say this, I shall say also, and with equal truth, that his departure from the United States on the very eve of the meeting of the Senate interposes, in my opinion, insurmountable objections to his confirmation. Whether a foreign minister should ever go abroad upon a mere Executive appointment, unless in rare cases of public urgency, may well admit of doubt. I do not say this as a party man, because I know full well that no such reserve has recently been imposed upon these appointments by any administration. But, as the session of the Senate approaches, the procedure becomes more improper, and utterly indefensible when it occurs upon the very eve of its commencement. I saw a paragraph in one of the city papers, only three or four days ago, stating that a distinguished citizen, for whom I have much personal respect, had left Kentucky on the 22d of December to proceed upon a mission to Mexico. He will never receive my vote to remain there. I do not understand this unseemly haste; this flight from the judgment of the Senate, as though confirmation were rendered necessary by the public expense thus incurred, and a sort of obligation consequently imposed upon this depository of a portion of the Executive power to conform its action to the action of the President. Trust that no such motives will influence our conduct, but that we shall take a course which, while it asserts the rights of the country, will restore to the Senate its efficient control, and will yield nothing, I will not say to the cupidity, but I will say to the earnest desire of office, which was never more powerful, nor more powerfully displayed than now.

Mr. SEWARD. I rise, not to speak with reference to the principal question, which has been discussed with so much ability and so much eloquence by the honorable Senator from Michigan; I rise with reference to a subordinate and incidental question, and I should not have ventured to call the attention of the Senate to that question, if it were not that, in the situation in which I am placed with regard to that subject, it would be a dereliction of duty, socially, politically, and morally, to be silent, when I ought to express my profound regret that a speech so eloquent, upon principles so noble, and discussing a policy so high, should be embarrassed at its close by the personal allusions which have been made to the honorable gentleman who fills that mission, which it is proposed to abolish, and that the subject of the propriety of the confirmation of the person who has been nominated by the President to that distinguished post abroad, should have been opened here at this time, and on this occasion, before this Senate in public session, instead of having been reserved, as I would have trusted that personal kindness and political magnanimity would have dictated that it should have been, until the nominee was called to pass the ordeal which the rules and customs of the Senate have prescribed. I find myself exceedingly embarrassed, as the friend, the personal friend, the unwavering friend, the devoted friend of this foreign representative. I have in my possession documents to extenuate, and I believe to remove the accusation of a precipitate flight from before the Senate of the United States, and yet they are of that nature which, in justice to the domestic relations of that individual, I am not at liberty to give to the world. I can only say, that I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and all others who declare their opinions to be against the confirmation of this individual, will suspend their judgment until I can have an opportunity, within the custom and practice of this Senate, to remove the objections, if it be in my power to do so, which are made the basis for refusing the confirmation.

Mr. CASS. The honorable Senator from New York has no more respectful personal feeling towards that gentleman than I myself have; but that Senator will observe that here is a grave case, which may well call for legislative examination on the part of the American Congress. It is not a question of personal fitness, but of departure under very peculiar circumstances, and may require a law to regulate intercourse of this kind with foreign countries, in order to ensure the rights of the Senate and of the country.

Mr. FOOTE addressed the Senate at some length, but the publication of his remarks is deferred, at his request, until our next publication.

The question was then taken on postponing the further consideration of the resolution till Monday next, and it was agreed to.

On motion, it was ordered that when the Senate adjourn, it be to meet on Monday next.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of Executive business; and, after some time spent therein, the doors were reopened, and the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. CHANDLER, on leave, presented the petition of Mr. JOHN S. LITTELL, contesting the right of Mr. ROBBINS, to a seat as the Representative of the 4th district of Pennsylvania. The petition was referred to the Committee of Elections, and is as follows:

The memorial of John S. Littell, of Germantown, in the county of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania, respectfully represents: That, on the ninth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and forty-eight, the time appointed by law for holding the general election in the State of Pennsylvania, he was duly chosen to be a member of your honorable body, to represent the fourth district of said State of Pennsylvania, by a majority of eighty-eight legal votes over his competitor, John Robbins, jr. esquire, of Kensington, in said fourth Congressional district. That is to say, the *true vote* was as follows:

	For John S. Littell.	For John Robbins, jr.
In Kensington	2,682	2,352
In North Penn	126	195
In District of Penn	237	487
In Roxborough	228	231
In Frankford	369	282
In Germantown	648	468
In Manayunk	385	268
In Bristol	165	150
In unincorporated Northern Liberties	182	187
In Oxford	141	128
In Lower Dublin	249	347
In Richmond	157	406
In Byberry and Moreland	124	103
In Blockley	309	274
In West Philadelphia	258	187
In Kingsessing	64	162
Total	6,318	6,230

