



THE HUNTINGDON JOURNAL.

"One country, one constitution, one destiny."

Huntingdon.

Wednesday morning, Feb. 12, 1845.

A NATIVE AMERICAN State Convention is to be held at Harrisburg, on the 22nd inst.

A bill has been reported in the U. S. Senate to amend the Naturalization laws.

Report says that the new Postage bill has become a law. Glad of it.

We learn from the Pottsville papers, that the Catholics contemplate the establishment of a Convent in that place.

The bill for the removal of the county seat of Columbia county has passed the lower House.

Two hundred marriages were solemnized in the course of a few months, at Lowell, Mass.—Great place for matrimony that!

Why is a fashionably dressed young lady like an unskilful printer? Because she makes a great bustle in dressing her form.

By a reference to the Legislative proceedings in another part of this paper, it will be seen that the bill erecting a new county out of parts of Huntingdon and Bedford, to be called Blair, has passed the House of Representatives. It now awaits the action of the Senate.

Who'll have the kindness to bring us a load of wood. Don't bring logs the DEVIL can't split!

In our next, we will give the speech of Mr. BREWSTER, against the bill erecting Blair county.

JOHN TYLER, has signed the "One Day Election" Bill.

AS WE EXPECTED.—A report is in circulation that the domestic circle of her majesty, Queen Vic, will probably be blessed with another increase towards the end of the summer. We believe it.

THE MAYORALTY IN BOSTON.—The sixth trial resulted as the five previous ones, without an election. The vote stood: Farnor, (loc) 1608; Parker, (whig) 3841; Davis, (native) 4414. A scattering vote of 46 was cast.

COMING HOME.—Our minister to England, Mr. Everett, it is said, will leave London for this country, early next spring. Who will be his successor?

A LADY OF EXPERIENCE.—An old lady remarked once that the only healthy corset for a waist, is a gentleman's arm. Goss she's right!

THE BURNT BRIDGE.—The re-building of the Harrisburg Bridge has been taken by Mr. Kirkbride, of Circleville, Ohio.

"MRS CARPENTER," has been re-elected Mayor of the city of Lancaster.

IMPORTANT.—The treaty negotiated by Mr. Cushing, secures to Americans the privilege of erecting hospitals and temples of worship at each of the five free ports of China—an indulgence never before allowed to foreigners, and a most honorable expression from the Chinese in favor of our missions.

SMOKING HAM.—Hams are very effectually preserved from the attacks of the fly, while their quality is not at all injured, by throwing red pepper upon the fire in the smoke house, during the latter of the operation.

MONEY.—A bill has passed, by the constitutional vote, the Legislature of this state, and is now a law, providing for the redemption of the Relief Notes issued by the Berks County Bank. The notes of this institution referred to, stand upon the same footing of the other Relief Notes, and being just as valuable, will obtain the same credit and circulation.

A SEVERE RETORT.—A Mrs. Beak wanted to insult a Mr. Shaud, thus she did it. "Mr. S." said she, "you say that you're a temperance man, yet you chews tobacco." "He—ah—yes mum!" he replied, feeling as if he had a pint of vinegar between his teeth, "but I doesn't squeeze my gizzard out with stays, nor stick my back up with bags of meal—I doesn't!"

THE LADIES' TOILET.—We would recommend to our fair readers, as a necessary requisite for a toilet, the following:

A fine eye-water, benevolence—best white paint, innocence—a mixture giving softness to the voice, mildness and truth—a wash to prevent wrinkles, contentment—best rice, modesty—a pair of the most valuable ear-rings, attention—an universal beautifier, good humor—a lip-salve, cheerfulness—bustles, a sufficiency of skirts.

We take the above from an old magazine and believe it would constitute the very best kind of a toilet. Try it—it is good!

