

THE DAILY CRESCENT.

Published every day—Sundays excepted—by JAMES M'OLURE & CO. Office—No. 95 St. Charles Street.

NEW ORLEANS: TUESDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 13, 1849.

Congressional. The following Congressional news we take from last evening's Picayune, received by that paper in advance of the mail:

[From the Baltimore Sun.] SATURDAY, Feb. 3.—The Senate was not in session to-day, having yesterday adjourned over to Monday.

In the House, Mr. Kaufman, on leave, introduced a resolution which was adopted, instructing the Committee on Public Lands to inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation of the Public Lands for a railroad from Red River to Sabine river, to Little Rock, &c., &c.

Mr. Vinton, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported an annual bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1850, and moved that it be committed to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. Goggin moved to add instructions to the Committee, first to consider and dispose of the bill reported by him to reduce the rates of postage, and for other purposes. It was impossible, he said, to act understandingly on the Post Office appropriation bill until the bill referred to was disposed of.

Debate thus arising, the motion to commit goes over to the next day.

Mr. Stephens asked the unanimous consent of the House to introduce the following resolutions, which were read for information:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to furnish the House with a correct copy of the original Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Consular Rights, signed at Washington, on the 22d of February, 1848, by N. P. Tilton, on the part of the United States, and Luis de Cevallos, Barrio Conto and Miguel Antonio de la Republica of Mexico, and particularly those articles in said original treaty which were struck out or amended by the Senate of the United States.

Resolved, further, That the President be requested to inform the House whether said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

Resolved, further, That the President inform the House whether the said Commissioner or Plenipotentiaries were empowered to make such alterations and give such assent to the said treaty, and whether the same were in fact ratified by the Senate of the United States, and be sanctioned by a constitutional majority of that body.

There was no discrepancy, though the language of the protocol might not be the precise language of the instructions. The explanations were strictly in accordance with the provisions of the treaty as amended by the Senate. Mr. Stephens contended that it would not be in the power of the United States to divest the holders of lands in the new territories of the titles which they held prior to the ratification of the treaty—and it was folly to suppose that by any treaty the Government of the United States intended to divest any of those titles, whether of church property or any other. It is also coincident with the doctrine of Mr. Buchanan's letter, from which he read to sustain his position. The protocol, though differing slightly in language from the letter of Mr. Buchanan, is strictly in conformity with his doctrines and with the law on the subject. Mr. Stephens contended that the Senate never intended to prevent Mexico from transferring or disposing of the \$12,000,000 in such manner as she might deem advisable—the amendment was made merely to prevent the issue of certificates of debt by the government.

Mr. H. defined any fraud had been practised upon the Government of Mexico, and stated the fact that the treaty, as amended, was formally sanctioned by both Houses of the Mexican Congress, before the signing of the protocol by the Commissioners on the Mexican side. Mr. Stephens contended that the validity of this protocol, why it was not submitted, subsequently to its adoption, to the action of the Mexican Congress? So far from this, however, the signatures of the protocol was among the last acts of the Mexican Government, and the sanction of the Mexican Congress to the treaty, as amended, had taken place before one word of conversation had been taken between the commissioners and the Mexican Government, in regard to explanations.

Mr. H. thought, in regard to the instructions, that reasons might have existed at the last session for the withdrawal of the matter from the Department, which did not now exist; and he concluded with moving to amend Mr. Stephens' resolutions, by adding that the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish a copy of the instructions to the Commissioners, and such other documents as pertain to the treaty.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

Mr. Schenck followed, contending that the President and Senate jointly constitute the treaty-making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized. He had objected to the President of the United States, through our Commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican Government. And how was it that these assurances were made, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power of this Government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this coordinate branch were nothing? Whether the amendments were made, or not, is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. It is a matter of fact, that the amendments were made, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorized.

THE LADY IN BLACK.

BY MISS S. H. HALL.

People find it easy enough to laugh at "spirit stories" in broad daylight, when the sunbeams dance upon the grass, and the deepest frowns are spotted and cheered only by the tender shades of leafy trees; when the rugged castle, that looked so mysterious and so stern in the looming darkness, smiles in the day's bow; when the rushing waterfall sparkles in diamond showers, and the hum of bee and song of bird tune the thoughts to hopes of life and happiness. People may laugh at ghosts then, if they like, but for me, I never could merely smile at the records of those shadowy beings, and cannot disbelieve in things supernatural, I lack such evidences as are supplied by the senses; for they, in truth, sustain by palpable proofs so few of the many marvels by which we are surrounded, that I would rather reject them altogether as witless errors, than believe in them as they suggest.

