

opinion given by the court I understand to be, that evidence cannot be produced by the traverser to prove the truth of a part of a charge; but if evidence could be adduced to prove the whole, then such evidence would be admissible. One specific charge is twofold; that the President is an aristocrat; and that he proved serviceable to the British interest. The evidence, we suppose, will support this charge; we wish to prove the truth of the whole charge if we can, though I do not know that it is in our power. The evidence, we have reason to believe, goes first to prove that he is an aristocrat, and secondly, that he did prove serviceable to the British interest; if the testimony will in fact prove these two points, whatever may be the opinion of the court, I do not hesitate to say that, in my estimation, it will fully excuse and justify the traverser; if we can prove that the President has avowed aristocratical sentiments in conversation, and that he did in reality prove faithful and serviceable to the British interest, the traverser must be acquitted of this charge. As to the first part I can prove by the words of Mr. Adams, published by himself, in his book called a Defense of the American Constitution, that he thinks a government of three parts, a king, lords and commons, the best in the world. Suppose, in addition to this, it could be proved that a law passed the House of Representatives of the United States, to sequester British property; and suppose that one-half the Senate of the United States were in favor of it; and that the policy of passing the law was advocated by the best and wisest men in this country, who have the same pretensions to patriotism and virtue that Mr. Adams has, but that its passage was prevented by the casting vote of Mr. Adams as speaker of the Senate, would not the traverser be justified as to this charge? Would it not demonstrate that he proved serviceable to the British interest? By the answers to the first and third questions we expect to prove both these points.

*Mr. Nelson* objected to the introduction of such testimony, as being altogether inadmissible; that gentlemen ought to reflect that, if such evidence as this was to be received, any