President's [illegible] complete [illegible] by inducing him to believe that Mrs. Calhoun's refusal to return Mrs. Eaton's card in February, 1829, had influenced the families of the Cabinet to pursue the course they had adopted towards her, finding him wrought up to the mad fury of a roaring lion" to use Col. Johnson's description, thought it a good time to arouse and turn him loose on his most formidable rival, Mr. Calhoun, who was then Vice President of the United States, and participated with him in the renown which he (Mr. Van Buren) attached to service under such a chief. The manner in which the unfriendly correspondence commenced between General Jackson and Mr Calhoun, taken in connexion with the time, is sufficient to convince any intelligent mind that it was instigated by Mr Van Buren. I exerted every nerve to defeat this fiend-like purpose. Often have I entreated General Jackson to avoid a rupture with Mr. Calhoun, as no good could result from such a quarrel. Knowing, as he did, that I was not the political friend of Mr. Calhoun, I considered my motives beyond the reach of suspicion.

Let any man read the first letter from General Jackson to Mr. Calhoun, in 1830, and he cannot fail to see a fixed purpose to produce a schism. Mr. Calhoun, with the coolness of a philosopher, proceeds to reason with him, and, to the satisfaction of every one but the President's advisers, and, doubtless, to their conviction, coldly meets and drives him from every position he had been induced to assume. To show that his allegation against Mr. Calhoun was a mere pretext, you see him now in sweet communion with those *who* in 1819, were his most bitter assailants. By this time, I well understood the character of Mr. Van Buren. With him, I found that the end justified the means; and, as the destruction of Mr. Calhoun was the object nearest his heart, he was very willing the old Chief, for whom he professed so much love and veneration, should accomplish this work at any and every hazard to himself.

I believed then that Mr. Van Buren placed too low an estimate on the virtue, patriotism and intelligence of the American people, and that his reliance on General Jackson to accomplish his purposes would prove delusive. He must recollect that I often told him that, in my opinion, he was selling his birthright, like Esau, for a mess of pottage; that General Jackson's popularity, great as it was, attached to the man, and could not be transferred. I then honestly believed what I said. But, sir, I was again mistaken. His skirts have proved strong enough to bear Mr Van Buren into the Vice Presidency, and recent indications have induced me to fear that the country is sufficiently corrupt to enable him, through the patronage of the Government, to reach the great object of his ambition. If so, it will be proof conclusive that the days of this Republic are numbered, and that this once high minded and chivalrous people are ready to bow the knee to Baal, and pass their necks under the yoke of bondage. At the commencement of the session of Congress, in 1830-31, this war of passion on the one side, and reason on the other, was so nearly brought to a close as to enable the President and Vice President to circulate an account of it in manuscript. On its perusal, there could be but one opinion among the intelligent and disinterested part of the community. The vindication of Mr Calhoun was, on all hands, acknowledged to be complete. The indirect agency which it was believed Mr. Van Buren had in producing the rupture, connected with other causes, made him perfectly odious to an overwhelming majority in both houses of Congress and he passed his time during a great part of the session with a mind deeply agitated, conscious his wicked machinations and crouching subserviency had recoiled on himself, and that, after all, they were not likely to avail him. Thus circumstanced, he and his friend Eaton, shortly after the adjournment of Congress, *magnanimously* tendered their resignations to the President. Before this was done, however, Mr. Van Buren knew that he was to be sent Minister to England, and that the new Cabinet would be devoted to his personal views. To silence the unyielding members of the Cabinet, offices were provided for them. Yes, sir, it never entered into the philosophy of this gentleman, that there were any higher incentives to virtuous conduct than the hope of office and the expectation of reward. When General Jackson was in the act of executing the purposes of the cabal, his manner was evidently studied and diplomatic to a degree unusual for him. He commenced by stating that he had desired my attendance, to inform me of the resignations of Mr. Van Buren and Major Eaton, and then a solemn pause ensued. I could but smile, and remarked to him, that he was acting in a character nature never intended him for; that he was no more a diplomatist than myself, and I wished him to tell me frankly what he meant. This unrestrained manner of mine relieved him, and, with great apparent kindness, he spoke out his purpose, and asked me if there was any thing abroad I wanted, adding that the commission for Governor of Florida was on his table, and it would give him pleasure to bestow it on me. To this I replied, that I had not supported him for the sake of office, and soon after retired. Thus it is apparent that causes contemptible in themselves, and such as ought never to have had the slightest influence on any Administration, were so managed as to produce a dissolution of the Cabinet and to give a direction of measures which, it would seem, under no other circumstances, could have been done.

