THE WHIG.

EASTON, MD.

TUESDAY MORNING, Sept. 28, 1830.

In the last Gazette, we have noticed a communication from R. H. Goldsborough, Esq. in reply to a review of his resolutions adopted at the Anti-Jackson Caucus in this county, which had been extracted from the Baltimore Republican; and although Mr. Goldsborough, has addressed himself to the editor or writer for that journal, we cannot permit his publication to pass without a brief notice of some its points.

Mr. Goldsborough in reply to the assertion of the Republican, that he had calumniated Andrew Jackson, in calling him "the enemy of the Union," says "this is blind misrepresentation"; that this body of men thus called Disunionists were by him "specifically located to the South." If this language mean any thing, it is that he does not charge upon the Jackson party generally the sin of being "Disunionists." He confines it to the Anti-Tariff men *of the South*; and yet we see him an open, avowed and strenuous opponent of the Tariff, the advocate of the very principle on which these Southern men sin beyond redemption, exhorting the people of Maryland to spurn from their confidence as the friends of Disunion, the Jackson party of Maryland, whom he here openly acquits of the charge. Again in speaking of these Southern men, he uses this language, "Do not be ashamed of your company "gentlemen, you never were in better. Pray "do not abjure your friends, you never will "find truer. These Southern men are among "the loftiest men in your ranks; they are truly "chivalrous men—*men of honor*, &c. Believe "me, opposed as I am to their proceedings, *they "are not impelled by any sordid love of the loaves "and fishes, they act from principle and will not "be in your way.*" What higher eulogium could be bestowed on any body of men than is here bestowed on these Southern men, these enemies of the Union," with whom not only it is pollution to mingle, but even with their friends. This gentleman may think there is danger to the Union and to the liberties of our country from an intercourse with *"men of honor," who "are not impelled by any sordid love "of the loaves and fishes, but act from principle"* —but we do not. These *"men of honor"* thus *"governed by principle"* stand not in our way; but they *did* stand in the way of the enemies of our country in the late war; they did stand in the way of foreign foes and *domestic traitors*. Mr. Goldsborough has forgotten when penning this paragraph, that these *"men of honor"* who *"are governed by principle"* are the infected portion of the inhabitants of his city of the immagination, whose disease was likely to be spread through the whole extent of its population, or he would not have told us in conclusion *"they will not be in your way."* He cautions the people of Maryland against trusting that portion of her citizens called "Jacksonians" because they have certain friends in the South, infected with a political plague which is likely to be communicated to the whole party, and in the next breath he calls these Southern men "men of honor," "governed by principle," and exhorts the friends of the administration not to abjure them, not to be ashamed of them, that they are the "loftiest men in our ranks" "the very elite of the corps."

Such inconsistencies, unworthy of a schoolboy's pen, we cannot but hold up to the ridicule and contempt of every intelligent mind. If you regard your reputation Mr. G. let us admonish you not again to be "advised by your friends." Keep silence.

But to return to these Southern men, we think with Mr. Goldsborough, that they are men of honor, not impelled by sordid principles. We regret the delusion, (or what we esteem a delusion) under which they labour in regard to the tariff. On this principle we cannot go with them; but believing them to be governed by principle, we are anxious to conciliate them. The mild, temperate course of the President in support of the tariff, the check which he has given to the wild and visionary projects of Internal Improvement in his veto on the Maysville road bill, and the determination he has shewn not to permit sectional feelings to govern his actions, nor to sanction the acts of Congress growing out of such unjust principles, are in our humble judgment much more likely to heal the differences with our Southern brethren and to cement the bonds of our Union, than the elevation of Mr. Clay, whose policy has created all this discord, and the obstinate perseverance in which without mitigation, is likely to drive them to desperation. We would take some notice of Mr. Goldsborough's apology for his N. England friends of Hartford Convention memory, but our time and pressing engagements will not allow us. We leave him to the notice of our friends of the Baltimore Republican, who, we have no doubt, will do him ample justice.

THE MAINE ELECTION.