Majority for John S. Littell.....88

And your memorialist further states that, notwithstanding this true vote, the officers conducting the election in the district of Penn fraudulently returned ten hundred and ninety-one votes, of which they declared nine hundred and twenty-one were for John Robbins, jr., and one hundred and seventy for John S. Littell; thus claiming, in said district of Penn, *a majority for Mr. Robbins greater than the whole number of votes polled in said district for both the candidates together by twenty-seven.*

In the name, therefore, of a majority of legal voters of said fourth Congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania, your memorialist respectfully solicits an opportunity of establishing the verity of these his declarations.

WASHINGTON, DEC. 3, 1847. JOHN S. LITTELL.

The SPEAKER having announced the regular order of business to be the election of a Clerk—

Mr. HAMPTON moved that the further execution of the resolution to elect the Clerk and other officers of the House be postponed till Monday next, for the purpose of allowing those gentlemen who were absent to participate in the election.

Mr. WILSON stated that he had paired off with Mr. AVERETT, of Virginia, who had been called home by a telegraphic despatch, on account of illness in his family.

The question was then taken on Mr. HAMPTON's motion, and decided in the affirmative—Yeas 98, nays 97.

After the vote was announced—

Mr. THOMPSON, of Mississippi, reminded the SPEAKER that he had a right to vote, and desired him to exercise it.

The SPEAKER, however, declined voting on the ground that, as the vote had been announced, it was too late for him to exercise his privilege.

Mr. WILLIAMS having risen to present some petitions—

The SPEAKER stated that, as the first thirty days of the session had expired, petitions were not now in order.

Mr. WINTHROP remarked, in substance, that this decision involved an important question. It seemed to him that, according to an old maxim of the English law, and which should prevail in this country, every interpretation should be made in favor of the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press. He therefore did not think that the great right of petition, which was intended to be maintained by the Rules of the House so as to allow gentlemen to present petitions freely, ought to be abridged or denied by construction. He desired only to suggest this consideration to the Chair, so that if the Chair had not decided deliberately, he might look into the precedents.

Mr. STANLY appealed from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. McCLERNAND having made a few remarks—

The SPEAKER reiterated his opinion that the first thirty days of the session had expired, and that therefore it was not in order formerly to present petitions. They could, however, be handed in at any time at the Clerk's table and be referred.

Several of the rules of the House relating to the subject were read.

The question was then put, whether the decision of the Chair should stand as the judgment of the House? And it was decided in the affirmative—Yeas 104, nays 91.

Mr. ROBINSON, after a few remarks on the impropriety of transacting any legislative business while the House was without a Clerk, moved an adjournment till Monday next. But he withdrew this motion at the request of

Mr. INGE, who raised a question of privilege, that, under the act of 1789, (which he read,) the House could transact no business before they had elected a Clerk, and moved to proceed to the election of that officer under the act of 1789.

The SPEAKER decided the motion to be out of order.

Mr. ROBINSON appealed from this decision.

Mr. INGE then withdrew his motion, and raised the point of order that the House could proceed to no other business till the election of Clerk.

Pending the question on this point of order—

Mr. ASHMUN rose to make a privileged motion, viz. that when this House adjourn it adjourn to meet on Monday next. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ASHMUN then moved that the House now adjourn; which motion was also agreed to—Ayes 114, noes not counted. And the House adjourned till Monday.

WASHINGTON.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1850.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.—No. II.

No one, who reflects upon the character of the Opposition which has been waged against President TAYLOR, from the moment of his nomination as a candidate for the Presidency, and compares it with the lures which were previously held out by the same party to tempt him from the path of straightforwardness which he had always trod, can be at a loss to discover that the war which is made upon his first Message to Congress has no real relation to the merits or the particular contents of that paper. It would have been equally made, had the Message, like the first Message of his latest predecessor, been as verbose, as vapid, as ambitiously rhetorical, as hollow, and as disingenuous, as it is in every respect directly the reverse; that is to say, terse, sententious, unpretending, truthful, and sincere. The Opposition to the Administration not only began before it had done any thing to be opposed, but before it came into existence. That Opposition became more and more violent in proportion as the President would do nothing that could honestly be opposed; and it is more violent than ever, now that the Message has blown sky-high all the false issues which mere faction and blind hate had made up in the absence of any thing substantial to ground an Opposition upon.

