

Mr. Ellicott; and being desirous at this time to avoid all equivocation, as to the substance of those letters, I have determined to communicate it to you in writing.

By the 2d article of the treaty with Spain it is stipulated that the garrisons which are found above the line of demarcation agreed on, shall be withdrawn. Setting out then with this principle, it appears that the first operation ought to be to draw this line, in order to know which were the garrisons which were to be withdrawn according to the article cited; and although the Natchez and some other Spanish posts are probably situated above the said line of demarcation, the formality and delicacy which one government owes to another, required that Mr. Ellicott should not pretend to take possession of the territory until the said demarcation should be made, and the more so, as he had been informed officially that the Spanish engineer, M. Guillemard, was already on his way to fulfil this part of his commission.

Mr. Ellicott not attending to these just observations, immediately began to wound the feelings of the Spanish Commander by hoisting the American flag on the territory which would not belong to the United States till after having jointly made the astronomical observations for ascertaining the course of the line. Not content with this, he began to exercise an authority, to wit, that of recruiting for the United States in a place which was then under the jurisdiction of the Spanish government.

These imprudences, which can admit of no excuse, gave rise to a personal resentment, from which there is little to hope with respect to harmony between those Commissioners in future.

In these circumstances, the Governor General of the province, the Baron de Carondelet, made known the just doubts which he had about the delivery of the posts, since in the 2d article, it is not stipulated that they were to be given up, and it seems that it could never have been the intention of his Catholic Majesty to deliver up any fortifications on which he had expended great sums of money, and which through political vicissitudes might perhaps be one day prejudicial to his subjects. In this situation, prudence required that the decision of this doubtful point should be left to the two governments; but Mr. Ellicott adding imprudence to imprudence, and with a pretext which a quarrel between some drunken Chickasaws and the people of his company afforded him, not only violated a territory then Spanish, by desiring to excite the inhabitants by all imaginable means, but also carried his zeal so far as to attempt to get possession of the fort of the Natchez by surprise. Governor Gayoso says he has in his power documents which prove evidently the intention of this attempt: Such conduct was little calculated to produce the spirit of harmony in such circumstances, and obliged Governor Gayoso when he discovered such hostile intentions, to take on his part, measures necessary for his defence.

This is the true state of things, by which it clearly appears that the inconsiderate conduct of Mr. Ellicott is the only cause of the disagreement at the Natchez; the more so, as the Spanish commanders declared to him that while the two governments were deciding on the doubt which occurred to the Baron de Carondelet, about the delivery of the posts, the drawing of the line of demarcation might be begun, when Mr. de Guillemard, who had already departed from New Orleans for the Natchez, should arrive.

If in this situation of the business, the commanders changed their ideas, or their measures, it could only proceed from the imprudent conduct of Mr. Ellicott. The Baron de Carondelet, desirous of observing religiously the treaty, so far as was not inconsistent with his duty, feeling the personal resentment which exists between Mr. Ellicott and Governor Gayoso, desires that there may be sent to command the detachment of American troops on that frontier, a man of judgment and prudence, who in such delicate circumstances shall act with moderation, which is of so much importance to the two governments.

This is what I had the honour of communicating verbally to you, in my last conference and I repeat it now; recommending more particularly that there should be sent on the part of the United States to that frontier, a person of prudence and sound judgment; leaving to Mr. Ellicott the technical part only; for while he acts as principal, it is to be feared that we shall not see the agents of the two governments, which are interested, proceed with that union and harmony which is ever important to us.

I repeat, sir, my wishes of obliging you, and that our Lord may preserve your life many years.

Philadelphia, 24th June, 1797.
Your most obedient servant,
CARLOS MARTINEZ DE YRUJO,
Timothy Pickering, Esq.
&c. &c.

[No. XIII.]
New Orleans, 1^o Marzo, 1797.
Moi Señor m:
HE recibido con mucha satisfacción la apreciable de V. S. de 27 Febrero pasado en que se sirve participarme su arribo a esta plaza en que se caracteriza de Comisario por los Estados Unidos de America para la demarcacion de límites entre los territorios de S. M. C. y los de los dichos Estados.

