to have slumbered for ten days, and then to have been aroused by the appearance of Mr. Trist in Mexico and your quarrel with him. If the order from the War Department had in fact "diverted" the forces with General Cadwalader, still it was fully justified by the threatening aspect of affairs on the Rio Grande; but I am quite sure it did not divert them. No previous order from the department had designated any other place of rendezvous than the Brazos for the troops that were to join your column. It was well understood, before you left Washington, that all the troops for both armies were to be sent to that place, and there to fall under your command.

This arrangement was not, nor was it expected that it would be here changed, until you had penetrated so far into the enemy's country as to render your communications with that place of general rendezvous difficult and dilatory.

You also complain that the order was not countermanded. If there had been such an order, and it had been countermanded, what would have been the consequence? The troops would have gone forward from the United States under the former orders of the department, which would have taken them to the same place.

You allege that "the news of the victory of Buena Vista reached Washington in time to countermand Cadwalader's orders for the Rio Grande before his departure from New Orleans." I notice this specification of neglect of duty, to show the extent to which you have carried your fault-finding, and the industry with which you have searched for occasions to indulge.

Your assumption is, that the news of the victory of Buena Vista should have satisfied the War Department that Cadwallader's forces were not needed on the Rio Grande; and the omission to countermand, as soon as that news was received, the orders to send them there, was neglect deserving severe animadversion. How did you act under similar circumstances? With better means of information as to the actual condition of the Rio Grande frontier, after the victory of Buena Vista, you did not deem it prudent, after forty-one days in possession of the news of that victory, to issue positive orders to remove a single man from that frontier; yet you venture to censure me, for not having sent the troops away the moment the news reached Washington.

You received information of that victory on or before the 14th of March, for on that day you proclaimed it in orders to your army. On the 25th day of April, more than forty days thereafter, you issued an order to the commanding officer at the Brazos to embark for Vera Cruz "such detachments of the new regiments as may have been ordered by the War Department to Point Isable," but you made it conditional with reference to the safety of the line of the Rio Grand; and said to that officer, that you relied upon his "sound judgement to determine on the spot whether that line would not be too much exposed by the withdrawal of the troops in question." Thus it appears that you do not hesitate to impute neglect of duty to me, for not having adopted and acted on the conclusion that the line of the Rio Grande was safe the moment I heard of the victory of Buena Vista; but when acting on the same subject, you dared not adopt that conclusion, although you had been in possession of the same information forty-one days. Your own conduct in this matter completely refutes this charge of yours against the War Department. It does more; it shows how rash and inconsiderate you have been in selecting topics for attack.

But the most serious consequences are attributed to the long delay of these troops at the Brazos. For your sake, I sincerely hope these consequences are much exaggerated, because I am quite confident it will be shown that you alone are responsible for the delay. The War Department did not—and it was proper that it should not—issue any order in regard to the movement of their troops after their arrival in Mexico. The order from the detachment of the 30th of April, making a division of the new levies between the two columns, does not contradict this assertion, for these levies were then mostly within the United States; only portions of them had then reached Mexico. Until this order took effect, the troops at the Brazos, and indeed, on the Rio Grande and with Gen. Taylor, were under your entire and unrestricted command. As to this matter, you were under no misapprehension; for on the 25th of April, before you were informed what had been done here to secure the Rio Grande line, you issued an order in relation to the troops at the Brazos. This place you well knew, was the general rendezvous of the levies from the United States, and before you sailed on your expedition to Vera Cruz you were notified that the Mexican army were advancing upon Gen. Taylor. To have assumed that you had not left at the Brazos, with a view to meet any probable contingency, orders for the proper disposition of the troops which were, or might be sent there, would have implied an opinion that you wanted suitable qualifications for the high station which had been assigned to you.

These troops were a part of your command, and subject to your orders; and if they remained one day at the Brazos after it was known that they were not needed on the Rio Grande line, and would be serviceable with your column, the fault was entirely your own, and in nowise imputable to the War Department. If your opinion be not extravagant—and you say it is not—that but for the diversion of Gen. Cadwalader's forces from you, and the "much precious time" lost at the Brazos, you "might easily have taken this city (Mexico) in the month of June, and at one-fifth of the loss sustained in August and September," you have, indeed a most fearful account to settle with your country.

I cannot, however, regard your speculative opinions on this subject as fanciful and wild. You greatly over-estimate the force which landed at the Brazos and subsequently joined you. From the best calculation which can be made from data in the Adjutant General's office, the number was much less than you imagine, and did not probably exceed one thousand. As the refutation of your charge against the department for diverting these troops is in nowise impaired by the number, be it more or less, it is not important to enquire into that matter. But there is a question of serious import, to which I think the country will expect you to answer.

