G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. IV.—NO. 40. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1850. WHOLE NO. 196.

The National Era is Published Weekly, on Seventh Street, opposite Odd Fellows' Hall.

TERMS.

Two dollars per annum, *payable in advance.*

Advertisements not exceeding ten lines inserted three times for one dollar; every subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.

All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to G. Bailey, *Washington, D. C.*

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS,
Sixth street, a few doors south of Pennsylvania avenue.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 30, 1850.

For the National Era.

THE PUBLIC HEART.

THE RULE OF RIGHT—MAN'S MORAL SENSE.

BY ISAAC H. JULLIAN.

"*I will place within them as a guide*
My umpire Conscience."
Gon in Milton.

Oh! listen to the throbbings of the mighty public heart!
Healing strong for Truth and Justice, bidding knave and tyrant start!
God is speaking in its cadence, He gave its earliest tone,
And it still repeats the harmony nearest to his throne!
As, like a front unyielding in purity and force,
It springs and swells eternally, aspiring to its Source.

Is human nature wholly false? Does Mammon reign supreme?
Is there no lingering ray divine, its darkness to redeem?
Let rapt Athens answer, treading there in the dust,
Hending not her great Themistocles, but Aristides Just;
Let Greece united answer, when Plinilius' decree
Awoke the thunder of her voice for new-found liberty!

Let Britain's millions answer, who, forgetting their own wrings,
Stretch eight hundred thousand manacles from slavery's crowding throngs,
And unshackled heavenly bites in grateful freemen's songs!
Yes, the self-same sun whose morning beams shone sadly on the cabin
And melancholy beauty of the slave-thronged lelas of Inlin,
Hoard their song of freedom rise at eve to Heaven like a psalm!

Let fiery France make answer—never call her struggles vain!
Behold her crying unto God for liberty again!
While the tempests on her gather, who, with countenance serene,
With a glory streaming round him, rises up to still the scene?
'Tis the great Christian statesman, immortal Lamartine!
He speaks—and rage and clamor, and the cry for human blood,
Are drowned in cheers of liberty, and songs of brotherhood!

Nation calleth unto nation, as deep answereth unto deep—
And lo, thy soul, Columbia! arouses as from sleep!
Arouses—and the fetters which bound her in her shame,
Part asunder at her rising, as dew before the flame!
Now hind again prisons, living statesmen! if you can,
And quell her pulse's throbbings for the holy rights of man!

Ye are wise in sordid craftiness, ye are men of mighty mind,
But God has your own heartlessness bestowed not to your kind;
And though, like Alpine summits, ye may soar aloft—to freeze,
Yet weight is as the slender reed's, swayed by the evening breeze;
For the fount of human feeling, in an exhaustless tide,
Is pouring forth a lava flood to whelm you in your pride!

Oh! listen to the throbbings of the mighty public heart!
God is speaking in each cadence! "Let your sordid aims depart!
Man is more than food or raiment, more than gold or silver bright;
Wealth and power are worthless bubbles, weighed against my Truth and Right!
Cease your impious machinations—dread the vengeance of my ire—
Stay your insolent rebellion 'gainst the goodness of your God!"

Mount Vernon, Linn County, Iowa.

For the National Era.

APOLONIA JAGIELLO.

BY GRACE GREENWOOD.

During a late visit to Washington, it was my good fortune to become acquainted with Mlle. Jagiello, the Hungarian heroine, who was then staying at the house of her friend, M. Tyssowski. Becoming much interested in her, I requested to be allowed to write a sketch of her "strange, eventful history"—knowing that, in so doing, I should not only give myself a rare pleasure, but gratify my countrywomen, to most of whom the brilliant career of the brave woman-soldier is more a dazzling dream of romance than a simple reality. To assist me in this pleasant work, a friend of Mlle. Jagiello, Major Tochman, of Washington, was so kind as to furnish me with some memoranda of facts, which she had communicated to him; and upon this authority I shall proceed in my brief biography. These notes are not as full as I could desire in regard to the private life and personal relations of the heroine; but I understand that there are reasons why matters of this kind should not now be made public.

Apolonia Jagiello was born in Lithuania, a part of the land where Thaddeus Kosciusko spent his first days. She was educated at Cracow, the ancient capital of Poland—a city filled with monuments and memorials of the glorious past, and full of every Pole the past glory of his native land. There, and in Warsaw and Vienna, she passed the days of her early girlhood. She was about nineteen when the revolution of 1846 broke out at Cracow. "That revolution," says Major Tochman, "so little understood in this country, although of brief duration, must and will occupy an important place in Polish history. It decided the emancipation of the peasantry and the abolition of hereditary rank, all over Poland; proclaimed equality, personal security, and the enjoyment of the fruits of labor, as inherent rights of all men living on Polish soil. It was suppressed by a most diabolical plot of the Austrian Government. Its mercenary soldiery, disguised in the national costume of the peasants, excited against the nobility the ignorant portion of the peasantry in Gallicia, which province, with other parts of ancient Poland, had to unite in insurrection with the republic of Cracow. They were made to believe, by those vile emissaries, that the object of the nobility was to take advantage of the approaching revolution, to exact from them higher duties. In the mean time the civil and military officers of the Austrian Government disclaimed proclamations, at first secretly, then publicly, offering to the peasants rewards for every head of a nobleman, and for every nobleman delivered into the hands of the authorities alive. Fourteen hundred men, women, and children, of noble families, were murdered by the thus excited and misled peasantry, before they detected the fraud of the Government. This paralyzed the revolution already commenced in Cracow.

"The Austrian Government, however, did not reap the full fruit of its villany; for when the peasants perceived it, they arrayed themselves with the friends of the murdered victims, and showed so energetic a determination to insist on the rights which the revolution at Cracow promised to secure to them, that the Austrian Government found itself compelled to grant them many immunities."

This was the first revolution in which Mlle. Jagiello, who was then in Cracow, took an active part. She was seen on horseback, in the picturesque costume of the Polish soldier, in the midst of the patriots who first planted the white eagle and the flag of freedom on the castles of the ancient capital of her country, and was one of the handfull of heroes who fought the battle near Podgorze, against a ten-fold stronger enemy. Mr. Tyssowski, now of Washington, was then invested with all civil and military power in the Republic. He was elevated to the dictatorship for the time being, and by him was issued the celebrated manifesto declaring for the people of Poland the great principles of liberty to which we have already alluded. He is now a draughtsman in the employ of our Government.

After the Polish revolution which commenced in Cracow was suppressed, Mlle. Jagiello resumed female dress, and remained undetected for a few weeks in that city. From thence she removed to Warsaw, and remained there and in the neighboring country, in quiet retirement among her friends. But the revolution of 1848 found her again at Cracow, in the midst of the combatants. Alas! that revolution was but a dream—it accomplished nothing—it perished like all other European revolutions of that year, so great in grand promises, so mean in fulfilment. But their fire is yet smouldering under the ashes covering the Old World—ashes white and heavy as death to the eye of the tyrant, but scarcely hiding the red life of a terrible retribution from the prophetic eye of the lover of freedom.

Mlle. Jagiello then left Cracow for Vienna, where she arrived in time to take a heroic part in the engagement at the faubourg Widen. But her chief object in going to Vienna was to inform herself of the character of that revolution, and to carry news to the Hungarians, who were then in the midst of a revolution, which she and her countrymen regarded as involving the liberation of her beloved Poland, and presaging the final regeneration of Europe. With the aid of devoted friends, she reached Preeburg safely, and from that place, in the disguise of a peasant, was conveyed by the Hungarian peasantry carrying provisions for the Austrian army, to the village of St. Paul.

After many dangers and hardships in crossing the country occupied by the Austrians, after swimming on horseback two rivers, she at last, on the 15th of August, 1848, reached the Hungarian camp, near the village of Kneesey, just before the battle there fought, in which the Austrians were defeated, and lost General Wist. This was the first Hungarian battle in which our heroine took part as volunteer. She was soon promoted to the rank of lieutenant, and, at the request of her Hungarian friends, took charge of a hospital in Comorn. Whilst there, she joined, as volunteer, the expedition of 12,000 troops, under the command of the gallant General Klapka, which made a sally, and took Raab. The heroine in safety to Comorn, where she remained, superintending the hospital, until the capitulation of the fortress.

She came to the United States in December last, with Governor Ladislas Ujhazy and his family, where she and her heroic friends received a most enthusiastic welcome.

I know that some of my gentle and delicate countrywomen may shrink from a contemplation of the martial career of Mlle. Jagiello, or regard it with amazement and a half-fearful admiration. But they must remember for what a country she fought, with what an enemy she contended. Loving Poland with a love which had all the strength and fervor of a religion, contending its haughty and brutal oppressors with all the intensity of a high and passionate nature, when the hour of uprising and fierce struggle came at last, could she do otherwise than join her brothers? To cheer them with her inspiring voice—to strike with them for the one glorious cause—a great purpose, making strong her girlish arm, and the dawn of a great hope brightening in her eye. Ah! those beautiful eyes! How often must her brave followers, when sad and disheartened, have turned to them for cheer and guidance, drinking fresh courage from those fountains of light.

The eagerness with which our heroine took part in the Hungarian revolution, proved that her patriotism was not confined within the narrow limits of her native land; that she loved freedom more than her native Poland. In the station which she so readily filled in the hospital at Comorn, as the patient nurse of the wounded and the comforter of the dying, she revealed beneath the heroism of the soldier the tenderness of the woman—a heart within a heart. The hand which had clenched the sword with a firm grasp, and been stained with the base blood of the Austrian, looked very soft and fair as it smoothed the pillow of the cloie, or held the cooling draught to fever-parched lips; and the eye which had looked steadily on the mad rush, the flame and tumult of the fight, and flashed its beautiful defiance in the face of the advancing foe, grew wondrous pitiful as it gazed upon the bleeding and prostrate patriot, and dropped fast tears on the dead brow of a fellow-soldier.

The daughters of Poland and Hungary are a grand race of women. They do not assume the garb and take the arms of the soldier, nor do his terrible work, because they are stern, and hard, and warlike by nature, but because all that is dear to them on earth—home, honor, liberty, and love—are at stake. They fight with and for the best loved of their hearts—their great hearts, which cannot comprehend a feeling that would cause them to shrink from the side of a father, a husband, or a brother, in the hour of extremest peril. Their courage, after all, is of that quality which

"Is but the tender fierceness of the dove,
Pecking at those who have crossed her young ones."

Many were the heroines actively engaged in serving the cause of Freedom during the Hungarian struggle. Not alone in the saddle and under arms, but in ways and capacities not less honorable, though perhaps less imposing. General Pragay, in his work on Hungary, says:

"No sooner had Windischgrätz gratified himself with executions by the dozen, and guarded the hospitals with his cannon, than he marched his disposable force, amounting to 72,000 men, upon Hungary. It was quite impossible to resist such a power in extended cantonments, and after several unimportant actions, Gorgey ordered a general retreat to Raab, in the middle of December. Here intrenchments were thrown up, *on which the noblest ladies worked with their delicate hands.*"

A sister of Kossuth served during the war as general superintendent of hospitals; Mlle. Mary Lagos served as adjutant in the brigade of General Asherman. She was taken prisoner, and her fate is unknown. Mlle. Cawl served as captain; she was a niece of General Windischgrätz, and fought twice against the Austrians commanded by her uncle. She was taken prisoner in a battle fought against the infamous Haynau, and shot by his order.

Not vainly have those glorious women dared, and struggled, and endured, and died. The world needs such lessons of heroic devotion—of the soul's greatness triumphant over mortal weakness—and their names, wreathed with the rose, the laurel, and the cypress, shall be kept in sweet, and proud, and tender remembrance. Those heroes are honored, and great deeds can rouse human hearts, and while the tyrant is hated of man and accursed of God.

Mlle. Jagiello is now with us. She seems to regard the land of her adoption with admiration and affection, though looking on its beauty and grandeur through the tearful eyes of an exile.

