

We make the following extracts from the report of the committee on public lands, to which were referred resolutions of the House and memorials from State Legislatures, asking a reduction of the price of the public lands, introduced in Mr. Lane's letter published last week. That portion omitted is chiefly documentary argument, relative to the conditions by which the western States ceded their territories to the General Government, &c., of not much interest to the general reader.

Mr. CLAY, of Alabama, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which the subject had been referred, made the following

#### REPORT:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to which have been referred memorials from the Legislatures of the States of Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Alabama, asking a reduction and graduation of the price of that portion of the Public Lands which has been offered at public sale, and remains unsold, and also sundry resolutions of the House, instructing them to inquire into the expediency of such a measure, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report:

That they have given the subject the attention and deliberation which seemed to be demanded by its nature and importance. Whether considered in reference to the interest of the General Government, the harmony of the Union, or the welfare and prosperity of the new States, which embrace the public lands, the question involved is one of more than ordinary magnitude. The committee have felt it their duty to look into the origin of the claim of the United States to the public domain, the better to comprehend the motives and inducements to the various cessions which were made by the states having claims to Western lands, and the obligations incurred by the General Government under those compacts. It is from this source that the title of the United States to much the larger portion of the public lands is derived.

The inducements to cessions, held out by Congress to those States having Western territory, were to aid in supplying the means of extinguishing the national debt created by the war of 1776-83, and "to promote the harmony of the Union," and "the stability of the general confederacy." On the one hand, it seems to have been considered not only desirable to obtain the means of payment, but to gain the confidence of the public creditors, by appearing to process them. On the other, it was no less important to the harmony of the Union to suppress controversies as to territorial claims among the States, to prevent too great inequality of size of the different States, and to keep down the jealousy which would have been inseparable from such disparity.

The public debt no longer presents any obstacle to the exercise of such policy as may, in other respects, be compatible with the terms of the compacts. Before any measure, producing an important change, can be carried into operation, it will have been entirely extinguished.

If, however, the subject be considered in reference to the financial interest of the general government alone, it is believed that the price of the public lands should be reduced, after having been first offered at public sale, and then remaining a reasonable time subject to private entry, at the present minimum. The Government of the United States is probably the only vendor, either of land or of any other property, that holds the most inferior quality of any article at the same price with the best. If an individual were to maintain that all domestic animals of a given species were of the same value, how inconsistent would he appear? If a merchant were to refuse to sell *kerseys* at any lower price than he could obtain for *superfine broadcloths*, his conduct would certainly be deemed utterly absurd. Yet there is no greater absurdity in either of these positions, than there is in maintaining that *land of every quality* is worth, or should command, the same price.

The experience of the last ten years has demonstrated that lands of the greatest fertility, when sold at auction, will only command a very small fraction above \$1 25 per acre. To prove this, it is only necessary to refer to official documents now on the files of the House. It is not probable that more than one-tenth of the public domain is of the first quality; yet we refuse to let the remaining nine-tenths go at any lower price.

By a report (which is hereto annexed) made by the Secretary of the Treasury on the 22d January last, in answer to a resolution of the House, it appears that the quantity of land to which the Indian and foreign titles had then been extinguished, was 301,965,600 acres. Of that quantity there had, on the 31st December, 1831, been offered for sale 130,932,265 acres; and only 26,524,450 acres had been sold. By the same report, the quantity of land subject to private entry, on the same day, (and which, of course, had been offered at public auction, and refused, at \$1 25 per acre,) was 104,407,755 acres. As evidence of the great inferiority of this large quantity of land, it is shown by the same report that the quantity which had been offered and refused at public sale, in the several States, had been in market, and subject to private entry, the following periods: That in Ohio had nearly all been in market 20 years; the greater portion from 25 to 30 years; that in Indiana had nearly all been in market from 15 to 20 years; that in Illinois had nearly all been in market for 15 years, and upwards; that in Missouri, on an average of about 12 years; that in Alabama from 12 to 22 years, the average period may be said to be 15 years; that in Mississippi from 12 to 20 years; that in Louisiana about 13 years; and that in Michigan about 13 years.

In December, 1828, a statement, compiled from official documents, and printed by order of the Senate, showed that 74,358,881 acres were then subject to private entry, having been offered at public sale, and refused, at \$1 25 per acre; and that, of this quantity, 28,247,000 acres (more than one-third) were unfit for cultivation. Taking the same relative proportions of the quantity now subject to private entry as the basis of calculation, it follows that we now have about 40,000,000 acres, not only inferior, but unfit for cultivation. Yet our system is based on the hypothesis that there is no difference in the quality or value of the public lands.

