

# WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE.

MONDAY, AUGUST 5, 1868.

No. 1223.

PAID IN ADVANCE.

VOL. VIII.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

### BY AUTHORITY.

An act concerning the Corporation of George Town.

**BE it enacted** by the First and Second Chambers of the City Council of Washington, That the Mayor and Corporation of George Town be and they are hereby authorized to build and erect such abutments or other works as they may deem necessary for the erection of a Bridge across Rock creek at the termination of M street south with said creek.

**Sec. 2.** *Be it enacted*, That the said Mayor and Corporation shall fix the abutment in the centre of D street and grade the abutment on said street, and such other streets as they may improve under the direction of the city Surveyor and make use of such improvements as they may deem necessary.

APPROVED, JULY 27, 1868.

An act making an appropriation for the repair of the Causeway leading to the Bridge over Lake creek in Seventh street, and for other purposes.

**BE it enacted** by the First and Second Chambers of the City Council of Washington, That for building a stone wall on the west side of the causeway recently laid down west, commencing on the end of the second tier of logs from the Bridge and extending the causeway to the south end of the first, and other repairs, the sum of one hundred dollars be, and the same is hereby appropriated.

**Sec. 2.** *Be it enacted*, That for repairing Seventh street west from the said Causeway to intersect the Maryland avenue, the sum of seventy-five dollars be and the same is hereby appropriated.

APPROVED, AUGUST 5, 1868.

An act to prevent members of the Council from holding offices in the Corporation to which a salary is attached.

**BE it enacted** by the First and Second Chambers of the City Council of Washington, That after the thirtieth day of July 1868, it shall not be lawful for any member of the First or Second Chamber of the City Council to hold any office or place to which a salary or compensation is attached under the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Washington.

**Sec. 2.** *Be it enacted*, That for every day after the thirtieth of July one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four any member of either branch of the city council of Washington shall not accept any place or office to which a salary or compensation is attached under the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Washington, nor shall he receive any salary or compensation therefor.

APPROVED, JULY 30, 1868.

An act to amend in part an act requiring annual returns to be made by Notaries and Ordinary Clerks, and for the keeping of Clerks' and Notaries' Tables.

**BE it enacted** by the First and Second Chambers of the City Council of Washington, That so much of an act entitled "An act requiring annual returns to be made by Notaries and Ordinary Clerks, and for the keeping of Clerks' and Notaries' Tables," as requires annual Returns to be taken out for the keeping of private carriages, and the same is hereby repealed.

**Sec. 2.** *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be the duty of the City Commissioners on or before the first day of January next, and annually thereafter, to cause a return to the Treasurer, of the number and weight of private carriages retained within the city describing the kind of carriage possessed by their respective owners.

APPROVED, AUGUST 5, 1868.

### READ IN SENATE.

**T**HAT the subscriber has obtained from the Ordnance Court of Washington a quantity of Colburn's Spectacles, all persons having claims against the said Spectacles, are hereby notified to exhibit the same with the vouchers thereon to the subscriber on or before the 15th day of February next, after which date he will be excluded from all benefit of the same.

Given under my hand this 11th day of August.

OSWALD GILSON, Adm.

### SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

April 9.

