Hon. J. C. Calhoun

MISSISSIPPI PORTFOLIO

MISSISSIPPI ADVERTISER.

BY SMITH & CHAPMAN.] [NEW SERIES-VOL. 1 NO 40.

ABERDEEN, MISSISSIPPI. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1845.

The Mississippi Advertiser

Is published every Saturday morning, at THREE DOLLARS, per annum in *advance*, or, FOUR DOLLARS at the end of six month; FIVE DOLLARS at the expiration of the year.

ADVERTISEMENTS, first insertion [ten lines or less] One Dollar, for each subsequent insertion, Fifty cents. The number of insertions must be specified on the face of the advertisement, or they will be published until ordered out, and charged the usual rates above stated.

☞ ALL articles of a personal nature will be charged double the rates above stated—Cash in advance when admitted.

☞ POLITICAL Circulars or Public Addresses for the benefit of individuals will be charged as advertisements.

☞ On yearly advertisements, a liberal discount will be made. The privilege of yearly advertisers is limited to their own immediate business; advertisements for the benefit of other persons sent in by them must be paid for by the square.

☞ No paper will be discontinued only at the option of the publishers, unless the order be accompanied by the money.

☞ LETTERS on business connected with the office *must be Post paid* to ensure prompt attention.

(From the Boston Post.)

DARING MOVEMENTS—DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION PROPOSED.

Things are a approaching a crisis with regard to the perpetuity of our Union. The great Whig party of the North are every where proclaiming through their presses, and orators, and public meetings, the sentiment that the annexation of Texas will be a dissolution of the Union. Appeals the most inflamatory are made to prepare the people for an over act. A convention is proposed, and strongly advocated by the whigs, to meet at Faneuil Hall, in which Massachusetts is called upon to take the lead. And to cap the climax, the Liberator, dated Dec. 27, 1844, contains the following petition. Read it one and all:

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

The memerial and petition of the undersigned, inhabitants of the town of , in the State of , respectfully represents as follows:

That your memorialists, deeming slaveholding a heinous sin, and convinced that slavery ought to be immediately and forever abolished, look upon the Constitution of the United States as enjoinining obligations and duties which are incompatible with allegiance to God, and with the enjoyment of freedom and equal rights

The clauses of that instrument to which they refer, are those relating to the slave basis of representation—those empowering Congress to suppress insurrection, and granting to the several States security against domestic violence, and that allowing the recapture of fugitive slaves.

The first of these, relating to representation, confers on a slaveholding community additional power for every slave held among them, and thus tempts them to continue to uphold the system.—It has introduced an aristocratic element into the midst of our republican institutions, and thus enabled slaveholders to monopolize the offices and dictate the policy of Government; to prostitute the strengh and influence of the nation to the support of slavery here and elsewhere; to trample on the rights of the free States, and make the courts of the country their tools; in the words of a distinguished statesman, 'it has made the preservation, propagation, and perpetuation of slavery the vital and animating spirit of the National Government.'"

Those relating to "insurrection" and "domestic violence," though perfectly innocent in themselves, yet being made with the fact distinctly in view that slavery exists among us, do deliberately pledge the whole national force against the unhappy slave, if he imitate our fathers and resist opp ession; thus making us partners in the guilt of sustaining slavery.

The last clause, relating to fugitive slaves, is a promise, on the part of the whole nation, to do that which God's laws expressly condemn, and which every noble feeling of our nature repudiates with loathing and contempt.

The clauses your memorialists cannot engage to support: and, though living under institutions which profess to be founded on the consent of the governed, conscience forbids them to assent to the Constitution of the United States. They are consequently debarred from all active participation in the government of their country.

Further: your memorialists are convinced that the natural consequences of such a compromise as they have referred to, between right and wrong, have followed its adoption in swift and frightful succession, to wit: the wide extension and vigorous growth of slavery and the slave trade—the multiplication of the victims of oppression from half a million to nearly three millions—the establishment by law, in one half of the country, of a vast system of lewdness, robbery, murder, and heathenism—the denial of the right of petition, and the free exercise of speech in Congress—the imprisonment and enslavement of Northern seamen in Southern ports, on account of their complexion—the complete subjugation of the General Government to the will and service of the slave power—the utter corruption of the politics, morals, and religion of the people—the robbery of the north of its hard earned wealth, to a vast amount, and the degradation and impoverishment of Northern laborers—and, finally, the outlawry from one half of the Republic of every outspoken and uncompromising friend of God and liberty.

