

other gentlemen appear to have done. On the subject of the conversation it might seem that I should have paid attention, have felt it and remembered it; from any other person it is probable I should; but from the member of Vermont I paid very little attention as coming from him. As to the conversation in the morning I can recollect no particulars. It was generally to this effect, that the sentiments of the people in Connecticut were different from what they are represented here.

Mr. Harper asked whether any allusion was made in the morning conversation, respecting the Connecticut Representatives studying their private interests, &c.

A. I did not hear any.

Mr. Chipman's testimony. In the course of last summer I heard the affair related in common conversation. A parody had appeared on Mr. Lyon's speech when he objected to waiting on the President with the address. I had some conversation with Colonel Lyon, on the subject of the speech and of the parody; I asked him whether he did not expect that speech would occasion some remarks on the affair of the wooden sword. He answered, that he did not expect it; that what he expected in the House was well guarded; that he did not mention any thing of fighting or of being a soldier; but only that he was at his post. I said, that it amounted to the same thing to say that he had remained firm at his post, as to have said he was a soldier. He replied he did not expect any remarks on his speech could lead to the affair of his being cashiered. I then reported to him how the circumstances of that business were related by persons belonging to the corps which was implicated, viz. That the officers thought themselves in a very dangerous situation, and had first suggested the idea of abandoning the post to the soldiers under their command; that the officers however could not desert their post without subjecting themselves to disgrace or punishment, but that the soldiers might mutiny and march off; and in that case the officers would not be obliged to tarry; that this the soldiers did, that the officers followed them. Mr. Lyon said it was true as related to the commanding officer and one or more of the others, and that he opposed what was intended, but was overruled. Mr. Lyon related the matter more particularly, but I suppose it will not be necessary to give it in detail. He then mentioned the circumstances of his arrest on his arrival at Ticonderoga and some circumstances related on the trials. He did not mention the particulars of the sentence of the court martial nor did I ask him. He further said that the next year, 1777, General St. Clair who commanded that detachment had reversed that sentence. A similar conversation passed between Col. Lyon and others about the same time; particularly one evening there were a number of people at the time belonging to the bar and others. Colonel Lyon observed, that he did not intend taking notice of any thing which should be said upon that subject in that part of the country, but that if any one in Philadelphia, or member of Congress (I am not sure of the expression he made use of) should insult him with it, it should not pass with impunity.

Mr. Clay asked why Mr. Lyon was called Colonel.

A. About 1731 he was made a Colonel of Militia.

Mr. Clay asked how far the regiment of which Mr. Lyon is Col. lays from the place where he was cashiered.

A. I should believe about 70 miles.

Mr. Brooks; who appoints the officers of militia in Vermont.

A. At that time, I believe, it was vested in the militia at large.

Mr. Gordon. Did the member of Vermont discover any sensibility when the subject of the wooden sword was mentioned.

A. He did not discover any resentment, but an anxiety to repel the insinuation.

Mr. Rutledge asked whether the witness was on such intimate terms with the member from Vermont as that he could take the liberty of mentioning the subject in a friendly manner.

The question was declared to be improper.

Mr. S. Smith asked whether the tenor of the conversation addressed to Mr. Lyon was such as to be considered in its nature insulting.

Mr. Chipman in answer repeated the words in which the subject was broached to Mr. Lyon and left the committee to judge of the nature of the expressions.

Mr. Clay; how far does Mr. Lyon live from Ticonderoga.

A. About 25 or 30 miles.

Mr. Kittera. Who were present during your conversation with Mr. Lyon.

A. Several gentlemen of the bar, and perhaps other persons also.

Mr. S. Smith. Were you a Judge at the time.

A. Yes.

Mr. S. Smith. What would have been the consequence if Mr. Lyon had resented against a Judge of the court.

Some objection was made to the propriety of this question and it was withdrawn.

Mr. Clay wished to know whether the witness and Mr. Lyon were ever in habits of friendly intercourse, and whether there were any difference between them now.

