TWENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

In Senate.

WASHINGTON, April 6, 1846.

With the incoming of this beautiful day, it is universally conceded that the spring season has set in. Light wind from the South. Thermometer verging upon 70 in the open air, in the shade. Large and fashionable auditory collected in the galleries. Prayer by Rev. Mr. Tustin. Journal of Saturday last.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain papers from the War Department, relating to the defence and improvement of the harbor of Buffalo. Referred, on motion of Mr. Dix, to the Committee on Commerce.

Petitions were presented by Messrs. Davis, Cameron, Dix and Huntington.

The bill providing for a change in the distribution of the duties of the several Naval Bureaux, coming up on its third reading,

Mr. J. M. CLAYTON made some remarks indicative of a desire to know the purport of the object of the bill.

Mr. FAIRFIELD explained that the object was to have a more perfect and uniform classification of the duties of the bureaux.

Mr. J. M. CLAYTON did not concur with the Senator that the reorganization proposed would effect a more uniform division of the duties of the naval bureaux. He objected to the principle as herein contemplated, of removing from any one of the bureaux a naval officer, to give place to citizens uneducated in the service of the navy. He objected to the bill, because in the classification, it proposed to make another bureaux, and to create new offices, thus adding to the expenses of the government. He asked for the ayes and noes.

On motion of Mr. CRITTENDEN, the subject was laid aside, and the Senate resumed the special order of the day, on the all-absorbing and important

OREGON RESOLUTIONS.

In the course of the discussions of these resolutions, since the opening of Congress, frequent allusions having been made to the treaty of Washington, settling the North-Eastern boundary, and Mr. Webster having at length found it incumbent upon him, in defence of that treaty and in defence of himself, called for the correspondence upon the subject; and the President last week, in obedience to the request, having sent in the papers required, Mr. Webster gave notice that he should seize an early opportunity in the course of the Oregon discussion, to place himself and the treaty of Washington, right before the country. His object, therefore, in rising to-day was to discuss as an incidental subject, connected with the discussion of the regular order,

THE TREATY OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. WEBSTER rose to the examination. He said it had been altogether unexpected to him to feel it to be his duty here, and particularly at this time, to defend the treaty of Washington of 1842, upon the correspondence accompanying the negotiation of that treaty. He thought it was past the day, after the lapse of four years, since, by the confirmation of the Senate, that treaty had become a law. When it was before the Senate, it had been discussed with the fullest freedom of debate, and with very great ability; and in its ratification it had received the vote of five-sixths of the Senate, as great or greater a majority than had been ever found before upon any disputed question. With this view, as far as he had any hand in the negotiation, and as far as his own responsibility was connected with this treaty, he had been willing to leave to the judgment of the country, if there were some things here which did not compel him, however he might regret the necessity, to pursue a different course. The documents connected with this negotiation were voluminous; and they, and the treaty itself, had not gone forth in regular numbers to the public, but had been published, as it were, by piecemeal; and even in this form, their publication had been almost entirely confined to the cities of the Atlantic coast. It had been his wish that these documents might be read by every man in every section of the country—north, south, east and west; but that, of course, was impossible. But now, having returned to the Senate again, there had been nothing further from his purpose than to revive this topic of discussion at this time; and nothing had been to him more unexpected than to be called upon to make a defence of this case. But the correspondence had been so often made the subject of disparagement, disapproval, and sometimes of contumelious remarks in this and the other House, that with all his disposition to forbear, he could hardly be expected to forbear as he had done—to continue to forbear through the debate, and through the session; he would say, that with these frequently recurring erroneous