Indiana State Sentinel.

SEMI-WEEKLY.

ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY.

INDIANAPOLIS, MAY 15, 1847.

☞ *In this paper are published the Laws, Treaties, and other public Acts of the United States, by authority of the Government.*

Our Terms.

The following will hereafter be the *permanent* terms of the *Weekly Indiana State Sentinel:*

☞ Payments to be made always in advance.

One copy, one year,	$2.00
Three copies, one year,	5.00
Five copies, one year,	8.00
Ten copies, one year,	15.00

Semi-Weekly.

(Published three times a week during the session.)

One copy,	$1.00	Three copies,	$10.00
One copy during the session,			1.00
Three or more copies, each			75

Legal Advertisements.

The undersigned will not publish legal notices in their respective papers without payment being made therefor in advance. JOHN D. DEFREES, CHAPMANS & SPANN.

To Correspondents.

A. B. C., New Orleans. Much obliged for your favor, though coming by *mail*, it was *seven days old*. Nearly every conveyance outstrips Uncle Sam these days. Such favors by any river boat will be always acceptable, and thankfully received.

J. W., Alquina. Will attend to your request, as far as possible, and as soon as possible. We are very much hurried just now, but hope a couple of weeks will "let us out."

RAIL ROAD CONVENTION.—The Convention which assembled here on Wednesday last, and held a two day's session, was one of the most imposing we have ever witnessed. If not so large in numbers, in point of *talent* and *respectability*, none have exceeded it. The deliberations were conducted in character with the convention and the importance of the subject. Great unanimity prevailed, as also liberal and enlarged views, and a manifest enthusiasm and confidence in this great, useful, and necessary work. *It will be accomplished!* We can only refer to the proceedings at present; but will hereafter refer to the subject,—it being second, in our opinion, to no other in the west.

Third Congressional District.

We have heretofore announced the nomination of John L. Robinson, Esq. as the Democratic candidate in the 3d district. A whig convention has nominated P. A. Hackleman as their candidate. Knowing each of the gentlemen, we anticipated an easy victory for the Democrats; but the following, from the leading whig paper of the district, the Brookville American, shows that we may expect no inconsiderable amount of *fun* in *that* canvass. We place it on file, also, for other reasons, not the least of which is, that it may answer as a *looking glass* for many a whig *leader*.

While the tone of the article is, in the main, just, we regret that the editor should be so wrongly informed, or so prejudiced, as to attack the characters of men, whom, we venture to say, would not shrink from a comparison with his own. We *know* they would not suffer from it. But as the editor *knows* the subject of his comments, we let him speak for himself.

WHIG CONVENTION.—We attended the Whig Convention for this Congressional District, on Wednesday last. We point to the patriotic resolutions passed by that body with great pleasure. They fully and heartly receive our approbation, as they endorse to the full extent the positions we have taken, and principles we have advocated. They, too, contain the sentiments of the Whig party, with the exception of a few fanatics, who have always been a burthen upon our cause.

The convention was large—every part of the District having been fully represented. The deliberations were entirely harmonious.

P. A. Hackleman is our candidate. At the organization of the convention, the President stated that we had heretofore suffered defeat in this District by our candidate possessing too much honesty, fair-dealing and gentlemanly deportment, and hoped in our deliberations, we should guard against this in future. To this infamous idea, John A. Matson entered his solemn protest—believing that the ultimate triumph of the Whig party depended upon the immutable and eternal principles of truth and justice; but the convention believing that men of the character of Pettit, Wick, and Kennedy, were more apt to "break into Congress" than gentlemen, they made their selection with a view of succeeding. They considered Hackleman "some," in a bear fight; and that if his opponent abounded in deception, trickery, and meanness, he could still more abound. They acted from the suggestion that we had tried good and honest men long enough, and that a change of pasture could at least do no harm. We believe Robinson once acknowledged that Wilson Thompson could out-lie him in a political speech, and if he does not acknowledge beat again before the close of the present canvass, we shall be sadly mistaken. We will risk Hackleman at that game any time. He is a team. He can speak louder, and stir up the monkies with longer poles than any sapling in this neck of woods. In presenting to the Whigs of this District, the claims of Mr. Hackleman, we do not pretend that he has any particular claims for his moral honesty or native goodness of heart; but we assure our readers that there is no danger, should he be elected, in corrupting his morals by associating with Pettit & Co. Then, Whigs, let us rally, and see if some things cannot be done as well as others.

We wish it understood that we did not approve of the nomination of Hackleman, nor the principles upon which it is urged. Yet, he is the Whig candidate.

