The New-Orleans Daily Bee.

No. 863. VOL. VIII.—NEW SERIES.
VOL. XII.—WHOLE No. 3584.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF GENERAL COUNCIL. NEW-ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, JANUARY 24, 1848.

MAGNE & WEBSTER PROPRIETORS,
No. 81 Chartres, and 13 Camp street.

TERMS OF THE BEE.

Daily Paper (one year in advance) $12 00
Country Paper, Semi-Weekly (one year in advance) 5 00

N.B.—In the case of the subscriber must give one week's notice in writing before he can be allowed to discontinue.

Advertising—One dollar for every TEN lines for each language, on the first insertion, and nine cents for each subsequent one. No Advertisement inserted for less than one dollar in each language.

Advertisements not specified as to time will be published one month, and charged accordingly.

Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged one dollar for every TEN lines, for each language and for each insertion.

☞ The privilege of Annual Advertisers is limited to advertisements strictly within the line of their business and in extent to one square every other day.

The New-Orleans Daily Bee.

Monday Morning, Jan. 24, 1848.

The Wilmot Proviso—Southern Locofocoism.

The hypocrisy of Locofocoism in charging the Whigs with being the sole authors and abettors of anti-slavery doctrines is so conclusively demonstrated in the subjoined letter from our Washington Correspondent, as to supersede the necessity of any comments of our own. We commend it to the attention of both parties.

The Whig party of the South is every where assailed by the Locofocos for having elected a Speaker favorable to the Wilmot Proviso. It is charged with a dereliction of duty and fidelity, and with having formed a coalition with Northern fanatics, to accomplish a party triumph. These assaults are predicated upon the fact that Mr. Winthrop moved a provision to the bill for organizing a territorial Government in Oregon, which is represented as being "identical" with the famous proviso of the *Democratic* Mr. Wilmot—that pet "republican," whom the *Union* hailed with so much delight.

I propose to show from the *record*, that this systematic and combined effort on the part of Southern Locofocos is a contemptible pretext to make political capital, and that they themselves are directly responsible for the *very same acts*, which they now profess to challenge in the Whigs, and to except to as compromising Southern rights.

Let us begin at the beginning. At page 250 of the House Journal, 2d Session, 28th Congress, will be found the resolutions for the annexation of Texas, the third of which contains the following remarkable *proviso*: "And in such State or States as shall be formed out of said territory, north of said Missouri compromise line, *slavery, or involuntary servitude, (except for crime, shall be prohibited.*" These are the resolutions of annexation, in the Wilmot Proviso, literally and substantially embodied—on the final passage of this proviso, at page 264 of same journal, stands recorded in the affirmative, every *Southern Locofoco* vote and but six *Southern Whigs*. Among the Locofocos, were Mr. Dawson, Mr. Sidney, Mr. Mouse and Mr. Barrancue from Louisiana. These proceedings occurred on the 25th day of January, 1845, made memorable by the annexation of Texas and the adoption of the Wilmot proviso.

At page 318 of same journal, on the 3d of February, 1845—only *eight days* after the annexation and proviso affair, the bill to organize a territorial Government in the Oregon territory, was resumed and a division occurred on the amendments which had been offered, the second of which, was that proposed by Mr. Winthrop, and which is now alleged to be so very obnoxious to the tender sensibilities of Southern locofocos. It runs in these words, "*Provided*, however, That there shall neither be slavery nor involuntary servitude in said territory; otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall be duly convicted." Almost syllable for syllable, the proviso attached to the annexation of Texas, which Southern Locofocos incorporated, and which Doughfaces, was the encouragement for Mr. Wilmot dare to connect it with this bill, so it and passed without opposition, except from the Whigs. I do not say this to place Mr. Winthrop's position, for he is an advocate of the proviso upon the same principle, that every Northern man is—it is, whether he avows it by the tongue or not.

This amendment was adopted 123 to 69 *every Northern locofoco* present, voting in favor of it, and among them JOHN W. DAVIS, of Indiana. Finally, the Bill came to its third reading as will be seen by referring to page 321 of the same Journal, and it was adopted, *including* this proviso, 140 to 59, *every Southern locofoco* present, voting for it.

No commentary is required upon these proceedings. Mr. Wilmot is denounced as the original author of the Wilmot proviso, and the Whigs are charged with cooperating with abolitionists, when these same locofocos, were the very men to elect John W. Davis speaker to the last Congress, who vote then stood recorded for that very *proviso*, and who *denounces* supported it.