statements, entirely erroneous, he could hardly be asked longer to keep the peace. If to these reiterated statements, wholly incorrect, entirely unfounded, without a particle of the testimony to sustain them, he were to make no reply, he knew to what use they might be turned in the party elections of the future. These assertions and misrepresentations would be cited, and it would be said this is a fact, because it was made where an answer ought to have been given; but no answer was given. Recurring, then, to the treaty in question, he said that whatever agency he had had in that treaty, was under the direction of the President of the United States. He (Mr. W.) desired to shield nothing; but wherever his name stood, and in whatever connection, he was ready to stand there, and answer for it. He was ready here, upon this question, and without intending the slightest disparagement of the late President of the United States, under whom he had acted, to take upon take upon himself the undivided responsibility of this negotiation. But it was a treaty which could not be called a newly arising question. It had been a matter of fifty years of negotiation; and it was his purpose first to show where this question arose, what had been its progress, and where it stood, when Wm. H. Harrison succeeded to the Presidency. He designed no crimination or reproof of the antecedent executive officers of the country, in showing the state of the question from first to last, down to the time that General Harrison came into the Presidential office. Mr. Webster then first proposed a brief review of the history of the north-eastern boundary question. He accordingly stated the line as defined in the treaty of 1783, a portion of which was the channel of the river St. Croix; but that subsequently, doubts arose as to what stream was intended as the river St. Croix; and this was made a question of negotiation in 1794, when a joint commission was appointed to determine the locality and identity of the river. They did so—they found the river, and established its name; and they erected a monument at its source. The next proceedings that transpired between the two governments were in 1803, between Rufus King and Sir K. Harrowby, in a convention for the settlement of our northern boundary, east and west. The negotiation as far as relates to the western portion of the continent, had already been alluded to in this discussion. The commissioners had settled between them authoritatively, definitively and conclusively, the whole boundary, but when it came before the Senate, the article relating to the western part of the boundary was stricken out, and the treaty failed. The treaty of Ghent had not failed; for the joint commissioners appointed under it did not agree; but decided on the other hand, that the question had become a proper subject of arbitration. Mr. Monroe, in 1823, instituted an arbitration for the settlement of the north eastern boundary. In 1827, under Mr. Adams, this convention for an arbitration met in London, and appointed as umpire the King of the Netherlands, whose decision in 1831 was pronounced quite unsatisfactory to the people of the United States. It was declined by both governments, and the whole matter was thrown back again. During the whole of General Jackson's administration, and it was not because of a want of strength or ability in his Secretaries of State, Mr. Livingston, Mr. McLane and Mr. Forsyth; what had been done, what effected, what accomplished! Nothing at all. Nor was it because General Jackson was not impressed with the necessity of effecting an adjustment if possible. The Dutch award of the 10th of June, 1831, had been referred to by General Jackson in his message of December, 1832, with the expression of a regret that the north eastern boundary question was still unsettled; and Mr. Webster read successively to the same effect, from the messages of President Jackson of 1832, '33' '34, '35 and '36, in the last of which, while he reiterates the old story that the question is still unsettled, he expresses his confidence in the British government to meet us in a satisfactory adjustment. Mr. Webster did not recapitulate these historical evidences to the disparagement of the administration of Gen. Jackson, or any of the preceding administrations; but he did it to show that there were inherent difficulties in the way; and that no administration, thus far, had been able to make any progress in the settlement of the controversy. For upwards of fifty years from the time of Washington, not one, nor all the executive officers of the nation had made a single step, or the slightest progress to a definite result.

