PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

PUBLISHED BY WHITE & CO.

PITTSBURGH.

THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 21, 1853.

☞ *READING MATTER WILL BE FOUND ON EACH PAGE OF THIS PAPER.*

☞ PITTSBURGH WEEKLY GAZETTE.—The extensive circulation of our Weekly Gazette offers to our business men a most desirable medium of making their business known. Our circulation is between four and five thousand, reaching almost every village and county in Western Pennsylvania and Eastern Ohio.

☞ TO ADVERTISERS.—Neither the Editorial Rooms nor Printing Establishment of the DAILY GAZETTE, are opened on Sunday. ADVERTISERS who desire their notices to appear in the paper on Monday morning, will please hand them in before 6 o'clock, on Saturday evening.

DEMOCRATIC WHIG NOMINATIONS.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,
MOSES POWNALL, *Of Lancaster County.*

FOR AUDITOR GENERAL,
ALEX. K. McCLURE, *Of Franklin County.*

FOR SURVEYOR GENERAL,
CHRISTIAN MEYERS, *Of Clarion County.*

CATHOLIC CHURCH PROPERTY QUESTION.

A writer in the *Chronicle*, who signs himself "A Layman," has undertaken to defend the mode by which the property of the Roman Catholic Church is held in this State, and to assail those who, in defense of the liberties of the people, oppose all such exclusive and dangerous powers.

The writer starts out with a perversion or misunderstanding of the meaning of our position, by saying that our remarks were "written with a view to create a feeling favorable to the repeal of the act passed by the Legislature of this State in 1842, in relation to the title of real estate for religious purposes;" and further, that as the conclusion is irresistible," judging from our language, "that we think that Catholic citizens have no claims to be considered as included in the Bill of Rights which secures equality to all."

With regard to the first allegation, it is untrue that we have asked or desire a repeal of the Act of 1842. That act refers to all religious denominations, and places all on a perfect equality under the laws of the State. With that act we have no quarrel in relation to its general provisions. We believe it might be modified to prevent abuses under it, but such modifications we would have extended to all denominations alike. We would place all on a perfect equality. This may also serve as a reply to the second allegation of the writer. We deny that it can be legitimately inferred from our language, in any part of this controversy, that we have any wish to impose any disabilities on Catholics we would not impose on Protestants. We hold most religiously that all laws should be general in their operation, and that all citizens should be equal before the laws. If any denomination, however, requires any exclusive privileges, in order to adapt the laws to their peculiar dogmas or forms of church organization, it is not to be granted, unless it is clearly evident that such demand can be of no injury to the rights, liberties and safety of others. We hope our Catholic citizens will understand us hereafter. We award to them perfect equality, but nothing more. It is because their demands are exclusive, dangerous and arrogant, that we oppose them.

What we oppose, and what we desire shall be repealed is the act of 1844, which vests all the ecclesiastical property of every kind, as well as all property designed for educational purposes, belonging to the Roman Catholic Church in Pennsylvania, in the Roman Catholic Bishops of Philadelphia and of Pittsburgh, and in their successors, forever, and in no other persons whatsoever. We oppose this act because it recognises, in his official capacity, an agent of a foreign prince, and a high official ecclesiastical dignitary, which is not done in the case of any other denomination whatever; and because there is no limit to the amount of property which may be acquired. The Bishop of Pittsburgh is, with his successors, by his act made a sole corporation, with unlimited powers of acquirement; for there can be no limit to possessions for "hospitals, almshouses, seminaries, churches, parsonages, *or other religious and charitable purposes!*" The whole State may be covered over in this way, until this agent, who is irresponsible as far as the people of this country are concerned, would exercise a power in every county dangerous to public liberty. This right of unlimited acquirement is possessed by no other religious corporation in the State. All boards of trustees or vestry men, of any religious congregation, are compelled to apply for a separate grant, or act of incorporation, in which the amount of property which may be acquired is specifically limited.—This is a wise provision, to guard the State from the danger arising from mammoth religious corporations.

In order to justify the act of 1844, and the Roman Catholic citizens for placing so much irresponsible power in the hands of the Bishop, the writer in the Chronicle says:

"The discipline of the Catholic Church recognizes the Bishops as the proper repository of the titles to property purchased and used for church purposes. *The Bishop holds his office, not from the people of his Diocese, but from a power which Catholics, as well as lay as clerical, are estopped to acknowledge as supreme in spiritual or ecclesiastical affairs; that power is the Pope—to whom the Bishop is responsible for his administration of the religious affairs of his Diocese;* he, alone, is answerable for the discipline and government of the churches confided to his care. That being the case, Catholics are content that he shall have the control of the churches."

We request the reader to mark well the language we have placed in *italics*. Here it is admitted that the Bishop holds his office, not from the people of his diocese, but from a foreign prince, the Pope of Rome, to whom alone he is responsible for the administration of affairs.—Here is a high ecclesiastical officer, with almost supreme powers in religious matters, holding the keys of Heaven, the gates of which he can at any moment shut against his people, permitted by our laws to grasp the whole ecclesiastical, educational and charitable property of that people, thus giving him almost unlimited control over his flocks, and with no checks of responsibility interposed between him and the resort to absolute despotism.

