

tion in good faith in the territories, and with a clear recognition of the boundary line of Texas in its integrity, and cutting out the full length of the Rio Grande, I would prefer this proposition to the Administration plan, which is full of compromises from end to end, without a single redeeming quality. But this compromise, so-called, I suppose, in decision of which have been heretofore adopted, begins with the unqualified admission of California with her present boundaries. My opposition to this measure is so deeply rooted, as well in its tendency to reject all schemes whatever of which it composes a part. The bill is too nauseating to be taken in connexion with our ingregrated, however palatable. If such an attempt is to be effected, such a precedent established, so improper in itself, and leading to such dangerous consequences. I never wish the future politician who may refer to my course, to say for me, "I did it."

One leading objection to the scheme is that it gives finality to nothing, and therefore, with quiet neither the North nor the South. The Wilmot Proviso is not enacted over the territories, and the bill is so framed that if the future of emigration shall render it necessary, it will be insisted upon.

It will be the starting point of new agitations, of Texas as a new field for contention. The South will insist that slavery has been recognized up to 36° 30'. The North will contend that the derived; and the South being the weaker party, it will have it all its own way.

Having voted for the annexation of Texas, I know it was well understood that she had a disputed boundary, and that she claimed the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source, as her western boundary. Texas was invited to trust the Government of the United States in this matter, and the result was, we obtained no adjustment. Can there be a doubt, then, of our duty and honor?

There has been the right of making four more States; the country expected to be divided into four States. The proposed adjustment will increase by one more slave State, and two free States. To call upon me to sell out the country, and to pay myself the consideration money, which was once solemnly stipulated for, and to be paid upon the extending still further, and swelling larger the disproportion of territory from which the South is excluded, is too extravagant, and it can never be yielded.

But I need not multiply objections; as that bill stands, I should feel myself untrue to my constituents, untrue to myself, untrue to the country at large, to give my support.

The fugitive slave act is a blot upon the States, they are apparently strong enough to repeal the act, but practically they are a dead letter upon the statute books. Public opinion does not demand their enforcement. Even so, it will be with the most stringent fugitive slave law. It will prove a mere mockery. The present States of the North, full and strong enough, if disposed to comply with their constitutional obligations.

The anxiety to suppress the slave trade in this self is only desired to suppress this kind of traffic, which is known to exist in the Southern States, and to make one step forward in the process of abolition of slavery in this District. The moral which impel the movement more than the movement itself, are obnoxious to me.

I come now to the consideration of the question, what shall we do to quiet agitation and remove the different sections of this country from the different sections of the abstract question of the North and the South. So acting the same government, we are to act in an effort from the foundation of a generally true that has honestly endeavored to do good or less good by which we could do more.

I have sought to improve upon the example of the fathers, and I am finally obliged to the firm conviction that the old and at wisest plan, and should be adopted.

At the adoption of our present Constitution, when the celebrated orator instituting slavery northwest of the river Ohio was passed, it was a well understood compromise, and the Ohio river was adopted as the compromise line. And while the first Congress under our Constitution recognized the interdiction of slavery northwest of the Ohio, they established a territory south of the Ohio in which it was sanctioned. Thus they reconciled their difference by a line of partition, and went on harmoniously. But the history of this compromise could not be a precedent for the importation of slaves from abroad had then been inhabited, and if the only question had been as to their locality, whether the slaves then in the country should be allowed to spread, as the interest or inclination of the people of the Ohio, that that ordinance had never found its place among our statutes. As an evidence of this fact, I shall refer to one authority as conclusive on this point. Mr. Madison, in his letter to Mr. Monroe, in 1820, says:

"I have observed as yet in none of the views taken of the ordinance of 1787 interdicting slavery northwest of the river Ohio an allusion to the circumstance that the ordinance was passed with no authority to prohibit the importation of slaves from abroad; that all the States had, and some were in the full exercise of the right to import them; and consequently that there was no mode by which Congress could check the importation, or direct one of narrowing the space open for the reception of slaves."

"Had the federal authority then existed to prohibit directly and totally, the importation from abroad, can it be doubted that it would have been exercised, and that a regulation having merely the effect of preventing the interior disposition of slaves actually in the United States, and creating a distinction among the States in the degrees of their sovereignty, could not have been adopted, or perhaps thought of."

This was the spirit and the cause of that ordinance. If in that day, it had been a question, not of increase of the number of slaves, but simply as to their locality in the United States, I have no doubt the ordinance of 1787 would have been adopted, and the measure having failed, to insist on the measure itself is most unreasonable. The South, fond of the Union, yielded to this discrimination, making the Ohio river the dividing line between slave and free States.

