







Which Jones has said, the notorious fact is, that he did copy this account from the Recorder, with the omission of a scolding remark, to that, let the sweet never so authentic, we had in publication the fact of him, both in points of time and of completion. The remark was that about ten thousand dollars had been expended, of which accounts had not been received. This fact is not proved.

Jones speaks of Mr. Spencer, as one of the political reptiles, who crawl about the pavement of the brickwork. This is mighty decent language to be employed in regard to a part of the city, and a part of it containing so many substantial citizens? Does it become the deplorable, the cuckolded rival of Mr. Wickham's mollato valet, Bos, to speak of reptiles, a fellow who converted his own house, and the bos of Mrs. Jones, into the receptacle of African prostitution? We have not been able to get one word out of Jones upon these matters. Is colonel Gamble, the fat, in-law of Mr. Wirt, one of these reptiles? We beg Jones to answer a question or two. 1. Whether dogs or cats not Mr. Examiner wear his picture about her neck, when she attends a barbecue, or the methodist meeting house? Whether Jones did not get into the executive council, by an interst, which understood that he was to be federal? This is a black, a very black part of his history? 2. Whether he did not, in presence of Callender, and six or eight people of all ages; harangue his own mollato slave, Lewis, who was not long since arrested for one of his matter's debts, upon the horrid wickedness of holding black people in slavery? And whether he did not, once and again, in presence of his family, enforce all this stuff to Lewis, with oaths and execrations? We could, in a court of justice, produce witnesses of this fact. Any body, who chafes to enquire of Callender, shall have some of their names; for, in matters of this all-blessing description, we do not chafe to go round about the ball, as Jones has done about the mabogny.

To conclude: we shall be glad to hear what Jones can say concerning the ungodly stealer of Philadelphia, and how many weeks, or minutes, he thinks that he shall be able to keep out of jail, after he loses the security of three thousand dollars?

Again, in the face of all Richmond, we dare Jones to deny his truly diabolical address; to Lewis. Upon one of these occasions, a person in company took the writer of this article aside, and asked him what thoughts of Jones' relating to before Lewis? This person resides at a distance of about twenty miles from Richmond. Lewis himself has asked us, once and again, whether his master was not in the right? This is the villain who cuts about towns, and about breaking up the ace of families!

From the Gazette of the United States.  
THE democrats have at length taken their choice with respect to Callender, and are ready to consider him as unprincipled and infamous. We are accordingly told, "That Callender never was respected by, nor obtained the confidence of the republican party; that a few individuals, from various causes, noticed him; some out of charity, others, because though they disliked his habits, they respected the talents which produced one of the best political tracts which was ever published; that Political Progress of Britain, the whole merit of which was exclusively attributed to him; that upon and after knowledge of his laxity of principle and hatred of his species, pined him; and hoped that a change in his habits of intemperance might be made by acts of generosity; and some who departed of his friends, and who more thought to prize his talents, from being purchased, and employed along with Libbycine."  
We care not what were the reasons that induced the democrats to choose him and distrust Callender; nor upon what ground they have chosen to regard him as a man, who is to be put in

production to receive him into their houses, and foster him under their roofs with their wives and children. They now acknowledge him to be a scoundrel; that they knew him to be such, and that he had neither the regard nor confidence of the party. What must be their cause when they stigmatize as knowledge, it to have been promulgated and upheld by such instruments, who must be the principles of men who can make the mob of a known villain's services, and then proudly vaunt of the triumph they have effected!

But how stands the President? It is confessed, that this man has been known by the party to be a scoundrel; it was known particularly by Duane, who boasts of the *friendship* of Miss Jefferson; the "Sketches," and the "Prophet" were known by the President to be full of falsehood and malignity; and yet with a complete knowledge of the man and of his works; that this man was a villain, and that his works were works of the deepest villainy, he reads the production before publication, he sanctions the lie and the calumny, and he meanly pays the profligate hiring for his hellish labors. Callender dips the point of the weapon in poison. But Jefferson draws the arrow to head. Let Callender stand as a recorded villain, yet the things must be believed, Mr. George Jefferson, Mr. Leiper, and a Scotchman of Richmond, are all attacked to, it support of the representation of Callender; and not one word in reiteration of its contradiction, has been extorted from them by the pressing exigency of the interests of democracy, and the reputation of Jefferson.

