

Terms of Publication.

Two DOLLARS per annum, payable semi-annually in advance. If not paid within the year, \$2.50 will be charged.

MINERS' AND POTTSVILLE GENERAL ADVERTISER.

Weekly by Benjamin Bannan, Pottsville, Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania.

VOL. XVI.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 9, 1840.

NO. 19

Speech of Mr. Corwin, of Ohio.

On the proposition to instruct the Committee of Ways and Means to report an appropriation for the continuation of the Cumberland Road.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Feb. 15, 1840.

Mr. CORWIN, of Ohio, rose and said: Mr. Speaker: I am distinguished by the eager solicitations of gentlemen around me to give way for a motion to adjourn, of that practice of the House which accords us more of leisure on this day than is allowed to us on any other day of the week.

If you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House have given that attention to the speech of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Cray, made yesterday, which some of us here thought it our duty to bestow, I am sure the novelty of the scene, to say nothing more of it, must have arrested your curiosity, if, indeed, it did not give rise to profound reflection.

I need not remind the House that it is a rule here (as I suppose it is every where else where men dispute by any rule at all) that what is said in debate should be relevant and pertinent to the subject under discussion.

Again, upon this process of reasoning; we must inquire where a general should be when a battle begins, especially in the night, and what his position during the fight, and where he should be found when it is over; and particularly how a Kentuckian behaves himself when he hears the India war whoop in day or night.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many and ponderous volumes written, and various unctuous discourses delivered, on the doctrine of "association." Dignified Stewart, a Scotch gentleman of no mean pretensions in his day, thought much and wrote much concerning that principle in mental philosophy; and Brown, another of the same school, but of later date, has also written and said much on the same subject. This latter gentleman, I think, calls

it "suggestion," but never, I venture to say, did any metaphysician, pushing his researches furthest and deepest into that occult science, dream that would come to pass, which we have discovered and clearly developed—that is, that two subjects so unlike as an appropriation to a road in 1810, were not merely proper in Indian war in 1811, were not merely akin, but actually, identically the same.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion, I should think, if not absolutely absurd and utterly ridiculous, which my respect for the gentleman from Michigan, and the American Congress, will not allow me to suppose, has elicited another, trait in the American character, which has been the subject of great admiration with intelligent travellers, from the Old World.

Mr. Speaker, I will not allow me to suppose, that the science and history of his subject. But here, sir, no such painful preparation is required; witness the gentleman from Michigan. He has announced to the house that he is a militia general on the peace establishment!! That he is a lawyer we know, tolerably well read in Tidd's Practice and Espanneses Nisi Prius. These studies, so happily adapted to the subject of war, with an appointment in the militia in time of peace, furnish him at once with all the knowledge necessary to discourse to us, as from high authority, upon all the mysteries in the "trade of death."

Such as becomes comrades fees, Reposing after victory. Sir, we all know the military studies of the gentleman from Michigan before he was promoted. I take it to be beyond a reasonable doubt, that he had perused with great care the title page of "Baron Steuben." Nay, I go further; as the gentleman has incidentally assured us he is prone to look into musty and neglected volumes, I venture to assert, without vouching the fact from personal knowledge, that he has perused his researches so, as to be able to know, that the rear rank stands right behind the front.

My faithful and gallant Lieutenant Harrison rendered most essential services, by communicating my orders in every direction, and by his conduct and bravery exciting the troops to great victory. Sir, this evidence was given by General Wayne, in the year 1794, some time, I imagine, before the gentleman from Michigan was born, and long before he became a militia General, and long, very long, before he ever perused the title page of Baron Steuben.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the House, in passing, that this battle and victory over the Indian forces of the North-west, in which, according to the testimony of Gen. Wayne, "Lieutenant Harrison rendered the most essential services by his conduct and bravery," gave peace to an exposed line of frontier, extending from Pittsburg to the southern borders of Tennessee. It was, in truth, the close of the war of the Revolution for the Indians who took part with Great Britain in our revolutionary struggle never laid down their arms until after they were vanquished by Wayne in 1794.