As an additional proof of the inferior quality of those hundred and odd millions of *refuse lands*, the fact may be stated, that it is dispersed through the oldest as well as the more recently settled parts of the States and Territories. It is not in such detached bodies, and so far removed from the improved and cultivated lands, as to impede its settlement and cultivation; on the contrary, were the soil good, its locality would afford unusual facilities in both respects. It is wholly unreasonable to suppose that such land will sell for the same price at which land of the best quality can be purchased. But, if reduced to its fair relative value, much might be sold. Inferior lands, lying adja-

cent to those which are improved and cultivated, would be valuable appendages to them, and would be purchased by present land proprietors. Other portions would be purchased by poor men, who have been driven from the more fertile tracts by men of large capital, and by speculators. As we have seen, much of this land has already been in market, unsold, for twenty years or upwards; for a period how much longer it may remain on hand, it is impossible to determine; but, is it not perfectly obvious that it would have been to the interest of the Government, regarding money alone, to have sold it at half the price in the first instance? Add interest for twenty years, at six per cent. per annum, on the value of a given quantity of land, estimated at fifty cents per acre, and it will be about equal to the price demanded by the Government. Yet we have this land still on hand, with its relative value diminished, not only in the ratio in which all other real estate has declined, but by being shorn of much of its valuable timber, by those residing in its neighborhood, or by settlers who have no permanent interest in the soil. Besides, we have sustained the expense of keeping up a number of land offices, amounting to thousands of dollars every year, which would have been rendered unnecessary by a speedy sale, if the price had been suitably reduced. The proposed policy would result in the sale of many thousands, if not millions of acres, which, otherwise, will not be sold, but be deprived of timber, exhausted, and worn out, by those who have no inducement to preserve the soil longer than for merely temporary use; which is not only detrimental to the interest of the United States, but highly injurious to the particular State in which they may happen to lie.

But the amount of money to be realized from the public domain is not the sole, nor even the chief consideration which should influence and determine the policy of a wise and paternal Government. In the language of the President, in his annual message of December, 1832, "The wealth and strength of a country are its population, and the best part of that population are the cultivators of the soil. Independent farmers are, every where, the basis of society, and true friends of liberty." These sentiments, it is hoped, will find a cordial response in every bosom. Their truth and justice are attested by all history. It may be asked, triumphantly, when did the cultivators of the soil willingly abandon the principles, or knowingly become the enemies of free Government? The soundness of the principle laid down is sustained by the most approved doctrines of political economy, and sanctioned by practical experience.

The Committee also concur in the sentiment expressed in the same message, that it is "our true policy that the public lands shall cease, as soon as practicable, to be a source of revenue, and that they should be sold to settlers, in limited parcels, at a price barely sufficient to reimburse the United States the expense of the present system, and the cost arising under our Indian compacts." The new States have, as they manifestly feel, a deep interest in this subject. By their memorials, they have urged upon Congress repeatedly, within the last ten or twelve years, the policy, justice, and necessity of reducing the price of *refuse lands*. They have represented, and truly represented, as the committee believe, that the existing law in regard to price operates materially and wrongfully to their injury. The high price of land inevitably retards the population of a country, and, taken in connection with the want of power to tax it must postpone the maturity of its resources.

In the opinion of the committee, it is due to the people of the new States that the existing state of things should be terminated as soon as practicable. It is certainly desirable that every acre of land should, if possible, be rendered productive; and this can never be done till it is in the hands of individual proprietors. Population is emphatically the strength of a state; and to render the people free, prosperous, and happy, they should be the owners of the soil they cultivate.

After a full consideration of the compacts between the General Government and the original States which surrendered territory, and those with the new States upon their admission into the Union; regarding that good faith with which engagements so grave and important ought to be fulfilled; looking to the interest of the Government either as to the amount of money to be realized, or the harmony, strength, and resources of the Union at large; and considering what is due to the tranquility and resources of the younger members of the confederacy, the committee cannot resist the conclusion that a law should be passed, reducing and graduating the price of that portion of the public lands which has been offered at public sale, and remains unsold, in proportion to the time it may have been in market. And they accordingly report a bill for that purpose.