My great-grandmother was a native of the canton of Bern; and at the advanced age of ninety, her memory of "the long ago" was as active as if she had been at fifteen; she looked as if she had just stepped out of a piece of tapestry belonging to a past age, but with warm sympathies for the present. Her English when she spoke excited, was very curious and mingled. French was necessary to Parisian, with here and there scraps of German done into English, literally, so that her observations were at times remarkable for their strength. "The mountains," she would say, "in my country, were high, high up, until they could look into the heavens; and God in the storm," she never thoroughly comprehended the real beauty of England; but spoke with contempt of the flatness of our island—calling our mountains "inequalities;" nothing more—holding our agriculture "cheap," saying that the land filled itself, leaving man nothing to do, and telling stories from morning till night, more especially spirit-stories; but the old lady would not tell a tale of that character a second time to an unbeliever; such things, she would say, "are not for make-believe." One in particular, I remember, always excited great interest in her young listeners, from its mingling with the real and the romantic; but it can never be told as she told it; there was so much of the picturesque about the old lady—so much to admire in the curious carving of her ebony cane, in the beauty of her point lace, in the size and shape of her eyes, in the fashion of her solid silk gown, the sturdiness of her wrinkled shoes—her dark-brown wrinkled face, every wrinkle an expression—her broad thoughtful brow, beneath which glittered her bright blue eyes—bright, even when her eyelashes were white with age, and her peculiarities gave impressive effect to her words.

"In my young time," she told us, "I spent many happy hours with Amie de Robean, in her uncle's castle. He was a fine man—large size, stern, and dark, and full of noise—a strong man, no fear—he had a great deal to say, and he was very kind. The castle was situated in the midst of the most stupendous Alpine scenery, and yet it was not solitary. There were other dwellings in sight; some very near, but separated by a ravine, through which, at seasons, a rapid river kept its foaming course. You do not see a mountain, nor a valley, nor country; your torrents are as babies—ours are giants. The one I speak of divided the valley; here and there a rock, round which it spouted, or stormed, according to the season. In two of the defiles these rocks were of great value; acting as barriers for the support of the mountain, and means of communication with our opposite neighbors. "Monsieur, as we always called the count, was, as I have told you, a dark, stern, violent man. All men are wild, my dear young ladies," she would say, "but Monsieur was the most wild; all men speak of him as the most terrible; but he was interrupted by her relatives, with "Oh, good Granny!" and "Oh, dear, dear herself;" then continued to tell us of her adventures, and the correspondence with the Mexican Government, and the ratification of the treaty by the Senate of the United States. Mr. Stephens consented to the modification, and the years and days were then ordered on the resolution, as amended, and it was adopted, 147 to 31.

