

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED.

Mr. CASS submitted the following resolution for consideration: Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested, so far as may be compatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate copies of any correspondence which took place with the minister of Great Britain in the United States, in respect to the treaty negotiated by Mr. Spenser with Nicaragua...

EUROPEAN INTERESTS IN AMERICA.

Mr. CASS. Mr. President, as the honorable senator from Louisiana [Mr. SOUTHWELL] desired, I will now read the resolution which was assigned for the consideration of the joint resolution which I had the honor to submit some time since, I will now move, in order to afford him an opportunity which he desires, to be heard in reference to the consideration of postponing its further consideration until Tuesday next.

NOTICE OF BILL.

Mr. DAVIS gave notice that he should to-morrow, or on some early day thereafter, ask leave to introduce a bill to amend the judiciary act.

CHARLES W. MORGAN.

The resolution submitted some time since by Mr. HALE, in reference to the official conduct of Commodore Charles W. Morgan, came up for consideration.

Mr. HALE. I presume it will be better to withdraw that resolution, as the commodore has died since it was offered. Mr. SHIELDS. Before that is done, Mr. President, in justice to that deceased officer, I wish to present to the Senate a letter which I received a day or two since from an officer who accompanied him to the gallant and gallant Mediterranean during the time alluded to. I would prefer, as I have not the letter here just now, that the matter should lie over a day or two. It is well known that the death of this officer will prevent any investigation of those charges.

Mr. HALE. There are no allegations contained in the resolution which lies upon the table; it is simply a resolution of inquiry. The last time it was before the Senate this body refused to consider it; and I am not at all desirous to have the matter pressed. I think, with all deference to the honorable senator from Illinois, that the course which he proposes is rather an extraordinary one.

Mr. SHIELDS. I think the better way would have been to have introduced the resolution. That is my opinion. But the resolution has been introduced by the honorable senator; and I do not mean to impugn his motives; but, on the contrary, I believe that he was imposed upon, and made in some sort the instrument to do injustice to a brave and gallant man, though so dead. I am informed that an hour or two before his death Commodore Morgan read these resolutions, these implied charges; for they are such. I hold the paper in my hand, for that I alluded. I do not wish to present now, for certain reasons, an act of injustice for as I know upon some other occasion; and I should therefore prefer that the honorable senator would permit this resolution to lie upon the table for the present; and I will call it up, or he may call it up, at any other time; and upon that occasion, I will refer to the memory of this officer. It has no reference to him, and shall not have, if he permits me to take this course.

Mr. HALE. I ask no favors of officers of the navy. If I have anything, let it come. But if the senator objects, I do not ask that the resolution be withdrawn. It can be passed.

THE NICARAGUAN MINISTER.

The next resolution in order was the following, offered by Mr. BROOKS on January 6; which was read:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if in his opinion not inconsistent with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate the reasons which have induced the Department of State to refuse to hold further official intercourse with the minister of the republic of Nicaragua near this government.

Mr. MASON. If it is agreeable to the senator who offered this resolution, I should prefer it should lie over a little while. As I remarked at the time it was introduced, I desired to converse with him upon it.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

After the reading of the journal, Mr. DEAN asked leave to introduce a bill, of which previous notice had been given, for the purpose of reference; but

Mr. LETCHER objected; so leave was not granted. Mr. GORMAN asked leave to move to take from the Speaker's table a bill treating a related list in connexion with the military service of the United States, for reference; but

Mr. ORR and many others objected; so leave was not granted.

Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, rising to a privileged report, reported from the Printing Committee a resolution authorizing and directing the 100,000 copies of the report of the superintendent of the census accompanying the President's last annual message, the printing of which had been ordered on the day before, to be bound.

After a few remarks by Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, in favor of this resolution,

Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, moved to recommit it, with instructions to the Printing Committee to cause the said 100,000 copies to be bound, each accompanied by a copy of the abstract tables from the census, originally published in the Congressional Globe.