If these new levies, which had just entered the service, would have enabled you to capture the city of Mexico in June, with a comparative small loss, why did you, at the very time you discovered that they were so much needed, and would have been so useful, send away from your army three times as many volunteers, who had been many months in service, and were, as you acknowledge, "respectable in discipline and efficiency," and who distinguished themselves at Vera Cruz and Cerro Gordo, and, in the hour of peril, had fought by the side of your vetran troops, and merited an honorable share in the glory of those memorable conflicts! The period of their engagement had not expired. When thus sent away, but one of the seven regiments had less than thirty, and most of them had more than forty-five days to serve. According to your own opinion, concurred in by the department, they could have been legally retained on your line of operations till the last hour of their engagement. If not deemed expedient to take them on towards Mexico with you, their services, at that critical period, would have been of inestimable value in holding the post at Jalapa—so important, and so unexpectedly abandoned—and in keeping open the communication between Vera Cruz and your headquarters, whereby supplies, munitions, and recruits could be safely and expeditiously forwarded to you. Had this been done, you would have been spared the trouble of inditing many items of grievance and complaints against the War Department for having failed to furnish them. If you had retained the twelve months volunteers until the end of their agreement—and no sufficient reason has yet been shown for their premature discharge—you might, for a season at least, have received, without much obstruction, supplies from the main depot on the Gulf; the army might have been strengthened by reinforcements at an earlier period; and many of the revolting scenes of barbarity on the road from Vera Cruz to Jalapa, in which so many lives of our fellow-citizen have been sacrificed by the ruthless guerrilleros, would not have occurred.

Another and still more lamentable calamity is, I think, fairly to be ascribed to the early obstruction of this important line of communication. The brave and patriotic men who were hurried on to Mexico, in small detachments, in order to reinforce your army, were unexpectedly, but necessarily, detained at Vera Cruz until the numbers there collected were sufficient to force their way through the strong guerrilla bands which hold the difficult passes on the Jalapa road.—While thus detained on that inhospitable coast, in the sickly season, they were exposed to the attacks of a wasting pestilence, more formidable, and, as it unfortunately proved, more destructive, than the Mexican army.

When the unwelcome news of the premature discharge of this large body of volunteers was received here, unaccompanied by any explanation to show the necessity of the act, it excited very general surprise and regret. Its consequences were at once foreseen, but the step had been taken and could not be retraced. It was loudly condemned. Many did not believe that a measure which appeared to be so unwise, and so injurious to the operations of the army, could have emanated from yourself; but they were less charitable towards the President and Secrptary of War. Both were denounced for what you had done; they were unscrupulously charged with weakness and incapacity; with being actuated by hostility to you, and a desire to secure popularity with the volunteers. Nor were these bitter assaults intermitted, until it began to be suspected that they were misdirected.

If you really regarded, on the 6th of May, the augmentation of your forces as being of such vital importance, it is almost as difficult to account for the course taken to re-engage the volunteers, as for their premature discharge. I am misled by information, on which I ought to rely, if many of these volunteers would not have continued in service, if proper measures had been taken at Jalapa, while they were indulging the hope of participating in further triumphs, and of being among those who would enjoy the enviable distinction of first entering the proud capital of the Mexican Republic. Though the subject was there presented to their consideration, no vigorous efforts seemed to have been made—no attempt to form new companies—or to muster them into service, until this powerful inducement was weakened or withdrawn—until they had been detached from a victorious army, as if no longer deemed worthy to be a part of it—sent sixty miles towards their homes into a pestilential region, and there brought within the sympathetic influences of the sentiments which it was natural that many should feel and manifest at the moment of embarcation to return to their families and friends. Considering the manner in which the President's order on this subject was attempted to be executed, it is not strange that, among more than three thousand patriotic volunteers, sent away by your order of the 4th of May, only about "fifty individuals" were found willing to re-engage.

You seem to have suddenly conceived the notion of converting the army like Cortez, "into a self-sustaining machine," and to make the resemblance between yourself and the Spanish hero more complete you indulged a dream of fancy, until you seemed to have adopted it as a matter of belief, that you were "doomed at Washington;" and you became, "like him, always afraid that the next ship or messenger might recall or further cripple" you. It should not be forgotten, that the design of this unaccountable military movement was first communicated to Mr. Trist, before you had given any intimation of it to your government, and while under the purtabation of mind which his unwelcome presence in Mexico had produced. Had you confided this extraordinary plan of campaign to him after the happy change in your relations—after you had digested his "farrago of insolence, conceit and arrogance"—and after he, too, mistaking notoriety for fame, had sought to win it by disobeying the orders of his government, defying its authority, and assailing its conduct—this distinguishing mark of your confidence in him, would have caused much less surprise. This novel conception so suddenly adopted, was as suddenly carried out; your army was, indeed, converted "into a self-sustaining machine," you discharged the twelve month volunteers, and broke up your post at Jalapa and on the way to your main depot, resolved, as you announced, "no longer to depend on Vera Cruz or home"—you put yourself beyond the reach of the supplies which had been provided by the government, and rendered yourself, in a great measure, inaccessable to the recruits and levies (except in strong parties) which had been raised to augment your command. In this way, you rendered unavailing, for a time at least, all that had been or could be done by the assiduous and incessant labors of the War Department in all its branches; and then you recklessly put forth the groundless complaint of "a total want of support and sympathy" from it.

