draft in favor of Mr. Seitz, and stated that in consequence of a letter which he had received from the governor of New Orleans, he had in the fall or winter of 1795—6, descended the Ohio, and at, or near its mouth had met with Gayoso. That they entered on the business, and he received the concessions before alluded to—that a difference in opinion took place between him and Gayoso as to the duty which should be paid by the people of the Western country, who might export produce down the Mississippi—Gayoso insisting that they should pay four per cent. as an acknowledgment for the permission given them—He, Mr. Sebastian insisting that as it was a conciliatory measure on the part of the Spanish government, that no duty ought to be exacted —that it was at length agreed to descend the river, and submit the difference to the governor at New Orleans. They did so, and in some short time after their arrival, he, (Mr. Sebastian) had an audience with the governor, who decided against Gayoso. That the governor appointed a day when he should again attend, in order to complete the business—but previous to the day appointed, a courier arrived at N. Orleans with intelligence that the treaty of friendship, limits and navigation had been entered into between the governments of the U. States and Spain. That the governor sent for him, and informed him of that circumstance, and observed that the business as to the concessions was at an end; but that he had it in charge from the king to inform whoever should come on that business, should be entitled to two thousand dollars a year. That upon this ground he had drawn in favor of Mr. Seitz, the draft before alluded to.

Upon being further questioned—At what time was Mr. Sebastian appointed judge of the court of appeals, at what times was he absent, and how long?

This deponent says that Mr. Sebastian was appointed a judge of the court of appeals in the year 1792, shortly after the commencement of this government, that from the record book of the court of appeals it appears that he qualified as judge on the 7th day of January 1793. From the same record book it appears that he was absent at the May term of the court of appeals 1796—that this absence was, as this deponent was informed and believes in consequence of his having descended the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, in the fall or winter 1795—6. That it also appears from the said record book he was also absent at the May and October terms of the court of appeals in the year 1798—this deponent was informed and believes that this absence was from his having also descended the said rivers in that year.

Question—Was you not clerk of the Kentucky convention in the year 1788?

Answer, I was.

Question—Did not general Wilkinson produce a lengthy memorial and read the same in that convention and then state that he had before that time presented to the governor or intendant at New Orleans a copy thereof?—Answer, He did.

Question—Was that paper deposited and left with you as clerk as other papers produced in like manner generally are?—Answer, It was not.

Question—At what time were you first informed, that a negociation of any kind (unauthorised by government) had been carried on, or attempted between the officers or agents of the Spanish government, and any individuals or set of men in the Western country?—Answer, Not until I saw the papers before stated in the month of August last.

Question—Did Mr. Sebastian at the time he explained himself to you, as to the draft drawn in favor of Mr. Seitz, speak of his having drawn drafts in favor of any other person?—Answer, He did not.

Question—Do you recollect the substance or object of the memorial read by general Wilkinson?—Answer, I do not, but upon reading the letters published in the newspapers, as having passed between col. Marshall, and gen. Washington, it appears to me to be tolerably accurately stated in col. Marshall's letter.

THOMAS TODD.

Col. Joseph Crockett, being duly sworn to give evidence, before the special committee appointed by the House of Representatives for the enquiry into the charge against judge Sebastian deposeth and saith, that he was in Kentcky convention, held at Danville in the year 1788, when gen. Wilkinson produced a memorial, which he read to the said convention as handed to him, sheet, by sheet, by judge Sebastian —and that the said memorial never was read, or handed into the clerk's table of the said convention.

JOSEPH CROCKETT.

Dec. 1st, 1806.

State of Kentucky, Clerk's office of the Court of Appeals, sct.

At the request of the special committee appointed to enquire into certain charges alledged against Mr. Benjamin Sabastian, late a judge of the court aforesaid, I do hereby certify that from an examination of the order books of said court, I find that Mr. Sebastian qualified as a judge of said court, on the 7th day of January 1793—and that he hath attended the respective terms of said court ever since, the May term in 1796 and the May and October terms in 1798 excepted.

