

ted 22d July, as deciphered by a member of the Grand Jury at Richmond.

Gen. Jonathan Dayton's letter to Wilkinson in cypher, President's message.

Wilkinson's deposition No. 8, and in page 209, of the report of Burr's trial as communicated to Congress.

Extract of Wilkinson's letter to the President, sent by Smith dated the 21st Oct. 1806, President's message, page 204.

In relation to the fourth point of enquiry, to wit, the conduct of General Wilkinson as Brigadier general of the army of the United States, refer to the

Deposition of William Simmons, Esq. letter S

Deposition of Capt. George Peter, letter P

Deposition of Captain Wm. E. Williams, letter W

Deposition of John Smith, letter H.

Letter from John Simmons, Esq. inclosing extracts A B C D.

Letter from Gen. Wilkinson to Daniel Clark, No. 71.

The committee think proper also to submit the following papers relating to tobacco and other commercial transactions in which General Wilkinson was concerned from the month of in the year 1788, to the month of in the year 1790, to wit:

Gen. Wilkinson's account current with Clark and Rees in the hand writing of Philip Noland, dated the 8th Aug. 1788, No. 27.

Philip Noland's account for sales of tobacco dated September, 21, 1790, No. 29.

Wilkinson's account current with Clark and Rees, dated May 1, 1789, contained in the account book, page 30.

Wilkinson's letter to Clark & Rees, dated May 20th, 1790, No. 30.

Wilkinson's letter to Clark and Rees, dated June the 2d, 1790, No. 31.

Wilkinson's and Dunn's account current with Clark and Rees, dated August 29, 1789, and 5th September 1789, with Wilkinson's order and Noland's receipt for balance, No. 32.

Philip Noland's declaration dated September 10, 1790.

Wilkinson's accountable receipt, No. 4.

Articles of agreement between Wilkinson and Dunn, and Clark sen.

Letter from Gen. Wilkinson to Daniel Clark, relative to the Plain Tale, No. 2.

In making the last preceding statement the committee beg leave to remark, from an examination of the sentence of the military court of enquiry, ordered at the request of Wilkinson, and of which Col. Burbeck was President, it appears that the tobacco transactions of General Wilkinson at New Orleans, in 1789 and 1790 constituted a material part of that enquiry, and that a copy of an account current was laid before the said court by Gen. Wilkinson and designated by No. ——— and several letters accompanying said account supposed by the court to be in the hand writing of Philip Noland the agent of general Wilkinson.

The committee conceiving that the papers collected by said court would aid them in their investigation, made application for these papers to the Secretary of war, but were unable to obtain them, they having been taken from the office by gen. Wilkinson, as appears from the deposition of John Smith, chief clerk in the war office. The committee then directed a subpoena to gen. Wilkinson, requiring him to send or produce all the papers which had been used or collected by the said court, in obedience to which general Wilkinson sent to the committee a packet of paper which did not contain either the account and letters referred to in the sentence of the court, or the defence of gen. Wilkinson, nor have the committee been able to procure them, and consequently have not had it in their power to compare the accounts herewith exhibited with those which were laid before the military court of enquiry. For the further elucidation, refer to Walter Jones's deposition marked W. 1.

The committee also submit the deposition of Daniel W. Cox, authenticating the papers to which he specially refers, marked D W C.

To the House of Representatives of the U. States.

I transmit to the house a report of the secretary of State complying with their resolution of the 30th of April.

JAMES MADISON.

May 1, 1810.

In pursuance of the resolution of the house of Representatives of yesterday the secretary of state has the honor of transmitting to the President of the U. S. the accompanying papers marked A. B. C. D. E. F.

No information has been received, that any communication has been made to our minister at London on the part of the British government in answer to any note presented by him in pursuance of instructions given on the 23d of Nov. 1809.

No answers have been given on the "propositions or overtures, made on the part of the United States, to the government of Great Britain, and France, respecting any of the orders and decrees affecting neutral commerce," which have not been heretofore or which are not herewith communicated. All which is respectfully submitted.

R. SMITH.

Department of State,

May 1, 1810.

(A.)

Extract of a letter from Gen. Armstrong to M. Champagny.

PARIS, Sept. 8, 1809.

"I had the honor of receiving your excellency's letter of the 22d of August last, in exposition of the principles adopted by his majesty with regard to neutral commerce. I shall hasten to transmit a copy of this note to my government."

(B.)

The Secretary of State to Gen. Armstrong.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

December 1, 1809.

SIR,

Enclosed you have five copies of the President's message and of its accompanying documents. They will afford you a view of the existing state of things here, and particularly of

the ground taken in the correspondence with the British minister. You will perceive that the deliberations of Congress at their present session cannot but be embarrassed by the painful consideration that the two principal belligerents have been for some time alike regardless of our neutral rights, and that they manifest no disposition to relinquish, in any degree, their unreasonable pretensions.

You will also herewith receive a copy of a letter to Mr. Pinkney which will shew the light in which M. Champagny's letter is viewed by the President, and at the same time the course of proceeding prescribed to our minister in London.

You will of course understand it to be wished that you should ascertain the meaning of the French government as to the condition on which it has been proposed to revoke the Berlin decree.

On the principle which seems to be assumed by M. Champagny, nothing more ought to be required than a recall by G. Britain of her proclamation or illegal blockades which are of date prior to that of the Berlin decree, or a formal declaration that they are not now in force.—Should this be done and followed by an annulment of all the decrees and orders in chronological order, and G. Britain should afterwards put in force old or proclaim new blockades contrary to the law of nations, it would produce questions between her and the United States which the French government is bound to leave to the U. States, at least, until it shall find it necessary to bring forward complaints of an acquiescence on our part not consistent with the neutrality professed by us.

You will yourself, and if necessary you will let the French government understand that we do not consider ourselves bound to contest the legality of a blockade which may be conformable to the definitions heretofore maintained by the United States and particularly to the definition contained in the treaty of June and October, 1801, between Great Britain and Russia. However founded the definition of M. Champagny may be in reason and general utility, and consequently however desirable to be made the established law on the subject of blockades, a different practice has too long prevailed among all nations, France as well as others, and is too strongly authenticated by the writers of admitted authority to be combated by the U. States.

If you should receive from the French government explanations proper to be communicated to Mr. Pinkney, you will not fail to transmit the same to him without delay. And should they be such as to make it important that Mr. Pinkney should immediately found thereon an application to the British government to prepare the way for the repeal of the Berlin decree, you will be pleased to hasten the communication to him by a special messenger. Whatever the explanations may be, you will of course transmit them to this department, with such other information as may be interesting.

With great respect, &c.

(Signed) R. SMITH.

Gen. John Armstrong, &c. &c. &c.

Mr. SMITH to Mr. PINKNEY.

Department of State,

November 11, 1809.

SIR,

From the enclosed copy of a letter from Mr. Champagny to gen. Armstrong, it appears that the French government has taken a ground in relation to the British violation of our neutral rights, not the same with that heretofore taken, and which it is proper you should be acquainted with. You will observe that the terms stating the condition on which the Berlin decree will be revoked are not free from obscurity.—They admit the construction however, that if G. Britain will annul her illegal blockades as distinct from her orders in council, such as the blockade from the Elbe to Brest, &c. prior to the Berlin decree, and perhaps of subsequent date, but still distinct from her orders in council, that France will put an end to her Berlin decree, or at least the illegal part of it.—Whilst therefore it becomes important to take proper steps, as will be done thro' gen. Armstrong, to ascertain the real & precise meaning of Mr. Champagny's letter, it is important also that your interposition should be used to ascertain the actual state of the British blockades distinct from the orders in council, whether merely on paper or otherwise illegal, and whether prior of subsequent to the Berlin decree, and to feel the pulse of the British government on the propriety of putting them out of the way in order to give force to our call on France to prepare the way for a repeal of the orders in council, by her repeal of that decree.

In the execution of this task I rely on the judgment and delicacy by which, I am persuaded, you will be guided, and on your keeping in mind the desire of this government to entangle itself as little as possible in the question of priority in the violation of our neutral rights, and to commit itself as little as possible to either belligerent as to the course to be taken with the other.

If it should be found that no illegal blockades are now in force, and so declared by G. Britain, or that the British government is ready to revoke and withdraw all such as may not be consistent with the definition of blockade in the Russian treaty of June 1801, it will be desirable that you lose no time in giving the information to General Armstrong, and whatever may be the result of your enquiries, that you hasten a communication of it to me.

Writing on short notice of the present conveyance, I have only to add the assurance of my esteem and great consideration, &c.

(Signed) R. SMITH.

(D.)

Extract of a letter from General Armstrong to the Secretary of State.

Paris, Jan. 28, 1810.

"In conformity to the suggestions contained in your letter of the 1st December, 1809, I enquired whether if G. Britain revoked her blockades of a date anterior to the decree commonly called the Berlin decree, his majesty the Emperor would consent to revoke the said decree. To which the minister answered, that "the only condition required for the revocation by his majesty, of the decree of Berlin, will be a previous revocation by the British government of her blockades of France, (such as that from Elbe to Brest, &c.) of a date

anterior to that of the aforesaid decree; and that if the British government would then recall the orders in council which had occasioned the decree of Milan, that decree should also be annulled."

(E.)

Extract of a letter from Mr. Pinkney to the Secretary of State.

London, Feb. 28, 1810.

"I have received from gen. Armstrong a letter of which a copy is enclosed; and have, in consequence, made a written enquiry of Lord Wellesley (with whom I had before communicated personally on the subject) as to the inexistence of the blockades to which it alludes. I am not without hopes that the reply to my enquiry will amount to a declaration (satisfying in substance the condition mentioned in Gen. Armstrong's letter) that these blockades are not in force; and if it should, I will send immediately notice to General Armstrong. I have prepared an official letter to you on this head, which with such additions as circumstances may enable me to make, will be sent by the corvette" (the John Adams.)

(F.)

Copy of a letter from Gen. Armstrong to Mr. Pinkney, Paris, Jan. 25, 1810.

SIR,

A letter from Mr. Secretary Smith of the 1st of December last made it my duty to enquire of his excellency the Duke of Cadore what were the conditions on which his majesty the Emperor would annul his decree, commonly called the Berlin decree, and whether if G. Britain revoked her blockades of a date anterior to that decree, his majesty would consent to revoke the said decree? To these questions I have this day received the following answer, which I hasten to convey to you by a special messenger.

ANSWER.

"The only condition required for the revocation by his majesty the Emperor of the decree of Berlin will be the previous revocation by the British government of her blockades of France, or part of France (such as that from the Elbe to Brest, &c.) of a date anterior to that of the aforesaid decree." I have the honor to be, &c. &c. JOHN ARMSTRONG.

CHARLESTON, May 1.

The French privateer schooner *La Revanche du Cerf*, of this port, dropped down into the Roads on Sunday morning last; in the evening she crowded the bar and came to anchor off the north channel. Yesterday a recruit of about 30 men was sent down to her on board a fishing smack and one of the Sullivan's Island packet boats, and we presume she is now completely ready to recommence her "useful labors." We hail her of this port, because it is here that she disposes of her plunder, and it is here that she has received a complete outfit in every thing necessary to enable her to continue her depredations on American commerce.—If gratitude were inherent in the composition of a French privateersman, we should at least hope that the vessels belonging to this port, from which she has been ushered forth with such increased energies, would be exempted by her from plunder; but we fear that even our own ships (here being a number ready for sea) may be sufferers, and that like the fabled adder, she will sting the hand that has so kindly nurtured her.

May 8.

The schooner *Dolphin*, capt. ACWORTH, from Key Sale, was brought to about 8 o'clock Thursday morning, off the north bar, by the French privateer *La Revanche du Cerf*, and while she was in the act of laying to, the Frenchmen ran under her stern & poured a volley of musquetry into her; while all the officers, passengers and crew, of the *Dolphin* were upon deck, & the vessels within half pistol shot of each other: Fortunately one shot only took effect, which pierced and broke the arm of Mr. Follin, a passenger on board. After committing this unprovoked and wanton attack upon a defenceless vessel they told captain ACWORTH to go about his business.—The *Dolphin* belongs to this port, and has only been absent twenty days on her present voyage; she was perfectly well known to the officers of the privateer, they having been frequently on board her, while the vessels lay near to each other at Gadsden's wharf, before the *Dolphin* sailed on her present voyage.

FROM THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN.

Why has Tobias Lear been suffered to expend such needless sums of money in Barbary? Why has he received such a salary? Why was he appointed to that office?

Perhaps an answer to the last question will suffice for the whole. Mr. Jefferson once wrote a false, calumniating and detestable letter to Mazzei, in which the Washington administration was grossly abused, and Washington himself. General Washington wrote to Jefferson to know whether that letter, generally ascribed to him, was really his. Jefferson was said to have written an answer, full of mean apology and confession of guilt. After this affair, this calumniator of Washington was glad to avoid his presence; though his money was not withheld from Callender, who could be paid for his blasphemous abuse of the great and good. When Jefferson came into office, Tobias Lear, who had long been the private secretary of Washington, and apparently federal, became apparently a democrat, and was soon taken into favor, and appointed to office by Jefferson? What was the reason? We have been informed that Judge Washington can account for it. The letter to Washington from Jefferson and the copy of the letter from Washington to Jefferson, were not to be found among Gen. Washington's papers, after his decease. Tobias Lear had access to them. The man who could be guilty of writing such a letter to Mazzei as Jefferson wrote; and who subsequently on detection was forced to confession of guilt, and profession of remorse; would no doubt be anxious, at any price, to have proofs forever concealed from the world; and Lear well understood how to butter his bread.

