MEN OF THE COUNTRY SHOULD FILL THE COMMISSION." I communicated the result of this interview to Messrs. Benton, Dix, Haywood, &c. The two last met, on appointment, to adapt the phraseology of Benton's bill, to suit us as an alternative for the resolution of the House, and it was passed after a very general understanding of the course which the measure was to take.

Both Messrs. Dix and Haywood told me they had interviews with Mr. Polk on the subject of the communication I had reported to them from him, and they were confirmed by his immediate assurance in pursuing the course which they had resolved on in consequence of my representation of his purpose in regard to the point on which their action depended. After the law was passed, and Mr. Polk inaugurated, he applied to Gen. Dix (as I am informed by the latter) to urge the Senate to act upon one of the suspended Cabinet appointments, saying that he wished his Administration organized immediately as *he intended the instant recall of the Messenger understood to have been despatched by Mr. Tyler, and to revoke his orders given in the last moments of his power, to thwart the design of Congress in affording him [Mr. Polk] the means of instituting a negociation with a view of bringing Texas peaceably into the Union.*

Your friend,
F. P. BLAIR.

THE BUFFALO CONVENTION.

This motley assemblage, composed of Abolitionists of both parties, Barnburners, Liberty men, Free soil fanatics, and almost every thing else—but mostly of Northern Democrats driven from the party by the nomination of Cass, have nominated Martin Van Buren for the Presidency, and Charles F. Adams for the Vice Presidency.

We look upon this nomination as fatal to the Democratic party at the North, which may now be considered as defunct. Martin Van Buren is the enemy of Lewis Cass, and, taking advantage of this Free Soil movement, he trips up the Presidential heels of the said Lewis without remorse, as his defeat in New York is made inevitable by the divison of the Democratic vote—while by the same means, the vote of that great State is secured to General Taylor.

So much for the Aristocratic principles which attempts to prevent the majority from ruling, for fear that the schemes of politicians may be defeated, and sets aside a great fundamental principle, when convenient, in favor of a two-thirds rule. As Cass and his friends defeated Martin in the Baltimore Convention which nominated Polk in 1844, just so surely will Martin and his friends defeat Cass before the people in 1848. "Rule or ruin," is now their motto.

We have no means of estimating the probable strength of this Free Soil party, in the different States represented in the Buffalo Convention. It is our impression though, that outside of New York, and perhaps Ohio, their influence will not be felt in the Presidential Election—while it insures both those States for Taylor. As Old Zack will sweep the Union any how, all the terror in the North must be confined to the Democratic ranks and we regard it as ominous of complete and universal overthrow to Cass and the Democracy.—*N. C. Times.*

THE OREGON BILL.

We stopped the press late on Monday night, to announce the fact, that the President had signed the Oregon Bill. The Baltimore Sun of Tuesday, confirms this intelligence. That paper says:

The presiding officers of the two Houses immediately signed the bill, and it received also the signature of the President. In returning it to the House where it originated, with his signature, his private Secretary delivered also a message in writing, understood to be a protest against that clause in the bill which contains the Wilmot Proviso, and at a subsequent stage of the proceedings the Speaker of the House stated to that body that an important message from the President was lying on the table, but the House would not suspend the business then immediately under consideration—it being then 20 minute to 11—to receive the same. And this message was not read in the House, though as to its character, what I have stated, I have no doubt may be relied upon.

Terrible and Destructive Conflagration in Albany.—About 10 o'clock last night, we received a despatch announcing the occurrence of one of the most awful and destructive fires that has taken place in the United States for many years.

On Wednesday last, a fire broke out, which destroyed FIVE HUNDRED houses. Several vessels were involved in the general destruction, shewing that the conflagration must have taken place near the basin, the business part of the city.

The loss sustained is estimated at TWO MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, and the distress and misery that must result therefrom, can only be appreciated by those who saw or experienced the effects of the awful conflagration in our city in 1838.—*Charleston Courier.*

From New Orleans.—Early yesterday morning, we received a communication from our New Orleans correspondent, dated 16th instant, announcing later intelligence from Yucatan. The dates from Campeachy were to the 5th inst.