But says the writer, "the discipline of the Catholic Church recognizes the Bishops as the proper depositaries of titles to church property."

The discipline of the church may *permit* the Bishops to know this authority, but it certainly does not *require* it; and it is a matter of astonishment to us, that Catholic laymen will tamely permit the acquisition of such enormous and dangerous power in the hands of their Bishops. If they have any regard to their own dignity as men, to the safety of their own liberty, to the rights of the children to come after them, or to the religion which they profess, they should say to their Bishops—"we will receive the Word of Life from your hands, as the constituted expounders of the Divine Oracles, but we will hold our own property, bought with our own money, and intended for the benefit of our posterity, *in our own hands.* You serve in spiritual things; we will take care of temporal matters. *It is not meet that you should leave the Word of God to serve tables.*"

We say the discipline of the Church does not *require* the property to be vested in the Bishop. It has been the perpetual and persevering effort of the Bishops and other ecclesiastics of the Roman church to accumulate all the property, as the stepping-stone to all the power, of the Church, in their hands. This has been resisted by Catholic laymen in ancient and in modern times. The famous statutes of mortmain, were passed in England before the Reformation, and were found necessary by the people to prevent the accumulation of too great an amount of property in the hands of ecclesiastics, by which the country was enslaved and impoverished.

In this country, this claim of the Bishops was not insisted upon until the Church began to increase in wealth and power, and it was found necessary to have such firm hold upon the people as to preserve them from the enlightening effects of freedom of speech and freedom of thought. There was danger, unless some further means of control was had, that the right of private judgment might creep into the Church, and produce troublesome consequences. The Catholic church can only exist, with any degree of purity, where there is *unlimited submission on the part of the people* to the requirements of the Pope, through his agents, the Bishops. To secure this submission it was early seen that the property of the Church must be removed from the hands of laymen to those of the Bishops. This question engaged the attention of the first Provincial Councils, and in October, 1829, the Provincial Council of Baltimore, passed the following decree:

"Whereas lay trustees have frequently abused the powers granted to them by the civil authority, to the great detriment of religion and scandal of the faithful, we most earnestly desire (*opt. famosa mezzina*) that in future no church be erected or consecrated unless it be assigned by a written instrument to the Bishop in whose diocese it is to be erected for divine worship and the use of the faithful, whenever this can be done."

This decree was approved by Pope Gregory XVI., by advice of the Sacred College, on the 16th of October, 1830.

This decree was not mandatory. It took the gentler course of the expression of a desire. It advised that the property be deeded to the Bishop. At that early day the Bishops were afraid to develop their whole policy. Now Archbishop Hughes and Bishop Timon venture to lay a Church under an Interdict for daring to resist their arrogant and exclusive claims.

In Pennsylvania this decree seems to have been yielded to without much resistance; but in New York there has been a determined opposition to it which has been kept up to this day.—In Michigan, on the 20th of April, 1843, the acting Bishop, Lefevre, made the following arbitrary decree:

"Adhering to the fifth decree of the first Provincial Council of Baltimore, (the same above quoted,) we have decreed that henceforth no church shall be built or consecrated in this diocese unless we shall previously be made the sole trustee thereof, and it be assigned over to us."

Two Catholic churches, in that State, were subsequently laid under an interdict by Bishop Lefevre, for organizing a Board of Trustees under the statute of that State relating to religious Societies, on the ground that the Canon Law prohibits a Layman to hold church property.

We see here the commencement and progress of this attempt on the part of the Bishops to possess themselves of all the property of the church, of every kind and degree, in which they have succeeded to a wonderful extent, to the everlasting disgrace of the laymen of the church; who ought to have resisted such unrighteous claims to the last.

The writer in the Chronicle contends that the Bishop is not an irresponsible agent. He says:

"The objection that it enables the Bishop to amass vast amounts of real estate, subject to no question and under no responsibility, is not true, in point of fact. The Bishop is but a trustee, and as such is amenable to the Courts of the State for the manner in which he manages the trust. It is not true as the Editor contends that he is not responsible. The law of our State takes cognizance of all trusts, and any member of a congregation who feels himself aggrieved, or fancies that he is, can at any time compel an account."

