THE PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

BY ERASTUS BROOKS & Co.

PITTSBURGH:
FRIDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 11, 1848.

☞ THE PITTSBURGH DAILY GAZETTE is published Daily, Tri-Weekly, and Weekly.—The Daily is Seven Dollars per annum; the Tri-Weekly is Five Dollars per annum; the Weekly is Two Dollars per annum, strictly in advance.

☞ ADVERTISERS are earnestly requested to hand in their favors before 5 P. M., and as early in the day as practicable.

FOR LATEST Commercial Intelligence, Domestic, Markets, River News, Imports, Money Markets, &c. see third page.

Editorial Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

Thanks to Scott and Taylor.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7, 1848.

There has been a most boisterous day's proceedings in the House of Representatives to-day,—more so than during any previous day of the session.—The members upon both sides having their party feelings and party preferences well defined and easily made manifest, are quick to express them when there is occasion to do so. To-day was one of the occasions, and has resulted I think in the great discomfiture of the friends of the Administration. A vote of thanks to Major General Scott, accompanied by a Gold Medal bearing suitable inscriptions, has been adopted, stripped of all extraneous matter. The officers and men under his command are included in the vote of thanks very properly, and as Gen. Scott would have it, for no man has been more tenacious of the honor of the Army than the Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. Hunt, of New York, offered this Resolution, and its appearance at once created a fluttering among the Administration members, who seemed anxious that the resolves should be amended to suit themselves. Mr. Henley, of Ia., was particularly active... So, also, Mr. Houston, another hot headed partizan, from Algbama, but all these efforts proved fruitless, and worse than fruitless, for it exposed the hostility of the supporters of the Administration towards the Whig commanders of the Army, while at the same time it demonstrated the unavailing effort of the party to carry out their designs. Quite too much has been done already by this party through the Executive and his Cabinet, in the persecutions heaped upon General Scott since the capture of Vera Cruz and Mexico, as they were upon General Taylor after the recapitulation of Monterey.

The vote of thanks having been ordered to Gen. Scott and his command unanimously, excepting the vote of Mr. Giddings, who does not believe in giving thanks to military men at all,—Mr. Stephens offered a similar resolution to Gen. Taylor for the brilliant victory of Buenna Vista, and to the officers and men under his command. This was carried through in like manner. The previous question was moved upon both resolutions, and no debate allowed upon either. As these great battles speak for themselves, and in language more emphatic than any fulsome eulogy can do, so no words were deemed necessary to accompany the resolutions. Upon all preliminary questions, they were opposed by the supporters of the Administration, but all opposition vanished upon that recorded vote which goes out to be canvassed and commented upon by the People.

INFORMATION.

By two or three resolutions adopted during the day, the Executive and War Departments were called upon to shed more light upon the action of the War Department. Certain letters written by Gen. Taylor in February, 1847, were called for under a resolution moved by Mr. Stephens, of Georgia. Mr. Houston wisely fearing that these occasional rays of light like the letter received last week, and the letters called for to-day, would expose too many of the operations of the Department of War, introduced a resolution calling for the whole correspondence between the Department upon the one hand, and Generals Scott, Taylor and Nicholas P. Trist upon the other.

N. P. TRIST A CRIMINAL OFFENDER

In passing, I may remark of Mr. Trist, that an attempt is making by some of the friends of the Administration to have him arraigned and punished for violating the laws of his country in an earnest and honest effort to secure Peace between the United States and Mexico. Curiosity has prompted me to look up this law, which I now quote at length, except an immaterial proviso which authorizes individuals to invoke foreign Governments for a personal redress of grievances. The law quoted was passed at the 3d session of the 5th Congress, on the 3d of January, 1799—the fifth Congress, on the 4th of March, 1799 Congress then met at Philadelphia. John Adams President, Thomas Jefferson Vice President, and James Ross was the President pro tem for the last part of the Session. The Statute enacts:

"That if any person being a citizen of the United States, whether actually resident, or abiding within the United States, or in any foreign country, shall, without the permission or authority of the Government of the United States, directly or indirectly commence or carry on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government, or any Officer or Agent thereof, with any intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign Government, or of any officer or agent of the Government of the United States, directly or indirectly commence or carry on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government, or any Officer or Agent thereof, with any intent to influence any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; or if any person being a citizen of, or resident within, the United States, and not duly authorized, shall counsel, advise, or assist in any such correspondence, with intent, as aforesaid, or shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and on conviction before any Court of the United States, having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, and by imprisonment during a term not less than six months, nor exceeding three years."

This old law, made to reach the case of one Dr. Leib, who sought officiously to interfere between the United States and France, and who proved a troublesome person, is to be revived, and Mr. Trist brought within the clutches of a law, the existence of which he probably knows nothing. But ignorance of the law, according to the proverb, excuseth no man, and Don Nicholas Trist,—General Scott, too, perhaps,—and nobody knows who else, may be fined and imprisoned by this amiable, peace loving, modest Administration, before they know what they are about. T. B.