THE U. S., MEXICO AND TEXAS.—Our readers will do well to read the article in another place, under the head of "the other side." It gives the most concise and comprehensive summary of the principal points involved in our relations with Mexico and Texas, that we have seen. Its views, too, are, in our opinion, very just and practical, not only as to the past and present, but the probable future. It is from the "National Era," the anti-slavery paper published at Washington. The editor, of course, does not altogether agree with the conclusions of his correspondent; but his disagreement we suppose is not on the grounds of fact, but because of his peculiar notions relative to war and slavery. These are *his* "weak points:" and but few of our readers are affected by them. It is *here* thought strange indeed that anti-slavery men should oppose the Mexican war and the acquisition of Mexican territory upon the supposition that it will strengthen slavery. If nothing else could be offered in disproof of the probability of any such result, it seems to us that the course of the ultra slavery men, with Calhoun and Taylor at their head, would be sufficient. If they thought that the "peculiar institution" would be strengthened, they would not be so inveterately hostile to the prosecution of the war as they are. So it seems to us.

☞ It would be a rare display of the madness of party to see the editor of a fierce anti-war paper crowding out of the train of the victorious Taylor some scarred veteran who has fought by his side, but whose credentials as "a good whig" are not so plain and satisfactory as the proofs of his valor and patriotism.

☞ We are sorry to see that the very liberal constitution formed for Wisconsin has been defeated by the popular vote, and by a large majority. This unfortunately keeps Wisconsin out of the confederacy and her Senators out of the Senate for a year of important events.

☞ Mr. Pakenham, the British Minister, has obtained leave of absence for two years, and returns home immediately. Mr. Crampton performs the business of the legation in his absence.

SIMPLE BUT IMPORTANT TRUTHS.—The Journal of Commerce of a late date contains the following brief, but concise and judicious remarks, on a very important but much misunderstood subject. We do not remember to have before seen the same positions maintained in print; but we have long entertained the opinions expressed. It is but a few weeks since we had a warm argument with a *legal* friend, who maintained the reverse of our opinions. It seemed to us that he had imbibed his notions from those superanuated maxims of the elementary law-books, which the common sense of democracy has long since practically exploded. It is the hardest thing in the world, however, for men to give up erroneous notions which they have *studied* to learn as unquestionable fundamental truths. In other words, "learned ignorance" is the most incorrigible of all ignorance, and the hardest to be eradicated or enlightened:

RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS.—It is a common notion and written over and over in books, that when men come into society, they give up a portion of their rights to secure the rest. Nothing, however, is more utterly untrue, or dangerous in the maintenance of liberty. The doctrine of our federal declaration stands out before the world a glorious truth, that men possess certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that to *secure* these rights, governments are instituted. Tyrants got up the pretence that society involved a surrender of rights, and under their management it did, to be sure; but their absurd proceedings did not constitute the true basis of society. That is always an improper and tyrannical act, which takes away from a man any of the rights which he possesses before entering into society. An unorganized community dwelling together, would possess, upon the great principles of moral government, just those rights, and no more nor less, that it would be the duty of the government to protect, when they should be regularly organized. Rights are inherent in persons; and the most perfect enjoyment of liberty is entirely consistent with the utmost energy of government.

Major General Jessup.

This distinguished officer, at present Quartermaster General of the United States Army, now doubtless at Vera Cruz, left Washington under circumstances singularly honorable to himself. He asked leave to assume the duties of his post, in Mexico, and in his letter employs the following patriotic language:

"The only possible objection that could be urged against the proposed measure in my case, it seems to me, is the question of rank—*my brevet of Major General making me the senior of every officer in Mexico; but that I waive*—I do not desire military command, and without a different commission from that which I hold, I would not accept it. I propose to go in my capacity as an officer of the staff, ready to obey the orders of Gen. Taylor, Gen. Butler, Gen. Patterson, Gen. Wool, or any other officer whom the Government, or the accidents of the service may place in command of the army, or of any seperate division of it. My only object is to benefit the country by securing the utmost efficiency to measures of my own department, and by that means giving effect to the whole service."

This disinterested and patriotic conduct, contrasting so favorably with the punctilio so often observed to the sacrifice of the great interests of the country by other officers of the army, is worthy of the gallant soldier of the late war.

☞ There is at least one old federal-Mexican-whig in Greensburgh, who thinks it "wrong for a moral and religious people to rejoice at the victories gained over their enemies." It seems they were patriotic enough in that town to kindle some bonfires and light some candles on the reception of the news of the capture of Vera Cruz; consequently the old tory-Mexican-whig addressed the following note to the editor of the Repository. It is perhaps worth saving to perpetuate the *marks of the breed:*

FRIEND MILLS—Do tell us what meant that awful destruction of candles, those bonfires, and sky rockets, and the great demonstrations of military enthusiasm in our town on Monday evening last? Was it in consequence of the news received that the American army, under Gen. Scott, had taken Vera Cruz and the Castle of San Juan de Ulloa—slaughtering some *two thousand defenceless women and children?* Yes! that is the way it reads! *Two thousand* women and children, who had never harmed a hair of an American head, were cruelly murdered by order of Uncle Sam! Is this matter of rejoicing and gratulation with the good citizens of Greensburgh? I hope not.