Mr. WEBSTER next proceeded to examine what had been done under the administration of Mr. Van Buren—what steps he had taken, and what had been their results. Read from the message of Mr. Van Buren, of Dec. 1837, regretting the unsettled state of the Northeast boundary, and complaining that it was even farther from adjustment than ever, since the peace of 1783; and Mr. Van Buren was right. But with all his sense of the importance of this question, what had he accomplished during the whole of his administration? Mr. Webster was not disposed to reproach Mr. Van Buren; but simply to state the facts in the case. What had he done? He had left the question as far, or a little farther, from a settlement, than when he came into power. If he had advanced at all, he had advanced backwards. He had thrown such a complicated mesh of entanglements about, it as to materially embarrass its future diplomatic adjudication. Mr. Webster proceeded, by detail, to examine the documentary history, as connected with this question, under the administration of Mr. Van Buren. Read from his messages of 1838, showing the still existing embarrassments. Recited from the correspondence between Mr. Fox and Mr. Forsyth upon the propositions of a commission mutually offered, and from the letter of Mr. Forsyth to the Governor of Maine, with a view to the Governor's opinion of the commission, and the umpire proposed; and also to ascertain the sense of the people of Maine. In December, 1839, Mr. Van Buren speaks of the project of Great Britain to the United States, and of the counter project embracing arbitration, of the United States to Great Britain. Mr. Van Buren surveys the impediments to the settlement of the question; states the proposition of Great Britain to the counter proposition of the United States; and of the prospect of the final settlement by the offer then before the British government, embracing the principle of arbitration. This, then, was all that had been done. Nothing had been accomplished but the submitting of a project on the one part and of a counter project on the other, embracing the alternative of arbitration. Mr. Webster referred back again to the diplomatic correspondence on the subject, under the administration of Mr. Van Buren. Read from the letter of Mr. Fox to Mr. Forsyth on the subject of the British survey of the boundary by Messrs. Mudge and Featherstonhaugh. It was an extraordinary report in its representations of the southern extension of the boundary. It had represented a chain of highlands where no highlands had been supposed to exist. With some general remarks upon this exploration, Mr. Webster referred to the last annual message of Mr. Van Buren, of December, 1840, in which he declares that we were far from having arrived at a final settlement of the north-eastern boundary. This was a very agreeable aspect and prospect of a settlement by arbitration. Mr. Webster recited the offer of Great Britain, the counter offer of the United States, the objections of Great Britain to our offer, and our objections to hers—and the final dispatches to England of all the offers and all the objections on both sides, with new objections from the United States. This was, indeed, as beautiful a view of diplomatic difficulties as one would wish to look at of a summer's day. It would have puzzled the oldest English diplomatists; it would have taxed the acuteness of a Nesselrode, a Talleyrand, or a Metternich to unravel them. The project of Great Britain, the counter project of the United States, the objections on either side, each and all receded farther and farther from the object, until it was out of view entirely. Lord Palmerston next took up all these papers to see what could be done. This was the condition of things when General Harrison was elected. After examining all the difficulties in the way, again recapitulated by Mr. Webster in detail, Lord Palmerston had arrived at the sage conclusion that under the administration of Mr. Van Buren, nothing could be done, or that it was impossible to settle the question under his administration. He next read from a speech of Sir Robert Peel in Parliament, reviewing the difficulties in the way. Next from a letter of Lord Palmerston to Mr. Fox, 24th August, 1841, declaring that there was no hope of concluding a settlement under the proposals of Mr. Van Buren's administration, and suggesting a new step under the new President. New proposals were accordingly submitted by Mr. Fox in 1841. But the commission proposed of three professors, to be appointed by the King of Prussia, the King of Sardinia, and the King of Saxony, each one professor not understanding the language of the other two, and none of them the language of England or America; a commission of such men to run a boundary in Maine, between the territories of the United States and Great Britain; and then to return to hold an arbitration at Frankfort on the Maine, (in Germany,) upon the face of it was absurd. Mr. Webster next referred to the border troubles of 1841; the dangers of an open rupture; the stationing of General Scott on the northern frontier; the civil posse organized in Maine for the defence of her territorial rights, the $800,000 placed at the discretion of the Governor for the military defence of the State, as indicating the stern necessity of prompt action between the two governments. He next referred to the special commission to England, which had been thought of as early as 1809, as a measure calculated to give emphasis to the importance of the case. But there was another feature. After stating all these projects and counter projects, Mr Fox had proposed a little convention or agreement for the maintenance of the peace, until the boundary could be definitely settled. But how was it to be settled by the commission proposed? It would require three years for an exploration of the line, if we had agreed to it in '41 or '42; then, perhaps, from disagreement, another exploration and survey of 3 years would be required, before we should begin to settle it. Here we are, then, after 56 years, standing stock still, as fixed as a statue. Mr. Fox himself, in writing back to Lord Palmerston, on the subject of the proposed commission, had appealed, "For God's sake, my Lord, spare us the professors." The plan was broken off. Mr. Webster next read a letter from Mr. Fox to Lord Palmerston, setting forth the purport of a conversation with the Secretary of State (Mr. Webster) on the subject of the final alternative of a conventional boundary. Mr. Webster said that he had thought that this was the true way of proceeding; the making a line by a special convention. He had seen it was desirous to settle the question at once, and hazardous longer to delay. He had seen how it was with the State of Maine which possessed not only a part of the territory, but the jurisdiction of it; and that it required a great deal of reliance on the part of Maine, even in our most distinguished men, to trust the discretion of this territory and this jurisdiction in their hands. But Mr. Webster had confidence in her, and the result proved that he was not mistaken. It had been said a hundred times that Maine had been coerced out of her territory. This was absurd. In August, 1841, Lord Aberdeen succeeded Lord Palmerston in the government of England. Mr. Webster here read a letter from Mr. Everett to Mr. Webster, (Secretary of State) of 31st December, 1841, stating a conversation Mr. E. had held with Lord Aberdeen, in which the project of a special mission to Washington was discussed.