In an extract given above, the writer acknowledges that the Bishop holds his power from the Pope, and is alone responsible to the Pope. He holds all this vast property of the church in fee, to him and his successors forever. Now, how are our Courts to ascertain whether a Bishop has betrayed his trust? He may bring a certificate from the hands of his ecclesiastical superior, that his conduct has been perfectly in accordance with the usages of the Church and the will of his absolute master, the Pope, whom he has sworn to obey, in the words of the following oath, which we are informed every Catholic Bishop is obliged to take before he can officiate in the United States:

"I do solemnly swear, on the holy evangelist, and before Almighty God, to defend the domains of St. Peter against every aggressor; to preserve, augment, and extend the rights, honors, privileges, and powers of the Lord POPE, and his successors; to observe, and with all my might to enforce, his decrees, ordinances, reservations, provisions, and all dispositions whatever, emanating from the COURT OF ROME; to *persecute and combat, to the last extremity, heretics, schismatics, and all who will not pay to the sovereign pontiff all the obedience which the sovereign shall require.*"

There is no danger that any Bishop will pervert his trust, because his own aggrandizement, the absolute power of the Hierarchy, the subversion of the entire liberties of the laymen, and the overthrow of Protestants and of all religious liberty, depends upon his carrying out his trust to its utmost extent. In this way he can the best observe his oath, and "augment and extend the rights, honors, privileges and powers of the Lord Pope," and "combat to the last extremity, heretics, schismatics, and all who do not pay obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff." It is a mere mockery to talk of a layman obtaining redress for grievances from a man who holds both the keys of heaven and of the Church, and who, by the extraordinary accumulation of power in his hands has almost, if not quite, unlimited influence over his flock. If he chose to do so, he could crush the aggrieved layman under his heel, and the poor wretch, while there writhing under a sense of his hopeless degradation, would feel how completely he had sacrificed his rights as a man and as a Christian—*yea, as a Catholic citizen,* when he permitted the Bishops to grasp such unreasonable and unlimited power!

This writer, "*A Layman,*" further says, that so long as the Catholic laity is satisfied with their position, it is not necessary for us to be distressed on the subject; and he begs us to spare them the insult of appearing as their defender. The writer mistakes us; we do not appear as the defender of such "as is. But there are other Catholic laymen who are not satisfied with their position, and who are struggling for their liberties. To such we extend our sympathies, and encourage them manfully to resist; though we fear they will finally have to go to the wall, or to come out from a Church which requires such unreasonable submission.

Our principal object, however, is to prevent the Catholic Bishops of this country from consolidating and cementing their power by the legal authority of our State governments. If the Catholic laity will persist in giving them the entire control of their ecclesiastical, educational and charitable property, we do not wish the sanction of the State to be given to a power so contrary to the spirit of our institutions, and so dangerous to the very stability of those institutions. Under the laws now in existence in this State, and asked for in New York, the Catholic Bishops appointed by the Pope of Rome, the most of them foreigners, may hold in perpetuity the immense amount of property in their hands, which is constantly increasing, and which, according to the Canon Law, cannot be alienated, for to alienate church property is sacrilege. Every Bishop will be a sole corporation, responsible only to the Pope, who is their absolute master. The effect of all this will be, and we ask the attention of every American citizen to the statement—the effect, we say, will be to make the Pope of Rome a sole corporation in the United States, and to place in his hands the absolute control of millions of real estate, with the unlimited right of acquisition! If the citizens, the voters of this country, think this is a safe and wise policy, they will fold their hands in heartless indifference. If they think, on the other hand, that the liberties purchased at so great a price by our fathers are worth preserving, they will repeal the act of 1844, in this State, and resist all enactments of a similar kind in future.

We cannot close this article better, than by copying the communication of another writer, who signs himself "*A Layman,*" which appeared in the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser. This writer, unlike the "Layman" of the Chronicle, thinks that the laity have some rights as well as the priesthood, and resists the dangerous claims of man, who, having usurped to themselves the keys of Heaven, now arrogate to themselves all the wealth and power of earth, leaving to the laity only the privilege of unconditional submission! To the comments of this "*Layman*" we ask the candid attention of our readers:

To the Editor of the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser.

SIR,—In common with others, who view the scheme of the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church to obtain control of the entire property appropriated by the members of their communion to charitable and pious uses as pregnant with most injurious consequences to the people of this State, I thank you for the publication of Mr. RANCOCK'S able speech in opposition to it.—Would that its warnings could reach every member of that communion! Would that they could be made to see that there is no difference between them and the rest of the community, in the influence of the proposed measure upon their prosperity and happiness, and that it has no connection whatever with their religious system of faith.

I perceive that the *New York Tribune* admits the defeat of the project, with the present legislature, but gives out that it will be renewed with a future one. This is no more than may be expected, so long as the Bishops are encouraged in their attempts by the support of such journals as the *Tribune* and *Evening Journal*. Let the characters of those journals weigh well the responsibility that rests upon them in this matter. *If this bill passes, it will be in consequence of their support!* But, sir, even with their support, the bill must not be allowed to pass; to prevent it the opposition to it must be as active as its supporters. In the nomination and election of members of Assembly and Senate, the question must be borne in mind by those opposed to the bill, as it most assuredly will by the Bishops and their coadjutors. The *Tribune* says they will meet us at *Phillippi*—meaning, doubtless, THE POLLS. Let us heed the warning, and prepare to them there.

