National Intelligencer.

& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. 1338.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, MONDAY, MAY 8, 1809. PAID IN ADVANCE.

THE *National Intelligencer* will henceforth be conducted by SAMUEL H. SMITH, and JOSEPH GALES, Jun. and printed at the Office of the *former*, to whom subscribers and correspondents are requested still to address themselves.

The annual price, payable in advance, is *Five Dollars*.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding one square in breadth, are inserted the first time at *fifty cents*, and for every subsequent insertion *twenty-five cents*. If inserted less than three times a *Dollar* is charged. If inserted but once a week, an addition of one fourth part is made. Other advertisements charged in the same ratio.

From the Aurora.

CIRCUIT COURT U. STATES.

On Monday afternoon, at 4 o'clock, the Jury, impannelled to try the case of the *United States, vs. Mi. Bright*, and others, appeared in court and delivered the following verdict :—

The United Sates, vs. Mi. Bright and others. } Special verdict, Phila. 1 May, 1809.

And now, to wit, on this first day of May, in the year aforesaid, the jurors sworn, affirmed, and impannelled as aforesaid, upon their oaths and affirmations aforesaid, do find, that on the said 24th March, 1809, in the city of Philadelphia, aforesaid, the defendants did knowingly and wilfully obstruct, resist, and oppose the said John Smith, then and there being an officer of the United States, to wit, the marshal of the district of Pennsylvania, in attempting then and there to serve and execute the said judicial writ of arrest, in the indictment mentioned ; and that the said defendants, then and there acted under the orders of the constituted authorities of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in so obstructing, resisting and opposing the said marshal, as aforesaid :—and whether, upon the whole matter, the law is in favor of the U. States or of the defendants, the jurors aforesaid refer to the consideration of the court ; and if the court are of opinion that the law is for the U. States, then the jurors aforesaid do find the defendants and every of them GUILTY—but, if the court are of opinion that the law is for the defendants, then they find the defendants not guilty.

(Signed)
William Sharswood,
Benjamin Thaw,
Mathias Corless,
John Gallagher,
John Philips,
Conrad Seybert,
Liberty Brown,
John Jennings,
John White, junior,
Charles Barrington,
Thomas Algeo,
Geo. A. Wray.

The court decided that this verdict should be entered, and instructed the counsel to be prepared by 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning if they proposed to discuss the point of law : the district attorney declared his readiness, and the counsel for the defendants enquired if the time allowed were not too short. Judge Washington answered that, if the counsel for the defendants would say on Tuesday morning that they were not prepared, the court would extend the time.

Yesterday morning the court met at ten o'clock. The district attorney said, that the discussion had already been so extensive and deliberate, he did not wish to trespass upon the time of the court by any further observations, and therefore as he could take no novel ground, he would submit the point of law to the decision of the court, as contemplated by the verdict.

Mr. *Ingersol*, counsel for the defendants, also declined entering into any argument.

Mr. *Franklin* attorney general of the commonwealth, having read an affidavit to prove that Mathias Corless, one of the jurymen, had clandestinely left the jury room, on the 30th ult. before a verdict had been agreed upon ; said, that he would merely submit the facts stated in the affidavit to the court, as he found they did not authorise him to move for a new trial.

Some conversation took place on the subject, between the court, the U. States' attorney and marshal.

Judge Washington then declared that, as the opinion of the court had been already decidedly and maturely formed, it was unnecessary to defer its decision ; in accordance, therefore, with the verdict of the jury, he pronounced the defendants guilty, in manner and form as charged in the indictment.

The court then directed the defendants to appear at four o'clock, to await the sentence.

At four o'clock, the court met, when Mr. Dallas, district attorney, prayed the court to pronounce its sentence. He prefaced the request, by expressing the great regret which he felt at the circumstances which made it his duty to ask it ; he declared that the prosecution would not have been urged had the constituted authorities of Pennsylvania expressed, through its organ, any regret at the part they had taken ; but that, as no such opportunity was offered him, he was impelled by his wishes for the integrity of the union, and the safety of the constitution and laws, for the welfare of the community, and by a sense of public duty, superior to all personal feeling, to seek the punishment of the defendants, for an offence, the certainty and tendency of which he was persuaded they would all acknowledge and regret.