Mr. ALLEN.—What is the date of that letter?

Mr. WEBSTER.—It is dated December 31st, 1841.

Mr. ALLEN.—Has the letter ever been communicated to the Senate?

Mr. WEBSTER.—Certainly, sir; certainly. It is on the top of the hill. (Laughter.) Mr. Webster next read from the replies of the Secretary of State to the letter of Mr Everett. The President approves of the special mission. Next, the Secretary of State had addressed letters to the Governors of the State of Maine and of Massachusetts, (Mr. Fairfield and Mr. Davis, both new in the Senate) soliciting their co operation in the plan of settlement prepared. The Governor of Maine (the State most interested) called the Legislature together; and they passed a preamble and resolutions, which Mr. Webster read, concurring in the plan, and appointing a commission of four persons, on the part of the State, to repair to Washington to represent the commonwealth in the negotiations. But there were those who appeared to know more of the interests of Maine than she herself, and they were continually mouthing it, that she had been robbed and coerced to the surrender of her soil. A line of 700 miles had to be run, between the British possessions and Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. Mr. Webster remarked upon the unsettled state of this line, and upon the nature of international compromises and concessions—that they consisted of mutual benefits conferred or equivalents rendered; and took occasion to speak of the general satisfaction of the people—not ten reasonable persons in the State objecting to the compromise upon the north-eastern boundary. The Maine commissioners had signed unanimously, though it appears they sought rather for points of objection than features of approval in the treaty, which latter they should not have overlooked. Reviewing all the difficulties which had been accumulating around this question under every administration of the government, down to that of Mr. Van Buren, and particularly including it, Mr. Webster, in the final settlement of the controversy, demanded to know what Maine had lost? Mr. Webster here turned to Mr. Phelps and said something about the snow being five feet deep at this time on the boundary in Vermont. The hon. Senator read from a book describing the territory surrendered by Maine, nineteen-twentieths of which is represented as unfit for cultivation. Besides, Maine had received from the treasury $150,000 for those lands, one-half of which sum they would not have produced in fifty years. For locations and surveys she had received $200,000, and hopes to receive $80,000 or $100,000 more; so that Maine gets $400,000, or $450,000, in cash, and the free navigation of the St. Johns. Mr. Webster descanted upon the value of this navigation, as being infinitely greater than that of the Columbia. The St. Johns was a fine river—larger than the Delaware or the Hudson—and it had a mouth to it. The Senator from Arkansas had said that no river was respectable unless it had a mouth. But the St. Johns had a mouth, and it was navigable for steamboats a greater distance than the Columbia. The value of the timber floated down the St. Johns by citizens of Maine, he doubted not exceeded already the value of the fur trade of the Hudson's Bay Company, which had been shown to be less than the value of $300,000 a year. In 1828, it only amounted to $136,000, and doubtless great portions of this were sent by other routes than Fort Vancouver. The St. Johns had also secured great advantages to the fine wheat country of the Aroostook, where forty bushels of wheat had been produced to the acre. Mr. Webster next came to speak of the boundary in a military view. He referred to a remark of the Senator from New York, (Mr. Dix,) in his late speech, that by the boundary agreed upon, we had surrendered an important military road.

Mr. DIX said that he had not spoken of a military road; but had said that Great Britain had derived a line which was deemed important as a means of military communication with Canada.

Mr. WEBSTER.—The Senator says it is a military communication and not a military road. Let us see what he says of this communication. Mr. Webster read from the late speech of Mr. Dix.

Mr. DIX.—If the Senator pleases to allow—

Mr. WEBSTER.—Certainly, sir.

Mr. DIX then said that when this treaty was concluded in the latter part of 1842, he was abroad; and that the injunction of secrecy was removed after that occurred. He had never examined the subject with very great care; but though abroad from the country, he did not altogether lose sight of affairs at home. He had read from the Parliamentary reports of the different routes of the boundary as assumed by the United States, and as actually run by the treaty. Respecting the importance of the military communication with Canada, Mr. Dix read extracts, which he had by him, from speeches of Sir R. Peel, Lord Stanley, and others, substantiating his statement. Mr. Dix had not spoken in any disrespectful spirit of the treaty itself.

Mr. WEBSTER, with a particular statement of the territory along the whole line of the boundary, (a statement which a limitation of time prevents us giving) exhibited that there was no military communication surrendered—that Featherstonhaugh, whose word was not worth a straw, had made a public report of the nature of the country—that the road was mislocated by Sir Robert Peel; and that on the other hand Lord Palmerston, so far from boasting of any advantages gained by the treaty of Washington, had called it the Ashburton capitulation, in which every advantage had been conceded to the United States, and every disadvantage to England. So far, however, from any military advantage being surrendered to Great Britain, we had gained an important—a most important, military advantage, in gaining Rouse's Point, near the head of Lake Champlain. Mr. Webster enlarged upon the advantages of this military point, commanding as it does the passage of the lake; and expressed his surprise that a Senator from New York, should not know the nature of the military positions in the northern frontier of his own State. While Mr. Webster was expatiating upon the strong military position of Rouse's Point,

Mr. DICKINSON inquired—Did not the Dutch line give us Rouse's point?

[The peculiar matter of fact voice of Mr. Dickinson—his peculiar matter of fact style, coming in so suddenly, excited a general outburst of laughter, Webster himself not being able to resist a smile.]

Mr. WEBSTER—No, sir, it gave us a little semi-circle. We might take that if we pleased—but by refusing the Dutch award we had lost even the little semi-circle. Mr. Webster continued his account of the important military location of Rouse's Point. Next to the passage of the Hudson, it was by far the most important point for the defence of the State of New York. Passing from the advantage thus gained by the State of New York from the treaty of Washington, Mr. Webster said that Vermont had gained by it some forty thousand acres of land—looking at Mr. Phelps.

Mr. PHELPS nodded his assent.

Mr. WEBSTER—Yes, sir, we did the same for you.

Mr. PHELPS nodded his assent.

Mr. WEBSTER—Yes, sir; we gave you by changing the line, some thirty [or forty thousand acres, New Hampshire 100,000 acres on Indian Stream, and excellent land it is for so so cold a climate. In conclusion, for the day, Mr. Webster maintained that with reference to Maine, the negotiation was fairly and satisfactorily concluded—that nine-tenths of the people of New Hampshire approved it, that we gave up no important military position; but that on the other hand we had acquired a most important one; and here he should leave this branch of the case.

And at half-past three the Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, APRIL 6, 1846.

