THE PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

PUBLISHED BY WHITE & CO

PITTSBURGH.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 24, 1850.

☞ Advertisers are earnestly requested to hand in their favors before 5 P. M., and as early in the day as practicable. Advertisements not inserted for a special time will invariably be charged until ordered out.

☞ V. B. Palmer is Agent for this paper at his several agencies in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and is authorized to receive subscriptions and advertisements for us.

Baltimore American.—Subscriptions and advertisements for this paper received and forwarded free of charge from this office.

☞ Cincinnati Daily Gazette.—Advertisements and subscriptions, for this paper, will be received and forwarded from this office.

☞ Philadelphia Commercial List.—Subscriptions for this valuable paper, will be received and forwarded from this office.

☞ Philadelphia North American.—Advertisements and subscriptions to the North American and United States Gazette, Philadelphia, received and forwarded from this office.

WHIG STATE CONVENTION.

At a meeting of the Whig State Central Committee, held at Harrisburg, March 13, 1850, it was

Resolved, That the Whigs of the several counties of this State be requested to select a number of delegates equal to their respective representatives in the Legislature; the said delegates to meet in Convention at the city of Philadelphia, on the 19th day of June, 1850, for the purpose of nominating a candidate for Canal Commissioner, to be voted for at the ensuing General Election.

MORTON McMICHAEL, Chairman.
George H Hart, Secretary.

Antimasonic and Whig County Convention.

In pursuance of the call of the Chairman, the Whig and Antimasonic County Committee of Correspondence met at the Court House. The following resolution was adopted, to wit:—

"Resolved, That the Whig and Antimasonic voters of the several Election Districts of Allegheny County be, and are hereby requested to meet at their usual places for holding elections, on Saturday, the 1st day of June next, then and there to elect two delegates to the County Convention to be held at the Court House, on Wednesday, the 5th day of June, at 11 o'clock, a. m. Said Convention to make the usual and necessary nominations for the ensuing October Elections, and also to appoint five delegates to represent the County in the State Convention, to be held in the city of Philadelphia, on Wednesday, the 19th day of June."

The primary meetings in the Townships to be held between the hours of two and five o'clock, (except Pitt) and those in the Wards and Boroughs between the hours of seven and nine o'clock, P. M.

A HILANDS, Chairman.

Jos. S. Parks,
Alex. Franklin, } Secretaries.
Thos. Sykes,
Pittsburgh, April 10, 1850.

☞ SEE NEXT PAGE FOR LOCAL MATTERS TELEGRAPHIC NEWS, &c.

A telegraphic despatch announces that the treaty lately concluded between Mr. Clayton and Mr. Bulwer, in relation to Nicaragua has been confirmed by the Senate—only *ten* members dissenting. As this treaty has been assailed with all the virulence and hate of disappointed partizanship; this remarkable unanimity is a most signal triumph for Mr. Clayton, and places him in an impregnable position before the country, as a most able and shrewd diplomatist. The *Union* said we were "sold to the British," when this treaty was agreed to, and it called upon the Senate to reject it! What will the venerable editor say now, *that twenty four Democratic Senators have voted to ratify it!* Have they voted to sell us to the British!

The fact is, that all this "bitter end" opposition to the administration, and to its every opinion and act, is dictated solely by party hatred. It makes no difference how wise, and just, and benificent are the acts of the administration, they will be vehemently denounced by the opposition, and every act of unprincipled partizanship will be resorted to, to render them distasteful to the country. The opposition to this admirable treaty of Mr. Clayton's, which has been ratified by so triumphant a majority, is a striking instance of this factious and unprincipled mode of warfare. This disgraceful party warfare cannot; however, be approved by the great mass of the intelligent people of this country. They will appreciate rightly the nature of the opposition the administration has to encounter, and will treat it with merited contempt.

The President's Opinions Unchanged.—The Washington Union, and letter writers from Washington, have been very industrious in trying to create an impression that the President had changed his opinion on the subject of the best policy to be pursued to settle the slavery question, since his message on that subject was sent in to Congress. To correct this impression, the Republic, of Monday, states, authoritatively, that the President "*remains firm in the opinion that the course of policy which he recommended was, and is, under all the circumstances, the best practicable, and that he has never for a moment changed or modified that opinion.*"

This settles all quibbles on this matter. Gen. Taylor's views are unchanged, and on this subject we affirm, unhesitatingly, that nine-tenths of the Whigs of the free States are with him.

A Bold Rip for Southern Votes.—The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Ledger, F. G. Grund, Esq., in a late letter, stated that a rumor was circulated in Washington that "a great Pennsylvania statesman had written a letter to some of his Southern friends, in Congress, expressing his readiness to accede to the Missouri Compromise line clear to the Pacific, and to accord a positive recognition of Slavery south of that line.' In a subsequent letter, in answer to some strictures of the "Pennsylvanian" newspaper, he reiterates the rumor, and says that *Mr. Buchanan's name is connected with it!* He says the rumor arises from various sources, but principally from a statement made on the floor of the Senate, by Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, while Mr. Buchanan was present, that he knew there was a northern statesman in favor of such a compromise, with a *positive recognition of slavery south of the line of division!* Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, made a similar statement. The writer calls upon Mr. Buchanan to come out and define his position, if these rumors are not true, as his opinion might greatly influence the settlement of the question.