**The Riots.** At Marlborough street office on Monday, John Hunt, a plasterer's apprentice, and Samuel Sparks, a journeyman chimney sweep, were brought up, charged with breaking the peace, by fighting in the streets. Mr. Conant. What have you to say in defence, Hunt? Hunt. Vy, this here Sparks hit a young hoo-man as I was a walking with a punch in the eye, and I hit him a vop again, that's all as I knows on it. Conant. What have you to say, Sparks? Sparks. I'd made a pintment with a young gal as I verry much respects, but I've kept company with for two years, to go to Common garden theatre last Saturday; and as I was cutting along home to clean myself, because I was kivered over with sut, I comes plump bang on this here young man, as he was coming along collabating with my verry young hoo-man herself, arm in arm. Hallo, marin, says I, you're doing it with a big anger I don't think. Yes, says she, Sammy don't you like it? No, says I, I does't marm, and that you'll find out afore long. With that I ups with my fist and hits her a crack, and then this here covey ups with his'n and hits me another, and then the police man comes up and quods both on us. Mr. Conant directed that the angry rivals should enter into surities to keep the peace for the future. *London paper.*

**A Quaker Remedy.** Mr. Sergeant, in giving a temperance lecture to the Bostonians a few evenings since related the following anecdote:

"A moderate drinking landlord, one who gave to almost every customer who came in, an example of moderate drinking, was harnessing the horse of a Quaker who had stopped with him, having some difficulty in bucking a strap, complained of the badness of his eyes, which were covered by a pair of goggles. As the quaker manifested an interest in his case, the landlord removed the goggles, and submitted the swollen and inflamed balls to the inspection of his customer, begging him to tell him what he had better do for them. 'My advice, friend,' replied the Quaker, 'is that thou shouldst put thy brandy on thy eyes, and tie thy goggles on thy mouth.'"

**A Grain of Corn.** One grain of corn, dropped by accident on the land of Major Jacob Clark, of Durham, Mass. yielded this year, nine ears, with sixteen rows each, averaging forty kernels to each row, and making the whole produce of the single grain about five thousand.

#### Indiana Legislature.

On Wednesday evening, the committee of the whole, in the House of Representatives, to which had been committed a bill providing for an ad valorem system of taxation, concluded their deliberations, & the bill with its amendments were reported to the House; and therefore a question was taken thereon, the House adjourned. No amendments were made, materially changing the principles of the bill as introduced. The general features of the bill may be gathered from the first section, which provides, "that all lands and town lots, and all buildings and improvements erected thereon or affixed thereto, which is the property of any individual, or individuals, body corporate or politic; also all personal property, including household furniture, over the value of one hundred and fifty dollars; all moneys loaned at interest on simple contract, bond or mortgage; the capital of all merchants and exchange brokers employed in this state; all capital in public stocks or the stocks of monied or other incorporations, shall be, and the same are hereby declared to be subject to taxation, with the exceptions hereinafter specified, to be levied and collected agreeably to law." The bill exempts from taxation, all lands sold by congress, for the term of five years from the day of sale—also exempts from taxation the property of different benevolent institutions, together with certain exemptions in favor of revolutionary soldiers. An assessor for each township is to be appointed to take a list of all taxable inhabitants and make an assessment of the property within the same. It provides for a poll tax on each male inhabitant over the age of 21 and under 50 years. The taxes of the present year are to be levied and collected as heretofore. The principal discussion in committee of the whole, took place on an amendment, striking out the amount of exemption of personal property from taxation, and in lieu thereof inserting a provision particularly designating the articles subject to taxation. While this amendment was pending, considerable discussion took place whether commodities—should be subject to taxation. The principal argument in favor of designating the articles, was the trouble of making out a schedule for valuation, of every minor article of personal property, and the difficulty that would arise, in compelling the assessor to invade the private sanctuary of every man's dwelling, in order to find out the most trivial articles that would be subject to taxation. It was contended on the other hand, that there would be a difficulty in designating the particular articles, as was already witnessed in the debate, relative to the item of hogs—and that the man who makes a parade of splendor, by throwing around him a large amount of personal property, could not be reached by taxation, and consequently the provision would operate unequally. The amendment was not adopted, and the first section of the bill stands as above stated. Another amendment, offered by Mr. Crume, created considerable discussion, providing for an exemption from taxation of all dwelling houses or other buildings, where the valuation shall not exceed two hundred dollars. Mr. Henkle offered an amendment to Mr. Crume's amendment, so as not to include in the exemption, buildings in towns and villages. This proposition created considerable debate with regard to the propriety of making a difference between the citizens of the town and country. Both of the above propositions also failed in the committee. No particular vote has been taken testing the strength of the friends and opponents of the bill; but it is given up, on all hands, that the bill will pass the House of Representatives by a considerable majority.

