THE PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

PUBLISHED BY WHITE & CO

PITTSBURGH.

MONDAY MORNING, MARCH 11, 1850.

☞ ADVERTISERS are earnestly requested to hand in their favors before 3 P. M., and as early in the day as practicable. Advertisements not inserted for a specified time will invariably be charged until ordered out

CINCINNATI:—C. W. James. No. Harrison street, Cincinnati, is our agent for the city. Advertisements and subscriptions handed to him will receive prompt attention.

PHILADELPHIA NORTH AMERICAN.

Advertisements and subscriptions to the North American and United States Gazette, Philadelphia, received and forwarded from this office.

☞ SEE NEXT PAGE FOR LOCAL MATTERS TELEGRAPHIC NEWS, &c.

The editor of the *Journal* continues his unfrue and dishonest statements in regard to the Gazette, and, in his paper of Saturday, confesses that he has resorted to a most disgraceful system of *espionage*, in order to find out the extent of our circulation, but which has only resulted in the publication of another falsehood in a different form. In a controversy of this kind, we candidly acknowledge ourselves at a loss. We cannot descend to the degradation which is necessary to come on even terms with one who seems, in this matter, determined to sacrifice all the proprieties of life, and every honorable and just impulse.

The communication we give to day, on the powers and duties of a Sheriff, in the suppression of a riot, most triumphantly vindicates the conduct of Mr. Curtis, in the late disturbances. The law and authorities in the case most clearly show that the Sheriff has the right to use efficient means for the suppression of riotous demonstrations, and in the case of Mr. Curtis we are happy to know that he has the nerve and energy to use all the powers he is invested with.

The same correspondent promises, in another communication, to show, by legal decisions and authorities, who are to be considered and taken as rioters. This will concern more persons than are now conscious of it.

Modification of the British Navigation Laws.

The correspondence, lately laid before Congress, a part of which is referred to by Mr. Cooper, in his speech quoted in another column, between Mr. Bulwer and our Government, is interesting, as showing that one matter important to both countries has been satisfactorily settled. By the British Navigation Act, which went into operation on the 1st of January, 1850, it is provided that her Majesty in Council may, at any time, on deciding that the reciprocity in the carrying trade between Great Britain and the United States, or any other country, is not mutual, or that British ships have not in our ports equal privileges with those which American vessels enjoy in British ports, issue her proclamation, by Order in Council, denying to our vessels the benefit of the indirect carrying trade. A question thus important to other nations is left at the discretion of her Majesty in Council. One of the letters from Mr. Bulwer, however, assures our Government that the vessels of the United States will not be excluded by any order in Council from the full benefit of that change of system which Great Britain has adopted by the recent modification of her navigation laws, and expresses the great satisfaction of her Majesty's Government with the decision of the President of the United States, conceding to British vessels in American ports the same privileges and advantages which are now granted to American vessels in British ports.

On this point, therefore, the negociation between the two countries has terminated very satisfactorily, and greatly to the credit of the Administration. In regard to letters on iron, given in connection with Mr. Cooper's remarks, the *National Intelligencer* has the following judicious comments:

"The letter of Sir Henry Bulwer on the subject of the duties upon iron, &c., was communicated to this Government, as is obvious from the face of it, in consequence of express instructions from his own Government, and quite probably in the very terms of those instructions. That letter connects the subject of the duties on iron with the modification of the British navigation laws; and, the Minister having been thus instructed to lay the subject before Government, it became the duty of the Executive of the United States to transmit his communication to Congress, which alone has jurisdiction in the matter. The subject is one of deep interest; and so, indeed, is the topic of the other part of Sir Henry, relating to the grant of American registers to British built ships.

We approve of the conduct of the Executive, in submitting these propositions to Congress; it not appearing to us that either could properly have been included in a diplomatic arrangement, or treaty, between the two Governments.

Sir Henry having declared that he is instructed by his Government, to present these subjects to the consideration of the United States, the country of nations required of the Executive to transmit them to that department of the Government to which the consideration of them properly belongs.

The President's Answer to the Call of the two Houses.

Is there any *native* in withholding public documents from Congress and the people? Is it the intention of its enemies that the Administration shall not come before the people with the facts necessary to explain and vindicate its course? If Mr. Calhoun had been in possession, before making his speech, of the documents communicated to Congress in answer to the calls of the two Houses on the President in relation to California, he might have thought it but an act of justice to the President to modify some of his views and expressions. Mr. Calhoun says:—

"I have not seen the answer of the Executive to the calls made by the two Houses of Congress for information as to the course which it took, or the part which it took in reference to what was done in California. I *understand the answers have not yet been printed*. But there is enough known to justify the assertion, that those who profess to represent and act under the authority of the Executive have acted, aided, and encouraged the movement, which terminated in forming what they call a Constitution and a State."

