

they may consider themselves members. The masses can never know the secrets or purposes of a party, which professedly has secrets, confined to degrees and orders, among them, some of which are locked from all but the few who may attain to the highest degrees. It will not satisfy the public therefore to say, the Governor has alluded to the American party—and in so doing has treated with indignity the majority of the Legislature—and this investigation should not therefore be proceeded with; and the Committee will not examine any one upon oath, because there is a large majority of the members of this Legislature who are members of that party, and can speak for themselves and declare their principles. All this may be true, but are you sure, gentlemen, that such of you as do, or may speak, will or can proclaim *all* the principles, objects, and purposes of that party? Are you certain that those who do, or will speak, even *know them all*? Again,—are you certain that none who may speak, have ever bound themselves by *oaths* not to make full disclosures, and are therefore not at liberty to speak fully? Is it past all doubt, that they will be believed as fully by the public on their *mere word*, as equally respectable gentlemen, not of the Legislature, would be, if speaking or giving testimony under the solemn sanction of a lawfully administered oath, which it would be perjury to violate?

But it may be said, it is unbecoming their dignity to be put upon trial! If they are upon trial, who has placed them there? Themselves alone; and it is not usual for any one to give testimony or to be a witness in his own case. Indignant, conscious innocence sometimes *demand*s investigation, and puts itself upon trial; but it is seldom seen to shun or shrink from investigation once begun. Having once condescended to stoop to an investigation, however disagreeable such an investigation may turn out to be in its progress, it knows too well, and dreads too much, the pernicious effect upon public opinion of such a step, ever to fall behind its dignity for protection, until that innocence is made manifest by the most thorough scrutiny. May it not be that some will say of this case, that the majority, the party who chose to consider themselves accused, not content with being the *judges* in their own case, have insisted upon, and determined to be themselves also, the *exclusive witnesses*, and not only so, but that their testimony shall be given when and where each one pleases, and without the sanction of an oath! What will an impartial public think and say of such a procedure?

For all these reasons and considerations, this minority were