state of servitude in which the creditor, by law, puts the debtor, to be terminated upon the liquidation of the debt by the labor of the peon, which debt is so managed by the creditor generally, that it accumulates instead of diminishing. With us the slave cannot contract with his master, and of course could not be subjected under that law, unless he first become free. African slavery, as it exists in the Southern States, was forbidden in that territory at the time it became, by cession, a part of our country. According to the principles of international law, and the decisions of our courts, the only laws which, *ipso facto*, were annulled, were the political laws. My colleague admits that no laws were changed except those which were in conflict with the Constitution. I think that I have shown that a law prohibiting slavery is not against the Constitution. Indeed, if it were, the laws in the Northern States abolishing slavery are null and void.

How, then, can I doubt that the courts, in the present state of the question, and without some action of Congress, would decide that, in California and New Mexico, slavery could not exist? Entertaining these views, honestly and conscientiously, whether they be right or wrong, how could I have voted for the bill? Would I not be yielding the claim of the South, knowingly and wilfully? What right have I to deceive my constituents by voting for a bill to "keep the word of promise to our ear, and break it in our hope?" Much less could I make the sacrifice without some hope that it would bring peace. It brought no assurance that the waters were subsiding. There was no spirit of compromise in the manner it was forced through the Senate. It came to the House branded with the spirit of intolerance. Its passage would have been the signal for the cry of repeal. It would have mingled itself in the Presidential campaign. There would have been a struggle to get a Northern or a Southern President, so as to have a Northern or Southern judiciary established in these territories. In the providence of God, a vacancy might occur in the Supreme Court of the United States. The judicial ermine might have been stained by political prostitution. At all events, the weight and moral influence of the court must have been forever destroyed in one section or the other of the Union. We have no right to throw the responsibility of settling this question upon the Judiciary. I would not permit it to go there in any shape, if it could be avoided; certainly not in this. It has surprised me very much to see those men who have heretofore been repudiators of some of the decisions of this court upon constitutional questions, now seeking refuge under its wing. I believe it is because they dare not meet the question. Sir, he who falters now is no true lover of his country. Let us meet it in a spirit of calmness and conciliation, not with heated denunciations and angry threats. Let us meet it with a determination to settle it, and we must assuredly succeed.

I will examine the bill a little more in detail. The people of Oregon have enacted a code of laws for themselves. These are subject to our control, and among them is one excluding slavery. The bill provides that these laws shall be and continue in force until "three months after the first meeting of the Legislature." When the Legislature meets, these must be re-enacted, or new laws made and brought to Congress under the sixth section of the bill for approval. Slaveholders in the mean time cannot take their property, and consequently will not settle there. The Legislature will be composed of free soil men, and of course the law of exclusion will be re-enacted, and the question come up before Congress again. If the bill had passed, we could not in *honor* have disapproved this law. The effect of course of all this unmeaning legislation, would be to keep open the subject, bring it again before Congress for agitation and secure, beyond doubt, to the North the share which she is to have under this compact. In the mean time the South is to take her chance, which I think I have shown to be a bad one, for California and New Mexico. The matter is to be suspended until a case is made for the courts. The fanatics of the North are invited to send their emissaries to stir up dissensions and law suits between the master and his slave. No law can be passed to prevent it, or to punish the officious intermeddlers. As soon as the slaveholder gets into the country, his slaves are all informed that it is expected by Congress that they will institute suits against their master, to try the question of their freedom. One suit may determine the general question, but each slave must stand upon the particular circumstances of his case. What a picture for a southern man to look upon. Can slavery ever in fact be carried there under such circumstances, even if the Constitution "extends" it, as it is contended it does, over the territory?

