

the monarchy, they were to become one people, homogeneous in nothing but in an imperial decree. A *charta octroyee* was got up for the occasion, and by a kind of political log-rolling—if not as dexterous at least as rapid as the feats of the necromancer—all the traits of nationality, cherished by the associated members of the monarchy, were swept away, and they all became Austrians by this act of arbitrary power, as offensive to their pride as it was subservient to their rights. Hungary was to disappear from the map of independent nations, and all its institutions were placed at the mercy of a foreign court; and while the empty form of a kind of representation was given to her, in a jarring assembly, divided by language, races, and interests, all substantial power was reserved to the Emperor and his cabinet.

But Kossuth has himself depicted the condition of his country in words of truth and power, which appeal to every heart:

"Nothing but the most revolting treachery, the most tyrannical oppression, and cruelties unheard of in the words of history—nothing but the infernal doom of annihilation to her national existence, preserved through a thousand years, through adversities so numerous—were able to arouse her to resist the fatal stroke, aimed at her very life—to enable her to repulse the tyrannical assaults of the ungrateful Hapsburgs—or accept the struggle for life, honor, and liberty, forced upon her."

She did accept it, and the Hungarian people rose as one man to resist these gross aggressions; and their gallant exertions would, in all probability, have been crowned by success, had not the common sympathy of despotism brought a new enemy into the field. The Russian scented the blood from afar, and Hungary fell, like Poland, before the Cossack and the Pandour—an everlasting reproach to the contemners of the laws of God and man, who accomplished these nefarious schemes.

The issue was made known to the Czar by his general, in a despatch whose brevity Sparta might have envied: "Hungary lies at the feet of your Majesty." Memorable words, and to be remembered in all future time! The foot of one man upon ten millions of people! Imperial arrogance can go no further. He who does not instinctively and indignantly scorn such pretensions would have opposed the declaration of independence on this side of the water, and the great charter of King John on the other.

I have presented this brief review of Hungarian rights and wrongs, not as the direct motive for the adoption of this resolution—that I choose to put upon another ground, the ground of atrocious cruelty—but because I desire to take from Austrian advocates (if there are any in this country—I know there are none in this Senate) the last excuse for these violations of the common feelings of our nature, by showing that the attack upon Hungarian independence was as reckless and unjustifiable as were the cruelties inflicted upon the Hungarian people.

After the political catastrophe came the catastrophe of vengeance, still more afflicting to humanity. The love of power being gratified, the love of revenge claimed its hour of triumph, and well did it enjoy it. The world, in the darkest period of its history, has rarely witnessed such scenes of gratuitous cruelty as marked the establishment of Austrian supremacy over unhappy Hungary. The moral tendencies of the age are to check the effusion of blood; to stop these judicial murders for political offences, so styled—often, indeed, as in this case, the efforts of true and tried patriots—men who do honor to our common nature by their noble qualities—to secure the blessings of freedom to their country. It is honorable to France and England that political martyrs are no longer considered by public opinion as vile malefactors; and I believe not a drop of blood has been shed in either country for offences of this kind during a period of many years. But the Austrian code, in principle and practice, out-Dracos Draco; and Jeffries himself loses half his claim to infamous distinction, when placed in competition with Austrian judges and generals.

I am not going to spread before you a map of these enormities. They have resounded through both hemispheres for many months. I shall merely glance at a few general facts, that the true character of Austrian supremacy may be justly appreciated.

Let the patriot leader himself speak.—In his letter to Lord Palmerston, after crossing the Turkish frontier, and when he feared the Porte would yield to the menaces of Russia, and while refusing to save his life by becoming a renegade to his religion, he makes this powerful appeal: "Time presses. Our doom may in a few days be sealed. Allow me to make an humble personal request. I am a man, my Lord, prepared to face the worst; and I can die with a free look at Heaven, as I have lived. But I am also a husband, son, and father. My poor, true-hearted wife, my children, and my noble old mother, are wandering about Hungary. They will probably soon fall into the hands of those Austrians, who delight in torturing even feeble women, and with whom the innocence of childhood is no protection against persecution. I conjure your excellency, in the name of the Most High, to put a stop to these cruelties by your powerful mediation, and especially to accord to my wife and children an asylum on the soil of the generous English people."

