

# The Camden Journal.

VOLUME 11.

CAMDEN, SOUTH-CAROLINA, JUNE 25, 1850.

NUMBER 50.

## AN HOUR WITH GOD.

One hour with Thee, my God! when daylight breaks

Over a world thy guardian care has kept,  
When the fresh soul from soothing slumber wakes,  
To praise the love that watched me while I slept;  
When with new strength my blood is bounding free,  
The first, best, sweetest hour, I'll give to Thee.

One hour with Thee, when busy day begins  
Her never ceasing round of bustling care,  
When I must meet with toil, and pain, and sins,  
And through them all thy cross must bear;  
O, then, to arm me for the strife, to be  
Faithful to death, I'll kneel an hour to Thee.

One hour with Thee, when rides the glorious sun  
High in mid heaven, and painting nature feels  
Lifeless and overpowered, and man has done  
For one short hour with urging life's swift wheels;  
In that deep pause my soul from care shall flee,  
To make that hour of rest one hour with Thee.

One hour with Thee, when saddened twilight fings  
Her soothing charm o'er lawn, and vale, and grove,  
When there breaths up from all created things  
The sweet ethereal sense of thy deep love;  
And when its softening power descends on me,  
My swelling heart shall spend an hour with Thee.

One hour with Thee, my God! when softly night  
Climbs the high heaven with solemn step and slow,  
When thy sweet stars, unutterably bright,  
Are telling forth thy praise to men below;  
O then, while far from earth my thoughts would flee,  
I'll spend in prayer one joyful hour with Thee.

## THE BOUNDARIES OF TEXAS.

In the Senate debate of Wednesday, Gen. Houston, of Texas, made the following remarks, which, with the exception of one ill-natured fling at a Southern Senator, are high-spirited, finely expressed, and indicate truly, as we believe, the temper of his State. All the information we have confirms what we have before published, that Texas will neither be bullied nor bought out of her territory.

Mr. Houston. Mr. President, I have entertained great anxiety for the progress of the business of the Senate, and it is therefore with great reluctance that I intrude myself in this discussion; but some remarks have fallen from an honorable gentleman this morning, respecting Texas, which, as a co-representative of that State, I cannot permit to pass without notice. My silence might be deemed submission to an indignity.

The honorable Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward) has thought proper to give an opinion upon the title of Texas to the boundary which she claims, and we have been asked to show the authority by which that boundary has been claimed. I will not enter into the discussion of that subject after the arguments which have been submitted by gentlemen who have participated in this debate, amongst whom is my very able colleague, who has left nothing for me to say. If he has failed to convince the Senator from New York, I certainly do not expect to succeed in convincing him that the title of Texas extends beyond the Sabine. Yet, sir, the Government of the United States must be placed in peculiar circumstances in relation to the national honor, if Texas has not a claim even beyond the Nueces. It was not objected after the annexation of Texas to the United States that Corpus Christi was then a territory of Texas; and it will be admitted that the war grew out of the position taken by the Mexicans opposite Matamoros on the Rio Grande.

But, sir, Texas was annexed with her declared boundaries of the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source. No question then arose respecting the boundary which we declared in 1836. Texas then conceded to the United States the right to settle the question of boundary with Mexico, but she did not concede the right, after the acquisition of all the territory which the United States acquired from Mexico, of adjusting it between Mexico and the United States. The United States was the agent of Texas, and as such acquired limits beyond the boundary which Texas claimed, and consequently secured to her all she had assumed for herself. If, however, this bill should pass, it will not be decisive with Texas, as the subject will be referred to her Legislature to judge of the fitness of disposing of this territory or retaining it, as she may think proper. It imposes no obligation upon Texas, it infringes none of her rights, it coerces her to no submission to the action of Congress; but it recognizes all the rights which she originally possessed. Gentlemen say this is an indignity, and indeed the honorable gentleman from Florida was so kind as to remark that it would be prostituting Texas if she submitted to such degradation. I will, with great deference to the honorable gentleman, assure him that I think all Texas will return him thanks, and in the name of Texas I return him my thanks, for becoming the special guardian of her purity and her honor; and I hope it will suffer no danger from his friendly interposition.