Me causa igualmente la mayor complacencia el testimonio que V. S. me da de la urbanidad y atenciones que ha recibido de los comandantes de las fuerzas, quienes han correspondido a las intenciones del gobierno, a mis ordenes, y a los principios generales de la nacion; y no dudo que en qualquiera oportunidad encontraran los Espanoles igual y reciproca correspondencia de parte de los ciudadanos de los Estados Unidos.

Dios, &c. B. L. M. de V. S.
Su más at^o. Sr.
EL BARON DE CARONDELET.
Sr. Don Andrew Ellicott.

[No. XIV.]
Extract of a letter from Wladimir Sargent, Esq. Secretary of the government of the North Western Territory, to the Secretary of State, dated Cincinnati, June 3, 1797.
General Wilkinson sending off an express, I seize the occasion to transcribe for you some paragraphs of a western letter.

"The Spaniards are reinforcing the upper posts on the Mississippi considerably—General Howard, an Irishman, in the quality of Commander in Chief, with upwards of 300 men, arrived at St. Louis and employed in erecting very formidable works. It likewise appears through various channels that they are inviting a great number of Indians of the territory to cross the Mississippi and for this express purpose Mr. Larronic an officer in the pay of the crown made a tour through all this country last fall; since which time several Indians have been sent on the same errand—and generally furnished with plenty of cash to defray their expenses."

"A large party of Delawares passed down White River about the 6th of May on their way to the Spanish side bearing the national flag of Spain sent them from St. Louis."

"They (the Spaniards) have above the mouth of the Ohio, on the Mississippi, several row-galleys with cannon."

[No. XVII.]
Department of State,
Philadelphia, April 27th, 1797.
Sir,

THIS week I received your letter expressing your acceptance of the office of District Attorney for Georgia. I was gratified by the information; and hope your health may be re-established and enable you to continue to hold and exercise it.

Within a few days, the Spanish minister, the chevalier de Trujillo, has written me as follows: "I know to a certainty that the English have made propositions to general Clark of Georgia in order to obtain his powerful influence in that state, in conjunction with some persons who might make a diversion or serious attack against Florida; and I doubt not that in consequence of this my advice, the Executive government will take suitable steps for effectually preventing the rights of neutrality being infringed by Georgia, to the prejudice of the possessions of the king my master."

His letter has been laid before the President of the United States, by whose direction I have now to desire you immediately to enquire into the fact asserted by the Spanish minister; and if any discovery shall be made of designs to violate our neutral duties, and especially of forming an expedition against the territories of his Catholic Majesty, from the territory of the United States, in defiance of their laws, and particularly of the act of Congress for the punishment of crimes against the United States, passed on the 5th June 1794—that you will take the most proper and effectual measures for frustrating such designs; and if the same shall be manifested by any overt acts, to cause the offenders to be arrested and secured, that they may be brought to condign punishment. Independently of the aid, which if necessary you will require of the Governor of Georgia, the commanding officer of the federal troops in that state, will be directed by the Secretary of War to afford you all the assistance in his power.

I shall be obliged by your acknowledging the receipt of this letter; and by a communication of the result of your enquiries into the subject of it.

I am, Sir, with great respect,
Your most obedient servant,
TIMOTHY PICKERING,
Charles Jackson, Esq.
District Attorney for the
State of Georgia.

[No. 18.]
Extract of a letter from Charles Jackson, Esq. District Attorney of Georgia, to the Secretary of State, dated Savannah, 22d May, 1797.

Sir,
Your letter of the 27th ultimo, I had the honor to receive some few days past. It has remained unanswered until the present moment, that I might enable myself to ascertain whether or not the suspicions entertained by the Spanish minister, respecting Gen. Clark, as expressed in your letter, were well founded. I have made diligent enquiry, and cannot find any person here that knows any thing of the business, or that entertains a belief of the kind. Clark was concerned in a former expedition against the Floridas in conjunction with the French, and it is possible from this circumstance that he is again suspected. He is a man of strong passions, of warm partialities for the French, and violent antipathies to the English. From these circumstances, and from the matter being unknown to the citizens here, I am led to doubt the truth of the report altogether. It might not be improper to add, that he is far from being the man of influence suggested by the Spanish minister. But should it happen contrary to my expectation that Clark should be daring enough to attempt a violation of the laws of the Union, by accepting a commission, as has been mentioned, no exertions shall be wanting on my part to bring him to punishment, and should it be necessary, I shall direct the marshal to call to his aid the Federal troops. But I have no doubt on my own part, but the civil authority has sufficient strength in this state, to carry into effect the laws of the Union.

