

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

The following proceedings took place in the United States Senate, on the 23d inst., in reference to the British Fisheries question. The views advanced by the several Senators will be read with special interest at this time:

Mr. MASON submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to communicate to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, all correspondence on file in the Executive Departments with the Government of England, or diplomatic representatives, since the Convention between the United States and Great Britain, of October 20th, 1818, touching the fisheries on the coast of the British possessions in North America, and the rights of the citizens of the United States engaged in such fisheries, as secured by said Convention, and that the President be also requested to inform the Senate whether any of the naval forces of the United States have been ordered to the seas adjacent to the British possessions in North America, to protect the rights of American fishermen, under said Convention of 1818, since the reception of the intelligence that a large and unusual British naval force has been ordered there to enforce certain alleged rights of Great Britain under said Convention.

Mr. MASON said—I have thought it my duty, considering the present aspect of affairs, so far as they are communicated to us by the public journals, to submit this resolution, and ask that it be considered immediately. We are informed, unofficially, but in a manner clearly indicating that it is correct, that the British Government recently asserted rights under the Convention of 1818, in relation to the fisheries of the North, which, whether they exist or not, they suffered from 1818 to 1841, when the question was moved as to the respective rights of British subjects and American citizens under the treaty of 1818, they still suffered to remain *status quo*. Sir, the British Government know well that very large and important interests are embarked by citizens of the United States in these fisheries. They know that the harbors and coasts and seas off their possession in North America, swarm with them at stated seasons of the year, and this, as I am informed, is one of those seasons with those fishing-vessels; yet, suddenly, without notice of any kind, we are informed from public journals, and semi-officially by a sort of proclamation from the Secretary of State, that a very large British naval force has been ordered into those seas, for the purpose of enforcing, at the mouth of the cannon, the construction which Great Britain has now recently determined to place on that Convention. Now, sir, I had supposed, in this civilized age, and between two such countries as those of Great Britain and the U. States, that were it the purpose of England to revive her construction of this convention, and require that it should be enforced, ordinary comity, national courtesy, would have required that notice should have been given of that determination on the part of Great Britain. But, sir, when no such notice is given, when, on the contrary, the first information which reaches us is that Great Britain has ordered into those seas a large naval force, for the purpose of enforcing this alleged right, I know not in what light it may strike other Senators, but it strikes me as a far higher offence than a breach of national courtesy, as one of insult and indignity to the whole American people. This morning, in the first paper I took up from the North, I see extracted from one of the British Colonial newspapers printed at St. John, N. B., a formal statement of the actual naval force ordered by Great Britain into those seas. It consists of the Cumberland, a seventy-gun ship commanded by Sir G. H. Seymour, who I believe is a British Admiral commanding on the West India station, and then follows an enumeration of steam vessels, sloops of war and schooners, to the number of nineteen, ordered to rendezvous there immediately, and with the utmost despatch. For what purpose? To enforce at once, and without notice to this Government, so far as I am informed, (and yet we have some information through the quasi proclamation of the Secretary of State,) at the mouth of the cannon the construction which the British Government has arisen. He saw nothing objectionable in this. The importance of these fisheries was conceded by all, and no one State was more interested in them than another. It was well known that any attempt to drive our fishermen from those fisheries would involve the whole country in a blaze of war, in which case, his State would be deeply interested. He deprecated, as well as the Senator from Massachusetts, all excitement on this subject. Whether the difficulty shall be settled by negotiation, or the sterner arbitration—war—there was a necessity for avoiding excitement—for keeping cool. He deprecated, also, the complaints made against any branch of the Government. All were aware that the Secretary of State, at this season, seeks his native climate, to escape the severity of the weather, and he could assure Senators that should the negotiation be conducted in the mountains of New Hampshire, there was nothing unpropitious in that locality for the liberties of the country. In that region, was written that famous letter which startled the Governments of the continent.