I do not hesitate to say, that I regard the question presented by the Bishops as the most momentous of any that is now before the people of this state, in either their federal or domestic relations. It is a vital question of *civil policy.*

One principal misrepresentation, in the articles in favor of the Bishops in the *Tribune* and *Journal* is, that it is a question of *religious belief.* How a question of the tenure of land can be made a question of religion, without upsetting all distinctions between secular and religious questions, I do not understand. Certain it is, that it is a question of civil policy; and with us, all religious interests are regarded as independent of such questions; none are allowed to bend them to their purposes. *No religious sect is permitted to introduce its tenets upon the legislature.* Any other principle would lead to endless confusion. The Mormons would want laws allowing polygamy. The Shakers would call for legislation forbidding marriage and sexual intercourse.—The Mohametans (if any were here) would have circumcision legalized; in which they would be supported by the Jews; who, again, with the Seventh-day Baptists, would call for laws in favor of the observance of the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week. The Communists would ask for laws in favor of their principles; while the Anti-Renters have only to erect themselves into a religious body, to claim the right, as of conscience, to occupy land free of rent and without a title.

In the absence of any established religion, there are two ways of being impartial toward all these solicitations; one is, to give each all that it asks; the other is, to ignore them all, and to pass laws for the general welfare of the whole, without regard to them; and this applies equally to Protestant and Catholic, and to every sect or fraternity of either. The American States adopted the latter alternative, as being the most conducive to harmony; and so far, until now, every serious attempt has been made to lead them to a different determination. I notice a studious endeavor to create the impression among their readers—by both the *Tribune* and the *Journal*—that our legislation has been in favor of the principles of one or all of the Protestant sects, on this subject; but as I am entirely unaware that it is matter of religious conscience with any Protestant sect, I can only attribute such endeavor to a want of knowledge or a want of candor.

The only foundation for such an idea is, that as a majority of the people of this State are Protestant, their legislation may be assumed to be influenced by the religious opinions which they profess. But this is only assumption, and is not to be received as truth. The *truth* is, that with Catholics and Protestants alike, the civil wars of England had, before the American Revolution, erected an impassable wall between secular and religious questions; and on the secular side of this wall was the tenure of land, whether for purposes of religion or otherwise. *It is with reference to this wall,* that we make all *religious* opinions equal and *free*; that is to say, when we say that all *religious* opinions shall be equal before the law, we mean, by *religious* opinions, such opinions as relate to a *future state*; not such as are of interest to society in the *present state*. This principle was contended for by the Catholics of that period, against the Church of England, as fiercely as by the Puritans. When their Bishops and clergy were banished from England they called it *persecution*, that they were not permitted to hold property for the purposes of worship; and when Lord Baltimore established the Province of Maryland, he did not ask, nor did the Catholic Church ask, that the Bishops or their clergy should hold the real estate of the Church; but it was held, in that Roman Catholic colony, by religious corporations, substantially as they do with us. This is my recollection; if I am wrong, I can be set right.

My recollection is, also, that in the Catholic colony of Louisiana, the churches were held by the laity, and not by the clergy; and that, under this system, from New Orleans to Green Bay, throughout the region west, the Catholic religion subsisted in peace and prosperity—its conscience in perfect repose on this subject. So the Catholics of Upper and Lower Canada—a numerous and influential body—consented to their union to Britain without any claim of any kind or right, on the part of their Bishops, as is here set up for them. So in Ireland; the laity of that oppressed country claim no such privilege for their Bishops; neither am I aware that the clergy make any claim of the kind for themselves. On the continent of Europe, large bodies of Catholics in the Protestant states of Prussia, Holland, Germany, and Belgium exist, their consciences undisturbed by any such idea as this, and without any such right existing in the clergy; and even in Catholic France no such right exists. I do not know what the facts are in Italy, Spain, and Asiatic Turkey; but I am willing to take, it for granted, that there the Catholic conscience is equally at ease under a system of clerical land tenures.

The system of tenures of Church property is not anywhere uniform in Protestant countries, and has nothing to do with conscience. The parish churches of the Church of England, and their temporalities, are in charge of the rector, wardens and vestry—a mixture of clergy and laity; while the churches of the dissenting sects and the Catholics are held by trustees, laymen or clergymen as the case may be. In the Lutheran states, the clergy and the state exercise a joint guardianship over this description of property; less favorable to the influence of the laity, if I recollect aright, than in the Church of England. In New England, the whole congregation claimed the right, and exercised it too, to hold and manage real estate, and all other temporalities, by a majority vote. In New York, property has been vested in trustees, or vestrymen; the latter being, in fact, only trustees, and even so,—everywhere the question has been treated as one of convenience and civil polity; and in no sense, as a question of conscience.