The bad treatment General Scott has received has aroused more of Representative and public indignation, than I have seen for a long time,—and ere long you will see some popular demonstrations, particularly in the Old Key Stone State, that may make the Executive and his supporters ashamed of themselves. T. B.

AN EXCELLENT SAFE.—We examined yesterday at the Manufactory of Messrs, Lippencott & Barr, late T. S. Strickler & Co., on Second Street, between Wood and Smithfield Streets, a large and very fine fire proof Safe, which they have just finished for Messrs. Hussey, Hanna & Co., Bankers. Strickler's Safes have long borne a high reputation for their excellence, and this is as fine a one as we have seen from their manufactory.

It is five feet high, by three and a half wide and two and a half deep, made perfectly fire and thief proof. It is finished in good style, with double doors, and fastened with Yale's Superior Patent Locks, which can neither be blown up by powder nor picked with any kind of instruments. Indeed it would take an expert thief to open the locks, even with the keys in his hands. Inside of the larger safe is a smaller one, for the safe keeping of articles of peculiar value. This safe may be seen to-day at Messrs. Lippencott and Barr's establishment by any one who may wish to examine it, and afterwards at Messrs. Hussey, Hanna and Co's office on Fourth street.

Messrs. Lippincott and Barr have recently moved into a spacious new shop, erected for the purposes of their business, and have now fifteen hands at work upon Safes, Vault doors and work of this kind.

We commend their establishment to public patronage, knowing that their articles will bear the test of a thorough trial.

PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE.—The proceedings are of little interest in this region. In the House a petition was presented for divorce, from S. Stackhouse. The bill relative to the Monongahela Navigation Co. passed the second reading. A resolution was also offerred as a supplement to an act incorporating a company to make a Lock Navigation on the Youghiogheny. In the Senate a message was received from the governor in which he states there is a deficit of about $60,000 in the amount necessary for the payment of the interest. He recommends that a loan of $100,00 0 be authorized.

CORRESPONDENCE.—We have the official communications between the authorities of Pittsburgh, Louisville and Cincinnati, in relation to the contributions on the part of Pittsburgh to the sufferers by the flood. It will appear to-morrow.

HON. ALBERT GALLATIN.—This gentleman has published another paper on the subject of the war, designed to show its expense, and the unjustifiableness thereof in view of any benefits to be derived.

LIEUT. FARRELLY, 5th Infantry, wounded at Cherubusco, has been ordered home on the recruiting service among the sixteen noticed on Thursday.

THE TRUTH.—The last conjecture is that four mischievous will meet at Havana, for the purpose of adjusting a treaty.

MR. WILMOT'S SPEECH.

We give the speech of Mr. Wilmot entire, and bespeak for it a careful reading, which it well deserves, for the truth and severity with which he castigates the government press, for its impertinent and indecent attempts to dictate to Congress its proper course of action.

On Monday Mr. Wilmot rose and asked leave to make a personal explanation.

It was the first time since he had been a member of this House that he had asked to have extended to him any indulgence of this character, and he should not now have made the request had it not been for the very extraordinary and peculiar character of an article which appeared in the "Union" of the 3d instant under its editorial head. As this is the second attack (said Mr. W.) which has been made upon me within the last few days in the editorial columns of that paper, that "venerable" editor who presides over it might think he was wanting in personal respect unless he noticed them. It is not, sir, I assure you, because I felt the slightest degree of inconvenience or pain under the lash which he chooses to apply to me. I feel entirely confident that any efforts which that gentleman may make to injure me before my constituents will be idle and abortive. My principles were known to them before I left my home; they were always freely promulgated, and when I choose to avow them on this floor, I claim the right to do so, and I am entirely indifferent what course the editor of the "Union" may see fit to take with reference to it. I will read the article to which I refer:

"Mr. D. Wilmot of Pennsylvania, is not content with the notoriety he has gained by this Proviso. We must have the *Wilmot Proviso*, No. 2. He has proposed a scheme of direct taxation—to fall, we presume, heavily on the slaves of the South. Fortunately, this day it was rejected in the House, several of the Whigs voting against it.

"The Administration does not ask such idle schemes and such mischievous allies. If this representative from Pennsylvania is not content with consulting wiser counsellors, he had better set up a school of his own, and call it the *Wilmot school*.

If he means, however, to cooperate with the Republican party, we advise him to consult and act with them. The Administration has laid down its platform. Pursue its measures of finance, let them be honestly carried out, and we shall require no direct tax; but we will obtain what money we require on moderate terms."

