"*Resolved*, also, That we view, with decided disapprobation, the renewed attempts in Congress to secure the passage of a bill providing for the disposal of the public domain upon the principles proposed by Mr. Clay, inasmuch as we believe that such a law would be unequal in its operations, and unjust in its results."

"*Resolved*, also, That we heartily approve of the principles set forth in the late veto message upon that subject," and,

"*Resolved*, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our representatives requested to use their influence to prevent the rechartering of the Bank of the U. States: to sustain the administration in its removal of the public deposites; and to oppose the passage of the land bill containing the principles adopted in the act upon that subject, passed at the last session of Congress.

"*Resolved*, That the Governor be requested to transmit copies of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives."

It is thus seen that four Senators have declared by their votes that the President, in the late Executive proceedings in relation to the revenue, had been guilty of the impeachable offence of "assuming upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both," whilst the Legislatures of their respective States had deliberately approved these very proceedings, as consistent with the constitution, and demanded by the public good. If these four votes had been given in accordance with the sentiments of the Legislatures, as above expressed, there would have been but twenty-four votes out of forty-six for censuring the President, and the unprecedented record of his conviction could not have been placed upon the journals of the Senate.

In thus referring to the resolutions and instructions of State Legislatures, I disclaim and repudiate all authority or design to interfere with the responsibility due from members of the Senate to their own consciences, their constituents, and their country. The facts now stated belong to the history of these proceedings, and are important to the just developement of the principles and interests involved in them, as well as to the proper vindication of the Executive Department; and with that view, and that view only, are they here made the topic of remark.

The dangerous tendency of the doctrine which denies to the President the power of supervising, directing, and removing the Secretary of the Treasury, in like manner with the other Executive officers, would soon be manifest in practice, were the doctrine to be established. The President is the direct representative of the American People, but the Secretaries are not. If the Secretary of the Treasury be independent of the President in the execution of the laws, then is there no direct responsibility to the People in that important branch of this Government, to which is committed the care of the national finances. And it is in the power of the Bank of the United States, or any other corporation, body of men, or individuals, if a Secretary shall be found to accord with them in opinion, or can be induced in practice to promote their views, to control, through him, the whole action of the Government, (so far as it is exercised by his department,) in defiance of the Chief Magistrate elected by the People and responsible to them.

But the evil tendency of the particular doctrine adverted to, though sufficiently serious, would be as nothing in comparison with the pernicious consequences which would inevitably flow from the approbation and allowance by the people, and the practice by the Senate, of the unconstitutional power of arraigning and censuring the official conduct of the Executive, in the manner recently pursued. Such proceedings are eminently calculated to unsettle the foundations of the Government; to disturb the harmonious action of its different Departments; and to break down the checks and balances by which the wisdom of its framers sought to ensure its stability and usefulness.

The honest differences of opinion which occasionally exist between the Senate and the President, in regard to matters in which both are obliged to participate, are sufficiently embarrassing. But if the course recently adopted by the Senate shall hereafter be frequently pursued, it is not only obvious that the harmony of the relations between the President and the Senate will be destroyed, but that other and graver effects will ultimately ensue. If the censures of the Senate be submitted to by the President, the confidence of the people in his ability and virtue, and the character and usefulness of his administration, will soon be at an end, and the real power of the Government will fall into the hands of a body, holding their offices for long terms, not elected by the people, and not to them directly responsible. If, on the other hand, the illegal censures of the Senate should be resisted by the President, collisions and angry controversies might ensue, discreditable in their progress, and in the end compelling the people to adopt the conclusion, either that their Chief Magistrate was unworthy of their respect, or that the Senate was chargeable with calumny and injustice. Either of these results would impair public confidence in the perfection of the system, and lead to serious alterations of its frame work, or to the practical abandonment of some of its provisions.