[No. 19.]
Rotterdam, May 9th, 1797.
DEAR SIR,
Altho' in the postscript to the original quadruplicate of No. 15, forwarded to-day, I have mentioned the late intelligence, yet as I find that the schooner Mary, of Boston, Capt. Hall, is to sail from this port to-morrow, I beg leave to mention again, that a summary of some of the articles of the preliminaries of the treaty of peace, between France and the emperor, arrived here this morning. "The emperor cedes Belgium to the French republic; he recognizes the independence of the republic of Lombardy. He admits the extension of French boundaries, to the limits already prescribed by their constitution and laws." Therefore the Meuse, and not the Rhine is to be the boundary. Buonaparte's flanks and rear were threatened when the preliminaries were agreed upon. The Austrians had recovered the Tyrol, Triuli and Trieste.

I received accounts to-day, that the Juliana, from Norfolk in Virginia, is taken and carried into Havre, and that the Juna, Rainbow and Charlotte, all three from Charleston, and the Hebe from Savannah, are captured and carried into Nantes, and in all probability will be condemned for want of a "Role d'Equipage," certified by a public officer, agreeably to the regulation prescribed by France.

I enclosed you in No. 95 (the original of which I sent by Capt. Simpson, of the Republican, via Baltimore, the duplicate by Captain Goodrich of the Lydia, via New-York; the duplicate by Capt. Harrington of the Eliza to Philadelphia, and the quadruplicate to the care of Mr. King) copies of citizen Merlin's letter to Mr. Skipwith, consul general at Paris, in which he says, that when he became just and grateful, and broke our incredible treaty with England, France will desert from her present conduct with respect to us. I refer you to the copies transmitted as above, for the particulars of this curious letter, it is now published as official in the "Rede Star."

Major Mounslor informs me by the letter received to-day, that he had drawn a reply to it; but that it had been judged not proper to be sent, but in lieu thereof it had been proposed to inform the minister by a short note, that persisting in the former reclamations and not authorized by the government of the United States to enter into a formal diplomatic discussion, on the subject therein mentioned, a copy of his letter of the 4th of real, should be transmitted to our secretary of state.

I remain with real respect and esteem,
your most obedient humble servant,
CHARLES COTESWORTH PINCKNEY,
Cot. Pickering, Secretary
of the United States.
[Nos. XV and XVI are papers which have already been published.]

NEW-YORK, July 6.
The letter of Merlin minister of justice, to the Consul of America in France, is one of those extraordinary things which characterize the French nation in the present revolution. It expressly enjoins on the United States a violation of the treaty with Great Britain, as the condition of obtaining the favor of the French government. That is, we must be faithless, perfidious rascals, and then we may expect the returning favor and affection of France. This is precisely the language of the French minister of justice. It is a remarkable fact that a high character, at the head of opposition, said a few weeks ago in public company, "That one of the conditions of preserving peace with France would be, a breach of the treaty with Great Britain." So perfectly well do the French in France and their partisans in this country understand each other.

Translated for the Diary, from the Gazette Françoise.

The following extract from a Paris paper may serve as a key for posterity to the rapid and prodigious fortunes accumulated by speculation during the revolution.

Method of making a fortune in three hours by means of mandates, assignats, and specie.

FIRST HOUR.
Operation 1. A man has a refection, or provisional mandat for 1000 livres. He sells it at 70 per cent discount, and receives 300 livres. He buys assignats at 6000 livres per 1000, and receives for his 30 crowns 50,000 livres in assignats.

With these assignats he goes to the treasury, and according to the law allowing 1 for 30, he receives in refections 25,000 livres, or 150 per cent profit upon his capital.

Operation 2. The same process repeated produces 6,250 livres.

