From the Globe, May 11.

H. M. Breckenridge, late Judge of Florida, who was taken up by General Jackson, cherished by his kindness, and promoted through his influence, when without succour or support—after having forfeited the confidence of his benefactor, has very naturally associated himself with Duff Green, in abusing one to whom he owes so many obligations, through the columns of the Telegraph. He evinces all the deadly hatred *of a renegade*—and every line which his pen gives the public, more truly than the pencil of the most perfect limner, serves to pourtray the character of one who first deceives—next hates—and lastly seeks to betray, a generous and noble minded patron.

In consequence of the knowledge which the President obtained of the manner in which Mr. Breckenridge conducted himself as Judge of Florida, (a station which was obtained for him through the influence of General Jackson, from Mr. Monroe,) he declined re appointing him to office. This has induced the ex-Judge to lay aside his mask, and come out in his true character before the American public.—In one of his late letters in the Telegraph, upon the subject of his disappointment, he seeks to make the impression that he was a kind friend of the President who owed him many obligations, and had been cast off and abandoned without cause personally—without fault officially—and as he says, in a "*faithless and dishonorable manner.*" He gives us, in his first letter, the account of the mode in which he solicited the renewal of his commission, and, as he says, obtained a promise that his wishes would be complied with. It will be observed that in this first letter he lays stress upon the circumstance that he made publications "*which operated in favor of Gen. Jackson's election.*"—We quote his remarks to show how he puts forth his claims to the President's gratitude, and will contrast them with the feelings he exhibits in his second letter, proving at once his hypocrisy, and how little claim he had on the President's kindness He says:

"My feelings towards General Jackson were those of the MOST PERFECT GOOD WILL, and I had no reason to suppose he entertained any other towards me. Influenced by this impression, I paid my respects to him, at Washington, last spring. He received me in the most cordial, *frank*, and friendly manner; invited me to a family dinner, and after it was over retired with me, smoked his pipe, and exhibited to me his nomination, by the legislature of New York, as a child exhibits its bauble—Finding him in such excellent humor, I took occasion to mention that my commission would have to be renewed at the next session of Congress. I had considered the renewal as a matter of course, as the term had been always, hitherto, practically regarded as being during good behaviour. It had been renewed on this principle by Mr. Adams, (although *I had just before made a publication under my own signature, which operated in favor of Jackson's election,*) but *I was willing to pay the compliment of* RECEIVING FROM THE GENERAL, AS A FAVOR, THAT WHICH, FROM ANY OTHER PRESIDENT, I SHOULD HAVE CLAIMED AS A MATTER OF RIGHT He appeared surprised, that I should entertain a moment's doubt on the subject."

Subsequently he says:

"It was intimated to me by a friend, that the General, on his electioneering visit to New Orleans, complained of my indifference, and spoke with some chagrin of my not defending him from attacks in relation to the ordinances, and the affairs of Callava, and particularly as to the former, which were drawn up by me. I did not hesitate, on this intimation, to make the publication which I have said operated favorably on the General's election, *although I disclaimed, at the time, all party views, and avowed my predilection for Mr Adams*"

The duplicity which is evinced in the last lines cannot escape the reader. He sets up again his claim to the President's gratitude for his *services as a partizan*, but as he is now *the partizan* of the factions that oppose him, he puts in a disclaimer of all party views "in his efforts to advance the General's election, and has the impudence to say that while he was *writing* in behalf of one candidate, he verbally "*avowed [his] predilections.*" for his opponent.

Again urging the claims of *gratitude* he exclaims:

"Is the individual, whom *our mistaken gratitude*, has elevated to the high, but, I hope, not *irresponsible* office, of President of the United States, above or below the rules of honor, truth, and justice, which govern the conduct of common men."

In his second letter, he still keeps up this strain. He says, "*after the election of General Jackson, I wished him success most sincerely.*"—"*I still wrote to the General as a friend.*" "*I wished him to be the President of the nation,*" &c. &c. And after telling us that "he wrote to him (the President) as if he was really what he wished him to be"—he concludes by saying, "The praise which I gave him in advance, was never earned."