In view of these facts, your memorialists, disclaiming citizenship, and repudiating the present Constitution as a covenant with death and an agreement with hell, ask you to take immediate measures, by a national convention or otherwise, for dissolving the union of these States."

The works of such men as Washington, Franklin, and Madison, a covenent with death and an agreement with hell!

But to show how extensive is to be the effort to dissolve the Union, we quote the following editorial recommendation in the same paper:

"*No Union with Slaveholders.*—Let the petition to Congress, in another column, for a dissolution of the Union, through a ational convention, be copied, or cut out and affixed to strips of letter paper, and circulated in every city, town, and village in the commonwealth. Be prompt and active in the cause of slavery, and victory is sure. Those whose motto is, 'no union with slaveholders,' are expected to be particularly assiduous to procure signatures to this petition. Now to the work, 'with a will.' Remember, the present session terminates on the 4th of march; therefore, not a moment's delay is in admissible. A 'Liberator Extra,' containing a variety of petitions, has been printed, and will be gratuitously distributed among the active friends of our cause in the Commonwealth."

Here then is a bold, open movement for an immediate dessolution of the Union. To show how intimately connected are the designs of the Federal leaders with the designs of the Abolitionists, we make the following extract from a fanatical article (editorial) that appeared in the leading Whig organ of this State—the Boston Atlas—Dec. 26

"THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.—We call upon the good people of this Commonwealth of Massachusetts to keep a firm and steady eye upon the movements of this national administration, in regard to this infernal project of the annexation of Texas to this Union. No political measure was ever brought before this people, that began to compare, in magnitude of in turpitude, with this. It involves the whole broad question of the permanence of our Government, and the continuance of our Union. We must not lose sight of it for one moment. We must be ready to ACT—promptly, fearlessly, effectually—when the time comes, if come it ever does. Massachusetts cannot—she must not—she will not—submit to the annexation of Texas to these United States.—Let this idea be impressed firmly, indelibly, upon the public mind. This Union is a partnership of twenty-six States. No new State can be admitted without the consent of all the old States.—Massachusetts is satisfied with the *Union* as it stands. She intends to abide by, adhere to, and uphold, this Union, with her utmost ability and power. The grand galaxy of the twenty-six stars sufficiently effulgent to light her on in the path of glory, and honor, and happiness. She desires not a ray from the 'Lone Star,' but is willing to let that star shine *alone*."

Thus the Atlas affirms that the "infernal" annexation project involves ☞"The continuance of our Union." ☞ It affirms that Massachusetts *must not, cannot, will not, submit to have Texas a part of this Union!* Of course, in case Congress enact laws to annex Texas, Massachusetts will be called upon to engage at once in rebellion! Remember that this comes from a pres *acknowledged by the Whig party to be its chief organ in New England!* A paper that reflects Federal sentiments *now*, just as the Boston Sentinel reflected Federal sentiment *thirty years ago*. To show what this sentiment is, we quote other extracts from the sayings of Whigs:

"We shall certainly consider the annexation of Texas, or any other foreign State to this country, as a virtual dissolution of the Union, and we apprehend that such a vast addition to our territory and population would so far change the nature and circumstances of the connection as to absolve the dissenting States from any further obligation under the original contract of Union."

John Reed, Lieutenant-Governor of this State, says, in his letter of August 4, 1844:

"It must be understood that the free States will neither consent nor submit to the annexation of Texas to this Union. Such annexation would result in its dissolution. Indeed, the annexation, without provision in the Constitution, and without consent, would be an ablution from the bonds and obligations of the Constitution.

Also the declaration of thirteen Whig Representatives in Congress, headed by John Quincy Adams.

"We hesitate not to say that annexation, effected by any act of proceedings of the Federal Government, or any of its departments, would be identical with dissolution.— * * * * Not only inevitably to result in a dissolution of the Union, but fully to justify it."

