

15th CONGRESS.]

No. 439.

[1st SESSION.]

CONTESTED ELECTION OF ELIAS EARLE, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM SOUTH
CAROLINA.

COMMUNICATED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 5, 1818.

Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, from the Committee of Elections, to whom was referred a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 10th of December, 1817, and a message of the President of the United States of the 29th of the same month, reported, in part:

That, in the month of April, 1815, Elias Earle was appointed postmaster at Centreville, in the State of South Carolina. That, at the last congressional election in that State, he was elected one of its Representatives to this House. On the 10th of February, 1817, the Governor executed a certificate of his election, which Mr. Earle states to have been received by him in April or May thereafter. On the 10th of September, 1816, he addressed to the Postmaster General, and sent by mail, a letter requesting it to be accepted "as my [his] resignation as postmaster," and recommending the appointment of a Mr. Tillinghast, who was accordingly appointed, but, having omitted to execute the bond required by law, he was never commissioned. The office continued to be executed in the name of Mr. Earle, and he superintended the same, until the 12th of June, 1817, when his connexion with it ceased, as appears by the message above mentioned. We subjoin hereto a letter from the Postmaster General, (marked A,) and copies of two letters of Mr. Earle, (marked B and C,) which we desire may be considered as part of this report; and respectfully submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That Elias Earle is entitled to a seat in this House.

A.

GENERAL POST OFFICE, *December 30, 1817.*

Elias Earle, esquire, being postmaster at Centreville, South Carolina, September 10, 1816, sent a resignation, and recommended Daniel H. Tillinghast to be his successor. An appointment was sent to Mr. Tillinghast, who never executed the bond. On the 12th of June, 1817, by letter, Mr. Earle recommended John Morris, jun. to be appointed postmaster. The appointment was sent to Mr. Morris, who also declined. During the above periods Mr. Earle superintended the direction of the office, though he considers his resignation to relate back to 1816.

R. J. MEIGS, JUN.

B.

CENTREVILLE, *September 10, 1816.*

SIR:

You will be so good as to receive and accept of this as my resignation as postmaster at this place; and I also take the liberty of recommending Daniel H. Tillinghast as postmaster in my place. In answer to your inquiries, to know where I was born, I can only say in Virginia.

Your obedient servant,

ELIAS EARLE.

C.

CENTREVILLE, *June 12, 1817.*

SIR:

Enclosed is a receipt paid Alexander Waddle for the amount of forty dollars, returned by your order, which amounts to upwards of twenty more than is due you by the returns forwarded to you last mail from this office, which I paid at your request, and which can be settled for hereafter. This office is for several months without a postmaster, although I wrote on to you last September, and lately again. I hope you will name Mr. John Morris, jun., as it is impossible I can keep any charge of it, as I am almost constantly from home; it has hitherto been tolerably well attended to.

Your obedient servant,

ELIAS EARLE.

15th CONGRESS.]

No. 440.

[1st SESSION.]

ALTERATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

COMMUNICATED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 6, 1818.

Mr. WENDOVER, from the select committee appointed to inquire into the expediency of altering the flag of the United States, reported:

That they have maturely considered the subject referred to them, and have adopted, substantially, the report of the committee to whom was referred the same subject at the last session of Congress, as forming a part of this report, [see No. 418, page 412.] The committee are fully persuaded that the form selected for the American flag was truly emblematical of our origin and existence as an independent nation, and that, as such, it having met the approbation and received the support of the citizens of the Union, it ought to undergo no change that would decrease its conspicuity, or tend to deprive it of its representative character. The committee, however, believe that an increase in the number of States in the Union since the flag was altered by law sufficiently indicates the propriety of such a change in the arrangement of the flag as shall best accord with the reasons that led to its original adoption, and sufficiently point to important periods of our national history.