The question being now taken on Mr. Calhoun's amendment to the amendment of Mr. Clay, it was decided by yeas and nays, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Archer, Barrow, Benton, Berrien, Buchanan, Calhoun, Clay of Alabama, Fulton, Kerr, King, McRoberts, Merrick, Nicholson, Pierce, Preston, Rives, Sevier, Smith of Connecticut, Sturgeon, Tappan, Williams, Woodbury, Wright, Young—25.

Nays—Messrs. Bates, Bayard, Choate, Clay of Kentucky, Clayton, Dixon, Evans, Graham, Henderson, Huntington, Mangum, Miller, Morehead, Phelps, Porter, Prentiss, Simmons, Smith of Indiana, Southard, Tallmadge, Walker, White—22.

So the amendment to the amendment was adopted.

The question then recurring on the amendment as thus amended, it was decided by yeas and nays, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Benton, Buchanan, Calhoun, Clay of Ala., Fulton, King, McRoberts, Nicholson, Pierce, Sevier, Smith of Conn., Sturgeon, Tappan, White, Williams, Woodbury, Wright, Young—19.

Nays—Messrs. Archer, Barrow, Bates, Bayard, Berrien, Choate, Clay of Ky., Clayton, Dixon, Evans, Graham, Henderson, Huntington, Kerr, Mangum, Merrick, Miller, Morehead, Phelps, Porter, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Simmons, Smith of Ia., Southard, Tallmadge, Walker, Woodbridge—29.

So the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. CLAY said that the effect of the last vote was, to leave the bill in the form in which it had been reported. If it should in this form pass both Houses of Congress, and become a law, the State bank system, as regulated in 1836, would be revived and continue in force until a substitute should be adopted by Congress.

Mr. C. took it for granted that a substitute of some description would pass; but if, unfortunately, Congress should be unable to agree upon any substitute, whether in the form of a bank or other fiscal agent, then he presumed that Congress would set about discharging the duty of rendering the State bank system as efficient and perfect as possible. After the gallant course pursued by the honorable Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Walker,) Mr. C. considered it as proper for him, also, to state that he would vote for that system under no circumstances—none whatever—none. He had ever been opposed to the plan, and would not have given his vote for the law of 1836 on any other ground than that that law contained the principle of a distribution of the surplus fund among the States. No, if gentlemen on the other side choose to put themselves in command of such a miserable fleet, he did not care under what Commodore, Mr. C. and his friends were ready to meet them upon any sea, and he doubted not that the encounter would result in such a victory as Perry had achieved on one of our great lakes, or the brave McDonough on another.

Mr. CALHOUN would say to the Senator from Kentucky that he was fighting against an imaginary flag if he supposed that the gentlemen on that side of the House meant to contend for the State bank system. No. They intended to go into battle under the noble flag of the Sub-Treasury. He was glad that the Senator had been compelled to say that if the Sub-Treasury should be repealed, the law of 1836 would be enforced. If that law as it now stood should in practice be found impracticable, the difficulty would fall chiefly on the South and Southwest.

Mr. CLAY said he had never doubted that the law of 1836 would revive; but, when he had introduced his bill to repeal the Sub-Treasury, he had given notice that that was the first in a series, and had avowed, openly, his preference for a Bank of the U. S. If, then, the law of 1836 did revive in its present form, he hoped it would be but for a very short time. But, if otherwise, it must undergo a complete revision.

Mr. YOUNG, of Illinios, proposed to amend the bill, first by inserting the words "neglect or" before the word "refuse," in the clause making a refusal to pay over public moneys to the order of Government *prima facie* evidence of embezzlement; which amendment was accepted by Mr. Clay and, adopted by the Senate: and in the second place further to amend the bill in such a manner as to provide that if an agent of the Government, previous to his refusal to pay over public money, should put his property out of his hands by assignment or other conveyance, that act should be pronounced a felony, and subject him to all the penalties of embezzlement.

Mr. CLAY said he could not agree to this amendment. He thought it pushed the penal principle rather too far. To declare the fraudulent conveyance of property a felony was going beyond any law with which he was acquainted, and there might besides, be many cases where the fact of conveyance was doubtful.

Mr. YOUNG observed that the case was one of very frequent occurrence, at least in the West, and some punishment ought to be provided for it. If gentlemen would not declare it felony, would they consent that it should be held as a conspiracy to defraud the U. States?

Mr. HUNTINGTON admitted that it was very desirable to prevent such frauds, but the courts were open, and he thought would provide a sufficient remedy. At all events, he could not consent to declare a fraudulent conveyance felony.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENTON moved the following amendments:

And provided further, That the following section and parts of said bill shall be excepted from this repeal and shall remain and continue in force, to wit: Sections 19 and 20, section 21, section 25, section 2, and so much of the 19th section as makes it felony in disbursing officers and persons connected with the Post Office Department to use the public money for their own or other purposes; and a neglect or refusal to pay over public moneys on demand or to transfer or disburse them shall be *prima facie* evidence of an embezzlement of the same.

Sec. . *And be it further enacted*, That the Bank of the United States, commonly called the Pennsylvania Bank of the United States, and its branches and the local Banks and agencies owned by it, shall not be entrusted with the collection, or safe-keeping, or transfer, or disbursement of the public moneys, or any part thereof.

And he asked that the question be divided, and that a vote be taken on each question by yeas and nays, and they were ordered by the Senate.

The item with regard to the Bank of the United States at Philadelphia having been read,

Mr. CLAY said that he had no hesitation in declaring, after all the disclosures that had recently been made, that he should deprecate as much as any gentleman could do the employment of that Bank, by the Government, as a depository for the public funds. He had intimated the opinion, as much as three years ago, that the Government was cut loose from that institution, from the period of its charter, by the State of Pennsylvania. But still he could not consent to the adoption of such an amendment as that proposed. If the Senate was to declare its disapprobation of the management of a particular Bank, there were many others, such as the Owl Creek Bank, &c., which might, with equal justice, be included in the denunciation. He did not, however, consider it as comporting with the dignity of the Senate to enter upon any such course of discrimination, and he hoped the amendment would not prevail.

