PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

PUBLISHED BY WHITE & CO.

PITTSBURGH.

TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 31, 1852.

WHIG NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,

GEN'L WINFIELD SCOTT, of New Jersey.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

WILLIAM A. GRAHAM, N. Carolina.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER.

JACOB HOFFMAN, OF BERKS COUNTY.

JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT,

(In the room of Hon. Richard Coulter, deceased.)

JOSEPH BUFFINGTON, of Armstrong Co.

FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

SENATORIAL.

A. H. REWN, JAMES POLLOCK.

REPRESENTATIVE.

Districts.	Districts.
1. WILLIAM F. HOOVER,	14. JAMES H. CAMPBELL,
2. JOHN MCCLELLAN,	15. JAMES D. PATTON,
3. JOHN W. PITCHER,	16. JAMES K. DAVIDSON,
4. JOHN P. VERREE,	17. DR. JNO. MCCULLOUGH.
5. STEPHEN MORRIS,	18. RALPH DALLAS,
6. JAMES W. FULLER,	19. JOHN LINTON,
7. JAMES PERRIGO,	20. ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON,
8. JOHN KRAMPTON,	21. THOMAS J. BIGHAM,
9. JAMES MARSHALL,	22. LEWIS L. LOCH,
10. CHARLES P. WALKER,	23. CHRISTIAN MYERS,
11. DAVID ALTON,	24. DARWIN PHELPS,
12. M. C. MERCER,	25. REM'L A. PATTERSON.
13. REM BRIDLEWARTE.	

Anthmasonic and Whig County Ticket.

FOR CONGRESS—21ST DISTRICT.

DAVID RITCHIE, Pittsburgh.

FOR CONGRESS—22D DISTRICT.

THOMAS M. HOWE, Allegheny.

GEORGE DARBIE, Allegheny.

FOR ASSEMBLY.

GEORGE R. APPERSON, Birmingham.
THOMAS PENNEY, Mansfield.
RICHARD COWAN, Pittsburgh.
G. R. RUPERT, Mt. Pleasant Twp.
JOHN M. FORSYTH, Dravosburgh.

SHERIFF.

WILLIAM MAGILL, Pittsburgh.

PROTHONOTARY.

EDWARD CAMPBELL, Jr., Pittsburgh.

CLERK'S JUDGES OF COURT OF QUARTER SESSIONS, &c.

JOHN GERHART, Allegheny.

COMMISSIONER.

WILLIAM ALGEO, Pittsburgh.

CORONER.

JAMES LOWRY, Pittsburgh.

AUDITOR.

FRANCIS I. GARDNER, Elizabeth.

Scott Club.

☞THE Executive Committee of the "County Scott Club" have met upon the following meetings to be held prior to the Grand Mass Meeting on the 23rd of next month—

At Glenfield, on Tuesday, the 31st, at 7½ P. M.

At Turtle Creek, at Brown's Hotel, on Saturday, the 4th of September, at 2 P. M.

At Perrysville, on Tuesday, the 7th, at 7½ P. M.

At Mt. Nebo Resort, on Friday, September 10th, at 7½ o'clock P. M.

At John Owen's, Baldwin Township, on Saturday, Sept. 11th, at 2½ P. M.

At Tarentum, on Tuesday, September 14th, at 3 and 7½ P. M.

At Noblestown, on Saturday, September 18th at 7½ P. M.

At Sharpsburgh, on Saturday, September 20th at 7½ P. M.

MR. MAGILL.—We spoke a few days ago of certain charges said to have been uttered by Joe Barker against WILLIAM MAGILL, the Whig candidate for Sheriff, and stated that in a few days Mr. Magill would meet those slanders with a full statement of the matter on which the charges were founded. That statement is published in our paper this morning, and to it we invite the attention of the reader.

We think Mr. Magill has triumphantly refuted the charges brought by Barker, and may confidently rely upon that innate sense of justice and right which animates the breasts of honest men, not to allow a citizen of unblemished reputation to be borne down by means so foul and disreputable as those resorted to by Barker and his coadjutors, the editors of the Post. No language that we can or may use is strong enough to characterize properly the course of the latter in relation to these slanders of Barker.

THE WHIG MEETING AT FINDLEYVILLE, on Saturday, was a glorious affair. The number present was very large. Music, banners, songs, good speeches, and every demonstration of enthusiasm, showed that the spirit of 1840 was up again. A large number of ladies were present, which we regard as one of the best evidences that our cause is prospering.