If there is any truth in this rumor, which comes to us so well accredited, it is one of the boldest bids for southern votes which has ever been made. Mr. Buchanan must count greatly on the blind submission of the Democracy of Pennsylvania, if he thinks they will follow his lead with such a fearful load on his shoulders. The open expression of such a sentiment would sink any public man in the north so low that his very memory would perish from the public mind, or, if his name should not be forgotten, it would only be recollected to be execrated.

Robt. C. Walker, Esq., of Elizabeth, and John Miller, Esq., of Sharpsburg, members of the late Legislature, we understand, are candidates for reelection. Mr. Espy is not a candidate.

Texas advices, to the 10th inst., have been received at New Orleans. Unpropitious weather has caused a heavy loss to the crops in the most productive part of the State. The rivers were all very high—the Trinity having overflowed its banks and caused great destruction of property.

The Washington Union of Saturday contains letters from the Hon. R. J. Walker, the Hon. David Stewart, and the Hon. Waddy Thomson, in reply to a note addressed to each of them, asking an expression of their views on the Compromise Bill now before the U. S. Senate. They are all in favor of the measure.

The Cuban Expedition.—The following is an extract from a private letter dated at New Orleans, April 15th, to a gentleman in Cincinnati:

"I am here with a company for Cuba, which we have raised, and shall receive the 'boys' on Sunday, $4,000. I could not have told you this, but we are going to sail to morrow, provided we are not as unsuccessful as the expedition was last summer, and there is already considerable discussion here."

The Philadelphia Inquirer learns from official sources that the following sums have been paid by the county of Philadelphia, for riots, pay of military and civil posse, since the year 1842 up to 1849, inclusive:—

1842, Lombard and St. Mary street riots, $6,382 50; 1843, Kensington, pay of military, &c., $790 76; 1844, Harper's brick yard, $22 50, 1845, damages from riots, pay of military, &c., $35,301 23; 1846, riot in Southwark, $7,617 91; 1846, riot in Kensington, $344 $23,421 66; 1847, claims of troops, $3,000; 1848, judgment for damages in late riots, $56,498 69; 1849, do. do. do., $31,515 59—total, $174,555 51.

Riot in Boston.—On Friday evening, in Ann street, Boston, there was a desperate fight between two parties of negroes and Irishmen, who met with feelings of "high disdain" for each other. In the course of the affray, knives, bludgeons, and stones were freely used, but, singularly enough, no one is known to have been seriously hurt. A great crowd was collected, but soon after the alarm was given, the firemen rushed to the scene and put an effectual damper on the whole affair. Four of the negroes were taken into custody by the police.

☞ At the last representation of the Huguenots, in St. Petersburgh, Madame Grisi was called before the curtain, and presented, in the name of the public, with a diadem of the value of 10,000 roubles. The Emperor, who was present at this event, also sent magnificent presents to all the artists who took part in the performance.

Washington, D. C., May 21.
SIX O'CLOCK, A. M.

The Cuban Expedition.

Of course every body is talking of the energetic measures adopted by the executive to stippress the piratical expedition against Cuba. There is of course some difference of opinion upon the expediency of this mode of action, but I have no doubt that the President will be triumphantly sustained, and I only hope that the naval forces which he has directed to interpose, may reach the scene of expected operations in time to prevent the landing of the ill advised, and misguided or unprincipled men who have set out upon this enterprise. In a telegraphic dispatch, forwarded yesterday morning, I informed you of the large and efficient force which had been ordered upon this very important service. The Saranac is a new, large, and powerful steamer, just completed and put in commission, and is expected to make the voyage to Cuba from the Potomac, in four and a half days. The squadron, with this vessel, will consist of four large and heavy vessels, and several smaller ones, and will be quite sufficient to enforce all the neutral obligations of the United States. It will be under the command of Commodore Foxall A. Parker.

Efforts have been made in both Houses, to day, to embarrass the decisive movements of the President, but they have made no impression. The House even refused to allow the introduction of resolutions of inquiry on the subject, and in the Senate they were laid over until to day. All parties agree that the precipitation upon us at this time of the questions that would grow out of the successful issue of this attempt to revolutionize Cuba, would be likely to produce the most disastrous effect upon the public councils of the country. The South would demand the immediate annexation of the Island, with a vehemence unexampled even in her modes of making known her desires. The admission of the Island as a Slave State, would be resisted at the North vigorously and effectually, let the consequences be what they would, and then with double distinctness, the phantom of a South-ern Slave holding, Slave breeding, and Slave trading confederacy would arise and flit before the distempered visions of our Nashville Conventionists, Disunionists, and Fanatics of all sorts. All respect able and right feeling people must commend in the lightest degree the prompt and judicious conduct of Gen. Taylor.