Next in order of time was the purchase of Louisiana, which had an area of 1,075,000 square miles; but if we include Oregon, (our ablest statesmen have claimed that our best title to the country west of the Rocky Mountains is derived from that purchase,) its area would be 1,416,463 square miles. On the bill granting permission to the people of Missouri Territory to form a State constitution, the North resisted her application, till they were forced to yield. The South, which divided the territory acquired by that treaty by the line 36° 30', still bringing the line of division further south, which secured to the North 2,000,000 square miles, and retained 110,000 square miles for the South, when it was adjudged on all sides that the whole territory was subject to be made slave territory. Thus the North took the lion's share of the territory, and the Congress at that time, I have heard repeated this adjustment, though disunion and civil war had been the consequence. This was done in 1820, and the South acquiesced. I regarded it as a decided question, and acting on the principle of stare decisis, I have given vote after vote in conformity with that line of division. When after this partition, by way of making amends to the South, the territory of Texas was ceded into, by which Florida was obtained, and Texas was yielded up, and again we were wronged; but let that pass.

Here I must take occasion to allude to that provision which seems to haunt the imagination of the gentleman from Missouri, and which he offered to the Oregon territorial bill. He offered a proviso prohibiting slavery in that territory. I voted against inserting it in the bill, because I regarded it as dishonorable to the South, and unnecessary. He said that the Missouri compromise as covering that territory, so do I; and therefore it was unnecessary. When it was inserted in the bill, being anxious to furnish those people with a government, and the protection which they were praying at our hands, I voted for the bill. I did so, because I wished to keep good faith. Those who will examine the law will at once see that all who intended in good faith to observe the Missouri compromise could not have done otherwise. There are terms.

That in all that territory ceded by France under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36° 30' north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by that act, slavery or involuntary servitude shall not exist, and the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be and is hereby forever prohibited," &c.

The question then was, did Oregon constitute a part of the Louisiana purchase? Our ablest statesmen so regarded it, and the fact that our Northern statesmen finally acquiesced in 42° 30' north latitude, is evidence that it was made the line of the treaty with Great Britain. Was it north of 36° 30'? Of that there is no question; these two lines heretofore adopted, begins with the unqualified admission of California with her present boundaries. My opposition to this measure is so deeply rooted, as well in its tendency to reject all schemes whatever of which it composes a part. The bill is too nauseating to be taken in connexion with our ingregrated, however palatable. If such an attempt is to be effected, such a precedent established, so improper in itself, and leading to such dangerous consequences. I never wish the future politician who may refer to my course, to say for me, "I did it."

One leading objection to the scheme is that it gives finality to nothing, and therefore, with quiet neither the North nor the South. The Wilmot Proviso is not enacted over the territories, and the bill is so framed that if the future of emigration shall render it necessary, it will be insisted upon.

It will be the starting point of new agitations, of Texas as a new field for contention. The South will insist that slavery has been recognized up to 36° 30'. The North will contend that the derived; and the South being the weaker party, it will have it all its own way.

Having voted for the annexation of Texas, I know it was well understood that she had a disputed boundary, and that she claimed the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source, as her western boundary. Texas was invited to trust the Government of the United States in this matter, and the result was, we obtained no adjustment. Can there be a doubt, then, of our duty and honor?

There has been the right of making four more States; the country expected to be divided into four States. The proposed adjustment will increase by one more slave State, and two free States. To call upon me to sell out the country, and to pay myself the consideration money, which was once solemnly stipulated for, and to be paid upon the extending still further, and swelling larger the disproportion of territory from which the South is excluded, is too extravagant, and it can never be yielded.

But I need not multiply objections; as that bill stands, I should feel myself untrue to my constituents, untrue to myself, untrue to the country at large, to give my support.

The fugitive slave act is a blot upon the States, they are apparently strong enough to repeal the act, but practically they are a dead letter upon the statute books. Public opinion does not demand their enforcement. Even so, it will be with the most stringent fugitive slave law. It will prove a mere mockery. The present States of the North, full and strong enough, if disposed to comply with their constitutional obligations.

The anxiety to suppress the slave trade in this self is only desired to suppress this kind of traffic, which is known to exist in the Southern States, and to make one step forward in the process of abolition of slavery in this District. The moral which impel the movement more than the movement itself, are obnoxious to me.

I come now to the consideration of the question, what shall we do to quiet agitation and remove the different sections of this country from the different sections of the abstract question of the North and the South. So acting the same government, we are to act in an effort from the foundation of a generally true that has honestly endeavored to do good or less good by which we could do more.

I have sought to improve upon the example of the fathers, and I am finally obliged to the firm conviction that the old and at wisest plan, and should be adopted.

At the adoption of our present Constitution, when the celebrated orator instituting slavery northwest of the river Ohio was passed, it was a well understood compromise, and the Ohio river was adopted as the compromise line. And while the first Congress under our Constitution recognized the interdiction of slavery northwest of the Ohio, they established a territory south of the Ohio in which it was sanctioned. Thus they reconciled their difference by a line of partition, and went on harmoniously. But the history of this compromise could not be a precedent for the importation of slaves from abroad had then been inhabited, and if the only question had been as to their locality, whether the slaves then in the country should be allowed to spread, as the interest or inclination of the people of the Ohio, that that ordinance had never found its place among our statutes. As an evidence of this fact, I shall refer to one authority as conclusive on this point. Mr. Madison, in his letter to Mr. Monroe, in 1820, says:

"I have observed as yet in none of the views taken of the ordinance of 1787 interdicting slavery northwest of the river Ohio an allusion to the circumstance that the ordinance was passed with no authority to prohibit the importation of slaves from abroad; that all the States had, and some were in the full exercise of the right to import them; and consequently that there was no mode by which Congress could check the importation, or direct one of narrowing the space open for the reception of slaves."

