

MODERN FRENCH ELOQUENCE.

The following is a specimen of the present State of French oratory. The harangue of Carnot comes limping after the oraisons funebres of the age of Lewis XIV.

Speech delivered by citizen Carnot, Minister of war, on the removal of the body of Marshal Turenne, to the temple of Mars, on the 22d instant.

Citizens—your eyes are fixed on the remains of the great Turenne: behold the body of that warrior, so dear to every Frenchman, to every friend of glory and humanity: behold him, whose name alone never failed to produce the most lively emotion in every heart inclined to virtue; whose fame proclaimed amongst all people, should be proposed to all generations as the model of heroes. To-morrow you will celebrate the foundation of the Republic: let us prepare that festival by the apotheosis of all that is praise-worthy and justly illustrious, which former ages have left us. This temple is not reserved for those whom chance has or may cause to exist under the Republican era, but to those who, in all times displayed virtues worthy of it. Henceforth, Oh Turenne! your manes shall inhabit this space, they shall dwell naturalized among the founders of the Republic; they shall embellish their triumphs, and partake in their national festivals. The idea is no doubt sublime, of placing the mortal remains of a hero, now no more, in the midst of warriors, who followed in the same career, and were formed by his example. It is the urn of a father restored to his children, and the legitimate and the most precious portion of their inheritance. To the brave belong the ashes of the brave; they are their natural guardians; they should be their vigilant trustees. A right after death belongs to the warrior who has been swept off on the field; it is that of residing under the safeguard of the warriors, of partaking with them of the asylum consecrated to glory, for glory is a property which death does not take away. Honoured be the Government which made it a study to acquit the debt of the nation towards its ancient benefactors, which dreads not the lights diffused by their genius; who has no interest in stifling their remembrance! Honoured be the Chiefs of a martial nation, who fear not to invoke the shade of Turenne! The greatness of a hero is attested by the greatness of those other heroes he surpassed: he enhances his own glory by making that of the greatest men shine in its full splendor, without any apprehension of being eclipsed by them, Turenne lived in a time when prejudice placed imaginary distinctions above the most signal services. He knew how to make the splendor of his rank disappear before that of his victories, and the great man was all that was seen in him. France, Italy, and Germany, refounded only with his triumphs; and it was his virtue alone, which, after his death, drew that praise so sublime, from the mouth of a generous rival, himself a great man also, de MONTCAUCULI—"Here died a man who did honor to man." I shall not repeat what history has taught each of us from his infancy, the actions of Turenne, the details of his military life; nor perhaps the still more interesting details of his private life. He is one of those men whose eplogues should be no more than the pronouncing of his name.

The names of heroes is as a focus, and unites in a single point all the circumstances of their lives. It impresses on the sense a stronger emotion, on the enthusiasm a more rapid impulse, on the heart a more impressive love of virtue, than even the recital of those actions which gain them the palm of immortality. Oh! what title more glorious could I join to that of father, by which the soldiers distinguished Turenne in his life-time! What trait could I add to that of these same soldiers, after his death, on seeing the embarrassment in which it left the Chiefs of the army, about the part they were to take. "Let loose la Pie," (which was the name of Turenne's horse) said they, "and he will lead us." How could I equal the words of St. Hilaire! The same buller which killed Turenne carried of the arm of the former. To his son, is an exclamation of grief, he said—"It is not I, my son, that ought to be bewailed, it is that great man." Turenne was in the plains of Saltzbach commanding the French, sure of his dispositions, certain of the victory. He is struck—Turenne is dead. Confidence and hope are fled? all France is in mourning, and the enemy do honour to themselves in mourning that great man. The Germans for many years left untill the spot where he was killed, and the inhabitants spared it as a sacred place. They paid respect to the old tree under which he reposed himself a little time before his death, and would not let it be cut down. The tree would have perished but because soldiers of all nations plucked off some parts of it out of respect to his memory. The remains of Turenne have been preserved to the present time in the tomb of the Kings. The republicans have withdrawn it from that stately oblivion. They have this day deposed him a place in the Temple of Mars, where the recital of his victories will be daily repeated by these old Generals who inhabit this abode. What avail trophies without motion and without life? Here glory is constant in action. Marble and brass may be consumed by time. This asylum of French warriors, whom old age or wounds disable from fighting any more, will endure from age to age, and our