Mr. Meade introduced a resolution instructing the Committee on the contingent Fund to inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation of the Public Lands for a railroad from Red River to Sabine river, to Little Rock, &c., &c. Mr. Hunter presented the resolutions of the Virginia Legislature in reference to slavery, accompanied by a few remarks, in which he stated that the resolutions were in favor of the restriction of slavery. Laid on the table and ordered to be printed. Mr. Clayton, from the joint committee on the subject, reported the customary resolution, in reference to the meeting of the two Houses on the second Wednesday in February, to open and count the votes for President and Vice-President, as amended, and Mr. Clayton was appointed teller on the part of the Senate. The Senate resumed the consideration of the postage bill, and Mr. Allen replied, at great length, to the speech of Mr. Niles, made on Friday last. Mr. Bayard followed, but the Senate, without action on the bill, adjourned. In the House, Mr. Sibley, of Minnesota, offered a resolution respecting the new mail routes on the Upper Mississippi. Adopted. Mr. Tuck offered a preamble and resolutions for settling disagreements between nations, by arbitration. He moved a suspension of the rules, to have the same acted upon. Motion lost. Mr. Stephens then asked and obtained general consent to offer his resolutions of inquiry as to the existence of a protocol to the Mexican treaty. The Clerk having read them, Mr. Wentworth called for the years and days upon the question of suspending the rules. Mr. Houston withdrew his objection to Mr. Stephens' resolutions, and the House, 181 to 3, suspended the rules to receive the same. Mr. Stephens, in presenting the resolutions, said that he considered the subject of great importance. He did not intend to discuss the matter now, but he had good reasons for believing that such a protocol, so signed, was in existence. At the close of the last session, a call was made upon the President for the instructions to our commissioners, to which the President replied that he deemed it incompatible with the public interests to furnish such instructions; that the treaty, as amended by the Senate, had been ratified by Mexico and ratifications exchanged, and that in these instructions the commissioners were only directed to urge upon the Mexican Government the ratification of the amended treaty. It thus appeared that the President had refused to furnish the House with a copy of these instructions, under which these assurances had been given. Mr. S. proceeded to read the articles of the original treaty struck out by the Senate, and also those substituted, and the protocol having reference thereto; and further contended, that whether the explanations were or were not correct, the President had nevertheless no constitutional right whatever to give such instructions. The vote in the Senate in favor of passing the original ninth article stood 18 to 29, and in favor of those in favor of the original article, he found recorded the name of one of these commissioners, who subsequently made these explanations, that the change was not intended to affect the rights secured by the original article. So in regard to the other portion stricken out of the original ninth article, Mr. S. contended that the original ninth article, which was retained in the original words, and the name of the same commissioner was again found recorded among the 16 in the affirmative. The explanations he contended were wholly unauthorized, and as regarded lands in Texas, wholly incorrect in point of fact. In the House, Mr. Sibley, of Minnesota, offered a resolution respecting the new mail routes on the Upper Mississippi. Adopted. Mr. Tuck offered a preamble and resolutions for settling disagreements between nations, by arbitration. He moved a suspension of the rules, to have the same acted upon. Motion lost. Mr. Stephens then asked and obtained general consent to offer his resolutions of inquiry as to the existence of a protocol to the Mexican treaty. The Clerk having read them, Mr. Wentworth called for the years and days upon the question of suspending the rules. Mr. Houston withdrew his objection to Mr. Stephens' resolutions, and the House, 181 to 3, suspended the rules to receive the same. Mr. Stephens, in presenting the resolutions, said that he considered the subject of great importance. He did not intend to discuss the matter now, but he had good reasons for believing that such a protocol, so signed, was in existence. At the close of the last session, a call was made upon the President for the instructions to our commissioners, to which the President replied that he deemed it incompatible with the public interests to furnish such instructions; that the treaty, as amended by the Senate, had been ratified by Mexico and ratifications exchanged, and that in these instructions the commissioners were only directed to urge upon the Mexican Government the ratification of the amended treaty. It thus appeared that the President had refused to furnish the House with a copy of these instructions, under which these assurances had been given. Mr. S. proceeded to read the articles of the original treaty struck out by the Senate, and also those substituted, and the protocol having reference thereto; and further contended, that whether the explanations were or were not correct, the President had nevertheless no constitutional right whatever to give such instructions. The vote in the Senate in favor of passing the original ninth article stood 18 to 29, and in favor of those in favor of the original article, he found recorded the name of one of these commissioners, who subsequently made these explanations, that the change was not intended to affect the rights secured by the original article. So in regard to the other portion stricken out of the original ninth article, Mr. S. contended that the original ninth article, which was retained in the original words, and the name of the same commissioner was again found recorded among the 16 in the affirmative. The explanations he contended were wholly unauthorized, and as regarded lands in Texas, wholly incorrect in point of fact.

on midsummer eve. She must have done all this, if not more; there could be little doubt that the "Femme Noir" had initiated her into certain mysteries; for they heard, at times, voices in low, whispering converse, and saw the shadows of two persons cross the old red-wood chapel, when "Monsieur" had passed the door. Monsieur glared in this fearlessness on the part of his gentle niece; and more than once, when he had revellers in the castle, he sent her forth at midnight, to bring him a bough from a tree that only grew beside the altar of the old chapel; and she did his bidding always, willingly, though not as rapidly, as he could desire.

But certainly Amie's courage brought no calmness. She became pale; her pillow was often moistened by her tears; her music was neglected; she took no pleasure in the chase; and her chamber, not receiving the usual attention, went off into the mountains. She avoided me, her friend! who would have died for her; she made no reply to my prayers, and did not heed my entreaties. One morning, when her eyes were fixed upon a book she did not read, and I sat at my embroidery, she called to me, and I went to her. She held in her hand a book which she had just opened, and she said, "I was blinded by my own, I heard monsieur's heavy tramp approaching through the long gallery; some boots creak—but the boots of monsieur!"—they groined.

"Save me, oh save me!" she exclaimed wildly. Before I could reply she struck her forehead, and stood before me like an embodied thunderbolt. He held an open letter in his hand, his eye glared, his nostrils were distended, and he trembled so with rage, that the cabinets and old china shook again.

"Do you," he said, "know Charles la Maitre?" "Amie replied, 'Yes.' "How did you make acquaintance with the son of my dead father?"