Nor is this all. The Federal clergy of New England are in the political field, preaching weekly in their desks political sermons, the whole tendency of which is to influence the pulic mind, and set it in the Federal current. Some of their sermons have been printed, and edition after edition sent out to the people. The last occasion—a specimen of the rest—was upon the recent meeting of the general court. Rev. Mr. Braman, who preached the election sermon, for which he received the thanks of the Senate of Massachusetts, was full of holy horror at the prospect of annexation, and the spread of Romanism! Its object evidently was to aid the Whig cause.—And it is a specimen of the manner in which the Federal clergy now, as they did in the times of the last Boston convention, assert and defend their political opinions. It all helps on this disunion project.

Here, then, is a scheme proposed for an immediate dissolution of the Union, that it is to be advocated in every town in Massachusettes! And how can the object of this infamous petition be more effectually promoted than by such language as can be seen any day in the Whig printed or by the proposed New England convention in Faneuil Hall? The crisis is indeed at hand. The question will soon be whether the people of New England will follow there hot headed party leaders in civil war or whether they will say, with the patriot of the Hermitage, '*The Union—it must be preserved.*"

But what is offered in justification of this political madness? For what are these hot headed Federal leaders ready to plunge into civil war and dissolve the Union? The ostensible reason is, the probable admission of more slave territory into the Union: the real reason is the loss of political power and probable continued ostracism from office. In this violence they do no more, however, than justice to their political education. Why did "certain leaders" of the Federalists, from 1803 to 1814, entertain a design of establishing a New England confederacy, declaring again and again that the Union was dissolved? Ostensibly because more slave territory was added in 1803 to the Union; in reality because the influences of the Federalists in the councils of the Union was destroyed. The leaders of the Federal party of to day have marked out precisely the same course in relation to an opposition to the annexation of Texas, that the leaders of the same party did, in 1803 about the Louisiana purchase. The opposition to Democracy raved about Louisiana just as bad as the opposition to Democracy now rave about Texas. As such men as John Quincy Adams and John Reed set the ely in motion that the admission of Texas into the Union will strike, New England out of it, it may be well to trace this resemblance more fully.

Louisiana was purchased in 1803. Immediately the Federalists engaged in opposition to it that did not cease until a part of it, in 1811, was admitted into the Union as a State. Jefferson was charged with having been actuated by the most selfish, sordid motives in buying it; the purchase itself was ridiculed as worthless; the attempts Jefferson made to explore its riches, were celebrated in verse and prose as among the grossest absurdities of the time and, in consequence of its admission, the free States were declared dissolved from the Union, and certain civil leaders were ready, under a military leader to plunge into civil war.

This Louisiana opposition of the Federalists commenced with the first step Jefferson took to recover the right of deposite at New Orleans.—On the 18th of October, 1802, the Intendant of Louisiana published a decree, by which Americans were no longer permitted to deposite their merchandize at New Orleans; all foreign commerce was prohibited; the immense trade of the Mississippi was to be carried on in Spanish bottoms and by Spanish subjects. This year this territory was ceded by Spain to France, and Jefferson promptly seized the occasion to negotiate for its purchase. This negotiation was denounced—the Federalists proclaiming that war and war alone was the remedy. The Federalists in Congress—Gouveneur Morris, Ross, and others—took the lead in proposing measures. The Boston Sentinel, July 9, 1803, says:

"All we wanted on the Mississippi was a place of deposite, that our treaty with Spain gives. It was basely withdrawn.—Our high spirited rulers are asked to defend our right. O, no; eighty thousand militia are to be held ready to defend our turnips, and feed the pigs and cattle. But to take our right, to seize what treaties gives, and fraud withholds, this is not their forte."

Again, July 27, 1803—

"An administration so feeble and despicable, by what it can and what it cannot do,"&c.

Again, August 13, 1803—

Like true spaniels, we are the most servile to those who most insult us. We receive back our right as a great favor, and pay tribute for that which the despoiler could no longer withhold."

