AMERICAN
AND
Commercial Daily Advertiser.

BALTIMORE, THURSDAY Jan. 13, 1814.

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.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 12.

TURREAU's LETTER.

This letter, about which our readers have already heard enough, occupied the attention of the popular branch of the National Legislature during the whole of yesterday! A discussion quite animated, when compared with the very diminutive nature of the object, took place, of which our reporter has endeavored to present as distinct and impartial a sketch as was consistant with the necessary brevity. Those who recollect the origin of this letter, its progress through the summer, and the paltry purposes to which it has been applied, will, we think, deem with us, that its latter end has been more honorable than it deserved. The only interest this letter has excited in the public mind since our publication of Mr. Graham's letter exposing the deception attempted on the Public, has arisen from a very natural curiosity to know "how and when" that letter came into the hands of its present possessors. On this point, though it was pressed on their notice, the opposition did not yesterday think proper to afford any information to the House.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman at Pensacola.—Communicated by Gen. Flournoy to the Secretary at War.

PENSACOLA, Nov. 21, 1813.

"I write you at present because I do not know where to address my father; I have therefore to request of you the favor to write to him, let him be where he may, and inform him that this port is at present blockaded by two ships, four brigs and three schooners, which have taken witheut discrimination or regard to either the U States, Spanish or French flag, one French privateer, two American and four Spanish schrs. within the last four and twenty hours, that they have informed the Governor of this place, that their orders are to interdict every species of intercourse between this port and any to the westward of it on our coast. That they, if he will permit, will send forthwith two regiments of black troops to defend the town against the Americans, who they understand are preparing to attempt the capture of it, *viet armis*, and to act in concert with those Indians of the war party—*Apropos:* The Indians under the Big Warrior have defeated the rebels in a general engagement; many of the latter have fled to, aud are now in this place for refuge. They have however waylaid the road, between this and Mobile, and rendered the use of it very precarious. If my father should be with you yet, do not fail to give him the earliest notice of that fact. Should he be gone to Bayou Sara, write to N. Orleans and to that place, stating, that there are encamped within two miles of this place, one hundred and fifty Indians who some believe are arrived for the purpose of acting in concert with the British, and the black and red allies. That upon no consideratiou he must attempt to bring the family here—that those vessels suffer no others to pass to or from hence to New Orleans, and that it will be impossible to bring them to Pensacola.

A letter from the post master at Warren, to J. Johnson, Esq. Post Master, Pittsburgh, dated

WARREN, Jan. 8.

"I am informed by the post master at Lower Sandusky, a party of forty men commanded by Lieuts. Larwell Fisk and Davis, who were sent by Gen. Cass to reconnoitre on the river De Trench, were attacked by the British, three killed, two made their escape, and the rest taken prisoners!"

FROM THE BORDERS OF ERIE.

Pittsburg, Jan. 5.

ALARMING INTELLIGENCE!

With feelings of agony we present our readers with the following alarming intelligence, received by a gentleman who arrived here yesterday from Erie, which place he left on Friday last. It is unhappily entitled to the fullest credit.

If there is any hope left in the present case, it is, that we understand the fleet is so moored in the harbor of Erie, as to present a battery of from fifteen to twenty guns from whatever point it may be attacked—that the ice is not sufficient to bear should the enemy attempt to board, and that it is completely cut away around the shipping. We also learn that Gen. Mead had issued circulars to all the colonels of his brigade, by express, ordering them immediately to march their respective regiments to the defence of Erie. May their patriotic efforts be successful—and may the enemy be checked in his incendiary career.

A number of patriotic young men of Pittsburgh, having volunteered their services, and the troops at Fort Fayette, will march this day for Erie.——*Mercury.*

COPY.

To the commandant at Erie, or to whom it may concern.

The British this morning landed about 3000 regulars, militia and Indians, at Black Rock; and after a severe engagement with the militia, under the command of Maj. Gen. Hall, forced them to retreat to the village of Buffalo; and, about sunrise, to surrender themselves prisoners of war. The houses in the village were immediately committed to the flames, and about 3 o'clock this afternoon almost entirely consumed. At the same time, 2 large vessels, lying above Black Rock, were entirely consumed. It is the avowed object of the British, as received by good authority, to proceed in a short time to Erie, for the purpose of burning the vessels in that port; and, as an inducement to the Indians to aid and assist them in this nefarious plan, full liberty is given them to plunder for their own benefit, wherever they may go. As the communication from this place to the eastward is entirely interrupted by the said Indians, &c. and as it is important for you to have the earliest information of the above, we recommend to you every exertion, to be in readiness, in case of an attempt to burn as aforesaid; and request of you some assistance in men, arms and ammunition, as we have but few arms and no ammunition.—The time is alarming—Destruction is the order of the day.