There are many readers who have never seen the Hungarian, or rather Polish heroine, may be interested in hearing something of her *personnel.* She is now about twenty-four, of medium height, and quite slender. Her arm and hand are especially delicate and beautiful, and her figure round and graceful. She is a brunette, with large dark eyes, and black, abundant hair. Her lips have an expression of great determination, but her smile is altogether charming. In *that* the woman comes out; it is arch, soft, and winning—a rare an indescribable smile. Her manner is simple and engaging; her voice is now gentle or mirthful, now earnest and impassioned—sometimes sounds like the utterance of some quiet, homely or pathetic song, and sometimes startles you with a decided ring of the steel. Her enthusiasm and intensity of feeling reveal themselves in almost everything she says and does. An amusing instance was told me when in Washington. An album was one day handed her, for her autograph. She took it with a smile; but on opening it at the name of M. Bodisco, the Russian ambassador, pushed it from her with flashing eyes, refusing to appear in the same book with "the tool of a tyrant!"

Yet, after all, she is one to whom children go, feeling the charm of her womanhood, without being awed by her greatness. She bears herself with no military air; there is nothing in her manner to remind you of the camp, though much to tell you that you are in the presence of no ordinary woman.

The life of a soldier, with its dangers and privations, with all its fearful contingencies, was not sought by Jagiello for its own sake, nor for the glory it might confer, but was accepted as the means to a great end. She believed that the path of her country led through the Red Sea of revolution, to liberty and peace, and stood up bravely by the side of that country. Her young heart fired, and her tender arm nerved with a courage that knew not sex.

As the women of America have given their admiration to her heroism, they will give also, and more abundantly, their sympathy to her misfortune. She bears to our shores a weary and an almost broken heart. May she here find repose and consolation, while awaiting that brighter day, which shall as surely dawn for her unhappy country, as freedom is the primal right of man, or oppression is a falsehood and a wrong, and God is over all.

For the National Era

BESSIE LINDSAY; OR, THE HOYDEN TAMED.

BY MARY IRVING.

"Come to our hearth and home, Charles—we will give you a welcome for your poor mother's sake, as well as your own. They tell us you're pining away off in that pent-up city, and going the way *she* went. Don't kill yourself studying, my boy; it's a sin, besides being a folly. Come out into the country for a bit of fresh air and fresh life! I haven't seen you for many a year, Charley; but if you're alive to the little shaver that used to chase my oxen and hunt my bird nests a dozen years ago, why, you'll still find something to stir your blood on 'Squire Lindsay's old-fashioned place. My poor wife has been dead these nine years come next Christmas; but I have girls enough to keep the old house lively, and not a bit of a 'laddie' among them. Come, Charles, I'm in right down earnest. My girls want a brother, I want a son, and you—you want a home and good nursing. I can't forget that you are Alice Wilson's boy—the child of my own favorite cousin; and there's a sort of rising in my heart when I remember it, that gives me a kind of feeling of claim on you. So come, my boy, now don't refuse an old friend's homely, blunt way of asking. Come to us for the whole summer!"

Thus ran the warm-hearted letter which Charles Franklin read reclining, one pleasant eve of spring-time, by the twilight gleams that glanced through a high western window in a city block. There was a grateful, almost buoyant smile on his countenance, but it was unmistakably "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." Charles Franklin had buried, six months before, a mother almost idolized—a mother whose moonlight smile from her sick chamber had shed a sombre cheerfulness over his whole young life. She was his only remembered parent, and remembered as always a sufferer. He had left his college cares to follow her to the far South, and there soothe her last hours. She had breathed out her calm life on his shoulder, and he had come back to sotive life with the "shadow of a great grief" on his futurity.

Yet he shrank not from the battle-field of Duty into the morass of Melancholy. He felt that her angel eye was watching him from the skies; he knew how she would have striven to nurture in his heart those seeds of patience, fortitude, and disinterestedness, which she had planted there from her own. "I will fulfil a destiny she shall smile upon!" was his resolve. With the vow of a high and holy profession upon his spirit, he threw himself again into the arena of study, and wrestled with the masters of old, as one who was determined to rifle their most hidden treasures. But the conflict with emotions thus nobly conquered had left his spirit's tenement too weak for the weight of duty he laid upon it; and sudden illness came to suspend for a time his plans.

The sharp visage of his "tutelar Esculapius" protruded itself through the doorway just as Charles was thoughtfully refolding his letter.

"Walk in, walk in, Doctor! good evening!" exclaimed he, advancing a chair, toward which the portly Dr. strode with a sort of impatient dignity.

"Books! books again!" growled he, thumping his knuckles upon the well-strewn study table beside him. "What were my orders, young man?"

"Only recreation, Doctor! Positively I was tiring to death of nothing to do, so I took up my Trigonometry for an hour *only.*"

"Trigonometry be hanged! or you will be—worse off!" exclaimed the offended dignitary, frowning fearfully as he rolled up his cuffs for the preparation of some powders. "I wish you were well away from under this roof and my care! These obstinate fellows! they are enough to ruin any clever man's reputation!"

"Aha! well, Doctor, what do you think of despatching me into the country for a month or two? I have just received an invitation from a kind old friend, a connection of my mother."

"Go! go! by all that's hopeful," exclaimed the physician. "There's no rest or respite for you *here*, I see plainly enough. Go upon a farm—hoe corn—dig ruta-bagas—hunt—swim—flirt with the country girls; do anything but study! and you may 'throw physic to the dogs,' with my hearty amen!"

"It is a journey of a hundred miles, Doctor. How soon is it advisable for me to set out?"

"This week—to-morrow—by all means, if you can. Be off with yourself forthwith! and mind! don't let me see you again until you are as ruddy and sunburnt as a Seminole!"

He rose to leave.

"But, Doctor," inquired Charles, laughing, "you are not serious in interdicting *all* study?"

"Yes, youngster! all but the study of botany and black eyes, if you please! As for this rubbish here, I *positively* forbid you to load your trunk with an inch of it. As you value your life, take heed! Take your eye off the valedictory, young man! You may blaze up like the rocket, but your life will be almost as short. Make a lesser star of yourself, and you may chine out your appointed time."

"You mistake me, sir; indeed, I am not ambitious!" replied Charles, with a slight glow suffusing his pale cheek.

"The mistake is in you!" rejoined the Doctor, incredulously. "This a wonderful age, this! Men imagine mind works by steam, like their new-fangled inventions. Why, it would kill an ox to sit bent as you young gentlemen bend over your books, through two-thirds of the blessed twenty-four hours! But I will rick your stumbling upon any mosty tomes in that out-of-the-way corner. Good evening, sir! a pleasant journey to you. Good evening!"

And the Doctor, a wiser worthy than some of his cotemporaries, clammed together his portmanteau, and bowed himself out.

The middle of a sultry afternoon landed Charles, dusty and weary enough with stage jolting, at the door of a low, old-fashioned farmhouse. I shall not attempt its description; for Daguerreotypes of places, as well as of persons, are too likely to turn out only prim caricatures of their originals; and that, too, in proportion to the fascinations of said originals. Charles only saw, at the first glance, three elms that invitingly waved him forward, and, any, two lofty maples which shaded the short and sanded avenue. A grayhaired man, with a calm, kind smile, stood on the door-stone at its extremity to welcome him; and two or three heads were vaguely peeping out from behind the muslin curtain of the "best parlor" window.

"Charles Franklin, I'm sure, and no other!" exclaimed his warm welcomer, with a cordial but courtly grasp of the hand. "Like mother, like son, sure enough. I should have known you among a thousand. Walk in—walk in—never mind your fare!" and, hurrying him through two low doorways, 'Squire Lindsay (for such prefix the plain farmer bore) ushered him into the assemblage of his family.

A dark, thin-featured, sharp-eyed "maiden," of an age beyond the "uncertain," quite formidable in a starched cap and immaculate apron, fixed Charles' eye at entering, as if by mesmeric power. She was whirring a wheel with the velocity of a small wind-mill, and turned upon him with a suddenness quite startling. "Aunt Hetty," as she afterwards learned to call her, or "Miss Lindsay," as she then introduced to him, was a well-meaning virago, whom no one but her all-enduring, imperturbable brother would have retained at the head of his young family. "Every one has a vocation, and that vocation is determined by natural gifts." If this be true philosophy, Aunt Hetty had not mistaken her own; for few could boast greater capabilities in the scrubbing and scolding line.

Mary Lindsay, her father's eldest—an invalid, with a slight veil of capriciousness and unrest over pale, regular features—was next brought to his kindred.

"Milly, the next one, is in the south district, teaching—you should see her proud mother's eye! Bessie, the rogue, is off in the woods, or the sheep in the meadows, as usual!"

"Yes, Aunt Hetty, she's riding Leopold to water," spoke up little Bella. "I spy her! There—now!"

Charles turned to the window by which he was sitting, just in time to see a long brown dash mass at a most alarming pace, ridden by a gipsy-looking girl, without saddle or stirrup—her sunbonnet swinging back in the wind and dust, with her laughed hair.

"Bessie is a sad romp!" observed the father, with a quiet, apologetic smile; "but we hope she will tame down somewhat as she grows. We have only remembered parent, and remembered as always a sufferer. He had left his college cares to follow her to the far South, and there soothe her last hours. She had breathed out her calm life on his shoulder, and he had come back to sotive life with the "shadow of a great grief" on his futurity.

Yet he shrank not from the battle-field of Duty into the morass of Melancholy. He felt that her angel eye was watching him from the skies; he knew how she would have striven to nurture in his heart those seeds of patience, fortitude, and disinterestedness, which she had planted there from her own. "I will fulfil a destiny she shall smile upon!" was his resolve. With the vow of a high and holy profession upon his spirit, he threw himself again into the arena of study, and wrestled with the masters of old, as one who was determined to rifle their most hidden treasures. But the conflict with emotions thus nobly conquered had left his spirit's tenement too weak for the weight of duty he laid upon it; and sudden illness came to suspend for a time his plans.

The sharp visage of his "tutelar Esculapius" protruded itself through the doorway just as Charles was thoughtfully refolding his letter.

"Walk in, walk in, Doctor! good evening!" exclaimed he, advancing a chair, toward which the portly Dr. strode with a sort of impatient dignity.

"Books! books again!" growled he, thumping his knuckles upon the well-strewn study table beside him. "What were my orders, young man?"

"Only recreation, Doctor! Positively I was tiring to death of nothing to do, so I took up my Trigonometry for an hour *only.*"

"Trigonometry be hanged! or you will be—worse off!" exclaimed the offended dignitary, frowning fearfully as he rolled up his cuffs for the preparation of some powders. "I wish you were well away from under this roof and my care! These obstinate fellows! they are enough to ruin any clever man's reputation!"

"Aha! well, Doctor, what do you think of despatching me into the country for a month or two? I have just received an invitation from a kind old friend, a connection of my mother."

"Go! go! by all that's hopeful," exclaimed the physician. "There's no rest or respite for you *here*, I see plainly enough. Go upon a farm—hoe corn—dig ruta-bagas—hunt—swim—flirt with the country girls; do anything but study! and you may 'throw physic to the dogs,' with my hearty amen!"

"It is a journey of a hundred miles, Doctor. How soon is it advisable for me to set out?"

"This week—to-morrow—by all means, if you can. Be off with yourself forthwith! and mind! don't let me see you again until you are as ruddy and sunburnt as a Seminole!"

He rose to leave.

"But, Doctor," inquired Charles, laughing, "you are not serious in interdicting *all* study?"

"Yes, youngster! all but the study of botany and black eyes, if you please! As for this rubbish here, I *positively* forbid you to load your trunk with an inch of it. As you value your life, take heed! Take your eye off the valedictory, young man! You may blaze up like the rocket, but your life will be almost as short. Make a lesser star of yourself, and you may chine out your appointed time."

"You mistake me, sir; indeed, I am not ambitious!" replied Charles, with a slight glow suffusing his pale cheek.

"The mistake is in you!" rejoined the Doctor, incredulously. "This a wonderful age, this! Men imagine mind works by steam, like their new-fangled inventions. Why, it would kill an ox to sit bent as you young gentlemen bend over your books, through two-thirds of the blessed twenty-four hours! But I will rick your stumbling upon any mosty tomes in that out-of-the-way corner. Good evening, sir! a pleasant journey to you. Good evening!"

And the Doctor, a wiser worthy than some of his cotemporaries, clammed together his portmanteau, and bowed himself out.