DEATH OF MRS. MAFFIT.—The Galveston News announces the death of Mrs. Ann Maffit, on the 1st instant. She was the first wife of the Rev. J. N. Maffit, from whom she was divorced. That paper in speaking of her, says:

The deceased was one of the oldest residents of Galveston—having emigrated to Texas, with her family, in the year 1840. During this period, amid the toils incident to a new country, added to those arising from our peculiarly unsettled state, with entire success did she promote the best interests of her family, so well discharge the various vocations of life, as to leave an enviable memorial of maternal affection, and an example in ministering to the wants and advancing the welfare of connexions and friends. The amiable manner of the deceased, added to her decision and excellence of character, made her the loved and honored of all who knew her. In every relation of life—whether as a mother in directing, or a friend in counselling, she was affectionate and faithful in discharging all her duties. To the social pleasures of those around her she contributed largely, and was ever ready in giving those polite and generous attentions to both friend and stranger, which insensibly support society, and so greatly enhance its enjoyments. To the absent members of her family, it will be gratifying to learn, that though called to endure much distress, she met her last change with becoming fortitude and resignation. To her pastor she gave consoling evidence that she placed her entire trust in her Redeemer, and that her's should be the reward promised to the faithful.

☞ A good many of the "respectable" whig papers are beginning to protest against the "hasty" nomination of Gen. Taylor, about whose political notions they know nothing. Still the *Ranchero* breed continue to shout for him, and some of them couple Corwin in the nomination as Vice President: thus—

For President,
GENERAL ZACHARY TAYLOR.
"*D—n 'em, give 'em h—ll!*"
For Vice President,
THOMAS CORWIN.
"*You've stormed the Bishop's palace, and shot a woman!*"

O whiggery! see yourself as others see you!

☞ The whig papers are roundly asserting that Gen. Taylor is a full-blooded whig; and in the same breath as positively assert that John C. Calhoun and other ultra free-trade men of the south are in favor of his election to the Presidency! Consistent! very.

A TRAITOR.—It is said that an American, who was well known in Santa Fe, fought hard against the Americans, and with his very good rifle killed most of those who fell dead. When the fortress was taken, he endeavored to make his escape, but fell with thirty odd balls through him. One hundred must have been fired upon him simultaneously, so great was the indignation.

A GREAT MEMBER.—Hon. Dixon H. Lewis, of Alabama, last week became a member of Oriental Lodge, I. O. O. F., of Washington city. He weighs considerably over 300 lbs.

☞ We regret to learn from the New Orleans papers that Gen. Shields died of his wounds, near Cerro Gordo, on the 19th ult. We have not space for further particulars this week.

☞ A company of 104 volunteers recently left Dixon county, Ill., for the rendezvous at Cairo.

Later from Vera Cruz--Capture of Tuspan--A triumph for the Navy.

We have the gratifying intelligence of the capture of Tuspan, by the gallant Commodore Perry, and the equally gallant squadron under his command—thus showing that our navy wants but the opportunities which have been presented to the army, to be, like them, every where triumphant.

On the 19th, Tuspan had been taken, after a fierce and determined resistance by the Mexican troops. We lost four men killed, and some fourteen wounded, among whom were four officers—Captain Tatnall, slightly; Lieut. Parker, severely; Lieut. Hartstein, and passed Midshipman Lowns, slightly.

The Mexicans, finding further resistance unavailing, spiked all their guns, razed the defences of the place, and then abandoned it.

—

We receive the Vera Cruz Eagle of the 22d ult., from which we learn that the army was still in the neighborhood of the late battle field.

Gen. Shields was still alive, but there were no hopes entertained of his recovery. Gen. Pillow's wound was not dangerous. Capt. Johnson was in a very critical state.

On the evening of the 21st ult., the Mexican officers, brought down to Vera Cruz as prisoners of war, were sent to the castle of San Juan de Ulloa. They seemed to be in excellent spirits.

Sergeant Tucker, of the 2d Dragoons, while conveying an express from Gen. Scott, near Jalapa, to the Governor of Vera Cruz, was fired at and wounded in the hand.

An American teamster was found murdered on the road, on the 21st ult.

The eagle estimates the number of men which will be required to garrison Mexico, in the event of a peace not being conquered, at forty-seven regiments, or 40,000 men, to be stationed as follows: one regiment at Tampico, one in Vera Cruz, two in Jalapa, six in Puebla, sixteen in Mexico, three in Victoria, one in Matamoras, three in Oajaca, three in Guanajuato, three in Zacatecas, four in San Luis Potosi, three in Durango, two in Chihuahua, one in Saltillo, and five in Guadalajara.

The expense of maintaining this army, the editor sets down at $15,000,000 per annum. He estimates a revenue from the new tariff of $13,000,000, and recommends the imposition of a direct tax on towns in our possession of $7,000,000; thus leaving a surplus in the treasury instead of drawing from it.

He further estimates, if permanent possession should be kept of the country, that the sale of the public lands, by encouraging immigration from the United States and Europe, would annually amount to more than one-fourth of the above sum.

