THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 7360. MORNING EDITION---TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1853. PRICE TWO CENTS.

NEWS BY TELEGRAPH.

MOVEMENTS OF GEN. PIERCE.

HIGHLY INTERESTING FROM WASHINGTON.

SPEECH OF SENATOR DOUGLAS O THE MONROE DOCTRINE RESOLUTIONS.

THE PLATFORM OF YOUNG AMERICA.

Comments of Senators Cass and Badger.

EXCITEMENT IN THE NEW YORK ASSEMBLY.

Debate Relative to the Arrest of Hon. Russell Smith.

The Strike of the Baltimore Operatives, &c., &c., &c.

General Pierce En Route for Washington.

DEPARTURE FROM CONCORD—THE CABINET FORMED

CONCORD, Feb 14—4 P. M.

General Pierce has just taken his departure for Boston, *en route* for Washington, accompanied by his private secretary, Sidney Webster. A large number of our citizens took leave of him at the Eagle Hotel, and at the depot, but, at his request, no public demonstration was made. He will stay in Boston to-night, and perhaps reach New York to-morrow night or Wednesday morning.

General Pierce has selected his Cabinet definitely and unchangeably. He has as yet communicated the names to none but those persons selected for the general offices, and probably will not do so till the 4th of March. There is no truth in the newspaper reports to the contrary.

PREPARATIONS FOR GENERAL PIERCE'S RECEPTION IN WASHINGTON, ETC.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1853.

The Washington *Republic* says a joint meeting of the committees appointed by the City Councils and the Jackson Democratic Association, to make arrangements for the reception of Gen. Pierce, was held Friday night. Mayor Mauray stated he had received no letter as to when the President elect would come on. A joint committee determined to meet him at Baltimore, and invited the Marshal of the district to join the committee.

General Pierce will take a private residence in this city during the spring and summer months, to admit of the executive mansion being rendered more comfortable.

Affairs in Washington City.

THE FISHERY QUESTION—SUPPOSED UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF MR. DAVIS'S BILL, ETC.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1853.

Mr. Davis's bill to settle the fishery difficulty is believed to be unconstitutional in its present shape, it being contended that the constitution gives the federal government no power over the fisheries of the several States. Florida will not consent to throw open her fisheries and admit the free blacks of the Bahamas, in order to benefit New England fishermen. Mr. Mallory intends, therefore, to introduce the following amendment:—

That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or allow any foreign vessel whatever, or any subject or citizen of any foreign power, to fish within the waters appurtenant to and within the jurisdiction of any State, contrary to the laws of such State, or to authorize or allow the bringing into or introduction within such waters and jurisdiction of any State, any person or persons, whether comprising the company or crew of such vessel, or others, contrary to the laws of such State.

The chances are that Congress will leave the matter this session where it stands. X. Y. Z.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT THE PHILADELPHIA MINT—THE ALLEGED FRAUDS CONCERNING THE CAPITOL EXTENSION—APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

FROM A REGULAR CORRESPONDENT.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1853.

The Secretary of the Treasury has appointed as a Committee to visit the Philadelphia Mint, and test the accuracy of the assays, Messrs. Hunter, of the Senate, and Brooks, of the House.

Samuel Strong appeared before the Investigating Committee, in the matter of the Capitol Extension, to-day, and testified that various statements sworn to by previous witnesses were erroneous. It is believed that Mr. Walters will fully exonerate himself, and the amount of plunder charged against other parties be greatly reduced by the testimony yet to be given. It is uncertain whether the Investigating Committee will report this session. We understand that Mr. Strong has sued the HERALD and another New York paper for libellous publications upon the subject.

Anthony W. Carpenter, of Burlington, Iowa, and Prior Nance, of Knoxville, Tennessee, have been confirmed as Surveyors of Customs.

The condition of Mr. Fuller, who was shot by Lieut. Schaumburg, is much improved, and the chances now favor his recovery.

Commodore Stockton's resignation is still the subject of much speculation.

THIRTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

SECOND SESSION.

Senate.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1853.

THE OPENING PETITIONS, ETC.

The Senate commenced business at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes.

Several executive communications were received.

Mr. SEWARD, (free soil) of N. Y., presented petitions for the repeal of the steamboat law, and others in favor of a line of steamers from Brooklyn to Germany.

REGISTERS FOR SHIPS.

Mr. SEWARD said the ship Resolute was lying now loaded and ready to proceed to sea, but could not for want of a register. He moved to take up the House bill granting a register to that vessel, which was agreed to, and the bill passed.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL, ETC.

Mr. HUNTER, (dem.) of Va., moved to take up the Deficiency bill during the morning hour. Lost.

Mr. FOOT, (whig) of Vt., presented a memorial of Mr. Morehead, praying an appropriation to make experiments with his improved patent for carrying cars up inclined planes without danger. Referred to a select committee.

Mr. HUNTER moved up the Deficiency bill to make it the special order for to-morrow. Agreed to.

He moved to postpone it. Rejected.

The bill was then considered, and the amendments reported by the Finance Committee voted on.

A large number of amendments to pay arrearages and supply omissions in former appropriations were adopted.

An item was proposed, allowing the application of last year's appropriation to pay arrearages of former years for lighthouses.

Mr. BORLAND, (dem.) of Ark., asked if this item had any reference to lighthouses on the Pacific.

Mr. HUNTER said it applied to lighthouses generally.

Mr. BORLAND said that facts had been disclosed before an investigating committee of the Senate, which would astound the country, showing the most outrageous frauds in the lighthouse contracts. The facts when disclosed would show that the administration of public moneys had of late years not been conducted on the principles of common honesty or justice. He proposed an amendment, excepting the lighthouses on the Pacific coast, which, after some remarks, was agreed to.

An amendment was agreed to providing for the lease of buildings and machinery in San Francisco, for assayers, weighers, and other officers. Bullion to be cast into bars, disks, &c., for depositors—no bar to be less than three ounces. $25,000 was added for the pay of Senators for the called session after March 4th.

Mr. GWIN, (dem.) of California, moved an amendment giving $300,000 to California out of the civil fund collected there as duties on imports previous to her admission.

Messrs. Gwin, Rusk, and Pearce, supported the amendment.

Messrs. Borland, Brodhead, Bright, Butler, and Badger, opposed it.

No question was taken, and the bill was postponed.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—SPEECH OF JUDGE DOUGLAS.

Mr. CASS' joint resolution, affirming the Monroe doctrine, and applying it to Cuba, was taken up.