The middle of a sultry afternoon landed Charles, dusty and weary enough with stage jolting, at the door of a low, old-fashioned farmhouse. I shall not attempt its description; for Daguerreotypes of places, as well as of persons, are too likely to turn out only prim caricatures of their originals; and that, too, in proportion to the fascinations of said originals. Charles only saw, at the first glance, three elms that invitingly waved him forward, and, any, two lofty maples which shaded the short and sanded avenue. A gray-haired man, with a calm, kind smile, stood on the door-stone at its extremity to welcome him; and two or three heads were vaguely peeping out from behind the muslin curtain of the "best parlor" window.

"Charles Franklin, I'm sure, and no other!" exclaimed his warm welcomer, with a cordial but courtly grasp of the hand. "Like mother, like son, sure enough. I should have known you among a thousand. Walk in—walk in—never mind your fare!" and, hurrying him through two low doorways, 'Squire Lindsay (for such prefix the plain farmer bore) ushered him into the assemblage of his family.

A dark, thin-featured, sharp-eyed "maiden," of an age beyond the "uncertain," quite formidable in a starched cap and immaculate apron, fixed Charles' eye at entering, as if by mesmeric power. She was whirring a wheel with the velocity of a small wind-mill, and turned upon him with a suddenness quite startling. "Aunt Hetty," as he

(CONTINUED FROM FOURTH PAGE.)

of such fugitive from service or labor, or by seizing and restoring such fugitive, where the same can be done without process, and by taking, or causing such person to be taken, forthwith before such court, judge, or commissioner, whose duty it shall be to hear and determine the case of such claimant in a summary manner; and upon satisfactory proof being made, by deposition or affidavit, in writing, to be taken and certified by such court, judge, or commissioner, or by other satisfactory testimony, duly taken and certified by some court, magistrate, justice of the peace, or other legal officer authorized to administer an oath and take depositions under the laws of the State or Territory from which such person owing service or labor may have escaped, with a certificate of such magistracy or other authority, as aforesaid, with the seal of the proper court or officer thereto attached, which shall be sufficient to establish the competency of the proof, and with proof, also by affidavit, of the identity of the person whose service or labor is claimed to be due as aforesaid, that the person so arrested does in fact owe service or labor to the person or persons claiming him or her, in the State or Territory from which such fugitive may have escaped as aforesaid, and that said person escaped, to make out and deliver to such claimant, his or her agent or attorney, a certificate setting forth the substantial facts as to the service or labor due from such fugitive to the claimant, and of his or her escape from the State or Territory in which such service or labor was due, to the State or Territory in which he or she was arrested, with authority to such claimant, or his or her agent or attorney, to use such reasonable force and restraint as may be necessary under the circumstances of the case, to take and remove such fugitive person back to the State or Territory whence he or she may have escaped as aforesaid. In no trial or hearing, under this act, shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence; and the certificates in this and the first section mentioned, shall be conclusive of the right of the person or persons in whose favor granted, to remove such fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons, by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate, or other person, whomsoever.

SEC. 7 *And be it further enacted*, That any person who shall knowingly and willingly obstruct, hinder, or prevent such claimant, his agent or attorney, or any person or persons lawfully assisting him, his agent or attorney, from arresting such a fugitive from service or labor, either with or without process as aforesaid; or shall rescue or attempt to rescue such fugitive from service or labor, from the custody of such claimant, his or her agent or attorney, or other person or persons lawfully assisting as aforesaid, when so arrested, pursuant to the authority herein given and declared; or shall aid, abet, or assist such person so owing service or labor as aforesaid, directly or indirectly, to escape from such claimant, his agent or attorney, or other person or persons legally authorized as aforesaid; or shall harbor or conceal such fugitive, so as to prevent the discovery and arrest of such person, after notice or knowledge of the fact that such person was a fugitive from service or labor as aforesaid, shall, for either or all offences, be subject to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, and imprisonment not exceeding six months, by indictment and conviction before the district court of the United States for the district in which such offence may have been committed, or before the proper court of criminal jurisdiction, if committed within any one of the organized Territories of the United States; and shall moreover forfeit and pay, by way of civil damages to the party injured by such illegal conduct, the sum of one thousand dollars for each fugitive so lost as aforesaid, to be recovered by action of debt, in any of the district or territorial courts aforesaid, within whose jurisdiction the said offence may have been committed.

SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted*, That the marshals, their deputies, and the clerks of the said district and territorial courts, shall be paid for their services the fees now allowed by law to them for similar services in other cases; and, where such services are rendered exclusively in the arrest, custody, and delivery of the fugitive to the claimant, his or her agent or attorney, or where such supposed fugitive may be discharged out of custody for the want of sufficient proof as aforesaid, then such fees are to be paid in the whole by such claimant, his agent or attorney; and in all cases where the proceedings are before a commissioner, he shall be entitled to a fee of ten dollars in full for his services in each case, upon the delivery of the said certificate to the claimant, his or her agent or attorney; or a fee of five dollars in cases where the proof shall not, in the opinion of such commissioner, warrant such certificate and delivery, inclusive of all services incident to such arrest and examination, to be paid in either case, by the claimant, his or her agent or attorney. The person or persons authorized to execute the process to be issued by such commissioner for the arrest and detention of fugitives from service or labor as aforesaid, shall also be entitled to a fee of five dollars each for each person he or they may arrest and take before any such commissioner as aforesaid, at the instance and request of such claimant, with such other fees as may be found reasonable by such commissioner for such other additional services as may be necessarily performed by him or them; such as attending at the examination, keeping the fugitive in custody, and providing him with food and lodging during his detention, and until the final determination of such commissioner; and in general for performing such other duties as may be required by such claimant, his or her attorney or agent, or commissioner in the premises, such fees to be made up in conformity with the fees usually charged by the officers of the courts of justice within the proper district or county, as near as may be practicable, and paid by such claimant, his agent or attorney, and taken

feelings, so vigorous with his pen, so frank and fearless in the utterance of his own convictions, unpalatable as they sometimes are to a majority of the American People. He is a hot partisan, and his prejudices lead him to do injustice to his political opponents, especially those of the Free Soil school—but he is no skulker, no hypocrite, no doughface—he does not cry, art thou well, my brother? while he takes you by the beard and plants a dagger under your fifth rib. We prefer him infinitely as an opponent, to any Northern doughface, who might be selected to fill his place, with a view to play a double game in politics, and harmonize contradictions by a humbug.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Gibbon's Decline and Fall. Vol. V and VI. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

We have received the last volumes of this new, neat, and convenient edition of Gibbon's Decline and Fall, by the Harpers. Several times have we had occasion to bring it to the notice of our readers.

The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey. Part V. Published and for sale as above.

One more number will complete this republication. It is a work full of intellectual entertainment. We observe frequent references to Americans and American authors in this Part, marked by great liberality. His biographer says that he was always rejoiced at an opportunity of showing attention to Americans, especially as he had been unjustly accused of holding and expressing opinions very unfavorable to their country. The anti-American articles in the Quarterly Review he protested against privately, condemning the spirit in which they were written.

Dictionary of Mechanics. Edwin Work and Ezekiel Newbery. No 16. Oliver Pryne, Editor. New York: D. Appleton & Co. For sale by R. Farnham, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

This work sustains its character, and its typographical execution is worthy of all praise.

Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution. By Benson J. Lossing. No. 5 and 6. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Washington.

There is no falling off in this very beautiful publication. The embellishments and illustrations are exquisite. Our readers will remember that it is devoted to illustrations by pen and pencil of the history, scenery, biography, relics, and traditions of the war for independence.

The Illustrated Domestic Bible. By Rev. Ingram Cobbin, A. M. No. 3 and 4. New York: Samuel Hueston. For sale by W. Salem, Bookseller, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

We take pleasure in again commending this work to the favor of our readers. Its peculiar features, making it an admirable family Bible, we pointed out a few weeks since. It will be completed in twenty numbers, at 25 cents each.

History of Darius the Great. By Jacob Abbot. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Washington.

The series of biographies prepared by Mr. Abbot for the young has been of real service to those who have been so fortunate as to be put in possession of them. They are well adapted to the taste and capacity of youth, and the author labors to imbue them with just and generous sentiments.

Health, Disease, and Remedy. By George Moore, M. D. Published and for sale as above.

Dr. Moore has done much to inform the masses of the People, by presenting professional or abstract truth in a popular and practical form. He is already known as the author of two of the best on the relations between the mind and the body. The one before us, treating of a subject in which all are deeply interested, in a style suited to the comprehension of all, ought to have an extensive circulation.

Massachusetts Quarterly Review. September, 1850.

A note by the editor informs us that this independent and spirited Review ceases with the present number—a matter of regret, for we do not know precisely what will take its place. We have here the editor's due contribution, in an article, to some persons perhaps more curious than edifying, on the different chronologies of the New Testament. This, with one from Mr Burney, on the political "crisis" we have just survived, will prove the main attraction. For the others, we trust at present to their advertised titles and their authors' names.

Christian Examiner. September, 1850.

We erred in calling this a quarterly. It comes once in two months, and makes two fair volumes annually, at two dollars each. This number is chiefly remarkable for a capital Editor's Table, near twenty close pages of "Literary Intelligence," or comments in general. There are three excellent biographical articles—an address by Dr. Burnap on theological study, an account and criticism of Fenerbach, and one on Furness's book recently noticed by us; the others are more general, and good as usual. An uncommonly pleasant brief one is that on Architecture.

Westminster Review. July, 1850. New York: Leonard Scott, &c. For sale by W. Adam, Washington, D. C.

We do not undertake to characterize all the articles, but this seems to us an unusually valuable number. The article on Leonardo da Vinci is, perhaps, more laboriously and ambitiously than well done. That on "Prostitution," or the causes, conditions, and victims of immorality in cities, is an eminently able, humane, thoughtful, and practical treatment on a subject, which, from its terror and hopelessness, most moralists have "passed by on the other side." The more one knows of it, the more he feels that it cannot be passed, silently and safely. Some of the foreign notices has an excellent discussion of the position and employment of women. In fact, it would be a long task to enumerate all the topics which this admirable review deals with, at once so gravely and hopefully.

London Quarterly Review. July, 1850. Published and for sale as above.

It is part of the established merit of this review, to have put forth the capital series of papers on the great works of Britain—the Railway, the Tubular Bridge, and now the Mechanism of the Post Office. What can we say more for this number than that it contains a paper on the Post Office tell the truth, for want of time we have read none of the others with proper care, save that on spectacles. The printer will not wait for us to finish those on Condorcet, National Workshops, and the Austrian Revolution, of which we reserve our opinion accordingly.

Edinburgh Review. July, 1850. Published and for sale as above.

This sober and discreet Quarterly gives us first something apparently very curious and well worth reading, on Probabilities; two good historical articles, on the Roman Empire and Pedro the Cruel; a Defence of the African Squadron, showing the deplorable effects which would follow the abandonment of that stupendous attempted blockade; and the usual complement of sundry topics. In "Göethe's Festival," we commend the excellent statement of the creed of this writer—"of all false religions the most subtle, the most tempting, the most attractive, from its very approximation to the truth."

Blackwood's Magazine. August, 1850. Published and for sale as above.

"African Sporting," and "Lochru Rollin on England," we have found the most attractive among the contents of this number. Good counsel, we presume, is given in the article on Landscape Painting; and for the rest, including that on Free Trade and on Courtship in the time of James I, we may readily suppose that they are in keeping with the character and credit of this invaluable, wayward and spicy magazine.

Knickerbocker Magazine for September: New York: Samuel Hueston, publisher.

Our genial friend, "Old Knick," has been on an excursion to the interior lakes and cities of New York, since we last had the pleasure of sitting at table with him, and gives so fresh and good-humored an account of what he saw and heard along the line of the Erie railroad, that we are put into an extremely pleasant mood with him. His table is seldom better spread than at this present feast; and while the is so, we find upon the side tables a great variety of dishes, supplied by his able corps of regular contributors to his own and his readers' entertainment.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine. No. IV. For sale by Franck Taylor, Washington City.

In the lighter portion of its contents this periodical has sustained the spirit with which it commenced, while in the more substantial department it has improved steadily from the first number. There are several articles in the September issue of real value, and one that is alone worth two or three times the cost of the number. We refer here to a paper on "Shooting Stars and Meteoric Showers," which possesses deep interest, and shows how beautifully, intelligently, and philosophically, modern observation and science deal with ancient record and superstition.