Having denounced Jefferson as pusillanimous in engaging in negotiation, the Federalists continued to denounce the acquisition of this noble country, in the most factious language. They then, in the Legislature of Massachusetts, proposed an amendment of the Constitution, in reference to representation, that they advocate at this time. This was introduced into the House by Mr. Ely, of Springfield, February 13, 1804, with a long preamble, the part in reference to Louisiana being as follows:

"And whereas the said provisions (in reference to representatives) have been rendered more injurious by important political changes, introduced under the present Administration, in the purchase of Louisiana, an extensive country which will require a great number of slaves for its cultivation, and when admitted into the Union, agreeably to the cession, will contribute, by the number of its slaves to destroy the real influence of the Eastern States in the National Government."

This amendment proposed "that the Representatives be apportioned among the several States according to the number of their free inhabitants respectively." It was heralded as a highly important movement," and received and advocated extensively, for years, in the Federal journals. These papers were then as full of slave statistics as the same sort of papers now are.

In short the arguments against Louisiana were, letter, for letter the arguments now used against Texas. The Union was already large enough; the addition of Louisiana, would add to and perpetuate slavery; it was unconstitutional; it would destroy the balance of power, and thus violate the original compact; it would bring on a foreign war; it would entail a national debt; it would add a bandit population to the country.—Such was the sum of the Federal argument against Louisiana. Such is the sum of the Federal argument against Texas.

A few items from the papers of the day will give the spirit of the federal opposition to Louisiana.

In the Massachusetts Legislature, Feb. 1805 a Federal member, after stating the arguments against Louisiana, exclaimed—"In a word, I consider Louisiana the grave of the Union."

Toasts give, generally, the political sentiments of the time. A toast given July 4, 1805, read as follows:

"The purchase of Louisiana—salt mountains, mammoths, gulls, and bullfrogs—a valuable museum for fifteen millions."

Another Federal toast was:

"Louisiana: of all materials—neither fit for land or water; may she be the receptacle of the turbulent and disaffected."

On the bill for the admission of the territory of Orleans—Louisiana—into the Union, 1811, Josiah Quincy, Jr., said, and after being called to order, *committed his remarks to writing*:

"If this bill passed, it is my deliberate opinion that it is virtually a dissolution of the Union; that it will free the states from their moral obligation, and, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, definitely to prepare for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must."

"Prepare for a separation"—what is the key of this? How far opposition to Louisiana went in the work of preparation, John Quincy Adams shall testify. He says:

"This design ("of *certain leaders* of the Federal party to effect a dissolution of the Union, and the establishment of a Northern Confederacy,") had been formed, in the winter of 1803 and 1804, immediately after, and as a consequence of, the acquisition of Louisiana. Its justifying causes to those who entertained it were, that the annexation of Louisiana to the Union transcended the constitutional powers of the Government of the United States. That it formed in fact a new Confederacy, to which the states, united by the former compact, were not bound to adhere.—That it was oppressive to the interest and destructive to the influence of the Northern section of the Confederacy, whose right and duty it therefore to *secede from the body politic and to constitute one of their own.* This plan was so far matured, that a proposal had been made to an individual to permit himself, at the proper time, to be placed at the head of the military movements, which it was foreseen would be necessary to carry it into execution."

Though the Louisiana purchase was the first justifying cause of this mad project, yet—says Mr. Adams in this same letter to the modern Federal or Whig leaders, dated December 30, 1828—the beneficial consequences of this purchase to the whole Union was so apparent as to take away "all possibility of holding it up as laborum of a political region of disunion." Its second justifying causes were the restrictive measure and the war of Jefferson's and Madison's administration. But Mr. Adams says again:

"That project, (the project New England confederacy,) I repeat, had gone to the length of fixing upon a military leader for its execution; and, although the circumstance of the times never admitted of its execution, nor even of its full developement, I yet had no doubt, in 1803 and 1809, and have no doubt at this time, that it is the key to all the great movements of these leaders of the Federal party in New England, from that time forward, till its final catastrophe in the Hartford Convention."