Mr. DOUGLAS, (dem.) of Ill., said he regretted the necessity which compelled him to postpone the deliberations of the Senate on the Deficiency bill to engage in a debate on this subect. Thirty years ago Mr. Monroe made his memorable declaration on the subject of European colonization. Since then it had been the topic on which orators, patriots, and statesmen had delighted to speak. It had seemed to be the part of all politicians to profess the Monroe doctrine; and whenever there was no opportunity to enforce that doctrine, they seemed to be most in favor of it, and whenever there was an opportunity of so doing it was always abandoned. Such had been the history of the nation upon it. The Oregon treaty was a case in point. Previous to that treaty there was no British colony west of the Rocky Mountains. The Hudson's Bay Company were restricted to certain rights within certain limits. Canada did not extend there, and there was no right in existence by which a colony could be established there. The title to the country was in abeyance, and there was a treaty with Great Britain of non-occupancy. By the Oregon treaty we terminated this non-occupancy, and established forty-nine degrees as the northern boundary. Great Britain consented that the United States should occupy south of that line, and we consented that she should occupy and colonize north of it. In 1850, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was made—every word, every line of which was in absolute negation of the Monroe doctrine. Since then, even that treaty, which was a violation of the Monroe doctrine, had been violated by the colonization of the Bay Islands. In the face of these open violations of the doctrine, the Senator from Michigan lays before the Senate his resolutions re-affirming that doctrine, recognizing existing rights, but declaring that henceforth no new European colony shall be established. Before voting for that resolution, he desired to know whether it was intended to bury the past in oblivion, and the declaration of this doctrine to be for the future alone? He desired to know whether it was intended to acquiesce in the colonization of the Bay Islands, in violation of the Monroe doctrine and the Clayton and Bulwer treaty? Such would undoubtedly be the construction which Great Britain would place upon it. If the resolution be passed, and the President should protest against these violations of the Monroe doctrine, he would be met by Great Britain with the declaration that these resolutions, passed by Congress, clearly, and upon their face, were intended to apply to cases henceforth to arise. If this be the intention of these resolutions, it would be far better to say nothing of the Monroe doctrine. We have proclaimed it for thirty years, and in each and every instance where it might have been asserted and maintained it has been violated, and we have suffered the contempt to pass unrebuked. Our retreat this time is to be covered with terrible threats of what we will do in the future. The resolutions say the United States in future will be free to adopt such measures as an independent nation may adopt. Are we not now free to act as an independent nation ought to act, when its doctrine and treaty are violated openly? Why, then, not meet this colonization at the Bay Islands at once—it presents a practicable issue on this doctrine—and act as a free and independent nation may act? This doctrine was announced thirty years ago, and again within the past eight years. Are we to submit again to have it treated with contempt, with no action on our part but terrible threats for the future? Where or when will there be a better case to test our courage on the enforcement of this Monroe doctrine than the present one of the colonization of these islands? It was in direct contempt of the Monroe doctrine, and an open violation of the express terms of the treaty of 1850. He voted against the Clayton Bulwer treaty because it was in open violation of the Monroe doctrine. The United States had shortly before acquired California, and a communication with the Pacific was highly desirable and necessary. American citizens were at the time in possession of the exclusive grants of transit by canal or railroad, by the way of Panama, Tehuantepec and Nicaragua. Mr. Polk sent Mr. Hise to Central America to negotiate for an exclusive right for a communication across Nicaragua to the United States. Mr. Hise made a treaty with Nicaragua, by which the United States were secured in the exclusive right to construct a railway or canal across the country to the Pacific, with the liberty of fortifying that at either end, to continue to the United States for ever. This convention was sent to the State Department by Mr. Hise in September, 1849, and Mr. Clayton never sent it to the Senate. Upon coming into power, the administration of General Taylor superseded Mr. Hise, and sent out Mr. Squier, with instructions to negotiate a treaty with no exclusive rights to the United States, but to be open to the world; and that if Mr. Hise should have negotiated a treaty by which the United States had acquired such an exclusive right, the government of Nicaragua was to be informed that Mr. Hise had no authority to act—that his course would be repudiated, and that he had been superseded. Any treaty negotiated by Mr. Hise for an exclusive right in the United States was to be modified by Mr. Squier so as to give such right to the world. Thus, the partnership with Europe was commenced. Mr. Squier so informed the Nicaraguan authorities, and he succeeded in negotiating a new treaty, opening this right of way to all Europe, and enabling them to interfere with affairs on this continent. Both treaties were in the State Department when Congress met in December, 1849. Mr. Clayton suppressed the one negotiated by Mr. Hise, and sent the Squier one to the Senate. It was not ratified, and the consequence was that we had no treaty with Nicaragua on this subject of the canal. The excuse by Mr. Clayton for this conduct was that the government of Nicaragua would not ratify the Hise treaty. But why would it not? Because Mr. Clayton had instructed Mr. Squier to say to that government that Mr. Hise had no authority to act—that his acts would be repudiated by the United States—and instructing him to modify any treaty which had been made so as to carry out the wishes of the United States, to allow Europe like privileges. The correspondence on this subject showed that Nicaragua desired to have nothing to do with Europe, and desired the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine. The President of Nicaragua addressed this government, and all the letters from Nicaragua were allowed to remain unanswered. Mr. Squier, in his correspondence, stated that his main difficulty in carrying out the objects of his mission was the attachment in Nicaragua to the Hise treaty, and to an exclusive association with the United States. Nicaragua thus abandoned by the United States, and knowing her own weakness, was forced to submit to the European partnership. Following these events, Mr. Clayton opened negotiations with the British minister for the European partnership on this canal. That Clayton Bulwer treaty was a total negation of the Monroe doctrine. It was an alliance with Great Britain, in which all the nations of Europe were invited to participate. It surrenders the exclusive right which might have been secured to the United States had the Hise treaty been sent to the Senate by Mr. Clayton, and substitutes for it a partnership with all Europe. The partnership was not confined to Nicaragua; it extended to any canal or railway to be constructed from Mexico to New Granada, placing that whole country under the joint control of Great Britain and the United States, and such European nations as may unite in it. The treaty also provided that neither nation should annex, colonize, or exercise dominion over any part of Central America. He was unwilling to pledge this nation to Europe that we would not do, at any time, any act which our rights and interests might demand at our hands. He was not then, nor was he now, in favor of annexing any part of Central America. It was not long since when Senators would have declared they did not desire the acquisition of California. How long will it be before those States of Central America, now the half way post to California, will be filled up with an active American population, who, for their own interests and protection, as well as for our benefit, may render their incorporation into this Union highly desirable to both? He was opposed to this part of the treaty, because he did not feel disposed to bind the United States not to do anything with respect to this continent without the consent of any nation in Europe. The treaty forbids the United States fortifying any place commanding the canal, thus leaving to Jamaica—the only point fortified—the exclusive command of that canal. It amounted to an express stipulation that Great Britain alone should have any fortification near that canal. He was opposed to that treaty in all its objects, purposes, principles, provisions, and details. No matter which construction was placed on the treaty, it was an unmitigated evil, which could not be remedied till that treaty was swept from the statute book. He did not believe there was a hair's breadth of difference in the understanding of the treaty between Mr. King and Mr. Clayton. Why talk about the construction of it? If the United States attempts to extend its exclusion to the Belize, the letters of Clayton and others will be cited, and Great Britain will make a firm and candid refusal. That was not the point on which to make the issue, for the protection of Great Britain was to extend from Mexico to New Granada. If an issue was desired, there was a better one—under no pretext could it be said that the Bay Islands were in the Belize settlement. They were in, and belonged to the State of Honduras, and they, according to the express terms of the treaty, were not to be colonized. The colonization of those islands presented plainly and directly a violation of the treaty, as well as the Monroe doctrine. In this issue we have not only the right of the case, but have the treaty—the Monroe doctrine—to sustain us. Now, are we prepared to stand by it? If the resolution said, "Whereas Great Britain has seized and colonized, in violation of the Monroe doctrine and the treaty of 1850, the islands of the Bay of Honduras, in derogation of the honor, rights, and