The influence of such proceedings on the other Departments of the Government, and more especially on the States, could not fail to be extensively pernicious. When the judges in the last resort of official misconduct themselves overleap the bounds of their authority, as prescribed by the constitution, what general disregard of its provisions might not their example be expected to produce? And who does not perceive that such contempt of the Federal constitution, by one of its most important Departments, would hold out the strongest temptation to resistance on the part of the State sovereignties, whenever they shall suppose their just rights to have been invaded? Thus, all the independent Departments of the Government, and States which compose our confederated Union, instead of attending to their appropriate duties, and leaving those who may offend, to be reclaimed or punished in the manner pointed out in the constitution, would fall to mutual crimination and recrimination, and give to the people confusion and anarchy, instead of order and law; until, at length, some form of aristocratic power would be established on the ruins of the constitution, or the States be broken into separate communities.

Far be it from me to charge, or to insinuate, that the present Senate of the United States intend, in the most distant way, to encourage such a result. It is not of their motives or designs, but only of the tendency of their acts, that it is my duty to speak. It is, if possible, to make Senators themselves sensible of the danger which lurks under the precedent set in their resolution, and at any rate to perform my duty, as the responsible Head of one of the co-equal Departments of the Government, that I have been compelled to point out the consequences to which the discussion and passage of the resolution may lead, if the tendency of the measure be not checked in its inception.

It is due to the high trust with which I have been charged; to those who may be called to succeed me in it; to the Representatives of the people, whose constitutional prerogative has been unlawfully assumed; to the people and to the States; and to the constitution they have established; that I should not permit its provisions to be broken down by such an attack on the Executive Department, without at least some effort "to preserve, protect and defend them." With this view, and for the reasons which have been stated, I do hereby SOLEMNLY PROTEST against the aforementioned proceedings of the Senate, as unauthorized by the constitution; contrary to its spirit and to several of its express provisions; subversive of that distribution of the powers of government which it has ordained and established; destructive of the checks and safeguards by which those powers were intended, on the one hand, to be controlled, and on the other to be protected; and calculated by their immediate and collateral effects, by their character and tendency, to concentrate in the hands of a body not directly amenable to the people, a degree of influence and power dangerous to their liberties, and fatal to the constitution of their choice.

The resolution of the Senate contains an imputation upon my private as well as upon my public character; and as it must stand forever on their journals, I cannot close this substitute for that defence which I have not been allowed to present in the ordinary form, without remarking, that I have lived in vain, if it be necessary to enter into a formal vindication of my character and purposes from such an imputation. In vain do I bear upon my person, enduring memorials of that contest in which American liberty was purchased—in vain have I since periled property, fame, and life, in defence of the rights and privileges so dearly bought—in vain am I now without a personal aspiration, or the hope of individual advantage, encountering responsibilities and dangers, from which by mere inactivity in relation to a single point, I might have been exempt—if any serious doubts can be entertained as to the purity of my purposes and motives. If I had been ambitious, I should have sought an alliance with that powerful institution which even now aspires to no divided empire. If I had been venal, I should have sold myself to its designs—had I preferred personal comfort and official ease to the performance of my arduous duty, I should have ceased to molest it. In the history of conquerors and usurpers, never, in the fire of youth, nor in the vigor of manhood, could I find an attraction to allure me from the path of duty; and now, I shall scarcely find an inducement to commence the career of ambition, when gray hairs and a decaying frame, instead of inviting to toil and battle call me to the contemplation of other worlds, where conquerors cease to be honored, and usurpers expiate their crimes.

The only ambition I can feel, is to acquit myself to him to whom I must soon render an account of my stewardship, to serve my fellow men, and live respected and honored in the history of my country. No; the ambition which leads me on, is an anxious desire, and a fixed determination, to return to the people, unimpaired, the sacred trust they have confided to my charge; to heal the wounds of the constitution and preserve it from further violation; to persuade my countrymen, so far as I may, that it is not in a splendid Government, supported by powerful monopolies and aristocratical establishments, that they will find happiness, or their liberties protection; but in a plain system, void of pomp, protecting all, and granting favors to none—dispensing its blessings like the dews of Heaven, unseen and unfelt, save in the freshness and beauty they contribute to produce. It is such a Government that the genius of our people requires—such an one only under which our States may remain for ages to come, united, prosperous, and free. If the Almighty Being who has hitherto sustained and protected me, will but vouchsafe to make my feeble powers instrumental to such a result, I shall anticipate with pleasure the place to be assigned me in the history of my country, and die contented with the belief, that I have contributed, in some small degree, to increase the value and prolong the duration of American Liberty.