Numerous engagements had occurred between the whites and Indians in that country, in which the whites were victorious, and most of the towns that the Indians had captured were recovered, and the Indians expelled.—*Charleston Cou.*

The Louisville Journal is responsible for the following hit at the different "Lives" of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency:

"One of the Boston transcendentalists says that 'too much life is death.' If that's the case, we apprehend that Cass's seven lives will be the death of him."

SPEECH OF

R. S. DONNELL, OF N. C.,

ON THE

Bill Offered by Mr. Clayton in the Senate as a Compromise of the Question of Slavery in the Territories:—Delivered in the House of Representatives of the U. S., July 29, 1848.

Mr. Speaker: I am aware that, in declaring reluctance to ask the attention of the House to my views of the important constitutional questions, growing out of the accession of territory under the late treaty with Mexico, I am adopting the customary, and often unmeaning, introduction to speeches in this Hall. In my case, at least, I trust you will believe it is sincerely felt.

My colleague from the fifth Congressional district, (Mr. Venable,) has indulged the House at different times during the session, with opinions which I do not think either meet or merit the approbation of a majority of the people of the State which he and I, in part, represent. I have waited until this late period of the session, in the hope that some other Representative from the State on this side of the House would reply to him. I do not feel at liberty to remain silent any longer. The extraordinary manner in which he has reflected upon those who differ from him, requires an answer from some one of us before we go back to our constituents. He made a speech here on the *first* day of June last which I did not have the pleasure of hearing, but of which I have in my hands a printed copy. In this he represents himself as speaking "for his own Carolina;" and I remember, also, that, in a speech on the 11th of January, upon the subject of internal improvement, he also represents *his* opinions as the opinions of the State. How came she its Carolina?—When did she accommodate him with her name for the endorsement of such opinions as he then avowed? I beg him to remember that he represents but one Congressional district. Let him speak for that, and I shall not object. But he speaks of the State as holding the opinions of Mr. Polk on the subject of internal improvements at the very time that we had upon our desks the resolutions of her last legislature requesting us to use our exertions to obtain an appropriation from Congress for the purpose of reopening one of the inlets on her coast. Not content to disregard her expressed wish; nay, more, openly, I had almost said, reproachfully to thwart it, as far as his speeches against the whole system would have a tendency to do it, he must misrepresent her views upon the subject, and unwarrantably invoke her spotless name to support doctrines which, by her actions, she had just repudiated. Those constituents of mine who have been tempted to read his remarks, have been, no doubt, startled to find their own State declaring, that almost all the light-houses and light-boats on her sounds and her rivers are there, and have been there since the beginning of the Government, in direct violation of the Constitution. Let me inform my colleague that on those waters a ship of war can never ride unless Congress will improve the inlets on the coast. The lights there can never serve our navy, and are, therefore, according to his argument, unconstitutional. His Democratic friends, who have the offices there because they have been to their party like Dogberry's watch, "good men and true," have been alarmed to learn from my honorable colleague that they are sleeping in unconstitutional berths and trimming unconstitutional lamps. We may erect beacons for our navy, and if the same light should happen to save a trader from shipwreck, why, it's all well enough. He will not complain. The Government must turn away from the cry of the sinking mariner, unless he sails under the stripes and stars, and wears the uniform of her navy. All those beacons upon the waters of his "*own Carolina*," that fret with golden light the dark recesses of her bays, and throw a welcome radiance over the maddened waves to guide the sailor on his pathless way, are to be extinguished, and there is no constitutional power which can such lights "relume." But I desire to direct my remarks to the speech which I have in my hand, and which purports to have been made on the first day of June last.

