

PUBLIC LANDS.

So much has been said of the debate which is now taking place in the Senate of the United States on this subject, and especially of the speeches of Mr. Hayne and Mr. Webster, that we cannot withhold from our readers some view of the matter, though it cannot be expected we can give the whole debate.

Mr. Hayne said, I have not risen Mr. President, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of instituting the inquiry recommended by the resolution, but to offer a few remarks on another and much more important question to which gentlemen have alluded in the course of this debate—I mean the policy which ought to be pursued in relation to the Public Lands.

Every gentleman who has had a seat in Congress for the last two or three years, or even for the last two or three weeks, must be convinced of the great and growing importance of this question. More than half of our time has been taken up with the discussion of propositions connected with the Public Lands—more than half of our acts embrace provisions growing out of this fruitful source.

their first settlement here, (whether deriving title directly from the crown or the local proprietors) received grants for considerations merely nominal. The payment of a penny, or a "pepper-corn" was the stipulated price which our fathers along the whole Atlantic coast, now comprising the old thirteen States, paid for their lands, and even when conditions seemingly more substantial, were annexed to the grants—such for instance as "settlement and cultivation,"—these were considered as substantially complied with, by the cutting down a few trees and erecting a log cabin—the work of only a few days.

Let us now consider for a moment, Mr. President, the effect of these two opposite systems on the condition of a new State. I will take the State of Missouri, by way of example. Here is a large fertile territory coming into the possession of the United States, without any inhabitants but Indians and wild beasts—a territory which is to be converted into a sovereign and independent State.

our misfortune to stand in that relation to the Federal Government which subjects us to a taxation, which it requires the utmost efforts of our industry to meet. Nearly the whole amount of our contributions is expended abroad—we stand towards the U. States in the relation of Ireland to England.—The fruits of our labor are drawn from us to enrich other and more favored sections of the Union, while with one of the finest climates and the richest products in the world, furnishing with one-third of the population, two-thirds of the whole exports of the country, we exhibit the extraordinary, the wonderful, and painful spectacle of a country, enriched by the bounty of God, but blasted by the cruel policy of man.

Let gentlemen now pause and consider for a moment what would have been the probable effects of an opposite policy. Suppose, Sir, a certain portion of the State of Missouri had been originally laid off and sold to the actual settlers for the quit rent of "a pepper-corn" or even for a small price to be paid down in cash. Then, Sir, all the money that was made in the country would have remained in the country, and passing from hand to hand, would, like rich and abundant streams flowing through the land, have adorned and fertilized the whole. Suppose, Sir, that all the sales that have been effected, had been made by the State, and that the proceeds had gone into the State Treasury to be returned back to the people in some of the various shapes in which a beneficent local government exerts its powers for the improvement of the condition of its citizens.

CONGRESS. SENATE. Tuesday, February 2. The Hon. John Tyler, from the State of Virginia, appeared and took his seat. Mr. Dickinson gave notice that he would tomorrow ask leave to bring in a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, to pay to Thomas Cooper, the amount of a fine paid by him on conviction, under the sedition act.