THE PITTSBURGH DAILY MORNING POST.

JOHN BIGLER, Editor.

PITTSBURGH, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1846.

☞The letter addressed by a number of the Democratic citizens of Allegheny county to the Hon. CHARLES SHALER, soliciting him to accept the Democratic nomination for Congress, and the reply of the Judge, to the same will appear in the Post of to-morrow.

Worse and More of it.

The editor of the Gazette has certainly succeeded in placing his party friends in Congress in a most ridiculous position. We stated, that nearly the *whole whig force* in Congress, had voted for the war bill, the preamble to which declared, that *"the recent acts of Mexico have caused a state of war to exist between the government of Mexico and the government of the United States."* The editor of the Gazette does not deny the fact, that nearly the whole whig force voted for the bill; but, in order to extricate himself from a position of dissent to the action of the whigs in Congress, points to their votes in the Senate, to strike out the preamble. The assertion that, *"the recent acts of Mexico had caused a state of war,"* is either *true* or *false*. If *false*, why did the whigs vote for the bill? if *true*, why did they vote to strike it from the bill? The editor of the Gazette has assigned them a most unenviable position; if he is to be believed, they actually voted for the bill, *believing and knowing* that the preamble to it affirmed a *falsehood*.

What excuse could a member of Congress give to constituents for voting for a *falsehood*? What would the people think of a member of Congress, who, on his return home, would say to them, "true I voted for the war bill, but the preamble which affirms that *"the recents acts of Mexico have caused war to exist"* is *false*; and I, at the time knew it to be so?" They would without hesitation tell him he was a degraded man, and should never again receive their suffrages. Yet, in this pitiable position has the stupid creature at the head of the Gazette placed all the whigs who voted for the war bill without protest against the preamble.

Speech of Mr. Douglass, of Illinois.

We publish in the Post of to-day the very able speech of Mr. DOUGLASS, of Illinois, on the Mexican question. Mr. Douglass has nobly vindicated the honor of his country, and most satisfactorily proves that the army of Gen. Taylor is posted upon soil belonging to the State of Texas. He not only states the fact that the country between the Nueces and the Rio Grande has been represented in the Councils of Texas, but he does more; he states that *James Powters* was the Representative of that country in the Convention of 1836, which framed the Constitution of Texas, and that Col. *Renery* has since represented the country in the Texian Congress, and further, that Texas has there organized counties and established courts. We hope our readers will give it a careful examination. It will enable them to meet and put down the thousand falsehoods with which the country is at present flooded. We trust our Democratic friends will be vigilant in the dissemination of correct information. The old spirit is again at work—it is as active now as it was in 1812, but it will ere long be as signally rebuked by the unbending patriotism of the people.

Speech of Hon. S. A. Douglass, OF ILLINOIS,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, on Wednesday May 13.

ON THE WAR BILL.

Mr. Douglass next took the floor. Several members proposed that the committee rise, that he might proceed with his speech in the morning.—He declined to avail himself of their courtesy, as he had but a few remarks to make, and those principally in reply to the gentleman from Ohio, who had just taken his seat. [MR. DELANO.] The gentleman from Ohio (said Mr. D.) has been so kind as to herald my advent before my arrival, and announce that I was about to follow him in the debate. I suppose that he drew this inference from the fact that I took a seat near him and listened to his speech with the most respectful attention.—Acting upon this suggestion, he has addressed a large portion of his speech to me, and invited an answer from me, especially to the principal points in his arguement. I propose to gratify him in this respect; and while I shall speak with freedom and boldness of his positions and arguments, I trust I shall observe the same respectful courtesy towards my opponents which has characterized his effort. I commend the patriotism, if not the morality, of the sentiment which he quoted at the beginning, and repeated several times in the course of his speech: "I go for my country right or wrong." I fear, however, that this sentiment, once so much improved by our countrymen, is about to be brought into disrespect and contempt by the use which the gentleman and some of his coadjutors are now making of it. They go for their country, right or wrong, but they insist that their country is, and has been, all the time in the wrong. They say that they will support the war, but that in their opinion, the war is unholy, unrighteous, and damnable."

Mr. J. W. Houston. Who made use of that expression? Was it any gentleman on this side of the House?

Mr. Douglass. Yes, sir. The gentleman from Ohio [MR. DELANO] who has just taken his seat, made use of the identical words, and repeated them several times with great emphasis in the course of his speech, while the great body of his political friends listened with the most profound respect, and gave every indication of approbation and encouragement, by expressions, looks, and nods of assent. I see the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts before me now nods his approval of the sentiment.

Mr. Adams. Yes sir. Mr. Chairman, I approve and endorse every word and syllable of it.