A DEFENCE OF THE BARNBURNERS.

Washington, September 18, 1850.

To the Editor of the National Era:

Your strictures on the action of the recent Convention at Syracuse, will, I think, accompany you a reply. You charge the Barnburners who participated in the proceedings of that Convention with being guilty of a total abandonment of the principles promulgated in the Buffalo Convention, and contended for in the Presidential election of 1848, and especially by adopting the Baltimore resolution of 1848 (Cass and Butler) in part. You assume that they openly acknowledge to the world that they were wrong, and the Hunker section were right, in their action on that subject. This is a very serious charge to make against any party, and when it is made against a body of men who, for three years, have been subjected to more small and contemptible persecution than any ever before in our political history, it should be promptly met and refuted—and the statement of a few simple facts will do this effectually.

The Baltimore resolutions express the position of the Democracy, on the subject of slavery, *past, present, and future*. That is, that Congress should not interfere with slavery in the States, and, in any *incipient* steps that may lead to such interference. The Democracy are strict constructionists of the Federal Constitution, and hold that the individual States, with the exception of the few subjects enumerated in the Constitution, are separate sovereignties, and that New York has no more right to interfere with the domestic institutions of South Carolina, either directly or indirectly, than she has with those of Great Britain or Holland. The Barnburners, therefore, were perfectly consistent in adopting this resolution—not only now, but would have been so had they adopted it in 1848.

But this resolution in 1848 did not touch the question in issue. The question was slavery in the *Territories, not in the States*. The Mexican war closed with a vast acquisition of free territory, and the "slave interest" demanded that it should be surrendered to slavery, by a constitutional construction. The nominee of the Baltimore Convention adopted that construction by giving an opinion that it would be a violation of the Constitution to *enforce* an opposite one. His election and endorsement by the people would therefore have been an indirect admission of the demands of slavery.

On this the New York Democracy took their position. It was to defeat such indirect admission, and consequent construction of the Federal Constitution, they placed themseves on a vital principle, instead of compromising in Democratic principle or right or wrong of slavery, or even the destinies of the territories in question—a principle, in fact, that involved the very existence of our government, and that was to decide which was the predominating element in the Constitution, slavery or freedom. They therefore separated from the National party, and from party and personal friendships of many years—most behind them all the bloodhounds of power and the emoluments of office, and arrayed themselves to more abuse and persecution than was ever before, in modern times, inflicted upon a political party; and they passed through the fiery ordeal with a constancy and unflinching fidelity that challenged the admiration of the very millions opposed to them.

The defeat of Gen. Cass, and consequent safety of the Constitution, accomplished the great leading object for which they had separated from their party and subjected themselves to so severe a trial; but they also wished, as a *practical* question, to exclude slavery from the territory in question, and in this they were joined by another body of men, who, believing that slavery is a great wrong inflicted upon the human race, and acting wholly upon and always in opposition to the Constitution, were necessarily opposed to its introduction into the Territories. The Convention at Syracuse *assumed* that the adoption of the Wilmot Proviso settles the question, and that slavery is or will be wholly excluded from the Territories. The Barnburners therefore, have not receded from the great principle involved, and then excluded slavery from the Territories, now assume the position that they have always occupied in regard to slavery in the States; and that the action of the Convention in the National party having passed away, they again take their place in the ranks of the National party, with whom they have always fraternized.

This is a statement of the facts in the premises, and you now charge them with an abandonment of their principles, and with bad faith to their allies on the Territorial question. You assume, that by acting with the Liberty men in a common object, they have thereby *acknowledged* themselves bound to adopt the prior owner's other allies, and thus contradict the leading *principles upon which, as political partizans*, they had always acted, and which, when they were in the Democratic Convention at their head, would have held every man of them up to the scorn and ridicule of the world. There it seems, no doubt that, out of 120,000 votes cast for Mr. Van Buren in the Presidential election in the State of New York, a majority were Barnburners; and, if you had reasoned in a precisely opposite direction, and resolved on conclusion that the Liberty men were bound to adopt the Baltimore resolutions, (the prior creed of the Barnburners,) and thus become *saved and resolute* Democrats, your skill as a logician would have been better displayed, although such a conclusion would scarcely have been reached by a

Barnburner.

REMARKS.

We see nothing in the reply of a "Barnburner," to change our opinion of the acts of the Syracuse Convention. His construction of the Baltimore resolution on the subject of slavery is totally incorrect. That resolution expressly recognises the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with slavery, not only in *the States*, but in *the Territories*. Its language is unmistakable:

"That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States; and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of abolitionists or others, made to *induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to agitate it in any form or manner, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an unviable tendency to alienate the affections of the people, endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.*"

The Barnburners admitted the truth of that part of the resolution which related to *slavery in the States;* so did the Liberty men who united with them; but they all opposed that part which related to *slavery in the Territories*. The Baltimore resolutions enjoined Non-Intervention in respect to the question of slavery in the Territories; the Barnburners denied it, and insisted on the right and duty of positive interference by Congress. They voted *against* General Cass, as the representative of Non-Intervention, and *for* Martin Van Buren, as the representative of Wilmot-Provisoism. That was their position in 1848.

Where do we find them in 1850? On precisely the ground they repudiated in 1848—sustaining *now* a policy which *then* they denied so wrong and mischievous as to justify their separation from the National Democracy! The *Washington Union* understands that matter when it says:

"The best sign in the Syracuse Convention, therefore, is the *readoption of the Baltimore Non-Intervention, and the profound silence which reigned in the Convention about the Buffalo Wilmot-Proviso Platform*, on which the Free-Soilers went off in the late Presidential election. Indeed, it is said that Mr. John Van Buren himself was no Free-Soiler, and that there was no such party. It is a pity that he had not made this discovery a little earlier. *This Convention also approves of the late measures of Congress which threw overboard the Wilmot Proviso.*"

The Territorial Question has undoubtedly been settled by Congress on the Principle of Non-Intervention. The Syracuse Convention by resolution expressly approves of this settlement, and in adopting the Baltimore resolution above quoted, expressly affirms its faith in the doctrine and policy of Non-Intervention with all questions of Slavery—and that is the Case platform!

We did all we could to effect a Union between the Liberty men and Barnburners in New York, and to bring about a general union of all the opponents of slavery extension, during the last Presidential canvass. Under the same circumstances, we should do so again. We see nothing in our course then, to regret. The nomination of Martin Van Buren, and the three hundred thousand votes given to him as the representative of the Wilmot Proviso, were links in the chain of causes leading to the passage of the Oregon bill with its inhibitory clause against slavery, and to the exclusion of slavery from the shores of the Pacific. For all that the Barnburners did by word and deed to contribute to these results, we have given them ample credit. Nor were we ready to blame them, even one year ago they adopted the doubtful policy of a union with the Hunkers. Although questioning that policy, we vindicated their integrity, and hoped for the best. But, now, when the State Convention, in which they are equally represented, with shameless profligacy abandons all they contended for in 1848, and adopts all that they then repudiated, as an independent journalist, bound by no party ties or connections, we are not at liberty to suppress our opinion of the movement.

OUR REPRESENTATIVES VS. TEXAS BOUNDARY BILL.

The question has been again and again asked why no effort was made in the House to amend the Texas Boundary bill, and, as a Member, in reply to the New York *Tribune*, who seems to have in his mind the adage, that "a poor excuse is better than none," we will offer the reason, but, we were rendered unavailing, because the Speaker would not look at any one who rose upon the Free Soil side. That gentleman had no eye for anything but the Slave interest—no ear towards any body but his own party. Gentlemen rose as numerously, in succession, as the phantom kings did before the eyes of Macbeth, and they spread out their chests, and held out their hands, and even hemmed; but the impassible Speaker looked on with no Boyd; and so the most meritorious act upon the American statute book was carried.

We admire the simplicity of the man who could advertise his disapproval for one of the most flagrant neglects of duty, and one of the most glaring exhibitions of supineness and cowardice, that have yet been perpetrated in the House of Representatives, and yet would incorporate an admission to know whether he believed it satisfactory or not. How would such an apology have sounded from the mouth of John Quincy Adams?

Worcester Spy.

John Quincy Adams, had he been living, could have done no more than was done on the occasion referred to. The editor of the *Worcester Spy* does injustice to the true men from the free States who sought to defeat or amend the bill. The rules of the House, enforced by a Pro-Slavery Speaker, gave them no opportunity. It is sheer nonsense to talk of the representatives of freedom betraying their trust, because they did not amend the bill. Men cannot do impossibilities. The Speaker gave the floor to Linn Boyd—how could Judge Allen or Mr. Rockwell deprive him of it? And when Mr. Boyd got the floor, offered his amendments, and sprung the previous question, how could the amendments be introduced? It was an impossibility. And when the previous question was not seconded, the ever-ready Speaker took care to give the floor to somebody who would move to commit, and spring the previous question on that. How could that be helped? Would you have the Speaker lynched, and the somebody on the floor choked off by main force?

There are plenty of Generals who can always plan a better campaign and fight a better fight than the man on whom are the responsibilities of the battle field: plenty of heroes, out of harm's way. Once for all we say, essential amendments to the Texas Boundary Bill were rendered impossible by the fact that the Speaker and a decided majority of the House were against them.

COLONEL BENTON

ON THE PROPOSED "NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC" ORGAN AND THE MISSOURI ELECTION.

The *St. Louis Union* of the 17th publishes the following letter of Old Bullion to one of his friends, in which he rights certain matters:

Washington City, *Sunday, August* 25, 1850.

Dear Sir: The *New York Evening Post* of the 17th inst contains a letter from this place, which concerns me, and I, of course, should be the last to notice, to prevent my friends from being left into any mistake or doubt with respect to my future course. The letter says that the Democratic party intend to start a paper in this place, to be devoted to reorganize the party, and to support me for the Presidency. The *Post* very justly remarks upon this communication, that it is proper started to support any particular person for the Presidency cannot be the organ of a party, but of an individual, and cannot do no good; but agrees that a new Democratic paper is wanted to be established here. These are my own opinions—a new paper for the party, not for an individual. Gen. Jackson was never more right than when he warned Mr. Polk against bringing Ritchie here, and foretold the ruin of the party if he did. Every day's experience has fully proved it, and has confirmed the truth of that warning, and if it remains here we shall be ruined, and shall again lose the Presidential election, and shall deserve to lose it, because we deserve it. But my object in writing this note was to notice what concerned myself in that letter to the *Evening Post*, and to tell my friends what I wish and ought to know, that they may not be misled by any erroneous report. The new paper, if one is established here, is not to support me for the Presidency, or for anything else. This I have always foreseen and always, who know me, know there is nothing more to be said on that point; so that the letter to the *Evening Post*, as it concerns myself, was dead here before it was known in Missouri.

The election of Senator is considered in the hands of the Whigs and Nullifiers, and the report we have here is that the latter will join the former, and elect a Whig. If so, it will still be a victory in behalf of the Union, and will show that Missouri will not "*cooperate*" with other slaveholding States in establishing a Southern Confederacy. It will also *assert* the party, and fix every man in his right place.

You know I was ready in St. Louis, (city and county,) and have deserved success if you have not commanded it, and have insured it for the next time. You know I have always been with a small minority, not one fifth of the party; and of which I am told there is not above one hundred and fifty real disunion and nullification men among them, the rest who vote with them being in reality good hard money and Union men, but led astray by continual falsehoods. These deceived citizens will be undeceived in the truth of themselves during the ensuing elections, and will return to the hard money Union Democracy to which they belong. So of other counties. The nullification Vatmian Democracy are a minority; a miserable minority in every county—in some counties none at all—and of themselves able to do nothing; but by organizing into one party, and by caucus, frauds, and trade in votes, have contrived to make themselves prominent, and often to rule the State, and this year to give it to the Whigs, after having first tried to give it to the Free-Soil Democracy, but this is about the last harm they will do us. The ensuing elections will give them their proper places in the ranks of the Whigs, and will free us from them forever, and will leave us stronger than ever.

