House. We should proceed with the legislation of the country.

The SPEAKER—The chair hears objections.

Mr. INGERSOLL—I move a suspension of the rule.

The Speaker was about to put the question, when

Mr. ASHMUN arose and said—If the gentleman be allowed to proceed, I hope leave will be given for a reply.

Mr. HENLY—What rule is necessary to be suspended for a personal explanation? We frequently hear personal explanations without a suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER—There is no such thing as a personal xplanation known to the rules; but when there is bjection, it requires a suspension of all the rules to admit it, and a vote of two-thirds.

Mr. HENLY—As there is no such rule, how can it be spended?

The SPEAKER repeated—It requires a suspension of all he rules. This has heretofore been the practice, unless here be unanimous consent. It requires a vote of two-hirds.

Mr. COBB called for the yeas and nays, which were dered.

The motion was stated, on a suspension of the rules, hen

Mr. ASHMUN moved to amend the motion.

The SPEAKER—The gentleman cannot move to amend e motion to suspend the rules.

The roll was called, and the result was—yeas 102, nays 25. So the rules were suspended.

The SPEAKER, (knocking with his hammer,)—Gentlemen will take their seats.

Mr. INGERSOLL arose, and was about to proceed, when

The SPEAKER requested the gentleman to suspend his remarks until gentlemen took their seats.

Order having been partially restored,

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL arose, and said:—When Mr. Webster, in virulant terms, in Senate, assailed my truth, concerning transactions of which proofs ought to be in the Department of State, I went there in search of them, for my vindication. As member of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, for some years, I have some freedom of access there, though probably none which any other member of Congress is not entitled to.

Searching for proofs, not to expose him, but vindicate myself, I fell most unexpectedly on others, which led me, next day, to denounce him as a delinquent. When the President's answer to the resolution of the House of Representatives refused certain documents, I repeated, in general assertion, the fact of his delinquency, and added that it is easily susceptible of proof. My friends advised me to go no further, supposing that Mr. Webster would challenge investigation. Not having done so, but having again, with opprobious language, in Senate, charged me with slander, and called on me to substantiate my accusation of him, I now submit a short statement, which may be tested as to truth. There are three charges of delinquency:—First. Unlawful use of the fund appropriated for the contingent service of foreign intercourse, commonly called the secret service fund. Secondly. Misapplying part of that fund to corrupt party presses. Thirdly. Leaving the Department of State in default to that fund. First. Congress appropriates annually a small sum, commonly $30,000, for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse; the disbursement of part of which is sometimes usefully clandestine, but never, as has been erroneously supposed, corrupt. Whenever, in the President's opinion, it would be wrong to make public how any part of it is disposed of, he so certifies, and, by act of Congress, his mere certificate is sufficient voucher at the treasury for the required settlement. These funds have, for the last sixteen years, if not always, been in the hands of a clerk, called, by acts of Congress, the disbursing agent of the Department of State, who kept them in banks, as agent. The official routine is for the President, on the requisition of the Secretary of State, to authorize payment of the money from the treasury to the disbursing agent of the State Department. The disbursing agent is debited at the treasury with the sum drawn into the Department of State, keeps it to his credit as agent, in bank, and gives checks as required by the Secretary, for payment to any person he may designate. In this way the first check I saw, when I went to the department, was drawn by the agent for the service at New York, in McLeod's case, $1,000. But, shortly after President Harrison's death, and before Vice President Tyler was at home in chief magistracy—in April, 1841—Mr. Secretary Webster began an entirely novel method of dealing with the secret service fund. Instead of directing the disbursing agent to pay any third person, Mr. W. required the money to be paid to himself in this way he drew to himself from the disbursing agent twelve thousand dollars during the first nine months of Mr. Webster's incumbency as Secretary, about $1,300 a month, in 1841, and three thousand dollars more early in 1842. Thus he took into his own hands fifteen thousand dollars in his first twelve months. The President, there is written evidence in the department to show, never authorized this, knew nothing of it, and when first apprised of it, more than fourteen months after it had been going on, to the large amount of fifteen thousand dollars, refused it his sanction. It was not till July, 1842, as the evidence in the department shows, in Mr. Webster's handwriting, that he got a President's certificate for four thousand four hundred and sixty dollars, ($4,460) That President's certificate, of which I took a minute, dated 19th July, 1842, is—

To J. J. Crittenden, for expenses of journey to New York..... $100

To F. O. J. Smith, for services connected with the Northeastern boundary..... 2,000

To Alexander Powell, for journey to, and stay on the frontier in 1841, on the subject of the disturbances..... 1,000