interests of the United States," it would express his idea of what the occasion demanded. He was opposed to equivocal expressions in dealings with foreign nations. In all questions rising out of disputes as to their meaning the weaker power was compelled to submit to the stronger. We do not think we are the weaker power, and Great Britain, from long association, would perhaps say she was not. This treaty has its difficulties and its equivocal phrases. It was not a bond of peace, but a source of evil, to the two countries. The treaty is equivocal as to the protectorate on the Mosquito coast. One proposition seems to abolish it, and another does not. We say it does abolish it. Great Britain says it does not. But has the President of the United States asserted that that protectorate has been abolished? Or has it been discontinued? They keep it up now just as they did before that treaty. How long are we to wait before they discontinue it? Are we to let Great Britain continue the protectorate of that Mosquito king until the world shall say that, by our acquiescence, we have admitted it was not abolished by the treaty? He desired to see our opinion, that that protectorate has been abolished, practically carried out. The history of that affair was singular. Great Britain never seized on San Juan till within six days after the date of the treaty of peace with Mexico, by which we had acquired California, and a passage to the Pacific became desirable to the United States. This fact alone was sufficient to show that the seizure of that place was from feelings of jealousy and motives of hostility to the United States, and not from any desire to protect the Mosquito king. He believed the first step which ought to be taken was to relieve ourselves from that treaty, and place ourselves in the position we occupied before it was concluded. The next was, to put an end to this colony in the Bay of Islands. He cared not for the form, but perhaps it should first be the duty of the executive to apply to Great Britain on the subject. The present administration, if it had done its duty, had already moved in the matter. If the protest of the executive be not sufficient, he could inform Congress, and ask for the authority and means to preserve the honor and rights of the nation. He was opposed to declaring in advance what we would or would not do, or for binding the nation in any way as to events which might arise in the future. For that reason he had voted against the treaty of peace with Mexico. By that treaty the hands of the United States are forever tied from doing that which, at some day hereafter, we will have to do, and when we do it, we will be reproached with being false to treaties. That treaty with Mexico prescribes the boundaries between the two nations, and provides that they shall be religiously respected by both nations, and that no change shall ever be made in them, except by the free consent of the two governments, lawfully given. What does this stipulation mean? It provides against the recurrence of a case like Texas. The Sabine was once the boundary of Mexico—Texas became settled by Americans, revolted, became independent, and was incorporated into the United States. By that act the boundary was changed to the Rio Grande, without the free and expressed consent of Mexico. War followed. She was conquered. We acquired some of her possessions, and this provision means that we acted wrong in that case, and bind ourselves not to repeat the dishonorable deed. This degrading acknowledgement of our wrong to Mexico stands on the statute book. By that treaty we were also bound never to annex any more territory in the manner we did Texas. Chihuahua and Sonoma—no matter how much our honor, our rights, our interests may demand it—no matter what may be their condition or that of Mexico—no matter if they are about to pass into the hands of European powers, they cannot come to us, for our honor and our faith are solemnly pledged not to annex them. The opponents of this provision strongly endeavored to strike it out, and, after a long and warm debate, they were left in a minority of 11 to 42. Thus, by treaties with Great Britain and Mexico, we are bound for ever to submit to violations of the Monroe doctrine. After all this, where was the virtue of proclaiming anew the Monroe doctrine? He would like to know the effect to be produced by the proclamation of that doctrine now—of proclaiming to the world that we will submit quietly to all its past violations, but that we will do terrible things from this time henceforth. Submission to wrong and threats to resist its repetition for the future produce but little fear in men, and much less in powerful nations. These resolutions referred also to Cuba. That we will resist, by all the means in our power, the transfer of Cuba to any European power, with or without the consent of Spain, is a matter too well settled to be questioned or doubted by any American. This is well known to all Europe. Why then, under cover of this declaration of the Monroe doctrine, make a disclaimer of any possible perfidy or interfering with the rights of Spain? Why disclaim any intention to wrong her? In what act in our past relations with Spain have we ever shown any want of faith, or disposition to do injustice towards her? If anything, we have forborne with her. Our President has overlooked the denial to American citizens, in her possessions, rights guaranteed to them by treaty. Why then anticipate suspicion of wrong by us by a disclaimer of any such intention? Great Britain has invited the United States to unite in a guarantee to Spain of Cuba. She may well ask the United States to do so. She is solicitous for Spain—very! Why does she not restore to Spain Jamaica, which holds Cuba in check? Why not restore to Spain Gibraltar—the key of the Mediterranean? Why does she not restore to their original owners her colonies scattered throughout the world—all of which she has taken by violence, fraud, and perfidy? All the possessions she has, she obtained by such means. Why, then, does she ask us to bind ourselves not to steal the property of our neighbors? We have got no territory but what we have paid for liberally. We have not held for centuries colonies obtained by war, rapine, perfidy, and fraud? Why then should the United States, jointly or separately, make any disclaimer of any such intention to commit a wrong upon Spain, thereby conveying the implication that we were open to any such accusation. Great Britain and France may do so. They, after getting all they have by fraud and violence, may pray that we, their neighbor, may become honest, and not steal Cuba. Tiger Island was seized by Great Britain, and when asked by the United States as to her intention, she assured the Secretary of State she did not intend to retain it. That officer and the President were so rejoiced they sent a message to Congress, considering it a cause for national congratulation. But now, following that act up, they have seized and colonized these Bay Islands. There was not much value in these disclaimers. He could not consider his house any more safe in the night because the thief had pledged his honor not to rob it. If there was a purpose to steal, the disclaimer would not prevent it—and among honest men, no disclaimer was necessary. It was true that the United States, and some of its public men, had been denounced in Europe as marauders and robbers, and he would not vote for any resolution, which, by implication, sanctioned such an accusation. There might be in these clauses of the resolutions, a lurking allusion to a certain individual of about his proportions. It was customary for some persons to attribute these lawless and marauding purposes to a portion of the people whom they designate as Young America, and he had been referred to, the other day, as being identified with that party. He knew of nothing in his political conduct deserving such an imputation. He had for six years past uniformly voted on treaties and other matters to sustain the Monroe doctrine. He had done no more. The difference between him and those with whom he had not voted was, that he was against giving pledges for our future conduct, and then submitting to their gross and open violation. His sentiments with regard to Cuba had been public for nine years. So long as Cuba is content to remain loyal to the crown of Spain, be it so. He had no desire or wish to disturb or change that relation. Whenever the people of Cuba shall show themselves worthy of freedom, by associating and maintaining free republican institutions, his heart, his feelings, and his sympathies, would be with them. When that independence shall have been asserted and maintained, if it be advisable for their interests and protection that we should do for them as we did with Texas, he would receive them into the Union. Whenever Spain shall be satisfied that she can no longer hold Cuba, and shall be willing to transfer it to the United States on reasonable terms, he would be willing to treat with her. If Spain refuse to transfer it to the United States, and should do so to any European nation, he was for taking possession of that island, and for holding it at all hazards. He could not vote to make the first declaration in the resolution, because, by implication, it sanctioned the charge of turpitude against the United States. He could not vote to make the second one, viz.:—"That it could not be transferred to any European power;" because no European nation would dare hazard its existence by attempting to take it. England would not attempt it, for the moment she did so she would be banished the North American continent. She has given bond and surety to keep the peace on this continent. Let us act firmly in the matter of the present offence, and leave future events to take care of themselves. This was the course he took when the resolution on intervention was before the Senate. He was then, and now, unwilling to say we would, or would not, interfere, but leave ourselves free to act as we deem best when the case arises. He thought it was the duty of the executive to take the first step—to protest courteously, respectfully, and firmly against the colonization of these Bay Islands. If that protest be disregarded, let him ask of Congress action in this matter. He intended to arraign no man, nor to attack any one, but as he had not till now had an opportunity of explaining his course on these several treaties, he had taken this occasion to do so.