To the end that the resolution of the Senate may not be hereafter drawn into precedent, with the authority of silent acquiescence on the part of the Executive Department: and to the end, also, that my motives and views in the Executive proceedings denounced in that resolution, may be known to my fellow citizens, to the world, and to all posterity, I respectfully request that this Message and Protest, may be entered at length on the Journals of the Senate.

ANDREW JACKSON.

April 15th, 1834.

—

Immediately upon the reading of this Protest, Mr. Poindexter rose and moved that it be not received by the Senate; and a warm and interesting debate ensued, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Sprague, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Benton, Mr. Southard and Mr. King, of Alabama, severally addressing the Senate. After these gentlemen, Mr. Leigh obtained the floor, and moved that the Senate now adjourn, which motion was agreed to.

Having room for only a very small portion of the debate, we give below but some of the

REMARKS OF MR. SOUTHARD.

* * * * * The President regards the resolution of the Senate as uncalled for; designed for no legislative purpose; intended to lead to no legislative action; not authorized by our legislative duties; but meant simply to express our condemnation of him; and, as an assumption of judicial power, an expression of an exparte judicial opinion. So far as I am individually concerned, I pronounce this view of it a gross misapprehension or misrepresentation and perversion of my vote and purposes. In what situation did this subject stand, when this message was received? Its history will explain its character. When we came here, at the commencement of the session, we found the public treasure removed from the position in which it had been, for years past, under the solemn sanction of the laws of the land. It was placed where no legal provisions have directed—without responsibility, and, as I believed, without safety. It was not only our duty as guardians of the public money, in our legislative capacity, to inquire into the authority by which the removal had been made, but, under the express provision of the statute, the reasons for the removal were to be given to us in our legislative capacity, that we might adjudge upon their sufficiency, and make such regulations as the public interest and the safety of the funds demanded. We could not avoid doing this without a shameful abandonment of our official trust. The reasons were given to us by the President and Secretary. They were submitted for our decision, and we were called on either to consider their validity, or to receive them as sufficient, merely because the President had chosen to act upon them. The latter I was not prepared for. The reasons or causes were those assigned by the Secretary, with the order of the President, when he took the responsibility upon himself. We investigated the reasons of the Secretary, and one of our resolutions affirms our convictions that they were not sufficient. The resolution, it is presumed no one will deny, we passed, as a part of Congress, in our legislative character. But if we had stopped there, we should not have met the whole case—there had been an immediate and direct action of the Executive; he had interfered, and the right was claimed by him and for him, so to interfere. If he had that right, the removal was to be justified by it, so far as law was concerned. This right was one of immense importance—deeply affecting the very essence of our institutions.

The claim was new, as many of us believed, in the history and theory of our Government, and tending to its absolute subversion. Yet it was boldly affirmed, and if it existed, was a shield for the act which had been performed by the Secretary. It is now again put forth in its boldest form, in the present paper. How, then, was it possible for us to decide upon the measure—to express our opinion upon the removal of the public treasure, without considering or deciding upon the right of the Executive to command and compel the removal? It was not possible. Before we undertake to repair an evil, we must see that the evil exists. Before we attempt to restore the laws, we must decide that the laws have been violated. We had no alternative, unless we chose to evade the question, as has been elsewhere done, and, without venturing to say any thing of the past, to look only to the future disposition of the money. Sir, I could perceive no reason why I should not disapprove of an illegal act of the Executive, and had no bonds to break in doing so. I felt it my duty to pass, also, upon this point. In doing this, I acted as a member of Congress, not as a Judge. How could we reach the legislation on the subject without first affirming the propriety or impropriety of the disposition which had been made of the money. It was either to be left where we found it, restored to the place from which it had been illegally taken, or some other provision made for it. The correctness of any one, and of all these courses, depended upon the propriety of the Executive action—upon the right of the President to give his order. It was incorporated in every view to which the subject was exposed. We could not legislate in any form without making up an opinion upon it. The resolution which the President condemns, was the result—It was the necessary and inevitable consequence of the position in which he had placed the subject, and if we had coincided with him in opinion, no fault would have been found with us—no absence of Legislative authority would have been suggested. Then it would have been quite evident that we kept within the pale of our legislative powers.