On the retreat from Buffalo, 30th December, 1813.

ISAAC BARNES, *Maj. Com.*
Militia near Buffalo.

N. B. Information is just received, that the enemy have advanced up Lake Erie 8 or 10 miles and destroy every thing as they pass.

From the Western Press.

TO ARMS!

Mercer, Pa. Jan. 3.

Our country is invaded. The enemy, whose course is marked by every species of depredation calculated to distress our fellow citizens, is progressing towards Erie, laying waste every thing that comes in their way.—Already has Buffalo, Fort Schlosser, Manchester, Lewiston & Fort Niagara been swept from the earth by conflagration: the cries of infants, women, the aged and infirm, call loudly for protection and redress, and every man having a single drop of American blood in his veins, will not refuse to repair to the protection of Erie, and shipping at that place.

BRIGADE ORDERS.

Meadville, Jan. 1.

SIR—In pursuance of General Orders of the most alarming nature, you are hereby commanded to march your regiment with all possible expedition to the town of Erie, there to perform a thirty days tour of duty, unless sooner discharged: the men must be armed with a sufficient rifle or musket, knapsack and blanket, if in their power to furnish the same. A court of appeal will be held at the house of Nathan Patterson, in the town of Mercer, on Thursday 7th April next. As at present advised, it is not in my power to furnish the rations that the law contemplates; I shall on its march to the place of rendezvous—and as far as in my power, I will furnish at Meadville & Waterford. You will therefore have this information communicated to your regiment in order that each man may, if possible, furnish himself to Erie.

WM. CLARKE,
Brigade Inspector.

Lieut. Col. T. Hoseck.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, Jan. 11.

Mr. *Richardson* of Mas. presented the petition of Ezekiel Gardner of N. H. praying compensation for Revolutionary supplies; Mr. *Wilson* of Mass. a petition of Philip Ulmer, for a pension in consideration of wounds received in the Revolutionary War; and Mr. *Kilbourn* of Ohio, a petition of John Statler of a like nature.—Referred to the committee on this subject.

Mr. *Telfair* of Geo. presented a petition of J. P. Williamson and Thos. Rice of Georgia, praying to be exonorated from the payment of a part of the judgement recovered against them by the U. S. as sureties for the late Marshall of that state—Referred to the Committee of Claims.

Mr. *Humphreys*, of Ten. presented a petition of sundry inhabitants of Tennessee, praying that certain lands in that state may be set apart to satisfy warrants already issued under the authority of the U. States; and that lands which have been located prior to the year 1790 may be resurveyed. Referred to the committee on Public Lands.

Mr. *Creighton*, of Ohio, presented the petition of James Denny, Major of the first battalion, 1st regiment Ohio volunteers, on behalf of the non-commissioned officers and privates in said regiment, praying compensation for undrawn rations. Referred to the military committee.

Mr. *Alexander*, of Ohio, and Mr. Jennings of Indiana, presented the petition of sundry inhabitants of the states and territorias west of the Alleghany mountains, to the same effect as former petitions from the same quarter, respecting the defence of the N. W. frontier; which were in a like manner referred.

On motion of Mr. M'Clean of Ohio, the petition of John Armstrong, attorney for the heirs of Richard Macaulay, was again referred to the committee of Public Lands.

On motion of Mr. Robertson, of Louisiana, the petition of Zenon Orso and B. Dubrocar, were referred again to the committee of Commerce and Manufactures.

Mr. *Lattimore*, of Mississippi, presented the petition of the Legislature of that territory, praying that further time may be allowed to purchasers of public lands to make payment for the same; which was referred to the committee on Public Landa.

Mr. *Ingham*, of Pa. from the committee on Pensions and Revolutionary claims, made an unfavorable report on the petition of Ann Brown; leave was given to the petitioner to withdraw her petition.