Mr. BENTON admitted that other Banks had behaved very badly, but the case of this Bank stood distinguished from all others, because it had originally come into existence under a charter from the United States, and the eyes of foreigners were, in a peculiar manner, fixed upon it. Mr. B. proceeded to speak with much warmth against the course of the Bank, generally, and especially on its bringing upon itself the last suspension by an underhanded and swindling endeavor to break the New York Banks. He accused it as having plotted the suspension in 1837, and as being in effect the only obstacle to a resumption of specie payments by all the Banks of the South. They had recently made an effort to resume, but this Bank had instantly run upon them and forced them to return to a suspension.

Mr. BAYARD admitted the culpability of the Bank, but opposed the amendment as unnecessary, because the law of 1836 expressly prohibited the Government from employing any Bank which did not pay specie.

Mr. WOODBURY, in reply to this, explained the construction of that law by the Treasury Department. When that Department had funds to deposite, and no Bank could be found which conformed to the provisions of the law of 1836, the Department considered itself as thrown back on the previous law, and under that law at liberty to place the deposites in non-specie-paying Banks. What else could it do, unless it threw the money into the streets?

Mr. DIXON said he should vote against the amendment, both because he thought it improper to refer to individual Banks, and especially because this Bank assigned as one cause of its suspension the hard treatment of the United States Government.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Archer, Benton, Buchanan, Calhoun, Clay of Ala., Fulton, King, McRoberts, Nicholson, Pierce, Sevier, Smith of Conn., Sturgeon, Tappan, Walker, Williams, Woodbury, Wright, Young—20.

Nays—Messrs. Barrow, Bates, Bayard, Berrien, Choate, Clay of Ky., Clayton, Dixon, Evans, Graham, Henderson, Huntington, Kerr, Mangum, Merrick, Miller, Morehead, Phelps, Porter, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Simmons, Smith of Ia., Southard, Tallmadge, White, Woodbridge—28.

Mr. TALLMADGE objected to that clause of the bill which made a refusal to pay over money to the order of the Government *prima facie* evidence of embezzlement, as violating the great principle of criminal law, that every man is to be held innocent until he is proved to be guilty. It might so happen that an innocent agent, through the death of his witnesses, might be unable to prove his innocence; and would it not be hard to convict and punish him in such a case, by throwing the burden of proof on him instead of taking it upon the Government?

Mr. MANGUM replied that, while the rule operated very favorably for the Government, it inflicted no real injury on individuals. It was intended to cover such cases as that of the late Collector in New York, who set the Government at defiance, and held over the public moneys to a great amount, because he was subject only to a civil prosecution. As between man and man, Mr. M. should be unwilling to adopt such a principle; but if a man undertook to serve the Government, knowing beforehand that this was one of the conditions of his service, he thought it not unfair, for after all he was subjected only to a suit in a court of law.

Mr. WOODBURY approved of the clause in the bill, but wished it slightly amended by adding the words draft or order to the word warrant; which amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALLMADGE further supported his position, insisting that it was a mere question of evidence, and that the Government gained nothing, while it violated a great principle of law, and ran the risk of inflicting cruel injury on an innocent man.

Messrs. BAYARD and PRESTON replied to his objection, and defended the clause in question, denying that this was any more a violation of the principle of law than a multitude of other cases where the law assumed certain facts as *prima facie* evidence of guilt, and imposed the burden of proof on the accused. If one man killed another, it was *prima facie* evidence of murder; if a man held stolen goods, it was *prima facie* evidence of theft. The *prima facie* evidence did not convict him, but he was held to explain, because he, of all other persons, was best able to explain. And even in civil cases, when a man refused to deliver up goods claimed by another, the law held it as *prima facie* evidence of conversion, and as laying the foundation for an action of trover.

Mr. WALKER confirmed this view, and illustrated it by the case of infanticide, when the violent death of an illegitimate infant was *prima facie* evidence of murder on the part of the mother.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was further slightly amended, on motion of Mr. HENDERSON, but how, the reporter could not hear.

The amendments were then concurred in by the Senate, and the bill ordered to be engrossed, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Archer, Barrow, Bates, Bayard, Berrien, Buchanan, Choate, Clay of Ky., Clayton, Dixon, Evans, Graham, Henderson, Huntington, Ker, Mangum, Merrick, Miller, Southard, Morehead, Phelps, Porter, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Simmons, Smith of Ind., Tallmadge, White and Woodbridge—30.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Benton, Calhoun, Clay of Ala., Fulton, King, Nicholson, Pierce, Sevier, Smith of Conn., Tappan, Walker, Williams, Woodbury, Wright and Young—16.

It was then ordered to be printed.

And the Senate adjourned.

IN SENATE.

Wednesday, June 9, 1841.

The President of the Senate communicated a letter from the Treasurer of the U. S. containing a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Post Office Department for the year 1840.

Mr. CLAY moved that the communication be laid on the table, and if it was usual he would move that it be printed. While on the subject of printing, he would submit whether it would not be better to have a committee to investigate that branch of business, and report whether it would be right and proper to print those voluminous documents which found their way to the tables.

The following memorials and petitions were presented and appropriately referred:

By Mr. TALLMADGE: From the Chamber of Commerce of the city of New York, praying the establishment of a National Bank.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Resolutions from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in favor of the repeal of the Sub-Treasury.

When the resolutions were read—

Mr. CLAY observed "Ah! I like that—it is in the good old Democratic language."

By Mr. MOREHEAD: From the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, asking the establishment of a National Bank.

By Mr. ALLEN: From citizens of Ohio, in favor of the passage of a general bankrupt law.

By Mr. CLAY of Alabama: A memorial of the General Assembly of that State, asking the establishment of a land district in the Cherokee purchase.

By Mr. STURGEON: From the Anti Slavery Society of the city and county of Philadelphia, praying the abolition of slavery, &c.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: From the Association of Friends, asking the improvement of the condition of people of color, and asking the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and the prevention of the domestic slave trade.

Mr. PRESTON and Mr. KING moved the question of consideration on the reception of the paper, but the Chair did not hear the motion until a motion had been made to lay the memorial on the table.

Mr. KING insisted that, according to the practice of the Senate in previous years, it was the duty of the Chair to take it for granted that the question of reception had been made.

The PRESIDENT replied that there was no rule of the Senate to that effect, and, therefore, the Chair had not chosen to assume the responsibility of making that presumption.