I understand that the friends of the expedition calculate that a landing was effected last week, and that consequently the intervention of our government will have come too late to be efficient. I think they are mistaken. The vessels containing the greater number of the revolutionists, could not have arrived at the rendezvous before the fifteenth instant, and several days must have elapsed before they could make the requisite preparation for a descent upon the main island. Still the race may be close and doubtful between them and the American squadron. Telegraphic despatches were received in town yesterday, to the effect that news had arrived at some northern port, bringing advices from Havana to the 12th instant, up to which time, although great alarm prevailed, nothing had been seen or heard of the exdedition. The Cholera was making terrible ravages among the troops and the people. Junius.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

Washington, May 19.

Cuba Expedition—Delegate from New Mexico—State Government there—The Democrats and the Galphin Case—Walker's Responsibility—Not to be let off.

Too fact that large numbers of men have set out, on a perilous and criminal enterprise against Cuba, is no longer any doubt. It is known that young men belonging to this place engaged in the abortive attempt of last season, left here some months since, and sailed from New Orleans for the general rendezvous near the south coast of Cuba, armed and equipped for actual service, about two weeks since, and they have communicated to their friends here by letter their determination, and the nature of their mad and hair brained movement.

We, more than Spain, have reason to hope for its failure; for if Cuba should now be wrested from the feeble grasp of her present rulers, the handful of invaders by whom the revolution would have been effected, would immediately propose annexation to our Union, which would at once quadruple our present dangers and embarrassments, and probably take away the last chance of amicable settlement of difficulties between North and South.

Hugh N. Smith, Esq., Delegate from New Mexico, has just issued an indignant but powerful address to his constituents, on the subject of their relations to the general government of the Union. Though himself a southern man by birth, he tells the people of the territory that such is the strength of the slavery interest here and so great its devotion to the claims of Texas, that they can expect nothing from Congress. He declares that the effect of the President's policy, as illustrated by the recent proceedings under it, will be to deliver New Mexico bound hand and foot, into the hands of Texas and Slavery. He argues against the validity of the claim of Texas to jurisdiction over New Mexico, with great ability, completely overthrowing it, and concludes by advising his constituents to proceed without delay to form a State government, with an express prohibition of Slavery in a fundamental article of it. It is an important document and is calculated to have a sensible effect upon the action of Congress.

I have read all the reports or arguments on the Galphin case, which have been submitted by members of the select committee. They are all distinguished by clearness and ability. That of the four Whig members is candid and exceedingly ingenious, but I confess that in my mind nothing can overcome, nor materially lessen the force of the adverse logic of the five other members in support of the conclusion that the principal was not a just claim against the United States, and that the interest was paid without "law or precedent."—It will not be forgotten that the principal was paid by order of Walker three days before he went out of office, and yet the five democrats, after having proved as they think that there never was any valid demand whatever against the United States, deliberately resolve, that it was paid "in conformity with law and precedent." The act under which it was paid directed the Secretary of the Treasury to "examine and adjust" the claim, and to pay "what may be found to be due." The act neither authorized nor contemplated any payment unless after a due course of investigation something should be "found to be due." But Walker paid the *forty three thousand* of principal, and his political friends at once turn round, and say—so much of the business was quite correct. Now the truth is plain, Walker and his Democratic apologists can be permitted to shirk no part of the responsibility for this piece of iniquity.—Walker paid the principal without authority of law or precedent, after the first comptroller had decided nothing to be due, and held the interest under advisement. It is altogether fair to infer that he would have paid that also, had he remained in office. The result and consequence of the wrong doing commenced by him, has been that the Treasury has been defrauded of $235,000, and if all the Democrats in or out of the House should swear themselves black in the face against Crawford and his colleagues on account of it, they would not white wash Walker's conduct, nor restore one cent to the Treasury.

I notice that in a recent letter I say that Mr Webster was going to give Mr. Clay's compromise bill his hearty support. This was simply a mistake.

We see the name of the Hon. C. C. Sullivan, brought forward by some of our eastern friends for the office of Auditor General of the State, in just and flattering terms. This we are glad to see. Mr. Sullivan is a gentleman of energy of character and sterling abilities, well fitted for the arduous duties of that important trust, and should he be selected as the candidate of the Whig party, every friend of the cause would find in him a candidate to be proud of. It sound judgment, and unshrinking integrity is any guaranty to justify the selection of a standard bearer, the friends of Mr. Sullivan can present him without fear or hesitation.—*Butler Democrat.*

There is no longer any doubt, according to the Post, but that the Nicaragua route to California will be attempted by the New York Company in June next. A gentleman arrived at New York in the last trip of the Cherokee, who came over from Realejo to San Juan in nine days. He traveled by land only nine miles. Several steamers of light draught of water are building to be used on this route.