"There was no answer. The question was repeated. Amie said she had met him, and at last she confessed that she had met him in the mountains. She threw herself at her uncle's feet—she clung to his knees; love taught her eloquence. She told him how deeply Charles regretted the long-standing feud; how earnest and true, and good he was; how bending low, until her tresses were heaped upon his head, she begged him to forgive her; and she loved this young man, that she would rather sacrifice the wealth of the world than forget him.

Monsieur seemed suffocating; he tore off his face cravat, and scattered its fragments on the floor. She clung to him, and he flung her from him; she wept and he wept with her. He had eaten, and he had drunk, and he had been in the mountains; but though Amie's nature was tender and affectionate, the old spirit of the old race rose within her; the slight girl arose, and stood erect before the man of storms.

"Did you think," she said, "because I bent to you that I am feeble?—because I bore with you, have I not thought?—I gave food to this frame, but you fed not my heart; you gave me not love, nor tenderness, nor sympathy; you showed me to your friends as you would your love; if you had been by kindness sown the seeds of love within my bosom; if you had been a father to me in tenderness, I would have been to you—a child. I never knew the time when I did not tremble at your footsteps; but I will do so no more. I would gladly have above created my own life, and I would have let you know I had a heart, lest you should tear and insult it. Oh, sir, those who expect love from themselves an unhonored old age, and lay up for themselves a hoard of gold, and a name of fame, are the most miserable of men. Amie's being conveyed fainting to her chamber. [Concluded to-morrow.]

RESTAURANTS, &c.

Holbrook Oyster Saloon and Restaurant

HAS made arrangements to be at all times supplied with the finest OYSTERS from Mobile and Biloxi, which will be served up in the most elegant and palatable manner. The proprietor has made every variety of GAME and FISH, in the most perfect manner, and will be pleased to gratify the taste of the most fastidious of wild game, and all delicacies that can be procured.

FRANKLIN HOUSE. The undersigned has just received, and opened the above well-known and favorite establishment, and is determined to make it, in every respect, worthy of the patronage of the public. The house is situated in the most pleasant drive to one of the most elegant and salubrious resorts in the country. The grounds and grounds will be kept up in the most perfect manner, and the table supplied with the finest fish, fresh from their own ponds. He will also be at all times supplied with every variety of wild game, and all delicacies that can be procured. "Come one, come all." DAN HICKOK.

MURPHY'S RESTAURANT. Bowling and Billiard Saloon, No. 100 St. Charles Street. THE Subscriber would respectfully inform his friends and the public that he has just received from the proprietors of this establishment, rendering it the most complete and desirable in the city. The RESTAURANT is situated in the most pleasant drive to one of the most elegant and salubrious resorts in the country. The grounds and grounds will be kept up in the most perfect manner, and the table supplied with the finest fish, fresh from their own ponds. He will also be at all times supplied with every variety of wild game, and all delicacies that can be procured. "Come one, come all." DAN HICKOK.

AMERICAN OYSTER SALOON and RESTAURANT. The undersigned would respectfully inform his friends and the public generally, that he has just received from the proprietors of this establishment, rendering it the most complete and desirable in the city. The RESTAURANT is situated in the most pleasant drive to one of the most elegant and salubrious resorts in the country. The grounds and grounds will be kept up in the most perfect manner, and the table supplied with the finest fish, fresh from their own ponds. He will also be at all times supplied with every variety of wild game, and all delicacies that can be procured. "Come one, come all." DAN HICKOK.

AMERICAN OYSTER SALOON and RESTAURANT. The undersigned would respectfully inform his friends and the public generally, that he has just received from the proprietors of this establishment, rendering it the most complete and desirable in the city. The RESTAURANT is situated in the most pleasant drive to one of the most elegant and salubrious resorts in the country. The grounds and grounds will be kept up in the most perfect manner, and the table supplied with the finest fish, fresh from their own ponds. He will also be at all times supplied with every variety of wild game, and all delicacies that can be procured. "Come one, come all." DAN HICKOK.

AMERICAN OYSTER SALOON and RESTAURANT. The undersigned would respectfully inform his friends and the public generally, that he has just received from the proprietors of this establishment, rendering it the most complete and desirable in the city. The RESTAURANT is situated in the most pleasant drive to one of the most elegant and salubrious resorts in the country. The grounds and grounds will be kept up in the most perfect manner, and the table supplied with the finest fish, fresh from their own ponds. He will also be at all times supplied with every variety of wild game, and all delicacies that can be procured. "Come one, come all." DAN HICKOK.

AMERICAN OYSTER SALOON and RESTAURANT. The undersigned would respectfully inform his friends and the public generally, that he has just received from the proprietors of this establishment, rendering it the most complete and desirable in the city. The RESTAURANT is situated in the most pleasant drive to one of the