After conversation on the cost of the proposed binding, in which Messrs. JONES of Tennessee, HUNTER, STEPHENS of Georgia, and STANTON of Kentucky, participated,

Mr. GORMAN addressed the House at some length against the motion of Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia.

Mr. WASHBURN next addressed the House in favor of the original resolution, and the motion of Mr. STEPHENS was defeated.

Mr. LETCHER moved to lay the whole subject upon the table, and then demanded the previous question.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested, so far as may be compatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate copies of any correspondence which took place with the minister of Great Britain in the United States, in respect to the treaty negotiated by Mr. Spenser with Nicaragua, which was submitted to and of any substitute for it, or any part of it, submitted to the American government by the British minister, and of the letters of the latter, showing the acceptance of such substitute, and the replies thereto. And also copies of any correspondence which took place between the Secretary of State and the British minister, and the minister from Costa Rica, in respect to a project which was submitted to Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and the Montserrat Indians, and a copy of such project, with the instructions given to Mr. Walsh, the special agent, despatched by the United States to present that project to the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica; as also of any other correspondence as may have passed between the Secretary of State upon the subject; as also copies of the correspondence with Mr. Kerr, chargé d'affaires of the United States in Nicaragua, in reference thereto; together with any correspondence with the government of Nicaragua, or its minister, in respect to the same project. And the President be requested to communicate to the Senate copies of any letters which may have been addressed to this government by the minister of Nicaragua, or the minister of Great Britain, in reference to the convention between the United States and Great Britain, signed April 19, 1850, and proclaimed July 5, 1850, and of the replies made to them, if any.

Mr. CASS said he would not ask for the consideration of the resolution now, but would call it up to-morrow.

Mr. CASS. Mr. President, as the honorable senator from Louisiana [Mr. SOUTHWELL] desired, I will now read the resolution which was assigned for the consideration of the joint resolution which I had the honor to submit some time since, I will now move, in order to afford him an opportunity which he desires, to be heard in reference to the consideration of postponing its further consideration until Tuesday next.

Mr. PEARCE. Does that postpone the discussion desired by the honorable senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CASS. It is to enable him to go on this morning. The joint resolution is to be postponed until Tuesday of the 13th inst., and it was made the special order for that day.

Mr. PEARCE. I have a statement which I wish to make to the Senate; but if the honorable senator from Louisiana is to go on with his remarks, I will postpone what I have to say until he has finished.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution declaratory of the views of the United States respecting colonization on the North American continent by European powers, and respecting the island of Cuba.

But at the request of several gentlemen, he withdrew both the motion to lay on the table, and the demand for the previous question; when Mr. STEPHENS, verbally amended his proposed instructions, and his motion to recommit, adding, also, instructions to the Printing Committee to inquire and report on the whole subject of printing the seventh census.

After further conversation, in which many members participated, Mr. STEPHENS withdrew the portion of the amendment to the resolution reported from the Printing Committee by Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, proposing its recommitment with instructions, and leaving it so as to refer to the abstract tables originally published in the Congressional Globe, with the 100,000 copies of the report of the superintendent of the census, accompanying the last annual message of the President of the United States.

As modified, this amendment was agreed to, and then, as amended, the said resolution was adopted.

The regular order of business being called for, the SPEAKER announced the regular order of business to be the further consideration of the bill for the prevention of frauds on the treasury; whereupon

Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, rising and walking to the floor, went on to address the House in favor of the said bill, arguing to show the importance of the enactment of some effective law of the kind, and urging that the bill before the House would accomplish the object.

Mr. J. reviewed the bill, section by section, explaining its provisions. He held that the Government should not be interested in the payment of any claims on the treasury. They were sent here as guardians of the treasury, and could not rightfully change the character of their calling, more especially as, directly or remotely, they were benefiting by the money they were making such payments. Thus, Congress had to make all appropriations from which claims were to be paid. How could members, he contended, vote on such appropriations, out of which they anticipated to receive the payment of claims, and still do justice to their trusts?