ANNEXATION, appears to be the whole go—petitions are being extensively circulated in the North, (to receive signatures), for the immediate re-acquisition of Canada; and above all, the best and the latest effort we have heard of, is for the acquisition of "Old Ireland." Some stories have been going the rounds for some time past, in these parts, stating that petitions will be presented to Congress, praying that negotiations for the acquisition of China, to the U. States, may be opened. What nation will come in turn next?

What a "blessed country" this will be, when we get Texas, Canada, Old Ireland, and CHINA annexed.

The Re-Annexation of Canada.

The Baltimore American says, the urgency with which the re-annexation of Texas has been pressed by the South seems likely to stir up a re-annexation fever at the North. The Detroit Daily Advertiser says that the people of that neighborhood are generally well satisfied with the Union as it is; & have never sought to extend its limits for their own sectional advantage against the wishes of other sections; nay, they exhibited a memorable instance of forbearance during the late Canadian troubles, when by following the example of the South West they could have poured volleys across the line and probably have found a San Jacinto somewhere on the St. Lawrence.

Nevertheless, the people of Detroit, and of the regions roundabout, are not insensible to the value of the county lying North and East of them.—Canada is a desirable place, it produces the best of ponies and potatoes. The largest half of the cataract of Niagara is in Canada also; and it belongs to the fitness of things that such a magnificent roarer should be within "the area of freedom."

In a political point of view, moreover, the acquisition of Canada would add strength to the peculiar institutions of the North.

The force of these considerations, or of others equally powerful, has operated upon the ardent minds of the people of Michigan. A petition to Congress for the re-annexation of Canada, is in circulation, as we learn from the Advertiser, among the citizens of that section. The prayer of the memorialists is that negotiations for the cession of Canada may be opened with the British Government, and that in any proceeding for the annexation of Texas a provision may be inserted that the same shall not take effect until Canada shall also have been annexed. The reasons set forth are twofold:—First that the addition of Texas to the South demands the like addition of Canada to the North, in order to preserve the just balance and equipoise of the Union; Second, That Canada is in itself a most desirable acquisition to the United States, with a view both to military defence and to commercial intercourse.

It will be found that the reasons there are considered so potential in favor of the acquisition of Texas apply with equal if not greater force to the acquisition of Canada. The National Intelligencer has placed some of the arguments for the latter in the line of comparative analogy—thus:

"Like the other, it will be a 're-annexation,' for Canada and the present United States were once parts of the same empire.

The acquisition of Canada will be a much more positive enlargement of the "area of freedom" than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

It will prevent smuggling, to an infinitely greater extent, for, instead of a mere interior border, little accessible to the transportation of goods, and only three hundred and ten miles long, Canada offers, by a great river, a lake and water access, at least two thousand miles in extent.

It will be far more advantageous to our manufacturers, for Canada contains a vastly larger population than Texas.

The annexation of Canada will certainly be less hurtful to the cotton-planting States than that of Texas; for Texas already enjoys a Republican Government, and Canada does not.

Jackson can write letters for Texas, and Mr. Adams may urge the "golden movement" for Canada. If the Gulf of Mexico is to be regarded as "our sea," according to the phraseology of one of the Heads of Departments, certainly the Great Lakes ought to be our Lakes—and the St. Lawrence our river. The extension of our limits in the remote South West, would not tend to weaken the Union, say the Texas men. How much more convenient and snug would our territories be if compacted by the addition of the adjacent soil of Canada! Upon the whole the Canada annexationists seem to have the better of it.

Annexation of Texas.

The resolution that passed the House, for the Annexation of Texas were not reported on the 3d instant. The subject, however, came up in another way. According to the National Intelligencer, Mr. JOHNSON of La., presented the Resolutions of the Louisiana Legislature upon the subject of the Annexation of Texas. Mr. J. observed that he had stated before he had received these resolutions that if the question of annexation could be presented free from constitutional objections, he would vote for it; and he said so still. He had great doubts, however, as to the power of Congress to provide for the admission of foreign territory into the Union by a joint resolution. He would give the matter the fullest examination, and when the question came before the Senate he would vote on it according to the best lights before him.