Appointments by the President,

By and with the advice and consent of the Senate

John Sommers Smith, of New York, to be Consul of the United States for the port of Malaga, in Spain.

George Mountefort, of Mass., to be Consul of the U. S. for the Island of Candia.

POST MASTERS.

Charles T. Maddox, to be Postmaster at Baltimore, Md.

William M. Blackford, to be Postmaster at Lynchburg, Va.

Frederick W. Smith, to be Postmaster at Houston, Texas.

THE ADMINISTRATION PLATFORM.

The Free Territory Question.

The following extracts from the speeches of Mr. Winthrop, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Duer, of New York, on the various propositions before Congress for settling the Free Territory Questions, are able and eloquent vindications of the plan of the President, which plan will, no doubt, be supported by the Whig members of Congress, as it is by the Whig press, and the Whig party, throughout the free States.

Extract from the Speech of Mr. Winthrop.

"Mr. Chairman, there must be something of reciprocity in any arrangement by which this question is to be settled.—But I can see none, whatever, in the plan of admitting California, organizing the two Territories without condition, and settling the boundaries of Texas, as proposed in the same bill. What concession does the South make in such an arrangement? The concession of California? I cannot admit that there is any concession in that. If there be any objections to the admission of California, they are national and not sectional in their character, arising out of irregularities in her preparatory proceedings, and not out of the provisions of her constitution. And yet, in consideration of this admission, the North is called on not merely to waive any anti-slavery action in regard to two Territories, but to sanction, as I understand it, the positive introduction of slavery where the South itself has already prohibited it. By the resolutions of annexation, all of Texas above 36° 30 m. is to be free soil; but, by this plan, we are to purchase all this, and unite it to New Mexico, and then abrogate the prohibition.

Sir, the true ground for conciliation is the middle ground, on which both sides can meet without the abandonment of any principle, or the sacrifice of any point of honor. Such, in my judgment, is the ground upon which the President has planted himself; and I cannot hesitate to express my belief that if party feelings had never entered into this question—if those pernicious and poisonous elements could have been eliminated from the controversy in which we are engaged, the great mass of the American people, from the South and from the North, from the West and from the East, would have been found rallying round the Executive upon this precise ground, and settling all their differences in harmony and concord.

Tell me not that New Mexico and Deseret may be left a little while longer without a government by such a course. Better that they should go without a government for ever, than that our sacred Government should be broken up! Better that they should be laundered from us eternally than that they should be instrumental in sundering us from each other! But no such alternative is involved in this policy. The people who occupy those Territories are capable of self-government; and no sooner shall we announce to them this policy, than they will follow the example of California, and relieve us of all further responsibility.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the President has changed his position, and deserted his original platform. This is not the first time, sir, such a charge has been brought against Gen. Taylor. The Mexicans proclaimed that he changed his plan, and deserted his post, and fled from the defence of his friends when he made that masterly and matchless movement from Fort Brown to Point Isabel. But they discovered their error before many days were over, and, to their cost, they had mistaken their man. I have not the slightest authority to speak for the President, nor would it be parliamentary for me to do so, if I had; but I am strongly inclined to the belief that there has been no change, and that he has changed or means to change his views on this subject, will be equally disappointed.

For myself, sir, I can truly say that I adopt his plan in a spirit of conciliation and compromise, regarding it as a compromise worthy of a Southern President to offer, and worthy of both the Southern and Northern people to accept.

I know that there have been many reproaches and criminations dealt out against some of us by the ultraists of the *free* states, *for* being willing to make even this compromise. Because we are not quite so rampant and roysterous in regard to the anti slavery proviso as some of its peculiar friends, we are charged with inconsistency, insertion, and treachery. Now, sir, I am one of those who think that northern men can afford to be a little forbearing upon this subject without incurring any just liability to such imputations. I am of opinion that there is ample reason to be found in the changed condition of public affairs, in the altered circumstances of the case for the manifest willingness of the northern mind to acquiesce in what has been called the *new action* policy of the President.

Why, sir, at the time that proviso was originally proposed—at the time it was made the subject of such ardent protestations of uncompromising devotion—what was the state of the country and of the question? We were then at war with Mexico, and with the strongest reason to apprehend that this war was to be pressed even to the extinction and absorption of the whole Mexican republic. A vast, undefined extension of territory was thus in prospect, upon which 'slavery was, or was not to be planted and established. That war, thank Heaven, has been brought to a close. We are now at peace; and what is more, sir, the spirit of the war has been so arrested, and the boundary line so run, that though we may hesitate to admit that Nature has everywhere settled the question against slavery, we must yet all perceive and acknowledge that the territory which has been acquired holds out but little comparative temptation or inducement to its introduction.

What else has occurred? Why, sir, at the time we all committed ourselves so hotly to the support of the proviso, no government had yet been established in Oregon, and a purpose had been exhibited to insist upon the right of slavery to go there. Since then, the principles of the ordinance of 1787 have extended, by solemn enactment, over that whole Territory.

