

tion was taken by the President to Gen. Kearney's proclamation of the 24th August declaring his intention to hold New Mexico "as a part of the United States,"—none to his requiring all the inhabitants to return to their homes on pain of being considered traitors, and subject their persons to punishment, and their property to confiscation—none to his intention of providing a civil government for New Mexico with a territorial legislature—none to his absolving in the name of the United States the inhabitants of that country from their allegiance to the Republic of Mexico—and finally, none to his claiming all persons residing within that territory as citizens of the United States, and denouncing the doom of traitors against all of them who should be found in arms against us. To nothing that was done, by either Commodore Sloat or Commodore Stockton, in regard to these matters is any exception taken; yet, Commodore Sloat proclaimed to the inhabitants of California—as early as July, 1846—that thenceforward, California would be a portion of the United States, and would enjoy a permanent government. And, in his general orders, issued July 7th, he says to the troops who were about to be landed on the coast, that it was their duty not only to take California, but to preserve it afterwards as a part of the United States at all hazards. And Commodore Stockton by his proclamation makes known to all men, that he has by right of conquest taken possession of the territory known as Upper and Lower California, and declares it to be the territory of the United States; under the name of the territory of California. And again, on the 17th August, he declares that the territory of California now belongs to the United States, and will be governed, as soon as circumstances permit, by officers and laws similar to those by which other territories of the United States are regulated and governed. Here, then, we see officers acting under the authority of the President, without rebuke from him, claiming and establishing civil governments in Mexico and California, as the permanent territories of the United States; claiming their inhabitants as our citizens, promising them a permanent form of a government, and denouncing them as traitors if they should take up arms against the United States. What is this but conquest? What is it but seizure and permanent annexation by force of arms? This, then, sir, I presume the President designed to do at the very time when he called upon the country for a recognition of this war, and placing at his disposal means of men and money to prosecute it. No intimation is given to us in any of his correspondence—if he did not then entertain the design—at what time the change took place in the Presidential mind. In June, July and August, from the Navy and the War Departments to all officers charged with carrying into execution the wishes of the President in the prosecution of the war—we have the same general tone of instructions, secure these territories, and see we have all these officers seizing the territories and treating them as a permanent part of the United States. And to these proceedings the President takes no exception! He does not intimate, by the slightest breath of disapprobation, that the zeal of these commanders has exceeded the purposes of the Executive!

I must suppose then, sir, that this was the object for which the President presented the war from the beginning, and that indemnity was not the purpose for which he carried on the war.—Why, sir, is it not a single mode of securing indemnity if such had been his purpose. At the commencement of the war, what did he want indemnity for? Mexico, it is true, owed to our citizens money. If the object had been to seize the Mexican territory and simply to hold it by military occupation in order to compel Mexico to recognize and discharge her debts to us, why is nothing of this kind mentioned in these instructions? Why did these officers treat the territories of which they obtained possession as a conquest, which was to become a portion of the United States? Why is it that no intimation was given to them or to us that the object had been misunderstood—that the possession which they held of these territories was as a sort of mortgage, or in the nature of a security to be held until the payment of the debts due to us by Mexico?

But this view of the subject, I think, becomes still stranger when we consider the mode in which the President carried on his negotiations. Mr. Slidell was sent to Mexico, if I recollect rightly, in the month of November. I believe that his credentials bear date on the 10th of that month. Well, when he went to Mexico he was not received. Why was he not? The President tells you that Mexico, in spite of her plighted word, insultingly refused to receive our minister. Well, now it is plain to me—it is evident, that when advertising to the correspondence which took place between our consul at Mexico and Senor Pena a Pena—it is plain it never was the design of the then executive government of Mexico to receive a minister resident from the United States. The expression used I think, on the 15th of October, 1845—"The Mexican government will receive a commissioner to settle the present dispute;" and two months thereafter, on the 15th of December, 1845, when our representative insisted upon it that he understood that the person who was to be sent from this government was to settle all the differences between the two nations—both the indemnity for spoiliations and the question of boundary—the Mexican minister replies in substance, "not a word is said in the credentials of this person about settling any differences. He is sent here as resident minister plenipotentiary, as if friendly diplomatic relations between the two countries had never for a moment been interrupted."

