FROM THE AURORA.

Before Mr. Jefferson was a candidate for the honorable station he now fills, his political principles were well known to the citizens of the United States. This knowledge, and his having steadily and uniformly acted up to those principles, secured to him the large majority of votes he had at the last election; a proof indubitable, that his political principles were in perfect conformity with those of the great mass of the people. To have persevered in, and acted up to, those principles, during all the time that has elapsed since he was called to the presidential chair, and particularly the latter part, owing to the arbitrary and hostile conduct of England, and the unjustifiable decrees of France, has been a difficult and arduous task. To preserve peace and a friendly intercourse with all foreign nations, has been one of his great objects: confident that such was the best interest of the U. S. and to preserve that peace, the strictest line of neutrality was necessary, and so rigidly has it been observed, that neither of the belligerent powers have had just cause for complaint.

Is it not then more than strange, that the man whose conduct has been so perfectly consistent, and so congenial to the principles and desires of the people, should be so vilified and abused, as he is, in some of the newspapers—from the tenor of many of them, one would be led to believe, that his principles were opposite to freedom, and his great object to ruin the country and oppress the people, that he was disposed to sacrifice their rights as an independent nation abroad, and undermine their liberties at home.

Strangers on reading some of our public prints, would be led to believe our government was the worst administered throughout the universe, the people the most distressed, no labor to be procured, no provisions to eat, and an universal discontent in all orders of the community—and all this effected by a man (Mr. Jefferson) who has been twice elected to the presidential chair, and who at his late election had nearly the unanimous voice of all the states; who, had he not requested the contrary, would be again re-elected. But who from a pure desire to see a rotation in office, to prevent any man or family acquiring an improper influence, voluntarily is about to retire from office to enjoy private life, unless indeed his country should again require his services.

Can they be friends to the government or the people of the United States, who, are thus calumniating the chief magistrate and the heads of department, endeavoring to embarrass every measure, and misstating every act and fact; who would barter the honor, the liberty, and the lives of our citizens to a foreign nation, for its licence to trade to its ports, and such of its allies, as its great goodness and *interest* may induce them to grant? No, they are not friends, nor can any man or party deserve that name, who are ready to sacrifice the interest and honor of our country to an, other, as those men are. One of the means adopted to effect their desired object is, that of unjustly accusing the administration of partiality in favor of one of the belligerent powers; a charge so ill founded, that the enemy of that belligerent, has never yet made a serious complaint to our government on that subject, convinced that it does not exist. The accusation is made to deceive, to create, if possible, divisions and dissentions among the people, and embarrass the operations of our government, and, by that means, and by creating doubts and jealousies, forward the interest of their foreign friends—regard the assertion of those persons so often repeated—that Mr. Jefferson could have arranged our differences with England, had he been disposed to do it, that *satisfaction* had been offered for the insult in wantonly and contrary to the law and custom of nations, attacking our frigate the Chesapeake, and rejected by Mr. Jefferson—and strange, they have the impudence to make this assertion in the face of the correspondence published between Mr. Madison and Mr. Rose. What was the nature of the satisfaction offered? As yet they have not ventured to publish it. Mr. Rose did not lisp it.

The speech of Mr. Canning in the British house of commons does not explain it, or that it was offered *but conditionally*, that we should begin first; admit we were wrong in excluding their ships of war from our ports—by repealing the act and receiving them again on the same friendly footing they were before our flag was insulted, and our citizens murdered—to do this was made a preliminary article, after which they would *inform* us of the nature of the satisfaction intended to be proposed.—Is not this adding insult upon insult? Especially after the British minister has declared in the house of commons, that they never pretended to the right of searching a national ship of war belonging to any neutral nation. With what effrontery then can any American pretend to justify or even palliate the conduct of that nation towards us. As to their orders in council, much has been said; from all that we can learn, no alteration appears to have been contemplated until a sudden and unexpected disturbance took place in Spain—when, without relinquishing any thing of their principle, but with a hope to extend their commerce and for toward their *private interest*—a revocation of the orders respecting Spain appears to be issued—until which their merchants dare not venture there unless under a special licence. But the very recalling the orders as affecting Spain and Portugal, is a piece of consummate arrogance—it is an assertion to their right to shut up and open the ports of other nations at their pleasure, and a right to control at will, all neutral commerce.

And for resisting this principle as a right belonging to England or any other country so far as relates to us, is our president, Mr. Jefferson, bespattered with daily abuse. Were he base enough to cede that principle, or should his successor venture to do it; whether it shall be Mr. Madison, Mr. Monroe, or any other, I hope and believe there is virtue enough in the people to resist it, and that congress would at the earliest moment impeach him.

