at several different times and under different circumstances appear to be intirely inconsistent with one another. We see by the testimony of Jordan and Kelly, that Mr. S. declared he knew nothing about Mr. Burr's business, and nothing that could *criminate* or *exculpate* him. We have seen what Glover stated Mr. S. communicated to him; we have seen that statement confirmed by Mr. Smith's own affidavit sent to the President, and we now see what Mr. S. has declared to Mr. Token and Mr. Gano—to the former he says that if Burr was engaged in any enterprise, it was under the *protection* and with the *advice* of our government; this was the very language Mr. Burr himself held out to induce the unwary and unsuspecting to join him. To Mr. Gano, Mr. Smith says he had endeavored to find out Burr's plans but could not, further than they were honorable, and would be approved by the United States; and to Major Riddle he says he knew more of Burr's plans than any man, in the state of Ohio but one. These three last conversations took place about ten days after Mr. Smith, had declared to Jordan and Kelly, that he *knew nothing* of Burr's *business*, or any thing that could *criminate* or *exculpate* him. How are these various declarations of Mr. S. to be reconciled? At one time, he says he knows nothing of Burr's affairs—ten days after he says, he knew more of his concerns than any man in the state of Ohio but *one*—and goes so far as to say, that if Burr was engaged in any enterprise, it was under the *protection* and with the *advice* of our *government*—and all this after Mr. Burr had told him that he had been persecuted in this government, shamefully persecuted, and that in it all private confidence between man and man seemed to be nearly destroyed. Could or did Mr. Smith believe that the government countenanced any of the plans of Mr. Burr; it appears to me impossible. What then could induce him to make such a declaration and at different times? Did Mr. S. believe that the government would give its sanction to an illegal act—for as a member of the national Legislature, he must have known it was not authorised by law, and that the President would not dare in violation of the consitutions—(even if he had ever so great an inclination) to countenance an enterprize that would inevitably involve our country in war? And did Mr. S. believe, that the administration had such unbounded confidence in Mr. Burr as to intrust him with so important an expedition at that critical period? Yet these things we must believe, if we believe Mr. Smith sincere in his declaration—and if we do believe him sincere in saying that if Mr. Burr was engaged in any enterprize, it was under the protection and with the advise of our government, we must believe that he was conversant with Mr. Burr's plans, which must have been very plausibly impressed upon him indeed, to have induced him to have formed so extraordinary an opinion.

I shall now proceed to the testimony of Col. James Taylor; who in answer to a question put by the committee, makes the following statement: That a piece signed Querist, published at Marietta, in the fall of 1806, excited a good deal of agitation at Cincinnati; that he was anxious to see the piece, and expressed himself to this effect to Mr. John Smith of that place. Mr. Smith promised to procure the paper, which he did. In a few days after Col. Taylor fell in company with Mr. Smith and Gen. Findley, in Cincinnati, when the conversation turned upon the subject of a separation of the union. Mr. Smith advanced as *his opinion* many of the arguments in the Querist; spoke as to the difference of interest between the western and Atlantic states; observed that although the doctrine was unpleasant at that time, in less than two years it would become orthodox. Mr. Taylor says one of the arguments made use of was, that we derived very little advantage from the great expence of foreign ministers and consuls, and the navy; he observed, that a few British ships or armed vessels at the mouth of the Mississippi could block up our trade effectually. This conversation abstractedly considered, (though peculiarly improper in a Senator or member of the national government) might not of itself be considered criminal; but combine it with Col. Burr's conversation with General Morgan and his sons, as stated in their depositions, to the very same purport. Add thereto the time at which the piece signed Querist was published; which was immediately on Col. Burr's arriving in that country; supporting the same doctrine, and considering the separation of the union as a part of Colonel Burr's great plan, and connect this communication of Mr. Smith's with the several conversations herein before detailed, and the information which Mr. Smith himself acknowledges to have received from Col. Burr; and it appears to me almost impossible not to believe, that Mr. Smith was concerned in Col. Burr's projects. Some attempt has been made by Mr. Smith to explain away or to invalidate the testimony of Col. Taylor; but the stern integrity of his character is such, blended with the very candid manner; the great reluctance with which he gave in his evidence before the committee; the extreme tenderness he evinced towards Mr. Smith and his family, were so conspicuous, that the evidence which has been presented to countervail the effect of Col. Taylor's testimony, has not made the smallest impression upon my mind; and the very circumstance of Mr. Smith not obtaining the deposition of General Findley, who Col. Taylor says was present, confirms me in the belief, that if that testimony was produced, it would fully accord with Col. Taylor's. I have now discharged my duty as a member of the committee, and whatever may be the determination of the Senate, I shall rest satisfied. The duty that the committee had assigned them in the case of Mr. Smith, has been an extremely unpleasant one; but they have deemed it their duty, uninfluenced by personal feeling or public opinion, to observe an undeviating course, and to endeavor to bring fairly and fully to the view of the Senate, the whole merits of the case; upon which I am constrained to pronounce, however painfully, that in my opinion the resolution ought to be adopted.

FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. IV.

We proceed in the necessary review of the manner in which England has enriched and attempted to aggrandise herself at the expense of the true and absolute rights of neutrals, of her own allies, and of adversary belligerents; and *in which she has drawn upon us the like treatment from her foreign enemies.*

Tho' *neutral* states can have no *war* rights against co-neutrals, or against belligerents, their allies, England, then a neutral state, committed all the breaches we have seen of the rights both of neutrals and allied powers in her detentions of the ships, cargoes and property of neutral friends and neutral and belligerent allies from the date of her proclamation of the 15th of November, 1792, till the commencement of her war with France on the 1st of Feb. 1793. England, then neutral, stopt them in her own ports, and captured them on the high seas, particularly in their voyages from the feeble and *disjointed* Hanseatic towns. The first victims of the crafty naval despotism of *neutral England* were the weak & *disunited*. Americans, ye are lost forever, if ye do not believe, that the sowers of *the seeds of disunion* among the commercial and agricultural states of America are dangerously hostile to your *just influence* among the powers of the earth.

The unprecedented engagement between Britain and Russia of the 25th March, 1793, to deprive unblockaded France of *all* neutral commerce, and the neutral states of all innocent French commerce, enormous as it is, must be considered as a sin of *neutral* England. This convention was published in London as early as the 25th of March, 1793, within fifty-three days of the commencement of the war between France and England. It is therefore certain, that the treaty must have been formed full three months before, while *neutral* Britain, disregarding all decency, and public law, was taking the vessels of neutral Hamburg, Bremen and Lubeck on their voyages with *innocent* goods the fruit of the labors of the Westphalian and Saxon subjects of the king of England and of his German relations and allies. If allies, relations and connections by blood and marriage, their own subjects, and confederated Brethren of Hanover were thus treated by neutral G. Britain, by Britain in the time of peace and in the earliest stages of her war with France, *an intelligent firmness* at this time on our part must be deemed necessary to our existence. "*Nemo repente turpissimus.*" These recorded sins of *neutral* Britain are nothing to those she has since committed against us. Governed by a legislature, in which the seats are publicly* bought and sold. Every thing is reduced to the acquisition of gain, *per fas et nefas.* Their Berkley's, their Cochrane's, their Whitby's, their Humphrey's, & their Love's, *et hoc genus omne*, can purchase these seats, *to give law to neutrals*, with a very little of their neutral plunder. It is no wonder that their navy rules in Britain. As long as we were known perfectly to understand and without measures of remedy *to endure these things*, it could not be expected, that the other belligerents, enemies of England, would respect our neutral rights. Hence the wisdom and the unavoidable duty of shutting our rivers against their *immense sea-army*. Hence our exclusion of an *impressive* portion of their redundant manufactures. Hence the incidental withholding of our precious raw materials and more precious food. Hence the withdrawing of *the persons* of our honest seamen from the field of undisguised foreign *slavery*—the scene of an odious and infamous impressment.

Of what avail is it that the people of America have acquired an exemption from British rule *in all the forms of* strict law, public and municipal, if the foreign legislature and crown they successfully resisted, openly maintain that rule *in fact?* Is the American seaman *free*, who is made *a degraded prisoner* in any spot of the terraqueous globe by a British press gang? Did the ensanguined body of *John Pearce*, when exhibited to the people by *Rufus King*, evince the actual exemption of Americans from the domination of England? Did the numerous bodies of impressed Americans, in the defeated fleet of admiral D'Orvilliers, slain and mangled in forced opposition to a sister republic and to *the principles of the American revolution*, then actually common to America and France, prove *the actual* termination of all British authority over the people of these states? Did the daily exaction of the *convoy* duty from American merchants support the important truth, that "taxation and representation are inseparable!" Do the forcing our ships into British harbors, and the *extortion* of money, without a shadow of law, under the *fraudulent* color of legitimate duties, prove that we are exempted from the avaricious rule of our colonial state?—The degree of resistance, which we had begun to make to this *government de facto* of G. Britain, occasioned us to be exempted, in reality, from the operation of the French decree of Berlin, down to the time when England under the pretence of retaliation for what we had in truth not acquiesced in, issued her *nine* orders in Council of November last. The British *avowal* of an intention to issue such orders, and the declaration at Copenhagen that there could be no neutrals, brought on the execution of the Berlin Decree.