This sir, it appears to me, is an article of the most extraordinary tone and character. In the first place, it denounces this "scheme" (it is pleased to so call) of direct taxation as a "second proviso," as "*another* firebrand" thrown into the Republican ranks. We have heard for the last year—nay, more, ever since the introduction of the proviso which I had the honor to introduce to exclude slavery from any territory to be acquired—through the columns of that paper, that it was a firebrand thrown into the ranks of the Democratic party, which is likely to divide, and perhaps eventually to result in the defeat of that party. There has been the constant clamor of the "Union." We now hear from the same source that this is "Proviso No. 2." A proposition which, as a representative of the people, standing on my rights as a member of this House—which, on my responsibility to my people, and to God under the oath I have taken here—I have proposed for the purpose of drawing from the capital and wealth of the country some fair proportion of the expenses and burdens of this Government, is denounced as a firebrand by this pretended organ of the Administration—*pretended* organ, I say; God forbid I should accuse it of speaking the sentiments of the Administration. I do not believe that any article of this character can procure the endorsement of the President or any prudent member of this Cabinet.

This is a "mischievous proposition" which I introduced: "A firebrand" says Mr. Ritchie. A "second proviso!" A second attempt to invade the principles of the Republican party! A second attempt to strike at that "peculiar" institution which this "venerable" editor seems always to have in view, and at which he seems to see some blow struck in almost every movement that may be made here.—Why, if a proposition is before Congress for the introduction of new territory into this Union, Mr. Ritchie sees nothing in it above and beyond the extension of slavery! If a proposition is introduced here for the purpose of raising money for the support of this Government in time of war, and for the payment of its debt, Mr. Ritchie, this far-seeing editor, sees nothing in that proposition but an effort to impose a tax upon a peculiar species of property. His vision is altogether unable to extend any further; and he seems to think that gentlemen are actuated by no other motives or objects, in whatever movement they may make here. I had no particular allusion to this species of property. If there had been no such property I should have made the same proposition; I do not propose to exempt, I do not know why a few thousand capitalists of the South, who hold a certain species of property, should be exempt from taxation; but my object was to call upon the capital generally in all sections of the country—North and South, East and West—wherever found, to bear its just proportion of the burdens of the Government. This was my object; to this object my amendment was directed, and to this only. And this is a "heresy" in the Republican creed! A new doctrine in the Democratic party, is it? Mr. Ritchie declares it to be a heresy; that it must be kicked out of doors; and "fortunately," he tells us, "it was; *several* of the Whigs voting against it." Mr. Ritchie, then, was fortunate in having some allies; it was fortunate for him that some *few* Whigs came to his aid and voted down this "mischievous" principle, which he charges me with attempting to interpolate into the creed of the Democratic party. Why, the language employed in this article, like every thing he says about me, is calculated and intended to mislead public opinion, and to place me in a false position before the country and my constituents; to represent me as acting with the great body of the Whig party in support of a proposition which goes to overthrow the principles of the Democratic party, and that there was here and there a Whig who voted with the Democratic party, and thus defeated this "mischievous" measure. An examination of the vote above that *seventy-two* Whigs voted against the proposition! This is *several* of them, with a vengeance! "Several" to come up and sustain Mr. Ritchie's views in this matter! Let the old man hesitate; let his look to the company he is in! While he denounces me as a mischievous ally of the Administration such an one as he did not want, he has taken into his bosom and confidence seventy-two allies! from the opposition party! So it would seem he denounces my proposition; they have adopted it; Thomas Ritchie and they not to gether up in it!

There is another fact to which I wish to call the attention of the House. The honorable gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means (Mr. Vinton) that respectable and able gentleman, one of the seventy-two Whig allies of Mr. Ritchie, is not content with giving a silent vote but gives his reasons for the course which the "Union" so highly approves, and for pursuing the opposite of which it sees fit to visit me with its strong denunciations. When the proposition which I moved came before the House, the gentleman (Mr. Vinton) is reported as saying:

"There existed in the country two opposing parties on the subject of taxation and trade, the Free-trade party and the Protection party. The doctrines of the Free-trade party ended necessarily in direct taxation. Thither they tended, and there they ended of necessity. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a free trade man, and so far his introduction of an amendment in favor of direct taxation was all quite consistent. Mr. Vinton was not a free trade man; and he never would agree to impose a direct tax while a system of indirect taxation would answer the purposes of Government."

I differ with the gentleman from Ohio that the doctrines of free trade necessarily end in direct taxation to the extent which he lays down. The true free trade doctrine is that the ordinary expenses of the Government in time of peace should be borne by an equitable system of duties on imports, but that all extraordinary demands upon the Treasury should be met by direct taxation. The doctrine of the protectionists, that no revenue should be raised by direct taxes so long as the wants of the Government can possibly be met by loans or by indirect taxes.