Col. Harney's charge is described in the Eagle, as the most brilliant act of the battle of Cerro Cordo.

A letter from Buena Vista dated on the 29th of March says Gen. Wool is encamped there with about 5000 men; regiments from Ohio, Illinois, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Indiana, two battalions of artillery, and a squadron of dragoons. One Kentucky regiment was at Monterey on the 4th of April, and one Ohio regiment in the citadel. Gen. TAYLOR was at Walnut Hills with May's dragoons, and the Mississippi regiment. Nothing is said of any advance movement. The towns between Monterey and Camargo are to be garrisoned by American forces without delay. When last heard from, Urrea was at Linares. The Alcalde of a small town twenty miles from Monterey, has informed Gen. TAYLOR of the murder of twenty Mexicans by American soldiers. Diligent inquiry has been made, and the General threatens to hang all concerned in the affair whom he can detect. The wounded at Buena Vista are rapidly recovering. Among the Mississippi wounded, only one has suffered amputation. The wounds were principally from musket balls, and not dangerous.—*St. Louis Union.*

☞ General Taylor is expected to move with a force of 12,000 men across the desert from Saltillo to San Luis, which is supposed to be garrisoned by about the same number of Mexicans. His water tanks and India rubber bottles will supply his army with water during the march. The distance is nearly 300 miles. He would then be some 200 miles from the capital, and about 400 from General Scott's present position.

Gen. Cushing has received an order from General Taylor, directing him to call upon the Alcaldes of Matamoras for the proportion of that department of the indemnification for the destruction of public property of the United States by Mexican robbers. It is $47,500, and can be liquidated in mules at $20 a head, beef cattle at $10, or corn at $1 per bushel. The Alcaldes were to confer with other towns as to the amount of taxable property in their several districts, to serve as data in fixing the proportion of each. The Quartermaster would receipt for all that would be "forked over."

Contributions through Mexican Ports.

From the "Union."

When the report first went forth that the Secretary of the Treasury was preparing a tariff for the Mexican ports in our possession, the first impulse of the opposition press was to claim the merit of the measure for their own party. "It was General Waddy Thompson" (exclaims the National Intelligencer) "who first proposed it in our columns." "It was Thompson, and Parrot, and Baldwin, and other whigs" (exclaims the correspondent of the Baltimore Patriot) "who recommended the measure." Now they are backing water. They hope that more capital may be made by attacking it as an administration measure, than by claiming it as a whig invention. The cue is given out by the flugelman, Mr. Joseph Surface, and he is compelled to swallow his own words first; and now we may expect almost the "whole sty" to be with him in an uproar. When they saw the Secretary of the Navy's instructions to Captain Stockton, in December last, not a word of censure escaped them. We heard nothing then of the "Orders of Council." When Gen. Thompson spoke of it in the National Intelligencer, it was all right. So also when Mr. Calhoun recommended it in his speech. But now, since the Secretary's *report* has been published, it is suddenly discovered to be the act of an autocrat—contrary to the Constitution, contrary to law—and a violent usurpation of power by the President. In vain do they see this authority conferred by the laws of nations in the case of war. In vain do they find the doctrine thus expounded by Martins, Vattel, and all the most celebrated jurists on the law of nations. In vain have they seen an equivalent rule laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States. All these considerations are of no account, provided the Intelligencer can plant a thorn in the side of the administration, raise a clamor against the war, and relieve the Mexican allies from its burdens. You may tell the opposition, in vain, that we will make the enemy contribute to the support of the war which he has provoked. You may tell them, in vain, that it will assist in relieving our own people from some of its burdens. You may as well address all this to the winds. The federal party will still insist upon it, that we shall tax the American people exclusively, and tax them *more*, and the Mexicans *not at all*, as the result of the war. If this be not giving "aid and comfort to the enemy," we know not what the course of the opposition amounts to.

We are indebted to a gentleman in this city for the following extract of a letter from his correspondent in New York. Notwithstanding his politics are on the "whig" side of the House, he does not hesitate to speak favorably of our receiving duties in the ports of Mexico. Indeed, the National Intelligencer claimed the honor of the invention for Mr. Waddy Thompson, in its article of Thursday last, when it says:

"This system of imposts is partly specific, and in part ad valorem, the latter ranging from a low rate to as high as forty per cent.; the whole averaging about one-fourth of the rates of the existing Mexican tariff. This is the general scheme recommended by the Hon. Waddy Thompson last winter, through the columns of the National Intelligencer, and if carried into effect will doubtless afford some help in the ways and means to carry on the war."

The Washington correspondent of the "Baltimore Patriot," puts in a claim to the "patent" right, when he says:

"I understand that the course adopted by the government in the matter is in accordance with the advice of General Waddy Thompson, Dr. Baldwin, Mr. Parrott, and other whigs, who have lived in Mexico, and whose opinions are valuable. The revenue anticipated from this tariff will be considerable, and will do something towards defraying the expenses of the war, though not much, comparatively."