Mr. *Ingersoll*, of Pa. from the committee appointed to enquire into that subject, reported a bill "providing for the appointment of Post Masters."—[That after the first day uf May next, no person shall act as Post Master in any office of the U. S. who shall not have been nominated by the President and received the approbation of the President.] The bill was twice read and committed.

Mr. *Lowndes*, of S. C. from the committee on Naval Affairs, reported a bill further to amend an act regulating pensions to persons on board private armed vessels—which was twice read and committed.

Several resolutions were adopted, and petitions presented and referred, from various quarters, on the subject of Post Roads; a species of business not usually detailed in our columns, because it would occupy much room, and is not generally interesting.

MR. HANSON'S RESOLUTIONS.

The House resumed the consideration of the two resolutions, yesterday submitted by Mr. Hanson. A division of the question having been required, the question was first stated on the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the U. States be, and he is hereby requested to communicate to this House, any information in his possession, and which it may not be improper to divulge, in relation to the omission or refusal of the French government to accredit the Minister Plenipotentiary sent by the U. S. to that court, or of his reception, if accredited, of the time when he was so accredited, and of the progress of is negociation.

Mr. *Calhoun*, of S. C. said that his object in yesterday calling for a division of the question, was to separate this from that which was connected with it. To this resolution he could see no objection; it was drawn up in respectful language and in the usual form. It asked for information in a proper manner, and he hoped the House would not refuse it.

The question was taken on this resolution, and decided in the affirmative, without a division.

The question was then stated on the 2d resolution in the following words:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire whether M. Turreau, late Minister of France, did or did not, on or about the 14th of June, 1807, write a letter to the Secretary of State, setting forth the terms and conditions upon which his government would treat of amity and commerce with the U. States, and urging certain complaints against this government, and requiring certain political sacrifices to be made as an indispensable pre-requisite to the formation of such a treaty, and whether the said letter was not withdrawn from the archives of the department of State, and *how* and *when* it was so withdrawn—and that the said committee have power to send for persons and papers.

Mr. *Calhoun* said it was a good rule generally in cases of this kind that enquiry be granted where it is moved in a proper manner. On such motions a very great liberality had usually prevailed in this house, which had been displayed in the vote just taken. But, as to the particular resolution before us, it is of that class which ought not to be passed in the present stage of its existence. To induce the house to pass this resolution, there ought to be three things stated. He need not suggest that this enquiry was of an unprecedented character, and varying from all usual calls on the Executive for information. To warrant the adoption, a specific object ought to be first stated; secondly, what was expected to grow out of it; and thirdly, that the object was of a character to warrant the investigation. Such enquiries as that now proposed, without these three prerequisites, would, he conceived, violate the spirit of the constitution. By that instrument diplomacy was confided wholly to the Executive. This house had indeed the power to require information, but it was through the Executive department that it ought to be sought for, and not through inquisitorial committees of this house, or on such vague statements as had been made. The inofficial mode of enquiry now proposed was a departure from the legitimate province of this body, to which he hoped the house would not accede.