OLD AMERICA CATECHISING YOUNG AMERICA.

Mr. CASS (dem.) of Mich., said the Senator had indulged in some pretty free remarks on the resolution, and he thought he could show them to be mere hyper-criticisms. The Senator objects, because the resolution says we have no intention to interfere with or disturb existing rights. Does the Senator desire to destroy existing rights?

Mr. DOUGLAS, emphatically—No.

Mr. CASS—Why not say so, then, in the resolution? The words were used by Mr. Polk, "Existing rights does not mean existing wrongs." If any colonization or possession at this time be wrong, it is not an existing right, but an existing wrong, and is not protected by the resolution. The resolution does not wipe out the past, but leaves us free as ever to act upon past wrongs. If the Bay Islands were taken in face of the treaty and our declared doctrine, it is an existing wrong, and it is not therefore an existing right. In the words of the resolution, possessory wrongs were not existing rights. He thought there was use for this declaration of the Monroe doctrine. Monroe, Jefferson and Polk thought there was use in laying this doctrine down, but it had laid idle in the archives of the nation, and should now be put in some authoritative shape. The Monroe doctrine was not violated in the Oregon treaty. The Senator had entirely misconceived the question. The moment we conceded the British line as coming down to 49 deg. we conceded that the Monroe doctrine did not apply above that line. We have given up nothing in the Bay Islands affair, for it was not known here till within six weeks. We have done nothing there conceding any British rights. As to Nicaragua, we could get no treaty there, and the easiest way to enforce the Monroe doctrine in Central America was to agree with Great Britain to keep hands off. The gentleman was in favor of a protest by the President. Of what value was that? It had already been made by Messrs. Monroe and Polk, but when put in this shape it will be the protest of the American people in an authoritative shape; and no nation in Europe would disregard it. In these days, when no man knew what to-morrow would bring forth, it was proper that this nation should notify the world of what its policy was to be. He did not intend, by the disclaimer of any intention to disturb the rights of Spain, to imply the existence of any turpitude in the American character.

Mr. DOUGLAS said such would be the inference of other nations.

Mr. CASS said it had not occurred to him in that light. He saw nothing of the kind in it. As to what was said about Old and Young America, it was not fit for the Senate. Old America had had to bear its burden of abuse, and, as Young America got old, it would have to stand the same abuse.

Mr. DOUGLAS said, as to the remark about Young America, he had never introduced it into the Senate till after it had been commented upon in a speech on this subject the other day—the only speech made on the subject to which the Senator from Michigan had not replied. He could not, therefore, understand; certainly did not expect to receive the lecture for using those words from the Senator.

Mr. CASS said he had not lectured the Senator. He had always taken "old fogy" to himself.

Mr. DOUGLAS said if it was fit for the Senator to use the words "old fogy," and "young America," for a year in the Senate, it was fit for him to use them on this occasion, in reply to a speech made by another Senator. The Senator says that his words "existing rights," do not justify the past. Do they justify the taking of Jamaica, seized by a usurper, whose act was disavowed, but the territory retained? Did they recognize the colony at the Belize, taken possession of under a grant to cut logwood, and extended without the recognition of Spain? Are we to consider all these as existing rights? Pass this resolution, and Great Britain will tell you that they are existing rights. The resolution itself was vague and meaningless. The condemnation it pronounces was entirely in the future—"henceforth" was the word. It said that "henceforth no new colonies shall be established," &c., thus carrying upon its face the inevitable construction that the past is to be blotted out; but there are terrible threats for the future. If the Senator will say that all European colonies established on this continent since 1823, in violation of the Monroe doctrine, and all that shall hereafter be established, shall be discontinued and resisted, they might agree.