### CASE OF JOHN SMITH.

Mr. ANGELO said, when he moved the postponement of this business for ten days before yesterday, it was from a desire to collate the testimony; which having done, he was prepared to vote when he first took his seat this morning, and had not intended to have taken any part in the discussion of the subject, but seeing that almost all the strong points of circumstantial testimony had been either overlooked or but slightly appreciated by the gentleman, Mr. Hillhouse (Mr. Giles) who had spoken against the adoption of the resolution; and who had withdrawn well, he returned into the discussion—he felt himself bound as a member of the committee to whom the case of Mr. Smith had been referred, to examine some of the prominent points of the evidence, and to present it impartially to the view of the Senate. Mr. A. said, in the course of his examination of the evidence he had seen, as the gentleman who preceded him had done, entirely discarded the testimony of Elias Glover, but should repeat that in his opinion it is in proper place, as one of the ground work of his observations, and support by Mr. Smith's own admissions, and by his admissions of parts of it, in his answer to the committee. Mr. A. said, in order to leave a necessary record of his proceedings, he would state the substance of parts of the testimony; as, by comparing and comparing the same with the facts as they are understood; and he would begin with the evidence of Peter Taylor, (as being the first in order) who testified on the 10th month of October, 1866, he was sent by Mr. Blannerhassett to Lexington after Mr. Barr, who was sent there to prevent Col. Burr from coming back with him to the island; that he was ordered to call at Mr. John Smith's house, that he called at Mr. Smith's store and asked for him; when he came out, that he was sent to Mr. Blannerhassett; Mr. Smith said he knew nothing of either of them; that he thought he mistook the place, where he was to enquire, Taylor said he was right; that he was directed to enquire for John Smith, and he did not recollect a young man that had come out of Col. Burr's store, (great crowd) who informed Mr. Smith he had lived with Blannerhassett three years; and that he thought he had lived with him, he took him up stairs and asked him the names; wanted to know if he knew the gentleman from Virginia (General Wilkinson); and if he Taylor would carry a letter from him to Blannerhassett, which he agreed to. Mr. Smith then informed Taylor that he would find Burr and Blannerhassett at the house of Mr. John Smith, at Lexington, where he found Mr. Burr, who among many other enquiries, asked what letters he had. Taylor replied he had two, one from Mr. Blannerhassett and one from John Smith of Cincinnati; the letter from John Smith he did not read, but he said it was directed to Blannerhassett; and if Mr. Smith's opening it, he found it contained a letter from Burr, which he recited some parts of the testimony of Peter Taylor; I shall proceed to make some observations on the evidence, but let me premise, that the general character of Peter Taylor has been before the Senate, and that he is a man of high repute at Richmond; and on a recent enquiry into his veracity and general character, the course of his testimony, which has not, in the course of these arguments attempted to invalidate it; but has contained some mistakes with pointing out some small mistakes that have not, in the best degree, lessened the credit of his testimony. With this fair character, then, does Peter Taylor stand before you, and his testimony may receive the sanction of credit which is due to established veracity. But notwithstanding the respectability of Peter Taylor, it is not his testimony which is the ground work of Mr. Smith's answer to the committee. I desire almost every thing that has been said by Peter Taylor to be forgotten, and that he be believed either that Peter Taylor, with all his fair fame of character, and totally disinterestedness in the case, has, respecting the conversation with Mr. Smith, or that Mr.

Smith in his answer to the committee, has so delicately but so fully endeavored to trace, which we are to believe? I shall make no comment; every member of the Senate can only be his own opinion for himself upon this subject as I could possibly express. Let us now examine the testimony of Peter Taylor against Mr. Smith. Taken by itself, although it may excite strong suspicion, perhaps to great criminality could attach to it; but combine it with many other circumstances, and it wears a different aspect. I pass over the extraordinary conversation between Mr. Smith and Peter Taylor, and come to the question asked by Mr. Smith. What was said about Gen. Wilkinson? Why is the name of Gen. Wilkinson introduced by Mr. Smith? The Senate will recollect, that in the decepted letter written by Col. Burr to Gen. Wilkinson, which was read yesterday by the hon. chairman of the committee (Mr. Adams) was the following: "I will supply provisions, to be sent to such points as Wilkinson may direct, for the outfit of the contractor for supplying the army; and a strong inference would here arise that he was the person mentioned in the letter." Mr. Smith's question to Peter Taylor, what is said about Gen. Wilkinson? And this question, which is so full of insinuation, that there take them into his charge—he having asserted him, that he, Burr, had been well for several years, and that Burr would have the gunboats he was then building. Mr. Smith in his deposition sent to the President, after the trial of Blannerhassett, and shortly after, when he found Taylor was a domestic of Blannerhassett, he directed Taylor to the house in Lexington where he would find Col. Burr; and they certainly excite a strong impression, that Mr. Smith had a knowledge of Col. Burr's plans and movements. It will be recollected that Mr. Smith introduced a letter for him to Blannerhassett; but from the testimony of Taylor it appears that the contents of this letter and the answer thereto, are presented to us, and from them arguments have been made to prove that Mr. Smith is entirely innocent—but the very able exculpation, which had been given of Burr, does not seem to have been attempted to be given to the contents of this letter and the answer thereto, by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Giles). Which will be one point of some importance, which Mr. Smith though virtually does not absolutely deny, but evidently intends to deny in the view of the committee. It is in that part of Mr. Smith's testimony respecting the gunboats which is supported by the letter of the Accountant of the Navy in answer to one from the Chairman of the committee, which accounts for why Mr. Smith had previous to November, 1866, built two gunboats for the U. States; that from the evidence given the plan, there arose a difficulty in fixing a proper valuation. Glover says that he told him that he had been treated about them at Washington. It is not how could Glover ever have done so, were he not a man of great delicacy about Mr. Smith's gunboats which he built for government. If Mr. S. himself had not communicated it, there is no great credit in this communication, but it certainly tends to prove substantially the same as was before the Senate by Mr. Smith. Thus, I conceive, have several important and material parts of the testimony of Elias Glover been supported, and so far as circumstantial testimony can tend to establish the testimony of Elias Glover, he is filled by it.

It has been attempted to show, that the testimony of Elias Glover, Mr. Smith, and affidavits to which effect have been produced, from which it is inferred that no such conversation between them could have taken place between them. In the deposition of General Adams, it is stated that Mr. Smith had known of Burr's plan in an electronic conversation made by Mr. Smith

even the very facts which are fully corroborated by Mr. Smith's own admission on oath—No, Mr. President, I look around, and observe that the plan of the gunboats, which, at the time, has been much accustomed to compare positive swearing of a strong character of veracity. I have not a doubt, but that each of those different kinds of evidence, will be duly and deliberately estimated, and will proceed to give weight to the material parts of Elias Glover's testimony, and will afterwards compare those parts with Mr. Smith's own affidavit. In Mr. S's deposition he states that on the 23d Nov. he, in company with a friend (Gris Friend) appears to be William McFarland) went to Mr. Smith's, and had a conversation with him, in which Mr. S. stated that Mr. B. had disclosed to him his objects, which he had never fully done before—which was, in the first place, should a war take place between the U. S. and Spain, to head a corps of volunteers, and march into the Mexican provinces—that a great number of enterprising young men were ready to follow him, and that his preparations on the western waters were extensive—that the plan had been fully matured, and that he had full confidence in Burr's success. Mr. S. said that his own views were formed in a few days; that he was likewise convinced. I shall take a very short view of Mr. Smith's journey to Frankfort, at the time the conversation which has been stated to have taken place at Mr. Smith's, was made, and which he had: Some business led Mr. S. to Lexington, where he was informed of Mr. Smith's conversation with Mr. B. known he, S. was there, he would be summoned as a witness against Burr, and he was accordingly summoned at that time arranged at Frankfort. Mr. S. said he was willing, he knew not the exact date. A similar conversation passed between Mr. S. and Mr. Kelly, by which it appears that Mr. S. was informed of Mr. B. on his own business; that for want of General Adm. J. Burr's delay in the grand jury was testified by Mr. Smith, but he was not to be detained at Frankfort from his business, particularly as he knew not whether he would either embrace or refrain Col. Burr. Thus we see Mr. Smith denying any knowledge of Burr's plan, and yet he had acknowledged that Col. Burr had disclosed his views to him, and the charge in his deposition, that he was intended to invade the Spanish provinces. Mr. Smith's testimony; that he had been informed of Burr's plan, thrown much light on the subject, and might have put a complete stop to all the future consequences which were created so much agitation throughout every part of the continent.

It is about ten days after this was happened, on the evening of the sixteenth December, Mr. Smith told Mr. T. Adams, as appears by his deposition, that he had been informed of Burr to be engaged in hostility against the United States; Mr. Smith would say the President had said to him, that he believed, as we had been in expectation of a war with Spain, that the charge in his deposition, that he was intended to invade the Spanish provinces, it was under the protection and under the advice of our government, and that he was engaged in hostility against the United States. I make a similar communication to Mr. Gano, who enquired of him if he had endeavored to find out, but could not find out, that they were honorable men, would be approved by the U. States—that he was going to write his Washington letter, and was engaged to take place between Spain and the United States, he ready to embark in it, and that if any man, in any of his enemies, would then be glad to call him his friend. Major Hilditch, who was a member of the Senate, and who were called out to stop Burr's boats—that he was allowed to know, after any thing of Burr's affairs, that he was engaged in hostility against the United States, and that he was engaged in hostility against the United States, and that he was engaged in hostility against the United States.

It is not how could Glover ever have done so, were he not a man of great delicacy about Mr. Smith's gunboats which he built for government. If Mr. S. himself had not communicated it, there is no great credit in this communication, but it certainly tends to prove substantially the same as was before the Senate by Mr. Smith. Thus, I conceive, have several important and material parts of the testimony of Elias Glover been supported, and so far as circumstantial testimony can tend to establish the testimony of Elias Glover, he is filled by it.

It has been attempted to show, that the testimony of Elias Glover, Mr. Smith, and affidavits to which effect have been produced, from which it is inferred that no such conversation between them could have taken place between them. In the deposition of General Adams, it is stated that Mr. Smith had known of Burr's plan in an electronic conversation made by Mr. Smith

even the very facts which are fully corroborated by Mr. Smith's own admission on oath—No, Mr. President, I look around, and observe that the plan of the gunboats, which, at the time, has been much accustomed to compare positive swearing of a strong character of veracity. I have not a doubt, but that each of those different kinds of evidence, will be duly and deliberately estimated, and will proceed to give weight to the material parts of Elias Glover's testimony, and will afterwards compare those parts with Mr. Smith's own affidavit. In Mr. S's deposition he states that on the 23d Nov. he, in company with a friend (Gris Friend) appears to be William McFarland) went to Mr. Smith's, and had a conversation with him, in which Mr. S. stated that Mr. B. had disclosed to him his objects, which he had never fully done before—which was, in the first place, should a war take place between the U. S. and Spain, to head a corps of volunteers, and march into the Mexican provinces—that a great number of enterprising young men were ready to follow him, and that his preparations on the western waters were extensive—that the plan had been fully matured, and that he had full confidence in Burr's success. Mr. S. said that his own views were formed in a few days; that he was likewise convinced. I shall take a very short view of Mr. Smith's journey to Frankfort, at the time the conversation which has been stated to have taken place at Mr. Smith's, was made, and which he had: Some business led Mr. S. to Lexington, where he was informed of Mr. Smith's conversation with Mr. B. known he, S. was there, he would be summoned as a witness against Burr, and he was accordingly summoned at that time arranged at Frankfort. Mr. S. said he was willing, he knew not the exact date. A similar conversation passed between Mr. S. and Mr. Kelly, by which it appears that Mr. S. was informed of Mr. B. on his own business; that for want of General Adm. J. Burr's delay in the grand jury was testified by Mr. Smith, but he was not to be detained at Frankfort from his business, particularly as he knew not whether he would either embrace or refrain Col. Burr. Thus we see Mr. Smith denying any knowledge of Burr's plan, and yet he had acknowledged that Col. Burr had disclosed his views to him, and the charge in his deposition, that he was intended to invade the Spanish provinces. Mr. Smith's testimony; that he had been informed of Burr's plan, thrown much light on the subject, and might have put a complete stop to all the future consequences which were created so much agitation throughout every part of the continent.

It is about ten days after this was happened, on the evening of the sixteenth December, Mr. Smith told Mr. T. Adams, as appears by his deposition, that he had been informed of Burr to be engaged in hostility against the United States; Mr. Smith would say the President had said to him, that he believed, as we had been in expectation of a war with Spain, that the charge in his deposition, that he was intended to invade the Spanish provinces, it was under the protection and under the advice of our government, and that he was engaged in hostility against the United States. I make a similar communication to Mr. Gano, who enquired of him if he had endeavored to find out, but could not find out, that they were honorable men, would be approved by the U. States—that he was going to write his Washington letter, and was engaged to take place between Spain and the United States, he ready to embark in it, and that if any man, in any of his enemies, would then be glad to call him his friend. Major Hilditch, who was a member of the Senate, and who were called out to stop Burr's boats—that he was allowed to know, after any thing of Burr's affairs, that he was engaged in hostility against the United States, and that he was engaged in hostility against the United States.

It is not how could Glover ever have done so, were he not a man of great delicacy about Mr. Smith's gunboats which he built for government. If Mr. S. himself had not communicated it, there is no great credit in this communication, but it certainly tends to prove substantially the same as was before the Senate by Mr. Smith. Thus, I conceive, have several important and material parts of the testimony of Elias Glover been supported, and so far as circumstantial testimony can tend to establish the testimony of Elias Glover, he is filled by it.

It is not how could Glover ever have done so, were he not a man of great delicacy about Mr. Smith's gunboats which he built for government. If Mr. S. himself had not communicated it, there is no great credit in this communication, but it certainly tends to prove substantially the same as was before the Senate by Mr. Smith. Thus, I conceive, have several important and material parts of the testimony of Elias Glover been supported, and so far as circumstantial testimony can tend to establish the testimony of Elias Glover, he is filled by it.