The returns of the election in the State of Maine are not entirely received, but sufficient have been received to make it quite certain that the Republican majority in the State will be at least *two thousand*. The democratic party carry the whole State—Governor, both Houses of the Legislature, and Congress. Where do the friends of Mr. Clay expect to get the votes necessary to his election?

Another Steam boat disaster.—A terrible disaster occurred on Lake Erie on the 19th inst. on board the Steamboat William Peacock, by which several persons lost their lives—the number not ascertained. About 20 were badly scalded. The following is from the Buffalo Journal of the above date:—

The Steamboat William Peacock left this port at nine o'clock this morning, for Detroit, and when about four miles outside the light house, a joint in the pipe which conveys steam from the boilers to the cylinder, gave way, which instantly discharged the whole head of steam into a steerage cabin, which is upon the deck. The apartment was thronged with passengers, mostly women and children, and the scene which ensued is not be described.

COMMUNICATIONS.

[FOR THE WHIG.]

A Card.—The political friends of Mr. Harrison, in Caroline, deny the assertion made by Mr. Culbreth, in his card of the last Gazette. He did not give Mr. Harrison a signal defeat, and they are not yet satisfied respecting the Chancery records.

One of the People.

Caroline, Sept. 24th 1830.

[FOR THE WHIG.]

☞PRECIOUS CONFESSION.☜

Edward N. Hambleton, the political friend and active partizan of Col. Hughlett, stated yesterday morning, in the office of the Eastern Shore Whig, *in substance*:—

That William Hughlett's bill for abolishing the Levy Court was an *electioneering trick got up by him to secure the county officers to the Adams party;* and that he (Hambleton) did not blame Henrix if he did oppose the bill, as stated by Hughlett.

If this be as stated by Hambleton:

My fellow citizens:

Pause in the name of God, and reflect on the deep and lasting ruin prepared for your dearest rights by the course of legislation disclosed in this precious confession. Col. Hughlett elected by the freemen of Talbot county, to make wholesome laws for the security of person and property, and receiving pay for his labour out of the people's money, spends his time in getting up intrigues and practising artifices, to *deceive and delude the people*—reflect before it is too late, and say through the ballot box on next Monday, in a voice of thunder, that you condemn such men to lasting obscurity.

A CITIZEN.

Monday, 27th Sept.

[FOR THE WHIG.]

Mr. Mullikin.—I have always been an Adams man, because I do not like Jackson; but when I see foul play, I am apt to suspect that all is not right. You know that our Adams leaders had a meeting at Quaker-town last Saturday. Well, Col. Hughlett's handbill was handed about among the people, and was read to the people, yet when Henrix wished to explain about the charge they were reading against him, he was not suffered to open his mouth—yet we hear these men talk about Jackson, and arbitrary power, and call themselves democrats. Shame! shame! shame! If Col. Hughlett's handbill was the truth, Henrix could not hurt it—but if Hughlett did not tell the truth, is it right that the people should be imposed on by falsehoods? Our leaders seem to be afraid to trust us, and wish to keep us blindfolded. Do they think us such fools that we are to be blown about by every breath, and therefore will not suffer us to hear any information but what they judge proper? As to my part, I am a Freeman, and I am resolved not to be imposed on any longer. I have a right to my opinion as much as they, and I will not vote for one of them, because I cannot believe in them any more; and when the tickets are counted out you will find more of my way of thinking, or I am mistaken. They can blow hot, and blow cold, just as they like:—it is *mighty wrong* in Jackson to turn bad men out of office, like Toby Watkins and Barney and others, and *very right* in them not to suffer an honest man to defend himself before his fellow citizens—they cry about among us that they are democrats to-day, and vote for federalists to-morrow, and serve under federalists too—and think the people ha'nt got sense enough to see through it.

A FREEMAN.

TO THE CITIZENS OF TALBOT COUNTY.

Fellow Citizens:

Among the topics of electioneering to which the desperation of the Adams party have induced them to resort, I find the public attention called by an article in the Gazette of the 18th instant, to Col. Hughlett's bill for abolishing the Levy Court.