But it may be said, that, however indifferent the Protestants and the Catholic laity may be to this question, the claims of the Catholic Church have made it a matter of conscience with their *clergy*, to possess themselves of the control of the temporalities of their Church. Their conscience, certainly cannot require impossibilities; we have, therefore, only to know the law as it is, and we satisfy their consciences and preserve our system. But, sir, the clergy of the Roman Church travel far back in history for support, when they rest their claims upon the pretensions of the Papacy under INNOCENT III., and his immediate successors; pretensions, which were the main provocatives of rebellion against its power in Germany, England, and France, and of sanguinary civil wars all over Europe; ending, in the two former countries, in the overthrow of its power; in the latter, in a compromise whereby the very *question now in dispute* was settled in favor of France; and virtually, as a *matter of conscience*, every where.

A LAYMAN.

☞ HEAVY LARCENY OF RAILROAD BONDS, &c.—The counting room of Messrs. Brewn & Wilson, commission merchants, of 83 Beaver street, New York, was entered on the afternoon of the 16th inst., and robbed of a large pocket book containing notes of hand, railroad bonds, certificates of stocks, and a dividend check on the Bank of Commerce for $28, the whole being security of upwards of $30,000. At the time of the robbery the clerk was to the office but had fallen asleep in his chair, and the thief took the property and left unmolested. The negotiation of the bonds and papers was immediately stopped, and the bank was notified in relation to the dividend check of $28. Nothing was heard of the stolen property until the afternoon of Friday last, when the check was presented at the counter of the bank by a German boy, named Francis Venh, who resides at No. 164 Reade street. The clerk recognized it as one, and Brewn & Wilson's bills on the boy, telling him to take them to the old son from whom he had received the check. The boy went out followed by the clerk, Mr. Samuel H. Orton, and proceeded to the opposite side of the street, where a Frenchman named Charles Jean Godard, a paper-box manufacturer, at No. 490 Broadway, was sitting upon the front steps of a building. The latter immediately arose and went towards the boy, but when he saw he was followed by Mr. Orton, he stopped suddenly, turned round and attempted to run off, but Mr. O. secured him and handed him over to the custody of Officer Van Winkle; on searching his person, a business card showing his name and address, was found on his person. The prisoner was then taken before Justice Osborne, who granted a warrant to search his premises, which resulted in the recovery of the pocket-book and all of the stolen property. He was then committed by the magistrate, in default of $5000 bail for trial. It appears that the prisoner had made about $5 worth of fancy boxes for a lady, who had instructed him to present his bill at the office of Messrs. Brown & Wilson, for payment; he had called once or twice in relation to the matter, and on the last occasion seeing the pocket-book lying temptingly on the desk and the clerk fast asleep, he thought proper to appropriate it to his own use.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

☞ OSWEGO.—The Oswego people are bestirring themselves with more than usual zeal, since their recent calamity. Contributions are coming in freely, much to the relief of the more indigent portion of the sufferers. Gerritt Smith has sent the handsome sum of *one thousand dollars!*

For the Pittsburgh Gazette.

FORFEITED RECOGNIZANCES.

MR. EDITOR.—In reply to "Observer's" communication, in your paper of Tuesday last, I state that all the cases arising from suits on forfeited recognizances are not "disposed of by the Commissioners, either by collecting debt and costs in full on some, and by compromising others." I also assert that the average does not "amount to forty dollars a suit, with costs," from the fact that, with the exception of four cases, none have been compromised; indeed, three of these were not compromised upon the representation from the proper officer, I was satisfied that *nolle pros.* were to have been entered in those cases, but had been overlooked at the time; I however took what would have been the fine. The other one the party was bail in two other cases, and the court recommended me to accept a smaller amount on that account. I received $100 in this case and still hold the party as surety in the other cases.

I have received $862 up to this time, and have the treasurer's receipt for the same.

Two of the cases were paid in full to me, and five were paid on account, and which I hope to make the balance on. The Sheriff has collected some on the executions now in his hands, and may probably collect more.

I herewith annex a letter from the Prothonotary of the District Court, giving a statement of the cases as they stand. You will perceive that I have obtained 51 judgments and issued 39 executions, on most of the recognizances I sued the principal and surety separate, and when I obtained judgments I issued execution against the principal before proceeding against bail, which is the reason why I issued less executions than judgments.

Affidavits of defence are entered in ninety-eight cases, and in many instances refer also to actions against the bail, which would really bring the defence to a much larger amount.

I can freely refer to gentlemen of the bar having cases for defence, to bear me out in the assertion, when I say that I utterly refuse to interfere where application is made for a reduction in the amount of the judgment. Neither the Commissioners or myself have the power to remit, and if I had, in a majority of cases, I would refuse to interfere in any manner.

I hope to realize something for the county out of actions brought, if not interfered with. The Commissioners are not interfering in the collection of the forfeited recognizances. They have placed them in my hands, and I assure them I would do all in my power to make the most out of them. The auditors' report for this year will fully answer any inquiries or curious to know the true state of collections made.

Respectfully,

J. H. SWEEL.

PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE, July 19, 1853.

J. HARRISON SWEEL, Esq.—DEAR SIR—On examining the Records in this office, I find that to June and October Terms, 1852, one hundred and eighty suits were brought on forfeited recognizances, for the use of Allegheny county; of this number, fifty-one have been prosecuted to Judgment. Affidavits of defence are filed in ninety-eight. Twenty-two of the original writs were not served, and two cases are discontinued.