Mr. BUCHANAN coincided in the view taken by Mr. King as the practice of the Senate, and observed that nothing but benefit had ensued from its observance. All agitation had entirely ceased so far as the Senate was concerned, and he hoped the practice would be perpetual. The question of reception was understood as made, that question was then laid on the table, and there was an end of the matter. Though he had held it his duty to present this paper, he hoped the same course would be observed with regard to this as to others.

Further conversation on the question of order took place on the part of Mr. MERRICK, Mr. KING, Mr. PRESTON, and Mr. CLAY; the result of which was, that whenever the President of the Senate was acquainted with the fact that the presentation of a description of papers was objected to by any member of the body, it was his duty to consider the question of reception as made, and that then, on motion made, the question might be laid on the table, and thus the whole subject in a quiet and summary manner be disposed of.

In conformity with this understanding, the memorial presented by Mr. Buchanan was disposed of.

Mr. RIVES called up his several times deferred motion to refer so much of the President's message as related to our foreign relations to the Committee on Foreign Relations; not because he wished to submit any views in relation to the report of the Secretary of State, but because the motion had been delayed at the suggestion of the honorable Senator from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Buchanan,) who was understood to be desirous of submitting some opinions in which he differed from the views of the Secretary on certain points of international law.

Mr. CLAY said he should be very happy to listen to the discussion alluded to; but as it was one out of which it was not proposed or expected that any action of the Senate should ensue, he thought it desirable that the motion should be postponed for to-day, as a very important measure was before the body. Mr. C. thought it entirely fair that all reasonable opportunity ought to be extended to gentlemen who were desirous of animadverting on the course of the Government; but in the existing circumstances he must be excused for moving that the motion of the honorable Senator be deferred till to-morrow.

Mr. RIVES said the gentleman from Kentucky had entirely mistaken his purpose, if he supposed he was desirous on his own account of having this subject now taken up. It was with a view to accommodate the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose remarks might possibly render it necessary for him to say a few words in reply.

Mr. BUCHANAN said he had been anxious to submit some remarks in reference to some positions taken by the Secretary of State, which he considered as important. He had no purpose of intruding himself upon the Senate; but he had come prepared these two or three mornings to say what he wished to say on this matter. Under such circumstances, a subject was apt to grow very cold.

Mr. CLAY said, nothing in the world could have been farther from his thoughts and his heart than to do any thing injurious to the feelings of his honorable friend from Pennsylvania, but he would remind his friend that it had been on his own motion that the reference now moved for had been heretofore postponed. There was now in progress before the Senate a measure, in the consummation of which, many of the members felt a deep interest. Let that bill be disposed of, and then Mr. C. would listen with the greatest pleasure to the remarks of the honorable Senator. He moved to postpone the motion.

On this motion, Mr. ALLEN demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted yeas 27, nays 18.

So the motion was deferred till to-morrow.

Mr. CLAY submitted the following, which he merely desired to lie on the table for the present:

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns during the present session leaving a subject under discussion and undecided, the consideration of the subject shall be resumed at the next meeting of the Senate, immediately after the journal is read and petitions and reports are received, without waiting for the usual hour of one o'clock.

On motion of Mr. CALHOUN,

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to transmit to the Senate any communication from the Government of Prussia to our representative at that Court in reference to the duties laid on tobacco in the German States of the Customs Union which may be in the State Department.

Mr. WOODBURY submitted the following:

Resolved, That the President of the U. S. be requested to inform the Senate if any application has been made officially to him, or the State or Treasury Department, by the holders of State stocks, or others on their account, respecting the payment or assumption of them, and to furnish copies of any correspondence which has taken place in relation to those subjects.

Mr. DIXON submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate will on Thursday next proceed to the election of printer, the price to be paid to be the same as under the resolution of 1819, deducting 20 per cent. therefrom.

Mr. PRESTON gave notice that he would on to-morrow move to proceed to the election of chaplain under the joint resolution.

REPEAL OF THE SUB-TREASURY.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the special order, being the bill for the repeal of the Sub-Treasury law. This bill having had its third reading, the question was, "Shall it pass?"

Mr. WOODBURY said it had been his misfortune to be in a minority when this bill was considered in committee. He had there stated at that time his objections to its passage, nor had those objections been since removed, but, on the contrary, greatly strengthened. As the bill went to change the entire system of collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public money, he felt himself bound to present to the Senate those objections he had urged against it in the committee. He was aware that much impatience was felt by the majority, under remarks of this kind, but he could not feel himself excused without presenting his views upon the proposed measure, which, however, he should do as briefly as possible.

And in the first place he would remark, that when the Senate had resolved to change the system which was in existence previous to the adoption of the Sub-Treasury law, they had nevertheless suffered that system to continue in force until a substitute for it was matured and agreed upon, so that the Treasury was not left during any interval without the control of law, nor was the head of the Department thrown upon his own discretion under the provisions of the law of 1789. The Senate at that time had deemed it expedient to defer the repeal of one system of fiscal management until a substitute was provided.