Mr. Rusk said that if one object of this naval force by Great Britain was to bring about a reciprocity trade—no matter how favorably he might look upon such a proposition otherwise—he would never give it his assent under the duress of British cannon. He thought this domineering spirit of England ought to be met promptly. Mr. Mason did not desire that war should be a substitute for negotiation; but that the sending of an unusual Naval force into those waters should not pass unnoticed, and if sent there to effect negotiations,

those negotiations should stop. He would not exchange one word, or write a line in the way of negotiation, till that force was withdrawn. He did not know the object of Mr. Webster or the British Minister being in New England; but if the Secretary of State exchanged a word or wrote a line of negotiation before that force was withdrawn, he would greatly disappoint his countrymen.

Mr. Toucey thought the sending of this force to the fishing seas the most extraordinary initiative towards negotiation he ever heard of. He hoped the resolution would pass, he thought it likely that the Executive required prompting. He discussed the terms of the treaty of 1818 and denied the validity of the British construction.

Mr. Dawson deprecated all complaints of the Administration till further information be received. He asked when the President had ever shown that he required any promptings to discharge his duty. Who so competent, or more likely to defend the men of the North than the Secretary of State? He saw no cause for war—no indications of war in all this. He would vote for the resolution.

Messrs. Dawson and Toucey continued the debate.

Mr. Borland contended that the Executive had information on this subject, for the Secretary of State had, in his newspaper discussion, gone minutely into all the particulars.

Mr. Seward contended that the resolution ought to pass. If there was involved in this question the remotest prospect of war, there ought to be no division between the different branches of the Government, and no complaining or fault-finding by either. England ought to see us united. It was impossible for any one to say what information the President possessed.

Mr. Bell hoped most sincerely that this matter would not lead to war. He did not believe a war was possible between the United States and Great Britain. Believing this, he rejoiced in what England had done. She had done that which would call attention to the miserable, defenceless state of the country, as well on the Atlantic coast as the Pacific, and good might follow. At present, we could not put twenty vessels afloat, to compete with the force on the fishing coast.

Mr. Borland answered the question as to who so capable of defending the interests of the country as the Secretary of State, by referring to that Secretary's course in the House of Representatives during the last war, which was a war commenced for the rights of these fishermen. He then denounced that war in terms which were too disgusting to be repeated. After the war, the party of which Mr. Webster was the leader, had declared that it was unbecoming a Christian people to rejoice over the victories of such a war.

Mr. Pearce said that Mr. Webster had been repeatedly assailed for his course during the war of 1812, but he never before heard imputed to him any remarks too disgusting to be repeated. He thought the Senator must be mistaken. He then suggested the impropriety of discussing matters of which we had no information.

He would like to know the object of the naval force gentlemen were disposed to send to the fishing coasts. What instructions were to be given to the commander?

Mr. Mason said—If the object of the British squadron sent in such unusual force, was to coerce negotiation, there ought to be no negotiation till it was withdrawn.

He would, in such case, instruct the American commander to maintain the American fishermen in those seas in statu quo, to secure to them the rights they have been enjoying for thirty years.

Mr. Pearce thought it probable if the British Government were asked the object of that force, they would disclaim any such purpose.

Mr. Pratt said this appeared to him more likely to result in war than did the 5440 difficulty. The English Government has decided upon the construction of the treaty—England don't want to negotiate, for she has sent a large force to execute her construction of that treaty.

Americans are to be expelled from rights which they have enjoyed for thirty years, under what their government has at all times, and now declares to be the proper construction of the treaty. Ought not a force to be sent there to protect them in those rights which this Government has declared to be theirs? Certainly there should. If this be done, and the British officer executes his orders, a collision must ensue, for no American commander will witness the seizure of an American vessel without firing into the offender. He hoped the resolution would pass.

The resolution was then unanimously adopted.

A MAJOR GENERAL IN FULL PAY PETITIONING FOR A PENSION.—A Washington correspondent of the *Cincinnati Enquirer* says:—Some of the Whigs are very much chagrined at the fact of General Scott petitioning Congress for a pension in 1836. The petition was presented and referred to the committee on *Invalid Pensions*, who, on motion of Mr. Dromgoole, of Virginia, reported against it, but at the solicitation of Gen. Mason, Mr. Taylor, and others, the report was not printed in the documents. They considered it a stigma upon the State in which he was born, to have the Major General of the American army, petitioning in person to be placed on the Invalid Pension list. The petition itself has been abstracted from the files, but the reprint is here.—Gen. Scott's friends feel very sore about the matter here. The report will probably be published soon. It is the first instance of an American officer in command petitioning for an *Invalid Pension*.

