

to show that it was owing to its introduction, and the disclosures it made, that I was deterred from introducing them as he states. The fact is not so. The session commenced the first Monday of December, 1847, and Mr. Dix did not introduce the paper until the 26th of July, 1848, nearly eight months subsequent, and one month after I had fully discussed the principles of my resolutions. Did he see, that all this would have been manifest at once without a word from me, if he had given the dates? and was not that his reason for not giving them?

Col. Benton seems to be conscious, that it was necessary for him to explain why he had not assailed my resolutions, and the base and corrupt motives he attributes to me for introducing them, long before, and in his place in the Senate; and accordingly, he has attempted to make one. He asserts that "Mr. Calhoun's resolutions are those of the Missouri Legislature. They are identical. One is copied from the other. When the original is invalidated, the copy is of no avail. I am answering his resolutions, and choose to do so. It is just and proper that I should do so. He is the prime mover and head contriver. I have had no chance to answer him in the Senate, and will not do to allow him to take a snap-judgment upon me in Missouri, in carrying disunion resolutions in my own State, which he has been forced to abandon in the Senate. Duty to the country requires me to answer him, and personal reasons reinforce that public duty."

His explanation then is, that notwithstanding his burning zeal to defend the Union and of his own character against these wicked resolutions, "he could get no chance before to answer them." What! could get no chance from February, 1847, until June, 1849, (the date of his speech) a period of upwards of two years! Could get no chance when they were first introduced and discussed? None during the long session which followed and which lasted more than eight months? None during the long and full discussion on the Oregon Territorial bill, when the principles of the resolutions formed the basis of the argument on the side of the south? None to reply to me, who fully discussed, and I may say established them by-and-by controversy? None during the discussion of the report of the select committee, of which Mr. Clayton was chairman? None on the discussion of the bill from the House of Representatives, which applied the Wilmot Proviso to the Oregon territory, and which was passed by his vote and his friend Gen. Houston's? None during the whole of the last session, and still more wonderful, none in making his last speech? I say none, for he confined himself to denunciation and abuse of the resolutions, without even attempting to answer them. No, he never could get, and never can get a chance to answer them. For every other purpose he can get a chance, whenever he pleases. No one is better at getting a chance when he is disposed. He had no difficulty in getting a chance to pour out a torrent of abuse, to empty seats, against the late General Kearney, day after day, for the greater part of a week, and that too just at the close of a session, to the utter disgust of the Senate, and at the hazard of defeating many bills then ready for final action. I might go on and repeat similar questions until they would fill pages, but enough has been said to prove that his explanation is puerile and hollow.

He had many and fair chances to answer the resolutions, and could have made one, if he desired it at any time, but there were two reasons which prevented him. The first is, that although he had made up his mind to desert you and your cause before the introduction of the resolutions, he saw the hazard, and was unwilling to take that step hastily. The Missouri resolutions forced him to disclose his intentions, and to proclaim his desertion before he was fully prepared to execute his design, and hence the depth to which they have excited his ire. The other is, that he had too much discretion to address such a farago to a body too well informed to be imposed upon by old, stale and oft-repeated charges. He knew besides that they would have been promptly met and repelled, and that the antidote would go with the poison. He knew this from experience. He had tried it before. It failed most signally.

It was in the session of 1847, a few days after I had introduced the resolutions. In that attack he paraded, nearly in the same words, all that he has charged in this, about the Florida treaty, Texas, and almost every other subject. He had taken time and prepared deliberately. It was given out that he would demolish me. The Senate was crowded by those who wished to witness the sacrifice. I rose and repelled off hand his charges. I leave those who were present to decide with what effect. It was certainly not to his gratification or satisfaction. He did not even attempt a rejoinder. But what becomes of his apology, that he had no chance to reply to my resolution? They had been introduced but shortly before, and then he had a full chance to answer them. He then assailed every act of my life, which he thought he could distort, so as to make a plausible charge against me. Why then omit to answer resolutions which he now holds up as the worst and most objectionable of all? Can any answer be given, except that he is either not sincere, in what he asserts, or that the time had not then arrived, at which he could safely venture to betray you?