Notwithstanding the daily abuse which is published against the present administration, such has been and such is their conduct, that it only requires to be fairly and strictly examined, while the conduct of its enemies under the same examination, will be certain to be reprobated. For the truth of this the appeal is made to our citizens and the world at large.

It is the wish and desire of the administration that their conduct should be enquired into, that it should be strictly examined; also, that of the minor party who are so liberal in abusing them—the calumny of those men will then meet the contempt it deserves—the abuse will cease to produce the deception desired, at least at home—it may impose on people abroad, but by these too the deception will be discovered and the authors despised.

Americans, will you continue the embargo and obtain a free commerce—or will you suffer England to impose a tax on your trade, and say to you—you, on paying certain duties may trade to such and such ports—but you shall *not* trade to any others? Such is now the question.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

"*Federalists and friends of order.*"

As the leaders of the party, opposed to the present administration, still assume the appellation of *Federalists and friends of order*, it may not be amiss, *at this important crisis*, to examine their pretensions to names thus arrogantly assumed.

It is well known that the term *Federalist* originated in this country at the adoption of the present Constitution, and was understood to designate those who were in favor of that *bond of union*, the *magna charta* of our liberties. The Constitution commences thus "*We the people of the United States, &c.*" It is therefore evidently founded on *democratic* as well as *federal* principles; and consequently a person cannot be friendly to the Constitution who is inimical to the principles of democracy.

But if it be denied that *anti-democrats*, *and anti constitutionalists* are synonimous terms—let me ask whether those who are in favor of a *dissolution* of the *Union*: merit the appellation of *federalists*? I am far from believing that the great body of those who have arranged under the banners of the opposition leaders, would countenance, much less aid in promoting so treasonable a project, as a *dismemberment* of the *republic*. It cannot however be denied that many of the opposition papers have for some time past been filled with inflammatory essays calculated to excite *local jealousies*, and ultimately to prepare the public mind for a dissolution of the Union.

Having endeavored to shew that the leaders of the opposition party are hostile to the constitution, I shall now proceed to investigate their claim to the appellation of "*friends of order.*" No sooner was this *junto* compelled, by the indignant voice of an injured and insulted people to abandon the helm of state, than a number of *mercenary presses* were employed for the avowed purpose of destroying the popularity of those whom "the *people delighted to honor.*" But instead of entering into a fair and candid investigation of the measures adopted by the administration, *calumny*, *misrepresentation*, *scurrility and personal abuse* has been the order of the day.

Not content however with calumniating our most distinguished patriots, not content in opposing with *jacobinic rage* every measure adopted by the government, not content with palliating, and even justifying the conduct of a *piratical king* in his relations with this country, the leaders of the opposition party have recently proclaimed sentiments which amount to *treason* and *rebellion* against the laws and constituted authorities of the *Republic*. The *embargo* has been denounced as *unconstitutional* and *oppressive*; and in consequence of the *incendiary publications* on this subject, several deluded persons have actually entered into combinations for the purpose of violating the laws of their country—Nay the blood of some of our citizens has been already shed, and God only knows how many will become the *victims* of this *treasonable opposition*, unless the leaders thereof are soon punished for their temerity.

Republicans!—The critical state of our foreign relations, together with the insiduous mathinations and intrigues of our internal foes, ought to convince you of the necessity of *vigilence* and *unanimity*. The *Genius of Liberty*, demands of you this new proof of your *patriotism*, and I am persuaded she will not demand it in vain.

FRANKLIN.

FROM THE AURORA.

Plain but short arguments on the embargo.

England, by orders in council, requires *Americans to pay tribute* and *take out licence* to *trade* with the continent.!

On the other hand—the continent declares that every vessel doing so becomes good prize, but whenever England will respect the neutral flag, the powers who command the continent will do so too.

To keep clear of both powers, America lays an embargo on her own ships, and confines her trade at home, until our flag shall be respected by the nations of Europe.

Now the question is, which of the three nations prevents trade, and which can restore trade?

America cannot, *without submitting to pay tribute, as at Algiers.*

France, who rules the continent, cannot, without receiving her supplies thro' her enemy, after being dutied.

It is then England alone that can restore free trade, when she pleases.

Whenever Britain declares the American flag free from molestation, that repeals or renders "*null and void*" the French decree, and immediately the embargo ceases.

Hence it is plain and undeniable, that the English are the only cause of the embargo.

The federalists require to get the embargo off *before their flag can go free.* If they could succeed, what would be the consequences?

They would have a stinted, harrassed trade. The moment the West Indies heard the embargo was off, down go the markets, well knowing they would be glutted in a few days—in England it would be the same, and the continent dare not be approached by any American vessel.

A low poor market, harrassed by the privateers of the continent, would be the fruits of raising the embargo, before we secure a free flag. Whereas, a grand market, and free trade to all nations, would be our own, as the only neutral, by holding out, and maintaining our integrity and our rights.