"Thus far were "certain leaders" of the old Federal party prepared to go, whenever they became assured that the people were prepared to follow them! To screw their courage upon this work, all the enginery that could aid a party was set in motion. Then the Osgoods and Parishes of the pulpit joined in the disunion cry. The Federal press was full of it. Take the following extracts from the old Sentinel, the Atlas of its day, December 10, 1814, it said:

"Those who started at the danger of a separation, tell us that the soil of New England is hard and sterile; that deprived of the production of the South, we should soon become a wretched race of cowherds and fishermen; that our narrow territory and diminished population would make us an easy prey to foreign powers. Do these men forget what national energy can be for a people? Have they not read of Holland? Do they not remember that it grew in wealth and power amid constant alarm? *That it threw off the yoke of Spain*, (our Virginia,) and its chavels became churches, and its poor men's cottages princes' palaces!"

Also, December 17, 1814:

"Is said that to makes treaty of commerce with the enemy is to violate the Constitution, to *sever the Union.* Are they not both already virtually destroyed! Or in what stage of existence would they be, should we *declare a neutrality, or open withhold taxes and men!*"

A dissolution of the Union! Do the co ite al charlatans, who speak through a partisan press, know what they are about when they threaten this? Have such factionists a tithe of an idea of the magnitude of the work of the formation of this Union? Can they comprehend the blessings it has conferred, it *will continue* to confer, not merely upon this people, but upon humanity? Are not the men who get up such petitions as we have quoted, the party presses that play into their hands, the pulpit efforts that aid them the people that countenance them, playing false with liberty itself? Where has it hope for a realization of the blessings it can confer upon mankind, if this republican government fail? And what can more surely contribute to its failure than to weaken the bonds that make the people of these states a united people? How can Americans with freedom on their lips, more completely play into the hands of the legitimate despots of Europe, with hatred of freedom in their hearts, than by working for a dissolution of this Union? Americans—patriots—descendants of revolutionary days; reverers of Washington—of all parties—pause ere you pass such a Rubicon—listen to the voice of the father of his county, and indignantly frown down these Federal hotspurs, who would make brother seen the blood of brother in civil war, rather than not obtain political power!

We cannot conclude this article better than by quoting the words the immortal Washington used in his farewell address to his countrymen!

"The unity of government, which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so—for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home—your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and to speak of it as a palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frown upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

ARGUMENTS AGAINST ANNEXATION, THE SECOND HAND APPEALS OF THE OPPONENTS TO THE ADMISSION OF MISSOURI—PINKNEY'S SPEECH—REASONS WHY TEXAS SHOULD BE ANNEXED FROM A NORTHERN COTEMPORARY—N. ORLEANS JEFFERSONIAN—THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS.

In the labored attempts of opponents to annexation, to abolish the institution of slavery in part or in whole, in the admission of Texas into the Union, we discover the same principles at work, which influenced the opponents to the admission of Missouri as a slave state; and it appears very clearly to us, and the same arguments which were then put forth by King of New York and Morrill of New Hampshire, have been borrowed largely from by their present followers. We have been surprised to find so much of imitation and so little of discovery and invention. The future historian may dwell upon the sophisms, even of BURRILL, of Rhode Island, with some degree of interest, and provoke a smile from the rigid constructionist, with this framers loose views of constitutional interpretion, but he may search the length and breadth of the present discussion, and though he may encounter the Adams', the Benton's and the Choates', men of the most distinguished ability, he will not find in all their arguments, one stone unturned that was not unturned twenty times before—one position laid down that has not its counterpart and original; its elucidation and comment in the debates of a previous day.

And it is equally plain to us, that we cannot meet the enemies of annexation with more powerful and cogent arguments on many important points involved, than were at that day advanced.—Every old observer is familiar with the celebrated speech of WILLIAM PINKNEY in the senate of the U. States, February 15, 1820. We would refer to that document as a complete exposition of the clause in our constitution relating to the admission of new states; and thus of the right of Texas to come into the Union with her slave institutions:

"New states *may* be admitted by the Congress into this union." It is objected that the word "may" imports power, and obligation; a right to declare; a discretion to grant or refuse. To this it might be answered, that *power* is *duty* on many occasions. But let it be conceded that it is discretionary. What consequence follows? A power to refuse, in a case like this, does not necessarily involve a power to exact terms. You must look to the *result* which is the declared object of the power. Whether you will arrive at it, or not, may depend on your will: but you cannot compound se with the result intended and professed. What then is the proffered result? To admit a *state* into this *Union*. What is that Union? A confederation of states equal in sovreignty: capable of every thing which the constitution does not forbid, or authorize congress to forbid? It is an equal Union; between parties equally sovereign. They were sovereign, independently of the Union. The object of the Union was common protection for the exercise of already existing sovereignty. The parties gave up a portion of that sovereignty to insure the remainder. As far as they gave it up by the common compact, they have ceased to be sovereign.—The *Union* provides the means of defending the residue; and it is into that Union that a new state is to come. By acceding to it the new state is placed on the same footing with the original states. It accedes for the same purpose, i. e. protection for its unsurrendered sovereignty. If it comes in shorn of its beams; crippled and disparaged beyond the original states, it is not into the *original Union* that it comes; for it is a different sort of Union. The first was Union *inter pares*: this is a Union between *desparates*: between giants and a dwarf: between power and feebleness: between ill-proportioned sovereignties and a miserable image of power; a thing which that very Union has shrunk and shriveled from its just size, instead of preserving it in its true dimensions.

"It is into "this Union," i. e. the Union of the federal constitution, that you are to admit, or refuse to admit. You can admit into no other. You cannot make the Union, as to the new state, what it is not as to the old; for then it is not *this Union* that you open for the entrance of a new party. If you make it enter into a new and additional compact, is it any longer the same Union? We are told that admitting a state into the Union is a compact. Yes: but what sort of a compact? A compact that it should be a member of the Union, as the constitution has made it. You cannot new fashion it. You may make a compact to admit; but, when admitted, the original compact prevails. The Union is a compact, with a provision of political power and agents for the accomplishment of its objects. Vary that compact as to a new state—give new energy to that political power, so as to make it act with more force upon a new state than upon the old—make the will of these agents more effectually the arbiter of the fate of a new state than of the old, and it may be confidently said that the new state has not entered into this Union, but into another Union. How far the Union has been varied is another question; but that it has been varied is clear."

"If," says Mr. PINKNEY, "I am told that you do not legislate upon a new state I answer that you do; and I answer further, that it is immaterial whether you do or do not; but it is upon *Missouri* as a state, that your *terms* and *conditions* are to *act*." We may say the same of Benton's bill for abolishing slavery in part, and of all other bills of like nature, that they are destined to act upon Texas and to govern her relations as a state in our confederacy. We claim with PINKNEY, that if a new state is admitted into our Union, it must be admitted on the same terms with the original states to the consideration.

The deep yet philosophic views of PINKNEY are admirably displayed in this speech:

"No state or territory, [he remarks] in order to become a state, can alienate or surrender any portion of its sovereignty to the union, or to a sister state, or to a foreign nation. It is under no incapacity to disqualify itself for all the purposes of government left to it in the constitution recognises not only to cause it does not deny them, but presumes them to remain as they exist by the law of nature and nations. Inequality in the sovereignty of states is unnatural, and repugnant to all the principles of that law. Hence we find it laid down by the text writers on public law, that "Nature has established a perfect equality of rights between independent nations;" and that "whatever the quality of a free sovereign nation gives to one, it gives to another." The constitution of the United States proceeds upon the truth of this doctrine. It takes the states as it finds them, *free and sovereign alike by nature*. It receives from them portions of their power for the general good, and provides for the exercises of it by separate political bodies. It diminishes the individual sovereignty of each and transfers what it subtracts, to the government which it creates; it takes from all alike, and leaves them relatively to each other equal in sovereign power."

At this moment when disunion has been ring in our ears by the old Hartford convention party again breathed to life, it is a matter of interest to review the grounds of former controversy in which similar issues were at stake. It will be seen that the positions taken by Mr Pinkney, militate against the federal government and the territory of Missouri from abolishing the institution of slavery. We would assume the same position the same position to-day. We would deny her the right of abolishing slavery in order to become a state of the Union from the reason, that she would stop herself of an attribute held in common by Mississippi, Louisiana, Virginia, and other slave holding states in the time of their admission into the Union, while we would also deny the right of Congress to do such a concession from Texas, not demanded of the original parties to the federal compact, nor left discretionary with the federal government.

