AMERICAN
AND
Commercial Daily Advertiser.

BALTIMORE, FRIDAY, Jan. 7.

PUBLISHED DAILY BY
W. PECHIN & G. DOBBIN & MURPHY
(PRINTERS OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION)
NO. 4, HARRISON-STREET.

Daily Paper $8—Country Paper $5 per annum
All Advertisments appear in both.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

Of the Physical, Economical & Moral Forces of Napoleon, in the years 1812 & 1813.

[*From the Supplement to the Petersburg Gazette of the 24th of September.*]

JANUARY, 1812.

1.—Napoleon was in absolute possession of the French Empire, the kingdoms of Italy, Illyria, and the Northern part of Spain.

2.—He was indirectly master of the states of the Confederation of the Rhine, of Prussia, of the kingdom of Naples, and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. He had possession of the fortresses on the Oder, and a limited alliance with Denmark.

3.—Austria dreaded his power; her military system was reduced; circumstances rendered her his Ally; she consented to give him 30,000 men.

4.—Russia kept her ports shut: she had 120,000 men upon her frontier to defend her independence; but she was at war with England and the Porte, and soon after with Sweden.

5.—This latter power was in a state of neutrality with France, and Napoleon offered her subsidies to induce her to declare herself for him.

6. Napoleon had an army of 500,000 veterans upon the Oder and the Vistula to attack Russia; this war has drawn more than 600 millions out of his treasury, and 2,000 pieces of artillery from his arsenals. The Poles supplied him with 80,000 men and 100 millions. He brought into the war 70,000 cavalry.

7.—Napoleon had in his own hands the monopoly of colonial produce throughout all Europe. This monopoly brought him 100 millions.

8.—Napoleon drew contributions from Austria, from Prussia, and from Illyria. He had the revenue of all Italy, from the confederacy of Germany, from Poland and that of the French empire, which amounted to nearly 1,000 millions tournois. Notwithstanding those resources, the deficiency for the year 1812 was doubled.

9.—Notwithstanding the battles of Aspern and of Eylau, Napoleon had preserved the reputation of being invincible; he enjoyed an opinion that nothing could resist him; it was sufficient for him to order, and every thing give way to his will—to order, and it was done; to direct, and every thing bended to his wish; to announce an event, and the prediction was fulfilled. Spain alone formed an exception, which, however, had not dissipated the belief.

August, 1813.

1.—Napoleon has lost a part of the 32d military division, a part of Illyria, all Spain, and the Dalmatian Islands.

2.—Prussia, Mecklenburgh, and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, are no longer his dependents. Prussia, and Mecklenburg are, on the contrary, in arms against him.

3.—Austria has an army of upwards 400,000 men, she is no longer allied to France, but has acceded to the new alliance against her.

4.—Russia has beyond her frontiers 200,000 men; she occupies the Grand Duchy of Warsaw; her ports are open; she is united with England, Prussia, Sweden, and Spain; she is at peace with Turkey, which considerably increases her moral force; and it has been proved by acts that she connot be conquered.

5.—Sweden having entered into the new war, furnished more than 30,000 men, who are acting on the Continent.

6.—Those 500,000 veterans of Napoleon have disappeared; he has lost all his cavalry, several Marshals, 80 Generals; of this army only some thousands of Officers remain to him. The cannon, army, effects, the 600 millions are lost, with the Prussian and Polish contingents—he has only of the latter 15,000 men, with the maledictions of the country.

7.—That monopoly has almost entirely disappeared, since the ports of Russia and Prussia have been opened, the war terminated between the Russians and Turks, and the English occupied all the Dalmatian Islands.

8.—The Austrian, Polish, and Prussian contributions have ceased—Illyria is exhausted—the war and army expences have doubled. What then will be the deficit for the year 1813? There no longer exists a continental system against England; it is in fact, destroyed.

9.—The battle of Smolensko, of Borodino, of Krasnoi, of Lutzen, and all the last campaign prove, that with inferior forces he can be resisted and beaten, and that consequently he must be beaten with equal forces, and destroyed with superior ones.