latest posterity will come here respectfully to converse with those who shall have terminated their career in the field of honor. It is on the tomb of Turenne that the aged will daily shed the tears of admiration, and where the youth will come to find his vocation to the trade of arms. If after having embraced his monument, after having invoked the manes of Turenne, he does not find himself filled with a holy enthusiasm; if his heart be not raised and purified; if he does not, above all things, passionately love the heroic virtues, he should say to himself that he was not born for glory.

In our days Turenne would have been the first to launch out in that career which our Republican phalanxes have run. It was not to the maintenance of the political system then prevailing that he consecrated his labours, that he sacrificed his life but to the defence of his country independent of all system. The love of his country was his actuating principle, as in our days it has been that of the Dampierres, the Dugommiers, the Marceaus, the Jouberts, the Desaix's the Latour d'Auvergnés. His Glory ought not to be separated from that of those Republican heroes and the great Turenne be sensible of this act of the national gratitude, commanded by a Government which knows how to appreciate the virtues.—Citizens, let us not enfeeble the emotion which your hearts feel at the sight of his funeral apparatus. Words cannot describe what is here presented to your senses. What should I say of Turenne? Behold the sword which armed his victorious hand. Of his death? Behold the fatal ball which snatched him from France, and from humanity altogether.

Pennsylvania Legislature.

In SENATE.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 14.

On motion to recede from the amendments of the secretary, to the Electoral Bill, the yeas and nays being called for, Gen. Woods, the speaker observed, that the subject under consideration had been so fully discussed in the public prints, and in that house, it was not his intention to have spoken thereon; but having understood that his silence was by some considered as an acquiescence in the reasoning of the minority of the house, and an admission that their arguments were conclusive—he would then claim the privilege of briefly expressing his sentiments on this important question. He said it was known to them all, that the laws under which the electors had hitherto been chosen, were laws of experiment, limited to the particular occasion: and that it was left to the Legislature to provide for a similar necessity—without adverting particularly to the reasons which provided the mode provided by the Senate and rejected by the House of Representatives at their last session it might be proper to observe, that in those states where the choice was made by the people, that mode was generally admitted to be the best, and as such had been contended for by the party who now opposed it:—It had also the opinion of the Legislature of Virginia in its favor, even in the same session, and after they had changed their law from districts to a general election—On a resolution brought forward (as he had understood) by Mr. Maddison—suggesting the necessity of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting the election of President and Vice-President &c. it was also declared, that the election of electors ought to be uniform: and that districts in each state for that purpose, would be most proper.

At the close of our late session, it was generally understood that the legislature would be convened in time to pass a law by which the people (who had theretofore exercised the right, and with whom it ought still to remain) might again participate in the choice of electors.—In this expectation he had been disappointed.—The Executive interposition was not until too late for any other than a legislative appointment.—He said he would mention these circumstances, and leave the comment for others.—He thought, the inference was obvious.

The constitution of the United States, he said, declared, that "each state shall appoint in such manner as the Legislature thereof shall direct, a number of Electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives, to which the State may be entitled in Congress. The Legislature of this State was now called on to comply with this constitutional injunction, and to direct the manner in which it should be performed. The manner ought therefore to be such as would preserve to each branch of the Legislature its respective rights and powers—ibat alone being congenial with the spirit of our Constitution. Thus it appeared that the Legislature was to direct the manner; but its members were not necessarily to be the agents in the appointment. In this and other states the people were considered the agents contemplated in the Constitution; and even in those where a different construction prevailed, it was not contended that the Constitution prescribed that it should be done either by joint or concurrent vote of the Legislature, or by each branch appointing a certain number of the Electors; yet it did not prohibit either of these modes. It was our State Constitution which would be the guide, and the spirit of that bore strongly against a joint vote—because it virtually destroyed the constitutional check and power which each branch of the Legislature had on the acts of the other.—It was useless to say that the Legislature were to direct the manner, if the Constitution had already prescribed it, and left no alternative. It would be in vain that the Constitution had rendered the concurrence of the several branches of the Legislature essential to the passing of a law directing the manner, if on the necessity of a legislative appointment, it

was to be determined by joint vote.—It would in effect be determining the whole by joint vote. This principle, if admitted, might be attended with the most mischievous consequences.—Wherever a disposition prevailed in either branch of the Legislature to withdraw from the people this privilege, it would only be necessary to defeat the law proposed for an election, and the result would be certain.—By such means the right intended to be secured to the people, would ultimately be transferred to the members of the legislature.