Given under my hand as clerk to the court aforesaid, this 1st day of December, 1806.

ACHILLES SNEED.

Auditor's Office, Nov. 29th, 1806.

I do hereby certify that it appears from the books and records in my office, that the hon. Benjamin Sebastian has regularly drawn his salary, as one of the Judges of the court of Appeals for the state of Kentucky, from the 18th day of July 1792, to the 1st day of October in the present year.

Given under my hand as Auditor of public accounts, for the state of Kentucky, the date above.

GEORGE MADISON.

Whereupon your committee does not hesitate to declare as their opinion, that the information given to the House of Representatives is substantially true, and correctly detailed—and that the said judge Sebastian is guilty of having for several years received from the Spanish government, a pension paid in cash annually, to the amount of two thousand dollars.

Your committee further report as their opinion, that whilst judge Sebastian was in the exercise of his office in this state, and drawing his annual salary therefrom he was employed in carrying on with the agents of the Spanish government, an illicit, unjustifiable, and highly criminal intercourse, subversive of every duty he owed to the constituted authority of our country, and highly derogatory to the character of Kentucky.

And the same being read was unanimously agreed to.

PROSPECTUS

OF A NEW

WEEKLY PAPER,

ENTITLED,

The ATLANTIC WORLD,

TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.

By John Wood,
Late Editor of the Western World, of Kentucky.

THE *Atlantic World* will be devoted to the interest of no particular party or set of men whatever, its sole object will be the support of the Constitution of the U. States, & those principles of Republicanism which are founded on sound reason, without a bias either for the caprice of power or the licentiousness of the demagogue. A concise but accurate statement of the proceedings of Congress taken by the Editor himself, will form a principal part of the columns of this paper. The Foreign Intelligence will be detailed in a brief and impartial manner. Occasional selections will be given from the latest reviews and works of merit, and communications on subjects either political or literary when expressed in a proper style of language, will be received with pleasure.

Without enlarging farther on those topics which the Editor purposes to discuss in the Atlantic World, or enter into a train of promises, which is too frequently the practice with publishers at the commencement, he humbly submits the following terms to the public, which he assures them will be punctually performed on his part.

The Atlantic World will be published weekly, the first number about the twentieth of January, on a good Type and size of paper, at Three Dollars per annum, one half paid in advance, and the other half at the expiration of the first six months.

The Printers and Post Masters, in the several towns of the United States are requested to receive subscriptions, and forward the money by letter to the Editor at the city of Washington, and an adequate premium will be allowed to them for their trouble.

As in the first numbers a correct statement will be given of the Plan of Colonel Burr which the Editor now feels convinced from the testimony produced at Frankfort, is not against the interest of the Union, as likewise of the proceedings in the Western country, which will be found highly interesting, those persons who may be desirous of patronising the Atlantic World are solicited to subscribe at the commencement.

January 9—

INFORMATION WANTED.

A YOUNG WOMAN of the name of ELLIOTT, came with me from Clones, county Monaghan, Ireland, with an expectation of finding an uncle near or within 40 miles of St. Augusta or Savanna in Georgia. She has wrote two letters but received no answer, nor can she get any information—she is in great distress of mind, thinking she will not find him out—his name is Wm. WILLIAMSON, he is about 18 or 20 years in this country, and about 40 years old—The young woman is with me.

WM. M'KILDEN, in the city of Washington near the Seven buildings.

☞ The Editors of newspapers in Augusta and Savanna will confer a favor by publishing the above.

January 9—

SALE AT AUCTION.

WILL be sold at the house lately occupied by Henry Schnibley near the Lower Bridge on Rock Creek, on Monday the 12th inst.

HOUSEHOLD & KITCHEN FURNITURE.

Sale to commence at 11 o'clock. Terms of Sale cash.

JOHN HEWITT, Trustee.
JOHN STEPHEN, Auct.

Washington, Jan 5—3t

*** *The sale of the above property is postponed to Friday the 23d instant.*

20 DOLLARS REWARD.

RANAWAY from the subscriber in August last, Negro Charles—he is a straight well made black man, about 26 years of age, 5 feet 9 or 10 inches high; has lost some of his fore teeth; is remarkably polite and much of a gallant. The above reward will be paid to any person who will bring him home or lodge him any jail so that I get him again.