In a late number of the Worcester (Mass.) *Palladium*, we find an elaborate and capital article on the subject of "SOUTHERN SECESSION", and while it assumes strong ground against the foolery and treason, states clearly and succinctly some of the many important reasons for annexing Texas.—These are embraced under the following heads:

"First; we want Texas because *it was once ours* and was wrongfully ceded to Spain by the treaty of '19."

"Second; we want Texas *for the safe and well defined boundary* it will give us on our southwestern frontier."

"Third; we want Texas *for the facilities it would give us for national defence and protection.*"

"Fourth; we want Texas *for the seaboard it will give to the immense region, already ours, that lies south of it*; and that is yet to be filled with states teeming with an active and industrious population—of which our laws, our arts, and our institutions of civilization, are but the multiplicand."

"Fifth; we want Texas *as a great highway from the ocean to Oregon*; and we should find it through the valley of the Rio del Norte—easily accessible and easily traversed—giving us facilities of communication, and for commercial intercourse with a country that is ours; and as it is our mission to establish there the principles of free government, so there we are to find an advantageous market for our manufactures and merchandise."

Sixth; we want Texas *for the control it would give us of that great staple of our commerce*—COTTON—which may be produced there to an immense abundance, at less expence, and of better quality, than in any other portion of the world."

"Seventh; we want *the market of Texas*. This it is one day to become a most important market, no one can question. Shall Great Britain have it or shall we have it? Essentially a *planting* region, it will have to obtain from abroad, in exchange for its cotton, etc., its supply of food and clothing; the former it could procure from Canada and the provinces—the latter, from England itself, or, obtained with the United States, it could draw its agricultural products from the valley of the Mississippi, and its manufactured articles from the mills of New England. In this view of the case, it is folly, it is stupidity, in New England, to resist the acquisition of Texas!"

"Eighth; we want Texas *for the protection of our home market!*"

"Ninth; we want Texas *for the employment to commerce will give to the shipping interests of the northern states!*"

"Tenth; we want Texas to *strengthen the Union and balance its interests*. Nothing ever gave so much strength to our institutions as the acquisition of Louisiana. It has made us invincible among the nations."

Here are ten reasons for the annexation of Texas, in all of which the interests of the Union are concerned, and will bear a strong analogy in the north as in the south. We cannot trifle then with this momentous question of annexation. Neither the madness of abolitionism or the corruption of demagogues can prevent its consummation. Secure the privilege of Texas to come into the Union with her slave institutions, and the stability of the federal government to force from her any compromise derogatory to her standing as an independent nation and member of our confederacy: so large the interests to be benefited by the introduction of the territory into the Union; and so well understood the question among our people every where, that no human power less than treacherous delay can stay annexation. It must come if there is any honesty in our public servants.

Among the papers in the south now taking an active part in favor of immediate annexation, is our sterling cotemporary, the New Orleans *Jeffersonian*, edited by one of Mississippi's distinguished sons, Col. J. F. H. CLAIBORNE. The course which the *Jeffersonian* has taken on this subject is calculated to give it pre-eminent celebrity. With such able confederates—with our *Rapperees* on *Pi blunt*; our *Mercury's*; our *Unionist*; our *Constitutions*; the republic will need neither Cæsars nor Antonys to extend her empire or build up her greatness. The *Jeffersonian* of a late date, alluding to the inroads upon the domestic institutions of slavery contemplated by the bill of Mr. Benton, says:

"The south would not have Texas upon his terms. Texas herself would consent to no such humiliatory condition. Let her come in as Louisiana came in, with her rights, her institutions and her boundaries untouched and unassailed. If not on these terms, we would not have her—and her spirited government and gallant and intelligent people, will spurn the Union—will trample on your compromises, and declaim our alliance. Texas or slavery—Texas to the Rio Grande—Texas with her slaves, or not at all."

Such are our own sentiments, and we trust it is to be shown, that in a constitutional view, the annexation of Texas cannot be unnumbered by any compromise on the subject of slavery, whatever other may be connected. The authority of PINKNEY is one among the most profound we should wish to quote.

HON. SILAS WRIGHT.