What must be the conclusion of all candid and intelligent men upon such a presentation of facts, taken from the public records—that our opponents are sincere in their professed friendship for the South? No; but that they have believed it barely whenever the opportunity was presented, and then have attempted to shelter themselves under the factious excitement produced by their infamous false charges against those who have always and courageously sustained its honor and its interests. Let the Locofoco press now confront these truths if they dare. Let them tell the South, why the last "Democratic" Congress, with its majority of sixty-five, selected, above all Southern men, John W. Davis for Speaker, who was notoriously the friend, supporter and advocate of that "identical" proviso which is now fulminated against Southern Whigs.

U. S. Senators.

The Whigs held a caucus on Saturday evening, at which, on the second ballot, the Hon. Duncan F. Kenner, at present State Senator from the parish of Ascension, was chosen as the Whig candidate for United States Senator. All our friends have to do now is to elect him. To accomplish this, the presence and the vote of every Whig, in both branches, is required. Let none falter—let none prove faithless. But we suspect neither defeasance nor treachery, and we shall be disappointed if the Whig candidate is not elected on the first ballot.

We are not aware that the Locofocos came to any determination in regard to a candidate. Doubtless they will have *one* ready when the time for voting arrives.

The Gaines Case—Our Washington letter contains some interesting information in relation to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the case of Mrs. Gaines. The following is the decision, as reported in the *Union* of the 15th inst.

No 3.—C. Patterson as Edmund P. Gaines and Myra, his wife. On appeal from the Circuit Court, District of Louisiana. Mr. Justice Wayne delivered the opinion of this Court, reversing the decree of the said Circuit Court in this case, and remanding the same to the said Circuit Court with directions that a decree shall be made in the said Court in this case, declaring that a lawful marriage was contracted in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, between Daniel Clark and Zelinde Carriere; and that Myra Clark, now Myra Gaines, is the legitimate child by child of that marriage, that the said Myra is the forced heir of her father, and is entitled to four fifths of her estate, after the excessive donation in his will of 1811 is reduced to the disposable quantum which the father could legally give to others; that the property described in the answer of Clarice Patterson was a part of the estate of Daniel Clark at the time of his death; that it was illegally sold by those who had no right or authority to make a sale of it; that the titles given by them to the purchaser, and by the purchaser to the defendant, Charles Patterson, including those given by the buyer from the first purchaser to Charles Patterson, are void; and that the said property is liable as a part of the estate of Daniel Clark, to the use of the heirs of the forced heir; that the defendant Charles Patterson, shall surrender the same as shall be directed by the mandate of this Court, and that other things to be done in the premises.

What the President Means.—Mr. Clayton, in the course of his speech in the Senate made the following happy hit—He said he could not exactly understand what the President means by "indemnity for the past and security for the future." But an ingenious friend had told him that *indemnity for the past meant one half of Mexico, and security for the future the other half.*

Population of Wisconsin.—The *Milwaukie Sentinel* gives the official returns of the recent census from twenty Counties of the State, showing an increase, within the short period of eighteen months, of 25,934—about 20 per cent. The whole population of the State at the present time, the Sentinel thinks, is about 210,000.

The Great Taylor Meeting.

Our space is so limited that we can only briefly allude to the great Taylor assemblage at the Commercial Exchange on Saturday night. It was attended by thousands, and the proceedings were marked by enthusiasm. Col. Maunsel White—a veteran democrat—presided, assisted by the following Vice Presidents and Secretaries:

Vice Presidents—Col. Robert Cutter Nicholas, Henry Renshaw, Jacob Barker, Ralph King, Col. W. Christy, J. B. Walsh, Gendy Burke, Justin Durel, John Winthrop, A. Gaudet, James Dick, J. T. Sompeland, C. Rosenfeld, Tebatout, E. Barthe, L. Evans, L. Bouquenaud, Gen. Wm. Debuys, P. S. Wilz, J. M. Caccuo, John Cumminger, John Culbertson.

Secretaries—L. Dupuis, L. Pakenham Le Blanc, Peyton H. Skipwith.

