National Intelligencer.

& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. 1141.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1808. *PAID IN ADVANCE.*

From the PARIS MONITEUR *of Nov.* 12.

England has within two years sent out four expeditions. The first was against Constantinople, which was attended with the loss of several ships, the confiscation of all English merchandize, and the expulsion of their commerce from the trading ports of the Levant. Admiral Duckworth and his squadron were happy in being able to find safety in flight.—The second expedition from England was against Egypt. This was still more shameful, more disastrous, more disgraceful. Its army defeated at Rosetta, surrendered on its march, lost more than 4,000 chosen men killed and made prisoners. In vain did the English break down the dykes, cut the canals, and inundate that unhappy country, in order to secure themselves in Alexandria.

On the 22d of September the Pacha arrived from Cairo, defeated them, and obliged them to surrender Alexandria, into which he made his entry on the 24th. It is difficult to find a more humiliating expedition.

The third English expedition was that against Monte Video and Buenos Ayres; ten thousand English troops failed in their attack upon an unfortified town. It is true, that the hatred which the Spanish Catholics have for the enemies of religion, furnished them with new means against them, animated the whole populace with a new ardour, and the 10,000 men were too happy in being permitted to retire.

This expedition, which cost the English enormous sums, only served to destroy the illusion which had induced them to imagine that it was easy to seize on the Spanish possessions. The Portuguese possessions would not have offered less resistance. Wherever there are Catholics the intolerant English will find enemies. In this fatal expedition they lost more than 5000 men.

Their fourth expedition has been most notorious—it was that of Copenhagen, the most atrocious expedition of which history can preserve the remembrance—the shame with which it has covered the English government is indelible. Why did the English evacuate Zealand and Copenhagen, when the Danish government would not ratify the capitulation, and the engagement to evacuate no longer existed?—Why did the English evacuate when the Prince Royal refused to receive their envoy; when that Prince concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with France: when he only answered their propositions by the recal of the agent he had at London; in fine, when in his political negociations he speaks only of the English by calling them robbers, a name they have so well merited? Why? Because they are well convinced of their weakness and inability by land. The approach of the season when the ice would render the arrival of the Danish troops possible, determined them prudently to take to flight, instead of waiting for the enemy, whom they had surprized when unarmed, and whom it would soon be necessary to combat: a disgraceful flight which can never be treated with too much contempt.

After these four expeditions, which so manifestly show the moral and military decline of England, let us speak of the situation into which it has brought Portugal: the Prince Regent of Portugal loses his throne; he loses it influenced by the intrigues of England; he loses it because he would not seize the English merchandize which was at Lisbon. What, then, does England, that powerful ally? She sees with indifference what passes in Portugal. What will she do when Portugal shall be taken? Will she go and seize upon Brazil? No; if the English make that attempt the Catholics will drive them out. The fall of the House of Braganza will remain a new proof that the destruction of whomsoever attaches himself to the English is inevitable.

But in the midst of so many disastrous events, what do the English ministers wish? We do not say England—England wishes only what all nations wish, peace; and to enjoy at length tranquillity, under the reign of morality and the laws. But what does the committee of Oligarchs which directs its government wish? It has declared perpetual war. These systems of perpetual war will last no longer than those crises in which wild and extravagant men wish to abrogate the law of nations, and push every thing to the extreme. The committee of Oligarchs at London is actuated by the same sentiments as those which animated our revolutionary committees: those who direct it are equally atrocious with Marat. What did he more atrocious than to present to the world the prospect of a perpetual war! These directors of government will conclude, as all violent and furious men have concluded, they will become the opprobium of their own country, and the object of the hatred of all other nations. The refusal of the emperor Alexander, and the expedition to Copenhagen, sufficiently reveal the sentiments of the English ministry, and their system of perpetual war. The first consequence of these events, has, therefore, been to determine the nations of the continent, which were still at peace with England, to break off in future all connections with her. Austria did not hesitate, scarcely had the emperor Francis the Second received certain information of the events of Copenhagen, and the refusal of the English to accept the mediation of Russia, when he declared war against England. Already the blockade is declared on every side Lord Pembroke, when he left Vienna, in order to return to London, was forced to embark at Triest.

The correspondence of England with every part of the continent is intercepted.

There are more than a hundred thousand English letters and bills of exchange, to the amount of several millions sterling, collected and detained in consequence of the blockade. These measures must press heavy on the English nation, and at length reduce it to a desperate situation. But what does that signify to the violent men who govern that nation? What have they in common with the English people? Happily in the day when these ministers are overthrown, they will become nothing. They may for some time continue to act on their maxims, but a catastrophe is inevitable, injustice and extravagance may for some time impose on nations, but experience has proved, that the duration of these scourges is transitory; peace, the first of benefits to a nation, ought to be the principal end of all the actions of those who govern a ministry which profess perpetual war, betrays the dearest interests of its country; it has lost its confidence, its inevitable and near approaching fall will satisfy the interest of the nation, and public in morals.

[*Moniteur.*]

THE subscriber begs leave to inform his friends and the Public, that he has on hand PORTER and ALE in bottles of the first quality, by the hogshead or dozen—Also BEER in barrels, of a quality superior to any ever known here.