The Legislature of New York assembled at Albany on the 4th inst. Horatio Seymour was chosen Speaker. After the organization of both Houses the message of the Governor was received.

From the eminence of Gov. Wright's position among the distinguished statesmen of the day, his first message has been looked for with unusual interest. It is devoted mainly to the concerns of the State. After an elaborate view of its finances, in which he adheres to the policy which in 1842 arrested the fearful accumulation of the State indebtedness, and limited the public improvements to the current means to defray their expenses,—he takes up the auburn difficulties—the penitentiary system—the common school system—agricultural societies, &c., all of which he discusses with his usual clearness and ability. He concludes his message with the following reference to the results of the late Presidential election:

"I cannot consent to close this communication without a brief reference to the interest of our State as a member of the Union. We have just passed through a presidential election second to none which has preceded it in the importance of its principles involved, or the deep and universal interest of the whole people in the contest. As no time has the excitement of feeling been more intense, and no similar election has passed away with a more universal acquiescence of the parties. Sections have the two great parties of the country arrayed themselves more distinctly upon the principles and measures of policy which divide them, or more geographically, started the result of a contest resting upon the strength of those lines, pro and con. Great issues, which heretofore have been not imperfectly joined, or continued, have now been universally recognized as presenting controlling questions in the contest.—The public mind and the known and acknowledged principles of the leading candidates of the respective parties, as well as these expressed issues, defined the grounds upon which the battle was to be fought.—These candidates were supported upon the principles and opinions which, as statesmen, they had avowed and practiced. The great mass of the people were more correctly appealed to, and more clearly addressed than at any preceding election, and every freeman in the country enjoyed the full opportunity thoroughly to understand and decide upon the points in dispute, before he cast his vote. The conclusion is almost unavoidable, that at the time, has the whole public mind been perfectly understood all the important questions involved in an election, or more clearly comprehended the influence to be exerted by its decision, upon the future policy and prosperity of the national government.

It is reasonable to hope that, after such a decision of the people, pronounced under such circumstances, the great interests of the country which have long been kept in a condition of uncertainty and agitation, will be allowed repose; that the basis of the action of the federal government on the subject of the currency, may now be considered settled; that all further agitation on the question of assigning one entire branch of the government to the states may be at an end; and that the principle upon which the revenues of that government is to be derived from customs, are to be assessed, is definitely defined. All these are subjects which deeply affect the business interests of every portion of the country, but more especially, and most deeply, the commercial and trading interests; and as the most commercial state of the union, we have felt, with great severity the uncertainty, the change and prospect of change which for many years past, have almost constantly surrounded all these questions.

Next to a policy based upon sound, constitutional principle, one which is stable, and will realize for the future, what it promises for the present, is the most important to all the great interests, agricultural, commercial and manufacturing. The issue of the late election seems to promise these benefits, at least for a time, and until the recurrence of another similar contest shall determine whether these issues are to be re opened, a result, in my opinion, greatly to be deprecated. No violent changes are required to conform the existing state of things to such a settled system as has long been indicated. My entire conviction, that the hands into which the administration of the federal government is to pass, are those which will most scrupulously respect these manifestations of the popular will, induces me to express the strong degree of confidence upon these points. That respect will draw to the new administration the continued confidence of the people, and secure the results anticipated, at least during its continuance.

Some apprehensions appear to be entertained of difficulty in our foreign relations, and an interruption of the peace of the country. I confess I cannot partake strongly of such fears. I am not aware of any good cause for such an interruption existing in the relations between us and any other government; and I firmly believe that a calm and statesman-like course in the management of our relations with other powers, based upon broad national principles, and governed by the rule "to ask nothing which is not clearly right, and to submit to nothing which is wrong," will continue us in peace, or if land in a war, it will be such a war as every patriotic heart in the country will sustain and approve. That this rule will be the guide of the new administration, in its management of the foreign relations of the country, I fully believe.

Under these impressions in regard to the interests involved in the administration of the National Government, and in the strong assurance that the affairs of the State to be elected by your deliberations and action, will be wisely disposed of with the continued smiles of that gracious Providence, which has hitherto so signally poured its blessings upon our country, I anticipate security and peace for our constituents, and prosperity for the State."