The member from Northumberland (Mr. Maclay) had said, Constitutions were designed to restrain and limit certain powers—not to extend them. This position was certainly correct; but instead of answering that purpose it unquestionably operated against the measure which he wished to support. In obeying a constitutional injunction, we were restrained in the exercise of our powers to our separate and corporate capacity; and could not act jointly with the House of Representatives, but in such cases as were specially provided for in the Constitution. This was not one of those cases—it would therefore follow that a concurrent vote in the appointment, would be the only constitutional mode. It appeared to him that the error arose from confounding the duty imposed by the Constitution with the legislative provision as to the manner. The law would be founded on the constitution, and the agency would be under the law.—The appointment of electors under the law of the state would be the appointment of the state; and as such regarded by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Woods said, from the reasons which he had urged against a joint vote it would be obvious that he should not consider any mode proper, which did not secure the respective branches of the legislature their separate and independent powers.

The mode contemplated in the amendments of the Senate to the Bill, seemed best calculated for that purpose. It would afford a just and correct opinion of the legislature on this subject, without meeting the difficulties that might arise on a concurrent vote.

It had been mentioned that in republics the majority should govern. This (of course) was admitted, but it was necessary to know the will of the whole before this could be determined. It was curious to observe the language used in some of the petitions presented on this subject.—It was stated that in Maryland an attempt was made to deprive the people of the right of election which was defeated only by the exertions of the Republicans. In that state the elections for electors were in districts, by which the majority and minority were both heard. The petitioners considered this proper there, where, on a general vote, the majority would be against their views; but in Virginia and Pennsylvania, where the majorities were supposed otherwise, it would be unconstitutional that the minority should be heard. Such was the consistency of those who assume to themselves exclusively the title of Republicans. He said he should not longer claim the attention of the Senate, but give his negative to the motion.

PROPOSITIONS

On behalf of the committee of Conference of the House of Representatives, to form the basis of a free conference on the Electoral Bill.

1. That the choice of Electors shall be made by a joint vote of the two branches of the Legislature, but the above shall be so regulated as to give each branch a portion of the number chosen.

2. That before the joint meeting each branch shall nominate a number of persons, equal to the whole number of Electors to be chosen; and at the joint meeting each member of the two branches shall vote for fifteen Electors of whom shall be taken from the nomination by the Senate & from the nomination of the House of Representatives.

3. That the Senate recede from their amendments to the Bill; and that the bill be so amended in the House of Representatives as to conform to the first and second propositions.

REPLY.

The Committee of Conference on the part of the Senate, delivered to the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives upon the propositions on Monday evening, 17th November in the afternoon.

The committee of conference on the part of the Senate, have considered the propositions of the committee of the House of Representatives, to which the following exceptions occur.

The first cannot be admitted, because it is destroying the principle in which the amendments of the Senate are founded, viz, preserving to the several branches of the Legislature their respective constitutional rights.

This exception resting against the principle therein contained it is unnecessary to notice the other propositions, as they of course will be rejected; but if the principle were conceded, the second proposition is not sufficiently explicit, the number to be taken from each branch of the Legislature not being inserted. On the whole the committee does not discover that any advantage can result from changing the principle.

The only object would appear to respect the number to be appointed by each branch and the sentiments of the committee have already been unequivocally expressed on that point.

Repeated conferences having already been had on the subject, the Committee on the part of the Senate cannot consider the propositions made by the committee on the part of the House of Representatives as forming the basis of a free conference on the

electoral bill, but rather as a conclusive opinion.