every one must see that our militia general, with his crop-eared mare, with bushy-tale and sickle-ham, would literally frighten off a battle field an hundred Alexanders. But, sir, to the history of the parade day. The general thus mounted and equipped in the field, and ready for action. On the eve of some desperate enterprise, such as giving order to shoulder arms, it may be, there occurs a crisis, one of the accidents of war which no sagacity could foresee or prevent. A cloud rises and passes over the sun! Here an occasion occurs for the display of that greatest of all traits in the character of a commander, that tact which enables him to seize upon and turn to a good account events unlooked for as they rise. Now for the caution wherewith the Roman Fabius soiled the skill and courage of Hannibal. A retreat is ordered, and troops and general, in a twinkling, are found safely bivouacked in a neighboring grove! But even here the general still has room for the exhibition of heroic deeds. Hot from the field, and chafed with the untoward events of the day, your general unheats his trenchant blade, eighteen inches in length, as you well remember, and with an energy and remorseless fury he slices the water-melons that lie in heaps around him, and shares them with his surviving friends. (Other of the sinews of war are not wanting here. Whiskey, Mr. Speaker, that great leveller of modern times, is here also, and the shells of the water-melons are filled to the brim. Here again, Mr. Speaker, is shown how the extremes of barbarism and civilization meet. As the Scandinavian heroes of old, after the fatigues of war, drank wine from the skulls of their slaughtered enemies, in Odinn's Halls, so now our militia general and his forces, from the skulls of melons thus vanquished, in copious draughts of whiskey assuage the heroic fire of their souls, after the bloody scenes of a parade day. But, alas, for this short-lived race of ours, all things will have an end, and so even is it with the glorious achievements of our general. Time is on the wing and will not stay his flight; the sun, as if frightened at the mighty events of the day, rides down the sky, and at the close of the day, when "the hamlet is still," the curtain of night drops upon the scene.

Such, sir, has been the experience in war of the gentleman from Michigan. We know this from the simple announcement that he is and has been a brigadier of militia in time of peace; and now, having a full understanding of the qualifications of our learned general, both from study and practice, I hope the House will see that it should give its profound reflection to his discourses on the art of war. And this it will be most inclined to, when we take into view that the gentleman has, in his review of General Harrison's campaigns, modestly imputed to the latter great mistakes, gross blunders, imbecility, and even worse than those of I shall show elsewhere. The force, too, of the lecture of our learned and experienced friend from Michigan is certainly greatly enhanced, when we consider another admitted fact, which is, that the general whose imbecility and error he has discovered had not, like the gentleman from Michigan, the great advantage of getting in water-melon campaigns, but only fought five Indians in the dark forests of the West, under such stupid fellows as Anthony Wayne, and was afterwards appointed to the command of large armies by the advice of such an inexperienced boy as Gov. Shelby, the hero of King's Mountain.

And now, Mr. Speaker, as I have the temerity to entertain doubts, and with great deference to differ in my opinions on this military question with the gentleman from Michigan, I desire to state a few historical facts concerning General Harrison, whom the general from Michigan has pronounced incapable, imbecile, and, as I shall notice hereafter, something worse even than these. General Harrison was commissioned by General Washington an officer in the regular army of the United States in the year 1791. He served as aid to General Anthony Wayne, in the campaign against the Indians, which resulted in the battle of the Rapids of the Maumee, in the fall of 1794.—Thus, in his youth, he was selected by General Wayne as one of his military family. And what did this youthful officer do in that memorable battle of the Rapids? Here, Mr. Speaker, let me summon a witness merely to show how military men may differ. The witness I call to controvert the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan is General Anthony Wayne. In his letter to the Secretary of War, giving an account of the battle of the Rapids, he says:

"My faithful and gallant Lieutenant Harrison rendered most essential services, by communicating my orders in every direction, and by his conduct and bravery exciting the troops to great victory." Sir, this evidence was given by General Wayne, in the year 1794, some time, I imagine, before the gentleman from Michigan was born, and long before he became a militia General, and long, very long, before he ever perused the title page of Baron Steuben. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the House, in passing, that this battle and victory over the Indian forces of the North-west, in which, according to the testimony of Gen. Wayne, "Lieutenant Harrison rendered the most essential services by his conduct and bravery," gave peace to an exposed line of frontier, extending from Pittsburg to the southern borders of Tennessee. It was, in truth, the close of the war of the Revolution for the Indians who took part with Great Britain in our revolutionary struggle never laid down their arms until after they were vanquished by Wayne in 1794.