We are pleased to see the proposition so heartily approved in the following extract of the letter to which we have referred. The writer is a scholar as well as a merchant:

"NEW YORK, March 31, 1847.

"Among the best inventions of the age, and altogether worthy of a *patent*, is the suggestion reported that we are about to establish custom-houses at all the ports of Mexico (on both sides) to collect an amount sufficient to pay the expenses of the war. The plan strikes me as an admirable one; and if it does not 'conquer a peace' sooner than by fighting Mexicans when they shall be scattered in 'guerilla parties,' I shall be much mistaken. I like the plan, too, on another account—it is a mode of war which even the Quakers cannot object to; and it also puzzles the *bears* in Wall street, who cannot succeed now in knocking down Mr. Walker's stock and treasury notes. If we even have one part on each side—or rather have not the whole—it will make little odds, for we can charge lower duties and get all the trade and customs. The plan reminds me of one that occurred on the parade ground near or between Troy and Lansingburg: a beer seller in his tent had a large cask of 'Philadelphia beer, 6 d. per glass;' and, to make room for his customers, kept pushing this cask aside until it protruded into his next neighbor's tent; whereupon the latter out gimblet and drew from the protruding cask—'Capital Philadelphia beer, 5 d. a glass,' and got all the custom till the cask was out. So we can afford to keep our rate of duty a shade under and get all the trade and custom, too, from such ports of entry we may not care to bother with. When this news gets to England, you will see United States stock advance and Mexican stock on the decline.

"Whilst writing thus far, the glorious news is heralded of the brilliant acts of General Zachary Taylor, which fills me with joy and gladness, and our good citizens are all on tip-toe. A few days ago we were all in the dumps, but I was not void of hope. I knew who was in the War Department, and I remembered the 'invincibles' and 'St. Regis.' I began to think it was almost time to take the axe and call out the 2d brigade from Downingville; but this is not necessary now, and, from all accounts of the warm work and smashing there, I would a little rather read the accounts and huzza over them, than to have had a hand in that fight. But glory to those who were there, say I; and so say all who boasts an American heart."

From the National Era.

The Other Side.

I think that it is to be regretted that the Abolitionists, as such, ever intermeddled with the question of the Mexican war, inasmuch as that war has not any connection with the question of abolishing slavery within our Union sufficient to compensate for the disadvantage of diverting our attention from the direct pursuit of the main object; and it is especially to be regretted, because the Abolitionists have generally taken that side of the question which is calculated to injure their cause, by bringing odium upon them. This being the case, I propose to present a brief view of the Mexican question, different from that which has been usually given in the Abolition prints, commencing with the controversy in reference to Texas.

I assume that Mexico never at any time, had any just claim to Texas, more than Texas had to Mexico. Texas, to the Rio Grande was not a part of the Viceroyalty of Mexico, under the Spanish Government, as appears from a document presented to the Spanish Cortes by Don ——— Arispe, which may be seen in Niles's Register of ——, 1816. Spain ceded Louisiana to France, and France to the United States, about the year 1804. This cession, according to the expressed opinion of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay, included Texas to the Rio Grande. In 1819, the United States relinquished to Spain their claim to Texas, as one of the conditions of the cession of Florida. The people of Texas, or a portion of them, then declared their independence, on the ground that the United States, having stipulated in the treaty with France for the admission of Texas into the Union, had no right to cede it to Spain. Thus Texas belonged either to its own inhabitants, or to Spain. No other Power had a shadow of right to it. The Mexicans, however, having declared their own independence, and created Iturbide Emperor, that despot, without a reasonable pretext, sent a force, and took possession of Texas, about the year 1821. The Texans had a moral right to shake off, at the first opportunity, the yoke thus unjustly imposed on them. In 1824, a Constitution was formed, by which Texas was constituted, not a province or dependency of Mexico, but a member of a confederacy of sovereign and independent States, equal in rights with Mexico herself. If this act was compulsory on Texas, she had a right to resist it the first favorable opportunity. If voluntary on her part, she had a right to demand that the other members of the league should comply with its terms, and to withdraw from it when they should fail to do so. In 1834, Santa Anna, in conjunction with the monarchists, aristocrats, and a portion of the clergy, for the purpose of preventing the reforms which the people and their representatives desired to make, commenced a series of military usurpations, by which, in violation of the Constitution, he abolished the freedom of the press, the militia, the right of the people to keep arms for their defence, the right of suffrage as to the mass of the population, and even the State Governments, reducing the greater portion of the confederated republic to a consolidated military despotism. The Legislatures, the people, and the militia of a considerable portion of the Confederacy, attempted to resist these usurpations; but the total defeat of the democratic forces, consisting mostly of militia, by the regular troops under Santa Anna, which took place near Zacatecas, and was accomplished, it is said, as much through corruption and treachery as by skill and courage, awed the rest of the Confederacy into submission, with the exception of Texas, which adhered to the republic until it ceased to exist, and then refused submission to the usurper, one of whose demands was, that the Texans should surrender to him their most prominent men, including Zavalia, formerly Secretary of State to the Mexican Confederacy; and another, that they should submit to be disarmed, retaining but one gun to five plantations, in a sparse population, for their protection against wild beasts and savage Indians. To coerce them into subjection, Santa Anna, in 1836, invaded Texas. His advanced force, under Urrea, made prisoners of about 600 men, under Colonel Fanning, who surrendered, it is stated, under an express stipulation, that they should be set free on their parole not to serve against Mexico during the war. Eight days after their surrender, by express order of that monster of duplicity, perfidy, and cruelty, Santa Anna, they were all shot, with the exception of three, who with much difficulty escaped, to tell the fate of their companions.