WHEELING BEHIND BOTH PARRIES.—We find the following telegraphic despatch in the *Wheeling Daily Intelligencer* of yesterday morning:

WASHINGTON, Aug. 29.

The bill legalizing the Wheeling Bridge passed the Senate last night at a late hour, by the following vote: Yeas, 33; Nays, 10—more than a two-thirds vote.

This we expected, and it remains now to decide whether the Supreme Court will permit Congress to legalize that which it solemnly pronounced a public nuisance, and the abatement of which it decreed.

THE IRON INTEREST.

A recent number of the Clarion Register advertises nine furnaces, with furnace property, for sale under the Sheriff's hammer. This will make *twenty three* sold in that county, by the Sheriff, within a year. Their owners have struggled on as long as it was possible for them to do so under the circumstance, most, or perhaps all of them sinking money continually, but working on, expecting the recurrence of a more favorable period in the iron manufacture. But a long continuance of the absurd and suicidal policy forced upon the country by the disgraceful servility of many of the northern members [of the so called Democratic party, to the dictates of the South, has blasted these hopes, and they have been compelled to stop, and in many instances to see their works sold at Sheriff's sale to pay even a portion of the debts, contracted during their vain efforts to tear up against all their losses.

The above facts are but examples of the condition of the iron business of Pennsylvania. Thus has the iron manufacture of our State been sinking into ruin for want of a tariff like that under which it so greatly flourished but a few years since. But we believe still, for the reasons stated in an article of ours some time since, that there are now better prospects before the iron manufacturer. We showed that various changes in the affairs of England, such as the extensive emigration to Australia, would have a tendency to increase the price of labor, as the result of this to increase that of iron, and consequently to point to some measure the present immense importation of British iron. Our prediction, with regard to the first mentioned circumstance, has already been partially verified. A most extensive strike has occurred among the workmen in the five districts of England, who obtained a considerable increase of wages. All of which may be expected, will operate in favor of the American manufacturer.

But is this any reason why there should not be an adequate protective duty on iron, as it is urged by those whom party ties compel to oppose the interests of their country? Certainly not. If our expectations with regard to English affairs are realized, even to such a degree as almost to stop the importation of iron, that is no reason why we should not have a tariff. If useless for the time being, it can surely do us no harm. Let us have a tariff by all means. Not a British tariff, with sixpenny duties working into the hands of British capitalists, but a protective tariff, with specific duties, and if for the reasons stated, it should be for a time useless, as we said before, it can do us no harm; but if, on the other hand, the present state of, things continue, we look upon such a tariff as the only means of saving our from interest from annihilation. Such a tariff would in a few years place our manufacturers in a position to bid defiance to competition. Think what we would have been even now, had not the vote of a recreant son of Pennsylvania turned the scale just poised between protection and free trade, in favor of the iron masters of England.

And how can this desirable end be accomplished? Simply by casting our votes, not only in favor of the candidate for the Presidency pledged to support the policy of protection, but also—which as far as the tariff is concerned, is still more important—by sustaining those candidates for our National Legislature who are in favor of this measure. Let Pennsylvanians be awake at the approaching State election to see to this, and not let the opportunity be lost by the silly efforts of demagogues, who have hitherto succeeded, by the aid of *their* votes, in sustaining a policy which wounds her in her most vital point.

☞Investigations of the Lake Erie disaster go to show that the propeller which run into the Atlantic, was the cause of the accident. She had got the proper lights out.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., Aug. 24.

To the Editor of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

DEAR SIR.—I have just read, in the *Tribune* of August 23d, your admirable remarks on the action of the men at Pittsburgh, commonly called Free-Sellers, but there is one remark made by you to which I desire to call your attention. In speaking of our divine Saviour, you say "that, meek and gentle as he was, he was no *Compromiser*." Allow me to say, I think this statement needs qualification, if you would represent the truth in reference to Christ with more exactitude. A compromiser is not necessarily an immoral character. Your statement is so bold as to be liable to give the impression that nothing but guilt and sin can characterise an act of *compromise*. It is not enough for you to say in reply that the word has come to have such a significancy in this country that you will not be misunderstood, for there are some who do not attach such a necessary meaning to it. On the contrary, they hold that there is a sense in which Christ did *compromise* or *concede* things which are essential to the accomplishment of the gospel plan of human salvation. And, indeed, does not every man act upon the principle of *compromise* who consents to live in and make a part of human society at all? In this view, the whole drift of your remarks goes to sustain the principle of *compromise* in its better sense, and this is why I like them. Very truly yours, B. S.