My loved and noble mother, my dear wife, my children, my poor, true-hearted wife, my children, and my noble old mother, are wandering about Hungary. They will probably soon fall into the hands of those Austrians, who delight in torturing even feeble women, and with whom the innocence of childhood is no protection against persecution. I conjure your excellency, in the name of the Most High, to put a stop to these cruelties by your powerful mediation, and especially to accord to my wife and children an asylum on the soil of the generous English people."

We are told that "many of the towns which are marked on the map have ceased to exist"—some of these with twenty or thirty thousand inhabitants.

I can afford but one extract for the deeds of the Austrian butcher, better known by that epithet than by the name of Haynau; but that distinction would have given him power and place under Nero.

Haynau put 13 Hungarian peasants to the rack one after the other, to force them to tell the truth concerning an apparently fortified town.

They all met death, true to their country.

I had taken a memorandum of the letter of a Hungarian lady, who was flogged in a public square after her husband had committed suicide and her son been compelled to enter as a soldier the Austrian army; but I forbear, having no pleasure in this retrospection of human suffering.

Even the Cologne Gazette, subject to Prussian censors, when alluding to the terrible scenes at Arad, and while speaking with reserve, sufficiently indicates its sentiments, and says: "We pass over the ground of these capital sentences. They are the same as those assigned by the Austrian courts-martial."

Martyrs and victims, there were noble examples among them of firmness and patriotism, which will illustrate the pages of Hungarian history in all time to come.—Prominent among these was Bathynani, revered through Hungary, and who was condemned by an Austrian Court to the punishment of death. Previous to the revolution he had held a high office, which he resigned; and he was sentenced "for losing the ties between Hungary, and the Imperial Royal States," and "for having entered the army of the enemy."

Rome—I mean ancient Rome—would have decreed him an ovation; Austria sent him to the scaffold! True to the instincts of his nature, his country was at his heart and her name upon his lips, as death closed the scene of Austrian vengeance—"My country forever" were the last words he uttered.

Now, sir, I say it without reserve, that a power thus setting at defiance the opinion of the world, and violating the best feelings of our nature, in the very wantonness of successful cruelty, has no bond of union with the American people. The sooner the diplomatic intercourse is dissolved—with marks of indignant reprobation—the sooner shall we perform an act of public duty, which, at home and abroad, will meet with feelings of kindred sympathy from all, wherever they may be, who are not fit subjects for the tender mercies of Austrian power.

I have already said that at least one representative body in Europe had pursued a course not very dissimilar to this, in order to mark with their disapprobation a palpable violation of national rights, under circumstances of peculiar injustice, originating in the basest cupidity. It was the Chamber of Deputies of France, which, to their honor, year after year condemned the last partition, by which the remnant of Poland—all that was left of the land of Sobieski and Kosciusko—was broken into provinces, and seized by the same triple combination, deemed to belong by the first division of that unfortunate kingdom.—The answer to the King's speech was the occasion usually taken by the chamber to express their opinion upon grave questions of policy, foreign and domestic; and for some years, during the reign of Louis Philippe, a reproval was thus annually administered to the royal spoilers—a reproval which excited much sensation in Europe, and was known to give much offence to the high personages thus arraigned at the bar of public opinion. I believe that for some time, this free expression of condemnation by the chamber, if it did not interrupt, rendered very precarious the diplomatic relations between France and Russia; which latter power seemed peculiarly sensitive to these rebukes for the adoption of this truly Muscovite process of national aggrandizement. One of these paragraphs—that in the address of January, 1840—I will here introduce, not only on account of the proper sentiments it contains, but to show that the chamber felt free to censure a great act of injustice, in terms not less forcible than just:

"In all the questions which divide the world, France invokes but justice; she demands only the respect due to all rights. Can she cease to recall to Europe those of the ancient Polish nation, and the guarantees that repeated treaties gave to a generous people, whose misfortunes time seems only to aggravate?"

I am gratified at being able to refer to this example of representative firmness; and though I do not seek to disguise that our action—if we act at all—will extend the principle further than it was carried in France, still the feeling of national sympathy for national wrongs was at the foundation of the movement there, as it will be here. We have many good men among us, who are alarmed at any proposition for public action, unless the very same thing has been done here or elsewhere.—If the case is not in the books, no remedy can be applied, however imperious the circumstances. They have an instinctive dread of progress, believing that what has been done has been well done, and ought to be done again, and that nothing else should be done.