The appeal is now decided and sustained, and the object I had in making it is accomplished. The nullification resolutions of the last General Assembly are condemned; the people waked up to the reality of the plot to dissolve the Union, and the State of Missouri redeemed from the pledge to "*cooperate*" in it. Yours, truly,

Thomas H. Benton.

Mr. John Smith, St. Louis, Mo.

CONGRESS.

THIRTY-FIRST CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

Tuesday, September 24, 1850.

A memorial from printers in Washington representing against the proposed copyright system was presented by Mr. Clay, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The Minimum Penalty bill from the House was taken up. Mr. Soulé moved an amendment providing for the payment of the instalments by the Secretary of the Treasury. This was rejected, and the bill was ordered to be read.

A bill making temporary provision for the working of the gold mines of California was considered. On motion of Mr. Ewing, it was so amended as to restrict a permit to every man to nine hundred square feet, and to allow of the transfer of permits in certain cases. Mr. Seward moved to amend the bill so as to confine its close who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. This was amended, on motion of Mr. Dodge of Iowa, so as to require testimonials of good character from the parties, and then agreed to—yeas 21, nays 18—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Bell, Benton, Bright, Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Ewing, Felch, Foote, Hale, Jones, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Soulé, Spaulding, Walker—21.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Berrien, Clarke, Davis of Massachusetts, Dawson, Fremont, Gwin, Hamlin, Hunter, King, Morton, Pearce, Sebastian, Sprunance, Underwood, Wales, and Winthrop—18.

The Senate soon after adjourned till 6 o'clock, when it met for the transaction of Executive business.

Wednesday, September 25, 1850.

The joint resolution from the House, to authorize the President of the United States to come a suit to be instituted against Jonathan Gray W. Crawford, late Secretary of War, was taken up, and read.

The resolution was debated some time—Mr. Crawford's friends endeavoring to vindicate his character, the well-laid plans of the Ex-Secretary, and to defeat the Democrats.

The bill to create certain collection districts in California was reconsidered, amended so as to provide for six ports of entry in that State, and then passed.

The bill making temporary provision for working the gold mines, &c, was taken up and passed.

The Senate, after some time spent in the consideration of the Indian Appropriation bill, adjourned till evening, when it went into Executive session.

Thursday, September 26, 1850.

The Senate had under consideration a bill granting bounty lands to officers and soldiers who have been engaged in the service of the United States. It was amended so as to include the representatives of all such officers and soldiers, and to entitle the representatives of those who have been exposed to the fire of the enemy. The amendments were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading of the bill.

The Senate took up the bill reported from the Select Committee on the memorial of Miss Dix, making grants of lands to the several States, for the support of the Insane Poor in Indigent Asylums.

Mr. Davis of Mississippi opposed the bill as unconstitutional.

Mr. Clarke was in favor of the object of the bill, but would like to see it put in a different form.

A motion to lay on the table failed—yeas 23, nays 25.

Mr. Whitcomb said he considered the bill little more than a proposition to distribute the proceeds of the public lands.

Mr. Benton moved to strike out the 3d section; and was proceeding to address the Senate in general opposition to the bill, when Mr. Pearce moved to postpone it till the second Monday in December next.

This motion prevailed, and the Senate then took up the Indian Appropriation bill. Without disposing of the subject, it adjourned.

Friday, September 27, 1850.

The Indian Appropriation bill was again taken up, and various amendments were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading of the bill.

A bill for the examination and settlement of the private claims in Florida, was debated, and laid upon the table temporarily.

The Fortification bill from the House was passed.

The Navy Appropriation bill was considered, and the Senate then proceeded to the transaction of Executive business.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, September 24, 1850.

The Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation bill, returned from the Senate with amendments, was referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

A resolution of Mr. Johnson of Arkansas, allowing stationery to the amount of $45 for the long and 525 for the short session of Congress, was adopted. On motion of Mr. Strong, ordered, that the delegates from New Mexico and Utah be paid their mileage, &c., out of the contingent fund.

A few days since, a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the House referred to the Committee on Commerce the Senate bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit vessels from the British North American provinces to lade and unlade at such places in any collection district of the United States as he may designate.

This motion was called up by Mr. Grinnell. Mr. Bayly moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. Lost—yeas 86, nays 93. The motion to reconsider then prevailed—yeas 96, nays 86. Mr. Grinnell moved to commit the bill to the Committee of Ways and Means, with instructions (such as had been proposed by Mr. Ashmun) to report certain sections, which he submitted, providing for a continuance of the open trade. Speaker decided that the amendment was out of order, on several grounds—one being that it was not german to the bill. Mr. Ashmun appealed, but the appeal was laid upon the table—yeas 97, nays 81—and the bill was then passed.

Two bills granting lands to aid in the construction of railroads in Missouri were then laid upon the table by considerable majorities.

Mr. Preston King said that he had been seeking throughout the session an opportunity to introduce a bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, but he had not been successful. And he now moved a suspension of the rules for this purpose.

The bill was read. It proposes that all persons held in slavery emancipated by this act shall be paid for out of the Treasury of the United States; and the value and the amount shall be ascertained and determined by the judges of the chronic court for the District of Columbia.

The House refused to suspend the rules—yeas 52, nays 109—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Alexander, Andrews, Bingham, Booth, Burrows, Joseph Cable, Calvin, Chandler, Clark, Cleveland, Cole, Corwin, Doty, Duncan, Durkee, Fitch, Fowler, Freedley, Goodenow, Grow, Gott, Gerrit Smith, Hall, Harlan, Harlan, Henry, Howe, Hunter, James G. King, John A. King, Preston King, Horace Mann, Matteson, Meacham, Morris, Ogle, Olcott, Peck, Reed, Reynolds, Risley, Rockwell, Root, Roman, Sackett, Schoolcraft, Silvester, Spalding, Sprague, Thaddeus Stevens, Van Dyke, Vinton, Waldo, and Wentworth—47.

Nays—Messrs. Albertson, Anderson, Ashe, Ashmun, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bissell, Bowdon, Bowlin, Bowlin, Briggs, Brooks, Albert G. Brown, Buel, Burt, Chester Butler, Thomas B. Butler, E. C. Cabell, George A. Caldwell, Joseph P. Caldwell, Carter, Casey, Cilingman, Williamson R. W. Cobb, Thomas, Clingman, Cocke, Cottman, Edmundson, Eliot, Alexander Evans, N. Evans, Featherston, Gilbert, Gorman, Green, Hall, Hammond, Hampton, Harris, Harris, Hampton W. Harris, Thomas L. Harris, Hay, Haymond, Hibbard, Hoagland, Holladay, Holmes, Howard, Hubbard, Inge, Joseph W. Jackson, Andrew Johnson, Kaufman, Kerr, George C. King, A. Sere, Leffler, Littlefield, Job Mann, Marshall, Mason, McClernand, McDowell, McLanahan, Robert M. McLane, McMullen, McQueen, Meade, Miller, Millson, Morris, Morton, Orr, Outlaw, Parker, Pendleton, Phelps, Pitman, Potter, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Rose, Savage, Sawtelle, Sebastian, Seely, Richard H. Stanton, Alex. H. Stephens, Stetson, Strong, Taylor, Jacob Thompson, James Thompson, Venable, Walden, Walker, Watkins, Wellborn, Whitmore, Wildrick, Williams, Woodward, and Young—109.

Mr. Johnson of Kentucky came into the Hall after his name had been called, and asked to record it in the negative, but the privilege was denied.

[Yeas—Northern Democrats and Free-Soilers—1. Nays—Southern Whigs and Free-Soilers—1. *Nays*—Northern Democrats—31. Northern Whigs—14. Southern *nays*—64. Northern members absent or not voting—44. A few members avowedly favorable to the principle of the resolution voted against a suspension of the rule, because they deemed the introduction of the resolution unseasonable. Under all the circumstances of the case, the vote in the affirmative was unexpectedly large]

A resolution authorizing the President to cause suit to be instituted against Mr. Crawford, for the recovery of money paid him on the Galphin claim, was passed—yeas 122, nays 29.

The Fortification bill was passed.

The bill granting lands to the several States for the relief and support of the indigent insane persons was taken up.

Mr. Bissell explained the provisions of the bill. It appropriates 6,000,000 acres of public lands, to be divided among the States in the compound ratio of their population and their representation in the House of Representatives; the acres of no one State to be computed at more than fifty thousand square miles. The lands are not to be sold at less than the minimum price, and the proceeds are to be invested in the United States or State stocks, to be forever kept as a permanent fund.

After remarks by several gentlemen,

Mr. Burt moved to lay the bill on the table; but the motion was rejected—ayes 82, nays 107.

Pending the question on the engrossment of the bill, the House adjourned.

Wednesday, September 25, 1850.

The House refused to order the bill for the relief of Jonathan Isaacs to a third reading, but referred it to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The House took up the bill amendatory to the act providing for the inspection of steam boilers on vessels propelled in whole or in part by steam.

Mr. McLane, who reported the bill from the Committee on Commerce, suggested various amendments, which were agreed to; and it was passed.

From the reading of the bill we learned that it requires, among other things, that every steamboat navigating the waters of the United States shall be provided with life-boats, and a life-preserver for every person on board; that it keeps in readiness for use, no light combustible materials shall be taken on board; all boilers to be examined by the inspectors, and proper measures to be taken than certain superficial dimensions will warrant. The act to take effect from and after the 1st of April, 1851.]

The Navy Appropriation bill was taken up in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and a debate took place on the general subject of extravagant appropriations.

Mr. Bayly called attention to the condition of the Treasury, and was proceeding to speak of the sums in the several Appropriation bills, when Mr. Bissell said he had the entire amount appropriated thus far, for everything?

Mr. Bayly replied, forty-one million four hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars. He did not include the ten millions in the Texas Boundary bill, nor the amendments to the Navy bill, nor did it include the million put into the Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation bill by the Senate; nor the amendments to the Indian Appropriation bill. [A voice: "And they amount to a million?" Mr. Bayly: "Yes; the amount of the appropriations, he turned to the condition of the Treasury. The actual receipts last year, from all sources, were forty-three millions four hundred thousand dollars. The receipts this year (for reasons which he stated) can hardly be as large as they were the last. And this being the condition of the Treasury, if the House did not resist extravagant appropriations, he desired the country to know what would be the consequence.

After a most confused, disorderly, ill-tempered, and barren discussion,

[CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.]

I have only to say that the address of the gentleman was an able vindication of Whig principles. It was worthy of himself and worthy of the party in whose behalf it was written. It was universally read, and universally approved; and it had its effect—we did elect an overwhelming majority of Whigs—thirty-two out of thirty-four of the Representatives of that great State are Whigs, elected to vindicate Whig principles, and first and foremost amongst those principles, the glorious Ordinance of 1787, now known in our vernacular as the "Wilmot Proviso." Had the subject of it been wholly unknown, or entirely unbroken front; and I trust that neither principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, can induce us, or any one of us, to be otherwise than true to his party, true to his country, and true to himself. What amusement will seize his adversaries, if they discover that a Whig, that the author of that address wore a mask—that while professing to believe in the necessity of active extension against extending slavery, he believed that all such legislation was idle, useless, nay, vicious and impious, and that the cherished principle of a great party was a mere "useless, mischievous abstraction?" I think they may, but, was sincere—that I profess, believe, and maintain now, the selfsame doctrines that I did then—and first and foremost amongst them this, *that the area of slavery must not be extended.*

Having thus vindicated myself from aspersion, I rehearse to the gentleman his own incantation, and I inquire whether there is any one, or other Whig principle which he is preparing to abjure? Is the principle of a protective tariff safe? How soon is his adversary to become an obsolete idea—a useless, mischievous abstraction.

"That the area of slavery must not be extended" was a national Whig principle then. The Ordinance of 1787 was the Whig creed, and was enunciated in the resolutions and instructions of almost every Legislature in the free States, and indeed in almost every State and Constitutional Convention. A fair sample of those resolutions, I quote from those of the State of Massachusetts, adopted on the last day of April, in the year of Grace 1850:

"*Resolved*, That the people of Massachusetts *earnestly invite the application by Congress of the Ordinance of* 1787, as the fundamental law of human rights, in all the territorial *possessions* of the Union in all parts of the continents and for all coming time.