I do not agree with my colleague that all the South ought to ask in relation to this territory is non-intervention. I maintain that if we have any right, whether that right be under the Constitution, or founded upon equity and justice, to carry slave property there, we have also, as a necessary consequence, a right to some legislation to protect and secure it. In a new and sparsely populated country the laws are, at best, imperfectly executed, and this peculiar kind of property requires something more than the rules of the common law, as applied to other property, to protect and secure it. Look at the statute books of the slave States. See the long list of police and criminal laws we have found it necessary to enact. Some enforced by severe penalties, some declaring certain interferences with the enjoyment of this kind of property to be felony without the benefit of clergy. Are not these or some of these *absolutely* necessary? If not, then they are bloody and atrocious, and my colleague's "own Carolina" stands convicted before the world of unnecessarily taking the life of man, by enforcing the execution of such laws. I do not believe it. I maintain that such laws are proper and absolutely necessary. I maintain that slave property cannot be secure in the Territories, any more than in the States, without some such legislative enactments. And holding these opinions, I turn to the bill, and find that the oligarchy of judges, governors, and secretaries, in whom is vested all the legislative power, is expressly forbidden to pass any law "*respecting* slavery."

Mr. Speaker, I look upon the struggle now going on in the country as one purely for political power in the Senate of the United States. I cannot see how it can be one of honor, of morals, or of sectional or State interest in any other way than as the question of *political* power makes it so. It is alleged on the part of the North that they have conscientious scruples about extending the institution. Sir, the number of slaves is not increased; none are made slaves who were not before. I know it has been said by an honorable Senator from New York, (Mr. Dix) that by well established laws, it is ascertained, that the population of a country increases more rapidly, and in proportion, as it is extended within certain limits. No doubt of it. But it is because their comforts are increased, and their moral and social condition improved. In its application to slaves this rule does not hold good. The reason ceasing, the rule ceases also. The condition of the slave, moral or social, is the same. It is the will and heart of the master that makes his condition more or less tolerable, and the obligations which public opinion impose upon him, are certainly as great and as strongly enforced in a country which has advanced in intelligence and refinement, as in one that is new and thinly settled. In connexion with this subject there is a fact which speaks loudly for the humanity and kindness of the master, and the comfortable condition of the slave. There has been no importation of slaves since 1808. Besides the natural increase of the white population, there have been, during the whole existence of the Government, very large accessions to it from emigration, and yet the aggregate increase of slaves has been as great as that of the white population of the country. To go back to the subject, if it were true that the condition of the slave would be improved, it would seem to me to be an argument which appealed to the moral sense of the North for, rather than against, its extension.

I cannot see, sir, how the interests of the slave States is to be advanced, or the institution strengthened *at home*, by *taking away* their citizens and their slave property. I have always resisted this extension of territory, not only because I believed it to be contrary to the interests of the whole country, and in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, but also because, as a North Carolinian, looking to the interest of my own State, and sincerely anxious to promote it, I had reasons that appealed most strongly to my feelings of State pride. I love North Carolina. I love her for her moral honesty. I love her for her political integrity. My destiny has been cast under the protection of her constitution. A portion of her citizens have taken me by the hand and honored me with their confidence before age had given the experience and information which might have emboldened me too seek it. Surely, sir, I could not be a true son of such a State if I could sacrifice or neglect her interests. I never could consent, if there were not reasons paramount to these, and of higher considerations to her, to add a new impulse to that tide of emigration which has been sweeping away her wealth and her population, and doomed her for years to be the "nursery of the Southwest." Such reasons, however, must, for the present, give way to a question of greater magnitude to the South and to North Carolina. I desire that this accession of political strength in the Senate and in this House, and in all the political questions which can come before the people, shall be fairly apportioned. And, in order that the South may have her share in truth, and not in empty promises, I ask and insist upon the affirmative action of Congress. I am told by those Southern gentlemen, who supported the bill, that it is idle to expect that. It may be so. It may *now* be too late—too late for the South to escape the chains of *political* servitude already clanking in her ears. If the wishes, (as I believe them to exist,) of some gentlemen are to be carried out, it may be too late for the Constitution and the Union. If it be true that I am asking in vain, it is not on that account the less incumbent upon me to discharge my duty faithfully and fearlessly. I shall never cease to make the effort until the matter is adjusted. If it is true that it is now too late, a heavy responsibility rests somewhere. Not upon me, or the party to which I belong. "Thou canst not say I did it," is the consolatory reflection which is left to us. *They* are guilty who have instigated and supported the Executive in his reckless disregard of the Constitution, and his ambitious and selfish projects of personal aggrandisement. With their "aid and comfort" he has, under the false pretence that national honor was endangered, but in truth with the settled and determined purpose of illustrating his Administration by a vast extension of our limits, precipitated us into a war with a neighboring Republic. Our armies have overrun her territory, desolated her fields, laid her smiling cities in smoking ruins, and reddened her rivers with the blood of her citizens, until—

> "It seemed as if their source had been some mighty heart
> Gashed to its death."