The next question is, will such holding out produce such effects? Most unquestionably! Britain's starving mechanics had compelled her ministry to bring into parliament a bill to promote commerce with America, so early as May. England's strong arm is commerce, that arm is now withering, while her warfare is encreasing. The strong arm of America is agriculture, which gives plenty, and we are at peace.

Federalists pretend England can sustain want of commerce better than America, and pretend our ships are rotting and sailors flying to England.

To judge of this, let us examine our relative situations. England had innumerable vessels and merchants constantly trading to the Baltic, the Mediterranean, to America, to the West Indies and East Indies. Now of all her immense shipping, all are out of employ, save those in the East and West India trade—consequently for every ship and sailor America has idle, the British have five, and if our sailors should fly to England, we might well expect to see double the number of her's flying to us; for her navy, great as it is, cannot find employment for half those sailors thrown idle.—These are plain manifest facts. It therefore follows clearly that a nation at war, with so many of her people starving for want of employ, and depending on a resource already half dried up, cannot hold out so well as a nation at peace, abounding in plenty of provisions, and room for all her people to be employed.

If with so gentle and cheap a weapon as the embargo, we can force from European nations, a permanent security for our flag, and unlimited market for our produce, would it not be wicked in the extreme, for a desperate faction, composed of those hostile to our national independence, united with those ambitious of power, and hungry for office, to produce so great a good—and in defeating it now to render the same weapon harmless hereafter? Should the embargo succeed now, it will always after be a cheap resource—if it fails now, it will be rendered contemptible for ever. Hence it follows that federalists are busily employed devising means to defeat a great general good. England has heretofore, and now is, holding out against us, because the federalists encourage her to believe that they can force our government to give up. The Boston people petition for a repeal of the embargo, as soon as they discover the ministry about to give up; thus do they prefer the English to their own nation. Our fathers did not do so!

A FARMER.

ST. LOUIS, July 19.

To-morrow the trial of the Indians for murder comes on. We understand they will have counsel appointed to defend them. Their friends and relatives in this place, have held several councils with the governor and gen. Clark, begging mercy for the culprits.

One of M'Clelland's barges arrived here a few days ago from the Maha village, (up the Missouri,) laden with fur and peltry. The master of the barge informs us, that the Rickarees have built another village on the other side of the river, surrounded with strong pickets, with caves made at some distances, as a place of retreat for their women and children, during an attack. They are determined to prevent the Americans ascending the river, and are extremely insolent. It is supposed the agents of the North-West Company are their abettors. It is thought the Mahas killed Messrs. Choteau and M'Clelland's hunters some time ago.—Their conduct latterly has been somewhat hostile.

A ruffian who murdered a young man in the streets of Boston, is the worthy editor of the Boston Gazette and the favorite apostle of federalism—by their works you may know them—the following is an extract from *Selfridge's* Boston Gazette:

"If the people have a right of *self-government*, may they not prefer a king to a president? May they not prefer the descendant of some of the heroes who heretofore led their armies to battle, and defended their rights against foreign invasions, as *a king?* to a *philosophic president*, whose mode of defending the rights and property of the people, is to annihilate them?"

We have it from the gentleman with whom the conversation took place, that the rev. THOMAS CUSHING THATCHER while speaking of the embargo, on the 16th inst. declared as his wish *that it might be kept on 'till it had created a civil war!* And that the said T. C. Thatcher, made use of other expressions equally incompatible with decorum, and particularly with those divine precepts which the duties of his office require him to inculcate. Such acts we hope are rare; but painful as may be the recital, we but fulfil our duty in giving them publicity.

Boston Democrat.

The old refugee, alluded to in the Baltimore Evening Post of Tuesday last inst. who holds a snug office under the United States government, and *d——d the* FRENCH *as causing the* EMBARGO, BECAUSE *they helped Washington to capture Cornwallis at Yorktown*, we have been since informed acted as a *pilot* to the British during a greater part of the war, and now enjoys 1000 acres of land in *Nova Scotia* bestowed upon him by "his majesty" for his "numerous and important services!" Does the *collector of the port know* the gentleman!

Balt. Ev. Post.

A distinguished member of the British parliament (C. J. Fox) remarked, in the year 1793, that "should the allies continue the war against France, it was not unnatural to apprehend that she might become the scourge of every nation. Driven to make exertions which could not fail to ensure victory—her sons, born as it were on the field of battle—trained to arms from delight. A nation of soldiers inflamed with military ardor, and thirsting for glory—they might be easily led from a just defence to unjust conquest; and, like ancient Rome, swallowing up the nations around her, become the mistress of the world."

This prediction have been partially verified. British gold has converted Europe into a slaughter house, and British alliances have been to the impolitic cabinets of Europe the precursors of ruin.