Mr. CASS—I will vote for such a resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS said that was pretty strong talking. He then understood that, under the Senator's resolution, the Belize is to be surrendered and the Mosquito protectorate abandoned. If so, he would rejoice to see the resolution carry these objects into execution. He had read the Senator's speech, but never dreamed he intended his resolution to extend so far. If Great Britain was to be notified to quit the Belize, and abandon the Bay Islands, was is not to be done through the State Department? This was the executive protest he wanted. If it failed, then it was for Congress to act. He was for enforcing the Monroe doctrine. If the Senator was so also, let him unite with him in procuring the abolition of the Clayton Bulwer treaty, which is in direct violation of the doctrine. If the Senator would put his resolution in that shape, he would find him (Mr. Douglas) his coadjutor in the cause he had so much at heart. If the colony of the Bay of Islands and the Clayton and Bulwer treaty be not set aside, it was useless to be talking about the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. BADGER, (whig,) of N. C., said he felt constrained to interpose in this controversy between the very harmonious friends—young and old America—for the purpose of rebuking the very unfair, illiberal and unjustifiable assault by young America upon an old fogy, to which class he claimed to belong himself. (Laughter.) He desired to shield this resolution. The Senator from Illinois objected to this word "henceforth," when, in fact, that word contained the whole merit and virtue of the resolution. Mr. Monroe put this doctrine forth to apply "henceforth." (Laughter.) The declaration then and now put aside all past misconduct, but nothing was to be done "henceforth." If that word were stricken out, it would not be the "Monroe doctrine." (Laughter.) The necessity for the word must be obvious. In twenty years from now, or sooner, coming on a presidential election, it will be of incalculable advantage to repeat the declaration, to put aside the past, and declare that "henceforth" no wrong shall be permitted. (Laughter.) Mr. B. pursued the subject much further in the same strain, amid much laughter and merriment. He was opposed to striking out "henceforth." He said he would vote for the Monroe doctrine, because it was right, but not because it was the Monroe doctrine. The resolutions of 1798 had become part of the constitution, and he objected to adding thereto the Message of Mr. Monroe.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, (whig) of Ky., rose to vindicate the truth of history. He read from the Senate Journal of 1835 to show that a resolution was then adopted, without opposition, directing the President to offer negotiations with Central America and the nations of Europe for the opening of a common highway to the Pacific. That received the approval of President Jackson. The treaties complained of had all been ratified by the democratic party. He argued with the Senator from Illinois in his opposition to abstract propositions. He preferred to wait for practical issues.

Mr. HOUSTON, (dem.) of Texas, got the floor.

The subject was then postponed till Saturday.

NEW SENATOR FOR KENTUCKY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD presented the credentials of his successor, John B. Thompson, Senator from Kentucky for six years from the 4th of March next.

The Senate then adjourned.

House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1853.

NO MORE EVENING SESSIONS.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, (dem.) of Ala., it was resolved that until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting be eleven o'clock, and that the order heretofore adopted for evening sessions be rescinded.

SWAMP LAND DIFFICULTIES.

Mr. DAVIS, (dem.) of Ind., from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill to adjust difficulties growing out of sales by the general government of swamp lands heretofore granted to certain States.

The bill provided that, in cases where the government had sold swamp lands granted to certain States, the money shall be refunded on condition that they give a good title to the purchasers. The Committee on Public Lands proposed a substitute—that instead of money, the States shall be permitted to select other lands, acre for acre.

Messrs. DAVIS of Ind., HALL, and others, explained the bill.

Mr. TOOMBS, (whig,) of Va., said that the act of 1850 only granted the swamp and overflowed lands unfit for cultivation, but the Secretary of the Interior had, to a disgraceful extent, included millions of acres of other lands. This was the cause of the conflicting title.

Mr. DAVIS, (dem.) of Ind., wanted to know what the gentleman would do with the men who had settled on some of those lands?

MR. TOOMBS replied—Their title is good against the general government and the States.

Mr. DAVIS said the government kept the Land Offices open, and sold the lands after the passage of the law which vested the title to the lands in the States. Would the gentleman turn the settlers from the lands and have the government keep their money?

Mr. TOOMBS repeated—They have got a good title against the government and the States, and he would vote for a bill to secure this to them.

Mr. JOHNSON, (dem.) of Ark., replied to the gentleman who preceded him in debate.

Mr. ORR, (dem.) of S. C., said the bill under consideration did not meet his favor, and the fact that the lands were entered, was conclusive evidence that they were not the swamp lands given to the States.

Mr. MOORE, (whig) of La., said—Since his State had received swamp lands and drained some of them, much government land had been brought into market—thus a benefit had resulted from the grant. Merely because lands were entered did not prove they were desirable for human habitation. Thousands of acres are purchased on the Mississippi river only for the timber, and after this is cut the land is deserted.

Mr. CLEVELAND (dem.) of Conn., said the effect of the bill was to take money out of the national treasury and transfer it, like a gratuity, to certain States, contrary to the intention of the Swamp Land act.

After further debate, Mr. CLEVELAND moved to lay the bill on the table, which was carried, by yeas 116, nays 50.

A motion to reconsider the above vote was tabled by a yea and nay vote.

PRIVATE BILLS PASSED.

The House passed two Senate private bills, and adjourned.

Curious Information from Albany.

THE ARREST OF MR. SMITH IN THE ASSEMBLY—A DAY SPENT IN ADJUSTING THE AFFAIR, ETC.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.

ALBANY, Feb. 14—10 P. M.

After the journal of the House was read, Mr. Russell Smith rose to a question of privilege in regard to his arrest on Saturday by the Speaker. He made a few remarks, and said he hoped the matter would rest. If the House was satisfied he was. But Mr. Burroughs was not satisfied. He felt very indignant, and offered a resolution amending the journal of Saturday, by stating that Mr. Smith was improperly arrested. Then a debate sprung up which occupied the whole day. Precedents were quoted from old English Parliamentary debates, the rules and orders of the House of Commons, and other antiquated records, which had been repudiated a century since. Both sides put forward their best speakers, and eloquence flowed in torrents until two o'clock, when the House took a recess until four. After dinner and wine the debate was resumed—some sustaining the Speaker, and others denouncing him. Several of the speeches were more pointed and personal than any of the session. At seven o'clock, Mr. Kennedy, (whig,) of Cayuga, offered the following resolution as substitutes to those of Mr. Burroughs:—

"Resolved, That the Speaker of the House, in causing the arrest of the Hon. Russell Smith, was actuated by a desire to do his duty, and that he believed that law and precedents warranted him in so doing."

This was adopted unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Beeman, (whig) of Washington county.

The following was also offered by Mr. Kennedy, and rejected by two to one:—

"Resolved, That it was irregular and out of order for the Speaker thus to arrest the Hon. Russell Smith, and that this House only can cause arrests to be made for contempt, and decide what constitutes contempt, and to prescribe punishment for the same."

Thus the Speaker stands pre-eminently justified by the House in the course he took on Saturday.

The Senate was cool and deliberate, and there was no excitement whatever.

To morrow is assigned for an executive session, and an attempt will be made, and is likely to succeed, to prevent the taking up any of the Governor's recommendations.

The striking out the tax on banks and railroads, of the the Loomis resolutions, is producing an inquiry how to raise funds to complete canals. W.

NEW YORK LEGISLATURE.

Senate.

ALBANY, Feb 14, 1853.

MEMORIALS FROM NEW YORK—BRIDGE AT ALBANY.

Memorials were presented from New York, relative to the abuses of the city government.

Mr. Cooley's resolution relative to the bridge at Albany was adopted.

THE CLAY MEDAL, ETC.

Mr. BEEKMAN, (whig) presented a letter from Daniel Ullmann and others, asking the Senate to accept a bronze copy of the Henry Clay medal.

