

"or 'confronting witnesses,' or any
 o' that plausible farago in Mitchell's case,
 until after it had got before the President,
 the proper tribunal for trying it? Does a
 prosecutor in a court of justice go to the
 accused and tell him, "I am now about to
 indict you for a crime, here is the charge,
 and here are the witnesses, you are at liberty
 to cross examine them before they go into
 court? Such is never done, and such would
 be perfect nonsense, for it would be trying
 the case twice; and once, of course without
 any possible effect. The Legislature could
 award no judgment, all they desired was to
 be supported in the charges they were about
 to prefer to the President—It would have
 been vain and idle to have gone before him
 without preparation, and until they knew
 the nature and extent of the evidence it
 was perfectly useless to prefer their charges.
 Therefore, I maintain Crowell had
 nothing to do with their investigation. It
 was time enough for him, when informed
 by the President that he was accused, and
 that the accusation was sufficiently found-
 ed to put him upon trial, to have an oppor-
 tunity of "confronting witnesses" and "ob-
 taining compulsory process."—This was
 the precise course pursued by Clark against
 Mitchell, and surely no one will deny to the
 Legislature the same right. And as to
 publishing the testimony in newspapers,
 surely no one will imagine, that the Presi-
 dent who alone determines the case, is like
 a petty jury, easily influenced by such a step.
 Does not every one see the reason of this
 opposition to Troop and protection of Crow-
 ell? If Crowell can be sustained, if the trea-
 ty can be defeated, if the Governor can be
 thwarted in all his measures, however in-
 tended for the public good, and calculated
 to subserve the people's interest, it will de-
 stroy his popularity and make way for the
 success of his artful competitor.

ATTICUS.