

# The National Intelligencer,

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER

A N D

VOL. 7. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, NEW-JERSEY AVENUE, NEAR THE CAPITOL, No. 113.

Five Dollars Per Annum.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12th, 1860.

PAID IN ADVANCE.

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1860.

Statement of facts attending the application of the Editor for permission to occupy a position within the bar of the House of Representatives, that he might be enabled to report with facility their proceedings and debates.

On the first day of the sitting of Congress, as well as the Editor recollects, he spoke to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and stated that, having been informed that it was usual to obtain his permission to take the debates, the Editor then desired the pleasure of making a request to that effect.

The Speaker replied that it was usual, and that the permission would be cheerfully granted as a matter of course. At this period a member came up to the Editor and asked him how he intended to publish the debates, and whether he designed publishing them at full length. Before the Editor had time to answer the question the Speaker flung, addressing himself to the Editor, "You had better not." When the speeches are so long nobody reads them." The Editor replied that he had not preferred to himself any settled plan, but that he certainly should give all important debates in detail. "It was probable that he should abridge those that were not interesting."

At the time it was understood by the Editor, though not expressed in terms, that permission was given by the words of the Speaker, to take the debates in the manner in which they had heretofore been taken, and with the advantages of plate which had previously been allowed.

The Editor does not recollect, and he is persuaded that it had occurred he would recollect it, that the Speaker made any remark whatever respecting any previous application made to him.

As an evidence of the conviction of the Editor that permission was granted to take the debates in the customary way, he need only mention, in addition to what is already stated, that he immediately had made a desk of a new size as to produce the best possible interference with the convenience of the members.

The next morning the desk was taken to the capitol. Previously to placing it within the bar, the Editor again spoke to the Speaker, explaining the purpose of the desk, and the Editor's desire to consult him respecting the best place for it.

It was then that the Speaker declared his fear that the accommodation requested could not be granted, and that he had been applied to by several other persons, and that the area he had so small as not to justify the admission.

The Editor assured the Speaker that he felt no desire to inconvenience the members of the House; that his opinion was that a position within the bar at the windows would not have such an effect; for that there were four windows, in each of which there was a space that retained within the line of the wall far enough to admit a desk, on each side, whereby eight persons might be accommodated, it was evident that no obstacle to the flight or passage of the members would be created by the benches.

The Speaker did not reply this suggestion by any expression of his wishes, but that one already applied by him, but said that he had been applied to by a number of individuals, that it was probable more meant to apply; if one was admitted, all would be admitted, and it was utterly impossible to admit the whole.

The Editor replied that he could not answer for the actions of others. But that his own opinion was that there would not be more than two, if in many benches, they would gladly attend. He further informed the Speaker, that Mr. Stewart, whose application he had alluded, had told him that he did not mean to publish the debates in detail, but intending to condense.

The Speaker, without yielding to the ideas of the Editor, repeated his conviction of

the impossibility of admitting the benches within the bar, and fluted his opinion that they might have very well without the bar. The Editor replied unequivocally that, in his opinion, they could not.

The manner of the Speaker impressed the Editor with a hope that his decision was not conclusive, as he said something in reference to his speaking to the members, and expressing a desire that the Editor would try whether he could succeed in hearing outside of the bar.

Under this impression he waded, for several days, any further conversation with the Speaker. In the meantime he consulted the portion of the members of the House, indiscriminately without reference to political opinion. Of those he consulted, there was not one that did not express a perfect concurrence with the Editor that it was an extraordinary expedient, as experienced by the admission of the benches; and most of those, on terms of political friendship with the Speaker, engaged to speak to him in favor of the application.

It was entertaining a double object, in the accomplishment of the object. The Editor made use of these means, from an earnest desire to gain admission within the bar, without being obliged to refer to the members of the House, and within the House, and from a sincere desire to manifest the highest respect for the Speaker.

The means, made use of, proved ineffective. Yet, on a personal application of the Speaker, the Editor was informed by him that on the most deliberate consideration of the request, it could not be granted; that it was impossible to grant it without deriding the dignity and order of the House, and the convenience of the members.

The memorial offered was forthwith prepared. But before it was presented, the Editor again advised the Speaker, and informed him that, guided by a few days, he meant to request from the House that permission which he had refused; but still desirous of evincing his respect for the Speaker, he wished to know from him in what way it would be best to present the memorial; stating that if not objected to by him, it would be presented through him to the House. The Speaker said that would be improper, and remarked that the usual way of presenting memorials was through a member. The memorial was accordingly presented.

The facts are thus minutely stated by the Editor, under a conviction that the subject is, not only interesting to him personally considered, but likewise deeply interesting to the people of the United States. How they are to obtain that correct information, which it would have been his effort to give, and which he thinks it is their right to receive, from reporters occupying their present positions, he does not know. He has affirmed, and the bill solemnly affirms, that he is unable to hear a large portion of the remarks made by many members. Even the words of the Speaker and Editor, generally deliberately uttered, are often so low, and so far from the floor of the House, there is not a position within the bar better than the one he at present occupies; and as to the upper gallery no man who has been there during a debate will deny that it is altogether unfit for a reporter, owing the constant passage of individuals and the incessant noise.

The Editor has been complimented by the ascription to him of pride, as the motive of his conduct. How just this ascription is, in the sense conveyed, let any man decide, who has perused the foregoing statement. It will demonstrate that the Editor, so far from courting a collision with the Speaker, did every thing in his power, which retainer of language and act of respect could effect, to conciliate his good will.

