zo and Wilkinson. Alfred set out immediately with his dispatches, upon the receipt of which by Giozo, intelligence was forwarded to New Madrid from the governor-general of Louisiana, that the forts could not be given up as had been agreed upon. The excuse offered was, that the river was too low, and the artillery could not be floated off. To this circumstance president Adams alludes in his speech to congress, 23d of November, 1797. "I have entertained an expectation, that it would have been in my power at the opening of the session to have communicated to you the agreeable information of the execution of our treaty with his Catholic majesty, respecting the withdrawing of his troops from our territory, and the demarcation of the line of limits. But by the latest authentic intelligence, Spanish garrisons were still continued within our country, and the running of the boundary-line had not been commenced. These circumstances are the more to be regretted, as they cannot fail to affect the Indians in a manner injurious to the U. States. Still, however indulging the hope that the answers which have been given will remove the objection offered by the Spanish officers to the immediate execution of the treaty, I judged it proper that we should continue in a state of readiness to receive the posts and run the line of limits."

Alfred Sebastian did not return for two years, but is said during his absence to have acted as an officer in the Spanish horse at New-Orleans. Among the various documents which were collected by gen. Wayne relative to the conspiracy, is a letter from major Green, of Natchez, proving in the most satisfactory manner, that Wilkinson, during his command at Fort Washington, also held a general's commission in the Spanish service. Mr. Ellicott, who was employed to run the line, procured documents of the like import, which were delivered to the executive. The death of gene- Wayne, which happened in the end of 1796, and the expiration of the presidency of general Washington, alone prevented the trial of Wilkinson on charges of treason. No sooner was Mr. Adams elected, than general Wilkinson hurried to Philadelphia to obtain the favor of the new president. The pomp, parade and artful address of Wilkinson soon gained upon John Adams. He caused the president to believe that many of the machinations of himself and his party, were the attempts of foreign agents to alienate the affections of the Indian nations, and to excite them to actual hostilities against the United States.

It will be recollected that the Indians at this period were worked upon and tampered with by many different parties. There were agents among them from the Kentucky associatian, procuring the interest of those in favor of Spain. General Bowles was active among the Creeks and Cherokees, as likewise were the partizans of governor Blount, for the purpose of exciting them to commence hostilities against the subjects of Spain in the Floridas and Louisianna. The emissaries of Genet were equally busy, but with contrary views.

The several interests of these parties in congress, sufficiently explain the lengthy discussion which took place in the session of 1797, on the motion of Mr. Harper for an address to the president. Several days were taken up in wording the following paragraph:

"The United States have been faithful in the performance of their obligations to Spain, and had reason to expect a compliance equally prompt on the part of that power. We still, however, indulge the hope that the convincing answers which have been given to the objections stated by the Spainish officers to the immediate execution of the treaty, will have their proper effect, and that this treaty, so mutually beneficial to the contracting parties, will be finally observed with good faith. We therefore entirely approve of your determination to continue in readiness to secure the post, and to run the line of partition between our territory and that of the king of Spain. Attempts to alienate the affections of the Indians, to form them into actual hostility against the United States, whether made by foreign agents or by others, are so injurious to our interests at large, and so inhuman with respect to our citizens inhabiting the adjacent territory, as to deserve the most exemplary punishment, and we will cheerfully afford our aid in framing a law which may prescribe a punishment adequate to the commission of crimes so heinous."

One of the editors being informed by Mr. Brown, that governor Grenup has written a letter softening in part his conversation with respect to him, we beg leave to lay before the public the following communication from Mr. Hopkins, who was requested to favor us with his sentiments on the subject, having been present during the whole conversation between governor Greenup and J. W. Leaving our subscribers to decide on the preference which ought to be given to the weight of testimony; we shall conclude at present, and continue our investigation of the conspiracy next paper.

Frankfort 9th July, 1806.