We now come to see something of the man, the General, whose military history our able and experienced General from Michigan has reviewed. We know that debates like this have sometimes been had in the British Parliament. There, I believe, the discussion was usually conducted by those in the House who have seen and not merely heard of service. We all know that Col. Napier has, in several volumes, reviewed the campaigns of Wellington, and criticized the movements and merits of Berezford, and Soult, and Massena, and many others, quite, yes, I say, quite as well known in military history as any of us, not even excepting our General from Michigan.

We respect the opinions of Napier, because we know he not only thought of war, but that he fought too. We respect and admire that combination of military skill, with profound statesmanlike views, which we find in Cesar's Commentaries, because we know the "mighty Julius" was a soldier, trained in the

field, and inured to the accidents and dangers of war. But, sir, we Generals of Congress require no such painful discipline to give value to our opinions. We men of the 19th century know all things intuitively. We understand perfectly the military art by nature. Yes, sir, the notions of the gentleman from Michigan agree exactly with a sage by the name of "Dogberry," who insisted that "reading and writing come by nature." Mr. Speaker, we have heard and read much of "the advance of knowledge, the improvement of the species, and the great march of mind," but never till now have we understood the extent of uranium in these pregnant phrases. For instance, the gentleman from Michigan asserts that General Harrison has none of those qualities of a General, because, at the battle of Tippecanoe, he was found at one time at a distance from his tent, urging his men on to battle. He exposed his person too much, it seems. He should have staid at his tent, and waited for the officers to come to him for orders. Well, sir, see now to what conclusion this leads. Napoleon seized a standard at Lodi, and rushed in front of his columns across a narrow bridge, which was swept by a whole park of German artillery. Hence, Napoleon was no officer; he did not know how to command an army. He, like Harrison, exposed his person too much. Oh, Mr. Speaker, what a pity for poor Napoleon that he had not studied Steuben, and slaughtered water-melons with us natural born Generals of this great age of the world! Sir, it might have altered the map of Europe; nay, changed the destinies of the world!

Again: Alexander the Great spurred his horse foremost into the river, and led his Macedonians across the Granicus, to rout the Persians, who stood tall upon the other side of the stream. True, this youth conquered the world, and made himself master of what had constituted the Median, Persian, Assyrian, and Chaldean empires. Still according to the judgment of us warriors by nature, the mighty Macedonian would have consulted good sense by coming over here, if, indeed, there were any here hereabouts in those days, and studying, like my friend from Michigan, first Liddell's Practice, and Espanneses Nisi Prius, and a little smatch of Steuben, and serving as a general of militia awhile. Sir, Alexander the Great might have made a man of himself in the art of war, had he even been a member of our Congress, and heard us coolets discuss the subject of an afternoon or two. Indeed, Alexander, or Sultan, I doubt not, would have improved greatly in strategy by observing, during this session, the tactics of the Administration party on the New Jersey election question. Mr. Speaker, this objection to a general, because he will fight, is not original with my friend from Michigan. I remember a great authority, in point, agreeing with the gentleman in this. In the times of the Henrys, 4th and 5th, of England, their lived one Captain Jack Falstaff. If Shakespeare may be trusted, his opinions of the art military were exactly those of the gentleman from Michigan. He uniformly declared, as his deliberate judgment on the subject, that "discretion was the better part of valor;" and this is an authority for the gentleman. But who shall decide? Thus the authority stands—Alexander, the mighty Greek, and Napoleon Bonaparte, and Harrison, on one side, and Captain John Falstaff and the General from Michigan, on the other! Sir, I must leave a question thus sustained by authorities, both ways, to posterity. Perhaps the lights of another age may enable the world to decide it. I confess my inability to say on which side the weight of authority lies.