But, according to his own statement, he is impelled in making his attacks by private grief, as well as public considerations. He says I instigated attacks on him for twenty years. I instigate attacks on him! He must have a very exalted opinion of himself. I never thought of such a thing. We move in different spheres. My course is, and has been, to have nothing to do with him. I never wanted his support, nor dreaded his opposition. He took the same ground in his speech just referred to, and endeavored to establish the charge by what purported to be an extract from a letter, which he states was delivered to him by the same person unnamed, and was written by an unknown person to an unknown person. He introduced it into the Senate, in a manner to make the impression that it was his author. I arose and asked him if he intended to assert that it was. He stood mute at first, but was

forced to admit I was not. I then repelled his charge with a scorn which the base insinuation, that I had any knowledge or connection with it whatever, deserved. He was covered with confusion; and yet he has the effrontery to introduce it again to the public, accompanied with the same insinuation which covered him with disgrace at its first introduction.

But the deepest wound, it seems, was inflicted by a statement in my address to the people of Charleston, on my return home after the session of '47 and '48, that he voted for the bill establishing the territory of Oregon, containing the principle of the Wilmot Proviso, and that he and Gen. Houston were the only two southern members who voted for it; that without their votes it would not have been defeated, followed by the expression of an opinion, that for so doing, they deserved the reprobation of the whole south. Neither of them have ever denied the truth of my statement, nor ever can. Every word is true, as the journals of the Senate show. The statement itself is in plain language and free from extortions or exaggeration. The fact stated, related to official acts which it was important my constituents should know. In expressing my opinion I abstained from imputing motives. All was done within the rules of decorum, and those that govern parliamentary proceedings. Wherein then consists the offence? I am at a loss to perceive, except the principle be adopted, that the greater the truth the greater the libel. It may be, that it was regarded as an offence because it was calculated to embarrass him, and thwart what he then meditated, and has since carried into execution—an open desertion to the abolitionists.

I pass now to his next charges. He asserts that I gave away Texas, and to make it out he asserts that Texas belonged to the United States, when the treaty with Spain was made, by which she ceded Florida to us. He claims that Texas was a part of Louisiana, and that its boundary extended to the Rio Grande; that it was all slave territory, and looked to as the natural outlet for their great increasing slave population; and finally, that it was surrendered by the treaty of Florida made in 1819, during the administration of Mr. Monroe, of which I was one of the members. On this statement he rests his charge that I gave away Texas.

It is difficult for one who lacks sincerity and is actuated by violent passions, to escape the greatest inconsistency and contradiction, in defending himself or assailing others, in making a long speech. Benton furnishes a strong illustration of the truth of this position, and never more so than in making the above statement. In order to aggravate the act of giving away Texas, which he charges me with, he has made assertions entirely inconsistent with the grounds he took, and the course he pursued while the question of the annexation of Texas was before the Senate. He now asserts that the boundary of Texas as part of Louisiana extended to the Rio Grande, when the treaty of Florida was made, in the very teeth of the assertions he made, when the question of annexation was before the Senate. In the speech he made in May, 1844, on the treaty for annexing Texas, he asserted, that "The Texas which we acquired by the treaty of 1803, (that of Louisiana) never approached the Rio Grande, excepting near its mouth." To show that "by near its mouth," he did not mean that it touched the river, he said, speaking of Tamaulipas, one of the States of Mexico, that "it covered both sides of the river, from its mouth for some hundred miles up." He asserted in the same speech that all New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas made no part of the Texas which we acquired by the treaty of Louisiana. He estimates the part belonging to Mexico lying on the east side of the Rio Grande to be 2000 miles long, (the whole length of the river,) and some hundred broad, and concluded by saying "he washed his hands of all attempts to dismember the republic of Mexico by seizing her dominions in New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila and Tamaulipas."

These were his assertions, solemnly made, and as he states after the fullest examination, when his object was to defeat the treaty which I negotiated with the Commissioners of Texas for its annexation. For that purpose he attempted to show that the treaty covered a large part of Mexico, which never belonged to Texas, although the treaty specified no boundary, and left the boundary open on the side of Mexico, intentionally, in order to settle it by treaty with her. But now, when his object is to show that I gave away Texas by the treaty of Florida, he holds a very different language. He does not, indeed, say in so many words, that Texas covered the whole region from the Sabine to the Rio Grande, for that would have been too openly and plainly a direct contradiction to what he contended for when his object was to defeat annexation; but he does the same thing in a more covered and objectionable way, by using language that could not fail to make that impression on all who heard him, or may read his speech.

