

TRIAL OF AARON BURR. (Continued by adjournment, and held at the Capitol in the Hall of the House of Delegates) for HIGH TREASON against the United States.

[The Examination on Tuesday, Aug. 13th, continued.] Examination of PETER TAYLOR.

Mr. Hay. This witness will directly prove the connection of Burr with Blannerhassett, and his connection with the crime itself. Peter Taylor. The first information I had upon this subject was from Mrs. Blannerhassett, when Mr. Blannerhassett and Mr. Alston were gone down the river. The people got much alarmed concerning this business, and Mrs. Blannerhassett sent me to Lexington after Mr. Bl. with a letter to prevent col. B. from coming back with him to the island.

I got back on Monday by 1 o'clock, and there Mr. Bl. was come, and preparing to go home. We started and got 10 miles that night. We stopt at a tavern. I went to see after the horses, and he went in the house. There were people in the house, who wanted to know his name: he told them his name was Tom Jones: he came out and told me the people in the house had asked, and he had told them his name was Tom Jones, and I must mind and make no mistake, but call him Jones too; so he passed by that name till we got to the Mudlicks. He then told me he was known there, and I must call him by his own name.

Mr. Hay. When did the boats leave the Island? A. It was contemplated to sail on the 6th of December; but they did not come till 10th (Sunday) and they sailed on the Wednesday night following. Q. How many boats were there? A. Four. Q. How many men from the boats came ashore? A. About 30. Q. What did the men do, who did not belong to the boats? A. Some were packing meat; and some were packing other things. Mr. McRae. Who went off on Wednesday night? A. Mr. Blannerhassett and Mr. Tyler and the whole of the party.

there any powder or lead? A. Both: I saw some powder in a long small-barrel-like a churn; but I was so employed, I could not notice particularly. Some of the men were engaged in turning bullets; but I do not know how many. Mr. McRae. Why did they leave the Island at that hour of the night? A. Because they were informed of the Kanawha militia were coming down there. Q. Did you carry some boxes to the boats? A. I carried a half bushel of candles and some brandy: several boxes were carried, and a great many things of which I knew nothing. Mr. Hay. Were you on the Island when they went off? A. Yes. They held a council at the foot of the pier, to determine which was the best way to go. Mr. Blannerhassett said, if he went in a canoe, he would be an easy prey. I said to them, "best stick together." And so they determined to stick together. They went off in great haste. Q. Why did they go in a body? A. I suppose for security.

Wednesday, August 19. Examination of Gen. JOHN MORGAN.

Sometime in August last, about this time twelve months, my father put a letter into my hands, signed Aaron Burr, in which he said that himself and his friend Colonel Dupieter would dine with him the following day. My father requested me and my brother to go and meet Col. Burr; which we did; about 7 miles distant. After a few words of general conversation, Col. Burr observed to me, that the union could not possibly last, and that a separation of the States must ensue as a natural consequence in 4 or 5 years. Col. Burr made many enquiries of me, relative to the country of Washington, particularly the title of its militia, the discipline, arms, accoutrements, and the character of its officers.

Mr. Hay. Which way did he go? A. I saw him leave Washington for Wheeling. Mr. Wirt. Where the separation of the union and military affairs the predominant features in his conversations? A. Our conversation was general and mixed; but these formed to be the leading subjects. Mr. Hay. Do you recollect anything he said, about Bradford's qualifications for such an enterprise? A. I recollect it well. He said that Bradford was very incompetent to lead an undertaking; and that in such a case, there ought to be the utmost confidence in the leader. Mr. Wirt. At what time in the month of August was this visit? A. Somewhere between the 20th and 25th. Mr. Hay. Perhaps the date of this letter (from the prisoner to your father) may show. This letter is dated on the 21st. Mr. Parker. (a juror.) Did he approve or condemn that sentiment of the major's which you have quoted? A. I do not recollect. The impression on my mind was, that he thought him a fine fellow.

told me! A. You seemed to know a good deal of the insurrection. Q. Did you not tell me that Bradford was a noisy demagogue? A. I did not. I had no objections to give my opinion of Mr. Bradford. I mentioned him to you as a mere lawyer. Q. Did I seem to know that Bradford lived at Pittsburg, before you mentioned it and pointed out his house? A. You did not seem to know it. Q. Who were at Dinner at your father's? A. My father, mother, wife, sister, Col. Dupieter, Mr. T. E., my brother Tom.

Examination of Col. George Morgan.