I hope I may obtain the pardon of American Congress for advertising in this discussion to another matter, gravely put forward by the gentleman from Michigan. Without the slightest feeling of disrespect to that gentleman, I must be allowed to say that his opinions, (hastily, I am sure,) uttered on the House on this military question, can only be considered as subjects of merriment. One observation to notice, since I am compelled to it. On the occasion of the gentleman, which I feel quite certain, on reflection, he will regret himself. In a sort of parenthesis in his speech, he said that a rumor prevailed at the time (alluding to the battle of Tippecanoe) that Col. Joseph H. Davis, of Kentucky, who commanded a squadron of cavalry there, was by some trick of Gen. Harrison, mounted, during the battle, on a white horse belonging to the General, and that, being thus conspicuous in the fight, he was a mark for the assailing Indians, and fell in a charge at the head of his men. The gentleman says he does not touch for the truth of a long-explored standard. It requires a bold man, a man possessing a great deal of moral courage, to make even an allusion to a charge such as that, against one whose only possessions in this world are his character for courage and conduct in war in his country's defence, and his unstained integrity in the various civil offices it has been his duty to occupy. Did not the gentleman know his vile story was known by every intelligent man west of the mountains to be totally without foundation? The gentleman seemed to appeal to the gallant Kentuckians to prove the truth of this insidious. He spoke of the blood of their countrymen so profusely, poured out at Tippecanoe, as if they would give countenance to the idea that the gallant Davis, who fell in that engagement, fell a victim to the artifice of the commanding general, and their other gallant sons who fell there, were wantonly sacrificed by the gross ingratitude of General Harrison in India war. No, sir, before the gentleman made this appeal, he should have remembered a few historical facts, which, if known to him, as I should suppose they were to every other man twenty years of age in Western America, would make the whole speech to that gentleman little else than a most wanton insult to the understanding of the People and Government of Kentucky. Let us briefly notice the facts.

In November, 1811, the battle of Tippecanoe was fought. There Col. Davises, and Col. Owens, with other Kentuckians, fell. These, says the gentleman (at least he insinuates it,) were sacrificed by either the cowardly artifice or by the ignorance of General Harrison. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not like the practice of open flattery, nay, I do not like to look in the face of a man, and speak of him in warm terms of eulogy, however he may deserve it; but, on this occasion I am obliged to say, what history will attest, of the people of Kentucky. If any community of people ever lived, from the time of the dispersion on the plain of Shinarump up to this day, who were literally cradled in war, it is to be found in the State of Kentucky. From the first exploration of the country by Daniel Boone up to the year 1794, they were engaged in one incessant battle with the savages of the West. Trace the path of an Indian incursion any where over the great valley of the West, and you will find it red with Kentucky blood. Wander over any of the battle-fields of that great theatre, or savage war, and you will find it white with the bones of her

children. In childhood they fought the Indians, with their fathers and mothers, in their dwellings. In youth and ripe manhood they fought them in ambushes and open battle-fields. Such were the men of Kentucky in 1811, when the battle of Tippecanoe was fought. There, too, as we know, they were still found, foremost were they to be lost, or glory won: and there they were commanded by Gen. Harrison. Now, sir, if in that battle Gen. Harrison had not conducted as became a soldier, and a general, would not such men have seen as he then did, the loss of one of the greatest and most valued citizens, condemned (as the gentleman from Michigan has attempted) to the conduct of the general who commanded in that battle!—Let us see how they testified. In January, 1812, two months after the battle of Tippecanoe, the Legislature of Kentucky was in session. On the 7th of January, 1812, the following resolution passed that body:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Kentucky, That in the late campaign against the Indians upon the Wabash, Gen. William Henry Harrison has behaved like a hero, a patriot, and a general; and that for his cool, deliberate, steady, and gallant conduct in the battle of Tippecanoe, he well deserves the warmest thanks of his country and his nation.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have just read was presented by JAMES J. CARRIZZAN, now a Senator from Kentucky, whom to name, is to call to the minds of all who know him, a man whose urbanity and varied accomplishments presents a model of an American statesman. Such a man, with both branches of the Kentucky Legislature, have testified, two months only after the event took place, that in the campaign and battle of Tippecanoe, Gen. Harrison combined the skill and conduct of an able commander, with the valor of a soldier, and the patriotism of an American. Who rises up twenty-eight years afterwards to contradict this? The young gentleman from Michigan! He who, at the time referred to, was probably consulting Webster's spelling book in some village school in Connecticut. But, Mr. Speaker, I must call another witness upon the point in issue here. On the 12th of November, 1811, the Territorial Legislature of Indiana was in session. This is just five days after the battle. That Legislature, through the Speaker of its House of Representatives, Gen. Wm. Johnson, addressed Gen. Harrison in the following terms:

"Sir: The House of Representatives of the Indiana Territory, in their own name, and in behalf of their constituents, most cordially recognize the congratulations of your Excellency on the glorious result of the late sanguinary conflict with the Shawnee Prophet, and the tribes of Indians confederated with him. When we displayed in behalf of our country not only the consummate abilities of the general, but the heroism of the men; and when we take into view the benefits which must result to the country from those exertions, we cannot, for a moment, withhold our meed of applause."

Here, sir, we have two Legislatures of the States whose citizens composed the militia force at Tippecanoe, greeted and emanating under the loss of their fellow citizens, uniting in solemn council in bearing their testimony to the skill and bravery displayed by Gen. Harrison in that battle, which the gentleman from Michigan, with a self-complacency that might well pass for insanity, now says he has discovered, was marked by palpable incapacity in the commanding general. But, Mr. Speaker, I must call yet another, nay, several other witnesses, to confront the opinion of the Michigan general.

In August, 1812, about nine months after the battle of Tippecanoe, news of fearful import concerning the conduct of Gen. Hull reached Ohio and Kentucky. Our army had fallen back on Detroit, and rumors of the surrender of that place to the British, which did actually take place, were floating on every breeze. Three regiments of militia were immediately raised in Kentucky. Before these troops had taken the field, it was well known that our army under Hull, with the whole Territory of Michigan, had been surrendered to the combined British and Indian forces, commanded by Brock and Tecumseh. Our whole frontier in the Northwest lay bare and defenceless to the invasion, not only of the British army, but the more terrible incursion of a savage foe, hungry for plunder, and thirsting for blood, led on by the most bold and accomplished warrior that the tribes of the red man had ever produced. In this state of peril, the gallant army of Kentucky looked round for a leader equal to the imminent and momentous crisis.

There was Scott, then Governor of Kentucky, who had fought through the Revolutionary war, and under the eye of Washington had risen to the rank of brigadier in the regular service. There, too, was the veteran Shelby, one of the Heroes of King's Mountain, a name that shall wake up the tones of enthusiasm in every American heart while heroic courage is esteemed, or lofty integrity remains a virtue. There, too, was Clay, whose trumpet-sound in this Hall was worth a thousand cannons in the field.—These were convened in council. This, let us not get, was about nine months after the battle of Tippecanoe. Whom, sir, I ask, did these men select to lead their own friends and fellow citizens to this glorious enterprise? Their laws required that their militia should be commanded by one of their own citizens; yet, passing by Scott and Shelby, called thousands of their own brave sons, this council called General HARRISON, then Governor of Indiana—he who had commanded Kentuckians but nine months before at Tippecanoe—he who, according to the gentleman from Michigan, had shown no trait but imbecility as an officer—be it against the laws of Kentucky, was by such a council asked to resign his station as Governor of Indiana, and take the rank and commission of Major General in the Kentucky militia, and lead on her armies in that fearful hour, to repel our national disgrace, and smother from British domination and savage butchery, the very country now represented by the gentleman from Michigan.

Let me yet another witness to call against the gentleman from Michigan. Sir, if the last rest of the illustration is disturbed in this unnatural way upon a living soldier's honor, and a living patriot's fame, the fault is not mine. It will appear presently that the gentleman from Michigan has—unwittingly, it may be—dishonored and insulted the dead, and charged the pure and generous Madison with hypocrisy and falsehood. If Gen. Harrison had been the weak, wicked, fit intellect thing the gentleman from Michigan would now pretend, was not this known to Mr. Madison, then President of the U. States, who gave the orders under which Gen. Harrison acted, and to whom the latter was responsible for his conduct? Surely no one can suppose that there were wanting those who, if they could have done so with truth, would have made known any conduct of Gen. Harrison at the time referred to, which seemed in any degree reprehensible. With all these means of

information what was the testimony of Mr. Madison respecting the battle of Tippecanoe! I will quote his own words from his message to Congress about a month after the event. The message is dated 15th December, 1811, and reads as follows:—"While it is deeply lamented that so many valuable lives have been lost in the action which took place on the 7th ultimo, Congress will see with satisfaction the dauntless spirit of fortitude victoriously displayed by every description of troops engaged, as well as the collected strength which distinguished their commander on an occasion requiring the utmost exertions of valor and discipline."