Mr. Douglass. So I supposed, from the marked indications of approval which that gentleman and his friends gave to every attack upon the rights, interests, and honor of his own country. What reliance shall we place on the sincerity of gentlemen's professions, that they are for the country right or wrong, when they exert all their power and influence to put their country in the wrong in the eyes of Christendom, and invoke the wrath of heaven upon us for our manifold national crimes and aggressions? With professions of patriotism on their lips, do they not show that their hearts are against their own country? They appeal to the consciences and religious feelings of our countrymen to unite in execration of our government, army, citizens, soldiers, and country, for prosecuting what they denounce as an unholy, unrighteous, and damnable cause. They predict that the judgment of God will rest upon us—that sickness, and carnage, and death will be our portion—that defeat and disgrace will attend our arms! Is there not treason in the heart that can feel, and poison in the breath that can utter, such sentiments against their own country, when forced to take up arms in self-defence, to repel invasion by a brutal and perfidious enemy! They for their country right or wrong, who tell our people if they rally under their country's standard, their bones will bleach on the plains of Mexico, and the enemy will look down from the mountain top to behold the destruction of our armies by disease and maladies, and all those mysterious elements of death which Divine Providence employs to punish a wicked people for prosecuting an unholy and unjust war! Sir, I tell these gentlemen that it requires more charity than falls to the lot of frail man to believe that these sentiments are consistent with the sincerity of their professions—with patriotism, honor, and duty to their country. Patriotism emenates from the heart, fills the soul, infuses itself into the whole man, and speaks and acts the same language. A friend of his country, in war will feel, speak, and act for his country—will revere his country's cause, and hate his country's enemies. America wants no friend, acknowledges the fidelity of no citizen who, after war is declared, condemns the justice of her cause, or sympathizes with the enemy. All such are traitors in their hearts; and would to God that they would commit some overt act for which they could be dealt with according to their deserts.

I will now proceed to examine the arguments by which the gentleman from Ohio, and those with whom he acts, pretend to justify their foreign sympathies. They assume that the Rio del Norte was not the boundary line between Texas and Mexico—that the republic of Texas never extended beyond the Nueces—and consequently our government was under no obligation, and had no right, to protect the lives and property of American citizens beyond the last-mentioned river. In support of this assumption, the gentleman has referred to the dispute which he says arose between the provinces of Coahuila and Texas, and the decissions of Almonte and some other Mexican general thereon prior to the Texan revolution; and those provinces constituted a state of the Mexican confederacy. He has also referred to Mr. Hastings's History of Texas, in which we are also informed that the same boundary is assigned to the Mexican province of Texas. I do not deem it necessary to go back to a period anterior to the Texan Revolution, to ascertain the limits and boundaries of the republic of Texas. But if the gentleman has so great a reverence for antiquity as to place more reliance upon old authorities, which have become obsolete and inapplicable, in consequence of the changed relations of that country, I will gratify his taste in that respect, by directing his attention to the various maps, records, histories, and authorities—Spanish, English and French—by which in is shown that the Rio del Norte was the boundary line between the French province of Louisiana and the Spanish provinces of Mexico.

The gentleman can satisfy himself on that point, if he will take the pains to read a dispatch (I might with propriety say a book, from its very great length) written by the American Secretary of State, John Q. Adams, to the Spanish minister, (Don Onis,) in 1819. He will there find the authorities all collected and reviewed with a clearness and ability which defies refutation, and demonstrates the validity of the American title under the treaty of 1803, to the country in dispute, together with the expression of the opinion, by the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams,) that our title to the Del Norte was as clear as to the island of New Orleans. This was the opinion of Mr. Adams in 1819. It was the opinion of Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney in 1805. It was the opinion of Jefferson and Madison—of all our Presidents, and all administrations, from the day of the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, to the fatal treaty of relinquishment to Spain in 1819. I give the gentleman the opinions of these men in opposition to the opinion of Almonte and his brother Mexican general, and then leave the question of boundary prior to the Texan revolution. Will he tell us, and his constituents, that those distinguished statesmen, including his friend from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams,) as well as Mr. Polk and the American Congress, were engaged in an unholy, an unrighteous, and damnable cause, in claiming title to the Rio del Norte?

But, sir, I have already said that I do not deem it necessary to rely upon these old authorities for the full and complete justification of our government in defending the possession of the country on the left bank of the Rio del Norte. There is better and higher evidence than that. The republic of Texas held the country by a more glorious title than can be traced through the old maps and musty records of Spanish and French courts. She held the country by the same title that our forefathers of the revolution acquired our territory and achieved the independence of this republic. She held it by virtue of her declaration of independence, setting forth the inalienable rights of man, by men who had hearts to feel and minds to comprehend the blessings of freedom; by principles successfully maintained, by the irresistible power of her arms, and consecrated by the precious blood of her heroes. These are her monuments of title to the empire which she has voluntarily annexed to our Union, and which we have plighted our faith to protect and defend against invasion or dismemberment.