The dog population of the United States is estimated at about two million, and the expense of keeping them upwards of \$10,000,000 per annum.

THE REPUBLICAN.

CLEARFIELD Pa., August 6, 1852.

FOR PRESIDENT.
Gen. FRANKLIN PIERCE,
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT.
WILLIAM R. KING,
OF ALABAMA.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.
For the State at large—Senatorial.
GEORGE W. WOODWARD, of Luzerne.
WILSON McCANDLESS, of Allegheny.
ROBERT PATTERSON, of Philadelphia.
DISTRICT ELECTORS.

1. Peter Logan, 13. H. C. Eyer,
2. G. H. Martin, 14. John Clayton,
3. John Miller, 15. Isaac Robinson,
4. F. W. Beckins, 16. Henry Peter,
5. R. McKay, Jr., 17. Jas. Burnside,
6. A. Apple, 18. M. McCaslin,
7. N. Strickland, 19. Jas. McDaniel,
8. A. Peters, 20. W. S. Colahan,
9. David Fister, 21. Andrew Burk,
10. R. E. James, 22. Wm. Dunn,
11. J. McReynolds, 23. J. S. McCalmont,
12. P. Damon, 24. G. R. Barrett.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER.
WILLIAM SEARIGHT,
OF FAYETTE COUNTY.

The 24th of August, And Brookline, will suit the Democracy of this county, as the time and place for holding the Congressional Conference.

THE DELEGATE ELECTIONS.
So far as we have heard, delegate elections were held in each district in the county on last Saturday. This is an event unprecedented, particularly when held so early in the season, and is full of promise of the general result, as showing that the proper spirit is pervading the ranks of the Democracy. The great contest seems to have been between the different candidates for Sheriff, and was very warmly contested in almost every district.

The Delegates will meet in County Convention on to-morrow evening, and make the different nominations, after which we trust there will be one course pursued by the Democracy of the county, and that is a cordial and hearty support of the Ticket, and the whole Ticket.

THE GOOD WORK GOES BRAVELY ON.
We rejoice that the Democrats of Pennsylvania have taken the lead in rolling on the Democratic Ball in this county. A handsome hickory pole was reared by them on last Saturday, in honor of Pierce and King. They had a good turn out, and a pleasant and promising time of it. This has always been a strong hold of the opposition, but the young Democracy are becoming quite numerous thereabouts, and we are credibly assured that Penn will be triumphantly and permanently redeemed in November next.

BE JUST AND FEAR NOT.
A few weeks ago we noticed a very pretty paragraph in *Arthur's Home Gazette*, on the morality and courtesy of political newspapers. The article was brief, to the point, and was correct in everything, except in its application. The habit of traducing private character was particularly dwelt upon, and if our recollection is not at fault, the editor made no distinction between the two parties, and by implication at least, charged the press of both parties with traducing the private characters, of both the prominent candidates now before the country for President. It is in this respect that we take exceptions to the article. At the time we thought it unfair; but supposed that perhaps something might have been said by some democratic paper somewhere, disrespectful of General Scott, as a man and a citizen, to give the colour of truth to the remarks referred to and which had escaped our notice. But since that, we have carefully examined every paper that came under our eye, and we now challenge Mr. ARTHUR, or any other gentleman, to point to a single attack upon Gen. Scott's private character by a democrat. It cannot be done; and to the credit of the Democratic press, it should be told.

It is not so with the whig press. The very first onset was that Gen. Pierce was a "street loafer," and a "common drunkard"—and it was no doubt this very contemptible attack that was in the editor's mind when he penned his item. But in doing a good deed he should have gone a little further with his independence and openly designated the guilty party. The lesson would have been much more salutary, than by accusing the innocent, in order to appease the guilty.