Mr. Speaker, I have no pleasure in thus recapitulating and piling proof upon proof to repel an insinuation, which I think is now apparent to all has been thrown out in the madness of party rage, without consideration, and founded only on a total perversion, or rather flat contradiction, of every historical record having relation to the subject. Something was said by the gentleman from Michigan about the encampment at Tippecanoe. If I understand him rightly, he condemned it as injudicious, because it had a river on one side and a morass on another. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall give no opinion on the question thus stated; but it just now occurs to me that this very subject, which I think in the military vocabulary is called "castigation," admits of some serious inquiry bearing upon the criticism under consideration. In almost all scientific research, we find that what is now reduced to system, and arises to the dignity of science, was at first the product of some casualty, which, falling under the notice of some reflecting mind, gave rise to surprising results. The accidental falling of an apple developed the great law of gravitation. I am sure I have somewhere seen it stated that Pyrrhus, the celebrated king of Epirus, who is allowed by all authority to have been the first general of his time, first learned to fortify his camp by having a river in his rear and a morass on his flank; and this was first suggested to him by seeing a wild boar, when hunted to desperation, back himself against a tree or rock, that he might fight his pursuers without danger of being assailed in his rear. Now, sir, if I comprehend the gentleman from Michigan he has against him on this point not only the celebrated king of Epirus, but also the wild boar, who, it seems, was the tutor of Pyrrhus in the art of castroamentation. Here, then, are two approved authorities, one of whom Nature taught the art of war, as she kindly did us colonels, and the other that renowned hero of Epirus, who gave the Romans so much trouble in his time. These authorities are near two thousand years old, and as far as I know, unquestioned, till the gentleman from Michigan attacked them, yesterday. Here, again, I ask who shall decide! Pyrrhus and the boar on one side, and the gentleman from Michigan on the other. Sir, I decline jurisdiction of the question, and leave the two hundred and forty colonels of this House to settle the count, "non nostrum tantis componere litas."

Mr. Speaker, I feel it quite impossible to withdraw from this part of the debate without some comment on another assertion, or rather intimation, of the gentleman from Michigan, touching the conduct of Gen. Harrison at the battle of the Thames. All who have made themselves acquainted with the history of that event, know that the order in which the American army was to attack the combined force of British and Indians at the Thames was changed at the very moment when the onset was about to be made. This order of the General drew forth from Commodore Perry and others, who were in the staff of the army, and on the ground at the time, the highest encomiums. The idea of this change in the plan of attack, it is now intimated, was not original with Gen. Harrison, but was, the gentleman seems to intimate, suggested to him by another, who, it is said, was on the ground at the time. Who that other person is, or was, the gentleman has not said, but seemed to intimate he was now in the other end of the Capitol; and thus we are led to suppose that the gentleman intends to say that Col. Johnson, the Vice President, is the gentleman alluded to. Sir, I regret very much that the gentleman should treat historical facts in this way. If there be any foundation for giving Col. Johnson the honor of having suggested to Gen. Harrison a movement for which the latter has received great praise, why not speak out and say so? Why insinuate! Why hint or suppose on a subject susceptible of easy and positive proof? Does not the gentleman know that he is thus trifling with the character of a soldier, playing with reputation dearer than property or life to its possessor? Sir, I wish to know if Col. Johnson, the Vice President of the U. States, has, by any word or act of his, given countenance to this insinuation? It would be well for all who speak at random on this subject to remember that there are living witnesses yet who can testify to the point in question. It may not be amiss to remind some that there is extant a journal of Col. Wood, who afterwards fell on the Niagara frontier. For the benefit of such, I too, will state what can be proved in relation to the change made by Gen. Harrison in the order of attack at the Thames.