It is impossible to read the correspon-

dence without seeing that the persons administering the government of Mexico were exceedingly anxious to settle the question of boundary, and that in order to enable them to do this, nothing might be done further to arouse or irritate the jealous feelings of the Mexican nation, and that therefore we should send them a commissioner, with power to settle the pending dispute. Well, we were not satisfied with that. They had promised to receive a commissioner; the President tendered them a minister resident. To that minister they objected, because he could not be received without arousing excited feelings and endangering the government of the country. But that is not all. Long before Mr. Slidell's mission was set on foot, on the 15th June, 1845, the acting Secretary of War writes to General Taylor in these terms:

"The point of your ultimate destination is the western frontier of Texas, where you will select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande del Norte, such a site as will consist with the health of the troops, and will be best adapted to repel invasion, and to protect what, in the event of annexation, will be our western border."

Now, sir, here is an order as early as the 15th of June, 1845, in which General Taylor is directed to select a position on or near the Rio del Norte, claimed as the western frontier of Texas, which should have these conditions—it should consist with the health of the troops and be the point best adapted to repel invasion, and to protect, in the event of invasion, what was to be our western border. Now, it will be sufficiently obvious from these documents, I think, that it was the intention of the President that General Taylor should move to the left bank of the Rio Grande. General Taylor so understood it, for in a despatch of his dated 4th October, 1845, he says:

"It will be recollected that the instructions of June 15, issued by Mr. Bancroft, then acting Sec'y of War, directed me to 'select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande, such a site as will consist with the health of the troops, and will be best adapted to repel invasion,' &c. Brazos Santiago is the nearest entrance to the mouth of the Rio Grande; and Point Isabel, within that entrance and 21 miles from Matamoros, would have fulfilled more completely than any other position the conditions imposed by the Secretary. But we had no artillery, no engineer force or appliances, and but a moderate amount of infantry; and the occupation of Point Isabel, under these circumstances, and with at least the possibility of resistance from the Mexicans, might have comprised the safety of the command. I, therefore, determined to take up the next accessible position in the rear, which is the mouth of the Nueces river."

Gen. Taylor says expressly that he understood that he would more completely carry out the order by taking a position at Point Isabel. Why did he not? He immediately assigns the reason.

As early as the 15th of December, an order was issued to Gen. Taylor, which he understood to be an order to take up his position on the left bank of the Rio Grande. An order which he thought would have been best complied with by establishing his position at Point Isabel. And he informed the department on the 4th of October, that this would have been done, but that he had not the requisite force to enable him to do it without the fear of a check on the part of Mexico. Well, sir, did he understand the order rightly? Let us see. On the 16th the Secretary writes to him:

"You will approach as near the western boundary of Texas (the Rio Grande) as circumstances will permit." &c.

And the final order of the 13th of January, 1846, which all admit, was an imperative one to Gen. Taylor to advance to the left bank of the Rio Grande, about the meaning and propriety of which there is no dispute. It is concluded in exactly the same terms as the two orders preceding it. He is directed to advance, and occupy a position on, or near the left bank of the Rio Grande. There is no intimation at any time after this despatch of General Taylor, informing him that he is mistaken in the construction which he puts upon the order. On the contrary, after that despatch must have been received—nearly three months after it was written—it is again indicated to be the design of the department, that he should occupy the same position which he was directed to do previously. He is directed to do it by a repetition of the order issued in June, 1845, almost in the same terms. Well, now what is the inference from this? If in June, 1845, Gen. Taylor had been provided with a train of artillery, if he had a suitable apparatus of engineers, he would under the order of June 15th have advanced, and taken possession of Point Isabel—expelling the Mexicans from that position, and placing it under the control of the United States. If he had done so, would he not have been obeying the orders of this government? Was it not what was designed by the government, that he should do if the means had been in his possession? It is evident it was so designed, because when they had given him the means and the same order—he assumes the position with the entire approbation and support of the government. Well, now, was not this a singular mode of proceeding, if the object had been to preserve peace and amity between the two nations? Offence having been taken for some cause, real or supposed, that before the President sends his mission of peace—a month before he sends it—an order is issued—the object and scope of which was to place a military force within the territory claimed and occupied by Mexico. Now, is it not obvious that had such a movement been made, it was calculated to rouse the indignation of Mexico, and to prevent the possibility of settlement of the differences between the two countries? If negotiation was desirable, if the President him-