A. We have never been in habits of political friendship.

Mr. Clay repeated the latter part of his question.

Mr. Rutledge objected to it, as it could only go to an impeachment of the credibility of the witness, and therefore was an improper question.

Mr. Nicholas contended this was a proper and usual question to be put to witnesses and there was no reason why it should be dispensed with now. He did not think the question a very material one in the present instance; but as it had been asked, and was countenanced by practice, he hoped it would be answered and no innovation be made on established principles.

Mr. Chairman declared that as far as political differences were concerned it was a proper question, but no further.

Mr. Nicholas. Did you ever mention the conversation you had with Mr. Lyon and his declaration, that he would resent any allusion to the wooden sword here; and have you any reason to suppose Mr. G. was acquainted with it.

A. I mentioned it one evening when Mr. G. was present. I am not certain he was present; but believe he was.

Mr. Elmendorph. Did you mention it more than once.

A. Probably I did more than once in the city.

Mr. Champlin was next called on as a witness. He declared he could only confirm the circumstances Mr. Goodrich had related. He was excused.

Mr. Sumpter was then called on. He could only testify to this point; that Mr. Lyon immediately after the affray mentioned to him his having heard Mr. G's allusion to the wooden sword twice.

Mr. Sitgreaves objected to this as second hand testimony. Mr. Bayard opposed its being received on the same ground.

Mr. Nicholas considered this evidence important. It was important to shew, that Mr. Lyon had forborne resenting the first provocation, and this was the best testimony that could be adduced in the case.

Gen. Sumpter began to relate the circumstances within his knowledge, but was interrupted by

Mr. Bayard, who insisted this was hearsay evidence of the worst kind; since it was from the party interested.

It was after some desultory conversation determined, that the witness should confine himself to answering, whether Mr. Lyon said to him that he had heard the words of provocation uttered by Mr. Griwold twice.

General Sumpter answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Dayton asked General Sumpter whether he knew when the affray happened, and how much time had elapsed between it and the conversation Mr. Lyon had with him.

A. Not precisely; but suppose it was very short; from the agitation of Mr. Lyon I believed he came directly from the place where the fracas happened.

Mr. Dayton asked whether Mr. Lyon did or did not; and whether he could or could not have spoken to any member before he addressed the witness.

Mr. Smith imagined this point would be more accurately decided by enquiring of those who knew that the words had been twice spoken, whether they had communicated the circumstance to Mr. Lyon.

Mr. Dayton observed, that this would not be conclusive; those persons must declare that they had mentioned the circumstance to no one; for a knowledge of it might have come to Mr. Lyon circuitously. He hoped the witness would answer the question he had put.

A. I do not know that Mr. Lyon spoke to any member before me, after the affair; if he did it is not within my knowledge.

Mr. Dayton. Might he not have spoken.

A. I have no more cause to believe he did, than I have that he did not.

KINGSTON, (Jam.) January 11.

His Majesty's ship Renoumee, Captain Rolles, arrived at Port Royal, on Saturday with the vessels from the Mole, under her convoy:—Also the following vessels prizes to the Magicienne and Regulus:

A brig name unknown, cut out of Porto-Rico in ballast.

Ship Lettuce, ditto ditto, in ditto.

Brig Mary, ditto ditto, in ditto of this port.

The three first vessels are American bottoms, taken and condemned by the French.

Before his Majesty's ship Queen left the Mole, information having been received that the enemy had mounted some cannon on the Platform, for the protection of their gun-boats, a detachment under the direction of the Hon. Lieutenant Colonel Stewart was dispatched from the garrison, in order to spike them up, which, notwithstanding a galling fire from the enemy, was accomplished without any other loss than Major Carles, who was mortally wounded, and died a few days after, on board one of our frigates—Colonel Stewart had a very narrow

escape, his belt being cut in two by a musket ball.

Sunday evening arrived the brig Eliza in ballast, and a French sloop, prizes to the Magicienne and Regulus cut out of Porto-Rico.