With several other items. The first item in this short account concerning McLeod, will show how I was led from that to other objects; and some of the other items will show the agents whom, as Secretary of State, Mr. Webster employed. Both houses of Congress, if not the public at large, have not been left in ignorance of the characters of some of those on whom the Secretary of State bestowed large sums of public money, if their receipts correctly vouch what they got. In a memorandum of payments to Mr. Webster, by authority of the President, there is a minute dated June 23, 1842, "By cash returned, $5,000." After drawing $15,000 to himself during fifteen months, during which period there is no trace of what he did with those large sums, he appears to have returned one-third of the amount withdrawn. Why return it, if taken for any public purpose? Where had it been kept? If in any place of deposite, was it separate from Mr. Webster's private funds? Did he use it? These $5,000 were returned ten days after, according to the published correspondence; his negotiation with the British envoy extraordinary, began by conversational and confidential intercourse, without protocols or other usual records of such transactions. In 1843, Mr. Webster took to himself $2,000 more, making altogether $17,000. On closing his account, crediting the $5,000 returned, and various other sums, there remained a balance against him of $5,290 of the secret service fund. One of his credits against it was for $1,400, published in House document, report No. 29, first session, 28th Congress—report of Mr. Rogers for maps, charts, surveys, and expenses of bringing them to the seat of government, and for copies of transcripts, and for various agencies to procure information connected with the boundary treaty. This inarticulate and comprehensive mixture of many incongruous items, without specification of prices, dates, or any apparent test of rectitude, Mr. Secretary Webster certified himself as a proper credit for himself, and deducted from his debit to the secret service fund. Without that credit his default to that fund would have been $3,690, instead of $2,290, which it was when he was removed from office. The $17,000 were in his hands, contrary to uniform usage, if used by him, contrary to the sub-treasury act. Whether so, is for him to make appear. The burden of proof is on him. Secondary, application of the secret service fund to corrupt party presses. The Ashburton treaty bears date the 9th August, 1842. Congress was then in session; and, as Mr. Adams has charged me lately, and I confess I did what little I could as one of a small minority in the House of Representatives (we had forty votes, I think, under the previous question) to resist a treaty which Mr. Webster has lately stated in the Senate granted near half a million of dollars from the treasury of the United States to the people of Maine and Massachusetts. I then desired to contend, when put down by the previous question, that the House of Representatives had a constitutional right to pass on such a treaty. What I am now enabled to add, of revelation from the Department of State, will prove that my instincts of aversion to the treaty were even truer than reason. In the Department of State there is now a letter, signed F. O. J. Smith, marked private, dated Portland, the 12th of August, 1842, addressed to Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, substantially as follows: It begins by congratulating Mr. Webster on his settlement of the Maine boundary question, by a new mode of approaching the subject, after forty years of diplomacy, without which new mode, another forty years of diplomacy would have come to nothing. [Mr. F. O. J. Smith seems to have suggested the boast, with which his correspondent, Mr. Webster, hugged himself in his elaborate vindication in Senate.] Mr. Smith informs Mr. Webster by this letter, that he had occasion to resort to services and influences, in order to adjust the tone and direction of the party presses, and through them of public sentiment, to a purpose so desirable of accomplishment, under Mr. Webster's administration. Mr. Smith, therefore, submits a claim, or account, if I recollect right, in blank, for Mr. Webster to fill up, of which he calls for payment out of the contingent fund. Mr. Smith presumes that the contingent fund will be ample, and Mr. Webster's control of it complete, to do whatever he may think just. The sums Mr. Smith vouches as got by him from Mr. Webster are $2,000 for services connected with the northeastern boundary; and two years after he vouches $500 more, as will be shown. Thirdly: Leaving the Department of State in debt to the secret service fund $2,290. The records of the department show this default beyond all denial or question. They show, furthermore, that it was neither paid or accounted for during nearly two years after Mr. Webster's removal from office. They show several letters sent to him by President Tyler's direction, urging payment, and evasive letters of excuse from Mr. Webster for non-payment. At length, a peremptory letter that exposure would or might be the consequence of more delay, produced reimbursement. But *settlement* did not take place till the first of February, 1845, ten days before President Polk arrived in Washington to be inaugurated, when Mr. Webster produced another voucher from Mr. F. O. J. Smith, for an additional $500, and other vouchers, one from George Smith, for $500. George Smith, since dead, denied that he had ever been paid or vouched more than $150, to which sum Mr. Webster reduced the $500 at first demanded, as his agent, now in Washington, will prove. Granting all the vouchers Mr. Webster produced, there was nevertheless a balance of about $1,200 due from him, at all events, when he left the department. That sum he was in default to the secret service fund, after crediting every thing in the way of repayment, offset, or voucher, that he claimed. In all I have said in this affair, no allusion has been made to any private aggravation. Regretting the exposure forced from me, having afforded Mr. Webster several opportunities to meet the charges in his own way, that which he chose, left me no alternative but this forbearing justification of myself. A resolution, or committee, which I cannot institute, will soon test the truth of my statements.

A FEW QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

Mr. ASHMUN asked leave to make a brief reply.

[Avoice, "Oh, no."]

Mr. HUNT moved a suspension of the rules.