Your letter of the 25th of July, which was not received at Washington until the 30th of December last, abounds with complaints against the department and refers in strong terms to the wants and sufferings of the army at that time. Before you ventured to make its then destitute condition a ground of charge against the War Department, you ought to have recollected that these afflictions fell upon it in the midst of your experiment of making it "a self-sustaining machine"—and were the legitimate fruits of that experiment. These sufferings came upon it before your estimated period of isolation from "Vera Cruz and home" had half expired. When you had designedly and unnecessarily abandoned both and entered upon your self-sustaining position, "cut off from all supplies and reinforcements from home, until perhaps late in November," by what pretence of justice do you complain of the War Department for the distress you thus voluntarily inflicted upon yourself and the gallant army under your command? Something very different from censure and reproof is due for the extraordinary efforts which were successfully made to reach you with recruits and supplies in your sequestered situation, and to rescue you from the embarrassments in which your ill-judged measures had involved you. I have brought into view this unaccountable movement of yours, with no purpose to make any comment upon it as a military measure, but solely to show that the evils resulting from it are not just grounds of accusation against the War Department, and that the labored attempt to pervert them to such a purpose discloses the manner and spirit with which you have executed the assumed task of its accusers.

As you have indulged in the widest range of speculation in regard to the alleged sinister motives and covert designs of others, I feel less reluctant to present my views as to the main object of your last communication. Throughout the whole of it, and particularly in the concluding part, you manifest the utmost solicitude to place yourself in the position of an injured and persecuted man. With all the aid you can derive from dexterous strategy, you will be likely to fail in your attempt, unless you can have the full benefit of your high coloring of some facts, and your forgetfulness of others, together with all your fanciful conjectures and surmises. Your recall is, you assert, the long suspended "blow of power," which you had the sagacity clearly to predict. It is somewhat remarkable, that your predictions preceded the events which you imagine provoked that blow. As early as the 25th of July, soon after "the happy change in my (your) relations, both official and private, with Mr. Trist," you looked, you say, "to be dismissed from the service of my (your) country."—If your recall can be regarded as a dismissal, you are entitled to all the credit of the fulfilment of your own early prediction.

In presenting in its true light the President's compliance with your own request to be recalled, which you now denominate your dismissal, I may be obliged to strip it of the embellishments you have ingeniously thrown around it; though, in doing this, you may be deprived of much upon which you depend to sustain your claim to be considered a persecuted man.

As early as June, you begged to be recalled. You allege that this application was "rebukingly declined." This is not saying the exact thing. The reply to your request was, "that it would be decided with exclusive reference to the public good. When that shall render it proper in his [the President's] opinion to withdraw you from your present command, his determination to do so will be made known to you."—This was not a denial, but a suspension of present action, accompanied with an assurance of future action on the subject. Your request was still pending; a regard to the public good then stood in the way of the immediate gratification of your wishes; but the President promised to act definitively on the question when that obstacle should be removed.—Judging from the state of things at the headquarters of the army in January, he concluded that it was removed, and that he ought no longer to require of you reluctant service as commanding general. This certainly cannot be called persecution or punishment. I do not deem it proper to comment on the state of things at the headquarters of the army, to which allusion is made in the letter granting your request; nor to express an opinion as to the share of responsibility therefore, which rests upon yourself or others; that matter is, to a considerable extent, involved in the investigations before the court of inquiry now sitting in Mexico. Your request to be recalled, thus ultimately granted, was prefaced with imaginary complaints, which could not be passed without notice, nor noticed without exposing their groundlessness. If the exposition has given offence, you can blame only yourself for introducing complaints so entirely unfounded.

The crowning outrage, as you regard it, is the simple fact that you, and "the three arrested officers," "are all to be placed together before the same court—the innocent and the guilty—the accuser and the accused; the judge and his prisoners are dealt with alike." "Most impartial justice!" you exclaim. And why is it not impartial justice? On what ground of right can you claim to have your case discriminated from theirs? It is true you have assumed to be their judge, and have pronounced them guilty; and complain and repine that the laws of the country do not allow you, their accuser, to institute a court to register your decree. But you are not their rightful judge, although they were your prisoners. Before that court you all stand on the same level, and all have equal rights. Though you may have the self-satisfying conviction that you are innocent and they are guilty, the government could act upon no such presumption. By becoming an accuser, you did not place yourself beyond the reach of being accused; unless you and are clothed with the immunity of despotic power, and can claim the benefit of the maxim "that the King can do no wrong." I know not why your conduct, when made the subject of charges, may not be investigated by a court of inquiry; nor can I perceive what better right you have to complain of and arraign the government, than the other officers whom you have accused, and whose cases, with yours, were referred to the same court. If yours is a hard case, theirs is no less so. If you can rightfully complain of persecution by the government, so can they with equal justice, and an equal claim to public sympathy.