The fruit of it all is this territory, which has brought such distraction to our councils and to our country. The "indemnity for the past" with Mexico, is threatening the "security for the future" at home. This crisis might have been foreseen. The history of the past was full of admonition. We have once before been in a similar situation. Once before the sky has lowered, the curtained atmosphere grown dark and heavy, and the deep muttering of the thunder broken upon our ears. A compromise brought us a clear sky, and the joy with which the first ray of hope was hailed throughout the whole country, told too well the deep sense of the danger we had escaped. We were not without warning. This crisis might have been avoided; and, warned as we were by past experience, why was it voluntarily encountered? Sir, the answer to that question will be found in the blind folly or mad ambition of the President and his supporters; and happy, thrice happy, for our country will be the day which shall determine, at once, the existence of the Administration and the power of the party which supports it.

TAYLOR MEETING.

A Taylor meeting was held at Spartanburg C. H. on the 7th instant, and resolutions passed condemnatory of Gen. Cass and declaratory of their preference for Gen. Taylor. The following paragraph occurs in the report of the meeting, published in the Spartan. It needs no comment.

"The friends of Gen. Cass not willing to let the people hear both sides, had made previous arrangements to draw off the people, by calling out a Band of Music and parading the streets for a while and then commencing a discussion immediately in front of the Court House. They were like men usually are, when on the wrong side, they dreaded to let the people hear the discussion on both sides, and therefore took this device to draw them off; but notwithstanding the trick, so well arranged and played off by the office-seekers and office-holders, there was a large assembly of the unbought people of the District, who remained in the Court House and entered cordially into the spirit of the meeting."

From the Mobile Tribune.

THE COMPROMISE.

It will be seen under our Washington head that the territorial bill has passed the Senate by a large majority. This is as we expected. In the House, doubtless, it will be stopped, either by a rejection, or by the adjourning without voting for it.

As far as we understand the nature of this compromise, it seems to be one of doubtful advantage to the South. According to the old mode of construing laws it is effectually securing the new territory as free territory.—What new process, could be devised under it to evade the force of these old laws and decisions, has not yet been made plain in the speeches on the bill. Indeed, most of these speeches have exhibited a plentiful lack of wisdom on almost all subjects concerning its principal features. We think with Mr. Phelps, the anti-extension senator from Vermont, and one of the best lawyers in the country. He defended the bill, on the ground that its practical operation was all that the Wilmot Proviso men of the north demanded it should be. It abolished slavery practically in Oregon immediately, and would certainly prevent the introduction of slavery into New Mexico and California, and that was all he desired. In giving his assent to the bill in committee, he said, he had not given up an iota of his principles of those of his constituents.

It is, therefore, we think, not to be lamented that the bill will, in all probability, be defeated in the House of Representatives.

From the Journal and Messenger.

THE DEFEAT OF THE TERRITORIAL BILL.—It seems that our opponents are resolved to make a new issue out of the defeat of what is called the Territorial or Compromise Bill, and Mr. Stephens, the mover of the Resolution to lay it on the table, is denounced on all hands. So far from condemning Mr. Stephens we feel convinced that when the facts are properly placed before the public he will be regarded by the people of Georgia, as one of the *boldest and noblest Champions of Southern rights*. The Bill itself was a virtual *capitulation* to the Barnburners. It was no compromise. It gave up every thing. It recognised the *principle* of the Wilmot Proviso in its *worst shape*, as applied to the Territory of Oregon and only *deferred* the settlement of the question in reference to California and New Mexico. It gave no new rights or guarantees to the South, except that it allowed any case to be carried up however *small* the amount involved.

This provision of the Bill is of but little importance as the value of the property contested would be insignificant compared with the amount of costs which would accrue in such a litigation. In all other respects property in Slaves was wholly unprotected because both the Territories and Congress was prohibited from legislating on the subject.