Operation 3. The refection is sold for 1,875 livres specie: this sum buys 47,750 livres in assignats, which brings in a refection for 12,625 livres.

Operation 4. His refection sells for 468,750 specie, equal to 1,715,875 in assignats, and thence a refection of 39,062. 10s.

SECOND HOUR.
The refection, by the same operations repeated, produces 1,535,895 livres.

THIRD HOUR.
These 1,535,895 in the same manner, accumulate by 4 operations to 59,625,237.
The speculator, tired at length of this day's work, sells out at 80 per cent. discount, and receives 11,921,040 livres in gold, the produce of 50 crowns in three hours and 12 operations.

CHARLESTON, June 25.
From a Correspondent.

The Citizen Le Conte, an officer of the marine of the French Republic, arrived a few days since in this city, from Porto Rico, assures that the governor of that island, to reward the zeal and bravery which the French citizens shewed in defending it against the invasion of the English, has granted to these brave warriors an unlimited liberty of commerce to Porto-Rico, for the space of two years.

The citizen Le Conte also informs, that he saw at St. Martin's, about six weeks ago, a vessel belonging to the French Republic, furnished with passports from all the powers of Europe, destined to make a voyage round the world; she had on board a number of scientific gentlemen; several of these the citizen Le Conte conversed with.

NORFOLK, July 1.
Extract of a letter from Capt. Henry Dickson, of the ship Bowman, of this port.

Guadaloupe, Point Petre, May 23
"this is my fifth" since captured and brought in here I hope some of them will reach you before long. This letter I send you by my mate, who goes passenger in a Danish sloop to St. Thomas's.

"I mentioned in my former letters that I was put on board the prison ship immediately after the Bowman was at an anchor—in which place I still remain confined—not allowed to go on shore—nor on board of any of the Americans that are in the harbour.—The ship and cargo has been condemned a fortnight ago.

I am not at liberty (neither should I think it safe) to express my thoughts on the proceedings here.

"I can give you no information respecting markets, or any thing else from the shore. I am not allowed to go there, nor do I know when I shall.—I am here cooped up from almost every body."

*None of these have been received.

Extract of a letter from Mr. Thomas Woodhouse, mate of the ship Bowman.

St. Thomas's, June 15
"The letters Captain Dickson gave me, when I left him in Point Petre on the 23d of May, on board the prison ship, I have forwarded in the brig Abigail, Capt. Anderson, who refused me a passage home.

"The carpenter and myself are on board of a sloop belonging to Newbury, and will sail for Norfolk in three days."

Yesterday arrived here the schooner Eliza, captain Moffatt, 19 days from Jacquemel. He informs that four days previous to his sailing, a schooner arrived there from the city of Saint Domingo, who related that a fleet of ships, under convoy of 15 sail of the line (French and Spanish) had arrived there—captain Moffatt cannot inform whether they had any troops on board.

Captain Moffatt, also informs, that two French-generals had returned from the investment of Port-au-Prince in consequence of disturbance among the Brigands, and had refused their command in the neighbourhood of Jacquemel.

The Spaniards are withdrawing their property from the island and sending it, and their negroes to Cuba.

CONGRESS.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
THURSDAY, July 6.
(Concluded from our last.)

Mr. SITGREAVES said, it was observable that no gentleman had ventured to do any more than express his doubts, both as to the fact and the law on this occasion. With respect to the fact, he did not expect any doubt. He believed that any gentleman at all conversant with the branch of law learning, which relates to impeachment, must know that impeachments have always been founded on official documents, or upon circumstances of notoriety, and not upon facts found as before a Grand Jury. In this instance they had conceived the letter of Mr. Blount sufficiently authenticated, in the communication of the President.