Now, I would like to know what becomes of the free trade principle if you commence increasing duties to meet extraordinary demands on the Treasury, like the present, and to avoid incurring a national debt, or to pay it off when contracted! Increase the duties in this way, and you have a protective tariff; you fall into the hands of the protectionists inevitably; and that is—what the gentleman from Ohio and the whole Whig party seek, what they are endeavoring to accomplish by resisting direct taxation—by resisting this appeal to the great principles of the Republican party. They are seeking to force us back again upon the ground of protection to bring upon us a high protective tariff; and Mr. Ritchie ought to know it, and does know it; and I charge him with co-operating with these high tariff men, with abandoning the doctrines of free trade. He is willing that a debt of one or two hundred millions should be accumulated, thus making it absolutely necessary that the principle of a low tariff should be abandoned and a high protective tariff resorted to, because there is no other way of meeting these extraordinary expenditures except by direct taxation, which he so loudly condemns. If you have brought your tariff down in time of peace to the lowest point demanded by an economical administration of the Government, how are you to meet extraordinary expenditures except by an increase of the tariff or a resort to direct taxes? If the tariff be increased, do you not come upon the grounds of the protectionists? To avoid this is the policy of the Republican party; the only alternative is a resort to direct taxation; and for bringing forward a proposition based on this principle I am denounced!

Within a few days I have been assiled from the same source, charged with having abandoned the doctrines of the Free-trade party. I have never abandoned them; I have held them from my youth. I adhere to them still. He charged me with deserting the tariff of 1816, and with laboring to defeat it in the last stages of its passage. This is not true, and I can bring "Father Ritchie" himself to prove it. I never gave a vote the intention or the effect of which was to defeat the bill. My votes will be found consistent with each other and with sentiments declared in my speech on that subject. Within the same hour in which I gave the vote of nonconcurrence with the amendment of the Senate, I voted twice against laying the bill on the table.—But suppose it to be true that I did abandon the principles of free-trade, did I not come forward on the 1st of February with a proposition founded upon those principles, providing for raising by taxes revenue to meet the extraordinary expenditures incident to the war, and for the payment within a reasonable time of the debt necessarily incurred in its prosecution? No sooner was this done than I am denounced as a "mischevious ally." This is the consistency of Mr. Ritchie!

Again: he advises me "to consult wiser counsellors." If by this he means to imply that in moving in this measure I have not consulted with the opponents of this Administration, I pronounce the insinuation false. I consulted with no man; I took counsel of my own judgment, and acted as I thought duty to my constituents required. If, on the other hand, I am to understand it as an invitation to take counsel of him, I respectfully decline. I would regard it as unsafe. I think he has arrived at that period of life when his judgment, if he ever had any, is unbalanced and unhinged. He has reached that period of old age known as *second childhood*, more feeble and more helpless than the first. I trust I will be able to show before I sit down that his deviations from party principles and policy have been so wanton and so flagrant that it would be unsafe for any Democrat to rely upon his' counsels or follow his advice.

But the most extraordinary and significant part of the article is that in which he informs me that the "platform is laid down" on which I am to stand. Now I appeal to every gentleman, can language more grossly insolent be employed towards a member of this house? It is substantially this: The platform is laid down; if you chose to stand upon it well; but if you dare depart from it I hold in my hand a lash with which to pursue you. I am commanded to walk between two parallel lines, and if perchance I step over, the anathemas of this man are fulminated upon my head; this man who professes to be one of the Democratic party, and I now appeal to every gentleman, can language more grossly insolent be employed towards a member of this house? It is substantially this: The platform is laid down; if you chose to stand upon it well; but if you dare depart from it I hold in my hand a lash with which to pursue you. I am commanded to walk between two parallel lines, and if perchance I step over, the anathemas of this man are fulminated upon my head; this man who professes to be one of the Democratic party, and who seems to have assumed the leadership of the party of the Union, and who has done more to weaken and divide the party, by his narrow and sectional views, and by his denunciations of sound and unswerving Democrats, than any other one hundred men. If the Republican party should be defeated, if its banner trails in the dust, this Mr. T. Ritchie will not for the first time be responsible for its overthrow by his assaults and denunciations of men who have stood with fidelity and entire consistency on the platform of the Republican party. Without arrogating to myself any particular merit, I claim to have stood there myself, and I defy him and those who use him to point out any act or vote of mine as a Representative upon this floor that conflicts in the least degree with the principles of the party to which I belong. Even if he chooses to penetrate my district and enquire into my political conduct and history, I defy him to bring against me the first act of party unfaithfulness.

This is a most novel, almost extraordinary charge preferred against me. I venture to say that you may search the records of the public prints of every party organ that has existed since the establishment of the Government, without finding its parallel. The principle here laid down is, that the representative has no right to think or act for himself, that he has no right to consult the feelings or wishes of the constituency he represents, but that his highest duties are disclinged when he follows implicitly the path marked out for him by others—when he stands like a block upon the platform laid down for him. I have always understood that the constitution all revenue measures must originate in this House. Mr. Ritchie, it seems, interprets the constitution differently. "The platform is laid down;" the measures of finance are marked out, and it is only to pass off those measures with the penalties of excommunication. Who authorized "Father Ritchie" to send in here his measures of finance? or who gave him the right to demand of us implicit obedience to the recommendations of the Secretary, or to fulminate his denunciations?