But, sir, the resolution was not only the appropriate and necessary part of our legislative action, it was also an ordinary and common matter. It was no more than, in the first place, settling, in the form of a resolution, the sense of this body, upon the principles by which our legislative action should be guided—a course which is of frequent occurrence. And it receives its condemnation now, only because it does not fall in with the high-handed assumptions of power which have been exhibited by the Executive, in utter disregard of legal and constitutional restraints. It is not our fault, if a resolution, settling the principle of the case, casts censure upon the Executive.

But, it is a condemnation of the President. That is true. And could we disapprove the removal of the public money, without condemning the conduct of the President?—Could we restore it to its old depository by law, without condemning its removal? Could we pass any law which did not fall in with his dictation, without expressing censure upon his action? Mr. President, the resolution was, in substance, an indispensable part of any legislation on the subject. And whenever and by whomsoever it shall be affirmed, that it was intended for no purpose of legislation, and unconnected with it, I shall not hesitate to declare, that, in my view of the case, and upon the principles by which I was guided, the assertion is absolutely and totally unfounded. I looked to legislation and to legislation only. Whether any law, or any action of any kind, may yet result from it, depends not upon myself, but others. If I have the power, I will carry out the condemnation in a shape which will prevent future trespasses. And I am not willing that the public should be misled by the character given to the resolution in this paper. It was no decision on impeachment—no act of judicial authority—no assumption of unlicensed power. It was a legitimate exercise of our legislative functions.

If we had not a right to pass this resolution, because it disapproves what the Executive has done, we can have no right to disapprove any other act of the Executive. Whenever he shall so violate the law that the Senate is compelled to condemn his conduct, he must go quit, and we cannot aid in repairing the law.

And, Mr. President, if we had a right to express any opinion adverse to the principles and conduct of the Executive, I am at a loss to perceive why the form of the resolution is so objectionable. It is in these words: "That the President, in the late Executive proceedings in relation to the public revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both." Language does not furnish terms more mild to express our opinion that the act of the President was unconstitutional, and destitute of legal right. We do not charge him with usurpation—with wilful violation of the constitution. If he chooses to put that construction upon it, it can be for no fair or proper purpose. It is a mere declaration that he had not rightful authority to do the act. It was connected with the resolution upon the reasons of the Secretary, and related to the exercise of the President's authority in making the removal, and declares that that exercise of authority was unconstitutional and illegal. It admits no doubt as to its application, and conveys no other censure, than an assertion of error. It imputes no improper motive.