"*Resolved*, That the people of Massachusetts, in the uninterrupted of these their well-known and invincible principles, *expect that our representatives will adhere to them at all times, on all occasions, and under all circumstances.*"

We shall see, in the progress of these bills and kindred measures now before the Senate, whether it would not have been more suitable for that Legislature to have adopted those emphatic resolutions on the first day of April, rather than on the last. We shall see whether they are to be considered the abiding sentiment of the glorious old Bay State, or only as a good joke, and worthy of All-Fools'-day.

Let us inquire, as become the Representatives of a free and thinking people, what are the terms of the "Wilmot Proviso" and how evince our faithfulness by applying to them the Ordinance of 1787, "*with all possible sanctions and solemnities of law.*"

The whole title of Texas to any territory west of the Nueces, or north of the Red river, consists in her own *assertions*, and the *assertions* of President Polk. Before Texas can establish a validity of that title, it will be necessary to establish the principle *that one alone can make a bargain, and that the President has power to give away the territory of the Republic of Mexico by word of mouth.*

There are three ways in which a nation one acquire territory: by prior occupation, by purchase, and by conquest. Texas I will not say, acquired acquired title to any part of New Mexico in any of those ways. She never occupied, never bought, never conquered, never even squatted there. Texas has, however, possessed a lie by which she claims the Rio Grande was her western boundary, from its mouth to latitude 42° north. Paper is passive, and receives all that ignorance and knavery choose to make. It was just as easy for Texas—nay, just as lawful—to fix her boundary on the Pacific as on the Rio Grande; for Mexico was in as full and undisputed possession of all the territory between the Rio Grande and the Nueces, and all the territory of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande, as she was of the Pacific coast. She had towns, villages, and a city there. Spain, and Mexico after Spain, have claimed and occupied this territory more than two hundred years; have exercised undisputed and undisturbed legislative, judicial, and executive power there. All this is to be overcome by a piece of paper, with a few words in writing thereon, made by Texas. Will it not rise to the dignity of a squat—it is only a constructive squat.

Texas seems never to have learned that "it takes two make a bargain." In the same spirit of wantonness, Texas passed a law extending her boundaries to the Pacific; it is lucky that the Governor of that "*self-denying State*" was so affected with a superabundance of modesty that he did not approve that law. If he had, the statesmen and lawyers around us would be debating claims for Texas all New Mexico and all California, and all the remainder of Mexico *when, under our manifest destiny*, we shall acquire that country. What an excellent thing is the right hand of fellowship! Exactly those which she had March 1, 1845, the date of the resolution of annexation? What territory *was they properly entitled to?* Nothing at all! *Fully belonging to Texas?* Nothing at all! These are the words of the resolution. All that territory which Texas occupied and exercised sovereignty and dominion over, was north of the Nueces, and by occupancy only—it was not a right by treaty or priority of occupation.

The boundaries were the Gulf on the south, the Sabine on the east, the Red river on the north to the one hundredth degree of west longitude from London, thence about southeast by south to a branch of the Nueces, thence down that river to the Gulf; and contained about one hundred and twenty-five thousand square miles. This is Stephen F. Austin's boundary, as designated on his own map in 1835. These are the boundaries of Texas as written down by Mrs. Mary Austin Holly, his relative, in her history of Texas. "The whole province lay between 25° 50' and 42° of west longitude, and between 27° and 33° 30' north latitude. It may not be amiss to say that Austin was one of the fathers of the Republic of Texas, and that his countrymen have created a monument to his memory. These boundaries have never been enlarged by any of those acts which constitute title. They remained the same up to the time of annexation. The battle of San Jacinto did not enlarge, it only secured, these boundaries. They were the same when Texas, adopting those boundaries, was the merest nullity. Santa Anna, as President, and free at home in the capital of the Aztecs, had no power to cede the territory of the Republic of Mexico; and he could he make any treaty while a prisoner of war.

The law of Texas was the merest bulwerque. It is amazing that men should urge either that treaty or that law as a foundation of title. The title of Texas was by conquest and occupation, and did not extend a rood beyond. But it is urged that President Polk, and President Tyler, Mr. Polk, has said in his message of the 8th of December, 1846, that the western boundary of Texas was the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source. The *sayings* of the President do not vary the fact. The boundary of Texas remained the same, no matter what the President said. President Polk had many strong arguments to hold a rare knack of telling stories to suit himself. He said that the northern boundary of Oregon was at 54° 40'. He said that the Rio Grande was in Mexico—that American blood had been shed upon American soil by Mexico. Mr. Polk was not at all particular what he did say.

The title of the Government has been for many years to acquire, right or wrong, the territory east of the Rio Grande. This was admitted in substance by Mr. Shannon, our Minister to Mexico, in that despatch of his which made us all ashamed of our Minister and of our Government. Mr. Shannon furnished a new proof of the old Spanish maxim, "that no cloak is large enough to cover itself."

Mr. Calhoun, when Secretary of State, put the question of annexation upon the ground that slavery was a blessing, and that it was necessary to extend it for the safety of the institution, and for the security of the South, and that it was for the benefit of all the rope. This accounts for those sayings of Mr. Polk, by which it is held we are concluded—estopped. Would treating with Mexico, for what of course claim all he could. And when he discovered that there was danger that the Wilmot Proviso would be applied to the territory we should acquire from Mexico, he did all he could, and said all he could, to extend the boundaries of Texas, because all which could be shown to belong to Texas was shielded from the Wilmot Proviso, and the Wilmot Proviso could not reach it. We had in Mr. Polk an unfaithful agent; we are not bound by his sayings, for they exceed his authority, and if we repudiate the sayings, Texas has no right to complain, for she understood the meditated fraud, and aided and encouraged its perpetration.

I contradict Mr. Polk with the less hesitation, because he contradicts himself. In 1845, Mr. Polk sent Mr. Slidell as Minister to Mexico, and through the Secretary of State, Mr. Buchanan, instructed Mr. Slidell, what everybody else knew before, "that Santa Fe was the capital of New Mexico; that it was settled by the Spaniards more than two centuries ago; and that that province had ever since been in their possession and that of the Republic of Mexico; that Texas had never conquered or taken possession of it; its people had never been represented in any legislative assembly or convention of Texas?" And still Mr. Polk says, in his message of 29th December, 1846, that this very territory was, by the act of annexation, admitted as a part of Texas as a State into this Union. Then, according to the statement of this veracious President, we, the people of the United States, incorporated into this Union a vast territory, containing at least one hundred thousand square miles, which contained towns, villages, and a city, and at least one hundred thousand inhabitants, which had been under the quiet and peaceable dominion of friendly Powers for over two centuries! It is melancholy to reflect, that the sayings of the President upon this subject are only monuments of mendacity, hastily compiled, and that his acts are more strously vicious. We all know that after the annexation of Texas, our Government proposed to buy of Mexico the territory lying east of the Rio Grande, and to pay her about six millions for it. We all know, also, that after the annexation we passed a law directing the duties to be refunded to the Mexican Government, and that we drove in unbroken packages to Santa Fe. The United States had a commercial agent there, accredited to the Mexican Government, and we knew, before. Are not these facts perfectly conclusive that we considered, knew, and admitted New Mexico and Santa Fe to belong to Mexico? Can they be reconciled with common sense upon any other principle.

Now, as Texas in her maps has located her own boundary; as the President has described it; as she does not show a town or village, or even a single squatter, north of the Red river, or anywhere else in New Mexico, and as President Polk, Texas and Texas friend, and Mexico were nearly admits all this, I shall assume as proved that Texas did not, previous to the annexation, own any part of New Mexico. Mexico, Texas, and Polk, by better title to the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande.

Will any gentleman inform me the name of any Texan town, village, or even a single squatter, on the west side of the Nueces? I have searched the geography and the history and the maps of Texas in vain. There was no such thing at the time of annexation. At that time the only pretence of settlement on the west side of the Nueces was just at its mouth, at the bay of Corpus Christi. This was used as a military station, and, probably, as the headquarters of General Taylor; his army, of about two thousand men, was encamped upon the beach, and remained there until it marched to Point Isabel. I have it from good authority, that at the time General Taylor encamped on that beautiful beach there were but two houses at Corpus Christi, and that the inhabitants (some) and they were erected by a Colonel McKinney, who had taken the cain of allegiance to Mexico, and that occupation was a flagrant smuggling purpose. Best and ample evidence of the fact that Mexican laws and authority prevailed there.

Mexico, on the contrary, had towns and villages on the east side of the Nueces. The country between it and the Nueces was called New Santander, or Tamaulipas, for the whole length of that province, which runs diagonally from the 26th to the 30th degree of north latitude, there were old Spanish settlements—there were Reinosa, Camargo, Revilla, Grande, Baptista, Monclova, and Aldamas, and Mier, and Guerrero, Mier, Leredo, Dolores, and Enonios, on the east side of the Rio Grande. There were intermediate towns, and Laguniller on the Pacific, and, for ages, a long and very large city. Why, sir, a part of the battle of Palo Alto was fought in a field of Indian corn, the standing and growing crop of a Mexican farmer. Mr. Polk said, in his message, that "*American blood was shed on American soil*"—soil that had been owned and occupied by the Spaniards, and by Mexicans, for more than two hundred years—their peaceable and undisturbed possession. We have no better title to the banks of the Potomac than the Mexicans had to the east bank of the Rio Grande and all east of the Nueces. The law which Texas passed is all her title—she had nothing by possession, nothing by conquest, and nothing by treaty.

It is insisted as a clincher, that the map attached to the treaty of peace with Mexico, made February 2, 1848, shows that all east of the Rio Grande belonged to Texas. The fact is, that what it is J. Disturnel's revised edition of the map of the United Mexican States, of the date of 1847, and does not show any division of the territory portion of the Mexican territory lying east of the Rio Grande, and north of the Red river. That country is designated in large capitals, "Santa Fe." All the best maps of Mexico, of the United States. It is the same province of Santa Fe, which President Polk, in his instructions to Mr. Slidell, says, was settled by the Spaniards more than two centuries ago, and which we have remained in the possession of Spain and the Republic of Mexico; that the Texans had never conquered it, nor taken it, nor any part of it, nor never been represented in any legislative assembly or convention of Texas.

This map also shows Austin's boundary line clearly defined, bounding Texas on the north and west. If any inference is to be drawn from this map, it is clearly proved that Austin's boundaries are true boundaries of Texas.

Let any gentleman trace the dotted lines along the south branch of the Red river to its source, and he will find that it is a continuation of the line what Austin considered, and what President Polk considered, the northern boundary of Texas.

Those who argue in favor of the title of Texas to territory north of the Red river and west of the Nueces, seem to adopt the legal folly, that a great many idle pretences, and numerous unfounded and groundless claims, will, when added together, make a good title.

Shall I be deterred from speaking the truth? Shall I falsely history, in the vain attempt to justify one of the most disgraceful transactions on record? American blood was not shed on American soil—it was shed upon Mexican soil; here I fight, by right, by treaty, by law, I am bound to defend it. Texas avers, that if her treaty with Santa Anna did not give the Rio Grande for her western boundary, nor her own law, that our President had made it was American soil, having marched the army of the United States there under the pretence and allegation that it belonged to Texas, and that Mexico had been concluded or *estopped* from saying it does not belong to Texas. This argument, if it amounted to anything, is only applicable to the territory east of El Paso; it has nothing to do with New Mexico, for it was not pretended that that, or any portion of it, belonged to Texas; expressly the contrary was admitted. The President, in his message and Resses de la Palma are nearly a thousand miles from Santa Fe. But let us examine this doctrine of estoppel. It is a plea in law, and has been acute Presidential jugglery or official legerdemain which has estopped the United States from claiming and owning the territory she has conquered and taken.

The plea of estoppel is a plea in bar, predicated on a man's own act and sayings of a man's agent who transcends his authority, which stope the man not only from claiming that the agent transcended his authority, but also from proving that what he said was false.

Blackstone's definition, in order to apply to the case, should be slightly paraphrased as follows:

A man shall always be estopped by the deed of his agent, who has no authority to make such deed, and not be permitted to aver or prove either that the agent did not make the deed, or that he had no authority to make it.

Gentlemen had better leave this quibble, this piece of official trickery, to the shifftogers—those who know nothing of the philosophy and much of the knaverice of the law.

