THE UNION.

CITY OF WASHINGTON.

SATURDAY NIGHT, NOVEMBER 8, 1845.

MEXICO AND HER ORGAN.

We stated a day or two since, that we should probably have occasion to notice the leading article of the "National Intelligencer" of Thursday last, in reference to our relations with Mexico. We can as little divine the purpose, as we can sympathise with the feelings of that journal, in the course which it is pursuing in regard to the foreign policy of our government and of our people. We say of our government and of our people—for that the foreign policy of the present administration, so far as it has made itself known, has been, and is, in strict obedience to the plainly-spoken popular mandate, the "Intelligencer" does not and cannot deny. What, then, do its editors seek to accomplish? What is their *drift* in coming boldly out again and again as the champions and the defenders of every foreign power with which our country is involved, or seems likely to be involved, in controversy? Is the government of the United States, in their judgment, always and evermore incapable of rectitude in its course towards foreign nations? Is it, in their view, *always* their duty, as public journalists, and as citizens of the United States, to hold up this Union as the one great and hardened national aggressor among all the nations? Do they take this tone as party men? How it subserves party purposes—how it works as the warcry of party—they should, by this time, have learned from experience. Is it for the *pleasure* of the thing, then, if not for its good policy, that they call down shame, and wrath, and scorn on the heads of the constitutional authorities of their own country, just so soon as any single foreign interest, no matter how weak or wicked, can be trumped up to set those authorities at defiance? We do not ask these questions at random. Far from it. We weigh our words. And we put the fact distinctly to the mind of every American, be he democrat or whig—nay, more; we urge especially on the consideration of the whig party of the country, the fact, that a most leading national organ of that party, published at the seat of the national government, *is now, and has been for no short time past, consistently, ardently, and unerringly* ANTI-AMERICAN in all its leading views of our relations with foreign states. Bear us witness the Intelligencer upon Texas. Texas was a colony, and the Intelligencer had nothing to say against her. Texas became independent, and still, for eight years, the Intelligencer reviled her not. Texas proposed *to join herself to us;* and then, from day to day, and from year to year, the Intelligencer poured out upon her, and upon her purpose, all the vials of its indignation. Bear us witness the Intelligencer on the affairs of South America. England, in alliance with France, grasps and throttles, with an iron hand, the belligerent rights of the Argentine republic, and the Intelligencer quietly notes the fact in detail, without speaking the first solitary word of protest or remonstrance. Bear us witness the Intelligencer upon Oregon. England, stretching out her armed hand first over three thousand miles of sea, and then over three thousand miles more of land, grasps *our* land of Oregon—ours by discovery—ours by settlement—ours by treaty—ours by contiguity—ours by the fixed decree of Providence, made manifest in the creation, *here alone*, of that heaving tide of population which must, ere long, pour through the gorges of the Rocky mountains, and fill up, as alone it can be filled up, the broad basin of the Columbia;—England, we say, against all law of nations and of nature, claims this land of ours—*claims it by diplomacy*—for she has no other claim; and the Intelligencer, when all men's minds are turned to the topic, finds not one manly word to speak against this British aggression, but quotes as "grave and timely" the assertion, that in part at least "the claim of England is better than ours;" and then parades before its readers, with doleful forebodings, the whole exaggerated array of British arsenals and dockyards warming with the artificers, and sounding with the note of preparation for war!

And last and worst of all, and most to be wondered at, and lamented, and censured, let the whole course of the Intelligencer in *relation to Mexico* bear us witness to the want in that leading metropolitan journal (whose position here and in Europe makes its course of no small concernment to this nation) of any rightful regard, and of any true sympathy, for the good name and the most sacred interests of the government of the United States in its controversies with foreign powers.

