National Intelligencer.

& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. 1213.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1808. *PAID IN ADVANCE.*

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1808.

Mr. Adams's speech on exclusion of Mr. Smith, concluded.

The conversation to which colonel James Taylor alludes, occurs within a very few days after the departure of Mr. Burr from Mr. Smith's house, at this period. The subject of that conversation was the separation of the states. Mr. Smith takes pains to circulate that *Queries* which was to settle the seeds of disunion throughout the Union, emanated from Mr. Burr's suggestions as his own; and adds others of the same tendency to substitute effects. Mr. Smith supposes that these doctrines however obnoxious then, *In less than two years would become orthodox.* Is there no knowledge and participation in Burr's projects on the face of these expressions? We do not know but they were speculative opinions—and we hear complaints that a man should be held accountable for his political speculations. But when speculative opinions are associated with military preparations, and a formidable conspiracy, the very process of execution, then, sir, they assumes a very different complexion, from that of free and legitimate discussion. Speculative opinions, at all times have been in all ages, were sacred, practice, that I hold it not very justifiable in a man vested with public trust, to speak in terms of approbation, of a dismemberment of this union, upon any contingency, or at any distance of time. We ought to deprecate this greatest of all possible calamities, for our posterity as well as for ourselves. Yet, I acknowledge, that even these dangerous opinions, when merely speculative may be expressed without evil intentions, and ought not to draw the weight of public censure, upon the person uttering them. In the form of a decision of this body. It is to the time, the occasion, the circumstance upon which this speculative opinion was divulged, which display it as evidence of Mr. Smith's participation in Burr's conspiracy against the Union.

We have followed the course of events until the close of September, about which time Blannerhassett follows Mr. Burr into Kentucky. In the interval and the following two months the preparations and conversations of both these personages; the movements of the Queries, and certain publications of an opposite character, which appeared in another Newspaper called the Western World, half round the solstices, the anxiety, the resentments of the people in that part of the Union to the highest degree. About the 20th of October Mrs. Blannerhassett visits Mr. Smith's at *Cincinnati*; and there he was to be told where Burr and Blannerhassett were to be found. At this time it was no longer safe to inculcate the dissolution of the states. The people, I think, would not, yet, not to be deluded by Mr. Burr's mode or by any other mode of effecting a disunion. Surely, I think, it was not to be deluded by Mr. Burr's mode or by any other mode of effecting a disunion. Surely, I think, it was not advisable for Mr. Smith to appear so intimate with Burr, as to know where he was to be found, and, it might also be necessary for him to have the ostensible object of Burr's movements. For this reason, he says that when Burr was with with him in September he had talked much of the prosperity of the Mississippi, yet at that time the purchase was not made.

Mr. Smith of the state of things at that time will explain the particulars of Peter Taylor's testimony. When he "arrives at Mr. Smith's and enquires for Burr and Blannerhassett, Mr. S. says that he knows nothing of either of them." That Taylor must be mistaken—that was not the place—but finding Taylor to be Blannerhassett's servant, he tells him "he expected they were at Lexington, at the house of a Mr. Jouett." Now, sir, that does this detail in the first instance that he knew any thing of them, and this pointing so precisely where they were they were where they were to be found, indicate? The council for Mr. Smith says that Taylor was sent there for Mr. Burr's great co—nothing of that appears in the evidence, but from Taylor's declaration it appears that he was sent there, to ascertain where Burr and Blannerhassett were to be found; that Mr. Smith at first denied knowing where they were, but afterwards told him the very house in Lexington where he was to go for them. At the time of Taylor's coming to Mr. Smith was to enquire where Burr and Blannerhassett were, and as before he left the house Mr. Smith gave him a letter for Burr, under cover to Blannerhassett, it is impossible to doubt that the object of Taylor's coming was to that respect; that Mr. Smith told him where to go. The inference is irresistible. Taylor had no knowledge where they were, and this express denial of that knowledge to a man, who, if he was not a stranger, is a proof that even then Mr. Smith knew much more than he was willing to tell.

The remainder of Peter Taylor's evidence, is to the effect Mr. Smith all concurs to establish the same fact. Mr. Smith's anxious enquiries for the time and place where he was, and what was said about General Wilkinson, the change to Peter Taylor to go to Burr, the Queries, Mr. Wilkinson, with the then situation of Burr and Blannerhassett. Recollect the passage in Burr's letter to Wilkinson, "Let the contractor orders to furnish six months provisions for a thousand men." Recollect the passage in Burr's letter, that "I shall be used only at the last moment, and then under proper principles."