The charges against you did not emanate from the government, nor did they relate to a matter in which it could feel any peculiar interest. Not believing it impossible for you to do wrong, or that you were exempt from all responsibility for whatever you might have done, the government deemed it proper, when charges were preferred against you, coming from a source entitled to respect, to cause them to be investigated. As the usual and mildest mode of proceeding, they were referred to a court of inquiry. Until you can show that you enjoy the transcendental privilege to have your official conduct exempt from all examination in any form whatever, you have no cause to complain of the course taken in regard to the charges against you.

If your extraordinary pretensions are to derive any support from your distinguished services in the field, you ought to be mindful that the three accused officers put under arrest by you have like claims for distinguished services. On the pages of impartial history, their names and their gallant deeds must appear with yours; and no monopolizing claims, seeking "malignant exclusions" at the expense of the "truth of history," will be permitted to rob them of their fair share of the glory won by our gallant army while under your command.

With your assault upon the character of your "erratic brother," I shall not meddle; but I must repel your charge that he has been favored for being a political deserter "TO THE TRUE FAITH"—for signalizing his apostacy by acceptable denunciations of one "to whom he had formerly" professed (and not without cause) the highest obligations. The reasons for not sending your charges against Brevet Major General Worth to the court of inquiry, are set forth in my letter of the 13th of January. I regret that they are so entirely unsatisfactory to you, but I am consoled with the assurance that they are in other quarters more favorably received. The errors of your commentary on my letter have arisen from your misapprehension of the text. The principle there laid down is of vital importance to subordinate officers, and in no respect impairs the rights or the authority of those in chief command. As the principles which you arraign are the creations of your own fancy, and have no countenance or support from my letter, I am in no way implicated by "the fatal consequences" you deduce from them. Whether legitimate or fanciful, they do not disturb the positions laid down in my letter.

I cannot, however, but regard your solicitude for the support of discipline to be more ostentatious than profound. When a general at the head of an army of freemen, who do not lose their rights as citizens by becoming soldiers, sets up pretensions to dictatorial power—when he contemns the authority of his government, and is much more ready to censure than to execute its orders and instructions—when he denounces as an outrage and a punishment the attempt to submit acts, charged to be an offence against a subordinate officer, to an investigation in the mildest form—when he administers an indignant reproof to his superior, for upholding the sacred rights to appeal, upon which depend the security and protection of all under his command,—such a general sets an example of insubordinate conduct, of widespread and withering influence upon sound military discipline.

By extending my comments upon your letter, I might multiply proofs to show that your accusations against the head of the War Department are unjust—that your complaints are unfounded—that the designs imputed by you to the government, to embarrass your operations, impair your rightful authority as commander, and to offer outrage and insult to your feelings, are all the mere creations of a distempered fancy; but to do more than I have done, would, in my judgment, be a work of supererogation.

In conclusion, I may be permitted to say, that, as one of the President's advisers, I had a FULL SHARE in the responsibility of the act which assigned you to the command of our armies in Mexico. I felt interested, even more than naturally appertained to my official position, that success and glory should signalize your operations. It was my duty to bring to your aid the efficient co-operation of the War Department. I never had a feeling that did not harmonize with the full and fair discharge of this duty. I know it has been faithfully performed.—There are some men for whom enough cannot be done to make them grateful, or even just, unless acts of subserviency and personal devotedness are superadded. From you I expected bare justice, but have been disappointed. I have found you my accuser. In my vindication, I have endeavored to maintain a defensive line; and if I have gone beyond it at any time, it has been done to repel unprovoked aggression. To your fame I have endeavored to be just. I have been gratified with the many occasions I have had to bear public testimony to your abilities and signal services as a military commander in the field. It has been, and, under any change in our personal relations, it will continue to be, my purpose to be liberal in my appreciation of your distinguished military merits. In respect to your errors and your faults, though I could not be blind, I regret that you have not permitted me to be silent.

I have the honor to be very respectfully your obedient servant,

W. L. MARCY,
Secretary of War.

Major General WINFIELD SCOTT,
U. S. Army, Mexico.

EXTRAORDINARY CASE.—In the year 1799, a young lad 18 or 19 years of age, residing in the western part of the State, was arrested with two others, on charge of stealing a grindstone from a man in this town, and carried before a justice of the peace, who fined each of them one dollar. The young man referred to, declared his innocence of the crime, and appealed to the Court of Common Pleas; but, before the sitting of the Court, was induced to settle the matter, rather than be arraigned as a thief, the Justice giving him to understand that no record would be made of the case, and it would probably never have been thought of. It was subsequently well ascertained that the lad was, in fact, entirely innocent, another boy having acknowledged that he himself committed the offence. The young man grew up and has ever since resided in the same town, sustaining a most exemplary character. He has held several offices of trust and responsibility, has served many times as a juror, and has been a worthy member of the Congregational Church for thirty or forty years.