Now, be beg our readers to attend to what this SYCOPHANT and HYPOCRITE, has the effrontery to declare in his last letter. Not only contradicting in the most positive manner, all he has said in his previous letter, in relation to his efforts to contribute to the elevation of the President, but avowing sentiments of hostility, previous to that event, wholly at war with the professions of friendship which he admits he has continued to manifest, *since:*

"My object, in the present communication, is not to notice the falsehoods of the anonymous writer, or to defend a character which, from my youth upwards, in purity, may at least compare with that of General Jackson; nor to add proofs in support of specific charges against him, which have not been denied, *but to vindicate myself from what I regard as a most serious imputation—that of having supported, aided, or countenanced the election of such a man to be the Chief Magistrate of this peaceful, enlightened, and virtuous people*—WITH THE PERFECT KNOWLEDGE WHICH MY OPPORTUNITIES ENABLED ME TO POSSESS, OF HIS NARROW, ILLITERATE MIND—HIS WANT OF ALL MORAL CONTROL OVER HIS VIOLENT, ARBITRARY, AND TYRANNICAL TEMPER; IT WOULD HAVE BEEN INEXCUSABLE IN ME, AS AN HONEST MAN, TO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO BRING SUCH A A MISFORTUNE ON MY COUNTRY. *I defy any one to produce a single line ever written by me recommending him to the Chief Magistracy, knowing him, as I did, to be unfit for a magistracy of any kind.*"

To show the utter destitution of the principle in this man, we make the following extract from a public letter, on file in the Department of State, which he wrote to induce the removal of a gentleman who had become obnoxious to him, in Florida. The sentiment expressed with regard to the President, will be found in admirable keeping with those which we have given in capitals above. The letter is dated, 23d September last:

"According to the admissions of Mr. ——, he stands convicted of a most injurious misrepresentation—of my Judicial conduct, and his letters display a defect of the moral sense truly deplorable. I know too well the indignant feelings of our venerable President, against any thing dishonorable, to believe that this affair will not be deemed of sufficient importance to claim his attention."

Of a piece with this shameless want of principle and consistency, are the various aspects in which his caprice has painted the character of General Jackson. At one time, in speaking of the General's imperious mind, he says "every thing must conform to his views, whether original conceptions of his own, or adopted from others," &c. &c. "It is impossible for any honest and independent man, to be long near him, without finding that he must either advance his opinions, submit in silence, or take his departure." And yet this very independent gentleman, in the next breath, pretends, that during the long period that he "was *near him*," Gen. Jackson had no mind of his own at all. He says, "judging from what I witnessed, he never wrote a single official letter, report or answer to an address. These things, while I was with him, having been prepared by me!!" What a pretension have we here for a miserable copyist, who was employed, as he admits himself, for "a trifling compensation, as translator of the Spanish language!!!" He, however, has the conscience to surrender, in another part of his letter, the modest appropriation he makes of all the General's productions. He says, "I do not mean to insinuate that some of his ideas are not to be found in his public writings—sometimes too many of them are there,' &c. &c. And then our wretched scribbler provides against a denial and apprehended conviction of his falsehood by thus characterizing the papers which he prepared as an amanuensis, under the General's dictation; by saying, "some are drawn from his conversation and some from rude and illiterate scraps."

This unfortunate Judge has acted, as he now finds, under a false view of the President's character. He tells the public in his last letter that "He [the President] is *but an indifferent distinguisher of real merit and talents; the most abject and unprincipled flatterer being generally preferred.*" Having acted upon this false idea, it is no wonder that he supposed his re nomination as Judge of Forida, "*a matter of course.*" The President, however, seems to have looked rather to his conduct in the judicial station—to have consulted the intelligent men of the Territory with regard to the satisfaction he gave to the people, than to have *satisfied himself* with his fulsome and flattering letters. Accordingly we find, from the following letter of Wm. P. Duval, *Governor of the Territory*, the species of information on which the President relied in the discharge of his duties to a distant people:

WASHINGTON, MONDAY NIGHT, April 23d, 1832.

Dear Sir—On my return to my lodings to night I found your note of this date in relation to my conversations with the President on the subject of the re-nomination of H. M. Breckenridge, as Judge of West Florida.