Mr. J. then alluded to his position by relating the history of an Indian treaty, by which the Senate bound the Government to pay certain claims against the tribe, and then senators who had voted for the ratification of the treaty had risen up before the board of commissioners, on the subject of the treaty, and they had demanded that the main attorneys for particular claimants. These practices Mr. J. held to be very improper, and explained their evils at length.

The Gardner claim purported to have originated under the treaty of 1820, and was one of the many which a large number of claims had already originated. The treaty of 1831 had provided for the adjudication of these claims by a board which had proved a failure, the Mexicans and Americans upon it not agreeing. A subsequent board had been provided for in 1843 which did little, failing to discharge its duties. These repeated failures had created much bad blood, threatening to involve the country in war. In 1840 Gardner went to Mexico as a travelling puller and plucker of teeth, where he pursued that business until he had done his worst, and then he returned to the United States, and he had gone into mining operations. The evidence showed that he had no capital then, though he further claimed that, when in the course of the two years, he was turned out of Mexico he had made \$200,000 by mining, having been involved in a total loss of \$500,000 worth of property actually in his possession.

Mr. J. (continuing) detailed the history of the presentation of Gardner's claim before the last board for full \$500,000. Mr. Waddy Thompson, of South Carolina, and Mr. J. I. Waddy, of Georgia, were the principal opponents of the fraud in the claim, had superintended the preparation of all the testimony brought forward by Gardner, showing him what testimony was necessary, &c.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, asked whether Mr. Thompson had acted in this case in any manner different from the custom of counsel in all cases.

Mr. JOHNSON (continuing) urged that he had been merely stating facts. It might be that such was the custom with counsel. But in this case Mr. Thompson had given Gardner in the first place instructions how to make his case, and then he had manufactured the testimony to suit the instructions.

Mr. ORR asked Mr. J. whether Dr. Gardner had not first presented to Mr. Thompson the affidavits of many substantial persons conceived to be respectable in Mexico, fully substantiating the truth of his representations.

Mr. JOHNSON, admitting that fact, went on to show that the claim was a marked fraud, made up of fraud and perjury. Messrs. Corwin, Waddy Thompson, Major Lally, and all who had been recipients of the proceeds of this fraud, should return the money. They now stood in the position of receivers of stolen goods. If honest men, they would do so; if dishonest men, they would not. It was needless for these recipients to try to argue themselves out of public odium by the plea that they were not parties to the origination of the fraud, while they refused to disgorge the stolen property.

Mr. J. further continuing, explained that the able defence by Mr. CHAPMAN, delivered on the day before, sought to exculpate Mr. Corwin not on the merits of his case, but on the plea that the committee's proceedings had been ex parte. Now, he conceived both these pleas to be but subterfuges.

Mr. CHAPMAN, interrupting Mr. JOHNSON, contended that he had merely argued that the investigation was ex parte so far as Gardner, not Corwin, was concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee, remarking, held that the committee only set out to try Mr. Corwin's connexion with the claim, not Dr. Gardner; that Mr. Corwin had been confronted with the evidence of the claim, and had been made to answer to it; and that he had defended himself as well as he could in the circumstances involved in his connexion with it. He had voted as a senator for the treaty under which the money had been paid. He had also voted for the creation of the board to adjudicate on this claim, as well as for the confirmation of the individual members of the board.

Mr. STANTON, of Ohio, asked whether the special committee had not been instructed in effect only to inquire what connexion with the claim Mr. Corwin had further than such connexion as senators and members of the board had by having been members of the board.

Resuming the thread of his remarks, Mr. JOHNSON contended that, look at the case as the House would, it was an improper one; and, further, that the conclusions to which Mr. BARRETT, of Ohio, had come on the day before, were not only in accordance with the facts, but were practically the result of the labors of the committee, as well as they reflected on Mr. Corwin. Mr. J. proceeding, commented on various portions of the testimony to show that Mr. Corwin could not help knowing something of the infamous character of the claim before the award was made.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, next obtaining the floor, on motion of Mr. ORR, the rules were suspended, and the House went into a Committee of the Whole on the subject of the Union, (Mr. BROWN, of Mississippi, in the chair.)