A few weeks since, having brought an action of debt against one of his neighbors, it became necessary for him to make an oath to his account; but being about to make the oath, to the utter astonishment of the gentleman and all present, the record of the conviction before the Justice of the Peace, alluded to above, was produced, and read by the opposing party, into whose hands it had by some means come, after the death of the Justice. Here was an old gentleman sixty-six years of age, who had, from his boyhood, deservedly enjoyed the reputation of an honest and virtuous citizen, held up to the community as a convicted felon, and deprived of the rights of citizenship, for an offence which, if he were really guilty, was committed nearly half a century ago!—We can hardly conceive the meanness and malignity which could prompt such a proceeding. In this state of the matter application was made recently, to the Executive, for a restoration of his civil rights to the worthy old man—as he did not wish to descend to the grave with this stigma resting on him—and upon the testimony of his excellent character for more than forty years, during the whole of which time one of the witnesses had known him, his rights were promptly restored.—*Salem Reg.*

Henry Clay's Pronunciamento at N. Orleans.

The *Delta* of the 20th says:—The circular of Ledru Rollin, did not prove a greater firebrand among the kid-gloved Republicans of Paris, than that of old "Harry of the West," lately issued from Lexington, did among our Whig friends of this city.—That circular arrived here yesterday, in an extra from a Lexington paper, and was soon freely circulated among the people. The emotions its perusal excited were various and conflicting. The Whig Taylorites gnashed their teeth with rage, the Clayites, who form by no means the smallest party in our city, shouted aloud for the old banner and the old leader, the Taylor Democrats chuckled with delight at their triumph over their Whig allies, who wish to force the old General upon them as a "good but not an ultra Whig," and the mass of the Democrats looked calm, composed and meditative, and seemed not indisposed to view with favor their old and stout-hearted foes, the dauntless champions of the Knight of Ashland. Alas!

THE VOLUNTEER.

John B. Bratton, Editor and Proprietor.

CARLISLE, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1848.

AGENCY.

☞ V. B. PALMER, Esq. is our authorized Agent for procuring advertisements, receiving subscriptions and making collections for the *American Volunteer*, at his office, N. W. corner of Third and Chesnut streets, Philadelphia.

FOR PRESIDENT,
THE NOMINEE OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,
ISRAEL PAINTER,
Of Westmoreland County.

DEMOCRATIC ELECTORIAL TICKET.

Senatorial Electors.

WILLIAM BIGLER, of Clearfield.
DAVID D. WAGENER, of Northampton.

Representative Electors.

Dist.	Dist.
1. Henry L. Benner,	13. John C. King,
2. Horn R. Knauss,	14. John Weidman,
3. Isaac Shunk,	15. Robert J. Fisher,
4. A. L. Ronmfort,	16. Fredrick Smith,
5. Jacob S. Yost,	17. John Criswell,
6. Robert E. Wright,	18. Charles A. Black,
7. Wm. W. Downing.	19. Geo. W. Bowman,
8. Henry Haldeman,	20. John R. Shannon,
9. Peter Kline,	21. Geo. P. Hamilton,
10. B. S. Schoonover,	22. William H. Davis,
11. Wm. Swetland,	23. Timothy Ives,
12. Jonah Brewster,	24. Jas. G. Campbell.

REPLY OF MR. MARCY,

To General Scott's Attack upon the War Department.

We surrender a large portion of our paper to-day to give place to the triumphant and able letter of Gov. MARCY, Secretary of War, in reply to General SCOTT's attack upon the National Administration and the War Department. We hope that every one, Democrat and Whig, into whose hands our paper of this week may fall, will give Gov. Marcy's letter a careful and attentive perusal. It is a most powerful and most complete answer to the complaints of Gen. Scott. Every charge preferred by Scott against the War Department is nailed to the counter as false or erroneous, and the testimony of Gen. S. himself furnishes the proof to do this. Every prop has been knocked from under this "hasty" General, and he now stands before the world in a most ridiculous light, and is really to be pitied because of his folly.

The course pursued by Gen. Scott, in his vile attacks upon the Administration and the War Department, confirms the opinion we have ever entertained of him. We have always considered him a skilful and accomplished commander—a General who understands his duty in the field. But whenever he drops the sword and attempts to wield the pen, he is sure to write himself down an ass in the estimation of men of sense. He is a military man, and nothing more. But, Gen. Scott, like too many of our military chieftains, has a longing to occupy the White House—the desire to be President haunts his imagination and disturbs his dreams. His object in attacking the National Administration, he vainly hoped, would create a sympathy for him which would ultimately place him in the chair of State; and in his "haste" to prepare these attacks, he forgot that he had before that furnished the proof himself by which his latter charges would be proved false—nor did it even enter his head, we suppose, that the Secretary of War would answer his misrepresentations and false conclusions. But, in this he has been mistaken. The Secretary of War, with great reluctance, we doubt not, answered the complaints of Gen. Scott, and in doing so he deals in facts which cannot be controverted, and which places this grumbling general in the light of an old man in his dotage. The letter of Gov. Marcy should serve as a lesson to Gen. Scott hereafter, and should teach him that he cannot libel and attack his superiors at pleasure, and with impunity.