Mr. W. could not see any sufficient reason for passing an act simply to repeal the Sub-Treasury law without inserting in the same act some provision as a substitute for it. This course had been pursued in 1836, and he could not perceive any sufficient reason why it should not be adopted in the present instance. The gentlemen themselves who urged the present bill had adopted this course at that time, and Mr. W. now invited them to cite a single precedent where a great system of fiscal operations had been abolished without either providing a substitute beforehand or inserting such provision in the act of abolition itself. This had been done on two former occasions, except in reference to the charter of the second Bank of the United States, and even then an express clause had been inserted, directing that the public funds should be transferred to the Bank, and that, until this was done, they should remain under the control of the system then in force. But here the bill provided for the isolated measure of repeal, without making the least provision in reference to a substitute to be adopted. The effect of this would be to throw back the Treasury on such resources as it could obtain by construction of previous laws. We had had an infinite deal of that within the last few years. It was said, indeed, that this state of things would in all probability endure but for a very short time; but he insisted that it ought not to be suffered to exist for a day or for an hour. No high officer of the Government, not the Executive himself, should be allowed the control of the public funds according to his own discretion or any doubtful or constrained interpretation of obsolete laws. There was no great public emergency at this time to require a dictatorship, with an absolute power over the public funds. Why, then, insist upon a measure like this? Why not defer the act of repeal until the substitute should be agreed upon? Why leave the whole treasure of the country at the discretion of the Executive, under old laws, which were held to be revived by construction? The bill before the Senate did not declare what law would be revived by its operation. Its whole effect was to pull down the edifice now existing, without placing by its side even a log-cabin or a shantee, leaving the inmates to seek shelter and security as they might. There was no crisis which required this urgent haste. It would be just as easy to defer the final repeal till proper provision had been made to meet it, and thus avoid all those difficulties which must now accompany the measure. It was no answer for gentlemen to say that they intended to provide some other measure in a short time. He had no doubt they were sincere in that intention, but they might avoid the difficulty altogether. Let him tell gentlemen that the Senate had recently had an example of this intention to postpone action only for a short time, and it went to show how easily that short time came to be extended. When this Senate had been organized on the 4th of March, the gentlemen now in the majority had insisted that it was necessary, in order to a proper organization of the body, to remove the former Printers from office. And why? Because they intended, in a very short time, to appoint somebody to supply the place. Who at that time so much as dreamed that the body would remain to this day without a Printer, and thrown upon the absolute discretion of its President and Secretary to employ any body they pleased, and at any prices they chose to give to execute the printing of the body? The arguments of gentlemen looked very well: they did but remove the printer for a short time, a substitute was immediately to be provided, yet three or four months had elapsed, and there was no printer yet. This act, which gentlemen held to be indispensable to the organization of the body, had not been performed to this day, and the printing was done through agents whom the officers of the Senate chose, and not the Senate, and at prices which the officers fixed, and not the members of this body. Just so, it might be after destroying the Independent Treasury. The country might be left three or four months, possibly for as many years, without the adoption of any measure as a substitute for it; and in the meanwhile, the public money would be left under a more unlimited discretion than the public printing was left now.

After presenting these remarks, in opposition to the time proposed for the work of abolition, Mr. W. asked the attention of gentlemen to the substance of the measure itself. They came here to do a great public act on behalf of seventeen millions of people and twenty-six States of this Union. Ought they to do this without duly considering what was the duty required of them? And what must be the effect of their act, whether that effect were temporary or permanent? Without this, they could not act discreetly in abolishing an important existing system. Mr. W. would readily admit, as some gentlemen had suggested, that there had been much talk against the Sub-Treasury and some arguments, but no experience. It had been greatly abused and grossly misrepresented, but he was not prepared to admit that there had been any verdict of the people against it. Was the repeal or the continuance of this law the only issue made before the people at the late election? Was the result of that election a verdict on that issue alone? The Senator from Kentucky had said they had come here for judgment—to carry into effect the verdict of the American people, but he would ask that Senator whether the result of that election was to be held as a decision by the People on all the questions which had been discussed before them? If so, how did it happen that they were sitting there in that splendid Hall, lighted by the magnificent and costly candelabra now before them? Had it not been decided that there should be no extra session with all its unavoidable expenditure? That gentlemen must not eat out of gold spoons, but must use horn? That they must not indulge themselves in the luxury of champagne, but must drink only hard cider? Did not the verdict of the People cover all that? It was easy for gentlemen to talk about issues being decided by elections, but he asked, what had been the issue in 1829, and what had been the verdict given then?

The Senator had had some experience in such matters. Did he believe that the People had passed a verdict on all the questions which had been mooted during that election? No; nor did Mr. W. They had different questions argued then: they had had the question about soda water furnished at public expense, about billiard tables paid for out of the public money, and other grave issues of the like character. Did the Senator hold that the People had delivered their verdict on all these important points? Why cut out the Sub-Treasury from all the other subjects agitated at the late election, and say that the verdict of the People had been given on that issue? But, admitting that it had, some of the gentlemen held the doctrine that they were not bound even by express written instructions from their own constituents. Much less, then, were they bound by a verdict given on five hundred issues, given at cross-roads, given at grog shops and on the hustings. There was nothing in this argument. It answered very well to talk about for political effect; but the People decided no issues but such as they put on record. The issue they decided was, that they elected this man as their Chief Magistrate, and not that man. That was an issue by which all were bound, and which all must respect. But the evidence went no further. For that reason it was that he addressed arguments to gentlemen, and entreated them not to throw themselves on imaginary or uncertain issues. He asked them what they were abolishing? What were their reasons for abolishing it, and what were the facts of the case? The system which it was now proposed to destroy was one which had been matured with great caution, after prolonged consideration and much debate. Was it because it was a system which did not comport with the supposed civilization and refinement of modern times? Because it was not marked with all the graces and beauties of the credit system, and was not ornamented with all those classic figures which came with so much grace from the Philadelphia Bank of the United States and the Bank of Gallipolis?

He admitted that the system was somewhat antiquated; it had been tried for two or three centuries in other countries, and was at this time in full force in many parts of the civilized world. It could not, indeed, boast of all the modern polish and trimming and flourish, but it was a system which had been tried, and had worked well. Some other refinements had also been tried, and they had not worked well. Let gentlemen look around them—let them see the general crash which had prostrated so many of our moneyed institutions. This was the effect of the much-admired and beautiful credit system, and not of the system of 1840—a system much abused, but one which had worked well wherever it had been tried, and would work well again whenever the trial should be repeated.

Gentlemen were, besides, abolishing a system which they knew to be constitutional: the constitutionality of the Sub-Treasury law none denied or pretended to dispute. Was this no excellence? This system had been the first offspring of the Constitution; it existed in its essence in 1789. In the next place, it was a system independent in its operations: the name of "Independent Treasury," given to it by its friends, was not a mere word or empty sound. The system was independent, because it carried on its operations by the force of law, and did not depend either upon States or individuals to make it effective. All other systems were essentially dependent in their character; they were conducted by officers who were appointed by bank stockholders and the act of private individuals. Another great excellence of the Independent Treasury system was, that it was perfectly safe. There was one remark in the report submitted by the present Secretary of the Treasury which had struck Mr. W.'s attention. The Secretary talked about the insecurity of the Sub-Treasury, but, instead of supporting this position by a statement of what sums had been lost under that system, the report went back twelve years to losses which had happened previous to its adoption. The Secretary could not show the loss of a single dollar under this much abused system of conducting the fiscal concerns of Government.

[Mr. Clay here said, speaking across, "the accounts have not been settled yet."]

