

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM PECHIN, (PRINTER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.) 31, SOUTH GAY STREET, NEAR THE CUSTOM HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Daily paper \$7 and Country paper 5 per ann. All advertisements appear in both papers.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1866

FROM THE AURORA.

HOW STANDS THE ACCOUNT NOW!

How much must we place to the credit of fact—how much to the credit of stock-jobbing—how much to hope—and how much to despair?—And how much to the merit and zeal of Gazette writers, who earn their bread quantum meruit?

The capture of Vienna is now no longer doubted! And even the defeat of Massena in Italy is no longer believed!

It is considered as a matter even of proud exultation that the archduke Charles had made a "masterly retreat," that is, he made his escape to Laubach or Layback—it is astonishing with what facility the princes of modern days make an escape!

Let us see where is Layback—it is an ominous name, it is as bad as fall back—or run back—or run away!—This is not Laubach, in the Duchy of Simmern on the Upper Rhine, a few miles from Metz—but Layback or Laubach, on the river Saar, in Carniola—about 25 miles N. E. of Trieste.

N. B. Trieste is in the hands of the French, as well as Goritz and the remains of ancient Aquila.

It was on the first of November (in the night) that the archduke set out for Layback; on his masterly retreat, or as they tell us after defeating Massena; this was twelve days before the capture of Vienna. Layback is about 200 miles from Vienna, which lies in a direction somewhat north of West; and Cracow is about 200 miles further off, a little more westward. It would seem then that the archduke's only safety is to lay back altogether; or to go further back, if he should be pursued; for forward he cannot go; if Massena's advance guard did, as the gazettes say, pursue him, either also.

Meanwhile Augereau has given an account of six or eight thousand of the division of the Austro-Italian army which was penetrating Germany by the frontier of Switzerland; and who fell into Augereau's trap at Regenz, which is within six or seven miles of Lindau, on the Lake of Constance.

Marmont with his flying camp of chasseurs, voltigeurs, and horse artillery; had scoured the country along the Drave from Clagenfurth to the neighborhood of Gratz—his force is at once an army of observation, a foraging party, and a patrol to intercept supplies passing to the army of Italy. Count Merveldt the second in command it seems had fallen back also, or had stepped aside, uncertain whether to make a masterly retreat through Istria or Hungary, or neither Austria. But general Solt it appears had on the 10th of November fallen in with Meerfeldt and put him to the rout; the general and count (like the English general and prince, and the Austrian prince generals made a masterly retreat accompanied by a single officer of Hulus.

The general archduke John also made a most masterly retreat from the Tyrol; leaving 1200 sick and wounded, and 16,000 muskets to the care of the French general Ney.

This is the age of retreats; the marches of major Sturgeon were never ludicrous, because there was no joke intended "from Brentford to Elin, from Elin to Acton, from Acton to Uxbridge," from Munich to Vienna, from Vienna to Znaim, from Znaim to Brunn, from Brunn to Troppau, from Troppau to Cracow; this is the route of the German emperor; a masterly retreat indeed!

But "so! so!" says the English Gazette Royal and extraordinary of the 18th December—the battle of Wischau in Moravia—27,000 French killed—all their artillery taken—Bonaparte wounded in the sword-arm—two horses and two side camps killed under him—and that he retreated afterwards and proposed an armistice.

This is the sum of the news of the official bulletin; and we should not be surprised to hear of an illumination and tower guns being fired, and a general fast, on the occasion; we recollect, there was a general illumination, and the tower and park guns were once fired, on the joyful and pious occasion of Bonaparte's assassination in Egypt.

Like the defeat of Massena it did not turn out to be true; but it served the purpose; it kept John Bull in sulky quietness—promoted the minister's finances; and stock-jobbing; we should like to know how much Dundas made by it.

But let us see this terrible affair at Wischau.

The English papers, (which of course are the best authority in the world!) say that the French general Mortier was killed and 12,000 of his troops cut to pieces; but the same papers before said his whole army amounted to only ten thousand men;

as they were cut up we may presume they counted the pieces. There is precedent for this, in the war of the American revolution the legs and arms of the Hessians were counted: a whole carcass cost forty pounds sterling; a leg or an arm a half or a fourth of that sum: for the princes it was a good pocket money calculation, but for the most pious king in Christendom: the least said about it the less disgusting the subject must be.