We have received the republic of Texas, with her entire territory, into this Union, as an independent and sovereign State, and have no right to alienate or surrender any portion of it. This obligation, the gentlemen of the opposition admit, so far as respects the country to the northeast of the Nueces, but deny both the obligation and right to go beyond that river. I should have felt myself under peculiar obligations to them, if they would have condescended to inform us upon what grounds they assume the Nueces to have been the boundary line of the republic of Texas, and draw a distinction between our right to the country on the opposite sides of that stream. I know nothing in the history of that republic from its birth to its translation, that will authorize any such assumption. In order that I might be certain of the accuracy of the facts to which I am about to refer, I have taken the precaution, within the last few minutes, to have them properly authenticated by the testimony of the two most distinguished actors (one of whom I now recognize in my eye) of those thrilling and glorious scenes of the Texan revolution.

Before this high authority I assert that as early as the campaign of 1835, there were soldiers and officers too in the Texan army, who resided in the country between the Nueces and the Del Norte.—These same heroic men from the west side of the Nueces, or so many of them as had not been butchered by the Mexican soldery, were present at the battle of San Jacinto, on the 21st of April, 1836, when Santa Ana was captured, and the Mexican army annihilated. Although few in number, and from their residences exposed to more of the barbarities of the Mexicans than any other portion of Texas, they were faithful to the cause of freedom, and constant in their devotion to the cause of the republic throughout its existence. Immediately after the battle of San Jacinto, Santa Ana made a proposition to the commander of the Texan army to make a treaty of peace, by which Mexico would recognise the independence of Texas, with the Rio del Norte as the boundary. In May, 1836, such a treaty was made between the government of Texas and Santa Ana, in which the independence of the republic of Texas was acknowledged, and the Rio del Norte recognised as the boundary. In pursuance of this treaty, the remnant of the Mexican army were ordered by Santa Ana to retire beyond the confines oi the republic of Texas, and take their position on the west side of the Rio del Norte, which they did in conformity with the treaty of peace.

Mr. *J. W. Houston.* I wish to ask of the gentleman from Illinois, was that treaty even ratified by the government of Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLASS. I will answer the gentleman's question with great pleasure. That treaty was never ratified on the part of Mexico by any body except Santa Ana, for the very good reason that, in the year previous Santa Ana had usurped the government of Mexico, had abolished the constitution and the regularly established government, and taken all the powers of government into his own hands. To give stability to the power which he had usurped by the sword, he called a Congress around him composed of his own adherents and followers, and had himself formally proclaimed *dictator* of the republic of Mexico, and, as such, clothed with all the powers of government, civil and military. In this capacity, he marched his armies into Texas for the purpose of reducing those people into subjection to the despotism which he had established, and exterminating the last vestige of freedom which remained in all his dominions. While engaged in this work of desolation with fire and sword, committing butcheries and barbarities unknown to civilized warfare, he fell into the hands of the heroic Houston and his gallant little army—a captive to those whom he was striving to reduce to captivity. Then it was the tyrant became a suppliant—a suppliant for his life and liberty—at the hands of those he had designed as his victims. Then the dictator bent the knee in prayer for mercy, offering to recognize the independence of Texas with the Rio del Norte. Subsequently the treaty was entered into in due form, as I have already stated, and the Mexicans evacuated Texas in pursuance of its provisions, retiring to the west side of the Rio del Norte. This treaty was entered into by the government of Mexico *de facto*, Santa Ana combining in his own person at the time all the powers of the government, and as such was binding on the Mexican nation.

Mr. John Quincy Adams. I desire to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if Santa Ana was not a prisoner of war at the time, and in duress, when he executed that treaty?

Mr. Douglass, in reply. Santa Ana was a prisoner of war at the time, and so was the entire government of Mexico, he being the Government *de facto*, and clothed with all the powers of government, civil and military. The government was a prisoner at the time, and in duress. But will it be said that circumstance rendered its obligation the less obligatory? We are now at war with Mexico. Our armies will soon march into the heart of that country. I trust they will penetrate as for as the capitol, and capture the army, people, and government—make them all prisoners of war, and keep them in duress until they shall conclude a treaty of peace and boundary with us, by which they shall not only recognise the Rio del Norte, but such other line as we shall choose to dictate or accept.

Will the gentleman from Massachusetts contend that a treaty made with us under those circumstances, would not be binding, because forsooth, the government was a prisoner at the time? How is a conquered nation ever to make peace, if the gentleman's doctrine is to prevail? They refuse to make peace before they are conquered, because they hope for victory. They are incompetent to do so afterwords, because they are in duress! Surely an unfortunate and defeated belligerent would be in a most lamentable condition. Too imbecile to resist, disarmed, conquered, still incompetent to make a treaty of peace, and adjust the matter in dispute on such fair and equitable terms as a magnanimous foe shall propose, because the war of aggression which they commenced has resulted disastrously, and made them captives! I fear that if this doctrine shall prevail, these gentlemen will soon find their Mexican friends in a most pitiable condition. Perhaps, if that government should be reduced to captivity, these gentlemen would require that our armies should retire within our own territory, and set the government at liberty, before negotiations for peace could be opened. This may be their view of the subject, but I doubt whether it is the view which the American government or the American people will deem it their duty to act upon. Our crude notions of things may teach us that the city of Mexico would be the most suitable place to form a treaty of peace.