This opinion having been opposed to their sentiments, the committee of the Senate cannot agree to recommend to that body to recede from their amendments.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

The committee of the House of Representatives in reply to the exceptions which are offered by the committee of the Senate to their propositions observe—

1. That it has been admitted in debate by the minority in the House of Representatives, it is understood to have been argued by the majority in debate in the Senate, and it is not denied by the committee of conferees on behalf of the Senate, that an appointment of Electors by a joint vote of both branches of the Legislature, would be a constitutional mode of proceeding.

2. That the majority of the House of Representatives are conscientiously of opinion, that electors can only be constitutionally appointed by a joint vote of both branches of the legislature.

3. That, therefore, in acceding to a joint vote the Senate will only waive, what is in their opinion a matter of form; but in departing from it, the House of Representatives would sacrifice, what is in their opinion, a matter of principle.

4. That on an occasion so critical and important, involving not only the respect that is due to the sacred obligation by which the Legislature is bound to support the constitution of the union, but the very existence of the Union itself, it is presumed, that a disposition will be felt, and manifested on both sides of the conference, to produce a conciliatory, and satisfactory result.

5. That under this impression, the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives have before declared, and now repeat, that they cannot consent to advise a surrender of the principle of a joint vote: but that they are willing to receive, and consider a proposition for apportioning the number of electors between the two houses, in such manner as shall not violate the constitutional right of the Senate.

6. That the Senate having in their amendments proposed the appointment of seven electors to the Senate, and eight electors to the House of Representatives; the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives are prepared to receive and consider the reasons of the conferees on behalf of the Senate, for making that apportionment, and at the same time, will candidly offer the reasons which occur in opposition to it.

7. That as it is obvious that the only difference which exists between the two Houses, is the apportionment of the number of Electors, the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives declare, that any reasonable proposition in that respect will be adopted by them, to rescue the state from the disgrace and odium arising from a dereliction of her federal obligations; and that, they trust, the candor of the conferees on behalf of the Senate, will prevent their making any but a reasonable proposition on the occasion.

8. That, upon the whole, the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives ultimately declare, that they cannot, conscientiously, recede from the principle of a joint vote; but that they consider the appointment of the electors, to the whole extent of the numbers to be appointed, as a fair subject for free discussion, and mutual concession.

(REPLY.)

The committee of conference on the part of the Senate have considered the second propositions of the committee of the House of Representatives, in which they do not discover any thing important, to which the former reply of the committee does not furnish an answer.

The committee of the Senate have already given their opinion on the appointment of the electors, and to enter now into a detail of the reasons on which that is founded would be useless to those who have already heard them, and not practicable in the time given to reply. The committee considers the propositions of the committee of the House of Representatives, as leading to uncertainty and difficulty on a point which (for the honor of the state) ought speedily to be settled. The mode proposed in the amendments, alike with that desired by the committee of the House of Representatives, furnishes the opportunity of a discussion as to the appointment of the electors. Upon the whole this committee impressed with the justice of the principle which dictated the amendments of the Senate, and feeling themselves conscientiously bound to support them, cannot agree to relinquish the ground which they have taken.

The following gentlemen have been elected Electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, for the state of Virginia, and it is supposed will vote for Mr. Jefferson, viz.

- George Wythe, of the city of Richmond, William Newsum, of Prince's Anne, Edmund Pendleton, sen'r, of Caroline, William H. Cabell, of Amherst, James Madison, jun'r, of Orange, John Page, of Gloucester, Thomas Newton, jun'r, of Norfolk borough. Carter B. Harrison, of Prince George, General Joseph Jones, of Dinwiddie, William B. Giles, of Amelia, Gred Taylor, of Cumberland, Thomas Read sen'r, of Charlotte, George Penn, of Patrick, Walter Jones, of Northumberland, Richard Brent, of Prince William, William Ellzey, of Loudoun, Andrew Moore, of Rockbridge, General John Brown, of Hardy, General John Preston, of Montgomery, Hugh Holmes of Frederick, Archibald Stuart, of Augusta.

Extract of a letter written by a Gentleman at Lancaster, dated Wednesday evening, November 19th.