Mr. BARNOW would merely take this occasion to say that he was opposed to annexation in any and every shape, at all times, and under all circumstances. The resolutions received from the Legislature of Louisiana left the Senators at perfect liberty to act in the matter as they thought right. He should always act, on this and every other question, as he thought right, whether under instructions or not. If he had been in favor of annexation, he should have opposed it in the shape presented to the Senate by the other House. He should be prepared, when the question came before the Senate, to prove that the annexation of Texas would be ruinous to the whole South, and particularly to the State of Louisiana.

He had not supposed that the people of Louisiana were favorable to annexation before the receipt of these resolutions. He was far from regarding the result of the late Presidential election in that State as indicative of the people's opinion upon annexation. He was convinced that if the election had been fairly conducted, that the vote of that State would have been given to Henry Clay. He did not undertake to say anything about other States; but this he would say, that, if Mr. Clay had not been cheated, villainously cheated, in Louisiana, he would have received the vote of that State. He was glad that the subject of the Election in Louisiana was now under investigation by the Legislature, and he hoped that that body would ferret out and expose the imposture and infamous frauds which were notoriously committed, and by which alone the vote of the State was given to James K. Polk.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON the resolutions were then laid on the table.

Annexation of Canada.

Something of a breeze sprung up in the U. S. Senate on Monday last, on the presentation of a memorial from New York, by Senator Dickinson, for the Annexation of Canada.

The correspondent of the Baltimore American says:—

Mr. D. took occasion to say that he did not sympathize with the prayer of the practitioners, regarding it, as he did, as an effort to bring the proposed annexation of Texas into ridicule.

Mr. PORTER, presented a similar memorial from Detroit, which being read, he moved to have referred to the committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FOSTER of Tenn., opposed the memorial and hoped it would not be referred to the Committee.—It was obviously designed to cast contempt upon the great question of annexation—a measure to which he was fondly attached. It seemed to him unjust and improper thus to oppose a great question by bringing it into contempt, as these memorials obviously did. He hoped they would be regarded in the spirit they were sent, and opposed accordingly. Mr. Foster said he differed with the Senator from Michigan in presenting these Resolutions with great reluctance, but he felt bound as a friend to annexation to oppose them at the outset.

Mr. PORTER expressed himself equally surprised with the Senator from Tenn., by his surprise arose from opposition to the memorials presented. They were simply in his view a solemn remonstrance to the annexation of Texas.

There was no good reason for doubting the sincerity of the gentlemen signing these memorials. They had as great a desire for the annexation of Canada as the gentleman from the South could have for the annexation of Texas. It was a measure equally important to them, and their locality gave them as much interest in Canada as gentlemen had in the proposed annexation of Texas.

AN IMMENSE PROJECT.—A project will soon be submitted to Congress, by a Mr. Whitney, a merchant of New York, for a Rail Road from the western shore of Lake Michigan, in a direct line to the mouth of the Columbia river, a distance of 2100 miles. The cost is estimated at \$50,000,000, and 25 years to complete it. It is calculated that by this route a trip from New York to China may be performed in a month, and thus secure to us the market of that and other countries. From England to China the shortest passage known is 85 days—hence by this route, via Columbia river, a cargo may be shipped from China to New York, and landed at Liverpool in 50 days. This would compel England to adopt this route. The projectors ask Congress to grant a tract of the wild lands 60 miles wide, along the road—for which they agree to carry mails, ammunition, stores, troops and all public matters, free of cost. It is truly a noble enterprise.

NEW COUNTERFEITS.—Counterfeits of the Lancaster Bank, Lancaster, Pa. are in circulation, of the denomination of \$10. Vignette—spread eagle, by which may be easily detected, as the genuine are different.

Bank of Wilmington, Delaware.—20's Vignette, Indian and female. On right end, reapers—on left, ship, &c. Terry, Peltou, & Co., engravers. Unlike the genuine.

PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, Jan. 29, 1845.

The Speaker and Mr. EDRO presented memorials from citizens of Huntingdon county, against any division of said county.

Mr. MORRISON: from citizens of Huntingdon county in favor of the new county of Blair; also a remonstrance against the same.

Mr. BLACK moved the confirmation of the nomination of David Krauss, as President Judge of the 7th district.

The nomination was confirmed by the following vote—Yeas 28, Nays 1.

Mr. ROSS presented on behalf of Commodore Elliott, a Lithographic engraving of the battle of Lake Erie, and accompanied it with a resolution that the same be framed and hung up in the Senate Chamber. The resolution was agreed to.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31.

The bill appropriating money for the payment of the February interest, was returned from the Senate with amendments, appropriating \$873,915 06 for the payment of the interest falling due on the 1st day of February 1845, to be paid in the funds now in the Treasury; which was concurred in by the House, and the question being on its final passage, the yeas and nays were called and it passed unanimously.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 1.

Mr. MORRISON: two remonstrances signed by 116 citizens of Bedford county, against the new county of Blair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, Feb. 1.

On motion of Mr. M'MURTRIE, the House took up in Committee of the Whole, (Mr. Smith of Monroe in the Chair) the act directing parts of Huntingdon and Bedford counties, into a new county to be called Blair, which was reported to the House with sundry amendments, and coming up on second reading, Mr. BISHOP moved to amend the bill by striking out that portion which contemplates incorporating any part of Bedford county within the limits of the new county to be called Blair. This amendment was opposed by Mr. M'MURTRIE in a very spirited manner.

Mr. BISHOP advocated his amendment at some length, giving the reasons why Bedford county should not be divided. He stated that the county of Bedford was largely in debt, and that the portion which it was intended to include in the new county, was the most fertile of the territory of Bedford county, and yielded into the Treasury more than any similar portion of the county. During his remarks the House adjourned.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 3.

Mr. CHAMPNEYS: a memorial from citizens of Woodberry township, Bedford county, against the erection of the new county of Blair.

Mr. ANDERSON: against the erection of the county of Blair.

Mr. MORRISON: against the county of Blair, and in favor of the erection of the county of Penn.

Mr. HECKMAN: from citizens of Lehigh county, praying that said county may be annexed to Oregon or Texas; also, from citizens of Bedford county against the erection of the county of Blair.

The bill repealing so much of the act of the last session as authorizes the appointment of a Board of Revenue Commissioners, came up in order on third reading.

Mr. STERIGERE moved to go into Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN called for the Previous Question, which was sustained, and the bill passed final reading, by the following vote:—Yeas 20, Nays 8.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, Feb. 3.

Mr. METZGAR: against the new county to be called Blair.

Mr. BISHOP: of like import. Also: petition for a new county to be called Penn.

SENATE.

TUESDAY February 4.

The resumption of the Beaver Division then came up in order, the question pending on the motion of Mr. GIBBONS to amend the second section—that if the company shall refuse to regulate the tolls in the manner provided for in the first section, the Canal Commissioners shall investigate the expenditures made by the said company, and pay them same rate of 8 per cent. interest out of the repair fund.

Mr. BABBITT moved to amend the amendment by referring it to the Court of Common Pleas of Crawford county, to determine the amount of damages sustained.

After some remarks by Mr. BATTIT, in favor of his amendment.

Mr. CRAIG moved that the subject be indefinitely postponed, and made a few remarks in defence of his motion, and reviewed the provisions of the act, giving the Erie Canal Company possession of this Division.

Mr. SULLIVAN thought a vote would determine whether they should legislate or not. The debate was continued by Messrs. Darsie, Sullivan and Rabbitt, when,

Mr. HORTON called the previous question, and the indefinite postponement of the bill was agreed to by the following vote:

YEAS—Messrs. Babbitt, Craig, Champneys, Cornman, Darrab, Ebaugh, Eyer, Horton, Kline, Morrison, Quay, Ross, Sherwood, Sullivan, Wilcox, Sparker—15.

