

CONGRESS.

IN SENATE, Monday, Jan. 2d. A Bill to admit the State of Michigan into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States.

Whereas, in pursuance of the act of Congress of June the fifth, eighteen hundred and thirty-six, entitled, "An act to establish the northern boundary of the State of Ohio, and to provide for the admission of the State of Michigan into the Union, upon the conditions therein expressed," a convention of delegates, elected by the people of the said State of Michigan, for the sole purpose of giving their assent to the boundaries of the said State of Michigan as described, declared, and established, in and by the said act, did on the fifteenth of December, eighteen hundred and thirty-six, assemble to the provisions of said act; therefore, Be it enacted, &c. That the State of Michigan shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That the Secretary of the Treasury, in carrying into effect the thirteenth and fourteenth sections of the act of the twenty-third of June, eighteen hundred and thirty-six, entitled "An act to regulate the deposits of the public money," shall consider the State of Michigan as being one of the United States.

Mr. CALHOUN addressed the Senate as follows:

I have bestowed on this subject all the attention that was in my power, and although accused by a most anxious desire for the admission of Michigan into the Union, I find it impossible to give my assent to this bill. I am satisfied the Judiciary Committee has not bestowed upon the subject all that attention which its magnitude requires; and I can explain it on no other supposition why they should place the admission on the grounds they have. One of the committee, the Senator from Ohio on my left, (Mr. MORRIS), has pronounced the grounds as dangerous and revolutionary. He might have gone farther, and with truth pronounced them utterly repugnant to the principles of the constitution.

I have not ventured this assertion, as strong as it is, without due reflection, and weighing the full force of the terms I have used, and do not fear, with an impartial hearing, to establish its truth beyond the power of controversy. To understand fully the objection to this bill, it is necessary that we should have a correct conception of the facts. They are few, and may be briefly told.

Some time previous to the last session of Congress, the Territory of Michigan, through its Legislature, authorized the people to meet in convention, for the purpose of forming a State Government. They met accordingly, and agreed upon a constitution, which they forthwith transmitted to Congress. It was fully discussed in this Chamber, and objectionable as the instrument was, an act was finally passed, which accepted the constitution, & declared Michigan to be a State, and admitted into the Union, on the single condition, that she should, by a convention of the people, assent to the boundaries prescribed by the act. Soon after our adjournment the Legislature of the State of Michigan (for she had been raised by our assent to the dignity of a State,) called a convention of the people of the State, in conformity to the act, which met at the time appointed, at Ann Arbor. After full discussion, the convention withheld its assent, and formally transmitted the result to the President of the United States. This is the first part of the story. I will now give the sequel. Since then, during the last month, a self-constituted assembly met, professedly as a convention of the people of the State; but without the authority of the State. This unauthorized and lawless assemblage assumed the high function of giving the assent of the State of Michigan to the condition of admission, as prescribed in the act of Congress. They communicated their assent to the Executive of the United States, and he to the Senate. The Senate referred his message to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that committee reported this bill for the admission of the State.

Such are the facts out of which grows the important question, had this self-constituted assembly the authority to assent for the State? Had they the authority to do what is implied in giving assent to the condition of admission? That assent introduces the State into the Union, and pledges it in the most solemn manner to the constitutional compact which binds these States in one confederated body; imposes upon her all its obligations, and confers on her all its benefits. Had this irregular, self-constituted assemblage the authority to perform these high and solemn acts of sovereignty in the name of the State of Michigan? She could only come in as a State, and none could act or speak for her without her express authority; and to assume the authority without her sanction is nothing short of treason against the State.

Again, the assent to the conditions prescribed by Congress implies an authority in those who gave it to supersede in part the constitution of the State of Michigan; for her constitution fixes the boundaries of the State as part of that instrument, which the condition of admission entirely alters, & to that extent the assent would supersede the constitution; and thus the question is presented, whether this self-constituted assembly, styling itself a convention, had the authority to do an act which necessarily implies the right to supersede in part the constitution.

