THE CHRONICLE.

SATURDAY MORNING, January 16, 1847.

The Orphan's Court of Dorchester county will sit on the 25th January.

☞By the way of reply to the article in our last paper, the "Democrat" cites a long list of Whig speeches on the Mexican war, which have been published in the Congressional Globe. We think our cotemporary manifests less than his accustomed sagacity in this matter. The remark which elicited our article is to be found in the "Democrat" of the 6th inst. and was made in reference to Gov. Pratt's message. Our neighbor stated that "as to the *cause* of our war with Mexico he (Gov. Pratt) differs widely from the Federal prints who are but echoing the speeches of the Federal members of Congress." In reply to this remark we stated that the Whig press had taken ground against the sufficiency of the causes which led to the war before a word had been said in Congress about it, and that not a single Whig speech upon the subject had been published. By way of rejoinder to our assertion, the "Democrat" parades a list of Whig speeches which have been made and published during the present session of Congress. But we would inquire, upon what subject are those speeches referred to? Upon the *causes* of the Mexican war? Upon the reasons alleged by Mr. Polk for ordering our army to the Rio Grande?—Most assuredly not. The speeches cited by the "Democrat" were made upon the resolution introduced by *Mr.* Garret Davis, calling upon the President for the orders and instructions to Gen'l. Kearney, Capt. Stockton and others, in relation to the organization and establishment of civil governments in any part of the Mexican territory, with the exception of the speech of *Mr.* Giddings, and we defy the "Democrat" to point out a single Whig paper that has endorsed his sentiments in regard to the war. These speeches all refer to one of the *consequences* of the war, and not to its *causes*. The remarks of the Whig press have been confined principally to an examination of the reasons put forth in the message in justification of the war—while the debates in Congress have been in reference to the Constitutionality of the acts of General Kearney, Captain Stockton and others in establishing civil governments in the provinces conquered from *Mexico*. Whenever the *causes* of the *Mexican* war have been adverted to at all, it has been done incidentally, and with a view to a proper understanding of ths position assumed by the Whigs in reference to the question under discussion. There is not, therefore, the least similarity between the remarks of the Whig press characterized by the "Democrat" as "echoes," and the speeches of the Whig Congressmen which have been published—because the remarks of the press relate to the *causes* of the war, and the speeches relate to one of its *consequences*.

We are somewhat at a loss as to the true construction to be placed upon the concluding portion of the "Democrat's" article. It seems to us to be intended as a charge of plagiarism against all the Federal prints (as our neighbor is pleased to style the Whig papers,) that have commented upon the causes of the Mexican war, & as the article was intended as a reply to our remarks we presume we are included in the charge. Why not come out plainly and not be eternally dealing in inuendoes and insinuations? Why employ language that will admit of a *double* meaning, and which may have the effect intended, and yet afford shelter from a just responsibility? Does our cotemporary mean to insinuate that our articles upon the subject of the Mexican war have been plagiarized from Whig speeches, and put forth by us as original? Certainly his language may be so construed. We are loth to believe our neighbor could resort to such unjust and ungenerous means to justify his failure to attempt a refutation of our remarks, and we hope it is not the case. If he is unambitious of a higher fame than is accorded to a mere newspaper politician—if he is satisfied to float along upon the mere surface of the stream of knowledge, without diving into the hidden recess—let him enjoy his taste. But in doing this he need not perpetrate injustice upon another who prefers a different path. *We* wish to live in peace and amity with our cotemporary, and would endure much rather than assume a hostile attitude towards him. But we cannot brook such inuendoes as *may* be concealed in the language used in his last paper. And if driven to it, we shall not fail to apply to such insinuations language that cannot be misunderstood. For such a spirit we entertain the deepest scorn, and shall hurl it at whoever does us injustice with a force that shall make it felt. Our course is candid and fearless. Whatever we say we mean, and there is no ambiguity about our language. *We* use no concealment ourselves, and will not tolerate it in others. If attempted to be practiced towards us, we shall apply the scalping knife to it without mercy or remorse. No one more than ourselves will regret such an alternative, and we will forbear as long as possible to adopt it. But we will not be wronged with impunity, and admonish those who "jeer the Tartar to beware his dagger.