Col Morgan was proceeding, when Mr. Burr objected to this kind of evidence, consisting of conversations and previous declarations. Some defultory conversation ensued upon this point, when the Chief Justice said that he understood the same objections would hereafter apply to the consideration as to the introduction of testimony; that these objections might be better urged; and that it was impossible for the court to know the nature of the evidence before it was introduced. Mr. Hay. If the gentlemen will only wait, they will find that other circumstances will come out to prove the materiality of this testimony. This witness will prove what was the state of the prisoner's mind in August last. Mr. Lee. I hope then, the jury will distinctly understand, that they are not to infer from the court's declining to interfere on the present occasion, that every thing which drops from the witness, is to pass without objection. Col. Morgan (the father of the last witness) There has been a long acquaintance between Col. Burr and myself. He had introduced to my notice two of his nephews by the name of — and a third by the name of Edwards, Pierpont Edwards's — I had received many civilities from Col. Burr in New York, after their things had parted: which had formed such an attachment to him, that he never should have forgotten it, had not this late business taken place. About three years ago, Col. B. was under considerable, and as I thought unjust persecution. I had then a younger son, who is now here, studying law at Pittsburg. I wished to make him known to Col. B. in consequence of my friendship for him and of the great rage of persecution against him. I invited him in that letter to Morgan's. In all probability, I should have done the same things, from the same motive, if not for the attachment which I had conceived for him. Col. B. however had left Pittsburg, before my letter reached it, and it remains now in my son's Scritoire at Pittsburg. — On the 24th of August, I received a letter from Col. B. dated at Pittsburg, informing me, that he would dine with me the next day (Here Mr. Hay handed the letter to Col. M. who said that the letter was dated on the 21st, and that he had not for some time seen it, as he had transmitted it to the President of the United States.) This letter was handed to me by a man, who called himself Count Willie. I believe my son did not call on me that evening; but next morning I informed him, if I was able, I should certainly go and meet Col. B. and I requested him and his brother to do it, with a letter of introduction explanatory of their names and their intention. What conversation took place between him and my son, I shall not state. — Col. B. mentioned to me in conversation C. Dupieter as one of the first military characters of the age. I shall pass over the conversation and incidents during dinner. I spoke of our fine country; I observed that when I first went there, there was not a single family between the Allegheny mountains and the Ohio; and that by and bye we should have Congress sitting in this neighborhood, or at Pittsburg. We are allowed to sport these things over a glass of wine. "No, never," said Col. Burr; "I'm left then five years you will be totally divided from the Atlantic States." The Colonel entered into some arguments to prove, why it would not be so.

The first reason was, the produce of the sale of the western lands, being carried to the Atlantic States, and that the people to the west should not be tributary to them. He said that our taxes were very heavy, and demanded, why we should pay them to the Atlantic parts of the country. By this time I took an opportunity to observe, God forbid! I hoped that no such things would happen at least in my time. This observation terminated the conversation at that particular point. It then turned upon the weakness and imbecility of the B. Government; I don't recollect saying anything on the subject; but began to think that all was not right. He said, with 200 men he could drive Congress with the President at his head into the river Potomac; or that it might be done; and he said with 500 men he could take possession of New York. He appealed to Col. Dupieter, if it could not be done; he bowed assent. There was a reply made to this by one of my sons, that he would be damned, if they could take our little town of Cannonburg with that force. Some short time after this, Col. B. went out from the Dining room to the passage and beckoned to my son Thomas. They went out and had some conversation. What that conversation was, I shall leave to my own husband to tell. Soon after a walk was proposed to my son's mill and the company went. When they returned, one (or both of my sons) came to caution me, and said, "You may depend on it, Col. B. will this night open himself to you. He wants Tom to go with him." After the usual conversation, Col. B. went up stairs, and as I thought to go to bed, Mrs. Morgan was reading to me, as is usual when the family have retired; when about 11 o'clock, and when I thought he had been asleep an hour he told me that Col. B. was coming, and as he had heard my son's conversation, he added "you'll have it now." Col. B. came with a candle in his hand. Mrs. Morgan immediately retired. The Colonel took his seat by me. He drew from his pocket a book; I suppose it was a memorandum book. After looking at it, he asked me, if I knew Mr. Vigo of Fort Vincent, a Spaniard. I replied, yes; I knew him; I had reasons to know him. One was, that I had reasons to believe that he was deeply involved in the British conspiracy in '88, as I supposed; the object of which was to separate the States; and which General Neville and myself had suppressed. I called it a nefarious project to aim at the division of the States. I was careful to put great emphasis on the word nefarious. Col. B. finding what kind of man he had to deal with, suddenly stopped, thrust into his pocket the book which I saw had blank leaves in it, and retired to bed. I believe I was pretty well underfoot. The next morning Col. B. and Col. Dupieter went off before breakfast, without my expediting it, in company with my son; and from that time to this, I have not seen him but in this place. My son agreed with me, that I should apprise the President of our impressions, and point out a mode by which Col. B. might be followed up by me. — Mr. McRae. After your observations about the country and the subsequent conversation, did the prisoner draw any comparison between the Eastern and Western States? A. He said, "Keep yourself on this side of the mountain, and you'll never be disturbed." By which I understood that there was an attempt to be made to effect a dis-

union. — There is one more circumstance, which I must state to the court. The Sunday after, the judge of our circuit court dined with me. I requested him to mention the circumstance as to Gen. Neville, and invited him to come the following Sunday to dinner, with judges Tillman and Roberts, for I had business of the first importance to communicate. They did not dine with me on that day; but they did on the following Sunday. These gentlemen wrote a joint letter to the President, informing him of my communications to them.