GENTLEMEN,

Agreeably to your request, I feel no hesitation in communicating my impressions arising from the conversation between governor Greenup and Mr. Word, relative to the "Kentucky Spanish association," during the whole of which, I was present.

I have a clear recollection that the statement contained in the first number of the Western World is, in substance, correct; and from the willingness with which the governor seemed to impart the information, I am much astonished at a denial of any part of it. With regard to the passage to which you particularly called my attention, I well remember that governor Greenup stated that he conversed with Mr. Brown on the subject of the propositions of the Spanish minister, and that Mr. Brown "seemed in a guarded manner to approve of them;" but on the governor's "expressing his abhorrence at the scheme," all communication afterwards, between him and any of the party, was entirely cut off.

I deprecate the circumstance that has imposed the necessity of this application, and the more especially, because I had thought it would never exist; but, unappalled at the idea of incurring the displeasure of *the great*, if you deem this letter important to your cause, you are hereby privileged to make use of it.

I am, gentlemen, with respect,
Your humble servant,
S. G. HOPKINS.

To the editors of the Western World.

(To be continued)

FOR THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

MR. SMITH,

IT is one of the inestimable previleges enjoyed under our republican institutions, that every man can, without fear or molestation, suggest any amendments to the political system. And although upon reflection, such amendments may be thought not advisable; yet the investigation of their principles, may be useful to the great body of the people. A late writer over the signature of "A Freeman," has suggested to the "citizens of Maryland" his reasons for calling a convention to alter the constitution. They seem to embrace the following ideas: First—That the governor and council are *impure* in their appointments to office. And secondly—That the governor, the council and the senate are not elected *immediately* by the people.

As it respects the intimation, that *corruption* exists with the executive in their appointments to office—Will any existing *fact* justify the insinuation?—Can one solitary instance be marked out, where *bribery* has purchased an office, or *corruption* elected her favorite? For if it can, no alteration in the constitution can reach the evil—we are lost, we are undone as a people. Virtue, that basis of true republics, has deserted our land,—the temples of justice must soon become polluted, while a long night of oppression, venality, and public corruption, will fill up the remnant of our days.

In a government like ours, where the press is free, it is easy to charge the executive with corrupt motives; and it is equally easy to deny the corruption.—But on a subject of such momentous consequence, not only to the happiness of the people, but even to the very existence of the political system—ought the charge to be lightly made?—or rather, if the charge is made, ought not the ACCUSER to produce FACTS, in place of SUGGESTIONS? The cries of executive corruption may for the moment alarm: but unless something more substantial is eventually produced, they will vanish like the baseless visions of the night.

The second reason assigned by Freeman for calling a convention, is—that "the governor, council, and senate, are unknown to the elective franchise."—As it regards the election of the governor and council, who very generally in our sister states exercise the executive function, it may be observed—that some variety exists in the manner of their appointment. In Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, N. York, Vermont, and Delaware, the governor is elected DIRECTLY by the people; but both in N. York and Massachusetts, where the council *jointly* with him form the executive branch, they are elected as with us, by the joint ballot of the legislature. Did the powers vested in the governor of Maryland bear any proportion to those as constitutionally exercised by the governors of Pennsylvania, Georgia, or Carolina, there might be some necessity for the popular election:—But when it is reflected, that ALL the authority as *exclusively* invested in him is, but the *shadow* of power; and that with the exception of granting a nolle prosequi, or pardon, no one important right is intrusted—surely there can exist no imperious necessity for bringing him "to the poll of the people."

But says Freeman—Our senators are one remove from popular elections. In this, however, there is nothing either dangerous or novel. County senators, perhaps, would more assimilate us with the general practice of our sister states; yet Kentucky, who formed her constitution in '92, on this point, has considered Maryland as worthy of imitation.

But if on mature deliberation, the people would amend the constitution, and elect by popular suffrage, the governor, the council, and the senate, it may all be done; not by calling a convention; but by the usual form of two concurring legislatures.