From this comparative statement it results that Napoleon's power and glory have insensibly declined since the year 1812. His army had then besides 110,000 auxiliaries, 50,000 Poles, 30,000 Prussians and 30,000 Austrians. His enemy now has an auxiliary force of 33 thousand—viz. 200,000 Austrians, 100,000 Prussians and 30,000 Swedes. His revenues have decreased 100 millions, and the diminutions will be still greater if we take into consideration what he drew by requisitions from Prussia, and the countries of the confederation of the Rhine, and the war contributions of Russia, Poland and Austria.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

When the subject of Mr. *Webster's* motion to recommit Mr. *Monroe's* report was under consideration on Monday, Mr. *Rhea* made some remarks which our reporter had not an opportunity of hearing. They were in substance as follows:

Mr. *Wright's* motion to postpone the motion to 4th March being under consideration—

Mr. *Rhea, of Ten.* said, he was opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Maryland, because it put off to a distant day; the effect of which may be a go-by to the consideration of a subject which he deemed ought to be attended to immediately. During the last session of Congress the resolutions presented by the gentleman from N. Hampshire were agreed to, and a report was communicated to this House accordingly—the Committee of Foreign Relations had the same under consideration and reported thereon; that report might have been acted on at the last session, but a press of business was urged as a reason to delay. Now at this session a postponement is contended for, because a consideration of the subject will prevent, as is said, the important business relating to the Army and Navy. That business increases as the end of a session approaches, is well known. If the motion prevail a go-by will probably be given to the whole subject, instead of being promptly met and decided. A consideration of it will not necessarily take much time—and the House may continue the longer in session each day. An agreemeut to the motion of the gentleman from N. Hampshire will not oblige the House to an uninterrupted discussion of the subject—for that the House can at any time delay it and attend to other important business, is well known. With the *quo animo* & *cui bono*, by which this business was brought before the House, the House, it is presumed, have nothing to do—but if otherwise, this House ought immediately to act on it. How the friends of a vigorous prosecution of the war will decide on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland is unknown—but the discussion of that question will not be evidence to determine who are or are not for a vigorous prosecution of the war—but if otherwise, the principal question ought to be immediately determined, that it may be ascertained. The motion is to postpone the subject to the 4th day of March next—the ides of March—to enable the friends of the prosecution of the war to express their opinions thereon. I thank the gentleman, said Mr. R. for his offered indulgence, but I desire it not. I am now prepared to express my opinion. That the ides of March are memorable in the annals of history, is true—the the ides of March are memorable, because on that day Julius Cæsar, who at that time was at the head of the Roman government, was destroyed—the introduction of the memorable ides of March will not help the argument in support of the motion to postpone the consideration of the subject to the ides of March next, in the mode argued for. Let then the motion last made be negatived, and the motion of the gentleman from N. H. prevail, so that the subject may be dismissed as soon as can be, that the people of this nation may know the conclusion and the votes of their representatives thereon.

NAVAL EXPLOITS.

The resolutions expressive of the sense of the House relative to the most recent exploits of our officers of the navy, having been read, yesterday—

MR. LOWNDES said, that he should be inexcusable if he were long to detain the committee from the vote, he hoped the unanimous vote, which they were prepared to give upon the resolutions. The victories to which they refer were indeed of unequal magnitude and importance, but the least important of them, if it had been obtained by the subjects of any government on the continent of Europe, would have been heard with admiration and rewarded with munificence. The action between the Enterprize and the Boxer, from which the public eye appears to have been withdrawn by the greater magnitude, and the confessedly superior splendor of a more recent victory—this action has shewn as conclusively as a contest between single ships could shew, the superiority of American officers and seamen over those of the nation which the continued success of a century had proved to be superior to all the rest of the world in naval warfare. Although Lieut. Burrows was mortally wounded early in this action, yet the skill and gallantry with which he commenced it, leave no doubt that if he had been longer spared to the wishes and the wants of his country, the same brilliant success which resulted would have been obtained under his command. While the ability with which Lieut. M'Call continued and completed the contest assures to him as distinguished a fame as if he had carried the vessel into action. The loss of a commander indeed may fairly be considered as rendering a victory more honorable to a successor, because it must render it more difficult. It may be expected to confuse though it do not depress. But the victory which was achieved in forty minutes, with a disparity in the effect of the fire of which there are other examples in *American* history, such a victory could only have been achieved by men who did not lose for a moment their confidence or their cool intrepidity.