Judge Washington addressed the defendants, in a very impressive manner, and represented the nature of the offence they had committed, and the circumstances that would follow a prostration of the civil before the military authority He regretted, for the honor of the union, and particularly for the honor of Pennsylvania, that the defendants had mistaken their duties, and obeyed a military order to do an unlawful act ; and said it was the more inexcusable in Philadelphia, where the means of obtaining legal and political information was at every man's command. He concluded by pronouncing the sentence, as given in our last.

FROM THE TRUE AMERICAN.

In the case of the United States, vs. Michael Bright and others, the Circuit Court decided on the special verdict, that the defendants were *Guilty*, & yesterday afternoon, the prisoners being placed at the bar, the district attorney addressed the court, and said, that in compliance with his duty, he called upon the court to pronounce the sentence of the law. This duty the most painful he had ever been called to perform, he would on his own responsibility, have omitted to perform for the present, if the At'y Gen. of the state of Pennsylvania, on behalf of the constituted authorities of the state, had or would request it. No reply was made by the counsel for the defendants. Judge Washington then rose and addressed the defendants as follows :

A concluding period has now arrived to the long and deplorable contest, in which you have been, we believe, under mistaken notions of duty, most unfortunate for the character of our common country, and peculiarly of this respectable part of it, engaged. The origin of the controversy is lost sight of in the more important and dangerous consequences which have grown out of it. If the measure of which you unhappily permitted yourselves to be made the instruments, had not been checked in its commencement, it might by its effects and example have swelled into an irresistible torrent, prostrating in its course the liberties, the laws, the happiness and the safety of the nation.

That such was the object, or that this was the melancholy catastrophe either intended or desired, we have not the most distant belief. But such must be the result when arms are opposed to laws, and force is resorted to in resistance to the deliberate and disinterested decrees of the tribunals of justice, or the lawful acts of the other departments of our government. In the members of this court, there exists no no other feeling or recollection, than such as the most sincere regrets inspire, that the occurrences we so much deplore have arisen from decisions in which we have, in our respective stations, had a share.

We should be unworthy of the responsible stations in which we are placed, if we suffered any other than public motives connected with a sense of duty to influence our conduct. Our task has been a painful one, but we have endeavored to perform it with impartiality. We reflect with pleasure that every opportunity was offered for discussion, and that this case has been conducted with a greater latitude and range of arguments, than perhaps woud have been strictly right on common occasions. Every thing has been done and said which could contribute to a clear understanding of the cases. The decision has been made on the law a it arises on the facts found by the jury, too plain and palpable to admit of difficulty or doubt, with the most entire conviction and belief of its rectitude.

It is obvious that you have mistaken a supposed duty which you presumed you owed to the constituted authorities of your particular state, while you were opposing the laws of the U. S. and violating predominant obligations. None more highly appreciate than we do, the military spirit of our fellow-citizens, and the discipline and subordination of our militia. These attributes when required in laudable and necessary efforts for the support of the laws, or for the safety of our country, are highly commendable. But when employed, as yours have been, in measures of resistance to established principles of the constitution and in violation of the peace and good order of the nation, they become destructive in their immediate effects, and widely mischievous in their example. We do not say this reproachfully, being persuaded that you acted under mistaken notions of duty ; it becomes us at the same time to express in pointed terms our disapprobation. As it has been your lot to be engaged in a measure which, on reflection hereafter, you cannot yourselves approve ; it should alleviate any unpleasant consequences you may experience in your situations, that nothing will wipe away the unfortunate stain on our republican systems but submission to the correction of the laws, not vindictive, but exemplary and salutary. If physical force is rendered nerveless by the superior power of the laws, we need not regard the reproaches nor the predictions of those unfriendly to republican forms of government.

