

On the Public Lands.—Messrs. Ewing, (Chairman,) Moore, Prentiss, Crittenden, and McKean.

On Private Land Claims.—Messrs. Black, (Chairman,) Linn, Ruggles, Porter, and King of Georgia.

On Indian Affairs.—Messrs. White (Chairman,) Tipton, Goldsborough, Swift, and Brown.

On Claims.—Messrs. Naudain (Chairman,) Buchanan, Leigh, Preston, and Crittenden.

On the Post Office and Post Roads.—Messrs. Grundy (Chairman,) Robinson, Ewing, Knight, and Davis.

On Roads and Canals.—Messrs. Hendricks (Chairman,) McKean, Robinson, Kent, Robins.

On Pensions.—Messrs. Tomlinson (Chairman,) Tallmadge, Linn, Prentiss, McKean.

On the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Tyler (Chairman,) Kent, Naudain, Southard, King of Alabama.

On Revolutionary Claims.—Messrs. Moore, (Chairman,) White, Hubbard, Leigh, Shepley.

On the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Messrs. McKean (Chairman,) Tomlinson, Brown.

On Engrossed Bills.—Messrs. Shepley (Chairman,) Hill, Morris.

The Senate adjourned to-morrow.

HOUSE.—The House took up the resolution heretofore offered by Mr. Bockee, for the appointment of certain officers of the House; when Overton Carr, was appointed Doorkeeper, and John W. Hunter elected Assistant Doorkeeper.

On motion of Mr. Beardsley, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the President's message, Mr. J. Q. Adams in the Chair.

The several portions of the President's message were then referred to appropriate Committees, &c.

The following resolution, offered yesterday by Mr. J. Q. Adams, was taken up and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to report to this House a statement of the names of all the pensioners for services during the Revolutionary War, pensioned under the Act of Congress, of 15th March, 1818, whose names were struck off the list by virtue of the act of 1st May, 1820, specifying those restored to pensions by the act of 1st March 1823, or since again pensioned under the act of 15th of May, 1828, the act of June, 1832, or any other act of Congress, subsequent to that of 1st of May, 1820.

The House adjourned till to-morrow.

Friday, December 18.

HOUSE.—Mr. Jackson, of Massachusetts, presented the petition of sundry citizens of the town of Wrentham, in Massachusetts, praying Congress to provide for the Abolition of Slavery within the District of Columbia, and moved its reference to a Select Committee.

Mr. Hammond moved that the petition be not received.

A debate of three or four hours, involving many points of order, and running occasionally into the merits of the question, ensued, in which Messrs. Hammond, Williams of N. C., Glascock, Peyton, Beardsley, Wise, Thomas, Hopkins, Mason of Virginia, Bouldin, Ripley, Vanderpool, Harper, Pierce of New Hampshire, and Pickens, took part.

A motion to lay the petition on the table was moved and decided by the Speaker to have precedence over the motion to reject.

The question being taken, the motion to lay on the table was rejected—Yeas 55, nays 121.

Mr. Hammond's motion, that the petition be rejected, being then in order, the debate was resumed, and continued by Messrs. Hunt, Glascock, and Sutherland.

Mr. Sutherland, without concluding, yielded the floor, and, on motion of Mr. Everett, the House adjourned to meet on Monday.

Monday, December 21.

SENATE.—John M. Niles, a Senator from Connecticut, appointed to fill the place of Nathan Smith, dec. appeared and took his seat.

A message was received from the President of the United States, submitting to the consideration of Congress a request made in London for an Institution in this country; which, on motion of Mr. Webster, was laid on the table.

Mr. Webster offered the following resolution, and moved its consideration at this time, which was agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to inquire what measures should be adopted by Congress in consequence of the destruction of merchandise and other property by the late fire in New York.

Mr. Webster offered a few observations on the circumstances and extent of the fire.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. Ewing, pursuant to notice, rose to ask leave to introduce a bill to define and settle the northern boundary line of the State of Ohio.

Leave being granted, Mr. Ewing introduced the bill, which was read and ordered to a second reading.