The Jacobins might have pursued a more cunning policy, by declaring, that they had believed in the integrity of Callender, but that they had found him false. They have told, however, the truth, that they knew the venom of the serpent they cherished. They kept him to annoy and to wound honest men and a virtuous cause; but he has turned upon them at last; and has stung their chieftain to his vitals.

### From the New-York Evening Post. FRIENDSHIP.

"THE Citizen bestows much advice daily on Judge Chase, who presided at Callender's trial, for not putting off the cause till he could produce one or two distant witnesses: but the good Citizen forgets that the two witnesses on whom Callender principally relied, namely, gen. Mason and Farmer Giles were not present, but in the very neighbourhood; and that notwithstanding, they would neither of them attend at the trial. What we recollect that it was Mason and Giles who actually furnished Callender with the facts, which constituted the basis, it will perhaps lessen our surprise. Yes! as soon as they got him into the traps, they gave him the slip, and in close imitation of old Clovefoot, they drew the stool in under him, and left him to hang like a dog. A good specimen of democratic friendship! Callender, however, is not without companions in adversity. How many are there in our own city, who have leaped through every street, lane, alley, and bye path to leave certain great men, who the moment election was over, don't know their ordinary than as humane tenants who must pay their rent by the first quarter day, or have a comfortable jail term before night."

MR. Coleman betrayed a want of judgment in bringing forward, as witnesses of fact, a *democratic* and a *legislator*. One man found himself had pressed upon the testimony of his friends. He, therefore, gladly took hold of the weak side of Coleman's argument, and while he is obliged to reproach Callender as an impostor, in one end of the same breath, upon the opportunity of the fact of the fact, he himself is shown to be a subject. Thus he betrays a man, who is no witness upon the testimony of the appearance of a *democratic* and a *legislator*. Coleman must have remembered that a *democratic* and a *legislator* are not to be put in

with what ground is proper to be taken, or to be decided. For instance, on the battle of Edge-Hill, prince Rupert, that one of Cromwell's, was chased about of the ground, and pushed them to a great distance. The situation of the field, Cromwell took of the same instant, routed a *democratic* of the royal forces, but he did not like to give the lost time in pursuit of the fugitives. He instantly wheeled round, and attacked the rear guard of the king's army. Thus not by superior bravery, but by knowing how to *fight* and to keep the ground, Oliver won a battle, which his parry had considered as lost.

Now, when Mr. Coleman found himself irresistibly victorious with regard to the casting, the profligate conduct of Thomas Jefferson; and regard to the gross falsehood of his principles of eleven years ago, John Adams, with regard to the payment of the one hundred dollars, and the repayment of the two hundred more; he should have contented himself, like Oliver, with halting on the field of victory, and completing and insuring the advantages he had gained. Instead of this he scampered away, like prince Rupert, in quest of an enemy, by whom nothing could be gained. All the logic of Locke, and elocution of Patrick Henry, could not reconcile this country to such a thing as the sedition act. A writer in the New-York Gazette has observed with great emphasis, that to vindicate the sedition act, is to share in the guilt of its principles, and the infamy of its authors. For this reason, we advise, we conjure Mr. Coleman, to be silent about the fact. His defence will be just like those of the stealing and publishing Bronson's letters. Every new law is just only in the eye of a blaker and blaker. Put the case; that the law had in itself, been a good one. The conduct of the judges, and attorney generals, was to unjustifiably scandalous, that nothing could have saved both them and the law, from popular disgrace. The federal party have sufficiently felt the consequences of their conduct, and will not be so stupid as to plunge in it, should above their ears. Why Mr. Coleman, you might as well attempt to defend Hamilton's amour with madam Reynolds, or Jones putting a yellow strumpet into the identical bed of his own wife; or the black seraglio at Monticello, where Jefferson cuckolded Sally, and Sally cuckolded Jefferson.

Like Rupert, at Edge-Hill, Mr. Coleman has become sensible of his error. In the passage above quoted; he flies off at a tangent from the subject before him. He jostles in general Mason and Giles for the sake of exposing democratical friendship. The names of those two persons ought never to be joined in the same sentence. The one, from constitutional timidity, committed a fault. The memory of that fault must for life, be a thorn festering in the bosom of his peace. The other is a liar; a gambler, a hypocrite, and, to sum up the whole, we have invited him to call at this office, where he shall be told to his face, that he has committed perjury. To be hired, it cannot be denied, that in the citation of those witnesses, the republican cause did make a most miserable figure. Three witnesses were summoned to appear. These were lawyers. They were able speakers. They were all men of good fortunes. They were all firm republicans. And yet, wonderful to tell, JOHN TAYLOR, of Caroline, was the only man of those three, that thought proper to appear. Why, then, for such behaviour, an Edinburgh cad, of a London porter, or a Dublin end liver, would have been turned out of the society or corporation of which he was a member. The name of JOHN TAYLOR will be mentioned with honor in history, but some people never think of such things.