There is in this speech another matter much more objectionable than the one to which I have alluded. It is the uncharitableness of accusing those colleagues who differ from him on a constitutional question of deserting their constituents. In order that he may do this, that he may have some excuse for the introduction of such matter, he refers on that *first* day of June to a speech that was made by his colleague in the Senate, (Mr. Badger,) on the *second* day of the same month. He resorts to the proceedings of the Senate to find the excuse for introducing into his *printed* speech a sweeping denunciation of all Southern gentlemen who were so unfortunate as to have an opinion upon a constitutional question differing from his. I refer to this singular instance of clairvoyance, or whatever else it may be, because I entertain the same opinion of the power of Congress over territory belonging to the United States which my colleague was prescient of, while it was yet muttered by the honorable Senator from North Carolina, and which called forth such unsparing censure from his indignant patriotism; and because I think it due to Mr. Badger that the fact should be noted here where my colleague's remarks are represented to have been made.* I throw back upon him the charges which he has so complacently heaped upon others. I will endeavor to show that it is he and those who act with him who are the deserters, who have "pulled down the flag," and surrendered the citadel, and whose votes and opinions would have yielded forever the claims of the South, and committed his constituents, politically, to the mercy of the North. In doing so, I shall be explaining the reasons which induced me to give an affirmative vote on the motion to lay the Senate bill, known as the Compromise bill, upon the table.

I gave that vote with a full sense of the painful responsibility then resting upon an American Representative. No one in this Hall realized more fully than I did the obligation we were under to adopt, if possible, some measure that would tend to calm the public mind upon this exciting subject. I regarded that bill as a blind surrender of the claims of the South, a treacherous bait thrown out to entangle her. And, so far from being a measure to quiet the agitation in the country, I regarded it as the beginning of another convulsion more violent and more to be dreaded than any which the Union has yet encountered. *I* would not grasp at the shadow, and let go the substance.

The only claims which it had to southern support are founded on what is called the non-intervention principle; that is, the principle that Congress should not legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories. It is contended that, under the Constitution of the U. States, and without any law of Congress upon the subject, the citizens of the slave States have a right to carry their slaves into the territory belonging to the United States; and that those slaves would be regarded and protected there as property by the Constitution, although there was a law in the territory at the time of its cession which excluded the institution. This, I believe, is the doctrine of my colleague. I confess that I am not sure I represent him correctly; for, although I have read his remarks again and again, I am not satisfied that I have extracted his idea upon the point. I was puzzled at the outset. He lays down in the first paragraph, as the basis of his argument, this new and remarkable postulate:

"Truth reduced to its elementary principles "affords the only safe guide to investigation, "and the only satisfactory conclusions are those "which are formed from such a development."

In my simplicity I had supposed that truth was itself an elementary principle in all sciences—in politics as well as philosophy. I was not a little startled at a proposition to reduce it, lest it should approximate its antagonistic principle. I was relieved to find that it was afterwards to be developed again. Not being very well skilled in metaphysics, I have not yet fully comprehended what it was when it had gone through my colleague's crucible, and come out in its new form. But this profound piece of metaphysics enabled me afterwards to reconcile some apparent contradictions in his remarks, which would have otherwise hopelessly puzzled me. He starts with the position, that the only legislative power which Congress has over the territory of the United States under the Constitution must be found in the clause which declares that—

"Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claim either of the United States or of any particular State."

Imagine my surprise to find him, after arguing himself into the belief that there was no power under this clause to govern our territory, falling into the following train of thoughtful musing:

"It is true, that the power to acquire territory implies the power to govern it when acquired; but it is also true, that such government must be in accordance with the Constitution. But Congress does not acquire territory. The People of the United States acquire it, and have the right to govern it, and have limited Congress, as their trustee, in the name of Government, *by the Constitution.*"

Again, in a subsequent part of his remarks:

"There can be no civil dominion over any territory of the United States which is not founded upon the Constitution."