In this state of the case it is not presumable that any sane man would carry property into a region where there are no laws to protect it, and where its very existence would have to be contested before a distant court, and at a cost of thousands of dollars. Hence we say, that the Bill was a virtual exclusion of Slavery from every foot of Territory acquired by the late Treaty. That Territory has been purchased with Southern treasure and at the expense of Southern blood, and how could any Southern man with proper feelings agree to offer the whole of it upon the altar of Northern cupidity? Even Judge Berrien, in his speech made immediately upon the passage of the Bill in the Senate, confessed that the discussions had shaken his confidence in the success of the measure as a settlement of the vexed question. Many other grave Senators expressed their doubts, though they voted for it. Mr. Badger of North Carolina openly opposed the Bill in a speech of machless power and point. Mr. Stephens we are asured did not stand alone in his opposition to the Bill. He differed, it is true, from his colleagues as to the proper manner of disposing of it. *They* desired to have it considered and discussed.

He believed, that a clear majority of the House were immovably opposed to it, and that a discussion of its merits would involve the country in an expense of thousands of dollars, and result in an increase of the present excitement in the embittering of sectional feelings and probably endanger the very existence of the Union itself.

At this distance from the scene of excitement, it is impossible for us to determine upon the full force of these views. We have no doubt however, that this and many others of equal or greater importance, prompted him to assume the responsibility of moving to lay the Bill on the table. We look only however, to the demerits of the Bill, which were quite sufficient to justify any Southern man in opposing it. It is no argument in its favor, that it was opposed by certain Northern fanatics. These men are resolved to be satisfied with nothing short of a positive enactment of the ordinance of 1787, or in other words, the Wilmot Proviso. They therefore oppose every thing which does not come up fully to this mark. Every time the South yields, the North will become more emboldened and more exacting, until, as was the case in this compromise Bill, we will finally be required to *succumb and give up every thing*. If we are to be driven to the wall let it be a fair and open capitulation, let it be done directly by Congress; but not indirectly by a third power, and especially by the Supreme Court of the nation. This Court is to a great extent, the creature of Executive will. It is even now rumored that a majority of the Judges are with the North on this great issue. But suppose the case otherwise—suppose either Mr. Cass or Mr. Van Buren should be elected President what possible chance would there be for the South in case of the death or resignation of any of the present Judges? Would Mr. Van Buren appoint a Southern man to the Bench, in view of such an issue? Would Mr. Cass do so? Be it remembered that he said, "*He is no Slave-holder, he never expects to be, and he prays for its abolition every where*, &c." Could such a man favor the south in an issue of this kind? Would it be possible for any man from the Proviso State of Michigan, and who has been nominated by over *twenty Conventions*, which passed Wilmot Proviso Resolutions, to appoint a Southern Judge, when that Judge might have it in his power to settle this great question? No candid man will believe any such thing. The giving up of this matter to the Supreme Court then is nothing more nor less than giving up, first *principal* and then the *control* of the whole question to that body. As Southern men we object to this. The South should never thus compromise either her dignity or her rights; but should plant herself firmly upon them and let those violate them who seek to meet the consequences.

There is no danger of disunion coming from this question. The North will not, dare not, push it to such an issue. Their interests, their feelings or patriotism forbid it. To do this they would have to be guilty of fighting for an abstraction against men who are contending for their rights, their property, their heritage, and their fire sides. They will meet no such responsibility, and if they did, our *domestic* regiments would drive them from our soil. All the south has to do in this crisis, is to be calm and steady, and firm; to make no capitulations, no concessions, no compromises unless met at least upon the *half-way* ground.

SLAVERY QUESTION.

The Washington correspondent of the New York Journal of Commerce, after referring to the action of Congress on the Slavery question at the close of the recent session, makes these statements:

"The Southern men, generally, of both parties, and more particularly the Calhoun men, leave this city with a fixed determination to recommend to the South some decided and separate action on this subject.