"Had the federal authority then existed to prohibit directly and totally, the importation from abroad, can it be doubted that it would have been exercised, and that a regulation having merely the effect of preventing the interior disposition of slaves actually in the United States, and creating a distinction among the States in the degrees of their sovereignty, could not have been adopted, or perhaps thought of."

This was the spirit and the cause of that ordinance. If in that day, it had been a question, not of increase of the number of slaves, but simply as to their locality in the United States, I have no doubt the ordinance of 1787 would have been adopted, and the measure having failed, to insist on the measure itself is most unreasonable. The South, fond of the Union, yielded to this discrimination, making the Ohio river the dividing line between slave and free States.

Next in order of time was the purchase of Louisiana, which had an area of 1,075,000 square miles; but if we include Oregon, (our ablest statesmen have claimed that our best title to the country west of the Rocky Mountains is derived from that purchase,) its area would be 1,416,463 square miles. On the bill granting permission to the people of Missouri Territory to form a State constitution, the North resisted her application, till they were forced to yield. The South, which divided the territory acquired by that treaty by the line 36° 30', still bringing the line of division further south, which secured to the North 2,000,000 square miles, and retained 110,000 square miles for the South, when it was adjudged on all sides that the whole territory was subject to be made slave territory. Thus the North took the lion's share of the territory, and the Congress at that time, I have heard repeated this adjustment, though disunion and civil war had been the consequence. This was done in 1820, and the South acquiesced. I regarded it as a decided question, and acting on the principle of stare decisis, I have given vote after vote in conformity with that line of division. When after this partition, by way of making amends to the South, the territory of Texas was ceded into, by which Florida was obtained, and Texas was yielded up, and again we were wronged; but let that pass.

Here I must take occasion to allude to that provision which seems to haunt the imagination of the gentleman from Missouri, and which he offered to the Oregon territorial bill. He offered a proviso prohibiting slavery in that territory. I voted against inserting it in the bill, because I regarded it as dishonorable to the South, and unnecessary. He said that the Missouri compromise as covering that territory, so do I; and therefore it was unnecessary. When it was inserted in the bill, being anxious to furnish those people with a government, and the protection which they were praying at our hands, I voted for the bill. I did so, because I wished to keep good faith. Those who will examine the law will at once see that all who intended in good faith to observe the Missouri compromise could not have done otherwise. There are terms.

That in all that territory ceded by France under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36° 30' north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by that act, slavery or involuntary servitude shall not exist, and the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be and is hereby forever prohibited," &c.

der to shoulder we have gone through many a hard contest; together we have suffered, together we have triumphed and rejoiced. In our grand power, wrong us not; attempt not to trample down our proud American spirit, or to force us to adjust the negro question in terms of social equality with ourselves. It will be said, We are your equals in honor, in character, in virtue, in religion, in charity, in patriotism; your equals we shall remain. But deal with us as you would have them to do to you under similar circumstances, and our country will be happy, prosperous, and contented, and ours will be a bright and glorious destiny.

THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

CITY OF WASHINGTON.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1850.

DEATH OF PRESIDENT TAYLOR.

It is our melancholy duty to announce the death of Gen. ZACHARY TAYLOR, President of the United States. He expired last night at twenty-five minutes of eleven. He was aware of his approaching dissolution, and two hours before his death declared he had done his duty to his country. May he rest in peace.

He was fortunate in his life, and we think in his death. His splendid military achievements, won the admiration of his countrymen, his simplicity of character a large measure of their confidence. He has departed at a crisis which he could scarcely have passed without danger or disaster to his renown.

The suddenness of his illness, and its catastrophe, has appalled the community, and inspired the most solemn and gloomy feelings. Less than a week ago he was in good health; he is now no more. Let us trust that this dispensation of Providence is one of mercy rather than wrath.

Mr. BUTLER, of South Carolina, had the honor yesterday in the Senate, and commenced a searching and thorough examination of the Compromise scheme, now before that body, as embodied by his rare powers of illustration and sarcasm. He gave way, before concluding, to a motion to adjourn made by Mr. WEBSTER, in consequence of the illness of President Taylor.

The Rights of Property—Abolition and Agrarianism.

It has always been contended by Southern statesmen, and by the more far-sighted and sagacious of their Northern brethren, in the better days of the Republic, that the crusade by the Abolition agitators against one peculiar description of property, would lead to the denial of the right to hold other species of property also, as an infringement of natural rights.

Following an inevitable sequence, the principles on which Abolition is based, must lead its advocates to agrarianism—and "the rights of man," under their construction, antagonizing directly with the rights of property, must be made to override all obstructions to the attainment of universal equality. The same cant of philanthropy that rises loudly in the Legislature and the market-place—in the highways and by-ways—proclaiming the "inalienable rights" of man for the public good, we see in the true principle to urge his "inalienable right" to land also.