He goes further. In order to aggravate the charge against me, he becomes apparently a warm advocate of slavery extension, as he calls it, and uses strong language to show the value of Texas to the south in that respect. He says, it was all slave territory; that it was looked to as the natural outlet of the Southern States with their increasing slave population, and that it was large enough to make six large States, or ten common ones. Such is his language, when his object is to prove that I gave away Texas. You would suppose from this language that he was a slavery extensionist, as he calls all those who defend your rights, and that he placed a high value on Texas, as an outlet for your slave population, and to preserve your just influence and weight in the Union. One would conclude, that with these feelings and views, he would have been a strong advocate of the treaty that was rejected by the Senate, which proposed to annex Texas without any restriction whatever in relation to slavery, so as to leave it, to use his own language, as the outlet to your increasing slave population. Instead of that he made the most strenuous efforts to defeat it, and contributed not a little towards it. He went further. After its defeat, he moved a string of resolutions, containing provisions for its admission, and among others one which proposed to divide Texas

into two parts, as nearly equal as possible by a line running north and south, and to allot the eastern to you, and the western to the abolitionists, to the entire exclusion of your "increasing slave population." It can hardly be, that he forgot all this in delivering his speech; but, if not, what matchless effrontery and inconsistency to make the charge he does against me? There would indeed seem to be no limits to his audacity and inconsistency, and he appears to have selected Texas as a proper field to make the greatest display of them. As if to cap the climax after having so deliberately asserted, and so strenuously maintained, that the western boundary of Texas, did not extend to the Rio Grande, he placed, a short time afterward, his vote on record, that it did—by voting for the bill declaring war against Mexico. The bill assumed it did in asserting that the blood shed on the eastern bank was blood shed on the American soil, which could not be unless Texas extended to the Rio Grande. If it did not the war stands without justification. If it did not the march of our army to the Rio Grande was an invasion of a neighboring country unauthorized by the Constitution or law; and yet Col. Benton, who had but a short time before declared solemnly, after full investigation, that all the east bank of the river for some hundred miles wide belonged to the Mexican Republic; and emphatically declared, he "washed his hands of all attempts to dismember the Mexican Republic, by seizing her dominions, New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas," voted for the bill! He went further. He reported it as the Chairman of the Committee on military affairs, in total disregard of his own motion made the day before to refer so much of the Message of the President, as relates to declaring war to its appropriate Committee—that on Foreign Relations. Comment is unnecessary.

But I am not yet done with Texas, nor with the effrontery and absurdity of the charges he made against me, in reference to it. He says I gave it away—gave it away by the Florida treaty. How could I give it away by that, or any other treaty? The power to make treaties belongs to the President, and never was invested in me. It was at the time invested in Mr. Monroe, as President of the United States. Nor did I negotiate it. I was only one member of the cabinet, and the youngest of the whole. How could I, then, give away Texas? To prove the charge he resorts to his old patent reasoning; that I was all powerful—so much so, as to make the President and all the members of his cabinet mere cyphers. He would have it, that they were but tools in my hands; and I alone was responsible for all that was done. Well—if he will have it so, I meet the charge directly. It is not true, that the Florida treaty gave away Texas. I did not believe, when the treaty was made, that Louisiana extended, or ever did extend to the Rio Grande, or even to the Nueces, and that it was uncertain whether it extended beyond the Sabine. I knew it was claimed to extend far beyond, even to the Rio Grande; just as we claimed the whole of Oregon, and with just about as little title. I have seen nothing to change this opinion: On the contrary, if my informant is correct, the Secretary of State in the State Department, obtained within the last few years, which conclusively prove, that Louisiana never extended an inch beyond the Sabine.

In reply to Col. Benton's assaults as to the treaty, I annex an abstract from a speech in answer to him, when he made the same charge, in 1847. It was an off-hand reply to a premeditated attack.