It suits the present sinister views of but too many of our transatlantic rivals to hold us up to all Christendom as pitiless aggressors on our weak and unhappy and distracted neighbor republic, of whom we yet want *nothing* but peace and justice; and to this malignant British charge, which the whole press of England is thundering in the ears of all the world, the National Intelligencer—from motives which it alone can explain—has long since lent, and is now lending, its steadfast and unflinching and unblushing countenance and support. And yet the Intelligencer knows just as well as we know, that if there be on the face of the earth one government which owes all gratitude and respect to another government, that great debt is at this moment richly due from Mexico to the United States. Who has forgotten the events and the policy of 1824? Who does not know and acknowledge, that when Mexican nationality lay weak and helpless in its cradle, and when more than two serpents of European force and fraud were sent forth to strangle it there, the United States stood boldly up as its defender, and crushed the coming and sure destruction? Who does not know that when the radiant and hopeful diadem of independence was placed upon that "baby brow," the United States still stood by, its sponsors, to do its battle, if need be, against the world, and so turned into hollow, and suppressed, and distant murmurs, the open-mouthed and fell imprecations of the "Holy Alliances" in Europe? And then, when independence was gained, who does not know that the Mexican government, independent, but impoverished, stretched out its hands to us for a population which might make her untilled fairies bloom into a State? On urgent Mexican entreaty, and under solemn Mexican stipulation, men of Texas (then our men) became her people, and sowed and reaped for her upon her lands? And then, when her constitution went down, and her freedom died, and a weak, and wretched, and cowardly, and most cruel despotism turned all the stipulations and covenant-guarantees of the past into a bitter mockery, and Texans, stung by intolerable wrongs, drew the cord of justice and liberty to stand as a nation of themselves, and finally did so stand on San Jacinto—who does not know that *their* infant freedom, even Mexico's, looked to us for aid and alliance; and that, in spite of all natural affinities, and at the sacrifice of a rich and mighty realm of land, was, by the grandest effort of national magnanimity and forbearance which modern times have seen, turned back again from the very doors of our Union by that great hero-statesman who then spoke and acted for democracy of America? They say that our democracy is rapacious. Show us one *monarch*, from the day of Nimrod to the day of Napoleon, that did a deed superior to this, our great democratic deed of generosity in 1837. One laughs to hear England call *our* Texan policy a policy of cupidity. All history tells us what *she* would have done with such an opportunity. And Mexico—how did her wretched government respond to our profusion of 1824, and our scrupulous magnanimity of 1837? By spoliation—by robbery—by ruthless violation of our flag, as in the case of the Champion, and the Julius Cæsar, and the Louisiana—by imprisonment and outrage of our citizens, as in the case of Baldwin—by a long system of public and private rapine, carried through to the worst by all the devilish enginery of infamous testimony, and mob violence, and perverted law. Nor did we so suffer alone, though we suffered the most. France suffered too; and what vengeance *she* took, let the batteries of San Juan d'Ulloa silenced and dismantled by the French cannon, attest. England, too, was at the same time in the field; and let the mortgaged mines of Potosi, and the mortgaged mint of Guanaxata, and the imperious dictation of British power at Mexico ever since, bear witness how the Money-Changer of the nations meted out the merciless measure of "the bond" to her weak and ruined debtor. And now, with such examples before us, what, under the pressure of this accumulated and intolerable wrong-doing of the Mexican government, has been *our* course? Have we marched an army to Mexico? Have we bombarded Tampico and Vera Cruz?

These things we might have done, and many a nation that now choruses our *National* Intelligencer, in crying shame upon us, would have done these things without delay. But not so with us. We urged, and insisted, and pleaded with Mexico, for a *peaceful treaty*. In 1838, we got it. *Under the treaty*, after long delay, we got what we thought was to be a fair judicial commission to arbitrate our claims, and give us back at least a part of the money of which we had been robbed. Mexico, in utter and absolute defiance of all fair dealing, *instructed beforehand her judicial commissioners how they should decide*. Still we expostulated and persevered. The commission heard a part of the case, and made its award, reluctant and grudging on the part of Mexico, to be paid in quarterly instalments for five years; two or three of those instalments were paid, and then Mexico refused payment; and because we would not again shut out Texas—Texas for nine years independent of Mexico—her government has slammed the door of peaceful negotiation in our face. All this, to the last, with the forbearance of conscious rectitude and conscious power, our government—that same "rapacious and violent democracy," as some of the Intelligencer's foreign friends will have it—has borne, and still it forbears! And now to all this, what says the Intelligencer, which still ventures to call itself what it is in position, and should be in duty—NATIONAL? Hear its own words of Thursday last. We speak to no party, but we speak to *Americans* of all party. Hear its own words, and be on its own head their obloquy and shame!

> In our view, this government committed a wrong towards it own suffering citizens, when it preferred, to the quiet execution of the stipulations in their favor, the interest of desperate political gamblers and of Texas speculators. *That wrong it now proposes, but too probably, to right by a still more cruel and bloody one upon Mexico, instead of paying the poor claimants, as it ought from the first to have done, out of its own pocket—either in its own engagements, (collecting the money for itself of Mexico,) or now out of the spoil that it has taken and proposes to wrest from her.*
>
> We can imagine nothing more revolting to common sense, as well as to any idea of justice and public faith, than what is now intimated to be the "probable" purpose of the Executive.
>
> Is there to be no mercy, no shame? Can this country have the heart to trample any further on the poor nation whom its treatment has already rendered so pitiable a spectacle of public humiliation?
>
> We have seized, without compensation, on what we then offered to buy? We have gone on to dispossess her, in arms, of what even annexation meant not to take, unless by treaty. We have stationed our squadrons upon her coast—itself an insult, if not an act of war, entitling a nation always to large amends, if *any* can be made in money. At this instant, we talk familiarly of California as presently ours, of New Mexico as a pear nearly ripe to fall into our hands. Helpless, distracted, covered with the disgrace of suffering such things, Mexico lies a victim-people at our mercy, with nothing to hope but to see her provinces torn from her, one by one, at the first pretext, at our first convenience. What! Is annexation grown too mild, too pacific, too righteous? We can help ourselves without resistance: is not that enough? Does the "Anglo-Saxon spirit" hunger no longer for *lands*, but thirst for *blood?* It is clear that we can inflict upon Mexico with impunity what we please; but if we are to dismember her, piece by piece, let us at least suffer the parts sliced off to cohere *by the first intention*, a little to unite with our own flesh, before we trench off others. And, at any event, let us not ravage by war dominions that we destine for our own, and can take without carnage, if we choose to be unjust enough to seize them.