Wm. B. BEANES.

Upper Marlboo', Jan. 9—tawtf

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9.

The Kentucky papers, received by the last mail, announce the receipt of the President's Proclamation.

The subscribers to the dinner to be given to Captain LEWIS are informed that it is deferred until WEDNESDAY next, to allow time for the arrival of Captain Clarke.

The subscribers are requested to meet at Stelle's Hotel THIS EVENING, at 6 o'clock to make the necessary arrangements.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman of great respectability, dated Frankfort, Ken. Dec. 15.

"Burr left this place about five days ago, and went to Lynch's. He told me he should wait to hear as to Wilkinson's success; if hostilities did commence, he should go down and try and take all he could get to follow him, and that if hostilities did not commence he should go to the southward. I believe there is no doubt but gen. Adair has gone to Louisiana, and it is said has gone to Wilkinson. There is no doubt but men are engaging for the Burr party. I have seen several persons who have conversed with the men engaged, viz. ———and———. They are engaged for 6 months at least; to have arms if required, and are to descend the river, to get 10 dollars per month, and 100 or 150 acres of land."

QUERE.—Is the above statement, represented to have been made by Mr Burr, meant by him as a cover to plans even more hostile to the peace of the union?

Hall of the American Philosophical Society, January 2, 1807.

The following persons were duly elected officers of the society:

President—Thomas Jefferson.

Vice Presidents—Caspar Wistar, Benjamin S. Barton, Robert Patterson.

Secretaries—Adam Seybert, Thomas T. Hewson, J. R. Coxe, Thomas C. James.

Counsellers for three years—Rev. Bishop White, P. S. Duponceau, Jonathan Williams, Wm. Short.

Curators—C. W. Peale, Robert Hare, jun. J. R. Smith.

Treasurer—John Vaughan.

CONGRESS.

House of Representatives.

Tuesday, Jan. 6.

Mr. Early called for the order of the day on the *bill providing for the punishment of CERTAIN CRIMES against the U. States.*

Mr. Eppes moved to recommit the bill to a select committee. He said he trusted that the bill in its present shape would not pass. The object contemplated by it, was to give the same powers to prevent or punish an expedition against the U. S. that was already provided in the case of an expedition against a foreign power. This would be found by consulting the message of the President delivered at the commencement of the session. The President observes—"Where an enterprize is meditated by private individuals, against a foreign nation, in amity with the United States, powers of prevention, to a certain extent, are given by the laws. Would they not be as reasonable, and useful, where the enterprize preparing is against the United States?"

This is the recommendation of the President—this is the provision deemed necessary by him. Let us compare it with the provisions of the existing law. In the 3rd vol. of the laws of the U. S 5th section, we find the following provision:

"That if any person shall within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, begin or set on foot, or provide or prepare the means for any military expedition or enterprize to be carried on from thence against the territory or dominions of any foreign prince or state with whom the United States are at peace, every such person so offending, shall, upon conviction be adjudged guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall suffer fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court in which conviction shall be had, so as that such fine shall not exceed three thousand dollars, nor the term of imprisonment be more than three years."

This is the provision at present in force in respect to an enterprize against a foreign nation. But in addition to this the committee are for giving the following power. Mr. E. here read the first section of the bill under consideration, as follows:

"Be it enacted, That if any person or persons shall within the territory or jurisdiction of the U. S. begin or set on foot, or provide or prepare the means for any military expedition or enterprise, with intent of taking possession of any fort, arsenal, magazine, dock, navy yard, or any public vessel of the U. S. or of invading or occupying with an armed force any part of the U. S. or the territories thereof, or with intent, in any other manner, of levying war against the United States, or of adhering to the enemies of the said states; or who, with intent, as aforesaid, shall combine or conspire together, or shall counsel, advise, or attempt to set on foot, provide or prepare the means for any such military expedition or enterprise, or to procure any insurrection, unlawful assembly, or combination, for such purpose, although such expedition or enterprize shall not be carried into effect, and whether such conspiracy, counsel, advice, or attempt, shall have the proposed effect or not; every such person or persons so offending, shall upon conviction, be adjudged guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall suffer fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court in which the conviction shall be had, so as that such fine shall not exceed thousand dollars, or be less than dollars, nor the term of imprisonment be more than years, or less than years; and further, at the discretion of the court, be holden to find sureties for his, or their good behavior, in such sum, and for such term, as the said court may direct: *Provided always*, That nothing herein contained, shall be construed so as to prevent the trial and punishment of any person or persons guilty of treason, murder, or any other offence punishable by any law or laws of the United States."

Mr. E. said the objection he had to this bill was this. It introduced a description of offences which could not be defined, or reduced to any known standard. What was a combination or conspiracy, but just what a court may please to make it? He had another objection. In the first section the committee who reported the bill had adopted the very words of a statute which had ever been considered odious and oppressive, and which he never wished again to see adopted in whole or in part. He alluded to the memorable sedition act. And that gentlemen might see the affinity of this bill to it, he would call the attention of the House to its first section, which was as follows:

"*Be it enacted*, That if any person shall unlawfully combine or conspire together, with intent to oppose any measure or measures of the government of the United States, which are or shall be directed by proper authority, or to impede the operation of any laws of the United States, or to intimidate or prevent any person holding a place or office in or under the government of the United States, from undertaking, performing or executing his trust or duty; and if any person or persons, with intent as aforesaid, shall counsel, advice or attempt to procure any insurrection, riot, unlawful assembly, or combination, whether such conspiracy, threatening, counsel, advice, or attempt shall have the proposed effect or not, he or they shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and on conviction, before any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, and by imprisonment during a term not less than six months nor exceeding five years; and further, at the discretion of the court, may be holden to find sureties for his or their good behavior in such sum, and for such time, as the said court may direct.

Here then we have the very offences, designated in that statute, a combination and conspiracy; and all that is necessary to make this act precisely the same with the sedition bill, is to introduce the words, navy yard and arsenals.

Mr. Eppes said these were his objections to the first section. He had yesterday fully explained his objections to the second section; and although some attempt had been made to obviate them, he believed it would be impossible in a committee of the whole, so to arrange the wording of the section as to prevent an interference of its provisions with the principles of the constitution.

He had another ground for recommitting the bill—the entire omission of what he conceived an important provision. He would again recur to the message. "While adverting to this branch of law, it is proper to observe that in enterprises meditated against foreign nations, the ordinary process of binding to the observance of the peace and good behavior, could it be extended to acts to be done out of the jurisdiction of the United States, would be effectual in some cases where the offender is able to keep out of sight every indication of his purpose which could draw on him the exercise of the powers now given by law."

He believed this a valuable provision, and one which might be so framed as not to infringe the rights of the citizen. If indeed the provisions of the bill were made conformable to those of the act providing against expeditions against foreign powers, it would in his opinion suffice. That act constituted such offence a high misdemeanor, gave to the executive the power to use the armed force for the purpose of its suppression, and authorised the binding over to good behavior. For these reasons he hoped the motion to postpone the bill would be rejected, that the committee of the whole would be discharged from its further consideration and that it would be referred to a select committee.

The question was then taken on postponing the bill till to-morrow, which was disagreed to—Ayes 44—Noes 61.

Mr. Eppes then offered his motion to discharge the committee of the whole from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. Dawson said he was at a loss to know what advantages would result from such a course of procedure, unless the bill should be recommitted to a different committee from that which introduced it. It had been already recommitted; and the committee to whom it had been recommitted had reported it unanimously. As an answer to some of the objections of his colleague, he would observe that the committee in reporting this bill had only reported in part; and that they had it in contemplation to make the provision he had alluded to in a special bill. He did not consider it the duty of a committee to draft a bill in precise conformity to the ideas of the President, but in correspondence with their own sentiments. As to the objection that the bill was similar to the first section of the sedition act, Mr. Dawson observed that if his colleague had been in the House when that bill was passed he would have known that the section read by him had not been objected to by any one, and that it was only the second section which had been opposed. He hoped, if the bill were recommitted, it would be sent to some other committee than the one which had introduced it.