"The Florida Treaty, forming another subject of attack, figured also on that occasion, is connected with annexation; and what he said now is but a repetition of what he said then. He then, as now, made me responsible for that treaty, although I was but one of six members of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, and the youngest of its members—responsible, without advancing a particle of proof that I even gave it my support or approbation. He rests the charge on some disclaimer, as it seems that the then Secretary of State (Mr. Adams) has, at some time made, that he was not responsible for the treaty. The Senator may be right as to that; but how can that, by any possibility, show that I was responsible? But I am prepared to take my full share of responsibility, as a member of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, without having any particular agency in forming the treaty, or influence in inducing the cabinet to adopt it. I then thought, and still think it a good treaty; and so thought the Senate of the United States; for if my memory does not deceive me, it received every vote of the Senate. [A Senator: "yes very vote."] It then received the unanimous vote of the Senate, promptly given. Of course, if that treaty was the cause of the war with Mexico, as the Senator seems to suppose, this body is as much the author and cause of the war, as the individual whom he is now so anxious to fix it.

I have said it is a good treaty, not without due reflection. We acquired much by it. I gave us Florida—an acquisition not only important in itself, but so in reference to the whole southwestern frontier. There was, at that time, for powerful tribes of Indians, two of whom the Creeks and the Chetaws, were contiguous to Florida, and the two others—the Chickasaws and Choctaws were adjoining. They were the most numerous and powerful tribes in the United States, and from their position were exposed to be acted upon excited against us from Florida. It was important that this state of things should terminate, which could only be done by obtaining the possession of Florida.

But there were other and powerful considerations for the acquisition. We had a short time before, extinguished the Indian title to large tracts of country in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia, lying upon streams and rivers which passed through Florida to the Gulf—lands in great measure valueless, without the right of navigating them to their mouths. The acquisition of Florida gave us this right, and enabled us to bring into successful cultivation a great extent of fertile lands, which have added much to the increased production of our great staple, cotton. Another important point was effected by the acquisition. It terminated a very troublesome dispute with Spain, growing out of the capture of St. Marks and Escobedo by General Jackson, in the Seminole war;

and, finally, it perfected our title to Oregon, by ceding to us, whatever right Spain had to that territory.

Nor is his next charge, in reference to the tract of land lying west of Arkansas, and south of 36 30, less baseless. He asserts that this strip of land, as he calls it, was enough to form two States, and that I "required this strip of land to be given up to the Indians, as a permanent abode; and that it was lost to the slave States." This, like his other assertions, is without foundation. He makes no attempt to establish it, but leaves it to be inferred from the mere statement, that "I was at the time Secretary of War, and member of Mr. Monroe's administration." He knew it would not do to go into details, as they would refute his charge, and hence the vagueness of the language in which it is couched. What he omitted I shall supply. The history of the affair may be told in a few words.

The Choctaw tribe of Indians, at the time, inhabited the State of Mississippi, and occupied almost its entire territory. General Jackson and General Hines, of Mississippi, were appointed by Mr. Monroe to treat with them, for the purpose of obtaining a cession of a portion of their lands. They succeeded in obtaining a large tract, lying in the very centre of the State, and extending from Pearl river to the Mississippi, in exchange for all the territory lying between the Red River and the Arkansas, west of a line drawn from the point of the Arkansas, opposite to where the lower line of the Cherokee Indians struck it, to a point on Red River, three miles below the mouth of Little River, and westwardly to the source of the Canadian fork of the Arkansas, and a line drawn due south to Red River. But the treaty, in making the exchange, made no provision to change the character of the Indian title to the land given in Arkansas, in exchange for that which we received in Mississippi. Nor did it make it the permanent abode of the Indians, as he asserts. They held it just as they held the land they ceded in Mississippi. Nothing was lost by the slaveholding States, but a great deal gained, by the treaty. A large and valuable tract in the very heart of the cotton region, and lying convenient to market, was acquired by Mississippi, without the loss of a single acre to her sisters of the slaveholding States. So that the great sympathy which he professes for the slave States, in this case, is misplaced. If he chooses to consider me responsible for the treaty, instead of Mr. Monroe, and the Commissioners who made it, and the Senate that approved of it, he is welcome to do so, however contrary to the truth of the case.