The following are the resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, Union, concert and co-operation are essential to the success of great enterprises, especially those of a political character, and in order to such co-operation it has been proposed to hold a Convention of Delegates from the several parishes of this State on the 22d day of February next, to nominate Electors who are favorable to the election of General ZACHARY TAYLOR to the Presidency, it is therefore

1. *Resolved*, That we cordially acquiesce in the said Convention proposed to be holden in the city of New Orleans at the time aforesaid, and that One Hundred Delegates be appointed by the Chair to represent this city and parish in the said Convention.

2. *Resolved*, That, confiding as we do, in the wisdom, justice, moderation and Republican simplicity of Gen. Taylor, as illustrated by his whole life, and in his patriotic devotion to his country as displayed in so many battle fields, we will not approach him to ask for pledges, given on most occasions by politicians, but are content to look upon the past as a sufficient guarantee for his future conduct; we wish to present him to the country the *Candidate*, not to sell to the *President*, of the People, and not of a Party.

3. *Resolved*, That we take pleasure in announcing to the friends of Gen. Taylor all over the Republic, that we have the best reason for asserting them that, come what may come, Gen. Taylor will not retire from the position in relation to the Presidency in which the people have placed him.

4. *Resolved*, That it is the sense of this meeting, that the *refusal* of Gen. Taylor to become the candidate of any particular party, so far from constituting a just ground of complaint, should be considered as evidence of his superior qualifications for the discharge of the duties of President.

5. *Resolved*, That, in electing Gen. Taylor to the Presidential chair, we secure, in the administration of public affairs, a strict observance of the Constitution, and the general principles of policy maintained by Washington, Jefferson and Madison.

6. *Resolved*, That the lofty patriotism, the sound judgement, the sterling integrity of Gen. Taylor, and more especially the eminent service he has rendered the country during the present war with Mexico, constitute the surest guarantee that the future conduct of this war will be safe in his hands, and that no treaty of peace will receive his sanction that will compromise the honor and interests of our country.

7. *Resolved*, That our hearts are filled with joy and pride, at the hope of seeing in the elevated place once filled by our illustrious Washington, a man, who, like him, can know no party but the country, and be ruled by no motives but duty and patriotism.

The Chairman then appointed the following committee to make arrangements for the meeting of the Convention on the 22d February:

William Christy, Ralph King, Dalie Peyton.

List of Delegates to Convention of 22d February—Messrs A. Baldwin, Leonard Hanson, Thomas J. Incey, Dalie Peyton, M. M. Cohen, Wm. Christy, Martin H. Devereux, Ralph King, C. W. Candid, H. R. W. Hill, T. K. Price, W. E. Kendricks, Samuel J. Peters, J. W. Smith, W. L. Dodge, P. H. Sigworth, W. J. Freeman, Doctor James Jones, H. G. Hearst, Jules Neville, A. Layet, R. E. Hamister, A. C. Bollitt, Jacob Barker, Alfred Deen, Joe W. Carroll, John Dougan, H. P. Hunt, J. W. Ross, J. B. Cassman, Wm. Henderson, John G. Gaines, N. G. Hall, H. Gleason, Geo. Boylen, Jacob Gill, James Kealey, E. Barine, A. K. Jones, Jos. Cannonick, F. Roselius, Justin Durel, P. O. Quintot, S. Andry, C. F. Foucal, P. Planque, J. L. Fitzer, A. Dejan, A. Dubuc, Ferran, A. Gardere, J. Jude, J. Dubuc, Wm. Andry, P. M. Bernon, Alex. Lambert, J. Puckenhan, Leblanc, J. A. Nacire, W. E. Murphy, J. Beron, G. C. Hy, Jos. Chas. Kershaw, P. Foucall, Chas. P. Sheaffer, E. Gonchoun, Alfred Rousseau, Z. Wilz, John Winthrop, John Prevost, R. Gedjes, W. Langlois, Rudolf Hoste, W. C. Moore, C. M. Pinckard, Jno. Leeds, J. N. T. Richardson, Leon H. Gale, J. W. Smith, Aiden McLaughlin, J. F. Lavillebrune, Charles Dupre, M. Wasson, J. F. Parmele, Alex. Bizzet, J. D. Marks, D. Harrison, Geo. W. Babcock, Wm. Debuys, D. Dean, Aug. Vignant, J. L. Mouliner, John Cumminger, W. F. Poingen, Theo. Wilz, V. L. Blanc, Gaschet de Leslie, Geo. May, Francis Mouney, Geo. W. Harby, E. Beauregard, Wm. Salsman, P. J. Forstall, F. B. LeBeau, B. Duquette, D. M. Carthy, D. B. Stille, V. Andre, J. H. Peaslie, L. Lemaire, H. Taney, N. R. Jennings, J. E. Dunham, A. B. Henderson, N. Jarvis, L. Delerta.