This spirit of standing still—conservatism, I believe, is the fashionable name for it in England, and is becoming so here, while both the moral and physical world is giving evidence that change is one of the great laws of nature—little becomes a country like ours, which is advancing in the career of improvement with an accelerated pace unknown in the history of the world.

Standing still! Why, sir, you might as well attempt to follow the example of the Jewish leader, and say to the sun, "Stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou moon in the valley of Ajalon," and expect that they should be obeyed, as to expect that this

country would yield to this sentiment of immobility, and stand still in that mighty work of improvement, material and intellectual, which it has been doing for generations, and will be called upon to do for generations yet to come.

Let not the timid be alarmed; where there is free inquiry, there is no danger. There is a fund of practical good sense, as well as a deep moral and religious feeling, in the people of this country, which will hold on to our institutions, not with blind tenacity, but with a firm resolution to maintain them; and while wisely admitting improvement, rejecting impracticable and dangerous projects, often originating in honest though mistaken views. Let us not fear the progress of opinion. The world is probably yet very far in its extreme point of improvement. Before that is reached, many a project will be proposed and rejected—many an experiment tried and failed—and a spirit of investigation will be abroad, dangerous only when met by force, instead of argument.

I am not going to reason with this feeling, which would have enjoined upon our fathers to stand still and suffer, instead of rushing into the danger of a revolution, not only because I am sure it is not a senatorial one, but because it is entrenched behind barriers which reason cannot overcome. To such, not here, but elsewhere, the example of the French chamber may divest this proposition of half its terrors. The other half may be safely left to time. They will gradually learn that the great political truth of our day is contained in the sentiment recently announced by the distinguished senator from Massachusetts—"We are in an age of progress."

And the eloquent remarks of Mr. Canning, when placed in circumstances bearing some resemblance to ours, may lessen apprehension among those—and there are many in this country—who believe that no good can come out of our American Nazareth, but that what comes from England is best and wisest.

"Those persons," said that distinguished man, and in a similar spirit with that displayed by the senator from Kentucky, almost at the same time, and while taking a kindred course, "seem to me to imagine that, under no possible circumstances, can an honest man endeavor to keep his country upon a line with the progress of political knowledge, and to adapt its course to the various circumstances of the world. Such an attempt is branded as an indication of mischievous intentions." He recommends "the pressing of generous and noble sentiments into the service of his country."

Too much caution is not wisdom, though rashness may be folly. He who does not keep himself upon the time of knowledge will soon find the world ahead of him, and that his associations belong to a past generation.

If there are any here so fastidious as to desire plain truths to be disguised by "honeyed words," and who are disposed to arraign the freedom of debate upon this occasion, I recommend to them to go back and learn wisdom from the discussions, in the English House of Commons and in our own Congress, and especially to take a lesson in the etiquette of political debate, where human rights are in question, from Brougham and Clay—I use these names historically—those masters of the power of scathing rebuke.

Mr. President, there is one topic I desire briefly to touch. In the allusions I have seen in many of the papers, and in conversations I have heard here respecting this subject, the name and personal claims of the gentleman who has recently departed upon a mission to Austria have been brought into question, as though they had some necessary connexion with the object of this resolution. I trust, sir, that these views will not be entertained here. The measure proposed is wholly independent of such personal considerations, and had we a minister at Vienna, equal in character, and experience to Franklin or Jefferson, it ought not change in the slightest degree, the course of our action. This proposition is of a far higher nature than any question of personal qualifications. Let not its importance be affected by any such considerations.