A resolution receiving it and placing it in the State Library was adopted.

Mr. COOLEY, (dem.) delivered a severe phillipic against those who, while Clay was living, abused and vilified him, and were now the loudest in their eulogies.

Mr. PIERCE, (dem.) followed this up by a resolution to raise a select committee to report appropriate resolutions relative to the distinguished dead of the last five years.

It was laid on the table after a debate.

THE ERIE RAILROAD.

Mr. CONGER, (dem.) offered a resolution calling on the Erie Railroad Company to communicate copies of leases made with companies in New Jersey, in relation to their business.

Mr. COOLEY saw no reason for these resolutions, except a desire to annoy the railroad company. He moved to lay them on the table, which was carried, by ayes 12, nays 8.

No other business of interest was transacted prior to adjournment.

Assembly.

ALBANY, Feb. 14, 1853.

THE ARREST OF MR. SMITH ON SATURDAY.

During the reading of the journal, Mr. R. SMITH raised a question of privilege relative to his arrest.

Mr. CLAPP inquired if while Mr. Smith was in contempt he could raise any question of privilege?

The SPEAKER said Mr. Smith was not in contempt.

Mr. W. TAYLOR, (whig) of N. Y., moved that Mr. Smith be permitted to go on.

The SPEAKER said he had the privilege.

Mr. LOOMIS, (dem.) of Herkimer, hoped Mr. Smith would defer his remarks till the reading of the journal had been gone through.

Mr. SMITH continued. He had given way on Saturday for a motion to adjourn, from the gentleman from Herkimer (Mr. Loomis), who thought they would come together this morning in better temper than they were on Saturday evening. Mr. S. hoped that gentleman's feelings had undergone some change, for it was his arbitrary proceeding which had produced his commitment to custody. Mr. S. said he had expressed his desire to be excused from voting on Mr. L.'s resolutions. He had asked it respectfully, and given a sufficient reason therefor. Compelling him to vote was placing him in a false position on the journals. The resolutions of Mr. Loomis had been presented to the House for the ostensible purpose of obtaining its advice; but instead of permitting a full interchange of opinions—instead of so changing them as to harmonize the views of the House, the previous question was demanded and the resolutions of instruction were forced through the House. Mr. S. could not vote on them without either voting against economy as a principle, or voting for instructions which he considered improper on the occasion. His refusing to vote was not a contempt of the House. He should first have been asked whether he had any personal interest in the question under discussion, which, by the rules, would exclude his vote. If he had committed a contempt, it was for the House to determine the penalty for it. It was not the province of the Speaker to do so. He did not charge the Speaker with a determination to exercise undue authority, or to arbitrarily place Mr. S. in arrest. He only thought it an error of judgment on the part of the Speaker. He desired no action to be taken on the subject, as far as he was concerned; but it was for the House to take such course as it should see fit, to protect its own rights and the liberty of the members. The reading of the journal was then completed.

Mr. BURROUGHS, (ind. dem.) of Orleans, desired to have the journal corrected as regarded the resolution made to release Mr. Smith from arrest. He believed it would be remembered, that when a resolution was made to adjourn, he had expressed the hope that there would be no adjournment while a member of the House was under arrest. He made a motion for the release of the gentleman. Amendments were made, as his motion was, verbally. The Speaker decided that the several motions should be sent up to the clerk's desk in writing. When that was done, the resolution of another gentleman was given precedence over his own. His resolution was accompanied by a censure of the Speaker, for committing Mr. Smith, while the other resolution made no allusion to the commitment. Mr. B. made no charge of a disposition on the part of any one to mutilate or change the record, but he simply regarded it as an error committed during the confusion which prevailed.

Mr. LOOMIS said his recollection was distinctly, that the resolution of Mr. Burroughs was offered as an amendment to another resolution.

Mr. BURROUGHS said this was a mistake, although he had said he would wish to offer it as an amendment, if another resolution should be decided to take precedence.

Mr. LOOMIS said this was giving the Speaker authority to put the resolution in that shape, and that the House cut it off by the previous question.

Mr. FORSYTH, (dem.) of Albany, said he hoped the journal would stand as it was.

Mr. O'KEEFE, (dem.) of New York, said so many motions had been made simultaneously in regard to the arrest of Mr. Smith, it did not require that any fuss should be made about it.

The journal was then approved.

Mr. CHAMPLIN, (dem.) of Allegany, called attention to that portion of the journal respecting a point of order, which had been raised by Mr. Beman, in regard to the propriety of the arrest of Mr. Smith by the Speaker. He wished the journal to state that the Speaker had decided the arrest to be legal, and that the House had sustained that decision.

Mr. BURROUGHS said the House had not, at the time of the arrest of Mr. Smith, passed upon the question of the rightful arrest of Mr. Smith by the Speaker. He hoped the journal would not be made false by stating this to have been the case. If the question of the legality of Mr. Smith's arrest was to come up, the time had come to act upon it.

Mr. CHAMPLIN pressed his motion to amend the journal.

Mr. BURROUGHS moved to lay the amendment of the journal on the table, as a privileged question. Lost.

Mr. LOOMIS said he was willing the proposition of Mr. B. should be entertained by the House at a suitable time. But he wished the journal to be amended in a way to set the Speaker right. The Speaker had decided the point of order by Mr. Beman not to be well made. An appeal was taken from that decision, when the House sustained the Speaker's decision. This constituted an approval on the part of the House of the manner of Mr. Smith's arrest.

Mr. KENNEDY, (whig,) of Cayuga, said this was the time, if ever, to correct the journal. The question ought to be decided now.

Mr. CHAMPLIN'S motion to amend the minutes was then carried.