Mr. ASHMUN—I appeal to the justice and generosity of the House.

The SPEAKER—All this is foreign to the rules of the House. By unanimous consent, personal explanations have been tolerated heretofore without a suspension of the rules. The chair hears no objection.

A VOICE—I object.

Mr. PENDLETON moved a suspension of the rules.

Mr. SCHENCK asked for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (rapping twice)—Gentlemen will come to order. Gentlemen will be good enough to take their seats.

Mr. PENDLETON—What will be the effect if I withdraw my proposition to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER—The gentleman from Massachusetts cannot proceed but by unanimous consent.

Mr. McKAY—I hope the House will give its unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER—Gentlemen will take their seats.

The question was taken, and the House suspended the rules by a vote of—Yeas 135, nays 32.

The SPEAKER—The rules are suspended. [A voice: "Now for Ashmun."]

Mr. ASHMUN—I was very confident, sir, that—

Mr. HUNTER, (rising)—Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. ASHMUN, (giving way)—Certainly, sir.

Mr. HUNTER—I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he received his information from Mr. Trist, the chief clerk of the State Department?

Mr. INGERSOLL—I said formerly that I did not.

Mr. BAYLY—Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. ASHMUN—Certainly.

Mr. BAYLY—I understood the gentleman to disclaim any imputation on ex-President Tyler with regard to this fund. Did I understand him correctly?

Mr. INGERSOLL nodded assent.

The SPEAKER—Gentlemen will come to order.

After the buzzing somewhat ceased,

Mr. ASHMUN—I was confident that I would not be precluded from replying to the member from Pennsylvania, after the deliberate, bloody ebullitions of the member from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER, (interrupting him)—The gentleman will avoid personality. The gentleman from Pennsylvania would have been held to the same responsibility.

Mr. ASHMUN—I suppose it was in order for the member from Pennsylvania to lavish all sorts of abuse on an absent Senator, by name, yet it is not strictly parliamentary to notice such conduct——

The SPEAKER—The chair has no power over absent gentlemen, but he has over gentlemen present, and will exercise it. [A Voice—"That's the talk."]

MASSACHUSETTS IN THE FIELD.

Mr. ASHMUN—I was certain, after the repeated and premeditated assault by a member of this House on a distinguished statesman of the other branch, that the House would not preclude me from a reply. I think the House, and the nation, are not only surprised, but mortified at the proceedings which have taken place in this hall. It had been published abroad and at home, that we were guilty of occasional violation of good taste and good manners; and I think, of late, that a gross offence has been committed against society as well as this house. It is matter of astonishment that a member, so long in public life, and who had a right to know what reputation is, should again and again endeavor to destroy that fame which is the precious property of the people of the United States—the fame of Mr Webster. The gentleman said that he came into public life thirty years ago; and I would ask him whether he has, from that time to this, received offence from Mr. Webster? However strongly Mr. Webster may express himself, all his speeches are free from personality. I do not believe he ever gave a personal offence to that gentleman or to any other. It may, perhaps, rankle in his bosom that Mr. Webster let him alone, being sufficiently acquainted with his character. Why, on the 9th of February, on a question of peace or war, when the gentleman was permitted to make the closing speech, did he, instead of doing so, voluntarily and deliberately, and purposely, go out of his way to slander a gentleman, bring into the debate a subject which had nothing to do with it, and which had been proved to be false? And for what purpose? He had known Mr. Webster for thirty years as a public man, and the recollection, when he met Mr. Webster for the first time might have waked up a reminiscence, and warned him not to attack private character. There was in that Congress a gentleman of the highest patriotism, of intelligence, and chivalrous bearing, from the State of New Jersey, (Mr. Stockton.) He was slandered to his face by the member from Pennsylvania, and the scarifying process is within the remembrance of all who witnessed it. Tradition tells us of the withering, scathing and blasting effect of the reply to the slander, and that the member left the hall crying, like a whipped child. I wonder the lesson has been forgotten! And not only had the member slandered Stockton, but Chief Justice Marshall himself did not escape. It seems, sir, that age cannot improve in this particular. The member from Pennsylvania is now the accuser of and the witness against Mr. Webster; and it becomes us to know his character. The President says that the seal of confidence is too sacred for him to break, even though called on by this House; but, by an adroitness unparalleled, the member has had access to the secret archives, brings forward his disclosures, and asks us and the nation to believe their truth! Who is the accuser and the witness? On the 9th of February, he made five or six charges against Mr. Webster, in the most imposing manner, and with solemnity pressed his important communications. He said among other things, that Mr. Webster had written a letter marked "private," and sent it by express, and paid $5,000 for a gentleman to appear for McLeod. This charge had been proved false. It is true a private letter was sent, but not by express.

Mr. INGERSOLL (in his seat)—I did not say so.

Mr. ASHMUN—I have it here, in a paper—the *Union*.

Mr. INGERSOLL—It's not right.