The President of the United States, irresistibly impelled by a sense of public duty, seasonably represented as a solemn truth to our Legislative Body, that G. Britain on the subject of the colonial trade, had interpolated the law of nations. And here we are brought to examine a new example of that inadmissible practice. Instead of a retaliating *blockade* of France, when France by her Berlin decree *blockaded* England, the British adopted measures of a different or more excessive nature and called them "*retaliations.*"

She insolently ordered us, wherever found on the high seas, to be *coerced at arms*, to trade through British ports, to France! She adopted a monoply of commerce! She ordained "*a tribute,*" under the veil of a municipal duty; and she granted "*perquisites*" out of our property, under the name of fees of office, to men who were impeachable for extorting them, before that act of indemnity for these crimes, that *deed of shame* which has blasted the reputation of the three states in the British Parliament in the face of the world. When acts of a sovereign Legislature, in high contempt of justice and decency are hung, like harlots mantles, upon the unhallowed walls of its public chambers, to cover the perpetrators of any deed of shame, the innocent and just among their own people must too soon lose all courage to endure misfortune or to encounter danger. *Conscience* must make cowards of the leaders of the nation and *a wounded spirit* must unman the good. Such must ultimately be the case with every British observer of every class in society, who traces *the contempt of sound policy, of constitutional law, and of all public justice*, in the commencement, the progress, and the present state of their orders in council.

What then must be the effect of this long series of orders upon the temper and conduct of the adversaries of England. They know the history of these orders of England from the days of her neutrality in 1792. They know well all that neutrals have done in consequence, and suffered. They cannot but think they have the best grounds to retaliate, *as against England;* and they would believe that they had a right to retaliate, as against us also, *but for the determined stand we have openly made.*

The noble protest against all the details of British impressment from the date of Mr. Madison's letter on that subject of January, 1804, to the termination of his recent correspondence with Mr. Rose, appear to have convinced the European continent, that we will not endure the incarceration and enslavement of our marine citizens in the floating prisons of England, nor the perversion of their neutral hands in illegitimate war upon her enemies. Connected with this subject, the excision of the whole marine *army* of England from our ports, in consequence of the afflicting treatment of John Pearce, of the impertinent insolence of *Love*, and of *the base and sanguinary outrage* on the frigate Chesapeake must carry convictions, the most satisfactory and decided, into the councils of the injured adversary belligerents. The open imposition of *an avowed fine* on England, by means of the non-importation law, for her early and indisputable violations of the law of nations and for all the consequent injuries she has *herself* inflicted, or *drawn upon us* from her allies and her enemies, must add to the convictions of our just determinations, in the European world. The serious effects upon the extensive and complicated British political œconomy, which the whole world knows our embargo will produce, including *the all important business of our own manufacturing system*, will convince Europe, that we have devised means to deprive the rapacious navy of England of spoliated food and replaced *a vulnerable foreign commerce* by great domestic *invulnerable* operations, in all the manufactures and the useful arts.

The effects of these well devised, impressive and temperate measures of firm tho' bloodless coercion seem to be perceived in France. As she had not, til goaded by the British proclamation to the Danes and the menaced orders of Council of November, 1807, applied her *Berlin* decree *to us*, so now she does not execute by final decisions her *Milan* decree upon us, because we do not appear tamely to permit the long series of British orders of council against our neutral rights to pass without serious attempts at measures of redress. Americans! The way is clear before you. Continue to resist, tho' it be only by efficient pacific coercions, the original English aggressors, and their enemies on the European continent will not probably execute against you those injurious decrees, which *the evil example of England*, producing *an angry spirit of defensive retaliation*, had led them to adopt.

JURISCOLA.