Mr. BURROUGHS then made a motion, that Mr. Smith had been improperly arrested by the Speaker on Saturday last, without the authority of the House. He disclaimed any intention of expressing any disrespect to the Speaker in what he should say. He would endeavor to speak of the question as one far above a party character. A question of privilege was of the highest character. He would look at the conduct of the Speaker on Saturday, with all the leniency the occasion demanded. The House had been in considerable excitement—many gentlemen had asked to be excused from voting. The House had in no case granted it. When Mr. Smith declined to vote, the Speaker may have supposed it his duty to compel that gentleman to vote. It was an error of judgment in regard to the authority of the chair. During the excitement a motion had been made to arrest Mr. Smith. The Speaker had decided that the motion was unnecessary, and without putting the question for the decision of the House, ordered the arrest of Mr. Smith. This case might be tortured into a precedent, and might endanger the personal liberty and rights of the members of the House. It was not to insult or censure the Speaker that he made these remarks; but hereafter the authority now assumed by the Speaker might be used as a precedent to exercise it for corrupt and tyrannical purposes. Suppose the House to be nearly divided, how easy it might be for the Speaker to arrest several members, and thus prevent their voting, and change the decision of an important question. A corrupt Speaker might easily do this. It is a dangerous authority. There was no precedent for it in the worst period of English history, when there was no written constitution to protect the rights of members. Here we have such a constitution to shield us. The arrest of a citizen in this country was never designed to take place, except by authority of law. [Mr. B. read from the national constitution, which requires that no citizen shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law.] What law was there to authorize the Speaker to exercise this power of arresting? It certainly had been placed on the statute in the House, but there was no rule delegating this power to the presiding officer. He could not have it without a special enactment to that effect. [Mr. B. also read from the statutes that no person could be disfranchised without a legal process.] But Mr. Smith had been refused the privilege of voting, when his name was called on a question while he was under arrest. But suppose there were English precedents for the authority exercised by the Speaker—our constitution and laws guarantee the rights of the citizen, and of course, override any precedent. So sacred is the liberty of the citizen held, that no one can be arrested except for disorderly conduct, and by direction of the House, tending to interrupt our proceedings. The mere neglect of a member to vote, was not disorderly conduct. And are not the rights of members as great as those of the citizen? Mr. B. said Mr. Smith had not even violated the rules of the House. The rules forbid any member from voting on a question in which he has a personal interest. A member may move to be excused from voting, and if refused, it is then the duty of the chair to ask if the member has any personal interest in the question. Until this is done, there is no authority in the Speaker or the House to authoritatively require him to vote. It is a legal rule that usage interprets the meaning of law; non-usage also acts as an interpreter. Where power has never been exercised, we may conclude it is not warranted by law. Has the power exercised by the Speaker in this case, ever been exercised before? Mr. B. gave examples where persons had been brought before the House, to testify upon oath, and had refused. In such cases, it had been decided that the Assembly could only compel them to testify, by calling in the judicial authorities to exercise their powers in the matter. Even at the time of the odious and tyrannical Star Chamber in England, members were not subject to impeachment or arrest without a vote of that body. The arrest of a member of this House, thus preventing his voting while in custody, is to disfranchise the constituents whom he represents. This was a serious matter, and not to be exercised arbitrarily. In England, the King himself has not a right to arrest a member of Parliament, even when supposed to be guilty of high treason, without permission of Parliament. It is the boast of this free country, that no person can be arrested without a legal process. This arrest of Mr. Smith had been made without authority of the statute. On the contrary, it had been done against positive law. The rule quoted by Mr. Beman was in point:—If a member continue obdurate, the Speaker may compel him to withdraw from the House, until his case has been passed upon. Lord Onslow, a distinguished jurist and Speaker of the House of Commons, had decided that when a member exhibited any contumacy, the presiding officer might call him by name and require his submission. But suppose he remains obdurate, it was asked of Lord Onslow, what should then be done? "The Lord in Heaven knows," was his reply. But even before a member is placed under arrest, the precedents show he is to be allowed to speak in exculpation of himself. But Mr. Smith was not given an opportunity to speak in his own defence, but was forced to take his seat when he attempted to speak. If this course was legal, the freedom of no member on this floor is secure. He cannot know that he is not liable to be placed in custody at any time. Mr. B. said the only precedent that could be given for this arrest was one where the Speaker of the House of Commons, while in one of the courts, was run against by a member of Parliament, and immediately ordered him to be placed under arrest; but he soon found that he had acted illegally, and released him. This could scarcely have much weight in the present case. We cannot, said Mr. B., be too jealous of the rights and prerogatives of members here. The mere neglect to do anything—not producing disorder—gave no occasion for such an arbitrary exercise of power. Until we have examples of this nature, let us presume the power is illegal. There is no rule of the House conferring the power of arrest on the Speaker, and until this is positively done he has it not.

Mr. CHAMPLIN said that this being the first time he had held a seat in a legislative body, it might be presumptuous in him, amid so many able men, to discuss this subject. But as he had been so often alluded to he must make some remarks. He should confine himself wholly to the question. He would take no advantage of the fact that the House had sustained the decision of the Speaker, on the point of order raised by Mr. Beman, now that the House has since corrected the journal so as to make this fact appear upon the record. After Mr. Smith had declined to vote, the presiding officer had asked the pleasure of the House. A motion had been made to order Mr. Smith into custody. Another member suggested that this was unnecessary, as the Speaker had already abundant power. It was only after this had been done that the presiding officer directed the arrest of Mr. Smith. It was done without objection or protest; and this silence might properly be presumed to sustain the action of the Speaker, without a mere technical vote. But he would waive all this, and argue the right of the Speaker to arrest a member. The case cited by Mr. Burroughs, said Mr. C., refers to the arrest of members of the legislative bodies, by authority of the courts, for offences other than against the House, in violation of the rights of the whole legislative body. He would invite the attention of the House to a precedent, sustaining the action of the Speaker of the House. Incidental to the right of the Speaker to order a gentleman from the House, was the authority to enforce that order by personal violence, and forcibly eject him from the House. This is certainly a more extensive exercise of authority than that in the case of Mr. Smith. Mr. C. cited instances where by a standing rule of the House, all persons were to be excluded from the lobbies, and when, in violation of this rule, people had entered the lobbies, they were placed under arrest. This action was decisive upon the whole question. It was the duty of the presiding officer to take notice of all breaches of the privilege of the House, or of its members. It was his duty to compulsorily exercise the right of protecting the prerogatives of the House. He mentioned the instance in which the Speaker might imprison every member of the House, by ordering the closing of the doors and then preventing any member from going out. The constitution has been read to us about freedom from arrest without due process of law. This is begging the question. If the Speaker has the legal power of arrest, his exercise of it is due process of law. The House gets this power of arrest from the constitution, and they have delegated it to their presiding officer. He must keep order in the House, and see that persons confine themselves to their proper spheres. Neglecting to conform to the rules of the House was contumacious and disorderly conduct. Without intending the least disrespect to the member who had been the first example of this power of arrest, he must say that the gentleman's conduct had been in contempt of the House, and made him amenable to its censure. Placing a man under arrest was not his trial or condemnation—it was preliminary to those. It must precede action on his conduct. His case was then to be considered, and punishment imposed, or his person released. It was essential to the safety of the government that members should be compelled, in an exigency, to exercise their legislative powers. They could not decline to do this when action was required by the House. It is urged that the placing a person under arrest took from him his right to vote. This point had no application to the case under consideration—the gentleman was arrested for declining to vote. Had he said he had any pecuniary interest in the question, no one would have attempted to require him to vote.

Mr. CLAPP, (whig) of Erie, would not long detain the attention of the House; but the importance of the subject justified his occupying a few minutes. It involved the liberties—the dearest rights of the people. All members on this floor were elected in the same manner, and were entitled to equal privileges. In electing a presiding officer, we have conferred on him certain privileges, the object of which is to preserve order. Was the refusal to vote a contempt of the House? If it was not, it would be incumbent on the member outraged to call for action on the subject. Upon the mere suggestion of a member, the Speaker had made the arrest.