On yesterday morning Mr. Thompson from the select committee of three, made a report changing the features of the bill for a general system of internal improvement, as follows: 1. Providing that so much of the White water canal as may be deemed expedient, shall be immediately put under contract, and pledging the faith of the State for a speedy completion of the work. 2. Altering the Wabash project, so as only to provide for the survey of a canal from Lafayette as far down as Corydon. 3. An amendment, providing for a survey of the White river canal, if possible, during the next summer, and if the canal be practicable, pledging the faith of the State for its ultimate completion. 4. Providing for an amendment to the bill, for a subscription of stock, to the amount of \$100,000 in a Turnpike Road Company, from Crawfordsville via Greensburg, Bloomington and Bedford to Salem—and a change of the charter from a Railroad to that of a Turnpike Company, on the same route. 5. That the Madison and Lafayette Railroad to pass through Crawfordsville, Danville, Indianapolis, Franklin and Columbus—the subscription of stock to be applied on that portion of the road between Indianapolis and Madison or Indianapolis and Lafayette, as may be designated by persons subscribing for stock—leaving the subscription as before, on the part of the State, at two thirds of the amount of capital stock, to be subscribed as soon as one third is subscribed and secured, by individuals. Either portion of the road to be put under contract, as soon as a sum sufficient be subscribed and secured on the part of individuals, to entitle it to the proportion of the State subscription, for the completion of the same.

Mr. Wallace moved that the House concur in the amendments generally; when Mr. Brackenridge called for a division of the question, and that the amendments be acted upon separately. Mr. Bryan moved that the bill and amendments be laid on the table; which, after an animated discussion, was decided in the negative. The question recurring on the motion of Mr. Wallace to concur generally in the amendments, the Speaker decided, that a division of the question being called for, the question would be first put on concurring in the amendments separately—when Mr. Wallace appealed from the decision of the chair—and the question being put, is the decision of the chair correct? it was decided in the negative, Ayes 35, Noes 30. Before any further question was had, the House adjourned until 2 o'clock P. M. In the afternoon the bill removing the Pension Agency from Corydon to Indianapolis, was read a third time and passed, Ayes 41, Noes 32. On motion of Mr. Kilgore, the previous orders were suspended, and the bill relative to internal improvements was taken up; when amendments were offered by Messrs. Lockhart, Phelps, Vandever and Shaw; which were negatived. Mr. McDougle proposed an amendment for a continuation of the Crawfordsville road from Salem to New Albany; when Mr. Wilson of V. called for the previous question; which the House refused to sustain by a vote of Ayes 21, Noes 35—consequently the bill was laid over for one day. The House then took up the ad valorem bill and concurred generally in the amendments made in committee of the whole. The first section of the bill was amended in the House, by striking out the exemption of a certain amount of property and specifying the items of personal property to be taxed.

Indiana Democrat, January 16.

The ad valorem bill, it will be seen by our proceedings, has passed the House of Representatives by a considerable majority. Its fate in the Senate we are altogether unable to predict. Time enough will be afforded however for a definite action on the subject either favorably or unfavorably.

The subject of internal improvement is still undetermined in the House of Representatives. The bill reported by the committee on canals and internal improvements, which was afterwards referred to a select committee and reported back to the House with amendments, was suspended in its progress on Thursday by a call of the previous question. The House refusing to have the main question (to wit, on engrossing the bill) put before the fate of the amendments was determined, the subject was laid over by the rules of the House for one day. On Saturday Mr. SMITH of Fayette, on leave granted, reported a bill, varying but little from the before mentioned bill reported by the canal committee with the amendments reported by the select committee. This latter bill was read once, and an unsuccessful motion made to suspend the rule and give it a second reading. A motion was then made to have it printed, upon which a very warm and exciting debate took place, involving, in a considerable degree, the whole merits of the question, which continued till the adjournment at noon, since which it has not been resumed. *Ind. Jour., Jan. 20.*

#### 28th Congress.....2d Session.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Jan. 3.

Mr. CHILTON submitted the following resolution: Resolved, That the Committee on Roads and Canals be instructed to inquire into the subject, and report their opinion to this House, of the most equal and just mode of applying the revenues of the country to such works of public improvement within the respective States of this Union, as may be necessary for the facilitating of commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States. And that they moreover report their opinion of the best and most practicable mode of ascertaining and determining the nationality and importance of such improvements as may be proposed within the said several States.