The tyranny of the President, in this attempt to control the domestic relations of the families of the Heads of Department, is without a parallel in the history of any free Government, and cannot be surpassed by any act of despotism in the lives of the Autocrats of Russia. Viewed in its true light, it is astonishing that any person should be found weak or wicked enough to approve or extenuate its enormity. It does surpass all belief that the cool, dispassionate and unprincipled *wire worker* in this plot should, by such means, render himself acceptable to a free, generous, patriotic, and enlightened people.

There is one view which I have taken of the subject that, while it affords an apology for General Jackson's conduct, offers nothing in extenuation of the guilt of his cold blooded abettor. It is well known that during the canvass for the Presidency in 1824, the party with which the gentleman from Warren stands connected, the Van Buren party, grossly and vilely, in my opinion, slandered the character of Mrs. Jackson. This the gentleman knows was done in a variety of ways: in public and in private circles, through the medium of their presses, and by the circulation, in this State, of thousands and tens of thousands of the Benton pamphlets. Yes, sir, I must render this act of justice to one, whose exemplary life of thirty years in the constant practice of every virtue that adorns her sex justly entitles her memory to this passing notice. Thus bitterly assailed in his tenderest feelings by these very men, who, when he has the power to reward them, and they find it convenient to float into the Legislature or into office on the popularity of his name, pretend to be his exclusive friends, his sensibilities in relation to female character became morbid, and he may be said to have been literally insane on this subject. Certain it is he was beyond the reach of reason, and was induced to believe that the attacks on his friend Eaton were intended for him; that the case was indeed his own. His generous feelings have been thus aroused, and advantage taken of them.

Here it may not be inappropriate to enforce the truths I have been presenting to the Senate, by introducing a letter which I received from the Hon. Jesse Speight in the Spring of 1831, immediately after the dissolution of the Cabinet. The production of this letter the Honorable gentleman has seen fit, within the last few days, to challenge by a publication, under his proper name, in one of the newspapers of the district. It is an answer to a circular addressed by me to him and to several friends, in which I gave the earliest intelligence of certain malign influences which, as I have shown, already prevailed to an alarming extent, and which have since swept over our land like a blighting Sirocco. Before I read the letter, I will state to the Senate that the gentleman professed to be my ardent friend whilst I was Secretary of the Navy, and thus became intimately acquainted with the causes which embarrassed, and finally dissolved the Cabinet. He then approved, in the most unqualified manner, the course I considered myself called upon to pursue, and made the bitterest denunciations against Gen. Jackson and the Cabal, if they should execute their designs. When he received my letter he returned the following answer:

"Stantonsburg, 9th May, 1831.

My dear friend.