—o—

"AID AND COMFORT."—That portion of the American people who have too much independence to prostrate themselves before the political Juggernaut, and who differ from Mr. Polk in regard to the causes of the Mexican war, have been charged with giving "aid and comfort" to the enemy. This foul and unjust libel, first published by Mr. Polk himself, has now become the watch-word of his partizans, and forms the staple of almost all the articles which emanate from the Loco Foco press. It is somewhat surprising too that this vile slander is promulgated in the face of the fact that the Whigs have rallied with alacrity and enthusiasm under the standard of their country wherever and wherever an opportunity has been afforded them, and the blood of a Ringgold, a Watson and a host of others, has been shed to the last drop in wringing victory from the grasp of the enemy. Shame upon such vile calumny, hatched and disseminated for mere political effect. It is unworthy a brave and honorable mind, and could originate only with a political gambler who has staked character and every thing dear to an honorable man, upon the success of one huge calumny.

If "aid and comfort" have been afforded to the enemy in the war, who has done it—the Whigs who have fought the battles, or those who have voted the means of prosecuting it with vigor, or those who through the press have pointed out the imbecility of its management by the President, and have suggested plans more likely to ensure success? Or, has the only "aid and comfort" which the Mexicans have received been rendered them by Mr. Polk himself? At a time when the whole nation was convulsed by intestine commotions, and was absolutely powerless, who sent them a consummate leader who could unite the discordant factions, and direct all their energies against our country? At a time when their best officers had either been vanquished, or were retreating before the victorious march of Gen'l. Taylor, and none seemed bold enough to confront his troops, who sent them twenty-five experienced and skilful Spanish officers to direct their operations and point their batteries against the American army? At a period when their Treasury was empty and they had not the means to prosecute the war, who sent them their most able and and accomplished financier, who had on all previous occasions never failed to raise funds when required? At a time when Parades threatened to convert the Republic into a monarchy, when the energies of the nation were paralyzed, and dark despair hovered over it, who sent them a brave and wise leader to revive their drooping energies, to sound the tocsin of freedom among them, and inspire them with ardent enthusiasm in their cause, and with deep and bitter hatred towards the United States? Who did all this but James K. Polk in allowing Santa Anna to pass through our squadron? And when he has given such signal and indispensable "aid and comfort" to the enemy, does not the charge of treason against the Whig party come with a miserable grace from *his* lips! Let him beware that the chalice he has prepared for the Whigs, is not returned to his lips, drugged with the poison of his own treachery.

—o—

THE WAR QUESTION.—Having shewn in previous numbers that Mr. Polk is unsustained by facts in saying at the time Gen'l. Taylor was ordered to the Rio Grande that he had received information which rendered it certain Mr. Slidell would be rejected by the Mexican Government—that he misrepresents the true state of the case in saying both the Congress and Convention of Texas had requested an armed force to be sent to the Rio Grande—and that he falsifies facts in saying Mexico had agreed to receive a minister authorized to settle *all disputes* between that government and our own—We come now to the last point upon which he attempts to justify the war, viz:—the right of the United States to the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande.

The message alleges various reasons why the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande belongs to the United States, the leading one, however, being the act of the Texan Congress declaring the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source to be their boundary, and by the said act they extended their "civil and political jurisdiction" over the country up to that boundary. Now it will be recollected that the act by which Texas was annexed to the United States provided:—

"First, Congress doth consent that the territory properly included within, and rightfully belonging to, the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a State, to be called the State of Texas, with a republican form of government, &c."

Again:—

"Said State to be formed, subject to the adjustment by this government of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments, &c."

It will thus be seen that the boundary question was left open for future negotiation, and being so left open what right had Mr. Polk to assume the right of deciding it! The settlement of boundaries belongs to the treaty-making power, and the President's undertaking to decide such a question without consulting the Senate, is a direct violation of the constitution, and an alarming usurpation of power.

The true question however, is, does the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande belong to Texas, and if so, what are the muniments of her title? The message, perhaps, furnishes the strongest arguments that may be found of her title, and these are the act of the Texas Congress—the laying out of the territory into counties—the representation of those counties in the Congress and Convention of Texas &c., &c. We presume no one would contend that the mere act of the Texan Congress defining the Rio Grande as the Western boundary would, *per se*, constitute any title to the territory. If the Texan Congress had declared the whole of Mexico to be included within the limits of Texas, and had proceeded to lay it off into counties and districts, upon the same reasoning the United States would have claimed the whole of Mexico. But the inquiry recurs, what right had Texas to fix upon the Rio Grande as her western boundary? Had she conqured the territory up to that line and held it in possession! If she had not done this the mere act of her Congress is a dead letter—an absurdity.