However tho' Mortier (like Bonaparte in Egypt) was killed: he was on the 12th (that is the day after his death) alive and in pursuit of the Russians: Nay it appears that Mortier, and Bernadotte, and Milhaud, and Lannes, and Davoust, and Soult's divisions had advanced to Stockerau, and that they reached Znaim (which is 35 miles from Vienna and 58 from Olmutz, on the 14th of November, as the French call it the 23 Brumaire)—this was three days after the French, as is said, were defeated; the Russians were making a masterly retreat before them...beating the French at running.

We find these victorious high flyers a little fatigued on the 24 Brumaire, (English 15th November) and entering into a capitulation with general Belliard, at Hohlbrunn.

The French Emperor had not time to say yea or nay, when the Russians take the moonlight for it, and leave their capitulation and the French behind them; and Murat pursued and overtook them on the 26th (17th Nov.) at Gundersdorff 6 miles north of Sonneburg, 15 S. of Znaim; and a battle took place which lasted the whole day. Here it is said (even in the English prints!) that the Russians made another masterly retreat; this is the age of retreats!

The emperor of Austria was all this time at Brunn, but as the French were so often defeated at a retreat, it was time for him to out-general them also; and accordingly he did set out for Troppau, and as that was not far enough, he retreated to Cracow.

Then comes the little Corsican; God help us; how vain and foolish is the habit of calling names! What is the artillery of Billingsgate opposed to the artillery of genius! What a satire on boastings and acclamations of feigned victory; when the conquered army are the pursuers and the captors; and the victors—find it difficult to escape. When in a few days we find the vanquished army in possession of Brunn on the 19th November; and not only regulating its police but occupying its fortified places. Brunn contains a population of 120,000; it must be about twice as large as Philadelphia; the manufactures of iron, steel, glass, cotton, and silk, velvets, and allum, must have furnished Bonaparte with many useful things, and many useful hands for his manufactures in France; for he blends the useful with the horrible in a very uncommon way.

However, he did not stop long at Brunn—but marched by Reskawitz, and Letekowitz in two columns; and crossing the Zavitá—his right marched by Namitz, and Ruprecht, Pustomez Kobersitz, to Kojetin, on the right bank of the Morava; while the left proceeded by Kyretein, Williamowiz to Hartmaniz, and threw into the defiles of Bohussin, such a force as should keep the Russians in check, who had taken an advantageous position at Wischau with two small rivers in the rear, securing a retreat, in the event of defeat a double entrenchment, while the road to Olmutz from Wischau by Prasnitz, Karbart, Olschau and Latein lay open, and the Morava either secured their right flank on a retreat, or afforded them by crossing another more formidable evant fosse.

Troppau which is about 40 miles N. E. of Olmutz, and on the Oppa river which separates Prussia from Austrian Silesia; it was occupied only for 12 hours by the German emperor, who made a curved retreat, across Prussia Silesia [a melancholy march] to Cracow—about 133 miles.

It would be cruel to deprive people of the only consolations of despair, that of a momentary delusion is too strong to be easily dissipated; but it is proper to give an antidote for that repercussion; but it of disappointment, which is to follow the English stock-jobbing bulletin of 18 December.

The composition of that bulletin, bears no—not one feature of authenticity—the account was a general one—it is sundries debtor to profit and loss, but the amount is not posted; it may be a good spec, or it may reduce the chap's discount. We are told "it appears that a great battle took place"—this was a likely thing, and the favorable position of Wischau, for a masterly retreating army; was such as might countenance such an expectation; from the particular circumstance too, that the French were pursuing them; they say again; "the contest seems to have been most obstinate"; this is very probable, for an obstinate resistance presupposes a very impetuous and persevering attack.

"The loss of the French was immense." This is a matter of course; they are such careless people, that they do not go out of the way of shot, and if they will not make a masterly retreat, but will stand to be shot at, why they must be killed.

But the best of all this bulletin is, that "the messenger left Olmutz 24 hours after the battle"; and he "relates that it was reported" what was reported? Why he relates that it was reported, that the allied powers lost less than the French!

Now this is all a report of what was reported; and every body knows what may be reported!