Of the victory of Lake Erie (Mr. L. said) that it was more difficult to speak. It was impossible for him to speak in terms which could convey any adequate conception of the importance of the victory, of the unrivalled excellence of the officers, of the gratitude of the country. The documents referred to the committee sufficiently prove that superiority of force on the part of the enemy, which would have ensured their victory—if it were not the appropriate character of military genius to refute the calculations which rely on the superiority of force. Nor was the victory obtained over an unskilful or a pusillanimous enemy. The English officers were brave and experienced, and the slaughter on board their vessels before they were surrendered, sufficiently attest the bravery of their seamen. They were skilful officers, subdued by the ascendency of still superior skill. They were a brave foe, who yielded to one yet braver.

There was one characteristic of this action (Mr. L. said) which seemed to him so strongly to distinguish it, that he could not forbear to ask the attention of the committee to it for a few moments. He knew not an instance in naval or military history, in which the success of the contest appeared so obviously to result from the personal act of the commander as in this. When the crew of Capt. Perry's vessel lay bleeding around him, when his ship was a defenceless hospital; if he had wanted—not courage, which in an American officer forms no distinction—but if he had wanted that ferulity of resource which extracts from disaster the means of success and glory—he did not say if he had surrendered his ship, but if he had obstinately defended her; if he had gone down wrapped in his flag; if he had pursued any other conduct but that which he did pursue, his associates might have emulated his desperate courage, but they must have shared his fate. The battle was lost. Now, examine any other victory, however brilliant. If in the battle of the Nile Lord Nelson had fallen even by the first fire, does any man believe that it would have affected the result of the contest? In the battle of Trafalgar he did fall, and victory never for a moment fluttered from what was then their chosen æry—the British mast. And not only in this view was the victory of Capt. Perry unrivalled, but in the importance of its immediate consequences, he knew none in the modern history of naval warfare that could be compared with it. An important territory immediately rescued from the grasp of English power—uppermost Cannada conquered or prepared for conquest—an ocean secured from the intrusion of every foreign flag—a frontier of a thousand miles relieved from the hostility of the most dreadful foe that civilized man has ever known. Nay, further, Capt. Perry and his gallant associates have not only given us victory in one quarter, but shown us how to obtain it in another yet more important.—How deep is now the impression on every mind that we want but ships to give to our fleets on the Atlantic the success which has hitherto attended our single vessels! We want but ships—we want then but *time*. Never had a nation when first obliged to engage in the defence of naval rights by naval means—never had such a nation the advantages of ours. The naval glory of other states has risen by continued effort—by slow gradation. That of the U. S. almost without a dawn has burst upon the world in all the sudden splendor of a tropical day. To such men we can do no honor. All records of the present time must be lost—history must be a fable or a blank—or their fame is secure. To the naval character of the country our votes can do no honor: but we may secure ourselves from the imputation of insensibility to its merit—We can express our admiration and our gratitude.

Mr. L. concluded by saying that the resolution respecting the capture of the Peacock, proposed by the committee of the House, was the usual expression of approbation which in similar instances had never been omitted. It was an inadequate memorial of the merit of an officer who devoted his life to the honor of his country.

WEDNESDAY, Jan. 5.

On motion of Mr. *Lovett* of N. Y. the petition of Andreas Van Patten, presented at a former session, was again committed.

Mr. *Hasbrouk* of N. Y. presented a petition of Christopher N. Kiersted, praying a discharge from confinement on judgements obtained by the U. States against him. Referred to the committee of Ways and Means.

On motion of Mr. *Crawford*, of Penn. the petition of Isaac Deardorff, presented on the 12th of June last, was again referred to the committee on the petition of Oliver Evans.

On motion of Mr. *M'Kim*, of Md. the petition of James Anderson, presented at a former session, was again referred to the committee on Pensions and Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. *Kent* of Md. presented the petition of sundry inhabitants of the city of Washington, praying that a law may be passed authorising the laying off into lots and the sale of vacant and unappropriated ground lying between the Capitol and the Potomac river, and that the proceeds of said ground may be applied to altering the course of the canal, and filling up certain marshy grounds. Referred to the District Committee.