Yours of the 4th inst. has this moment come to hand. I am not mistaken in the opinion I had formed as to the cause of the *blow out* at Washington (as we call it here.) It is impossible for me to express the deep and heartfelt mortification I have and continue to feel for the honor of my country. I too, sir, am disappointed. Never did I believe that the *high minded chivalrous independence* of Andrew Jackson could be made to bow at the shrine of selfish ambition. Ah! and so as to forsake *old and tried friends* at the polls, and deceitful artifices of such men as Martin Van Buren, moved and seduced by the instigation of Mrs. Eaton. So far as I have understood, the feelings of your friends are with you. I have heard a number of your friends intimate a wish that you should return to the Legislature and pave the way for a seat in the U. States Senate, when Mr. Brown's time expires; for, says every body, he can never return. I shall return back to the Legislature in two years, and would now most willingly, if I could forsake the district in credit, but you sir know how I am situated. Reflect on what I have here written. I attempt nothing like *duplicity*. If I know myself, I am incapable of that towards you. You are not politically dead yet I hope. I hope to put you in the Senate, and I will do it again. Remember to Mrs. Branch. (Write me.) God bless you.

J. SPEIGHT."

With an administration that properly appreciated the virtue, the patriotism, and the talents of the country, such signal subserviency as the *Hon.* Gentleman has since displayed, in a blind and ardent support of Mr. Van Buren, Mr. Brown, and, in fact, of every odious man and measure of the *powers that be*, could not fail to excite loathing and disgust. But, under this administration, the *Hon.* Gentleman is well known to be a distinguished favorite.

The Senate will now see the reasons why I have given this narrative of the causes which produced the dissolution of General Jackson's first Cabinet. Such facts should never indeed have disgraced the annals of our country; but am I responsible for them? Surely not. I have certainly been the victim of the malign influences which they have generated, which now control the whole patronage of the General Government, and threaten to sap the foundations of public liberty. Having clearly established their existence, and depicted their corrupting tendencies, I feel that I have a right to call on every friend to the institutions of our country to abstain from the adoption of any measures calculated to promote them. Under what influences are you now about to act? Those very influences against which I have been endeavoring to guard you. By their official agent, they have issued their mandate, and, through an *appropriate organ*, have called upon you to offer up as a sacrifice one of your most distinguished fellow citizens. What has he done to deserve the stigma you are attempting to fasten on his character? Has he deserted the principles that carried him into the Senate? No, I deny it, and challenge you to the proof. What then? It is true, he has called in question the infallibility of General Jackson, in saying he had no right to seize the public purse; and that, in doing so, he had encroached on the powers of Congress. Had he not a right so to act? I maintain that he had, and defy you to show where the right has been denied, for the last fifty years, either in this country or Great Britain. Did not the gentleman from Warren exercise the same right, while a member of the House of Representatives of the United States, in 1819, in relation to this same Gen. Jackson? I assert that he did, and will prove it from the Journals of Congress. In 1819, Gen. Jackson, with orders from his Government, to bring the war with the Seminole Indians to a speedy termination, captured and executed two vile incendiaries, Arbuthnot and Ambrister, and pursued the hostile tribe to Pensacola, where they had taken shelter at a time the Government of Spain was too imbecile to perform her neutral duties. This gentleman and his party then said was a virtual declaration of war against Spain and, as the Constitution gave to Congress the power to declare war, that General Jackson had invaded the rights of that body, and violated the Constitution by the occupation of Pensacola and the Barancas They accordingly

"Resolved, That the late seizure of the Spanish posts of Pensacola and San Carlos de Barancas, in West Florida, by the army of the United States, was contrary to the Constitution of the United States."

Now what right had he thus to censure Gen Jackson for having violated the Constitution, if Judge Mangum had no right to pass a similar censure or exercise a similar power? I speak of the abstract right. Again: I would ask what right had he to defend the legislative powers of the House of Representatives, which does not equally belong to a member of the Senate of the United States? The legislative powers of the Senate are co extensive with those of the House, with the exception of the power to originate revenue bills. Does the gentleman from Warren desire the floor to explain? [Mr. Edwards remarked, that "the House were legitimately in the exercise of their impeaching."] Ah! said Mr. Branch, Do you call this the process used in originating and preparing articles of impeachment?—Does not this partake of all the attributes of a judicial sentence, as just explained by the gentleman himself?—Gen. Jackson was here not only arraigned, but condemned by the gentleman's own votes, without an opportunity of being heard in self-defence.—The gentleman was his judge, his juror and witness. He condemned him first, in order that he might impeach him afterwards. How supremely absurd!