What further have we witnessed? Why, sir, California, California, a thousand fold the most important and valuable part of the territory acquired from Mexico, has settled the question for herself, and spontaneously dedicated the treasures of her virgin soil, and the riches of her magnificent mines, to the labor of freemen forever.

Sir, I do not say that there is to be found in all this the slightest justification for an abandonment of northern principle. But is there not, is there not ample reason for an abatement of northern tone, for a forbearance of northern urgency upon this subject, without the imputation of tergiversation and treachery?

I think sir, that I do not undervalue the importance of the great principles of the ordinance of 1787, and of that proviso which I prefer henceforth to associate with the great names of Thomas Jefferson and Nathan Dane and Rufus King, rather than with that of any public man of the present day, however distinguished or notorious he may have become. But I can never put the question of extending slave soil on the same footing with one of directly increasing slavery and multiplying slaves. If a positive issue could ever again be made up for our decision whether human beings, few or many, of whatever race, complexion or condition, should be freely subjected to a system of hereditary bondage, and be changed from freemen into slaves, I can conceive that no bonds of union, no ties of interest, no chords of sympathy, no considerations of past glory, present welfare or future grandeur, should be suffered to interfere for an instant with our resolute and unceasing resistance to a measure so iniquitous and abominable. There would be a clear, unquestionable, moral element in such an issue which would admit of no compromise, no concessions, no forbearance whatever. We could never sanction such a policy; we could never submit to it. A million of swords would leap from their scabbards to arrest it, and the Union itself would be shivered, like a Prince Rupert's drop, in the shock. * * *

These, Mr. Chairman, are the considerations which influence and control my action on the question before us. I do not ask what the northern States or what the southern States might find most agreeable to their feelings, or most advantageous to their interests. I ask only what is right, what is just, what is best for the permanent welfare of the people of those future commonwealths whose foundations are now about to be laid, and whose destinies are now about to be determined. And all my observations, all my experience, all the convictions of my mind and of my heart, unite in replying to this question, that slavery is not right, that its injustice and a wrong to those who are under its immediate yoke, but that it is an evil and an injury to the highest social, moral and political interests of any State in which it exists.

Here, then, sir, I bring these remarks to a close. I have explained, to the best of my ability, the views which I entertain of *the great questions of the day.*—These views may be misrepresented hereafter, as they have been heretofore, but they cannot be misunderstood by any one who desires or who is even willing to understand them. Most gladly would I have found myself agreeing more entirely with some of the friends whom I see around me, and with more than one of those elsewhere, with whom I have always been proud to be associated; and whose lead, on almost all occasions, I have rejoiced to follow.

One lie, however, I am persuaded still remains to us all—a common devotion to the Union of these States and a common determination to sacrifice every thing but principle to its preservation. Our responsibilities are indeed great. This vast Republic stretching from sea to sea, and rapidly outgrowing every thing but our affections, looks anxiously to us to take care that it receives no detriment. Nor is it too much to say that the eyes and the hearts of the friends of constitutional freedom throughout the world are at this moment turned eagerly here, more eagerly than ever before, to behold an example of successful republican institutions, and to see them come out safely and triumphantly from the fiery trial to which they are now subjected.

I have the firmest faith that these eyes and these hearts will not be disappointed. I have the strongest belief that the visions and phantoms of dissunion which now appal us will soon be remembered like the clouds of some April morning, or the "dissolving views" of some evening spectacle. I have the fullest conviction that this glorious republic is destined to outlast all, all at either end of the Union who may be plotting against its peace, or predicting its downfall.

"Fond impious man! think'st thou you sanguine cloud,
Raised by thy breath to quench the orb of day?
To-morrow it repairs its golden hood,
And warms the nations with redoubled ray."

Let us proceed in the settlement of the unfortunate controversies in which we find ourselves involved, in a spirit of mutual deference and concession. Let us invoke fervently upon our efforts the blessings of that Almighty Being who is the "author of peace and the lover of concord," and we shall still find order springing out of confusion harmony evoked from discord, and Peace, Union and Liberty once more restored to our land.

Extract from the speech of Mr. Duer.

"I have considered with attention and respect the propositions that have emanated from several eminent gentlemen for the adjustment of this question; but I will say that I have nowhere seen any thing that in my judgment is so wise and so just as the plan submitted to us by the President, in the message now under our consideration. And in speaking of the plan of the President, I have in view the principles to which he refers us. I am aware that, strictly speaking the President has presented no plan, but rather an idea; and has very properly referred entirely to the legislative branch of the government the consideration of time and mode, and the arrangement of details. It seems to me erroneous to say, that the policy of the President settles nothing; that is a position of inaction. On the contrary, it has an advantage in this respect over every other plan—it settles the question, and it is the only plan that settles it. It is not a policy of inaction. Though it does not absolutely demand, yet it admits of action, and immediate action. We may give finality to the policy when we please; and for one I am ready, and think it most wise, to do so now. In plain words, I am ready to vote for a bill authorizing the people of New Mexico to form a constitution for their government as a State, and declaring that, upon their adoption of a constitution, republican in its form, they shall thereupon and thereby be one of the States of the Union.—Such a bill should contain a provision, as matter of preliminary arrangement, for the extinguishment, upon just terms, and with the assent of Texas, of her claim to a portion of her territory. A provision of that character appears indeed to be necessary, whether we adopt the State or Territorial plan, since in either case we ought to know what it is for which we are legislating. I do not think it doubtful that we may make a proposition to Texas which she will not reject. Pass such a bill and the question is settled, irrevocably settled, settled by an irreparable law; and before the meeting of another Congress, New Mexico will be one of the States of the Union.