But sir Arthur Paget's messenger sends word of the same report; and moreover that Bonaparte proposed an armistice. And is this a new thing?—Did he not propose an armistice to Leoben? Did he not propose an armistice when he was appointed first consul? Did he not propose an armistice to Austria, before he entered the field?

The measures of this man are not like those of your light headed prince—he appears destined to reverse every thing, and to turn the stupidity of hereditary governments into ridicule and contempt. He said long ago, that nothing in the present century would resemble the last.

There is a tall paragraph to the bulletin that puts it beyond doubt, what the object of the bulletin was—we allude to what relates to the 140,000 Prussians, who are said to be in motion; what kind of motion, perhaps emotion!

There is one circumstance concerning this bulletin that fixes its character—reader refer to the introductory paragraph, it is in this paper—there it says on the 18th of Dec. as follows—"in our last night's paper we noticed," &c. This was said on the evening of the 18th Dec. Then the account goes on—and "in the afternoon (of the 18th) the following official notice was circulated," &c.

Now this little apparently unimportant incident shews the value of the thing—who can doubt, that if on the evening of the 17th the English government had really any news of importance, that it would have remained till the next evening unpublished—without tower guns, or illuminations!

The delay would be impolitic if there was good news—the apparent delay shews there was no good news and the making of the news to raise something for a speech—the report of news has at once served to raise the funds, and the arrival of the messenger, rendering the prospect of peace more remote, depressed the funds—detaining the bulletin till the stock exchange was shut on the 18th—left full time for deception and stock-jobbing—Had the battle of Wischau been as fatal to Bonaparte, as was represented; the consumption of candles, and oil, and gunpowder, and church steeple music, would have been enormous.

As to the remarks upon the Bulletin in the English papers, we will not touch them; those who can swallow them, may take jalap without a very face or an emotion.

[Here the Aurora makes some remarks, relative to the arming of the Leander in the port of New York, and then proceeds as follows.]

To return to Europe—we find in some measure realized occurrences which we have frequently anticipated—the revolt in Poland—the promotion of Bavaria to a kingdom, and with the addition of the Suabian portion of the house of Lorraine—the separation of Hungary and even of Bohemia, are not impossible things—we have seen an account of an expedition to South America, and the capture of Buenos Ayres on the Rio Plate—let us not be accused of extravagance if we venture to anticipate a consequence of this event—if it should be true that the English have taken Buenos Ayres—then is the fate of PORTUGAL determined; and we should not be surprised to find Portugal transferred to Spain and the royal house of Braganza removed to Brazil—in exchange for Portugal, France would request that part of Spain fronting on the Bay of Biscay, from Bayonne; round Capes Ortegal and Finisterre to the mouth of the Minho; comprehending the hardy Biscayan nation, who inhabit Navarre, Biscay, Asturias, and Galicia, but particularly possessing the important maritime and naval ports and positions of Finisterre, Coruna, Vigo, Ferrol, St. Antonio, Bilbao, and St. Sebastian.

The best illustration of the English bulletin perhaps is to be found, in the approach of the session of parliament, which was to meet on the 17th of January. A month's preparation for the King's speech is full time—and as there are loans and taxes to be bulgeted, what is wanting of success in the field must be made up in bulletins. The reliques of lord Nelson come in good time for the minister—the circumstances of the funeral and lying in state must amuse John Bull very commodiously.

Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 12.

MR. SLOAN.—Mr. Speaker, I trust I am correct first in saying, that the representatives of the people in Congress assembled, are the only tribunal to whom they can look for redress of national grievances, and protection in their national rights—and secondly, that every member as a component part of the national legislature, has a right to introduce resolutions in such form, as he may think best calculated to redress existing grievances; or secure them from future insult and injury.

Notwithstanding several resolutions have been laid on the table respecting the impressment of our seamen by the commanders of British armed vessels, and their depredations on our commerce; I have seen none which I consider fully adequate to the purpose proposed; or couched in that firm, and decisive language, that I conceive the nature of the case requires. Under this impression I beg leave to offer a resolution; and previous thereto, ask the indulgence of the House to offer a few reasons.