On motion of Mr. *Gholson* of Virg. the petition of Amy Dardin was once more referred to the committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. *Jackson* of Virg. presented a petition of David Scott, praying a pension for wounds received in the Revolutionary army; which was referred to the committee on that subject.

On motion of the *Speaker*, the petition of George Shannon, heretofore presented, was again referred to the committee on Public Lands.

On motion of Mr. *Beall* of Ohio, the petition of James Crawford was again referred to the committee on Public Lands.

Mr. *Archer* of Md. from the committee of Claims, made an unfavorable report on the petition of Wm. Gamble; which was referred to a committee of the whole—and also an unfavorable report on the petition of Agnes Jackson, which was concurred in.

Mr. *Wright*, of Md. from the committee on the subject, reported a bill establishing an uniform mode of Election of Senators and Representatives to Congress; which was twice read and committed to a committee of the whole.

NORTH-WESTERN FRONTIER.

Mr. *Klibourn*, of Ohio by way of again introducing to the attention of the House a subject which had been presented to their notice at the last session but not finally acted on, moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire into the expediency of providing more effectually, and in a manner more economical, for the protection of the North-western frontier of the U. S. against the incursions of Savages and other enemies, by granting donations of land to actual settlers, and for public purposes, in such situations as may best promote the ends proposed in the northerly and westerly parts of the state of Ohio, and of the territories of Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, and that they have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. *Taylor* moved to amend the resolve so as to refer the subject to the Military committee; and,

Thus amended, the resolve was passed

The engrossed bill making certain partial appropriations for the service of the year 1814, was read a third time. [The main appropriation in the bill is one and a half millions of dollars on account of the expense of the military establishments.]

Mr. *Pitkin* moved to lay the bill on the table until to-morrow, with a view, if the annual estimates were not then received, to move its postponement from day to day until they were received. He could not conceive why the estimates had not at least accompanied, if not preceded, the demand for an appropriation of money. It would be with an ill grace that the Head of the War Department could assign his absence from the seat of government as a reason for their not being prepared, if such should be the act. Be the cause what it might, he hoped the House would not pass the bill, until the estimates were received.

The postponement was also advocated by Mr. *Grosvenor*, who exhorted the House, as guardians of the public purse, to use the power in their hands of refusing supplies, in order to coerce the production of the necessary estimates. The mere demand from the Head of a Department was not, in his view, sufficient warrant to justify the appropriation of money, even if a confidence were reposed in the call of such officer, which for his part he did not feel.

Mr. *Eppes* of Va. and Mr. *Troup* of Geo. stated in reply, as was stated yesterday by Mr. E. that the course was by no means novel, of anticipating the regular annual general appropriation by partial appropriations for particular objects; that this appropriation had been recommended by a letter from the Head of the Department of War, in which it is stated, that the appropriation for the year 1813 having been expended, a partial appropriation for the year 1814, similar to that made last year, was essential to the public service; that the appropriation at this time destroyed no accountability for past or future expenditure, and sanctioned no application of public money except to objects already authorized by law, &c.

Some incidental desultory discussion took place on the amount of the appropriations of last year, &c. not generally interesting. In the course of it, Mr. *Cheves* of S. C. said he should give a reluctant vote for the bill, inasmuch as the estimates were not before the House; and Mr. *Post* declared that it was not his object, nor, he believed, that of those who voted with him, to refuse the necessary supplies but merely to lay over the bill until estimates should be laid before the House.

The question on the motion for postponement was decided by yeas and nays as follow:

For the postponement	57
Against it	101

So the motion was lost.

The bill passed without further opposition, and was sent to the Senate for concurence.

The engrossed resolution relative to the brilliant exploit of the deceased Capt. Lawrence and the crew of the Hornet, in the capture of the British brig Peacock, was read a third time, passed *unanimously*, and sent to the Senate for concurrence.

MR. PICKEN'S MOTION.

The House resumed the order of the day on the report of the committee of the whole, on the proposed amendment to the constitution, for making uniform the mode of choosing Electors of President and Vice-President. The report of the committe is against the resolution.