The committee proceeded with the further consideration of the bill to suppress the circulation of small notes in the District of Columbia.

Whereupon Mr. FREEMAN, after giving notice of his intention at the proper time to propose a substitute for the bill, addressing the committee in favor of legislation to prevent as far as possible the circulation of paper money in the District of Columbia.

Mr. AVERETT made a few remarks in favor of the bill.

Mr. FICKLIN addressed the committee for a few moments in opposition to the bill.

Mr. VENABLE addressed the committee against the bill, saying that its penalties were so much beyond the grade of the offences they were to punish as to make it certain that it (the proposed law) could not be executed if enacted.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, addressed the committee at length, urging the enactment of the bill with the amendment drawn up and proposed by Mr. CARTER.

Mr. MEADE then addressed the committee in favor of various amendments to the bill which he proposed to offer.

After which the committee rose.

Mr. HOUSTON, by leave, asked the House to concur in a clerical amendment of the Senate to the invalid pension appropriation bill; which being agreed to,

Mr. ASHE asked leave to present certain resolutions from the State legislature of North Carolina, for reference.

But objection being made, leave was not granted.

Mr. HUNTER moved the usual resolution to close debate on the bill to suppress the circulation of small notes in the District of Columbia in five minutes after it should again be taken up in Committee of the Whole; on which motion he demanded the previous question.

No quorum voting on the demand for the previous question.

The House adjourned.

NOTICE UNDER THE RULE.

Mr. CLARK gave notice that on to-morrow, or some subsequent day, he would ask leave to bring in a joint memorial asking a grant of land for the construction of a railroad from Davenport, via Muscatine, to the Missouri river, in said State.

CITY OF WASHINGTON.

THURSDAY MORNING, JAN. 13, 1853.

Congress—Wednesday.

SENATE.—The Chair laid before the Senate a report of the Secretary of the Treasury, communicating information in relation to the branch mint in California; also, a report from the Secretary of State in relation to the encroachment of Indians upon the territories of Mexico.

Various petitions were presented and referred.

The invalid pension bill and the navy pension bill were considered and passed.

Mr. Cass submitted a resolution calling on the President for information with respect to the treaty negotiated by Mr. Spier with Nicaragua, which was submitted to the Senate in 1850, &c.

Mr. Soule concluded his remarks with respect to English aggressions in Central America; and the subject was further debated by Messrs. Cass, Pearce, Downs, Underwood, Hale, and others, until the hour of adjournment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Mr. Stanton, of Kentucky, reported from the Printing Committee a resolution directing the 100,000 copies of the report of the superintendent of the census, accompanying the President's last annual message, ordered on the day before to be printed, to be also bound; which, on motion of Mr. Stephens of Georgia, was amended so as to include in the volume the abstract from the census tables published some time since in the Congressional Globe; and then as amended this resolution was agreed to.

The House then proceeded to the further consideration of the bill to prevent frauds on the treasury; upon which Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, delivered an hour's speech. After which, in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, the bill to suppress the circulation of small notes in the District of Columbia was considered.—Messrs. Freeman, Averet, Venable, Jones of Tennessee, and Meade addressing the committee.

Shortly after, the committee rose, and the House adjourned.

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty—Additional Information.

We mentioned yesterday, in our congressional summary, that the Senate had removed the injunction of secrecy as to the proceedings connected with the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which occupies just now so much of the public attention. Our readers will find in our columns to-day the papers hitherto withheld, which complete the documentary history of that transaction. They consist of General Taylor's message of April 29, 1850, communicating the convention, and asking advice as to its ratification; a letter from Mr. Clayton to Sir Henry Bulwer, of the same date, submitting for his signature the convention which had been drawn in accordance with conferences between them; Mr. Bulwer's reply, expressing his readiness to sign; and a further correspondence touching the rumor that Mr. Chaffield, the English minister to Central America, had concluded a treaty placing Costa Rica, one of the Central American States, under British protection.