Mr. ASHMUN—I recollect the member made use of the words "sent by express." Is it to be supposed that the reporters come here and falsify what the members say? The member did say that five thousand dollars were put in the hands of the District Attorney. Is not that false?

Mr. INGERSOLL—It is true.

Mr. ASHMUN—The gentleman himself proved this false this morning

Mr. INGERSOLL (in his seat) made a reply, not heard to the reporter; to which

Mr. ASHMUN responded.—I put it to the honest sense of the House. [Laughter]. The member spoke, too, about a minister to England, to settle the Oregon question. I think the 54 40 men would have been glad if a minister had been sent to settle this question. Mr. Webster and the journal did not say that a letter was written to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for this purpose. However, so far as that goes, I give the member credit for nearly telling one truth. It reminds me of an anecdote. An Indian came to a farmer's house, and asked for something to drink. The farmer being crabbed and testy, the Indian told him he knew where, by a creek, with a tree in it, a deer was feeding, and if he would give him the drink, he would communicate the information. The farmer gave him the drink, and went in search of the game. He found the tree and the creek, but no deer. The farmer returned, in anger, and called the Indian to account. "Why," said the Indian, "did you not find the tree and the creek?" "I did." "Well, I told two truths and only only lie, and that's pretty good for Indian." [Laughter].

Mr. MARTIN, of Tennessee, raised a question whether the gentleman was strictly in order.

The SPEAKER said this was a matter of great difficulty for the chair; but it was his opinion that the gentleman was in order. The House had suspended all rules.

Mr. ASHMUN resumed. The member said he went to the State Department for one item of information, and in his search he fell upon something more. It was very natural, if he has a tree run, that he should go there. He was but following out the bent of his inclination in making an effort to get information. By what means, foul or fair, has this pretended information been extracted from the secret archives of the State Department? The House made a solemn call on the President to furnish us with certain information; the President refused to communicate the information. The President said the law imposes on me a duty not to divulge anything there—there is a seal of confidence I cannot break. And yet the member from Pennsylvania comes here, with boldness, and says *he* has been there, and knows what is there, and has information which the President cannot communicate to this House! I want to know how he got there. The President says there is a seal of confidence. Who broke it? I have no idea any honorable man had any thing to do with it. Did any subordinate break the seal? Who furnished the key, or did the member take one from his own pocket? He exempts Mr. Trist. Who then is the guilty one? If he does not tell, the responsibility will rest on him that he broke in where he ought not to have gone! Has any clerk been driven out for revealing the secrets? Who assisted? The responsibility is on himself. He has broken in where the President says there is a sacred seal, and where he had no right to go. The member remarks the fund was in the hands of the clerk. Was it the clerk? The member says he stumbled on the information. I cannot help thinking of a man feloniously breaking into a house, and grasping at things which do not belong to him—

Mr. CHIPMAN raised a point of order—of irrelevancy.

The SPEAKER said the House had suspended all rules, and it was for them to permit the gentleman to proceed or not.

Mr. ASHMUN resumed—The member having spoken of having stumbled on the information, I was only repeating it a little more graphically, and I was going to illustrate it. [Laughter.]

Two or three gentlemen rose to order.

Mr. ASHMUN—Is my time—my hour—going on?

A VOICE—The rules are suspended, and of course the hour rule is suspended.

The points were not pressed, and

Mr. ASHMUN asked, what has the member brought here? Is it for the purpose of drawing attention from one state to another? The member held office, and was turned out by General Jackson for cause connected with the use of the public moneys.

Mr. HOPKINS—There is no subject before the House which authorizes the gentleman from Massachusetts to charge peculation on the gentleman from Pennsylvania during General Jackson's administration. I call on the chair to decide.

AN episode—AN APPEAL.

The SPEAKER—The chair has already stated that the House has already suspended the rules of order and business, and tolerated debate not known to legislative rules. It is therefore impossible to confine the gentleman to the rule. If an error has been committed, the House, as well as the Speaker, is responsible. The chair has several times requested the gentleman to confine himself to the subject. If the House overrule the decision of the chair, he will submit the motion.

Mr. HOPKINS.—Does the Chair decide that the gentleman is in order?

The SPEAKER.—Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS.—I appeal.

Mr. ASHMUN.—Mr. Speaker—

THE SPEAKER.—Gentlemen will take their seats. [Cries of "order."]

Mr. SCHENCK.—Can an appeal be taken, under a suspension of the rules?

The SPEAKER.—The Chair is of opinion it can.

Mr. ASHMUN.—On this subject—

The SPEAKER.—The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ASHMUN.—I wish to ask if the appeal is debatable?

The SPEAKER.—The gentleman from Massachusetts—

Mr. ASHMUN.—The member from Pennsylvania made charges of peculation.

Mr. HOPKINS.—The appeal is not debatable.

The SPEAKER.—The appeal is not debatable. As many as are in favor that the decision of the Chair stand on the judgement of the House—

Mr. ASHMUN—If an appeal is to be taken from the decision of the Chair, I ask for the yeas and nays. [Voices. "Oh, no."]