Mr. *Wright*, Mr. *Macon*, Mr. *Alston*, and Mr. *Gholson*, spoke against the report; when the further consideration of the report was postponed to to-morrow, on the suggestion of of Mr. *Gaston*, that he had understood that some gentlemen who voted against the amendment were friendly to the principle of the proposed amendment, but opposed to its detail; and that being desirous that the principle should be fairly tried, he wished time to prepare an amendment which should place the principle directly before the House.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Mr. *Taylor* of N. Y. offered for consideration the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee on the Judiciry be instructed to enquire into the expediency of making it the duty of the Attorney-General of the United States to keep his office at the seat of government during the session of Congress, and that they have leave to report by bill ortherwise.

Mr. T. observed that it would seem to be necessary from the experiance of the House, that the law officer should be present during its sesssion. In most of the states, the law officer was required to be present during the sessions of their Legislatures, and all papers involving legal questions were referred to him for his opinion thereon. The vast importance of the acts frequently before Congress, and their bearing on pre-existing laws, seemed to render it especially necessary that such an officer should be present at this place during the sessions of Congress—and to bring the subject before the House, he had moved this enquiry.

The resolution was agreed to without opposition.

ASSUMPTION OF DIRECT TAX.

On motion of Mr. *Taylor*, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. *Desha* in the chair, on the bill to amend the 7th section of the act to lay and collect a direct tax within the United States.

The bill having been read through—

Mr. *Taylor* observed, that the Legislature in New York hold but one session annually, which commences on the last Tuesday in January, and that the bill is intended to give to New York the same priviledge of electing to pay its quota of the direct tax into the Treasury as has been enjoyed by other states under the 7th section of the act to lay and collect a direct tax within the U. States.

The obvious propriety of passing the bill was evident from the same consideration which induced the introduction of the general principle of state assumption into the act of last session. But there was another consideration intimately connected with the original compact between the states, to which he begged leave to ask the attention of the committee. The federal constitution was ratified in convention by most of the states between the autumn of 1787 and the spring of 1788. New York was among the last states adopting it. If his memory served him, it was last except North Carolina, the convention in the latter state having closed its session on the first of August, and in the former on the 26th July, 1788. Considerations connected with the general power vested in Congress by the Constitution to lay and collect direct taxes, had among others in the state of New York an effect to retard its ratification. And when the convention finally yielded their assent, they took care in the same documents to enjoin it upon their representatives in Congress to exert all their influence, and use all reasonable means to obtain a ratification of several amendments, among which is the following:

"That Congress do not lay direct taxes but when the monies arising from the impost and exercise shall be insufficient for the public exigences, nor then until Congress shall first have made a requisition upon the states to assess, levy and pay their respective proportions of such requisition agreeably to the census fixed in the said constitution in such way and manner as the legislature of the respective states shall judge best; and in such case, if any state shall neglect or refuse to pay its proportion pursuant to such requisition, then Congress may assess and levy such state proportion together with interest at the rate of six per centum per annum, from the time of payment prescribed in such requisition."

The same convention expressed their confidence that all laws in the mean time to be passed by Congress, would conform to the spirit of that and the other amendments, as far as the constitution would admit. A conviction of the propriety of such amendment was not peculiar to New York. An amendment was recommended by the conveotion of North Carolina in the following words:

"When Congress shall lay direct taxes, they shall immediately inform the executive power of each state, of the quota of such state, according to the census herein directed, which is proposed to be thereby raised; and if the legislature of any state shall pass a law, which shall be effectual for raising such quota at the time required by Congress, the taxes laid by Congress shall not be collected in such state"

An amendment in the same words was proposed by the convention of Virginia, accompanied with an injunction upon their representatives in Congress, to use all reasonable and legal methods to obtain its ratification.

The convention of South Carolina accompanied their ratification of the Constitution with resolutions.

"That the General Government of the U. States *ought never* to impose direct taxes but when the monies arising from the duties, imports and excise, are insufficient for the public exigencies, nor then until Congress shall have made a requisition upon the states to assess, levy and pay their respective proportions of such requisitions."

And "That it be a standing instruction to all such delegates as may hereafter be elected to represent this state in the General Government, to exert their utmost abilities and influence to effect an alteration of the constitution, conformably to the foregoing resolution."