He requests those indebted to him for the last year to make speedy payments, so as to enable him to meet his engagements.

JOHN DOBBIN.

Navy Yard, February 3—3t

2000 bushels
BEST RICHMOND COAL,

Now landing from on board the sloop Laurel, at Charles King and Co's wharf, George Town. Apply to Wm. O'Neale Square 78, city of Washington, or to Josiah Taylor, on board. Those who are indebted to W. O'Neale may be supplied, if they pay off their former accounts, and not otherwise.

WM. O'NEALE.

February 3—3t.

☞ This notice applies to those who have been called on for payment, and have not complied. A few tons of good TIMOTHY HAY for sale. Apply as above.

FOR SALE.

10,000 ACRES OF LAND
Situate on Elk River in Randolph county state of Virginia.

A large portion of this land is fertile, of excellent quality, and is adapted to the growth of grain, grass and pasturage—it abounds with fine timber, large poplar, ash, sugar tree, &c. & is well watered. Birch river runs through it and affords many mill seats. Elk is a beautiful smooth deep river emptying into the Kenhawa, and Ohio, and may be navigated with large boats at any time, in the spring and fall, it abounds with every kind of Fish common to the Ohio. The whole or a part will be sold at a very reduced price for cash or exchanged for property in or near the city of Washington. For particulars apply to

JOSEPH WHEATON,
Com. Merchant & Broker.

Washington city, Jan. 6——1m

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEBATE

On the Resolution for requesting the President to cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct of GENERAL WILKINSON.

(CONTINUED.)

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12.

Mr. Rowan's resolution being under consideration.

Mr. SLOAN introduced his remarks by observing, that if he could reconcile it with his duty as a member of this House, and as one who considered himself placed as a watchman to guard, as far as his weak abilities would permit, the rights and liberties of his constituents, with only giving a silent negative to what he considered the most dangerous and most alarming innovation that had ever been attempted, he should not have detained the House one moment to express what he was about to say. But he felt alarmed, and he considered it his duty to express that alarm in the manner in which the God of nature had enabled him to do it. What did he see and hear? Propositions to throw into confusion and break down the barriers of our rights and liberties. He had been taught from his infancy, from the time in which he was susceptible of instruction, to consider that the excellency of government consisted in the various branches of that government acting each within its proper sphere—that the Legislative department should confine itself completely to making laws for the good government of the U. States; that on the other hand the Executive department should confine itself within its sphere, and faithfully execute those laws committed to its trust. How dangerous and alarming then must it be to him, brought up in these principles, to hear and see the highest legislature of the Union, the House of Representatives of the United States—to see in that august body, a resolution brought forward, the tendency whereof was absolutely to invade the rights of the Executive department. Had they not laws already severe enough. If not, said he, let us make them more strict. If the judges have not done their duty, let them be impeached. This would be the proper course.

But it was strange, passing strange, to see this matter now brought up, when there is a tribunal now sitting with power of enquiry to pave the way to another court vested with the power of using the musket or halter to take away the life of the accused, if found guilty. If he were not amenable to a military tribunal, was not the civil department open? Permit me, said Mr. S. to call the attention of the House to what passed at the last session. How lucid were the exclamations against this very officer for what was then called a breach of civil law in arresting certain traitors. What was the cry then raised against this officer? That we were not safe. Recollect the language of a member addressing the Speaker—"your honor is not safe in your chair." Let us contrast this with present circumstances. What were the reasons for this officer's conduct? That he considered his country in danger; that he saw an host of traitors ready to deluge his country in blood: he then did indeed usurp the civil authority, but he did it like an honest man—like the saviour of his country. Does any such an exigency as that was now exist? Is the country so much in danger as to justify the Legislature of the union in invading the Executive department? I cannot conceive it.

Before he sat down, Mr. S. said as there had been a great deal (to make use of a metaphor) of dirt cast, he would ask whether it attached to any one? He would not be understood as giving his opinion whether Wilkinson were innocent or guilty. It was not his province so to do; but it was his province to give his opinion on what appeared. It was a sound maxim in law, that what does not appear, is of no weight. Whatever had appeared against this officer, did him honor. What he was charged with could not have weight, for Gen. W. had no opportunity of being confronted with is witnesses, of cross examining them, or of disproving the charges. I have no objection, said Mr. S. that this evidence shall be handed to the Executive department. What has been made to appear against him? That he arrested traitors: and who doubts that if he had not done so he would not have acted as the saviour of his country. Is it because this man assisted in the capture of Burgoyne, which was the first great step towards securing our existence as a nation, and because he has now arrested an infernal band, an host of traitors? Is it for these things that he is now charged? I do not say that it is; but, if it is, I hope to God that the malignant darts hurled at him, may recoil upon those who cast them. If he is innocent, I hope his sun will set in glory, like the great luminary, after a tempestuous day.

The member who introduced this resolution, observed it would answer one purpose. It has answered two: God forbid it should answer a third, that of committing the legislature of the Union by doing a thing intirely unconstitutional and out of its province. I am willing to give my vote against any thing farther then to hand the evidence to the proper tribunal.