Mr. Adams. Has not that treaty with Santa Ana been discarded by the Mexican government long since?

Mr. Douglass. I presume it has, for I am not aware of any treaty or compact which that government ever entered into that has not either been violated or repudiated by them afterwards. And our treaty stipulations with them furnish ample ground for this presumption. I have not deemed it necessary to inquire, therefore, what particular acts of disavowal have been since adopted by the Mexican government. It is sufficient for my purpose that the treaty was entered in to and sanctioned by the government *de facto* for the time being. The acts of a government *de facto* are binding on the nation as against foreign nations, without reference to the mode in which that government was established whether by revolution, usurpation, or rightful and constitutional means.

Mr. Adams. I deny it—I denythe proposition.

Mr. Douglass I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the law of nations with the learned gentleman from Massachusetts. I will only say that I understand all writers on the law of nations to lay down the principles as I have stated it. Certainly the practice and usages of all civilized nations sanction it, of which history furnishes us innumerable examples. Mexico herself was nothing but a government *de facto* in the strict legal sense of the term at the time of the Texan revolution. She had revolted from Spain in 1821, and had successfully maintained her national existence, but her independence was not recognized by the mother country until December, 1836. Yet we had recognized her independence as a government *de facto* in the meantime, and had entered into treaties of commerce, as well as of boundary. These treaties were made with the existing government for the time being, whether a constitutional republic, a military despotism, or a dictatorship. We never pretended to inquire into the question whether the government had been rightfully formed or not; it was sufficient for our purpose that it was the existing government *de facto*. So it was with Texas. She became independent *de facto* in 1836, and we recognized her independence as such immediately afterwards, and so did England, France, and most of the great powers of the globe. All other nations formed treaties with her as a government *de facto*, without inquiring who had been right and who in the wrong in her revolutionary struggle.

We purchased Louisiana from Napoleon, a usurper at the head of a military despotism. Does the gentleman deny the validity of the acts of the British government during the times of Oliver Cromwell, because it was a mere government *de facto*, established in blood, in violation of the British constitution? Many of the most important treaties affecting the destinies of Europe were made with the British government during that period. Who ever thought of denying their validity because they had been made by a government *de facto*, which had been reared on the ruins of the British monarchy! The doctrine of the gentleman from Massachusetts is a novel one—it finds no sanction in the books, and no examples in history. The universal doctrine is that the acts of the government *de facto* are binding upon the nation as against other nations, from the consequences of which it cannot release itself by a subsequent revolution. It is immaterial, therefore, whether Mexico has, or has not, since repudiated Santa Ana's treaty with Texas. It was executed at the time by competent authority. She availed herself of all its benefits. By virtue of it, she saved the remnant of her army from total destruction. Under it she was enabled to remove in peace and security all her soldiers, citizens, and property beyond the Rio Del Norte.

The question is, had she a moral or legal right to repudiate it, after she had enjoyed all its advantages? But the right of Texas to the country west of the Nueces does not rest on this treaty and the preceding acts alone. She has had legal possession, and exercised jurisdiction over it, from that day to this. When the people of Texas assembled in 1836 to form the constitution of the republic, the inhabitants residing between the Nueces and the Rio del Norte had their representative there.—James Powers, a citizen and resident of that part of Texas, was a delegate in that convention. Col. A. Benny, formerly a citizen of my own State, has for many years resided west of the Nueces, and represented that county in the Texan Congress.—He was a member of the convention, which formed the constitutton of the State of Texas, preparatory to her admission into the Union, and is now a member of the Senate of that State. Besides all these facts, Texas has had counties organized, and courts established there for years, and has successfully maintained her jurisdiction, not only against the marauding parties that Mexico has been able to send across the Rio del Norte.

There is still another item of information which I can give the gentleman, to show that Mexico has, at a recent date, recognized the Rio Del Norte as the boundary. The members of the last Congress will recollect that much was said in debate on the treaty and resolutions for the annexation of Texas, about an armistice which had been entered into between Texas and Mexico, for the cessation of hostilities. The proposition was proposed and accepted; and in the proclamation of the President of Mexico announcing its existence, the Mexican troops were directed to retire from Texas to the west bank of the Rio Del Norte, and did so in pursuance of that armistice. Here we find a clear and unequivocal recognition of the Rio del Norte as the boundary by Mexico as late as 1843. What stronger evidence could we have of the establishment of a boundary line than this train of facts, reaching back as far as 1835, and all tending to two points—first, that Texas has always claimed the country west of the Nueces, and exercised jurisdiction over all sections of it occupied by her people; and secondly, that Mexico has: on all occasions, recognized the Rio del Norte as the boundary?