If we take the map of Mexico and trace the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source, we shall find that there is contained within the territory now claimed by Mr. Polk, several towns and villages belonging to the Mexicans, and in which no hostile Texan has ever been save as a pioneer of war. The Texans had no settlements or ports (nor ever have had any) on the Rio Grande, upon any of its tributaries, or within its long valley, from its sources to its mouth. Beginning with the city of Taos, more than one thousand miles up the Rio Grande, the Mexicans had east of that river towns and cities, Santa Cruz, Santa Fe (the capital of New Mexico) San Miguel, San Domingo, Albuquerque, Torreon, Totillas, Tajiqua, Nutrease, Tabira, Valverde, Fra Cristobal, Old Presidio, Dolores, Laredo, and Point Isabel, stretching the whole length of the river from its sources to the Gulf. From the time that Mexico became independent of Old Spain, her jurisdiction, her laws, and her officers, had swayed over all these cities and towns, and the entire rural population of the country. Texas never had dad a foothold in the country of the Rio Grande.

But this is not all. To shew conclusively that our own Congress did not consider the claim of Texas to the Rio Grande at all valid, we have only to state the fact that the same Congress which passed the act of annexation, also passed an act allowing a drawback on merchandise received at our ports, and exported to Santa Fe. Why was this drawback allowed? Because Santa Fe was, in the opinion of Congress, in a foreign country: it was clearly, therefore, no part of Texas, as then understood. Now if Santa Fe was not a part of Texas and incorporated by the act of annexation into the Union, neither was Point Isabel, nor the country adjacent. If Point Isabel was not a part, then the blood which was drawn in the skirmish on the Rio Grande, was not shed on *American soil*: and if that be true it is equally untrue that "war exists by the act of Mexico." The marching of our army to the left bank of the Rio Grande—the overthrow of the Mexican town of Santiago and the expulsion of its citizens by our army—the occupation of territory always held and owned by the Mexicans, and the erection of fortifications opposite the city of Matamoras—these were the acts of aggression on the part of Mr. Polk—these are the causes of the war, and it is therefore a naked and indefensible falsehood to say "war exists by the act of Mexico." It exists by the act of Mr. Polk, upon his own responsibility! Again that Texas was claimed to the Rio Grande, for the sake of claiming as much as possible, is evident from her own conduct subsequent to 1836, when the act was passed defining her western boundary. In 1839 Canales, a Mexican chief, attempted, with the aid and countenance of Texas, to establish the Republic of Rio Grande, constituted of the States of Tamaulipas, Coahuila, and Durango. Its independence was declared, and Canales elected President. He had possession of it for six months when he was attacked and defeated by General Arista. In the mean time Canales and the government of Texas had entered into a secret agreement, of which the three first articles are as follows:—

"1st. The President of the Republic of Rio Grande (Gen'l. Canales) pledges himself to declare the independence of the Republic at Rio Grande, and to declare and establish the State and Federal Constitution of 1824 so soon as he shall have established his head quarters within the territory claimed by the said Republic.

2nd. That the Republic of Rio Grande shall immediately after such declaration of independence, recognize the independence of Texas.

3rd. The Bepublic of Texas pledges herself to aid the Federalists of Rio Grande in their struggle for independence, directly her independence is recognized by the Republic of Rio Grande."

Nearly three years after the act of the Texan Congress, defining her Western boundary to be the Rio Grande, she gravely and formally abandons it by acknowledging that Tamaulipas and Coahuila constituted a part of another Republic; and, instead of claiming any part of them to be her territory, pledges herself, and actually by her army and navy aids in the attempt, to maintain the independence of that other country, of which a section that she had before declared to be within her limits was an integral part; and this is the identical territory into which General Taylor marched his army in the exaction of the orders of Mr. Polk.—And this is the territory which Mr. Polk claims to be a part of Texas—and upon this claim justifies the occupation of it by our army.

Much more remains to be said upon this branch of the subject, and we stop here to resume the discussion in our next.

MARYLAND LEGISLATURE.

Correspondence of the American.

ANNAPOLIS, Jan. 9, 1847.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

Mr. Orrick presented a memorial from inhabitants of Baltimore county, relative to the laws licencing the sale of ardent spirits. Mr. Allnutt, of Montgomery, presented a petition from John Devier, to be refunded certain taxes paid in error.

On motion of Mr. Patterson, of Baltimore city, a bill to incorporate the Baltimore White Lead and Chemical Manufacturing Company, was considered, by special leave, and re-committed.

Also, called up a bill in relation to the Merchants' Mutual Insurance Company of Baltimore. Passed and sent to the Senate.

Mr. Stephenson offered an order calling upon the Treasurer to report the number of officers of the State, their salaries, and fees, &c. Adopted.

On motion of Mr. Ege, the bill confirming an act of the last General Assembly, granting a Lottery—changing the Constitution—for the construction of a Road from Westminster to the Pennsylvania line, was taken up; and, after some discussion, passed. Adjourned.