The gentleman has exhibited a degree of solicitude that would have been favorable to Texas at one period, when she was surrounded by temptations and difficulties, and when she was wooed on all sides, and was in a situation to yield to solicitations. The honorable gentleman then steps forward and exhorts her to maintain her purity, and also to maintain her standard unshaken by prostitution. Sir, Texas has never been prostituted. If she were incapable of vindicating her rights here, through her representatives, the collective wisdom of Texas, in her deliberative assemblies, will have the proposition submitted to them; and Texas, through her agents, can then say whether it is conformable to her wish that she should relinquish her right to this territory, or whether she will maintain it. It will be a matter of discretion with her, and I trust she will not stoop so low as to

humiliate or degrade herself to a state of prostitution. Texas is surrounded on the one hand by sympathy and on the other by menace and reproach. Honorable gentlemen have threatened her with expulsion from her territory which she claims, and which none other has ever claimed. Sir, it is said that Texas has asserted her right to that territory or has preferred a claim to it. She has never preferred a claim to it. In the face of eight millions of people she has asserted her right. She has no claim to advance. Her right has been asserted from the very beginning of the independence of Texas. The Executive of the United States and the nominal delegate from New Mexico are, I believe, the most ostensible personages that have alleged that Texas has set up a claim to this territory. An adverse claim to the right of Texas has been set up, but Texas has set up no claim adverse to any other. She has asserted no claim which she did not contend for through years of revolution. If Mexico, at any period in the Texan revolutionary conflict, had offered, if Texas would relinquish her title to the country beyond the Nueces, to recognize her sovereignty and independence, Texas would have spurned it; every man within her borders that had a heart would have bit the dust in defence of that territory. And now it is said that she has set up a claim. Trace her history down to annexation, and that right remains unchanged and undisputed by Mexico. Her contest was for the Sabine boundary and never for the Nueces; but she subsequently ceded the right of Texas to all the territory East of the Rio Grande. The honorable gentleman from New Jersey, the other day, appeared to think that the Central Government—yes, sir, the Central Government, which means, I suppose, the Government at Washington—had power and right, and of right ought to expel Texas from her territory, if she were in peaceable possession of what is called New Mexico. He appeared to think that the troops of the United States should expel them under the direction of the Federal, or as he styled it, the Central Government. That is an ungracious word to Texas ears.

Mr. Dayton. Will the Texan representative permit me to remind him that he is entirely mistaken? I do not say that if Texas were rightfully in possession of New Mexico, the Central Government should expel her from her Territory. But I said that, if Texas went there with a view to take possession of that territory by force, which I hold to be the territory of the United States, they would find the United States in their way and ready to repel them from that forcible possession, if they attempted to make it.

Mr. Houston. Texas, so far as I am acquainted with her history has never threatened violence to the officers of the United States, nor has she threatened to take the territory by force. She sent her commissioner, a single individual, unguarded—not a corporal's guard with him—and the people of New Mexico have acquiesced in the authority of Texas, conveyed by that single individual. But will the honorable gentleman say that his language conveyed no menace, no vaunting, no threat to Texas? Sir, we were told that if we attempted to take possession of our borders, and to fill what had been our claim from our inception as a nation, we should find a lion in our path. But we have met no lion; we have met no adversary hunting without our borders. We have not been a warlike people, but we have resisted aggression and repelled injury, when it was attempted to be enforced upon us. We have no sword to strike at our assailants. The Constitution, I presume, has no clause to allow the United States to strike their swords at a people in the possession of their rights. Our shield is justice, to repel aggression, and we will be carried from our fields upon that shield before we will surrender one constitutional right. It is our *ægis*, and we will have it to the inch.

A Central Government, indeed! The honorable Senator here speaking of a Central Government! A Central Government for what? To coerce Texas to submit to aggression. To tell Texas that she must surrender her rights before adjudication! To tell her that she must surrender rights for which the United States as her guardian went to war, after she herself had merged her powers of resistance to a foreign Government in the United States! Because she occupies that territory in a peaceable manner, is she to be threatened by the myriads of power? I tell them that they have a lesson to learn from Texas. She never goes beyond her borders. She resists no constitutional requirement, and will submit to no aggression from any power under Heaven. She will have the rights to which she is entitled, or the wrongdoer must soon hear their requiem.

I would say to gentlemen, then, with all deference and good feeling, that when they wish to indulge in tropes, and figures, and dashing metaphors, they will keep "lions" and "Central Governments" out of the path. I do not like to encounter them, "A lion!" I am no Samson, (laughter) A "Central Government!" I have been accustomed to resistances to Central Governments. Texas keeps her warriors at home to defend her women and children against the savages. She sends none of her warriors here; but let a Central Government lay a rude hand upon her banner, and that star will never be eclipsed, though gentlemen by treading on stars here, may not seem to think much of it. Our banner floats on the wind, and I would let gentlemen remember that from the darkest clouds of revolution, it has led us to association with this Union, which we are ready to contribute the last drop of our blood to maintain—faithful to the Union, faithful to the Constitution, and faithful to Texas.