But, sir, I owe it to the relations subsisting between that gentleman and myself to say publicly to you, that if I were called upon to give my vote upon his nomination divested of all questions but his personal fitness for the office, that vote would be given in his favor. I have known him since his boyhood; and mutual regard and kindness have always subsisted between us. I consider him fully competent to discharge the duties of a foreign minister; and I do him this act of justice because he is absent, and exposed to severe censure, and because, as a political opponent I may thus speak of him, without any danger of being misunderstood. But, sir, while I say this, I shall also say, with equal truth, that his departure from the United States on the very eve of the meeting of the Senate interposes, in my opinion, insurmountable objections to his confirmation. Whether a foreign minister should ever go abroad upon a mere executive appointment, unless in rare cases of public urgency, may well admit of doubt. I do not say this as a party man, because I know full well that no such a reserve has recently been imposed upon these appointments by any administration. But as the session of the Senate approaches, the procedure becomes the more improper, and utterly indefensible when it occurs upon the very eve of its commencement. I saw a paragraph in one of the city papers, only three or four days ago, stating that a distinguished citizen, for whom I have much personal respect, had left Kentucky, on the 22d of December to proceed upon a mission to Mexico. He never will receive my vote to remain here. I do not understand this unseemly haste—this flight far, and while getting bills struck here, he learned that she had been very heavy. The roads being very heavy, Capt. Henry V. Simpson, of this place,

and a sort of obligation consequently imposed upon this depository of a portion of the executive power to conform its action to the action of the President. I trust that no such motives will influence our conduct, but that we shall take a course which, while it asserts the rights of the country, will restore to the Senate its efficient control, and will yield nothing—I will not say to the cupidity, but I will say to the earnest desire of office, which was never more powerful nor more powerfully displayed than now.

From the Pennsylvania.

ARRIVAL OF THE CANADA.

This mail steamship arrived at New York on the 16th, bringing London dates to Dec. 28, and Liverpool to Dec. 29.—We gather little news from the papers and letters brought by her. The most interesting or important we note below:

Letters from Rome contradict the previously announced return of the Pope to Rome on the 2d of January. It is now asserted that his Holiness had postponed his decision till the 8th inst.

The archduke John has resigned the office of regent of Germany.

The papers have nothing further respecting the alleged conspiracy of the nobles against the Emperor of Russia. A recent ukase of the Emperor summons all his subjects who are abroad, to return home, on penalty of the confiscation of their property.

The New York ship *Oncida*, was wrecked on the 19th Dec., off the Island of Guernsey. No lives were lost, and but a small portion of the cargo.

Letters from Vienna, Dec. 21, confirm the account of the Servian insurrection, but add nothing to the intelligence already received by telegraph. The circumstance of the *cordons* being raised on the Turkish frontier, is regarded as a most important feature in this insurrection, as all those Hungarian and Polish refugees who have the means of escaping from the custody of the Porte, will be thus able to join the Servian insurgents. These letters also state if Jellicich is too discerning a man not to see that the present government is so rash, violent, weak, unstable and friendless, that its endurance for another year is next to impossible. If the Croats revolt *en masse*, it is not easy to see what card remains for the Ban but to put himself at the head of the movement. That he will use all his influence to retard such an event is beyond doubt. But causes are in operation to bring it about which are beyond his control.

Jellicich left Vienna suddenly for Agram. It seems to be thought that there would be more chance of Jellicich resigning his Banship, if he could afford to do without the pay attached to that office.

The Agnes Aurenseit, from N. York for Bremen, was wrecked on the coast of Texas, the 19th of December. Twelve of the crew and seven passengers were saved; and the master, nine men and thirty-four passengers drowned.

The Sandwich Island Princess, Alexander Lihilihi and Lot Kamehameha, with the Hon. G. P. Judd, had arrived in England.

The First Lord of the Admiralty, appreciating the eminently distinguished services of Captain Sir James Ross, both as one of the most successful Arctic and Antarctic explorers, has awarded to him a vacant captain's good service pension of £150 per annum.

The Queen and Prince Albert have contributed five hundred pounds toward the fund for promoting female emigration, which is now raising under the auspices of the Right Hon. Sidney Herbert.

The next batch of convicts, under sentence of transportation, will be forwarded to the new settlement at Perth, Western Australia.

The late Commissary General, Sir Gabriel Wood, has bequeathed £70,000 to erect and endow a hospital at Grenock, for shipwrecked and distressed mariners.

The Emperor of Austria has sent his portrait, richly framed, as a present to the President of the French Republic, accompanied by an autograph letter, complimenting him on the services he had rendered to the cause of order and society.

The President has likewise received an autograph letter from the Pope, in which his Holiness informs him of his proximate return to Rome, and thanks him for having freed his dominions from the oppressions of an anarchical and anti-Christian faction.