We hope our Democratic cotemporaries of the press throughout this State will not fail to give the reply of Gov. Marcy to their readers. Our neighbor of the *Herald* published the letter of Gen. Scott, with the remark, "it will excite a warm feeling of sympathy in every honest breast for the wronged and injured old soldier." If those who have read Gen. Scott's letter, will now read the reply to it, as published in our paper of to-day, they will be better enabled to judge of the "sympathy" to which Gen. Scott is entitled. All who will take the trouble to read both, will no doubt agree with us in saying, that if Gen. Scott is deserving of "sympathy" at all, it is because he has placed himself in the ridiculous position in which he now stands—it will be "sympathy" for his weakness and unbounded vanity. Had we room we would also publish Gen. Scott's unprovoked and most extraordinary letter, so that our readers might fully understand the points at issue between the War Department and himself, but the crowded state of our columns will not, without much inconvenience, permit. Still, however, we will agree to give it to our readers, provided our neighbor of the Herald will agree to publish Mr. Marcy's answer to it.—This is certainly a fair offer, and if the Herald is not afraid of the *effect* it might have, it will agree to our proposition.

ORGANIZE FOR THE CONTEST!

The Democratic National Convention to nominate candidates for President and Vice President, will assemble at Baltimore on next Monday week, the 22d inst. So soon as that Convention shall name the candidates, it will be the duty of every true Democrat—every one who has the honor and welfare of his country at heart, to be up and doing. An early organization of the party should take place, and arrangements made to spread before the people all the political information necessary to a full understanding of the issues presented. We therefore renew the suggestion which we made about this time last year, and which we were pleased to see so generally adopted, viz—that DEMOCRATIC CLUBS be formed in the several townships throughout the county. No better course can be adopted to effect a complete organization. All will admit that the party was well organized in this county last fall, and it will be conceded also that that organization was effected, mainly, through the efforts of those who were associated together in Democratic Clubs. Let this plan be again adopted, and our word for it old Cumberland will give a sweeping majority for the Democratic candidates. "Honest old Shunk" carried this county last fall by 308—this fall we can swell the majority to 500, if every Democrat will but do his duty. We say that this majority *can* be given—will not our Democratic friends decree that it SHALL be? Let our friends therefore once more buckle on their armor, and, with justice and right on their side, march forward again to try their strength with the enemies of Democratic principles. Old Cumberland must sustain her well-earned reputation in the coming contest. Let it be remembered that "as goes Cumberland so goes the State," and "as goes the State so goes the Union!"

☞ The *Herald* now considers Gen. Taylor a Whig, who "stands out in the full noon-tide light of day." Will our neighbor tell us what the General's views are on the Tariff, Independent Treasury, Bank, Internal Improvements, Slavery and the War? And will he be kind enough to tell us the difference between a "Whig" and an "*ultra* Whig?"

ERIE BANK FAILED.—By the Pittsburg papers we learn that the Erie Bank, in this State, has failed.

What! Another Letter from Gen. Taylor?

Below will be found *another* letter from General TAYLOR, in relation to the Presidency. The old General is becoming quite celebrated as a letter-writer, and what is more, he has the knack of writing a long political letter, without saying anything. A Philadelphia lawyer would be puzzled to ascertain, from his letters, what the General's views are—if he has any—on any of the great questions of the day. He says very distinctly that "if nominated by the Whig National Convention he shall not refuse acceptance," and then follows up the remark by declaring that he does not design to withdraw his name, even if Mr. Clay should be the nominee of the Whig Convention! This is decidedly modest in the old hero. He says to the Whigs, in as many words—"nominate me, and I will consent to run a race for the Presidency; refuse to nominate me, and I shall still run, and defeat the nominee of your party!" If this is not flaunting the banner of revolt in the face of the Whig party, we know not what is. But to the letter. It is written in answer to one from the editor of the Richmond Republican, making certain inquiries, the tenor of which may be gathered from the replies. How many he has since written, God only knows, but were we to publish all that he writes in relation to the Presidency, we would not have room enough left to announce the birth of the *one half* of Queen Victoria's "*young 'uns.*"

BATON ROUGE, LA., April 20, 1848.

Dear Sir:—Your letter of the 10th inst., which alludes to certion statements that have recently been made in some of the papers at the North, and which submits several inquiries for my consideration, has been received.

To your inquiries I have respectfully to reply:

First—That if nominated by the Whig National Convention, I shall not refuse acceptance, provided I am left free of all pledges, and permitted to maintain the position of independence of all parties in which the people and my own sense of duty have placed me—otherwise I shall refuse the nomination of any convention or party.