self desired to settle the differences upon amicable terms—would he have pressed amission of peace by an aggression upon the power with which he desired to restore friendly relations? But, be it remembered, I have shown to the Senate already, that the President considered, (we have it under his own hand in the orders transmitted to his officers,) that the expulsion of the Mexicans from the left bank of the Rio Grande—the removal of their settlements was an act of aggression, a hostile act, an act to be avoided—in order to insure the peaceful settlement of our difficulties, and which nothing would justify but the occurrence of actual war. Thus, it seems to me, that not only did the President bring on the war by an unlawful and unconstitutional act, but that he has prosecuted it for the purpose of conquest.

To be concluded next week.

SENATOR MANGUM'S RESOLUTION.

The Washington correspondent of the Baltimore American gives the following sketch of the debate which took place in the U. S. Senate on Thursday upon Mr. Mangum's Resolution:

Mr. Mangum's Resolution is substantially that—the President be requested to state whether the General Order 378 issued by General Scott was from instructions from the War Department, and also an opinion of Gen. Scott on file, as the military means necessary to carry them into effect.

Mr. Mangum pressed his Resolution, and the duty of the President to communicate whatever information was necessary for the true guidance of the body. One Senator, from N. C. said that he desired to know what was the Executive purpose on this subject, and that he should officially inform the Senate what object was now designed by the war.

There was a tender-footedness upon this subject—a sort of skittishness, which was surprising. He had never seen such a sensitiveness before in his long service in this body and in the other House. Gentlemen seemed afraid to communicate light to the Senate. They were afraid of informing the Senate of what was designed—of what was done—and Senators were called upon to carry out the wishes of the Administration without even knowing what they were.

Mr. Crittenden thought the Senator from Michigan might well be sensitive at being called "tender-footed" upon this subject. The Senator had signalled himself by opposition to all calls of information here. Whenever light was wanted he was for keeping dark, and we were to be made to walk blind-folded over red hot coals in order to keep the President's secrets prosecuting the war.

There was no State secrets worth keeping. Such things belonged to little Governments and little persons. Little Governments adopted them and nobody else. They belonged to little things, little people and little Governments. When we employed spies, in Heaven's name keep secret our operations, but not in other great things. The Senator from Michigan did not want Mexico to know what we wanted—what we designed. Why, did we not know ourselves. We were kept in the dark—wholly in the dark.

The other day the Senator did not want to destroy the Nationality of Mexico. Soon after we could swallow the whole of Mexico and it would not hurt us.—Now he was for the entire subjugation, or conquest of Mexico. We might swallow Mexico, though he thought it would make us a most mishapen mass.

Mexico was now entirely at our mercy, and we could "swallow" as the Senator said, leg, arm, or head, or even the whole if necessary. Any new species of cannibalism we were strong enough to attempt.—Mexico was conquered already, and there was no need of all these State secrets—all these impenetrabilia and arcana. It was unbecoming our people to adopt this darkness.

Mr. Crittenden argued that within six weeks we should have peace, and question put to us would be in a legislative form—what would we do with Mexico? Mr. C. held, in most eloquent words and with great force of manner, that the Senate had a right to know what was done and what was designed.

Mr. Cass rejoiced that war was a game, and that secrets were necessary. He would vote for all necessary public information which the Executive might deem it discreet to give.

Mr. Crittenden objected to the communications in a partial form, and to one Senator. Every Senator here was an equal—and it was hardly respectful to let just such an amount of light, or twilight, as he regarded as most proper to give. The Senator became here the grave distributor of knowledge to others. He (Mr. Crittenden) wanted the information in an official form. Give us light—light—light! The people had a right to know what the Executive meant.