Examined. Cross-Examined.

Mr. Burr. What sort of book was the one I had in my hand? Was it bound? A. It was not so large as this; I do not recollect whether it was bound, as it would not be very polite in me to take particular notice of such things, when gentlemen are dining with you. Q. When you saw Col. B. in your own house, to what transaction did you allude? A. Vigo's plan, which I conceived was intended to deliver the union. Q. Who were present, when Judge Tillman saw you? A. General Neville and Judge Roberts. Q. Was there any other from Pittsburg? A. None. Q. Your conversation was then jocular about the moving of Congress to Pittsburg? A. My manner might have been jocular; but not my meaning. Q. Did you not once live on the Mississippi? A. I did with the approbation of my country. Q. Where was it? A. At sev Madrid, Q. On which side of the Mississippi? A. The west. Q. In the Spanish Territory? A. With the approbation of the Spanish government. Q. How long did you live there? A. About 45 days. I went from that place to N. Orleans, where I boarded a British Spy. Q. In what year? A. In '88.

Gen. Morgan was then called in at the request of the prisoner. Mr. Burr. What was the situation of your father, about the time of my visit? A. He had lately had a fall, which had done him considerable injury. Q. I mean as to his capacity. Did you not make some apology to Judge Tillman for the state of his mind? A. I did tell Judge Tillman, that my father was old and infirm; and like other old men, he told long stories and was apt to forget his repetitions. Mr. McRae. What was the prisoner's reply to your examination? A. When Col. B. said that with 200 men he could drive the President and Congress into the Potomac, I must confess that I felt myself hurt and I replied with some warmth I'll be damned, Sir, if you could take the little town of Cannonburg with that force. Col. B. replied "confine yourself to this side of the mountain; and it is another thing" Mr. Burr. Do you recollect that the probability of a Spanish war was mentioned? A. It was a general subject of conversation.

It is not without sentiments of profound regret, that the human mind looks back upon England at the period when her sons stood nobly forward in defence of the rights of the human race, and contrast the great principles of those days with the maxims of corrupted polity which predominate in the present times among the descendants of those very men who so often and so gallantly contended for liberty. One who wish a well to the cause of freedom, might not find it an uninteresting enquiry to investigate the origin of those evils which have tended to the decay of happiness, and the oppression of a numerous population, among a people naturally jealous of their rights, and who in anterior times have exhibited an uncommon sturdiness in opposing despotism in its most frightful and hideous aspects. In the sincere veneration for the laws of Edward the Confessor, which so long prevailed in England, we may discern the inherent love of rational liberty that prevailed in the bulk of the English nation. And to that same deep-rooted and glorious passion we may attribute those successful struggles which the great barons made against their arbitrary kings; for they never could have prevailed to the extent they did, had not the people at large supported them in their demands upon the crown. They could not (as Hume very emphatically says) expect the concurrence of the people, without comprehending, together with their own, the interests of inferior ranks of men. The same spirit which compelled king John to sign the great Charter, was the occasion of the decapitation of Charles the first: That very spirit of freedom compelled Cromwell, in the height of his usurped power, to allow a liberal scope to the exercise of the elective franchise; and pursued its object, though partially repressed by the restoration of Charles the second, and his successor James, till it produced the revolution of 1688. That was the period at which the friends to freedom made a fatal mistake. The power of the king was not sufficiently limited. In abrogating certain rights attached to the crown, the nature of the royal authority only was changed; the power remained in fact as great as ever. Sir William Blackstone is doubtful, in truth, whether the crown has not gained by the revolution of 1688. That despotism, which before was open and palpable, and which, unless exercised with great discretion, never failed to rouse the people to oppose it, was translated into a form apparently guaranteeing freedom to the subject, but, in reality, veiling from the popular eye the vast power of the monarch. The right of creating nobles, the secret service-money of the king, the practice of buying off opposition in the House of Commons, give such a preponderance to the executive of Great-Britain, that the independence of parliament is nothing but a name, that serves no other purpose than to delude the commonalty. It is believed that the great body of the English people are sincere lovers of liberty; and that there is yet spirit and patriotism enough in that nation to lead them at no distant day to an improved form of government.