"Am I not a man and a brother," says the model Free-soiler, "and shall you monopolize more of the earth than you can possibly need to supply your wants, or even your luxuries—while I cannot claim or occupy an acre? While you are so strenuously asserting the inalienable rights of the black slave, shall you be allowed to neglect and refuse the inalienable rights of the white freeman? We will take care that you do not—we will insist on our share of our common heritage."

Such, substantially, is the language now used by the followers of Owen, Wright, Abolition, &c., but by the more practical operatives of Free-soil agitators—and it is only a natural corollary to their propositions. Substitute for the settled provisions of written constitutions the opinions of each individual, founded on his crude notions of "a higher law"—make each man's private judgment the tribunal for establishing the rights of property—in one word, substitute conscience for the constitution, and Mr. SEWARD's construction of its provisions for those of his framers—and the reign of Anarchy, the millennium of Free-soil, will have arrived.

The doctrine, however, is not original either with Mr. SEWARD or his satellites: it is a foreign exotic, not a native product. Its earliest and most eloquent apostle was JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU—baptized in blood, it passed down to ROBESPIERRE, and his mantle has recently been assumed by PROUDHON. So that Senator SEWARD stands now before the American public arrayed in the shreds and patches of this cast-off garment, a world too wide for his intellectual proportions scanty as it is.

But his pioneers were bolder far than he—they swept down upon their destined victims, the privileged classes, (as they called them,) with the screen and swoop of the hungry vulture—they did not silently wind their stealthy way up to them with the sly sinuities of the serpent. Had the Senator, in his late speech, cited the examples and the precepts of these his true prophets, instead of seeking the shelter of a great and glorious name, by striving to assimilate himself to ALGERNON SIDNEY, he would have done but justice to all. That patriot wrote, fought and fell for the maintenance of rights and the protection of property, which a despotic power sought illegally to wrest from himself, his neighbors, and the charter of their common country. His position was identically that of the men now stigmatized as Southern ultras—standing up for right against might, and braving the clamor that would call it treason. There was nothing of the subterranean—of the sapper and miner, in the mind, heart, or soul of ALGERNON SIDNEY—nothing in his life or death to assimilate him to the philanthropists of this day.

It is said that a certain well known character can "quote scripture for his purposes." So can demagogues and fanatics pervert and parody the utterances of patriots, to subvert their ends and screen their selfish purposes.

We propose to show that this Free-soil school is founded on the same basis as that instituted by these French "reformers," and the parallel can be very easily drawn. The cardinal and fundamental doctrine of PROUDHON, its modern preacher, is condensed into the pithy maxim that

"All Property is Robbery."

Senator Seward and his disciples have not yet adopted their full extent the doctrines of the master—for we presume that the former would strenuously oppose a division of his fees, per diem and mileage, with them; and they in turn

would be equally loath to divide their personal pickings and perquisites with the whole brotherhood of man. Yet as far as it could be done, without personal expense or inconvenience, they have carried out the doctrine as far as relates to two of the most important shapes property assumes, viz: in slaves and in land. The recent movements made both in and out of Congress in reference to both these interests, conclusively show that Abolition and Agrarianism are Siamese twins; the conditions regulating the existence of the one, also controlling the other.

There is not a proposition laid down by Senator SEWARD, in relation to the abolition of slavery, that does not equally apply to the abolition of property of all kinds, and more especially of landed estates. The title of both is based upon the same general truths, and may be assailed, by the same appeal to some "higher law," or "inalienable right."

The Senator himself must see this; but he has also the sagacity to see that such a "general overturn" *culture generale*, as the French schools call it—would not promote his interests; he views; he therefore modifies his policy, by "giving Cerberus a sop" in the shape of bounty land bills, and free farms from the public domain. Not so all of his followers: They are not equally politic, but insist in pushing the principles to their legitimate conclusions. We have seen a paper, published in New York City, (and possibly there may be many others elsewhere,) which had at its head an engraving of a naked man sitting on the globe, under the motto, "the earth is the common property of all her children."

Not only are these doctrines avowed, and this position proclaimed by Northern Free-soilers, but in the giant Northwest these fatal heresies are taking root. In the *Ohio Standard*, published at Cleveland, we find the editor warmly endorsing and endorsing a communication, in which the platform of the party is thus laid down. The writer begins by quoting a letter addressed to him by a gentleman who "holds a distinguished post of honor and trust" in that State, to the following effect:

"I agree with you in thinking that the platform of the 'Free Democracy' ought to be broad enough to include all the reforms in the political and social condition of men which are within the proper scope of legislation. I think, also, that the several reforms which you specify, are all of them, and should be included in the platform, nevertheless, that political progress, like all others, is *gressu*—if I may coin a word—that is, step by step. And the step to be taken first, is the abolition of slavery. The principle of the platform should reach forward to the last step. The movement must necessarily begin with the first."

In my judgment the first step rationally, in any real progress in this country, is the rescue of the government from the control of the slave power, whose base it is that the slave holding ascendancy has saved the country from the horrors of agrarianism—under which name slaveholders and aristocrats stigmatize all real progress. This they do not claim, but they do it in the true principle. When this is done, the road will be clear to other reforms. My first labors, therefore, are directed to the overthrow of the slave power and denationalization of slavery. I do not, however, lose sight of other reforms."

