

motion by Mr. Speed, made the order of the day for Tuesday the 30th instant, viz.

The committee of grievances and courts of justice, to whom was referred the petition of Daniel Bussard, of the city of George Town, beg leave to report—That in the year of 1815, the said petitioner became bound as security to the United States, for certain individuals trading under the firm of Stull and Williams, who borrowed from the government sixty thousand pounds of gunpowder, to be returned on demand. Stull and Williams failed to comply with their contract, because of insolvency, in consequence of which the petitioner was bound for the restitution of the said quantity of gunpowder. In addition to this, the said petitioner became bound to the government of the United States, for other quantities of gunpowder. The said petitioner, in order to fulfil these and other contracts, became proprietor of certain powder works in or near the town of Bladensburg, and there proceeded to the manufacture of gunpowder, and the delivery of the same, in conformity with his aforesaid contracts. Previously to the year 1818, the said petitioner was enabled to deliver to the government of the United States, powder to the amount of twenty thousand pounds, towards the fulfillment of his contract. At this time an explosion took place, by which a part of the buildings, necessary to the manufacture of gunpowder, was destroyed. On the petition of the inhabitants of Bladensburg, the Chancellor of Maryland granted an injunction, forbidding the rebuilding of the works destroyed. These works had been erected during the late war, (sometime in 1812.) a time when the proprietors of such works were thought worthy of praise, with the full and free approbation, (as your committee believe,) of the inhabitants of the said town, and had been employed in the manufacture of gunpowder until the period of their explosion in 1818. The interference, on the part of the people of Bladensburg, was the more astonishing, as three successive explosions had taken place, and not a murmur of complaint was heard upon the subject.

Your committee would further state, that the injunction of the chancellor was granted without any bond of indemnity on the part of the applicants; so that the said petitioner is without any redress whatever in a court of law or equity.

Your committee do not pretend to dispute the propriety of the chancellor's injunction, how much soever it may have violated the principles of equity. But admitting that the injunction was right and proper, and that, for the safety of the citizens of Bladensburg, it was necessary to pre-