

HILLSBOROUGH RECORDER.

UNION, THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAWS—THE GUARDIANS OF OUR LIBERTY.

Vol. XXXI.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1850.

No. 1535.



LOVE THAT DIETH NOT.

Love not alone the gay,
The beautiful, the bright;
For youth will fade away,
Like day-beams into night.
But love the heart that's pure,
How plain so'er the face;
Such love will long endure—
Such love cannot decay.

Love not alone on earth,
Those transient things of life,
Who, like the rainbow's birth,
Soon fade midst shadowy strife.
But love the Power that made
All that to man is given—
Whose spirit doth pervade,
The universal Heaven.

Love all things, great and small,
From man to tiny flower;
Created were they all
By an Almighty power.
For "God is Love" we know,
Whate'er may be our lot;
In life, then, let us show
The Love that dieth not.

Hon. J. C. Fremont.

The history of this young man is highly interesting. A few years ago he was a lieutenant in the army, attached to the corps of Topographical engineers. His business called him much to Washington, where he became acquainted with the second daughter of Hon. Thos. H. Benton. Young, vivacious, and ambitious, this stripling in epaulettes had the temerity to ask the young lady's hand in marriage, notwithstanding he knew those much higher in authority had solicited the same in vain. Miss Benton readily consented, so far as she was concerned, but intimated that she had a father who had manifested some degree of interest in her welfare, and might want to be consulted in the matter. She laid the "proposal" before the old gentleman. He objected to the proposition in toto. "His daughter, educated for a Prince, was not going to marry a Corporal." Fremont was forbidden to enter his domicile, and Miss Benton was put under guard. "Old Tom" had over-acted the matter. He did not then know the young lieutenant. His daughter, too, took that occasion to show her Benton, and as "Old Tom" had stuck to the "Expunging Resolutions," she was bound to stick to her young lover against the world. The next the anxious father heard of his once devoted daughter, she had escaped her keepers, and in a private parlor at Gadsby's Hotel, was interchanging vows before a magistrate with the young lieutenant.

At first the old man raved, but soon was made acquainted with the metal of his son-in-law,—a reconciliation took place, and in Old Tom, Fremont has not only had a friend, but an admirer ever since.

His travels, researches, scientific explorations, and feats of valor and suffering in the Far West, are events known to the world, and we may say are without a parallel.

His collision with Kearny, in California, brought him before the country in a new light. He was accused of disobeying the commands of his superior, and technically so convicted on trial, by a court-martial demanded by himself. But the country acquitted him, and although reprimanded by the President, he was applauded by the people. We were present at the trial in Washington, and saw him confront the witnesses for the Government, in the most frank and gallant style. Old Tom sat by him as counsel, and "solitary and alone" he encountered the craft of Kearny and the contumely of a naval and military court prejudiced against the aspiring young Lieutenant then luxuriant with the rank of Colonel. Dismissed from the army, he scorned to be reinstated, but he recommended his explorations on his own account. He raised a company of men and started for California by a new route, with Kit Carson the famous old guide at their head. Ten of his men he lost in snow and literally starving and freezing to death. With the remnant he reached San Francisco, and has been spending the summer in the mines. In the meantime a Commission reaches him superseding Col. Weller as Boundary Commissioner under the late treaty with Mexico. This he declines, and the next we hear of him, he is elected a United States Senator from the new State of California, and is now quietly awaiting the admission of his State, to take his seat among the "grave and reverend" Senators of the Union.

Mr. Fremont will be the youngest member of the Senate, his age being less than forty. With the exception of Gen. Houston, no one in that body can boast of so eventful a life.

THE BEST RECOMMENDATION.

A young man a few years since came to this city from an adjacent county, seeking employment. It was his first visit here, having been reared by a pious mother who was naturally adverse to her son's seeing the world and becoming acquainted with its vices.

But the son grew up and longed for an opportunity to become learned and exalted.

His father, willing to gratify him, procured testimonials from some of the first men in the State, and sent his son forth to seek his fortune.

He came here in all his serendity and in the beauty of purity. He entered a certain counting room and inquired if they wanted a clerk, and was told they did not.

"I can give you good recommendations," said he, and turning his papers for his bag to find his letters, a large book rolled upon the floor.

"What book is that," said the merchant.

The boy caught it up and kissed it, and presenting it, said, "it is the Bible."

"A singular book to bring with you from the country," said the merchant, "here in New York; can you tell me what you intend to do with it here?"

The boy looked seriously into the merchant's face, as if to discover whether he meant to reproach him. The tears gushed into his eyes as he replied,

"I promised my Mother that I would read it every day, and I shall do it."