The SPEAKER stated the question The Chair decided that as all rules were suspended, the gentleman from Massachusetts was in order The question now is: whether the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. SCHENCK—If I understand the decision of the Chair, the appeal is not debatable. Will it be competent to take an appeal from that?

The SPEAKER—It will not.

Mr. BAYLY—As I desire to vote understandingly, I desire to ask a question. The Chair says our rules are suspended. Are we not now acting under the parliamentary law?

The SPEAKER replied affirmatively.

Mr. ADAMS—The Speaker has decided that the parliamentary law is now the law of this House, independently of the rules established by the House itself. I ask on what authority he makes the decision, and what is the parliamentary law.

The SPEAKER.—Whenever the House choose to suspend their rules, the parliamentary law is appropriate. The Chair refers to a decision of the gentleman nimself for an example. He so decided on one occasion, at the commencement of the 26th Congress.

Mr. ADAMS.—(Very loud) Mr. Speaker, I demand whether this House is bound by the parliamentary law of another country, independently of our own rules. I deny that I made any such decision.

The SPEAKER.—The clerk will recur to the journal. The question is on the appeal.

A VOICE.—"Why, I thought that was settled."

Mr. WENTWORTH—I voted to suspend the rule for the gentleman to reply, but not to—(Here the concluding part of the sentence was lost in cries of "order."

Mr. TIBBATTS.—Is it in order to lay the appeal on the table?

Cries of "no," "no."

The SPEAKER.—It is.

Mr. TIBBATTS.—What will be the effect?

The SPEAKER.—If the appeal be laid on the table, the gentleman can proceed with his remarks.

Mr. TIBBETTS—I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. HOPKINS—I ask for the yeas and nays, to see whether the House will continue this business.

The SPEAKER—The yeas and nays have been asked on laying the appeal on the table.

The result was—yeas 70, nays 67. The appeal was not laid on the table.

The SPEAKER now stated the question to be on the appeal from the decision of the Chair.

And, by yeas 90, nays 67, the decision of the Chair was ordered to stand as the judgment of the House.

The SPEAKER said he found it neccessary to make a correction. He withdrew his decision that *all* rules were suspended, but only so far as restricts debate when no question is before the House.

Mr. ASHMUN wanted to know whether he was confined to one hour.

The SPEAKER said he was, but the interruption would not take from the time.

This impediment having been removed, there was a new feature introduced in the pathway of debate, no less than

A VERY SERIOUS CHARGE AGAINST MR. INGERSOLL.

Mr. ASHMUN (holding a Congressional volume in his hand) said, that on the accession of Gen. Jackson, in 1829, Mr. Ingersoll was dismissed from the office which he then held, for abuses connected with the public money. We all knew that Gen. Jackson made a pledge that if he found abuses he would reform them. Accordingly, one of his first acts was to remove from office the district attorney of the eastern district of Pennsylvania, on the ground stated. He held in his hand a document printed in 1839, which contained a history of the transaction. The officer was removed in March or April, 1829; his term would have expired in 1830, and he had less than one year to run. Gen. Jackson, with honesty of purpose, would not permit him to continue, but removed him and appointed Mr. Dallas. The last payment of the balance due from the member from Pennsylvania was not paid into the treasury until February, 1839, nearly ten years afterwards. In 1836 a suit was commenced against him as a public defaulter, and he found means to reduce the sum to $3,965, almost $4,000. The document tells how this was done; six hundred and fifty-one separate bills of indictment were made out in the tea case. He claimed taxes and costs on all. There were two or three cargoes of tea. He had been directed to prosecute them, not one case at a time, but all. Did not gentlemen see that this was a monstrous abuse?

A DEFENCE.

Mr. JOSEPH R. INGERSOLL.—Will the gentleman allow me to say a word?

Mr. ASHMUN.—Certainly.

Mr. J. R. INGERSOLL (the brother of Mr. C. J. Ingersoll).—I have endeavored to keep myself aloof; but I am called on to discharge a duty which I cannot avoid. With regard to that transaction, I stood in another light than that of relationship. I was his counsel (as well as brother) during the transaction. I know that for a course of years he was endeavoring, in vain, to bring the government to some means of adjustment. The officers of the Department delayed. At length, a suit was brought, and the matter decided by a court and jury.

Mr. ASHMUN interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. INGERSOLL said he was certain the gentleman, by permitting a reply, would not lose any portion of his hour. The money which was held by his brother was invested for the benefit of the government. When suit came forward, the authorities demanded a million and a half of dollars to be accounted for. He showed vouchers for the payment of every thing except the small amount which he had employed to oblige the government to institute suit against him. It was settled to the entire satisfaction of the judge, jury, and every body. He asserted, on the faith of a gentleman, that he was not cognizant of a more honorable course of transaction.