We adhere to our position in all its strength, although it may be well, as our unknown but respected correspondent suggests, to explain what we mean when we say that the Saviour 'was no Compromiser!'

We agree that "compromiser is not necessarily an immoral character." Matters which involve no questions of ethics, such as the adjustment of the details of a tariff bill in Congress, or the settlement of pecuniary matters between individuals, belong to this category, and may be not only sinless, but positively good and praiseworthy. But we meet with no no compromises of this class, nor occasions for any, in the history of Christ. All that is recorded of his words and actions involves some moral principle. All his conduct was perfectly sinless, and all his precepts are aspure and holy as they can be. Upon every species of wrong, every form of sin, he put the stamp of condemnation—not specifically, to be sure, but by those all-comprehensive principles which bear the unmistakeable impress the Divinity. He was merciful and indulgent; he apologized for his erring disciples, and even for his murderers; but where do we find him *acquiescing* in any thing sinful either in theory or practice? To be merciful and long-suffering towards the wicked; to suffer evil to exist, or wrong to be done, is one thing; but to acquiesce in it is a very different thing. The first Christ did do all his life, the second never. Now the very idea of compromise embraces that of acquiescence. We do not say approbation, but acquiescence. To approve of that which is wrong in itself presupposes utter depravity, or a mistaken conscience; and in that case the party approving cannot be said to compromise when he agrees to it; but to acquiesce in that which we know or believe to be sinful is, as far as it goes, a compromise. To do so, no matter what inducements may press upon the mind, is necessarily and always sinful; for we may not do evil that good may come.

The distinction between *approbation, acquiescence* and *sufferance* is very important, and ought never to be lost sight of. Where the object is in itself sinful, the first presupposes depravity, ignorance or mistake; the second a lack of moral principle; the third may be Goodness and Mercy in their highest forms.

If this reasoning be correct, we cannot for a moment hesitate as to the motive that prompted Christ to deal as he did with many forms of evil with which he found himself surrounded. He was "merciful and gracious, and long-suffering;" but he was never known to "clear the guilty," or compromise one iota of moral principle on any consideration.

We think our language was not too strong, and our object in throwing it in where we did was to guard against an opposite and greater error than the one against which we were contending.

For the Pittsburgh Gazette.

CHANGE OF TACTICS.

I wish to relate an incident, that occured at a party given by President Madison in 1814, to show the position occupied by the Federal and Democratic parties at that day.

At a Levee of Mrs. Madison, Mr. Madison remarked to a number of gentlemen around him, among whom was Mr. Pleasants, afterwards Governor of Va., holding out his arm, "There is not a fibre of anything but American wool in that coat, and as long as I live, I intend to wear nothing but American manufactures. Jefferson at that day never wore anything but American cloth, and on many occasions severed his intimation of never wearing any other. This was one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Democratic party of that day.

My informant, in 1814, travelled through Eastern Virginia, and met with a number of leading men clothed in the same way, and among them Chief Justice Marshall.

Contrast this with the conduct of the leading men of the so called democratic party of the present day, and then tell me, Mr. Editor, whether this party has not entirely changed its principles. THREESCORE.

Not at all. It is not the same party. It bears the same name, to be sure, but that is all. The principles of Madison and his compeers, in respect to fostering American manufactures, and cherishing and promoting all truly American interests, are perpetuated by the Whig party. In the confusion of parties which resulted from the advent of Gen. Jackson as the head of a party, the old Federalists, who had caved in as a party a little before that, rushed in under the wing of that old hero, stole the name of the old Democratic party of Jefferson and Madison, and soon became the ruling spirits of the new mis-called democratic party, and have been playing into the hands of Old England ever since. James Buchanan and his high-toned associates hated the old democratic party with a perfect hatred; but he loves the new one exceedingly. He has not changed, except in the party name. He has been gratifying his old Federal instincts for the last quarter of a century under the name (but nothing else) of the party he so heartily abused in the days of President Madison.

The true democratic doctrine is what it ever was; and a true democrat still glories in wearing a coat made of American cloth, just as Mr. Madison did. Of course he goes in for a protective tariff.