We commend to the whig party this language of its organ. If we were going into national canvass now with that party, we might rejoice perhaps, for a moment, in the assurance of signal triumph over our opponents, which such language would give. Though even then, as Americans, we should lament that *any party here* could breathe such a spirit, more than we should rejoice, as democrats, in the certainty of its defeat. We hope, and we believe, that the whigs of the country and of Congress will rebuke this language. But be that as it may, we have done our duty of protest. If we have misrepresented the Intelligencer, we have done it unintentionally, and we will gladly correct our error. But our strong conviction is, that all we have said is too true.

In taking leave of the subject at present, we subjoin the following communication from an able hand. We assent to its general spirit. We think all will admit the ability with which it is written, while we do not feel called upon to endorse all the expressions toward the Intelligencer which it contains.

Communicated.

The Intelligencer is of opinion that our "government committed a great wrong towards its own suffering citizens, when it preferred to the quiet execution of the stipulations in their favor, the interests of desperate political gamblers and of Texas speculators. That wrong it proposes, but too probably, to right by a still more cruel and bloody one upon Mexico, instead *of paying the poor claimants, as it ought from the first to have done*, out of its own pocket—either in its own engagements, (collecting the money for itself of Mexico,) or now out of the spoil that it has taken and proposes to wrest from her."

The "poor claimants" are under infinite obligations to the Intelligencer for this tardy indication of sympathy. It now calls them "suffering citizens;" and asserts the obligation of the government to "pay them out of its own pocket." Yet, but a few weeks since, an article appeared in this very paper, in which the question was put, Who, until recently, ever heard of claims upon Mexico? We congratulate the Intelligencer upon the reception of new light upon this subject. Upon one point we are now agreed. There *are* claims of our "suffering citizens," and the "poor claimants" ought to be paid.

Then comes the question, By whom ought they to be paid? Mexico was the perpetrator of the wrongs—that very Mexico, whose honor and good faith in scrupulously adhering to all the obligations imposed on her by the laws of nations, or voluntarily assumed by her solemn treaties, have been the theme of such repeated and lofty eulogiums in the columns of the Intelligencer. Mexico is bound to repair these wrongs. It is incumbent on her to compensate the "poor claimants." This obligation she has recognised, and again and again promised to fulfil. These promises were made and broken years before Texas became the subject of controversy between the two governments. These are incontrovertible facts. The United States have, in every possible form and manner, called upon Mexico to redeem her pledges and her plighted faith. This duty has, nevertheless, been omitted—these promises continually violated.

Does the obligation continue—or is she dispensed from its performance? Would the intervention even of a war between the two nations amount to such dispensation? We address these questions to the learned editors of the Intelligencer, equally and profoundly versed in all the refinements of moral casuistry and of public law. Does England, or France, or the United States, recognise the doctrine that a public war cancels the debts which the nation owes to the subjects of a hostile state? Does such a war involve the forfeiture of public funds or securities? If not, Mexico is still as firmly bound as ever to pay to the "suffering citizens" of the United States what she owes them.

If, then, for the sake of argument, we admit that the United States has perpetrated a wrong upon Mexico in reference to Texas,—in what possible manner does this affect the obligations of these liabilities? How does it impair the correlative duty of this government, so often and so distinctly recognised, to enforce the payment of these debts? Both remain in full force. Mexico is bound to pay, and the United States is bound to enforce the payment. Even if it were plain beyond controversy, that Mexico was injured and insulted by the annexation of Texas—if that act merited all the Billingsgate epithets which the refined taste and courteous delicacy of the Intelligencer are accustomed to bestow upon it—still we repeat, Mexico is under every obligation to compensate for the injuries she has perpetrated upon the "poor claimants." Two wrongs will not make a right. If Mexico has received injury and injustice from our government, it furnishes no excuse for her originally wrongful acts, or for her refusal to repair injuries committed by her. But the Intelligencer well knows that the United States asserts the justice and legality of its conduct with as distinct an emphasis, and as clear conviction, as Mexico does. It well knows that this opinion is as sincerely entertained by men of as pure integrity, as unsullied honor, as scrupulous veracity, and as enlightened minds, as any in the land—by men whom the Intelligencer *would not dare* individually to characterize as "desperate political gamblers," or as "Texas speculators." These are general categories, which—how wisely, or how truly, or how courteously, we leave others to judge—the Intelligencer applies to all who differ with it in opinion upon a question in which it is at least plain that the honor and reputation of the country are deeply implicated. The use of such epithets is one of the common resorts of vulgar impertinence. It is unbecoming what the editors of the Intelligencer at least assume to be—courteous gentlemen. It adds nothing to the force of argument, and is a contemptible substitute for it.