The merchant was satisfied, and immediately engaged his services.

Years have passed, but the lad has kept his promise. He has read his mother's gift daily.

Perseverance, industry, and a diligent improvement of his time, have made him a partner in the firm, while charity and christian purity have rendered him an object of general admiration.

As he now with his young wife, peruses daily the pages of that Bible, he sometimes relates to her the incident that made that book the recommendation that brought upon him her father's favor.

The Rope Dancer.—It is in the humbler classes of society, that the most beautiful sparks often shine. A fire broke out in a house at Alencon, the flames of which made rapid progress, and produced dreadful ravages. An entire family was saved by an unknown man, who sealed the walls with a wonderful agility, treading with dexterity the burning beams, and who, from an abyss of fire, extricated victim after victim, in the midst of acclamations from the spectators. This man was Joseph Pledge, who exercised the humble profession of a rope dancer; and it was the agility and dexterity developed by his occupation, that enabled him to save a whole family, by venturing on narrow and moving surfaces to snatch them from the flames. The company to which the worthy Pledge belonged, were preparing to quit Alencon, but their departure was delayed, to give him a benefit. The theatre was crowded in every part, and thunders of applause greeted the courageous rope dancer, who, covered with burns and bruises, endeavored to merit the enthusiasm by which he was overwhelmed. When the receipts, which were considerable, were handed to him, Joseph Pledge presented the whole amount to the family he had saved. "These poor people," said he, "are ruined; what good shall I have done to have saved them from the flames, if I leave them to the horrors of starvation?"

The authorities gave a medal of honor to the brave man who had displayed so much humanity, devotion, and virtue.

Farmer M. was an infidel. One Spring he thought he would sow a certain large field in English turnips. The seed were sown and the crop came up in due time and looked very promising. Not long after, Deacon K. looked over Mr. M.'s fence and remarked:

"Your field looks very well indeed. With the blessing of God you will have a fine crop of turnips, Mr. M."

"I shall have my turnips, God or no God!" replied the infidel.

"Very well, we shall see," returned Deacon K., and passed on.

The crop grew beyond all expectation, and when the time for harvesting arrived, Deacon K. again looked over into Mr. M.'s field and said:

"Well, Mr. M. God or no God, I see that your turnips have all turned out to be mustard."

So it was. Mr. M. by mistake, had sown mustard seed, and, God or no God, he did not have a turnip. Never crow before day.

Olive Branch.

Overland Californians.—The St. Louis Daily Organ says that the number of California-bound persons now at St. Joseph is about 25,000. They are all living in tents, which extend for a long distance up and down the river. There is considerable disheartenment among emigrants at that place, and many are wishing they had never started on the journey. The number returning, however, is not over five per cent., or one in twenty.

Speech of Mr. Clay,

OF KENTUCKY,

On the Pending Measures of Compromise.

IN SENATE—May 31, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the special order, bringing the bill to admit California as a State into the Union, as established Territorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico, and making proposals to Texas for the establishment of her western and southern boundaries—and Mr. Soule having addressed the Senate—

Mr. CLAY said: Mr. President, the debate has been conducted in this case with great irregularity. A single proposition was before the Senate, and that of an amendment to a particular section, in relation to the prohibition as to legislation by the territorial Governments on the subject of African slavery. And although this was the sole question pending before the Senate, Senators have launched out upon the broad ocean, and embrace, in the course of their arguments, the entire subject. Sir, I feel constrained, in vindication of the acts of the committee of which I was an humble member, to meet some of the arguments of the honorable Senators; and I will begin with the last, who has just sat down. The Senator from Louisiana finds himself unable to concur in the scheme of compromise which has been proposed. Will that Senator condescend to present a counter project of his own, for the satisfaction and reconciliation of the people of this country? Will he tell us what he wants? Sir, this finding of fault, and with the aid of a magnifying glass, discovering defects, desecrating the hallowed altars which move upon the surface of matter, and which are indistinguishable to the naked natural eye, is an easy task, and may be practised without any practical benefit or profitable result. It is the duty of the Senator who has just addressed us—it is the duty of all who assail this compromise, to give us their own and a better project; to tell us how they would reconcile the interests of this country and harmonize its distracted parts. And I venture to say that, upon every subject of which the learned Senator has treated, he has done great injustice to the acts of this committee. I do not mean to follow him throughout the whole course of his remarks, but I will take a rapid notice of his objections to the various features of this report.