Again: Civil officers only are constitutionally subject to impeachment. Does the gentleman again desire the floor to explain? If so, it will be cheerfully yielded to him. [Here Mr. Edwards observed, "he would take occasion, in his reply, to explain."] It is manifest the gentleman is embarrassed by the inconsistency of his conduct. Let me entreat him, then, to pause and abstain from the consummation of this partizan act, which, while it purports, on its face, to condemn Mr. Mangum, will thrice, on record, condemn himself. If it is his object to expunge from the Journals of Congress all censure of Gen. Jackson for violating the Constitution, he should move to amend the resolutions by including his own votes censuring Gen. Jackson for the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, and the forcible occupation of Pensacola and the Barancas. The only difference between the two gentlemen is this: when the gentleman from Warren censured General Jackson, the General was powerless, and had no patronage to dispense.—When Mr. Mangum censured him, he had every thing to risk, and nothing to gain. His elevated and patriotic bearing entitles him to the plaudits of his countrymen; but he has certainly yielded up all claims to the favor of the Administration. In the exercise of this high censorial power, which you have gratuitously assumed, why shrink from the discharge of your whole duty? Is it because Gen. Jackson's conduct may be called in question? Does he, too, possess *inherent* powers, authorising him to do what no body else has a right to do? When we dissolved our connexion with the mother country, we repudiated the doctrine of the divine right of Kings; but, it seems, this odious attribute of royalty is to be revived under a new name.

With a hope that you would dispense justice to all parties, I have passed in review before you the abuses of Mr. Adams's administration. Let me entreat you to go along with me, in comparing the abuses of this administration with those of the preceding one. Mr Adams's you have condemned in the most unmeasured terms. Will you approve in this what you have condemned in that? We shall see. Mr. Adams expressed the opinion, that it was competent for him alone to appoint Ministers to Panama. But he took care not to exercise the power. Gen. Jackson expressed no opinion, but, without the consent of the Senate, he actually sent a Minister to the Ottoman Porte, and *has, in utter contempt of the Senate*, and in *palpable* violation of the Constitution, put men in office, who had previously been rejected by the Senate, *on his nomination for the same office;* as for instance, the case of Guinn. Mr. Clay displaced a few printers, who had been appointed by his predecessor to print the laws of Congress. Gen. Jackson has done the same thing through his Secretary of State. Nay, more—in defiance of recorded pledges, he has appointed scores of partizan editors to offices of profit and honor. Against this I remonstrated at the time; and yet, sir, truth compels me to acknowledge that, in one instance, I participated in it. Without the knowledge of Gen. Jackson, I appointed your newly elected State Printer to a highly lucrative office in the Navy, *whence he has been sent to you.* You, my friend from Burke, may smile; but you advised it. Whether we served the country, or strengthened the malign influences with which we are now grappling, time will determine. I must acknowledge, however, that I have some misgivings.

I may now ask, what has General Jackson not done to corrupt the press, and make it subservient to his purposes? Permit me to lay before you an instance of the indirect action of the government, through its patronage, on a leading press in the Old Dominion—a press which Mr. Van Buren, I know, was anxious to conciliate and bind by the strongest cords. I mean the "Richmond Enquirer." When Mr. Stephenson was nominated to the Senate of the United States as Minister to England, I was lost in wonder; for I well knew Gen. Jackson's opinion of him; it was never disguised.—When, sir, I separated from General Jackson, but a short time previous to his determination to appoint Mr. Stephenson Minister to the Court of St. James, he did not regard him as "worth the powder and ball it would take to kill him." *This very expression I have heard used or assented to by him*, and candor compels me to admit that I heartily concurred with Gen. Jackson in his estimate of Mr. Stephenson's worth. When the developements which took place in the Senate of the United States were laid before the public, more particularly the correspondence between William B. Lewis and Mr. Ritchie, the mystery was unravelled, and thus it appears that the first diplomatic appointment in the gift of the President was conferred on Mr. Stephenson for the *patriotic* purpose of conciliating this Editor