Two distinct positions, one the result of an argument based upon truth "reduced," the other upon truth "developed." I admit the proposition that the right "to acquire," brings with it, *ex necessitate*, the right to govern territory; but I believe that the clause in the Constitution confers expressly upon Congress the right to legislate for territory belonging to the United States. If we have a right to acquire foreign territory under the Constitution, which I am not prepared to admit, then it must necessarily fall under the description of property provided for by that clause. Laws are rules; they are so defined in all the books. The word rule, in its primary sense, is more comprehensive, but is often used synonimously with law. A law is a particular kind of rule. It is a "rule of action, prescribed by the supreme power in a State." This is the very kind of rule meant by the Constitution. My colleague, *following* the remarks of an honorable Senator from S. Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) as they were "developed" in a speech, made *after* his, of the 1st. of June, says that this power is restricted to such rules as are necessary to dispose of the lands. *He* gives no reason for it; but the Senator from South Carolina does. The Senator asserts that the terms "rules and regulations are not applicable to Government;" "they are never so applied in the Constitution;" "they refer to property, things, or some process, such as rules of court." I find, by reference to the Constitution, power is given to Congress "to regulate commerce," "to establish an uniform *rule of naturalization*;" "to make rules concerning captures on land and water;" "*rules* for the *government* of the land and naval forces." The honorable Senator is, in my judgment, equally unsound in his argument, that the words "or other property" must restrict the power which would seem to be given by the terms "rules and regulations," inasmuch as they show that those terms relate to the territory regarded as property only. The answer is obvious. The property which a government has in its territory is not simply in the estate—the mere title to the land. It is in the empire—this very right of sovereign command. If the title to every acre of the land had been granted away, it would still be the territory belonging to the United States, and would strictly and properly be denominated its property. In the very message under consideration Mr. Polk, in his unsatisfactory account of the value of our acquisitions, asserts that it is this very sovereignty which we have acquired that "constitutes indemnity for the past." But however that may be, my colleague admits that Congress has the general right of legislation over the territories, and so does the Senator from South Carolina; although they do not derive that authority from the express words of the Constitution. This Compromise bill, as it is called, admits it by the strongest application. It makes a form of government for Oregon, California, and New Mexico. In New Mexico and California it establishes a kind of oligarchy, withhold from the people of the Territories any voice in the enactment of the laws that are to govern them. The Legislative power is all vested in their governors, secretaries, and judges. This anti-republican feature of the bill, and the amalgamation of the power which enacts with that which interprets, or declares the law, would be sufficient in an ordinary case to determine my vote against it. No one who advocates this bill can deny the right of Congress to legislate upon the subject, for it is upon that assumption that its character as a compromise is founded. It is at least intended to make the impression at the north, that it affirms the prohibition of slavery in the Territory of Oregon for a limited time.

If I may be allowed a digression here, I will commend to the attention of the House another extract from my colleague's speech, which, when taken in connection with his subsequent vote, affords another striking example of his powers of vaticination, as well as the practical application of his doctrines about truth:

"I know that it is asserted, and that by southern statesmen, that Congress has unlimited power of legislation over the territories; but if this be true, then Congress may, by law, commit the entire government of the persons and property in the territories to the will of a single individual, and thus present the anomaly of a despotism created and sustained by the Constitution itself,—a conclusion so monstrous as only to carry home the conviction of its fallacy to every mind."

My colleague would seem, with the power of Cassandra, to have foreseen that he would be called upon by his own party friends and southern coadjutors to vote for a bill vesting the legislative power of New Mexico in four men, and that of California in five, who were to be the creatures of executive appointment. When this compromise bill was before us for action, he would appear to have lost, in the realization of the exercise of such power by Congress, the horror with which he anticipated it. He hugged the "monstrosity," and sustained the "fallacy," but there was no inconsistency. His magical metaphysics vindicates his vote upon the motion to lay the bill upon the table. He reasoned upon truth "reduced," but voted upon truth "developed."

The power of general legislation being established, what is there to except power over the subject of slavery. No one contends that there is any express clause in the Constitution which so restricts it. Why, is not the power of Congress over the territories as great as the power of a State Legislature over the State? No one denies that a State Legislature may forbid or establish it within the limits of the State. Why may not Congress exercise the same over the territories? It is said by the Senator from South Carolina, that the restriction is to be found in the nature and objects of the trust. I admit that the powers of Government are a trust in the hands of those who constitute the legislative branch of the Government. But this is not a trust subject to the same rules which are established by courts of equity to govern the relations of the trustee to the *ceslui que trust.* It is a trust *sui generis*, controlled by its own principles, and the trustee is the supreme power. Take, for example, the case of public property in the hands of the Government, to be disposed of by sale, with a view to its settlement and ultimate admission as a State into the Union. The trust does not, by the sale, attach itself exclusively to the fund which arises from the sale. All interest in the land is not lost; its nature only is changed. It is the duty of the Government to look to the laws which are to govern the purchasers in the use of the property, both with respect to their relations to one another and to the Government.—It must be purchased upon this implied condition. Otherwise, you would make it obligatory upon the Government so to dispose of it as to make it bring the largest sum of money, without reference to any other matter. Vattel thus lays down the principle:

"All the members of a community have an equal right to the use of the common property. But the body of the community may make such regulations on the manner of enjoying it as they think proper, provided that these regulations are not inconsistent with that equality which ought to be preserved in a community of property."

"All the members of a body having an equal right to their common property, each ought to have the profit of it in a manner that does not injure, in any manner, the common use."

These principles, applied to our action on the subject of slavery, would seem to indicate a fair partition of our whole territory, with a reference to its situation, soil, and climate, as the true basis of a compromise. It is true that, strictly speaking, the exclusion of slavery from the territory would not exclude any citizen of the slave States from settling in the territory, but it imposes restrictions upon the enjoyment of that right, which would practically destroy, or unjustly impair it. On the other hand, while the toleration of slavery would not prevent a citizen of the free States from going there, it is contended that, according to his views, it imposes such objectionable political and social encumbrances upon the territory, as, practically, would exclude him. As it would seem, therefore, that the same portion of territory cannot be made equally available to both sections of the Union, we can only in a partition hope for or obtain equality of participation. The application, however, of these, and other principles relating to government, is a matter which addresses itself to the sound discretion of government itself. In the application it must look to the general good of the whole, taking care never to sacrifice the interest of any section of the country, or of any individual of the community, unless the public welfare imperiously demands it. In the discharge of this trust the Government may err. It may even abuse its powers. But could its action be declared by our courts to be unconstitutional! On the contrary, it would be the abuse of the constitutional power; a violation of the principles of good government, and not the assumption of unconstitutional power. The imagined rights of the North or the South are, at best, but rights of *imperfect* obligation. They could not be enforced. I will leave this part of the subject with the remark, that the southern States themselves have heretofore acted on the assumption that Congress had the power to legislate on the subject. Passing over the compromise, I refer to the cession of territory to the United States by the States of Georgia and North Carolina, after the adoption of the Constitution. They both expressly provide against the abolition of slavery in the territory which they respectively cede. In the deed of cession, made by North Carolina through her commissioners, Samuel Johnston and Benjamin Hawkins, [I need not stop to tell my colleague who Benjamin Hawkins was, or how many of his respectable descendants are now in the district he represents,] there is a proviso or condition that "no regulation made, or to be made, by Congress, shall tend to emancipate slaves." This admits the power to be in Congress, and it proves also that, in those days of simplicity, a "regulation" was not thought to be a very different thing from a law. At all events, whether a law or not, it was thought comprehensive enough to abolish slavery.

To be Continued.

*Mr. Venable, who was recognised by the Speaker after Mr. Donnell's hour expired, in the course of an explanation on this subject, said that, in his speech on the 1st June, he had named no Senator, but had in his mind distinguished Whig Senators from the South, and that, upon seeing afterwards that Mr. Badger held the same opinions, had, in writing out his remarks, made reference to him.

Mr. Donnell denied that any Whig Senator from the South had, at the time, opened his lips upon the subject in the Senate, and asked to whom his colleague alluded?

Mr. Venable said, to Mr. Underwood, of Kentucky.

Mr. Donnell denied that Mr. Underwood had then spoken upon the subject. The Register of debates in the Senate showed that he expressed his views upon this subject on the *third* day of June, the day after Mr. Badger's speech.

Extract from the Register of Senate Debates, June 3, 1848:

Mr. Dayton.—As the Senator from Kentucky is so distinguished for his professional reputation, as well as his statesmanlike views, I am anxious to hear a distinct enunciation of his principles as to the right of the Federal Government to exclude slavery in the territories under its jurisdiction. Did I or did I not understand him to admit the existence of that right?