I do not subscribe to the lavish panygerick bestowed by that article on Col. Hughlett, but having no ill feelings towards him, I should not in all likelihood have attempted to question his title to it, had not the republication of that article in a handbill form satisfied my mind, that the real object of the writer was to cast unmeritted censure on Mr. Henrix, rather than to tickle and flatter Col. Hughlett. I therefore respectfully submit the following queries and reflections to the consideration of Col. Hughlett and to the public:—

Did Col. Hughlett consult the people of this county on the important change contemplated by his bill?

Did not Col. Hughlett's bill propose to elect in place of the now annually appointed Levy Court, five Commissioners, *to serve three years?*

Did not Col. Hughlett's bill propose to place the money raised by the taxes *out of the people's pockets in the hands of these five Commissioners, to be held by them without bond for its faithful fortheoming when called for?*

Has Col. Hughlett been always thus friendly disposed towards this "great measure?"

Did not Col. Hughlett in the progress of this measure before the Legislature, *evince an utter disregard and contempt for the wishes and opinions of the people?*

I have heard it asserted as a fact, and I am compelled to believe it, from the votes and proceedings of the last session (see page 120 of the proceedings of the Senate), that this boasted *Republican measure* of Col. Hughlett, smelt as strongly of *Aristocracy* and contempt for the rights of the people, and the principles of free government as ever did any measure which has been brought forward in our Assembly for the last *thirty years*. That under the shallow and flimsy pretence of increasing the amount of the elective franchise, by conferring on the people the right of electing the members of the Levy Court (under the name of Commissioners), it contained the *abominable and odious* provision that these Commissioners SHOULD HOLD THEIR OFFICE THREE YEARS. ☞ So much for Col. Hughlett's *Republicanism*.

It is further asserted as a fact, and for proof of the truth of it, see votes and proceedings of the Senate (page 120), that Col. Hughlett's bill proposed to place all the money which should be collected by his *five aristocrats*, out of the people's pockets, for county expenses, &c. in the hands and keeping of these same *five aristocrats*, without bond or any other security from them, for its forthcoming when wanted—to be kept by them and used as they thought proper, during the THREE YEARS THEY WERE TO HOLD THEIR OFFICE. And in the interim the people were to have no more control over their own money, than they now have over Col. Hughlett's. ☞ So much for Col. Hughlett's economy and care of the public purse. Does he thus take care of his own?

I have understood that Col. Hughlett's bill in the above *odious* and *abominable* form, was voted for by Col. Hughlett, Spry Denny, and George Dudley. *Mr. Henrix being absent from the House, confined to his room by sickness, did not vote against it, as he no doubt would, had he been present, and unable to obtain amendments to it.*

Col. Hughlett having managed to get his bill through the lower House in the absence of Mr. Henrix, with all these imperfections sticking about it, it was carried up to the Senate, where it was amended by Col. Lloyd, by striking out in the first place, that outrageous and anti-republican clause, by which these five aristocrats of Col. Hughlett, were to hold their office for three years; and by inserting in the place of it, a *provision for the election of five Commissioners every year at the same time that Delegates are elected to the Legislature.*—☞ Col. Hughlett objected to this amendment, and when the bill came down from the Senate with this amendment, Col. Hughlett, Denny and Dudley *voted against the bill because of the amendment.* See handbill. It destroyed, says Col. Hughlett, the rotational principle—meaning, I suppose, the *aristocratic principle.*

Col. Lloyd further amended this bill by inserting a provision that the money collected from the people should not be placed *in the hands of the Commissioners, who were to give no bond, but that it should be placed in the hands of the Collector, who gives bond and security for the safe keeping of the public money, and for its faithful payment to those entitled to receive it.* And also, inasmuch as the change designed to be made in the transaction of the public business of the county was a most important one to the people, Col. Lloyd added a clause by way of amendment, postponing the operation of the bill for one year, in order that the people might see and judge for themselves, and say by their votes this fall whether they would have this new law, or not, in place of the old Levy Court, before they become subjected to its operation. (See votes and proceedings of the Senate, page 120.) ☞ Col. Hughlett opposed both of these amendments, the last with so much violence, that his opposition to that and the first amendment caused himself, Denny, and Dudley, finally to vote against the bill. (See handbill.)