The language quoted from the Intelligencer implies, in the most distinct manner, that the government of the United States had a choice open to it, of either acquiescing in the "quiet execution of the stipulations" in favor of their "suffering citizens," the "poor claimants;" or of yielding to the influences of "desperate political gamblers and Texas speculators." Such is the plain import of the language used. If this is not its signification, it is without meaning.

If this be the meaning—and we have a right to insist upon a direct and explicit answer to our inquiry, whether such is the meaning of the language cited—then we call, with the same distinctness, for the further answer to this,—Where is there the slightest foundation for the assertion that our government ever had the option which is stated?—when was it in its power, by any means, by any action or inaction, to secure to our "suffering citizens" "the quiet execution in their favor" of the engagements into which Mexico had entered—that it ever did prefer to this high duty "the interests of political gamblers and Texas speculators?" Such accusations are either true or false. If true—and they are uttered with such knowledge of their truth as can alone justify the expression—the evidence is accessible, and we demand its production. If it is not, and cannot be produced, we submit to every honorable man to draw his own conclusions, and to stamp with appropriate character the individual who, without evidence, and in the face of notorious facts, would, in a controversy with a foreign nation, impute to his own government what the language of the Intelligencer implies.

THE NORTHWESTERN TERRITORY.

The National Intelligencer, with a deal of complacency, refers to a paragraph in the Union, in which was expressed our astonishment that it (the Intelligencer) should have endorsed, with its approval, a declaration from the Journal of Commerce, avowing that to all the territory of Oregon north of 49 degrees, *the claim of England was better than our own.* The Intelligencer *of course* does by no means deny its *concurrence* of opinion with that quoted. Such a denial would have been too *uncandid* for a paper of such transcendental independence; and, besides, quite too *American* for the National Intelligencer! With infinite grace and self-possession, the editor fortifies the position he ventures to occupy, by bringing up to view certain resolutions offered in the Senate by Col. Benton in 1828. The one upon which he particularly relies for the purpose in hand, and which he stamps with all the force and authority which italics can confer, is in these words:

> *Resolved*, That it is *expedient* for the government of the United States to treat with his Britannic Majesty, in reference to said claims and boundaries, upon the basis of a separation of interests, and the establishment of the forty-ninth degree of north latitude, as a permanent boundary between them, in the *shortest possible time.*

The Intelligencer has thus, in an eager pursuit of justification, found what is denominated *democratic* authority for what it has endorsed; and, finding it in this resolution, vauntingly proclaims our previous ignorance of its existence. We think that the following editorial passage from the "Union" of Thursday should have protected us from that reproach. What did we then say? "If it have ever been deemed *expedient* (as a matter of *compromise*, and to hush up a dispute, to *give away* to England a certain portion of that land, all of which we consider ours, &c.") These remarks pointed to all that had ever been done in the way of *compromise*. But when before has it been concluded, that in the difficulties which occur between nations, (any more than those which arise among individuals,) a proposition to compromise, or yield an asserted right, involved thenceforward the utter and final *abandonment* of that right? The opinion conveyed by such a supposition is too irrational for serious consideration.

We asserted, that "as the question has been discussed for a quarter of century between us and England, we are not aware of one argument—scarcely of one phrase purporting to be an argument—which carries our title up to 49 degrees, *and there stops.*"

Let us respectfully inquire of the Intelligencer if the quoted resolution of Col. Benton be any proof to the contrary?

Does the resolution surrender the ground of the solidity of the American title *beyond* 49 degrees? Did the mover of the resolution, in any argument, abandon the justness of our title beyond that degree? Does Col. Benton *now*—as it is inferentially alleged he did in 1828—mean to abandon as untenable our title to Oregon beyond the 49th degree? If no person at all acquainted with the sentiments of that distinguished senator believes such to be his purpose—if the National Intelligencer has reason to know the contrary,—with what face can it presume to put an interpretation upon a resolution which its language does not justify, and which he who drew it would repudiate at once?

The Intelligencer has not met the issue presented. Our declaration was, that no authority, or shadow of authority, worthy of consideration, could be adduced, which, sustaining our title to Oregon, fixed our limit to the 49th degree.

