

JUDGE CLAYTON AT HOME, vs. JUDGE CLAYTON IN CONGRESS.

It is commonly thought by reflecting men, that he at least should be innocent, who prefers an accusation against another. This principle is well illustrated in a memorable instance, adjudicated by the Saviour of the world, "let him that is without sin first cast a stone at her." It is not intended to enter into any argument to shew what might be the best mode which Congress could adopt, for the final settlement of the numerous memorials, which have been annually poured in upon it for the last ten or fifteen years, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; but, as a former member of Congress, A. S. Clayton has, in no measured terms, arraigned the conduct of those members from the south who have, since the commencement of the present session, voted to lay such memorials and petitions on the table, briefly to shew, how far that conduct has been justified or condemned by his own. On referring to the Journal of the House of Representatives, during the last session, it will be found, that on the 29th of Dec. 1834, a memorial, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, was presented by Mr. Thomson of Ohio, and referred to the committee on that District; and that similar memorials were presented on the 12th, 19th, and 26th of Jan.; and on the 2d and 9th of Feb., 1835, by Messrs. Vinton, Thomson, Whittlesey, Fuller, Jones, Stewart, Lincoln, Young, Heister, Lay, and John Quincy Adams, to the number of thirteen, and referred to the same committee on the District of Columbia. On the 9th of February foregoing, a memorial on the same subject, from the inhabitants of the District of Columbia was, on motion of Mr. Hubbard, ordered to be printed. On neither of these did Mr. Clayton either demand that the petition be rejected, or not printed—nor did he ask a division of the House; but, for aught the Journal discloses, voted to refer and to print. Among the petitions, presented on the 26th of January, three were offered by Mr. Dickson of New York, which were laid on the table until Monday the second of February; Mr. Dickson moving to refer them to a select committee. On the 2d of February the question recurred on the resolution to raise a select committee, when a motion was made, by Mr. Chan, "That the said memorials do lie on the table."—"And the question being put thereon, it passed in the affirmative,"—yeas 117, nays 77.—Every southern man present voting in the affirmative, including Augustin S. Clayton.—This vote appears to have been decisive and satisfactory—as the memorials afterwards received were some referred to the committee on the District of Columbia, and others laid on the table, without the yeas and nays being required but once, as it is believed, and then in consequence of a previous motion to reconsider a vote to print. Can Mr. Clayton say why the motion to print prevailed, and why he did not make the motion to reconsider that vote?

The country was satisfied with this course, and thus matters stood, until after the commencement of the present session of Congress. On the 16th December, 1835, two abolition memorials were presented by Mr. Fairfield, who moved that "they lie on the table."—"And the question being put, it passed in the affirmative."—Yeas 180, nays 31. A motion was then made by Mr. Slade, "That the said petition from inhabitants of Lymington and its vicinity, in the State of Maine, be printed for the use of the members of the House."—"A motion was made by Mr. Vanderpoek, that this motion to print do lie on the table."—"And on the question to agree to this latter motion, it was passed in the affirmative."—Yeas 169, nays 49. Every southern man present voting in the affirmative on the first, and all but one in the affirmative on the last question.

When it is remembered that southern members had before them the high example of Augustin S. Clayton—sometimes silently voting to refer abolition memorials to the committee on the District of Columbia—one time silently voting to print, and sometimes voting by yeas and noes to lay them on the table, how could they expect to find their conduct questioned by him for voting to lay such as have been presented, at the present session, on the table? More.—If he was content with a majority of forty in favor of laying on the table, all the southern members present voting with him, how could the members of the present Congress be otherwise than satisfied, with a majority of one hundred and forty-nine to lay on the table, and a majority of one hundred and twenty against printing such a memorial? What then has induced Mr. Clayton to arraign men who can at least, claim the merit of having followed his example in voting to lay abolition memorials on the table? Is it because they have neither voted for, nor carelessly permitted, such memorials to be printed, nor to be referred to the committee on the District of Columbia? of one of which, as it appears by the Journals, he must himself have been guilty—either of directly voting for, or negligently, permitting, such printing or reference. Or is his attack part of a system of operations connected with a certain motion made in the House on the 18th Dec., that a memorial should "be rejected?" Is it true, that nullification is once more cheered with the hope of being able, either to rule or ruin the country, by operating on the fears of the people? Let this immaculate accuser answer.

HANCOCK.