Now, we ask the American people what kind of justice towards the President and the Administration they can expect from opposition majorities which make calls upon the President for official papers; and then, if they do not answer their purpose, hagger mugger them up in the printers' closets? There was a long and loud outcry by Mr. Clemens, in the Senate, and Mr. Venable, in the House, for these documents. The opposition majorities were hot and impatient to procure them from the President. Clerks were employed at great expense, to make the necessary copies; and, when Mr. Calhoun makes a speech two months afterwards—He understands that *the answers made have not been printed*."

We protest against this kind of warfare. The opposition majorities in the two branches would have deluged the country with these documents long since, if they had been calculated to reflect upon the conduct of President Taylor; but since they only show that the old man has acted wisely, prudently, and patriotically, the documents cannot be printed! Even a Senator of the United States cannot procure a copy to enable him to assail the Administration understandingly. This is shabby and shameful.—*Republic.*

BANK DEFAULTER.—Mr. Bulloch, the absconding Cashier of one of the Savannah Banks, took about one hundred thousand dollars of the bills of the bank. His bondsmen are liable for only forty thousand dollars. The reserved fund of the bank is more than sufficient to cover the loss. An intimate friend of Mr. Bulloch's has been arrested and committed on charge of having aided in his escape. It is understood that he sailed from Savannah on the 25th ult., in a British schooner, the Abel, Capt. Hicks, bound to Rotterdam, touching at Truro, in Cornwall, England. He is the only passenger.

CAPT. B. F. BOURNE.—The New Bedford Mercury says that a letter received in that city from Capt. B. F. Bourne, late of the schooner John Allyne, dated at Callao, Jan. 5th, confirms the account heretofore published of his escape from the Patagonia natives, at the Straits of Magellan, and mentions his safe arrival at Callao, in the schooner Hopewell, Capt. Morton, of Boston, to sail in a few days for San Francisco.

THE BURNET HOUSE, CINCINNATI.—The Gazette, of Cincinnati, of March 5th, has a fine cut of this noble building, which stands decidedly at the head of any establishment of the kind either in the new or old world. We have already given a description of the interior, as well as exterior, arrangement of the House. It will, says the Gazette, be opened between the middle of April and the first of May.

One of the items of Expense, in printing a newspaper, the N. Y. Tribune paid, during 1849, amounting to $29,000, for telegraphing news, alone, besides the news from the East, West, and South. The whole sum $50,000.

News from California.

The Baltimore Sun has received, by private hand, direct from New Orleans, full files of San Francisco papers, four hours in advance of the mail.—The news, however, is not very important. We select such portions of it as seem to possess interest. The dates are up to the 14th of January.

Edward H. Harrison, Esq., formerly of Baltimore, ex collector of San Francisco, was to leave for the United States on the first of February.

Several persons who were arrested for stealing goods at the late fire have been tried, and sentenced, as follows:

W. Quinn, two years' hard labor in public streets with ball and chain; Peter Nottear, Patrick Ayre, Thos. Crosby, Thos. Dohity, Jose Maria Antonia, Jose Antonia, one year hard labor in the public streets with ball and chain; Geo. Campbell, Lucien Munios, six months' hard labor in the public streets with ball and chain."

The city authorities have purchased the American House for $50,000. It is designed to convert the same into public buildings.

Up to the 14th of January, the winter has been one of incessant severity, commencing many weeks earlier, and accompanied by more rain than the last or even the winter of '47. The streets were such a mass of mud that locomotion was almost impracticable.

The burnt district was being rapidly rebuilt—Denison's Exchange was rebuilt in eleven days after the fire, and open to the public.

The propeller Hartford arrived at San Francisco on the 7th Jan., from New York, after a passage of one year, all to eleven days, having been delayed on the Pacific by the difficulty of getting fuel. She brought a large number of passengers from San Diego.

The ship Sea Queen, Captain Shearer, arrived at San Francisco, from Panama, January 10, after the unusually quick passage of thirty four days. She brought up 198 passengers to that port.

There had been a riot at the mines, caused by an attack made by the Chilians, on the American miners, near the Calaveras River. Two Americans were killed, and four wounded.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE.

The Legislature was in daily session at the capital of San Jose, and the proceedings are regularly reported.

On the 5th of January an act was passed, and received the approval of the Governor, "authorising a loan of money to pay immediate demands upon the treasury, until a permanent fund can be raised for the purpose." The sum to be raised is not to exceed two hundred thousand dollars, and for a time not less than six, nor more than twelve years, the whole sum payable at the pleasure of the State, at any time after the expiration of six years. The act provides for the reception of proposals as to the terms on which capitalists will agree to furnish the whole or any part of it.

On the 4th of January, Mr. Randolph offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

"Resolved, That the committee on the judiciary, be instructed to report at an early day, a bill for the suppression of prize fights, and bull fights, on the Sabbath, and all other brutal exhibitions; and also to take into consideration the propriety of suppressing bull fights on any other days."

A motion to amend, by striking out "bull fights," and also, another, to strike out "prize fights," were both lost.