Mr. W. repeated the assertion that there was no evidence of the loss of one dollar by the Sub-Treasury. In contrast to which statement he pointed gentlemen to the general wreck which had attended the employment of banks. There were losses growing out of the species of currency employed, but such losses were effectually prevented by the Sub-Treasury system, which, when perfected, were to provide a currency subject to no depreciation. What would have been the loss suffered by Government had it employed the currency of the present Bank of Pennsylvania? There was admitted loss of four or five millions from the depreciation of bank paper. A committee of the other House had estimated the total loss to Government from the employment of banks at thirty-two millions. Again, the system now to be destroyed was one eminently free from Executive influence.

[A laugh on one side of the Senate.]

Mr. W. said that he was well aware that gentlemen on the other side insisted that the Sub-Treasury system was subjected to Executive influence in a greater degree than any other. But let them come down to facts. Could the Executive put his hands into the vaults of the Sub-Treasury and take out a single dollar without subjecting himself to be sent to the penitentiary? Would he not be indicted as a robber? Not a dollar could be drawn out but by warrants and drafts. Neither the President nor his Secretary of the Treasury could take from his custody enough to buy a pen, nor could they loan out the public money for purposes of speculation or gambling. If they attempted such a thing, they would be convicted of embezzlement and sent to prison. Was this the case under the bank system? Could not the Executive, or the Secretary, in person, or through their friends, be accommodated with loans by a Bank of the U. S. or by the pet banks? Had not the public money been lent in thousands and hundreds of thousands to friends of the bank, both out of Congress and in Congress? But when had a dollar of the public money been loaned under the Sub-Treasury? The thing could not be done without burglary and theft. And yet, strange to tell, the community seemed impressed with the idea that under that much-abused system the President and the Secretary of the Treasury could take and use for their own purposes just as much of the public money as they pleased.

Now, as to the Executive influence over the keepers of the public money (for that was the only possible way in which the money could be reached,) did not the President select the pet banks? Did not the Secretary do the same? Was there any check on the Executive discretion? Did not the bank directors elect their own Cashier and President? Had either House of Congress any control over that matter? But how was it under the Sub-Treasury? Did the President select the receivers-general or the treasurers of the mints? No more than he could select his own successor, or appoint a foreign minister without the consent of the Senate. Executive influence was limited, not extended, by that system, it brought the public money under the control of Congress. It gave to the Executive no new powers, for the power of removal existed before as it did now, but now it was restrained, whereas, under the bank system, it was not. Mr. W. would not now go into the doctrine of removal, nor would he show how that power had been exercised since the 4th of March, 1840. He believed the keepers of the public money had been no freer from removal than before that time. What had become of the receivers-general at New York? at Boston? Charleston? They had been disapproved, and others had been appointed in their place. It had been urged that the Executive could control these receivers through the power of removal, yet it did so happen that none of them had been so removed until March, 1841. So much for the argument on Executive influence.

But the Sub-Treasury system had yet one other and infinitely greater excellence. It did not stimulate the spirit of wild and reckless speculation by loaning out the public money. All such loans were, by that law, strictly prohibited and declared to be felony, and it was an acknowledgment and homage paid by the Senator from Kentucky to the excellence of that law, that, bent as he was on destroying the system, he retained this feature of it, and incorporated it in his own bill. That system provided no stimulus for over-trading. On the contrary, its effect was to subdue and quench that destructive fire which had consumed the prosperity of the country. It kept the public treasure where it could be had when it was wanted. Every receiver-general, every treasurer of a mint, must be ready to hand over every dollar of the funds in his hands on its demand by Government. But was this the case under the Bank? Far from it. When the money was most wanted by the Government it was most wanted by the Banks also. But Mr. W. would not protract these remarks; he could not, for his life, see any thing in the system itself to justify or excuse this hasty and precipitate effort to get rid of it at a blow.