To these views the writer demurs, though concurring in the benevolent purposes expressed. He is impatient, and thinks the process too slow.

"Now, for my part, I cannot see any good reason why the 'Free Democracy' should wallow in this very desirable object is attained, before it inscribes upon its banner the absolute and unconditional freedom of public lands to actual landless settlers—provided it believes this policy to be the best for the country. But granting the public land question to be the *second step* in the true progressive movement, as to national policy, and that the 'Free Democracy' should not take that step until it has *denationalized* slavery, my friend will not claim that the *second step* is not in its State policy, by limiting the amount of land to be acquired by one individual, until this is accomplished. No. He claims no such delay, as he would prefer to proceed by referring to the quotations from his letter, and I have there in the true principle 'Free Soil' authority for making 'Land Limitation' an issue in the coming contest. And this in fact is the main question. The sale, at present, of land to speculators, and the free grant, (aside from permitting speculators to purchase,) to actual landless settlers only, are matters of little moment compared with this master evil of our land system."

Adding this remark:

"I have some, but not an extensive, acquaintance with Free-Soilers, and so far as that acquaintance extends, all are avowed advocates of land reform."

No comments could make this matter plainer: that such are the real results, and the inevitable consequences of the first step, no sane man can doubt. The same wild idea of the inalienable right of man to land, as well as to liberty, was proclaimed at a late meeting in Wisconsin, and with much ingenuity of argument by the speakers at a Land Reform Mass Meeting, the proceedings of which we shall publish to-morrow. For the present we propose to make a few brief extracts.

Mr. HOWE, (one of the speakers) "wanted to re-nature the law of Nature," (therein differing from Mr. Webster,) and thereby render the soil free for the use of mankind." He was warmly applauded, and gave way to Mr. INGALLS, who said that "Land-monopoly was the parent of slavery, and contributed more to its extension and perpetuity, than all other causes combined."

"The condition of our people under it, but little better than human bondage."

Mr. VAN AMRINGE said, among other things, that "Land-monopoly in our country was rapidly on the increase, far more so than most persons suspect, unfamiliar as they are with the facts. It is growing beyond all conception in the Eastern States; it is so in the Western States, and in our own State. Speculators have forestalled the actual settler, and emigrants are now compelled to press far out beyond the verge of civilization, and to pass over the extended hand of the non-resident speculator."

He concluded by offering the following series of resolutions:

1. Resolved, that it is mockery to declare that all men have a natural, inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

2. Resolved, that all men have an inalienable right to a Home, no one man, and no company of men, have a right to monopolize all the Homes; and that Land Limitation is a cardinal and essential principle of the Republic.

3. Resolved, that Mechanics and others who do not wish farms, must be guaranteed building lots and out-lots, in towns, villages, and cities, and that no Land Bill is a just one which does not provide for them.

4. Resolved, that we witness with pleasure the progress made by Land Reform in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress, and among the People, and we pledge ourselves to bend our energies to the establishment of the measures of this great reform, which is fundamental to all others.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

If such are the fruits of Free-Soil in the green-tree, what may we expect from it in the dry? License for liberty—Anarchy for order—a short reign of equality, to be succeeded by a bloody revolution, if not a reign of terror, un-

der some subtle demagogue, whose love for humanity all centers in his own person, and who raises the storm that he may ride upon his waves to power over the wreck of "Liberty, the Constitution, and the Union."

The aspect of the times is rapidly becoming revolutionary. He must be smitten with judicial blindness who does not see and feel it. It becomes, therefore, the duty of all who can give a sound and healthy tone to public sentiment, either from the pulpit, the press, or the Legislature, to do it speedily; for the bats that love the twilight—the purblind expounders of natural rights—can be driven into their native obscurity by the bright light of reason and of truth.

An owl can endure the sun-light just about as long as this "Comus and his crew" could resist full and fair discussion of their principles before the people. From their own mouths let them be condemned.

The "self yept" Union editor admits that in 1848 he took the ground that the South "would acquiesce in the Missouri Compromise line," and in nothing less. But he says he did not make it a *sine qua non* or ultimatum, which he complains of us for doing, for he would agree to any adjustment as favorable to the South as that Compromise. Well, did we not say that the line of 36° 30', or its equivalent was our ultimatum? What is the difference to a plain man between our position now, and the Union's in 1848?

The Union however now maintains that what he calls the non-intervention policy of the pending plan, is as good for the South as the Missouri Compromise or better. Well, we would like some ingenious man to show what possible chance the South has by the plan now proposed, of obtaining one inch of the territory in dispute, or even of retaining what we thought we secured to us in Texas by the terms of annexation.

But by the Missouri Compromise line extended to the Pacific, the South certainly has a chance of occupying the Territory of California south of that line, and is sure of retaining her Texan territory.

As for the stand that General Cass has taken against the Wilmot Proviso and in favor of non-intervention, as he understands it, we cannot conceal from ourselves and our readers, that he and his friends have rendered the latter policy acceptable at home, by contending that it would operate as effectually to exclude the South from all territory, as the Wilmot proviso. And we are not oppressed with admiration of such justice or gratitude for such liberality as that.