Troy Register.

New-York. Sept. 5.

ELECTION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

New-Hampshire.—The Boston papers of Friday, which were received yesterday at this office, give a statement of the votes from 80 towns in New-Hampshire, by which it appears that the federal candidates had 7,690, and the democrats 5,858, leaving a federal majority of 1,832. The net federal gain in 72 of these towns, compared with the votes of 1805, (the last contested election) is said to be 3,245. The Portsmouth Intelligencer of Thursday is of opinion that the federal candidates will be chosen by a majority of between 5000 and 6000.

Rhode-Island.—The whole number of votes given in this state for members of Congress, it is expected, will be about 6000; of which the ultimate federal majority is calculated at near 450. The election of State Representatives took place at the same time; and it was sponen of as probable that there would be a federal majority of 7 or 8 in the Rhode-Island Assembly.

As a proof of one of the manufacturing *capacities and preparations* of Pennsylvania, it may be relied on as true, that there are fifty water wheels already erected and, in operation, on Chester creek, south-west of Philadelphia.

The actual measurement of the new *turnpike road* from Philadelphia to Baltimore has been completed. The distance reduced to eighty-eight miles.—There will be no difficulty in going from Philadelphia to Baltimore in one day.—The present distance is *one hundred and three* miles along the post road. The whole number of shares necessary to organization is subscribed by substantial and zealous citizens. The embargo gives *activity and importance to such operations.* *Aurora.*

Distinction without a difference, or Minoritism and Federalism one and the same thing.

The minority entertain a deadly resentment against the administration.—They are continually vapouring about foreign influence and corruption, in the cabinet.

They declaim with a great deal of violence against Presidential hatred to Great Britain. They say that he has forgotten the principles of '76. That Mr. Madison is not so much a fool as a knave. They would wish to see our commerce entirely in the controul of Great Britain. They would wish to form a treaty with that base and faithless power, regardless of national Honor. They would wish our Citizens and our property to depend entirely upon their mercy and honesty, which we all know is not worth a *sous*. *Though last not least*, they are determined to excite disturbances rather than not gratify their refractory tempers. The Federalists agree in every item of the enumeration. Upon what principle then, do they differ unless from the common one, that no two things in nature are perfectly alike? *Va. Argus.*

The federalists talk a great deal of *national honor*—they express extreme regret that our rulers (as they say) and our national character are diminishing in the estimation of foreign nations.—Now let us examine how PRACTICALLY honest those good men are with respect to this point. Common sense would dictate something like this:—If Jefferson, is a "coward,"—Madison a "tool of Bonaparte,"—Gallatin, an "unprincipled foreigner,"—Dearborn, "an old woman."—Wilkinson, a "pensioner," &c. &c. &c. What must the nation be, or the majority whose choice they are, if tories speak truth, for the alternative is, that either those public officers are such as the *tories* describe them, or those who describe them must be the most abandoned villains; and if what they allege concerning their own government and public officers is false—that those who falsify are holding themselves up *for sale*. Do not proclaim it on the house top; keep these facts at least from the knowledge of Europeans, for by making this proclamation you subject yourselves to their scorn and detestation: besides, the consequence of such knowledge, may probably be fatal to your lives and liberty. For what nation (having confidence in federal assertion) would suffer the people long to remain unassailed, whose rulers were a cluster of FOOLS and KNAVES!

Boston Democrat.

TO MAKE CIDER

Of early or late fruit, that will keep any length of time without the trouble of frequently drawing off.

Take the largest cask you have on your farm, from a barrel upwards; put a few sticks, in the bottom in the manner that house-wives set a lye-cask, so as to raise a vacancy of two or three inches from the bottom of the cask; then lay over these sticks, either a clean old blanket, or, if that be not at hand, a quantity of the swinglings of flax, so as to make a coat of about a quarter of an inch thick when it is well pressed down; then put in so much clean washed sand, from a beach or road, as will cover about 6 or 8 inches in depth of your vessel; pass all your cider from the press through a table cloth suspended by the corners, which will take out the pummice; and pour the liquor gently upon the sand, through which it must be suffered to filter gradually; and as it runs off by a tap inserted in your vessel in the vacancy made by the sticks at the bottom, it will be found, by this easy method, as clear as cider can be expected, after the most laborious process of refining; and all the mucilaginous matter, which causes the fermentation and scouring of cider, will be so separated as to prevent that disagreeable consequence.

N. B. Other methods may easily be invented of passing the cider through the sand, which is the only essential part of the above process.

The late camp meetings on the Eastern Shore have met with abundant success. At Bohemia, we are told, one hundred became converted. The proselytes are mostly of the old church, which is said to be nearly extinct in that quarter. [*N. American.*