Again: the last year of Mr. Adams's administration, he expended a little upwards of twelve millions of dollars. Gen. Jackson, the last year of his administration, expended nearly double that sum. You charged Mr. Adams with negligence and prodigality: but have no censures to impose on this economical administration!—

Where are the pledges, we made to the people to curtail expenses and abolish useless offices? Unredeemed and abandoned! Where is your regard for the freedom of the press, and your abhorrence of Executive patronage when brought into conflict with the freedom of elections? When you see the patronage of the government, through one of its well feed officers, buying up a press in this city, can you not be roused from your deathlike slumbers to a proper sense of the true condition of the country, and of the obligations you are under, to hand down to posterity that liberty which a race of illustrious ancestors has bequeathed to you? or will you rather prefer the ignoble fate that awaits the degenerate sons of noble sires? Can you overlook the means which are daily practiced to control the freedom of our elections, and thus virtually take from the people the right to choose a successor to Gen. Jackson? In whatever direction you turn your eyes, you have the most convincing proofs that the money and the offices which belong to the people, are bestowed with a lavish hand to influence their choice. So daring have these corruptors of public morals become, that it matters not whether the applicant for executive favors be for the Bank or not, State Rights or not, provided he be in favor of Mr. Van Buren for the succession.

Can you flatter yourselves with the belief that our representative form of government can long endure, when the source whence our public functionaries emanate becomes impure and corrupt? The elective franchise in its purity is vital to liberty, and ought to be guarded with unwearied vigilance. But, say you, my constituents are Jackson men, and as I am told this is a Jackson measure, I feel bound to sustain it. It is to be borne in mind that most of us are planters; and, therefore, I must observe, without intending any disrespect, but ill qualified to settle and adjust such difficult constitutional questions as we shall necessarily have to encounter in reviewing the decisions of the Senate of the United States. Does your being a member of this General Assembly, by magic convert you into a profound constitutional lawyer? Did your constituents send you here for such purposes, or with such expectations? No, gentlemen, you deceive yourselves and misrepresent them grossly, if you believe they would willingly see their Senator, Mr. Mangum, who has risen from among them without the aid of opulent friends to push him forward, prostrate at the feet of Gen. Jackson, thereby dishonoring himself and the sovereign State he so ably represents. But, says another, I don't expect him to obey—I wish him to resign. Then why not let the resolutions speak your wishes? It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, their intention is to drag down this distinguished Senator from that high station he has attained to their *own level.*—When you shall have done this, and thereby made yourselves acceptable to the influence which dictated these resolutions, what will you have done to shield yourselves from the indignation of the virtuous and enlightened portion of the community? Surely you cannot flatter yourselves with the belief, that you will have secured a glorious immortality, or entitled yourselves to the gratitude of the country.

But it is said that, in opposing these resolutions, we are taking sides with the Bank. Against whom could such a charge be made with less semblance of truth than myself? I own no Bank stock, am not indebted to any Bank, and have no sympathies in common with any such institution. My opinions and official acts for near a quarter of a century, are conclusive to show my decided hostility to a paper system in every variety of form. No man who knows me, believes any thing of the kind.

In what section of the country is the President most severely censured for having seized the public treasure and taken it out of the custody of the law? The South. Who, or what portion of our people are most opposed, *on principle*, to rechartering the United States Bank? That portion which inhabits the Southern States.—While we believe that the Constitution has not conferred on Congress the power, we, nevertheless, know that it has been exercised since the adoption of the Federal Constitution; and, as I observed before, that it has met the direct approval of Washington and Madison.

