NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. V. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. DCCLIX.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1805. PAID IN ADVANCE.

HISTORY
Of the West Indies:

A WORK in the contents of which every citizen of America must be interested whether devoted to business, or desirous of information through the medium of amusement.

A new & revised edition of Mr. EDWARDS's History of the West Indies, with a third volume, (completed by its amiable author a short time previous to his death) has lately been published in London. This third volume contains the interesting and important history, with a large Map of the Island of St. Domingo, or Hispaniola, as also that of Tobago; likewise a history of the war in the West Indies from its commencement in 1793, and a tour of Sir William Young through several of the islands. It is accompanied by a highly finished portrait of Mr. Edwards, a history of his life written by himself, and a prefatory advertisement by Sir WILLIAM YOUNG, Baronet, M. P. F R. S. &c. under whose editorship it has been given to the public.

The subscriber, impressed with a sense of the great importance a general knowledge of the History, civil and commercial, of the West Indies, must be to every citizen of America, and of the great celebrity of the above work, proposes to print it by subscription, and respectfully offers the following for public patronage and encouragement.

Proposals for Printing,
From the London copy, 3 volumes quarto,

THE HISTORY,
CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL,
Of the British Colonies in the West Indies.

BY BRYAN EDWARDS, ESQ. F. R. S. A. S.

Containing, with a variety of other matter:—

A political and topographical survey of the sugar islands.

A comprehensive account of the ancient and present inhabitants, agriculture, productions, laws, government, constitution and commerce.

An historical review of the slave trade; including observations on the character, genius, dispositions, and situations of the enslaved Africans.

An historical review of St. Domingo, comprehending an account of the former government of the French part of that island, its political state, populations, productions, and exports; a narrative of the calamities which have desolated the island ever since the year 1789; and a detail of the transactions of the British army in that island.

Also, a tour through the islands of Barbadoes, St. Vincent, Antigua, Tobago and Grenada, by Sir William Young, Baronet, &c. And

A history of the war in the West Indies from its commencement in 1793, &c. &c.

CONDITIONS.

It will be printed in four volumes, large octavo, on a perfectly new and beautiful type and on a handsome large medium paper, agreeable to a specimen, which may be had at the subscriber's Book Store.

The price to subscribers to be three dollars the volume, in boards; each volume to be paid for on delivery.

With the last volume will be given an ATLAS, (without any additional price) containing the following maps, viz.

1 A large general map of the West Indies.
2 Map of Jamaica.
3 Barbadoes.
4 Grenada.
5 St. Vincents.
6 Domisica.
7 St. Christophers.
8 Nevis
9 Antigua.
10 Virgin islands.
11 St. Domingo, or Hispaniola.
12 Tobago.

To prevent disappointment or complaint, it is now premised, that on the publication of the second volume the subscription price will be advanced to three dollars and a half the volume, and on the publication of the last volume the price will be again enhanced.

With the last volume, besides the Atlas, will be given an elegant engraving of the celebrated author. Also a list of the subscribers names.

The London copy of the foregoing work in three volumes cannot be sold in America, in boards, under sixty dollars.

JAMES HUMPHREYS.

☞ Subscriptions are received by said Humphreys at his book-store the corner of Second and Walnut streets, and by the principal booksellers through the Union.

Philadelphia, July 15—

FOR SALE.

AN unfinished two story brick house with an excellent cellar fronting on seventh street, east, square No. 907, in the city of Washington; if not disposed of at private sale previous to the 4th day of September next, it will on that day be offered at public sale, for terms apply to the subscriber.

And on the same day will positively be sold a frame house situated on the same street and square as the above property; and a quantity of household and kitchen furniture.

The vicinity of the above property to the navy yard renders it an object worthy of attention.

WILLIAM PROUT.

Aug. 12—

CHARLES H. VARDEN,
MERCHANT TAYLOR.

Has received from Philadelphia a handsome assortment of FALL goods, consisting of the best London and French superfine cloths, cassimeres, patent Bennet's cord, toilenetts, fancy and white Marseilles, black and figured silk, moleskins, fancy silk, Marseilles, constitution cords, velvets, Genoa cord, silk and sattin Florenteens, superfine coating, knapped cloths, with a variety of other articles suitable for the winter season.

N. B. Ladies habits, regimentals, and navy uniforms made in the first stile of fashion.

New Jersey avenue near the Capitol,

December 10——tf

Twenty Dollars Reward.