THE REPRESENTATIVES FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Committees were called for reports, when

Mr. HAMLIN, from the Committee of Elections, made a report, to discharge the committee from the further consideration of a memorial from forty-four citizens of Dover, N. H., protesting against the right of certain members of Congress from that State, to hold their seats on this floor, having been elected under the general ticket system, instead of by single districts, as required by a law of Congress. He moved that it be laid on the table.

Mr. CULVER asked the gentleman to withdraw the motion.

Mr. HAMLIN acquiesced.

Mr. JONES, of Georgia, asked whether this could be done, being the report of a committee?

Mr. CULVER submitted a resolution—that the memorial be recommitted to the Committee of Elections, with instructions to report whether persons holding seats on this floor from New Hampshire were elected in conformity with the law on the subject, passed in 1842; and if not, then to report what action is necessary in the premises.

Mr. BRINKERHOFF asked whether it would be in order to make a motion?

The SPEAKER was understood to say that the gentleman from New York had the floor.

Mr. CULVER made a brief explanation; in the course of which, he said the memorialists complained that four individuals [somebody said "three"] held their seats here in violation of the act of Congress, having been elected under the general ticket system, instead of according to the law of 1842, and that, therefore, they were without a legal representation. On the 10th of March, 1846, the State of New Hampshire was disenthralled; and, in speaking to the democrats, he said, that is a warning for you—your Switzerland—your Gibraltar—your stronghold—has given way; and this took place when the question of Texas and slavery were presented to the people. [Cries of "go it," and "order."] The poor "collar" State was redeemed, and the flag of freedom waves in triumph. Mississippi and Missouri had both been districted, and New Hampshire should have followed the example. He asked the yeas and nays on the resolution which he had offered.

Mr. BRINKERHOFF.—Will it be in order to lay the whole subject on the table?

The SPEAKER.—It will.

Mr. BRINKERHOFF.—I make that motion, sir.

Mr. CULVER.—I ask for the yeas and nays.

[A VOICE.—"Move to lay the speech on the table."]

The yeas and nays were taken, and the motion of Mr. Brinkerhoff prevailed, by a vote of—yeas 94, nays 55.

A FRUITLESS EFFORT.

Mr. MCCONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a resolution (holding it in his hand.)

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL arose at nearly the same time, and addressed the Speaker.

Mr. MCCONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, (holding out the resolution) I ask leave.—[Several voices—"What is it?" Let it, sir, be read for information. ["What is it, Mac?"] It is a resolution asking information of the Post Office Department.

[VOICES.—"Oh, yes, read it for information," and there was one "Oh, no."]

The SPEAKER.—The resolution is objected to.

Mr. MCCONNELL resumed his seat, as calm as this beautiful vernal morning.

Mr. THOMAS SMITH asked leave to submit a little resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL.—I shall object, if nobody else does. ["That's right."]

Several objected, and, therefore, the permission was not granted.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

A bill was reported, creating the office of Assistant Secretary of State, which was read twice, and committed to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

SMALL POX.

Mr. KING, of Georgia, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, introduced a resolution, which was adopted, confiding to the Committee on Commerce certain statements and statistics in relation to the suppression and prevention of small pox on shipboard, and at ports, with instructions to report by bill or otherwise.

A CHAPLAIN REPRIEVED.

Mr. BAYLY, from the same committee, made a report, which was concurred in, discharging the committee from the further consideration of the petition of citizens of Norfolk, asking an appropriation for a Chaplain.

PRESERVATION OF PEACE—"RE-ANNEXATION OF CHINA."

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, asked to be discharged from the consideration of two memorials, which were sent to the chair.

Mr. ADAMS, of Massachusetts, inquired what they were.

Mr. INGERSOLL said the first recommended a reduction of the Navy as the best means of preserving peace, and the second, from a hundred citizens of Pennsylvania, asked for the re-annexation of China. [Cries of "good."]

The request of the Committee was granted.

PAINTING FOR THE ROTUNDA.

Mr. W. W. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on the Library, reported a joint resolution, providing for the execution of a painting to represent a scene in our early history—the subject to be left to the selection of the artist, and the price not to exceed that paid to other artists for similar works.

The SPEAKER—What action does the gentleman propose?

Mr. CAMPBELL—That it be put on its passage, as it has been fully discussed by the joint committee on the Library.

Mr. MCCONNELL—How much is to be paid?

Mr. CAMPBELL—As much as has been paid to other artists.

Mr. MCCONNELL—How much was that? I shall vote, and object to the passage of the resolution.

A motion was then made that the resolution be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and the question being taken, it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 75, nays 62.

A large number of reports were made by the several Committees.

MCCONNELL SUCCESSFUL!

Mr. MCCONNEL again proposed to submit a resolution making inquiry as to the expediency of a post route somewhere in the State of Georgia, and as there was no objection to the introduction, it was agreed to.

