

Compromise of our national faith and honor, for any object, of whatever magnitude. More especially would I have our intercourse with Mexico characterized by fair dealing and moderation, on account of her unfortunate condition, resulting from a long-continued series of intestine dissensions, which all who have not been born to liberty must inevitably encounter in seeking for it. As long, therefore, as the pretensions of Mexico are attempted to be asserted by actual force, or as long as there is any reasonable prospect that she has the power and the will to re-subjugate Texas, I do not propose to interfere. My own deliberate conviction, to be sure, is, that that period has already passed, and I beg leave to say that, in my judgment, there is more danger of an invasion and conquest of Mexico by Texas, than that this last will ever be renewed to Mexico. The entertaining of this opinion, perhaps, constitutes the only difference between mine and the views of the Executive, as declared in the correspondence with the Texian minister, General Hunt. The negotiation is declined by the Secretary of State, because it would involve our relations with Mexico. Now, sir, I do not conceive that Mexico, in the obvious hopelessness of operations against Texas, should so consider it. I admit, however, that the Executive has the most legitimate jurisdiction of this question, and is doubtless in possession of more extensive and exact information upon it than we can have. It is, therefore, avoided in the resolutions, which import a declaration of opinion in favor of the annexation of Texas, only when it can be effected without a disturbance of our relations with Mexico. I do not understand—I should be very unwilling to believe—that the administration has taken decisive grounds against my proposition, in every contingency. Indeed I believe, I can show that I am warranted in entertaining the opinion that the opposite is the most probably the truth. It was obviously proper for the Secretary of State to avoid, in his correspondence with a foreign minister, any indication of the policy of the Government in the contingency contemplated by my resolution; but what that opinion would be, if it were proper to avow it, may be inferred from the fact that the President himself has heretofore, as Secretary of State, while carrying into effect the policy of his predecessor, to whose great measures he is devoted and pledged, exerted all his ability to accomplish this object; that Mr. Poinsett, the Secretary of War, has been sedulously engaged in the same enterprise, under the auspices of two administrations; and that Mr. Forsyth, the Secretary of State, is a Georgian by birth and allegiance, and will not, therefore, be suspected of entertaining different opinions. It is not to be supposed that the remainder of the cabinet could exert sufficient influence to overcome the sentiments of these three gentlemen, or would, for a moment, entertain a purpose of reversing the favorite policy of General Jackson.

I disavow, Mr. President, all hostile purposes, or even ill temper, towards Mexico; and if I trust that I impugn neither the policy nor principles of the administration, I therefore feel myself at liberty to proceed to the discussion of the points made in the resolution, entirely disengaged of any preliminary obstacle, unless, indeed, the mode by which so important an act is to be effected may be considered as interposing a difficulty. If the object itself be within the competency of this Government, as I shall hereafter endeavor to show, and both parties consent, every means mutually agreed upon would establish a joint obligation. The acquisition of new territory has heretofore been effected by treaty, and this mode of proceeding in regard to Texas, has been proposed by her ministers; but I believe it would comport more with the importance of the measure, that both branches of the Government should concur, the Legislature expressing a previous opinion; and this being done, all difficulties, of all kinds whatsoever, real or imaginary, might be avoided by a treaty tri-partite between Mexico, Texas, and the United States, in which the assent and confirmation of Mexico (for a pecuniary consideration if you choose) might be had, without infringing the acknowledged independence and free agency of Texas.

I will now proceed to show that the territory actually occupied by the Republic of Texas was at one time a part of the United States.

In 1762, France ceded Louisiana to Spain. In 1800, by the treaty of Ildelonso, Spain re-ceded it to France. (See the words of the treaty.)

In 1804, France by the treaty of Louisiana, ceded it to the United States. The United States thus obtained title to whatever was conveyed to Spain by the treaty of 1762, the effect of the intermediate conveyance being precisely the same as if the conveyance by the treaty of 1762 had been made directly to us instead of to Spain. The extent of the French claim, therefore, determines ours.—The title of France to the Mississippi, and to the territory drained by its western tributaries, has never been disputed. It rested upon the discovery made by La Salle in 1683, who penetrated from Canada by land, descended the Mississippi, and established a few posts on its banks. A short