Great numbers of old democrats, it is true, supported Gen. Jackson; but the irruption of multitudes of the ablest and most ambitious of the old Federalists into their midst played the mischief with their old principles; and hence the anomaly of a *Democratic* party invested with Federal principles, and guided, in a great degree, by old Federal leaders. Look calmly at the facts. Many of the prominent men of the so-called democratic party of the present day were leading Federalists, as long as there was a Federal party, but we do not find any leading men in the Whig party who were ever Federalists.

The *London Times* is laboring as zealously as any other Locofoco paper in behalf of Pierce and King. It has its correspondents in this country, whose letters drawn exactly in the same vein as those of such papers as the Washington Union or the Pennsylvanian, admire of Gen. Scott, lauds to the skies the services in genuine locofoco style of that great general.

Pierce is the British candidate, and Scott gold and British intrigue are used against his election; he will be knocked into a cocked hat, &c. &c. There is nothing like the old democracy dread more than to see the old democratic party restored to power. The Times knows that they would be compelled to look to the American people for support, and not to the British market for their iron and other manufactures. The contingent prospect of a return to power of Gen. Pierce and his party, of the Democratic party, of the United States of 1812, fills the London Times with dismay. The Times forts to secure the support of the British Government and the American Democracy, by its attempts to throw cogs against the wheels of those cogs after a

☞The New York Mirror, in speaking of the reports of Cuban rebellion are [illegible] speculations, but in many cases [illegible] and thinks it is a matter of [illegible] that the Courier and Enquirer should [illegible] lumns to the support of such reports. The Mirror thinks, to advance the cause [illegible] terns. It was upon the authority of the Courier and Enquirer, that such reports gained [illegible] and evidence of they did.

TO THE PEOPLE OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY.

I learn from letters and other sources of information, that *Joseph Barker*, a candidate for the office of Sheriff, is charging me with having, while Commissioner of this county, appropriated county scrip to my own use; with having taken it to my own dwelling, and that there it was signed by myself and family; or that I obtained scrip in some manner, over and above what was justly due me as pay for my services as Commissioner. To sustain these charges he refers to JAMES CUNNINGHAM, Esq, a late Commissioner, and to the present Board of Commissioners.

I pronounce the charges just referred to, and all others of a similar kind, as utterly false. All the scrip bearing my signature was signed by myself in the court-house, my family having nothing to do with it. I never took or borrowed a dollar of the scrip, except what I drew by warrant from the Treasurer, as my legal pay as Commissioner; and during the period I was in office I never knew or heard of any man having obtained, taker or received scrip or county funds in any manner, who was not lawfully entitled to it, and that was not drawn by warrant on the Treasurer.

Being a candidate for nomination for another office, before the Convention of June 3d, 1846, I resigned my office as Commissioner on the 23d of May preceding, (having served one year and seven months,) at which time, as the books will show, there was due me for services as Commissioner, the sum of twenty-two dollars and six cents. Since that time I have had no connection with the Commissioners' Office.

Through the politeness of Mr. Gormley, who was clerk to the Commissioners at the time I was in office, and is yet; Messrs. Mitchell, Boyles and King, the present Board; and Mr. Cunningham, who was one of my colleagues in office, and to whom reference is made by Barker, I am enabled to append to this statement a mass of testimony so entirely satisfactory, that I cheerfully submit the case to my fellow-citizens, with full confidence that they will do me justice, and that they will decide that the charges in question have no foundation in truth.

WILLIAM MAGILL.

Pittsburgh, Aug. 25, 1852.

I was clerk to the County Commissioners during Wm. Magill's time in the office. On his retirement he requested me to examine the scrip account, as far as he was concerned with it, I did so, and found it correct, with the exception of three dollars, which was supposed to be an error of the Treasurer, and was accounted for by him. The scrip, during Mr. Magill's time, was all signed in the office of the Court House. The name of Wm. Magill has never appeared on any counterfeit. I am able to say that Mr. Magill never obtained a dollar of County Scrip, or funds, either by loan or otherwise, except his legal pay as a Commissioner.

JAMES GORMLY.

Sworn and subscribed, this 30th day of August, 1852. ARD. MCMASTER, Ald'n.