On the Judgments obtained, thirty-nine executions were issued, twenty-one of which the Sheriff returned "no goods," two "money made," five "Stayed by the Court of Common Pleas," one "Stayed; Gov. Bigler having remitted the fine," and ten yet remain in the Sheriff's hands. And to three of the Judgments writs of error have been taken; and the records are now in the Supreme Court.

EDW. CAMPBELL, JR., *Prothonotary.*

(Correspondence of the Commercial Advertiser.)

LONDON, July 5, 1853.

The increasing excitement on the war question has produced, since the departure of the last packet, a more rapid and serious effect on the prices of the funds, than had previously been experienced. Two days ago a positive announcement came from Vienna that the invasion of the Danubian principalities had actually commenced by a body of 12,000 Russian troops having crossed the Pruth and occupied Jassy, the capital of Moldavia, and a fall of nearly one per cent. in Consols was the immediate consequence. Subsequently still more were thrown upon the steamboat, but the market showed scarcely any recovery, reports being rife that whether it had or had not yet actually taken place, the aggression was fully resolved upon by the Czar, and this morning this adverse impression has been confirmed by advices from St. Petersburg, with the Imperial proclamation of the intended invasion, which, however, it is sought to soften by the announcement that it is not to be regarded as a step of actual "war," but merely as a means of obtaining the guarantee of the rights which Russia is entitled to demand.

That this mode of forcibly occupying the territories of an independent sovereign will not be interpreted by the other powers in the conventional fashion proposed by Russia, so as to allow her to gain all that war can obtain, without running the risk of its penalties, is considered certain. Hence the advance of the English and French fleets through the Dardanelles to Constantinople appears inevitable, and has probably already taken place, in which case the existence of hostilities between Turkey and Russia becomes a recognized fact.

At the same time there are certain circumstances which tend to inspire the belief that the Czar would be glad that matters should stop with the act he has just committed, and that having made what he considers a display of his determination, he would now be glad to make loopholes for negotiation. The Emperor of Austria has just despatched Count Gyulai on a special mission from Vienna to St. Petersburgh, for the purpose, it is understood, of facilitating a pacification; and this step may perhaps be looked upon as having been taken in obedience to a hint of its being desired.

The wording of the proclamation of the CZAR, announcing the invasion, is also considered in some parts to indicate a hope of an ultimate withdrawal being found practicable. He is still ready, he says, to stop the movement of the Russian troops if Turkey "will bind herself to observe religiously the inviolability of the orthodox church," and as Turkey has lately given perfect freedom to all the Christian churches, and professed her readiness to give any guarantees with regard to them which the united European powers may require, it is evident that in the force of this declaration there can be no permanent pretext for attacking her.

The strongest ground, however, for believing in the preservation of peace, seems still to consist in the peril to which Russia would obviously expose herself by a contrary course. The events that arise after war has once commenced, in any part of the world, are often so curious and unexpected, that it is impossible to feel confidence in any prognostications of its final course, but as far as calculating signs can be of value in enabling an anticipation to be formed in the present instance, it seems that there has certainly never been an example in history of a nation entering into an act of aggression equal in recklessness to that which Russia will perpetrate if she forces matters to the dangerous conclusion.

Regular advices from Constantinople are only as late as June 20, six days, at least, before Russia marched her troops across the frontiers. From the Journal de Constantinople of the 19th of June, and other sources, we glean the following:—

At 5 o'clock on the 16th, M. Argyropulo went to the Porte, and had an hour's conversation with Redschid Pacha, who delivered into his hands the reply to the ultimatum. In most friendly and conciliatory but firm language, the demands of Russia, as contained in Count Nesselrode's note, were rejected, "for high reasons (*hautes raisons*) connected with the dignity, rights, and sovereign independence of the Sultan." Should the threat which had been held out by Russia be carried into execution, "the Imperial Government would be under the painful necessity of considering it a declaration of war."

The Turks appear to speak pointedly, and the facts that the Imperials say only what the Government permits them to say, and that nearly all of them speak in almost the same language, lead to the inference that the Minister of Foreign affairs has given the cue. They all maintain that the passage of the Pruth by the Russians is a violation of treaties. The *Siecle* has the following, which appears to have made considerable impression in Paris:

"The Czar, in spite of treaties, of justice, and of international law, invades the Turkish territory. It will, no doubt, be said that the question of the invasion of the principalities is a case of war. Certainly neither England nor France can declare themselves virtually at war with Russia, because that power violates a treaty between the Porte and the Sultan. *It is for the latter to take the initiative* France and England have done all that depended on them, in expressing, in diplomatic dispatches, the formal opinion that the occupation of the principalities constitutes a *casus belli*. If Russia enters the provinces of the Danube, and the Sultan summons the allied fleets, *the fleets will respond to his invitation.* This is what we consider certain."