The title to this territory we shall soon discuss in all its bearings.

With regard to the novelty of the fact which the Intelligencer so complacently congratulates itself on having brought forward for the enlightenment of the "Union" on this subject, we have only to say, that we have known for years, and we supposed till now that the Intelligencer knew, that, in most of our negotiations with England on this point, we have always *urged* a compromise, by a line running to the 49th degree—not because our title stopped there, but because we wanted the matter settled without delay. We need hardly add, that, until recently, she has rejected such propositions *in toto*. Mr. Rush's late work will give the Intelligencer some information on this subject.

ANECDOTE OF MR. WEBSTER—IF TRUE, OMINOUS IN REGARD TO OREGON.

The "New York Morning News" of yesterday relates the following expressive anecdote about Mr. Webster:

> The privileges of aristocrats and the protective system cannot stand under the influence of railroads. This feeling was expressed a fortnight since by Daniel Webster. Mr. A. Whitney, the projector of the great western railroad, called upon Mr. Webster to know if he was favorable to the project. "No!" "Why?" "Because I will not support any means of improving the intercourse with the country west of the Rocky mountains. All that country must become a *separate and distinct nation;* and for that object I will oppose this railroad with all my influence!" This was said within three weeks, and is very significant from the negotiator of the surrender of Maine.

We regard this anecdote as important, not as bearing on the question of railroads, but of Oregon. Is it true that Mr. Webster (one of the whig champions of the Senate) is in favor of erecting a distinct republic on the shores of the Pacific? Then does he not share the American feeling, but he adopts the policy of England and of France. Mr. Guizot is for trimming the "balance of power" in America. Mr. Webster appears to fall into a similar policy. Great Britain was in favor of establishing an independent government in Texas. The "London Times" enforced it with all its power. It was for establishing another republic on our borders, for the purpose of balancing the weight and counteracting the influence of the United States. For the same reason, too, many of the English politicians are anxious to cut us off from Oregon, as well as from California, and, indeed, to cripple us in all directions. Such, we apprehend, is the spirit of Mr. Webster himself. If he has made this declaration to Mr. Whitney, he is for cutting us adrift from Oregon, and inviting her people to erect that country into an independent republic. How different is this feeling from the sentiment ascribed to General Jackson: "No compromise (of Oregon) but at the cannon's mouth!"

DEATH OF DR. HOUGHTON.

Official information has been received of the sudden and melancholy death of Dr. Douglass Houghton, State geologist of Michigan, and United States surveyor of the mineral lands south of Lake Superior, who was drowned in Lake Superior, within a short distance of Eagle river, in a terrible storm, on the night of the 13th October, 1845.

Dr. Houghton was well and favorably known to the world of science, by which his death will be deeply felt and sincerely lamented. He was engaged in prosecuting a mineralogical survey of the northern peninsula of Michigan, in conjunction with the linear surveys of the United States, and combined with barometrical observations, which, if completed, and combined with his geological survey of the southern peninsula, would have been the most perfect and minute survey of the kind known, and alike invaluable to the State of Michigan and to the United States.

We copy the following eloquent letter relative to this melancholy catastrophe from the Detroit "Free Press:"

DEATH OF DR. HOUGHTON.

FORT WILKINS, LAKE SUPERIOR,
Oct. 21st, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith, I forward to you a statement of facts connected with the unfortunate end of Dr. Douglass Houghton, as given by the survivors of the melancholy catastrophe—Peter McFarlane (his true and trusty voyageur by flood and field for many years) and John Baptiste Bodrie.

I am aware that, in a district of country duly organized, with the usual county officers, the law, upon finding the body of Toussaint Piquet, demanded an investigation from the hands of a coroner. This course was impracticable, without removing all the witnesses to the Sault Ste. Marie, a distance of nearly two hundred and fifty miles, and at this late season impracticable.

Thus situated, upon consulting with Col. Gratiot and others, it was considered as the best and only method of procuring the statement of the two survivors in the presence of witnesses, to reduce it to writing signed by them, with a certificate of those present of its correctness.

Upon this mode of proceeding I have acted, in reducing the statements of McFarlane and Bodrie, and trust that it will meet with your approbation and that of the numerous friends of Dr. Houghton.

The original is sent to you, believing that, through you, in your official character, the intelligence should reach the executive department at Washington, in whose service he was engaged.

Amid the gloom surrounding the death of Dr. Houghton, it is a matter of congratulation to the world of science, but more particularly to our own State, that all his valuable papers connected with the geology and survey of the northern peninsula for the last six months, are saved, with the exception of one small book, containing the surveys of a fractional township between Eagle river and the Portage.

It is indeed strange, that out of the many scientific men, and hundreds of others who have coasted on the waters of our great inland sea during the past season, the *master spirit of them all* should only fall!