On motion of Mr. Webster, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Grundy, Mr. Southard, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Black, and Mr. White, such parts of the President's Message as had reference to the subjects pertaining to the Committees of which they are Chairmen, were referred to those Committees.

Interdinary Publications.—Mr. Calhoun moved that so much of the President's Message as refers to the transmission of Interdinary Publications by mail, be referred to a Special Committee.

On this motion some debate took place, in which the affirmative of the proposition was sustained by Messrs. Preston, Mangum, Clayton, Goldsborough, Leigh, Ewing, and Davis, and the negative by Messrs. King, of Alabama, Grundy, Buchanan, and Brown.

The motion of Mr. Calhoun was carried in the affirmative—ayes 23.

On motion of Mr. Calhoun, the committee was ordered to consist of five Senators.

The Senate proceeded to ballot for the committee, when the following Senators were elected, viz: Messrs. Calhoun, King of Ga., Mangum, Davis, and Linn.

HOUSE.—*Relief of the Sufferers by the Fire in New York.*—Mr. Cambreleng rose, he said, to throw himself on the indulgence of the House, for the purpose of asking what he was sure would be granted—the unanimous consent of the House to report a bill from the Committee of Ways and Means, for the relief of the sufferers by the late fire in the city of New York.

Mr. Cambreleng, from the Committee of Ways and Means, then presented the following report and bill:

In considering what measures were best calculated to moderate the shock upon the trade, revenue, and industry, of the country, by the late calamitous fire in New York, three propositions were suggested to the Committee, viz: the extension of the credit on bonds due from those who have suffered, three, four, and five years—placing the vast surplus revenue of the country where they may be more actively and extensively employed, in our cities, in extending relief to the embarrassed and impoverished debtors of Government, and remitting the duty on all merchandise destroyed in original packages. The Committee submit a bill embracing the two first propositions. The first provision is in accordance with the practice of Government heretofore—the second, while it will most extensively relieve the immediate wants of trade, and aid in reviving the energies of the commercial capital of the Union, cannot diminish in any manner the security of Government, or em-

barrass the operations of the Treasury. The question of remitting duties on property destroyed was also considered by the Committee, but appearing to require previous examination and more deliberation, and not wishing to delay the proposed measures of relief, it was not finally acted on. A BILL for the relief of the sufferers by fire in the City of New York.

Whereas, various persons are indebted to the United States for duties on merchandise, for which bonds have been given, with one or more sureties, payable to the collector for the District of New York, and the said persons have suffered a loss of property by the late conflagration at that place,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Collector of the Port of New York be, and he is hereby authorized, as he may deem best calculated to secure the interests of the United States, to cause to be extended (with the assent of the sureties thereon) the time of payment of all bonds heretofore given for duties as aforesaid, to periods not exceeding an average of three, four, and five years, or to allow the said bonds to be cancelled upon giving to the said Collector new bonds, with one or more sureties, to the satisfaction of the said Collector, for the sums of the former bonds, respectively payable, in average periods of three, four, and five years, from and after the day of payment specified in the bonds to be taken up or cancelled as aforesaid. And the said Collector is hereby authorized and directed to give up or cancel all such bonds upon the receipt of others described in this act; which last mentioned bonds shall be proceeded with, in all respects like other bonds which are taken by Collectors for duties due to the United States: Provided, however, that nothing in this act contained shall extend to bonds which had fallen due before the 17th day of the present month.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted by authority aforesaid, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to such Banks as he may select any surplus moneys of the Government, or any part thereof, which may not be required for the public service, and to permit the same to remain in such Banks for twelve months from the passage of this Act.

After the reading of the bill, Mr. Cambreleng said there was another subject before the Committee which was not definitely acted on, viz: the remission of duties on goods destroyed, which required more examination and deliberation. The subject was brought before the Committee by the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting letters from the Collector of the port of New York. He would not detain the House by any remarks on the subject now; and merely remarking that it was with infinite regret for the cause of it that he found himself called upon, as the first act in his new situation, to bring in a bill of this description, he would ask the indulgence of the House to take up the subject to-morrow.

The bill was read twice, and committed to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. Jarvis, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported a bill providing for the enlistment of boys for the naval service; with a report; read twice, and committed.