The question was then put on discharging the committee of the whole from the further consideration of the bill, and passed in the negative—Ayes 50—Noes 50—the Speaker declaring himself in the negative.

Mr. *Southard* from the committee appointed on a memorial of sundry citizens of Washington, presented a bill authorising the President to lease the public ground in the city of Washington, which was referred to a committee of the whole to morrow.

Wednesday, Jan. 7.

On motion of Mr. *Mumford* the petition of Samuel Beebee, heretofore presented, was referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

The House resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the bill to prohibit the importation or bringing of slaves into the U. S. after the 31st of December, 1807.

Mr. *Early* after some preliminary remarks offered the following amendment:—In all actions, suits, or informations, which shall be brought under the 3rd, 4th and 5th sections of this act the burthen of proof shall lie on the claimant, or party sued or prosecuted, where probable cause is shewn for the seizure or prosecution, to be judged of by the court before whom the seizure or prosecution shall be tried.

After a few remarks from different members, this amendment was agreed to.

Mr. *Bidwell* moved to amend the 3rd section which prescribes the forfeiture of any vessel, importing persons of color into a state where slavery is permitted, together with *her cargo*—by striking out the word "*cargo*."

The Yeas and Nays were called on this amendment, and were—Yeas 39—Nays 77.

Mr. *Bidwell* moved to add a proviso to the end of the 7th section, of the following tenor:

"*Provided that no person shall be sold as a slave by virtue of this act.*"

On this amendment a debate of considerable interest arose.

Messrs. Barker, Findley, Quincey, Varnum, Smilie, Conrad, Sloan, Chandler, Bidwell, Bedinger, Southard and Fisk supported; and Messrs. J. Clay, Alston and Early opposed the amendment.

The advocates of the amendment observed that they could never agree to sanction the existing provisions of the bill, which authorised the sale of persons of color imported into the U. S.; that while they respected the sentiments and feelings of the people of the southern states, so far as to be opposed to adopting any course which would be injurious to them, they claimed an equal respect for the sentiments and feelings of their constituents, which were so repugnant to slavery that no consideration whatever could induce them to give it their sanction; that nothing could be more abhorrent to their feelings than the legal authorisation of the sale of persons as slaves, and the drawing money into the public treasury from such sale; that indeed, such a provision, so far from inhibiting the trade, would in a measure tend to its encouragement; that as the bill stood, without the proposed provision, persons forfeited would be sold under the authority of the U. S. a title be given to the purchaser by the U. S. and the sale be for the benefit of the U. S. The object of the provision was to prevent this. Its advocates declared that they did not mean by it in the least to interfere with the existing laws of the state on the subject, much less to turn persons of color imported loose on the states where slavery was permitted. Should the present provision be adopted, it might become necessary to recommit the bill to a select committee for the purpose of introducing into its details, a provision for the disposition of the persons who may become forfeited to the U. S. that this might be done by binding them out for terms of years, or transporting them to a foreign country; and that if forfeited in states where slavery was allowed, provision might be made for their removal to states where different laws existed. The power of the general government might not, it was admitted, be competent to their liberation in the former states; but becoming by their forfeiture the property of the U. S. they would possess the right of removing them to those states with whose laws there would be no interference.

The opponents of the amendment contended that the plan contained in the bill was the only effectual and practicable one that could be devised for preventing the importation of persons of color; that their forfeiture to and sale by the U. S. was an essential provision, as without it, no person would be found to give information of the infraction of the act, & that without such information the act would be a dead letter, as in the indirect trade with the adjacent provinces of European powers it would be altogether impossible to render the vessel or master importing them liable to be seized, from the inability of reaching them.

They also contended that Congress did not possess the right to say that persons of color brought into the southern states should not be sold as slaves,