The ways of Providence are truly mysterious! The labor and toil of fifteen years, in endeavoring to penetrate the veil which shrouds from our view many of the mighty events that preceded the history of our race, and which required only the magic of his pen and the power of the press to place him among the Humboldts of another hemisphere, is now lost.

Our country—nay, the world of science—was looking with more than Argus eyes for his final report of geology of the northern peninsula. Michigan beheld his scientific talent and moral worth with pride and admiration; but, alas! he has tracked the steps of glory to a watery grave.

The transcendant genius of *Cuvier* expired in revealing the shades of colossal and unknown forms belonging to the remote ages of a past eternity.

Champolion died beneath an African sun, deciphering the hieroglyphics of Egypt.

Davy fell in the midst of enlarging the boundaries of natural science, and *Houghton*, like them, has fallen a martyr.

> The waters of our northern sea,
> ——"Where the Almighty's form
> Glasses itself in tempests; in all time
> Calm or convulsed—in breeze or gale, or storm,
> Icing the pole, * * * * * *
> Dark, heaving, boundless, endless, and sublime,
> The *Image of Eternity*—the *Throne*
> Of the *Invisible*,"

was truly a glorious winding-sheet, for often on its bosom he was "himself a billow in her energies."

I cheerfully avail myself of this opportunity to bear witness to the kindness of Col. Gratiot, and all connected with the mining works at Eagle river, in alleviating the sufferings of the survivors, and in administering to their wants, as well as to his unwearied zeal and indefatigable efforts in making, with a sufficient force, all possible exertions, but without success, to find the body of Dr. Houghton, or that of his voyageur, Oliver Larrimer.

I am, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
E. H. THOMSON.

Hon. LUCIUS LYON,
Surveyor General, Detroit.

Instead of publishing the original certificates obtained by Mr. Thomson, we publish a more condensed narrative of the catastrophe from the "Monroe (Michigan) Advocate:"

From the Monroe (Michigan) Advocate, Oct. 30.

DEATH OF DR. HOUGHTON.

Dr. HOUGHTON, of Detroit, was drowned in Lake Superior on the night of the 13th instant. The circumstances of his death, as communicated in a letter from Copper Harbor of the 19th, are briefly these:

The doctor started in the afternoon from a point on the lake coast, about ten miles above Eagle river, the place of his destination, in a boat manned by four voyageurs—Oliver Lorimer, a Frenchman, and three half-breeds, Peter McFarlane, J. B. Bodice, and Toussaint Piquet. The weather was rather rough, but less so than in the former part of the day, which had been cold, with occasional flurries of snow. Having arrived within about two miles of their destination, the weather suddenly changed and threatened a storm. Being then near a good landing-place, one of the hands advised going ashore to encamp for the night; but the doctor thought best to push on to Eagle river, where they would find good accommodations. They proceeded but a little further before the waves dashed over, and half filled the boat, which they could not clear by bailing. The doctor's life-preserver was handed to him to put it on; but he laid it down by him, thinking there was no immediate danger. In the mean time, the fury of the storm increased, filling the air with snow and sleet. Everything was thrown into confusion, and the waves dashing violently towards the shore, the boat was capsized. McFarlane first regained it, as it lay keel upwards, and caught the doctor's hand as he saw it above water on the other side of the boat, and assisted him to the boat. The doctor, while pulling off his gloves, said to McFarlane, "you had better get ashore (then about fifteen rods distant) as fast as you can. I can get ashore well enough." The next instant they were separated, the boat being again capsized, and the doctor was no more seen or heard.

McFarlane and Bodice, or Bodrie, clung to the boat, and were driven towards the shore, and saved themselves by seizing hold of bushes twenty feet above the ordinary beach. Here they staid until there was no longer any hope of rescuing the doctor, or their other companions, who all perished. The body of Piquet was found in the morning a short distance from the place of the wreck, shockingly mangled by being dashed against the rocky shore. A roll of blankets, a book of field-notes, and a few articles of clothing belonging to the doctor, were picked up at different points. The boat was dashed to pieces, and scattered along the coast for three miles.

On the 17th, Capt. Alburtis sent from the garrison a boat's crew, under Lieut. Hamilton, to search for the bodies of the doctor and Lorimer. The boat returned on the 18th without finding either of them.

Thus has perished, in the midst of life and usefulness, an eminently worthy and distinguished man, of whom as a citizen, and as a public character of great merit and worth, the State of Michigan may well be proud, and whose death all will lament and mourn.

CALUMNIES.

"Father Ritchie is certainly alarmed about the printing, and, in consequence, he allowed Mr. Heiss, his partner, the other day, to call upon the editors of the *United States Journal* in favor of a compromise. This you may depend upon."