But further: The State of Michigan, through its Legislature, authorized a convention of the people, in order to determine whether the condition of admission should be assented to or not. The convention met; and, after mature deliberation, it dissented to the condition of admission; and thus again the question is presented, whether this self-constituted assembly, this caucus—for it is entitled to no higher name—had the authority to annul the dissent of the State, solemnly given by a convention of the people, regularly convoked under the express authority of the constituted authorities of the State.

If all or any of these questions be answered in the negative—if the self-created assemblage of December had no authority to speak in the name of the State of Michigan—if none to supersede any portion of her constitution—if none to annul her dissent to the condition of admission regularly given by a convention of the people of the State, convoked by the authority of the State—to introduce her on its authority would be not only revolutionary and dangerous, but utterly repugnant to the principles of our constitution. The question then submitted to the Senate is, had that assemblage the authority to perform these high and solemn acts?

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary holds that this self-constituted assemblage had the authority; and what is his reason? Why, truly, because a greater number of votes were given for those who constituted that assemblage, than for those

who constituted the convention of the people of the State, convoked under its constituted authorities. This argument resolves itself into two questions—the first of fact, and the second of principle. I shall not discuss the first. It is not necessary to do so. But if it were, it would be easy to show that never was so important a fact so loosely testified. There is not one particle of official evidence before us. We had nothing but the private letters of individuals, who do not know, even the numbers that voted on either occasion; they know nothing of the qualifications of voters, nor how their votes were received, nor by whom counted. Now, none knows better than the honorable chairman himself that such testimony as is submitted to us to establish a fact of this moment, would not be received in the lowest magistrate's court in the land. But I waive this. I come to the question of the principle involved; and what is it? The argument is, that a greater number of persons voted for the last convention than for the first, and therefore the acts of the last, of right abrogated those of the first; in other words, that mere numbers, without regard to the forms of law, or the principles of the constitution, give authority. The authority of numbers, according to this argument, sets aside the authority of law and the constitution. Need I show that such a principle goes to the entire overthrow of our constitutional Government, and would subvert a social order? It is the identical principle which prompted the late revolutionary and anarchical movement in Maryland, and which has done more to shake confidence in our system of government than any event since the adoption of our constitution, but which happily has been frowned down by the patriotism and intelligence of the people of that State.

What was the grounds of this insurrectionary measure, but that the Government of Maryland did not represent the voice of the numerical majority of the people of Maryland, and that the authority of law and constitution was nothing against that of numbers. Here we find on this floor, and from the head of the Judiciary Committee, the same principle revived, and if possible, in a worse form; for in Maryland, the anarchists assumed that they were sustained by the numerical majority of the people of the State in their revolutionary movement; but the utmost the chairman can pretend to have is a mere plurality. The largest number of votes claimed for the self-created assemblage is 8,000; and no man will undertake to say that this constitutes any thing like a majority of the voters of Michigan; and he claims the high authority which he does for it, not because it is a majority of the people of Michigan, but because it is a greater number than voted for the authorized convention of the people that refused to agree to the condition of admission. It may be shown by his own witness, that a majority of the voters of Michigan greatly exceeded 8,000. Mr. Williams, the President of the self-created assemblage, stated that the population of that State, amounted to nearly 200,000 persons. If so, there cannot be less than from 20,000 to 30,000 voters, considering how nearly universal the right of suffrage is under its constitution; and it thus appears that this irregular, self-constituted meeting did not represent the vote of one-third of the State; and yet on a mere principle of plurality we are to supersede the constitution of Michigan, and annul the act of a convention of the people regularly convoked under the authority of the Government of the State.

But, says the Senator from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Buchanan,) this assembly was not self-constituted. It met under the authority of an act of Congress, and that had no reference to the State, but only to the people; and that the assemblage in December was just such a meeting as that act contemplated. It is not my intention to discuss the question whether the honorable Senator has given the true interpretation of the act, but if it were, I could very easily show his interpretation to be erroneous; for, if such had been the intention of Congress, the act surely would have specified the time when the convention was to be held, who were to be the managers, who the voters, and would not have left it to individuals, who might choose to assume the authority to determine all these important points. I might also readily show that the word "convention" of the people, as used in law or the constitution, always means a meeting of the people regularly convoked by the constituted authority of the State, in their high sovereign capacity, and that it never means such an assemblage as the one in question. But I waive this; I take higher ground. If the act be, indeed, such as the Senator says it is, then I maintain that it is utterly opposed to the fundamental principles of our Federal Union. Congress has no right whatever to call a convention in a State. It can call but one convention, and that is a convention of the people of the United States to amend the Federal Constitution; nor can it call that, except authorized by two-thirds of the States.