Leaving out of view the improper concession by which England was permitted to negotiate, the first part of General Taylor's message which arrests the attention is the description which it gives of the country intended to be covered by the treaty, and the effect which it would have in liberating all Central America from foreign aggression. The language used on that point is plain and explicit; and it places the conduct of Mr. Clayton, in accepting the conditional ratification of England without consulting the Senate, and in attempting to justify that acceptance by showing that it was in accordance with the sense of that body, in a light infinitely worse than it has before appeared. We quote from the message itself, which says:

"It will be seen that this treaty does not propose to take money from the public treasury to effect any object contemplated by it. It provides protection to the capitalists who may undertake to construct any canal or railway across the isthmus, commencing in the southern part of Mexico and terminating in the territory of New Granada. It gives no preference to any one route over another, but proposes the same measures of protection for all which ingenuitly or enterprise can construct. Should this treaty be ratified, it will secure in future the liberation of all Central America from any kind of foreign aggression."

Nothing that we can say will add to the force and precision of this language. It specifies distinctly the territory contemplated, whose neutrality is guaranteed as the whole of the isthmus, "commencing in the southern part of Mexico and terminating in the Territory of New Granada." The whole of Honduras, as well as British Honduras, lays in the territory between Mexico and New Granada, and is therefore a portion of the country which General Taylor informed the Senate was included in the objects of the treaty. The message further states that, should the treaty be ratified, "it will secure in future the liberation of all Central America from any kind of foreign aggression." Now, Central America is a geographical term which designates a district of country embracing the whole of British Honduras; and it is preposterous to suppose, after this statement of the President as to the scope of the treaty, and after seeing that the treaty itself included all parts of Central America, in positive and express terms, that the Senate should have entertained the opinion that British Honduras, a part of Central America, laying in the territory between the southern part of Mexico and New Granada, was exempted and excepted from the operations of the treaty. We have the declarations of senators that they entertained no such opinion when they voted for the treaty; and we think it is demanding too much of credulity to ask the public to believe that such an opinion was entertained by General Taylor when he attached his signature to the message from which we have quoted. It is clear to us that the conditional ratification by Great Britain coerced Mr. Clayton, and that, finding from his conference with Mr. King that the Senate would not consent to the conditions imposed respecting Honduras, he permitted himself to accept them without consulting the Senate, because he did not have the firmness to meet the issue presented by British violence in Nicaragua. In considering this point, it should be borne in mind that the other commercial nations of the earth were invited to become parties to the treaty. Suppose any of them had accepted that invitation, and made themselves parties to it: what would they have said to Mr. Clayton's defence? What would they have said if, when about to oppose under the treaty British colonization in the Bay of Honduras, or improper claims in British Honduras, a vague and dreamy article in the National Intelligencer of July 8, 1850, had been quoted as "contemporaneous exposition," excluding Honduras from the operations of the treaty? What would they have said if assured by Mr. Clayton, of the State of Delaware, that a member of the Senate had informed him in a private note that the Senate of the United States understood that Honduras was not embraced by the treaty? What would they have said if the secret paper signed by Mr. Clayton and Mr. Bulwer, recording the conditional ratification, had been shown to them? But it is useless to expose further the unprecedented course which Mr. Clayton pursued in order to avoid the issues presented by his own bungling management. It is useless to expose further the method he has adopted to evade the just responsibility he has incurred by that course. The fatal step had been taken by the suppression of Hiez's treaty, and the admission of the right of England to treat touching Nicaragua; and, rather than meet the consequences of that step, he was forced into a course which it would be an insult to his intelligence to say that he approved.

Speech of Senator Seward.