Mr. *Hanson of Md.* said he had flattered himself, when he had the honor to make a statement a few days ago on this subject to the house, that his object would be distinctly understood. As to the proceeding which this house in its wisdom might think proper to ground on this resolution, it was not for him to dictate. Certain it was, that if any high and responsible officer had done any act for which he was amenable to the constitutional authority, it was the duty of this house to lay the foundation for an enquiry. The statement which he had made, was of itself, he conceived sufficient foundation for the house to proceed upon. He entertained no wish on his part to examine the Department of State, as the gentleman appeared to suppose, or any officer of the government in relation to the object of the enquiry; on the contrary he pledged himself to be able to prove the statement he then made without resorting to any department of the government. He denied in toto the principle laid down by the gentleman from South Carolina on the subject of the grounds necessary to authorise enquiry. Do we not know, said he, that it is the practice in this house, as well as in the British parliament, that information given by any member rising in his place may be made the foundation of an enquiry? The gentlemen had said, Mr. H. observed, that a committee ought not to be appointed on this matter; that an enquiry ought not to be granted in the present stage of vague information. Now, Mr. H. said, the information given had been as precise and explicit as could be. It had been stated in this House, that a letter of a most insulting nature, requiring of this government the most degrading political sacrifices, a letter striking at the honor of the government, had been transmitted by the French minister to the Secretary of State, and placed on the files of that Department. And what constituted the files of that office? he asked. If such a letter had been transmitted to the Department of State, and suffered to remain in that office, was it not on the files of the department? Was it necessary that it should be recorded, to constitute its admission? It had remained in the office sufficiently long to give it an official character. What was the nature of this document? As far back as the year 1809—and gentlemen would recollect the state of our foreign relations at that time; when a minister coming from England with full powers to negociate a treaty of amity and commerce was momently expected——the French minister addresses to this government a letter to be held as a rod *in terrorem* if we presumed to negociate with Britain. This letter set forth certain pretended grievances, and required particular political sacrifices of our government, on the presumption that it was going to make a treaty with G. Britain. It appeared from that letter, Mr. H. said, that France set forth certain disgraceful and dishonorable conditions on which alone it would remain at amity with this government. Now call this document public or private, the question was—had it been received by our government? The views and feelings of the French government had been spread on paper, and could be as well known through a private as through a public document. As to the objection stated on a former occasion, that the letter was a private letter addressed to the gentleman who held the office of Secretary of State, but not in his official capacity, Mr. H. said that this objection was perfectly frivolous. The letter was addressed to Robert Smith, Esq. as Secretary of State; it treated of nothing but public business, and the Minister said he felt himself thus called upon to explain to the American the views of the French government. Not to go fully into the subject at this time, but merely to shew that this House was already possessed of sufficient information to act on this subject, it was enough to say, that a document of immense importance to the nation had been concealed and suppressed from public view; that whilst we have gone on to consider France as a friendly power, yet, as far back as 1809 our government perfectly well knew that it had nothing to expect from the justice of France. And, after having made those political sacrifices, one after another, and thus done every thing required of us by this tool of a despot, what had we received in return? Had there been any restoration of the millions on millions of property stolen from us, or did the House know to this day, even that our Minister had been accredited at the French court. It was of the utmost importance Mr. H. said, that such matters should be enquired into. It was a radical principle of our government that information should be as widely as possible diffused among the People; that they should not be kept in a situation of delusion; that they should not be hood-winked and blinded to the real state of our affairs with foreign nations, and it could not be denied that an impenetrable veil had heretofore been spread over our relations with France.——Was it not of importance to the house and to the nation to know in what manner we had been involved in a war which one half of this community knew to be unjust and unnecessary, and felt to be oppressive. At the period when this letter was transmitted, this house at least had pledged itself to a system of neutrality.—Gentlemen on the committee of foreign relations at that day might be able to say why it was, after taking a stand on the report of their committee, they were induced to change their neutral ground. But why call on the Executive, as was suggested, for this information, when the very foundation of the enquiry was, that the President had done an act this house ought to enquire into; and for which, if satisfied of his guilt, the President ought to be proceeded against? Gentlemen may smile, said Mr. H. but if the document which I produced yesterday, (Mr. Graham's translation of the letter) is substantiated, and all the facts said to be connected with it are proved, then I say that a high misdemeanor has been committed. Let me ask gentlemen if in the days of Adams's administration a letter of this description had been written by Mr. Liston or any other foreign minister to our government, and it had been concealed from public view, and the people had never heard of it till it had been dragged forth like this letter, what would gentlemen have said? Sir, said Mr. H. I want an opportunity to prove facts; and, if gentlemen then pronounce a verdict of acquittance, let them do so. But do not suppress an enquiry; do not, by smothering investigation, attempt to give impunity to such conduct. Gentlemen appeared to him, Mr. H. said, to take offence, as if they had a fee simple in the government, or a lease of power for ninety-nine years, renewable for ever whenever any investigation was proposed which struck at the characer of the Executive. They must expect, said he, and if they do not they ought, that we shall use every fair and honorable means to oust them from the possession of power, which we feel they have abused. This House has pledged itself to the people, by implication, that this subject shall be investigated; and let me ask them what will be the impression if this motion be rejected? As to the impression I wish to produce, sir, the rejection of this motion will be tantamount to a positive proof of all that I have alledged.

[Mr. Hanson being the mover of the resolution, his observations are, in justice to his views, reported more at length than those of the gentlemen on both sides who followed him in debate.]