Ours is a Federal Republic—a Union of States. Michigan is a State; a State in the course of admission, and differing only from the other States in her federal relations. She is declared to be a State in the most solemn manner by your own act. She can come into the Union only as a State; and by her voluntary assent, given by the people of the State in convention, called by the constituted authority of the State. To admit the State of Michigan on the authority of a self-created meeting, or one called by the direct authority of Congress, passing by the authority of the State, would be the most monstrous proceeding under our constitution that can be conceived; the most repugnant to its principles, and dangerous in its consequences. It would establish a direct relation between the individual citizens of a State and the General Government, in utter subversion of the federal character of our system. The relation of the citizens to this Government is through the States exclusively. They are subject to its authority and laws only because the State has assented they should be. If she dissents, their assent is nothing; on the other hand, if she assents, their dissent is nothing. It is through the State alone, that the United States Government can have any connexion with the people of a State; and does not, then, the Senator from Pennsylvania see, that if Congress can authorize a convention of the people in the State of Michigan, without the authority of the State, it matters not what is the object, it may in like manner authorize conventions in any other State for whatever purpose it may think proper.

Michigan is as much a sovereign State as any other, differing only, as I have said, as to her federal relations. If we give our sanction to the assemblage of December, on the principle laid down by the Senator from Pennsylvania, then we establish the doctrine that Congress has power to call at pleasure conventions within the States. Is there a Senator on this floor who will assent to such a doctrine? Is there one, especially, who represents the smaller States of this Union, or the weaker section? Admit the power, and every vestige of State rights would be destroyed. Our system would

be subverted, and instead of a *federacy of free and sovereign States*, we would have all power concentrated here, and this would become the most odious despotism. He, indeed, must be blind, who does not see that such a power would give the Federal Government a complete control of all the States. I call upon Senators now to arrest a doctrine so dangerous. Let it be remembered, that under our system, bad precedents live forever; good ones only perish. We may not feel all the evil consequences at once, but this precedent, once set, will surely be received, and will become the instrument of infinite evil.

It will be asked, what shall be done? Will you refuse to admit Michigan into the Union? I answer no; I desire to admit her; and if the Senators from Indiana and Ohio will agree, I am ready now to admit her as she stood at the beginning of last session, without giving sanction to the unauthorized assemblage of December.

But if that does not meet their wishes, there is still another by which she may be admitted. We are told two thirds of the Legislature and people of Michigan are in favor of accepting the conditions of the act of last session. If that be the fact, then all that is necessary is, that the Legislature should call another convention. All difficulty will thus be removed, and there will be still abundant time for her admission at this session. And shall we, for the sake of gaining a few months, give our assent to a bill fraught with principles so monstrous as this?

We have been told, that unless she is admitted immediately it will be too late for her to receive her proportion of the surplus revenue under the deposit bill. I trust that on so great a question a difficulty like this will have no weight. Give her at once her full share. I am ready to do so at once, without waiting her admission. I was mortified to hear on so grave a question such motives assigned for her admission, contrary to the law and constitution. Such considerations ought not to be presented when we are settling great constitutional principles. I trust that we shall pass by all such frivolous motives on this occasion, and take ground on the great and fundamental principle that an informal, irregular, self-constituted assembly, a mere caucus, has no authority to speak for a sovereign State in any case whatever; to supersede its constitution, or to reverse its dissent deliberately given by a convention of the people of the State, regularly convoked under its constituted authority.

CONGRESSIONAL ABSTRACT.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10th, 1837.

SENATE.

A message was received from the President, communicating certain information in reference to the proposed negotiation with foreign powers, to construct a rail road or canal across the Isthmus of Darien, for the purpose of connecting the waters of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. The message is unfavorable to the project at present.