"The attempt made to procure a meeting of the Southern members signally failed. Mr. Meade, a member from Petersburg, Va., wrote and carried around a paper inviting a meeting of the Southern members, without distinction of party, for the purpose of protesting against the course of Congress on this subject and demanding for the South to be placed on equal footing with the North, as to the use and enjoyment of the new territories.—The paper was handed to many, and very few consented to sign it, many refused. If the meeting had been held, it would have been not a meeting of Southern members, but a partial meeting of the Cass men of the South.

"The same will be the result, no doubt, of any attempt that may be made in the Southern States, to get up a Convention. Gen. Houston declared that no respectable men in the South could go into a Convention of a character so wild, unnecessary, and mutinous. Mr. Calhoun would not heed the Convention, declared the General, because he himself voted against the bill containing the Missouri Compromise—and, continued he—Heaven will not heed it—and men would scout it."

HON. JOHN M. BOTTS.

The course pursued by Mr. Botts about the time of the National Whig Convention, and his devoted adherance to Mr. Clay, is known to our reders. In a letter recently published, addressed to a Mr. Janney, he alludes to his convictions of the strength of Mr. Clay and his dissatisfaction with the position of Gen. Taylor, in relation to the Whig party. He cannot stultify himself by now professing a change of opinion. But mark the close of his letter; it is worthy the man, and a plain indication of the proper course of every patriotic Whig in similar circumstances:—

"But, then there is another thing that *I can do*. While I cannot play the part of an active partisan and pretend that Gen. Taylor is an acceptible candidate to me, I can say that he is far preferable to Gen. Cass, whom I regard as the most objectionable, I may say the most obnoxious, man of a party whose principles I have warred against for twenty years, and shall for forty or more, if life and health and mind shall last as long.

"When I look upon his course in connexion with the Mexican war, from which we have but just escaped, with a loss of life that the mines of Mexico could not repay, and with the honor of the nation impaired; when I look upon him as the justifier and defender, in the United States Senate, of all the usurpations of power and violations of the constitution practised by the present Administration; when I see him bending his respectable abilities from the high purposes of a statesman to the grovelling ambition of a demagogue; when I witness his insatiable thirst for conquest and his grasping rapacity for the acquisition of his neighbor's goods; when I look upon his huge dimensions, reader to "swallow all of Mexico" at a gulp without disturbing the rotundity of his proportions, I am constrained to say that no room for doubt remains, and that no alternative is left me but to give my vote to Gen. Taylor, and take the chances, whatever they may be.

"I will not presume to offer my advice to others: every man must take the responsibility of acting for himself as his judgment directs; All I can venture to do is, to set them what I hope may prove to be a good example."

OUR MARKET.

The Telegraph on Monday brought us the intelligence of the arrival of the Cambria, with advices from Liverpool to the 5th instant, reporting the Cotton Market steady and firm, with sales for the week, 32,000 bales. What these accounts will have on our market, remains to be seen. As yet there is no change in prices from those current at the close of last week.—On Tuesday the market was again active, and the demand good—prices advanced $\frac{1}{8}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$ on those of the previous day. The sales of the week comprise 1158 bales, as follows: Wednesday, 160 bales, at $4\frac{1}{2}$ to $6\frac{1}{4}$; Thursday, 389, at $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 6.20; Friday, 188, at $4\frac{1}{8}$ to $6\frac{1}{8}$; Saturday, 32 at $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 6; Monday, 173 at 4 to 6; Tuesday, 216 at $4\frac{5}{8}$ to 6.18. We now quote inferior $4\frac{1}{4}$ to $4\frac{3}{4}$; ordinary 5 to $5\frac{1}{4}$; middling $5\frac{1}{2}$ to $5\frac{3}{4}$; fair — cts.; choice, a shade higher.

Flour.—The transactions in Flour for the past week have been on a very limited scale, consequently, our quotations for the present, must be considered nominal. We quote \$5, to \$5$\frac{1}{2}$.

Corn.—The supply of Corn still continues light, and prices are very firm at 56 to 60 cts. per bushel.

Oats.—We have no change to notice in the price of Oats—we continue to quote $37\frac{1}{2}$ to 40 cts. per bushel.

Salt.—This article has advanced a fraction since the date of our last report—we now quote \$1,75 per sack, steady.

