did not expect, he should settle his Washita lands and make society as pleasant as possible."

And this is the communication, which *added strength* to Mr. Smith's confidence in Mr. Burr! This is the communication, upon which Mr. Smith engaged his two sons to go as Burr's associates!

The attack upon Mexico was to be *in case* war should take place between Spain and the U. States. But is it possible, sir, that a man of Mr. Smith's understanding should *at that time*, and under these circumstances have given an instant of credit to that shallow pretence? If Mr. Swartwout, one of Burr's acknowledged associates, was ashamed of pretending to rely on this tale of contingent war, and frankly told the grand jury at Richmond, that they were to attack Mexico to be sure in case of a war with Spain; but if there had been *no* war *he* was ready to forget the law of the U. States against such expeditions. If commodore Truxton, a private citizen, smarting under the injuries which he conceived he had suffered from the administration, even in July, while the project was but in prospect, and not in actual execution, made his first and emphatical question, whether the government of the U. States was acquainted with it, and on being informed that they were not, instantly refused to have any concern with it; let me ask, whether in the last days of November, while Burr was persevering in his preparations after having been brought before a judicial court upon this very charge, and dismissed solely because a witness was absent, *a Senator of the United States*, receiving this communication from Burr himself, could possibly be the dupe of this pretence? Whether his first question ought not to have been that of Commodore Truxton. Is the Executive of the U. States informed of your designs? Is it possible, sir, that this disclosure of the intended Mexican invasion, could confirm the confidence of Mr. Smith, when it was the very thing for which the district attorney not three weeks before had entered the complaint against Mr. Burr, before the court of the U. States competent to try that offence? Is it possible that Mr. Burr's confession of his guilt should have been the confirmation of Mr. Smith's confidence? Yes, sir—So far as relates to the misdemeanor, to Mr. Smith's participation in the project for invading Mexico, his own affidavit on the 6th of Jan. 1807, is evidence, which in my mind, nothing can control. His engagement of his two sons to Mr. Burr, admits neither of denial nor of justification.

About ten days after this; on the second and third of December, Mr. Smith goes to Cynthiana, Frankfort, and Lexington, to purchase provisions, and to sell bills of exchange. Here he accidentally sees again Mr. Burr. Here he finds that Mr. Burr, is for the second time charged, and now before a grand jury with that very offence of preparing an expedition against Mexico, which in his confidential communication to Mr. Smith he had explicitly avowed. And Mr. Smith by the testimony of three of his own witnesses hurries away from the scene to avoid being subpœnaed as a witness, declaring that he knows nothing on the subject that could either criminate or justify Mr. Burr.

The first of these witnesses is Kelly, Mr. Smith's confidential agent and store keeper, at Cynthiana; of whose character as a man of uprightness and veracity, the most respectable attestations are produced. After stating the motive of Mr. Smith's going to Cynthiana, and thence to Lexington, Kelly's deposition, produced here by Mr. Smith himself, proceeds thus:

"He returned and informed me that on his arrival at Lexington he understood that the principal men with whom he wished to transact business were at Frankfort; that he was also informed that a prosecution the second time was commenced against col. Burr, and he Smith was told, that if it was known he was in the state he would be subpœnaed as a witness—that he told his informers he would not put them to the trouble to summon him, if he had a fresh horse he would go on there immediately—finding he could not see the men he wished to see, he started for Frankfort—that on his arrival there he enquired for major Morrison, I think he said in two or three public houses, but could not find him; that he was informed the investigation into Burr's conduct before the grand jury was delayed for want of gen. Adair, who was said to be a principal witness against him, and that in all probability proceedings would be staid for several days, and as he (Smith) could not be detained so long from his business particularly as he *knew nothing that would either criminate or exculpate col. Burr*—that if his testimony could be of any benefit either way he would have staid with pleasure, but *as he was entirely ignorant of any of Burr's political views*, he conceived to stay there for no purpose would be doing injustice to his private as well as his public concerns, and therefore as he was not summoned he started away early next morning."

Mr. Jordan's deposition, after relating Mr. Smith's application to him respecting the bills of exchange, says:—"The conversation then turned on the pending trial of Colonel Burr; and I mentioned that I had been called on as a witness; and observed that Burr had also been at your house; and was it known that you were in this place, that you would also be called on. You said you was willing; *that you knew nothing of the business*; but as you could not get your business accomplished here; that if you had a fresh horse you would go to see major Morrison, and save them any trouble of subpoenaing you."