Sir, he began, if I am not mistaken, with that which relates to the recovery and restitution of fugitive slaves; and he said, with an air of great dissatisfaction, if not of derision, that the committee had brought back that bill with certain embarrassing instead of improvements. Sir, I beg you to recollect that the greatest objections made to the amendment relating to fugitive slaves come from States which are not suffering under the evil of having to recover fugitive slaves. I stated here the other day, what I repeat again now, that my own State is perhaps the State suffering most from this cause, while the State of Louisiana is among those States which suffer from it the least. And yet the honorable Senator from Louisiana, when we are satisfied with these provisions, sees in them objections which are insurmountable. And what are the embarrassment of which he complains? Why, sir, that the slave owner, in the pursuit of his fugitive property, has to carry with him a record! That instead of carrying with him, in pursuit of his slave, at great trouble and expense, witnesses and loose affidavits, he is furnished by an authentic record! That, I say, is an advantage and a protection to the slaveholder—a great advantage: for that record will command respect in the free States, and will give him an advantage which oral testimony or loose affidavits taken before a justice of the peace could never confer. The record, moreover, is a cumulative, not an exclusive remedy, leaving him free to employ the provisions of the act of 1793.

With respect to the other portion of the report which relates to this subject—that of trial by jury—where is the inconvenience of such a trial taking place in the State from which the fugitive has fled? In point of fact it will be no disadvantage, for there will not be one instance in a thousand where the bond to allow a trial by jury at home will incommode the slave owner, since the fugitive will be found to have asked for it as a mere pretext; and when he gets back to his own State he will, beyond all question, abandon that pretext. Sir, I put it to the honorable Senator whether he does not believe that this will be the case; and this, you will recollect, is proposed as a substitute and a satisfaction to the North of that trial by jury which they contend for at a distance from home, and which I have already insisted would amount to a virtual surrender of the constitutional provision. Moreover, it is granting to the slave only the right which he now indisputably possesses, in all the slaveholding States, of resorting to their tribunals of justice to establish his claim to his freedom, if he has one.

Mr. President, I find myself in a peculiar and painful position, in respect to the defence of this report. I find myself assailed by extremists every where; by undercurrents by those in high as well as those in low authority; but, believing, as I do, that this measure, and this measure only, will pass, if any does pass, during the present session of Congress, I shall stand up to it, and to this report, against all objections, springing from whatever quarter they may.

Sir, it was not the other day that I found myself reproached at the North for conveying an alleged calumny of their institutions by saying that the trial by jury, in this particular description of case, could not be relied upon as a remedy to the master who had lost his slave; as if I had made any such charge on Northern judges and juries, in ordinary cases, in the way of reproach, or had not applauded the administration of justice both in our State and our Federal courts generally. But I urged that, if, in Massachusetts, you require a Kentuckian, going in pursuit of his slave there, to resort to a trial by jury on the question of freedom or slavery of a fugitive, it would be requisite, in consequence of such an assertion of privilege on the part of the fugitive, that the parties should produce testimony from the State of Kentucky; that you will have to delay the trial from time to time; that there must be a power to grant a new trial, and that a supervisory power would be necessary when you come to a final trial; that distant and foreign courts would be called on to administer the unknown laws of a remote commonwealth; and that, when you sum up the expenses and charges at the end of the case, although the owner may eventually recover his property, the contest to regain it would have cost him more than it is worth; that, in short, he might be largely out of pocket, and that he would find he had better never have moved at all in the matter. That was the argument which I used; and yet, at the North, I am accused of casting unmerited opprobrium upon the right of trial by jury and the administration of justice; while at the South, in another and the last extreme, from which I should have expected any thing of the kind, I find that this amendment is objected to as creating embarrassment to the owners of fugitive slaves. Sir, this is something like the old song—

"I do not like thee, Doctor Fell,
The reason why I cannot tell;
But this I know, and know full well,
I do not like thee, Doctor Fell!"

Such, Mr. President, are their objections to this measure.

Now, let us follow the honorable Senator from Louisiana a little further. One of his great objections was to the clause which prohibits the Territorial Legislatures from passing any law in respect to African slavery within the Territories. Did the honorable Senator know the history of that clause? Did he know that that clause was moved in the committee of thirteen by his own colleague? Did he know that that clause was voted for by every Southern member on that committee except myself, if I am so to be denominated, contrary to what is my usual habit of denouncing myself? Every Southern man on that committee voted for the clause which is the theme of the Senator's criticism to-day, against my opinion, and that of all the Northern members of that committee, with I believe one solitary exception. And yet, the moment it presents itself, although it comes under Southern auspices, it is objected to!