These issues being all exploded, the strained attempts which are made to raise new ones out of the Message itself are for the most part subjects for merriment rather than for serious argument. Such, for example, is that to convert into a charge against the present Administration the public debt in various forms and the deficiency in the Treasury, created by the foreign policy, wise or foolish, of the immediately preceding one; and that other, to "repeal" *instanter* the Home Department—the only measure (except the Subtreasury) of interior legislation by which the last Administration will be much remembered.

The objections taken to the Message by the Opposition are indeed so opposite and inconsistent as in many cases to be sufficiently answered by being stated side by side, one with another. The "Union," in this city, for instance, in its second number on the Message, describes it as "a paper "which an American representative has no right to "address to the People;" for, argues the ex-organ of that President who assumed more monarchical power than any of his predecessors but one ever dreamed of, "Our Government is not a monarchy, "and our Chief Magistrate but a servant of the Peo-"ple: he has no right, therefore, to hold the same "language which the Queen of England holds from "her throne." This is the doctrine of some pestilent Whig, who has slily slipt it into the columns of the Union, where it is, to say no more of it, very much out of its latitude. It is capital Whig doctrine, but how far applicable to any thing in the President's Message, let the commentary of other leading Oppositionists determine. Thus, saith one, (the New Haven Register:) "Aside from some "ridiculous and obsolete Tariff notions, it [the "Message] is remarkable *for nothing but its sim-"plicity*, and the absence of any mark of states-"manship." Another (the Boston Post) represents it as so "tame" and "spiritless" that "Demo-"crats of *the Jackson school*, who like fearless "strong American doctrine, *will not like it.*" And a third treats its plain and unassuming character as "an *affectation* of simplicity." We might fill columns with equally absurd and incongruous exceptions taken to the Message by those who would have equally opposed it had it contained the wisdom of Omniscience delivered in the tongue of Angels.

Beside the merely idle and flippant criticisms upon the Message, however, are a few of sufficient substance to deserve a more respectful and attentive consideration.

The first which we shall take up is that of the "Boston Post," which speaks of the Message in in the following terms:

"It is passably well written, tame in its tone to-'wards foreign Governments, Whig in its domes-'tic policy, and flat in its constitutional law. De-'mocrats of the Jackson school, who like fearless, 'strong, decided American doctrine, will not like 'it. The people will not respond to its rank con-'servatism."

This objection is at least a real and conscientious one. It is not *all* pretence, or, in the classic language of our neighbor, "humbug and gammon." The Message is acknowledged to be "well written." It is objected to it, that it is not bellicose in its tone towards foreign Governments; that it is Whig in its domestic policy; that it is far from lofty in its pretensions to power under the Constitution; that it is thoroughly conservative; and that therefore Democrats "of the Jackson school" will not like it.

No journal can be better entitled than the "Post" to speak the sentiments of "the Jackson school." No one, we are satisfied, more sincerely entertains them. We have frequently had occasion to note the ardent devotion of that print to the doctrines of that school, and its frank and forcible illustration of them; and, in the present case, it speaks plainly and without reserve the same sentiments as those by which some others are influenced whose grounds of objection to the Message are clad in language less plain and intelligible.

We are glad at length to find the "doctrine" of the Message challenged, and placed, as it fairly is, in contrast with the doctrine of Constitutional law and practice of the Jackson school. The doctrines of the Taylor school—in other words, of the Whig school—and those of the Jackson school aforesaid, being as wide as the poles apart, the mere statement of them will be sufficient to enable the reader for himself to choose between them. We thank the "Post" for tendering this issue; an issue which involves at the same time another raised by the "Union" upon the President's Message, viz. that the party which that paper represents is the "Progressive or Democratic" party, and that a favorite principle of the WHIGS (including Gen. TAYLOR) is *the irresponsibility of the Chief Magistrate;* and also another issue, raised by the same paper, in which it undertakes to prove that President TAYLOR and the Whigs are, of all things on earth, *Monarchists!* We shall see, before we have done with the subject, *who* are the Monarchists, and *what* are the doctrines of the "Progressives"—of the politicians who acknowledge that term as their distinctive appellation.

Let us, in the first place, turn to the President's Message, with the doctrines of which those of the Jackson school are drawn into contrast. We state in his own language, and as briefly as possible, the doctrines of President TAYLOR in regard to our *Foreign policy:*

Peace with all the Nations of the World, and to maintain with them relations of amity.

An independent position towards all foreign Powers.

In disputes between conflicting foreign Governments, it is our interest, not less than our duty, to remain strictly neutral.

So long as acts of Congress enjoining the use of the National force to preserve neutral relations shall remain on the statute-book, the President will faithfully obey its injunctions.