The adulation of obsequious friends, and the suggestions of an inordinate vanity, have emboldened Senator Seward to set up a pretension to the character of an accomplished statesman. For extent and accuracy of information respecting such subjects as engage the thoughts of an American statesman, as well as for a thorough comprehension of the philosophy of politics, this honorable gentleman claims to be pre-eminently distinguished above the grave senators with whom he is associated. The solid merit of his orations is so highly appreciated by himself and his adherents, that they have been collected, and are soon to be published in vindication of his title to the reputation of a mature statesman, and for the instruction and guidance of an admiring posterity.

We have felt some concern to know if the forthcoming edition of "Seward's Works" is to embrace his speech of Friday last on the British claim in Honduras, and whether this last production is to be regarded as a sample of the eloquence and statesmanship of the distinguished author. Satisfaction upon this point would probably save us the labor of the perusal of his book; for, if we are to regard the speech above alluded to as equal to the usual efforts of Senator Seward, we shall certainly not be guilty of the extravagance and folly of purchasing and reading a work that must abound in egregious errors and feeble declamation. Senator Seward never speaks without elaborate preparation. The labor of the plodder, and some may think the finish of the rhetorician, characterizes all his orations. We have from him an abundant display of ingenious illustration and sonorous declamation, but never an impassioned outburst of honest feeling and true eloquence. His most unpremeditated oratory is the result of laborious effort and artful contrivance. No apology, therefore, drawn from the disabilities of an unexpected debate, can excuse his exhibitions of ignorance. And in reference to the speech under review, it is a fact that it was delivered with the assistance of copious notes, and was supported by citations of authority; yet does it abound in errors which can only be charged to the grossest ignorance of the subject so dogmatically discussed. This assertion may sound strange to those who recollect the confident and magisterial air with which the honorable senator promulgated his own opinions, and undertook to expose the errors of others; but we will make it good by pointing out instances of his deplorable ignorance. It was really refreshing to witness the air of triumph with which the honorable gentleman presumed to correct the errors of his colleagues, and to enlighten the Senate on the geographical and political disputes concerning the States of Central America. "I know," said Senator Seward, "that Spain still claims all Central America, and all Mexico, and all South America, and even Texas." This, is, indeed, a startling proposition; but, fortunately, it is so palpably absurd, that not even the dogmatic "I know" of the honorable senator can give it respectability. It is a fact of historic record, if not of universal notoriety, that in 1850 the government of Spain formally recognised the independence of all the Spanish American States, or, in the language of the act itself, "the entire independence of the new American States, so as to restore tranquillity to those regions and render to humanity its rights." And, furthermore, Spain has made treaties with several, if not all, the Central American States, in which she expressly renounces all the rights she ever possessed in their favor. Thus, she has a convention with Costa Rica, and on the 25th of July, 1850, she signed a treaty with Nicaragua, in which the title of the latter was recognised as covering the entire Mosquito territory, and extending from sea to sea. So much for the "I know" of the honorable senator upon this point.

"I know," he again asserts, "that Great Britain claims to hold British Honduras by absolute right, and has thus held it undisturbed since 1783." Now, all the world knows—Senator Seward alone excepted—that England does not pretend to hold British Honduras by "absolute right," for in 1786 she conceded, in express terms, and by solemn treaty, the absolute sovereignty of Spain over this territory; which admission and treaty were revised in 1814, and are still in full force and effect. And all the world, save the aforesaid senator, knows that as late as 1817 and 1818 England, by her public acts, distinctly affirmed that the territory in question is in her "possession for certain purposes" only, and that it is "not within the dominion of his Britannic Majesty." Thus another "I know" turns out to be an egregious error.

Equal ignorance is displayed by the erudite senator in his geographical distinctions. Honduras neither as a province nor as a State included Belize, or as it is loosely called, "British Honduras." On the contrary, this territory pertained to Guatemala, and now belongs to her as heir to the rights of Spain. The name "British Honduras" is not used by Great Britain, whose government always alludes to Belize as "the settlement in the bay of Honduras."