As for the supposition that Turkey would allow herself to be insulted, despoiled without demanding assistance which she has at hand, and which is generously offered to her, we consider it morally and materially inacceptable. The manner in which the Sultan defended the right of asylum in 1849 and 1850 should, it seems to us, place him out of the reach of an accusation of cowardice, for it is an accusation of that kind that some persons have dared to make in stating that, though supported by France and England, he will give way to Muscovite insolence."

The Southern and South-western papers generally, are exhorting Mississippi to pay her repudiated bonds, both for her own sake and that of the country, as well as in justice to the great, by wronged bond-holders. They remind her that her projected works of internal improvement will require the use of some credit, and that nobody will trust her while the present stain rests upon her character.

☞ A HUGE "PINCH" OF COPPER.—Under this head the Detroit *Tribune* says:—We learn from a correspondent at the North American Copper Mine, Lake Superior Country, a piece of mass copper has been found "lying round" in that region, detached from the rock and ready for cutting, the weight of which is estimated *at one hundred and fifty tons.* At the present market value of copper, this one mass is worth over *one hundred thousand dollars.* When the gold diggers can turn out a lump of gold worth as much, we shall be willing to admit that the Pacific is worth more than the Lake Superior "California," and not till then. The mass referred to is that No. 1, North American Mine, and it is worth a visit to the upper peninsular to see it.

THE JOHN MCFADEN.—In our Friday's issue, on the information of a passenger, we stated that the cook of the John McFaden, on a recent trip up the Ohio, had thrown a boy overboard, compelling him to swim ashore, and the boat going off and leaving him in the woods. The statement was erroneous it appears, as we learn from the officers of the boat that the boy referred to was the assistant cook. The boat was aground, and said boy dropped a bucket overboard, and after rolling up his pants, jumped into the river after it, and just then the boat started ahead, and he waded ashore, merely taking in a little water over the tops of his boots.—*Lou. Courier.*

SAM PATCH COME AGAIN.—A couple of gentlemen were walking quietly across the wire bridge yesterday evening, and when about the middle one of them stripped off his clothes, except pantaloons, and jumped off into the river, a distance of about one hundred and fifty feet. He swam to the shore, and came up uninjured, except that he was very much fatigued. The gentleman decliced giving his name, but we understand that he is employed in the manufacturing works.—This is certainly a capital way to cool off this warm weather, but most persons would prefer a shorter jump.—*Nashville Whig.*

THE NEW YORK BARNBURNERS AND HUNKERS.—The New York Democratic State Central Committee, which met at the Astor House on Friday, to arrange about the State Nominating Convention, broke up, like Macbeth's feast, "in most admired disorder," in consequence of the Hunkers trying to make the Barnburners swallow resolutions endorsing the Fugitive Slave Law. The Barnburners ran away, and would not vote at all. This, it is suspected, is but the beginning of the renewed quarrel, which will break out again between the two factions, when the State Convention assembles.

Proposals are advertised for contracts on the Virginia portion of the Steubenville and Pittsburgh Railroad, as our Wheeling friends may see by reference to advertisement. The gentlemen whose names are appended, are willing to board the Douglass in his halls though we do not opine that any excessive amount of nerve is requisite to brave him under all the circumstances. Nothing but the Frenchies can stop the locomotive now, and they will do well to keep out of the way of the cow catcher.—*Wells burg Herald.*

CLEVELAND AND PITTSBURGH RAILROAD.—The Commissioners of Allegheny county have agreed to make a subscription of $150,000, to the above road. The Commissioners of this county have a few preliminaries shall have been settled, will subscribe $100,000. The engineers are now at work, permanently locating the road. The contract will probably be awarded some time next month.—*Beaver Argus.*

OHIO AND INDIANA RAILROAD.—The Crawford County Forum states that the work on this important road is in a gratifying state of forwardness. Some of the heaviest jobs between Crestline and Bucyrus are nearly completed, and a few miles of iron have been laid. It is expected that the road will be completed so that the cars may run to Bucyrus during the fore part of next month.

RAILWAYS.—Owing to the unfavorable news from Spain regarding the injury to the grape vines there are held at better prices, and a cargo of 7,000 to 8,000 boxes were sold on Saturday, at New York, to arrive, at $2 70.

RAILROAD BRIDGE COMPLETED.—The great iron railroad bridge across the Monongahela river, about one mile above Fairmount, Va., was completed last week. It is stated that it cost *four hundred and ninety six thousand dollars!*

Treasurer.

☞ Major JOHN WILLOCK will be a candidate for the Office of COUNTY TREASURER, before the Whig and Anti-Masonic County Convention, to be held in August next. jy14dtwtf

☞ HUGH S. FLEMING, Esq., of Allegheny will be a candidate before the approaching Anti-Masonic and Whig Conventions, for nomination to the office of COUNTY TREASURER. jy13&14tf

☞ For Commissioner.—MR. JAMES MCGLAUGHLIN, of the Borough of McKeesport, will be proposed and supported as a candidate for the office of Commissioner, by his numerous friends, subject to the decision of the Antimasonic and Whig County Convention. jy21 tf M'KEESPORT.