Mr. Adams. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois if the last Congress did not pass a law regulating commerce and trade to the foreign province of Santa Fe?

Mr. Douglass. I believe there was an act passed regulating trade between Independence, Missouri, and Santa Fe. I do not now recollect its exact provisions. Nor is it important, inasmuch as that was before Texas was annexed to this Union. Of course Santa Fe was foreign to us at that time whether it belonged to Texas or Mexico. But as the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts has called my attention to an act of Congress, which he supposes bears upon the point at issue, I will reciprocate the compliment, by asking his attention to one for which he voted at the present session.—Will that gentleman inform us why he voted at the present session of Congress for a bill establishing a collection district in Texas, and in it included the country between the Nueces and the Del Norte, and in the bill itself provided for the establishment of a port of delivery west of the Nueces, and the appointment of a serveyor of the port to reside there, and to superintend the execution of the United States' revenue laws over the very country which he now asserts belongs to Mexico? The present Congress has passed such a law. It is now in force over the country in dispute, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. Adams,] and if my recollection serves me right, every gentleman of this House who is now denouncing the President for sending the army there, voted for that law. My friend from Ohio, who sits nearest to me, says that the gentleman from Massachusetts made a speech for it—a fact which had escaped my recollection.

A surveyor at that port has been appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, and, I am informed, has been engaged for months in the performance of his duties under the law, for which all these especial guardians of Mexican rights voted. Now, sirs, I ask in all fairness and candor, what right these gentlemen have to abuse the country to protect the lives of our citizens, after they had voted to take legal possession of it by the extension of our laws? They had asserted our right to the country by a solemn act of Congress, they had erected it into a collection district; the constitution required the President to appoint the officers, and see the laws faithfully executed. He has done so, and for this simple discharge of duty, under a law for which they voted, he is now denounced in the coarsest terms known to our language, as having done an act unholy, unrighteous, and damnable.

And this denunciation is endorsed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, who, in 1819, declared that our title to the Del Norte was as perfect as to the island of New Orleans.

Mr *Adams.* I never said that our title was good to the Rio Del Norte from its mouth to its source.

Mr. *Douglass.* I fully understand the points of the gentleman's denial. He denies that he claimed the Del Norte *all the way to its source*. I know nothing of his mental reservations. He claimed the Del Norte as the boundary, without specifying how far it extended up the river. He will not deny this fact, for I have the official evidence of his own signature. It is true I cannot prove the handwriting, for it is printed in the State papers, and is the same celebrated despatch to Don Onis, the Spanish minister.

Mr. *Adams.* I wrote that dispatch as Secretary of State, and endeavored to make out the best case I could for my own country, as it was my duty.—But I utterly deny that I claimed the Rio Del Norte in its whole extent. I only claimed it as the line a short distance up, and then took a line northward some distance *from* the river.

Mr. *Douglass.* Will the gentleman specify the point from which his line left the river?

Mr. *Adams.* I never stated the point.

Mr. *Douglass.* Was it above Matamoras?

Mr *Adams.* I never specified any particular point.

Mr. *Douglass.* I have heard of the line to which the gentleman refers. It followed a river near to the gorge of the mountains: certainly more than one hundred miles above Matamoras. Consequently, taking the gentleman on his own claim, the position occupied by Gen. Taylor opposite Matamoras, and every inch of the ground upon which an American soldier has planted his foot, were clearly within our territory as claimed by him in 1819. I am not now to be diverted from the real point at issue by tracing the line and which our army has marched. My present object is to repeal the calumnies which have been uttered against our government for the purpose putting our country in the wrong in the existing war. I have exposed these calumnies by reference to the acts and admissions of our title at least as high up as we have taken possession. The President had ordered the army no further than Congress had extended our laws. I have shown that the country in dispute has constituted one congressional election district in Texas since 1836; that its citizens were engaged in the war of the revolution; that they participated in the convention which formed the constitution of the republic; and also the State constitution; that the same country is within a senatorial district for the State of Texas, and has a senator residing within it; that it forms a part of one of the districts for electing members to the Congress of the United States; and that it is included in our revenue districts for the collection of tariff duties, and has officers of the customs residing within it.