The SPEAKER interrupted Mr. C., and said the arrest was made on the suggestion of no one, but in conformity with the views of the Chair as to his prerogative.

Mr. CLAPP continued. The House has the power to prescribe its own rules; but where they have not directed how these rules shall be enforced, it is for the House to decide the point, and not for the Speaker. He could exercise no power not clearly delegated to him. After the gentleman had been ordered under arrest, four distinct votes were taken, upon all of which he was disfranchised. And to show that the House had not felt aggrieved, they promptly released him when a vote was taken upon it.

Mr. NOBLE, (dem.,) of New York, was impressed with the importance of the question whether this power of arrest was vested in the House or delegated to the Speaker. Plain, practical common sense would decide the whole matter. We have elected a Speaker to preside over our deliberations—to maintain order and enforce the rules of the House. He must have full power to do this without a further motion of the House. This was a practical solution of the matter. The proceedings of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Smith) were in contempt of the House, and tended to interrupt its proceedings. If one might decline to vote, others might, until a constitutional vote could not be obtained. Mr. N. gave way to a motion to take a recess until 4 o'clock, which was carried.

On re-assembling, the debate was renewed on Mr. Burroughs' motion censuring the Speaker, and was continued until a late hour, when Mr. Kennedy offered a substitute for Mr. Burroughs' resolution, which Mr. B. accepted.

The first resolution, exonerating the Speaker from any intention of wrong in ordering the arrest of Mr. Smith, was unanimously adopted.

The second resolution, declaring that the Speaker had no power of arrest without the order of the House, was rejected by a vote of ayes 38, nays 55.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN, (whig) of Oswego, offered a protest, to be entered on the minutes, assigning reasons for his votes on Mr. Loomis' resolutions.

This was cut off by the previous question, and the House adjourned at half-past eight o'clock, P. M.

The Great Strike among Railroad and other Operatives.

THE MECHANICS' DIFFICULTY NOT SETTLED—LARGE MEETING—NATIONAL STRIKE ANTICIPATED, ETC.

BALTIMORE, Feb 14, 1853.

Monument Square was again thronged this morning with mechanics from all sections of the city, music, banners, &c. The strikers have been joined by the workmen from the Federal Hill establishment, to the number of 700 or 800 men. The meeting was attended by about 4,000 men.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad workmen, having pledged themselves to stand by the others, still refuse to go to work, notwithstanding the company give the prices demanded. The engineers and brakemen are at their posts, and the trains are running—their strike having been separate and without any pledges to the mechanics. The Susquehannah engineers are also at their posts, and the trains are running; but they have given notice that they will quit to-night, and the whole operations of the road will cease unless the mechanics on it receive their price. The company have made arrangements with the Errickson line to carry their Pittsburg freight to Philadelphia and send it on by the Central road. No establishments, except those of Wells & Miller, Ames & Green, Page & Co., and Washington & Magee's, give the prices. Ross Winans, who employs 800 hands, refuses to listen to the demands; so also do Murray & Hazlehurst and Adam Denmead, who employ over 1000 men.

The employers have held a meeting, condemning the City Councils for interfering with the prices of the railroad mechanics, and asking them to instruct the city directors in the Board to vote for an increase of fifteen per cent on the large contracts for cars and locomotives they have made with the company.

The saloon of the Mechanics' Institute was tendered to the mechanics, and at eleven o'clock they marched down with banners and music, and completely filled the immense hall.

Resolutions were adopted, returning thanks to the President and Directors of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad for the prompt response to their demands, and asking their indulgence whilst they continued to sustain and encourage their fellow-workmen.

A delegation from Alexandria reported that the mechanics of that city would stand for their prices when settled, but in the meantime would continue at work, and contribute weekly to sustain their Baltimore brethren.

The President announced that he had received information from the North which had led him to believe that it would be a grand national strike.

WORK AGAIN SUSPENDED—STRIKES IN PENNSYLVANIA—ANOTHER MEETING, ETC.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 14—9 P. M.

The engineers, firemen, and brakesmen of the Susquehanna railroad, all left the trains to-night, and the business of the road, except the mail trains, is entirely suspended.

We learn from Harrisburg, that all the upper sections of the Pennsylvania road to Pittsburg will strike to-morrow.

The mass meeting at the Mechanics' Institute was thronged to-night, and great enthusiasm prevailed. The resolution not to go to work in the railroad shops until all the large establishments yield, was re-adopted. A number of speeches were delivered.

The application of the contractors for cars and locomotives to the council, to back their application for an advance on the contract prices, was treated with derision.

Ross Winans, the millionaire mechanic, is the strongest opponent of the strike, and the mechanics resolved to-night to go to work when other establishments yielded, and support his men in standing out. Good order and quiet prevailed.

All the trains on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad are now running regularly, the engineers and assistants having been fully satisfied by the action of the directors.

Great Freshet in Maine.

BANGOR, Feb. 14, 1853.

On Thursday night last, the ice left the Piscataquis river, and got jammed upon the falls, causing the water to flood the village of Passadumkeag. All the bridges were carried away in an hour. The large barn of Mr. Kelly was moved, and the stores of A. P. Kelley, Jas. Bassett, J. D. Cleveland, G. A. Smith, T. S. Bassett, and the Post Office, were flooded. In some of them, the water was from three to six feet deep. It was with great difficulty that the horses and cattle were driven to a neighboring hill—the only elevated land that could be reached—and after the first hour this could only be reached in boats. The loss to the town and to individuals must be very large. At last accounts the water had somewhat subsided, but communication was then only kept up with boats.

Michigan General Railroad Bill, &c.

DETROIT, Feb. 14, 1853.

The Michigan General Railroad bill, which was passed by the House last week, has not yet been taken up by the Senate.

Ten of the prisoners who escaped from the county jail have been retaken.

The Liquor Law Repealed in Illinois.

CHICAGO, Feb. 14, 1853.

The liquor law has been repealed by the Legislature of Illinois.

Mr. Paine, the banker, is quite insane, and has been obliged to be placed under restraint during the past two days.

Pittsburg and Cornellsville Railroad.

PITTSBURG, Feb. 14, 1853.

A subscription for ten thousand shares—amounting to $500,000—in the Pittsburg and Cornellsville Railroad, passed the City Council this evening unanimously.

The Canadian Parliament.

QUEBEC, Feb. 14, 1853.

The Provincial Parliament resumed its sitting to-day.

The Steamship Black Warrior.

MOBILE, Feb. 14, 1853.

The steamship Black Warrior sailed this morning for New York, via Havana.