Scrupulously to avoid any interference in the wars and contentions which have recently distracted Europe.

To do every thing in the power of the Government to strengthen the relations and establish a mutual and cordial spirit of amity between the United States and other Governments whose territories border on the coast of the Pacific.

These leading features of the Foreign Policy of the Administration *we* shall not place in contrast with those which characterized the Administration of President JACKSON. Our object is not here to arraign *his* Administration of the Foreign Relations of the Country, but to vindicate the doctrine of President TAYLOR on the subject. The quotations which we have made from the Message speak for themselves; and there is, we presume, no statesman, nor any fair politician, who will say aught against them. They are, in fact, unassailable.

The doctrines of President TAYLOR which stand distinctly in contrast, as great as between light and darkness, with the recorded doctrines of President JACKSON, are those, to which the "Post" adverts, which relate to *Constitutional Law.*

President TAYLOR's doctrines on this head, as recited in his Message, are these:

Our Government is *one of limited powers.*

Its successful Administration eminently depends on *the confinement of each of its co-ordinate branches within its appropriate sphere.*

The Executive has authority to recommend (*not to dictate*) measures to Congress.

The check provided by the Constitution in the clause conferring the qualified veto he will never exercise, *except in the cases contemplated by the Fathers of the Republic.*

By cautiously confining this remedy within the sphere prescribed to it in the contemporaneous expositions of the framers of the Constitution, *the will of the People,* legitimately expressed on all objects of legislation, *will have its full effect.*

The *independence of the Representatives of the States and the People* is guarantied by the Constitution; and *they owe no responsibility to any human power but their constituents.*

With equal care we should study to defend the rights of the Executive *and* Judicial departments.

Our Government can only be preserved in its purity by *the suppression and entire elimination of every claim or tendency of one co-ordinate branch to encroachment upon another.*

From different documents under his own hand we hastily collect together certain remembered passages of public record, showing the opinions which President JACKSON at different times delivered and acted upon, and which together may be taken to embody the "doctrine" of "THE JACKSON SCHOOL" on Constitutional Law.

In the face of a decision by the House of Representatives, by more than a two-thirds vote, expressive of the opinion of that body to the effect that the deposites of public money ought to continue with the Bank of the United States, President JACKSON *removed* those deposites from the Bank of the United States, *took them into his own keeping,* and rested his justification of the act upon this reason: "Whatever may be the opinion of others, 'the President considers *his re-election* [to the 'Presidency] as a decision of the people against 'the Bank"—that is, notwithstanding the known sense of both Houses of Congress to the contrary. And, again, in the same paper, (his Manifesto of September 18, 1833,) showing his contempt of the Legislative authority, he says to his Cabinet (Congress being to assemble within *three months,* and the Bank charter having then yet nearly *three years* to run) that "Being bound to regulate *his* 'course by the laws as they exist, and not *to anti-'cipate* THE INTERFERENCE OF THE LEGISLATIVE 'POWER for the purpose of framing new systems, 'it is proper for *him* seasonably to consider, &c."—his consideration ending, as above stated, in a removal of the public money from the Bank in defiance of the Legislative authority.

The following passages from the Messages of President JACKSON to Congress assert powers and prerogatives, some of them not pretended to be authorized by the Constitution, but derived *by analogy* from Monarchical Governments:

"*That a Bank of the United States,* competent 'to all the duties which may be required by the 'Government, might be so organized as *not to in-'fringe on our own delegated powers, or the 'reserved rights of the States,* I DO NOT ENTER-'TAIN A DOUBT. Had THE EXECUTIVE *been called 'upon to furnish the project of such an institu-'tion,* the duty would have been cheerfully performed. IN THE ABSENCE OF SUCH A CALL, it was 'obviously proper that he should confine himself to 'pointing out those prominent features in the act 'presented which, in his opinion, make it *incom-'patible with the Constitution* and sound policy."

[*Bank Veto Message, July* 10, 1832.

"The Congress, the Executive, and the [Supreme] Court must act for itself, and be guided by 'its own opinion of the Constitution. Each public 'officer, when he takes an oath to support the Constitution, swears to support it *as he understands 'it,* and not as it is understood by others. The 'opinion of the Judges has no more authority 'over Congress than the opinion of Congress has 'over the Judges; and, on that point, THE PRESIDENT IS INDEPENDENT OF BOTH."

[*Bank Veto Message, July* 10, 1832.

"The PRESIDENT is THE DIRECT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, but THE SECRETARIES ARE NOT. If the Secretary of the Treasury be independent of the President *in the execution of the laws,* THEN there is no direct responsibility to the People," &c.