CUMBERLAND ROAD.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union; and immediately more than two dozen gentlemen left the hall for the Senate, where Mr. Webster was to hold forth, and the seats were nearly all vacant.

Mr. R. SMITH, of Illinois, delivered a speech in favor of the Cumberland road bill. If this were the first time the subject was presented, he would oppose it. In 1802, when Ohio came into the Union, a compact was entered into with her by the government, by which the latter stipulated, on certain conditions, to construct the road. He was opposed, as much as any gentleman, to indiscriminate and general improvements; but taking every thing into consideration, he came to the conclusion that, although the two per cent fund was exhausted, the obligation resting on the government was by no means removed. Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Missouri, had paid into the treasury $85,000,000 for public lands; and certainly something was due to these States in consequence. He spoke his hour in support of the measure, and was succeeded by

Mr. MCGAUGHEY, of Indiana, who contended that the original design of the road was to connect the Western with the Eastern States, for the purpose of facilitating travel and carrying the mails. If a war comes it will be used as a military road. He expressed his desire that a railroad be constructed over it, and showed the advantages of such a measure. When they commenced anything they ought to go through with it; it was one of the strongest arguments in the mouths of those opposed to a republican form of government, that the people were vacillating and unstable in their legislation; therefore we should go on with the work proposed, and finish it.

Mr. THOS. SMITH, of Indiana, after avowing his determination to vote for the land proposion of his colesgue, (Mr. Wick,) answered the remarks of the colleague who preceded him, with reference to the action of political parties on this subject.

Mr. DROMGOOLE had prepared himself to make a speech, but he was precluded from doing so, although he had his documents and papers before him. He asked how many minutes he had.

The CHAIRMAN informed him the time to which the debate was limited had expired. [Cries of "leave," "leave."]

THE VOTE.

The committee proceeded to vote on the pending amendments.

That of Mr. YELL, (to continue the road from St. Louis through the States of Missouri and Arkansas, the nearest and most practicable route to St. Antonio in TEXAS; and for the completion of said road, granting to each State 540,000 acres of public land, and $50,000 for TEXAS,) was rejected.

As was also the amendment of Mr. STANTON, appropriating 250,000 acres of land for the completion of the military road commenced in the State of Arkansas, opposite Memphis, in Tennessee.

An amendment appropriating $50,000 for a bridge over the Ohio, at Wheeling, was rejected.

Mr. MCCONNELL moved that the committee rise and report the bill, with a recommendation that it do not pass.—[Cries of "Oh! no!"]

A vote was taken on an amendment offered by Mr. Davis, of Kentucky, appropriating 500,000 acres of land to all the States except those which received that quantity under the distribution act of 1841, and that the lands shall be sold and the money paid over to the States; and the chair decided it to be carried.

The question was about being taken on the proposition, substituting lands instead of money to finish the road, when

An amendment was offered, that the lands shall be selected from those lying in the direction 54 40, and West of the Rocky Mountains.—[Laughter.]

The substitute offered previously by Mr. Wick, was then agreed to—ayes 82, noes 35. It proposes to give Ohio 344,000 acres; Indiana, 921,600; Illinois 1,289,360, and Missouri 1,231,632 acres, to be applied to the completion of the Cumberland road; to be completed in eight years from the passage of this act, and to be free from any tolls or charges whatever for any property of the United States, or person in their service passing along the same. The lands not to be disposed of at less than a minimum price, etc.

The Committee rose, and

The SPEAKER, having resumed his seat, called to order.

The CHAIRMAN was about to make his report, when

The SPEAKER requested him to suspend until the House came to order.

The confusion having in some degree abated,

The CHAIRMAN reported what had been the result of the action of the Committee.

Three or four gentlemen arose, and

The SPEAKER recognised "the gentleman from Illinois." [Several gentlemen—"Which one?"] Mr. Wentworth.

Mr. WENTWORTH—I move the previous question.

Mr. DROMGOOLE—Mr. Speaker, will it be in order to lay the whole subject on the table?

The SPEAKER.—It will.

Mr. DROMGOOLE.—Then I make that motion, and call for the yeas and nays.

They were ordered, and taken, and the result was—yeas 74, nays 84.

So the whole subject was not laid on the table.

The SPEAKER stated that the question was now on seconding the demand for the previous question, when

Mr. WENTWORTH arose on one side of the hall, and

Mr. COBB on the other.

Mr. WENTWORTH.—Mr. Speaker, will it be in order to withdraw the motion for the previous question?

A VOICE.—I renew it.

The SPEAKER.—It will.

Mr. WENTWORTH.—I will withdraw it. And—

Mr. COBB.—The motion has been withdrawn, and the gentleman is not entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER.—The previous question is withdrawn.

Mr. COBB (Mr. Wentworth still standing).—Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER.—The gentleman from Georgia—

Mr. COBB.—I move the previous question. (A laugh.)

Mr. WENTWORTH claimed the floor.

Mr. HAMLIN.—If the previous question shall be seconded, will it then be too late to move a call of the House?

The SPEAKER.—It will.

Mr. HAMLIN.—Then I move a call of the House, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (rapping with his hammer).—Gentlemen will take their seats. Order!

Mr. TIBBATTS rose to a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois had the floor when the Speaker recognised the gentleman from Georgia. He did not give way, and therefore the gentleman from Georgia was not entitled to the floor. (Cries of "order," "order." There were more than a score of gentlemen on the floor, who were not entitled to it.)

The SPEAKER explained the matter, and stated the exact state of the question.

Mr. MCDOWELL appealed from the decision of the Chair.

A motion was made to adjourn, but did not prevail.

The question was stated on the motion for a call of the House, and the yeas and yeas.

Mr. MCHENRY stated a point of order, to which

The SPEAKER responded.

Mr. TIBBATTS understood that an appeal had—[Cries of "Order, order."] If any gentleman calls me to order, let him state his point. [Cry of "Order."]

Some gentleman, invisible to the reporter in consequence of the intervening barrier of the clerk's table, did so, and there was much good-humored confusion in the hall.

Explanations took place between several gentlemen and the Speaker; and, in reply to a question,

The SPEAKER said he would look at the rule, and he examined the book.

Mr. TIBBATTS.—I believe I am entitled to the floor. [Voices on the right of the chair—"Gentlemen in front, be seated, then we can hear," and "Fall back, boys."]

The SPEAKER (as if in answer to a question).—No debate is in order after the previous question has been called.

Mr. TIBBATTS.—That is the very point. The gentleman from Georgia—the gentleman from Illinois not having yielded the floor—was not in order in moving the previous question. [Cries of "Order," and "Sit down in front."]

The SPEAKER.—The chair is confirmed in his opinion that the gentleman from Georgia was in order. After the gentleman from Illinois withdrew his motion for the previous question, he was not entitled to the floor; and——

Mr. WENTWORTH.—One question—— [Cries of "Order, order."]

The SPEAKER continued and concluded his explanation—"that the gentleman from Georgia was as much entitled to it as any other gentleman." [A voice—"That's the talk."]

The question was taken on the appeal, in this form—"Shall the decision of the chair stand as the judgment of the House?" and it was decided in the affirmative by a very loud and long-reverberating "aye." Therefore the chair was sustained.

A motion was made that the House adjourn, and the question being taken,

The SPEAKER said the ayes seemed to have it.

The yeas and nays were called for, and there was a "sound of many voices."

The SPEAKER.—It is impossible for gentlemen or the chair to hear. [Elevating his voice.] The ayes will rise. [Cries—"Up, every man," "Get up."]

The motion to adjourn was withdrawn; and it was renewed.

The yeas and nays were asked, but a sufficient number did not rise.

Tellers were called for, but not ordered,

And the House, at about 20 minutes to 4 o'clock, adjourned.

BALTIMORE, April 7, 1846.

Death of Mr. Ashcomb—Success at the Fisheries—More Criminal Rowdyism—City Mortality—Broken Merchants—A Splendid Engine—Markets—Stock Board, &c.

The unfortunate rencontre which I mentioned yesterday, as having occurred in St. Mary's county, has, I regret to state, proved fatal to Mr. George G. Ashcomb. Later accounts state that Mr. Ashcomb had drawn a dagger, and that the pistol was only fired by Mr. Thomas, when self-preservation demanded its use. An examination of the case was immediately after held by the magistrate before whom it occurred, and the surviving party discharged.

Information has been received here from the Potomac and Susquehanah fisheries, of the most gratifying character. Shad and herring have not been known to run so heavy for many years, and the fishermen are in prospect of unusual good luck, should the weather contine favorable. There has been but little money made at fishing for three or four years past, a great many old fishermen have retired from the business in consequence.

On Sunday last a party of young rowdies, belonging to the upper crust of society in Old Town, proceeded to Herring Run, about three miles from the city, where they grossly insulted the visiters of the place, drew a pistol on the wife of the proprietor of the hotel, robbed and beat the person who attended the stables, and gave other proof of their proficiency in blackguardism and rowdyism. Warrants are out for the arrest of the entire party, and it is to be hoped that the Court will teach them a lesson that their parents have neglected.

The number of deaths in this city, during the past week, was but 59—34 males and 25 females. Of this number 9 died of consumption and only 1 of small pox.

Among the list of applicants for the benefit of the insolvent laws last week, are two merchants, John D. Tustin and John Bunting.

The new independent engine of this city, which will be finished in a few weeks, is to be exhibited at the Washington National Fair next month, by its enterprising builder, Mr. John Rogers. It is the largest, most powerful, and beautiful engine ever constructed.

THE MARKETS.—The arrivals of Beeves at market yesterday, were considerably below the supply of the previous week, though as large as is customary at this season. There was very little animation, but prices perhaps averaged something higher than last quotations, owing to the improved description of stock. The offerings at the scales comprised 380 head, of which 110 were driven to Philadelphia; 70 remain over unsold, and the balance, 200 head, were disposed of to city butchers at $3 50 a $3 60 per cwt. on the hoof, equal to $5 a $6 75 net. Sales averaged about $3 25. Sales of good to choice hogs at $4 75 a $5.

There were sales on Saturday of 1500 bbls. Howard street Flour of mixed brands, at $4 75. The same rate prevailed yesterday, but some dealers are not much disposed to operate until the reception of later English intelligence, now daily expected; the receipt price from cars is $4 62½. The stock of City Mills Flour is very light, and holders are firm at $5, but we hear of no transactions. Small parcels of red wheat sold on Saturday and yesterday at 100 a 110 cts, for good to prime lots. A sale of family flour, white, yesterday, at 125 cts. Corn is dull. Sales of Maryland, yesterday, at 63 a 64 cents for white, and 65 cents for yellow. A sale of Pennsylvania yellow, on Saturday, at 67 cents.

The demand for Whiskey is limited, and small sales only are making at 23½ cents for hhds., and 24½ cents for barrels.

Sales of Stocks at Baltimore.

BROCK BOARD, April 6.—$1900 City 6's, 1890, 95½; 100 shs U. Manufacturing Co., 5d, r 31; 35 shs do, 5d, r 31½. State 6 per cents, closed at 76 asked, 75½ bid; City 6 per cents, of 1890, closed at 95½ asked, 95½ bid. The Farmers' and Merchants' Bank has declared a dividend of three per cent for the last six months.

PHILADELPHIA, April 7, 1846.

The Weather—Arrested for Attempting to Kill his Wife—An Outrage—Young Snyder's Case—Abortion Case—Stocks, &c.

The weather is warm, but windy; the dust has been blowing about in every direction, and for the last two hours the sky has become gradually overcast, giving indications of a storm before the day is over.

George Lacey, the man who attempted to shoot his wife at Fettersville, N. J., opposite this city, and who escaped, was arrested yesterday at Wilmington, Del., and is now in the Woodbury jail, awaiting his trial.

A man was found drowned in the Delaware, near Gloucester Point, on the Jersey shore, yesterday afternoon, but he has not yet been identified.

The southern suburb of the city has witnessed another scene, similar to those enacted some years since, and which rendered it dangerous for a male and female to stray away from the crowded parts of the streets. A man, named Janvier, was walking on Sunday evening, a short distance below the railroad, in Southwark, in company with a female, when he was assaulted by two ruffians, and the female taken from him. She, however, managed to escape, without violation, in consequence of the struggles and outcries of Janvier, and also of her quickness in gaining the line of houses. He got off without being seriously injured. It was a transaction similar to this, and occurring over Schuylkill, that produced the death of a young man, last summer, by the hand of young Snyder, and for which the latter is to be tried in the course of this month. Snyder was in company with a young girl, on the west side of the river, when the deceased and some companions followed him, as he thought, with violent intent—a collision took place, the girl fled, and Snyder seizing a stick of wood, felled his opponent to the earth, inflicting a wound of which he died in a very short time. Whether Snyder was mistaken in the intent of those who followed him remains to be seen; certain it is, that the happening of such outrages as that which he anticipated, was well calculated to make him fear a similar danger. The outrage of Sunday is yet involved in mystery, so far as the perpetrators are concerned. It would be advisable for a man who takes long walks with his sweetheart, to be well armed, and to make cold meat of any scoundrel who attempts to molest him.

The court of Quarter Sessions was engaged to-day, in hearing an argument for a new trial, in the case of Dr. Montgomery Chambers, convicted of causing an abortion. Judge Parsons presides, and he holds the matter under advisement.

The stock market is still depressed, particularly as to State fives—these securities being down to 68½; and closing heavy at that. Large quantities have been parted with by holders, probably from the necessity of realizing, to meet demands in bank. The independent treasury begins, already, to check stock gambling.

Sales of Stocks at Philadelphia.

FIRST BOARD—April 7.—$5000 State Fives, 2 days, 68½; 5000 do, 2 days, 68½; 5000 do, 5 days, 68½; 10,000 do 68½; 700 do 69½; 12 shares U. S. Bank 4½; 10 Commercial Bank 51; 6 Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank 44½; 200 Reading Railroad 34; 3 Planters Bank, Tenessee 54½; $500 Texas Notes 19; 50 shares Girard Bank, b5, 9½; 17 do Planters' Bank Tennessee 54; 50 Norristown Railroad 8.

AFTER BOARD.—$5000 State Fives, s5, 68½; 1000 Lehigh Sixes, 9 days, 55.

SECOND BOARD.—$5000 State Fives 68½; 350 Schuylkill Navigation Convertible Loan 81; 3000 do 81; 5000 State Fives, 5 days, 68½; 5000 do, 5 days, 68½.