Secondly—I do not design to withdraw my name if Mr. Clay be the nominee of the Whig National Convention—and, in this connection, I beg permission to remark that the statements which have been so positively made in some of the Northern prints, to the effect "that should Mr. Clay be the nominee of the Whig National Convention," I had stated "that I would not suffer my name to used," are not correct, and have no foundation in any oral or written remark of mine. It has not been my intention, at any moment, to change my positin—or to withdraw my name from the canvass, whoever may be the nominee of the national convention, either of the Whig or Democratic party.

Thirdly—I have never stated to any that I was in favor of the tariff of '46—of the sub-treasury, nor that I originated the war with Mexico. Nor, finally, that I should (if elected) select my cabinet from both parties. No such admissions or statements were made by me, at any time, to any person.

Permit me, however, to add that should such high distinction be conferred upon me as that of elevation to the Executive office, the constitution, in a strict and honest interpretation, and in the spirit and mode in which it was acted upon by our earlier Presidents, would be my chief guide. In this, I conceive to be all that is necessary in the way of pledges.

The election of another candidate would cause no mortification to me, but to such a result, as the will of the people, I should willingly and calmly submit. As I have had no ambition to serve, but in the desire to serve the country, it would bring to me no disappointment.

With sentiments of high respect and regard, I remain your most ob't servant, Z. TAYLOR.

O. P. Baldwin, Esq., or Ro. H. Gallaher, Esq., editor of Richmond Republican, Richmond, Va.

STATE LUNATIC ASYLUM.—The Harrisburg Intelligencer states that the Commissioners of the State Lunatic Asylum, have held a meeting, and concluded to commence the building during the present summer.

VIRGINIA.—The New York Tribune attributes the light vote in this State, and the Democratic gain, to the fact that General Taylor was nominated by the Whigs in their State Convention.

☞ The Mississippian publishes the following expressive letter from Washington city:

"The news from all quarters is glorious. The Democrats have carried New Hampshire and France, and are about to overrun all Europe.

GEN. CADWALADER.—The Washington Union learns upon inquiry, that no information has reached the War Department of the intention of this distinguished officer to resign his position in the army, and that the rumor in a New Orleans paper of his resignation is believed to be without any foundation whatever.

☞ At a meeting of the Federal members of the Massachusetts Legislature, held in Boston, an address was unanimously adopted, nominating the Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER as a candidate for the Presidency.

HORRID SUICIDE.—On Friday, the 21st ult., a man by the name of *Boyer*, residing in North Whitehall township, Lehigh county, committed suicide by blowing his head off. It appears that he had some time ago stolen a coat in Bucks county, for which crime he was arrested and committed. A brother of his, however, entered bail for his appearance for trial, at the Doylestown Court on Monday the 24th ult., and accordingly on Friday last, made preparations to deliver him into the hands of justice, when Boyer obtained a pistol, went out of the house into the yard, and is supposed to have held the pistol into his mouth, and lamentable to relate, blew the upper part of his head off, causing instant death.

CONSCIENTIOUS OFFICE HOLDER.—The Pike county (Ill.) Free Press states that a Justice of that county voted against the new Constitution on the ground that he had taken an oath to support the old one!

VIRGINIA ELECTION.—The Democrats have handsomely overcome the 10 whig majority in the last house, and both branches of the legislature are largely democratic. The Richmond papers show a total democratic gain of 17, and loss 8—making a net gain of 9, equal to eighteen members—with 24 yet to hear from, one half of whom it is not doubted will be democratic.

SHOOTING DESERTERS.—Extract from a letter, dated Camago, March 13:

"I have just returned from a most melancholy scene. Seven soldiers were sentenced to death for desertion. Three were first brought out, kneeled on their coffins, and were shot. The other four were then brought forward, kneeled, bandage tied on their eyes—the words, 'ready! present!'—and (glorious news it was) the poor fellows were reprieved! They all stood it like majors. One of them fainted when the bandage was taken from his eyes.

☞ Queen Victoria was 29 years of age on the 4th day of May.

The great length of Gov. Marcy's admirable letter has crowded out much matter intended for this weeks paper.

COMMON SCHOOLS.

Report of the scholars returned for April 1848, to the Select School of Secondary Department. Their names are according to their improvement.

No. 11. John Snodgrass, William M. Biddle, Bannister Hall.

No. 12. Jane Brannom, Anna McCartney, Rebecca Shawley.

No. 13. Hannah R. Hacket, Ann E. Park, Mary A. Hughes.

No. 14. Joseph Bautz, Alfred S. Sanderson, Wm. Hoffer.

HIGH SCHOOLS.—*Report for May.*

No. 15. Mary S. Shoaffer, Mary Bontz, Mary Summerville.

No. 16. William Natcher, Lewis J. Foulke, Wm. W. Hepburn.

JAMES HAMILTON, Sect'y.