[*Washington correspondent of N. Y. Herald, Nov. 6.*

False throughout. If the N. Y. Herald cannot obtain more veracious correspondents, it had better disband the whole corps. We scorn to make any compromise with any one—above all, with such a "*Journal!*"

Equally false is an insinuation recently made by a Washington correspondent of the "Charleston Patriot," that efforts had been made to buy off the Washington "Constitution," for the benefit of the Union. We say, once for all, we scorn all coalitions—all bargains—all arrangements of any description to advance our interests for the public printing. No such proposition has been made to buy off the "Constitution," by us, directly or indirectly.

The New York Courier and Enquirer takes bold and unqualified ground in relation to the present position of Texas. It considers Texas as much American soil as Vermont or Missouri: "There is not a nation in the world," says the Courier, "that does not regard the annexation of Texas as adding immensely, beyond all present computations, to the power and wealth of the United States."

We are obligingly favored with translations of Mexican papers down to 11th October, just received at the departments. But we received them too late to insert them in this evening's paper. We should not suppose, from the accounts we have received, that the danger of war deepens with Mexico; but that, judging from the courteous reception she has given to our squadron at Vera Cruz, the hostile feeling is rather abated.

☞ CHEWING TOBACCO.—The fine chewing tobacco mentioned in our paper on the 4th inst., will be opened and ready for distribution by 1 o'clock p. m., on Monday next, at Fuller's Hotel.

OFFICIAL.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT.

JAMES CLARKE as governor of the Territory of Iowa, in the place of John Chambers, removed.

For the Union.

The Philadelphia "Inquirer" is taking ground against the United States in relation to Oregon. Now, it is said here, that one of its editors is an Englishman named Crump, and that he lives in Camden, New Jersey.

What does he mean (in a late article) when he says, that the leading journalists of the country are expressing their views in decided and unequivocal terms in relation to the Oregon question? Does he call the whig papers leading papers? He has been trying everything within the last year against the government as it respects Oregon. He has an American associate.

Yours, respectfully,
SCRUTATOR.

Of Mr. Medill, whose appointment as the chief of the Indian Bureau we noticed yesterday, we would say a word. Of all the good appointments Mr. Polk has made, and the good men and good democrats he has brought to Washington, Mr. Medill is among the best—honest to the bottom of his heart—honorable in the very best and strongest sense of the word—cool, reflecting, and sagacious in forming opinions; steady and determined in carrying them into effect. He has trodden through life in the straight path himself, and all who have anything to do with his department will have to pursue one as straight. Mr. Medill is still but a young man; yet in Congress, among the great men of the country, as one of the representatives of Ohio, he won for himself a name. It is but a few years since he was teaching school in little Delaware. Such is the destiny of worth, talents, and industry, in this country.

The "Union" announces that Mr. William J. Brown, a representative in the last Congress from Indiana, has been appointed Second Assistant Postmaster General, in place of Mr. Medill.

[*Pennsylvanian.*

TENNESSEE.—In the legislature of Tennessee, resolutions have been introduced instructing their senators, and requesting their representatives, to vote against any bill to charter a national bank—against any bill to distribute the proceeds of the sales of the public lands among the States—against any bill for the assumption of the State debts;—to vote for any bill for the modification of the tariff—for the reception of the constitution of the State of Texas—and for the extension of the laws of the United States over the territory of Oregon.—*Phila. Sentinel.*

MELANCHOLY LOSS OF LIFE.—A slip from the office of the Charlestown (Va.) Free Press furnishes the following account of a serious accident which occurred near that place on Thursday evening last:

"On Thursday evening, Mr. Henry Brown, (the agent of the Winchester railroad at Harper's Ferry,) his son William, and Mr. Henry Gasker, together with several others, were engaged in pushing an iron car, laden with coal; and, whilst so engaged, a portion of the trussel work at the bridge immediately above the road that leads over the Shenandoah river, gave way, precipitating all engaged, with the car, and burying them beneath the coal.

"Our informant states that Mr. Brown was taken from under the ruins much injured, and his recovery pronounced doubtful; his son William a corpse, and Mr. Gasker, and another individual, whose name we have not learned, also dead."

OUR CONSUL AT LIVERPOOL.—Private letters, we learn, says the New York Sun, have been received from the veteran Armstrong, the United States consul at Liverpool, announcing his continued good health, with the exception of some trouble which he has experienced from the wound received in the last war, (which still contains the ball received in battle,) owing, probably, to the change in the climate. The general, we understand, has removed the office of the consulate to the new Washington buildings, and the stars and stripes will henceforth wave in triumph over the venerable consul's new headquarters. We are glad to hear that the old soldier is well pleased with his new position; and that his life and health may be continued through a long series of years, we doubt not will be the wish of every American patriot, for his valor and patriotic deeds are long since inscribed high on the scroll of his country's fame.—*Phil. Sentinel.*

The steamboat Oceola arrived at Norfolk on Sunday night from Washington, with one hundred and forty-seven colored persons, men, women, and children, emigrants for Liberia. These people were liberated by will on two estates in Virginia, and are to be conveyed to their new home in the ship Roanoke, which was to sail on Tuesday.