Sir, what were the objects and purposes of my amendment, honestly and fairly considered?—I have already stated that it was to reach the capital and wealth of the country. I am one of those who believe that a great public debt is a great calamity, one of the most paralyzing and unmitigated curses that can be inflicted upon labor; one of the most effectual means of binding down and keeping down the honest laborers of the land. Such has been its consequences in every Government, and, if the same policy be pursued by us, such will be its results here. So believing, I am anxious to provide for the extinguishment of the debt at an early day; and this, too, from the position I occupy on the floor of this House I can do best. We are in the midst of a war—a war that must be prosecuted. In its prosecution, a large debt has already been incurred, and, if continued, it must be greatly increased. I hold that it is our duty that we should at the time provide means for its early extinguishment—We have no right to inflict upon posterity those burdens which properly belong to ourselves, and which we are abundantly able to bear. What right have we to cast upon our children the burden of an onerous public debt? I hold that provision should be made for its early payment, at least within the life of the generation that creates it. This is my doctrine, and it is for entertaining such principles that I am denounced.

The able gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the last Congress, (Mr. McKay,) when my proposition was introduced, made a speech in favor of resorting to direct taxation, if the present war is speedily brought to a close. He, of course, comes in for a share of the denunciations of the "Union." I differ from that gentleman in this: he would resort to this mode of raising revenue only in the event of a prolonged war. I would advocate the adoption if the war were to cease to-day. I look as well to the payment of the public debt as to the raising of money to supply the immediate wants of the Treasury. If, after the extinguishment of the public debt, there should be a surplus, East and West, beyond the ordinary wants of the Government, I would diminish the duties, and thus relieve the people from a portion of the burdens of taxation.—Such, I undertake to say, are the doctrines of the free trade party, and by such results my proposition was directed. Every man knows that the great burdens of Government rest upon the laboring, toiling masses; and because they bear the load in silence, because they have no persistent presses to utter their complaints, or to wield their mighty influence, you would load them down until their very backs were broken. My proposition was to reach the capital and wealth of the country—to tax stocks, money at interest, and personal property. I could not go into details as to the particular kinds of personal property on which I would have this tax imposed. This was the appropriate duty of the Committee. Could I have gone into details, I should have designated as the objects of taxation gold and silver plate, pleasure carriages, watches and jewelry of all kinds, and household furniture exceeding in value a given amount.

These, sir, were some of the luxuries and extravagancies of the rich that I particularly had in view. I have always spared the rich; I have never attempted to exempt the capital of the South; and therefore the peculiar property in which the money of the planter is principally invested would have been embraced. I desired to exempt the humble laborer of the country from any portion of this tax. I believed that if the whole five millions proposed to be raised by my amendment was drawn from the large capitalists and more wealthy classes, it the largest portion of the burdens of Government would fall upon the shoulders of Southern capital.

I have said I regard Mr. Ritchie as an unsafe counsellor; I would not dare to follow his advice even if I were disposed to see it. In order to show how unsafe and how dangerous it would be to be guided by his counsels, I will read some of the violent attacks upon Gen. Jackson and the give the opinion which General Jackson entertained of him. I read extracts taken from the Richmond Inquirer at the time when Gen. Jackson's name was before the country as a candidate of the Republican party:

"We cannot consent to lend a hand towards the election of such a man as Andrew Jackson."

"We would deprecate his election as a curse upon our country."

"One who, in any great crisis would convert the whole country into one great camp, and would reduce almost every thing under martial law."

"Compare him with Adams and Crawford, and how inferior must he be."

"We can commend General Jackson's modesty in retiring from the Senate and the bench, where he discovered the superior qualifications of other people. Can we say as much for his modesty when he is now aspiring to the highest office in this nation."

"He is too little of a statesman, too rash, too violent in his temper, his measures too much inclined to arbitrary government, to obtain the humble support of the editor of this paper."

"What kind of a President would this great civilian make. A gentleman who cannot interpret the plain expression of one law; and yet would be called upon to administer all the laws of the land! One who would see a purely military offence, would transmute a traitor into a spy, or would punish treason, not by the civic courts but by court martial."

These were the opinions entertained by Mr. Ritchie of Gen. Jackson. Do you think, sir, that I would be a safe adviser for a Democrat who has drawn largely from the opinions of that great man in the formation of his political creed; who looks upon his veto message as a textbook to guide the Republican in the path of safety? I shall not call upon him for his advice, but most respectfully decline to follow any he may offer.

But Gen. Jackson placed on record his estimates of Mr. Ritchie's character. I read from the letters of Judge Breckenridge:

"I have often heard him (Jackson) use the emphatic words: 'Ritchie is the greatest scoundrel in America.' And in one of these letters he uses the following language, which deserves to be engraved in letters of brass:

"'I see that I am attacked in Congress by Cooke, Whitman and Williams, aided by that infamous press, the Richmond Enquirer. If such a corrupt press as the Richmond Enquirer were to approbate my conduct, I should think that in some unguarded moment I had committed some great moral impropriety!'"