There had been a bull fight, and a prize fight, on the Sunday previous, and one was going on at the time the resolution passed.

A joint resolution giving their United States Senators and Congressmen instructions relative to the public domain, mineral lands, ports of entry, custom houses, branch mints, and monies that rightfully belong to the State of California, was reported on the 5th of Jan., and laid on the table.

The gold accounts are about as usual. The Sacramento had overflowed its banks, and caused much damage to the Town.

DEATHS IN CALIFORNIA.—Died, at San Francisco, on the morning of the 5th January, James P. Fraser, of Green Valley, Bath County, Va.

At San Francisco, on the morning of the 29th December, Robert B. Greene, formerly of Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.

At San Francisco, on the 7th January, of inflammation of the lungs, Dr. J. N. Bybee, late of Memphis, Tenn. Deceased was a member of the Masonic fraternity, and was interred with the usual Masonic honors, by Davy Crockett Lodge.

At San Francisco, on the 30th December, Francis Forbes, Esq., son of Sir Charles Forbes, Baronet, aged 32 years, at the house of Dr. Barnett.

Suddenly, at San Francisco, on the 12th Jan., Geo. F. Beck, Esq., aged 28 yrs.

There had been numerous arrivals at San Francisco, of cargoes from all parts of the world, and in consequence of this great influx of all descriptions of merchandise, the markets, have experienced a material decline.

Mr. Calhoun—the Union.

Our correspondent, "Junius," gives the substance of a wordy conflict between Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Foote. As our readers may desire to see the exact language used by Mr. Calhoun in regard to the danger of disunion, unless the constitution is amended, we copy from the *National Intelligencer* a portion of his reply to Mr. Foote.

"Mr. Calhoun. My friend from Mississippi might have been saved from the necessity of making these solemn protests, that he has never followed a leader, for I have never pretended to be the leader of any man. When I speak, I speak for myself—upon my individual responsibility—and not for the Senator from Mississippi, nor any other Senator. Sir, I desire that my words shall go out and be received by the public as they stand, and not as they may be attempted to be explained here by any gentleman.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has unfortunately overlooked the character of my remarks. What was the great object I had in view? It was to ascertain the cause of the disquiet which prevails; and could I overlook that cause which is so obviously to be traced to the utter inability of the Southern States to defend themselves through Congress, upon this or any other subject upon which the northern States choose to act? Could that be overlooked? It is the great and manifest cause. If we had the same power now that we had formerly, we could defend ourselves here; but that power is gone. And it is the sense of weakness that the South feels—it is the conviction that they cannot defend themselves here that is the cause of the deep excitement which prevails in that section of the Union. Could I overlook that? And what was my summing up? It was that, unless this question is finally and forever settled now, it is not probable that it will be settled at any future time, and that it never can be satisfactorily settled, unless the cause which has led to that disquiet be removed. I said nothing about *sine qua non*; I did not allude to any *sine qua non*—that is an inference of the Senator from Mississippi, not to be deduced from any language that I used.

But I will say, and I say it boldly—for I am not afraid to say the truth on any question—that, as things now stand, the Southern States cannot with safety remain in the Union. When this question may be settled, when we shall come to a constitutional understanding, is a question of time;—but, as things now stand, I appeal to the Senator from Mississippi, if he thinks that the South can remain in the Union upon terms of equality.

Mr. Foote. We cannot, unless the question is settled; but, in my opinion, the question may be settled, and honorably settled within ten days' time.

Mr. Calhoun. Does the Senator think the South can remain in the Union upon terms of equality with a specific guaranty that she shall enjoy her rights unmolested?

Mr. Foote. I think she may, without any previous amendment of the constitution. There we disagree.

Mr. Calhoun. Yes, there we disagree entirely; and there, I think, he disagrees with our ancestors. I agree with them. They thought liberty required guaranties, they thought that it required protection; and so believe I. Mr. President, I will not dwell upon this topic, which has been brought up in this irregular manner.

The World's Fair in London.

The following letter is in answer to one written by C. Y. Haynes, Esq., of Philadelphia, to Prince Albert:—

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER,
February 4th, 1850.

SIR—I beg leave to acquaint you that her Majesty's government is in correspondence with the government of the United States, and that the Commissioners hope to be put in communication with some central authority in the U. S. through which they will be able to communicate information on all points connected with the exhibition.

In the mean time you will perceive from the enclosed statement the present position of arrangements. I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

STAFFORD H. NORTHCOTE, Secretary.

COLUMBIA, PA., March 5.

Canal Navigation—First Boat of the Season. The canal boat James Bingham, with sixty thousand pounds of merchandize, has just left our wharf for Pittsburgh. The Wm. Barr is also just starting. These are the first boats of the season.

THE FORREST DIVORCE CASE.—The National Police Gazette states that the petition of Edwin Forrest, for divorce from his wife, has already received a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and that the bill was passed to a third reading in the House, on Tuesday last.