But, in the next place, he was compelled to look at what must succeed this system when it was destroyed, whether it was to succeed temporarily or permanently. What would succeed it temporarily? Nothing was provided in the bill itself, but it was held under a sound general principle of law that, when an act repealing a previous law was itself repealed, the previous law revived *ipso facto*. Now, if the Sub-Treasury was destroyed, what law would be revived by its repeal? He would tell gentlemen. We were to have the act of 1836, with all its acknowledged imperfections in its train. Would this be a better system? Wise men did not pull down one thing to substitute another, unless that other were a better. The act of 1836 was not without some excellences. It contained a provision which restrained the Secretary from removing the deposites from a bank where they had been placed, provided that bank continued to redeem its notes in specie; it also forbade the depositing of the public money in non-specie-paying banks, and in banks issuing notes under five dollars. Some approved of the pet bank system in the abstract, because it was a system which could be regulated by law. When President Jackson had been forced to remove the public deposites from their former depository, and there existed no regulated system for the safe keeping of them, he had implored Congress to pass a law for that purpose, and they passed the law of 1836, which had these excellences. But they were countervailed by defects which broke it down in twelve months, and it was now a dead letter. One gentleman had suggested that it was destroyed by faults in its administration, and not in the system itself. This suggestion had been made before. Mr. W. would not say whether this were the case or not, but he saw ample cause for its failure without this. It provided that the twelve or thirteen millions of dollars which had been deposited in safe banks, should be taken out of them and divided among seventy or eighty others, for no other purpose than to give each of them the benefit of its possession. A bank was to be selected in every State, and the effect was general stimulation of the community to every form of speculation and gambling. The banks were required to pay interest for the money, at least for all they held over a given proportion, and they consented to pay the money, obviously, because they expected to loan it out. Was not this in itself sufficient to break down any set of banks in the world? Could such an operation be accomplished without infinite distress? To force twelve or thirteen millions of dollars out of the channels of trade, and to put it in entirely different depositories, was an operation which Mr. W. insisted to be the true cause of the commercial ruin which followed. That alone was sufficient to account for it; but if on the back of this, there was superadded the requirement to collect within nine months thirty six millions more, and pay it over to the States, was it any wonder that the most ruinous consequences should follow? No discretion was left to the Secretary; the time was fixed by law, and, should he fail to obey, he was liable to be impeached, and was actually threatened with impeachment. This he had actually done. He had collected nine millions, and deposited it with the States in specie, or in specie worth, and it was emphatically said at the time that every instalment in the payment of this money was a new turn of the screw.—The pressure rose from rheumatism to gout, and from gout to convulsion. All this suffering had been attributed to the Executive and to the Treasury Department, as though it were their wrong, when, in fact, they had but carried out the law of Congress.—Then came, in addition to all the rest, an unexampled recoil from abroad, produced by the course of the Bank of England. American credit was suddenly cut off by millions at a blow. Yet all this too, was charged upon the Treasury. And here he would relate an amusing anecdote. In compliance with the requisitions of the law, deposites of specie were made in North Carolina, which carried it out of the usual course of trade. The order to transfer the funds was given in advance, payable in North Carolina.—This was strenuously objected to, and the Secretary was asked why he did not make the order payable in New York? The Secretary was acquainted with the operations of trade, and knew that the order could better be met in North Carolina than in New York, because New York was then drained of specie. But the holders came to him and insisted that the drafts should be made payable in New York. He did so, and the holders immediately went to New York and demanded the specie, and found themselves so much embarrassed that there was not a man of them that was not glad to part with his draft after he had got it. It reminded Mr. W. of the Irishman who was ordered to be flogged, and when he was flogged low down wanted to be flogged higher up; but when flogged higher up, wanted to be flogged lower down. Mr. W. had been determined to execute the law, cost what it would, and let those who made it be answerable to posterity, that just tribunal whose judgments, though often slow, were ever according to equity. As might naturally have been expected, the newly made deposite banks, flushed with the possession of their twelve or thirteen millions of dollars, speedily disgorged this treasure upon the community, for they had been obliged to pay interest for it, and were glad to loan it out as soon as possible. The consequence of this had been that the land sales which usually realized from two to three millions of dollars were swelled to twenty-four millions in a single year. The banks which had loaned their money to individuals instead of to the Government, when called upon by Government to pay, could not collect it in, and the natural consequence was, that they all went to wreck—suspension was inevitable.—But these lamentable consequences were not to be charged to the administration of the pet bank system, but to the provisions of the law itself. And were gentlemen called upon now to revive such a system as this? Must the Secretary of the Treasury scatter the public money among eighty banks and revive again the scenes of 1836? It could not be done. The country then, though nominally thrown back on the law of 1836, would in fact and in truth be cast on the unlimited discretion of the Treasury Department; for the law having been rendered impracticable by the change of times, the Department must necessarily be thrown back on the laws in force before this was enacted. Mr. W. would undertake to say that there could not now be five banks found in the whole U. S. such as that act required deposite banks to be; and the act itself declared that in that case the Treasury must revert to the previous laws, and those previous laws allowed the deposites to be placed in banks which did not pay specie; and to place it there not merely on special but on general deposite. Nor was this any thing new—this very thing had been done by Secretaries Campbell and Dallas for years together, and it must be done again.

There were other consequences which must also follow. The Secretary would not merely be compelled to use Banks of this description, but he would be stripped of every facility in the business of his Department until he did make his selection among the Banks, and place the money there. He invited gentlemen to put inquiries to the Secretary of the Treasury, and see what answers they would get. The moment this bill became a law, the receivers-general, as such, were dead—the Secretary could no longer draw on them. Where must he put his money? What must he do with his drafts? In N. Y. immense sums were coming into deposite at the rate of one hundred and a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a day. The Secretary could not arrange with a Bank to receive this money under less than a week, and, in the mean time, the collector or the receiver-general might have half a million of dollars under his lock and key, and be, at the same time, out of office. Who would be liable then? Not his sureties, for their liability expired with his office. In the more distant parts of the country, such a state of things might exist for a whole month. That time must elapse before the receiver knew that his office was abolished; but the Secretary here would know it, and could not draw upon him. What, then, must be the result? In one portion of the country he would draw on collectors; in another portion he must act under the law of 1836; and in still another he must be left at his discretion, under a construction of the old law. Here would be three or four fiscal systems in operation at one and the same time; and all this state of confusion must ensue because gentlemen would insist upon repealing one plan before they had provided another.

Another question arose as to what money the Treasurer should receive. It was contended that he would be under the act of 1836. If so, then all public dues must be paid in gold and silver. There was not a bank in New England which did not issue bills under five dollars. He was prohibited from receiving their notes, though redeemable in specie, and therefore, instead of receiving his dues one-half in convertible paper and one-half in specie, he must have the whole amount in hard money, or violate his oath. Some gentlemen, indeed, might like the measure on this account, but would the friends of this bill vote for it in this view of its effects?

Again: as to the effect on public sentiment, he could tell gentlemen, if Congress adjourned without providing a substitute for the Sub-Treasury, it would be found that the act of 1816 was not imperative. Its language was not that paper of a certain description should be taken, but that it *ought* to be taken. Yes; it ought. But, supposing the Secretary could not get it, how then? What had been the argument in 1837 on that point? Shinplasters were then current, and what had been called the ten cent rebellion in Boston had been gotten up, because specie was demanded by the collector. The Secretary said he could not get convertible notes, and the verdict of the People was, that in that case he must take depreciated paper. By this state of things, all specie and specie-paying banks must go by the board. Discretion was said to be the law of tyrants; yet now the Treasury was to be let loose again, to use, at pleasure, the paper of non-specie-paying banks; and this the Secretary could not avoid, if he respected public opinion.

But it was said that we should soon have a substitute, Some great fiscal agent was to be provided, or else an old-fashioned bank of the U. S. Mr. W. would not argue that question, with him the time was gone by; but he would ask the members of that Senate whether they were ready to repeal the existing law, to re-establish such an institution as the old Bank of the U. S. If they were, very well; but he could not yet tell whether such a plan had been matured and was to be presented. Why not wait till then?

It was said, however, that we were to have a Bank that would not be unconstitutional: it was to be free from all objections of that kind. He was glad to hear it; but what was the plan? Had not gentlemen better wait till they saw whether it did avoid all constitutional difficulty or not? Surely, they would act thus in their own affairs, why not in the affairs of the public? What was this Bank to be? If it was a mere fiscal agent not incorporated, then it was a Government Bank, and he said to gentlemen that they were abolishing just such a Bank, though without the name. All they had to do was to call the Sub-Treasury a fiscal agent, and the thing would be effected. Was this any thing new? Had not gentlemen contended that the bill of 1840 went to create a Treasury Bank?—Yet they were now for destroying that, only to make another. Here Mr. W. quoted the title of a speech he held in his hand, in which the Sub-Treasury was denominated a Government Bank, of which the President of the U. S. was to be president, cashier, and teller. All they had to do was to give the Secretary power to issue small drafts, and the Sub-Treasury would be a Government Bank.