These sayings of President Polk, on which the plea of estoppel is founded, are untrue in fact; and as he had no power to convey away the territory of the United States directly, still less could he do so by indirect sayings. Texas, by her missions were not the admission of the United States.

Not only was President Polk destitute of authority to cede away the land of the United States, or in any way to invalidate our title, but his admissions and sayings are not entitled to the credit of impeachment.

In his intercourse with Mexico, his drift and evident intention was to provoke a war; and his sayings were made with that intention and object.

After the conquest of Mexico, he was still partial to Texas; because, under the operation of the Wilmot Proviso, all the territory which he had conquered, and which I belong to Texas, would be and remain free. What was yielded to Texas would, of course, be slaveholding. His great object was to extend slavery. Hence his admissions and hence his sayings. They are entitled to no more credence than those of any interested and unscrupulous individual in his own favor.

The President is but the agent of the United States, and his powers are clearly defined by law. Illegal acts cannot be made legal by his sayings, they exceed his authority. The President has no authority to give away or sell a rood of the territory of the United States. The President actually to give would amount to nothing, still less would his talk. If Texas obtains a rood of land of the United States, it must be by a paper title, executed in conformity to law. The title of Texas to all her lands is traced with her own sword. This position is perfectly equitable, for Texas knew and understood the terms on which she understood the power of the President, and knew that the pretence of extending her territory by an act of legislation hardly arrived at the dignity of infantile nonsense. It is no answer to say that the Congress of the United States backed up the President, and voted men and money to sustain his pretensions. The Congress of the United States ordered American troops surrounded by hostile Mexicans; those troops must be succored; they were our countrymen, our friends, and brothers—we could not leave them to be destroyed. General Taylor and his army were in Mexico, in that dangerous position by the command of the President. It was no fault of General Taylor; as a soldier, his first, second, and third duty was to obey. We must not leave the brave old soldier and his army to be out to pieces; the Mexicans had taken possession of the disagreed; "our country, whether right or wrong," was the patriotic watchword; we granted men and money, and we did what we could, we relieved our dishonor by branding the words "this unjust and unconstitutional war" upon the law that granted the supplies; we did not sanction the doings of the President.

But it is alleged that we "*acted as the AGENT of TEXAS?*" in carrying on the war with Mexico; that we conquered and bought for Texas; and that we, "*in her agent?*" Is there any obligation in the article of annexation defining the boundaries of Texas, that the United States should assert those boundaries? Is there any obligation to defend territory annexed? Is territory properly included in and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, and subject to the adjustment by the United States of all questions between Texas and Mexico?

Agency implies a principal who has authority to command, and who is bound, of course, to pay for services rendered. The President is not the AGENT OF AMERICA THE AGENT of Texas! This great Republic under the direction and control of less than fifty thousand inhabitants! When the conscientious Senator from the great State of Ply that lights on it as it rolls—when the giant oak becomes agent for one of its smallest twigs—the Texas agency may be pleaded as a plea.

Well, if we are your agent, come, principal, account with your agent; pay your agent; pay us for the services we have rendered you; pay us for the $150,000,000 which we have expended in your service; pay for the property we have entailed upon us; pay us for the fifty thousand lives we have laid down in the war in which we were involved by your agent; pay us, and then talk of our surrendering the acres we have won, or cease talking of agency. We *have* secured your boundaries that rightfully belonged to you, and our duty is done.

But, says the gentleman from Alabama, [MR. HILLIARD,] here is a map, brought from the capital of Texas, which shows that the territory which we propose to cede, which lies north of the Red river, is not included within the boundaries of New Mexico as laid down on that map. Neither is it included within the boundaries of Texas, as laid down on that map, or any other map. Has it come to this—that Texas owns all the land that she has never been possessed of? Has it so long been taken up and marked as belonging to some particular province? Does Texas acquire territory as a debtor and bankrupt acquires property, by implication? Texas, it seems, claims, as did the greedy farmer, all her own, and all the land adjoining!

It is not a satisfactory answer to say that the land is valueless. First, I do not believe the alleged fact; and if the land is poor, it is as rich for freedom as the best land in the State of Texas; the mountain home, that liberty loves to dwell. The argument that the country is poor, and therefore it is no matter how it is divided, reminds me of a story of a Yankee, who, complaining of the unfair division of a cake by his step-mother was told that it was a poor cake: "It seems to me, mother, that Sam's piece is the biggest bitch out it?" I object to the bill because it proposes to give ten millions of the people's money where not one dollar is due. We all know that we are to be charged with the value of the lands of Texas was, that we should be saddled with her debts. This objection was stoutly resisted by some of those who now propose to do the very thing *we pay.* To provide against the possibility of that contingency, the following clause was inserted in the article of annexation, and without that insertion it never would have passed:

"Texas shall retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits, to be subject to the payment of its debts and liabilities, and to the payment of the expenses and liabilities to become a charge on the Government of the United States."

Everybody knows that this article of annexation could not have passed without this clause. Does it mean something or nothing?

Was it a mere lying pretext—a false and fraudulent pretence, to induce Congress to vote for annexation? Was there no more truth in that pretence than in that other pretence that we are now in the eve of a war with Mexico? Was this clause inserted to delude Congress and appease the ill-suppressed wrath of an indignant people? Does not all the world know that Texas could not have seen annexed without this clause? Does it mean, on the contrary, it had been added to the article of annexation, that the United States should become liable to pay the debts of Texas, and that Congress take her and her war, and give $10,000,000 besides; what Representative or Senator would have dared to vote for the monstrous proposition?

Has anything occurred to increase our liability? The words still stand on our statute book, and the United States is liable to the creditors for the debt of Texas. The war which Whigs predicted would follow the annexation, did come. It cost us $150,000,000—it cost us fifty thousand lives. Is it just to ask us to pay, that we may see the end of the pensions growing out of that war, or of the reproach it has brought on us. Let us examine this pretence of estoppel.

At the time of annexation, the whole population of Texas was less than fifty thousand; she had neither money nor credit; she was at war with Mexico, and there was the utmost inveterancy of hatred between the two countries. Texas exercised jurisdiction over about one hundred thousand square miles, and her population was feeble, and there was some doubt whether she could maintain her independence. But she had a right to cede the territory which she had conquered, and fly the act of annexation she retained her rightful boundaries, and surrendered the right to extend them. Was that right worth anything to her? Certainly, it was worth the annexation, being, for they had the full right before to conquer these Territories.

We are assumed those revenues of Texas which arise from duties on imported articles, and those duties, it is said, were pledged for the payment of her debts. Well, is there any surplus in our hands? I have we not paid Texas? Have we not daily pay out more than the duties amount to? Is not Texas relieved from a war? Are not her revenues increased? Are not her debts relieved of the expense of foreign diplomacy? Are not her Senators and Representatives supported here? Is not Texas relieved from her debt been diminished by annexation? On the contrary, has not her ability been vastly increased? Do we not import, use, and consume her productions? Do we not pay her duties on those productions admitted free of duty? Would they not have been taxed if Texas had remained independent? Do we not pay her duties on imports? Texas? Does it not increase the value of her lands, and of course her ability to pay her debts? Have not her lands quadrupled in value? Her productions, which formerly sold for a copy, have increased with unexampled rapidity. And is not this the result of the peace and security which annexation brought? Has not Texas had no vested right in these revenues—no claim that they could enforce; it was a reliance out of which they had not received the first dollar, and there was no prospect that they would. Their chance on the honor and ability of Texas is far greater now than previous to annexation. We have increased, not lessened her ability to pay.

Will the House indulge me while I illustrate by an allegory? The owner of a mill pledges its tolls for the payment of a debt which he incurred in defending the mill of his neighbor rich from the title of which was in dispute. The tolls are small, not enough to sustain his family and pay the interest on the money borrowed. The war ceases, the mill and the water to another mill pond. In return, I perfect his title, put up capital fences all around his farm, enclose the land up the center of it, and, in every act of directing the water from the mill has drained and rendered immensely valuable a tract of alluvial soil that was before so much of a morass as to be a continually deadly miasma. I render it fertile and wholesome. The miller and his boys are now healthy; they are not dingged with fever and ague, and the farm they well fenced, they are able to devote all their time to industrial pursuits; they are better fed and clothed; their productions are far greater; and the value of the family debts vastly increased. Under these circumstances, the money lender, in conjunction with the miller and his boys, come to me and say, and call upon me to pay their mortgage. I reply to the mortgagee, no; I am none the richer for these tolls; they have cost me ten times as much as they have benefited my property. I am vastly increased the value of the remaining property, which is also liable for the payment of your debt. Look to your other remedy, which is abundant; and when that remedy is exhausted, and your debt is not paid, and I have any funds in my hands resulting from the tolls of the mill, we will talk about the matter further. But unless you pay the full extent of the claim, they will come and take my farm and my mill by force. A little roused, I say, You Mr. Miller, and your boys, are ungrateful dogs—you were originally a kind of loafer, and strayed away and squatted on land where you had no business to go. You picked a quarrel with the proprietor, and I drove you off the quarrel, much to my disgrace and loss. I love you nothing but good will. As for you, Mr. Money-lender, you are a stranger to me; I owe you never heard of the name of the money you claim; it is all a shaving, gambling transaction; and I have strong reasons to believe that much of the money you claim I was the cause of taking from me. If you want my money or my mill, you must come and take them. I don't care a fig for your threats; but if you commit any violence I will go to court to my premises with the design you have expressed, I shall defend my premises, and put you under bonds to keep the peace.

The equity is all clearly on the other way. By right, the United States should retain the sovereignty and own the soil of all that territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, as some small indemnity for the expenses of the war, the lives it cost, and the pensions it has entailed upon us. I will propound one question to those who insist that we are equitably bound to pay this $10,000,000. It is a plain, searching question, and the honest answer will show whether it is under a profound sense of justice or a less noble motive that we are asked to pay. Texas has been long at peace; made no disloyal threats; was as quiet as the claimants for French spoliations are; would any man think, still less would any gentleman or Senator, vote for a law for Congress to give to Texas $10,000,000 for equity only—for justice? That man is not to be found. Will Congress yield, then, to the harassed cry of Texas, to the clamor of unreasonable bluster, what you would not think of yielding to justice and equity? Will you be frightened from your propriety, because Texas has sent us to war with Mexico? Is that what she calls justice—Texas, that could not furnish Major Neighbors with spending money when he went to see you at the Capitol—Texas, that could not prevent the Indians from scalping her frontier inhabitants? Nothing is further from Texas than the desire to have any collision with the United States. Texas would be the more anxious to remain in the Union. The first nullifier remains to be found. She has no affinity with traitors; her sympathies are with those who have shed their blood, and her brave men would run mad, if division should begin. The idea of such a gammon; it is an invention of the "bulls and the bears"—speculators in Texas land, and speculators in steel pens-in-liers and "terrible-accident writers?"

In whose behalf is it that we are called on to pay ten millions? Texas avers that she don't ask it. We have a right to ask, in her behalf, is it enough we know her mouth waters for the money; and when she has got it she will, like the lewd woman named in Scripture, wipe her lips, and say, "I have done no harm?"

Sir, I will venture to predict that before we get through these bills, we shall have proof of what I say. Texas, I think, will, in some stage of passage, be doubtful, and we shall see the Representative from Texas [MR. HOWARD] come to their rescue. Sir, I doubt not that Representative, who for weeks and months, has been "sweating against the stomach of our sense," that Texas claims and insists upon the Rio Grande from its source to its mouth as her boundary, and that she will not barter her rights—that she despises our gold—will whip in with amazing alacrity when he discovered that these bills cannot be passed without his vote. The unanimity of the Texan delegation, the benefits resulting from benefits conferred, that we should give to Texas, and of course to hopeless slavery, the fertile and beautiful country, the ten millions in money? Our connection with that country has been one continued source of unmixed mischief. Almost the first official act which the Senate of the United States passed, in a Slave State did, was to repeal the tariff 1842, and inflict on us that of 1846—a tariff that has brought the manufacture of cotton goods to a stand-still. The Senator from Virginia told us that Texas would be a poor cake: It seemed to me that I could see the boy who got the bitch out it? I object to the bill because it proposes to give ten millions of the people's money where not one dollar is due. We all know that we are to be charged with the value of the lands of Texas was, that we should be saddled with her debts. This objection was stoutly resisted by some of those who now propose to do the very thing *we pay.* To provide against the possibility of that contingency, the following clause was inserted in the article of annexation, and without that insertion it never would have passed:

"Texas shall retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits, to be subject to the payment of its debts and liabilities, and to the payment of the expenses and liabilities to become a charge on the Government of the United States."