For the last few weeks we have failed to give our usual portion of California news. We can only say, by way of summing up, as the lawyers do, that it is still the land of gold, and the steamers continue to arrive at New York, every two weeks, and average about one million of the root of all evil every load, which, as a little figuring will show, will amount to a pretty considerable pile in the course of the year. A few weeks ago a fire broke out in Sonora, and destroyed the greater part of the town; loss estimated \$2,000,000. Occasional disturbances continued on the part of some distant tribes of Indians, but generally the country is prosperous.

THE CANAL COMMISSIONERS AND THE PENNSYLVANIA RAIL ROAD COMPANY.

We regret to see an unpleasant state of feeling between the Board of Canal Commissioners, and the officers of the Pennsylvania Rail Road Company. The Canal Commissioners are the guardians of the public improvements, chosen by the people for that purpose, and they are only responsible to the people. The state owns the rail road from Columbia to Philadelphia, and the carrying of passengers on this line has always led to great difficulty, and was thought by some, from some cause or other, not to yield as much revenue as it should. Different plans have been tried, and in May last, the Canal Board entered into a contract with BINGHAM and DOCK, of Philadelphia, an old and responsible transporting Company, by which the latter were bound to furnish first class cars, to build a large and convenient depot at Philadelphia, and transport the passengers over said road, and to carry the mails, &c., for which service they were to be paid at the rate of five mills per mile for each passenger so transported.

This arrangement gave rise to complaints, which have been loud and unceasing, and the Philadelphia press has been loaded with anonymous communications arraigning the Canal Commissioners before the public for various violations of duty, all of which they alleged had a tendency to injure the credit and revenues of the Pennsylvania Rail Road Company. These attacks seem to have been unheeded by the Canal Board, until they assumed a sort of semi-official shape, and until the officers of that company came out openly before the public in support of those charges.

The Canal Commissioners, being thus arraigned, it was their duty to speak out, so that the public might have an opportunity to hear both sides; and this they have done in the most satisfactory manner. They show, in the statement before us, that everything was done by them in this matter that gentlemen and faithful public officers were required to do—giving copies of the contract with Bingham & Dock, as well as that of two contracts with the said company for carrying passengers over the Portage road, by which it would seem that they pay a mere pittance on the Columbia road, compared to what they do on the Portage. Their statement is couched in respectful language, and they allege nothing, and make no assertion but what they hold themselves ready and fully prepared to prove to the satisfaction of the most cavillous.

We rejoice that they have thus officially and publicly presented their case to the people; and we rejoice, also, that facts enabled them to vindicate their conduct so triumphantly.

The Pennsylvania railroad company is a creature of the State's creation. It is managed and controlled entirely by its own officers; and whilst no one wishes to view it as a rival to the State works, all are anxious for its success. The Canal Commissioners have control of the State works, and in their management of them the Pennsylvania railroad company is entitled to no more consideration than may be claimed by the humblest citizen of the Commonwealth. The state of facts here revealed, however, leave but little room to doubt but that at least some of the officials connected with this company claim for it favors, and assume for it the exercise of privileges totally foreign to the object of its creation. We are sorry to see this. It is not likely to lead to good. And it is only realizing a little sooner than any body expected the very fears entertained and expressed by the enemies of that company at the time it was chartered.

THE DISPUTE WITH ENGLAND.

In 1818 a treaty was made between England and the United States, by which the citizens of the United States had the right to take fish in any Bays belonging to British North America, providing they kept at a distance of not less than three marine miles from the main land, or shore. Under this treaty, the citizens of the United States have enjoyed the privilege from that day to this without particular molestation, and thousands of citizens, hundreds of vessels, and millions of money are yearly employed in this business. But all this time the British Provinces have been striving to drive the Americans off, in order that they might monopolize the business, claiming that the plain reading of the treaty will prevent Americans from entering any of the bays at all, for the purpose of taking fish, but on the contrary, compels them to keep outside of three miles in a straight line from the mouth (or opening towards the sea) of said bays.

It is now understood that the present Ministry of Great Britain, has resolved to enforce the treaty as understood by the provinces, and has actually commenced the work of driving the American fishermen from the enjoyment of rights and privileges they have enjoyed for upwards of 30 years, and have actually captured and

condemned several vessels already. This appears to be the truth in relation to the present disturbance between the two countries. The subject has been discussed in the Senate, and the President called upon for information relating thereto. This he has not given as yet.