Any difficulty between two parties can be readily adjusted, if one of them can be prevailed upon to surrender every thing worth contending for!

## THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE PATROL.

Through the kindness of A. Herbemont, Esq. Clerk of Appeal, we are enabled to lay before our readers, the following opinion of our Law Court of Appeals, on a matter of general interest and great importance. It may be relied on, of course, as a correct exposition of the law; while the spirit which it manifests is equally creditable to that law, and to those who have expounded it.—Eds. *Telegraph*.  
Spring Term, 1850.

THE STATE  
vs.  
WASHINGTON BOOZER and others. } WITHERS, J.

OPINION.—The defendants are convicted under the Act of 1841, which punishes, as for a misdemeanor, any person who shall "unlawfully whip or beat any slave, (not under his or her charge) without sufficient provocation, by word or act."

The defence was rested upon their rights as Patrol; and it proceeds upon the idea that they were engaged in dispersing an unlawful assembly of slaves; for the notion is preposterous that the slaves whipped were "under the charge" of the patrol who were punishing them in the sense of the Act.

The slaves who were whipped were on the premises of a citizen, himself a slave-owner, by his consent, and with tickets from their master. The occasion was a perfectly innocent one, even meritorious; for Hunter's negro woman had obtained his permission to call in assistance towards the construction of a quilt for her bed, or some bed; and it is to be hoped that no master in the State would have denied such an indulgence, when he had no motive to suspect that it was contrived to cover up some evil design. How many of us have permitted to our slaves the enjoyment of a wedding party and ceremony, in imitation of the custom of the higher class, and even contributed, liberally, to the good cheer of the occasion? It is surely no novelty among slave owners, that, by the consent of all parties, one slave should obtain the assistance of his neighbor to gather his little crop, even though it be on a Saturday night, or to erect or improve his cabin. It would be painful to find that the law forbids masters to permit, or to encourage the slave in honoring the humble virtues that may be consistent with his condition, whether the same may take the direction of social relations and intercourse among themselves, or the advancement of household comforts. The true spirit of our law does not aim at such an end, where the mode of attaining it presents no conflict with the interests, the peace and security of the public. These, undoubtedly, must be regarded at all hazards; and no police regulations, subserving that high policy, can be justly branded as cruel or tyrannical. To ascertain whether the slaves punished by the defendants were caught in the violation of any law, we must look to the statutes.

Our fundamental code, now time-honored, is that of 1740. It was enacted soon after a violent, barbarous and somewhat bloody servile outbreak at Stono. Not a few of its provisions took their hue from the exigency of the occasion, and that it has faded somewhat in the lapse of time is only the usual inevitable consequence of all police systems, in the shape of positive terms, which cannot have the quality to keep up with the advancement of a community. An attentive examination, however, of our slave law will show, that there are few occasions where a slave is supposed to need the interposition of police discipline, whether wielded by the private or the public arm, when his errand from home is known to his owner, and permitted by him in writing. By the 7th section, Act 1740, a magistrate was authorized, personally or by warrant to another, to call the posse and disperse "any assembly or meeting of slaves which may disturb the peace or endanger the safety of His Majesty's subjects." By the 43rd section, any person was authorized to apprehend and chastise, within a limit, a body of "men slaves exceeding seven in number" who were seen "to travel together in any high road." How often this section would work mischievously, at this day, if indiscreetly enforced according to the letter, will occur to everybody.

But the 36th section of the same act is supposed to be the only one that can have the semblance of application to this case. It is too long to be incorporated here. But the object of the provision was declared to be the safety of the Province. It would seem simply ridiculous to suppose that the safety of the State or any of its inhabitants, was implicated by such an assemblage as that at Hunter's composed of a few males; more females; with tickets from the owners; in the kitchen of a citizen; by his consent; not impudent nor disorderly, by the admission of the defendants; assembled at a quilting; and no evidence of a caustic by eating or drinking. The said section declared that due care should be taken to restrain the "wanderings" and meetings of negroes and other slaves—"more especially on Saturday nights, Sunday's and other holidays," and the using and carrying certain dangerous weapons, drums, horns and other loud instruments—and to prevent the meeting of negroes under such circumstances, anybody was authorized to arrest and disarm one out of his master's premises, "not being on lawful business and with a letter from his master, or a ticket or not having a white person with him." This was all designed as precaution; to prevent such wanderings and meetings before denounced. Then follow the material provisions, to wit: "And whatsoever master, owner, or overseer shall permit or suffer his or their negro or other slave or slaves, to beat drums, blow horns, or use any other loud instruments, or whosever shall suffer and countenance any public meeting or feasting of strange negroes or slaves in their plantations shall forfeit, &c."