And her recommendation of the plan of the President is, that it involves no sectional triumph; calls for no surrender of any principle that has been contended for, either by the North or by the South; is founded upon no compromises but those of the Constitution itself. As a necessary consequence, it must quiet agitation; for the question being settled, and settled in such a manner as to leave no sting behind, agitation must expire for want of aliment.

Compare now, in these respects, the plan of the President with the plan for a territorial government A territorial bill must either contain, or it must not contain, a prohibition of slavery. If it contains such a prohibition, its passage would be regarded as a northern triumph. So far as it would operate in such case to prevent the extension of slavery to those regions, I cordially approve of it; but in so far as it would do this in a manner—unhappily, without, in my opinion, just cause—offensive to the South, I should regret it. We all understand this; and it is the necessary result of our position. Since, this is not the alternative of probable occurrence. Suppose, then, that your bill contains no such prohibition. Would not its passage under such circumstances be regarded as a southern triumph, and—as a surrender by the north—as an abandonment by the north of a principle to which almost every northern State stands solemnly committed? Not a few would regard it in that light, and the apparent and real triumph would spread an element of discord and of strife, which would give to the opposition of the South, a tangible subject for agitation. Your bill would be no settlement; it would leave the question open; open to another Congress, and to yet another to be heard. It would not be a settlement, and would be misled by looking only to the present; the scene of agitation may be shifted. The north as well as the south may be unreasonably angry; the same passions may exist elsewhere, and if at the south they are more easily excited, they are not less durable in colder regions.

Besides, we must look beyond the intrinsic merits of a measure, in order to form a judgment of its consequences; we must look to the collateral circumstances. I will not only say that such a bill might not be passed by a majority, so strong and so composed of men from both sections of the Union, and from both the great political parties, as that this Union would be able to put down agitation. But how is your majority likely to be composed? You will not restore harmony to the Union by any measures of which one of the proposed effects is the establishment of one of the series of the nation upon the ruins of the other. It is impossible to shut our eyes to the existence of such expectations. There is a glimmering of them through the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dimmick.) They are revealed to us more clearly in the daily columns of a paper published in this city. What, then, will be the character of your majority? Suppose that it shall be found to be composed of almost the entire North, and just a sufficient number of northern Democratic members to insure the passage of the bill. In such case, the measure would present two popular questions: the one sectional, the other partisan. Is there not, then, danger that you may thus place one of the great parties at the North into a position of anti slavery agitation—that it may be joined not only by all the Abolitionists and Free Soilers, but by a large section of the other party—that the cry of "repeal" may be raised—and that, all other questions being merged in this, two parties, geographically divided, may take the place of the present national parties, and the unhappy sectional controversy already existing, thus reach a height more dangerous than ever? I should deeply regret this, but I should be powerless as an individual to prevent it; I fear those vastly my superior might be equally powerless. If there be those who look without regret to such a state of things, I certainly am not of them. I point to the danger that it may be averted.

There is an other recommendation which the plan of the President possesses. If the people of New Mexico be ready and willing, as I believe they are, to come into the Union now, the spirit of our treaty with Mexico appears to demand their admission. At the proper time, we may be judged by the Congress. But though Congress are the judges, they are not to judge capriciously; the rule of action is prescribed. What is the proper time? To ascertain it we must have reference to the general course of our Government. New Mexico has now a population with which no State has ever been refused admission into the Union—a population more than sufficient to entitle her to one member of the House of Representatives. Can we reject her on account of the character of her population? It is true her citizens are not Americans by birth, but they are Americans by treaty; and I do not think that in the spirit of the treaty we can make a discrimination against them for that reason. If there are sufficient grounds for her rejection, her admission may be delayed indefinitely. The proportion which her numbers bear to the representative ratio is so small, that there is no probability that the character of her population will essentially change, since there is nothing to carry Americans there, with or without any particular species of property. I doubt whether her case will be stronger fifty years hence than it is now.

These, then, are the recommendations of the policy of the President. It is demanded by the spirit of a treaty; it rests on a constitutional principle; it solves no sectional triumph—requires no abandonment of principle; it settles the question irrevocably, quiets agitation, and restores harmony to the Union.