The New York Home Journal, noticing this application says:

"In the large circle of most respectable families in which we meet Mrs. Forrest, there is not, at the present moment, the slightest invalidation of her claim to respect as a woman of perfect purity and propriety. It would seem to her friends, indeed, that there were no need of saying what could be so easily known by inquiry, but it may guard those at a distance from drawing erroneously, such conclusions as are ordinarily suggested by an application for divorce."

THE PACIFIC RAILROAD.—The subscriptions in St. Louis to this road, as far as can be ascertained, amount to $400,000. The real amount is no doubt greater.

For the Pittsburgh Gazette.

Powers and Duties of the Sheriff in the Suppression of Riots.

Mr. EDITOR—Being of the mind that good and not harm cometh of a knowledge of the law, we purpose calmly to lay down, from authority, what the power of the Sheriff is, to prevent offences against the public peace, under which head riots, routs, and unlawful assemblies are included.

1st. As it may add to the clearness of the subject matter, we will take from Hawkins' Pleas of the Crown, chap. 65, section 1st., A definition of a Riot, which "seems to be a tumultuous disturbance of the Peace, by three persons, or more, assembling together of their own authority, with intent mutually to assist one another, against any who shall oppose them, in the execution of some enterprise of a *private nature* and *afterwards* executing the same in a *violent* and *turbulent manner*, to the terror of the people, whether the act intended were of itself *lawful* or *unlawful*."

2nd. Who ought to suppress riots, we quote from the same author, section 11.—"That every Sheriff, and also every other Peace Officer, as Constables, &c., may and ought to do all that in them lies towards the suppressing of a riot, and may command all other persons whatever to assist them therein."

From this it is clear, the Sheriff is officially bound to suppress riots.

3rd. How much and what kind of force should he employ? On this point we cite 1st, Blackstone 344. "He (the Sheriff) is also to defend his county against any of the King's enemies, when they come into the land; and for this purpose, as well as for *keeping the peace* and pursuing felons he may command all the people of his county to attend him, which is called the *posse comitatus*, or power of the county; and this summons every person above fifteen years old is bound to attend, upon warning, under the pain of fine and imprisonment."

This gives us the quantity of power. Now let us ask of the law the kind of power he may use. In Dalton, chap. 46, the law is thus, "Sheriffs are, in suppressing riots, to raise the *posse comitatus*, by charging any number of men to attend for that purpose who may take with them such weapons as shall be necessary; and they may justify the beating, and even killing such rioters, as resist, or refuse to surrender themselves." In 1st Russell on Crimes, it is held that "private persons may arm themselves in order to suppress a riot; from whence it seems clearly to follow that they may also make use of arms in suppressing, if it there be a necessity." Under the command of a peace officer, still more under the command of the highest peace officer, of the County, the Sheriff, they would be justifiable, they are not only justifiable, but are in duty bound.

In 1st Russel—"Upon an information against the Mayor of Bristol, for neglect of duty in not suppressing the Bristol riots, in 1831, which was tried at the bar of the King's Bench, it was laid down that the general rules require of magistrates that at the time of riots, they should keep the peace, restrain the rioters, and pursue and take them; and to enable them to do this, they may call on all the King's subjects to assist them, which they are bound to do upon reasonable warning; and in point of law, a magistrate would be justified in giving fire arms to those who thus come to assist him, but it would be imprudent in him to give them to those, who might not know their use, and who might be under no control, and who, not being used to act together, might be cut off from the rest of the force, and the arms thus get into the hands of the rioters." If a magistrate may arm his posse, his superior the Sheriff may, and the law by implication directs him to arm the most skilled in the use of arms, viz: the military, or here, the citizen soldiers, the volunteers. In 1832, Lord Chief Justice Tindel instructed the Grand Jury of Bristol, thus in relation to the Bristol Riots. "But if the occasion demands immediate action, and no opportunity is given for procuring the advice or sanction of a magistrate, it is the duty of every subject to act for himself, and upon his own responsibility in suppressing a riotous or tumultuous assembly; and he may be assured that whatsoever is honestly done by him in the execution of that object will be supported and justified by the common law.

The law acknowledges no distinction in this respect between the soldier and the private individual. The soldier is still a citizen, lying under the same obligation, and invested with the same authority, to preserve the peace of the King as any other subject. If the one is bound to attend the call of the civil magistrate, so is the other; if the one may interfere for that purpose, when the occasion demands it, without the requisition of the magistrate, so may the other too; if the one may employ arms for that purpose, when arms are necessary, the soldier may do the same."