Mr. CLAY here interposed to inquire of Mr. W. whether he rightly understood him as now admitting that the Sub-Treasury was a bank.

Mr. WOODBURY replied in the negative. He had represented it as a bank only under the supposition that the Secretary could cut up his drafts into small sums; and use them as bank notes.

Mr. CLAY. Well, and could he not do it?

Mr. WOODBURY. He did not do it. I admit that the argument itself is a fair one, but he did not do it, nor could it have been done without sanction of law.

Mr. W. concluded by observing that though much more might be said, he should add no further remarks.

Mr. CLAY here demanded the question on the passage of the bill; but—

The debate was continued until near 7 o'clock by Messrs. CALHOUN, BENTON, TALLMADGE, WRIGHT, YOUNG, and McROBERTS—all of them speaking in opposition to the bill, except Mr. Tallmadge. [The late hour of the adjournment rendered it impossible to prepare this debate for this paper, but it will be given in our next, together with the various propositions submitted, and the votes thereon.]

The question having been taken on the passage of the bill, it was decided in the affirmative as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Archer, Barrow, Bates, Bayard, Berrien, Choate, Clay of Kentucky, Clayton, Dixon, Evans, Graham, Henderson, Huntington, Kerr, Mangum, Merrick, Miller, Morehead, Phelps, Porter, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Simmons, Smith of Indiana, Southard, Tallmadge, White, Woodbridge—29.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Benton, Calhoun, Clay of Alabama, Fulton, King, McRoberts, Nicholson, Pierce, Sevier, Smith of Connecticut, Sturgeon, Tappan, Walker, Williams, Woodbury, Wright, Young—18.

And the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Some explanations took place between the Speaker and several members in relation to certain proposed corrections of the Journal, which, however, resulted in no action, so far as the Reporter could understand what was going on.

Mr. C. BROWN of Pennsylvania rose to make an inquiry of the Speaker. He (Mr. B.) saw, on looking at the newspapers, that the committees there announced were not the same as the committees which had yesterday been read at the Clerk's table. He desired to know where the real committees would be found.

The SPEAKER (though very imperfectly heard on the left of the chair) was understood to say that it had been his intention to state a fact to the House in regard to the committees, and that he was about to do so when a gentleman had risen to move a correction of the Journal. The Speaker would now state that, in looking over the list of committees, a few mistakes had been found. It was known to the House that the Chair had had only a very short time in which to make out the list, and there had not been time to have them copied. A few of the names had thus been transposed, and, in three instances, the names of three gentlemen had been entirely omitted. These things having occurred solely from the hurry in which the committees were required to be made up, the Speaker presumed that it would be in the power of the Chair to make the corrections.

Mr. BROWN. That is not answering the question. I merely wish to know where the real committees are to be found—whether they are those published in the newspapers, or those read from the Clerk's table.

The SPEAKER. The correct list will be found in the possession of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM rose, in pursuance of notice given on the second day of the present session, and asked leave to introduce a bill to repeal the act of July 4, 1840, commonly known as the Sub-Treasury bill.

Mr. WELLER objected.

Mr. BRIGGS said that the House had yesterday adopted a special order to proceed to the election of its officers. He hoped the House would execute its order.

The SPEAKER said that that was the order of business, and that the unanimous consent of the House would be required to enable the gentleman from N. Carolina (Mr. Graham) to introduce a bill at this time.

Mr. WOOD of New York sent to the Chair a resolution which was read for information, requesting the President of the U. S. to communicate to this House, so far as the public interest would permit, the correspondence, if any, between the Government of the U. States and that of Great Britain, in relation to the American citizens now British prisoners of State in Van Dieman's Land.

Objection was made.

Mr. BRIGGS hoped the House would not suffer any thing to interfere with the execution of the special order.

Mr. WOOD thereupon withdrew his resolution.

The House then proceeded to vote for the election of Doorkeeper.

And on the first voting, Mr. Joseph Follansbee was declared to be duly elected Doorkeeper of this House.

Whereupon he appeared and took the oath of office.

The next election in order, under the resolution of yesterday, being that of Assistant Doorkeeper—

Mr. EVERETT asked leave to present a resolution providing that J. W. Hunter be elected Assistant Doorkeeper to this House for the Twenty-seventh Congress, and that Wm. J. McCormick be elected Postmaster of this House for the same period.

Mr. Hunter, receiving a majority of all the votes, was declared to be duly elected Assistant Doorkeeper of this House. Whereupon he appeared and took the oath of office.

On motion of Mr. MORGAN, by unanimous consent, it was resolved that Mr. McCormick be re-appointed Postmaster of this House.

On motion of Mr. WISE, the House then proceeded to the election of Chaplain to this House.

And the following gentlemen were nominated:

Mr. UNDERWOOD nominated Rev. J. W. French, Episcopalian.

Mr. YOUNG, Rev. Wm. T. Page, Episcopalian.

Mr. BROWNE, Rev. J. W. Bristol, Methodist.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, Rev. Mr. Braxton, Baptist.

Mr. CAMPBELL of S. C., Rev. R. W. Bailey, Presbyterian.

Mr. WISE, Rev. A. Welton, Presbyterian.

Mr. C. MORRIS, Rev. Levi R. Reese, Methodist.

The SPEAKER appointed Messrs. UNDERWOOD, YOUNG, and CAMPBELL, of S. C. tellers to superintend the voting.

Vote for Chaplain.

Whole number of votes	189
Necessary to a choice	95
Of which Mr. French received	118

Mr. Page 6—Mr. Bristol 16—Mr. Braxton, withdrawn—Mr. Bailey 16—Mr. Welton 16—Mr. Reese 15—Scattering 2.

So the Rev. Mr. French, having received a majority of all the votes, was declared elected.

PUBLIC PRINTER.

Mr. SERGEANT then rose and offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House now proceed to the election of Printer of this House for the 27th Congress, whose compensation shall be twenty per cent. less than the prices fixed by the joint resolution of 1819.