Important Message from the President in relation to Yucatan.

The following message was sent into Congress on Saturday by the President. It will be seen that it refers to an important matter:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the U. S.—I submit for the consideration of Congress several communications, received at the Department of State, from M. Justo Sierra, Commissioner of Yucatan, and also a communication from the Governor of the State, representing the condition of extensive suffering to which their country has been reduced by the insurrection of the Indians within its limits, and asking the aid of the United States.

These communications present a case of human suffering and misery which cannot fail to excite the sympathy of all civilized nations. From these and other sources of information, it appears that the Indians of Yucatan are waging a war of extermination against the white race. In this civil war they spare neither age nor sex, but put to death indiscriminately all who fall within their power. The inhabitants, panic stricken and destitute of arms, are flying before their savage pursuers towards the Coast, and their expulsion from their country, or their extermination would seem to be inevitable, unless they can obtain assistance from abroad.

In this condition they have, through their constituted authorities, implored the aid of this government to save them from destruction, offering, in case this should be granted, to transfer the "dominion and sovereignty of the Peninsula" to the United States. Similar appeals for aid and protection have been made to "the Spanish and English governments."

Whilst it is not my purpose to recommend the adoption of any measure with a view to the acquisition of "domain and sovereignty" over Yucatan, yet according to our established policy we could not consent to a transfer of this "domain and sovereignty," either to Spain, Great Britain or any other European power. In the language of President Monroe, in his message of December, 1823, "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety." In my annual message of December, 1845, I declared that "nearly a quarter of a century ago, the principle was distinctly announced to the world in the annual message of one of my predecessors, that the "American Continent, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

This principle will apply with greatly increased force, should any European power attempt to establish any new colony in North America. In the existing circumstances of the world, the present is deemed a proper occasion to re-iterate and affirm the principles avowed by Mr. Munroe, and to state my cordial concurrence in its wisdom and sound policy. The re-assertion of this principle, especially in reference to North America, is at this day but the promulgation of a policy which no European should cherish the disposition to resist. Existing rights of every European nation, should be respected; but it is due alike to our own safety and our interest, that the efficient protection of our laws should be extended over our whole territorial limits, and that it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy, that no future European Colony or dominion shall with our consent be planted or established on any part of the American Continent.

Our own security requires that the established policy thus announced should guide our conduct, and this applies with great force to the peninsula of Yucatan. It is situated in the Gulf of Mexico, on the North American continent, and from its vicinity to Cuba, to the Cape of Florida, to New Orleans, and indeed to our whole Southwestern coast, it would be dangerous to our peace and security if it should become a colony of any European nation.

We have now authentic information, that if the aid asked from the United States be not granted, such aid will probably be obtained from some European power, which may hereafter assert a claim to "dominion and sovereignty" over Yucatan.

Our existing relations with Yucatan are of a peculiar character, as will be perceived from the note of the Secretary of State to her Commissioner, dated on the 24th December last, a copy of which is herewith transmitted. Yucatan has now declared her independence, and we treat her as a State of the Mexican Republic. For this reason we have never officially received her Commissioner, but whilst this is the case, we have to a considerable extent recognized her as a neutral in our war with Mexico. Whilst still considering Yucatan as a *portion of Mexico*, if we had troops to spare for this purpose, I would deem it proper, during the continuance of the war with Mexico, to occupy and hold military possession of her territory, and to defend the white inhabitants against the incursions of the Indians, in the same way that we have employed our troops in the other States of the Mexican Republic in our possession, in repelling the attacks of savages upon the inhabitants who have maintained their neutrality in the war.—But unfortunately we cannot at the present, without serious danger, withdraw our forces from other portions of the Mexican territory now in our occupation and send them to Yucatan. All that can be done under existing circumstances, is to employ our Naval forces in the Gulf, not required at other points to afford them relief. But it is not to be expected that any adequate protection can thus be afforded, as the operations of such naval forces must of necessity be confined to the coast.

I have considered it proper to communicate the information contained in the accompanying correspondence, and I submit to the wisdom of Congress to adopt such measures as in their judgment may be expedient to prevent Yucatan from becoming a colony any European power, which, in no event should be permitted by the United States, and at the same time to rescue the white race from extermination or expulsion from their country.

JAMES K. POLK.

Washington, April 29, 1848.

LATE FROM VERA CRUZ.

Prospect of Peace believed to be small—Illness of Gen. Kearney—Return of Mr. Trist and Gen. Cadwalader.

The steamships Augusta and Virginia left Vera Cruz on Saturday, the 22d ult.

In another column we have given the twenty-sixth day's proceedings of the Court of Inquiry. We understand that the impression was that the court would not adjourn for three weeks, and that Gen. Scott would await its adjournment. The Star of the 15th says that he is in fine health.

Parades, as late as the 11th inst., had not been arrested by the Mexican Government. He was still at San Luis, and, according to a letter in *El Eco de Comercio*, "taking up his residence with the different