Judge Parsons, in a charge to the Grand Jury of Philadelphia County, at the June term, 1844, in relation to the riots of May, 1844, held the law to be thus, "Every officer and soldier is bound to attend the Sheriff armed and equipped, if he direct it, and for the occasion is subject to his command." The same authority also held that, by an Act of Assembly, passed the 31st of May, 1841, "If property is destroyed in consequence of any mob or riot, the owner may sue the county for the damage he sustains, and it must be paid out of the county funds." By another section of the act, "the owner of such property is required to give notice to the Sheriff, of the intention of the mob, if it be known to him, and he has time before it is destroyed: and it shall be the duty of said sheriff, aldermen, constables, and justices, upon the receipt of such notice, to take *all legal means* to protect said property so attacked, or *threatened to be attacked*; and if the sheriff, aldermen, constable, or justice of the peace, upon the receipt of such notice, or upon knowledge of such attack, or *impended riot or disturbance* shall neglect or refuse to perform his duties in the premises, he or they so neglecting or refusing shall be liable for the damages done to such property, to be recovered by an action on the case, in the Court of Common Pleas of the proper county, and shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor in office, and on conviction thereof, by the proper court, his commission shall be void." "This statute is in addition to the common law principles which we have stated, and leaves no doubt as to the authority of the Sheriff to suppress a riot or disperse a mob, by the employment of *any force* necessary to accomplish the object, even at the *sacrifice* of the life of an *assailant*."

"Military officers and soldiers are amenable to a judicial tribunal if they refuse to obey the orders of the Sheriff, when so called out by him. The Sheriff may require all whom he enrols in his *posse comitatus* to be armed and equipped, if, *in his opinion*, the case demands it for the suppression of an outrage upon the peace of society."

"Rioters assembled and bent on mischief are enemies to the state. They have declared war against the government under which they live and are, in a legal point of view, little better than pirates."

Judge Jones, in a charge to the Grand Jury of Philadelphia County and City, on July 1st, 1844, held the law thus: "If the rioters are armed, or too numerous to be overawed by the moral force of mere numbers, he must command every man he summons to bring his arms; and whether commanded or not, every man summoned on the Sheriff's posse has the right to come armed."

"When the power of the county is crowned, the legal means which the law *requires* the Sheriff to use are every means, physical and moral, which his array puts at his command, and the occasion requires."

English history furnishes us with instances of the High Sheriff, at the head of the armed array of the country, fighting regular battles with rebels, and even with invaders, exercising in fact the functions of a general, without a military commission. Thus doth the law utter the power and declare the duty of the Sheriff, and in proportion as it increases his responsibility, it enlarges his discretion, but makes him answerable for the use of that discretion, at the bar of public justice and to public opinion.

The Sheriff is the judge of the emergency: notice of the threatened danger is sufficient to put him upon his inquiry; he is answerable for the mischief, and must choose among his legal modes of prevention, that which, in *his opinion*, will be sufficiently effectual. In the late threatened and actual riots, the Sheriff called out the military and stationed them at threatened points—the very points attacked when the volunteers were subsequently withdrawn. It is clear from the law, as cited above, this was his duty. The military did not prevent any portion of our fellow citizens from exercising any constitutional right. They did not over awe the humblest citizen—having therefore nothing of which to complain, we must commend the course of our honest and brave old Sheriff, and hope he will have always that charity for mobs which they deserve.

We will, if time permits, in another article discuss the question, who are rioters?

FROM WASHINGTON.

Special Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

WASHINGTON, March 6.

Messrs. Editors—I snatch a moment after the conclusion of the labors of the day, to write you a line in reference to a scene which this day occurred in the Senate, in relation to a matter of deep interest to every Pennsylvanian.

A communication was yesterday sent to the Senate, containing a letter from Sir H. Bulwer, relating to the anticipated alteration of the duties on iron, in which he states that any additional duty imposed by Congress on the importation of that article, will not be agreeable to the feelings of the people of Great Britain, and urges as a reason against this course, the liberal policy recently adopted by the government of that country.

The communication having been sent into the Senate, near the close of the business of the day, Mr. Cooper had, a few moments before, retired from the chamber, and had not an opportunity of seeing the document, until it appeared in the morning papers. At the earliest possible opportunity, he took occasion to advert to the matter, and he did so in such a manner—as you will see by the report of the proceedings—as must be highly gratifying to all interested in the manufacture of this staple article of the Keystone State. He characterized the letter of Sir H. L. Bulwer, as "impertinent and indecorous," and intimated, in a manner not to be misunderstood, that this was peculiarly the affair of the people of the United States and their Representatives, and not that either of Sir H. L. Bulwer or the people of England. A very animated conversation ensued, in which several senators took part, both from the North and the South.

Allow me to suggest, that the report will be deeply interesting to your readers, both as showing the general feeling of the Senate on the subject of the duties on iron, and also, in an especial manner as exhibiting the promptitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania, in defending her interests from the least encroachment on the part of foreign influence.

After expressions of regret on the part of several Senators, that language of a harsh nature should have been used—although agreeing in the general sentiments of Mr. Cooper—that gentleman, with a boldness and manliness truly his own, wound up the whole affair, by stating that he had said nothing which he regretted, nothing which, if the occasion and the circumstances required, he would not cheerfully repeat.