STRAYED or stolen from the subscriber on the night of the 4th instant, two BAY HORSES, one a large bay six years old, one of his eyes appears to be injured, his tail bobbed very short, shod all round; the other an old horse, with two white hind feet, several white saddle spots, has a switch tail, which has been lately cut at the ends; the first accustomed to the carriage, trots & paces, the second made use of as a road horse, trots easy, but paces badly, very lately shod all round. As I am satisfied they have been stolen, I will double the reward, on conviction of the thief or thieves, and on getting the horses.

DANIEL CARROLL, of Dud'n,
July 12—F&W1m

On a liberal credit.

THE subscriber will dispose of at private sale, his estate called Chichester, lying on he eastern branch, immediately o, land the city of Washington. This tract o' from containing 697 acres is laid off in lots from 83 to 144 acres for the convenience of purchasers. Plats of the estate and the terms of sale are in the hands of colonel Hanson at the navy yard, and Charles Wayman of George Town The lots will be shewn by Mr Wedden, living on the premises, near the Eastern Branch bridge

ANTHONY ADDISON.

Barnaby, 12th June 1805—tf

For Sale

IN the county of Prince William, Virginia, Neabico Furnace and its appendages, with four or five thousand acres of land adjoining, near the town of Dumfries, and within four or five miles of the Potomac—the soil is generally adapted to small grain, and if too considerable for one purchaser, will be laid off in Lots suitable for small farms—a description of the land is thought unnecessary—as those wishing to purchase will no doubt first view it: the payments required will be one third cash, and the other two thirds in annual instalments, to be secured by a mortgage on the land; and no deed given until the last payment is made; any person wishing to purchase, may know the terms by applying to Mr. Thomas T. Page, living near the premises, who is fully authorised by me to sell the whole or any part.

JOHN TAYLOE.

August 16—3m.

N. B. A valuable mine bank in Maryland may be had with the furnace if required.

J. T.

Lands for Sale.

PURSUANT to an order of the court of Calvert county—the subscribers will sell at public auction at the house of Mr. James Duke, at Prince Frederick Town in the county aforesaid on the 29th day of August, if fair, if not the next fair day—ALL the real estate of captain Walter Smith late of said county deceased, consisting of the following tracts of land.

The tract on which the said captain Smith resided, containing 1225 1-8 acres lying on the river Patuxent, bounded on the west by said river, and on the south and east by a fine navigable creek called St Leonards, so that a short fence will enclose the whole land—the soil of this tract is equal to any on Patuxent either for farming, planting, or grazing; and in their season a great abundance of fine fish and oysters may be had either from the river or creek.

One other tract of land in the Forest, about two miles from the former, containing 627 1-2 acres. The greater part of which is covered with hickory, chesnut, and oak wood, and a great proportion of Swamp land, which at a trifling expence might be converted into valuable meadow.

One other tract of 536 1-2 acres lying on Chesapeake Bay, bounded on the east by said bay and on the north by a creek called Parker's creek; on this tract there is a very fine salt marsh a quantity of fine meadow land, and abundance of timber.

It is thought needless to give a fuller description of those lands, as it is presumed no one will purchase without first viewing them. And on application to Mr. John Turner who lives adjoining the first mentioned tract he will shew the different tracts as well as the plats of the same.

These different tracts will be sold in a body or divided into lots, as may best suit those who wish to purchase: The purchasers to give bond on interest with approved security for the purchase money to be paid in three equal annual payments the whole interest to be paid yearly. And on the ratification of the sale by the court and a full payment of the purchase money, a deed of conveyance will be executed to the purchasers agreeable to an act of assembly in such case made and provided.

JO. WILKINSON,
JOHN TURNER,
JAMES HEIGHE, } Commissioners.

July 31—wtf.

IMPEACHMENT

OF

JUDGE CHASE.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25.

When the court met again,

Mr. RANDOLPH said, that with the leave of the counsel for the respondent, he would offer one or two observations, which might save that gentleman and the court some trouble. We know, said he, we cannot lay much stress on the testimony of a single man, rebutted by that of another respectable witness. Among the persons summoned to appear, who are able to give evidence of the declaration of Mr. Heath respecting the conversation between judge Chase and Mr. Randolph, are Messrs. Meriwether Jones and Hugh Holmes. Mr. Jones, we are advised, is, from extreme indisposition, unable to attend—Mr. Holmes, the Speaker of the House of Delegates, did not attend until since the evidence on the part of the prosecution was closed. That honorable and respectable man is, however, now in the lobby. I only state this circumstance, in tenderness to the character of the witness, and that Mr. Holmes is ready to prove that pending the trial of Callender, Mr. Heath did declare to him as having passed in his presence such a conversation as the witness has stated. It is not our wish to press his evidence, because we know that the evidence of a witness thus rebutted can establish nothing material to the prosecution. But we are ready, if the court and counsel for the respondent agree, to receive his testimony?