NAYS—Messrs. Anderson, Bailey, Black, Crabbs, Darsie, Enue, Fegely, Goukford, Gibbons, Heckman, Hill, Hoover, Sterigere—13.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4.

Mr. STETTLER, the member elected in Berks county, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the death of James N. Hunter, appeared, was duly qualified and took his seat.

The House then took up on second reading the bill erecting parts of Huntingdon and Bedford counties into a new county to be called Blair—pending the amendment of Mr. Bishop to strike from the bill that portion which includes the townships of North Woodberry and Greenfield in Bedford co.

On this amendment the yeas and nays were called and were Yeas 24, Nays 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurring on the passage of the first section of the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER of Huntingdon addressed the House, at length, in opposition to the bill. He denied that the bill would if passed be of any utility to the people of Huntingdon county; that there was no growing discontent among them in relation to their locality; that it was an attempt of the people of Hollidaysburg to build up their broken down fortunes; and for the especial benefit of many speculators, and land owners, who had pounced upon the misfortunes of the citizens of that place, and had become the owners of a great proportion of the real estate. He said that the leader of the project was an iron master, who was about to remove to this new county seat: that a large portion of those

who had petitioned for this project were not the land owners or the tax-payers of the county, but the teamsters and workmen employed by the rich capitalists of the county who were most directly interested in the affair. He said if he was to act from selfishness or from hopes of personal emolument he should favor the Blair county project; but he acted from higher motives; from a sense of duty which he owed to his constituents, and which with him was of paramount importance and of binding influence. He then went into an examination of the relative advantages of the several sections of the county. He then stated at length the objections to the project, in the form of enormous taxation; burdensome requisitions for the discharge of which the means would be diminished, instead of being enhanced. Many of the remonstrances against the new county of Blair, were from citizens residing in the immediate vicinity of Hollidaysburg itself and among the most wealthy and intelligent portion of the inhabitants of Huntingdon county.

Mr. McMURTRIE followed in support of the bill.—He was aware that there was always a disposition in Legislatures to pass local bills, without that examination to which they were entitled. He said he thought he was doing any injustice to any portion of the citizens of Huntingdon county. He denied that the project was one of the land speculators of the town of Hollidaysburg; but claimed that it was the voice of the whole people. He said that the charge of interested individuals being here, for the purpose of boring this bill through, was without foundation. The whole opposition to the bill originated in the borough of Huntingdon, and he would throw back the charge made by his colleague, that it was a matter of speculation among the property holders in Hollidaysburg. He claimed that the charge of speculation had been made again and again and it was without foundation. He denied that there was any sacrifice of property under sheriff's sale—what property had been sold, had been sold for its full value, and that no one who had purchased had made any great bargains. He then went on to show that the charges of bankruptcy which his colleague had applied to the citizens of Hollidaysburg, were unjust and incorrect, and that he hoped he would save himself the trouble hereafter, of mourning over the bankruptcies of Hollidaysburg, and reserve his sympathies for his constituents in and around the borough of Shirlersburg, in which he resided. He next went into a detailed exposition of the relative situation and advantages of the inhabitants which would ensue upon the passage of this bill—exhibited the peculiar advantages under which the citizens who had petitioned were now laboring, in attendance upon the courts of Justice in Bedford and Huntingdon counties, and the remedy which the bill was calculated to bestow.