I congratulate the iron men on the feeling exhibited in the Senate on the occasion. Let them keep moving in the matter; and there can be little doubt, that when this ridiculous excitement passes off about "dissolution of the Union" which nobody seriously believes to be in danger, the true interests of Pennsylvania will not be overlooked.

Excuse this brief communication. I would otherwise write to you, but am mostly engaged till late in the evening. I will, however, occasionally avail myself of these opportunities.

YOUR OLD FRIEND.

FROM HARRISBURGH.

Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

HARRISBURGH, March 6, 1850.

In the House to day, Mr. Miller, from the Committee on Vice and Immorality, reported a bill to restrain the sale of intoxicating drinks.

Mr. Dormen, from the Committee on the Militia, reported a bill to grant gratuities to the soldiers of the war of 1812.

Mr. McLaughlin, from the Committee on Corporations, reported a bill to incorporate a company to erect a bridge over the Juniata, at or near Granny's Ripples, to be styled the Union Bridge Company, and to repeal the 2nd Section of the act, entitled an act to regulate the taking up of lumber and flat boats in the Ohio, Allegheny and Monongahela rivers, &c., passed the 6th day of March 1849.

APPRENTICEMENT BILL.

This bill was the special order of the day, and will be for every succeeding day until disposed of. The question was upon an amendment, offered by Mr. Smyser, to unite the counties of Lancaster and Lebanon into one Senatorial District.—Mr. Smyser had the floor, and addressed the House at considerable length upon the subject, in reply to Mr. Hoge, who had said that any amendment would mar the beauty of the bill. Mr. Smyser said that he had too much respect for the House to believe that they had delegated the whole matter to the Committee on Apportionment, or that the Committee had produced a Minerva from their brains, perfect like the fabled one. He made a conclusive argument in favor of the amendment; and pointed out numerous instances of unfairness in the bill.

Mr. Hoge essayed a feble reply; but before the question was taken up the House adjourned.

In the Senate, a large number of local and private bills were taken up and passed; none, however, of a general character occupied the attention of the Senate.

The following bill, relating to the City of Pittsburgh, was amongst those finally passed:

An Act to authorize the school directors of the Eighth Ward of the city of Pittsburgh, to borrow money.

The provisions of this bill are as follows, to wit—

"That the school directors of the Eighth Ward, of the city of Pittsburgh, be, and they are hereby authorized to borrow such an amount of money, not exceeding five thousand dollars, as may be necessary to pay debts incurred in the purchase of ground and the erection of school houses thereon, and they are further authorized to secure the repayment of any loan or loans contracted by virtue of this act by a mortgage or mortgages on said real estate."

The Judiciary Committee are engaged in the investigation of the Forrest divorce case. Mr. Forrest himself is here with a host of attorneys, agents, borers, and advisors, using every possible means to operate upon the members. I have never seen more adroit and skillful manouvering in all the course of my Legislative experience—A dozen of his borers, some of the most prominent men of Philadelphia, who have all received large fees, of course, may be seen gliding to and fro upon the floor of the Senate at once; and if money can accomplish his object, I have no doubt he will succeed. It would not be extravagant to say that twenty thousand dollars had already been expended by him! His wife, this morning, presented through her counsel, an indignant denial of all the criminal pratices imputed to her.

Mr. Cooper and Protection to Iron.

A special correspondent notices the remarks of our Senator, Mr. Cooper, on a letter of the English Minister, Mr. Bulwer, in reference to an increased duty on iron, and the subsequent conversation which ensued. As our readers have a deep interest in this matter, we copy below Mr. Cooper's remarks at length, together with a synopsis of the conversation which followed:—

Mr. Cooper—I was about to remark, that when the President's Message was disposed of yesterday, by a motion to lay it on the table, I had left my seat and retired from the chamber, and I was not then aware of the extent to which the British Minister had felt himself warranted to go in making suggestions relative to what our domestic legislative policy should be in reference to a particular subject. In order that I may have a foundation for the remarks which I design to submit, I will read the letter, dated January 3, 1850. It is as follows:

BRITISH LEGATION,
Washington, Jan. 3, 1850.

SIR—It, having been represented to her Majesty's Government that there is some idea on the part of the Government of the United States to increase the duties upon British iron imported into the United States, I have been instructed by her Majesty's Government to express to the United States Government the hope of her Majesty's Government that no addition will be made to the duties imposed by the present tariff of the United States, which already weighs heavily on British productions, and I cannot observe, for my own part, that an augmentation of the duties on British produce or manufacture, made at a moment when the British Government has, by a series of measures, been facilitating the commerce between the two countries, would produce a very disagreeable effect on public opinion in England.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

HENRY L. BULWER.

Hon. J. M. CLAYTON, &c., &c., &c.