Col. Hughlett's bill being thus amended by Col. Lloyd, went down from the Senate to the lower house, and being now deprived of these *anti-republican and aristocratic features*, which in its first shape so much disfigured it, and in fact made it any thing rather than *republican;*—it was voted for by Mr. Henrix, and *voted against* by Col. Hughlett, Spry Denny and George Dudley, *and defeated by them.*

Mr. Henrix and Col. Lloyd had never heard of any such change spoken of by the people; they regarded the thing much in the light of an *experiment*, and before they submitted the people to Col. Hughlett's *schemes* and *experiments*, I think they were right, and discharged their duty faithfully in wishing to put off the practical operation of the *experiment*, until the people could be informed what was designed for them, and could say for themselves whether they were willing to submit to it or not.

If an amendment doing away the three year's tenure of office, providing for the faithful accountability of the people's money, and proposing to pay but 'a decent respect' to their opinions and wishes, caused Col. Hughlett, Spry Denny and George Dudley to vote against the bill, is it not nonsense to talk of their respect for the people, their republicanism, &c.? In fact the conduct of these gentlemen almost raises a suspicion of their sincerity; and one is led to believe that their object was to *amuse*, not to *serve* the people, did not the indignant manner in which they spurned the idea of consulting the people's wishes, force on us the conviction that they had determined to set the people at defiance.

Col. Hughlett it seems had made up his mind, that the people *should have his law in his own way*, right or wrong, want it or not. No he could not condescend to consult them; if they would not take his *own law* in *his own way*, they should not have it in *their way*. Really this looks a little like the *old leaven*. He could scarcely have Hectored it more with one of his *customers*.

It is true that a bill did pass the Legislature, to abolish the Levy Court of Queen-Anne's county, but it is also a fact, that it was well understood that this was the wish of the *People* of Queen-Anne's county, and being unanimously supported by the Queen-Anne's Delegation, it accordingly passed. But in the case of Col. Hughlett's bill, the people *were not consulted*, and as far as Mr. Henrix, and Col. Lloyd were informed by letters from their friends, a majority of opinions appeared to be against the bill, until something more could be learnt of it. Under these circumstances alone, it was the duty of a prudent man desirous of conforming to the will of the people, to pause for information and reflection. But has Col. Hughlett himself been always friendly to this increase of the elective franchise? has he not invariably opposed all such extensions of the right of suffrage? It will be found that in the year 1828, Col. Hughlett voted against the bill for electing the Levy Court of Washington county by the people. And in the same year, against electing the Levy Court of Allegany county by the people, (see votes and proceedings of 1828, pages 516, 554 and 613,) and no single instance is within my knowledge until in the case of his hopeful bantling, where Col. Hughlett has not been against the increase of the suffrage of the people.

A VOTER.

Saturday Evening, Sept. 25th, 1830.

[FOR THE WHIG.]

ANNAPOLIS, September, 1830.

To THOMAS CULBRETH,

SIR,

While you are publicly censuring the conduct of Gen. Jackson, you threaten every man with a law suit, who makes charges against yourself; provided he will first enter into security for the payment of such damages as an honest jury shall award you. I am an obscure individual, ignorant of the law, and too poor to contend, in a Court of law, with a man of your influence. You have filled many high stations, and have had opportunities, which you turned to good account of laying up money enough, to enable you to sue your old neighbours for telling the truth. But I have been advised by counsel, that any man may publish what he can prove to be true; that the Sedition Law has been repealed, and that even if it were in force, it would not prevent the *Truth* from being given in evidence. My lawyer informed me at the same time, that you had no intention of bringing suit, but expected, by that threat, to prevent farther scrutiny into your official proceedings. This being the case, I shall examine your conduct freely, but with that respect, which is due to the great dignity of your character. As I bear you no malice, I shall omit many things that might be stated to your disadvantage, and confine myself to one or two prominent facts. You wish to be attacked in company with the Executive, of which you no doubt considered yourself the most influential member; and assert that you can establish the purity and propriety of their conduct, by official documents. You could produce legislative reports, prepared by political friends, exemptting you and the Executive, and every body from blame in relation to the Chancery Records. But you are not now required to answer for the Executive *"of that day,"* but are put upon the more difficult task of—defending yourself. You say that you completely refuted the charges, made by Mr. Harrison, at a meeting of the people of Caroline. As it was so easy to refute Mr. Harrison, why could you not gratify your friends so far, as to refute the *printed* charges? You consider the publication, containing those charges, *"a miserable compound" "of knavery and folly,"* and yet in your notice of it, betray more anger than so *contemptible* a production ought to excite in a man of your consequence. Persons, ignorant of the facts, would suspect, from your irritated feelings, that you were conscious of the truth of the charges; and I, who am acquainted with the facts, entertain the same suspicion.