On my arrival here I was informed that he had been active in the removal of Benjamin D. Wright, Esq, the Attorney for the United States, in his judicial districts.

I know Mr. Wright to be a man of high standing and integrity. He was considered as a good officer, except by the Judge, and a few others, who were his personal enemies. The recommendations of Mr. Wright for office are on file in the Department of State and will show who urged his pretensions to office.

The frequent disputes which the Judge had with this law officer, was intended to drive him out of office,—this course certainly operated injuriously on the public business and affected the respectability of the court.

Judge Breckenridge participated freely in the political feuds of the Territory, and was in the habit of writing articles for a party paper at Pensacola—attacking under fictitious signatures, or the Editorial head, his brother officers, and those opposed to his political opinions. As a Judge, I do not believe he ever had the confidence of the Bar or the People of Florida. Strong in his partialities and prejudices, he was considered by the respectable members of the Bar, as often influenced by his political or personal feelings, for or against the suitors in his courts.

Without reference to party divisions, I have recent assurances, from the most respectable authority, that the people generally, and the bar, are highly gratified he was not re-nominated. But little respect is entertained for his legal knowledge, independence, or fitness for office, and his impartiality and sincerity is questioned by those who know him. His abstraction of mind from the business before him, has been often remarked by those who were commonly attending his Court, and I have heard from respectable members of his Court, that in his absence of mind, (which is not unusual with him,) he once left the Court and business unadjourned.

These opinions I have expresed to General Jackson in *several conversations* since my arrival in this city, and the intelligent men of all parties in Florida, who know the Judge, will express the same substantially. I do not believe we have sustained the smallest loss; but think the Territory will be benefitted, and the citizens gratified, that the President has respected their interests and responded to their wishes, by nominating another Judge for the Western District.

I am, with respect and esteem,
Your friend,
WM. P. DUVAL.

Since the President's determination not to re-appoint Mr Breckenridge has been known in the Territory, a gentleman of the highest character writes:

"Information has been received here by the last mail that Mr. BRYCE, of Virginia, was appointed to succeed Judge Breckenridge. This change is *hailed with much pleasure* by all persons who are friendly to the administration."

MORE OF THE FARCE.

On Friday last the cap sheaf was put to the farce which has been in the course of performance at Washington by the convention of National Republican young men during the past week. As it was found inconvenient for the mountain to go to Mahomet, Mahomet concluded to go to the mountain. The convention had resolved, on the previous day, to ascertain at what time it would be agreeable to Mr. Clay to receive the respects of the convention; and we supposed that we were to hear of their walking in procession to his lodgings to obtain for each of the members of the convention a shake of his hand. But it seems that Mr. Clay concluded to go to the convention. As the person who had been selected as the President of it, was, as we suppose, considered incompetent to perform the service, one of the Vice Presidents was fixed upon to occupy the chair, for the occasion, and to address the idol, on behalf of the members generally, testifying their great reverence and respect for him. Things having been thus arranged, Mr. Clay was ushered in, and seated on the right of the chair, when the address was delivered to him, to which he replied, in a style which does not argue much in favor of his modesty. After telling them what great things he intended to perform for the country, in case he should be elected to the Presidency, he alleged that upon the members of the convention and the young men of the country generally, it depended to save the country from ruin, and to preserve its free institutions unimpaired, by endeavouring to elevate Henry Clay to the Presidency! It would, we think, have been quite as modest, and as much to his credit to have suffered some other individual to give this piece of information to the young men.

Is it possible that any reflecting and intelligent man can look upon a scene like this without laughter mingled with disgust? To see grey headed and bald headed men, under the designation of young men, with solemn faces assembled together from different parts of the country, to *confirm* a nomination of candidates for the two highest offices in the gift of the country, which had been made months before by delegates selected for their wisdom, prudence and intelligence from the ranks of the same party; to see the candidate selected as the first officer addressing to one convention a letter in which he represents the country as ruined, because he is not placed at the head of our national affairs, and in a short time after, as was the case in Mr. Clay's Tariff speech, representing the country as enjoying a degree of prosperity and happiness altogether unparalleled; and then again to see the same candidate meeting with a body of men, under the denomination of young men, assembled together for the express purpose of renominating, and to hear him again representing the country as on the brink of destruction, that he, if elected, will save it from ruin, and telling the members of it, that upon them and persons of their age, depends the salvation, the success and the happiness of the country, by endeavouring to elevate his own dear precious self to the highest office in the country, is truly singular enough.