A communication was received from the Secretary of the Treasury, in reference to the present condition of the deposit banks.

Various petitions of a private character were presented, and referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. Buchanan presented the petition of various persons engaged in the coal trade, protesting against the reduction of the duty on coal. Mr. B. accompanied the petition with some remarks, and motioned that it be printed and referred. Agreed to.

After passing some other ordinary business the Senate took up the resolutions of Mr. Ewing, of Ohio, to rescind the circular of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the amendment of Mr. Rives.

Mr. Rives addressed the Senate in support of his amendment, and had not concluded his remarks when our paper was put to press.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

A message was received from the President.

Mr. Davis, of Indiana, asked the consent of the House to submit a resolution, that all petitions and memorials on the subject of abolition be laid on the table, and no further action be had on them.

A motion to suspend the rules to allow of the introduction of the resolution was negatived.

The speaker communicated a Message from the President containing a communication relative to the carrying into effect a treaty with Spain.

Also a report from the Secretary of War relative to the clearing out of the mouth of Black river in the State of New York.

Mr. Hamer had the floor, and continued his remarks upon Mr. Wise's resolution.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1837.

SENATE.

The credentials of the Hon. John Spencer, Senator elect from the State of Maryland, were presented by Mr. Kent.

Mr. Preston presented the petition of the citizens of Charleston, South Carolina, praying the establishment of a naval depot and navy yard in that city. Read and referred to the committee on Naval Affairs.

Reports were received from standing committees. From the committee on Foreign Affairs, unfavorable to the petition of Thomas Vowell. From the committee on Pensions, unfavorable to sundry petitions. A bill was reported by the committee on Public Lands relating to the surveyor of the State of Louisiana. The salaries of these two officers are fixed at \$2000 per annum, with other perquisites. A bill from the same committee, for the relief of Thomas Connor. A bill from the committee on Military Affairs, for the relief of the corporate authorities of the city of Mobile, Alabama.

Mr. Walker offered a resolution proposing to recognize the independence of Texas. He accompanied the resolution with a few remarks, in which he expressed himself decidedly in favor of the immediate recognition of the independence of Texas. He said that he had full information, which warranted him in saying that the threatened invasion of Mexico had failed entirely. He moreover said that his resolution expressed the views and opinions of the President.

After some further business, the Senate took up the order of the day. The question being on the amendment of Mr. Rives to the resolutions of Mr. Ewing, of Ohio, proposing to rescind

THE TREASURY CIRCULAR.

Mr. Clay rose and addressed the Senate in support of the resolutions. He was still speaking when our paper was put to press.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Cambreleng, from the committee on Ways and Means, made a report on the surplus revenue, accompanied with a bill for the reduction of the revenue to the wants of the Government. The bill and the accompanying report were read and ordered to be printed.

On motion of Mr. Cambreleng, the bill was referred to the committee on the Whole.

Mr. Lawrence addressed the House. He stated that his object was to reduce in eighteen months that reduction of the revenue which

by the law of 1833 would be reduced in four and a half years. This bill he said would come on the country like a clap of thunder. It would, he said, add to the pressure already existing in the commercial transactions of the country. He asked if this was to be considered a party question. He appealed to the members from Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, Connecticut, to the whole of New England—if they were willing to adopt the principles of this bill, and the report. Its effect, he said, would be to affect the credit and confidence existing between the different classes of the country.

Mr. Lawrence was addressing the House when our paper was put to press.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12th, 1837.

SENATE.

A bill from the committee on Military Affairs was reported, providing for the relief of the Vermont militia, at the battle of Plattsburg. Read a first time, and ordered to a second reading.

On motion of Mr. Walker, the resolutions proposing to recognize the Independence of Texas was postponed, and made the order of the day for Wednesday next.

Mr. Calhoun moved to postpone the orders of the day, in order to take up the bill to extend certain sections of the deposit bill of the last session, with the view of making it the special order of the day.

After some remarks from Mr. Grundy, the Senate adopted the motion.