You were employed to superintend the recording of the Chancery papers, and received between five and six thousand dollars for the care and labor which it was supposed you had bestowed upon the work submitted to your superintendency. Instead of doing this work for which you were so well paid, you employed Mr. Mayo, a careless and ignorant clerk, to examine and correct the records which had been made up by himself and his associates.

To his discretion it was left, what papers were to be recorded, and *all* were recorded, whether of value or not, that the profits of the job might be enlarged. Even forgery was committed for the same purpose, in altering the date of a long decree, that it might appear as an unrecorded paper, though it had already been recorded by the present Register. Not only were useless papers recorded, but in some instances, valuable papers were destroyed. It is said and believed that one of the clerks destroyed such as were difficult and unprofitable to copy. To Mr. Mayo was also left the computation of the work, which it was his interest to overrate. It is said and believed, that the words were counted on a side that was *closely written*, and that every other side in a whole record was then estimated to contain the same number of words. You are not charged with this forgery, false calculation and destruction of records. But you are charged with *neglecting to do*, what *you had contracted to do*, and what you were *paid for doing*. This you have not denied in your publication. You will never deny it in writing, though you may still boast of your triumphs before "a portion of the people of Caroline."

When you received your money for doing *nothing*, you divided it with Mr. Mayo for doing *your work*. Did you not know when you undertook the work that you could not perform it, without neglecting your duties as clerk of the Council? If you knew you were not able to attend to these accumulated employments, you must have intended to sell out your agency, and thus speculate upon Executive appointments. If you believed that you could perform the work you were deceived; and as soon as you discovered your mistake, it was your duty to resign the management of the Chancery Records, that the Executive might appoint a suitable person in your place. Suppose you had superintended the work yourself, and like Mr. Mayo, had committed mistakes and frauds, instead of preventing them; in that case, would you have been entitled to the large sum you received? If you would not have been entitled to extravagant compensation for doing the work in this manner *yourself*, was it reasonable or just that you should receive nearly six thousand dollars for the fraud and mismanagement of your deputy? The constitution prohibits any member of the Executive from participating in the profits of any other public employment; and the *spirit* of this provision would equally prohibit their Clerk. He has a salary sufficient for his support, and his situation gives him advantages over other men, in obtaining Executive patronage.

Let your conduct be fairly viewed, and every intelligent man must admit that you ought to have been removed from office. You may boast as much as you please about your wonderful triumphs in Caroline, but you will not venture to deny in writing, that you received upwards of five thousand dollars, for services which you never performed.

You are an exceedingly modest man, not obstinate in your temper nor conceited in your opinions, but like Henry Clay you are the humblest of the most humble, and somewhat addicted to the American System.—This being your character, I leave it to yourself to decide, whether the people of Maryland, enjoying the privilege of speech and the liberty of the press, should forbear to speak of public abuses, because you threaten them with a law suit. I leave it to yourself to determine whether silence, in your situation, would not have been more prudent and becoming, than a course of violence and intimidation. Perhaps you were of opinion that a little clamour would be considered as a proof of your innocence. You ought to have remembered that Toby Watkins, Miles King and a host of swindlers and defaulters adopted the same system, without producing the least change in public opinion. I leave it to yourself to say, whether you had not hopes of being continued in office by the present Executive, and whether you did not say, that you would, in that case, take no further part in the contest between the present parties. If you had been retained, you would have endeavoured to *keep* in, by your moderation; as you were turned out, you now attempt to recover your place by your violence. You have this excuse for your present course: you have so long been accustomed to office, that you cannot be satisfied without it.