Mr. CLIFFORD inquired of the Chair whether the resolution was in order at this time.

The SPEAKER decided that it was in order, the previous order of business having been disposed of.

Mr. CLIFFORD submitted that the business next in order was the motion, submitted yesterday, to reconsider the vote on the adoption of the rules of the last House.

A motion was made that the House do now adjourn; which, by yeas 41, nays 137, was rejected.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. UNDERWOOD submitted to the Speaker that the business first in order was the motions for reconsideration; if so, he would move to take them up, and lay them on the table.

Mr. GILMER suggested that the gentleman could not make two motions at one time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD explained. He presumed these motions came up regularly; if so, they were now before the House, and he would move to lay them on the table.

The SPEAKER said that the motion to reconsider, if it had been called up immediately after the special order had been disposed of, would have been first in order; but that the gentleman who had that matter in hand did not make that motion.

Messrs. WISE, FORNANCE, UNDERWOOD, J. C. CLARK, INGERSOLL, EVERETT, SERGEANT, WISE, FILLMORE, A. BROWN, and CLIFFORD spoke to the point of order.

And the decision of the Chair being called for—

The CHAIR decided that the first motion in order was the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Ingersoll,) and that that gentleman was entitled to the floor on that motion.

This motion was read from the journal (substantially) as a motion by Mr. Ingersoll to reconsider the vote of yesterday, adopting the amendment of Mr. J. Q. Adams to the resolution of Mr. Wise to adopt the rules of the last House of Representatives, by adding to the said resolution the words, excepting the 21st rule; that Mr Everett excepted to the reception of the motion, on the ground that it was not in order.

Mr. EVERETT said there appeared to be great excitement whenever any question approached the subject of abolition. He wished to divest himself of that excitement. It was his desire that the House should act coolly and deliberately. He would say for himself, and he believed he could say for the most of those who voted for the omission of the 21st rule, that the great consideration on which their votes had been given was the right of petition; that absorbed all other considerations. And Mr. E. stated the grounds of his objection to be—

1. That the rules adopted relate only to votes passed under the rules, and not to a vote passed under the Lex Parliamentaria.

2. That the motion is overlaid by a resolution to appoint committees, which has been executed, and not liable to reconsideration under the rules; that if the motion to reconsider the rules suspends the operation of the rules, then the motion is under the Lex Parliamentaria, and cannot be received.

3. That it is overlaid by the main vote.

4. The vote adopting a rule not susceptible of reconsideration provides for its own alteration.

The House became involved in one of those intricate questions of order which so constantly distract its attention and consume its time—a detailed account of which cannot be made interesting, even if intelligible, to the general reader.

The question of order was spoken to by Messrs. WISE, BRIGGS, INGERSOLL, FILLMORE, and GILMER, after which, (no action being had upon it,)

Mr. INGERSOLL (without further contest) took the floor. Mr. I. made some remarks upon the subject to which the twenty-first rule has reference, a sketch only of the more prominent points of which we are able to give, at least in to-day's paper. He commenced by observing that he considered the rule as presenting three elementary, constitutional, and all-important questions, which he had unfortunately been obliged to support, and that without having an opportunity of explaining his sentiments, and endeavoring to submit, not only to this House, but to his country and the whole world his views in relation to the highly important questions which were involved in the consideration of the rule under discussion. He wished to explain why he should vote for the adoption of the twenty-first rule. The three important questions it involved were: a question of abolition, as it was called; a question of petition, and a question of regulation. Now, he was aware that, taken separately, or together, each presented the most exciting topics that could possibly be embraced, and involved the most agitating questions that had ever attracted public attention, since the foundation of this Government. He knew, that the question was one in which those at the North, not less than at the South, felt a deep and abiding interest. He knew, too, that there was a gentleman in that House—a right honorable gentleman, and for whom he entertained the highest respect and regard, and who had for the last forty years filled the highest stations in the Government—who evinced the most lively interest in the question. And he had a day or two since, addressed the House at length on it, with much zeal, animation, and ability, and at the same time announced himself as a Northern man. He (Mr. Ingersoll) considered himself a Middle man on this question, which he would endeavor to treat with the strictest impartiality and fairness; and perhaps, in what he might say, he might develop principles which would lead to peace and harmony upon points which had been altogether misconceived. Although he was a party man, he would not be led away from the fulfilment of his duty, and would upon this, as well as upon all other questions, vote according to his conscience. He knew no party in a question of this kind, and would be governed only by what he deemed his duty to his country, and a compliance with its Constitution.

The question of Abolition had been discussed in this country for a great number of years past, and it had led to much excitement and heart-burning in various parts of the Union. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) had observed that he was in possession of some hundreds of petitions on the subject of the abolition of slavery, and which he had not had an opportunity of presenting. And he (Mr. I.) had had some sent to him to present: hence it was that he wished to make a few remarks in order to let the House and his constituents know the grounds he took in reference to the question. Mr. I. adverted to the language of the President's Message in regard to the subject of slavery and the slave trade, and commented upon it, adding that he looked upon it as the ominous feature of the Message. He next called attention to the fact, and remarked that the African slave trade was spoken of in the last paragraph of the Message of President Van Buren. He then addressed himself to the South, and those representing it, and said that the signs of the times behooved them to be more on the alert than they had ever yet been in guarding their rights, so far as regarded this question of abolition, and added that they had never yet taken ground as high as he would take, and which he believed ninety-nine men out of a hundred would take in the North, situated as were those in the South. He then adverted to the British cruisers on the coast of Africa, overhauling American merchant ships on frivolous pretexts, and threw out some intimations that the Florida war had been protracted by runaway negroes from the Bahamas.

Mr. PROFFIT here rose to a question of order.—He desired to be informed by the Chair whether, upon a motion to reconsider the vote upon a rule, it was in order to discuss whether the British Government was engaged in advocating or aiding the slave-trade, or whether we were engaged in it, or what we were doing in the different departments of our Government.—Every body knew what his views were on the subject before the House. But, if we were to enter upon a discussion of this sort, no man could tell where it would terminate.

Mr. INGERSOLL was understood to say that no doubt the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Proffit) had the advantage of possessing a more logical and clear mind than he (Mr. I.) had, and every man was compelled to present his argument according to the peculiar construction of his mind.