Again, I ask the honorable Senator from Louisiana, if this is to be rejected, tell us what you want; put it down in black and white; put down your project; compare it with that of the committee, and let us know the full extent of your demands, and then we shall be able to pass judgment upon them, approving them if we can; and do not restrict yourselves, in this unstatesmanlike manner, to the mere finding of fault with what is already proposed, without offering a solitary substitute for the measure you oppose.

Now, sir, the honorable Senator raises great objection to this clause of prohibition. He tells us that no police regulations can be made. Either there is slavery there, or there is not. If there is no slavery there, then there is no need of any police regulations. If there be slavery there, then the necessary police regulations exist already. And I imagine that they will be found sufficient, as they have already been found in time past; at all events from the present time until the time when States shall be formed out of these Territories. Now, let him escape from that dilemma if he can. I repeat it, if there is slavery there, there are police regulations; if there is no slavery, then none are required.

Sir, the aim of the committee, in the introduction of that clause—I speak for every member of it, and the honorable mover of it as well as others—was simply to do this: to declare that the Territorial Legislatures should have power neither to admit nor to exclude slavery. That was our purpose—our sole purpose; and, if the amendment does not accomplish that purpose, would it not be more consistent with a spirit of amity—with that desire of settling these questions which, I trust and hope, animates the Senator from Louisiana as well as others—would it not have been more conformable to that spirit to have moved an amendment, simply providing against the admission or exclusion of slavery in these territories, leaving them free to establish any police regulations they please, than to have attacked this measure in the manner in which he has done, as if that clause contained some new and dangerous principle to be guarded against; and as if it did not embody the exact principle for which the South has uniformly contended!

Again, the honorable Senator objects to the clause interdicting the slave trade in the District of Columbia. He objects to it on two grounds. In the first place, because the committee do not affirm in their report that there is no constitutional power in Congress to pass upon the subject of slavery in this District. Now, what is the opinion of the Senator and of the Senate upon this subject? A large portion, probably a majority of the Senate, believes, that Congress has the power; another portion believes that Congress has no such power. And how does the honorable Senator expect to arrive at a compromise in which one of these opinions shall be made to triumph over the other? How does he expect that those Senators who think that the power does exist in Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, are to plunge their hands into the inmost recesses of their souls, and drag out that truth which lies there? If he wants a compromise, he must take it without asking Senators, on the one side or on the other, to repudiate their fixed and deliberate opinions; if he does not want a compromise, then let him insist that one class of Senators shall surrender the opinions which they hold to the other class. Sir, I thought that the committee were on that subject as happy as they could be. The report neither affirms nor denies the power of Congress to abolish slavery within the District of Columbia. It says that it ought not to be done; and he who thinks it ought not to be done upon constitutional grounds, ought to be satisfied; and he who thinks it may be done constitutionally, but who believes that it ought not to be done, from considerations of expediency, or kindness, or fraternal regard towards other portions of the country, ought also to be satisfied. Thus, by neither affirming nor denying the power, but by asserting that the power ought not to be exercised, I say it is a compromise with which all ought to be perfectly satisfied. Does the honorable Senator expect that my learned friend in my eye, (Mr. Webster,) who has no doubt about the power, will give up that opinion? Does he expect that he will renounce his deliberate, well considered, and well formed opinions, which he has entertained for years? Does the South expect to succeed in any such demand as that? Will the Senator from Louisiana demand it? If he does, he demands that there shall be no compromise, no settlement of the questions which are now agitating the country.

But, sir, the honorable Senator has misconceived the bill for abolishing the slave trade which the committee have reported. This bill is a mere amendment of the law of Maryland. I will here mention a fact which shows how wrong it is to prejudge a thing. An honorable friend of mine, in my eye, has suggested that the object can be accomplished in a certain manner; and I should like to know, from the Senator from Louisiana, whether he thinks it attainable and acceptable in that way or not? The introduction of slaves now into this District, either for sale or for being placed in depot for subsequent transportation, arises out of two laws which were passed by Congress itself, one in the year eighteen hundred and two, and the other some years after, permitting it to be done. The Senator to whom I have referred alluded to me some time ago: "Mr. Clay, you can accomplish your object simply by repealing these two laws, and by leaving the state of the law where it was before Congress allowed by law the introduction of slavery into this District." I have not examined the two acts of Congress; but, as I know the Senator to be familiar with the laws of this District and the laws of Maryland, I have no doubt that he is right. Now, if instead of adopting the law of Maryland, which, in other words, is the bill proposed by the committee, we had proposed simply to repeal these two acts of Congress, in virtue of which alone slaves have been introduced into the District for the purpose of being transported to New Orleans and elsewhere, would he think it wrong, would he think it unconstitutional? Would he think it was alarming to the rights of the people of the South for Congress to repeal its own laws? Sir, where there is a disposition to look at things with an impartial and a candid eye, and to look at all the interests of all the parts of the country, and all the opinions, and all the prejudices, if you will, of our fellow citizens, we shall be much more likely to arrive at a satisfactory and harmonious result, than by attaching ourselves to a single position, and viewing from that point every thing, and seeking to bring every thing to the standard of our own peculiar opinions, our own bed of Procustes.