We might expose the ignorance of the honorable senator in contending, in behalf of Great Britain, that the islands in the bay of Honduras, the recent colonization of which gave occasion to the debate now progressing in the Senate, are the "dependencies of British Honduras;" but upon this point the letter of Mr. Spier, published in another column, leaves nothing to be said; and, besides, it were a tedious task to undertake to trace out and expose the innumerable blunders of the honorable senator. We have said enough to indicate the exact value of the dogmatic "I know."

Whatever criticism we may make upon Senator Seward's speech, we must confess that its peroration is perfectly appropriate and consistent; for, as the body of the speech was an elaborate justification of British aggression, so its conclusion was a eulogy or (elegy, as General Cass wittily suggested) on the administration, which of all others has done most to sacrifice American dignity and American rights to the arrogant pretensions of British power. But little regard for public opinion must that man feel who can pronounce a panegyric on the brief but disastrous administration of the Galphin cabinet. The assertion of Senator Seward that the Galphin cabinet organized the governments of California and New Mexico on the principle of "universal liberty," may unravel the mystery of his affection for an administration which everybody condemns, but will do little to commend it to a more general approbation. Nor will the boast of the honorable senator that he enjoyed the confidence of that administration contribute to relieve it of the odium under which it labors, although the confession may disclose to what evil counsels it was plunged into the abyss of disgrace and misfortune.

The Theatre.

Charles Burke, the celebrated eccentric comedian, is in the midst of a most successful engagement at the National. His admirable personations have elicited great applause from the large audiences which he has attracted. Last night he played Ollapod in Colman's comedy of the Poor Gentleman, and Ebenezer in the farce of Ole Bull, exhibiting in both characters great comic powers. To-night he plays Deuteronomy Dautful in the Wood Dealer, and Benjamin Bowball in the Illustrious Stranger; and we would advise all who enjoy a hearty laugh to be in attendance. The performances will conclude with the Wind Mill, in which Mr. H. C. Jordan, who is so justly a favorite with the theatre-going portion of our citizens, takes the leading character.

WASHINGTON, January 11, 1853.

To the Editor of the Union.

Sir: Although the substance of the following letter, addressed to the "New York Journal of Commerce," has been in a great degree anticipated by your article in this morning's Union, still I have concluded to ask for its insertion in your paper. The discussion upon the matter to which it refers, both in Congress and out, has, it seems to me, diverged from the real point at issue, which is this: Do the islands of Bonaca, Roatan, &c., fall within the scope and conditions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty? Admitting that Belize or British Honduras was intended to be excepted from the effect of that treaty, yet that exception cannot be extended to the islands in question. It is true they were organized as dependencies of Belize; but it was more than a year after this treaty was signed, and the act was in violation and defiance of the treaty. They are not and never were in any sense of the term, dependencies of British Honduras.

One word in respect to Belize. Senator Pearce is reported as having said that, although under the treaty of 1786 the English had no right to enter British Honduras, except to cut woods and gather the fruits of the earth purely natural, yet having in 1798 repulsed a Spanish force sent to expel them, they "have from that day to this taken occasion to acquire their authority, &c., on the ground that they had acquired a right by conquest."

This must be a mistake. The treaty of 1786 was revised in 1814, and is now in full force and effect between England and Spain; and so far from affecting to hold Belize by right of conquest, or any other right, Great Britain has since, and repeatedly, recognised the binding force of this treaty, which rigidly excludes her from everything except its conditional occupation for specific purposes. We need only look into the acts of her Parliament for proof of this. June 27, 1817, Parliament passed an act which received the royal sanction and became a law. It is entitled:

"An act for the more effectual punishment of murders and manslaughter committed in places not within his Majesty's dominions."

And its enacting clause is as follows: "Whereas grievous murders and manslaughter have been committed in the Bay of Honduras, THE SANKING A SETTLEMENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES IN THE POSSESSION AND UNDER THE PROTECTION OF HIS MAJESTY, BUT NOT WITHIN THE TERRITORY AND DOMINIONS OF HIS MAJESTY, &c."