Another, and only another treaty, was made with that tribe, while I remained in the War Department. I was the Commissioner on the part of the United States, and, of course, acknowledge my responsibility for its provisions. Instead of requiring a strip to be given to the Indians for their permanent abode, the Indians received to the United States, by treaty, a part, and a most valuable part, without our ceding an inch to them. The entire line was moved westward, as far as Fort Smith, on the Arkansas, and thence by a line drawn due south to Red River. Nor did it make the slightest change in the title to what remained to the Indians, or provided a permanent home for them, as he would have you believe. So much for this charge and its author.

The next is of a kindred character. He states it still more vaguely; so much so, that I am at a loss to know to which one of the many treaties made with the Indians about the region in question, he refers. He speaks of a slice forty miles wide and three hundred long, "cut off from Arkansas and given to the Indians;" "that it was done by Indian treaty—treaty made by a protégé of Mr. Calhoun's;" and adds that I was Vice President at the time, but gives no boundary, and avoids naming what treaty it was, with what tribe of Indians made, or the name of the person he calls my "protégé." It is an indictment without specification of time, place, or circumstances, in which it is impossible to make a specific answer. But, fortunately, such an one is not necessary to repel it effectually, without descending into details, which, it is fair to presume, were omitted because they could not be given without exposing the absurdity of the charge. His admission, that the treaty was made while I was Vice President, furnishes me with ample means for that purpose.

It is sufficient to repel it, to state, that during the whole period, that I filled the office of Vice President, that of President was filled, either by Mr. Adams or Gen. Jackson, and that it was my fortune to be in opposition to both, and the object of their strong dislike, as must be well known to all. I not only had no influence with either, but was the object of their persecution. My support of any measure or recommendation of any individual, was sufficient to defeat the one, and reject the other; and yet Col. Benton, who is familiar with all this, assumes, in making his charge, that I am responsible, for a treaty made by either the one or the other of them, it matters not which. It was going far to make me solely responsible for the acts of administration, of which I was no member; but it makes me responsible, not only for them, but for the acts of those, that were deadly hostile to me, is a piece of extravagance beyond the reach of any individual, but the author of the charge. Even he, in this instance, seems to have a misgiving, that he has gone too far, and in order to give some color to so wild a charge, adds, that the treaty was negotiated by a protégé of mine. He must have been a fortunate man bearing that relation to me, to have got an appointment from either of the two administrations. I have examined all the Indian treaties, relating to the region in question, made during their administrations, in order to ascertain, who this lucky individual could be, but have been unable to discover him. There is not a single treaty negotiated, during the period, that was negotiated by any individual, who had any claim to be called a protégé of mine.

But why charge me with being the author of a measure, by which these large tracts, sufficient, as he says, to make two states, were lost to the slave States, and given away to the Indians, when the authors of the measures by which they were

given away, are known to all, and to none better than Col. Benton. They were the measures of Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson and their administrations. One or the other made all the treaties by which the old merely possessory titles of the Indians to their lands, were converted over the whole territory, into a permanent right of possession, and property, and made the permanent home of the Indians, to use his own expression.—There was no treaty made while I filled the War Department, in Mr. Monroe's administration, which made any such alterations in the title of Indians, to lands west of the Mississippi, or any where else to my knowledge. The making of Indian treaties, containing stipulations for permanent titles, and their removal west of the Mississippi, constituted a large portion of the doings of those administrations, and much of that on which they rested their reputation. Much the greater part was the work of Gen. Jackson's administration, with which Col. Benton was intimately associated, and over which he had sufficient influence to make any such alterations in the title of his doings, especially as to what related to the west. In attempting now to shuffle off his portion of the responsibility, and that of the administration, and to place it on me, who was hostile to it, speaks badly for his manliness, or regard for the character of the administration of Gen. Jackson, for which he professes so much attachment and admiration. He would hardly have ventured in the lifetime of "the old Hero," to make the heavy charge he has, against measures, of which he was the author, and on which he so much prided himself.