Is there any reason why the South should reject it? What is that you desire? The preservation of the *Union upon just terms?* That is, I doubt not, what the great majority, perhaps, still greater of your constituents, sincerely desire.—Well, in this way, you will preserve and strengthen the Union; and you cannot dispute the justice of the terms. They are in accordance with principles which the South has always proclaimed, and which equally have received the emphatic sanction of the empire individual—who was southern, if any thing he so—whose death we have lately deplored. Do you desire to enjoy your property at home, in quiet, and without agitation? You will then attain that end. Many southern gentlemen have said to us, that slavery can never enter New Mexico, and that consequently the Wilmot Proviso was a mere abstraction, and that for the North, therefore, to insist upon it, was to insist upon a useless offensive to the South for no practical end. Why, then, if your premises be correct, will you, for an abstraction, require an abandonment of principles and consistency, humiliating to the pride of the North? But it is said that it is a principle of which you desire the recognition. You can get no recognition of the principle that Congress may not prohibit slavery in the territories of the United States. If you will look at the recent speech of the great northern statesman, you will find in it any thing but an abandonment of the principles of the ordinance of 1787; you will find, on the contrary, that principle most emphatically asserted.—Would you vote that you can get there, even expressly repudiating it, be of service to you; for the principle is one that the people of the North will never abandon. On the other hand, by the measure I have proposed, you would gain the acknowledgment of a principle not repugnant to the South, and that in such a manner, and by such a vote, as to be of practical use.

From the Cincinnati Gazette.

Debate on the Danger to the Union in the General Assembly.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION.

When the afternoon session had been opened, the motion to make Dr. Brisbane's resolution the order for Monday afternoon, was rescinded by a unanimous vote, and a motion prevailed to fill up the blank for the committee with a member from each Synod. The question was then on the passage of the resolution.

Dr. Spencer of Brooklyn, thought there was no danger. He thought the excitement on the dissolution of the Union grew out of the action of unwise letter writers and unwise editors. He was unwilling to give a memorial which would give unwise men, known as Abolitionists, a power to wield for agitation.

Dr. Mosely, of Mississippi, thought the Union was in danger. He had not been a croaker, but he did think that nothing but the providence of God would preserve the Union. The Assembly possessed a power no other body could wield. If by the presentation of a memorial, it could do any thing to preserve the Union, every member should be willing to sign it. He thought the time for action had come, but the question would more properly present itself before the body when the memorial had been offered. The Assembly, the people should hear from all the churches of the land what the sentiment was on the question of dissolution, and if the danger appeared to warrant he would be in favor of a day of fasting and prayer.

Mr. Nichols thought that the Assembly was stepping out of its sphere. God's church would live if the Union of the States was dissolved.—This was not a question for ministers to discuss. He felt no alarm.

Mr. Reynolds, of Tennessee, thought the members of the Assembly did not sit there as politicians, but as citizens—as religious men. There was fear—members of Congress felt it, and expressed it. He felt that the danger of dissolution had never been so imminent; Mr. Clay had been laboring in vain for five months to settle the question. He wished there was not a *nigger* in the land. He would gladly give the few he owned to save the Union.

Mr. Payne, of New York, wished that the question might be indefinitely postponed. It would create an interminable debate. Questions would be introduced that ought not to be discussed in that body—topics would be agitated that Assembly should have nothing to do with. He did not believe the Union was in danger, but if the resolution was not postponed, he should vote for it.

The people is his neighborhood had no fears of the dissolution of the Union, any more than they had of the dissolution of the earth; but, if there was danger, he was willing to sign any memorial that would have a tendency to prevent any such calamity. He moved an indefinite postponement, because he thought the question ought not now to be discussed, and because he did not see that there was danger.

Prof. Girault, felt that the church had nothing to do with the question. He did not understand why the Presbyterian church should apply to Congress for the protection of any thing but its rights. He had lived in the South and at the North, and he had never seen the man who wished the Union dissolved.

Dr. Breckenridge, of Louisville, was glad that the question had been met by the resolution for postponement. If the Assembly thought there was no danger, the postponement was better than a negative, and if the members thought the Assembly should not take up the question at all the postponement was the best way to dispose of it. He was clearly, decidedly, and solemnly of the opinion that a state of case could exist when the Assembly should act as the resolution required—he believed that state of case did exist. He felt that there was portentous danger. Had brethren forgotten that the Methodist Church had been rent asunder on the slave line—the most homogenous church in the country. Where could men have lived that they concluded there was no danger? Had not the Baptist church divided publicly, before Heaven on the slave line? Should churches do what gentlemen tell us ungodly politicians are trying to do, and the cry still be, "there is no danger." Ever since 1831, the Presbyterian church had required peculiar wisdom, peculiar forbearance—peculiar management, the peculiar blessing of God to keep it from dividing.