Mr. CHILTON remarked, that this day was set apart for the consideration of private bills; and if any gentleman would move to proceed to the consideration of the orders of the day, he would postpone the remarks which he desired to make in favor of the adoption of the resolution which he had presented.

Mr. E. WHITTELSY moved that the House proceed to the consideration of the orders of the day; which was agreed to.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a resolution of the Legislative Council of Michigan territory, relative to the boundary line between the State of Ohio and said Territory; and also a resolution relative to the construction of a harbor in the Territory aforesaid. Referred.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the First Comptroller of the Treasury, transmitting a list of balances on the books of the Fourth Auditor, for the last three years, &c.; which was laid on the table.

The following bills from the Senate were read twice, and committed.

A bill making appropriations for completing the Military Bunkers at New Orleans;

A bill providing for the legal adjudication and settlement of the claims to land therein mentioned.

#### CONGRESSIONAL SUMMARY.

IN SENATE, Jan. 6. Mr. CLAY from the committee on Foreign Relations, to which had been referred that part of the President's message, appertaining to our relations with France, made a report which concluded by a resolution, "That it is inexpedient at this time to pass any law vesting in the President authority for making reprisals upon French property, in the contingency of provision not being made for paying to the United States the indemnity stipulated by the treaty of 1831, during the present session of the French Chambers."

Mr. CLAY read the report from his seat, which occupied an hour and a half, and when he concluded, he submitted a proposition to make the report and the resolution the order of the day for Tuesday next, and that the report be printed, together with any of the documents which any gentleman might desire.

Mr. TALLMADGE suggested to the honorable Chairman the propriety of asking the Report the special order for Tuesday, two weeks hence—and whilst he was up, lest it might be inferred, from the general language of the Report, that it had received the unanimous approbation of the committee on Foreign Relations, he felt it his duty to express to the Senate his dissent from some portions of it. He concurred with the honorable Chairman [Mr. Clay] in many of the views which he had taken of this interesting subject; but there were others in which he could not concur—there were some of the premises, the arguments, and conclusions, which he could not approve. He believed that the President was fully justified and borne out by the correspondence, in the positions which he had assumed in his Message to Congress. He entertained no doubt of the binding obligation of the treaty on France, and the duty of the French Chambers to carry it into effect; and that a refusal on their part to make the necessary appropriation to meet the stipulations contained in it, would be a violation of the pledged faith of the nation. He dissented entirely from that part of the report in relation to the effect supposed to have been produced on the Chamber of Deputies, in the late rejection of the bill, by reason of the correspondence of Mr. Rives, the able and skillful negotiator of the treaty. He had no doubt of the power of Congress to pass a law at this session authorizing reprisals on French property, in the manner recommended by the President. But this was no time for discussion or argument on these or other matters of the report. He would only say, that with a knowledge that the French Chambers had been convened nearly a month earlier than was anticipated by the President, when he communicated his message to Congress, he was of opinion, when this subject was under consideration before the committee, that, as a matter of expediency, it were better that no report be made, until we had heard further of the action of the Chambers, and which we were in the daily expectation of hearing.

Mr. CLAY said it was true, that this subject, the report, and he regretted to say it, was not entirely coincided in by all the members of the Committee; he did not know whether there was a concurrence in the resolution or not. It was true that it was not time to enter into the argument now, for the only thing was, what time should be chosen for the consideration. He thought that the sooner Congress manifested its will on this subject, the better—better for the country, its commercial operations, and the various assurances made. And he had a perfect persuasion that if it was the intention of Congress not to pass a law authorizing reprisals in the contingency indicated by the President, the sooner it was known, as well on the other side of the Atlantic as on this, the better. He thought, therefore, that the postponement to the time suggested, ought not to prevail. He did not know what France might do; or what construction she would put upon the late message of the President, nor any thing about the view she might take of it. If she should fly into a passion on account of it, we might be involved in serious difficulties. But if she was prudent, she would wait to see whether the message should be seconded by Congress. If Congress thought it expedient to pass no such law as that requested by the President, but that it was safest and wisest to wait for the action of France, he asked, would it not be likely to produce a better effect? He did not know whether a discussion would ensue upon the report or resolution.

The postponement to next Tuesday was agreed to—and, on motion of Mr. POINDEXTER, 20,000 extra copies were ordered to be printed.

January 7. The bill making an appropriation to improve the navigation of the river Wabash, came up on its third reading.

Mr. CLAY said he desired to make some observations upon that part of the President's Message out of which this bill had grown.