But General Cass has intimated that he might vote for the Missouri Compromise to save the Union. We think the safety of the Union depends on the success of that plan. If General Cass will thus vote, he will give substantial proof of his title to Southern regard—to the regard of all friends of the Union. And none will be more ready than we to recognize his patriotism in so doing. If his constituents will not support him in such a course, they are unfaithful to that Union they profess to love so much; they prove themselves ready to sacrifice it to their own lust of territorial or political aggrandizement, attempting to exclude their brethren from a soil and climate they themselves will never occupy.

As for the line of policy which General Cass now pursues, we deny it to be non-intervention. It gives the intervention of Congress to sanction an exorbitant claim of territory by California—a claim designedly exorbitant to accomplish the object of the Wilmot Proviso—to determine by the will of the people of the North the institutions of the people yet to colonize South California, and to exclude the South from all share of it.

As for our desire to modify the Missouri Compromise, so as to obtain guarantees for slavery south of the line, all we propose, is to provide that all property recognized as such in the several States, shall be recognized south of the Missouri line. Otherwise the South might, after conceding to the North by act of Congress, all north of that line be excluded from her portion south of it, by the enforcement of Mexican law. And no man who is disposed in good faith to adjust this controversy on the basis of the Missouri Compromise, can hesitate to make the terms clear and explicit.

We seek no recognition or guarantee by Congress of slavery. The South asks no such endorsement of her institutions. But we desire the rights of American citizens under American laws and on American soil to be held paramount to Mexican law.

It is in vain to evade the merit of the position the South has now assumed. She stands acquitted of all ultraism by taking it. She cannot be bewildered by sophistry—she cannot be deluded by cunning—she cannot be intimidated by abuse or by threats to abandon it. Every day conviction attends her argument, harmony increases in her councils, and confidence in her cause.

If the third class of opponents, the Southern non-interventionists, could be reconciled, the bill would certainly be a law; but they, unfortunately, demand what is difficult to grant. They ask that Congress shall guarantee protection to slave property which shall be transported to the territories; that Congress cannot establish slavery in a territory—all that can be done is, to throw the door open alike to emigration from the North and South, leaving the people, in the formation of their constitution, to adopt or reject slavery, as they may consider expedient. And this the compromise bill proposes to do, by prohibiting the territorial legislature from acting on the subject of slavery in any form. What more can be obtained for the South? We confess that we do not see how legislation can confer other advantages; but, if there be any plan, consistent with justice, let the tried. We are content with the Compromise bill as it stands, because we see in its passage the restoration of harmony and good feeling—the overthrow of the Free-Soil party—and the constitutional protection of Southern rights. Reject that bill, and the nation may become tempest-torn, and the interest of the South be sacrificed.

Baltimore Clipper.

All we ask is, that the South may have the right to enter the territory without obstruction from Mexican law or any other law. We are willing to abide by the decision of the people of the territory when they are entitled to admission as States, as to whether slavery shall remain or not.

Mr. STEVENS said:

"I am opposed to the diffusion of slavery, because confining it within its present limits will bring the States themselves to its gradual abolition. Let this disease spread, and although it will render the whole body leprous and loathsome, yet it will long survive. Confine it, and like the cancer that is tending to the heart, it must be eradicated, or it will eat out the vitals. The sooner the patient is convinced of this, the sooner he will procure the healing operation."

"Yes, sir; this admitted result, to my mind one of the most agreeable consequences of the legitimate restriction of slavery. Confine this maldy within its present limits, surround it by

a cordon of freemen that it cannot spread, and in less than twenty-five years, every slaveholding State in this Union will have on its shores a free people, and the great and final extinction of the very. Then will have been consummated the fondest wishes of every patriot's heart. Then will our fair country be glorious, indeed; and be to posterity a bright example of the true principles of government—or universal freedom."

My colleague has been subjected to not a little severe criticism from Southern gentlemen for the expression of these sentiments. I can tell gentlemen from the South, that this language is by no means peculiar to my colleague. They are as far as I know, the sentiments of the entire North. That speech has been again and again republished both in English and German, and circulated by thousands. This sentiment is of no new growth. I doubt not that my colleague has learned it at his mother's knee, and these lessons are seldom forgotten.—Speech of Hon. John W. House, of Pennsylvania.

Confine the North to its present limits, and ere long, pauperism, crime, vice and disease, will eat out her vitals, or the vast horde of the victims of these ills, controlling the ballot-box, will rise against the institution of property and the rewards of industry; and plunder, socialism and anarchy will overspread that region to be followed by desolation and the stripes of rapine and famine, until military despotism rises on the ruins of their boasted freedom.

The name of Hon. Robert W. Johnson of Arkansas, as a signer of the Southern address in behalf of this paper, was in the copy furnished us changed to William R. Johnson. We correct it to day.

A friend has sent us the following Correspondence:

The Clayton Compromise and the Clay Compromise.