A LIE CHARGED—BOWIE KNIVES AND PISTOLS.

Mr. ASHMUN—The gentleman's position entitles him to be heard, so far as his opinion is concerned. When suit was commenced, judgment was rendered against him for $4,000, and it was not paid till two years afterwards. The gentleman said the transaction was honorable. I leave it for the House and the world to judge whether it was honorable to bring six hundred and fifty-one cases, out of which a large amount was realized.—The gentleman (Mr. C. J. Ingersoll) charged on Mr. Webster a personal use of the public moneys. I pronounce the charge false. I know measures have been taken to induce Mr. Tyler to testify in this matter——

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL (in his seat.)—Do you know it?

Mr. ASHMUN—Yes: I have been told so, and have seen it in the prints.

Mr. INGERSOLL—Do you accuse me?

Mr. ASHMUN—Yes.

Mr. INGERSOLL, (rising)—It is false, sir. A lie, sir—the lie of a coward! [A Voice—"That's right."]

The SPEAKER, (rapping)—The gentleman will take his seat.

Mr. ASHMUN—The aged gentleman from Pennsylvania said——

Mr. INGERSOLL, (rubbing his hands)—Aged! aged! young enough, sir.

Mr. ASHMUN—I come from a section which neither believes in duels, nor bowie-knives, nor pistols——[hisses.]]

Mr. INGERSOLL—Nor getting drunk?

Mr. ASHMUN—But—[a voice: "You wont fight."]—let the member try it, and he will find it out. When I see such means resorted to—secrets broken into—I am not at liberty to remain quiet. Talk about corrupting the public press! Practical printers offered to do the printing of this House fifty per cent less than the prices paid to Ritchie & Heiss, and the editor of the "official" was thus enabled to write homilies for this House.—As to what effect, ask the fifty-four forty men.—Blair & Rives, too, were made rich. Suppose it true that Webster and Tyler caused articles to be published, giving the public information on a deeply interesting question—the Northeastern boundary—what harm was there in it? Was this for corrupt party purposes? This embraces substantially the whole of the charges. I have done nothing more than my duty in holding up the slanders to public disgust and contempt. I do believe that there are men of all parties—high-minded gentlemen—who hold the fame of public men as part of their property, and will do justice to them; and that they will put on the author of the calumnies the mark of reprobation, until repentance shall move his heart, and he shall ask and obtain mercy.

AN IMPORTANT MOVEMENT.

Mr. COBB submitted a resolution.

Mr. SCHENCK rose to a question of privilege; he had a resolution to offer.

Mr. COBB—Mine is a question of privilege.

The resolution was read; that the debate on the bill to establish the Smithsonian Institution shall cease in two hours after it shall again be taken up in committee.

Mr. COBB moved the previous question.

Mr SCHENCK repeated that he rose to a question of privilege; and sent to the Clerk's table a resolution, which was read for information. It was prefaced by the resolution of Mr. Ingersoll, heretofore adopted by the House, calling for expenditures from the secret service fund, and asserted that the President had declined to answer, giving his reasons therefor, and concluded by instituting a committee of five, to send for persons and papers, to make inquiry into the means by which access has been obtained to the secret archives of the State Department.

Mr. BOYD objected to the reception of the resolution.

The SPEAKER said the question was, objection being made, whether the House would receive the resolution

Several questions were raised, as to whether Mr. Schenck's resolution could be received, Mr. Cobb's having been offered previously. There was much talk about a question of privilege and a privileged question.

The SPEAKER came to the conclusion that it was not a question of privilege.

Mr. LEAK moved to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. SCHENCK asked for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

The CLERK commenced calling the roll. When he reached the name of

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL—That gentleman arose, and asked whether he was allowed to vote.

The SPEAKER replied that the gentleman could exercise his own discretion.

Mr. Ingersoll sat down.

The roll being called through, the vote was announced—yeas 61, nays 94.

So the question was decided in the negative.

Mr. PETTIT desired to offer an amendment to Mr. Schenck's resolution.

Mr SCHENCK was permitted to amend his resolution, to the effect, that the inquiry shall extend to the agency, in procuring copies of documents from the files of the State Department, whether by Mr. Ingersoll, or any other person. If so, him, whether he does not deserve punishment by the House, and whether it does not amount to an offence against the dignity of the House.

After other questions of order had been raised.

A motion was made to lay the whole subject on the table; but it did not prevail—yeas 51, nays 104.

AN IMPEACHMENT.

Mr. PETTIT submitted his amendment; and that another committee of five members be appointed, to inquire into the truth of the charges thus made by Charles J. Ingersoll against Daniel Webster, with a view to found an impeachment; and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers, and vouchers.

Mr. SCHENCK said, if the gentleman would make it a separate and independent resolution, he would vote for it. [A voice:—"Let them go together."]

Mr. PETTIT moved the previous question.