Are not the people calling on us from almost every part of the union? Previous to my leaving home, to attend this session, I expected the impressment of our Seamen by British armed vessels, and their depredations on our commerce would have been the first business taken up; but, to my astonishment more than ten weeks elapsed, and we are only preparing to discuss this important subject. Is this giving immediate attention to the sufferings of our constituents? But, what astonishes me still more is, that by conversation I have had with some members, they appear yet unprepared to do any thing decisive.

One member (Mr. Nicholson) who offered a resolution two days past, objected to a former resolution offered by a member from Pennsylvania (Mr. Gregg) from an apprehension that it would injure our revenue 5,000,000 of dollars. (Here Mr. Nicholson explained, stating that he had only said that it would affect it to that

amount.) Another member from Massachusetts, (Mr. Crowninshield) well acquainted with mercantile business, supposed it would not injure it more than 1,000,000.

But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that however pleasing it may be to see our debt diminishing, and our revenue increasing; the fear of diminution of revenue, will never deter the Congress of the U. States from supporting their national rights. I hope we shall not shrink from a temporary evil, to procure a great and permanent benefit.

In hearing the conversation of some members out of doors, and observing the delay that had taken place in the House, this query is extorted from me; where is the spirit that actuated the noble patriots of seventy-six, at the risk of life to oppose the unjust aggressions of Great Britain? Has it fled from our land, or is it only sleeping? I hope the latter; and that it may speedily awake, refreshed, and invigorated by its long nap.

But perhaps some may conclude, that I wish to involve the United States in war—God forbid—I want to prevent war with those horrid engines made to destroy the human species. I want to prevent it by doing to all nations, as we would they should do unto us; are we so doing whilst we permit one of the belligerent powers, to impress, and keep on board her vessels of war, three thousand of our seamen, to assist in fighting her battles with other belligerent powers, in amity and peace with us? I want the United States to treat Great Britain as they would treat an individual, who in his dealings had evidently been unjust; break off all intercourse, until reparation is made for past injuries; and security given that they shall not be repeated in future. This line of conduct, I conceive, instead of producing war, would be the most certain means of securing a permanent, and lasting peace. In the present state of Europe, can Great Britain do without our trade? Certainly she cannot—It is probable that Bonaparte has ere this time prohibited her trade with a considerable part of Europe. Thus circumstanced, trembling for her very existence, if we make a firm determined demand for reparation of damages, my opinion is, that she dare not, that she cannot, nor will not refuse.

I will not detain the house at this time, with a more detailed investigation of the subject; but knowing it to be the desire of many of my constituents, and hoping that upon a full investigation, it will be the determination of this House, to adopt firm and decisive measures, for the purpose of obtaining redress for injuries sustained, and to prevent the like in future, I offer the following resolution, hoping the house will commit it to a committee of the whole, on the state of the union.

Whereas the commanders of the British armed vessels have impressed many American seamen, and compelled them to bear arms on board said vessels, and assist in fighting their battles with nations in amity and peace with the United States, and also brought into British ports for adjudication, many merchant vessels, sailing under the flag, and owned by citizens of the said United States, where some have been a long time unjustly detained, and others condemned, contrary to justice and the law of nations.

For remedy whereof.

Resolved, That in case the government of Great Britain shall neglect, or refuse for months to restore all American seamen impressed, and detained as aforesaid, and also discharge all American vessels detained contrary to the law of nations, making compensation for the loss sustained by such detention, and also for those condemned as prizes; all trade and intercourse shall thenceforth cease, and be prohibited between these U. States and Great Britain and its dependencies, until equitable arrangements shall be made between the two governments, that shall insure a return, or compensation for the property unjustly seized and condemned; and also the restoration of American seamen to liberty and their country. Provided also, that upon such arrangements being made the President of the United States shall have power, by proclamation, to open trade and commerce, upon the principle of such equitable arrangements between the said U. S. and Great Britain, and her dependencies.

This resolution was immediately considered, and referred to a committee of the whole on the state of the union.

On the motion of Mr. J. Clay, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole—Mr. Dawson in the chair—on the bill declaring the consent of congress to an act of the state of Pennsylvania, intitled "An act to empower the board of wardens for the port of Philadelphia, to collect a certain duty on tonnage for the purposes therein mentioned."

This bill authorizes the imposition of four cents a ton on all vessels clearing out of the port of Philadelphia for any foreign port, to be expended in building piers in, and otherwise improving the navigation of the Delaware.