We cannot perceive that the assembly of negroes, as before described, with which these

defendants interfered, can be made to answer the terms of the foregoing quotation, according to their usual import, and still less when taken in connection with what was recited as the danger to be guarded against—the mischief to be remedied. We do not mean to affirm (what seems to have been the Circuit Judge's impression) that if it had been such an assembly the patrol may not have dispersed it, notwithstanding the liability to a pecuniary penalty of him who suffered and encouraged it. Nor do we mean to trench, in any degree, upon the vigorous administration by the patrol of the important police power entrusted to them, within the orbit prescribed for their action. Let them exercise, with judicious freedom, the power to disperse unlawful assemblies, as they are expressly empowered to do by the 13th section of the patrol law, in relation to slaves, free negroes, mulattoes, and mustozes; such, for example, as are found in disorderly houses; such as are described in the 11th section of that Act; but a judicious freedom of administration in our police law for the lower order must always have respect to the confidence which the law reposes in the discretion of the master, the presence of the proprietor, his loyalty to the sympathies and the policy that involve our common interests, peace and safety. Let the patrol always act in the spirit that should guide the discreet, sedate, intelligent, and humane owner of slaves, and they will find the judicial arm of the government nerved to sustain them—if indeed it could be presumed that in such case they would ever need it. Thus guided, they may often find occasions—no doubt they will—to overlook a harmless violation, a venial transgression, of the strict letter—to construe in a spirit of mildness—to concede something to the sacredness of domicile, the quiet of a family at the midnight hour—to recognize, what is eminently the negro's quality, the love of social intercourse, with no object beyond it, and no time to indulge it but the night—to distinguish between the premises of the quiet, orderly citizen, and of him whose very business of life is to corrupt the slave in his morals and his allegiance. This very case may illustrate what is meant: supposing that this assembly was an unlawful one, could it not have been dispersed just as readily and without flogging as with it? Why therefore chastise negroes who seem to have had no idea that they were doing wrong; who were at the place where they were found by the consent and written license of their master; when the proprietor came out to add his own authority and consent; when, as we presume, he was not a suspicious person or engaged in suspicious traffic?

We are mindful, however, that the statute of 1740, in the 53rd section, enjoins, that every portion of it "shall be construed most largely and beneficially for the promoting and carrying into execution this Act and for the encouragement and justification of all persons to be employed in the execution thereof;"—and since we are persuaded that it is probable these defendants had no deliberate purpose to commit an outrage upon the rights of others, we are gratified to learn from the Judge who preside on Circuit that it has not been his design to inflict any exemplary punishment.

As already intimated, it would be agreeable to us to be always able to sustain so useful and important a body as the patrol; but perceiving no error in the conviction of the present parties we are constrained to order, that their motion be dismissed.

We concur.  
JOSIAH J. EVANS.  
D. L. WARBLAW,  
EDWARD FROST.

## A CARD TO THE PUBLIC.

Summoned to Washington City, to aid Mr. Fisher, in conducting the *Southern Press*, and animated by the hope of being useful to the great cause, which so long has enlisted my mind and pen, I am reluctantly constrained, for a time, to leave my native State, and to resign into the hands of my colleague, Mr. Carlisle, the control of the *Telegraph*.

It is, however, neither my design nor my desire to forfeit my domicile in Carolina, nor to relinquish my interest in the *Telegraph*, though the term of my absence will depend upon the exigencies of the times, and the need of my humble services at Washington—and I feel assured, that my friends and fellow citizens at home, will appreciate the sacrifice which I make, even while availing myself of a mark of confidence from the Southern members of Congress, as flattering as it is unmerited. As they have passed by others more worthy, to select me, I would prove myself unworthy, of that signal compliment, were I to permit any reasons of a mere personal character, to prevent my acceptance of so delicate and difficult a trust—and have, therefore, accepted it, in the same spirit in which it was tendered.

In my absence, I bespeak for the little *Telegraph*—the Benjamin of my affections—the same generous support and kind indulgence which has cheered and sustained my labors, and those of my colleague hitherto; and can confidently promise that the change will enhance rather than diminish its claims to public patronage.

The Editorial conduct of the paper (owing to my protracted absence at Washington) has been for many months past in the hands of my colleague—who will continue to task his energies and abilities in its behalf—and his facilities for obtaining the earliest and most reliable news from Washington will not be lessened hereafter.