But, sir this paper not only perverts the character of the resolution—it alleges that the resolution *contains an imputation on the private character* of the President. Is this true? or is it altogether unfounded? Read over that resolution. Is there one word—one allusion against his private character or motives? The slightest imputation against it, either by express words or by implication? Does he think himself so infallible, that when we declare him in error, we necessarily declare him base and unprincipled? Or is this imputation pretended, that he may take occasion to pronounce his own eulogy and trumpet his own fame, as if he had no other trumpeter? There were personal allusions to him by individual Senators in debate, but of these he does not take notice, nor had he any right to notice them in an official communication to the Senate. He speaks of the resolution only, and his allegation in regard to it, is unfounded. The Senate has made no accusation against his personal character; and when his paper shall go out as good care will be taken by him that it shall go out promptly, the public ought not to be deceived on this point. The Senate has merely declared its opinion that his act was illegal. Is this an impeachment which will justify him in coming to us with an inflated commentary upon himself, which we are to place upon our journals to last forever, and send out to the world with the authority of a public, official, legislative document? He reminds us, if I heard the reading correctly, that he bears upon his person enduring memorials of the contest in which our liberty was purchased. Sir, I for one am ignorant of the nature of those memorials, and should have been pleased to see some specification or description. I never saw his name in the history of the Revolution. If he and his friends have stated his age correctly, he was at that period a boy of some 14 or 16 years old. We have, it is true, heard of wounds and balls connected with his person, but we are not told that they were received at the head of a battallion or a brigade fighting the battles of his country. He has been lauded for his blood shed; mere fiction and poetry, rather than fact—but where was it credited, it served as well as truth to excite the admiration of the ignorant and credulous. Such remarks, sir, are unpleasant to me, but they are justified by the unnecessary eulogy of himself, which he has thrust upon the Senate, and which is only fitted for an electioneering appeal to the people, to excite their sympathy in his favor, when they ought to be scrutinizing his actions, and his trespasses upon the Constitution and laws of the country.

In denouncing the resolution of the Senate, the President not only perverts it into a judicial act—he asserts that the solemn decision of the People against the Bank, among other causes, made it expedient and proper for the Secretary to do the act which the resolution condemns. But, sir, that decision of the People, if there be one, could have had no possible relation to the removal of the money from the Bank *by Executive authority*. When and where has that question been decided by the People, at an election or otherwise? It has never been submitted to any portion of them, at any election, until those recent ones, in particular States which give no very favorable omen of their ultimate approbation. The People may well be opposed to the Bank, and yet not justify the claim set up, in this paper, to Executive control over the Treasury; nor the violation of law, in taking it from the custody created by law and contract. But I do not perceive how the people have passed a solemn decision against the Bank. Congress has not yet done it in constitutional form. Reference is doubtless intended to be made to his own election—but how does that establish the assertion? Shall we admit that all who voted for Andrew Jackson did so to put down the Bank, and for no other cause? How many votes were given for "the spoils of victory?" How many for the promised reforms, which have cheated all hope and expectation, and ended in increasing the number of officers, and the expenses of administration—in making bankrupt one of the Departments, to the extent, perhaps of a million of dollars—and rendering it doubtful whether your income will equal the ordinary wants of the nation? How many of those professed constitutional principles which have been rendered so very clear, that, if you find them asserted in one public document, you find them denied in another, and no man can tell what they are—and all are disputing about them. How many for the fiction of the Revolutionary services and the blood shed? How many for "the enduring memorials upon his person?" How many for the battle of New Orleans? Take these away, and what number will remain, which were given as evidence of hostility to the Bank? Quite too few to constitute "a solemn decision of the American people."

* * * * We are engaged in discussing a subject of *legislative power and duty;* in deciding on measures proper to be taken upon a question which has agitated the whole nation, in seeking relief from a distress which is universal and appalling. We have to furnish an appropriate legislative remedy. Petitions have been poured in upon us from the people in every quarter, pointing out their views of this remedy, and urging its adoption. We have, as the first step, expressed our opinion of ths cause of the public distress, and, while the subject is still before us—while a bill is actually upon our table, ready to be called up for consideration—we receive this paper from the Executive, which denounces our conduct, and presumes that we purpose no legislative action. It is not, indeed, a peremptory command, in words, not to proceed; but it is a direct breach of our privileges as a Legislative Assembly—an interference which, in other countries less free, would be resisted with firmness and effect. It is an imitation of men whom the Chief Magistrate of a free country ought not to imitate, and which, if unchecked, may lead, at no distant day, to disastrous consequences to our institutions. Charles insulted the Parliament by charges of sedition and turbulence; Cromwell, with corruption; the Corsican, with disregard of constitutional restraints. How far does Andrew Jackson fall behind them? or fail to join their merits into one? If this body shall quietly yield to such breaches of privilege, permit its action to be arrested, halt in its duty, or be unsupported by the people, it only remains for the band of armed soldiery to enter our hall, and expel us from our seats.