time afterwards, La Salle endeavoring to enter the Mouth of the Mississippi from the Gulf, passed it unperceived, and sailing westward, discovered the bay of St. Bernard, now called Matagorda, where, penetrating a short distance into the interior, he established a military post on the bank of the Guadalupe, (whose ruins exist to this day,) and took possession of the country in the name of his sovereign. The discovery and the possession were precisely such as gave title to the Mississippi, made by the same enterprising individual, about the same time, and the occupation for France was attended by all the circumstances and incidents which characterized that of St. Louis or the Island of Orleans. It was this perfect similarity of the monuments of title which authorized Mr. Monroe and Mr. Pinckney, in 1805, to hold this emphatic language to the Spanish commissioner: "The facts and principles which justify this conclusion are so satisfactory to their Government as to convince it that the United States have not a better right to the island of New Orleans, under the cession referred to, than they have to the whole district of territory west to the Rio del Norte."

The extent of territory which should enure to the French Crown, by virtue of this discovery and occupation, was determined on the east by the discoveries of La Salle on the Mississippi, with which those on the St. Bernard were of course connected. On the west the extent was determined by the application of a principle recognized by the European Powers making settlements in America, viz: that the dividing line should be established at a medium distance between their various settlements. At the period of La Salle's settlement, the nearest Spanish possession was a small post called Panuco, at the point where a river of that name falls into the bay of Tampico. The medium line between Panuco and the Guadalupe, on which was La Salle's fort, was the Rio Grande del Norte, which river was therefore assumed as the true boundary between France and Spain. France never failed to assert her claim to that boundary from 1683, the period of La Salle's discovery, up to 1762, when, by the cession of Louisiana to Spain, the countries were united and the boundaries obliterated.

It is thus that Mr. Adams, in his conclusive letter to Don Onis of March, 1818, recapitulates the testimony in favor of the French title.

On the part of the United States:

1. The discovery of Mississippi, from near its source to the ocean, by the French from Canada, in 1683.
2. The possession taken, and establishments made, by La Salle, at the bay of St. Bernard, west of the rivers Trinity and Colorado, by authority from Louis XIV. in 1683.
3. The charter of Louis XIV to Crozat, in 1722.
4. The historical authority of Du Prat and Champigny and of the Count de Vergennes.
5. The geographical authority of De Lisle's map, and especially that of the map of Don Thomas Lopez, geographer to the King of Spain, published in 1762. These documents were all referred to in the letter from Messrs Pinckney and Monroe to Mr. Cavallos, of 20th April, 1805. Since which time, and in further confirmation of the same claims, the government of the United States are enabled to refer you to the following:
6. A map published by Homann, at Nuremberg, in 1712.
7. A geographical work published in 1717, at London, entitled "Atlas Geographicus, or a Complete System of Geography, Ancient and Modern," in which the map of Louisiana marks its extent from the Rio Bravo to the Perdido. In both these maps the fort built by La Salle is laid down on the spot now called Matagorda.
8. An official British map, published in 1755, by Bowen, intended to point out the boundaries of the British, Spanish, and French colonies in North America.
9. The narratives published at Paris, of Hennepin, in 1683; of Tonti, in 1697; and of Joutel, in 1713.
10. A letter from Colonel La Harpe to Don Martin d'Alarconne, of 8th July, 1719. (A. Nos. 1 and 2.)
11. The order from the French Governor of Louisiana, Bienville, to La Harpe, of August 10, 1721. (C. No. 3.)
12. The geographical work of Don Antonio de Alcedo, a Spanish geographer of the highest eminence. This work and the map of Lopez having been published after the cession of Louisiana to Spain, in 1762, afford decisive evidence of what Spain herself considered as the western boundary of Louisiana, when she had no interest in contesting it against another State. (D. No. 4.)

Mr. Adams was not content to rest our title upon this imposing array of positive testimony; but examined and dissipated all the objections to it taken by the Spanish minister, and by a masterly refutation of the Spanish pretensions, satisfied, (as it has been since understood,) the Spanish negotiator himself so thoroughly that he would have been willing to have characterized the result of the negotiation as a "treaty for the exchange of territories," &c., between Spain and America.