In his eagerness to assail me, he has lost, not only his discretion but his memory. In order to make out that the anti-slavery party of the North, duly appreciate the great service that I had done their cause, he says "that they gave proof of their gratitude, that I was then a candidate for the Vice Presidency, and became the favorite of the North, beating even Mr. Adams himself on the free soil track," forgetting what he had said just before, that I was Vice President at the time, when he well knew, that I was elected for the first time Vice President with Mr. Adams, and of course, the vote of the North could not have been given me for the reasons he assigns.

His next charge is that I supported the abolition of slavery in a State. Among his other traits, Col. Benton is distinguished for charging on others, what he knows he is guilty of himself. Most men from prudence and a sense of propriety, cautiously abstain from assailing others for what they know they may in turn themselves be justly assailed. Not so with him. He is one of the few who are ever more fierce in their assaults when they know they can be assailed for the same thing. They seem to delight in dragging down others to their own level, and to have concealed joy in thinking that others partake of their own deformity.—It is a trait so detestable that those who are distinguished for it are usually likened to a notorious personage reproving sin. Col. Benton has strikingly displayed this trait of character in the present charge. He well knows how utterly false he was to you throughout the "Texas question." He took, as has been stated, an active part to defeat the treaty of annexation, negotiated by me on the part of the United States. He knows that it contained no provisions that countenanced, the abolition of slavery in any portion of Texas. I was strongly urged during the negotiation to insert a provision to extend the Missouri compromise line across Texas to its western boundary, and was informed that it would aid in securing a constitutional majority in the Senate, in its favor—I peremptorily refused. He knows that he offered a proposition to abolish it in one half of the whole of Texas, and that by a line, not drawn east and west, but north and south, so as to hem in the south on all sides; by surrounding her with abolition States. He also knows, that his friend and supporter, on the occasion, Mr. Hayward, of North Carolina, went still further, and offered resolutions to extend the ordinance of 1787, not only over Texas, but even all the Territories lying west of Arkansas, and Missouri, and south of 36 30, with however a proviso excepting the portion of Texas lying south of a line drawn east and west in the 34th degree of parallel of latitude. The presumption is strong that in offering his resolutions, he acted with his friend Colonel Benton, to whose course he adhered on the Texian question. But, he that acts as it may, certain it is he sat mute. He raised no voice of indignation, against a measure which proposed to exclude slavery forever from that very region, which he charges me with having given away to the Indians, and losing it to the South. As bad as the policy of Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson may be in reference to that region, they did not exclude slavery. The Indians, who occupy it, are slaveholders, and having an interest in common with you, may be regarded as faithful allies on that vital question. The resolutions of his friend Mr. Hayward were designed to deprive you of this advantage; and yet Col. Benton now raises his voice in loud denunciation against me upon the false charge of giving away the territory to the Indians while he approved, at least by his silence of excluding you entirely from the territory, and one half Texas to boot, and to extend the principle of the ordinance of '87 over the whole, including Texas and the territories. So much for his own position, in reference to the subject of the charge.

It now remains to show that it is, like all his other charges, destitute of foundation. He rests his charge that I abolished slavery in Texas, on the fact that I was then Secretary of State, and that I selected the resolution, as it passed the House of Representatives, instead of the amendment originally proposed by him, as the basis on which to annex Texas. Thus far, he has departed from his usual and stated facts correctly. I shun no responsibility. I am willing to take all on this occasion; but it is due to the President and the members of his administration to say—they were unanimous in favor of the selection made. I not only selected it, but assigned my reasons for making it, in a despatch to our then Minister to Texas, Mr. Donalson. I assigned them because I anticipated that there would be an attempt to

undo what was done, after the expiration of Tyler's administration. This I was resolved to prevent, by stating reasons for the selection that could not be overruled. The attempt, as I suspected, was made, and the late President has since been arraigned before the public by two friends and associates of Col. Benton, (Blair and Tarpan.) because he could not be forced to overrule, what his predecessor had done. The following is an extract from the despatch:

"It is not deemed necessary to state at large the grounds on which his decision rests. (The President.) It will be sufficient to state, briefly, that the provisions of the resolution, as it came from the House, are more simple in their character, may be more readily, and with less difficulty and expense, carried into effect, and that the great object contemplated by them is much less exposed to the hazard of ultimate defeat.