The speakers on the occasion were Messrs R. N. Ogden, Baur Peyton, J. N. T. Richardson and Howard. Their remarks were eloquent, earnest, and inspiring, and were received with unalloyed approbation.

Correspondence of the Bee.

Washington, January 15th, 1848.

Mr Clay is the great object of attraction now in the city. He has been visited by a number of distinguished persons from Boston, New York, Philadelphia and other places, who have come here for the special purpose of expressing their personal regard. At a large wedding party at Mr. Bodisco's, the Russian Minister, Mr Clay gave away the bride, who is a sister of Mr Bodisco, to Mr. Williams, the brother of Madam Bodisco. It is a singular coincidence, that Mr. Clay should have officiated in the same capacity at the nuptials of Mr. Bodisco himself—The party was a brilliant one, and numerously attended.

It is now stated, that a meeting between Col. Benton and Gen. Kearney is on the *tapis*, in consequence of the indignity exhibited at the Court Martial. One or more gentlemen, high in authority, were appealed to yesterday to interfere. It is one of those cases—something like that between Mr. Clay and Mr. King a few years ago—in which the parties should not be permitted to fight. As men of courage and honor, they have both reputation enough not to suffer by abstaining from hostilities. *Prima facie*, the insult offered to Gen. Kearney was of the grossest and most exceptionable character, but those who know Col. Benton will not be surprised at this or any other exhibition of passion, as they will not surely persuade themselves to believe that Gen. Kearney has been in any way injured by this assault in public estimation; whatever may be the real merits of the case, which I do not claim to understand.

The President transmitted to the House of Representatives a message in answer to the resolution calling for all papers connected with the return of Santa Anna to Mexico, and for the original instructions sent to Mr. Slidell.—He refused to answer the call, on the ground that it was, in his estimation, incompatible with the public interests, which discretionary reservation had not been made as was customary—He cited a case in which Gen. Washington had declined to comply with an inquiry of the House, which struck nobody as being in point.

Mr. Gregin moved the message be laid upon the table and printed. This was withdrawn, to admit a motion to refer it to the Committee on Foreign relations. Mr. Adams then rose and said he felt called upon as a matter of duty to raise his voice, however feeble, against the doctrine promulgated in the message. It was a denial of the right of the House to demand information. It was an infringement upon the rights of the representatives of the people and their constituencies. This was the first instance, he would venture to say, in which a principle so high-handed had been attempted to be exercised. The case of Gen. Washington was not analogous to, plus the qualification contained in the Pinckney case. But the President had told only a part of the story. What were the facts? There was then a Democratic House of Representatives—they adopted resolutions affirming their right to the information. With all the reverence that he entertained for Washington, he was bound to say, he was wrong upon that occasion. In view of the importance of the subject, he would not be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Schenck said, this was a case which demanded the most serious consideration of the House. The President had peremptorily refused to communicate information, necessary to legislation. It was an assumption of power, that demanded the most marked rebuke, for it was contending all precedent and assuming a prerogative not warranted by the Constitution. Were we to be told, here is a war and you must vote as I ask, without investigation. Should the Executive be permitted thus to insult the people's representatives? He, for one, would not submit to it, no matter what others might consent to do.

The discussion continued on both sides between Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, Toombs, Houston and others, and was finally made the special order for Tuesday next. The President's refusal in this case is not only a high handed proceeding in itself, but it goes to prove, that three dispatches, connected particularly with Mr. Slidell's mission, which he dare not present to the people of the United States. There are grave suspicions entertained too with the return of Santa Anna, that, upon net of conduct, is by his signature.

A [illegible] branch of the case of Mr Bodisco, was argued in the Supreme Court yesterday. The question involved was whether property in the District of Columbia, belonging to a foreign Minister, is liable to be seized and sold to satisfy a judgment against him. The Attorney General argued the case for the Bodisco family, and Mr. Coxe for the plaintiff. The decision of the Court will be pronounced on Tuesday next.

[illegible]