☞ District Attorney.—ALEXANDER M. WATSON, Esq., will be a candidate for nomination for the Office of District Attorney, subject to the decision of the Whig and Antimasonic Convention.

☞ Daguerreotypes.—If you wish a fine picture, moderate in price, go to CARGO'S GALLERY, No. 75 Fourth street. jy6

☞ WE DIRECT the attention of our readers to the advertisement of "MORSE'S INVIGORATING COMPOUND," to be found upon the fourth page.

☞ New Certificates.—MR. SOLOMONS: I called at your office on the 24 July, and stated the nature of my eyes, which was very bad at that time; you called me with Spectacles that did my eyes a great deal of good—They were very much inflamed at the time, but their inflammation has now left. I can now bear the light of the Sun or a Lamp, as well as ever. I shall call on you and get another pair, in case I should have any misfortune with them, as I would not be without them under any consideration. Yours, Respectfully,

JOHN MAGEE, corner High and Webster streets.

PITTSBURGH, July 11, 1853.

MR. SOLOMONS:—Being compelled to wear Spectacles, I have never been able to get a pair but what made my eyes sore.—I have tried a great number of glasses, but always failed, until I obtained a pair from you. I can see by day or candle-light, for any length of time, with the greatest ease and comfort.

Mrs. Waterman is very much pleased with her glasses.

I remain, Yours, Truly,

L. S. WATERMAN, 109 Wylie street.

PITTSBURGH, July 19, 1853.

I have been under the necessity of using Glasses for several years, but have never found a pair to suit my eyes or that I could use without fatigue, until I obtained a pair of Mr. Solomons. By the aid of those I bought of him, I can see as well as ever I could. I can read or write with them for hours, without the least fatigue, both by day and candle-light.

I have tried, in all the stores in the State of Pennsylvania, to obtain a pair of Glasses that would suit my eyes, and failed in every instance. Knowing the difficulty of obtaining those suitable for the sight, I do most earnestly recommend to those laboring under defective vision, to apply to Mr. Solomons, of whom Glasses can be obtained to suit all cases. Yours, &c. J. MORRISON.

ALLEGHENY CITY, July 20, 1853. jy21dawtf

☞ Lyon's Kathairon.—FOR PRESERVING, RESTORING and BEAUTIFYING the HAIR, is the most delightful and wonderful article the world ever produced. Its astonishing success is without a precedent in the history of the *Materia Medica.* Dark and lux'riant curls, soft and glossy hair, with scores of admirers, or Gray hair, indeed is the universal effect of the Kathairon. Bald heads were perfectly astonished. "The Kathairon has fully restored my hair after a baldness of 15 years. A. J. COURTENAY, 76 Bond-st. N. Y." "The Kathairon is a certain cure for Nervous Head-Ache, and all Cutaneous diseases." So all disease. Sold by all druggists everywhere. Try it. Price only 25 cents, in large bottles.

D. S. BARNES, Proprietor, 161 Broadway, N. Y.

Sold in Pittsburgh by R. E. Sellers, C. Fraser, Benj. Page, jr., Fleming & Bro., and Brown & Heiter.

jy20:1m

☞ Dr. M'Lane's Vermifuge.—During a practice of more than twenty years, Dr. M'Lane has attended innumerable patients afflicted with every form of worm disease, and was induced to apply all the energies of his mind to the discovery of a Vermifuge, or worm destroyer, certain in its effects; the result of his labors is presented to the American Worm Specific, now before the public, which is perfectly safe and may be given either to children of the most tender age, or to the most adult in point of age, mildly and subdues fever, and destroys worms with infallible success. It is easy of administration, and as it does not contain mercury in any form whatever, no restrictions are necessary with regard to drinking cold water, nor is it capable of doing the least injury to the tenderest infant. An incredible number of worms have been expelled by this great Vermifuge.

Purchasers will be careful to ask for DR. M'LANE'S CELEBRATED LIVER PILLS, and take none else. There are other Pills, purporting to be Liver Pills, now before the public. Dr. M'Lane's Liver Pills, also his celebrated Vermifuge, can now be had at all respectable Drug Stores in the United States, and from the sole proprietors,

FLEMING BROTHERS,
Successors to J. KIDD & Co., 60 Wood street.

☞ MR. SOLOMONS:—From infancy I have been afflicted with weak eyes and shortsightedness, and in all my travels I have never been able to get a pair of GLASSES that would help me. I have had several pairs that would enable me to see more distinctly, but could never keep them on more than one-half hour from the fact that they caused such great pain.

I happened to see your advertisement, by which I saw you had just imported some, and as it has been my constant aim to get a pair that would benefit me, I thought I would try yours.

You must not think me flattering when I say they more than answer my expectations. I have not been able to read by candle-light for more than half an hour at any time before I got these Glasses. Since I got them, I read one Sunday all day, and until ten o'clock, without experiencing the least pain, which