Mr. Mangum argued this question still further, and wished to know, and most to know, what the Executive meant upon this subject:—what he meant to do with Mexico after it was conquered. This war was coming to an end which the people were not ready to come up to. If the Chairman of the Committee of Military Affairs would tell us this, he would care less for the resolution. The Senator (Mr. Cass) went for the conquest of Mexico, and this was what was meant.

Mr. Allen gave notice that he should introduce his ancient resolution,—of allowing light to come in upon all subjects, save one—(and that probably negotiations.) He would have all executive nominations considered in public and no Executive secrets.

After a few words more the Resolution was adopted.

Two men, says the Laurensburg (S. C.) Herald, from Rutherford county, N. C., carried a very pretty mulatto girl, 19 years old, to that place to sell her.—But she gave information that she was free and had been kidnapped. One of the men was arrested, but the other escaped. The one arrested gave his name as Jos. S. Gibbs, and said the other was named William Wilson.—*Cheraco Gazette.*

South Carolina Electors.—The bill to give the election of Presidential Electors to the people, reported in the Legislature of South Carolina, having been defeated in the Senate, will compel an extra session of the Legislature, to cast its Electoral vote, upon the one day appointed by the Law of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE.

PENSIONS TO WIDOWS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 21, 1846.

The House having again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and resumed the consideration of the Bill for the relief of Mary Brown, widow of Jacob Brown—

Mr. BOWLIN said he had heretofore offered an amendment, to obviate the constant struggle which had been sustained in this House against the principle under which the Government had sought to pension the widows of the soldiers of the Revolution. There was a principle involved in that rule; and the abandonment of the rule was the abandonment of the principle. The principle was, that no pension should be allowed to any widow who did not live in the time of the Revolution. The year 1794 was therefore fixed as the limitation; so that no marriage since that day could entitle the widow to a pension. It was considered that no lady would be likely to marry under twelve years of age; and therefore every woman married previous to this period must have lived through the trying times of the Revolution. If this bill pass, therefore, it should carry on its face the reason for extending the law to the present case in the terms of his amendment—namely, that she was born before the close of the Revolution, and did live within that trying period—thus bringing within the equity of the principle the existing law. But if you pass the bill without such an amendment, you establish a precedent allowing a pension to the widow of a revolutionary soldier who was not married till the year 1813; and if the claim be allowed without qualification in once instance, it cannot be refused in any.

Mr. STUART, of Michigan, was in favor of reporting the whole subject back to the House, without further action in committee, and proceeded to speak on the merits of the case. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, (Mr. BOWLIN) was based, not on the fact of her marriage, but on the fact that she was born and lived during the period of the Revolution.

Mr. BOWLIN here interposed and explained his amendment.

Mr. STUART resumed. He understood the gentleman's reasoning in favor of his amendment, and only wished to show its fallacy. If Congress pensioned widows at all, it was done on account of the services of their husbands.—It was of no consequence when the widow was born. The consideration on the part of the Government was this: because your husband afforded signal service in the war of the Revolution, we will aid you in sustaining yourself. That was the consideration, and not because of her birth during the revolution, or before it, she was entitled to a pension; but because her husband was a soldier. In this was the equity of the case. It was of no consequence (he said) whether she had lived through the Revolutionary struggle, or whether, from necessity or choice, she had not married until after the year 1794. He was opposed to the passage of the bill, not because he was opposed to the principle, for he was in favor of that, in all its length and breadth. Under the present law, there were but about five thousand pensioners; and it would not increase the list much if we were to pension the widow of every Revolutionary soldier. If we were even to double the number it would not cause any very startling expenditure of money. The danger was not in paying these soldiers too much, or doing too much for their widows. He could not, in the present case, admit the claim of this lady on the score of her relationship to Major Jacob Brown; for, by the time of the end of the present war, many cases of this character would come up; and he doubted not, if they could be all looked up at this time, they would amount to many as two thousand cases. If this case was peculiar on this score, he must confess he could not see it. He could easily perceive why it should add to the reputation of this lady, and entitle her to the consideration of the country. This whole case, he contended, was only one among a thousand reasons why a general law on this subject should be passed. But it had been urged to pension every widow of revolutionary soldiers would cost too much. Mr. S. deprecated this argument in strong terms. Let it be once understood that they would not take care of their widows, and he would warn the House that volunteers would no more come into the service.