He was sorry that the measures which the Executive had taken in this business, should have been censured, even by insinuation. Mr. S. said, he had read the opinion of high law authority, which had been obtained by the Executive. When he did this, he thought he was giving proof of the honourable motives of the Executive. Information had been given to the Executive, which, on the first blush, shewed designs against the peace of the United States. It was the duty of the President to preserve the peace of the United States. It was natural and right for him, therefore, to take the opinion of those persons who were best qualified to direct him what course would be best to be pursued. These gentlemen had given it as their opinion that the proper way of proceeding would be by impeachment, and, in effect, that the President had no more to do with it, but that it should be turned over to the proper branches of Government. In consequence the President had communicated more to them, than he had done to the Senate, as the original letter of William Blount was sent to them, as evidence upon which they were to found their charge. The President did not direct them to impeach; but he had laid before them the facts, with the opinion of the law officers.

Mr. S. conceived that the conduct of the President had been strictly proper. He would pass on to the constitutional doubts which had been expressed. It was acknowledged that there was no restriction upon the right of impeachment; but his colleague thought that something like a restriction might be gathered from the 4th clause of the 2d article of the Constitution, which he had quoted. It was to be observed, that this article was found in that part of the Constitution which related only to the Executive department of government. This, he took it, was a good reason why this rule should not be taken as a rule in the present case; but there was another clause which spoke of disqualifying persons from ever filling any office in future, which was a greater power than that under the Executive department. If the construction which his colleague had put upon the Constitution with respect to impeachment, was the true one, an officer of Government would not be brought to trial after he had resigned, as he could not then be removed from office.

His colleague had produced another article of the Constitution, which confined the punishment under an impeachment. This, Mr. S. said, was meant to guard against any disgraceful excess of governmental vengeance, or party venom; because it went on to say, that if the offence was within ordinary crimes, it might be prosecuted and punished in the same way as if an impeachment had not taken place.

Impeachment was then to be considered as for the purposes of the State, distinguished from the general purposes of society.—If it had been intended that the power of impeachment should be limited in the manner suggested by his colleague and the gentleman from Virginia, it would have been so expressed, as in the Constitution of Pennsylvania; they had spoken on this subject in a way not to be mistaken, as they expressly said who were liable to impeachment, and what offences should be impeachable.—And if it had been the intention of the Constitution of the United States, that officers of Government only should be impeached, it would doubtless have been so expressed. But was not the present case, that of an officer charged with an offence directly connected with his office, with the official confidence entrusted to him? When it was particularly his duty to appoint to office, it was surely a peculiarly aggravated offence to seduce an officer, or to turn friends into enemies. What was a Senator, if he was not an officer of Government? The President, who was himself a branch of the Government, was allowed to be an officer of the Government, and surely a member of one of the branches must also be an officer.

As to the form of proceeding necessary to be taken on this occasion, he would state what the opinion of the Committee was as to this matter. They supposed it would be first proper for that House to determine

that the gentleman in question should be impeached. This being done, that a member of that House should go to the bar of the Senate, and impeach the person, in the name of the House, and of the people of the United States, and state that the House of Representatives will proceed to draw out specific articles of charge against him. According to the ease, they require that he shall be sequestered from his seat, be committed, or held to bail. When this is done, a Committee will be appointed to draw articles of impeachment.

The reason, Mr. S. said, why some steps should be taken at present, was that means should be taken to secure the person of the offender, either by confinement or by bail, since it was the opinion of the law officers of Government that he could not be arrested by ordinary process. He could not be arrested by the Senate; they could send for him (as he understood they had done) by the Sergeant at Arms, to take his seat in the House; but when the House adjourned, they had no further power over him, until an impeachment was made against him.

Gentlemen said there was no danger of escape. If it were not improper to state what had taken place out of doors, it might be said, that there had already been an attempt at an escape. Besides, if no investigation were now to take place, how were they to come to a knowledge of the plot which gentlemen seemed so desirous to come to a knowledge of. When they had determined to make the impeachment, and an oral declaration was made of it to the Senate, when they were ready to go home,—they might go, and exhibit the charges at the next session, when they should have had leisure fully to consider the subject.

Mr. RUTLEDGE had no doubt in his mind on the subject; but he thought it necessary that the hand writing of Mr. Blount should be proved. He had himself attended the trial of an impeachment which had excited the attention of the world (he alluded to the trial of Mr. Hastings) and the order of proceeding was as has been stated. He moved that evidence be taken of the hand-writing.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the propriety of having the business done in the house.