We all know with what apprehensions, nay, with what fear Gen. Jackson in his last moments contemplated the displacement of his old friends Blair and Rives and the removal of T. Ritchie to the seat of government as the editor of the organ of the Republican party. He predicted that division in the party and disaster would follow. He remonstrated, he did all that a dying patriot could do to save us from such a calamity, to preserve the integrity and harmony of the Republican ranks, But the faithful and tried servants of the party, Blair and Rives, who had stood by us in our hour of peril, who had safely carried us through the most trying and eventful struggle in the annals of party warfare, were thrust aside. What were the reasons assigned for this? Did any one ever question their integrity as partizans or as men? Their ability and energy were never doubted; but it was said they had assailed so roughly many Democrats as to make them obnoxious to a considerable portion of the party. True, they did assail with vigor, and justly too, many professed and pretended Democrats. It was at a time when treason was rife in our ranks, when the Bank of the United States had openly entered the political arena and was buying up, like cattle in the market, presses and the people's representatives. And yet Blair and Rives, during the whole twelve years of Jackson's and Van Buren's administrations, never denounced half as many members of the party as has this querulous, and waspish old man. They denounced for good cause; he without reason or just foundation. Take the members of the last Congress, and of the one hundred and forty Democrats of which it was composed, there cannot be found twenty whose shirts are free from the direct or indirect censures of this reviler of Gen. Jackson. Those who sustained appropriations for internal improvements, embracing a large share of the Democratic representatives in Congress, have been duly read out of the party, unchurched from its communion, and sent over to the Whigs. In the Union of Dec. 16, 1847, all such are censured as co-operating with the Whigs "to oppose the war, to compel the Administration to withdraw the army, to embarrass the Republican party and elevate the Whig candidate for the Presidency."

Next came those who in the late Congress opposed a tax upon tea and coffee. All will remember the severity with which the anathemas of the "Union" were poured out upon the heads of this class of men. At one time there was no redemption or salvation for those who opposed the principles of free trade; and last, but in due season are heard the thunders of this organ against those who support this policy, and honestly seek to carry it out by a resort to direct taxation to meet the heavy expenditures of a foreign war.

But the editor of the Union has other and deeper sins to answer for than any I have yet charged upon him. He labored to destroy the administration of Mr. Van Buren in the crisis of its fate. He opposed that greatest and most wholesome of all measures that engaged the attention and enlisted the support of the Republican party of modern times, the Independent Treasury, recommended by Mr. Van Buren whose Administration reflects the highest honor on the Democratic party, and will constitute a bright page in the history of the republic. I read again from the Richmond Enquirer.

"Let it once get foothold, and all the restraints of the Constitution will be broken down, with the liberties of the people.

"The institution and establishment of subtreasuries at all the necessary and commercial points in the United States would cost the Government several millions of dollars. Strong houses, with vaults, chests, bars, bolts, and locks, would be necessary with a regular corps of watchmen and an additional set of officers. To fund the public, the subtreasuries would be commenced with very few new officers, but they would soon be increased to any number actually necessary."

For the benefit of Mr. Cooper's argument we will suppose all the State banks put down, their charters repealed, and, if you please, the *Penny Royal* doctrines carried out to the extreme advocates desire; all grants to lands annulled, debts, contracts credits, and slavery abolished; marriages and our religious to morality and religion abrogated; and every thing we wish to be purchased or sacrificed by the actual payment of gold and silver, and in what would we be improved?

"We go for the sound State banks—those which will answer the purposes of the Government; those which are honest in their promises and zealous in their efforts to resume specie payments—in preference to the Treasury scheme."

"We have objected to the Sub treasury system, so called, that, in the first place, it will enlarge the *Executive power*, already too great for a republic; secondly, that it contributes to endanger *the security of the public funds*; and, thirdly, that it calculated to produce two currencies—a baser one for the people and a better one for the Government."

"We opposed the Subtreasury system, so denominated, in 1834; we maintained the same ground in 1837."

Where will you find more gross and outrageous assaults upon this measure, should you search the most violent Whig papers of the time? This is the country and the Democracy upon his knees, a suppliant for mercy, imploring forgiveness for himself and his fellow-traitors, Rives and Tallmadge, and begging to be received once more into the party. This is the man who now denounces, and heads denunciations of men who are his superiors. Then, he was anxious to be taken in upon any terms, even on trial-now, he has grown so arrogant and presuming as to erect a platform on which all must stand.

