shewn he did, by publishing the order in the Intelligencer. In the next place, from my best recollection of Major Young's statement, I have put down the sum at $180, or from $100 to $300, Sangston however objects to this estimate, and assuming it as a fact, strives to impress "*you* with a belief, that the whole deficiency occurred in the amount of taxes of one year's collection, and thence, argues, that as the amount of Taxes for any one year did not exceed *one hundred dollars* it was, consequently, impossible that, as treasurer of the corporation, he could fall in arrears *one hundred and sixty dollars*; and to rivet his argument he adds, when we (the board of commissioners of Denton) at least had a settlement annually." If his premises were true his conclusion would be inevitable. But his major proposition is so far defective that it is neither self-evident, proved nor granted; and consequently his conclusion to say the least of it, is not conclusive. His whole argument is calculated to deceive. As Major Young never stated to me, so neither have I ever stated, nor do I believe, the whole deficit occurred in the taxes of one year. On the contrary, from the very loose and negligent manner in which the commissioners appear to have conducted the business of the corporation, I think it more than probable, that the deficit had been accumulating for several years previous to Major Young's discovery of it. In order, however, to rebut this inference, Sangston alleges, that "we (the commissioners) at least had a settlement annually"—admit it; (although very doubtful) then if the term *settlement* was synonymous with, or always meant *payment* there might be some force in Sangston's rebutter; but even in that case "*they*" would like to know, to whom the payment was made, and for what purposes. I have stated the deficiency at $180 or from $100 to $300 dollars. In contradiction to this statement Sangston, throughout his letters and "*small statement*," continues to assert, that I charged him with retaining "in his hands unaccounted for $160 of the monies belonging to the corporation of Denton," whence I infer, in the first place, that Sangston knows better than either Saulsbury or myself what the sum is actually deficient, and, in the second place, that $160 is that very sum.

We have now, as nearly as possible, fixed on the sum deficient We shall next proceed to enquire where, or in whose hands, the deficiency lies. Thomas Saulsbury certifies that "when Mr. Sangston was called on by the board, he presented his statement of the *monies* received by him from the collector; *there was a small deficiency*; he Mr. Sangston *said* that it was all he had received from the collector, and that he had passed his receipts for all that he had paid him; the collector stated that he had paid over all that he had received, & said he had taken the treasurer receipts for the same, in a receipt book, and had lost it, or mislaid it so that he could not find it" Here we have the treasurer, Sangston, and the collector, Gove Saulsbury at points each indirectly charging the other with being a defaulter.—The question then is, which of the two is most worthy of credit? For my own part I give full credit to neither: I think I have proved satisfactorily, in the Intelligencer of the 25th inst. that Sangston did swear for the very trifling sum of twenty dollars. I know that he has, in the face of his acknowledged receipt denied, that the money mentioned in the receipt, had been paid to him; whence I infer, that he would not boggle to say, or *swear*, that he had accounted for all the monies he had received from the collector; and more particularly when he knew, as they were lost, that he could not be contradicted by the exhibition of his receipts. Where the parties are equally well known, no person will doubt, that Gove Saulsbury's word would carry as much weight, and was equally as worthy of credit, as James Sangston's.—Be that however as it may, it is certain there was a deficiency, and, that the deficiency lay between James Sangston and Gove Saulsbury: that they were both defaulters I cannot doubt—so I have stated in the Intelligencer, so I still believe, and now leave the public to decide on the probable correctness of my opinions.

Sangston, in his "*small statement*," says, "I some time since, as you will see per reference," (To what?)—"addressed him a note inquiring if he did make the statement? to which you can also see his evasive answer;" (where?) "in which you will see, where he states that Major Young, as one of the commissioners, gave orders for the commencement of a suit against me as Treasurer; or that an eminent Attorney gave orders." Setting aside the lucid perspicuity of this passage, if Mr Mullikin, or "YOU" can see all that Sangston says "per reference" he, or "YOU" will see, he, or "YOU" must be gifted with the most perspicacious vision that ever fell to the lot of man. Forever "*per reference*," if he, or "YOU" can see where I have stated, that either Major Young, or an eminent Attorney gave orders for the commencement of a suit against James Sangston, as treasurer, he, or "YOU" *will see what never had an existence*. This is adulterated coinage from Sangston's own mint, intended, as well to impose on the reader, as to make way for the gratification of his stupid vanity, by telling "YOU" that he was once elected an elector to elect the Senate. Read again Mr. Sangston and "*you will see, per reference*," to my statement published in the Intelligencer, that Major Young's Attorney did give an order—not as you have falsely stated, to commence a suit against *you*, as treasurer, but to sue the Bailiff's bond. But Sangston thinks "any person acquainted with the case must know that he (Major Young) possessed not the slightest idea of ever progressing with *that suit*." No indeed; nor of commencing "*that suit*," either, if by "*that suit*" Sangston means a suit against himself. But what was to prevent him from "*progressing with*" a suit against the Baliff and his securities? Why: forsooth, 'in the first place it is not the business of *one single commissioner* to institute a suit.' Suppose, however, he chose to make it his business, where is the law that could have prevented him from instituting a suit, and sustaining it too? 'In the second place the sum for which THEY contended was not worth a suit.' But it is worth remarking, that Sangston condemns himself by his own argument. He, falsely, charges me with having stated 'that Major Young, or an eminent Attorney, gave orders to commence a suit against him, as treasurer, and assigns, as one reason why the Major could not entertain an idea of 'progressing with that suit, that the sum for which *they* contended was not worth a suit." Now, why does Sangston step aside from the truth to talk about a suit against himself, if not conscious that the sum deficient, although, as he says, "not worth a suit" was in his own hands? It is also worthy of remark, that be "the sum, for which *they* contended," what it might, great or small, the commissioners nevertheless acting under the solemnity of an oath "diligently and faithfully to the best of their judgment (to) perform the duties of commissioners without favour partiality or prejudice," were bound, at least, to make an effort to recover it.