In conclusion, Mr. S. said he made these remarks to justify himself in voting against the resolution, whether amended or not. He should do, as he had before said, with the hope of getting up a general law upon this subject; and if it were not for this expectation, he would vote every individual claim of this class that might be presented. He moved that the committee rise and report the whole subject to the House, with a recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, with instructions to report a general bill.

Mr. ATKINSON said it might be that he was not so keenly alive to the principles of justice and sympathy as other men. He did not believe that this House had the right to dispose of money belonging to the people by conferring it on any object which, in their opinion, may be deserving of the national sympathy and compassion. The powers of Congress were strictly defined. They must act on the principle of law, and not upon the principle of sympathy or their own ideas of justice; because that which would excite the sympathy of one man might excite the ridicule of another, and the contrary. He would go as far as any to support the widows of Revolutionary soldiers, but must protest against Congress putting its hand in the public purse out of sympathy merely. Mr. A. considered that the various reasons given by gentlemen for their support of this bill, in themselves furnished an argument against the principle involved in this special legislation.

After further debate upon the merits of the case by Messrs. D. P. KING, DICKINSON, JOHNSON, of Arkansas, and ROCKWELL, of Massachusetts—

Mr. BOYDEN, in support of the bill remarked that he was at first a little surprised at the observations of some of the gentlemen upon the other side of the House, and particularly those of the gentleman from Virginia, who had taken occasion to read us a lecture upon the danger of trusting our sympathies, or even the principles of justice, unless we had rules prescribed to us by which we were governed in administering it. The gentleman had taken occasion to go into a long discussion of our pension laws, and seemed to be greatly alarmed at the idea of voting a small pension to the poor widow, whose only prop and stay in her declining years had fallen, through the Mexican war, in fighting the battles of the country. From the great solicitude of the gentleman for the safety of the Treasury, he hoped that the gentleman from Virginia would manifest this degree of solicitude when

we were called upon (as we shortly should be) to vote fifty thousand more men and some fifty millions of dollars to carry on this war of conquest of Mexico. For his (Mr. B.'s) part, he thought that, both as a matter of conscience and in a pecuniary point of view, it was much better to vote a few thousand dollars for the support of the widows and families of those brave men who had already fallen in battle, than to vote fifty thousand men and fifty millions of money to conquer the sister Republic of Mexico, and to make thousands more widows and orphans, who would eventually be supported out of the National Treasury. Mr. B. was about to state his views as to the course he intended to pursue in relation to the families of those who had fallen in this Mexican war; when—

Mr. ATKINSON, interposed, said that, whenever the time should come, he would be found ready and willing to support the defenders of our rights and liberties. He would take the liberty of calling upon Whigs to support their consistency by refusing men and means to carry on a war which they had denominated, by a solemn vote, unnecessary and unconstitutional; which damnable act would ever follow them with odium. As for himself, he voted for the war, and gloried in it. All he asked of gentlemen was for them to stand up and refuse now to vote men and means to carry on the war, and they would be damned in the estimation of the people.

Mr. BOYDEN remarked that as it suited the gentleman to put questions, he would propound one to the gentleman. Reminding the gentleman of the present state of the Treasury, he desired to know of the gentleman from Virginia whether he would come up to the point directly to borrow money, and likewise to levy a direct tax upon the people of the United States to repay this borrowed money. Or did he intend to vote for Treasury notes, to pay the hard earnings of our soldiers in what the Democratic party have been in the habit of denouncing rag-money? He should like to hear the gentleman upon these questions.