In view of all these facts I submit it to the candor of every honest man, whether the President did not do his duty, and nothing but his duty, when he ordered the army to the Rio del Norte. Should he have folded his arms and allowed our citizens to be murdered and our territory to be invaded with impunity? Have we not forbearance to act offensively until our forbearance is construed into cowardice, and in exciting contempt from these towards whom we have exercised our magnanimity! We have a long list of grievances; a long catalogue of wrongs to be avenged. The war is commenced, and he who is not on the side of our country, must necessarily be a traitor to it. I had trusted and hoped that there would be no anti-war party after war was once declared. But I am particularly mortified to see one of those who were ready to go to war for Oregon, arraying himself on the side of the enemy when our country is invaded on the other side of the Union. To me, our country and all its parts are one and indivisible. I would rally under her standard for the defence of one portion as soon as the other—the South as soon as the North—for Texas as soon as Oregon. And I will here now do my southern friends the justice to say, that I firmly believe, and never doubted, that if war had arisen out of the Oregon question, when once declared, they would have stood shoulder to shoulder by me as firmly as I shall by them in this Mexican war. When the Oregon issue comes, I have no fears of the result.

Mr. *Adams.* I thought I understood the gentleman, some time ago, to be for 54 deg. 40 min., and to tell his southern friends that he wunted no dodging on the Oregon question.

Mr. *Douglass.* Sir, I was for 54 degs. 40 min., and am as ready to fight for that line as the Del Norte. My patriotism is not of that kind which would lead me to go to war to enlarge one section of the Union out of mere hatred and vengence towards the other. I know of no sections in this respect; and while I did complain of some of my southern friends on the Oregon question, I never doubted their patriotism when war was actually declared. But, since the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred to the Oregon question, I wish to call his attention to one of his wise sayings on that subject, and see if he will not apply it to Texas as well as Oregon. He told us that he went for the policy of the great Frederick in regard to Silesia. He was for taking possession first, and negotiating afterwards.

According to the gentleman's showing, that is precisely what Mr. Polk has done in regard to the country on the Del Norte. He certainly ought not to blame the President for acting over one of his own maxims. The President has taken possession, and has offered to negotiate, and gone so far as to send a minister to Mexico for that purpose. For this he is abused also. He is condemned alike for using the sword and the olive branch. His enemies object to his efforts for amicable adjustment as much as to the operations of the army. All is wrong in their eyes. Their country is always wrong, and our enemies in the right. It has ever been so. It was so in the last war. Then it was unbecoming a moral and religious free people to rejoice at the success of our arms. We were wrong in their estimation in the French indemnity case—in the Florida war—in all the Indian wars, and now in the Mexican war. I despair of ever seeing my country in the right, if they are to be the oracles.

To the Honorable the Judges of the Court of General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, in and for the County of Allegheny.

The petition of Griffith Jones, of Lower St. Clair Township, in the county aforesaid, humbly sheweth, that your petioner has provided himself with materials for the accommodation of travelers and others, at his dwelling house, in the county aforesaid, and prays that your Honors will be pleased to grant him a license to keep a public house of entertainment. And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will pray.

GRIFFITH JONES.

We, the subscribers, citizens of lower St. Clair tp., do certify that the above petitioner is of good repute for honesty and temperance, and is well provided with house room and conveniences for the accommodation of travelers and others, and that said tavern is necessary.

John Obey,	Henry Ingram,
F. Cotter,	Philip Smith,
Samuel Duff,	John Robinson,
James Flanigan,	Andrew Robinson,
Joseph Lawson,	Hugh Roberts,
James McDonald,	J. P. Ross,
Ephraim Jones.	

my21w3t.

Adjourned Meeting of the Journeymen Printers.

The Journeymen Printers of the cities of Pittsburgh and Allegheny met agreeably to adjournment on Tuesday evening, in Allegheny Hall.

The officers of the last meeting having been called to the chair, the committee appointed to draw up a Bill of Prices, submitted the same with the following preamble and resolutions, which were adopted:

WHEREAS, We, the journeymen printers of the cities of Pittsburgh and Allegheny, have for a long time been laboring under serious difficulty and many hardships and privations connected with the honest prosecution of our occupation, which find their origin, in the exceedingly low prices which they have been offered, and which they have received, and the ruinous "boy system," which is continually driving the best journeymen from their situations; therefore, in view of these, and many other considerations of a like character, be it

Resolved, That, for the purpose of sustaining the honor of the craft, and that we be enabled to provide for ourselves and families, the necessaries and comforts of life, we adopt a regular Bill of Prices.

Resolved, That the Bill of Prices adopted is as low as we can afford to labor for, so as to maintain ourselves and families; and that if our employers are not justifiable in giving them under the present low prices received for advertising, job work and subscription, we would recommend that they be raised so that we may be enabled to sustain ourselves and the honor of the business.

A committee consisting of Messrs. Cooley, Latshaw and Russell, were appointed to wait upon the Printers of the cities of Pittsburgh and Allegheny and obtain their signatures to the Bill of Prices.

Messrs. Connelly, Eagle and M'Norton were appointed a committee to wait upon the Master Printers and obtain their signatures to the Bill of Prices.

A committee consisting of Messrs. A. J. Foster, Wm S Haven, and J. D. Thornburg, were appointed, to prepare a statement of the ruinous condition of the Printing business in the two cities, and submit the same to the public.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting (the Bill of Prices excepted,) be published in all the daily papers of the city.