[*Protest against the Senate, April* 15, 1834.

"By the Constitution 'the Executive power is 'vested in the President of the United States.' 'Among the duties imposed upon him, and which 'he is sworn to perform, is that of 'taking care 'that the laws be faithfully executed.' Being thus 'made RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ENTIRE ACTION OF 'THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, it was but reason-'able that the power of appointing, overseeing, 'and CONTROLLING *those who* EXECUTE THE LAWS '*should remain in his hands.*"—(*Protest Message.*)

"The whole Executive power being vested in 'the President, who is RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS EXER-'CISE, it is a necessary consequence that *he* 'should have a right to employ agents of *his* own 'choice to aid *him* in the performance of *his* duties," &c.—(*Same Message.*)

"In *the Government from which many of the 'fundamental principles of our system are de-'rived,* the head of the Executive Department '[the KING] originally had power to appoint and 'remove at will all officers, Executive, Judicial, '&c.—(*Same Message.*)

"The custody of the public property (under 'such regulations as may be prescribed by legisla-'tive authority) has always been considered AN 'APPROPRIATE FUNCTION OF THE EXECUTIVE DE-'PARTMENT in this *and all other Governments.*" "Congress cannot, therefore, take out of *the hands 'of the Executive Department* the custody of the 'public property, WITHOUT AN ASSUMPTION OF EX-'ECUTIVE POWER, &c."

It can hardly be necessary to multiply extracts, which abound in President Jackson's Messages, and especially in the "Protest" against the Senate, to show to what an extent (such as no Monarch dare to have done) he claimed and arbitrarily exercised powers denied by the Constitution to the Executive, or expressly belonging to the Legislative Department of the Government. For any comment of our own on these pretensions we substitute the following extracts from a speech delivered on the "Protest" by Mr. Senator BIBB, who had been one of the early and zealous advocates of the General's election to the Presidency, but could not stand these deliberate and reiterated assaults by the President upon the Legislative and Judicial Departments of the Government:

"Whence did the writers of this Protest derive 'their notions of unqualified power, of *responsibility 'of officers to the President, of his responsibility 'for them,* and his custody of public property and 'money, as 'an appropriate function of the Executive Department in this and in all other Governments?' *Not from elementary treatises upon free 'Governments and civil liberty.* Not from the pure 'fountains of American constitutions. Not from 'the writings and speeches of the patriots and sages 'who have been distinguished in the United States 'in settling the foundations of the State and Federal 'Governments."

"They must have studied *the dark ages of high-'toned prerogative, of non-resistance, and passive 'obedience, and become infected with the divine 'right of Kings,* and enamored of the writings of 'Fillmer and such like. The President who can 'assert, before the Senate and the People, such 'claims to the custody and management of the public property and money, coupled with such *claims 'to obedience from the civil officers,* must be ill-advised, or so intoxicated with adulation and love of 'power as to have overlooked the elementary principles of civil liberty and the spirit of the people."

"The idea of an officer of the President, the 'mere instrument of the Chief Magistrate, is not to 'be found in the Constitution, nor in the suggestions of those 'who organized the Government.' 'They are all officers of the United States, officers 'of the Government, officers of the law, responsible 'to the Government and the laws. And, if the President makes out their responsibility to him, as he 'has claimed it, he must make out that he is THE 'GOVERNMENT, THE LAW, AND THE PROPHET."

"The powers and prerogatives claimed by the 'Protest, united to those powers delegated by the 'Constitution to the President, will leave us THE 'SUBSTANCE OF AN ABSOLUTE MONARCHY, *disguised 'by the forms of a commonwealth.*"

Satisfied with the judgment pronounced by the honorable and worthy Senator from Kentucky upon the merits of "the Jackson School" of Constitutional Law, and the effectively Monarchical character of the doctrines of that school, we willingly leave to our readers to determine what party in this country is best entitled to the epithet of "Monarchists"—that which, when in power, upheld the claim of its President to supremacy over the Laws, the Legislature, and the Judiciary, or that which, like the Whigs of the present day and the President of their choice, disclaims for the President any such pretensions; a fundamental principle in their conception of Constitutional Law being the actual separate and independent authority, within its own sphere, of each Department of the Government.

But, says the "Union" in its last Sunday's discourse upon the principles of the opposite parties in this Government, "one of these parties represents the Progressive or Democratic principle, and the other (meaning the Whigs) the Retrograde or Monarchical principle." Having already satisfactorily shown in *what* "school" Monarchical principles have been chiefly taught in this country, and knowing of no *retrogression* in any direction on the part of the Whigs, we take the "Union" upon its own definition of its political cast, whilst denying, for the respectable mass of the Democracy, the character in which that paper, in the hands of its present Editors, appears to take pride. In its comments upon our claim of Conservatism as one of the characteristics of the Whigs, the "Union" puts a construction upon the term which no lexicographer will sustain, nor any Whig for a moment allow. More just than our opponents, we will give them the benefit of the exposition, by their own party, of their own professed principles.