This Senate, Mr. President, is not a fit place for a minute examination of all the particulars, or the weighing of all the opposing arguments in the progress of this controversy. But I may be permitted to add, to what I have indicated as to the grounds of our claim, the fact that all our statesmen, whose attention has been turned to the investigation, have with one consent expressed the clearest and most unhesitating conviction of the validity of our title, from the first moment at which it was agitated down to the unfortunate treaty of 1819. Mr. Jefferson, whose turn of mind led him to such investigations, and whose thoughts, as every one knows, were long and deeply engaged upon all matters con-

nected with Louisiana, expressed himself in the most positive manner. Messrs. Monroe and Pinckney, in 1805, used the language I have before quoted, in obedience to instructions from Mr. Madison, at that time Secretary of State. Mr. Monroe, when President, held an equally strong language, through Mr. Adams, his Secretary of State. Thus, sir, we have the authority of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Adams, officially and emphatically announced to us. General Jackson is known to have entertained the same opinion. And to these let me add the very high authority, of another distinguished name; that of the honorable Senator from Kentucky near me. When the treaty with Spain in 1819 was concluded, it is well known that some delay occurred, on account of the internal dissensions of Spain, in the ratification of it. While it was thus suspended, the Senator from Kentucky, then a member of the other House, taking the view of the treaty which I am now urging—that it was a cession of a portion of the territory of the United States which was incompetent to that treaty-making power—offered the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the constitution of the United States vests in Congress the power to dispose of the territory belonging to them; and that no treaty purporting to alienate any portion thereof is valid, without the concurrence of Congress.
2. Resolved, That the equivalent proposed to be given by Spain to the United States, for that part of Louisiana lying west of the Sabine, was inadequate, and it would be inexpedient to make a transfer thereof to any foreign Power."

I shall have occasion, by and by, to advert to the resumption for Congress of power to alienate the territory of the United States. My present purpose in quoted these resolutions is to show that, while the treaty with Spain was yet pending, it was considered as a cession of our territory. The resolutions presuppose the fact and take it for granted. They proceed upon the ground that a part of Louisiana was ceded, and in advocating these resolutions their distinguished author holds this emphatic language: "He presumed the spectacle would not be presented of questioning, in this branch of the Government, our title to Texas, which had been constantly maintained by the Executive for more than fifteen years past, under three successive administrations." He also said: "In the Florida treaty it was not pretended that the object was simply a declaration of where the western limit of Louisiana was; it was, on the contrary, the case of an avowed cession of territory from the United States to Spain. The whole of the correspondence manifested that the respective parties to the negotiation were not engaged so much in an inquiry where the limit of Louisiana was, as where it should be. Hence we find various limits proposed and discussed. Finally, the Sabine is fixed, which neither of the parties ever contended was the ancient limit of Louisiana. And the treaty itself proclaims its purpose to be a cession of the United States to Spain." Such were the opinions and statements of the Senator, in 1820; of which I gladly avail myself. It is unfortunate for the whole country, that Congress did not concur with him in the declaration that it would be inexpedient to make a transfer thereof to any foreign Power; and I cannot but trust that the wisdom and patriotism which warred against that rash treaty of 1819, will now be exerted to remedy its great and growing evils, on the earliest opportunity, and by the only means left, viz: the reannexation of Texas whose transfer the honorable gentleman eloquently denounced as inexpedient and unconstitutional.

But, Mr. President, I take a higher ground than Mr. Clay on the occasion alluded to. He rested the constitutional objection upon the incompetency of the treaty-making power to alienate the territory of the United States. I take the ground that it is incompetent to the whole Government; that it does not belong to its granted powers; that its assumption is of the most alarming consequences. The constitution vests in Congress the power to "dispose of the territory or other property of the United States." The true exposition of this clause is found in the vast and wise land system adopted in pursuance of it, at the institution of the Government. Large cessions of territory had been made by several States to this Government, as property, for certain general purposes; and this clause of the constitution was inserted to give the necessary power to effect the objects of these grants. The clause has this extent, no more: the power is exhausted when these purposes are accomplished. It was never meant that Congress could dispose of the sovereignty of any portion of the territory of the United States; and we may well imagine with what feelings Virginia would have contemplated the proposition to endow this Government with power to transfer the North-west Territory to Great Britain or Russia. The clause does not discriminate between the power of this Government to dispose of territory within and without the limits of the States. It is general, and applies to all territory belonging to the United States, wherever it is found—whether it be Point Comfort in Virginia, or the vacant lands in Arkansas, or those within the Territory of Florida. The power granted within the State and within

the Territories is identical; and if one can be transferred to a foreign Power, both can. But the protection of the Territories against this wild power of alienation is enforced in every instance by the high guarantees of solemn compacts. Wisconsin is protected by the terms of cession from Virginia—Florida is protected by the terms of cession from Spain—and Louisiana is protected by the terms of cession from France. They were all on the same footing, under the guarantee of the same faith—and Wisconsin or Florida may be alienated under the same right.