It was vain for gentlemen to say there was no danger. He knew from personal observation that the peril to the Presbyterian Church had been imminent. He could convince a jury in a court of common law, with testimony taken from members of the Assembly, that these things were facts.—Wise men in Congress, the most patriotic body in the world, told us there was danger—they had told all the people this. He was born in Kentucky. He was a Kentuckian, and he desired first to be a Christian, then a gentleman, then a Kentuckian. Besides pride in being a Christian and a gentleman, he should take more pride in being a Kentuckian than anything else. He knew the people of Kentucky, and he gave it as his deliberate opinion, that if ever the threaded day came, the people of Kentucky will not permit an army to march over their State to preserve the Union. It would not allow its preservation by the sword, nor suffer an army to force the Union on the States south of it. He felt that unless great wisdom and great prudence, with the blessing of God, were exercised, such a state of things might come. Unless he was egregiously deceived, the country was in danger, and every man should meet the issue.—He renounced the union of Church and State, but the Church of Christ had an interest in what was going on in the civil governments around her.—The Church could exist if the States were dismembered, and if it had to retreat to caves, and under numerous trying circumstances, and it must always exist: but did gentlemen wish to further a state of things that would drive it into caves!

Could nobody see the difference between the church peacably pushing the cause of Christ with one hand into the far West, and with the other into foreign lands, and a state of affairs in which the North would be arrayed against the South, and the West, perhaps, against them both. Was it enough for minister to know that the church would exist and take no consideration of the difference in the postures into which it might be forced. He felt that there was a squeamishness in this matter of politics. What did the church do during the progress of the Revolution? What did history tell us of the action of ecclesiastic bodies in defence of liberty? He held to no such doctrines as that ministers should calmly stand by and see the nation upon the ruins of the other. It is impossible to shut our eyes to the existence of such expectations. There is a glimmering of them through the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dimmick.) They are revealed to us more clearly in the daily columns of a paper published in this city. What, then, will be the character of your majority? Suppose that it shall be found to be composed of almost the entire North, just a sufficient number of northern Democratic members to insure the passage of the bill. In such case, the measure would present two popular questions: the one sectional, the other partisan. Is there not, then, danger that you may thus place one of the great parties at the North into a position of anti slavery agitation—that it may be joined not only by all the Abolitionists and Free Soilers, but by a large section of the other party—that the cry of "repeal" may be raised—and that, all other questions being merged in this, two parties, geographically divided, may take the place of the present national parties, and the unhappy sectional controversy already existing, thus reach a height more dangerous than ever? I should deeply regret this, but I should be powerless as an individual to prevent it; I fear those vastly my superior might be equally powerless. If there be those who look without regret to such a state of things, I certainly am not of them. I point to the danger that it may be averted.

There is an other recommendation which the plan of the President possesses. If the people of New Mexico be ready and willing, as I believe they are, to come into the Union now, the spirit of our treaty with Mexico appears to demand their admission. At the proper time, they may be judged by the Congress. But though Congress are the judges, they are not to judge capriciously; the rule of action is prescribed. What is the proper time? To ascertain it we must have reference to the general course of our Government. New Mexico has now a population with which no State has ever been refused admission into the Union—a population more than sufficient to entitle her to one member of the House of Representatives. Can we reject her on account of the character of her population? It is true her citizens are not Americans by birth, but they are Americans by treaty; and I do not think that in the spirit of the treaty we can make a discrimination against them for that reason. If there are sufficient grounds for her rejection, her admission may be delayed indefinitely. The proportion which her numbers bear to the representative ratio is so small, that there is no probability that the character of her population will essentially change, since there is nothing to carry Americans there, with or without any particular species of property. I doubt whether her case will be stronger fifty years hence than it is now.

These, then, are the recommendations of the policy of the President. It is demanded by the spirit of a treaty; it rests on a constitutional principle; it solves no sectional triumph—requires no abandonment of principle; it settles the question irrevocably, quiets agitation, and restores harmony to the Union.

Is there any reason why the South should reject it? What is that you desire? The preservation of the *Union upon just terms?* That is, I doubt not, what the great majority, perhaps, still greater of your constituents, sincerely desire.—Well, in this way, you will preserve and strengthen the Union; and you cannot dispute the justice of the terms. They are in accordance with principles which the South has always proclaimed, and which equally have received the emphatic sanction of the empire individual—who was southern, if any thing he so—whose death we have lately deplored. Do you desire to enjoy your property at home, in quiet, and without agitation? You will then attain that end. Many southern gentlemen have said to us, that slavery can never enter New Mexico, and that consequently the Wilmot Proviso was a mere abstraction, and that for the North, therefore, to insist upon it, was to insist upon a useless offensive to the South for no practical end. Why, then, if your premises be correct, will you, for an abstraction, require an abandonment of principles and consistency, humiliating to the pride of the North? But it is said that it is a principle of which you desire the recognition. You can get no recognition of the principle that Congress may not prohibit slavery in the territories of the United States. If you will look at the recent speech of the great northern statesman, you will find in it any thing but an abandonment of the principles of the ordinance of 1787; you will find, on the contrary, that principle most emphatically asserted.—Would you