It does not lie with us to enter into these considerations which belong exclusively to another department of the government. Our duty is prescribed and must we obey. Instances in other cases have occurred, wherein the imperative obligations of duty have induced decisions contrary to the wishes and feelings of those who gave them. Your case, and particularly that of the commanding officer, is less susceptible of apology than those alluded to.—You were called upon to act in an enlightened city, where the means of information on legal and political subjects are particularly great, and where it was in your power at any moment to have obtained the best advice as to the obligation of the orders you received. If you listened to improper council we can only lament the circumstance.

It is our duty, however unpleasant the exercise of it, to pronounce the following sentences in your several cases, and in fixing the degree of punishment, we have not been inattentive to every circumstance which has been offered in your favor. The triumph of the laws over military force arrayed against them, is sufficient for their objects. The measure of punishment is, in your unfortunate case particularly, of small comparative importance. Example and not severity is dictated by our duty and has been our aim.

The sentiments of the court, are that you, Michael Bright, be imprisoned for the term of three months, and pay a fine of two hundred dollars, to the United States, and that you James Atkinson, William Cole, Charles Westfall, Samuel Wilkens, Abraham Ogden, Daniel Phyle, Charles Hong and John Knipe, be severally imprisoned for the term of one month, and severally pay a fine of fifty dollars to the United States, and stand committed till these sentences are complied with.

The Marshal immediately conducted the prisoners to jail, where they are now confined. All was transacted in peace and tranquility, and to the honor of our city be it mentioned, that the demands of the laws have been satisfied without tumult or riot.

BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

FEBRUARY 17.

The order of the day being read, Lord *Grenville* rose and spoke to the following effect :—

" My Lords, it will be in your lordships recollection, that towards the close of the last session of Parliament, I gave notice of my intention of making a motion similar to the one I am about to propose for the consideration of this House. For this purpose it was, the manufacturers and merchants affected by the ruinous consequences of your orders in council, were summoned and gave evidence at the bar, which completely and fully proved the impolicy of those measures. But I had reasons to suppose at the time, what was the strongest wish of my heart, that means would then be resorted to, by which the differences between this country and America might be placed in a situation most likely to produce reconciliation. This consideration induced me to relinquish the motion of which I gave notice on the occasion ; and when, my lords, I retired from this House, it would have been a consolation to my mind, if what had been then already known in respect to the pernicious effect of these orders, and what has since resulted, had led to the adoption of more just and wiser counsels. On the contrary, we find the same conduct persevered in ; his majesty's ministers persist in this blind policy, which renders it necessary for me to bring this subject again under your solemn investigation. It might be found, upon former occasions, that the expediency of this line of conduct towards America was a question of argument : but it has now ceased to be so : no pretext can be set forth to do away those facts which irresistibly prove the increasing calamities growing out of the orders in council. If we revert to the end of that disastrous war which raged between the two countries, and review the proceedings of government in respect to America in 1783, and from that period down to the present administration, every endeavor was made that all disputes might cease, all past prejudices be obliterated, and complete harmony be established between the two countries. The wisdom of conciliating America naturally presented itself ; that country was nearly allied to us, and many events might take place to make it one of the most important interests of G. Britain to have America our friend.