The following Message from the President of the United States to the Senate, was received and read in that body, at the opening of Monday's sitting:

To the Senate of the United States:

Having reason to believe that certain passages contained in my Message and Protest, transmitted to the Senate on the 17th inst., may be misunderstood, I think it proper to state that it was not my intention to deny, in the said Message, the power and right of the legislative department to provide by law for the custody, safe keeping, and disposition of the public money and property of the United States.

Although I am well satisfied that such a construction is not warranted by any thing contained in that Message, yet aware from experience, that detached passages of an argumentative document, when disconnected from their context, and considered without reference to provisions, limitations, and the particular positions they were intended to refute or to establish, may be made to bear a construction varying altogether from the sentiments really entertained and intended to be expressed; and deeply solicitous that my views on this point should not, either now or hereafter, be misapprehended, I have deemed it due to the gravity of the subject, to the great interests it involves, and to the Senate, as well as so myself so embrace the earliest opportunity to make this communication.

I admit, without reserve, as I have before done, the constitutional power of the Legislature to provide by law the place or places in which the public money or other property is to be deposited; and to make such regulations concerning its custody, removal or disposition, as they may think proper to enact. Nor do I claim for the Executive any right to the possession or disposition of the public property or treasure, or any authority to interfere with the same, except when such possession, disposition or authority is given to him by law; nor do I claim the right in any manner to supervise or interfere with the person entrusted with such property or treasure, unless he be an officer whose appointment, under the constitution and laws, is devolved upon the President alone, or in conjunction with the Senate, and for whose conduct he is constitutionally responsible.

As the message and protest referred to may appear on the journal of the Senate, and remain among the recorded documents of the nation, I am unwilling that opinions should be imputed to me, even through misconstruction, which are not contained in it; and more particularly am I solicitous that I may not be supposed to claim for myself, or my successors, any power or authority not clearly granted, by the constitution and Laws to the President. I have therefore, respectfully to request that this communication may be considered a part of that message, and that it may be entered therewith on the Journals of the Senate.

ANDREW JACKSON.

April 21, 1834.

Baltimore Market—April 22.—*Flour*, Howard street, wagon price, $4 75; from stores, $5—Susquehanna, $5 a 5 06¼. *Wheat*, good Maryland red, $1 a 1 05. *Corn*, 55 a 57 cents for white, and 55 for yellow. *Rye*, 60 a 62½.—*American.*

The reports which were so very current in this city on Wednesday, respecting the failure of the Bank of Virginia on Monday last, are disproved by yesterday's mail.—*Balt. Am.*, 18*th.*

We learn that a breach has occurred in one of the embankments of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and left it bare of water. The damage is said to be material, and as yet it is not known when the navigation can be resumed.—*Balt. Amer.*

The London Times quotes, as an evidence of the oppressive operation of the Corn laws, statements to show that the same quantity of Corn, which costs in Amsterdam £42,000,000, cannot be purchased in London under £79,000,000.

CAMBRIDGE:

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1834.

☞The Orphans' Court of this county will sit on Monday, the 5th of May.

We publish in this number, to the exclusion of our usual variety, the whole of the President's *Protest*. It is an extraordinary document, and we doubt whether it is calculated to allay the feelings of an already excited people.

Our Washington dates are to the 23d instant, inclusive. Up to the close of that day's session of the Senate, the vote had not been taken on the question of receiving the President's Protest.

We are constrained to omit various articles the interest of which would ensure them a place to-day, but for our exceeding want of time and room.

The National Intelligencer of Tuesday morning last, 22d, gives the result of the election in 47 counties in Virginia. These, it appears, have chosen 23 Administration, and 37 opposition members.