The *United Service Journal* says that another North West expedition is probably determined upon, and that the command will be given to the veteran Sir John Ross, who maintains that he is still vigorous enough to sustain the rigors of an ice campaign.

The Washington correspondent of the *Baltimore American*, states that news has reached the former city, that a personal encounter took place at Lima, on the 9th of December last, between our newly appointed Consul, Col. Potter, and Mr. Sullivan, the British charge d'Affaires near the Government of Chili, and the nephew of Lord Palmerston. The origin of the difficulty is stated to be, that Mr. Sullivan, in the absence of Col. Potter, forcibly ejected Mrs. Potter and child from her lodgings in the hotel, whereupon Col Potter sought an interview with him, and not receiving a sufficient apology, gave him a severe horse-whipping which he richly deserved.

A FEMALE HORSE THIEF.—On Monday night last Mr. Benjamin Buffington, of Elizabethtown, Dauphin county, arrived at this place in pursuit of a woman who had stolen from his stable, on Saturday night previous, a fine horse, buggy and harness. He had traced her thus far, and while getting bills struck here, he learned that she had been very heavy. The roads being very heavy, Capt. Henry V. Simpson, of this place,

accompanied by Martin Harrison, set out about midnight, with a span of fine horses in pursuit, and overtook her ladyship at a private house near Aronsburg, Centre county. Her entertainer, and herself having made some resistance, a warrant was applied for, and in the mean time the woman managed to escape. The captors returned to this place on Wednesday with the horse, buggy and an *old* set of harness. The next morning Mr. Buffington left for home with his property, loss \$25, the amount of the reward paid, and an *old*, instead of a new set of harness.—*Sunbury American*.

THE DOLLAR.

Clearfield, Pa., Jan. 25, 1850.

Court commences in this place on next Monday week.

We are pleased to learn that T. C. McDowell, Esq., has been selected as State Librarian for the ensuing year.

Dreadful Accident.

We learn, verbally, that a truly melancholy accident happened the other day, near Wilkesbarre, by which three young ladies suddenly passed from time to eternity. This is the story, as told to us.—A daughter of Judge Woodward, a daughter of the late J. M. BENNER, of Bellefonte, and a Miss BROWN, were on a sleighing excursion, and on crossing a dam, broke through the ice, and were drowned. We learned no other particulars.

STATE TREASURER.

The election of State Treasurer took place on Tuesday last. The Democrats of both Houses met in caucus on Saturday last, and after several ballottings, selected Gen. BICKEL, of Schuylkill county, as their candidate. We have not heard the result of the election, but presume that Gen. B., who is said to be a gentleman of fine capacity, was elected.

The Magazines for February.

Both the *LADY'S BOOK* and *SARTAIN'S Union Magazine*, for February, are before us. We have not had time to give them a perusal, but a glance at them is sufficient to convince any man with eyes that they publicly sustain their high reputations.

Louis A Golley.

We forgot to acknowledge last week the beautiful full length portrait of this gentleman, the accomplished publisher of the *Lady's Book*. His appearance is entirely very attractive, and not a single lady could look at it without at once extending him her patronage.

WHAT CONSTITUTES TEXAS?

Among the leading questions in controversy in our National councils, that of the proper boundaries of the State of Texas, is, to our mind, of the greatest magnitude. And whilst we anticipate a most exciting discussion on this question, we are well satisfied that whoever makes a thorough examination of it, determined to be governed by no other lights than those of truth and justice, must come to the conclusion, irresistibly and immovably, that there are no grounds for controversy at all, and that the claim of Texas to all the territory on the east side of the Rio Grande, not hitherto belonging to the United States, is "clear and indisputable."

But a number of politicians, and a few of the Northern State Legislatures, have already committed themselves, by the expression of opinions adverse to the claim of Texas—certainly without giving the subject that investigation which they should have done; or, what is worse, they have been influenced by a wicked desire to fan the flame of agitation on the exciting subject of slavery.