Mr. Smith has at one time denied all the material facts attested by Peter Taylor; and he attempted to disguise his character; as little has he been born out by his own evidence now produced, that he positively admits the very facts he had denied. The same course has been pursued with regard to Mr. Taylor's testimony. Mr. Smith, sir, this treatment of the witnesses is not calculated to inspire confidence, in the minds of Mr. Smith's defence. Unfounded attacks upon the character of a respectable witness, not only confirm facts, aggravate the weight of his testimony.

It however the testimony of Peter Taylor be not sufficient to convict, it will be found in the substance of the letter itself, of which he was the bearer, which he was to deliver, and, in the these two documents I now ask the particular attention of the Senate. The proclamation is dated 13 October, and says—"I beg leave to inform you that we have to this quarter various objects of public delicacy to our country. It is believed by many that our design is to dismember the union; allegations of this nature that I have heard my object be what it may, that the tranquility of the country will be disturbed, and that it will be rashly disclosed, which I solicit, and to which I presume you will have no objection. Thus for the answer to the solicitude manifested in this letter? It is not so much so, Mr. Burr's object should be disclosed, as that it should be declared not to be the dismemberment of the union. It asks for something which may be *said*, to prevent the tranquility of the country from being interrupted. And if very explicitly declaration what must be *denied*. It is an answer of a very peculiar kind which appears to be made in an answer contained in the letter itself. A voucher is wanted to deny the project for dismembering the union; and it speak with the levity of the ostensible object. This was the settlement of the Washington. Mr. Smith in one of his narratives says that Burr had talked with him on this subject in September before; but the purchase of the lands was not then concluded. It was uncertain whether that could now be spoken of as the professed purpose, and Mr. Smith's letter was well adapted to obviate that certainty.

Mr. Burr's answer appears perfectly, by have understood the object of these enquiries. Much has been said by Mr. Smith about the apparent *frankness and candor* of his letter; and on this document he relies with great emphasis, as a complete justification of all his conversations and conduct in Mr. Burr. To-day, sir, there is a very different aspect. Considering it to be the file of an answer to the solicitude of a man altogether unconscious of Burr's real designs, and aware of the extremely suspicious appearances in which the conduct of Mr. Burr was involved; this answer appears to be calculated for any thing, rather than to restore confidence. To restore it, it should have been attempted to stand on some of its most remarkable passages.

Mr. Burr says, "If there exists any design injurious to the union from the eastern states, I am totally ignorant of it. I never hatched or expressed any such intention to any one nor did any person ever intimate such design to me. Indeed I have no conception of any object in which such a measure could be promoted, except *by operating on the minds of the people*, and decisively I say that under no circumstances, I have never written or published a line on this subject, nor ever expressed any other sentiment than those which you may have heard from such public companies as I have spoken to and which are *known to you concerned.*"

The remarkable feature is the following, "I know Mr. Smith—" J. Smith, and Blannerhassett, Burr and others say emphatically that the dismemberment of the United States would compromit two different governments."—Mr. Smith, I know him.

I have no political view whatever; those which I entertained some years ago, I have long since completely mortified to you, have been abandoned."

It is somewhat note by Mr. Smith, —" J. Smith presumes that Mr. Burr refers to an invitation to settle in Tennessee, of which he heard him speak." The letter proceeds.

"Having bought of col. Lynch, four hundred thousand acres of land in the Washita, I propose to send thither this fall, a number of settlers; in proportion as I shall see, or hear, of certain time, to be paid in land and found and provisions for the time they labor. Amongst my very select, I Breckinridge, Adair, and Fowler, have separately and in one that was the strong desire of the administration that American settlers should go into that quarter, yourself and *his friends* I should be grateful to the government. *I have some other views which are personal and which I have not yet, nor shall I, any objection to state to you personally but which I do not deem it necessary to write.* I have *projects* which *may affect the interests of the United States it would be less faithful, yet I have reasons that are sufficient determinations have led me to this speculation, but merely the interest and comfort of my family and friends.*

And finally, there is the following marginal admission:" It may be an idle speculation, but I never write for publication."