J. H. EAGLE, Chm'n.

F. H. COOLEY, Sec'y.

COMMERCIAL RECORD.

Prepared and corrected every Afternoon.

PITTSBURGH BOARD OF TRADE.

COMMITTE FOR MAY.

J. Carothers, J. May, John Shea.

PORT OF PITTSBURGH.

9½ FEET WATER IN THE CHANNEL AND FALLING.

ARRIVED.

Michigan, Boies, Beaver;
Louis M'Lane, Bennet, Brownsville;
Consul, Mason, Brownsville.
Lake Erie, Hoops, Beaver.
Uncle Ben, Crawford, Bridgeport;
Rhode Island, Dawsou, Wheeling;
Wilwington, do do
Clipper, No 2, Crooks, Cincinnati;
Milwaukie, ——, do
Susquehanna, Isaacs, do

DEPARTED.

Lake Erie, Hoops, Beaver.
Consul, Mason, Brownsville
Michigan, Boies, Beaver.
Louis McLane, Bennet, Brownsville.
Hibernia, Klinefelter, Cincinnati.
New England, Page, Cincinnati.

IMPORTS BY RIVER.

Louisville—per stmr Pacific—27 hhds tobacco, 15 boxes grit, 80 bbls tallow, 114 tierces, 1 hhd and 17 casks bacon, 1 bale cotton, 14 bbls and 1 box scrap iron, 1 box leather, 107 bbls and 700 kegs lard, 17 bbls vinegar, 203 dry hides, 6 bags bristles, 10 bbls, 13 sacks and 2 casks potatoes.

Cincinnati—per stmr Wisconsin—56 hhds bacon, 1 chest tea, 17 casks cracklins, 6 bxs shoes, 2 bags wool, 1 box hardware, 56 bbls corn.

Bridgeport—per stmr Uncle Ben—220 hhds tobacco, 1 bx do, 2 bxs sundries, 72 bbls flour. 18 sack rags, 21 bundles shovels, 1 bx mdse, 10 bxs bacon, 3 bags sacks.

Wheeling—per stmr Rhode Island—53 hhds tobacco, 93 bbls flour.

Per stmr Wilmington—425 bbls flour, 5 kegs lard.

☞The splendid steamer Wisconsin leaves for Cincinnati this morning at 10 o'clock.

☞The new and splendid steamer Tom Corwin, under command of Capt. Bougher, leaves for St. Louis to-morrow.

Steamboat Burned.—Last night, about 10 o'clock, the steamboat Rob Roy, used as we learn, formerly in the Texas river trade, but latterly as a hardwater, took fire at the Levee, edge. Soon after the fire broke out she was cast adrift, and floated down stream, presenting a splendid spectacle.—She soon got in shore, but did no damage to any other vessel. We could not learn how the fire originated, or indeed any more particulars about her.—*N. O. Delta, may* 10.

SUMMARY OF MARKETS.

Philadelphia May 16.

There is no apparent change in the market today and business generally, under the influence of a stringent money market, and the unsettled condition of our public affairs, is becoming extremely dull and languid. The sales of Cotton are small and prices less firm. In breadstuffs the transactions are unusually limited for the season, supplies being kept back, on an account of the new rates.—We note some further sales of Flour at $4,25@$4311 ℔ bbl. for common brands, and good brand at $4,37½. Rye Flour is very dull, and a small sale is reported at a shade less than $3,25. Corn Meal scarce and enquired for at $3,10@$3,12½. Wheat is at a stand at 95c.@$1 ℔ bush. $1 for Pennsylvania reds, and $105 for prime white.—Sales of corn at 61@63c., for southern, and 65@67c, for Penna. as in quality. Oats are dull at 41@47c., for northern and southern The Provision market though not active, is more firm. We note sales of Pork at $11,50 for Mess, and $9,37½ for good prime, and in some instances these rates refused. Sales Spirits of Turpentine at 37½c. ℔ gull. Whiskey rather dull at 21@21½c. in bbls., and hhds.

New York May 16.—The sales of Cotton for the week are 6,600 bales, and the decline on most descriptions is about ¼c. ℔ lb. The receipts are 5,297 bales. the sales to-day are 500 bales. The market for Flour continues firm, and the whole amount sold this week for port is estimated at about 20,000 bbls. This being a rainy day, there is very little doing. We hear of a sale of 2500 bbls, of Genessee at $4,62½. We quote Genessee at $4,62½, and Michigan at $4,56¼ mixed brands, that in bright order, can be bought at $4,50.

Boston May 14.—Flour—Considerable sales have been made from vessels of Genessee, good common brands, at $4,75@$4,81 ℔ bbl.; about 3500@4000 bbls. Michigan $4,75; Southern, nothing doing prices nominal. Corn—Sales of a few cargoes yellow flat at 70c. ℔ bushel. Cats 43@45c.