Will any one at this time of day claim for Congress the power to dispose of either of these Territories to a foreign Power? If it be said that, having purchased them, we may sell them, the proposition is equally true of the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri. Can we sell them, or exchange them for Canada? If such a doctrine were countenanced for a moment, would any man south of the Potomac feel himself safe from sale or exchange, while the wild fanaticism of the abolitionists is hurrying so large a portion of our fellow-citizens upon measures less extravagant, and infinitely more fraught with all those disasters that make humanity shudder? Will that spirit which demands the exercise of political power for the confiscation of property, and spurs itself upon the very brink of servile war—will that spirit pause in its reckless career, at so obvious a measure as the retrocession of Southern territory? The treaty, Mr. President, of 1819, was a great oversight on the part of the Southern States. We went into it blindly, I must say. The great importance of Florida, to which the public mind was strongly awakened at that time, by peculiar circumstances, led us precipitately into a measure by which we threw a gem away that would have bought ten Floridas. Under any circumstances Florida would have been ours in a short time; but our impatience induced us to purchase it by a territory ten times as large, a hundred times as fertile, and to give five millions of dollars into the bargain. Sir, I resign myself to what is done; I acquiesce in the inexorable past; I propose no wild and chimerical revolution in the established order of things, for the purpose of remedying what I conceive to have been wrong originally. But this I do propose; that we should seize the fair and just occasion now presented to remedy the mistake which was made in 1819; that we should repair as far as we can the evil effect of a breach of the constitution; that we should re-establish the integrity of our dismembered territory, and get back into our Union, by the just and honorable means providentially offered to us, that fair and fertile provinces which in an hour we severed from the confederacy. (To be Continued.)

CONGRESSIONAL.

Saturday, May 19.

The Senate did not sit.

In the House of Representatives, the Hon. Linn Banks appeared and took his seat. His majority is 13 votes.

Mr. Cambreleng laid before the House communications from the acting Secretary of War and the Quartermaster General, shewing the pressing want of appropriation for preventing and suppressing Indian hostilities.

Mr. Russel asked leave to offer the resolution presented to the House on Thursday, to repeal the small note restriction. Objection being made, he moved a suspension of the rules—which was lost, yeas 51, nays 101.

Mr. Boon made a motion to take up the resolution regarding the specie circular. A motion to suspend the rules for the purpose was lost—yeas 108, nays 69; a majority of two thirds being requisite. Nothing else of importance occurred.

Monday May 21.

IN SENATE.

Plan of a National Bank.

Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, rose, and stated that he wished to present a petition confided to his care, signed by a number of persons, praying for the establishment of a Bank of the United States. It was similar to several other petitions which had been presented to the Senate, or to the House, during the present session, praying for the same object. They afforded evidence of a deep and returning conviction, among the People, of the utility of such an institution.

Whilst I am up, (continued Mr. Clay) with the permission of the Senate, I beg leave to submit a few observations upon this subject. There is reason to believe that much honest misconception and some misrepresentation prevail in regard to it, which I wish to correct. It had been supposed that those who are desirous of seeing a Bank of the United States established are anxious that a charter should be granted to an existing State institution, which has an eminent individual at its head, and that this was the sole object of all their exertions. Now I wish, for one, to say that I have no such purpose in view. I believe in a man very high respect. I believe in a commonly able, profoundly skilled in finance, and truly patriotic. There is but one other person connected with the banking institutions of the country, in whose administration of a Bank of the United States I should have equal confidence with Mr. Biddle, and that is Albert Gallatin, who, I am glad to learn, at an advanced age, retains in full vigor, the faculties of his extraordinary mind.—There may be other citizens equally competent with those two gentlemen, but I do not know them, or am not acquainted with their particular qualifications.