Jefferson to be sure did not expect that Mazzei would publish his letter; but vanity induced the publication. Mazzei had resided several years in

Virginia, and was well acquainted with him who however never could have had much for his talents; or he would never have trusted him as he did in Paris; seeing him at a distance, Jefferson exclaimed, "I wish that I could see Mazzei to see if he publishes it; nobody will read if he publishes it; it is a book relative to Virginia, which he was about to publish in Paris. Yet, though it was not intended for the public, the intention of the writer are not less censurable.

The conduct of Lear in making a treaty with the reigning Bashaw of Tripoli at the expense of the United States, through the interpositions of gen. Eaton, every thing considered on the point of being so, may be explained, when it is considered that a treaty was made to the minister who negotiated with the bashaw. What the present was we know not; possibly a sixth, third or \$50,000 stipulated for ransoming the ship. Nor do we wonder that Jefferson published secret articles of the treaty as to have the wife and children of Hamet Esam, that restoration was publicly stipulated; we wonder that presents have been made, tended to be made, to a vast and unaccountable amount, and that Mr. Jefferson allowed a spirited and determined conduct to be respected for the American name, and been a utility; and had he not been thwarted he would have rendered permanent in our advantages, and saved the necessity of expending for presents to maintain peace, all right, we say, that general Eaton neglected, and the sly, cunning Lear should for his services rendered to Jefferson.

LATEST FROM THE CONTINENT.

THE DIE IS CAST!

Extract of a letter from a mercantile gentleman in another in Philadelphia, dated

"ANTWERP, MARCH 23.

"The Emperor has ordered all the cargoes detained at St. Sebastian, and those of Spain, to be transported to Bayonne, and the proceeds placed in his private Treasury. Similar measures, it is apprehended, will be taken in Italy with respect to American property detained there, and I fear it will in the end tend to the unfortunate cargoes detained in the *Dunshoria*. Understand they have refused to release American property. The prospect for us is gloomy, and we cannot look for a favorable decision until it is known how the Emperor will settle in your quarter. I fear the result of your quarrelling with England will be the Emperor to release the American property here."

[Is it possible that the American people will continue a minister at the court of Napoleon after this last act of robbery, which capitalizes the plundering and burning system, is in itself nothing more nor less than a declaration of war? Time will determine whether poleon is or is not our king. If he had a formal declaration of war, what more could he have done to injure us, than he has now done?]

FROM AMSTERDAM, MARCH 23.

On the 24th of February last, the ship *Alexandria*, was brought in here by the French privateer; her cargo tobacco, &c. &c. of which were to be appropriated to the benefit of the interest of the Dutch merchants from Mr. Gallatin, Secretary of the States' Treasury, in proof of which were paid, but no respect paid to them.

Extract of a letter, dated Amsterdam, March 23, received at Philadelphia

"We have noticed the nomination of the French minister to the U. States.

"It is said a treaty between the French Emperor and our King, was concluded the 16th of February. That Holland will remain a kingdom; and of territory and a pecuniary sacrifice, will be made. The King will return to his states, and marriage feasts of his brother are ordered. Our decrees prohibiting the admission of American vessels into our ports, remain working—on the other hand, our outposts guarded by French corsairs, that capture every vessel they can lay hold of on approaching our shores; which are every one condemned to the Prize Court at Paris.

"As it is said the British ministry have concluded an arrangement with Mr. Pitt, ambassador at the court of St. James, we may hope France and Great Britain will hold their orders that affect our neutrality, however, sorry to remark, that every French influence prevails, the American is treated and considered as the instrumentum used by the English merchants to carry their trade with the continent of Europe, and kind of colonial produce can be exported to the duchy of Holstein to Germany. This will bear heavy upon the American advantage at Tonningen."

TOWN-MEETING.

It is said that Colonel Moulton, proposed to call a meeting for the purpose of thanking partner for the very able speech he delivered in senate, justifying Bonaparte for confiscating American property in retaliation for the course law, as well as of thanking him for his partner or himself, or some other of the party, may become Democrats, get rid of and sell more Bills of Exchange. Also, the wisdom of congress in reserving the last three sloops to support our last Northern Confederacy. Also to thank the of Monticello for devising ways and means for the surplus revenues without any payment to the constitution. And lastly to the Secretary of State for receiving a present from Mr. Pinkney, just before the Massachusetts election. Daily Tel. Rep.

Col. Buchanan, the partner of Gen. S. Smith.