Shortly afterwards, being defeated and taken prisoner at San Jacinto, Santa Anna entered into a convention, by which he stipulated for the withdrawal of all the Mexican troops *to the other side of the Rio Grande*. The stipulation was complied with by those who assumed the power at Mexico, although they disavowed Santa Anna's acts. No Mexican troops were left between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. None returned there, until General Woll, as commander of the Mexican army, issued a proclamation, put an end to the armistice, speaking of the territory this side of the Rio Grande as one of which the possession had been usurped by the Texans, and declaring that all Mexicans found one league on this side of that river should be tried by court martial, and punished as traitors. Woll, however, soon retired, and from that time to the present the mass of country between the Nueces and the Rio Grande has remained unoccupied and ungarrisoned by the Mexicans, although they have possessed the vicinity of Santa Fe, some 300 miles above the sources of the Nueces.

It was not till 1839, after the independence of Texas had been acknowledged by several nations, that the mother country, Spain, acknowledged that of Mexico herself. This acknowledgment, whether it referred to Mexico as it then existed, or as it existed under the Spanish Government, conveyed, in either case, no right to Texas, if Spain had any to convey. I believe that Spain subsequently acknowledged the independence of Texas; and, if so, the people of that country received the grant of it from the only Power which could plausibly claim it, with a knowledge of facts, except themselves.

Mexico had no right to Texas, because she did not originally possess any, nor did she ever acquire one by consent of the people. The joining of the Mexican Confederacy, by Texas, no more made her a province of Mexico proper, than the joining of the American Confederacy made Vermont the property of South Carolina. Texas might, after 1835, have invaded Mexico with some show of reason, to compel her to comply with the compact between them, or to emancipate the people from the yoke of their military tyrants. But Mexico, in the eye of reason, guided by the light of truth, had no plausible excuse for invading or claiming Texas. Texas was faithful to the Government and the compact. It was the military tyrants of Mexico who were the rebels. In these circumstances, all the world had a right to assist the Texans, and it was highly honorable to many Americans that they did assist her. They had a better cause than Lafayette had in assisting America, or than Commodore Porter and thousands of Americans had for assisting Mexico against Spain; for the outrages which Santa Anna attempted upon the Texans were tenfold more gross, and tenfold less palliated by any claim arising from long-continued possession and dominion, than those which England attempted against us, or Spain against Mexico. Our Government had a perfect right to assist the Texans in defending themselves against an unjust invasion, had it chosen to do so; but in reality it maintained a strict neutrality, as Mr. Webster truly asserted in his correspondence as Secretary of State.

Of course, it was without the least reasonable foundation that Mexico protested against the union of Texas with this country; that she, in substance, declared war, by proclaiming that she would consider such union as a declaration of war, and by withdrawing her own minister from Washington, and driving ours from Mexico.

While she was avowedly preparing to invade us, without any other declaration of war than the foregoing, our Government, in a spirit of amity and liberality, offered to send "an *envoy* from the United States, intrusted with full power to adjust *all the questions in dispute* between the two Governments." This offer was accepted by the Mexican Government, without the least intimation that it was accepted only in part; although the language used was somewhat different from that employed on our side, owing probably to the different habits and usages of the two countries and the two languages.

Mr. Slidell was accordingly sent out as our envoy or minister, with full authority "to adjust all the questions in dispute between the two Governments," according to the very terms of the offer which Mexico had accepted. She refused, however, to receive him, on the pretext that she had only agreed to receive a commissioner to treat upon the subject of Texas alone, and that such was the proposition of our Government. That this pretext was false, and a mere afterthought, is proved by our original proposition, made in the most explicit language, and accepted without reservation; by the fact that the counter-revolution, gotten up by Paredes and the monarchical and military parties, placed its opposition to Herrea on the ground of his disposition to negotiate about Texas, and not about other questions; by the fact that the Mexican minister, Mr. Pena y Pena, in his letter to Mr. Black, the American consul, of October 13, 1845, spoke of "awaiting the issue of the negotiation proposed by the United States," and of its object as being "the pacific arrangement of the pending QUESTIONS between Mexico and the United States"—thus using the word *questions* in the plural, after the acceptance of our offer; and it is still more conclusively proved by the fact, shown in Mr. Black's letters, that in two interviews which he had with the Mexican minister on the 3d and 8th of December, that minister endeavored to back out of or put off the agreement made with this country to receive a negotiator, he not then knowing the nature of Mr. Slidell's commission or of the subjects on which he was to treat, otherwise than by the original compact on the subject. He spoke of Mr. Slidell as a "*commissioner*," but said the Government was taken by surprise in his coming so soon; that "the opposition are calling us traitors for entering into this arrangement with you;" and begged that the commissioner might "not disembark at that time," or at least, "not come to the capital." And it was not until the 13th of December, when the Mexican Government had had Mr. Slidell's credentials five days in their possession, that they pretended to have discovered an excuse in them for doing what they had before shown themselves disposed to do.