These attacks upon me, after all, have not come so unexpectedly. I anticipated them before I left home; and in a public meeting of my constituents I told them I was a marked man by this old dotard: that if it were in the power of his press to destroy my standing he would do it. But I bid him defiance. My people know me, and are beginning pretty well to understand him and those who use him. I could easily save myself from these assaults if I were as vacillating as he has been—if there were not a principle involved in Mr. Ritchie and myself, if one day I would support a great measure on principle, and the next day turn round and oppose it. I would be secure from misrepresentation and abuse if I would submit my neck to the yoke and wear the collar of a certain aspirant for the Presidency, in whose interest the "Union" is enlisted, and for whose elevation it is laboring. If I would make myself an instrument in his hands (which God forbid!) I have no doubt but there would be an abatement of my sins. Let me tell you, Abraham's bosom of "Father Ritchie" is wide enough and warm enough for all sorts of sinners except myself. Those who opposed the tariff—do not wish to be understood as assuming them—have been received back into the fold of the party; those who opposed the Administration on the question of rivers and harbors, although excommunicated, have received absolution; for even the flagrant sin of opposition to the tax on tea and coffee, I think there has been forgiveness, and I earnestly believe that I, although the greatest of sinners, might be forgiven even for the heinous offence if I would enlist under the banner of a certain aspirant for the Presidency. I have formed my own opinions and estimates of the man, and I declare I prefer any other man named by the Republican party as a candidate for the Presidency, either Cass, Dallas, or Woodbury, nay, even Mr. Calhoun himself he is a bold, frank man. We meet a question fairly, never evading or dodging the issues they involve.

Sir, simultaneously, on the 25th of December, the "Union" in this city, and the "Pennsylvanian," in Philadelphia, one hundred and fifty miles distant, came out with articles abusive and denunciatory of myself. The Editor of the latter paper was *in this city at the time*, and from the similarity of the charges preferred against me, I have no doubt that the attacks were arranged and preconcerted. My presentation was delayed for a time because it was believed that my opposition to this Presidential aspirant was uncompromising and unyielding. Again the article which I have been quoting, which appeared in the Union of the 3d, was also on the 3d in Philadelphia and Harrisburg, a similar attack, in the Pennsylvanian of the same date and they are both the leading organs of the scheming, ambitious candidate. The one in Philadelphia is known to be directed entirely to his interest, and by his personal friends, and the other is the organ of the public patronage. The singular coincidence of these attacks, both in time, character, and circumstances, leaves no doubt upon my mind as to the source from which they come, or the reasons that prompt them. I have received from my constituents and documents take my county to men, of whose names he has never heard, except as they have been furnished, inscribed with the kind respects of

Yet he will find the Democracy of this county firm and unyielding in their attachment to their principles and their determination to visit me with no strong denunciations. (When the proposition which I moved came before the House, the gentleman (Mr. Vinton) is reported as saying:

"There existed in the country two opposing parties on the subject of taxation and trade, the Free-trade party and the Protection party. The doctrines of the Free-trade party ended necessarily in direct taxation. Thither they tended, and there they ended of necessity. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a free trade man, and so far his introduction of an amendment in favor of direct taxation was all quite consistent. Mr. Vinton was not a free trade man; and he never would agree to impose a direct tax while a system of indirect taxation would answer the purposes of Government."

I differ with the gentleman from Ohio that the doctrines of free trade necessarily end in direct taxation to the extent which he lays down. The true free trade doctrine is that the ordinary expenses of the Government in time of peace should be borne by an equitable system of duties on imports, but that all extraordinary demands upon the Treasury should be met by direct taxation. The doctrine of the protectionists, that no revenue should be raised by direct taxes so long as the wants of the Government can possibly be met by loans or by indirect taxes.

Now, I would like to know what becomes of the free trade principle if you commence increasing duties to meet extraordinary demands on the Treasury, like the present, and to avoid incurring a national debt, or to pay it off when contracted! Increase the duties in this way, and you have a protective tariff; you fall into the hands of the protectionists inevitably; and that is—what the gentleman from Ohio and the whole Whig party seek, what they are endeavoring to accomplish by resisting direct taxation—by resisting this appeal to the great principles of the Republican party. They are seeking to force us back again upon the ground of protection to bring upon us a high protective tariff; and Mr. Ritchie ought to know it, and does know it; and I charge him with co-operating with these high tariff men, with abandoning the doctrines of free trade. He is willing that a debt of one or two hundred millions should be accumulated, thus making it absolutely necessary that the principle of a low tariff should be abandoned and a high protective tariff resorted to, because there is no other way of meeting these extraordinary expenditures except by direct taxation, which he so loudly condemns. If you have brought your tariff down in time of peace to the lowest point demanded by an economical administration of the Government, how are you to meet extraordinary expenditures except by an increase of the tariff or a resort to direct taxes? If the tariff be increased, do you not come upon the grounds of the protectionists? To avoid this is the policy of the Republican party; the only alternative is a resort to direct taxation; and for bringing forward a proposition based on this principle I am denounced!