Mr. *Calhoun* said he now hoped the House would refuse the enquiry proposed. He had asked for a specification of the object, and had received none. He had asked for practical consequences to result from it, and had received none. Mr. C. pronounced the resolution extraordinary in its character, and unprecedented in its form. The resolution went to break into the executive offices, to call *ex parte* witnessess before the house, for what purpose?—For the highest purpose in the power of the house? No; for a mere inquisitorial and vexatious procedure, which is, as no such purpose is avowed, to lay no foundation for *impeachment*, the only object which would justify the application of such means. Suppose it were proved that this letter was in fact written by Gen. Turreau, and that all the other circumstances relating to it were true, which for himself he did not credit, what did it prove?——Merely that an impertinent letter had been written by a foreign minister. Did the Executive sanction it? No. What view the Executive ought to take of such a letter, or how to treat it, depended on a variety of circumstances, on which this House had not the means to form an opinion. Mr. C. said he hoped this House would not grant what was in his view a direct violation of the spirit of the constitution. He went on, and adverted to the nice sensibility displayed by the whole phalanx on the other side of the House, yesterday, on a mere proposal for enquiry into the constitutional power of Congress to punish spies. Mr. C. said he had thought for his part we had the constitutional power to enquire into that subject. He hoped on this occasion to see gentlemen consistent, and exhibit the same commendable zeal as on yesterday and join with him to secure the constitution against an invasion of its spirit. Mr. C. expatiated on the vexatious nature of enquiries of this description tending to no practical result, &c. As to all the insinuations of French influence, and the vague declamation which the House had heard, he did not deem fit subjects of enquiry, or of so much importance as to constitute ground on which to put the Chief Magistrate under a committee of this House.—Mr. C. repeated the three requisites he had before stated as necessary to justify this enquiry. If gentlemen could shew that a crime had been committed by the executive of such a character as to make him amenable to the constitutional authority of this body, then and not till then would he consent to an enquiry which was equally a novelty in this House and in the history of legislation.

Mr. *Gaston* of N. C. said the gentleman last up did no more than justice to the motives of those with whom he acted, in supposing they would oppose the resolution if he could establish the doctrine that its adoption would involve a violation of the constitution. But he could not agree with him on that point. The gentleman from Maryland has recommended to the adoption of the House a resolution having for its object the attainment of a document which must be allowed to be of considerable importance—a document stating the conditions on which alone we could retain the amity of France and in which the views of that government were declared. If this document were indeed in possession of the Executive the House might with great propriety apply to him to lay it before them, to afford them the information necessary to their correct decision on our foreign Affairs. But we know said Mr. G. if any credit is to be given to the information which the gentlemen from Maryland has received and believed to be true, that there is no vestige of this document in the possession of the government. If this information said to exist be of importance in our future legislative proceedings, how are we to come at it? Only by the mode designated in the resolution.

And would it be denied that this document ought to have an important influence on the deliberations of the house? It was not expected, he said he hoped, that this session was to pass over without Congress coming to some conclusion in respect to our relations with France. If by the verification of this document, it could be ascertained that the relations of amity were not to be maintained with that nation but by the sacrifice of great political rights or by an accession to the maritime conferacy, conditions which he presumed this people was not prepared to accept, all hopes of an accommodation with that country must be at an end—far no man who possesses an honorable feeling would consent to such amity, on such conditions. There was no other way in which the house could obtain the requisite information but by raising this committee. Mr. G. explained the difference between such an enquiry as this, and one directed to the Executive. The opposition to the resolution, he conceived, proceeded from an over sensitive delicacy on the part of the majority in respect to the Executive. The information he considered important in respect to the legislative proceedings of the house—and he believed the mode proposed the only one in which it could be obtained.