Mr. BROOKES said, he should not have spoken on the occasion, if he had not heard gentlemen express wishes to have the present subject postponed. For his part, he could not tell how gentlemen would be able to acquit themselves to their own consciences and to their constituents, if they should refuse to stay a day or two to do this business.

Mr. VENABLE said, that as this was a new case, and would be referred to as a precedent, they should attend to the form of their proceedings. He thought the first step should be to prove the letter. If the committee could not do it, he should wish the committee to rise, that it might be done in the house. He did not think their determination should be postponed; but, that if an impeachment was to be entered upon, that it should now be done. He had no doubt of the truth of the letter; but he wished it to be duly proved, as hereafter a case might occur, in which such a letter might be a forgery.

Mr. NICHOLAS said, that some gentlemen had spoken upon this question, as if there were persons upon the committee who wished to exculpate the person charged [Mr. Sitgreaves declared, if he was allowed to, that he had no such intention.] Mr. N. thought he intimated something of the kind when he said gentlemen ventured to say, &c. No member of that committee, he trusted, would wish to screen the offender, and he believed no person less than he who was nearly connected with him (meaning, we suppose, his brother Thomas Blount). Mr. N. thought it was not sufficient that the President had sent them a letter, which he believed to be the hand-writing of William Blount. If they were to take this for granted, they gave their power of judging over to the President.

Mr. N. said he had merely enquired what would be the consequences of a postponement to the next session. He did not think it could produce any bad effect, as if the offender were to escape, the final punishment did not require the presence of the man.—Mr. N. again expressed his doubt, about the constitutionality of the proceeding.

Mr. DAYTON (the Speaker) said he held in his hand a letter, which he had received from the President of the United States, inscribed as an original letter of William Blount, to be preserved with care. If any member of the committee will say that he believes the writing to be the writing of William Blount, it might save the trouble of the committee's rising for the purpose of having the fact ascertained in the house.

Mr. HARPER thought the committee were as well satisfied as to the fact now, as they could be when the hand-writing was proved; but he denied that the committee had the power of taking evidence of this kind. He moved for the committee to rise, either to examine evidence, or to adjourn.

Mr. GALLATIN wished the committee to rise; but, before it rose, he wished to mention two or three ideas, upon which he should wish to have satisfaction when the committee sat again.

So far as relates to the constitutional question, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Dana) had removed a part of his doubts; therefore, what he should mention would not relate to that point.

If he rightly understood his colleague, when speaking of the opinion of gentlemen of the law, he said that their opinion was, not only that William Blount was liable to an impeachment, but that the proper mode of prosecuting him was by impeachment. He had since looked at the opinion, and did not find it so; but that he was liable to impeachment. In the next place, he understood him to say, that Mr. Blount was not amenable to ordinary process. He wished to know whether this idea was well-founded,

As to the form of proceeding necessary to be taken on this occasion, he would state what the opinion of the Committee was as to this matter. They supposed it would be first proper for that House to determine

that the gentleman in question should be impeached. This being done, that a member of that House should go to the bar of the Senate, and impeach the person, in the name of the House, and of the people of the United States, and state that the House of Representatives will proceed to draw out specific articles of charge against him. According to the ease, they require that he shall be sequestered from his seat, be committed, or held to bail. When this is done, a Committee will be appointed to draw articles of impeachment.

The reason, Mr. S. said, why some steps should be taken at present, was that means should be taken to secure the person of the offender, either by confinement or by bail, since it was the opinion of the law officers of Government that he could not be arrested by ordinary process. He could not be arrested by the Senate; they could send for him (as he understood they had done) by the Sergeant at Arms, to take his seat in the House; but when the House adjourned, they had no further power over him, until an impeachment was made against him.

Gentlemen said there was no danger of escape. If it were not improper to state what had taken place out of doors, it might be said, that there had already been an attempt at an escape. Besides, if no investigation were now to take place, how were they to come to a knowledge of the plot which gentlemen seemed so desirous to come to a knowledge of. When they had determined to make the impeachment, and an oral declaration was made of it to the Senate, when they were ready to go home,—they might go, and exhibit the charges at the next session, when they should have had leisure fully to consider the subject.