He would vote with pleasure for the bill, and he hoped it would pass the Senate, and meet with a kinder fate in the House than it experienced last session. The President in his Message had stated a principle in relation to the power of Congress over Internal Improvements which was so novel and so extraordinary in its character that he thought it ought not to pass without some observation. What was that principle? It was this. That the limit given by the constitution to the power of Congress over Internal Improvements, was that limit which was furnished by tide water, and that such improvement could not be authorized by Congress which should extend beyond a port of entry, and they were generally confined to tide water. By this construction of the constitution, the exercise of the power did not depend upon the grants in that instrument, but altogether on collateral circumstances. If this interpretation were correct, the constitution did not depend upon its own provisions to govern, but entirely upon the discretion of Congress, and he also complained of the effect of such an interpretation. What was it? It was to repudiate, and entirely to cut off from the benefits of Internal Improvements made under the authority of the General Government, the whole interior of the country which lay above tide water. Whatever might be the fate of this construction, it was impossible that the country should be contented with this limited extent of power. He had risen on this occasion solely for the purpose of entering his protest against such an interpretation of the power of Congress over Internal Improvements, as was held by the President in his message.

The question being on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. KING of Alabama, demanded the yeas and nays; which were ordered, and are as follows, to wit:

YEAS—Messrs. Benton, Clay, Clayton, Ewing, Frelinghuysen, Hendricks, Kane, Kent, Knight, Linn, McKean, Naudain, Porter, Prentiss, Robbins, Robinson, Silsbee, Smith, Southard, Swift, Tipton, Tomlinson, Webster—23.

NAYS—Messrs. Bibb, Black, Brown, Buchanan, Calhoun, Grundy, Hill, King of Ala., King of Ga., Leigh, Moore, Morris, Preston, Shepley, Tallmadge, Tyler, White—18.

So the question was determined in the affirmative.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Jan. 7.

Mr. CARR submitted a resolution, that the committee on the public lands be instructed to inquire into the expediency of granting to each fractional township in which there is no school lands located, a quantity of land for school purposes, sufficient to make them equal with whole townships, in proportion to the quantity of land contained in said fractional township.

Mr. CARR remarked that in all the new states, he believed, by the act of Congress admitting them into the Union, the section numbered sixteen in every township, and where such section had been sold, granted or disposed of, other lands equivalent thereto, and most contiguous to the same, was granted to the inhabitants of such township for the use of schools. Mr. C. stated, that upon the Ohio river and elsewhere, there were fractional townships in which there are no lands set apart for school purposes, and there were also other fractional townships adjacent to a tract of country in the state of Indiana which was given to General George Rogers Clark, and the officers and soldiers under his command, which is called the Illinois grant, in which fractional townships there are no school lands. Mr. C. said, the resolution which he had submitted, had for its object nothing more or less, than to grant to the persons residing in fractional townships, where no school lands are set apart, such quantity of land as will make them equal with those residing in townships, and to whom school lands have been granted. He presumed to this proposition no one could object. The resolution was adopted.

Jan. 9. Mr. CASEY, of Illinois, asked leave to introduce the report of the engineer appointed by the commissioners of the fund appropriated by the States of Illinois and Indiana for the improvement of the navigation of the Wabash river.

On leave being granted, Mr. CASEY said, it would be recollected by the House that on yesterday the bill which had passed the Senate making an appropriation for the improvement of the navigation of the Wabash river, was referred to the committee on roads and canals. By the last mail from the West, through the politeness of a friend, he had received the report of the engineer appointed by the commissioners of the fund appropriated by the States of Illinois and Indiana for the improvement of the navigation of the Wabash. It contained some valuable information in relation to the proposed improvement; and as it was desirable that the National Legislature should be in possession of every possible information on this subject, he thought it his duty to introduce this report. It was a subject of deep and abiding interest to the people of that section of country, and he did hope that it would receive the favor and consideration of Congress. Mr. C. concluded by a motion to refer the report to the committee on roads and canals and that it be printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. KINNARD moved to discharge the committee on revolutionary claims from the further consideration of the petition of Robert Allison, and to refer the same to the committee on private land claims, which was agreed to.

From Mexico. The bark Mexican brings papers to the 30th Nov. In the state of New Mexico, the Indians still continued their barbarities. A consular party of 740,000 dollars, arrived in the latter part of Nov. at Vera Cruz from Mexico. Congress was to have met on the 1st instant. The country generally was tranquil.

N. Y. Eve. Star.