This act was amended in 1819, and is still in force. (See 57 George III. p. 193.) It is a full recognition of the treaty of 1786, revised in 1814, and now in full effect. Respectfully, yours,

E. G. SQUIER.

New York, January 8, 1853.

To the Editors of the Journal of Commerce.

GENTLEMEN: In the Journal of Friday last, in the course of an article on Central America, you observe that the question of territorial right in respect to Belize, or, as it is sometimes called, "British Honduras," stands precisely where it did before the treaty of 1850, known as the Clayton and Bulwer treaty. You do not state, however, that the alleged exception, which it has from the operation of that treaty, does not result from anything on the face of the treaty itself, but from the mutual understanding of its negotiators as contained in the notes which they exchanged upon the subject, and from the alleged understanding (now emphatically denied) on the part of the Senate, at the time of its ratification, that such an exception was intended.

But in your article you do not stop with admitting the exception in favor of Belize. You go further and assume that the islands of Roatan, Bonaca, and San Pedro Barbat, and Helena are in reality dependencies of Belize, and, therefore, also excluded from the operation of the treaty in question. To prevent mistake, I quote from your article:

"But it has been seen not only that the settlement of Honduras by the small islands in its neighborhood, known as its dependencies, are expressly excluded from the operation of that convention by the terms of its ratification. So that if this government have any right to protest against the establishment by Great Britain of the colony of the islands, it is an assumption which is founded in error, either geographically or politically. The British claims jurisdiction over what is known as British Honduras and its dependencies."

In this assumption, I am constrained to think, you are entirely wrong. The islands of Roatan, Utila, &c., are not, as you have ever been connected with or dependent on Belize, either geographically or politically. The careless use of the name "Honduras" has doubtless led to misapprehension in many minds in respect to this matter. Honduras proper is the State, formerly province, of the same name. On the peninsula of Yucatan above it, and separated from it by the State of Guatemala, is the English settlement of Belize, loosely called "British Honduras," perhaps from fronting on the bay of that name.

Now, the islands in question lie along the north shore, and within sight of the State of Honduras are geographically contiguous to it, and have always, from the earliest times, been under the sovereignty of Great Britain, as well as since 1850, as a province and a republic, been under its political jurisdiction.

Fortunately, we know precisely what constitutes Belize—no equal division of the world has had its limits more clearly defined. It is well known that early in the last, in fact as early as the preceding century, the English made various establishments on the eastern coast of Central America for the purpose, or under the pretext, of cutting dye-woods. These establishments, which were called "plantations" by the Spanish Crown, as derogating from its sovereignty over these countries, which led to frequent disputes, and finally to a war, which terminated in 1763. By the 17th article of the treaty of peace of that year, it was provided that the islands of Roatan, Utila, and San Pedro Barbat, and Helena, and all other islands which were erected in the Bay of Honduras, and other places of the territory of Spain in that part of the world, within four months.

Accordingly the English demolished their forts, but still kept up some of the establishments, which, as a result of faith again led to a war. By the treaty of peace of 1783 it was stipulated that the English might cut logwood, &c., in the district "lying between the river Hondu and Belize." Provided that the plantations shall not be considered as British territory, and that the cause to be deemed the King of Spain. It is also provided that all the English who were dispersed, "whether on the Spanish continent or in any of the islands which ever dependent upon it," should at once evacuate their establishments and retire within the limits of the territory of the King of Spain.

These provisions not being sufficiently stringent to satisfy Spain, or having been evaded by the English, another treaty was made in 1786, in terms as distinct and explicit as it was in the power of language to make it. And as this treaty was revised in 1814, and is still in force, I beg to quote the article defining not only the limits of Belize, but the nature of the tenure under which it can lawfully be held by Great Britain. In the first place it provides that:

ART. I. His Britannic Majesty's subjects, and the other subjects of Great Britain,