The House resumed the consideration of the petition from sundry inhabitants of the town of Wrentham, in Massachusetts, praying the Abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

The motion to reject the petition still pending, Mr. Owens, after some remarks with a view to reconcile the conflicting opinions of the members on the subject of the disposition of this and similar petitions, moved to lay the petition and all motions respecting it on the table, stating that, if it prevailed, he should offer the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the question of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, ought not to be entertained by Congress.

And be it further *Resolved* That in case any petitions praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia be hereafter presented, it is the deliberate opinion of this House that the same ought to be laid on the table without reading.

Mr. Owens expressed the hope that the resolutions would be accepted by the gentleman from South Carolina, in lieu of his motion to reject the petition.

Mr. Hammond was very sorry, he said, that he could not accept the proposition, and he hoped the gentleman from Georgia would withdraw his motion.

Mr. Wise proposed to amend the first resolution by adding "because Congress has no power to legislate on it under the Constitution of the United States;" and to amend the second by striking out all after the word "Resolved," and inserting "that this House will not receive any future memorials on that subject," adding that, with these modifications, he would vote for the resolutions.

Mr. Owens declined the acceptance of the amendments as modifications of his resolutions.

Mr. Patton asked what would be the consequence of laying the motion on the table? Would the resolutions of the gentleman from Georgia then be in order?

The Chair replied they would not. It would be in order to move to suspend the rule, to allow him to move them, or, when the States were called for resolutions, they might be offered without suspension of the rule.

The question being taken on the motion to lay the petition and all the motions relating to it on the table, it was decided as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Chilton Allan, Anthony, Ashley, Barton, Beale, Bean, Beardsley, Beaumont, Bockee, Boon, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Buchanan, Burns, Cambreleng, Carr, Carter, Casey, George Chambers, Chaney, Chapman, Chapin, Cleveland, Coffee, Coles, Craig, Cramer, Cushman, Davis, Deberry, Dickerson, Doubleday, Droughtole, Effner, Fairfield, Farlin, Forester, French, Fry, William K. Fuller, Gilbrith, James Garland, Gilet, Grantland, Graves, Haley, Hamer, Hannegan, Harlan, Harlan, Samuel S. Harrison, Albert G. Harrison, Hopkins, Haynes, Henderson, Holsby, Hopkins, Howard, Howell, Hubley, Huntington, Huntsman, Ingersoll, Ingham, Jabez, Jackson, Jarvis, Joseph Johnson, Richard M. Johnson, Cave Johnson, John W. Jones, Benjamin Jones, Jenson, Kilgore, Kinnard, Klingensmith, Lane, Lansing, Laporte, Gideon Lee, Joshua Lee, Thomas Lee, Leonard, Logan, Loyall, Lucas, Lyon, Alajah Mann, Job Mann, Martin, John Y. Mason, William Mason, Moses Mason, Sampson Mason, May, McComas, McKeon, McKio, McLene, Mercer, Miller, Montgomery, Morgan, Mulenberg, Owens, Page, Parks, Patterson, Franklin Pearce, Phelps, Pinkney, Reacher, John Reynolds, Joseph Reynolds, Ripley, Roane, Rogers, Schenck, Seymour, William B. Shepard, Augustine B. Shepherd, Shinn, Smith, Spangler, Sutherland, Tallaferte, Taylor, Thomas, John Thomson, Toucey, Turrill, Underwood, Vanderpool, Wagner, Ward, Wardwell, Webster, Weeks, Lewis Williams, Sherrod Williams—149.

Nays—Messrs. Adams, Heman Allen, Bailey, Bell, Bond, Borden, Bonidin, Briggs, Bunch, William B. Calhoun, Campbell, J. Chambers, Childs, Claiborne, Clark, Cooner, Crane, Cushing, Darlington, Dennis, Dunlap, Evans, Everett, Fowler, Philip C. Fuller, Rice Garland, Glascock, Graham, Granger, Grayson, Greenwood, Griffin, Joseph Hall, Hildner Hall, Hammond, Hard, Harper, Hazeltine, Heister, Hear, Hunt, William Jackson, James Henry Johnson, Lawler, Lawrence, Lay, Luke Lea, Lincoln, Love, Maury, McCarty, McKay, McKean, Molligan, Morris, Parker, Patton, Du-

tee J. Pearce, James A. Pearce, Pittigrew, Pickens, Potts, Reed, Robertson, Russell, Shields, Slade, Sloane, Sprague, Standefer, Storck, Waddy Thompson, White, Whitteley, Wise—76.