But it is not for any existing State bank, or any particular individual at its head, that I am contending. I believe the establishment of a Bank of the United States is required by the common good of the whole country; and although I might be willing, if it were practicable, to adopt an existing bank as the basis of an such institution, under all circumstances, I think it most expedient that a new bank, with power to establish branches, be created and chartered under the authority of Congress. My friends (as far as I know their opinions) and I are not particularly attached to this or that individual, to this or that existing bank, but to principles, to the thing itself, or to the institution, to a well organized Bank of the United States, under the salutary operation of which the business of the country had so greatly prospered, and we had every reason to hope would again revive and prosper. And presuming upon the indulgence of the Senate, I will now take the liberty to suggest, for public consideration, some of the suitable conditions and restrictions under which it appears to me that it would be desirable to establish a new bank.

1. The capital not to be extravagantly large, but, at the same time, amply sufficient to enable it to perform the necessary financial duties for the Government, to supply a general currency of uniform value throughout the Union and to facilitate, as high as practicable, the equalization of domestic exchange. I suppose that about fifty millions would answer all those purposes. The stock might be divided between the General Government the States according to their federal population, and individual subscribers. The portion assigned to the latter to be distributed at auction or by private subscription.
2. The corporation, in the spirit of a resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly of the State, one of whose Senators I have the honor to be, to receive such an organization as to blend, in fair proportions, public and private control, and combining public and private interest. And, in order to exclude the possibility of the exercise of all foreign influence, non-resident foreigners to be prohibited not only from any share in the administration of the corporation, but from holding, directly or indirectly, any portion of its stock. Although I do not myself think this latter restriction necessary, I make it, in deference to honest prejudices, sincerely entertained, and which no practical statesman ought entirely to disregard. The bank would thus be in its origin, and continue, throughout its whole existence, a genuine American institution.
3. An adequate portion of the capital to be set apart in productive stocks, and placed, in permanent security, beyond the reach of the corporation, (with the exception of the accruing profits on those stocks,) sufficient to pay promptly, in any contingency, the amount of all such paper, under whatever form, that the banks shall put forth as a part of the general circulation. The bill or note holders, in other words, the mass of the community, ought to be protected against the possibility of the failure or the suspension of a bank. The supply of the circulating medium of a country is that faculty of a bank, the property of the exercise of which may be most controverted. The dealings with a bank of those who obtained discounts, or make deposits, are voluntary and mutually advantageous, and they are comparatively few in number. But the reception of what is issued and used as a part of the circulating medium of the country is scarcely a voluntary act, and thousands take it who have no other concern whatever with the bank.—The many ought to be guarded and secured by the care of the legislative authority, the vigilance of the few will secure them against this. I think this provision should be inserted in our American banking, and the credit of first embodying it in a legislative act due to the State of New York.
4. Perfect publicity as to the state of the bank at all times, including, besides the usual heads of information, the names of every debtor to the bank, whether as drawer, endorser, or surety, periodically exhibited, and open to public inspection; or if that should be found inconvenient, the right to be secured to any citizen to ascertain at the bank the nature and extent of the responsibility of a any of its customers. There is no necessity to throw any veil of secrecy around the ordinary transactions of a bank. Publicity will increase responsibility, repress favoritism, insure the negotiation of good paper, and when individual insolvency unfortunately occurs, will deprive the bank of undue advantages enjoyed by banks practically in the distribution of the effects used for remittances upon notes and checks, used for remittances upon notes, one and a half per cent. more than any two the remotest points in the Union. Although it may not be practicable to regulate foreign exchange, depending as it does upon commercial causes not within the control of any one Government, I think that it is otherwise with regard to domestic exchange.
5. Every practicable provision against the exercise of improper influence, on the part of the Executive, upon the bank, and on the part of the bank, upon the elections of the country. The late Bank of the United States has been, I believe, most unjustly charged with interference in the popular elections. There is, among the public documents, evidence of its having scrupulously abstained from such interference. It never did more than to exercise the natural right of self-defence by publishing such reports, speeches, and documents as tended to place the institution and its administration in a fair point of view before the Public. But the People entertain a just jealousy against the danger of any interference of a bank with the elections of the country, and every precaution ought to be taken strictly to guard against it.
6. This is a brief outline of such a new Bank of the United States as I think, if established, would greatly conduce to the prosperity of the country. Perhaps, on full discussion and consideration, some of the conditions which I have suggested might not be deemed expedient, or might require modification, and important additional ones may be proposed by others.
7. I will only say a word or two on the constitutional power. I think that it ought no longer to be regarded as an open question. There ought to be some bounds to human controversy. Stability is a necessary want of society. Among those who deny the power, there are many who admit the benefits of a Bank of the United States. Four times, and under the