Bagging and Rope as before.—*S. C. Tem. Adv.*

CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

Salisbury, N. C.

THURSDAY EVENING, AUGUST 31, 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.

DAVID S. REID, AND THE WILMOT PROVISO.

We suppose that every man in North Carolina, at all conversant with public affairs, remembers how the Locofocos have been holding up that party as the one above all others to be trusted by the people of the South, on the subject of *Negro Slavery!* And how this same *dough-faced* party slanders and villifies all who dare to question its sincerity and its allegiance to the South as being stronger than those who have given the whole of their lives to the service of the Country, and who have faced and confronted the enemy—saved the Country, when others had abandoned all idea of saving it. Without further remarks, to show the hypocrisy of those who call themselves Democrats on this vital question, we ask the People of North Carolina, or that portion of them that voted for David S. Reid, if they knew, they voted for a *Wilmot Provisoist?* If they did not know it, we tell them now, that they *did* vote for a man for Governor, who voted while in Congress to prevent Southern men from carrying their Negroes into Oregon Territory. Yes, DAVID S. REID, the *Democratic candidate* for Governor of North Carolina, voted with the *North* upon this question. He deserted the *South*, and notwithstanding this desertion by him, he was run and voted for by the Democrats as the very *type* of honesty and fidelity on this vexatious question. Where is all the indignation of the Locofoco papers and leaders? Will they read this Mr. DAVID S. REID out of the party for giving this Northern vote? No! It is not *democratic* to do so; but they will hug him to their bosom just as they are now doing Sam. Houston and Benton, Locofoco Senators from Texas and Missouri, although they voted for the Bill establishing a Territorial Government in Oregon, which contained this unjust restriction against the rights of the Southern States. We appeal to the People, to say, if they are satisfied with such a manifestation of fidelity of *Southern democratic Senators* to their rights! Would not every Locofoco paper and gabler of this heterogenous party have been perfectly *furious* if two Whig Senators from Slaveholding States had voted for the Oregon Bill the other day in the Senate?—Common sense and former practice teaches us such would have been their course. But it so happens, that the *deserters* and traitors to Southern interests are *self-styled democrats*, and not a word do we hear from the peculiar guardians of our rights. But with that *impudence*, characteristic only of Locofocos, they shout from corner to corner for Cass, another "*Northern man with Southern principles!*" Will the people of the South be longer deceived by these political tricksters? Will they prefer Lewis Cass—a man without any feeling in common with theirs on this or any other question, to General ZACHARY TAYLOR, who has always been with them and one of them. We do not and will not believe it, until we see it.

☞ A meeting of the Rough and Ready Club will be held on next Saturday evening, at the Rough and Ready Hall, opposite Col. Robard's Hotel. A full attendance is desired.

☞ The Whigs of Virginia appear to be confident of carrying that State for Gen. Taylor—or rather that the old Hero will carry it.

☞ We complete, in [illegible] Speech of Mr. Donell's on [illegible] monly called the Compromise [illegible] who have paid attention to [illegible] will be struck with the inappropriateness of the title by which that [illegible] known. The South, we think, [illegible] proud that it met the fate [illegible] although we are willing to [illegible] those Southern gentlemen who [illegible] the measure, the very best [illegible] we cannot but allow superior [illegible] those "Eight Southern Whigs" [illegible] abused.) to whose discernment [illegible] lessness we owe its defeat [illegible] rent too, that this will be [illegible] already so, the sentiment [illegible] South; for the true character [illegible] sure, than which none [illegible] served the sweet sounding [illegible] promise," must be seen, and [illegible] ly be objected to.

Since this subject is attracting [illegible] deal of attention, we propose [illegible] Mr. Donell's speech with [illegible] other gentlemen, so that the [illegible] be placed in possession of all the arguments which impelled the "Southern Whigs" to the course [illegible] formance of their duty, in [illegible] the Bill in question.