The SENATE transacted no business of public importance.

CONGRESSIONAL.

Correspondence of the American.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9.

SENATE not in session.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. McKay, of N. C., asked leave of the House to report the following Bills from the Committee of Ways and Means:

For the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department for the year ending 30th June, 1848.

For support of Volunteers and the Army for the year ending 30th June, 1848.

For the support of the Naval Service for the year ending 30th June, 1848.

Read twice and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Rockwell of Conn. asked leave to offer a Resolution, which was read for information, but not received.

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed to take into consideration the propriety of aiding in the construction of a Rail Road from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, via Panama.

The House went into Committee of the Whole, and

Mr. Long of Md. addressed the House in continuation of the argument commenced by him yesterday. He was at times strong in his language, and through all his speech earnest and impressive. We were bound to recognise Mr. Polk as *de facto* and *de jure* President of the United States, and he should give as much support to the war under this Administration as if it had been carried on under one of his own choice. Nor could he agree to call this a villanous war. The brave Ringgold had fallen in it, the gallant Watson, the valiant Cross, and many other heroic spirits. The Government could not refuse to carry on this war, and the people were now identified with it in almost every town and city.

Mr. Long took strong ground in regard to the Executive, and seemed to think, to the amazement of every body who differed from him, and probably of every Whig member of the House, that it was necessary to concur with him or not differ from him. Much more surprised were the Whigs to hear from a Whig member that Mr. Webster was opposed to the last war and that it was for this reason that he had not been a popular candidate with the Whigs for the Presidency. He would detract nothing from Mr. Webster's talents or patriotism or his abilities, but intimated strongly that Mr. W. opposed the late war.

Mr. Long also spoke upon the slave question with earnestness, and contended that there was no right to interfere with it in the States or out of them. In regard to the war, he was not for an aggressive war, but he wished to have a line marked out and defended, and most of all he wished that the Administration should not be opposed in carrying on its war.

Mr. Haralson of Ga. next addressed the Committee, and gave his reasons for a vigorous prosecution of the war with regulars rather than volunteers.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. H. reflected upon the Whig States of North Carolina and Massachusetts for not furnishing their troops. Virginia was also involved and in a moment there were a score of flashing eyes upon the floor.

Mr. Leake said that there were more Democrats in one company from Virginia, he had heard, than there were Whigs.

Mr. Pendleton said that of the 18 Companies of Volunteers from Virginia, nearly all of them had come from Whig Counties or towns.

Mr. Barringer of N. C. said the regiment from his State would soon be in the field. So said Mr. Winthrop, and a dozen members appeared to be speaking at the same time, all proving or attempting to prove the patriotism of their constituents.

When Mr. Haralson concluded, the floor was given to Mr. Thompson, of Miss. who made some reflections upon General Taylor's government of his troops, and insisted that he was the cause of the sickness and suffering of the troops upon the Rio Grande. We wanted a directing mind—in other words, a Lieutenant General, to take command of the troops and give counsel and guidance to the whole campaign.

Voices—Name your Lieut. General.

Mr. Thompson.—There is surely some one suited to the office, and Mr. T. went on to show how much superior a man Napoleon was to his Marshals, and to express his confidence that some suitable man could be found.

Mr. Burt of S. C., closed the debate, in the course of which he replied to Mr. Thompson's argument in favor of the appointment of a Lieut. General. There was, he thought, no man whom the country would wish to see in such an office, and he thought there had been none since the days of Washington.

The debate being closed, amendments came from every quarter, but the first of importance was one moved by Mr. Ashmun of Mass. and which provided that no member of the present Congress should hold any commission in the Army. Agreed to, 97 to 76.

The next important amendment was that moved by Mr. Thompson of Miss. asking for a Lieutenant General to take superintendence and control of the Army. Tellers were demanded, and the vote excited a good deal of interest. The tellers reported, yeas 94, nays 67. Fifty members present did not vote, reserving the test vote for the yeas and nays.

The next exciting question was upon a substitute for the whole bill moved by Mr. Rathbun, of New York, and proposing a volunteer force, instead of ten Regiments, to be added to the regular army as proposed by the Military Committee. Agreed to, yeas 96, nays 88.

The Committee now rose and reported as an amendment Mr. Rathbun's Bill—the effect of which was to cut off the appointment of a Lieutenant General.

Mr. Thompson of Miss. was awarded the floor and renewed his amendment for securing the office of Lieutenant General!

The previous question was then moved, followed by a motion, which was hotly resisted, that the House do now adjourn. The yeas and nays were ordered and the motion lost.—Yeas 89—nays 119!

The Previous Question was now carried, followed by a new motion to adjourn, which was withdrawn.