Everybody knows that this article of annexation could not have passed without this clause. Does it mean something or nothing?

Was it a mere lying pretext—a false and fraudulent pretence, to induce Congress to vote for annexation? Was there no more truth in that pretence than in that other pretence that we are now in the eve of a war with Mexico? Was this clause inserted to delude Congress and appease the ill-suppressed wrath of an indignant people? Does not all the world know that Texas could not have seen annexed without this clause? Does it mean, on the contrary, it had been added to the article of annexation, that the United States should become liable to pay the debts of Texas, and that Congress take her and her war, and give $10,000,000 besides; what Representative or Senator would have dared to vote for the monstrous proposition?

Has anything occurred to increase our liability? The words still stand on our statute book, and the United States is liable to the creditors for the debt of Texas. The war which Whigs predicted would follow the annexation, did come. It cost us $150,000,000—it cost us fifty thousand lives. Is it just to ask us to pay, that we may see the end of the pensions growing out of that war, or of the reproach it has brought on us. Let us examine this pretence of estoppel.

At the time of annexation, the whole population of Texas was less than fifty thousand; she had neither money nor credit; she was at war with Mexico, and there was the utmost inveterancy of hatred between the two countries. Texas exercised jurisdiction over about one hundred thousand square miles, and her population was feeble, and there was some doubt whether she could maintain her independence. But she had a right to cede the territory which she had conquered and fly the act of annexation she retained her rightful boundaries, and surrendered the right to extend them. Was that right worth anything to her? Certainly, it was worth the annexation, being, for they had the full right before to conquer these Territories.

We are assumed those revenues of Texas which arise from duties on imported articles, and those duties, it is said, were pledged for the payment of her debts. Well, is there any surplus in our hands? I have we not paid Texas? Have we not daily pay out more than the duties amount to? Is not Texas relieved from a war? Are not her revenues increased? Are not her debts relieved of the expense of foreign diplomacy? Are not her Senators and Representatives supported here? Is not Texas relieved from her debt been diminished by annexation? On the contrary, has not her ability been vastly increased? Do we not import, use, and consume her productions? Do we not pay her duties on those productions admitted free of duty? Would they not have been taxed if Texas had remained independent? Do we not pay her duties on imports? Texas? Does it not increase the value of her lands, and of course her ability to pay her debts? Have not her lands quadrupled in value? Her productions, which formerly sold for a copy, have increased with unexampled rapidity. And is not this the result of the peace and security which annexation brought? Has not Texas had no vested right in these revenues—no claim that they could enforce; it was a reliance out of which they had not received the first dollar, and there was no prospect that they would. Their chance on the honor and ability of Texas is far greater now than previous to annexation. We have increased, not lessened her ability to pay.

Will the House indulge me while I illustrate by an allegory? The owner of a mill pledges its tolls for the payment of a debt which he incurred in defending the mill of his neighbor rich from the title of which was in dispute. The tolls are small, not enough to sustain his family and pay the interest on the money borrowed. The war ceases, the mill and the water to another mill pond. In return, I perfect his title, put up capital fences all around his farm, enclose the land up the center of it, and, in every act of directing the water from the mill has drained and rendered immensely valuable a tract of alluvial soil that was before so much of a morass as to be a continually deadly miasma. I render it fertile and wholesome. The miller and his boys are now healthy; they are not dingged with fever and ague, and the farm they well fenced, they are able to devote all their time to industrial pursuits; they are better fed and clothed; their productions are far greater; and the value of the family debts vastly increased. Under these circumstances, the money lender, in conjunction with the miller and his boys, come to me and say, and call upon me to pay their mortgage. I reply to the mortgagee, no; I am none the richer for these tolls; they have cost me ten times as much as they have benefited my property. I am vastly increased the value of the remaining property, which is also liable for the payment of your debt. Look to your other remedy, which is abundant; and when that remedy is exhausted, and your debt is not paid, and I have any funds in my hands resulting from the tolls of the mill, we will talk about the matter further. But unless you pay the full extent of the claim, they will come and take my farm and my mill by force. A little roused, I say, You Mr. Miller, and your boys, are ungrateful dogs—you were originally a kind of loafer, and strayed away and squatted on land where you had no business to go. You picked a quarrel with the proprietor, and I drove you off the quarrel, much to my disgrace and loss. I owe you nothing but good will. As for you, Mr. Money-lender, you are a stranger to me; I owe you never heard of the name of the money you claim; it is all a shaving, gambling transaction; and I have strong reasons to believe that much of the money you claim I was the cause of taking from me. If you want my money or my mill, you must come and take them. I don't care a fig for your threats; but if you commit any violence I will go to court to my premises with the design you have expressed, I shall defend my premises, and put you under bonds to keep the peace.

The equity is all clearly in the other way. By right, the United States should retain the sovereignty and own the soil of all that territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, as some small indemnity for the expenses of the war, the lives it cost, and the pensions it has entailed upon us. I will propound one question to those who insist that we are equitably bound to pay this $10,000,000. It is a plain, searching question, and the honest answer will show whether it is under a profound sense of justice or a less noble motive that we are asked to pay. Texas has been long at peace; made no disloyal threats; was as quiet as the claimants for French spoliations are; would any man think, still less would any gentleman or Senator, vote for a law for Congress to give to Texas $10,000,000 for equity only—for justice? That man is not to be found. Will Congress yield, then, to the harassed cry of Texas, to the clamor of unreasonable bluster, what you would not think of yielding to justice and equity? Will you be frightened from your propriety, because Texas has sent us to war with Mexico? Is that what she calls justice—Texas, that could not furnish Major Neighbors with spending money when he went to see you at the Capitol—Texas, that could not prevent the Indians from scalping her frontier inhabitants? Nothing is further from Texas than the desire to have any collision with the United States. Texas would be the more anxious to remain in the Union. The first nullifier remains to be found. She has no affinity with traitors; her sympathies are with those who have shed their blood, and her brave men would run mad, if division should begin. The idea of such a gammon; it is an invention of the "bulls and the bears"—speculators in Texas land, and speculators in steel pens-in-liers and "terrible-accident writers?"

In whose behalf is it that we are called on to pay ten millions? Texas avers that she don't ask it. We have a right to ask, in her behalf, is it enough we know her mouth waters for the money; and when she has got it she will, like the lewd woman named in Scripture, wipe her lips, and say, "I have done no harm?"

Sir, I will venture to predict that before we get through these bills, we shall have proof of what I say. Texas, I think, will, in some stage of passage, be doubtful, and we shall see the Representative from Texas [MR. HOWARD] come to their rescue. Sir, I doubt not that Representative, who for weeks and months, has been "sweating against the stomach of our sense," that Texas claims and insists upon the Rio Grande from its source to its mouth as her boundary, and that she will not barter her rights—that she despises our gold—will whip in with amazing alacrity when he discovered that these bills cannot be passed without his vote. The unanimity of the Texan delegation, the benefits resulting from benefits conferred, that we should give to Texas, and of course to hopeless slavery, the fertile and beautiful country, the ten millions in money? Our connection with that country has been one continued source of unmixed mischief. Almost the first official act which the Senate of the United States passed, in a Slave State did, was to repeal the tariff 1842, and inflict on us that of 1846—a tariff that has brought the manufacture of cotton goods to a stand-still. The Senator from Virginia told us that Texas would be a poor cake: It seemed to me that I could see the boy who got the bitch out it? I object to the bill because it proposes to give ten millions of the people's money where not one dollar is due. We all know that we are to be charged with the value of the lands of Texas was, that we should be saddled with her debts. This objection was stoutly resisted by some of those who now propose to do the very thing *we pay.* To provide against the possibility of that contingency, the following clause was inserted in the article of annexation, and without that insertion it never would have passed:

"Texas shall retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits, to be subject to the payment of its debts and liabilities, and to the payment of the expenses and liabilities to become a charge on the Government of the United States."

Everybody knows that this article of annexation could not have passed without this clause. Does it mean something or nothing?

Was it a mere lying pretext—a false and fraudulent pretence, to induce Congress to vote for annexation? Was there no more truth in that pretence than in that other pretence that we are now in the eve of a war with Mexico? Was this clause inserted to delude Congress and appease the ill-suppressed wrath of an indignant people? Does not all the world know that Texas could not have seen annexed without this clause? Does it mean, on the contrary, it had been added to the article of annexation, that the United States should become liable to pay the debts of Texas, and that Congress take her and her war, and give $10,000,000 besides; what Representative or Senator would have dared to vote for the monstrous proposition?

Has anything occurred to increase our liability? The words still stand on our statute book, and the United States is liable to the creditors for the debt of Texas. The war which Whigs predicted would follow the annexation, did come. It cost us $150,000,000—it cost us fifty thousand lives. Is it just to ask us to pay, that we may see the end of the pensions growing out of that war, or of the reproach it has brought on us. Let us examine this pretence of estoppel.

At the time of annexation, the whole population of Texas was less than fifty thousand; she had neither money nor credit; she was at war with Mexico, and there was the utmost inveterancy of hatred between the two countries. Texas exercised jurisdiction over about one hundred thousand square miles, and her population was feeble, and there was some doubt whether she could maintain her independence. But she had a right to cede the territory which she had conquered and fly the act of annexation she retained her rightful boundaries, and surrendered the right to extend them. Was that right worth anything to her? Certainly, it was worth the annexation, being, for they had the full right before to conquer these Territories.

We are assumed those revenues of Texas which arise from duties on imported articles, and those duties, it is said, were pledged for the payment of her debts. Well, is there any surplus in our hands? I have we not paid Texas? Have we not daily pay out more than the duties amount to? Is not Texas relieved from a war? Are not her revenues increased? Are not her debts relieved of the expense of foreign diplomacy? Are not her Senators and Representatives supported here? Is not Texas relieved from her debt been diminished by annexation? On the contrary, has not her ability been vastly increased? Do we not import, use, and consume her productions? Do we not pay her duties on those productions admitted free of duty? Would they not have been taxed if Texas had remained independent? Do we not pay her duties on imports? Texas? Does it not increase the value of her lands, and of course her ability to pay her debts? Have not her lands quadrupled in value? Her productions, which formerly sold for a copy, have increased with unexampled rapidity. And is not this the result of the peace and security which annexation brought? Has not Texas had no vested right in these revenues—no claim that they could enforce; it was a reliance out of which they had not received the first dollar, and there was no prospect that they would. Their chance on the honor and ability of Texas is far greater now than previous to annexation. We have increased, not lessened her ability to pay.

Will the House indulge me while I illustrate by an allegory? The owner of a mill pledges its tolls for the payment of a debt which he incurred in defending the mill of his neighbor rich from the title of which was in dispute. The tolls are small, not enough to sustain his family and pay the interest on the money borrowed. The war ceases, the mill and the water to another mill pond. In return, I perfect his title, put up capital fences all around his farm, enclose the land up the center of it, and, in every act of directing the water from the mill has drained and rendered immensely valuable a tract of alluvial soil that was before so much of a morass as to be a continually deadly miasma. I render it fertile and wholesome. The miller and his boys are now healthy; they are not dingged with fever and ague, and the farm they well fenced, they are able to devote all their time to industrial pursuits; they are better fed and clothed; their productions are far greater; and the value of the family debts vastly increased. Under these circumstances, the money lender, in conjunction with the miller and his boys, come to me and say, and call upon me to pay their mortgage. I reply to the mortgagee, no; I am none the richer for these tolls; they have cost me ten times as much as they have benefited my property. I am vastly increased the value of the remaining property, which is also liable for the payment of your debt. Look to your other remedy, which is abundant; and when that remedy is exhausted, and your debt is not paid, and I have any funds in my hands resulting from the tolls of the mill, we will talk about the matter further. But unless you pay the full extent of the claim, they will come and take my farm and my mill by force. A little roused, I say, You Mr. Miller, and your boys, are ungrateful dogs—you were originally a kind of loafer, and