In ordinary cases, to see a man display such an utter want of modesty, would excite our laughter; and to see such gross contradictions in his own statements, would excite our contempt; but in a case like the present, it should excite in the people generally laughter at the folly of the men; contempt for the want of principle which is displayed; indignation at the design of the ludicrous and unprincipled movement, and a determination to resist their attempts, and to teach such *modest* men as Mr. Clay that the proper places for them are upon their "farms," where they can take care of their "fields" and their "fences."—*Baltimore Republican.*

From the New York Standard.

We copy from the Lowell (Mass.) Mercury, a new and othodox political journal, a few wholesome items for the benefit of the opposition:

"ITEMS."—POLITICAL.

Henry Clay challenged and shot at John Randolph "for words spoken in *debate*" in the House of Representatives.—*Right.*

Timothy Upham assaulted Hon. Isaac Hill in the streets in Exeter, N. H.—*Right.*

"Young Platt" slapped Hon. Edward Everett on the cheek in a public house in New York.—*Wrong. Wrong.*

Governor Houston assaulted Hon. Mr. Stanberry in the streets in Washington.—*Wrong.*

Henry Clay made John Quincy Adams President, in 1824, and Adams made him Secretary of State—because they were *the best men.*—*Right.*

The PEOPLE made Andrew Jackson President in 1828.—*Wrong.*

John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay sent three ministers to England during four years, and gained nothing. They would have taken the West India Treaty on the same basis, upon which the present administration negotiated successfully, but were too late.—*Right.*

Andrew Jackson obtained in a few months the opening of the West India Ports, through the able diplomacy of Mr. McLane.—*Wrong.*

The Senate confirmed the TREATY opening the West India ports.—*Right.* The *same* Senate abused Mr Van Buren, and rejected his nomination to the court of St. James for his instructions to Mr. McLane, directing him to make the said treaty.—*Right.*

Jackson has succeeded in obtaining from France indemnity for spoliations on American commerce under the Berlin and Milan decrees, to the full amount of just claims.—*Wrong.* He has obtained indemnity from Denmark.—*Wrong.* Also from Portugal.—*Wrong.* Also from the South American Governments.—*Wrong*—*Wrong.* Adams and Clay failed in all these negotiations.—*Right*

Jackson has succeeded in making a treaty with Turkey, opening to our merchants new avenues to commerce and wealth.—*Wrong.*

Mr. Adams did not succeed.—*Right.*

Mr. Adams was *unsuccessful* in almost all his foreign diplomacy.—*Right* Jackson has been *successful every where.*—*Wrong.*

Adams and Clay agreed to submit the difficulties respecting the North Eastern Boundary to the King of Holland.—*Right.*

Jackson and Van Buren submitted the reference thus agreed upon.—*Wrong.*

Mr. Adams sent Rufus King to the court of St. James.—*Right*—*Right.* Gen. Jackson sent John Randolph to the court of St Petersburgh. ☞ Those who could justify or acquiesce in the first should be *slow to condemn the last.*

Adams recommended the removal of the Indians, and attempted to remove them, but failed, for want of energy.—*Right.* Jackson recommended the removal of the Indians, and is rapidly carrying his recommendation into effect.—*Wrong.*

Every Administration pressed to do so by Massachusetts and Maine, failed to settle the Massachusetts claim.—*Right.*

The present administration has admitted and settled several hundred thousand dollars of it.—*Wrong*—*Wrong.*

The late administration of Mr. Adams was irresolute, weak and unsuccessful at home and abroad.—*Right.* Mr. Adams was a *minority* President.—*Right.* Gen. Jackson's administration is full of energy, strong, and successful in our foreign intercourse, and domestic affairs.—*Wrong.*

During Mr. Adams' administration our commerce languished, and our Manufactures drooped and were ready to perish. Money was scarce, and labor and produce low.—*Right.*

Since Jackson's election, commerce and manufactures have *revived and were never more flourishing*, labor and produce bear a good price, and the nation is prosperous and happy.—*Wrong.*—*Wrong*—*All wrong.*

From the New Orleans Argus.