The Bank of Salisbury stopped on the 21st. The Board of Directors, notwithstanding, having unlimited confidence in the solvency of the institution, say its resources are abundant and amply sufficient to discharge all its obligations. The notes on the Bank and certificates of special deposite, the President and Cashier are authorized to redeem with promisory notes, bearing interest of six per cent. per annum.

George Stebbings, charged with the murder of Miss Cunningham, in 1825, was last week tried before Cecil county Court, and acquitted.

Extract of a letter to a house in this town, dated *Baltimore, April 22d*, 1834.

I have just returned from a visit to the valley of Virginia; and while there, had intercourse with many of the Directors and Officers of the Banks in that part of the State, and it is with much pleasure that I state upon my own knowledge derived from undoubted sources, that the Banks of Virginia are as safe as the Banks of any section of the U. States. I found the Directors and many of the largest stockholders willing to pledge their entire estates for the redemption or security of their notes. Confidence is re-appearing and money matters are becoming easier.

Robert B. Morris has been elected President of the Mechanics' Bank of Baltimore, George Brown, Esq., having resigned, in order to give his attention to the affairs of the house of Alexander Brown & Sons.

The New Orleans Bee contradicts the report that the Cholera exists in that city.

THE GREAT WHIG MEETING.

The meeting of Freemen yesterday was a glorious one for Baltimore—her whole population, as it were, rose in the majesty of their strength to show to the world their determination to enter their "Solemn Protest" against the arbitrary acts and alarming pretensions set up by Andrew Jackson, in his capacity of President of the United States. It was the largest meeting we ever before witnessed on a similar occasion in Baltimore—to number them accurately were as impossible, as to count the sands upon the sea shore. They were variously estimated at from seven to ten thousand. Besides our own citizens, a great number poured in from the circumjacent country.

The citizens assembled together agreeably to a public call, in the newspapers *to all those who were opposed to the doctrines of the Protest sent to the Senate of the United States.* Major General McDonald, a Soldier of the Revolution, and a patriotic Whig in all times, was called upon to preside at the meeting.

The meeting was eloquently addressed by John P. Kennedy, Charles C. Harper, John V. L. McMahon and Joshua Jones, Esqs., who, let it be borne in mind were all original Jackson men, and the same applies to several of the presiding officers. The speakers proclaimed these facts from the stand in free and manly terms, and declared they could no longer give countenance and support to an administration that assumed such highly dangerous and arbitrary powers, and which by its acts was inflicting the deepest distress over the whole face of the country.

The whole proceedings of the meeting were characterised with the greatest moderation and fairness, yet with all that firmness of purpose that becomes the sons of the Whigs of the Revolution, who are determined to hand down to the latest times the rich inheritance bequeathed to them.

The stores throughout Baltimore street and other principal business portions of the city, almost without an exception, were closed at an early hour, and remained closed during the period of the meeting.—*Balt. Pat. of Thursday 24th.*

A great Whig Jubilee.—A great Jubilee was held at Powellton, near Philadelphia, on Tuesday last, at which more than 60,000 freemen were present.—*Balt. Pat.*, 24*th.*

☞Advertisements necessarily omitted today, shall appear in our next.

WE are authorised to announce JOHN N. STEELE, Esq., as a candidate to represent in Congress the district composed of Worcester, Somerset and Dorchester counties, in the place of the Hon. LITTLETON PURNELL DENNIS, deceased.

April 26

NEGROES FOR SALE.—*For sale, a Woman and Child, a likely Boy, and a Man, advanced in years, but serviceable as a gardener, &c. The woman is acquainted with cooking as well as house-work generally, and can be highly recommended. They are not offered for sale because of any misconduct; and it should be distinctly understood that none of them will be disposed of to persons residing out of the county.*

JAMES HOUSTON, Agent.

April 26 3*w*

LOST,

ON Monday last, on the road between Cambridge and my house, a Pocket-Book, containing a five dollar note on the United States Bank, and one of the same denomination on the Salisbury Bank, together with some papers of use to me. Five dollars will be given for the pocket book and contents. JOHN MEREDITH.

Black Water, April 26