The position of the British and Indians had been reported to Gen. Harrison by volunteer officers—brave men, it is true, but who, like many of us, were officers who had not seen a great deal of hard fighting. On this report the order of attack first intimated was founded, but, before the troops were ordered on to the attack, Col. Wood was sent to examine and report the extent of front occupied by the British troops. Col. Wood's military eye detected at once what had escaped the unpractised observation of the others—that is, that the British regulars were drawn up in open order—and it was on his report that at the moment, the change was made by Gen. Harrison in the order of the attack—a movement, which, in the estimation of such men as Wood, and Perry, and Shelby, was enough of itself to entitle Gen. Harrison to the highest rank among the military men of the age.

Mr. Speaker, when I review the historical testimony touching this portion of Gen. Harrison's history, I confess my amazement at the Quixotic, (I pray my friend from Michigan to pardon me,) if I must call it the Quixotic exhibition which he has made of himself. Sir, the gentleman had no need to tell us he was a General of militia. His conduct in this discussion is proof of that—strong even as is his own word for the fact. He has shown all that reckless bravery which has always characterized our noble militia, but he has also, in this attack, shown that other quality of militia troops which so frequently impels them to rush blindly forward, and often to their own destruction. I should like to hear many of the brave men around me speak of Gen. Harrison. Some there are now under my eye who carry British bullets in their bodies, received while fighting under the command of Gen. Harrison. I should be glad to hear my whole-souled and generous-hearted friend from Kentucky, (Major Butler) who agrees with the gentleman from Michigan in general politics, who has not merely heard of battle, but who has mingled in war in all its forms, and fought his way from the ranks up to the head of a battalion—I say I should be glad to hear his opinions of the matters asserted, hinted at, and insinuated by the gentleman from Michigan.

Why, I ask, is this attempt to falsify the common history of our country made now, and why is it made here? Is it a wantonly imagined that Congressional speeches are to contradict accredited long-known historical facts?—Does the fierce madness of party indulge a conception so wild?

Sir, I repeat, that I feel only amazement at such an attempt. I could not sit still and witness it in silence. Much as I desired to speak to the house and country on the question touching the Cumberland road, I should have left it to others had I not been impelled to get the floor to bear my testimony against the gross injustice which I thought was about to be done to a citizen—an honored, cherished citizen of my own State. This house, Mr. Speaker, knows that

While it is deeply lamented that so many valuable lives have been lost in the action which took place on the 7th ultimo, Congress will see with satisfaction the dauntless spirit of fortitude victoriously displayed by every description of troops engaged, as well as the collected strength which distinguished their commander on an occasion requiring the utmost exertions of valor and discipline."

Mr. Speaker, I have no pleasure in thus recapitulating and piling proof upon proof to repel an insinuation, which I think is now apparent to all has been thrown out in the madness of party rage, without consideration, and founded only on a total perversion, or rather flat contradiction, of every historical record having relation to the subject.

Something was said by the gentleman from Michigan about the encampment at Tippecanoe. If I understand him rightly, he condemned it as injudicious, because it had a river on one side and a morass on another. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall give no opinion on the question thus stated; but it just now occurs to me that this very subject, which I think in the military vocabulary is called "castigation," admits of some serious inquiry bearing upon the criticism under consideration.

In almost all scientific research, we find that what is now reduced to system, and arises to the dignity of science, was at first the product of some casualty, which, falling under the notice of some reflecting mind, gave rise to surprising results. The accidental falling of an apple developed the great law of gravitation. I am sure I have somewhere seen it stated that Pyrrhus, the celebrated king of Epirus, who is allowed by all authority to have been the first general of his time, first learned to fortify his camp by having a river in his rear and a morass on his flank; and this was first suggested to him by seeing a wild boar, when hunted to desperation, back himself against a tree or rock, that he might fight his pursuers without danger of being assailed in his rear. Now, sir, if I comprehend the gentleman from Michigan he has against him on this point not only the celebrated king of Epirus, but also the wild boar, who, it seems, was the tutor of Pyrrhus in the art of castroamentation.