In my last I informed you of the fate of the bill introduced to the House of Representatives by Mr. Penrose.—It was revived this morning by a motion to re-consider, made by Messrs. Huston and Moore, two of the Members who were in the majority yesterday. The reason assigned by the mover, Mr. Huston, was, that the vote had been hastily taken, and the bill not fully understood by all the Members—several not having voted either for or against it. Mr. Huston also observed, that, notwithstanding he wished a re-consideration, he probably should again vote against the bill. The question, being then put, was carried in the affirmative; and, the first section being before the House, a postponement was moved by Mr. Boileau, in order that the bill might be printed for the use of the Members, which was also carried in the affirmative, and the House, after acting on some other business, adjourned until the afternoon.

When the House met, in the afternoon, the bill was read a second time, and (a few small amendments, no way affecting the principal of it, being made) ordered to be transferred for a third reading. It will pass the House to-morrow morning, and be transmitted to the Senate, where it will, doubtless, receive suitable amendments.

The letter published in yesterday's Gazette, gives the substance of the bill, as mentioned in the preceding letter.

In addition to the information which the above letter conveys, we are informed, that an unsuccessful motion was made, on the second reading of the bill, to amend the latter part of the third section so as to read as follows, viz. ]

And each Member shall vote for fifteen Electors—seven of whom shall be taken from the nomination of the Senate, and eight of whom shall be taken from the nomination of the House of Representatives, and the seven highest in vote which shall be taken from the nomination of the Senate, and the eight highest in votes which shall be taken from the nomination of the House of Representatives, shall be the Electors to elect, on behalf of Pennsylvania, a President and Vice-President of the United States."

By this Day's Mail

PITTSBURGH, November 14.

On Friday last marched through this town under the command of Colonel Strong, the Federal troops, (amounting to about 500) which were encamped near this place, and embarked on board of boats to descend the river for the place fixed on for their winter quarters, which we understand was to have been near the mouth of the Ohio. We are since informed, that counter-orders have been received from the Commander in chief, and that the troops will remain in the neighbourhood of this place during the winter. They had proceeded only about twelve miles down the river when these orders were received.

CHILLICOTHE, November 6.

Monday last, the Honourable Legislature for the Territory North West of the Ohio, convened in this town, and having made a quorum, proceeded to business.

His Excellency Arthur St. Clair, Esq. arrived on Tuesday morning.

The following Gentlemen compose the two branches of the Legislature.

Council.—Messrs. Olivar, Burnett, Vance, Finlay, and W. C. Schenck, Sec'y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Ross County.—Messrs. Tiffin Speaker, Worthington, Lincham, S. Finly.

Hamilton County.—Messrs. Smith, Ludlow, Benham, Goforth, M'Mellon, Lytle, Martin.

Ams County.—Messrs. Massie, Darlington.

Washington County.—Messrs. Meigs, Fearin.

Jefferson County.—Messrs. Prichard, Kimberly.

Wayne County.—Messrs. Sibley, Vilgar, C. F. Chebert De Joncaire, and John Riley, Clark.

His Excellency the Governor met the two branches of the Legislature in the Representatives room yesterday, and delivered his speech. Its extreme length, obliges us to omit the publication of it until our next.

This morning, in the Legislature now sitting here, came on an election for two delegates to represent this territory in the Congress of the United States, when William M'Mellon, Esq. of Hamilton County, was declared duly elected to serve until the 4th of March next, in place of W. H. Harrison, Esq. appointed Governor of the Indiana Territory; and Paul Fearin, Esq. of Washington County, to serve for two years from the 4th of March ensuing.

NOW LANDING,

At Messrs. Wain's wharf below the Drawbridge

The Cargo

Of the brig Mentor, direct from Malaga, viz.

- MALAGA WINE in quarter casks 750 kegs fresh SUN RAISINS 400 boxes MUSCATEL Do. 300 boxes BLOOM Do. 800 shells ALMONDS in bags GRAPES in jars FIGS in kegs—and A small quantity of SHEET CORK,

Apply to EDWARD DUNANT, No. 149, South Front Street, November 19. Pd:3t.