Thus you see, sir, that the design of which you have heard, is stated in terms as capable, as Mr. Smith's letter had desired, not with how much regard to truth, but with the evidence of evidence, Richmond, has sufficiently proved. The purchase of the Washita lands, Mr. Burr stated to have been completed. Thus for the answer is precisely such as the letter seemed to ask. But the note is darkness and obscurity. The caution against publication was itself not naturally suited to the occasion, and it is one of those things, you may show tale letter, but you must not publish it. The distinction is very fine, and it is not unintelligible, that Mr. Smith has found it necessary to make them clear to the public. There is a reference to former conversations on the subject of a separation of the western states, from the U. S. in Kentucky, filed a complaint against Mr. Burr, for a violation of the laws of the U. S. in setting on foot an expedition against Mexico which complaint I beg leave to read—

"Mr. Dawson, counsel for the said United States in and for said district, upon his corporal oath doth depose and say, that the deponent is informed and doth verily believe, that a certain Aaron Burr, esq. late Vice President of the said United States for several months past hath been and is now engaged in preparing and setting on foot, and in providing and preparing the means for a military expedition and enterprise, within this district, for the purpose of carrying into effect a scheme of a dismemberment of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and making war upon the subjects of the King of Spain, who are now in a state of peace with the people of the United States, to wit: on the province of Mexico, on the westwardly side of Louisiana, which happens and belongs to the King of Spain, an European prince, with whom the United States are at peace.

"And said deponent further saith, that he is informed and fully believes, that the above charge can and will be fully substantiated by evidence, provided this honorable court will grant compulsory process to bring in witnesses to testify thereto."

"And this deponent further saith, that he is informed and verily believes that the agents and emissaries of the said Burr, have purchased up and are continuing to purchase large quantities of provisions as if for an army, while the said Burr seeks to conceal the great mystery from the people at large his purposes and projects! and while the thousands of the good people of this district seem agitated with the current rumor, that a military expedition against Mexico, is actually preparing or preparing by said Aaron Burr.

"Wherefore said suppoeny, on behalf of said United States, that due process issue to compel the personal appearance of the said Aaron Burr in this court, and also to bring witnesses as may be necessary in behalf of the said U. States; and that this honorable court will duly recognize said Aaron Burr, to answer such charge as may be preferred against him in the premises. And that means time that he desist and refrain from all further preparations and proceedings in the said armament within the said U. S. or the territories or dependencies thereof."

It will be remembered that on this complaint a Grand Jury was summoned, and on the 13th of October discharged, because Davis Floyd, whom the attorney deemed a material witness, and which was proved to have been one of Mr. Burr's principal associates, was absent. We all know what the effect of this disunion was here. Certainly not of inspiring *confidence* in those who were engaged with Mr. Burr's real designs.

No, sir! The confidence, which this abortive attempt to bring Mr. Burr to justice inspired, was in himself and his associates. He wrote immediately to Blannerhassett, not to approach any subpoena, or process prosecution, (which his friends then said so long after called a prosecution) but *delay* in the settlement of the lands—and one fortnight after—that is on the twenty-second of October, we see him again at Cincinnati, making the promised personal and confidential communication to Mr. Smith, which he had not dared in the letter of 24th Oct. to commit to paper—and he wrote, for it is a complete and unquestionable acknowledgement of the identical crime for which Mr. Burr had been summoned into court at Frankfort, not twenty days before, and discharged merely upon the failure of a material witness. But it is not merely a confession of *the guilt*, it imports much more; and every reader of the letter to Mr. Smith, relating it, in his abstract of the fact, that's show that he understood it, as imposing upon Mr. Smith, Mr. Smith, that his design "is not disinhonorable, or *inimical* to this government" and that *he is hostile to the people of the United States in Mexico*, "*and that he is not a traitor to his country*" Whether the design was honorable or dishonorable, Mr. Smith could have judged for himself. That it was not inimical to this government, there was time enough to him to believe when coupled with those boiling resentments which overflowed from the lips of Mr. Burr in the very act of making this acknowledgement. In this interval he had been persuaded, misunderstanding, that the people of this state, and the government of the United States, would be between the U. States and Spain, he, *Burr, should, head a corps of volunteers, amounting to a march to the Mexican territories*, peace should be preserved, which