The Senator is mistaken in saying that

a resident of the District cannot go out of the District and purchase a slave and bring him here for his own use.

Mr. SOULE. I feel assured that the honorable Senator has misunderstood me. I have merely stated that the effect of this section, if I understand it well, will be to preclude the introduction into the District of any slave for the purpose of being sold, even if it were for the purpose of supplying the necessities of those inhabiting the District; and I know that the honorable Senator will do me the justice, on looking at the section, to admit that such will be its legal effect.

Mr. CLAY. Well, what is the inconsequence of it? A slave cannot be brought within this place for sale and be here sold, but a man who wants a slave here may go to the distance of five miles and purchase one, and bring him here, not for sale, but for his own use. The real amount of inconvenience then, is, that a resident within the District will have to travel five miles to purchase a slave, instead of the slave being brought here to be sold. There is nothing whatever in the bill which prohibits a resident within the District from going out of the District and purchasing a slave for his own use. The only prohibition is that no slave can be brought into the District or into market for sale, as merchandise, without a forfeiture. But, sir, I repeat, that, by the repeal of the laws under which this is done, all difficulty might have been avoided; and so it will probably be, if the bill be allowed to take its usual course.

No part of this compromise seems to receive the commendation of the Senator from Louisiana, or to afford him any solace or satisfaction. He says that it has been contended by me and by others, that the law of Mexico abolished slavery; and that it does not exist there by law, and is not likely to be introduced there, in point of fact. I cannot renounce that opinion. It is impossible in my nature for me to do so. I cannot disbelieve what I believe. But the honorable Senator has taken up the greater portion of the time in which he has so ably and eloquently addressed us, to prove—what? That that opinion of mine is incorrect. He has gone into an historical account of the abolition of slavery in Mexico; he has gone into the negotiations which led to the conclusion of the treaty of Hidalgo; he has gone behind the negotiation into the instructions given with regard to the proposition of the Mexican commissioners, forbidding the introduction of slavery into the ceded Territories. He has come into the Senate, and traced what has been done in this body, in order to prove that even here, by the negative of a proposition, moved, I believe, by a Senator from Connecticut, there was an implied purpose on the part of Congress to allow slavery, or rather to recognize it there. Now, cannot the Senator be satisfied with his own view? He thinks that slavery is not abolished there. I know that he is much more eminent as a jurist than I ever aspire to be. Why, then, is he not satisfied with his own opinion? Will he not, in a spirit of liberal toleration, allow an opposite opinion to be entertained? But the objection to the measure is, that, although this proposes to be a settlement of all the questions involved, yet there is one question which is left unsettled, that of the *lex loci* in regard to slavery in these territories, which ought to have been adjusted. Will he tell me how it could be settled? Will he or any body else tell me how it can be settled, otherwise than by the Supreme Court of the United States, whether the law of Mexico did or did not abolish slavery within the limits of those Territories? That is what the committee proposes to do. They have recommended this plan to the consideration of the Senate, and of the country, as a measure of general compromise, which would settle all the questions that were practicable or possible for legislation to settle. The question which the Senator supposes is left unsettled, can only be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, and there it is left.

Now, sir, it is a little remarkable that the Senator argued with such great ingenuity, and great earnestness, that, according to the local law of Mexico, slavery was not abolished; that, according to the local law of Mexico, there was a right on the part of the slaveholder to carry his slaves there; that, according to that local law, and the constitution of the United States, that right exists. If it does, ought not the Senator to be satisfied? Why, I should suppose that it was all that he wanted. He says that the right to carry slaves there exists, and that Congress has no power to legislate on the subject of slavery one way or the other. What more then, does he want? He says that the *lex loci* admits the existence of slavery. Then has not the honorable Senator got precisely what he wants?

Mr. SOULE. The honorable Senator does me injustice. I expressly admitted that slavery was abolished by the Mexican law. I never raised a doubt upon that question. Slavery has been abolished within the limits of Mexico by the constitutional power of Mexico. So far as that goes, therefore, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt, in the mind of any

resident of the District cannot go out of the District and purchase a slave and bring him here for his own use.