Mr. Calhoun then said that in fixing the day, he should be governed by the Finance committee. He wished to make the order subsequent to the report of the committee, if he could ascertain at what time that report might be expected. He said that he preferred to see a reduction of the revenue, rather than a deposit, if such a reduction could be made. He, therefore, desired to await the report of the committee, as that would enable him to form an opinion upon the probable state of things hereafter in regard to the revenue.

Mr. Wright, Chairman of the committee, could not say with certainty when the report would be made. The committee were going on as fast as it could, and were anxious to make a report as early as possible; but he could not say on what day the report might be expected.

Mr. Calhoun then moved that the bill be made the order of the day for Thursday next—agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Walker, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the general land bill.

Mr. Clay hoped that so important a bill would not be acted on now. He referred to the absence of members, and especially of Mr. Ewing, of Ohio, who was deeply interested in the result, and who had been called home by the sickness of his family. He therefore moved a postponement of the order to this day week.

Mr. Walker was opposed to any further postponement.

Mr. Calhoun hoped that the Senate would postpone the subject, at least, until Monday next. The bill was highly important in its results, and he wished for time to make himself acquainted with it thoroughly. He had not read the documents. It was too important to be acted on hastily.

Mr. Buchanan was willing to postpone the order till Monday, but to allow the chairman of the committee to express his views now.

After some further remarks from Messrs. Benton, Calhoun, Buchanan, King, of Ala. Clay and Walker, an amendment was offered by the last named gentleman, and the subject postponed until to-morrow, with the understanding that it will then be postponed and made the special order for Monday next.

EXPURGING RESOLUTIONS. The special order being the expurging resolutions, was taken up.

Mr. Benton addressed the Senate, and had the floor when our paper was put to press.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Mr. McKean asked leave of the House to introduce a resolution directing the committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of building life-boats.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. Whittlesey moved that the House take up the bill from the Senate providing for the payment of losses sustained in the last war. The bill was taken up, and referred to the committee on Claims.

The House then went into the consideration of the bill for the reduction of the revenue. Mr. Course addressed the House in opposition to the bill, and in favor of its indefinite postponement.—Mr. Corwin argued that it was a subject of too much importance to be taken up at this time, when there was but twenty two days to be occupied by the House in general legislation. He characterized it as unwise, even if he be not the intention of the majority of the committee to mature it into a law at this session, to throw it abroad on the community, and thus injuriously affect the manufacturing and commercial interests of the country.

Mr. Corwin addressed the House at length, and was speaking when our paper went to press.

SENATE, Friday, January 13th, 1837.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented the credentials of the Hon. THOMAS CLAYTON, Senator elect from the State of Delaware, in place of the Hon. JOHN M. CLAYTON, resigned.

Reports from the standing committees. On Naval Affairs, a bill for the relief of Commodore Ridgely; Committee on Claims, a bill for the relief of Geo. K. Kreigh: Commerce, a bill to extend the limits of the Port of New Orleans; a bill for the relief of Capt. Allen, for expenses of bringing Gen. Lafayette to this country. These bills were read a first time and ordered to a second reading.

A resolution was offered by Mr. Davis, calling on the President for certain information in reference to Mexico and Texas, and such correspondence, if any, at may have passed between Gen. Santa Ana and the Executive, and between the Government of the U. States and foreign powers in relation to Texas.

Various resolutions were presented and read a first time.

SPECIAL ORDER—EXPURGING RESOLUTIONS. Mr. DAVIS resumed his remarks, in favor of the resolutions. He had the floor when our paper went to press.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Mr. WHITTLESEY reported the bill from the Senate, with an amendment, for payment for horses and other losses. The amendment from the Senate, was concurred in.

Mr. SMITH, from the committee on Ways and Means, introduced a resolution for the printing of 10,000 extra copies of the report of the Committee on the reduction of the revenue.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on the judiciary, introduced a resolution for an inquiry into the expediency of increasing the salaries of the Judges of the United States District Courts.

Mr. HOWARD, from the Committee of Foreign Affairs, reported a bill relative to the

payment of the salaries of foreign ministers, and for other purposes. Read, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTLESEY, Ohio, moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole, and take up such bills as will not produce debate. Rule suspended and motion carried.

Mr. BELL gave notice that he should each day renew his motion to leave to introduce his bill to secure the right of election.