The first time that we recollect to have seen the term "Progressive" officially used as a party phrase was in the Platform of the Baltimore Convention of 1848, and we had occasion, soon afterwards, to notice the rather curious coincidence of the publication in the Boston "Post"—the same journal which now takes exception to the President's Message because it is not of a character to be relished by the Jackson school of politicians—of a leading article of several columns, showing what that wing of the Democracy means, in calling itself "Progressive." Repeating our disclaimer of any intention to impute to the whole Democratic party the principles of these "Progressive" gentlemen, we give, in their own words, their understanding of the "Progress" to which they conceive themselves to be devoting their energies and their abilities. The following is an extract of the article in the "Post" to which we have referred:

"We are yet upon the threshold of social PROGRESS, and the steps by which we have reached 'our position are not yet removed. Force, unfortunately, lies at the bottom of elevation. The savage, whom you would reclaim, will not be won by 'sweet abstractions. His native woods and loitering hours are too dear to him. There must be 'compulsion before there can be victory. The 'rugged soil must be subjected to the tearing plough-'share and destroying fire before it will bear fruit. 'In all the great accomplishments man has made, 'his steps have been, in the beginning, through severest toil *and the most unrelenting destruction.* 'We climb continually *over the ruins of the past 'to a hopeful present and a golden future. Where* 'now would be those institutions we love so much 'and defend so constantly, whose promises are 'boundlessly rich, had not their first uprisings been 'watered with man's blood, and had they not been 'planted here with surest trust in their power? The 'stronger always overcomes the weaker, and always 'will, in nature and in society. There is a disposition on the part of man, in obedience to God's 'law, to advance at all hazards and at any expense. 'All history teaches us this. Man, degraded 'by barbarism, broken down by the falsity of 'the social and political laws, under which he 'exists, *takes his first step upward by wading 'through the field of battle.* The universal law 'of PROGRESS takes in this element, ranging it by 'the side of others, giving it its proper rank in 'the elementary means of reform. Power is the 'great controlling influence of course, and it 'must be physical power *before it is moral.* It is 'hard to find a war out of which good has not 'grown, either from the attendant reform of abuses, 'the establishment of political rights, or the compulsion of a nation to its first step towards enlightenment. It is useless to prove this by instances. 'The law is sufficient, and it is our weakness, not 'our strength, which makes us start back when we 'contemplate it. We dread the horrors of a battle; but we would, as independent, firm, unshrinking PROGRESSORS, march steadily on to the highest 'glory. Men, as unconscious instruments in the 'hands of God, are obedient to the great law of 'power; and *even when blinded by circumstances, 'and filled with the lowest passions, are working 'out the great results his laws demand.* These 'inexorable laws bind all men, individually and in 'masses. From them alone comes their retribution. 'The timid man, who cannot contemplate them, 'may never know them; while he who contends for 'his rights with the 'sword of the Lord and of Gid-'eon,' and *he who forces his way with the torch of 'civilization and the sword* into degraded countries, 'each opens the way for *the glory and moral ele-'vation* of future generations, either consciously or 'as a blind instrument in the universal government."

To those who delight in being classed, on the high party authority of the "Union," as representatives of the "Democratic *or* Progressive principle," this portrait of what are the objects and aims of the fanatics or demagogues who have taken out a patent for that entirely new improvement upon old-fashioned Democracy—this view of the agencies and means by which it proposes to accomplish the perfection of human wisdom and virtue—may be instructive. We commend it to their most serious consideration.

Having given a Democratic explanation of the word "Progressive," as applied by the party itself, or rather by one wing or division of that party—limited, we trust, as well in numbers as in its capacity for mischief—we shall dedicate the remainder of this article to some notice of an attempt on the part of the "Union" to disparage the character of CONSERVATISM which we claim for the WHIG party of the United States. We quote from the "Union" of December 29, as follows:

"THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.—The *National Intelligencer,* with a tenacity which can be accounted for only by its own peculiar instincts and associations, still persists—and we think very properly—in calling the Federal party of the United States the 'CONSERVATIVE' party. When the true meaning of the term is understood, it will be conceded by every intelligent friend of republican liberty that 'CONSERVATISM' is the true and proper term by which the principles and practices of Federalism may be most clearly expressed. Of course the Editors of the *Intelligencer* will not pretend to assert that Conservatism in America means any thing more or less than Conservatism in Europe. No English word can have two meanings. If conservatism is the representative of a principle or a system of public polity, or a mere expression used to define some peculiar quality or characteristic of parties, it must mean the same thing whenever and wherever used, whether in Europe or America. This we suppose the Editors of the *Intelligencer* will not presume to deny; and consequently we have a right to infer that they understand conservatism to mean the same thing in one country as in another, and that it represents the same ideas in the United States as it does in England or in Austria."