Waiving the further consideration of this duplicity, let us come to the ultimatum of the two Governments. That of the American Government, as stated in Mr. Buchanan's letter of January 20, 1846, was, that the negotiation, if entered on, must include the subject of redress by Mexico "of the real injuries of our citizens," instead of being confined "to the adjustment of a pecuniary indemnity of its (Mexico's) imaginary rights over Texas." The ultimatum of the Mexican Government, as stated by the Mexican minister, Castillo y Lanzas, on March 12, 1846, was, that Mexico would "admit only a *plenipotentiary* from the United States clothed with powers *al hoc*, that is to say, special powers, to treat upon the question of Texas, and upon this alone." "Upon this point (said he) the resolve of the Mexican Government is immutable."

Let us now consider which Government was in the right in this matter. Mexico had for many years a piratical sort of Government. France had seen fit to capture Vera Cruz, in order to compel redress of injuries; and England had sent another fleet for the same purpose. The British fleet lay off the town, and refused to depart until the Mexican Government sent on board of it the money which she had plundered from British subjects. England would not trust to promises, as we have done. The Mexicans have committed tenfold greater outrages and robberies upon the American nation and its citizens, than upon the English or the French, and continued them for a much longer period. They commenced plundering our citizens some eighteen years ago, and continued it down to about the commencement of the present war. The whole amount of claims is about eight millions. Our Government having repeatedly demanded an investigation and settlement of these claims, without success, President Jackson, on the 6th of February, 1837, recommended to Congress to authorize reprisals, and the use of our naval force against Mexico, to enforce them, in case of further refusal. On the 11th of April, 1839, the Administration succeeded in concluding a treaty with Mexico, which provided that two Mexican and two American commissioners should sit at Washington, to examine the claims of American citizens on the Mexican Government for spoliations; and that the cases of disagreement that might arise should be referred to an umpire, to be named by the King of Prussia, according to the proposition of Mexico. This convention was organized on the 25th of August, 1840, being limited by the convention, to eighteen months, as the time for sitting. The first four months were consumed by frivolous objections raised by the Mexican commissioners as to the mode of proceeding. During the remaining fourteen months, claims were allowed to a fraction over two millions of dollars, while nearly one million, on which the Americans and Mexicans had disagreed, remained undecided by the umpire, whose authority had ceased, and nearly five millions of claims remained unexamined. The Mexican Government paid about two hundred thousand dollars only of the two millions allowed, and then ceased, on pretext of want of means. Since the sitting of the commissioners in 1840—'41, our Government has endeavored in vain to bring Mexico to an honorable investigation of the remainder of the claims. It should be remarked, moreover, that the Mexican commissioners had dishonorably carried off with them the documentary evidence belonging to some of the claimants, in defiance of the protests of those claimants and of our Government. A new convention or treaty for the examination of the remainder of the claims, was concluded at Mexico, April 30th, 1843. The American Senate ratified it, with two amendments. The Mexican Government has never deigned to inform ours, whether it would or would not agree to those amendments.

Hence it appears that while we had claims, some of them of twenty years' standing, and many of them undoubtedly just, she had only a claim upon us of recent origin, and that evidently unjust. And yet she had the hardihood, after once accepting an offer to negotiate upon all subjects in dispute, to recede from it, and insist upon making her unfounded claims the only subject of treaty, while our just claims should remain in abeyance. I believe there is no instance in history of a powerful nation submitting to such pretensions. At the time they were set up, we had on hand the unsettled controversy with England respecting Oregon. Had Mr. Polk acceded to the offer of Mexico, to negotiate in reference to Texas alone, I doubt not that those who now condemn the war, as one made for the support of slavery, would have thought, and said, that he had made the concession out of regard to the interests of slavery; that he was fearful of an alliance between England and Mexico, and the employment of colored troops from the West Indies in conjunction with the Mexicans; and that the interests and rights of the claimants upon Mexico, who are mostly Northern men, had been shamefully sacrificed by a Southern President, in order to guard the slaveholders against the dangers of such a war.