The struggle now ensued upon the amendment creating the office of Lieutenant General. The amendment was lost. Yeas 90—nays 120!

The motion to adjourn was renewed and lost.

Mr. Bayly—If the amendment (*Mr.* Rathbnu's bill) is now rejected, what will the House have to vote upon?

The Speaker. The original bill.

Mr. Bayly.—As amended?

The Speaker—No. The House can know nothing of what is done in Committee.

The question was then taken upon Mr. Rathbun's amendment, by yeas and nays.—The vote excited great interest among the members, and many members changed their votes and thus changed the result. The Speaker announced that the amendment was lost, yeas 103, nays 104.

The question now came back upon the bills as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, without amendment.

The Previous Question was moved by *Mr.* Boyd of Ky. and before there was a second, a motion to adjourn was lost, yeas 91, nays 91, the Speaker voting in the negative.

The Bill was then ordered to be engrossed, and the yeas and nays ordered upon the passage, when a motion to adjourn was carried 122 to 47.

FROM THE ARMY.

Rumored movement of Santa Anna on Saltillo—Concentration of Troops at Monterey Later from Tampico

The steamer Virginia arrived at New Orleans on the 4th inst. from Tampico, via Brazos Santiago, having left the Brazos on the 27th ult.—The brig Empressario, which sailed from Tampico on the 26th, also arrived at New Orleans on the same evening. By these arrivals the Picayune received the following news:

We have conversed with a gentleman who came passenger in the Virginia from Brazos, and who is direct from Monterey. He has kindly furnished us the following information, which is highly important if there be no error in the accounts. They were fully credited at the Brazos, and are confirmed by Captain Brower, of the schooner Robert Mills, who arrived last evening from that port.

An express from Gen. Worth, at Saltillo, arrived at Monterey on Wednesday, the 16th of December. It brought the news that Gen. Worth had learned through his spies that Santa Anna was within three days march of Saltillo, at the head of an army of twenty or thirty thousand men. The express bore a call upon Gen. Taylor for reinforcements. Gen. Taylor and his staff had left Monterey on the 15th ult—the day before the express arrived—for Victoria, to join his command, which was two days march in advance of him.

Gen. Butler in command at Monterey, immediately sent off despatches to Gen. Marshall, at Camargo, and to Gen Patterson, at Matamoras, to send forward without delay all the troops they could spare from their commands.

Gen Patterson had left Matamoras only the day before the news reached that place. It was at once forwarded to him, and upon learning its purport our informant states that he immediately started on his return with the view to proceed to Monterey.

It was reported at Tampico on the 25th ult. that a portion of Gen. Patterson's command had entered Victoria, but it is not mentioned that the General himself had arrived, so that we cannot judge how far the news from the two sources may conflict.

The express reported at Matamoras that the road from Monterey to Camargo was lined with troops—regulars and volunteers—on their march to Monterey, having been previously ordered up. Our informant says there were four regiments upon the road. The route from Monterey is infested by predatory bands of ranchos by which travelling is rendered insecure. One train had been attacked a few days before our informant passed over the road, as had also several small parties, and some few men had been killed and wounded.

We need not say that this news possesses the deepest interest. As we write we have only verbal reports in regard to it, but hope to receive this morning our correspondence from the army. There is no intrinsic improbability in the news of Santa Anna's movements, and if he possesses the energy and skill claimed for him, nothing appears more likely than that he should fall like a thunderbolt upon some point in our extended line & hope to crush us. But we have every confidence in the vigilance of Gen. Wool and his ability to hold the enemy in check until Gen Wool and Gen Taylor arrive to his support. We await further intelligence with the deepest interest.

—o—

POSTSCRIPT.

The mail of Thursday evening brought nothing of interest from Annapolis. There is but little doing in either branch of the Legislature.

From Washington we learn that the proposition to create a Lieutenant General has been rejected a second time by the House of Representatives, notwithstanding which Mr. Dix, of the U. S. Senate, has reported favorably upon the proposition, and it is believed both houses of Congress will be whipped into acquiescence with the President upon this measure. Gen'l. Houston of Texas is now spoken of as likely to receive the appointment. We also learn of the death of Mr. Pennybacker, a member of the U. S. Senate from Virginia.

Later news has been received from the Army. It is now pretty certain that Santa Anna has made a descent upon Saltillo, and it is probable a bloody battle was fought there about the 25th of last month. We learn that large bodies of troops were despatched to the aid of General Worth at Saltillo, and he probably had six or seven thousand men The number of of Santa Anna's army is variously estimated from twenty to thirty thousand. We shall know in a few days the