Now, sir, in order that I may say nothing but what I design to say, I will use very full notes in relation to that part of my remarks which refer to the conduct and course pursued by the British Minister. I will repeat what I have already stated, that I had left the Senate yesterday, before the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the British Minister had been disposed of, and without being aware of the extent to which the latter had felt himself warranted in making suggestions, relative to what our domestic legislative policy should be. As far as the policy of one independent nation towards another is within the control of the Executive, and subject to regulation by treaty, so far is it legitimately the object of suggestion and discussion by the diplomatic representatives of either. By this I do not intend to say, that the representative of one nation may not make known to the Government of another, that its policy in particular cases, in which it comes in conflict with the interests of that which he represents, might be modified in such a way as to be mutually beneficial. But I do say, that a diplomatic representative fails in all the duties of etiquette and courtesy towards the Government to which he is accredited, when he undertakes to inform it that any contemplated legislative action on its part, "will produce a very disagreeable effect on" the Government, "or public opinion" of his country. To do so, sir, is obtrusive, impertinent, and deserving of rebuke. We are competent to manage our own domestic policy, without hints or suggestions from the agents of other Governments, however powerful, however wise in the management of their own. It is our duty to regulate our own policy for the benefit of our own people—the whole of our own people, without reference to the state of British public opinion," or French public opinion, or public opinion elsewhere.

I doubt not, Mr. President, that British public opinion is gratified by a policy which feeds her people, though it should starve ours; but it is impertinent on the part of the British Minister to tell us so. I know that there is a difference of opinion at home, on the subject of the policy referred to; but it is a difference which we can settle at home amongst ourselves, and all the better and sooner without obtrusive, unsought advice from abroad. Our southern brethren do not all of them agree with us on the subject of this policy, but they will agree with me that it is of domestic concern, and to be settled at home, by our own Congress, in such manner as shall best comport with the interests of all. When England, through her statesmen, in a manner far less offensive, inasmuch as it was said of us and not to us, has denounced the institution of slavery as a stain upon our national escutcheon which ought to exclude us from the community of civilized nations, northern men as well as southern men have expressed their indignant disgust at the claim of those who denounce us for the tolerance of that which was inflicted on us in the beginning by British cupidity. I am opposed to slavery—deeply, conscientiously, and forever opposed; but, sir, entertaining an opinion hostile to slavery, I shall never so act as to give cause of offence to the citizens of the States in which the institution exists, in which it is protected by the constitution; and while I am opposed, and conscientiously opposed, to slavery, I wish to hear no English denunciations of my country, nor any part of it, on this account or any other. And what would our southern brethren say, if this same Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer should conceive it to be his duty to tell us what the "public opinion" of England is relative to the institution of slavery? I leave it to them to answer.

This same ambassador seems to have a peculiar *penchant* for offering his advice to the Governments to which he happens to be accredited. But a little more than two years since, when Minister to Spain, he volunteered to tell the Queen of Spain England thought her policy ought to be in relation to the domestic management of the internal affairs of Spain. The correspondence which took place between the Duke of Sotomayar, the Prime Minister, so to speak, of Spain, and Lord Palmerston, on the subject, is fresh in the memory of all. One would have thought that he might have profited by the lesson which was taught him then; but it seems that he regards England so far in advance of all other nations, in power and wisdom, that they will be obliged to look for such hints and suggestions as may emanate from her ambassadors, wherever they may chance to reside.

Now, for my own part, I do not thank him for the suggestion in relation to our domestic policy, and the Administration will not thank him, I trust. But a little while since, it will be recolled, that, in a case not entirely dissimilar, when the ambassador of another Power quite as respectable as that of England, and to whom we were far more than we owe to England of friendship and of courtesy, undertook to tell the national Executive of this country what was due to its honor, and what was due to justice on his part, his passports were furnished to him by the President of the United States, and he has left our shores for his home, there to account for his interference, not with a matter of domestic policy, but for volunteering advice as to what was compatible with honor and justice on the part of the country to which he was accredited. In that case the Executive did right, and I have no doubt that Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer has already been informed by the President of the United States that his advice is unsought for, in language equivalent to that which he used to Monsieur De Tocqueville, the Prime Minister or Minister of Foreign Affairs in France.

Sir, I am willing to trust the honor of this Government to him in whose hands the people have placed it. He will do all that is necessary for its vindication; but I thought that it was but right that this department of the Government, the legislative department of the Government, equally concerned in all that relates to the honor of the country, might speak its sentiments in reference to this matter; and if the humblest member of this body felt called upon, by the relation which he bears to the particular subject to which reference is made to speak, the rebuke will be all the more severe.

It was in order to submit these remarks that I made the motion to refer the subject embraced in the President's message and correspondence to the committee on commerce, and if there be not a reply intended, I will now withdraw it.

Mr. Davis, of Mass., declared that the Senator from Pennsylvania was quite wrong. It was the usual course of Governments to communicate to each other, their views as to these subjects.

We had passed that claim, and sent a Minister to obtain a reduction of duties on tobacco. The subject of duties on French wines was made the subject of a treaty.