You will perceive, from what I have said, that I bear you no ill will, and that I have suppressed many things out of tenderness to your feelings. As a farther proof that I entertain no hostility toward you, I now advise you, (if it be not too presuming to give advice to a man of your wisdom,) never, in the whole course of your life, whether *in* office, or struggling to *get in*, to utter a single word about the Chancery Records.

A RECORDER.

NEW FRENCH MINISTRY.

PARIS, Aug. 12.—As, at this important crisis, every eye is directed towards this country, and every person in Europe is more or less interested in the conduct of the French Government by which the tranquility of France and of other countries may be prevented or established, I send you (by express) the following list of Ministers who have just been appointed by Louis Philip the First.—Foregin Affairs Count de Mole; War, Gen. Gerard; Finance, Baron Louis; Instruction Publique and President of the Council of State, Duc de Broglie; Interior M. de Guizot, Marine, General Sebastiani; Justice, M. Dupont de l'Eure.

It will be seen from this list that the majority of the appointments made by the Provisional Government have been confirmed.

From the Baltimore Republican.

THE COMING ELECTION.

The principles contended for, by the opposing parties in this State, have been so frequently and fully discussed, that nothing which can be said at this time by either side can be expected to influence the judgment of the people in the contest. It is perfectly understood among the *people* (however the *ex-office holders* and politicians by trade, may attempt to smother and disguise it,) that the friends of General Jackson in this State, rally in defence of his character and principles against a selfish faction, and that the cardinal points of policy for which they contend, are, LOW TAXES; the rapid EXTINGUISHMENT of the PUBLIC DEBT;—a republican interpretation of the constitution, which shall save the TREASURY from being squandered, and the halls of Congress from a debasing scramble for money, and preserve the State governments in full possession of their rightful powers;—a proper rotation in office which shall destroy the growing aristocracies which had begun to deform the purity of our institutions; and finally the *supremacy* of the people's will, constitutionally expressed.

Against these principles, on various pretences the opposition is embodied. A blind unreasonable hatred to General Jackson,—a steady instinctive hostility to republican principles—personal devotion to a fallen politician,—feelings of personal revenge, from disappointed office seekers, and ejected office holders, defaulters and peculators;—these are the passions and motives, which have stirred up the furious and unrelenting opposition which rages in Maryland such a relentless warfare against the administration. The partisans of this faction are considered as having embarked themselves, on these various pretences in direct hostility to the distinguishing principles of Jackson policy which we have enumerated. The open declaration of Mr. Clay at Cincinnati, respecting the SALT and MOLASSES duties, pledges him and them in favor of INCREASED TAXES on those necessaries of life—taxes which the Clay organ in this city once called a HEAVY TAX *upon that portion of the community which earns their bread by the sweat of their brow!*

They are too, supporters of the CLAY doctrine opposed to Gen. Jackson's VETO DOCTRINE—and consequently advocates of that profuse expenditure of public money for local purposes, which would have been established in the *Maysville* bill,—a principle which would have beggared the Treasury, established in congress a *bargaining system* for votes and appropriations, and rendered an augmented NATIONAL DEBT necessary to satisfy its claims.

They are, moreover, committed in this anti-veto doctrine, to principles of administration in the general government, which would reduce the states (in the words of John Holmes of Maine) "below the grade of petty corporations;"—and make the general government despotic over the entire resources of the whole union, to be distributed at pleasure among the favorites of an accidental majority in Congress.

They maintain a HEREDITARY and INALIENABLE RIGHT TO OFFICE, asserting the merits of fathers, as unanswerable claims upon the public purse, and giving an undefeasible right to honors and emoluments of office; and have grossly abused and slandered the President for denying, and efficiently destroying this monstrous pretence, so hostile to republican principles, and the equal rights of all her citizens.