Within a few days I have been assiled from the same source, charged with having abandoned the doctrines of the Free-trade party. I have never abandoned them; I have held them from my youth. I adhere to them still. He charged me with deserting the tariff of 1816, and with laboring to defeat it in the last stages of its passage. This is not true, and I can bring "Father Ritchie" himself to prove it. I never gave a vote the intention or the effect of which was to defeat the bill. My votes will be found consistent with each other and with sentiments declared in my speech on that subject. Within the same hour in which I gave the vote of nonconcurrence with the amendment of the Senate, I voted twice against laying the bill on the table.—But suppose it to be true that I did abandon the principles of free-trade, did I not come forward on the 1st of February with a proposition founded upon those principles, providing for raising by taxes revenue to meet the extraordinary expenditures incident to the war, and for the payment within a reasonable time of the debt necessarily incurred in its prosecution? No sooner was this done than I am denounced as a "mischevious ally." This is the consistency of Mr. Ritchie!

Again: he advises me "to consult wiser counsellors." If by this he means to imply that in moving in this measure I have consulted with the opponents of this Administration, I pronounce the insinuation false. I consulted with no man; I took counsel of my own judgment, and acted as I thought duty to my constituents required. If, on the other hand, I am to understand it as an invitation to take counsel of him, I respectfully decline. I would regard it as unsafe. I think he has arrived at that period of life when his judgment, if he ever had any, is unbalanced and unhinged. He has reached that period of old age known as *second childhood*, more feeble and more helpless than the first. I trust I will be able to show before I sit down that his deviations from party principles and policy have been so wanton and so flagrant that it would be unsafe for any Democrat to rely upon his' counsels or follow his advice.

But the most extraordinary and significant part of the article is that in which he informs me that the "platform is laid down" on which I am to stand. Now I appeal to every gentleman, can language more grossly insolent be employed towards a member of this house? It is substantially this: The platform is laid down; if you chose to stand upon it well; but if you dare depart from it I hold in my hand a lash with which to pursue you. I am commanded to walk between two parallel lines, and if perchance I step over, the anathemas of this man are fulminated upon my head; this man who professes to be one of the Democratic party, and

BY MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH.

Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

FROM EUROPE—THREE DAYS LATER.

NEW YORK, Feb. 10, 1848.

The fine packet Ship Isaac Wright, Capt. Bailey, from Liverpool Jan. 19, landed her mails at an early hour this morning on Long Island, and were received in town by express. She brings three days later news and has advices down to the 12th ult.

Her passage has been remarkably short, but her Captian is one of the most accomplished navigators in the merchant service and has often worked his ship in ahead of the Steamers that leave near his time. He was recently in the packet Ship Yorkshire, the crack ship of the port.

The market for American Flour at Liverpool on the 17th was dull and Genesee could be had at 28s 6d@29s; Philadelphia 27s 6d@28s; Sour 23s@25s; Cornmeal 15s ⅌ bbl, and dull.

Grain was held with less firmness and the turn of the market was in favor of the buyer. White Wheat 7\" S. ⅌ 70lb, 9s 6d@9s 9d, Red do 8s 6d@8s 9d Indian Corn Yellow ⅌ quarter of 480 lbs 31s@33s; White 32s@33s.

Cotton the steadiness noticed on Saturday the 14th continues, and holders not anxious to realize.

Provisions are dull of sale at the quotations last named with good stocks in the hands of the trade.

STILL LATER.

ARRIVAL OF THE SARAH SANDS, LIVERPOOL, FEB. 22d—LONDON, FEB. 21st.

New York, Feb. 10, 1848.

The Steamship Sarah Sands, Capt. Thompson arrived at her dock at noon, with four days later news than that brought by the Isaac Wright.—She sailed on the 22d of Jan. and has made the run in 19 days.

The London mail is down to the 21st and has Liverpool dates to the morning of the 22d ult.

The London grain makets since the 18th are lower and Indian Corn was offered at one to two shillings ⅌ 480 lb cheaper. For American flour the rates were unchanged. English Wheat was steady at the decline the week previous.

In Liverpool at the markets held on the 18th ult Wheat was abundant at 3d@4s ⅌ 70 lb cheaper.—Flour both home-made and American had fallen one shilling ⅌ barrel.

Indian Corn and Meal had given way and the price of Corn was placed full two shillings lower for 480 lb than that day week and Indian meal one shilling less ⅌ 196lb in the same time. Prices ruled as follows. Flour 27s@28s ⅌ bbl, Meal 14s@14s ⅌ bl, Corn 30s@33s ⅌ 480lb; Wheat, 7s@8s for White; and 8s@9s for Red ⅌ 70 lb.

At the market held on the 21st at Liverpool there was a better feeling shown and prices rallied a little. Corn may be quoted one shilling ⅌ quarter higher and Corn meal one sixpence ⅌ barrel dearer.

Cotton early in the week there was a good demand, resulting in sales of 16,000 bales at full prices. Since then the demand has been checked and holders are anxious to sell, which caused a decline and the market closed dull.

Fair bowed 4¼; Mobile 4¼; and New Orleans 4¼.

Provisions the market still remains without change.

CONGRESS.

Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

WASHINGTON, Feb.