HARPER'S FERRY, July 6, 1850.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your copy of late, that the Clayton Compromise is a compromise to the South all that the Clayton Compromise professes to do, and a good deal more. I do not profess to know how this is myself, but I have heard that Mr. Calhoun and other enlightened Southerners should have said, that the South would be content with the Clayton Compromise as to the Territorial question, and if the Clayton Compromise conceded the same and would not allow why in the name of peace do we not accept it, and be done with it?

Yours, A COMPROMISER.

If "Compromiser's" premises were true, I should hardly dissent from what he advises; but the Clayton Compromise falls deplorably short of reaching all to the South that the other does; though I admit it aims at more, and would be all the better for the surplus, if it were of the right sort, and would ensure that the remedy would not aggravate the disease. A very summary contrast will show in what the differences between the measures consist; and point to the sources of preference between them.

1. The Clayton Compromise was silent about the Wilmot Proviso, north or south of the line of the Missouri Compromise; withheld from the Territorial Legislatures of Utah and New Mexico all powers of legislation to admit or exclude slavery, and referred to the Supreme Court of the United States the question, whether the Mexican laws prohibiting slavery, survived the cession and remained in force in these territories?

The Clayton Compromise, in express terms through necessary implications, does the same.

2. The Clayton Compromise subjected the whole of California both north and south of 36° 30' to the same provisions which it adopted to the Territories of Utah and New Mexico.

The Clayton Compromise does nothing of the sort, but gives the direct sanction of Congress to the establishment of the Wilmot Proviso, both north and south of the line, and excluding Southerners from the whole thoroughly and always.

3. The Clayton Compromise took not an acre from the slave territory of Texas, to doom to the dominion of Freesoilism, nor consequently a dot from the South's pocket to pay for it.

Mr. Clay's Compromise slices from the slave territory of Texas, territory enough to make two or more States, and destitute it irrevocably to the sovereignty and ascendancy of Freesoilism—provides an unsearchable asylum for fugitive slaves, and exacts \$6,000,000, out of the South's Exchequer, to bribe herself, to cheat herself out of her own jurisdiction, and her own sovereignty!

4. The Clayton Compromise contained no provisions touching the reclamation of fugitive slaves—neither assisting nor obstructing claimants in pursuit of them.

The Clayton Compromise essentially embarrasses, delays and obstructs their recovery, by exacting the production of record proofs, as the super-added and indispensable conditions of their surrender and delivery; and after the claimants have proven their slaves and fugitives upon the highest species of testimony, it confers an option on the fugitives to bind their owners in penal bonds of \$1,000, payable to (whom think ye?) the United States forthwith, to secure them jury trials by way of appeals from the judgments of the federal judges and commissioners in the free States, who have never in 60 years surrendered a fugitive who was not a slave, and (to the credit of Southerners be it said,) have never been asked to do so!

5. The Clayton Compromise deals with slavery in the District of Columbia, as the Constitution of the United States, and the cessions of Virginia and Maryland dealt with it half a century ago; being powerless to meddle with it, it lets it alone.

The Clayton Compromise, under color of abating negro-traders' shambles and slave-marts as public nuisances, indiscriminately emancipates every slave brought into the District for private sale to supply the wants of the citizens within it, or to discharge the obligation of their debtors beyond it, and thus abandoning to the mercies of the fanatics and to Congress, all the restraints of the Constitution and the public faith, against federal legislation upon the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia!

Such are the contrasts which mark the difference between the one, and our irreconcilable hostility to the other. Is "Compromiser" satisfied?

DEATH OF THE HON. W. H. BROCKENBROUGH. The Tallahassee Floridian and Journal, of 29th ult., says:—We should our columns in black as a token of respect to the memory of this distinguished gentleman, whose melancholy death occurred in Tallahassee, on Wednesday, August 1st morning, June 28th. By his demise Florida has lost perhaps the most brilliant intellect within her limits. None who knew him well, failed to avow to the deceased the possession of genius of high order. He only needed continuance of life, connected with physical vigor proportioned to his mental strength, to have risen to the eminent rank among the great names of the Republic. Mr. Brockenbrough was 37 years of age the 23d of February last. We hope that some friend, whose ability better fits for the work, will furnish us an appropriate obituary notice.

HEALTH OF BALTIMORE.—The whole number of deaths in this city last week was 114, two more than in the corresponding week last year. Week before last the deaths in Baltimore were 99, or 18 less than in the same week of 1849. These facts show an increase of 24 in the mortality here in a single week this season, consequent of course upon the increased heat in all quarters, producing the usual bowel diseases, there being 25 deaths by cholera infantum, whereas there were only 12 the week previous by that complaint. Two were by drinking cold water.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BALTIMORE, July 9, p.m.

Premature announcement of the President's Death.

Travelling Mail—Fire—Wheeling Bridge Issue—Markets, &c.