Mr. ATKINSON replied: I will tell the gentleman that, whatever may be necessary for the defence of the rights and honor of the country, I am willing to lay a tax, either directly or indirectly, on all the property in the United States. He would tell any gentleman that he would do any thing for the preservation of the honor of his country. These (said Mr. A.) are my views. All that astonishes me is, that men will declare the war unjust, and yet vote means to support it.

Mr. BOYDEN resumed. Oh yes; here is Democratic economy for you! When the National Treasury was almost exhausted, when the specie was flowing out at both ends, and nothing to supply its place but Treasury notes the gentleman would vote any number of men and any amount of money to overrun and conquer all Mexico. Yes, when her army had been destroyed—nay, totally annihilated, by some fifteen thousand American soldiers, (and a braver and more gallant body of men never entered a battle-field,) and when our forces since the annihilation of the Mexican army had been trebled, and when Mexico by panting at our feet, bleeding at every pore, he would still vote any amount of men and money the Executive might require, and, for the purpose of concealing the true object of those men and this money, called it voting men and money for the defence of honor and liberty of the country.—May God deliver us from such a defence of the honor and liberty of the country! Oh yes; he and the gentleman has constitutional scruples; he can find no authority in the constitution for voting a pension to this poor widow. Oh no; no authority for voting this pension. Talk about the constitution! Who does not know that that sacred instrument has long since ceased to have any binding influence upon the present Executive? I would ask the gentleman from Virginia (said Mr. B.) in what article, what section, or what clause of that once sacred instrument he finds authority to dignify the President of the United States with the title of conqueror, and to authorize him, under and by virtue of that high title, to levy any amount of taxes he pleases upon eight millions of people, and to appropriate them to such purposes as his imperial majesty may see fit! Talk about the constitution, and the defence of the liberty and honor of the country, after sanctioning such high handed and tyrannical measures!

The CHAIRMAN here remarked that the debate had wandered away from Mary Brown. [Cries of "Go on; go on!"]

Mr. BOYDEN proceeded to say that when he rose he had intended to submit but one or two observations to the committee, but that he had unconsciously been led off by the gentleman from Virginia. He desired to say that he should not only vote for this pension for Mary Brown, but that he should vote to pension the widow of any American soldier that had fallen in this war. Could any man stand up here and say that the Government should do less for this poor and aged woman than the brave and gallant Major Brown had done for his step-mother? But the gentleman from Virginia remarked that it was wrong and unsafe to trust our sympathies in such a case, and, moreover, that the case should not be decided upon the principles of justice.

Mr. ATKINSON here again interposed and remarked: Because we could never come to any conclusion upon that principle.

Mr. BOYDEN. There may be men who cannot safely trust their sympathies, but for his part, he had always relied upon his, and thought they could be trusted, especially when they led to charitable and benevolent deeds. The gentleman said he was willing to tax his constituents to defend the liberties of the country. But that was not an answer to the question he asked him. Why does the gentleman answer in this evasive way? He would repeat the question. Would the gentleman vote a direct tax upon his constituents for carrying on this war for the conquest of a sister Republic?

Mr. ATKINSON replied. He would vote any tax which might be necessary to prosecute the war vigorously, in order to secure an honorable peace. He would ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he would do that? Let him say yes or no to it.

Mr. BOYDEN said he had no difficulty in answering this or any other question that he or any other gentleman desired to propound to him. He was glad of the opportunity to declare that, as at present advised, he would not vote a single man nor a dollar of money for the purpose of carrying on this war for the conquest of Mexico. He would vote to supply the men now in Mexico; he would pension their widows if they fell; he would go still further—he was willing if though necessary, to vote the most liberal provision for the families of all who fell or died in the service.

Mr. McLANE desired the gentleman from North Carolina to inform him whether he would vote means to reinforce and make safe the army now in Mexico or the navy off the coast? Mr. BOYDEN. Does the gentleman from

Maryland expect to bring this country with the idea that we are in any danger in Mexico, or are we in any danger in Mexico, or are we in any danger in any other part of the country? Mr. McLANE said the gentleman from Carolina had kindly volunteered to interrogate him. He (Mr. B.) did not know if he did not think the country was in any danger when it first went to Mexico.