Mr. Uunderwood.—I admit that, during the existence of territorial governments, you have a right to legislate for them within the limits of the Constitution of the United States. It is said, however, that there is a constitutional prohibition to the passage of a law prohibiting slavery in a territory, but I am inclined to think there is none; I am, moreover, inclined to the opinion that slavery cannot exist in a territory without the positive sanction of law tolerating it.

CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

Salisbury, N. C.

THURSDAY EVENING, AUGUST 24, 1848.

FOR PRESIDENT,
GENERAL ZACHARY TAYLOR,
OF LOUISIANA.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
MILLARD FILLMORE,
OF NEW YORK.

WHIG ELECTORS.

Dist. No. 1—KENNETH RAYNER.
" " 2—EDWARD STANLY.
" " 3—HENRY W. MILLER.
" " 4—W. H. WASHINGTON.
" " 5—GEORGE DAVIS.
" " 6—JOHN WINSLOW.
" " 7—JOHN KERR.
" " 8—WILLIAM WITHERS.
" " 9—JAMES W. OSBORNE.
" " 10—TODD R. CALDWELL.
" " 11—JOHN BAXTER.

HENRY A. WISE.

This *great* man, who twelve years ago, went to greater lengths in abuse and denunciation of the Locofoco party, than any man of that day; and who, against Gen. Cass, espicially, as one of that party, made charges the most serious, and to those charges added the solemnity of an *oath*—this man, than whom no one was esteemed more devotedly attached to *Whig principles*—this man, who called so loudly for a "union of the Whigs for the sake of the Union"—this man is now, strange to tell, as strong a Locofoco as he was a Whig; and more strangely still, denounces his old friends, the Whigs, with greater bitterness than the most rabid of the original Locofocos. And yet more strange than all, is an elector on the Ticket of Lewis Cass, the man against whom he came forward in Congress, and voluntarily *swore*, that to the best of his knowledge and belief, had been guilty, while Secretary of War, of offences which not only rendered him liable to impeachment, but were calculated to damn him forever in the estimation of every honorable man in the community: This man, Henry A. Wise is out in a long letter, before the world in justification of his apostacy,—his inconsistency—and *such* a letter, to have for its author a *great man*, (as Henry A. Wise, thinks himself, and some few others think him to be,) is strange to a degree, wonderfully curious, and exceedingly funny. It has no parallel in political history, that we know of; and we sincerely hope that it may forever remain, as it deserves, an isolation as complete as its disgrace is above any thing of the kind on record. Well may the Whig press of Virginia laugh to scorn the worse than vain attempt of Mr. Wise to justify his course; and if the Locofoco party expect to retain him on their Ticket as an Elector, we do most heartily commend them for the zeal displayed in the work to which they have loaned themseves—the work of concealing the deformity of this *interesting "subject."* And if we were a democratic voter in Virginia, we have only to declare that, rather than handle that ticket we would not vote at all, or else go it with a pair of oyster tongs.

"As to the politics of the Commoner from Ashe we are not informed. We learn that Mr. Reuben Mast was elected from that County without opposition; and we know that Colonel Bower, democrat, swept the Senatorial District of Surry and Ashe by over a hundred votes, and that Col. Reid beat Mr. Manly in Ashe more than 200 votes. Under these circumstances, if Mr. Mast should be a Whig, we doubt very much whether he will consider it his duty to go for all the Whig measures and Whig men—in other words, to play the partizan in the House of Commons."—*Standard.*

Will the Editor of the *Standard*, in his anxiety, at this time, for members to carry out the expressed will of their constituents, advise Messrs. Ellis, Clement and Coleman, Commoners from Rowan, Davie and Buncombe, to do so? Ought they to "play the partizan in the House of Commons?" And are they not elected from Counties giving Whig majorities for Governor as well as in the Senatorial election? Be consistent Mr. Holden, and in your next number, read these members elect a lesson on the impropriety of "playing the partizan."—They ought not by all means to "consider it" their "duty" to go for all the *Locofoco* measures.