We are further told that the Bank gave no equivalent for the use of the government deposites. Permit me to say, I think I know better. In 1816, some person or persons, who I know not, appointed me one of three commissioners to open books in this place, for the subscription of stock to this very Bank. The charter came to us as it had passed Congress, and was tendered to the people for their acceptance or rejection. No persons' names were attached to it as its proprietors. As applications were made we received them from A., B., C. and D. You are entitled to all the privileges and immunities of exclusive banking in the United States for twenty years; you are entitled to the use of the Government deposites for the same time, and to every other right which the charter confers on you: for which you are to give to the Government one million and a half of dollars. This, sir, was the language, and these were the terms held out to the subscribers; among whom were to be found the widow and the orphan, relying implicitly upon the plighted faith of the Government for a strict performance of all its promises. And yet, sir, because Senator Mangum has condemned the bad faith of the Executive, in depriving the stockholders of the benefit of these deposites without good and sufficient reasons, you are urged to condemn and digrace him. Where, sir, is the man reckless enough to declare that the reasons of the Secretary of the Treasury were sufficient to justify the President in executing this rash and lawless act? Thrice were the House of Representatives of the United States, pliant as in every other instance they had shown themselves to be, pressed to approve this course, and thrice did they refuse their assent.

Then, Mr Speaker, Mr. Mangum has done nothing more than it became him to do; and, instead of deserving your censure, he is justly entitled to your applause. For General Jackson's virtues, patriotism and distinguished public services, I respect and honor him. For him personally, I entertain no unfriendly feeling: on the contrary, there is an irrepressible feeling of kindness for him in my bosom, (created by the reminiscences of former days,) which often impels me to rush into his presence and attempt his deliverance from the perfidious embrace of his vile betrayers. But it is impracticable. We are separated, and——forever!

I thank the Senators for their indulgent hearing. I feel that I have addressed them with great freedom, in the discharge of a high and solemn duty which I owed to the country. In performing this painful task, I have endeavored "nothing to extenuate, nor aught set down in malice." I have taken no greater liberties with others, than I am willing—nay, anxious that they shall take with me. The public acts of public men are open to scrutiny. I go into private life with as few personal regrets as any man ever did: I know I have given to my fellow-citizens the most conclusive proofs that the allurements of office have not been sufficient to make me unmindful of my country's rights and honor, or my own. Let those who practice on other principles, enjoy, if they can, the triumphs which they may now or hereafter achieve by the ascendency of corrupt influences. To a *just God I confidently appeal, by whose award I am not only bound but willing to abide.*

TARBOROUGH,

SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1835.

☞We would freely copy from the Washington Whig, as requested, the strictures of "Truth," on the communication of M. E. Manning, which recently appeared in this paper, were it not highly probable that it would lead to a discussion not only premature, but irksome and profitless to most of our readers.

☞We insert in this paper Gov. Branch's speech on the instruction resolutions—and, in our next, we will copy from the Raleigh Standard, the defence of Gen. Speight against the charge of inconsistency, imputed to him in said speech.

More Snow.—It has been snowing, hailing, or raining, nearly the whole of this week. In our last, we remarked that we had had a very cold and snowy winter—so far we have the prospect of a cold and snowy spring—we fervently hope we shall not have to record a cold and snowy summer.

Congress.—The Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives, made a Report on our relations with France, on the 27th ult. The following resolutions were appended to the Report:—

"Resolved, That it would be incompatible with the rights and honor of the United States, further to negotiate in relation to the treaty entered into by France, on the 4th of July, 1831, and that this House will insist upon its execution, as ratified by both Governments.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of so much of the President's Message as relates to commercial restrictions, or to reprisals, on the commerce of France.

"Resolved, That contingent preparation ought to be made to meet any emergency growing out of our relation with France."