The deposition of Joseph Taylor is to the same effect; that Mr. Smith denied all knowledge of any thing which could operate either for or against Mr. Burr.

Now, sir, how was the fact? Was Mr. Smith thus ignorant? It seems to me that he was not. The disclosure which on the 23d of November, he himself has sworn Mr. Burr had made to him in confidence, was knowledge of the most decisive character on the question before the grand jury, was knowledge, which had Mr. Smith been even a private citizen, he was bound in duty to have gone and related to them. Admitting even that Mr. Smith could have believed, that Burr intended the Mexican invasion, only in case a war should break out; still the preparations he was making were unlawful; still he was guilty of the very charge made against him then before the grand jury; and had confidentially avowed the object to Mr. Smith. Had Mr. Smith gone before that grand jury, and told them from the lips of Mr. Burr, what the affidavit of 6th January, 1807, declares upon oath; that grand jury instead of dismissing Mr. Burr as they did, with commendation and applause, would have been bound, with the oath of God upon their consciences to find a bill against him. The confession of Mr. Burr unquestionably brought him within the operation of the statute upon which he was prosecuted, and I cannot but attribute to Mr. Smith's studious avoidance of attending upon that grand jury, all the unfortunate, and I may say calamitous consequences which have befallen this nation, from the failure of bringing Burr to justice at that time. Had he then been indicted on Mr. Smith's testimony alone, he must have been convicted. The alarms, the agitations, the extraordinary and irregular stretches of power at New-Orleans, which have distressed every free and patriotic heart, would have been needless; would have been prevented. The progress of that pernicious enterprise would have been arrested there. The whole judicial authority of the United States would not have been laid prostrate before the wiles of conspiracy. There would have been no trial; no occasion for a trial at Richmond; treason would have been nipped in the bud, and Mr. Smith himself would at this day have been here, in the full enjoyment of his reputation, with the consciousness of having rendered a service of the highest importance to his country. But, sir, unfortunately for him; unfortunately for us; unfortunately for his country, he had engaged his two sons to Mr. Burr. He could not testify against Burr without condemning himself, and he shrunk from the presence of the grand jury.