DRY GOODS, & FURNITURE AT AUCTION.—At McKenna's, No. 144 Wood street, to-morrow, Friday, May 22d, at 10 o'clock, A. M. a large lot of Dry Goods, such as Cloths, Cassimeres, Cassinetts, Tweeds, Ginghams, Lawns, &c. A lot of fine Straw Bonnets.
At 2 o'clock, P. M.—
903 pair Butt Hinges, assorted.
6 boxes good Chewing Tobacco.
4 half chests Y. H. Tea.
Furniture, viz: Bedsteads, Tables, Bureaus, Rocking and Arm Chairs, Feather Beds, 3 bird cages, 1 double bbld Shot Gun, twist and patent breech, a superior article, and 3 Turtle Doves.
my21 P. McKENNA, Auct'r.

PENN INSURANCE COMPANY.—An eighth dividend of ten per cent. on all claims against the Company, has been declared payable on Monday the 25th inst.
J. FINNEY, Jr.
my21-4t Secretary.

PITTSBURGH THEATRE.

Charles S. Porter, Manager. | *Mr. Predericks*, Stage Manager.

Prices of Admission:

First Tier,	50	cents.
Second Tier,	37½	"
Third Tier,	20	"
Pit,	25	"

Last night of Mr. MURDOCH.

This Evening, will be performed the Play of MONEY.

Dance, by Miss BERTHA LEWIS.
Song, by Mr. WALTERS.

To conclude with the Farce of PURSE.

☞Doors to open at a ½ before 7, Curtain to rise at ½ past 7. [my21

GREAT WESTERN CIRCUS.

FOR A FEW DAYS.

In Front of the American Hotel, on Penn street.

Equestrian Director, Mr Shay.
Clowns, Green Johnson and W. Worrell.

THIS evening, *Thursday*, May 21st, 1846, the entertainment will commence with the beautiful Allegory entitled, OUR COUNTRY'S GLORY.
Horsemanship, by Messrs. McCollum, E. and D. Stone, J. Sharp, and Levi.
Comic Singing, by Young.
Posturing and Slack Rope, by W. Day.
Plate Spinning, by E. Stone.
Groupings of Statuary, by the four Brothers.
Tom Young on the Iron Wire.
John Smith and his associates in their dark saying and doings.
Conclude with the sketch entitled:
All in the Wrong.

☞There will be an afternoon performance given on Saturday, commencing at half past 2 o'clock P. M.
Box, 50 cents; Pit 25. No half price to Pit.
☞Proper officers engage to enforce order.

Regimental Orders.

THE Officers, (commissioned and non. commissioned,) of the 5th Regiment, 1st Brigade, 15th Division, Pennsylvania Militia, are requested to meet at the house of MAJOR FICKEISON, (in the Diamond,) on *Saturday*, the 23d inst., at 8 o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of tendering the services of the Regiment, in defence of our country's Flag.

By order of the Colonel,
D. D. BRUCE, Adj't.

City papers friendly to the cause of our country will copy. may 21

To the Honorable the Judges of the Court of General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, in and for the county of Allegheny.

The petition of John Martin, of Wilkins township, Allegheny county, humbley sheweth that your petitioner hath provided himself with materials for the accommodation of travelers and others, at his dwelling house in the county aforesaid, and prays that your Honors will be pleased to grant him a license to keep a public house of entertainment. And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will pray.

JOHN MARTIN.

We, the subscribers, citizens of Wilkins township, do certify that the above petitioner is of good repute for honesty and temperance, and is well provided with house room and convenience for the accommodation of travelers and others, and that said tavern is necessary.

John Campbell,	David Stotler,
John Robinson,	John Harshey,
Francis Wilson,	Andrew M'Kelvey,
John Hill;	Jesse Patton,
George Smith,	John Greenwalt,
William Stewart,	Thomas Likens.

may21-d&w3t.

To the Honorable the Judges of the Court of General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, in and for the county of Allegheny.

The petition of Robert Hopper, 2d ward Pittsburgh, humbly sheweth that your petitioner hath provided himself with materials for the accommodation of travellers and others, at his dwelling house in the city aforesaid, and prays that your Honor will be pleased to grant him a license to keep a public house of entertainment. And your petitioner, as in duty bound will pray.

ROBERT HOPPER.

We, the subscribers, citizens of Pittsburgh, do certify that the above petitioner is of good repute for honesty and temperance, and is well provided with house room and convenience for the accommodation of travelers and others, and that said tavern is necessary.

Robt. Porter,	James Clark,
George Felix,	Wm. Anderson,
Wm. Sinclair,	John Bryson,
Robt. Story,	T. J. Adams,
W. McWhinney,	Robt. Cannon,
R. M. Young;	Robt. Mitchel.

my