The announcement this morning of the dangerous condition of President Taylor took the city by surprise, and the subsequent despatches this morning, announcing the dangerous aspect of his disease, caused the most anxious inquiries up to one o'clock, when despatches were received by some of the papers announcing his death. In a few minutes a dozen flags on Baltimore street were suspended as half-mast, which was followed by the shipping in the harbor, and the Church and its bells throughout the city were tolling a solemn requiem for the dead. It was however found that the flag had received despatches later than those announcing his death, which reported him still living, and some hopes still remaining for his recovery. This soon spread through the city in turn, the bells ceased ringing and the flags were lowered, enabling us all to breathe freer again, and still entertain a hope of his final recovery.

The travelling mail yesterday between Lady Moscov and Lady Suffolk, afforded but little sport. Lady Suffolk distanced Moscov in the first heat, then winning the purse in 21. 31s. Lady Bevan and Roanoke try their speed again to-day.

The following gentlemen were last night elected Democratic candidates for Delegates, to the State Constitutional Reform Convention, to assemble in this city, at the close of this month:—Chas. G. Mc. Gwinn, Robt. G. Brent, Geo. W. Sherwood, David Stewart, Elias Ware, Jr., and Jas. Carroll.

A despatch from Washington to some of the Northern papers state that Chancellor Walworth, to whom the Wheeling bridge case was referred has pronounced it a nuisance, and a serious obstruction to the free navigation of the Ohio river.

The large warehouse of Wm. G. Price, on Lombard street, fruit and commission merchant, was totally destroyed by fire at 4 o'clock this morning.

The fire in Brooklyn, on Sunday last, was a tremendous affair, the loss not falling much short of a million of dollars. Among the items lost was 1200 hds. of molasses; 600 hds. sugar; 600 tons of guano; 900 tons saltpetre, &c.

THE MARKETS.

At auction to-day—

150 lbs. P. R. Sugar	5,156.50
30 " " " "	2,142.41
131 " Cuba Sugar, 40 solid (balance withdrawn)	5,156.50
38 " hds. P. R. Molasses	21
38 " Cuba Molasses	17 1/2
13 " Sugar House Syrup	21 1/2

We hear of no sales of Flour or Wheat worth reporting.

No Corn offering, and prices continue nominal.

Boston, July 8th.

A hearing was held this morning before the Committee on Pardon, in the case of Professor Webster.

A petition was presented for clemency, signed by 988 persons of New York city—two from Franklin county, New York, and two from Michigan.

The Lieutenant Governor stated that a large number of petitions for a commutation of the unhappy sentence was received from all parts of the country—one from Mr. Green, a jurymen in the case, and one or three others from persons who said they themselves committed the murder, and not Professor Webster.

Several medical men were present, and showed that a blow on the head, such as that which Professor Webster said he received from Dr. Parkman, could not have caused death in so short a time.

Mr. Edwin Jarvis cited two instances to prove the ungenerous temper of Professor Webster, and how soon it was over. In one case, Dr. Webster, when a student, commenced the play of knocking off of hats with a fellow student, in which Webster got rather the worst of it. Finally, Webster got enraged, seized a stick, and would have given his companion a deadly blow, had he not been prevented. The next morning he was all over with him, and he did not evince the least resentment whatever.

At another time, while in London, Professor Webster was being struck, and nearly all the Professors of Harvard College, praying for a commutation of punishment, not on the ground of his confession—he, as they say, having forgotten the blow—he believed—but on the great probability that exists that the act was not premeditated.

Professor Bowen urged a delay in order to obtain more direct proofs in the case.

The case was then postponed until the 18th inst.

THE CHOLERA IN CINCINNATI.

CINCINNATI, July 8.

The Board of Health report, for the twenty-four hours ending yesterday evening, 87 deaths, 50 of which were of Cholera.

DEATH OF S. S. PRENTISS.

NATCHEZ, July 3.

The eloquent and gifted Senator S. S. Prentiss, who represented Mississippi in Congress a few years ago died here to-day, after a severe illness of several weeks.

PHILADELPHIA, July 9—2 P. M.

The weather here is quite pleasant to-day.

Flour continues dull, and prices range from \$5.12 to \$5.35 for shipping brands.

Wheat is dull, and sales of red at 130a129c., and white at 130c.

Provisions dull at last quotations.

	1850.	1849.
February 2nd sales,	846	3,718
March "	2,106	674
April "	1,342	385
May "	316	139
June "	6,641	6,336
Decrease,		296

The Troops at the Western Posts.

The Washington Republic publishes orders from the War Department, in which, agreeably to the act recently passed by Congress to encourage the rank and file of the army, and to encourage enlistments, it is directed that the light artillery companies be increased to 64 privates each; while the companies of the army on duty at the posts in Texas, New Mexico, California, Oregon, and the posts in the Territory, are to be each increased to 74 privates. At the stations in Texas, New Mexico, and the new posts on the Canadian and Arkansas rivers, where there is no regular mounted force, one half of each infantry company is to be equipped and mounted as cavalry, under the direction of the commanding officer of the military department where they may be serving.

Previous orders, reducing company organizations below 42 privates are repealed. The commanding officers at the posts in the above named territories are to recruit for their companies and their regiments; and, to encourage enlistments, the following bounties are offered: in the 8th, \$117; in the 11th, \$142; at Fort Snelling, \$23; at Fort Gaines, \$27; at the post of Fort Kearney, \$34;