MR. HARPER. It is not for us to say how the honorable managers shall proceed in conducting this prosecution. We have no objection to Mr. Holmes being examined; and we feel perfectly indifferent whether Mr. Heath be abandoned or not. Should Mr. Holmes not be examined, I presume it will be understood that he was offered to support the declaration of Mr. Heath.

Mr. *Randolph* said it was not intended to abandon Mr. Heath.

Mr. *Harper* enquired how long Mr. Holmes had been in the city. If correctly informed he had been here three days, and if so, his testimony might have been adduced before the defence on the part of the respondent was made.

Mr. *Randolph* said the not previously offering Mr. Holmes to the court arose solely from an indisposition to interrupt the counsel for the defendant. The character of Mr. Holmes stood too high to be impeached. It was only when they heard the correctness of Mr. Heath's testimony questioned, that the managers deemed it necessary to do that, for the not doing of which they had received the censure of the counsel for the respondent. Mr. Randolph then moved that Hugh Holmes should be sworn.

The *President* said the reasons assigned for the admission of Mr. Holmes's testimony, so far as they arose from tenderness to the character of Mr. Heath, could have no weight with the court. The only question for them to decide was, whether his testimony was or was not material.

Mr. *Nicholson* said he held it to be the right of either party at any stage of the trial, when the evidence of a witness was impeached, to justify it by the testimony of another witness. He asked the receiving, therefore, of Mr. Holmes's testimony as a matter of right, not of favor.

The yeas and nays were taken on examining Mr. Holmes, and were—Yeas 21—Nays 11.

HUGH HOLMES *sworn.*

In answer to an interrogatory put by Mr. *Randolph,*

Mr. *Holmes* replied—I was at Richmond when the circuit court sat there. I am told they sat on the 22d of May, 1800. On the Sunday following I left Richmond. My impression is that Mr. Heath, between Wednesday and Sunday, told me in substance what I understand has been related to this honorable court. It has been detailed to me, and I cannot trace any difference between it and my recollection.

Mr. *Harper.* Please to state it.

Mr. *Holmes.* It was this. That he (Mr. Heath) had business with judge Chase of a judicial nature, and waited upon him; that while he was there Mr. Randolph came in; that he held a paper in his hand; that the judge asked him what it contained. He replied the pannel of the jury for the trial of Callender. The judge asked if there were any persons of a particular description, I think democrats, on it Mr. Randolph said there was—The judge then said, no such persons must be on the pannel.

Mr. *Harper.* Are you confident that you left Richmond the Sunday following?

Mr. *Holmes* I think so. It is possible that I may be mistaken. As to the substance of the conversation I cannot be mistaken; though I may as to the time.—Mr. Heath may have given me the account in the following September when I was at Richmond.

Mr. *Nicholson.* Were there any persons present when Mr. Heath gave you this information?

Mr. *Holmes.* I think judge Brookes and Gen. Minor were.

Mr. *Martin.* Did you leave town on the Sunday before or after Callender was tried?

Mr. *Holmes.* I left town before he was tried.

Mr. *Randolph.* I understand you as stating that you are positive as to the substance of the conversation, but not as to the time.

Mr. *Holmes.* I think it was during the first time I was in Richmond; but it may have been during the second time. But I think I may speak positively of the substance of the conversation.

Mr. HARPER—This testimony of Mr. Holmes, Mr. President, completes the overthrow of John Heath, whom it was adduced to support. It adds the last clench to the nail, by which his testimony is fixed on high. This honorable court will recollect that John Heath declared, that as soon as the conversation between judge Chase and the marshal, about striking those "creatures called democrats" from the jury summoned to try Callender, took place, which was in the morning before the court met, he went immediately on the hill, related that conversation to Hugh Holmes. This, consequently, must have happened before Mr. Holmes left Richmond. He tells us that he left Richmond on Sunday, the 25th May. We know from the record evidence in the cause, as well as from the testimony of Mr. William Marshall and some other witnesses, that Callender was not brought to Richmond until the 27th of May. And it is well known that by the practice of Virginia, a jury is never summoned to try an offender, till he is before the court, and puts himself upon trial. Consequently at the time when John Heath informed Mr. Holmes, that he had seen the marshal present to the respondent the pannel of jurors summoned for the trial of Callender, and had heard the respondent tell the marshal to strike off all the "creatures called democrats," it is perfectly certain that no jury had been summoned; that the marshal had not taken Callender; that it was perfectly uncertain whether he would be taken; and that no such circumstance as Heath related to Mr. Holmes, could possibly have taken place. For this flat contradiction of their witness, we are indebted to the honorable managers, and we tender them our thanks. They have furnished us by the same respectable testimony, with another contradiction of minor importance, but not undeserving of notice. Heath says that he made this communication to Mr. Holmes in the morning. Mr. Holmes states, as his strong belief, that it was made in the evening. So much for the testimony of Mr. John Heath; which I leave without further remark, where it has been placed by Mr. David M. Randolph, Mr. William Marshall, and Mr. Holmes; and proceed to consider the transactions at New-Castle, in Delaware, which form the matter of the seventh charge.