The Editor of the National Intelligencer has, since the commencement of the session, reported the debates with the greatest fidelity and impartiality; that circumstances would admit. His statements have been

unpropitious to the full accomplishment of his wishes. Still he has done his best. This he will continue to do, so long as he is impelled by those convictions of duty which he at present cherishes. While he continues to conduct a print at the seat of government, designed to diffuse correct political statements, it shall not be said that the interests of the public liberty are inattentive to the important duties of institutions of those who are its constituted guardians. Whatever, therefore, may be the inconveniences experienced or the obstacles presented, he will persevere in the faithful discharge of his professional duties, regardless though furnished with unfavorable circumstances, not to violate his trust.

## CONGRESS

### OF THE UNITED STATES

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DEC. 10, 1860.

The House went into a committee of the whole, Mr. Edmond in the chair, on the bill for erecting a Mausoleum to the memory of GEORGE WASHINGTON.

MR. ALFON said, he was glad when he first made the motion now under consideration, that a question would have been taken upon the amendment without debate; but as his will upon that subject had not been complied with, he felt it his duty to give to the House the reasons which actuated him.

He said that he by no means wished to detract any thing from the merit of that illustrious character, whose memory we were now about to perpetuate; that it was his wish that his character might be handed to the latest posterity unimpaired, and that he really thought the amendment equally calculated to effect that desirable purpose, was a matter of importance to the people of this country; that the expense of a mausoleum, from the best information he had been able to collect, would amount to at least 100 or 200,000 dollars; that a monument such as was contemplated by the amendment, would not cost more than ten cents as much as a mausoleum, as contemplated by the bill is now laid. He believed that the bare expense of interest; the remains of George Washington in a mausoleum would cost as much as the proposed monument.

MR. ALFON said he considered congressional as for the resolutions of the last session; that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Otis) who was up a few days ago upon this subject had requested information; and in answer to which he had only to observe that if that gentleman would have given himself the trouble to have examined the proceedings of the last session of Congress he would have been informed that he appeared to be that a committee, equally respectable with that which had reported the bill at the present time, had then fully investigated the subject, and had made a report, which was to be found upon the journals of the last session of Congress, recommending a monument such as was contemplated by the proposed amendment; and that the request made by the gentleman of the United States in Washington in conformity to the report of that committee, was for a monument; to which request he had consented; he therefore, considered Congress as pledged to this far and no farther; that a motion was made for the amendment, and the result was a mausoleum; that the recent death of general Washington at that time prevented any person from opposing any measure which was offered, let the expense be what it would; but that the time which had elapsed since, had enabled the public mind the better to judge.

The gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Lee) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Griswold) had dwelt a great deal upon the subject of public gratitude. It was by no means his wish or intention to lessen that gratitude, but that he could not give his consent to an expensive measure like that contemplated in the bill, when a mea-

sure far less expensive, in his opinion, would answer every purpose as well.

MR. ALLISON was followed by Mr. HING, who advocated the erection of a Mausoleum.

MR. SWALE replied. He considered the erection of a Mausoleum as productive of unnecessary expense, as a monument would answer every rational purpose contemplated in the bill.

GENERAL LEE next spoke at some length in favor of a mausoleum, and read a letter received from Mr. King, our ambassador at London, expressing a plan, presented to him by an eminent foreign artist, for a mausoleum of one hundred and fifty feet high, and the same height, the expense of which was estimated at 170,000 dollars.

We shall make no apology for the brief notice of these proceedings. We could not bear them.

MR. CHAMPLIN, after some remarks, the indefinite hearing of which did not enable us to determine on which side of the matter he was argued, moved that the committee rise, progress, and do leave to fit again, which motion being carried without a division, the committee rose; and on the question to grant them leave to fit again, only three members voted in the affirmative. Leave was, of course, denied.

MR. CHAMPLIN then moved the recommitment of the bill to the same committee that reported it, with the addition of Mr. Claiborne, Messrs. Claiborne and Messrs. Claiborne and Champlin appointed.

AFTER MR. CHAMPLIN'S motion for a recommitment of the Bill to a select committee was carried.

MR. CLAIBORNE said, he had intended to move that the committee just appointed be instructed to enquire into the expediency of carrying into effect a resolution passed by the old Congress, on the 7th of August 1783, "Directing an equilateral statue of general Washington, to be erected at the place where the residence of Congress shall be established."

MR. CLAIBORNE said, that on a question which could not fail to excite the feelings of every American heart, it was a subject of great interest, that a division of sentiment should arise. The memory of our departed patriot lives in the affections of a separate country, and will triumph over time. During a long life, to faithfully and honorably employed, Washington had rendered to himself a fabric of fame, the fulcrum of which can neither be diminished or heightened by any measure that we can see. But, far, from a respect for our own, as well as for the feelings of the nation, we should endeavor to unite in the last act of attention, which we propose to show this venerable character.

MR. CLAIBORNE said, that the proposition for a mausoleum was calculated to excite liveliness. The expense of such a monument would be immense, and would beviewed by many, as a profuse and useless expenditure of the public money. He believed that the statue recommended by the old Congress, could be better justified upon the principles of economy, and would meet with more general approval. Here Mr. Claiborne read from the journals of the old Congress the following resolutions: "Resolved, That an equilateral statue of general Washington be erected at the place where the residence of Congress shall be established."

—The General, that the statue be of bronze.—The statue to be erected in a Roman dress, holding a scepter in his right hand, and his left encircled with a laurel wreath. The figure to be supported by a marble pedestal, on which are to be represented in bas-relief, the following principal events of his life, in which general Washington commanded in person, viz. The evacuation of Boston—the capture of the Hessians at Trenton—the battle of Princeton—the action of Monmouth—the first surrender of York.—On the upper part of the front of the pedestal, to be engraved as follows:—The U. States in Congress assembled, ordered this statue to be erected in the year of our Lord 1783, in honor of George Washington, the illustrious and heroic chief of the armies of the United States of