He would not be so wanting in respect to a foreign government as not properly to notice communications from it. The subject matter to the Committee on Apportionment, or that the Committee had produced a Minerva from their brains, perfect like the fabled one. He made a conclusive argument in favor of the amendment; and pointed out numerous instances of unfairness in the bill.

Mr. Hoge essayed a feble reply; but before the question was taken up the House adjourned.

In the Senate, a large number of local and private bills were taken up and passed; none, however, of a general character occupied the attention of the Senate.

The following bill, relating to the City of Pittsburgh, was amongst those finally passed:

An Act to authorize the school directors of the Eighth Ward of the city of Pittsburgh, to borrow money.

The provisions of this bill are as follows, to wit—

"That the school directors of the Eighth Ward, of the city of Pittsburgh, be, and they are hereby authorized to borrow such an amount of money, not exceeding five thousand dollars, as may be necessary to pay debts incurred in the purchase of ground and the erection of school houses thereon, and they are further authorized to secure the repayment of any loan or loans contracted by virtue of this act by a mortgage or mortgages on said real estate."

The Judiciary Committee are engaged in the investigation of the Forrest divorce case. Mr. Forrest himself is here with a host of attorneys, agents, borers, and advisors, using every possible means to operate upon the members. I have never seen more adroit and skillful manouvering in all the course of my Legislative experience—A dozen of his borers, some of the most prominent men of Philadelphia, who have all received large fees, of course, may be seen gliding to and fro upon the floor of the Senate at once; and if money can accomplish his object, I have no doubt he will succeed. It would not be extravagant to say that twenty thousand dollars had already been expended by him! His wife, this morning, presented through her counsel, an indignant denial of all the criminal pratices imputed to her.

Mr. Cooper and Protection to Iron.

A special correspondent notices the remarks of our Senator, Mr. Cooper, on a letter of the English Minister, Mr. Bulwer, in reference to an increased duty on iron, and the subsequent conversation which ensued. As our readers have a deep interest in this matter, we copy below Mr. Cooper's remarks at length, together with a synopsis of the conversation which followed:—

Mr. Cooper—I was about to remark, that when the President's Message was disposed of yesterday, by a motion to lay it on the table, I had left my seat and retired from the chamber, and I was not then aware of the extent to which the British Minister had felt himself warranted to go in making suggestions relative to what our domestic legislative policy should be in reference to a particular subject. In order that I may have a foundation for the remarks which I design to submit, I will read the letter, dated January 3, 1850. It is as follows:

BRITISH LEGATION,
Washington, Jan. 3, 1850.

SIR—It, having been represented to her Majesty's Government that there is some idea on the part of the Government of the United States to increase the duties upon British iron imported into the United States, I have been instructed by her Majesty's Government to express to the United States Government the hope of her Majesty's Government that no addition will be made to the duties imposed by the present tariff of the United States, which already weighs heavily on British productions, and I cannot observe, for my own part, that an augmentation of the duties on British produce or manufacture, made at a moment when the British Government has, by a series of measures, been facilitating the commerce between the two countries, would produce a very disagreeable effect on public opinion in England.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

HENRY L. BULWER.

Hon. J. M. CLAYTON, &c., &c., &c.

Now, sir, in order that I may say nothing but what I design to say, I will use very full notes in relation to that part of my remarks which refer to the conduct and course pursued by the British Minister. I will repeat what I have already stated, that I had left the Senate yesterday, before the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the British Minister had been disposed of, and without being aware of the extent to which the latter had felt himself warranted in making suggestions, relative to what our domestic legislative policy should be. As far as the policy of one independent nation towards another is within the control of the Executive, and subject to regulation by treaty, so far is it legitimately the object of suggestion and discussion by the diplomatic representatives of either. By this I do not intend to say, that the representative of one nation may not make known to the Government of another, that its policy in particular cases, in which it comes in conflict with the interests of that which he represents, might be modified in such a way as to be mutually beneficial. But I do say, that a diplomatic representative fails in all the duties of etiquette and courtesy towards the Government to which he is accredited, when he undertakes to inform it that any contemplated legislative action on its part, "will produce a very disagreeable effect on" the Government, "or public opinion" of his country. To do so, sir, is obtrusive, impertinent, and deserving of rebuke. We are competent to manage our own domestic policy, without hints or suggestions from the agents of other Governments, however powerful, however wise in the management of their own. It is our duty to regulate our own policy for the benefit of our own people—the whole of our own people, without reference to the state of British public opinion," or French public opinion, or public opinion elsewhere.

I doubt not, Mr. President, that British public opinion is gratified by a policy which feeds her people, though it should starve ours; but it is impertinent on the part of the British Minister to tell us so. I know that there is a difference of opinion at home, on the subject of the policy referred to; but it is a difference which we can settle at home amongst ourselves, and all the better and sooner without obtrusive, unsought advice from abroad. Our southern brethren do not