Ten days after this the President's proclamation and Governor Tiffin's orders for the militia to be called out, both arrived on the same day, the 13th of December, at Cincinnati; and from that time Mr. Smith's exertions to carry into effect the orders both of the General and the state government were characterised with great and extraordinary zeal. But even then he writes to the Secretary at War a narrative not exactly conformable to that afterwards contained in the answer to the committee—In the answer Mr. Smith declares repeatedly that all his *doubts* and *suspicions* about Mr. Burr, had been removed by his open hearted candid letter of 26th Oct. In the letter to the Secretary at War, he speaks of himself as harboring so strong suspicions on Burr's subsequent visit to Cincinnati in November, as then to have *asked* him *pointedly* if any object he had in view justified the suspicions which prevailed about him, and that from Mr. Burr's apparent candor in answering this question, he Smith, entertained no doubt of him. Now this apparent candor, was an acknowledgement of the very same undertaking which the President's proclamation called upon the people to suppress. The proclamation had no reference to the part of Burr's project which aimed at the dismemberment of the Union—it was the intended invasion of Mexico, which it extended the arm of the nation to restrain—the very expedition upon which Mr. S. had engaged his two sons—How was it possible that this disclosure of an unlawful design, could have restored the confidence and received the countenance of Mr. Smith? It is this, with the circumstances attending it, and which I have noticed, that render Mr. Smith himself the most material of all the witnesses against him. The letter, I have shewn, contained little to remove, and much, very much to excite suspicion. The avowal of the intended march to Mexico was an avowal of guilt—Mr. Smith does not pretend that Mr. Burr hinted to him that the design was approved by the government—the bitterness with which he spoke of the government, was surely of itself an indication to the contrary. Did not Mr. Smith know that this was an unlawful enterprise? Could he have been ignorant of this before; the first prosecution in Kentucky must surely have given him sufficient notice of that. Before he engaged his two sons, ought he not to have enquired how the Washita settlement was to be made? How the same preparations could be transformed at pleasure from purposes of war to purposes of agriculture? How the same men and the same things could possibly be applied to the invasion of one country and the settlement of another? By what magic they were to beat their swords into ploughshares, and their pruning hooks into spears? Even Peter Taylor, the stupid Peter Taylor, as Mr. Smith has pronounced, and his council endeavored to prove him—even Peter Taylor, when Blannerhassett attempted to engage *him* for the Washita settlement, enquired what kind of *seed* they should carry with them? Nor would he be satisfied with Blannerhassett's evasions of this question, but urged him with it until he forced out the whole project; the Mexican Empire—the royal diadem of Mr. Burr, and the dismemberment of the American Union. Peter Taylor was indeed as Mr. Smith says a gardner. He certainly cannot in point of understanding be compared with Mr. Smith. Yet even he could bethink himself of the articles which would be suitable for his agency in a settlement of lands—even he could discern the difference between garden seeds & gun-powder; and yet Mr. Smith a Senator of the U. States, a settler in a new country, a confidential and intimate friend of Mr. Burr, engaged his two sons for an amphibious expedition of settlement or war, without putting a single question to ascertain how these schemes of contrariety could be reconciled together; without one single enquiry, which could lead to a colorable pretence of right for the warlike part of the plan—preparations for war! Levying of troops! Was a Senator of the United States to wait for the President's Proclamation to learn the unlawfulness, or the danger to the liberties of this country of such enterprises, undertaken without public authority—Was he yet to learn that the power of making war, and of raising soldiers, has been deemed by the people of this nation, of such magnitude and danger, that they would not entrust them to the Executive authority, but have expressly and cautiously reserved them exclusively to the representatives of the nation assembled in Congress? And until the declaration of war, by Congress, he surely knew that every preparation of expeditions to invade the territories of a neighboring sovereign, was even in the incipient stage of beginning and setting on foot, in direct violation of the laws of the land? The pretence that it was to be pursued only in case war should take place, did not make it at all more lawful; but made it if any thing more dangerous. Suppose, Sir, that war, had been declared—was it for Aaron Burr to say, who should *head* corps of volunteers, or who should be *the first* to march into the Mexican provinces? Entertaining the opinion that I do and then did of Mr. Burr, I should have considered it as one of the greatest misfortunes which could have befallen the U. States, even if they were at war, to have had such a man as him at the head of their armies—nor can I consider it but as highly unbecoming in a member of the National Legislature to have given him countenance in this project of forcing himself upon the government of the Union, as the general of an army for the invasion of Mexico. It was encouraging and aiding a violation of the constitution in its vital principles. It was setting an example more to be dreaded by the people of this Union than the most formidable foreign war. And of all this Mr. Smith himself is the self-accusing witness. All the other witnesses, are but in confirmation and aggravation, of these decisive facts. Some of them indicate circumstances of very strong suspicions, that Mr. Smith's participation was much earlier and much deeper. Other strikingly demonstrate that he was acting under a consciousness of unlawful engagements; and all concur in producing upon my mind the conviction that this resolution ought to pass.

Mr. President, I have discharged a painful obligation. No discussion has ever devolved upon me, as a member of this body, in which I have taken a part with more reluctance than in this. Until these transactions occurred, there was perhaps not another member of the Senate in whose integrity I more confided; and but for this there is none whom I should more readily take by the hand as a friend and a brother. I trust, sir, that I feel as I ought, for his personal situation, on this occasion; as well as for the interests and the feelings of his family. I am sensible, and have never lost sight of what is due from me to him as members of this assembly. But there is also a duty to the character and reputation of this body—a duty to the state, whose representation on this floor has been in part entrusted to him; and a duty to the whole nation whose public servants we are. In the discharge of these duties, I have felt myself compelled to submit these observations to the Senate; and with these I shall conclude.

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, JULY 22.

The PRESIDENT of the UNITED STATES left the City on Wednesday for Monticello.

The *Secretary* of the *Treasury* has also left the city for New-York.

The government schooner Hope, capt. Woodward sailed yesterday. She carries out two messengers, capt. Haley to France, and Mr. Atwater to England. Capt. Haley will be landed at Havre-de-Grace, while Mr. Atwater will repair to England. On the return of capt. Haley from Paris, the Hope will sail for England, whence she will return to this place with capt. Haley and Mr. Atwater.

We have received a number of very interesting official statements of the EXPORTS and IMPORTS of Great Britain, lately laid before Parliament; discriminating those to and from the United States, and the value of foreign and colonial merchandize from that of British produce and manufactures exported. These documents will enable us to lay before our readers, with great precision, several important views of the relative trade of Britain and this country, and of the effects likely to be produced on the former by her orders of council.