SCANDALOUS OUTRAGE.—On Tuesday night some scoundrel or scoundrels, broke open the tomb of the late Col. Thomas, in the Catholic burying ground where it had been deposited about eight days ago, and having opened the coffin, cut open the body on the left side, and extracted the heart and other vital parts around, and carried them off, leaving the corpse exposed on the ground, where it was found yesterday morning. We have also been informed that the grave of a lady buried a few days ago was also violated the night previous.

TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS,

FIRST SESSION.

In the Senate, on Friday, the bills authorising a division and extension of the duties of the Navy Department, to give effect to the commercial arrangement with the Republic of Colombia; and relinquishing the residuary interest of the United States in certain India reservations, were ordered to be read a third time. The Senate then resumed the consideration of the unfinished business; and Mr. Bibb having renewed his motion to amend, by abolishing the postage on newspapers, which was again negatived, the Ayes and Noes having been ordered, and the vote standing—Ayes 22, Noes 23. The bill was then ordered to be read a third time. The Senate then took up the bill supplementary to the act for the relief of the surviving officers and soldiers of the Revolutionary War. The question being on the motion of Mr. Robinson, to recommit the bill, and the ayes and noes being ordered, some discussion took place, which lasted, without any question being taken, until the Senate adjourned, to meet on Monday.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Mr. McDuffie, having obtained leave, presented the Report of the Minority of the Committee appointed to investigate the Proceedings of the Bank of the United States, and moved that it be laid upon the table and printed; but withdrew the motion at the request of

Mr. Cambreleng, who inquired of Mr. Duffie whether the Report had appended to it the replies of the President of the Bank to the last set of interrogatories presented to him on the part of the Committee?

Mr. McDuffie replying in the affirmative.

Mr. Cambreleng stated that, in order to enable the President of the Bank to answer these interrogatories more at his leisure, they had been left in his hands by the committee on their departure from Philadelphia. On looking over the replies which the President had made, Mr. C. perceived that many of them were not replies to the queries which had been put by the committee. In others, the President had denied facts which the committee had stated on the ground of the statements submitted by the bank to Government from year to year; and had answered questions which Mr. C. had never asked of him. In consequence of this Mr. C. took this opportunity to give notice that he should feel it his duty to propound to the President other queries, for the purpose of ascertaining who had been right and who wrong in the matter.

Had that course been pursued in the Committee which Mr. C. had proposed and desired, and the President had been permitted to give verbal replies to those interrogatories, and his answers been taken down, Mr. C. would have had an opportunity to have prevented all misunderstanding. But he had waived this advantage and consented, for the convenience of the President, to leave the written queries with him, and had little anticipated that that gentleman would have taken advantage of the waiver.

Mr. McDuffie said, that from the perusal he had been able to give to these replies, they appeared to him to be full, complete, and satisfactory. If any misunderstanding has taken place, it would seem more likely, from the knowledge the President of the Bank possessed on all subjects connected with the subject of banking, that that officer was less likely to have fallen into the mistake than the honorable gentleman from New York. But he rose to inquire whether he had correctly heard the gentleman. Had the gentleman said that the President of the Bank had given replies to questions which had not been put to him?

Mr. Cambreleng said, in explanation, that from the replies, it would seem either that the President of the Bank had misunderstood the interrogatories, or else had purposely given such replies as were calculated to place the queries which had been put to him in a ridulous light before the public. It seems to him that the President had wilfully misunderstood the queries. He could not undertake to say what had been the motives of that officer, but it was certain that the replies did not answer the questions. If the gentleman from South Carolina would sit down by his side, and with him go over the interrogatories and the answers, he could satisfy him that such was the fact.

Mr. McDuffie asked Mr. Cambreleng to say whether the questions set down by the President in connexion with the replies, were or were not the questions put to that officer by the Committee?

Mr. Cambreleng said that they were.

Then, replied Mr. McDuffie, as the questions and the answers will be submitted side by side to the public, the public would be able to judge whether the President of the Bank made himself ridiculous by the answers he had given, or whether the ridicule would fall elsewhere.

Mr. Adams stated that the separate Report he wished to submit to the House on his own behalf would be in readiness on Monday next.

Mr. Clayton said that as the Counter Report from the Committee had now come in, he hoped the House would consent to the printing of an extra number of both the documents.

The Chair suggested that the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams) had just given notice that a third report would be submitted to the House on Monday: perhaps the gentleman would prefer to defer his motion until then.

Mr. Clayton assented, and did not press the motion.

The case of Samuel Houston again coming up—

Mr. Burges who had the floor, advocated the amendment of Mr Huntington, declaring that he had been guilty of a contempt and violation of the privileges of the House.

Mr. Archer followed in a Speech upon the opposite side.

Mr. Kerr and Mr. Dickson successively took the floor, in laborate arguments in support of the amendment of Mr. Huntington. The latter gentleman was still addressing the House, at 8 o'clock when our paper went to press.—The House seemed determined to have the question before adjournment.

On Friday night the case of Gen. Houston which was before the House of Representatives when our paper went to press, was not disposed of till nearly eleven o'clock. After Mr. Kerr concluded his speech, Mr. Dickson took the floor in support of the amendment and addressed the House at length. When he had concluded a call of the House was ordered—193 members answered to their names.—The question was then taken on Mr. Huntington's amendment, declaring Gen. Houston guilty of a contempt and breach of privilege, which was carried.—Yeas 106—nays 89.

Mr. Clay then moved the following resolution;

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to proceed further in the case of Samuel Houston, and that he be discharged from the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. C. said quite time enough had been already spent in the discussion, and he would not detain the House by any remarks upon the propriety of the resolution.

Mr. Huntington moved the following amendment—strike out all after the word *resolved* and insert:

That Samuel Houston be brought to the bar of the House on Monday next at 12 o'clock, and be there reprimanded by the Speaker, for the contempt and violation of the privileges of the House, of which he has been guilty; and that he be then discharged from the custody of the Segeant at Arms.

Resolved, That Samuel Houston be excluded from the priviledge conferred by the 13th standing rule of the House

Whereupon Mr. Davis, of South Carolina, rose to enquire of the Chair whether the second resolution was in order under the rules of the House?

The Speaker decided that the second resolution was not in order, under the 13th and 105th rules of the House. By the 13th rule, every individual who has been a member of either branch of the legislature, has the right of admission to the privileged seats within the Hall.—This is one of the standing rules of the House. By the 105th rule, it is declared that no standing rule or order of the House shall be rescinded or changed without one day's notice being given therefor. The Chair regarded the second resolution of the Gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. Huntingdon] as effectually changing this 13th rule, to which it expressly refers in terms. It is therefore a proposition to change a standing rule and order of the House, under cover of an amendment, without *one day's notice*, and in direct violation of another rule of the House. The 105th rule expressly forbids its being done. The resolution therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, is not in order without one day's notice.

From this decision, Mr. Mercer appealed, and the decision of the Chair was reversed.

So the amendment was decided by the House to be in order.

Mr. Lamar called for a division of the question. The question was stated upon the first member of the amendment directing Gen. Houston to be reprimanded & discharged.

Mr. Archer thought the majority of the House, who had solemnly asserted the power of unlimited punishment, were now creeping out from the consequences of that decision.—The penalty proposed might be proper for an idle school boy—but, in this case, it was altogether childish. He hoped gentlemen would now show firmness enough to impose imprisonment, at least, upon the accused, in order that the question of power could be brought before a Court of Justice.

Mr Huntington said, the gentleman from Virginia could move an amendment imposing imprisonment, if he thought proper. The two resolutions together, expressed the strongest censure he could conceive of, on the part of the House.

Mr. W. Thompson said, after so much time as had been spent in the affair, gentlemen ought not to shrink from the responsibility of playing the game out. The offence charged against the accused, had been characterized as of the most flagitious nature. If such was the fact, after assuming the power of punishment, the dignity of the house required some infliction. These resolutions inflicted no punishment whatever, and only turned the whole course of proceeding into ridicule.

The question was then taken on the first member of the amendment, and was carried—Yeas 106—noes 89.

The question on the second member of the amendment was then stated as follows.

Resolved, That Samuel Houston be excluded from the exercise of the privilege conferred by the 13th standing rule of the House.

Mr. Carson hoped this branch of the amendment would not be adopted. Gen. Houston had been a member of this House. His conduct in this affair had not been dishonorable, or such as, in any way, rendered him unworthy the society of gentlemen.

Mr. Huntington considered this branch of the amendment as consequent upon that already adopted. It was the practical enforcement of the privileges of the House against the person who had been guilty of a contempt of the House.

Mr. Cambreleng said, the utmost the House could do, was to imprison, during the remainder of the session. He would prefer that, to fixing this punishment, during life, upon an individual who had served his country with credit both in the field and on this floor.

Mr. Coke replied to Mr. Cambreleng.—The accused enjoyed this right only under the rule of the House. He was not disposed to permit the person, who had been solemnly adjudged guilty of a contempt of the House, to walk in to this Hall,—a privilege denied the mass of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Craig perceived no beneficial result from this part of the amendment, and should vote against it.

Mr. Blair, of South Carolina, said he had voted against the accused so far, from a sense of duty and at the expense of his personal feelings. The accused was his friend, and had conducted himself in this affair, like a man of honor. He had gone thus far, to sustain the power of the House, but would go no further.

The amendment was further opposed by Messrs. Clayton and Budd, when the question was taken and was negatived.—Yeas 90—Nays 101.

The question was then taken upon the agreeing to the resolution as amendded by the first clause above stated, which was carried.—Yeas 96—nays 84.

Mr. Polk presented the original opinions of the members of President Washington's Cabinet upon the first apportionment bill in 1792, which he moved might be printed in season for Monday, at which time he should move to take up the apportionment bill, which was agreed to. The House then, at a few minutes before eleven o'clock, after a sitting of nearly thirteen hours, adjourned.

Tuesday, May 15.

In the *Senate*, yesterday, the bill remitting duties on merchandize imported by John F. Lewis, from the operation of the Tariff of 1828, was taken up, and the amendment heretofore offered by Mr. Silsbee, embracing certain other similar cases, was adopted, and the bill, as amended, ordered to a third reading.—The Post Office bill was taken up, and read a third time. Mr. Hill addressed the Senate, in reply to some remarks made on Thursday last, by Mr. Holmes; and, after some remarks by Messrs Holmes and Dickerson, the bill was *passed.*—Mr. Holmes gave notice that, to-morrow, he would ask leave to introduce a bill for the abolition of Postage on Newspapers.—Mr. Dickerson gave notice that he would, on Wednesday, call up the bill to repeal, in part, the duties on Imports. This bill is the first which was reported from the Committee on Manufactures, and is limited to unprotected articles.—The Pension Bill was taken up, and Mr. Holmes spoke at length in its support. The question being on the motion to re-commit the bill, with instructions so to amend it, as to provide for the officers and soldiers who served in the Indian wars during the revolution and subsequent to it, till the year 1795; a division of the question was called for, and the motion to re-commit was rejected by a vote of 19 to 21.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. J. S. Barbour offered a resolution directing the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill defining contempts against either House of Congress, which was adopted.

COLLECTOR OF WISCASSET.

Mr Slade resumed his speech against the report of the Judiciary Committee, which he continued till the expiration of the hour allotted to morning business.

CASE OF GEN. HOUSTON.

Mr. Archer rose and offered a paper on the part of the accused for the consideration of the House. The accused, when brought before the House for judgment, was entitled to state orally the contents of the paper—but the great respect the accused felt for the House, had induced him to submit, beforehand for their consideration, what he proposed to offer. Mr. A. wished not to be understood as acting in consequence of any direct communication with the accused. He had not seen him excepting in the Hall. But having been requested to present the paper, which contained nothing which was not perfectly respectful, he wished it might be read for the information of the House.

Mr. Burges asked what the paper was?

Mr. E. Everett wished the gentleman from Virginia would state the substance of the paper.

Mr. Archer said the accused was about to be brought to the bar of the House to receive judgment for an offence of which he had been declared guilty. It was perfectly within his constitutional privileges, to state at that time the considerations in that paper by way of protesting against the competency of the House to pronounce such a judgment. The accused might have done this without permission, it being his undoubted right—but he thought it more respectful to the House to communicate his intention beforehand. He assured gentlemen there was nothing disrespectful in the language of the paper.

After some conversation between Messrs. Barringer, Vinton and Archer, in which the former gentleman objected to the reading of the paper. Mr. McDuffie said the proposed form was the most unexceptionable one for the accused to do what he had an undoubted right to do. Any man brought up to receive sentence has a right to state the reasons why it should not be pronounced.

Mr. Archer said the accused had no doubt of the right, and the only reason of presenting the paper, by the hand of a member of the House, was to manifest his respect to the House. Mr. A. said, for his own part, he did not care whether it was read or not—he had not the slightest wish on the subject. The accused was willing to apprise the House of what he proposed to say when called before them for judgment. He had been requested by a friend (we understood him to say the counsel of the accused) to offer this paper for the previous information of the House. Whether it was read or not, the contents of the paper would be known throughout the country.

Mr. Barringer withdrew his objection, and the paper was read as follows—

To the Honorable the House of Representatives of the United States:

The accused, now at the Bar of the House, asks leave respectfully to state,

That he understands he is now brought before the House, to receive a reprimand from the Speaker, in execution of the sentence pronounced upon him.

Was he to submit in silence to such a sentence, it might imply that he recognized the authority of the House to impose it.

He cannot consent that it shall be thus implied. He considers it a mode of punishment unknown to our laws, and, if not forbidden by the prohibition of the Constitution against "unusual punishments," yet inconsistent with the spirit of our institutions, and unfit to be inflicted upon a free citizen.

He thinks proper to add, in making this declaration, that he has been unwilling to trouble the House.

That though he believes the whole proceeding against him, as well as the sentence he now objects to, unwarranted by the constitution of his country, yet circumstances may exist to justify or excuse a citizen in determining (as he has done on this occasion) to suffer in silent patience, whatever the House may think proper to enforce.

SAMUEL HOUSTON.

May 14.

Mr. Archer then moved that the accused be permitted to present this paper to the House at the bar, which was agreed to.

The Speaker then ordered Gen. Houston to be placed at the bar: he soon afterward appeared, accompanied by the Sergeant at Arms.

The Speaker informed him if he had any thing to offer to the House before the judgment was pronounced upon his case, it would be received.

Gen. Houston rose and delivered the above paper.

The Speaker then addressed him as follows:

SAMUEL HOUSTON!

You have been charged with a violation of the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives, in having offered personal violence to one of its members, for words spoken in debate! In exercising the high and delicate power, of ascertaining and vindicating their own privileges, the House have proceeded throughout this investigation, and in relation to your individual rights, with all that deliberation and caution which ought to characterize the dignified and moral justice of such an assembly!—

You have been heard in person in your defence: You have been ably and eloquently defended by eminent counsel, and every facility afforded you, to place your cause fully and fairly before the House, and to urge upon its consideration, matters of principle as well as fact, in explanation and justification of your conduct!

Whatever the motives or causes may have been, which led to the act of violence committed by you, your conduct has been pronounced by the solemn judgment of the House, to be a high breach of their rights and privileges, and to demand their marked disapprobation and censure—

If, in fulfilling the order of the House, I were called upon as its presiding officer, to reprimand an individual, uneducated and uninformed, it might be expected, that I should endeavor as far as I was able, to impress upon him, the importance and propriety, of sedulously guarding from violation, the rights and privileges secured to the members of the House by our invaluable constitution;—But when addressing a citizen of your character and intelligence, and one who has himself been honored by the people with a seat in this House, it cannot be necessary, that I should add to the duty enjoined upon me, by dwelling upon the character or consequences of the offence with which you have been charged and found guilty!

Whatever, has a tendency to impair the freedom of debate in this House, a freedom no less sacred than the authority of the constitution itself, or to detract from the independence of the Representatives of the people, in the rightful discharge of their high functions, you are no doubt sensible, must in

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0370.jpg