Kentucky Election.—Mr. Crittenden, Whig, has been elected Governor of this State by over 7,000 votes, and in the Legislature, the Whig majority is also increased.

In Missouri and Illinois the Locofocos have as usual, succeeded, though by reduced majorities.

In Indiana, the same party has obtained a majority in the Legislature, owing to the way the floating Representatives are apportioned, while it is said the popular vote is against them. Such being the case, Gen. Taylor is good for Indiana.

The subjoined article, from the *Carolina Argus*, so wr... views, on the *mis*-called C... which lately passed the Senate and failed in the H... sentatives, that we give it to any thing of our own ... How any man could supp... unless it was for the reas... the latter part of this ar... terly at a loss to know ... that it was grasping at t... the substance was alto...

THE COMPROMI...

The Democratic Press ... pouring out the vials of th... upon the devoted heads of ... members of Congress who ... ing on the table the Ter... commonly called, the ... lately pending before the ... resentatives.

Are these gentlemen ... they know what they ... tell us what were the pro... about the passage of ... much anxiety? Will they ... to inform us upon what ... in dispute was to be com... portion of the territory ... and California was to be ... occupation of the South... his slaves? Up to what ... stitution to be tolerated ... be free, and what por...

We have never seen ... self; but from a Democratic ... learn that the following ... portant section at all be... question:

Section 26 provides, "... power of said territory ... shall otherwise provide, ... ernor, Secretary, and Judges ... Court, who, or a majority ... power to pass any law for the ... justice in said territory, ... pugnant to this act, or ... laws and constitution of the ... no law shall be passed ... mary disposal of the soil, ... lishment of religion, or ... no tax shall be imposed ... the U. States, nor shall the ... perty of non-residents be ... lands or other property ... laws shall be submitted to ... United States, and, if disa... and void."

Now, if this be the ... the mountain brought forth ... labor—the grand panac... heal the difficulties exist... North and the South, and ... concord upon the trouble... terness and strife—for ... ly obliged to those South... the House who voted to ... the table. What compro... tain? What security ... South does it provide? ... propose to put to the ... verily, we are told that ... of the Bill, had it been ... the Southern man might ... any part of New Mexi... and settled with his pro... right to do so had been ... he might have looked ... Court of the U. States ... And can he not do this ... ment on the subject by Co... out the passage of this bill ... it? Could he not purch... sylvania or Massachusetts ... with his slaves; and if hi... were called in question, ... peal to the Courts to prote... possession of his property ... very cannot exist in that ... been abolished by law.—... tablished and legalized in ... ritory where it does not ... positive enactment? We ... Slavery does not exist in New ... California; the Compromise ... was laid on the table expre... the passage of any law whic... ing the subject; and we ... know then, how any man ... could move in with their ... galize the holding of them ... this territory. What author... would they have for such ... Suppose the slave were to ... ence to the commands of his ... could they be enforced? Suppo... to abandon the employment ... how could his services be re... Suppose the question of his ... to come up before the Courts, ... not be compelled to adjudge ... was no law of the land by which ... be held in bondage? Most assuredly ... would. The Courts of common law ... long since decided this question ... to the law now in force in this ... respecting the subject, there can ... doubt: slavery did not exist before ... conquest, or cession, whichever you ... to term it: and the Supreme Court ... United States have expressly decided ... the laws and municipal regulations ... force at the time of the conquest or ... sion remain in force until changed by ... new sovereign power. The information ... conveyed by Mr. Polk to Congress, in ... special message, that the temporary ... ernments established by him in New Mex... ico and California having ceased to exist ... on the ratification of the Treaty of Peace ... by the United States and Mexico, and ... therefore the people of these territories ... were without law or municipal regula... tions of any kind, was without foundation ... and did but serve to show his profound ... norance of the whole subject. During ... the war he had only a usufructuary right ... to the territory which he had subdued. ... The latent right of Mexico to the territory continued until the Treaty was signed ... and its municipal regulations established ... by that power for the possession and transfer of property will continue until by ... press enactment, they are changed by the ... United States. But this Bill forbade ...