The French War.—The President yesterday communicated to both Houses of Congress, a correspondence between Mr. Livingston and the French Government, and also, a correspondence between Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Livingston. By it we are informed officially of what had before reached us through the French and English papers, relative to the feeling produced by the President's message; of the recall of M. Serrurier, and of the notification that Mr. Livingston's passports were in readiness for him, on the contingency of his wishing to leave France. Mr. Livingston also writes that he would await the instructions of his own Government—to which Mr. Forsyth replied, giving the approbation of the President, and informing him that an armed frigate would be despatched to bring him home in case the Chambers refused to pass the appropriation for the indemnity.—*Telegraph.*

Senator Poindexter.—A correspondent of the Raleigh Register, under date Feb. 21, gives the following condensed statement of a singular and somewhat mysterious affair, that has recently occupied [illegible] at Washington City.—

"An occurrence, which produced considerable excitement, took place in the Senate [illegible]. You have heard, through the Press, of certain Affidavits in possession of the President, [illegible] that *Lawrence* had been [illegible] the two days preceding the [illegible] on the President, in the [illegible] Mr. Poindexter. The S[illegible] having traced the report to [illegible] J. Pearce, of R Island, a member of the House of Representatives, called on him for his author[ity]. He is answered by Mr. P[illegible] that he was shewn the Affid[avits] (3 in number) by a friend of the President, and that he then there read the contents of [the] same. Upon this, Mr. Poindexter addressed a letter to the President of the Senate, setting [forth] these matters, and asked for the appointment of a Committee, to be clothed with power to send for persons and papers, in order to an investigation of the subject. The Committee was duly appointed, with full powers, and consists of Smith of Con. Wright of N. Y. Tyler of Va. Mangum of N. C. King of Geo. So we shall be advised how the facts are."

To which the Register adds—

Two of the Affidavits, mentioned in our Correspondent's letter, are published in the Globe—one is signed David Stewart, the other Mordecai Foy. The Affidavits depose that they saw Lawrence in Senator Poindexter's house, one of them that he saw Lawrence and Senator Poindexter talking together, a few days previous to the attempt on the President's life.

We find the following, given as the result of the above investigation, in the Petersburg Intelligencer:—

We learn from the National Intelligencer that, in the Senate on Thursday, Mr. Smith, from the Special Committee to whom the letter of the Hon. George Poindexter was referred, stated that the Committee had concluded their labors so far as regards the taking of testimony, but that as the evidence was voluminous, and would require much time to copy, and as it was understood that the Senator had refrained from taking his seat until the examination should have been closed, he was instructed by the committee to report, that not a shadow of suspicion rested on the Hon. George Poindexter, in relation to that charge, and in this report all the members of the committee concurred. As soon as possible a more full report would be made.

The report was received with a simultaneous burst of applause from the galleries.

Mr. Poindexter then resumed his seat.

☞A Washington Correspondent of the Baltimore Patriot reports that Mr. Cass, Secretary of War, is about to be appointed Minister to London, &c.—We suspect there is no truth in the report.

Private letters bring an account of a rencontre between Mr. Ewing, a member of the H. of R. from Indiana, and Lieut. Lane, an officer in the Engineer Corps, and the son of Mr. Lane, another member of the House from Indiana.—The reader will recollect the very unpleasant dispute in the House of R. between Messrs. Lane and Ewing, about two weeks since, in relation to the Commissioner of the Public Lands. The public were disgusted by the controversy on both sides—and it is supposed that Lieut. L. made an attack upon Mr. E. in consequence of that dispute. It is said that Mr. E. was much hurt during the scuffle. *Rich. Enq.*

Washington, Feb. 29.—An important bill, to amend the Judiciary System, has passed the Senate by a large majority, and is now before the House of Representatives. The bill dismembers the fourth circuit, which now consists of the districts of Maryland and Delaware. It attaches Delaware to the third circuit, (Judge Baldwin's,) and Maryland to the fifth circuit, (Judge Marshall's,) which by the bill, with this addition, to constitute the fourth circuit.