away of all the political parties, have Congress deliberately affirmed its existence. Every Parliament of the Government has again and again affirmed it. Forty years of acquiescence value of the currency, facility and economy in the general business of the country, with a wild disorder in the currency, ruinous prostration in domestic exchange, and general prostration in the commerce and business of the United States, would seem to have proved that it is not to be perpetually agitated. The power has been sustained by Madison, the Father of the Constitution; by Marshall, the Father of the Judiciary; by Jefferson, the Father of the Executive; by the People, who are to be blessed or cursed by the evidence in its proportion to integrity, wisdom, and patriotism of those who establish it. I think that on no occasion could there be an array of greater or higher authority. For one, I hope to be permitted yielding to it, in preference to submitting my judgment to the opinion of those who now deny the power, however respectable they may be.

But, Mr. President, strong as my convictions are, I have no intention of formally presenting any proposition to establish a Bank of the United States. Composed as Congress and the Executive now are, it would be an unnecessary waste of time to offer such a proposal. I should regret to see a bank established, unless it were clearly called for by public opinion. I believe it is now desired by a majority of the People of the United States. But of that there does not exist any conclusive evidence. Let us wait until demonstrations of their will shall be clearly given; and let us all submit, and, for one, I shall most cheerfully to their decision, whatever it may be. Mr. G. moved that the petition be laid on the table.

A debate followed, to be given heretofore, in which Mr. Allen, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Clay, of Ky., participated.

The position was laid on the table.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The House was all day engaged in the reception and consideration of petitions, memorials, &c. among which was one from Virginia, praying that Mr. Adams be expelled as a nuisance. Laid on the table.

Tuesday, May 22.

IN SENATE.—

Mr. Buchanan presented a petition from nine citizens of Pittsburgh, praying the establishment of a Bank of the United States, with 150,000,000 dollars capital, and a branch in each of the States. Laid on the table.

CHEROKEE INDIANS.—

A message was received from the President of the United States, transmitting and submitting to Congress Communication from the Secretary of War, commending certain stipulations in relation to the indemnity and removal to the west of the Mississippi of the remaining Cherokee Indians; which proposed stipulations originated in a correspondence between the Secretary of War and the Cherokee Delegation now in Washington, and of which the principal were the granting of two years for the completion of the removal, and an additional sum of money for indemnity or remuneration.

Laid on the table.

In the House of Representatives, another effort was made by Mr. Williams to obtain the suspension of the rules for the purpose of taking up the resolution rescinding the specie circular. It was lost by a vote of 104 to 82. A long debate occurred upon a motion to refer a communication from the President transmitting a document addressed to the Secretary of War by the Cherokee Delegation. It was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. The consideration of the Message of the President in relation to the occupation of the Oregon Territory was resumed. The motion was to commit it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Certain instructions to the committee were moved by Mr. Culling, and an amendment proposed by Mr. Elmore being accepted, they were adopted. Before the House adjourned, was taken the House adjourned.

Wednesday May 23.

In the Senate to-day a message was received from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Governor of Maine, with resolutions of the Legislature of that State, and also copies of a correspondence between Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Fox, on the subject of the North-eastern boundary question. The bill appropriating 500,000 for the construction of the Falmouth and Alexandria Railroad was read a third time, and passed. [The mail is to be carried on the road free of expense.] The Cumberland road bill, from the House, was then taken up, and, after discussion and amendment, ordered to be engrossed by a vote of 26 to 17.

Thursday, May 24.

The Vice President presented a communication from the treasury Department in pursuance of a resolution recently offered by Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, in regard to the receipt of bank notes for revenue. The communication was read, and was understood to state that no new orders had been given on the subject, and that the receipt of bank notes was a consequence of previous orders, and of the resumption of specie payments by certain banks. The communication was accompanied by a copy of a letter from the Department to public officers at New York, dated April 23, 1828, which was read, and which was understood to sanction the receipt of specie-paying bank notes from banks not issuing notes of less than 5 dollars, according to orders and instructions given previous to the suspension of specie payments.

The communication was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

The bill for the continuation of the Cumberland road in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, was passed by the following vote: