language, and with all responsibility towards whom that language concerns, is what we cannot admit.

Irresponsibility (Inviolability) whether it relates to persons, to acts, or to words, irresponsibility, when it is legally established, is a pure national institution a purely internal regulation, and can never be used as argument in the intercourse which Government hold with each other. If it were otherwise, & if we were disposed, after the example of Mr Livingston, to carry the argument to its extreme consequences, it might be maintained that the President of the United States has the right, provided it be in a Message to Congress, to imoute publicly to foreign Governments and to foreign nations the most odious acts, the most perverse intentions; to hold them up publicly to the animadversion of the world, without these governments or the nations having the right to manifest the slightest resentment, since, according to this very strange doctrine, they would not even be allowed to take official notice of it.

To state such a doctrine, is to refute it.

However, sir, we do not wish to exaggerate any thing. Mr. Livingston is perfectly right when he says that the cause which he supports, is, in a general sease common to all free countries.—That all Governments founded on the division of power and on the publicity of debates, have an interest in repelling, on the part of foreign powers, any interference with the communications with the Prince and his Ministers in constitutional Monarchies, and in republics the magistrates entrusted with the executive power, are called upon to make to the Legislature: And this is the reason as Mr. Livingston very judiciously observes, that in France and in England the language of the royal speeches is so reserved in every thing that concerns foreign relations: & it is this same motive, as you will observe, Sirs to the Cabinet of Washington, that has directed the conduct of France in relation to the Message of President Jackson. If the expression contained in that Message had been inserted in a proclamation, or any other act of the executive power of the Union, we would at once have called for an explanation Out of respect for the very nature of the act, the French Government deemed it a duty to manifest the seatiments it felt on that occasion, by instantly recalling its Minister, and stating in a communication the motive for that recall; but it did *not ask* for explanations; it was content ed to expect them from the justice of the Government of the United States and from the ancient friendship of the American nation: not doubting that the Government of the United States would appreciate the difference in such cases between answering an interpellation, and preventing by a spontaneous determination, by explanations readily *offered* a misunderstanding always to be regretted.

The amendment of the Chamber of Deputies is conceived in the same spirit of reserve and conciliation. It does not make it the duty of the French government to ask for explanations; it merely supposes they will receive them.

We were not mistaken, Sir, in believing that the government of the United States would appreciate that difference, since Mr. Livingston, as he himself observes, hastened as early as the 29th of January last, when the Message of President Jackson had been only known a few days, to offer us explanations at great length, of every passage of that Message which treated of the relations between the United States and France; and since, that step and the explanations contained in his note of the 29th Janary have received, as he informs us by his note of the 25th of April, the entire approbation of the President.

Mr. Livingston was not astonished that those explanations, as long as they were presented only upon his personal responsibility, did not produce upon us the effect he intended; but he supposes that being now clothed with the approbation of the President, they must satisfy all that the nices sense of national honor could desire.

He therefore makes it a point in his note of the 25th, to repeat & to develope them, in the hope that the French government by examining them anew, under the impression that they had become the expression of the sentiments of the President, would deem them sufficient. He is so much the more anxious to impart to us his own conviction on this subject, as he deems it impossible for the Government of the U States to go any further. He even seems to be apprehensive that future events which he need not specify, designating thereby no doubt the adoption of the amendment of the Chamber of Deputies by the other two branches of the Government, may hereafter render improper any allusion to explanations presented under the influence of different circumstances.

We sincerely wish sir, not to add to the difficulties of the situation in which the two countries are respectively placed—The question of date, to which Mr. Livingston seems, in this case, to attach an importance which it belongs not to us to appreciate, does not in any way alter either the nature or the extent of the duties which are prescribed to us—If satisfaction had really been given to the just susceptibility of the French Nation as early as the twenty ninth of January, (the date of Mr. Livingston's first note,) and therefore previous to the adoption of the amendment under consideration by the Chamber of Deputies, or as early as the 27th of April, (the date of Mr. Livingston's 2nd note,) that is, to say, before the adoption of this amendment by the two branches of the Legislature, we would be sincerely gratified—The more the Government of the United States would have shown a willingness to explain itself, the more we should be ourselves disposed to find the explanations satisfactory, and to view the solicitude of that Government as a testimony in favor of the intentions which had dictated the Message of the President.

We will simply observe, before we proceed.

First, That even supposing the explanations, given by the note of the 29th of January, to have been such as we might have wished them, they were on the 18th April, the day of the passage of the amendment in the Chamber of Deputies, nothing more than the simple expression of the personal sentiments of Mr. Livingston. This is an observation which did not escape his notice.

We will also observe that by the publication of Mr. Livingston's correspondence, the Government of the U. S. had excited against him such a feeling of irritation, that it would have been out of our power, even supposing that we had considered that correspondence as containing nothing but what was right and proper, to avail ourselves of a document bearing his signature, to repel in one or the other of the Chambers the amendment under consideration.

I will now proceed to the examination of the explanations which have been offered to us.

Mr. Livingston is right in thinking that our objections to the Message of the President are confined to these two points.

1st. The Message impeaches the good faith of his Majesty's Government.

2d. It contains a threat to secure the execution of the treaty by the fear of reprisals.

It is indeed under this double point of view that the Message of President Jackson excited in France the greatest indignation. The Cabinet of Washington will readily admit that if the allegation were true, the indignation would be just. No Government, no people, could for one moment bear without degrading itself, either the direct or indirect imputation of a want of good faith, or the idea of another Government or another people endeavoring to obtain from it through menace, what could only be granted by it to justice. It must equally be admitted that when the impression produced by the appearance of any document in general, when that impression is felt, not only by the whole nation whom the document concerns, but even by foreigners, uninterested people, by persons the least disposed to take a part in the contest, the very universality of that impression is a sufficient evidence against the general tenor of the document.

If we examine in detail the Message of the President of the United States, I mean that part of it which relates to the relations between the U. States and France,) it will possibly be found that passing successively from phrase to phrase, none will be met with that cannot bear an interpretation more or less plausible; none, of which, strictly speaking, it cannot be said that it is a simple expose of such or such a fact true in itself, or the assertion of such or such a right which no one contests, or the performance of such or such an obligation imposed on the President by the very nature of his functions. There will certainly be found several in which the idea of impeaching the good faith of the French Government, or of acting upon it through menance or intimidation, is more or less disavowed.

Yet when the whole succession of facts is taken into view; when we perceive the care which seems to have been taken to present them in an unfavorable light, without making allowance for circumstances which explained them, without paying any regard to considerations which the government of the U States itself had previously admitted; when we see at the end of this uninterrupted series of allegations, which have the appearance of wrongs, for the sole reason that they are made to rest on isolated and incomplete statements, the unexpected proposition, the extreme proposition to say the least, to seize upon French property, it is impossible at first view, it is even difficult after reflection, to escape the thought that all this part of the Message had been written for the double purpose stated above.

It is not so, however; at least we hope it is not.

But to banish entirely such an idea, what would be necessary? Nothing but what is very simple We do not here contend about this or that phrase, this or that allegation, this or that expression; we contend about the intention itself, which has dictated that part of the Message. If it be true that the President of the U. States in presenting to Congress a statement of the facts connected with the treaty of the 4th of July, had no intention to cast any doubt on the good faith of the French Government; if it be true that the President of the U. States in proposing to Congress the seizure by force of arms of French property, had not the intention to assume with regard to France a menacing attitude, we cannot see how he could find any difficulty in declaring it.

Is such a declaration really contained in Mr. Livingston's note, addressed to the French government on the 29th of January, or in that which the same Minister left at his departure on the 27th of April?

We would be equally at a loss to affirm or to deny it;—and for this reason it is evident that neither the one nor the other can be considered sufficient. The note of the 29th of January is intended to discuss contradictorily with the French government, the correctness of facts asserted in the message of President Jackson. It is intended to prove that the view taken by him of these facts is at least plausible. It is in the midst of this long disquisition that two or three phrases are incidentally thrown out, on the just confidence which the government of the U. States has always entertained in the sincerity of the French government; confidence which Mr. Livingston has always made it a duty to foster, and which according to him, is not in contradiction with any of the ideas or allegations expressed in the Message.

The note of the 25th of April, is chiefly intended to make an indirect and anticipated examination of the amendment introduced by the Chamber of Deputies. While upon this examination and with a view to prove that any demand for explanations would in future be useless in fact and inadmissible in principle, Mr. Livingston refers to the testimony given by him in his first note, to the good faith of the French government; he refers to subsequent sanction given by the President to the contents of that note; he dwells on the paragraph of the Message of the President, in which all idea of threat is, he says, *expressly disavowed*

You will easily conceive, Sir, and the Cabinet of Washington will we think understand it also, that such phrases incidentally inserted in documents, the purport and tenor of which are polemical, and surrounded, in some measure, by details of a controversy which is besides not always free from bitterness, cannot dispel sufficiently the impression produced by the perusal of the Message, nor strike the mind as would the same idea expressed in terms simple, positive, direct, and unaccompanied by any recriminations concerning facts or incidents no longer of any importance. Such is the motive, which, among many others, has placed the French Government in the impossibility of acceding to the wish expressed by Mr. Livingston, towards the conclusion of his note of the 25th April, by declaring (to the Chamber of Peers probably) that previous explanations given by the Minister of the United States and subsequently approved by the President, had satisfied it.

The impression produced by the perusal of the Message was deep It was so in France, in Europe, and even in the United States; the debates in Congress public notoriety sufficiently prove the fact. Under the weight of this impression, the French Government did not hesitate to place itself in a situation to meet the engagement contracted in the name of France. In pausing there for the present, and waiting for the fulfilment of those engagements to be claimed, or expecting them to be claimed, in terms consistent with the regard which is its due, it is not afraid of being accused, nor France which it represents, of being accused, of appreciating national honor by any number of millions which it could withhold, as a compensation for an injury offered it. Mr. Livingston is the first to repel such an idea. Far from it, the French Government will consider as a fortunate day, the one in which it will be able to deliver up honorably the trust that lies in its hands; but each State has duties to perform towards itself, each situation has its exigencies. Mr. Livingston objects to the idea of seeing the President of the United States give a new testimony to the good faith of the French Government, lest such a step, reasonable and just in itself, should not appear to be exclusively dictated by justice and by reason. He will not be astonished if the French Government, on its side, attaches an equal importance to show that in acknowledging openly a legitimate debt, and declaring itself ready to discharge it, it has exclusively consulted reason and justice.

You are authorised, Sir, to read the present despatch to Mr. Forsyth, and if he desires, let him take a copy of it.

Accept, Sir, &c &c.

(Signed) V BROGLIE.

M. Pageot, Charge d'Affaires of the King.

Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.

Washington, Jan. 19, 1836.

This day has been devoted to the discussion of abolition, in both Houses. The Senate were occupied with Mr. Calhoun's proposition not to receive Mr. Morris's petition.

Mr. Morris withdrew the petition, and the debate proceeded on a similar petition offered by Mr. Buchanan.

Mr Leigh made a long and interesting speech, in the course of which he made allusion to the work on slavery just published by *Channing*, as having been thrown into the midst of the community at a time and under circumstances more likely to do injury than any other pamphlet, or paper, or publication of any kind since the question of abolition began to be agitated. Mr. Leigh is always gentlemanly and courteous in debate, and he did not, although upon this very exciting question forget himself upon this occasion. He spoke decidedly and firmly upon the motion of Mr. Calhoun, and supported it with much force of argument, but did not for a moment lose that mild dignity for which he is remarkable.

Mr. Goldsborough said something on the same side. I am extremely sorry I am not able to do justice to this most learned and able Senator's speeches, but on both the occasions upon which he has spoken of late, I have been so situated in the crowd as to make it absolutely impossible, such was the bustle around me to follow him clearly. He spoke in support of Mr. Calhoun's motion.

Mr. Wright of New York, was opposed to Mr. C's motion. Although his constituents were, as a body, *opposed* (mark this!) to the agitation of this question, he said they were still of the opinion that it was the constitutional right of Congress to legislate upon the subject, and that therefore he could not give his vote for Mr. Calhoun's motion. He believed that the subject of abolition was not discussed at the North, now, to any alarming degree, and deprecated very much the exertions made by the abolitionists in that section of the Union.

Mr. Moore, of Alabama, took the floor, and moved for adjournment. So that Mr. Moore has the floor for to morrow.

In the House, Mr. Jarvis's resolution, with its amendments by Mr. Wise and Mr. Glascock, came up in order. Mr. Holsey of Georgia, said a few words. He was in favor of disconnecting the considerations of *expediency* as raised by Mr. Jarvis, and of *constitutionality* as raised by Wise and other gentlemen. He wanted to meet the latter question, as the most important one.

Mr. Peyton, of Tennessee, took the floor.

Mr. Hawes of Kentucky, rose full ten seconds after Mr. Peyton.

Mr. Peyton is a White man, and favorable to a full discussion of this question.

Mr. Hawes is a Van Buren man, & wishes to crush discussion, for party purposes.

The Speaker saw Mr. *Hawes* before Mr. Peyton, although Mr. Peyton rose first.

Mr. Peyton—"I leave it to the House if I am not entitled to the floor."

Mr. Polk—"If Mr. Peyton had the floor I did not know it. The gentleman from Kentucky caught my eye first. If he relinquishes the floor, the gentlemen from Tennessee can go on."

Mr. Hawes—"I cannot relinquish the floor."

Mr. Hawes then went on, and after a few remarks, MOVED THAT GAG—"the previous question."

Mr Peyton, (turning to Mr. *Hawes*.) 'That gentleman well knew I had the floor'

Many Members—Order! order! order!"

The Speaker—"The Previous Question is demanded Is it seconded?"

The House then passed between the tellers, and the vote was found to be 101 *against*, to 99 *for* the previous question.

Mr Peyton then took the floor, and made a long speech against abolition and abolitionists. He clearly identified Mr. Van Buren as an opponent of slavery west of the Mississippi, by the showing of Silas Wright, Mr. Van Buren himself, and B F. Butler,—of slavery in Missouri by recorded votes and documents, and of slavery in the District of Columbia, by many analogical proofs.

Mr. Boulden of Virginia, spoke also at some length on the same side, and had the floor at the adjournment. O.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Correspondence of the Baltimore Chronicle.

Washington City, Jan. 22, 1836.

A strange day in the House of Representatives.

This has been an extraordinary day and will long be remembered as presenting the most terrible picture of human malice that could have been imagined. These are strong terms but they are strangely true. The three million appropriation was in consideration, and Mr Adams moved that a committee be appointed, whose duty it should be to investigate the matter and free the last House from the charge of losing the bill. When I entered the House it seemed to be in no small commotion, and I discovered that it originated in Mr Mercer, of Virginia, having called Mr. Adams to order, for words used in debate. I was put to the House and decided that Mr Adams had not used the words attributed to him by General Mercer. Previous to putting the question, Mr. Wise rose and said that he hoped the gentleman from Massachusetts would be allowed to proceed, whether in or out of order, as he wanted every fact to be told relative to the important subject of the loss of the bill. Mr. Adams resumed—his voice quivered with anger, which he could ill disguise; the book from which he occasionally read trembled like a leaf in the tempest, as it grasped it—ever and anon he would scream like the Eagle as he hovers over his prey, and now he would lower his voice almost to a whisper—he was defending the House from the charge—he was upholding the purity of President Jackson—it was the Heroic selling his inheritance for a mess of potage—the inheritance of his life of toil and of fame—he reproached the constitutional foes of the bill and with his face pallid and his tongue glowing with poison, he quoted that sublime passage of Mr. Webster's last speech upon this very question, then in debate, wherein that expounder of the law and of the principles of the country had said, that he would oppose the bill if "the guns of the enemy were battering against the walls of the Capitol," and said Mr. Adams, there was "one other step left for him to take, and that he could easily do, *go over to the enemy*." This was the signal of death, and with one accord the enemies of the Charter, the Van Burenites, hailed the entry into their ranks of the venerable slanderer by a violent clapping of hands. Mr. Speaker Polk rose with great dignity and called upon the old and the young members to protect the decorum of the House—nothing of the kind had ever happened before in the hall of Representatives. And thus Mr. Adams has gone over to the enemy; thus with a base and degrading insinuation upon his lips, he has consummated the sale to Pierce. Did not Mr. Webster stand upon the great pinnacle of his own wisdom, away and far above the storm of party and of detraction, this stab from Mr. Adams would prostrate him forever—the malignity is deep—the allusion pointed and refers to the *Hartford* Convention charge against Mr. Webster.

All this abuse, this wickedness, springs from the disappointment of the ex-President—the food he has craved with an appetite that never palls - office, office, has been denied him, and because he is not now occupying the seat in the Senate held by Mr Davis, he pours forth the engendered wrath of his embittered heart. When the clapping commenced on the floor, the galleries, which were crowded, exhibited their feelings by a profound silence, interrupted occasionally by a reproving hiss. The scene changed, and chivalry stood in the place of dark and disgusting detraction—Wise obtained the floor. He said he rose to tell the truth, to point to the cause that lost the three million appropriation—he leant over his desk to Cambreleng who sits immediately in advance of him, and shaking his finger in his face, exclaimed with a voice that could have been heard in the far recesses of the hall, "Thou art the man!" Cambreleng started, and the speaker called Wise to order, but in vain; the blood of the proud and independent, and I will say, honest Virginian was up, and he thundered the remark once more into the ears of his agitated victim.

The party were astounded. Wise went on with the Journal of the house in his left hand, and a broad and unsparing sword in his right: the minions of power trembled as it gleamed over their heads and when it fell, it struck upon the thick skull of the honorable Mr. "Perish Commerce" Beardsley of New York It is impossible for me to follow out his points; but he spoke of the inconsistency of the gentleman named, their want of conscience, &c. And then he looked with his arms folded at the chair, his head drawn back and his eye flashing—"and you, too Mr. Speaker were concerned in the dark doings of that night." He then stated that two gentlemen of the House asked Mr. Polk, who was then chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, if the President had desired the appropriation; and that Mr. Polk replied, that he (the President) had wished it, but it had better be kept secret—so thus it was made known to a few while the rest were left to follow. He charged Mr. Polk to deny it if he could. Mr. Polk asked permission of the house, and admitted all except that relating to secrecy. One of the members who had asked him the question rose in his place and corroborated the statement made by Mr. Wise. The clouds were darkening around the party—they saw the lightning that was glittering over their heads—but they could not avoid the tempest—they listened to the terrible denunciations of the orator—his expositions of facts—they heard him say that the Bill was not entirely killed in the house, but that it had met its death between the door of the Senate and the Clerk's desk of the house—he spoke of the whisperings of imps in the capitol, the influences behind the curtain, and then he poured out the lava upon the underlings and the subservients He said that they had acted more like savages than the representatives of a free people. Mr. Peyton of Tennessee, here moved an adjournment in order to rest Mr. Wise—and the house accordingly adjourned until to morrow. No one but Wise could have spoken as he did—his power of reasoning is strong, and of arguing from numerous facts strikingly great.—Take him in all he is a glorious champion.

B.

Harrisburg, Jan. 18, 1836.

Mr. Poulson—The committee investigating freemasonry had a sesion this afternoon, and as the crowd was very great, too large to be contained in any of the committee rooms, the hall of the *House* was occupied by the committee The session was one of intense interest, though as will be seen nothing to-day was elicited.

The first witness called upon was Joseph R Chandler, the editor of the U. S. Gazette. Mr. C. appeared before the committee and took the book in his hand. Mr. Stevens, the Chairman of the Committee had proceeded as far as "You do swear" when Mr. C dropped the book, and requested the oath to be repeated to him, whichwas done. *He* then wished the oath reduced in writing, which the chairman pronounced a most *extraordinary request* to be made by a witness, and refused to have it done, but at the suggestion of one of the members he complied. The oath was then reduced to writing and handed to Mr. C. He then peremptorily refused to take the oath, but took from his pocket a protest which he read to the committee and retired, being informed by the Chairman that his attendance would be expected at Harrisburg, until the House of Representatives could decide upon his case.

T. B. Freeman was then called. He drew his document at once, and refused to take the oath.

Samuel M. Stewart, Charles Snyder, Samuel H. Perkins, Wm. Stevens, Josiah Randall, were successively called, and entered their protests, which they drew from their pockets and refused to be sworn.

George M. Dallas was then called. He answered, being near the door. Mr Stevens asked him to come forward. He said he was near enough to be heard. Mr. S. "you are requested by the Committee to come forward to the same place of the other witnesses, and that too without any disrespect being shown to the Committee." Mr. Dallas asked if that was a resolution passed by the Committee, & being informed that it was, came forward.—Mr Stevens then offered to administer to him the oath. *He* inquired "what is the oath." Mr. S. "the same always administered in a court of justice of which, you sir, cannot be very ignorant," Mr. Dallas refused the oath, and also drew out his protest which he read.

During the reading, a Mr Reed, who I believe represented Philadelphia county in the 1st Legislature, commenced a *stamping* back of the Speaker's chair. The Chairman of the Committee rose up, and in a most determined manner asked who that was. Mr. Reed admitted himself to be the gentleman, and was going to make some impertinent remarks.

Mr. S. called the sergeant-at-arms, who answered and came forward, and then turning to Mr. Reed, who appeared determined to say something, said, "Now, sir, let us hear no more from you, or the sergeant-at arms will take you in his keeping."

The latest information on this subject is contained in the following letter from the editor of the Philadelphia U. S. Gazette, now at Harrisburg. It is dated

Harrisburg January 21, 1836

This morning at an early hour, the Sergeant at Arms called at the lodgings of the numerous 'protestants,' and arrested them in the name of the House of Representatives of the State At half past 10 A. M. the prisoners assembled, to the number of about 20 in the room of the Canal Commissioners—and at 11 o'clock, the Sergeant at Arms announced to them that the *House* was ready to attend to their case. The company was marshaled, and proceeded to the *Hall*: the Sergeant at Arms at the head, an *Anti Mason*, next Gov. Wolf, followed by Mr G. M. Dallas, a Van Buren man, next J. R. Chandler, a whig—and in that piebald mixture of political complexion, and of equally diversified religious creeds, the whole of the 'culprits,' as they had been called, entered the *Hall* of the House of Representatives The spacious room was crowded to excess, and among the visitors was a large number of very handsome ladies.—When the 'prisoners' entered, Mr. Steven's was enforcing the motion, that the oath be tendered to 'George Wolf,' and other witnesses who had refused to be sworn before the Committee, this prevailed, as a matter of course,—and when the prisoners had taken their seats, the Speaker rose and said.

"George Wolf. I am instructed to propose to you an oath, or affirmation, that you will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, touching the matter to be before the House."

Mr. Wolf rose and said, "I respectfully decline taking the oath, for reasons assigned to the Committee.

And in this manner the whole of the "witnesses" were questioned, and thus they replied.

The *House* then went into consideration of a resolution from Mr. Stevens, that the witnesses at the bar be committed to the charge of the Sergeant at arms, and there continue until delivered by a due course of law.

To this resolution amendments were offered in rare abundance. One of which was from a member from Allegheny county—a Mr. *Kerr*. It was, that "the Speaker of the House be instructed to apologise to the prisoners at the bar, for the crime of having called them there,"—And for a time it was uncertain whether the prisoners would be committed, or the House apologise to them. How such a member of the Legislature can think contempt towards him a crime, I know not. If it is, there were a vast many criminals in the House.

Just before the house adjourned, at half past 1 o'clock, it was resolved that the committee report to the house, the protests of the witnesses and that the latter be allowed to appear in their defence by themselves or by counsel.

In the afternoon, the resolutions of the morning came up, and afterwards one amendment, which went to dismiss the witnesses entirely, was lost by the absence of three persons, who came in, I believe, shortly after the question was taken.

Mr. Reed, from the city, then offered an amendment, which went to declare: 1st. that the house had a right to institute inquiries, &c. &c—2dly. that the prisoners were guilty of contempt to the house in refusing to take the oath, and that they be brought to the bar of the house, and be reprimanded therefore by the speaker.

The last part of this motion was opposed by Mr. T. S. Smith, as being an indignity too gross to submit the witnesses to. Mr. Reed voted for his own motion; the rest of the city delegates, and all from the county, voted against it—as also did the speaker himself.—The first part was carried, and the other part was lost 40 to 50

In the course of the afternoon, a young man, named M'Connell, from Huntingdon county, made his first speech—in which he so far forgot every rule of propriety, and every sense of decency, as to mention by *name* Governor Wolf and to charge him and his administration by direct allusion, with the grossest crimes. He also mentioned Mr Dallas's name, while both these gentlemen were at the bar, and of course not allowed to reply.—For the rest of the young man's speech, it was the rankest piece of fustian farrago I ever saw or heard; & had Burton done it at the theatre, it would have convulsed the house.

The house adjourned between 5 and 6 o'clock, without deciding upon the fate of the prisoners.

I never saw a legislative body get into worse difficulties than did the house this day, and this not because Mr. Middlesworth did not do his duty for he is a most excellent presiding officer, but because the members did not know what they wanted or rather *how* they wanted, and especially how to get rid of a difficulty into which a miserable curiosity had brought them.

In the course of the afternoon, the speaker called upon the prisoners to know whether they wished to make any defence. Mr Dallas in their behalf returned thanks for the kindness of the house, but respectfully declined responding or defending referring to the protests of the several prisoners. The remark of Mr. D was calm and dignified.

From the Jacksonville Courier Jan. 7.

INDIAN HOSTILITIES.

Latest intelligence.

Last night Capt. Ross, with several of his company (who preferred riding in the night, to sleeping at Black Creek and marching in to-day) arrived in town. After the battle at Withlacoochy; the forces under Gens. Clinch and Call, returned to Camp Lang Syne. On Sunday last, Gen. Call with the volunteers from Middle Florida, started for home; and and on Monday, Colonels Warren and Mills, with the volunteers from East Florida, set out on their return, and were last night at Black Creek. They will reach this place to-night.

The volunteers served the time, one month, for which they offered their services. The want of provision & of every necessary to prevent extreme suffering, and the impracticability of following up the victory gained over the Indians, induced them to return.

It is said Gen. Call intends to raise fifteen hundred men by drafts from the militia, and return to the aid of Gen. Clinch The East Florida people will have enough to do, and we fear more than they can do, on the home stations, to prevent the Indians from extending their ravages further south. Gen. Clinch must of necessity wait for reinforcements—his forces are hardly sufficient to protect his posts. The whole of East Florida is in danger. The Indians have possession of the Southern portion of it as far north as Bulow's 20 miles south of St. Augustine—the data on the St. Johns—Whitesville on Black Creek—Alligator and Suwannee—an extensive and exposed frontier. It is the general opinion, that unless adequate aid is immediately extended to us, the whole of Florida, east of the Suwannee river will be inevitably ruined. We must not only abandon our property to destruction, but, stripped of all our hard earnings must fight for our lives, our women and our children.

We here are the fourteen companies reported by the Secretary of War, as now at the disposal of Gen. Clinch? We are told to day by Col. McIntosh, just from camp, that Gen. Clinch has only five companies. All communication is cut off between Camp King and Tampa Bay—so that if any companies have arrived at the latter point they are for the present useless. The undisguised truth is, we want instant aid—men, arms and ammunition. To our sister States, and especially to Georgia and South Carolina, do we look for that assistance which can come in time to save our people from total ruin. Thanks to the Savannah Volunteers, who have already magnanimously come to our protection, that Picolata is strongly and safely garrisoned. We shall be glad to see those spirited and gallant companies, first we were told, were ready to fly to our assistance, on their way, to give protection to our country and battle to the Indians.

A great battle was fought on the 31st ult. in which many on both sides were slain and wounded. The battle ground was on the Withlacoochee River, about 35 miles from Camp Lang Syne, and within a few miles of the Indian Warrior Powell's town, where it is supposed the Indian women and children are assembled.

The officers and men engaged on the 31st, we are happy to learn, behaved with great bravery. In fact, such was the disposition of the Indian forces, their boldness and desperate fighting, that nothing but the determined spirit with which the men fought and charged into the swamp, put the Indians to flight and silenced their fighting.

The engagement lasted one hour and five minutes.

At the first onset, the Indians on one flank leaped from their hiding places, and in front of the thicket formed boldly into line with Powell at their head. At this moment, the fire of the whites did execution; the Indians broke, taking to their covert again. It is thought Powell is wounded in the hand.

We insert below a letter from Col. Mills, containing an account of the engagement.

HEAD QUARTERS, }
Fort Crane, Jan. 3d, 1836. }

General Circular to all the good Citizens of Duval and Nassau. The army took up the line of march on the 29th ult. and on the morning of the 31st at day break, arrived at the Withlacoochee and found the river too high to ford, commenced swimming horses, and sent one man over for a canoe that was seen on the opposite bank, and in it began to cross the regular troops; at 12 o'clock, there were over all the regulars, and about fifty of the militia, when we were soon informed that Indians were coming, and but a moment elapsed, before a furious fire was heard in our front; Col. Warren and myself immediately formed and extended our line from the river out through the swamp to the pine barren, and saw the regular troops on our right boldly engaged with at least three hundred Indians: we were ordered to remain stationary, and prevent the Indians entering our lines. After repeated solicitations on the part of Col. Warren and myself, we took the responsibility on ourselves, and Col. Warren led the right to the left of the regulars, and I was stationed on the left of our own line when a charge was made, which after about ten minutes more of sharp fighting, forced them to retreat, and the battle ended.—We made out forty Indians killed, and wounded we suppose in proportion, the precise amount we cannot tell, as they carried them off—the loss is severe on our part.—Gen. Cliach says, that in many much greater battles, a much less number has been killed and wounded. Further particulars will be told on Friday next, when we will be at Jacksonville. I can now write no more.

W. J. MILLS, Lt. Col.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-1029.jpg