They have also, from the commencement of the administration warred against the POPULAR WILL.—Before the developement of any course of policy by which measures might be tested, and rightful and salutary opposition commenced upon principle, they rallied under a disappointed leader, and commenced a bitter persecuting warfare against a president, elected by a majority unexampled in the history of contested elections, and with a demonstration of popular preference and affection, to which our annals have no parallel case.

These we take to be some of the prominent grounds upon which a party is organized in Maryland, to get control of the State;—not that all men of the opposition, openly avow or even concede that they agree in *all* these designs, but a spirit of selfishness has bound into a common interest, discordant elements of party, maintaining substantially all their views.

Upon these points, the battle is to be fought,—we have not permitted ourselves to doubt of the result.—We believe that a full sense of the importance of the question, is entertained by the Jackson Republican party of Maryland, and that they will demonstrate in the coming elections, the importance which they attach to them, by signally and irretrievably defeating the motley party, which is laboring to throw Maryland into a hopeless opposition.

Independent of these forcible reasons for maintaining true principles in the coming elections by the support of Gen. Jackson, it is worth while to inquire, what do the opposition expect from success? What benefit is to accrue to Maryland, by joining in a desperate alliance of opposition to General Jackson, with four N. England States combatting the *twenty* States which support him? Besides the abandonment of true principles, which such a course would shew, the result would be the sacrifice of the interests of Maryland for the mere purpose of distributing offices among needy partizans, and embarking the State in a feverish contest against an overwhelming majority of the Union.

The recent elections in every part of the Union, have demonstrated the utter hopelessness of the cause of the Anti-Jackson party. A brief and candid sketch of the results as they have been developed, will shew how completely in all parts of the Union, the opposition has failed in its attempts to array any strength in its crusade against the present administration.

In LOUISIANNA—A Jackson majority is elected to the Legislature—and a Jackson Senator will be elected.

In MISSISSIPPI, among six candidates—one only for the opposition,—a Jackson member of Congress is elected, and the aggregate Jackson majority is not far from *ten thousand*, and a Jackson Senator will be elected.

In MISSOURI, *two-thirds* of the Legislature elected, are for Jackson—and a Jackson Senator will be elected.

In KENTUCKY, the Clay majority of last year is annihilated, and if the members vote truly as they were elected, a Jackson Senator will be elected.

In ILLINOIS, all parties are for Jackson, and it is stated that there are not *five* opposition men in both houses of the Legislature

In INDIANA, the Clay majority in the Legislature, is diminished since last year, and as the majority of the State is undoubtedly Jacksonian, measures have been taken, as we learn, to instruct the Legislature in the will of their constituents, which being obeyed, will ensure a Jackson Senator.

IN RHODE ISLAND, where the vote at the last presidential election was FIVE to ONE against the administration, the opposition have only succeeded in getting a majority of *eight* or *ten* in a legislature of *one hundred* members.

IN VERMONT, where the majority against us, at the Presidential election, was nearly *seventeen thousand*, the vote for the Anti-Jackson Governor has failed to elect him.

IN MAINE, the Clay party which held the power has been routed and defeated, and all branches of the government are JACKSONIAN.

Such are the results of the fall elections, so far as they have taken place, and in no place has the strength of the opposition been increased. On the contrary, it has been very promptly met by the friends of General Jackson, and in some places triumphantly put down.

We ask then, why should Maryland throw her weight into such a faction? Is it proper that the state should forsake her just place in the ranks of the Republican party, lose her proper influence in the Councils of the Administration, and become one of a desperate minority, merely to keep that *"astute arithmetician"* Ezekiel F. Chambers, in the Senate of the United States, and to dispense the State offices among the enemies of "PROSCRIPTION," who are hungering and thirsting after an opportunity to proscribe? This is a grave inquiry, which every citizen may answer for himself.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in this town being nearly completed, public worship will be renewed on next Sabbath at 11 o'clock, A. M. at which time a collection will be taken to assist in defraying the expenses of plaistering, &c.—A sermon appropriate for the accession may be expected.

N. B. The members of Society are informed that there will be a Love Feast in the morning before public service.—The doors closed at 9 o'clock.