While canvassing the propriety of amending the constitution, permit me to suggest, that the 19th article is at war with republican principles. It is there declared, "that in case of death, refusal, resignation, or disqualification of any senator, that the senate shall at their next meeting, elect another person for the residue of the term of five years." This extraordinary donation of power, that enables the senate to fill up their own vacancies, is not only contrary to the true *representative* principle; but it contains one of the most prominent features in the picture of aristocracy; it destroys all popular responsibility; it forms a self-created and independent phalanx; and removes *one half* of the legislative branch from the salutary control of popular influence.—That this principle is aristocratic, anti-republican, and at war with the representative plan, none will deny; and yet strange is the fact, that neither a former federal, nor a late republican senate would admit a constitutional corrective!!! Is it, that divested of power, man thinks and acts with error? or is it not, that when clothed with a little "brief authority," he considers power as a personal prerogative, and refuses to give it up.

Considering *responsibility* the vital principle of the representative system, whether it was either wise or politic to invest part of the legislature with a *five* years tenure in office, independent on popular election, is a question that merits serious consideration. That this branch of the government, which daily acts on our lives, our liberties, and property should for a period so long be wholly beyond control, was at least an experiment of hazzard: but that this body should inherit the additional prerogative of SELF-CREATION, is a wide departure from the republican system.

Whoever attentively examines the constitution will immediately perceive, that the qualifications for a senator are more highly considered, than those for the other branch, and this sufficiently demonstrates the opinion the convention entertained of their future influence.—In a majority of the American constitutions, the senate are elected for a longer time than the members of the other house; but it is worthy of remark, that in no state, except Maryland, is their continuance in office longer than FOUR years; and in ALL, the salutary maxim of ROTATION is wisely introduced. And perhaps the true reason why the ROTATIVE principle was not engrafted on our constitution was, that as the senate fill up their own vacancies, the new members would be equally *far* removed from the popular suffrage. As a republican elector, I would advocate the election of no senator, who would refuse to amend the constitution, and prohibit the senate from filling up their own vacancies.

REPUBLICAN.

Queen Ann's county, August 19th, 1806.

FOR THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

MR. SMITH,

Before I enter on the remarks promised, I beg leave to premise—that I have not (as far as I know myself) any animosity towards any individual member of the Methodist Society;—that I would not willingly or wantonly wound the feelings of any person;—that to enable the public to judge of a letter much conversed about, as relating to the subject of Methodist Episcopacy, was my chief object in giving it publicity;—and that I esteem myself fully justified in so doing, since from the general tenor of the letter, it appears that the writer expected it to be made known as extensively as was necessary to meet the reports which caused it to be written.

The letter published as written by Mr. M'Claskey to Bishop White, and that of Bishop White to Mr. M'Claskey in reply, I suppose are correct copies, and I will not call them in question. Yet admitting this, and even supposing the statement of the conversation said to have taken place between the Rev. S. Wilmer and Dr. Anderson to be correct, (though I am credibly informed, that a certificate could be produced from a person present, now a Deacon of the Church, were it necessary, to prove it not altogether so,) I see no very material opposition between the contents of that statement and the testimony contained, either explicitly or impliedly, in Bishop White's letter.

I readily also acknowledge, that no *explicit* or *direct* proof is contained in the Bishop's letter, that Dr. Coke applied for re-*consecration*, nor was that letter published to prove that circumstance in particular—although the Wesleyan has made that idea the basis of all he has written on this occasion: but there are inferences naturally arising from that letter, which have a close connection with the point debated for some time past between a Wesleyan and a Churchman and others, viz. the validity of Methodist Episcopacy, and the ordination thereon depending. For which purpose (not as primary proofs, but as collateral evidences) the letter and extract from Dr. Coke's Journal, were produced.

Let us then collect the collateral and fairly presumptive evidence afforded by the letter. An application we find was made by Dr. Coke for a union between the Methodist Society and the Episcopal Church, and a re-ordination of the Methodist ministers, was one of the points stipulated for—no exception of any order in the ministry, or of any individuals in those orders, being made—consequently, Methodist Bishops being one order of Methodist ministers, must be included in that general stipulation. This is as fair an inference, and as solid an argument to prove the consistency between Mr. Wilmer's account and Bishop White's letter, and I will venture to think much more so, than any the Wesleyan has produced in support of the validity of Methodist Episcopacy. Upon this, however, I shall not place my sole reliance.

The stipulation respecting a re-ordination, doth in itself imply a defect in the former one. For never was it known in the Christian Church, that for the sake of accommodation solely, or for merely temporal purposes, that that sacred rite was consented to be sported with. And, re-ordinations, like re-baptisms, have ever been looked upon with a degree of horror, and have never been complied with or submitted to, but under the supposition that the former was invalid or defective.

Again—If in this general re-ordination the Wesleyan Bishops were not to be included, Dr. Coke, by this stipulation, actually gave up his and Mr. Asbury's hitherto assumed prerogative of ever ordaining Bishops, Elders or Deacons in future; since it would have been a mere burlesque upon ordination, for them to have gone through sacred rites and ceremonies, which must be repeated by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, before such ordained persons could be admitted to exercise the functions of their order.

In that letter also, if the foregoing inferences will not suffice, we may collect another presumptive evidence that Dr. Coke was not perfectly satisfied that all was right respecting his Episcopate—since he suggested the propriety of admitting him and his colleague in the superintency into the Episcopacy. Now what need of such suggestion, if he was fully satisfied he was already in the Episcopacy in consequence of his Wesleyan consecration? Besides, Dr. Coke well knew he could not possibly be admitted into the Episcopacy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, without a re-consecration; and from this suggestion it is fairly to be deduced, that he was willing his former consecration should be deemed invalid. For, I again repeat it, as an established principle in all Episcopalian Churches, that it is only on the supposition that a former ordination was invalid or defective, that would justify any man in receiving, or any Bishop in conferring a re-ordination.

This view of the subject is also far more honorable to Dr. Coke as a christian, under the influence of no improper or sinister motives, than the motive the Wesleyan adduces for his conduct. What! a Bishop of the Church of God, to allow his ordinations to be set aide, and to renounce his Episcopal powers in future, merely for the privilege of officiating in a few *revenous buildings!* Noble motive truly! I cannot entertain so mean and unworthy an opinion of Dr. Coke.

These inferences are, in my opinion, fairly deducible from Bishop White's letter, and are an answer to the letter of Mr. M'Claskey; and so I expect the public will consider them to be, although the Wesleyan asserts that an answer is wholly avoided being given by the Bishop; and, that not one word is expressed or implied respecting Dr. Coke's application to the convention for a re-ordination, &c. &c.

It is however a well known maxim, "Qui facit per aliuim, facit per se"—accordingly Dr. Coke acted by his attorney, Bishop White, in this business; and the latter in his letter declares that it contained an answer, either explicitly or impliedly, to the questions which had been put to him both by Mr. Wilmer and Mr. M'Claskey. Now the Bishop being a Churchman, write like a Churchman, acquainted with the tenets of the Church respecting ordination; and could not expect that gentleman who bears the title of Reverend, and stands high in the society, in which he is esteemed an Elder or Presbyter, could be ignorant of the subject particularly, when it is remarked, that it is a society which assumes the apellation of an Episcopal Church.

These inferences from the Bishop's letter, shows that there is some collateral evidence to be obtained therefrom respecting Methodist Episcopacy, and for which purpose it was given to the public. And though it declares not, totidem verbis, that Dr. Coke suspected his ordination to be invalid, or applied personally for a re-consecration,—it proves, very nearly indeed, an equivalent; and more particularly so, when taken in connection with the extract from his Journal, respecting Bishop Hoadley's treatises on Conformity and Episcopacy. So that notwithstanding all the Wesleyan has written, there is no very material opposition between the Rev. S. Wilmer's account and Bishop White's letter. And, in respect to the main question, Mr. Wesley's defender has not afforded us the shadow of an argument in favor of Methodist Episcopacy, which is the subject before the public, and not a personal dispute between two gentlemen.