So the petition and all the motions depending thereon were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. Owens moved that the Rules of the House be suspended, in order to allow him to offer the resolutions he had already indicated to the House, on which he asked for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

The question being taken, it was decided in the negative—Yeas 100, Nays 113.

So the House refused to suspend the Rule.—[Two-thirds of the members present would have been necessary to carry that question.]

Mr. Patton called up the motion made by him on Friday last, to reconsider the vote of the House by which a petition for the abolition of slavery in the District, presented by a gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Briggs,) was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A debate ensued on the motion to reconsider, in which Messrs. Patton, J. Q. Adams, Bouldin, and Hammond took part; but without taking the question, the House adjourned, at the usual hour.

The "SPECIAL MESSAGE."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT TO BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS.

Monday, January 18, 1836.

To the Senate and House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: In my message at the opening of your session, I informed you that our Charge d'Affaires at Paris had been instructed to ask for the final determination of the French Government in relation to the payment of the indemnification secured by the treaty of the 4th of July, 1831, and that, when advices of the result should be received, it would be made the subject of a special communication.

In execution of this design, I now transmit to you the papers numbered from 1 to 13 inclusive, containing, among other things, the correspondence on this subject between our Charge d'Affaires and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, from which it will be seen that France requires, as a condition precedent to the execution of a treaty unconditionally ratified, and to the payment of a debt acknowledged by all the branches of her Government to be due, that certain explanations shall be made, of which she dictates the terms. These terms are such that Government has already been officially informed cannot be complied with; and, if persisted in, they must be considered as a deliberate refusal on the part of France to fulfill engagements binding by the laws of nations, and held sacred by the whole civilized world. The nature of the act which France requires from this Government is clearly set forth in the letter of the French Minister, marked No. 4. We will pay the money, says he, when "the Government of the United States is ready on its part to declare to us, by addressing its claim to us officially in writing, that it regrets the misunderstanding which has arisen between the two countries; that this misunderstanding is founded on a mistake; that it never entered into its intention to call in question the good faith of the French Government, nor to take a menacing attitude towards France;" and he adds, "if the Government of the United States does not give this assurance, we shall be obliged to think that this misunderstanding is not the result of an error."

In the letter marked No. 6, the French Minister also remarks that "the Government of the United States knows that upon itself depends henceforward the execution of the Treaty of July 4, 1831."

Obliged, by the precise language thus used by the French Minister, to view it as a pre-emptory refusal to execute the Treaty, except on terms incompatible with the honor and independence of the United States, and persuaded that, on considering the correspondence now submitted to you, you can regard it in no other light, it becomes my duty to call your attention to such measures as the exigency of the case demands, if the claim of interfering in the communications between the different branches of our Government shall be persisted in. This pretension is rendered the more unreasonable by the fact that the substance of the required explanation has been repeatedly and voluntarily given before it was insisted on as a condition—a condition the more humiliating because it is demanded as the equivalent of a pecuniary consideration. Does France desire only a declaration that we had no intention to obtain our rights by an address to her fears rather than to her justice? She has already had it, frankly and explicitly given by our Minister accredited to her Government, his act ratified by me, and my confirmation of it officially communicated by him, in his letter to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs of the 25th of April, 1835, and repeated by my published approval of that letter after the passage of the bill of indemnification. Does France want a degrading, servile repetition of this act in terms which she shall dictate, and which will involve an acknowledgment of her assumed right to interfere in our domestic councils? She will never obtain it. The spirit of the American People, the dignity of the Legislature, and the firm resolve of their Executive Government, forbid it.

As the answer of the French Minister to our Charge d'Affaires at Paris contains an allusion to a letter addressed by him to the Representative of France at this place, it now becomes proper to lay before you the correspondence had between that functionary and the Secretary of State relative to that letter, and to accompany the same with such explanations as will enable you to understand the course of the Executive in regard to it. Recurring to the historical statement made at the commencement of your session, of the origin and progress of our difficulties with France, it will be recollected that, on the return of our Minister to

the United States, I caused my official approval of the explanations he had given to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs to be made public. As the French Government had noticed the message without its being officially communicated, it was not doubted that, if they were disposed to pay the money due to us, they would notice any public explanation of the Government of the United States in the same way. But, contrary to these well-founded expectations, the French Ministry did not take this fair opportunity to relieve themselves from their unfortunate position, and to do justice to the United States.

Whilst, however, the Government of the United States was awaiting the movements of the French Government, in perfect confidence that the difficulty was at an end, the Secretary of State received a call from the French Charge d'Affaires in Washington, who desired to read to him a letter he had received from the French Minister of Foreign Affairs. He was asked whether he was instructed or directed to make any official communication, and replied, that he was only authorized to read the letter, and furnish a copy if requested. The substance of its contents, it is presumed, may be gathered from Nos. 4 and 6, herewith transmitted. It was an attempt to make known to the Government of the United States, privately, in what manner it could make explanations, apparently voluntary, but really dictated by France, acceptable to her, and thus obtain payment of the twenty-five millions of francs. No exception was taken to this mode of communication, which is often used to prepare the way for official intercourse; but the suggestions made in it were in their substance wholly inadmissible. Not being in the shape of an official communication to this Government, it did not admit of reply or official notice, nor could it safely be made the basis of any action by the Executive or Legislature: and the Secretary of State did not think proper to ask a copy, because he could have no use for it.

Copies of papers marked Nos. 9, 10, and 11, show an attempt, on the part of the French Charge d'Affaires to place a copy of this letter among the archives of this Government, which, for obvious reasons, was not allowed to be done; but the assurance before given was repeated, that any official communication which he might be authorized to make, in the accustomed form, would receive a prompt and just consideration. The indiscretion of this attempt was made more manifest by the subsequent avowal of the French Charge d'Affaires, that the object was to bring this letter before Congress and the American People. If foreign agents, on a subject of disagreement between their Government and this, wish to prefer an appeal to the American People, they will hereafter, it is hoped, better appreciate their own rights and the respect due to others, than to attempt to use the Executive as the passive organ of their communications.

It is due to the character of our institutions, that the diplomatic intercourse of this Government should be conducted with the utmost directness and simplicity; and that, in all cases of importance, the communications received or made by the Executive should assume the accustomed official form. It is only by insisting on this form, that foreign Powers can be held to full responsibility, that their communications can be officially replied to, or that the advice or interference of the Legislature can with propriety be invited by the President. This course is also best calculated, on the one hand, to shield that officer from unjust suspicions, and, on the other, to subject this portion of his acts to public scrutiny, and, if occasion shall require it, to constitutional animadversion. It was the more necessary to adhere to these principles in the instance in question, inasmuch as, in addition to other important interests, it very intimately concerned the national honor—a matter, in my judgment, much too sacred to be made the subject of private and unofficial negotiation.

It will be perceived that this letter of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was read to the Secretary of State on the 11th of September last. This was the first authentic indication of the specific views of the French Government received by the Government of the United States after the passage of the bill of indemnification. Inasmuch as the letter had been written before the official notice of my approval of Mr. Livingston's last explanation and remonstrance could have reached Paris, just ground of hope was left, as has been before stated, that the French Government, on receiving that information in the same manner the alleged offensive message had reached them, would desist from their extraordinary demand, and pay the money at once. To give them an opportunity to do so, and at all events to elicit their final determination, and the ground they intended to occupy, the instructions were given to our Charge d'Affaires which were adverted to at the commencement of the present session of Congress. The result, as you have seen, is a demand of an official written expression of regrets, and a direct explanation addressed to France, with a distinct intimation that this is a *sine qua non*.