* William Cobbet, whom the Pennsylvania democrats expelled by the coercion of the laws, from the city of Philadelphia in 1800, declares in the 11th volume of his Political Register, A. D. 1807, that he has read in the daily papers of the city of London fifty-seven public advertisements for the sale and purchase of seats in their *imperial* Parliament! These were all of his *Britannic* majesty's *most faithful* Commons! The *right* honorable the viscount *Melville* is, as we know, the recorded standard of the virtue of the Lords, spiritual, and temporal! Him, with all his blushing honors thickened on him, *his right reverend and right honorable peers* have declared to be innocent upon their *honors!* To complete the system, his imperial majesty of the united kingdoms retains the name of the virtuous *Melville* upon the list of *his most honorable* Privy Council, to aid him in the formation of those orders in council, *the letter* of which that independent prize judge, sir William Scott, has declared to be the rule of his court! Gracious Heaven! Can it be Timothy Pickering of 1776 and 1793, who *now avows* an ardent love for that government? Mark what Cobbett, (whom he well knew when President Adams removed him) says of this venal state of things. He gives it plainly to be understood in his own print, under the eyes of all the members of the three estates in Parliament, with all the common law terrors of "*contempts*" hanging over his head, that he can find "nothing more *disgraceful*, or more *damnable* than what is described *in these advertisements.*" If the French understood the X Y Z of corruption in the time of Chief Justice Marshall's embassy, it appears pretty certain, that England must understand the rest of the Alphabet. We might appeal even to *Cobbett*—"*Nothing* more *damnable*" than these overt corrupt sales of seats in the Imperial Parliament of the United Kingdoms of G. Britain and Ireland, says *Cobbett*, the apostle of the Pitt administration, to the Americans!

LOTTERY TICKETS

Just received and for SALE, *by Joseph Milligan, at J. March's book store George Town.*

*** A few Tickets in the Charitable Marine Society, which commences drawing in Baltimore on Wednesday the 24th inst.—present price of Tickets Five dollars, but will advance to 5 1 2 dollars before the drawing begins.

August 15—

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, AUGUST 15.

ELECTIONS.—The greatest exertions have been made by the opposition party to gain their point, at the election which took place on Thursday and Friday last in the state of N. Carolina. Amongst other equally absurd and wilful misrepresentations, the planters were told by printed handbills assiduously circulated on the eve of the election, that *salt* would be four or five dollars a bushel in the ensuing autumn from the effects of the embargo. Whoever is acquainted with the southern country, knows that salt is there an article of the first necessity; and may conceive the weight of such an assertion with the less opulent part of the community.

If by such artifices as this the people are to be "FEDERALISED," let those who thus atchieve their ends, enjoy all the honest pride which attaches to the possession of property acquired by swindling; for what is it but swindling to pass the base coin of falsehood under the dazzling exterior of truth.

But the yeomanry of N. Carolina—of America, are not to be thus deceived.

As yet, republicans may proudly boast that they owe not their popularity to artifice or misrepresentation. If they lose ground, the purity of their principles will forbid them to emulate the arts of their opponents to regain it.

We have heard the result of the election in one county in North Carolina, which (by a special law) takes place a week previous to the general election in the state. In this county (Granville) the three members chosen to the state legislature, are firm republicans. Granville is one of the three counties composing the Congressional district represented by Mr. MACON.

The votes given in this county for a member to Congress were as follow:

For Mr. Macon,	629
For any other person,	NONE.

INSANITY.

QUEM DEUS VULT PERDERE PRIUS DEMENTAT.

The following is from the Boston Repertory, a leading federal paper:

"If then we could not safely trade to France, were the embargo removed, it is to be continued because Bonaparte *commands* us not to trade with England: therefore it will be *perpetual*, says Mr. Jefferson, or we must have a *war with England* instead. That this is the intention of our government is now daily proved by acts, and by writings in the National Intelligencer, in which Mr. Jefferson is endeavoring to prepare the public mind for war with England, by every charge against that nation, that his VIRGINIAN HATRED* of commerce, or his French hatred of England can suggest, and by excusing every encroachment of France on our honor and independence."

* If we could believe that the writer of this is not yet deranged, we might recommend to his consideration an extract from Washington's farewell address—an authority which he will not dare to dispute, as he professes to venerate the memory of its author:—"In contemplating the causes which may disturb our union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterising parties by *geographical* discriminations—*Northern and Southern—Atlantic and Western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to *misrepresent the opinions* and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by *fraternal* affection."

The following paragraph is from the Boston Gazette:

"Does any man doubt that we shall be ordered, like Spain, to follow in the train of French vassalage; or believe that a time serving complaisance, such as her's *has been*, will induce our Emperor to permit even our own countrymen to be his prefects over us? Wherefore then is New England asleep? Wherefore does she submit to the oppression of ENEMIES IN THE SOUTH who are themselves slaves and would make us so? Have we no *Moses*, who is inspired by the God of our fathers, and will lead us out of Egypt?"

Comment on this article is unnecessary. It speaks volumes.