Mr. *Roberts* of Pa. said it was the right of this house and of each of its members to move an enquiry on subjects relating to their constitutional functions, and it was sufficient to justify it that common fame warranted it. Of this right it was more usual for a minority than a majority to avail themselves; but whether a call by them for information, was proper, expedient or necessary, it was for the majority to determine. As to the conduct of the executive, no call upon it could be made which this house ought to feel any hesitation in granting. Mr. R. therefore disclaimed, in offering his objections to the resolution, any intention to shield the executive. But he meant to exercise his right, as a member of this house, to judge of the expediency of the course proposed. The gentleman who moved the resolution had looked around and said—gentlemen might smile, but that should not deter him from his course Mr. R. said, he might retort, that gentlemen might frown, and use great vehemenee of language; but they could not swell into importance what was merely the breath of common fame and rested on no better than newspaper evidence. The gentleman in substituting the motion under consideration, for that first moved, had assigned delicacy towards the executive as his motive. There was no need of it, Mr. R. said, if called on, the executive would freely have given him all the information he could have asked for—which he had acknowledged he expected thus to attain. But now the principle of the motion was changed, and a committee was to be raised to send for persons and papers, to any extent, at the option of the committee. If they could shew ground to believe the conduct of the President to be criminal, Mr. R. said he had no objection to the enquiry. But if such was the object, why not openly and fairly march up to it? The gentleman from Maryland however had not been content with the strongest insinuations that the conduct of the Executive have been criminal, but had avowed his determination to drive the men now in office from that power which he says they have abused. If such were his object, the most direct way would be at once to disqualify them by impeachment. It had not been very long since, at a former session, the gentleman himself had alleged a delay to have existed on the part of the government to accept the mediation of Russia; now common fame, who was the gentleman's authority on that occasion, reports that the President invited Mr. Daschkoff, without authority from his government, to offer the mediation. If the gentleman was then so far mistaken in allegations equally positive with those now made, it was not unlikely that he was as much in error on this occasion. Be that as it might, the fact of this letter having been written had nothing to do with our present relations with France. The letter being declared inadmissible, the withdrawal of the obnoxious paper was a disavowal of it. If addressed to the government, on the statement of gentlemen themselves, reparation was made for the wrong done by withdrawing the offensive letter. Mr. R. viewed this motion, he said in connection with other things, as intended as a bugbear to drive men from power which the gentleman says they abuse. We have had much prediction, and much augury, said Mr. R. on the subject of the popular feeling. Gentlemen have told us the people are not with us, and now we are informed one half the people are against us. What is the fact, sir? Have we not had elections in all the states recently—and do they prove any disposition on the part of the people to support the war? On the contrary, notwithstanding every obstacle has been opposed to the measures of the government, and not a few disasters have occurred the popularity of the war increases. Mr. R. expressed his regret at the consumption of time in debating on this frivolous subject, when measures of real importance burthened the table of the House. In order to abridge debate, which he believed would be the effect of the motion, Mr. R. moved to amend it so as to change it to a call on the Executive for the information proposed to be obtained through a committee.

[This motion was declared to be in order by the Speaker, but was afterwards withdrawn by Mr. Roberts, at the instance of his friends, but renewed by Mr. Bayly of Va.]

Mr. *Calhoun* expressed his hope that this amendment would not succeed; but that a question would be taken on the original proposition in the shape in which the mover wished it to stand.

Mr. *Fisk* of N. Y. who conceived this mode of occupying the time of the House at this moment, to be trifling with the feelings of the nation; and anxious to get at the volumes of bills now before them, moved to postpone this subject to the first Monday in March next

Mr. *Stockton* and Mr. *Pearson* opposed postponement on the ground that it would be equivalent to an evasion of the question; and Mr. M'Kim supported it, on the ground that great evils might result from the delay of other business before the House, but none could result from the delay of a decision on this question.

The question on postponement to the first Monday in March was decided in the negative by Yeas and Nays.

Mr. *Bayly* of Va. assigned the reasons why he should vote to amend the resolution as first proposed by Mr. Roberts; because as it stood, the resolution implied a strong censure on the Executive, to whom at least so much respect was due from this branch of the government as to require what he had to say on the subject in question before they raised a committee to inquire into his conduct.

Mr. *Oakley* of N. York, spoke at considerable length against the amendment and in support of the original proposition; in doing which he occupied much of the ground before taken by Mr. Hanson and Mr. Gaston. He said, in addition, among other things, that this House ought never to call on any department for the cause of the failure of its own measures—which principle he assigned as a motive for having voted a few days ago against the enquiry into the causes of the failure of our arms, and as a reason why he was opposed to the motion, as originally proposed some days ago, of his friend from Md. Mr. Hanson. A sufficient specification had been given, he contended, as cause for this motion, in the statement of facts made by Mr. Hanson, which Mr. O. briefly repeated. If these facts were established, they proved, he said, on our government the charge of subserviency to the views and influence of the French government. If the facts were fully established, the most condign punishment ought to await those implicated in the accusation. The practical result then of successful enquiry would be to prove the Executive to have been guilty of a high crime or misdemeanor, and subject to impeachment. As to the form, if information when merely wanted as the foundation of legislative acts, it might well be required of the Executive; but when