We understand it is the intention of the Lords of the Admiralty, in order to prevent the danger that may arise to vessels sailing without convoy, from the measure of the French government converting their frigates into privateers; to appoint convoys for the West-Indies to sail regularly every month; a plan which cannot fail to give universal satisfaction to the commercial world.

B O S T O N, February 5.

On Friday afternoon, about 4 o'clock, a fire broke out in one of the dressing rooms of the Theatre in Federal street—and such was the height of the flames before discovered, and such the nature of the combustibles which they first took hold of that no exertions of several of the attendants of the Theatre could check their progress; and before 7 o'clock the entire inside of perhaps the most elegant building in the United States was totally destroyed—nothing being left unconsumed but the brick walls. The property lost on this occasion is very great; but fortunately such was the state of the wind, and the activity and vigilance of the citizens present, that the adjacent buildings, tho' all of them of wood, and some of them very near, were not in the least damaged.

We have taken some pains to ascertain the cause of the destruction—Rumour, ever active, and almost ever erroneous, readily attributed it to a rehearsal of the fire-works to be exhibited in the pantomime of *Don Juan*; but we have, from the evidence of persons on the spot, ascertained, that it is to be attributed totally to accident, or the negligence of the servant whose duty it was to watch the fires in the dressing-rooms.

Only one share of the property was insured; and when we contemplate the elegance of the building—the beauty of the architecture and other ornaments we must deplore the loss as a public injury.

Great credit is due to our worthy fellow-citizens of *Charlestown, Roxbury, Dorchester, Cambridge*, and other adjacent towns, for their spirited zeal, and indefatigable activity in assisting to stop the progress of flames which on the first discovery were alarming, and which with almost any other people, would have carried destruction far and wide.

We are happy to hear, that no shadow of blame in this calamitous occurrence, is attached to the Managers; who have always been particularly attentive to the extinction of the fires in the Theatre; it must be wholly ascribed to accident.—Mr. Barrett, who was indefatigably alert, as well as Mr. Harper to suppress the ravages of the fire received a violent contusion on his right shoulder, by the fall of a door, from one of the stage windows, which has since confined him to his bed.

Consummate villainy and murder.

[The following very extraordinary letter was handed us on Saturday evening for publication.]

State of America, Jan. 1798.

MADAM,

I am one of those people who subsist on the spoils of the traveller, but if the spark of humanity was entirely extinguished from my breast, you would never gain this, or any other information of a person who was very dear to you—you will of course heap curses on the villains who have deprived you of your husband. But your curses or blessings is a matter of indifference, as I am well assured that every precaution necessary is taken for our security.

As my word was passed for this indulgence these lines will find a conveyance to you, and operate for your interest hereafter.

You must know madam, that it was my fortune, with two or three of my associates to fall in with Mr. Oliver Johnson; after taking from him his cash to the amount of about 1800 dollars, we mutually agreed for our own security to dispatch the said Oliver Johnson, and informed him of our determination.

Immediately when he saw his fate determined upon he craved these two favours—viz. that we would write to his family which he said lived in Westmoreland, and direct the letter to be left at the Post-Office in Walpole, (N. H.) to inform you of his fate; and his last request is that Col. Joseph Burt, and Ezra Peirce, administer upon his estate, and wishes them to assist his distressed family.

To the wife of Oliver Johnson,  
late of Westmoreland.

A true copy—attest

THOMAS K. GREEN,  
JOSEPH BURT, *Select men of*  
J. BUFFUM, *Westmoreland.*

Feb. 14. Yesterday arrived the brig Joseph, Captain Hopkins, in 28 days from Malaga.—By her a number of letters were received.—They contain nothing particular, except, that at the last dates of the Paris accounts (Dec. 27) the Extra Envoys of the United States, had not been accredited by the French Directory.

Same day. Ship Polly, Jones from Benecoles, from whence he sailed September 9. On the passage to