See last week's Recorder.  
From the Commercial Advertiser.  
GILLENDEK'S SECRETARY AND SON.  
"STROKE SECRETS."  
The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been named in the above advertisement, and who are supposed to be the authors of the same. The names are given in the order in which they are mentioned in the advertisement. The names are: Mr. Mason, Mr. Giles, Mr. Leiper, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Callender, Mr. Jones, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Greenleaf, Mr. Webster, Mr. Adams, Mr. Duane, Mr. Madison, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Bland, Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Clay, Mr. C. Smith, Mr. F. Smith, Mr. G. Smith, Mr. H. Smith, Mr. I. Smith, Mr. J. Smith, Mr. K. Smith, Mr. L. Smith, Mr. M. Smith, Mr. N. Smith, Mr. O. Smith, Mr. P. Smith, Mr. Q. Smith, Mr. R. Smith, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. T. Smith, Mr. U. Smith, Mr. V. Smith, Mr. W. Smith, Mr. X. Smith, Mr. Y. Smith, Mr. Z. Smith.

recent publication of Callender's confession in his share of the same, and that it could not have been a more authentic of Callender's intimate intimacies, and the fact of his administration of the House, before 1793, for the military purpose of treating the eyes of his "despised fellow citizens." Better a thousand times had he been for Mr. Jefferson to have paid the two thousand dollars, promised to Callender, as the reimbursement of his fine, out of the same private fund from which he had before paid the 100, than to have had the same disclosure, blazoned to the world. Now, the president had a "prophet" before him; but when the reimbursement of the fine was promised, that prophet was *retracted*. His object was attained, he had been declared president. Yet when he was attacking in defiance of his oath and the constitution; to refund this fine from the public purse, he ought to have remembered, "that a day of reckoning would 'foot or later arrive.'"

From the Commercial Advertiser.  
"Since Callender's apology from the party of Messrs. Jefferson, Madison, Giles and Co. since he commenced his development of the base and low intrigues of these patriots, to displace the federal interest and elevate themselves to office; the democratic papers are assiduously endeavoring to impress on the public a belief that Callender has *never* become a *seditionist*. Nothing is more false. When he first quarrelled with the president, he made overtures to the federal gentlemen of Virginia; and with their aid. [This is *ALIE*] His advances were rejected with a dignity and contempt worthy of their cause. Since that time, he has been almost as liberal of abuse towards the federal as the democratic interest—His *objec*; however, calls for nothing; but the facts he relates are uncontroverted; and are truly important. The president and his chief secretary feel the lash, but sit mum. In such a case, silence is their best policy. To contradict what is so manifestly undeniable, would only add one more proof of political thirpicide to the many they have already exhibited."

Extract from SEDGWICK AND CO.  
On Saturday, March 31, 1798, a statement of the Affairs of James Greenleaf, the celebrated land-jebber, was exhibited in the Supreme court of Pennsylvania. Under the head of benefactions, there appears an article to this effect:—  
"April 9th, 1794: To Mr. John Fenno, to assist him to continue his business, he is to receive five hundred and ten thousand dollars." There is another item to Nath Webster, amounting to between two and three thousand dollars. The precise sum cannot be here stated, but it considerably exceeds two thousand dollars. Since the discovery of these donations, both Mr. Fenno and the doctor have been repeatedly called upon in the Aurora, to acknowledge or disown them. They observe strict silence. Mr. Greenleaf did not intermeddle with politics. Hence, he had no conceivable motives for juggling, from his own pocket, such large sums of money. A present of three thousand dollars is a novelty in the affairs of human life. The natural solution of this gift must be traced to the court of London, through the agency of her minister in Philadelphia. The conclusion amounts to the strongest probability, that the two donors are the immediate pensioners of England. This monstrous disclosure was first announced through the Aurora, in an article written by me; and the brutal, yet amusing, evidence, with which Mr. Fenno has ever since assailed my name, illustrates the depth of his confusion, and the pungency of his feelings. On reality, the natural intelligence, who, like Webster, and Fenno, are subsidized by a British treasury, and an ancient enemy, the friends of American liberty, must look with unfeigned jealousy and indignation on