MR. M. WILLIAMS said he would state a few reasons why he should vote for the resolution now before the House. It will be recollected, said he, that some days ago when a motion was made to refer the resolution to a select committee, with power to collect testimony and summon witnesses, it was rejected by a large majority. I was one who voted against a reference; and it has been mentioned by gentlemen in the course of argument that those who voted in the majority then, should now vote against the present motion or they would act inconsistently. But I think very differently from those gentlemen, and shall vote for the resolution. At that time the House was not in possession of any papers nor the deposition given by the delegate from the territory of New Orleans; but as the House is now possessed of the evidence, the question is very different, and I think ought to be adopted.

We have been repeatedly told that this House has no right to make the enquiry; that the constitution has not given any such power. The constitutional objection I think is not a good one. If this House was about to assume the right to try General Wilkinson, the objection would be a solid one—but what is the object of this enquiry? Not to try General Wilkinson; it is to procure testimony, and to give information to the proper authority. It has been admitted by all the gentlemen who have opposed the enquiry, that it will be proper for this House to transmit to the President all the information they possess relative to the conduct of General Wilkinson. If therefore that is proper, and is not a violation of the constitution, most undoubtedly this House has the right to procure further testimony. Why have they received the deposition of the gentleman from New Orleans territory? Can there be any difference in the principle? I think not. What will be the power of the committee? Only to collect testimony and report to the House; and what can be a greater security to the preservation of our present form of government, than the members of this body, convened from every part of the union, that they should watch with a vigilant eye over the conduct of persons high in office.

It has been often repeated by gentlemen who are opposed to the resolution, that by passing it we shall cast a censure on the conduct of the Executive. Surely not. What are the circumstances? Did not the gentleman from Virginia inform us that the papers were put in his possession the morning that he brought forward the resolution? Can any censure then be attributed to the President? No. I have the utmost confidence in the President; the people of the United States have the greatest confidence in him. Another reason stated by some gentlemen why the House should not act, is, that it is the President's duty to make the enquiry, and that he has full power to do so. The only power the President has is derived by the act of Congress establishing rules and articles for the government of the army of the United States. But I think the provisions of that act are inefficient. The President who is commander in chief of the army can order a court of enquiry, which shall have the same power to summon witnesses as a court martial, and there is no provision by which that court can compell the attendance of witnesses out of the army. In addition to this, there is another reason why I think this court is insufficient: The officers who are under the commanding officer are to compose the court, and may be influenced to acquit him; or on the other hand may convict the person charged, and by that means be themselves promoted. We have been told that if the resolution be adopted, you will destroy the enquiry. Will the diligence of this House to collect testimony have any thing to do with the court of enquiry? It perhaps may have a good effect, and make them more strict.

Another objection to this resolution is, that the person charged may be prosecuted in a court of justice. Admitting he can, is that any solid objection why the resolution should not pass. In a case like this, who will undertake the prosecution? Is it not well known that the proceedings in our courts are very tedious and expensive, and that the juries of our country require strong and pointed evidence, before they will convict any person? Besides, would any man contend that the same evidence is necessary on a charge like this as would be required, to convict a person charged with treason or felony? I presume not.

By the constitution, Congress have the right to raise and support armies, and to make rules for the government of the same. Suppose it was necessary now, and we know not how soon it may be, to increase our military force; and suppose we had some proof that our commander was a traitor to his country or intended to subvert the government, and this House knew where they could procure the testimony to shew his corruption; would any person under those circumstances contend we had no right to use the means to collect the evidence; and would this House pass a law to raise an army before they made the enquiry? Certainly not. Can it be supposed they ought to be silent?—Truth never ought to be stifled. This enquiry is due to the individual and to the nation. In a government like this the conduct of every person holding an high office should always be subject to investigation. And the conduct of none in the government is more interesting to the people than the commander of the army; whose character should be unsuspected as much as the President himself; and I am sure that this House will not violate the constitution, nor infringe on the powers of any other department of our government, by exercising the right of making this enquiry. I therefore hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. UPHAM said he had attended to the debate on the resolution on the table with attention, to discover whether he could constitutionally agree to pass the resolution. His feelings would impel him to vote for the resolution, but his judgement would restrain him: He was desirous that Gen. W. or any other man charged with whatever crime should be tried for it—but constitutionally. He would here observe that when they were told of persons high in office being pensioned by a foreign power and concerned in conspiracies to dismember the Union they were liable to be carried away by their zeal for ascertaining the fact; they should therefore proceed with caution and deliberation. He considered this question as it respected the power of the House, in the same light as if General W. were a subaltern officer instead of commander in chief. If the House had not power to investigate the conduct of a subaltern, he could not see whence they derived their power over a brigadier general. He was himself fully impressed with the testimony which had been produced and was in favor of an investigation into the conduct of this person, that if guilty he might be removed. But he could not for this reason alone agree to this resolution. He went upon the ground that the Legislature had no more power by implication than the Executive or any

(Continued on last page.)