Mr. BOYDEN. No, sir, I do not think the country is in any danger. What, sir, is the American army? No, sir, I do not think of such a thing. I always have the utmost confidence upon our arms, and I have no doubt that the more Mexicans there were to take to their heels, the more we would be able to do. No man would be more prepared to vote all that might be necessary from all danger—to keep the country safe. But, sir, as to the pension, no man thinks of that. I suppose the Executive would now think of such a thing. Have not the orders already issued to our men just about to be sent to Mexico? Our men cannot suppose that our men cannot take much gold from those Mexican hearts can desire; Sir, we would hate people. Just at the moment we posed our Subtreasury was full of specie payments, so, and he would come to our relief.

Mr. Chairman. That gentleman, head of the Treasury Department, last week, in looking over the money-box, has discovered that in one corner which had been looked.

Mr. ATKINSON. If you cure in Mexico, and if you cure much money there, he could not be taxed to carry it out. But Mr. A. objected to this, and would move that the gentleman to the House, and be rejected.

Mr. BOYDEN. I am sorry to be apprehended by the gentleman. He certainly is the only gentleman who could misunderstand me.

Mr. ATKINSON. Yes, the gentleman from North Carolina; and, regarding him, I would like to be speaking by authority, and the gentleman could just as well be the pension of Mary Brown.

Mr. BOYDEN. Just as well as it would be taken for granted on the other side of the House that I, but as I understand the doctrine—

Mr. ATKINSON. Well, you said the war was unjust.

Mr. BOYDEN. I have said the war was just or unjust. But on occasion to say—as I happened to do—to vote on a certain resolution, I believe the war to have been unjustly commenced, and unconstitutionally commenced, without any warrant therefor. [Here the conversation dropped.]

WHIG MEETING IN CONCORD.

At a meeting of the Whigs in Concord, on the 19th of January, 1846, on the motion of Maj. Joseph W. Kirkpatrick, of Concord, N. H., the following resolutions were adopted, to act as Secretary. The resolutions were then submitted to Krimminger, and after some remarks of Maj. R. Barringer, were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we approve of the convention to be held in Raleigh, N. C., next, and that this meeting designate to represent the Whigs at the same.

Resolved, That we continue to diminish confidence in the present principles of the Whig party, regard the present lamia, as a country, as it is in an unconstitutional and foreign war, with evils, as mainly attributed to the excess of these principles in the election in 1844.

Resolved, That at this period of our history, it behooves the patriotic Whigs to unite in resisting the dangerous Executive Power, and in bringing the Federal Government from its present state of War and Conquest, to its legitimate fostering the arts of peace and prosperity and happiness of our people.

Resolved further, That it is right that the people throughout the Country, in their primary assemblies, should freely give their opinion on the present condition of affairs, in order that their silence may be construed into an approbation of the present administration of the Federal Government.

The following persons were then appointed as Delegates under the first resolution: George W. Scott, Moses Petta, G. W. er, W. F. Pharr, John F. Risher, Robert, John Shimcock, Rufus Barringer, J. Scott, Jas. L. Badger, Dr. S. L. Gilman, C. Means, J. F. Gilmer, J. W. Black, J. W. S. Harris, S. C. Harris, Robert K. R. C. Cook, Kerby Pope, Josiah White, Dr. W. W. Rankin, and Edwin Harris.

On motion of L. B. Krimminger, the proceedings of this meeting be published in Carolina Watchman, Charlotte Journal, Raleigh Register.

ROB. KIRKPATRICK, Secy.

ROB. BURTON, Secy.

BRIER CREEK, Wilkes Co., Jan. 21, 1846.

Messrs. Editors: Is it not evident to you, when you notice the invading Standard man, against the Standard man, for voting to withdraw our troops from Mexico for this "unhappy, untimely, and unjust war," in which we are engaged, that he (Mr. Standard) has come to a dead halt for something to say about? For until Hon. T. L. Clingman made his powerful speech on the Question, he made him his subject.