MARRIED

On Thursday 11th inst. by the Rev. Mr Warfield, Mr. THOMAS GANNON, to Miss ANN STITCHBURY all of this County.

Another Revolutionary Hero gone.

Died on Monday last, in this county at the Cottage, the residence of Wm. H. Tighman, Esq. General JAMES LLOYD, in the 74th year of his age.

Departed this life on Saturday the 11th inst. in the 15th year of his age, after a short but painful illness, HENRY C. 3d son of Foster Maynard, Esq. of this county.

In this County on Monday last, Mr. JOHN JEFFERSON.

In this county on Tuesday last Mrs. TODD, consort of Mr. Jeremiah Todd.

In this county on Tuesday last, Mrs. ELIZABETH ROBINSON, in the 70th year of her age.

On Saturday last, Mrs. ELEANOR HOPKINS consort of Mr. Rigby Hopkins, of this county.

COLLECTOR'S NOTICE.

IN pursuance of an order of the Commissioners of the Tax of Talbot county, dated July 13, 1830, will be sold at the Court House door in the town of Easton, on TUESDAY the 19th day of October next, between the hours of 10 o'clock, A. M. and 5 o'clock, P. M. all those tracts and parcels of land (or such parts thereof as may be necessary to raise the several sums due thereon,) which were advertised in the Gazette, Star, and Whig of Easton, and the Baltimore Patriot, in August last, on which the tax has not been, or shall not be paid before the day of sale; for the years 1828 and 1829; to be sold for cash, the purchaser to pay the expenses of locating and conveying.

SOL: MULLIKIN, Collector of Talbot county Taxes for the years 1828 and 1829.

Easton, sept. 28, 1830 4w

PUBLIC SALE.

WILL be sold at public vendue on the premises on WEDNESDAY the 6th of October between the hours of 2 and 4 o'clock, P. M. a lot of ground being part of the tract of land called Londonderry, situate on the North side of Cabinet Street extended, contiguous to the town of Easton, and containing the quantity of 4 acres and 7-8 of an acre of land. There is an excellent stable, carrige house and granary on the premises—The soil is of excellent quality and the whole well enclosed—Terms made known on the day of Sale.

WM. TOWNSEND, Agent.

Sept. 28 2w

SALE.

In addition to the property advertised to be sold at Belle Ville, on THURSDAY next, the 30th inst., there will be also sold, on the same credit of six months from the delivery, the entire crop of corn, by parcels or lots of ten barrels, to be delivered at the Farm yard, and a good gig and harness.

JOHN LEEDS KERR.

Easton, Sept. 28.

WOOD LAND.

ANY person having a good SPRUCE PINE WOOD LOT, say from 500 to 1000 Acres, bounding on navigable waters, and is willing to dispose of it cheap, can hear of a purchase, by applying to the subscriber, manager of Volona Copper Rolling Mill, Smith's wharf, Baltimore.

SAMUEL HAYWARD.

sept. 28 3t G.

Farm for Rent.

FOR rent for the next year, two thirds of the farm of the late Robert Larrimore, dec'd. now occupied by Lambert W. Ford; situate about 3 miles from Easton, on the road to Wye Mill. The terms will be made known on application to the subscriber, in Queen Ann's, or at Easton.

ROBERT LARRIMORE, Adm'r.

de bonis non of Robert Larrimore, senr. dec'd.

sept. 21 w

NOTICE.—Was committed to the jail of Frederick County, on the 17th day of August last, as a runaway, a negro Man, who calls himself JEFFRY, and says he belongs to Elijah Robertson, of Culpepper County, Virginia; had on when commited, a striped domestic close body coat, old cassinet pantaloons, old fur hat. He has a scar over the right eye and one on the back part of the left hand; is about fifty years of age, five feet five or six inches high.—The owner of the above described negro is requested to come and have him released, he will, otherwise be discharged, according to law.

JOHN RIGNEY, *Shff.*

Frederick county, Maryland.

sept. 21 8w

WANTED

TO serve as apprentices to the different branches of Coach-Making, three well grown boys from fourteen to sixteen years of age.

EDWARD S. HOPKINS

Easton, sept. 14 3w

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0068.jpg