That they are more simple in their character, a very few remarks will suffice to show. According to the resolution as it came from the House, nothing more is necessary than that the Congress of Texas should be called together, its consent given to the provisions contained in it, and the adoption of a constitution by the people in Convention, to be submitted to the Congress of the United States for its approval, in the same manner as when one of our own territories is admitted as a state. On the contrary, according to the provisions of the Senate's amendment, the Congress of Texas must, in like manner be convened, it must then go through the slow and troublesome process of carrying a state out of a part of its territory; afterwards it must appoint agents or commissioners to meet similar agents or commissioners, to be appointed on our part, to discuss and agree on the terms and conditions on which the state shall be admitted and the cession of the remaining territory to the United States; and after all this, and not before, the people of the said state must call a convention, frame a constitution, and then present it to the Congress of the United States for its approval, but which cannot be acted on, until the terms agreed upon by the Negotiators, and which constitute the conditions on which the state is to be admitted, shall have been ratified.

That they may be more readily, and with less difficulty and expense carried into effect, is plain from the fact, that the details are fewer and less complex. It is obvious that the numerous and complicated provisions contained in the amendment of the Senate must involve much time and difficulty in their execution,—while as to the expense, the appropriation of \$100,000 provided for by it, is a clear additional cost, over and above that attendant on the execution of the resolution of the House.

But the decisive objection to the amendment of the Senate is, that it would endanger the ultimate success of the measure. It proposes to fix by negotiation, between the Governments of the United States and Texas, the terms and conditions on which the state shall be admitted into our Union, and the cession of the remaining territory to the United States. Now, by what name the agents conducting the negotiation may be known, whether they be called commissioners, ministers, plenipotentiaries, or other title—their names, and their powers, would be a treaty, called or designated by some name.

[CONCLUDED ON FOURTH PAGE.]

MOORE AS A POET.—On a bed, perhaps of death, in a thatched cottage in Devonshire, lies the greatest poet of the new tongues of Ireland. After a life of nearly seventy years—for fifty years of which he has been famous—the son of a Dublin greener, the friend of Emmett, Grantin, Byron and Fox, lies, crushed in mind and heart, his memory with all its untold tales taken from him, the quiver of his fancy emptied of the last arrow with many years and sorrows like oak and lead wrapping about his body in anticipation of the grave. Poor "Tom Moore, how grey and cold sets in the night of his long and brilliant day!

The poet's body must die. Let us leave that to the undertaker and sexton—it belongs lawfully to them. But the poet's works and words, his genius, or that part of it developed in type, his philosophy as revealed in his writings, his moral influence on his nation and his age—these belong to us who are of that posterity to which all the genius of the past has appeared, and before whom such men as Moore have laid their words as it were in evidence.

Of the moral influence of Moore on his age but little can be said. In temperament and tastes, he was neither European nor Christian. He was "a child of the sun"—an Asiatic. All his imagery and all his predilections were oriental. Born in the very west of Europe, on the brink of the Atlantic, in an atmosphere of salted mist, he was as totally unlike an Islander of that latitude, as man could be. Judging by his writings, he should have been a native of Rhodes, half-Greek half-Asiatic an intellectual compound of Epicurus and Mahomet. He sighs forever of the sun, of nightingales, of living in the open air, of orange groves and fire flies, palanquins and plum trees. A true child of the islands would have substituted for these the cloudy storminess of his own climate. The mighty Homeric sea, the oak and pine, the struggling ship, and the thunder of heaven. But his first exercise of self-will was to forsake his country, and to acclimate his imaginations in the east—an effort in which he succeeded, as no Western man ever did before or will da again.—The Nation.

There is some hope that the people of Massachusetts will yet come to their right minds on the subject of abolition. We see by the papers that Mr. Frederick Douglass, (a gentleman of color,) was regarded with a shower of over-ripe eggs in Weymouth, while holding forth on the subject of slavery.

N. P. Willis, speaking of those who pride themselves on their own ancestry, says—"They are like the reflections of stars in the water—they never would have been there but for their bright originals in heaven."