lower House, rather than he would yield his opinions and his object on the subject of slavery. You have heard your own especial favorites declare that dissolution must come rather than the Wilmot Proviso shall be abandoned. You take no alarm at these things, bold and daring as they are. Much as they may show a total disregard for the Union, they are passed over as harmless. You have never been suspected of an over devotion to State sovereignty, or constitutional restrictions, and if the South had claimed power for Congress, instead of denying it, she would have found more friends.

My only motive in making this communication, is to vindicate myself and those with whom I acted, from the charge so unwarrantably made, of unkindness to the Union. We have been actuated by a settled conviction, throughout, that we were right. We believe conscientiously that Congress has no power over the question of slavery, either permissive or prohibitory, and that any action on the subject would be a gross infraction of that instrument. We desire to see the question banished from our National Council-house, and harmony restored; but we warn the North not to expect us to submit. We are quite as firm in our resistance as they are in their encroachment.

That we may stand vindicated, and have that justice to which we are entitled, it is hoped that you will publish this letter, and the proceedings of the Convention, or at least the address, a pamphlet copy of which I send you; and lest the MSS. should be lost, it is published in the papers of this place, from which, in that event, it may be extracted.

Your obt. servant,  
W. L. SHARKEY.

Telegraphed to the Louisville Democrat.  
**Congressional.**  
WASHINGTON, April 10.

The Speaker stated that McClanahan on the Galphin committee would necessarily be absent for a few days and therefore asked to be excused from serving on said committee.

On motion of Mr. Burt Mr. McClanahan was excused and the Speaker was authorized to appoint another in his place.

Bill from committee on Resolutions, Penalties &c., explanatory of certain acts granting five years half pay to widows and orphans of those who have or may hereafter die of wounds received or diseases contracted in the Mexican war, of going to or returning from same.

House—Without coming to conclusion the gentleman who had the floor yielded to go into committee of the Whole upon the state of the Union.

Speaker said he had received a letter from Mr. Gentry stating that he was unable to attend either of the meetings (of the Galphin committee) of the House, and asked to be excused from serving as a member.

Mr. Burt regretted the necessity which induced the application to the House, but he must yield to the request of the gentleman and moved that another member be appointed in the place of Mr. Gentry, which was agreed to.

The House then went into committee upon the California message.—Ross maintained that Congress had no power to establish or prohibit slavery in the territories.

Durr followed Ross, taking opposite grounds. The House then adjourned.

SENATE.—Mr. Hale presented a large number of anti-slavery petitions. Mr. Clay called the attention of the Senate to the fact that a greater portion of these petitions were printed, and similar for the purpose of showing that there was a concerted movement among the abolitionists, to misrepresent public sentiment in various sections of the country, by sending these petitions in blank, to be circulated insidiously and to return them to the Senate. Hale called the Senator to order for speaking without his motion being pending. Clay took his seat greatly excited, and demanded a statement of the point of order. After some conversation on the point of order, Mr. Clay proceeded in a strain of strong denunciation of the abolitionists of the North, as the worst enemies of slavery to the South. He also intimated that Hale had made