On a careful examination of the facts and the correspondence, I see no reason to doubt the entire sincerity of the professions of a desire for peace, made by President Polk. I think, however, it would have been better for him not to have adopted the recommendation made by General Taylor, in his letter of October 4, 1845, to move the troops from the Nueces to the Rio Grande, as a means of facilitating a settlement; yet, in adopting it, more than three months afterwards, I see no reason to suppose that Mr. Polk was governed by any bad motive, nor can I deny that the reasons in support of the measure were strong. I would have preferred, however, that the President should have thrown the responsibility upon Congress that that body, notwithstanding our unparalleled forbearance, should have forborne somewhat longer, and furnished additional proofs of the extraordinary moderation of this country in its intercourse with other nations. Yet, considering the unreasonableness and infatuation of the Mexicans, I do not think it likely that such forbearance would have prevented, though it might have delayed, the war.

It is common for some people to speak of this as a peculiarly unjust war; yet I have not found one of them able to designate any war of invasion, in the whole range of history, that they could themselves pronounce a more just one; or to designate any powerful nation that they think would have forborne longer than the United States have done.

There are many reasons for regretting the existence of the war; but it affords some consolation to believe that the amount of blood shed in it is not much greater than that shed in the same period in the civil broils of the Mexicans, and the incursions of the Indians into the Mexican districts, left unprotected and deprived of arms, lest the people might use them to regain their liberty; that the result will probably be the introduction of a better Government, freer trade, and more civilization, into Mexico; that if this Government acquires territory, such territory will enjoy more freedom of religion and of the press, and will be settled more rapidly; and that, if slaves are allowed to be transferred to the acquired territory, the transfer will not increase the number of slaves, but will place them in a climate more congenial to their constitutions, where there is less prejudice of color, and more facility for emancipation; and will, moreover, by the withdrawal of a portion of slaves from the Northern slaveholding States, render the speedy emancipation of the remainder more practicable and more probable.

In conclusion, I will notice, or repeat, some of the errors into which the violent censurers of the war have fallen. They are found in the assertions: 1. That Mexico ever had a right to Texas; 2. That Texas in 1825 was a "province" of Mexico; 3. That the Texans, instead of Santa Anna, were rebels; 4. That the resistance of Texas to the usurper was prompted principally by a desire to perpetuate slavery; 5. That the Government of the United States did not remain neutral in the contest; 6. That Texas was annexed with a view to perpetuate slavery; 7. That the tendency of annexation will be to perpetuate that institution; 8. That, whatever the motive, Mexico had any right to complain of the measure; 9. That Mexico did not accept the proposition to treat on all subjects in dispute; 10. That the negotiation was prevented from going on by a dispute as to whether our negotiator should be called a "commissioner" or a plenipotentiary, instead of whether he should be confined to the new claim of Mexico upon us, passing by our old claims on her; 11. That our claims upon her are mere *debts*, instead of demands for the restoration of property taken by shameless robbery; and 12. That Mexico came to an adjustment of all our claims and delayed their payment only by reason of inability. Though these statements have been made by prominent members of Congress and respectable editors, I deem them one and all erroneous. E.

Foreign Items.

From the London Correspondent of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

The Duke of Northumberland—one of the richest peers in Great Britain—died suddenly in his bed, at night, having merely suffered a few days attacks from influenza. It is an awful thought to reflect that all the enormous wealth of this nobleman—the descendant of the renowned Percys—with an income averaging from £2,000 to £3,000 daily, perfectly unencumbered—could not procure him a single hand to close his eyes, or which he might have grasped and breathed "farewell." His grace died without issue, and is succeeded in his titles and possessions by his brother Lord Prudhoe. Though not a man of great abilities, the late Duke held the high office of Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. He also had been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, ambassador to the court of St. Petersburgh, and special envoy to France at the coronation of the ill-fated Charles the Tenth. During the latter embassy he refused to receive any public money for outfit, or for any thing else; though a diamond hilted sword of the value of £10,000 sterling, voted to him by the House of Commons, he subsequently accepted. During the whole time that he remained in France, he had, independent of retainers three hundred gentlemen of birth in his suite. As he progressed through France to Paris he scattered gold among the crowds that surrounded his train of equipages, at every post-town. His wife was the governess to Queen Victoria. The remains of the Duke were interred in Westminster Abbey, in the tomb of the Percys, and with royal state. An important move, in consequence of his grace's demise, has taken place in the University of Cambridge, of which, as I have stated, the Duke was Chancellor. Some of the heads of houses, or colleges, were very anxious to have Prince Albert as Northumberland's successor. Others were averse to this, and suggested the Earl Powis, who is a member of the University, a talented and a pious peer. When solicited to stand, his royal highness declared that he should have been happy to do so had the requisition shown unanimity on the part of the senate; but that not being the case, he respectfully declined the invitation. Notwithstanding this denial, the requisitionists put the royal consort in nomination, and bravely went to the poll. After a contest of three days the number stood thus: for Prince Albert 948—for Earl Powis 835; majority for the Queen's husband 109.

"The Ten Hour Factory Labor Bill" has been debated in the House of