And when the late war broke out on the continent, it was not only my own firm conviction, but it was the particular care of Mr. Pitt, to take every step to put an end to all differences which remained unsettled, being certain of the prudence on our part, to use every means of strengthening the bonds of amity between the two nations. I had reason to feel happy, not only in being so disposed, but in having the opportunity of being assisted in this pursuit by the ability of so great a statesman. It was also one of the first considerations, on the parts of myself and colleagues, in the late administration, to hasten the completion of what had been so wisely begun ; and, under the management of a noble lord near me, it was confidently hoped, that every prior dispute would then be happily adjusted, and a treaty, disadvantageous to neither, but mutually advantageous to both, was agreed upon between the two countries. Soon after, every engine was set to work, every means was resorted to by those who approve of the present proceedings, to make it believed a treaty had been negociated, inimical to our mercantile interest. But, my lords, I will venture to say that there was not the smallest part of the treaty alluded to disadvantageous to commerce, but was actually more advantageous than what had since been required on the part of his majesty's ministers. Before the terms of that treaty were known, they were condemned by those who wish to drive the two countries into open hostility. In discussing the present question, the first point and most material feature which I shall first mention, is the statement which has been recently made, relative to the proposal of America for rescinding our orders in council, and reversing the decrees of France. How such a statement should be made from such an authority as the noble Secretary of State, and so contrary to the fact, is to my mind incomprehensible. But, my lords, in the course of this evening, I pledge myself to clear this part of the American conduct from the shadow of a doubt. I will shew you from documents now on your lordship's table, a satisfactory contradiction to this studied misrepresentation. (Hear! Hear! from the ministerial side.) I mean to convey no personal allusion to the noble Secretary, but it was certainly declared that America, in her proposals, exhibited a disposition partial towards France, and hostile towards this country. *Here it becomes me, in justice to the* character of the person who presides in the United States, to retract a mistatement, for God forbid I should not do so, and particularly when I complain of the mistatement of others ! I did think, from the information I then possessed, his conduct was not unworthy of approbation, in shewing a preference to the cause of France. But it was not so ; the speech imputed to him was not true, and it was for noble lords opposite to have corrected all mistakes on the subject. My lords, it may well be remembered, when the present administration had succeeded in their desired and favorite object of filling the situations which they now occupy, their first step was to manifest by all possible means, their determination to pursue a line of conduct completely contradictory to that pursued by their predecessors. Happy, my lords, very happy do I feel, that there is no resemblance between their measures and those of their predecessors. I am far from being happy because they have adopted measures so contradictory ; but I am happy their predecessors guided themselves by wiser counsels, by principles more just and more conducive to the welfare of these dominions. They have fully evinced to the world their success in this determination ; no contrast can be more opposite than the measures produced by the two administrations.

It was our province to conciliate—it has been theirs to irritate—It was ours to smooth over difficulties, and produce a good understanding and harmony between this country and the United States—it has been their study to foment dispute, to inflame by injustice and outrage, and to drive by force that country into open war with ourselves. Their predecessers may feel consolation that the whole of their conduct was different from that of the present ministers. It was different in respect to Ireland, in respect to the Continent, in respect to neutral nations, in respect to domestic policy, in respect to measures of finance, and most of all, in respect to America. It will be unnecessary to have recourse to what has been on former occassions so repeatedly urged upon the present question, and I shall on that account conform myself to those observations, which arise out of the effects produced by the orders of council. But at the same time my conviction is the same ; the opinion I before delivered is confirmed by experience, and is more and more strengthened by the accumulation of facts : I am fully convinced the policy of these measures betrays more egregious folly, and more confounded ignorance, than was ever manifested by any set of men, conducting the affairs of government. The avowed object of these orders was declared to be, to counteract the unjust decrees of the ruler of France ; I shall not now discuss the impropriety of making such orders, contrary to the laws and statutes of the realm and in open and wanton violation of the sacred laws of nations, but shall next call your lordship's attention to the proposals themselves, made by the United States of America. On the 23d of August last, in consequence of what had previously been communicated on this subject, between the two countries, instructions were given to Mr. Pinkney, the American minister, resident in this country to propose to his Majesty's government, that if the orders in council were rescinded in respect to America, the embargo would be taken off in respect to us ; and if the enemy should not repeal their decrees, the embargo would be continued with regard to them. *The documents themselves are on the table, and they fully contradict the statement made, so surprizingly made by those in whose possession the documents were at the very time*, namely that America, exhibited a favorable disposition towards the government of France, and in making these proposals, had promised more to France, than to Great Britain. But, my Lords, it is by no means the case ; these documents will enable me to prove the reverse of that position.—It was well known to America, if France alone had annulled her decrees, still America would not improve her situation as to the embargo : for if she were to send her numerous merchant vessels to cover the seas, they would eventually fall a sacrifice to the orders in council. Therefore, the only prospect of advantage held out to France, was to this purpose : rescind