The amendment of Mr. Pettit was agreed to,

And the resolution as amended, was adopted

Mr. Cobb's resolution to terminate the debate on the Smithsonian Institution, was taken up.

An effort was made to lay it on the table, but without success—yeas 77, nays 82.

The House refused to adopt it—yeas 93, nays 86.

Several Executive communications were received and read,

And the House adjourned.

By the Magnetic Telegraph.

WASHINGTON, April 28, 1846.

Senate.

Mr. MILLER presented resolutions from New Jersey; in favor of the tariff, and for light-house on Tucker's Beach.

Mr. JARNAGIN gave notice of a joint resolution authorizing a Board to be appointed to adjudicate the claims of our citizens against Mexico

A bill for the relief of Goddard and others was taken up, which Mr. Turney opposed.

House of Repesentatives.

The SPEAKER appointed Messrs. Schenck, Dobbin, McIlvane, Stanton and Rockwell a committee on Schenck's resolution; and Messrs. Pettit, Vinton, Davis, of Mississippi, King of Mass., and Wilmot, on Mr. Pettit's resolution.

The Smithsonian bill was discussed.

Messrs. Sims, J. Q. Adams, Johnson, of Tennessee; Thurman, Rathbun and Owen reported bills.

The House will be used to-night by the pupils of the Institution for the Blind.

☞ It is rumored that the President yesterday gave Mr. Pakenham the notice.

LATER FROM THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION.—A correspondent of the *Baltimore American*, writing under date of New Orleans, April 20, says:—

By the arrival of the schooner W. C. Preston, this morning, from Matamoros, we have advices from thence to the 2d inst, by which it appears that the report of the removal of General Taylor from his original position is incorrect. He maintained his ground opposite the town, and was in possession of the two ferries. On the 29th ult. Gen. Ampudia had reached Matamoros with a body of 3,000 troops under his command, and the Mexican force then in the town was upwards of 4,000 men. The general impression was, that the disputes between the Governments would be, or had been, amicably adjusted.

In consequence of the continued absence of the European advices by the Unicorn, our cotton market is very quiet. The business of Saturday reached 2800 bales.—This morning I have only heard of sales of 1000 bales.—Prices remain quite steady.

The arrivals this morning are the ship Montreal, Prince, from Bangor; barks Oberlin, Bulch, Boston; Clermont, Desmond, Vera Cruz; schrs. St. Paul, Talbot, Matagorda; W. C. Preston, Taylor, Matamoros.

You are aware that the time of departure of the mail has been altered to 12 o'clock, and I am consequently unable to give the clearances or so full a report of market transactions as I could wish to do.

PHILADELPHIA, April 28, 1846.

The trial of Frederick C. Snyder, for the murder of James H. Garvin, of which mention was made in my letter of yesterday, continues to occupy the attention of the court. The evidence on both sides was concluded before the adjournment, last evening. From the testimony of the girl who was in company with Snyder, on the evening in question, it appears that they were assaulted by the deceased and his two companions, when the parties met in the road—that Snyder was beaten by them, and on their drawing knives, he fled down the road, followed by them for some distance. The young men did not attempt to molest the girl, and she joined Snyder after the fatal collision had occurred, which resulted in the death of Garvin. Snyder returned to the spot to see Garvin, and on finding that the injured man would probably die, gave himself up without an effort to escape. The argument of the counsel was commenced, this morning, by F. Wharton and William D. Kelley, Esqs., for the prosecution, and William A. Porter and G. W. Barton, Esq., for the defence. The closing speech of Mr. Barton was a brilliant effort. The case will be given to the jury this evening.

The first of May, so long known in your city as a day of moving, bids fair to be rivalled in this city, in consequence of an ordinance recently passed by councils requiring the flags displayed as signs by our storekeepers, not to extend beyond a certain distance from the line of the houses. The signs, &c., erected along the curb-stones are also to be removed, and wheelbarrows are to be in future trundled over the paving stones in the streets. The requirements of the law will require a great number of flags and signs, which float aloft in every street, or obstruct the footway, to be removed. There is at present, no symptom of these nuisances being abated, but it is probable that the storekeepers will hasten to remove them on the first of May, rather than stand a suit and pay the penalty imposed.

Philip Rickeit, a boy, aged 13, was taken to the hospital this morning, in consequence of being dreadfully crushed by a car upon the Columbia Railroad passing over his thigh. The accident happened near Fairmount. No hopes are entertained of his recovery.

A poor cripple, named McCabe, was beaten in a dreadful manner about two o'clock this afternoon, by a stout and stalwart man, named John D. Wood, and was taken to the hospital in a dangerous condition. McCabe had sued Wood for using threats, before one of the city aldermen, but the latter suffered him to depart on his own recognizance. A square from the office, Wood overtook the unfortunate man, and having knocked him down, afterwards kicked him. No perceptible serious injury could be discovered, but he has doubtless received an internal injury, as he is bleeding from the mouth. The doctors think his recovery very doubtful. Wood was immediately arrested and committed to prison. All bail was refused.