The undersigned, Commissioners of Allegheny County, have no evidence, on the books or otherwise, that William Magill, while Commissioner, had ever received any county scrip or funds in any manner, except as his legal pay as a Commissioner. Nor has any intimation ever been given connecting his name with any deficiency of scrip.

JAMES MITCHELL,
EBENEZER BOYLES,
ROBERT KING.
COMMISSIONERS' OFFICE, August 27, 1852.

I certify that I never told Joseph Barker that I had known Wm. Magill, candidate for the Sheriffalty, to take Scrip belonging to the County, when he was a Commissioner. I never knew or heard, save what has come from Barker and his friends, that Magill ever took Scrip home with him to have it signed. The assertion, therefore, that I am his authority for the charge which he prefers against Wm. Magill, Esq., is entirely false, and without the slightest foundation. I am no political friend of Wm. Magill, I belong to a different party, but justice requires (as my name has been coupled in this matter by Barker) that I should give this certificate, which I freely do.

JAS. CUNNINGHAM.

Attest—THOS. SCOTT, (Wylie street.)
Pittsburgh, August 26, 1852.

The Union party of Georgia is dissolved by the action of the Executive Committee. They have published an address in the Georgia papers, withdrawing their electoral ticket. The reasons given for the dissolution, is that the great mass of the Whig party of the State had withdrawn themselves from the Union organization. A part of the committee have, however, called a convention to meet on the 8th of September, at Atlanta, Ga., for the purpose of deciding upon the policy to be adopted; but this will, in all probability, end in nothing.

Thus ends the Union party after an existence of a few short years. It was a faction in whose favor but little could be said. Got up by politicians who took that means of advancing their own interests, and though concurred in by many patriotic but mistaken citizens of that and the adjoining States for the purpose of defeating the pretended designs of the secessionists, it could not be expected to survive that ephemeral organization, which, like an outward pressure, held the Union party together. So long as that existed the Union party flourished, but when that prop was broken the party fell to pieces.

It is dead, and there is no reason to mourn over the fact. Such an organization, even for the best of purposes, could do no good. Instead of giving the desired turn to the opinions of one of the great national parties already existing, they have undertaken the more difficult, nay impossible, work of effecting their ends by means of a separate and a necessarily sectional organization. But their motives, though ostensibly of the best order, as is indicated by the title by which their party is called, were by no means those they professed to act upon. Under the appellation of the Union party they have endeavored to carry out the most ultra-Southern and sectional principles; more especially during the latter part of its existence, when their ostensible antagonists, the secessionists, had returned to their old allegiance, or joined the so-called Unionists and aided in giving it a character as much like their own as they could have expected. Such being the case no lover of the Union need regret the loss of the doubtful aid of their seeming allies in the South.

☞Thursday last was the day appointed by the Democrats of New York for holding their primary meetings for the purpose of choosing delegates to the State and County Conventions. The day was characterised by a series of disgraceful riots in different parts of the city. This had been expected beforehand, and though preparations were made to prevent it, the enmity between the Bunkers and the Barnburners was so great that it was impossible to prevent collisions between them. General riots occurred in several of the wards, and in many instances the officers of the elections closed the polls long before the appointed time, either from fraudulent motives, or from fear of being mobbed. In the said it appeared that the Hunkers were victorious.

☞The Hon. E. P. Penfman, nominated for Congress by the Whigs of the first district of Michigan, has declined the nomination on account of ill health.

The Vicksburg Sentinel, a violent Democratic paper, has already opened its fire on Gen. Quitman, whom it designates as "a new enemy in the field," because, as our readers probably remember, he endorsed Scott's claims to the Presidency on the ground of his being highly qualified for the civil as well as that office, but refused to support him on the ground of his principles not coinciding with his own.

It is proposed by the citizens of Lopiaville [illegible] a system of vigilance committees in that [illegible] protection against and prosecution of the numerous burglaries, [illegible] and other villainies with which [illegible] are being made at [illegible] great majority [illegible] of Gen. Pierce and his party, of the [illegible] party. The Times [illegible] forts to secure the [illegible] and the [illegible] our American Democracy [illegible] to these rags after a [illegible]

Southern Rights Party [illegible] Committee called a State Convention [illegible] ber, to nominate a [illegible] called [illegible]

[illegible] Thompson, the English abolitionist, has returned to England from Abbeville, in [illegible]

SYRACUSE, N. Y., Aug. 26.