CALIFORNIA

Below we give an extract [illegible] connoisance of Lieut. Emory [illegible] ted States Topographical Engineers in 1846 and '47, giving [illegible] Topography, Climate and Products [illegible] Country. It will be observed [illegible] Emory's description of the [illegible] the Locofocos, does not tally [illegible] en by the orators of the party [illegible] fore the People for the Legislature as well as other Counties, [illegible] particular. Instead of being [illegible] most desirable countries in the [illegible] the Farmer, it is said by an American Officer, in the employ [illegible] Government, to be an arid [illegible] for cultivation, except right [illegible] of its principal rivers, and [illegible] *irrigation*—or in other words [illegible] to be able to raise his bread [illegible] these *rivers* to overflow [illegible] purposes of *rain* as the rain [illegible] *depended upon*. There are [illegible] *trees*, and only along the principal [illegible] of mountains are to be found [illegible] oaks, sycamores and pines [illegible] most important item to the [illegible] to be had. Such being the [illegible] by any means fit for agriculture [illegible] certainly not the country [illegible] the democracy, in justification [illegible] sident in bringing on the war [illegible] borne in mind by the People [illegible] a portion of the Territory [illegible] quired by the Mexican War [illegible] cost so much blood and money [illegible] of Locofoco misrule:

"About midday (20th Jan. 1847) [illegible] Diego, and next morning taking [illegible] animals that had done us such good [illegible] on board the prize brig Malek Adhel [illegible] Lieutenant Schenck, of the Navy [illegible] my leave of Upper or Alta California [illegible] however, I may venture upon a few [illegible] based upon personal observations [illegible] climate, and products of that portion [illegible] covered by my survey, or that of [illegible] vations were made after I had [illegible] my assistants and instruments, [illegible] ed with other subjects. The information [illegible] them is, therefore, less precise than [illegible] other portions of my journal.

The region, extending from the [illegible] California to the parallel of the Pueblo [illegible] Angels, is the only portion not [illegible] own notes and journal, or by the [illegible] other scientific expeditions [illegible] States.

The journals and published accounts [illegible] expeditions combined, will give [illegible] portions of California susceptible [illegible] tlement. From this remark is to be [illegible] basin watered by the Colorado, and [illegible] between that river and the range [illegible] sented as running east of the Tulare [illegible] the parallel of 36°, and the country [illegible] rado and Gila rivers.

Of these regions nothing is known [illegible] reports of trappers, and the specimens [illegible] As far as these accounts go, all concur [illegible] it as a waste of sand and rock, [illegible] tion, poorly watered, and unfit, it is [illegible] the useful purposes of life. A glance [illegible] show what an immense area is embraced [illegible] aries; and, notwithstanding the [illegible] to it, it is difficult to bring the mind [illegible] existence of such a sea of waste [illegible] ry other grand division of the country [illegible] inent feature in the economy of [illegible] to the wants of man. Possibly this [illegible] may be filled with valuable minerals [illegible] I have alluded elsewhere, to the [illegible] country, the savage character of [illegible] cle to its exploration, and [illegible] its true character and resources.

Alta California, between the [illegible] of latitude, presents to the eastern [illegible] navigable rivers and broad estuaries [illegible] graphical features of a very unusual [illegible]

Two chains of mountains traverse [illegible] direction nearly parallel to the [illegible] verging towards each other, and [illegible] parallel of 32°. Here they form [illegible] Lower California, extending its [illegible] minating abruptly in the ocean, at [illegible]

The first chain (that nearest the [illegible] sidered a steppe of the second or [illegible] tains. It inpinges on the coast at [illegible] Santa Barbara, San Juan de Capistrano, San Luis Rey and San Diego—at [illegible] with so much boldness as to make it [illegible] duct the road along the margin of the [illegible] lines of high and low water mark [illegible] ra and San Juan present points which [illegible] to the military commandant charged [illegible] of that country.

Between the first and second [illegible] there is a valley, traversed by a [illegible] rectly from the great desert to the [illegible] les, and a defending force would [illegible] the greatest advantage at Cariso Creek [illegible] of the "jornada" across the desert [illegible] and locality of Cariso Creek has [illegible]

The second or principal range [illegible] great distance from the first, and [illegible] fers some arable land. The distance [illegible] range and the sea coast varies from [illegible] The surface covered with vegetation [illegible] difficult to estimate; and perhaps [illegible] an estimate should be made, since [illegible]