He claimed that the purposes of public justice, which were now denied by the present organization of the county of Huntingdon, would be furthered by the division contemplated in the bill—denied that the accumulation of suit in the docket of the different courts of Huntingdon county, was the legitimate fruit of the bad organization and arrangement of the county; and that a refusal now to divide the county would be an absolute denial of justice, there being now upon the docket of that county, from 1500 to 2000 suits, which were constantly accumulating. He admitted that a large portion of the legal business of the county originated from the upper end of the county—but that it was the fruit of the increased business and growing prosperity of the upper portion of the county. He said that the result of the erection of the public works, and the litigation was not owing to any litigious disposition among the citizens as claimed by his colleague. He earnestly urged upon the House the importance of passing the bill, as a remedy for the growing evils which were the result of an overloaded docket, and which were continuing to increase. He then urged the propriety of the locality of Hollidaysburg as being eminently well suited for the purpose contemplated. He adverted to the fact that nearly 4000 inhabitants residing within the limits of the new county of Blair, had petitioned for the passage of this bill, whose prayer ought not to be disregarded. He denied that any large portion of the voters of any township in the proposed new county were anxious for the defeat of the bill. The people had been petitioning on this subject year after year, and would continue to do so, until it was granted. He demanded justice for the whole people of Huntingdon county, as well as for those who resided in the new county of Blair. He hoped that the House would not refuse its aid in putting this vexed question to rest.

Mr. BISHOP, followed at some length in opposition to the bill, and concluded by moving a postponement of the consideration of the bill at present, for the purpose of submitting further evidence from Bedford county on the subject. The motion was consequently withdrawn.

The question being then on the first section of the bill, the Yeas and Nays were called and were, Yeas 40, Nays 44. So the whole bill was negative.

A communication was received from the Secretary of the Commonwealth containing a statement of the number of convicts pardoned, during the administration of Gov. Porter: from which it appears that the whole number pardoned amounts to eight hundred and one, of which fifty-three were "previous pardons."

The House then adjourned.

The amendment was opposed at length by Mr. McMURTRIE, and supported by Messrs. Nicholson, Burnside, Hollingshead, Brady and Kunkle, and was lost by a vote of Yeas 42, Nays 49.

Mr. BREWSTER of Huntingdon offered to amend the bill by leaving the question of division to the people of Huntingdon county, which was voted down. The question then being on the transcribing of the bill for a third reading, the yeas and nays were called and were as follows: Yeas 48, Nays 45.

The House then adjourned.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 6.

Mr. MORRISON presented a petition in favor of the county of Blair; also, against the erection of said county.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, Feb. 6.

Mr. BISHOP: a petition against the new county to be called Blair.

Mr. MEGBAN: a petition for the new county to be called Blair, from Greenfield township, Bedford county.

Mr. BURNSIDE: a petition for a new county to be called Penn; and against the new county to be called Blair.

Mr. BREWSTER of Huntingdon, five petitions against the new county of Blair, and for the same.

Mr. BURNS: a petition for the new county to be called Blair.

Mr. COOPER: a petition against the new county to be called Blair.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 7.

A number of petitions were presented praying for the erection of new counties, &c. &c.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, Feb. 7.

The act erecting a new county to be called Bluff, came up on its third reading, and the question being on its final passage, the yeas and nays were called and were as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Amer, Armstrong, Banning, Barber, Bingham, Brewster of Phil'a. co., Brown, Brush, Burns, Burrell, Cross, Dowling Eldred, Eliott, Funston, Gray, Harper, Heck, Hoffman of Phil'a. co., Jacoby, James, Knox, Megehan, Merrifield, Morely, M'Caslin, M'Bride, M'Kinley, M'Murtrie, O'Bryan, Fainter, Porter, Power, Rieder, Salter, Samuels, Sankey, Sheets, Smyth of Clinton, Smith of Monroe, Stewart, Struthers, Taggart, Vleet, Walton, Workman, Patterson, Spiesker—49.

NAYS—Messrs. Adams, Bailey, Bagard, Bishop, Hoyer, Brady, Brewster of Huntingdon, Burnside, Cochran, Connor, Cooper, Cumfings, Cunningham, Dickey, Dotts, Dunlap, Gilder, Hall, Hollowell, Hazelhurst, Herr, Hilsand, Hill, Hoffmann of Berks, Kennedy, Kunkle, Larkin, Meloy, Metzger, Muse,