On this bill a debate of considerable length arose, Messrs J. Clay, Findley, Leib and Marion supporting, and Messrs. J. C. Smith, Crowninshield, Quincy and Ely opposing it.

It was opposed on two grounds; on the ground of unconstitutionality and inexpediency. On the former ground it was contended that the imposition of the proposed duty was inhibited by that pro-

vision of the constitution, which prescribes that "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one state over those of another; that the object of the bill was to lay a special tax for the exclusive benefit of the port of Philadelphia, which would be giving a preference to that port over the other ports in the United States; that instead of doing this, in case the navigation of the river Delaware required improvement, which was feasible, the better way would be to draw a sum for this purpose from the general treasury. It was, however, contended that it was inexpedient to make any provision whatever for this purpose, as it was extremely doubtful whether the object contemplated were practicable, and as the navigation of the Delaware was much better than that of many other streams, on which other ports were situated, which consequently had higher claims on the aid of congress. It was further stated that the contemplated duty would operate, not merely on vessels belonging to the port of Philadelphia, but likewise on foreign vessels entering therein; and that it was unjust to derive revenue from the accomplishment of objects of a local nature.

The advocates of the bill contended that it was strictly constitutional, in proof of which they appealed to that part of the constitution, which says that "no state shall without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage;" which provision exactly met the present case. As to the constitutional provision, quoted on the other side, they observed that it was only made with the view of preventing the adoption of partial regulations of trade or revenue, or the establishment of free ports. They quoted several precedents, by which it appeared that in several instances a like authority with that in the bill had been given, and in some cases without any limitation of time. On the ground of expediency, they represented the navigation of the Delaware as seriously obstructed by a shoal which was every year increasing, and which might, unless measures were taken, operate at some future period to the destruction of the navigation. The tax asked would be paid exclusively by vessels trading from the port of Philadelphia, and ought not, therefore, to be opposed by those whose interests were not in the least implicated. It was added that it was strange that, while scarcely a year passed without large appropriations being made from the general treasury for the erection of light houses in various parts of the United States, the request of the merchants of Philadelphia to be authorized to subject themselves to a tax for the improvement of the navigation of the only port in Pennsylvania, should be opposed.

The question was then put on Mr. Crowninshield's motion to strike out the first section, which was negatived—Ayes 27.

Mr. Crowninshield moved to amend the bill so as to confine the duty to vessels belonging to the port of Philadelphia.

Mr. Crowninshield spoke in favor of, and Messrs. J. Clay, Sloan, Conrad and Elner against this amendment, which was disagreed to—Ayes 12.

Mr. Crowninshield offered an amendment limiting the duration of the bill to three, instead of seven years.

Messrs. Crowninshield, Southard and Ely supported; and Messrs. J. Clay, Leib and Sloan opposed it; when the question was put, and the amendment disagreed to—Ayes 34—Noes 56.

The committee then rose, and the House ordered the bill to be engrossed for a third reading to-morrow.

Mr. Smilie submitted two resolutions for reading the district of Columbia, similar to those heretofore offered, with this difference that the present resolutions include a recession of the city of Washington.

Mr. Smilie said he had two objects in view in offering these resolutions. The first was that Congress might be divested of that multiplicity of business which arose from the situation of the territory, which would increase with the growth of population and the progress of society. The other reason was still more important. He wished to see the people of the district restored to their political rights; the deprivation of which was to him a matter of great regret, and which could not be remedied until there was a decided change in their situation. Alluding to the apprehension of the inhabitants that this measure was connected with a removal of the seat of government, he declared that this was not his object; he, on the contrary, believed the measure would be highly beneficial to the city of Washington.

On considering the resolutions the House divided—Ayes 48—Noes 36.

Mr. Smilie moved a reference of them to a committee of the whole on the 1st day of March.

Mr. Lewis moved their postponement indefinitely.

Mr. Lyon hoped an immediate decision would be had upon them.

Mr. Sloan hoped some time would be allowed previous to their decision.

The House determined to refer them to a committee of the whole—Ayes 56.

Mr. Conrad moved their being made the order of the 1st Monday in August.

Motion disagreed to—Ayes 44—Noes 56.

On the 1st Monday of May—1821—Ayes 39.

Mr. Nicholson moved Mr. Lyon's