And here three questions present themselves for examination. What was the respondent's conduct on that occasion? How far was that conduct conformable to duty and propriety? What were the motives from which it proceeded? On all the previous articles the same division of the matter presented itself to the mind; but the two first grounds were fully occupied by my learned colleagues. What remained for me belonged almost entirely to the third division. Here, and on the eighth charge, being deprived of their able assistance, it is incumbent on me to consider the subject under each of these three points of view.

As to the conduct of the respondent, he admits in substance that he did, on the first day of the court, decline to discharge the grand jury, on their request; did state to them some information which he had received, respecting a seditious printer in the town of Wilmington, who was said to be in the habit of violating the act of Congress called the sedition law, and did inform them that it was their duty to enquire into that affair. He also admits that he requested the district attorney to assist them with his advice, in making this enquiry. But he denies that he did utter those expressions relative to a seditious temper in the state of Delaware, or any part of it, with which he is charged.

That he uttered those expressions is sworn by Mr. George Read, the district attorney of Delaware, and Mr. Lee, one of the grand jurors. Four witnesses on the contrary equally respectable and equally intelligent with Mr. Read and Mr. Lee, have deposed that they were present, that they attended particularly to what passed, and that they heard no such expressions. First, judge Bedford, who sat by the side of the respondent at the time, who must have heard all that was said, and who appears to have remarked particularly what the respondent said on the subject of seditious publications: for he afterwards told him, that he had used expressions which would give offence. Yet judge Bedford did not hear any such expressions, as are stated by Mr. Read and Mr. Lee. Next, Mr. Vandyke, the attorney general of the state of Delaware; a gentleman of high character, whose manner of delivering his testimony proves him to be very capable of accurate observation. He attended in court at this time, and was attentive to the proceedings; but he heard nothing of those remarkable expressions. Then Mr. Hamilton, who attended the court as an assistant to his father, the marshal, sat near the judges, listened to the conversation between the respondent and the jury, but heard nothing of those remarkable expressions. And fourthly, Mr. Hall, who was in court during the whole time, paid particular attention to what passed, but heard nothing of this seditious temper in the state of Delaware, and particularly in the county of New Castle, and more especially in the town of Wilmington. On Mr. Moore so much stress cannot be laid as on the former witnesses, because he was not particularly attentive to what passed on the first day. Laying him, however, out of the case, we have four witnesses against two; and these four witnesses were so situated, that they must have heard those expressions had they been uttered, and must have remarked them. Judge Bedford did remark expressions far less strong, which he was apprehensive might give offence. Is it possible then to believe, that those very offensive expressions, had they fallen from the respondent, could have escaped his notice?

But there is another piece of evidence, still stronger than the testimony of these witnesses. We know that within a day or two after these transactions took place, an account of them was published by the printer, and in the gazette, which had been the object of the respondent's animadversions. The publication is in evidence before the court. It is sufficiently exaggerated, but it makes no mention of those remarkable and offensive expressions. This printer, it is evident, was extremely well disposed to represent the respondent's conduct in the most unfavorable light that truth would justify. He, no doubt, received his information of what passed, from persons who felt the same disposition. These persons must have heard these expressions had they been uttered, must have been struck by them, and surely would not have suppressed them.

When this mass of evidence stands opposed to Mr. Read and Mr. Lee, can we hesitate to pronounce that they have stated what never took place? I am far from intending to charge them with intentional departure from truth. No doubt they understood in this manner something that was said. But it is plain that there must be a mistake some where. Their testimony can not be reconciled with that of the four witnesses for the respondent; or with that of the printer, which under the circumstances of this case, is stronger than all the rest. And it is much more probable that two men should be mistaken than four; and that all the six should have been mistaken, than that this printer should have been uninformed of, or should have omitted to notice, those expressions, if they had been used by the respondent.

These expressions indeed contain nothing criminal. To have used them would not have been an impeachable offence; but it would have been an act of