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

NEW YORK LEGISLATURE.

	Whig.	Native.	Dem.
Senate, (hold over)	3	1	20
Add 1st district			1
2d do			1
3d do	1 gain		
5th do	1 gain		
	5	1	22

Four to be heard from.

ASSEMBLY.

	Whig.		Dem.
Albany	1		gain 2
Cayuga	2 gain		1
Chenango	1 gain		2
Columbia			3
Fulton and Hamilton			1
Genesee	2		
Greene			2
Herkimer			2
Kings, (last year natives)			2
Lewis	1 gain		
Madison			3
Monroe	3		
Montgomery			2
New York	(last year natives)		13
Niagara	2		
Onondaga	1 gain		3
Oneida	4 gain		
Ontario	3		
Orange			3
Oswego			2
Otsego	1 gain		2
Putnam			1
Queens			1
Rensselaer	3		
Richmond			gain 1
Rockland			1
Saratoga	2		
Seneca			1
Schenectady			gain 1
Schoharie	1		1
St. Lawrence			2
Suffolk			2
Sullivan			1
Ulster			2
Washington	2		
Warren			1
Wayne	2 gain		
Westchester			2
Yates			gain 1
	31		61

Whole number of assemblymen, 128.

Enough is known to show that the democrats will have a considerable majority in the assembly, as well as in the senate. The number of whigs will be somewhat greater than last year, but not equal to the whigs and natives together. The only member of the new legislature elected as a native is Mr. Folsom, of this city, elected last year to the senate.

Dutchess county is reported to have elected the democratic assembly ticket. Last year whig.

[Correspondence of the New York Journal of Commerce.]

ALBANY, November 6, 1845.

Lewis county 543 whig in all towns but two, which give 100 democrat.

Jefferson county, town of Wilna gives 300 whig; a gain of 340.

Oswego county probably democratic by 300 to 500.

Chenango, democratic by 500, except Storrs, (whig,) elected to the assembly.

Cortland county is reported whig by a small majority.

McCarty (dem.) is defeated for the assembly in Onondaga county.

One whig in doubt in Cayuga county.

Spencer (whig) has probably 2,000 majority for the senate in Oneida, Otsego, Jefferson, and Lewis. He is elected by over 1,000.

Nothing further from the 6th district.

The 7th senatorial district is probably democratic. Wayne 150 on senate; Ontario under 700.

Great doubts about 4th district. If Essex county is but 100, as reported, Young (dem.) is elected.

NEW JERSEY ELECTION.

LEGISLATURE—COMPLETE.

	Last year. Senate. W.	D.	Assembly. W.	D.	This year. Senate. W.	D.	Assembly. W.	D.
Bergen,	1		1	2	1		1	2
Hudson,	1		1		1		1	
Passaic,	1		2		1		2	
Essex,*	1		7		1		7	
Morris,	1		4		1		4	
Sussex,		1		3	1			3
Middlesex,	1		4		1		4	
Warren,*		1		3		1		3
Hunterdon,		1		4		1		4
Mercer,	1		3		1		3	
Somerset,	1		3		1		3	
Monmouth,*		1		5		1		5
Burlington,	1		5		1			5
Gloucester,*	1		2		1		2	
Camden,*	1		2			1		2
Salem,*	1		3		1		1	2
Cumberland,	1		3		1		3	
Atlantic,		1		1		1		1
Cape May,	1		1		1		1	
	13	6	40	18	12	7	31	27
			13	6			12	7
			53	24			43	34
			24				34	
Whig majority on joint ballot,			29				9	

* New senators.

Geo. Sykes, democrat, is elected to Congress to fill the vacancy in the 2d district, comprising the counties of Burlington and Monmouth.

UNION OF THE ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC.—It is said that the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Central America has arranged with a company of capitalists of Belgians, French, and English, to make a ship-canal from Lake Nicaragua to the Pacific, the expense of which can be defrayed for ten millions of dollars—which we think can be easily done, using the lake for navigation. It is very possible that, in this age of internal improvements, the two seas will be united before much more time elapses; and, unless we avail ourselves of our unrivalled facilities for communication with the Pacific, by the shortest and most expeditious route, via Oregon, England will head us off completely.—*Phila. Sentinel.*

We have read of the fabled Upas and its deadly effect upon vegetable as well as animal life; but, until we perused the recent report of that highly intelligent body, the French Academy of Sciences, we knew not that the proximity of the waln