We shall, in the first place, publish as most interesting, a comparative statement of the whole exports from Britain of the following articles, & the exports of the same articles to the U. States. We have taken the year ending the 5th of Jan. 1807, as preferable to the succeeding year, which is affected in some measure by the orders of council. The materials we possess only supplying the *official value* of the exports generally from Great Britain, we have been obliged to calculate their *real value*, which we have been enabled to do from possessing both the official and real value of the exports of the same articles to the United States; the proportion in one case holding good in the other. This circumstance has obliged us to omit one item, formed of articles other than those specified, which, however, do not much exceed half a million sterling. All the other exports to the United States are given. The first column gives the value of British produce and manufactures generally; the second the value of those to the U. S.

	£. STERLING.	£. STERLING.
Brass and Copper Manufactures	654,000	82,142
Cotton Goods	13,810,000	4,645,739
Glass and Earthen ware	750,000	175,526
Haberdashery	1,256,000	313,764
Hats	567,000	99,260
Iron and Steel	3,336,000	684,678
Lead	378,000	44,619
Linens	1,165,000	289,044
Salt	248,390	84,689
Silk Manufactures	751,000	425,165
Tin and Pewter	378,000	79,189
Woollens	10,154,000	4,866,178
	33,647,590	11,809,993

1. It thus appears to be the necessary effect of the British Orders to destroy the trade of England to the extent of twelve millions sterling of the usual export of her produce and manufactures to the United States; for it has been clearly shewn that if we are prohibited from carrying our produce to an European market, we shall not be able to purchase British manufactures.

2. The twelve millions of her manufactures and produce, whose exportation to this country is thus inhibited, amount to nearly one third of her whole exports of British manufactures and produce, as appears by these official documents.

3. But the most important consideration is, that the foregoing articles are principally such as we can do without, or soon fabricate for ourselves, in sufficient quantities for our real wants. Of these, cotton and woollen goods constitute nearly four fifths of the whole. Of one we have the raw material in the greatest abundance, and of the other we can in two years obtain a full supply, by which time, if the present spirit continues, we shall be able to manufacture all the goods of these descriptions absolutely requisite for our comfort.

Brass and copper manufactures will be equally in our power; and those of glass and earthen ware even more so; as well as those of iron and steel, of lead, of tin and pewter. This will be still more the case with hats and salt. The other articles are either inconsiderable in amount, or the demand for them will be greatly reduced by the frugality of our habits or the substitution of other fabrics. For instance silks, which are brought to us to nearly the value of two millions of dollars, may be easily exchanged for cottons.

Supposing then Britain to persist in her injustice towards us, and our manufactures to progress, as progress they must, and our habits of dress to undergo a material change, what will be the effect on her and on us?

The evil to us will be light, and to her most serious, from the relative unimportance of commerce to us, and from its all-importance to her.

Light as it will be to us it will be *temporary*, while on her, its effects will *be durable*. At worst, it will only, in some measure perhaps, prematurely, have approximated us to that state of things which before long must at all events have taken place; while it will have deprived her of a great and growing market for her manufactures, which, instead of expanding with her increasing capacity to supply our wants, will sustain a positive and rapid diminution.

INSANITY.

QUEM DEUS VULT PERDERE, PRIUS DEMENTAT.

Under this head we propose, from time to time, to amuse our readers with the ravings of federalism—not that honest federalism, which however it may err in political theory, is always right when the great interests of the nation are at stake; but that species of federalism, which in times like these is so lost to patriotism as to be the apologist nay advocate of those who inflict upon her the deadliest wrongs. These notices will be of some importance as shewing the trash taken from American prints, with which the British ministerial papers abound, and which tend to give the British nation the falsest impressions of our character and measures.

The following article is from the New York Evening Post—"Thus, only give these patriots office, and they care not who or what is President. Let him but be a republican, and give all the offices to republicans, and he may be, as great a scoundrel as disgraces the earth. *Will the people never be convinced of the baseness of these wretches?*"

The more we reflect on the baseness of those Americans, who, in the present circumstances of their country, stoop to the degradation of carrying on a trade under British licences, the more we feel the wound inflicted on our national character, and the necessity of healing it either by the force of public opinion or legal coercion, or both. Were Congress now in session we have no doubt but that they would take immediate measures for putting an end to a traffic, which goes directly to destroy the end intended to be answered by the embargo—the security of our property on the ocean; to debase the national character by the most abject submission to iniquitous power, and to widen our differences with foreign powers. It was, probably, with a foresight of the possible occurrence of these evils, and with a sense of the disgrace they would bring upon