The question then still stands thus—Is Methodist Episcopacy a valid Episcopacy, or is it not? Episcopalians say not—and unless something more satisfactory con be said in its defence than has been, I must, for one, remain in the opinion—that it is a nullity, and that all the ordinations depending thereon, are null also.

Having shewn that the Bishop's letter answers all the purposes for which it was published, I shall make no remarks on what the Wesleyan asserts respecting the concessions to be made to the Methodists in the (then) projected union, as he produces no testimony but his own opinions and conjectures, and Dr. Coke's *thoughts* for them. More convincing testimony than this ought to have been produced, to render them worthy of a serious attention.

As to the matter being made a subject of newspaper investigation, I should conceive that a complaint of this kind must come with a bad grace from this writer, since he, or some friend to his cause, began the contest, and have since availed themselves to the utmost, of all the advantages such a mode of communication affords. If this be a cause of complaint, Protestant Episcopalians have the sole right of complaining.

I shall conclude this letter with remarking, that the Wesleyan wishes to make it appear from Mr. Wilmer's letter, that he did not esteem the Bishop's letter satisfactory; but I am authorised to observe, that Mr. Wilmer was satisfied with the Bishop's letter, and made the communication of the names mentioned, solely to remove an impression made on the public mind, that he was singular in his opinion of Dr. Coke's application to Bishop White, and of the invalidity of Methodist ordination.

Should the further remarks of the Wesleyan require an answer, you will again hear from your correspondent

JUVENIS.

Philadelphia, August 22.

Distressing Information.

By the Endymion, arrived at the Lazaretto, from Laguira, we have received the melancholy advice of the execution of the whole of the officers and crews, of the two schooners belonging to Miranda's squadron. They were first hung; then their heads taken off and exposed on poles. Among the number of unfortunate victims to the sanguinary rage of the Spanish government, we have heard of several whose cases certainly claimed exemption from this cruel fate; one in particular, a young man belonging to New-York, who had been impressed by the British frigate, which boarded Miranda on his passage out from New-York. He was transferred from the frigate to one of Miranda's schooners; and was thus *forcibly* enlisted in the cause, for which he has innocently forfeited his life! while we sympathize with the friends of the deceased, we also participate with them in indignation at this barbarous outrage on humanity.

August 23.

MELANCHOLY!

By the arrival of the brig Endymion, captain Suter, 16 days from Laguira, we are informed, that a part of the crews of Miranda's schooners, taken some time since by the Spaniards, viz. captains Donohue and Gardiner, Messrs. Lippincot, Ludlie, Paul George, Kirkland, a Polish gentleman, and one Smith, a butcher, of New-York, were all hung, and their heads set on poles, a few days before the Endymion sailed, and the other part of the crews, 48 in number, were condemned to the mines for 10 years. The same accounts say, that Miranda had received a reinforcement of ten sail, and gone against the Caracas; but that no fears were entertained by the Spanish government.

Extract of a letter from captain Suter, of the brig Endymion, arrived at the Lazaretto, from Laguira, dated August 22, 1806.

"I arrived here after a passage of 15 days from Laguira—I was boarded by the Brutus, armed schooner, from Antigua, and politely treated. In the Mona Passage, was boarded by one of his majesty's brigs from Europe, behaved very mean, detained us and pressed several men from the brig, leaving me only two seamen on board. He would not tell his name nor that of his vessel. Lat. 26, 20. long. 71, spoke schr. Caroline, 9 days out, from Trinidad, bound to Philadelphia. Lat. 34, 56, long. 72, 30, spoke sch'r Trent from Edenton, bound to Guaddoupe.

"Eight days before the End, m