The question is this: Does Texas include within her limits the territory lying between the rivers Nueces and Rio Grande, and also that part of New Mexico known as the Santa Fe District? This territory (or at least the Santa Fe district) was never in the peaceable possession of Texas—never conquered by her—but several expeditions sent out by the Texans for the purpose of conquering it, and bringing it under the subjection of the Texan government, failed in the undertaking. However, by the treaty concluded between Santa Ana and his officers, and the Texan authorities, after the victory of San Jacinto,—and which treaty, according to national law, was made fully binding upon Mexico by reason of her availing herself of all the advantages stipulated therein, such as the recovery of all the arms and military stores then within the reach of the Texans—in this treaty, we say, the limits of Texas were clearly defined as including all the territory lying east of the Rio Grande, from its mouth to its source. The Mexican government saw proper to disregard this treaty, and for seven or eight years—from 1836 to 1844—refused to make peace with Texas, and only kept up a hostile attitude by threats of invasion.

Other nations—our own among the number—recognized the independence of Tex-

and treated with her as such. Texas took her place on the maps, among the nations of the earth, and still Mexico refused to acknowledge her an independent nation. Then comes the Act of Annexation—and here the controversy must cease, unless the government of the United States willfully disregards her solemn contracts. The limits of Texas were clearly defined in that act, and it is only the boundaries thus defined that Texas is now contending for. And again in support of the claim of Texas comes in the late treaty of peace between the United States and Mexico.—In defining the boundary between the two countries in that treaty, a certain map is referred to and made part of the treaty. According to this map Texas covers all the territory lying between the Rio Grande—from its mouth to its source—and the western boundary of the United States.—Such was the description of the Texas that was annexed to the United States by a solemn act of Congress. Can any thing be plainer? To settle the question forever, one would suppose, it would only be necessary to produce this map.

But it is contended, that as this territory never was in the peaceable possession of Texas, but was conquered from Mexico by the United States, it necessarily belongs, not to Texas, but to the United States. Suppose the British were in possession of a part of the State of New York, and the United States were to drive them out, as Gen. TAYLOR did the Mexicans, would that territory, thus conquered, revert to New York, or would the United States put in a claim to it as national property? Or, suppose again, that the Northeastern boundary question, instead of having been peacefully settled, had been the cause of war, and that the territory in dispute had been "conquered" by an American army, and the British driven out, just as the Mexicans were driven out of Santa Fe, would that territory have been claimed as national property, or would it not have been conquered as territory forming a part of the State of Main? Undoubtedly it would. Then why should there be any dispute about the limits of Texas? What would have been justice in the one case, must be justice in the other. Strip this question of collateral issues, and there is not a sane mind, who knows there is such a State as Texas, who will dispute the validity of the claim of Texas for one moment. There is nothing in it to be disputed.

Unfortunately, those who opposed the late war with Mexico, and denounced President Polk for ordering Gen. TAYLOR to take up his position and "occupy" the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, will be placed in an unfavorable position, if the claims of Texas are accepted to—or rather, we should say, if Texas is not despoiled of her just rights. For, if the limits of Texas—Texas as annexed by act of Congress—did extend to the Rio Grande, and include the territory ordered to be "occupied," then all the denunciations about "invading foreign territory" falls to the ground, and their authors will be forced to acknowledge that Mr. Polk was but discharging his sworn duty in marching an army to the protection and defence of one of the sovereign States of the Confederacy. The late administration thoroughly understood this question, and if they had not believed that the United States were bound, by every obligation that could bind a nation, to the faithful observance of the words of the act of Annexation, clearly describing Texas as extending up to the Rio Grande, they never would have ordered an American soldier to cross the Nueces. Without such an understanding of the act of Congress, such an act would have been a clear violation of the Constitution, and rendered them subject to an impeachment. To take this territory from Texas, in disregard of the Act of Annexation, and claim it as the territory of the United States, would be a virtual acknowledgement that the war was unconstitutionally commenced, and that we had wrongfully despoiled Mexico of her possessions. Thanks to the wisdom and foresight of the statesmen whose council gave direction to the acts of the late administration, they committed no such damning error. Guided by their oaths, their ambition was to "see that the laws were faithfully executed."

There are other facts in support of the just claim of Texas, but which we have not room to refer to now. One of them is, that Texas came into the Union burdened with a heavy national debt, contracted in her war of independence.—This debt was not assumed by the General Government. And to have taken the public lands from her, would have been to rob Texas of her only means of paying that debt.

But our object was not to discuss the question. It was merely to call the attention of our readers to it, and to point out some of its most prominent features, that those who had not investigated the subject might be induced to seek for information and prepare themselves with an