The reader is referred to the sketch of the debate in the Senate, and the telegraphic despatches for further information on the subject.

WEBSTER NOMINATED.—A Union Convention, composed of delegates representing sixteen States, as we learn from the *Daily News*, assembled in Philadelphia on Monday last, and nominated the Hon. Daniel Webster for President, and Hon. J. K. Kenedy, for Vice President.

The *Bellefonte Whig*, is also endeavoring to make out Gen. Scott a liar, by insinuating that General Pierce is a coward—and hence that the Quakers will vote for the latter. Agreed, gentlemen, you are welcome to go ahead at that game. We would at any time rather be a coward than a liar, for all liars are cowards also.

REASONS WHY NO WHIG SHOULD VOTE FOR GENERAL SCOTT.

1st. He is not identified with the whig party as an originator or advocate of a single measure of whig policy. The sum total of his whiggery consists in having voted the whig ticket, when he has voted at all.

2d. He is no Statesman. In every attempt which he has made at political writing or discussion, he has only made himself ridiculous to both friends and foes. I challenge you to point out a single exception. Have not the whigs had sufficient experience to satisfy them, that the qualities which make a military hero, and a great President, are widely different; two trials of that kind have thus satisfied the people, and among them a large portion of the whig party.

3d. It is high time that the people of this nation set their faces decidedly against the nomination and election of a man for President merely on the ground of military honor, glory and renown. The brief history of other Republics is full of warning to us on this subject. Is it wise or prudent to shut our eyes or turn a deaf ear to those admonitions?

Especially, should the whig party, if it possesses the high conservative character which it claims, if moreover, it would be consistent with its past professions—be the very last to present a candidate for President whose only merit is founded on a successful military career.

4th. There is nothing in the manner in which Gen. Scott was brought into the field, previous to the National Convention, and absolutely nothing in the manner in which that nomination was made, to induce any whig to give him his vote. To those whigs who never reason, or examine for themselves, but swallow readily any pill which their leaders prepare, it is useless for me to say any thing; but to those who are accustomed to examine political matters for themselves, I have a few words to say.

As whigs, we all admired the administration of Millard Fillmore. We were justly proud of it, for it elicited the respect and commendation of our political opponents. The leading Statesmen of both parties, had just, by a series of measures known as the compromise, cemented the bonds of this glorious Union, then shaking to its very foundation by secession, strife and turmoil of Abolition disorganizers. The enemies of this Union were already anticipating its total wreck; but the wisdom of these Statesmen defeated their unreasonable hopes and designs. You rejoiced and so did all. One thing only remained to question. Is there ability, strength and determination on the part of the General Government to enforce these laws? This question was soon answered in the affirmative. Millard Fillmore was not long in satisfying the country, that his administration would enforce the law in every particular—and Abolition agitators were shorn of their strength. The people, by an overwhelming majority, of both political friends and foes, applauded Mr. Fillmore for his firmness. But mark the consequences:—This very fidelity to the Constitution and law of the land, was offensive in the eyes of Seward, Greeley and Abolition and "Higher Law" Abolitionists. For this reason, and no other, they quarrelled with him and continued ever since to wage an unrelenting war upon him and his supporters—characterised by the most bitter and fiendish malignity that treason and ingratitude could invent. Fraternizing with the most ultra abolition factions of the North, the very worst passions were appealed to for the purpose of resisting the fugitive slave law, casting odium upon Mr. Fillmore, as its Executor. At the same time, math, these violent agitators and disunionists unfurled the banner of Scott. Said they, *he is our man!* From that time up to the National Convention, they persisted in their crusade against Fillmore and exaltation of Scott.

During all this time, what was the course of Gen. Scott? While these Traitors and Disunionists were proclaiming him as their chosen chief, what does he do? He gives his assent by the strongest of all assurances—a *strict silence*. Not a word did we hear from him; while Clay, Cass, Webster and Foot were appealing to the nation in thunder-tones to preserve its Union. Why did not the Senior Major-General of our army—always an aspirant for civic honors—always vain enough to consider himself of the greatest importance—why did he not throw the influence of his position, at least, into the current which their mighty minds were creating? But, what