My duty compels me to work in any harness which may be thought best adapted to my powers—and in making this change I defer to the judgment of others, fully conscious of my own deficiencies, for which a conscientious earnestness of purpose may possibly compensate.

Personally I never have asked a favor of my State, or of my fellow citizens—but if they think that my course and labors merit anything

at their hands, let them sustain, in my absence, the paper I have established—which, as a link binding me to my home, I cannot resign, and to the conduct of which I hope hereafter to return when the exigencies now existing are dispelled, or have assumed a less threatening shape.

When that change will take place—or how soon—no human prescience can now foretell—but whatever may betide, South Carolina will ever claim a citizen in

EDWIN D. LEON.

Washington, June 13th, 1850.

My cotemporaries of the Press throughout the State will confer a favor by giving this Card an insertion in their respective papers.

The announcement above made will be read by the readers of the *Telegraph* with regret, while to the remaining Editor, whose intercourse with his colleague thus retiring for a season, was still more intimate, it must cause still deeper regret so far as his own feelings are concerned.

The circumstances however which have occasioned the event afford at the same time some mitigation of the pangs of parting, and we can but acquiesce in the call which has removed a colleague to a sphere in which his exertions may be of more avail to the cause which we have at heart, and to which the *Telegraph* has been devoted.

To the advocacy of that cause it is still pledged, and whatever falling off kind patrons and readers may perceive in ability, there shall be no change in zeal, fidelity, or honest endeavors to vindicate a cause whose inherent justice can give strength even to the feeblest advocate.

## TO WIVES.

The first inquiry of a woman after marriage should be, "How shall I continue the love I have inspired? How shall I preserve the heart I have won?"

1. Endeavor to make your husband's habitation alluring and delightful to him. Let it be to him a sanctuary to which his heart may always turn from the calamities of life. Make it a repose from his cares, a shelter from the world, a home not for his person only, but for his heart. He may meet with pleasures in other houses, but let him find pleasures in his own. Should he be dejected, soothe him; should he be silent and thoughtful do not heedlessly disturb him; should he be studious, favor him with all practicable facilities; or should he be peevish make allowances for human nature, and by your sweetness, gentleness and good humor, urge him continually to talk, though he may not say it, "this woman is a comfort to me—I cannot but love her and requite such gentleness and affections as they deserve."

2. Invariably adorn yourself with delicacy and modesty. These, to a man of refinement, are attractions the most highly captivating; while their opposite never fails to inspire disgust. Let the delicacy and modesty of the bride be always, in a great degree supported by the wife.

3. If it be possible, let your husband suppose you think him a good husband, and it will be a strong stimulus of his being so. As long as he thinks he possesses the reputation he will take some pains to deserve it; but when he has once lost the name, he will be apt to abandon the reality.

4. Cultivate and exhibit with the greatest care and constancy, cheerfulness and good humor. They give beauty to the finest face; and impart charms whose charms are not. On the contrary, a gloomy, dissatisfied manner, is chilling and repulsive to his feelings; he will be very apt to seek elsewhere for those smiles and that cheerfulness which he finds not at his own house.

5. In the article of dress, study your husband's taste. The opinion of others on this subject is of but very little consequence if he approve.

6. Particularly shun what the world calls, in ridicule, "curtain lectures." When you shut your door at night, endeavor to shut out at the same moment all discord and contention, and look on your chamber as a retreat from the vexations of the world, a shelter sacred to peace and affection.

How indecorous, offensive and sinful it is for a woman to exercise authority over her husband's, and to say "I will have it so. It shall be as I like!" But I trust that the number of those who adopt this unbecoming and disgraceful manner, is so small as to render it unnecessary for me to enlarge on the subject.

7. Be careful never to join in a jest and laugh against your husband. Conceal his faults and speak only of his merits. Shun every approach to extravagance especially if you are not more than well off. The want of economy has involved millions in misery. Be neat, tidy, orderly, methodical. Rise early, breakfast early, and have a place for everything, and everything in its place.

8. Few things please a man more than seeing his wife notable and clever in the management of her household. A knowledge of cookery, as well as every other branch in house-keeping, is indispensable in a female, and a wife should always endeavor to support with applause the character of the lady and the household.

When a man's skull is very thick, it is hard to put ideas into it; but, when once in, of course they will not readily get out. That is the reason that when a thick-skulled person has been once made to believe he is a great man, it is so difficult to get the idea out of his head.

SMALL POX.—The small pox is raging to such an extent in Columbus, Ohio, that it is most probable the State Convention to amend the Constitution, now in session there, will adjourn to some other place.