A man has spoken to day in the Senate and as all men must expect, who chooses to speak unpalatable truth, he has encountered unmeasured personal abuse, insolence and villification. Mr. Sumner made the motion, of which he long since gave ample notice, to append to the appropriation for the support of the judiciary a proviso that the fugitive slave law should be repealed.—He addressed the Senate upon that motion three hours and a half, and his speech is admitted to be one of the most refined, polished and effective pieces of eloquence ever heard in the Senate.

Jerry Clemens, of Alabama, however, who, I hope for his own credit, was in liquor, declared the speech beneath contempt, in a single sentence, too low and disgraceful to be responded to.

The debate which followed was tolerably free from excitement, nor was it characterised by any particular ability or brilliancy. Mr. Dodge of Iowa, denounced Mr. Sumner and abolitionism with a good deal of point as well as fervor.

Mr. Douglass thought, inasmuch as the constitution provided for the return of fugitives, nobody could oppose the present law on that subject without violating his oath to support that instrument.

Mr. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, was glad that Mr. Sumner had made the speech which was the subject of criticism and censure, because he had an undoubted right to speak, and he was anxious that the country should have an authoritative exposition of the purposes of the party which Mr. S. represented. It was now evident that their purpose was to make a war upon the constitution. That would be sufficient to ensure their political destruction. Mr. Cooper intimated that the general sentiment of his State would not have sustained him in voting for the fugitive act, but now it was otherwise, and he should with pleasure vote against its repeal.

Mr. Cass went into an explanation to show why he did not vote for the fugitive act. The reason was that he demanded the insertion of a clause securing, or pretending to secure, the alleged fugitive a trial by jury in the State from which he is said to have fled. He only asked that the claimant should give a bond, *without any security*, that the fugitive should have such trial. But the Southern men would not consent, upon the ground that the laws of the Southern States already secured to colored people that right.—Now he thought this a frivolous objection, and he would not yield to it. Now I think the people who still take any interest in Mr. Cass and his past acts will look upon this statement as rather a pretence than a reason for not voting for the fugitive act. The true reason still appears to be what it then did. He was afraid it would injure him before the nominating convention.

The proposition to repeal was rejected, ayes four, nays forty-seven. The four Senators in the affirmative were Messrs. Wade, Hale, Chase and Sumner.

The Senate was still in session at eight o'clock in the evening, and a strong effort will be made to get through with the bill.

The House appears determined to make a stand against the extravagance of the Senate in respect to Indian claims, of which nearly a million of dollars were added to the regular Indian appropriations. But I presume it will end as all such resolutions in that body do, in an unconditional surrender. JUNIUS.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 27, 1852.

Mr. Seward's absence from the vote on the Fugitive Law—Gen. Armstrong elected printer to the House—The Texas Debt—Yulee's claim to a seat in the Senate—Richie's Claim allowed—Our British Relations.

It has excited a great deal of comment that Mr. Seward was absent from the vote on Mr. Sumner's motion to repeal the Fugitive Law. Mr. Seward, I presume, would have supported the amendment, and, of course, his vote would have been recorded in the affirmative. It is said that he was engaged that day to dine with Mr. Crampton, the British Minister. I cannot refrain from saying that Mr. Seward's duties in the Senate on that day were much more important and obligatory upon him than any dinner engagement could possibly be.

The House has elected Gen. Armstrong, proprietor of the Union, their printer under the new bill, which the President has signed. Armstrong's majority over all others was about thirty; the whigs, as usual, presented no candidate. The Senate will, doubtless, also choose Armstrong, and after all his sufferings in the cause of democracy, the old gentleman will make a fortune, though the drippings under this new law will be nothing like so rich as under the old system.

The Senate were yesterday engaged almost the whole day in discussing an amendment to the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill, authorising the immediate and unconditional delivery to Texas, of the five millions of stock reserved for the security of her creditors. Whatever might be the intention of the mover, there is no doubt that the effect of this proceeding would be to cause the addition of another five millions to the national debt, by the issue of another five millions of stock to pay the creditors, for Texas has already repudiated about three-fourths of all the debts covered by the supposed guarantee of the U. States. The cat in the meal tub was apparent to a majority of the Senate, and this evening the mover withdrew it. The scheme of the committee of finance, to issue eight and a half millions of stock to pay off these Texas claims, is the complexion to which this will probably come at last. We gulped Texas whole, with our eyes shut; we