SENATE, Saturday, January 14th.

Mr. TALLMADGE presented the petition of the Board of Trade of the citizens of New York, praying the establishment of a National Bank, after the plan proposed by the President of the United States in his annual message of 1830—to be located in the city of New York. Mr. T. accompanied the petition with some remarks in which he expressed himself opposed distinctly to the prayer of the petitioners—referred to the committee on Finance.

Reports of standing Committees were received. Making appropriations for the construction roads in the Territory of Wisconsin—for the benefit of John H. Hall—to amend the charter of the Franklin Insurance Company—to prevent the abatement of suits in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes—were generally read a first time and ordered to a second reading.

Various resolutions were read and adopted. The resolution of Mr. DAVIS, calling for information in regard to Texas, was adopted.

Mr. GRUNDY expressed a hope that it might lie on the table until Monday, for reasons which he did not fully express; but we gathered from his remarks that a communication from the President might be expected in a short time. Mr. DAVIS yielded to the motion.

Sundry bills on the table were taken up, read, and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

The Senate then postponed, on the motion of Mr. KING of Ga., the expurging resolutions, and took up the bill in relation to

PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. WALKER addressed the Senate in support of the bill, and was speaking when our paper went to press.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Mr. PICKENS wished to know of the Chairman of the committee on Foreign Relations, if there was any likelihood of the committee soon making a report relative to the recognition of Texas. It was he said, an important subject, and great interest was felt in relation to it throughout the country.

Mr. HOWARD said that the committee had been industriously engaged in the consideration of the subject, but had not as yet, come to any conclusion.

The House then took up the resolution of Mr. ALLEN, for the appropriation of a portion of the public lands for the purposes of education in the old States.

Mr. LANE addressed the House in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. BELL said, that at one time he had been in favor of something of the kind contemplated in the resolution. But he did not think them sufficiently broad. Mr. BELL then dwelt with much force and earnestness on the great importance of settling the various questions arising from our land system. The final settlement of these questions was of more importance than any difference that would arise in the manner in which the settlement would be made. He alluded to the great importance both to the new States and the old ones, of settling finally the question of granting pre-emption rights. He was willing to reduce the price of the lands.

Mr. Bell then moved a postponement of the resolution. A motion was also made to lay them on the table, but the hour appropriated to the discussion having expired, the House proceeded to the consideration of sundry engrossed bills, which were read a third time, and passed.

DOINGS IN CONGRESS. IN THE SENATE.—Expurging Resolutions. It is impossible for us to give any thing like a synopsis of what was done yesterday on the expurging process. The debate was so animated in its character, and so absorbing in its interest, that it required a much more practised hand, and more disciplined feelings than we possess, to have sketched even its outlines. The hand forgot its office; while the eye and the ear were engrossed with theirs. Nor are we ambitious of the honor of chronicling this funeral of the constitution—this last and lowest act of degradation. The time must come when the actors in this, shall we call it farce or tragedy—shall receive from an honest and intelligent people that measure of recompense which the act and the motive deserve at their hands. The present may bestow rewards proportioned to the demerits of prostitution; but the future will apportion its recompense, by a far more honorable and equitable standard. Men intoxicated with power, emulous of the honors and hopeful of the rewards of excessive severity, urged on by the ignoble ambition of being foremost in the work of abasement, may trample the constitution of the country under foot; plant an indelible stain on the national character—and stamp the records of a mighty people with the foul blot of falsehood and perjury; but the end is not yet—a day of reckoning will come, and when the rancor of party contests has passed away, and the turbulence of popular feeling subsided, the names of these men will stand out before the eyes of the whole world as synonymous with infamy—scorned, detested, and accursed, by every noble, virtuous, and patriotic spirit.

We have said we could not give an outline of the speeches delivered. Notes were taken by others, and the whole debate will, of course, be published. We must content ourselves with naming the speakers and the order in which they addressed the Senate.