Borrowing from the "Union" for the use of the moment one of its own arguments—without intending, of course, to use it otherwise than in the process of reducing to absurdity another of them—we say that, in gratifying its malice by attempting to excite hostility to the Whigs in the minds of ignorant and prejudiced readers, by applying the epithets "Federalists" and "Federalism" to the Whig party, the "Union" must be "aware that no English word can have two meanings." If Federalism "is the representative of a principle or a system of public polity, or a mere expression used to define some peculiar quality or characteristic of parties, it must mean the same thing whenever and wherever used." The term *Federal* came into use at the formation of the Government of the United States, as designating the particular form of that Government, and to distinguish it from a "Confederation," such as that of the old German Empire, in which, though a Confederation, one member might wage war against another, whilst the different States of "the United States" had given up, among other things, all political power in regard to foreign affairs, commerce, &c. The term "Federal" thus came to designate those who advocated the adoption of the Constitution. In our Dictionaries, the definition of the word "Federal" is, "Friendly to the Constitution of the United States." In no other sense has the term "Federalism" at this day any sense or signification whatever. We *are* friendly to the Constitution of the United States, we acknowledge, and, as the "Union" says, both by instinct and by association. To the "Union" we leave the profession of the converse of that proposition. In the way that things are now going on, it may not be long before it will in earnest have to avow or get itself shrived of that heresy.

Abandoning, however, this notable argument of the "Union" to its proper owner, we must be permitted to say that there is no other word in our language that admits of more wide difference of meaning than the term *Conservative,* as applied to different forms of government. But, if it be true, as the "Union" argues, that the Emperor of all the Russias, or any other Monarch, adopts the Conservative Principle to support his Power, have not the Administrators of the Government of the United States the right, and is it not their sworn duty, to adopt the same principle to preserve what has excited the admiration of every enlightened mind, and raised to its present elevation the great Anglo-Saxon empire on this Continent?—an empire brought into existence by *Conservative Principles,* since, to the effort to conserve the rights of the People, and not to obtain what they already possessed, the struggle which we designate "The American Revolution" owes its birth and its success? As to "*Conservatism,* what is its real meaning," demands the "Union," "as used by the Federal politicians of this country and the advocates of Monarchy and Aristocracy in Europe?" And in the next breath the "Union" answers, "It is simply this, the conservation intact and unaltered of *the existing order of things.*"

The "Union" having attempted to cast reproach upon the term "conservative," which we have connected with the Whig party and its principles, its Editors will be complimented rather than offended by our reviving a definition made several years ago, in this paper, when considering the characteristics of the two great parties of the country, as they then stood, divided into Whigs and Democrats. The former we then described as *Conservative* in their purposes; the other, as *Destructive.* The meaning of the term "conservative," as defined by the best authorities in our language, is, according to Webster, "One who aims to preserve from radical 'change; one who wishes to maintain an institu-'tion in its present state;" and, according to Richardson, to conserve, to be a conservative, is "to 'shelter from harm or injury; to protect, to keep 'safe, to guard, to defend." If it be highly criminal to *preserve,* to *keep safe,* &c. it must be correspondingly meritorious *to destroy,* and to leave nothing permanent.

The Government of these United States is the great wonder of modern ages. Happily this splendid monument is constructed on a foundation of materials too sound and substantial, and too firmly based, to be shaken by *Destructives* under any name. That this now flourishing and powerful Confederacy must be tested by time, as all things earthly ever were and ever must, we consider it as insane to deny; but we regard insanity as an excuse for those whose *creed* is CHANGE. Of the Governments of the Earth, who would give any other than one answer to the questions, What Sovereignty now in existence gives most promise of permanency? Under what Government are the People best protected, most prosperous? In what country is the power of Government the least onerous, or are the securities most to be relied on that a long futurity will sustain the promise of the present?