The convention of New Hampshire proposed an amendment embracing the same principle, and in nearly the same words as that of New York. Even Massachusetts, *at that time* distinguished among the states for her attachment to the general interest of the confederation, and having given the most signal examples of her confidence in the general government, did not ratify the federal constitution without recommending the same amendment proposed by New York. The direct tax for the ensuing year has already been assumed by several states. He did not speak from authority, but it was understood that it had been assumed by New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, South Carolina and Georgia, making an aggregate in amount of about one third part of the whole tax. The quota of New York is about one seventh part of the tax. He wished to afford to New York the same privilege as had been enjoyed by other states—and such was the object of this bill.

Mr. *Robertson*, of Louisiana, remarked, that from the extent of territory of the state which he represented, and the very small compensation attached to these officers, it would be impossible in that state to get proper persons to accept the office either of assessor or collector; so that the only way in which the direct tax could be collected in that state, would be by the interposition of the Legislature.—But that assembly did not meet until this month; so that the law as it now stood would not embrace the case of Louisiana.—He proposed therefore to amend the bill so as to extend the time, but, not having his amendment ready, must defer the motion to a future opportunity.

After an observation from Mr. Taylor, that an understanding with the constituted authorities of that state might obviate the necessity of legal provisions in relation to its quota, as it was generally understood the state would assume its proportion,

The committee rose and reported the bill—which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

NEW YORK, JAN. 4.

Fire at Brooklyn.—Last evening, a few minutes before 10 o'clock, an alarming fire broke out in a stable in the rear of Mott's tavern, near the lower ferry at Brooklyn, and burst through the roof with great fury at the instant it was discovered. The citizens turned out with their engines, and with the aid of the floating engine and five other engines from this city, and an engine with a party of men from the navy-yard, arrested the threatening conflagration, and by half past 11 got the flames extinguished. The following is the property lost on the occasion, and the occupants of the premises:

Daniel Mott's tavern, brick, nearly destroyed.

William M'Laughlin's tavern, burnt.

Joseph Burk's house, do.

House and stable, by Neil Ryerson and Palmer Buckbee.

Joseph Place's house—all these on Ferry-street.

In the rear, Mr. Mott's stable, with 4 horses, 2 chairs and 1 sleigh.

Thomas Everit's store, occupied by John Place and John Bedell, with 400 bushels of grain.

And 2 houses, 1 kitchen and 1 barn, of Mr. Everit, much injured. But little furniture was destroyed.

Mr. Willis's brick stable stopped the course of the flames towards the dock; and considering the compact block of wooden buildings surrounding the fire, it is very extraordinary that no greater damage was sustained.

The news per the Bramble has had an inconceivable effect upon our market. An immense deal of property was yesterday literally thrown under the hammer, and knocked down at the following prices; Coffee at 23 cts. Sugar at 22, 50, per cwt. Hyson Tea at 1, 94 p. lb. Souchong at 1 50, Salt 87 1-2 ctsp. bu. and other articles in proportion! To what madness has the rage of speculation driven thousands, who *now*, with equal folly are making unnecessary sacrifices. The public *know not* the cause. All is conjecture and report.

N. Y. Gaz.

AMERICAN
AND
Commercial Daily Advertiser

BALTIMORE: FRIDAY, Jan. 7.

By the intercepted letters of Gen. Proctor, it appears that the enemy had a much greater military force in Upper Canada than had been generally imagined, besides the Canadian militia, and a numerous swarm of Savages, altogether making a very formidable force; against which our militia and a small body of regulars had to contend in a hostile country, and with all the obstacles and stratagems of a savage and unprincipled mode of warfare.—The successful issue of the campaign redounds highly to the persevering spirit of Gen. Harrison; and infinite praise is due to those brave and truly patriotic men of Ohio and Kentucky, who, at the battle of the Moravian towns, gave a complete defeat to the iron-hearted Proctor and his red allies.

Gen. Harrison's letter in answer to that of Gen. Proctor, [see yesterday's paper] but addressed to Gen. Vincent, is a document of uncommon interest, and should be read with attention—more particularly by those men among