Mr. Dana, expurger, had the floor, and concluded the remarks he commenced on Thursday. He was followed by Mr. Preston, whose torturing eloquence drew out Mr. Rives in reply. He started from his seat in the utmost conceivable wrath. His whole frame quivered with anger, which seemed to struggle in vain for a vent. In the tempest of his feelings his prudence forsook him entirely, and with a face as pale as that of a corpse, and tongue faltering out wild incoherent clamors, he poured forth what his antagonist called "a rabble of ideas," in admirable confusion. It had been better for his feelings and his fame had he remained silent. The reply of his well poised and collected adversary, at least, will never forget, though his years should embrace the remnant of the time that is to come.

When Mr. Preston again took his seat, Mr. Rives attempted a second time to disengage himself from the shirt of Nessus which enveloped him, but the effort was more feeble than the first, and he sat down with a countenance which pictured the deep agony within. Mr. Niles then came to his rescue—talked for a half hour; but we heard not a sentence he uttered. The whole audience, filled with the deepest emotions, seemed

totally disinclined to listen to baldersdash. Mr. Moore then made a few just and pertinent remarks in explanation of the vote he should give; Judge Southard followed, and after expressing his wishes to speak upon the subject, moved an adjournment, as the hour was late. The party refused to accord this privilege to him. Mr. Moore again renewed the motion. It was again lost. Mr. Calhoun then arose and spoke about ten minutes, in a strain of solemn and indignant eloquence. He seemed to be overcome by his own emotions, and sat down, as it appeared to us at a distance, unable to give full utterance to the strong feelings which the occasion excited. Mr. Clay then rose and said, that he had intended to address the Senate in defence of the original resolution sought to be expunged; but from what had passed, he supposed that the privilege would be denied, unless he spoke at that late hour. Mr. Moore again rose to move an adjournment. Mr. Clay said he should not now ask the favor. Mr. Moore then urged him to give way to the motion, which he finally consented to; and the motion was carried by a majority of two. So that he has the floor to-day.

With this brief outline, the reader must be content for the present. The debate was one of greater interest than we have ever witnessed, and we shall take the earliest opportunity of laying it before the public.—U. S. Telegraph.

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1837. SENATE.

A communication was received from the Secretary of the Treasury covering a statement of the undrawn appropriations on the 1st inst.

Mr. Preston from the committee on Military Affairs, reported a resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to examine by a board of officers the improvements made in fire-arms.

The resolution of Mr. DAVIS calling upon the President for certain information in regard to Texas, was taken up and adopted.

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1837. SENATE.

A communication was received from the Secretary of the Treasury covering a statement of the undrawn appropriations on the 1st inst.

Mr. Preston from the committee on Military Affairs, reported a resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to examine by a board of officers the improvements made in fire-arms.

The resolution of Mr. DAVIS calling upon the President for certain information in regard to Texas, was taken up and adopted.

EXPURGING RESOLUTIONS.

The Senate then took up the Expurging Resolutions.

Mr. Clay addressed the Senate, and was speaking when our paper was put to press.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The order of the day was the reception of the abolition petition presented by Mr. Adams. Mr. Bynum had the floor, but he gave way to Mr. Howard, who expressed a wish to offer a resolution that the Speaker should call for petitions, beginning in a reverse order. Mr. Howard moved a suspension of the rules to allow the introduction of the resolution.

On motion of Mr. Adams, the yeas and nays were ordered on the suspension of the rules.

The rules were suspended, and the resolution adopted, and petitions were presented by Messrs. Jones, of Wisconsin, White, of Florida, Yell, Ashley, of Missouri, Lewis.

Mr. Lewis presented a memorial from the Legislature of Alabama, praying remuneration for losses sustained by citizens of that State from the Creek Indians.

Mr. Lewis presented other petitions from citizens of the same State, praying the same.

Mr. Jones, of Ohio, presented a memorial from the Colonization Society, requesting aid from Congress for the furtherance of the objects of the Society.

Mr. Pinckney moved that the memorial lie on the table.

Mr. Adams asked for the reading of the memorial.

On motion of Mr. Pinckney, the yeas and nays were ordered.

The memorial was laid on the table by vote of 130 to 49.

Mr. Wise stated that he was in his seat at the time his name was called, and he felt it his duty to state that he declined voting.

Other petitions were presented by Messrs. Storer, M'Leane