CONSERVATIVE PARTY, indeed! Can a prouder title be conferred than one implying a prerogative so sacred as that of the Guardians of such institutions as those forming the Government of THE UNITED STATES? Our readers will not understand us as arrogating to the Whigs exclusively the character of Conservatism. There are, we doubt not, many of them that consider themselves of the Democratic School, who are at the same time Conservatives. In truth, *we* carry our notions of the political duty of Citizens of this Republic so far as to deem that no man in the public service, whether Whig or Democrat, unless he be also a Conservative—that is, disposed to protect and defend the Government which he is sworn to support—has a valid claim to the confidence of the People. All that the People either have, or hope to have, of peace at home or safety from abroad, depends upon the cultivation and practice of Conservative principles.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The Legislature of Pennsylvania commenced its annual session at Harrisburg on the 1st instant. VALENTINE BEST was chosen President of the Senate over the regular nominee of the Democrats, and JOHN S. MCCALMONT (Dem.) was elected Speaker of the House.

The Message of Governor JOHNSTON was laid before the Legislature the same day. From it we learn that the public debt of the State has been reduced during the year in the sum of $521,465.86. The total debt now is $40,574,413.45.

NEW YORK

The Legislature of the State of New York convened at Albany and was duly organized on the 1st instant. In the Senate where the Lieut. Governor presides, Whig officers were chosen. In the House of Delegates, Mr. Fullerton, whose seat is contested, having declined to vote, enabled the Democrats to elect all the officers by a majority of one vote. NOAH S. ELDERKIN is the Speaker. The Whig vote was given for ROBERT H. PRUYN.

The Message of Governor FISH was laid before the Legislature on Wednesday. We extract from the New York papers the subjoined epitome of that part of it which relates to the finances of the State:

The total direct debt amounts to $22,895,058. The amount in the sinking fund for the payment of this debt is $214,392 17. The aggregate receipts during the fiscal year were $4,235,358; of which $3,442,960 were derived from the State works. After paying the ordinary expenses of the Government, and the payments out of the Canal fund, there is left a sum of $907,102 71, applicable to the completion of the Erie enlargement, &c.; besides a balance on hand of $113,279 22. The increase during the past year on the canals amounted to $225,000 over the receipts of the preceding year. The expenses of collection, superintendence, and ordinary repairs of the canals, are nearly $70,000 less than during the preceding year. The annual interest on the general fund debt amounts to $354,829 86.

Of the canal debt $3,140,819 34 will become due prior to January, 1856. The avails of the canal debt sinking fund will be sufficient to meet this amount, as the surplus for the year 1851 and 1852 can be arranged to meet the loans falling due in 1851, and no further loan on the credit of the fund will be required to meet the stock now outstanding until the 1st January, 1856, when $4,000,000 will become due.

DESTRUCTION OF A SHIP BY FIRE.—The fine ship *Caleb Grimshaw,* Capt. HOXIE, whose loss at sea was reported by the steamer Cambria, was owned by S. Thompson & Co., New York, and was valued at $80,000, and her cargo was worth over $200,000. Insured in Wall street and London. She had 399 passengers, all of whom, except about sixty, were rescued by the noble conduct of Capt. DAVID COOK, of the Nova Scotia ship *Yarmouth,* who came in sight after the crew had struggled five days and nights to extinguish the fire below in vain, having pumped 9½ feet of water in the hold. As soon as the hatches were lifted the flames broke out, and the vessel was in a blaze. The sixty passengers who are supposed to be lost had moved from the burning vessel to one of the rafts, and, having cut loose from the ship, have not been heard from. Capt. COOK, in order to accomplish his humane purpose of rescuing the passengers and crew, was obliged, on account of high winds, to lay by for eight days after discovering the signal of distress. So writes Capt. HOXIE, in giving to the owner the particulars of his misfortune.

Commander GORDON, of the U. S. brig Porpoise, died at Port Grande, Island of St. Vincent, on the 11th of October last. He had been in command of the African squadron since the return of Com. COOPER. The squadron is now under the command of Commander MARSTON, of Philadelphia.

FROM TEXAS.

It appears by accounts from El Paso, published in the Texas papers, that Government has concluded to erect a strong fortification at the Northern Pass, to be permanently garrisoned with five hundred men, for the double purpose of affording assistance and protection to emigrants and repelling the inroads of the hostile tribes upon the Mexican frontier. Col. Johnston, with a company of topographical engineers, was in the field at the last accounts making the necessary survey.

The Matagorda Tribune of the 10th instant says that by late accounts from El Paso, brought into San Antonio, Maj. Chevallie, the Texian ranger, had blown out his brains.

The Galveston Civilian states that sugar making is still progressing in the cane-growing portion of Texas with great success. All the samples of sugar manufest a great improvement upon the product of last season.