Sales of Stocks at Philadelphia.

APRIL 28—FIRST BOARD—50 shares Girard Bank 10⅝; $2000 Pittsburgh 6's 93; 2000 Cincinnati Bonds 95; 600 State 5's 67⅛; 13 shrs Bar & Mechanics' Bank 41; 2 N Liberty Bank 25½.

AFTER BOARD—400 City 5 s, 1850, 101; 350 shrs Girard Bank b 5, 10⅝.

SECOND BOARD—200 Girard Bank 10⅝; 10 do c 10⅝; 8 do 10⅝; 1300 U States Bank Notes 77; 600 do 77.

AFTER BOARD—10 shares Lehigh Navigation 21⅛; 100 Reading R R, 5 days, 25¾.

BOSTON, April 28, 1846.

Mr. Webster's Arrival—His Reception at the Depot—Escorted to his Lodgings—Compelled to walk by an unruly Horse—Great Sale of Lots at the New City—Business on the Western Railroad—Arrival of Emigrants—Rev. Mr. Skinner's Farewell Sermon, &c.

Mr. Webster, arrived in town last evening, about 6 o'clock, by the Long Island train. He was received at the depot by the Mayor, Josiah Quincy, jun., and a large concourse of the citizens of Boston. Mayor Quincy made a speech, and Mr. Webster replied, in a very appropriate manner, of course, though I did not hear either of the addresses. A procession of citizens was then formed, headed by the Brigade Band, to escort Mr. Webster to his lodgings. Mr. Webster, Hon. Jeremiah Mason, formerly of New Hampshire, Hon. Josiah Quincy, late President of Harvard University, and one or two others, commenced the journey in a barouche; but in going up Tremont street, one of the horses became unmanageable, and refused to budge another step. In consequence of this unfortunate and ill-advised stubborness on the part of the horse, Mr. Webster alighted from the carriage, and performed the rest of the journey on foot. There was something of a crowd at the corner of Washington and Summer streets, waiting the arrival of Mr. Webster, and just as the procession began to pass, an old lady arrived on the spot, and inquired what the matter was. I told her Daniel Webster was coming. "My conscience!" exclaimed she, and hurried off to a point where she could have a good view of the great and wonderful man.

Some cheers were given by the multitude as the procession passed, but I did not think the enthusiasm was very great. The fact is, the whigs here have not entirely forgotten that speech in Faneuil Hall, in which Mr. Webster declared a National Bank to be "an obsolete idea," and censured the entire whig party of Massachusetts, in no measured terms. They admire his great talents, and fully appreciate the importance of the services he is capable of rendering them, but their esteem for the man and confidence in his integrity was considerably diminished by the course he pursued while a member of Mr. Tyler's cabinet. The attack of Mr. Ingersoll, however, has done Mr. Webster no harm in this quarter.

There is to be a great sale of building-lots at Andover Bridge, the site of the new manufacturing city, to day. Contracts have already been made for building five large factories at this place, and dwelling-houses, workshops, and buildings of all kinds, are said to be rising, as if by magic. Real estate in the vicinity is selling at advancing prices. These new outlays of capital show that our manufacturers and monied men have confidence in the continued prosperity of American manufactures.

It is said that the railroad between this city and Albany has done a business twenty-five per cent. larger, this season, than during the same period last year.

The ship Norfolk, from Liverpool, which arrived here on Sunday, brought out 163 Irish emigrant passengers.

The corner stone of a new Baptist Church, for the society of which Rev. Mr. Hague is minister, was laid yesterday morning, at the corner of Bedford and Rowe streets.

Rev. Brown Emerson, D D, who has been pastor of the South Church in Salem about 40 years, is about to visit Europe. He will sail in one of the New York packet-ships, about the middle of May, accompanied by the prayers of his parishioners and numerous friends.

Rev. Otis A. Skinner preached his farewell sermon to his church and society on Sunday afternoon, he being about to remove to New York, and to become pastor of one of your Universalist churches. The house was filled to its utmost capacity, and the sermon was deeply interesting. At the close, the audience were mostly affected to tears. The speaker at times found great difficulty in giving utterence to his words, so great was his emotion. Mr. Skinner was ardently loved and admired by his congregation, and his friends and acquaintances generally regret exceedingly to lose the society of a man whom they esteem so highly.

Stocks are still on the rise.

Sales of Stocks at Boston.

APRIL 27.—BROKERS' BOARD—85 shares Norwich and Worcester Railroad, 58; 50 do 58, b 10; 150 Long Island Railroad, 36½; 100 do, 36¾; 165 do, 37; 10 Western Railroad, 95¾; 40 do, 95½; 7 do, 95¾; 10 Connecticut River Railroad, 93½; 4 Old Colony Railroad, 105; 5 Fitchburg Railroad, 121½; 5 Boston and Worcester Railroad, 117; 4 Boston and Ma