Mr. Barton having, in pursuance of his instructions, returned to the United States, and the Charge d'Affaires of France having been recalled, all diplomatic intercourse between the two countries is suspended—a state of things originating in an unreasonable susceptibility on the part of the French Government, and rendered necessary on

our part by their refusal to perform engagements contained in a treaty, from the faithful performance of which, by us, they are to this day enjoying many important commercial advantages.

It is time that this unequal position of affairs should cease, and that legislative action should be brought to sustain executive exertion in such measures as the case requires. While France persists in her refusal to comply with the terms of a treaty, the object of which was, by removing all causes of mutual complaint, to renew ancient feelings of friendship, and to unite the two nations in the bonds of amity and of mutually beneficial commerce, she cannot justly complain if we adopt such peaceful remedies as the Law of Nations and the circumstances of the case may authorize and demand. Of the nature of these remedies I have heretofore had occasion to speak, and, in reference to a particular contingency, to express my conviction that reprisals would be best adapted to the emergency then contemplated.

Since that period, France, by all the departments of her Government, has acknowledged the validity of our claims, and the obligations of the treaty, and has appropriated the moneys which are necessary to its execution; and, though payment is withheld on grounds vitally important to our existence as an independent Nation, it is not to be believed that she can have determined permanently, to retain a position so utterly indefensible. In the altered state of the questions in controversy, and under all existing circumstances, it appears to me that, until such a determination shall have become evident, it will be proper, and sufficient to retaliate her present refusal to comply with her engagements, by prohibiting the introduction of French products and the entry of French vessels into our ports. Between this and the interdiction of all commercial intercourse or other remedies, you, as the representatives of the People, must determine. I recommend the former, in the present posture of our affairs, as being the least injurious to our commerce, and attended with the least difficulty of returning to the usual state of friendly intercourse, if the Government of France shall renounce the justice that is due, and, also, as a proper preliminary step to stronger measures, should their adoption be deemed necessary by subsequent events.

The return of our Charge d'Affaires attended with public notices of naval preparations on the part of France destined for our seas. Of the cause and intent of these armaments I have no authentic information, nor any other means of judging except such as are common to yourselves and to the public; but, whatever may be their object, we are not at liberty to regard them as unconnected with the measures which hostile movements on the part of France may compel us to pursue. They at least deserve to be met by adequate preparations on our part; and I therefore strongly urge large and speedy appropriations for the increase of the navy and the completion of our coast defences.

If this array of military force be really designed to affect the action of the Government and People of the United States on the questions now pending between the two nations, then, indeed, would it be discomfiting to pause a moment on the alternative which such a state of things would present to us. Come what may, the explanation which France demands can never be accorded; and no argument, however powerful and imposing, at a distance or on our coast, will, I trust, deter us from discharging the high duties which we owe to our constituents, our national character, and to the world.

The House of Representatives, at the close of the last session of Congress, unanimously resolved that the treaty of the 4th of July, 1831, should be maintained, and its execution insisted on by the United States. It is due to the welfare of the human race, not less than to our own interests and honor, that this resolution should, at all hazards, be adhered to. If, after so signal an example as that given by the American People during their long protracted difficulties with France, of forbearance under accumulated wrongs, and of generous confidence in her ultimate return to justice, she shall now be permitted to withhold from us the tardy and imperfect indemnification which, after years of remonstrance and discussion, had at length been solemnly agreed on by the treaty of 1831, and to set at naught the obligation it imposes, the United States will not be the only sufferers. The efforts of humanity and religion, to substitute the appeals of justice and the arbitration of reason for the coercive remedies usually resorted to by injured nations, will receive little encouragement from such an issue. By the selection and enforcement of such lawful and expedient measures as may be necessary to prevent a result so injurious to ourselves and so fatal to the hopes of the philanthropist, we shall therefore not only preserve the pecuniary interests of our citizens, the independence of our Government, and the honor of our country, but do much, it may be hoped, to vindicate the faith of treaties, and to promote the general interests of peace, civilization, and improvement.

ANDREW JACKSON

Washington, Jan. 15, 1836.

Death of the Ettrick Shepherd.—The Dunfriesshire Courier of the 25th November, announces, on the authority of a letter from Altrive, the decease of JAMES HOGG, better known as the Ettrick Shepherd, on the 21st.