The New-Orleans Bee.

No. 1267. Vol. X—NEW SERIES. Vol. XXIII—Whole No. 6818.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF THE STATE ..... NEW-ORLEANS, TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 27, 1850.

MAGNE & WEISSE, Proprietors. NO. 82 CHARTRES STREET.

TERMS OF THE BEE.

DAILY PAPER, (one year in advance,) $12 00
TRI-WEEKLY PAPER, semi-weekly, (one year, in advance,) ..... $ 00

In all cases the subscriber must give one week's notice in writing, before he can be relieved of the issue.

ADVERTISING—One dollar for every TEN lines for each insertion on the first insertion, and fifty cents for each subsequent one. No advertisement inserted for less than one dollar in any language.

Advertisements not specified as to time will be published till forbid, and charged accordingly.

A liberal discount is inserted at intervals will be charged one dollar for every TEN lines for each insertion.

☞ The privilege of Annual Advertisers is limited to advertisements strictly within the line of their business, and in extent to one square every other day.

The New-Orleans Daily Bee.

Official Journal of the State, General Council, First Municipality, and Board of Liquidators.

Tuesday Morning, Aug. 27, 1850.

☞ The Northern Mail came through yesterday, with the latest dates.

THE BOUNDARY QUESTION IN TEXAS.

As the Texas papers make this a prominent subject of discussion. Most of them have, until recently, treated it in a very evasive and exceptionable style—defending the General Government, defying its commissioners as hostile, insisting upon the entirety and integrity of the claim of Texas to New Mexico, and invoking the Legislature, now in session, to take military possession of the disputed territory. The views, however, of these rampant fire-eaters have been somewhat modified, since the reception of the news of the passage, in the United States Senate, of Mr. Pearce's bill. Ten millions of dollars for the relinquishment of a doubtful title, with the extension of the best part of New Mexico seem rather pleasant conditions, when contrasted with the alternative of a direct conflict with the United States, and the horrors of civil war. Accordingly we find the press of our sister State disposed to accept the olive branch, though grumbling a little at the terms—"Uncle Sam's rake we presume. We entertain no doubt whatever that if Mr. Pearce's bill should pass both Houses of Congress, it will be entirely acceptable to the people of Texas.

Amidst the exaggerated language, and sometimes violent and silly menaces that distinguish the greater number of the journals of Texas, we have been surprised and gratified to find moderate sentiments and judicious and patriotic views expressed in relation to this subject by the Houston *Telegraph*—one of the ablest and most influential papers in the State. The *Telegraph* of the 21st has an article on the Boundary Question, which is calm and rational, and yet put forth so manfully, that we must suppose it reflects the opinions of at least a respectable minority in the State. The editor deprecates all rash expedients by the Legislature. He says: "Will our Senators and representatives comply with the recommendations of the Governor, and adopt a line of policy that will entail more disaster and misfortune on our country than pestilence, famine or tempest? We answer emphatically, no!—We know there are those who compose this Legislature, of their patriotic devotion to the interests of the Union, and we know that they will do nothing that will tend to precipitate the country into a war that must result only in the disgrace of either party." Referring to the appropriation to employ the "United States Military Force," and to the purpose of raising an army, the *Telegraph* says:

"We must use words upon a subject of this kind [introduction as a contest of a State against a confederacy. In this enlightened age of republican States whose people are brothers and sisters, and are united by the common ties of kindred will never settle their disputes by the sword. The States of this glorious Union are like members of one great family. The loss of any family should create a void in the heart of another brother, what should Christian men and ladies say, in regard to the course of Cain in such a case? Would not the cause of Cain be stigmatized? Were stained with a brother's blood? How much more in accordance would such a case be with the precepts of Christianity and the general sentiment of the age, to refer the matter to the other members of the family, that they might adjust it peaceably with the precepts of justice and equity. When Texas was first admitted into the Union, she had her confidence in the justice and magnanimity of her sister States, that she allowed them the privilege of adjusting her boundary with Mexico. Will she be less generous now, when the Executive branch of the Government refuses to acknowledge her boundaries as they were ceded to Texas by the annexation? Let her remember that there is not a single State that has by Legislative action denied her claims to all the territory embraced in her statute of limits. Congress has not yet passed upon the claim. Let not her legislature, then, by any rash and ill-advised measure, prejudice her claims before the great tribunal of the nation. We can believe, that a spirit of honor, nothing of a character to be ashamed of, adjusting the