In the next instance Sangston has exhibited an acuteness of reasoning and subtilty of thought equal at least, if not superior, to that of the sable son of Afric, who hit upon the sex of a child at two guesses. He accounts for major Young's order to commence a suit on Gove Saulsbury's bond, as bailiff, on the ground of political differences between the major and himself; "for if (says he) *you* recollect in 1821 and immediately after the little dispute in question, I was a candidate for an elector to elect the senate, and in spite of the Major and his friends, was elected by a considerable majority"—admit, it, and pray, what possible relation or connection, could his convass or election have had, to or with a suit on Gove Saulsbury's bond, as bailiff of the village of Denton? He proceeds "I will venture to say, if the order was given, it was either given before the election, so as to *effect* me, or soon after it, in order to show his wrath." Astonishing sagacity! The child was either a boy or a girl! The order was given either before or after the election! But still more astonishing is the profundity of wisdom, he has displayed in the reasons, assigned why the order was given either before or after the election If before the election, it was 'to effect him!' if after the election it was "to show his wrath!!" what understanding beside his own, can comprehend it? Who can comprehend or satisfactorily explain, how a suit on Gove Saulsbury's bailiff's bond, could possibly effect James Sangston's election? And how Major Young could "show his wrath "against James Sangston, by instituting a suit on that bond, is to me irreconcileably paradoxical

Sangston, in the next place, proceeds to ask several questions, the answers to which, being anticipated in a preceding publication, I deem it sufficient barely to glance at here. "You will see (then) per reference" to my statement published in the Caroline Intelligencer commencing in the paper of the 20th ult. and ending in that of the 25th inst.—that an order was given to put the Bailiff's bond in suit,—the reason why the suit did not progress—that I did not neglect my duty—that I have read some part of "*the laws Denton*," the whole extent of my evasion, and a great deal more than Sangston would wish you to see. I will now turn my attention to his proof. "Notwithstanding says he your evasion of my question, in my first letter, I have now found *proof* of the correctness of what I heard." At the word, *heard* he refers by a * to Wm. T. Purnell's certificate, which follows at the end of his communication in the Whig, as his proof, and William T. Purnell certifies, "that in a conversation with Joseph Douglass and Jacob C. Wilson Esq. some time during the month of May last ..... they severally observed, that Joseph Richardson stated to them, that James Sangston former Treasurer of the board of commissioners of Denton, had received from Gove Saulsbury, then bailiff, the sum of one hundred and sixty dollars, which he positively denied receiving and refused to account for it." Fortunately, perhaps, as well for Sangston, as for his certifier, Mr. Douglass is now no more; but Jacob C Willson Esq. is still living, & frequently in Denton. And if Sangston relies with such confidence on his testimony second hand from Mr. Purnell, it is very natural to suppose, that it would carry much more weight direct from the fountain head, from Mr. Wilson himself.—Why, then, did not Mr. Sangston apply directly to Mr. Wilson for a certificate? Why prefer the second hand, indirect testimony of Mr. Purnell, to the primary, direct evidence of Mr. Wilson, if he had not known, or had strong reasons to believe, that Mr. Wilson's testimony, like that of the other members of the Levy Court whom he had consulted on the subject, would go directly to contradict Mr. Purnell's certificate? Mr. Wilson will certify, not, "that he and Mr. Douglass severally observed, (to Mr. Purnell, or in his presence) that Joseph Richardson stated to them, that James Sangston, former treasurer of the board of Commissioners of Denton, *had received* from Gove Saulsbury, then bailiff, the sum of one hundred and sixty dollars, *which he positively denied receiving and refused to account for*."—No: he will certify no such thing; but he will, I dare say, certify, that my statement to the Levy Court was, substantially, as follows: that there was a deficiency in the funds of the corporation of Denton unaccounted for nearly if not quite sufficient to enclose the public square, and he may probably further certify, that I expressed my belief, that the deficiency, or the greater part of it, lay in Sangston's hands. Mr. Clanor, Mr. Rumbold, Mr. Newlee and Mr. Harrington, all at that time members of the Levy Court, will I have no doubt certify the same thing. "If says Sangston" (a little further on) "you say there was $160 in arrears, you charge the commissioners with the crime of not attending to their business." Yes; I do directly charge the commissioners, of that day, (major Young excepted) with the *crime* of not attending to their business. And pray, does not Sangston's acknowledgment of the "*little dispute*" about "*the sum for which THEY contended (that) was not worth a suit*"—And Thomas Saulsbury's certificate of the "*small deficiency*" prove positively, that they were guilty, not only, of "the crime of not attending to their business," but of not attending to their oath's as commissioners? But Sangston continues, "when you charge them with mismanagement, you charge men who held *stations* to which you never dared aspire." Ah! and pray what stations were these? Do now *my noble*, learned sir descend for a moment from your elevated *station* and condescend to tell the Public what *stations* these were? And what article of the federal or state constitution, or laws, closes the doors of station or office, against the aspirings or pretentions of the humblest white native free born citizen of America? For, I assure you, it is a fact, that every intelligent, native, white citizen of the United States fully believes that the right to aspire to any station or office, from the Presidential Chair down to a commissioner of the village of Denton, is guaranteed to them by the constitutions and laws of the country——— and now, although, I never did, like Sangston, aspire to a station or office, the duties of which I knew it impossible to qualify myself to perform, still, vanity apart, on the score of honesty, fidelity or capability, I shall never shrink from a competition with James Sangston, or any of his brother commissioners, *who held these high stations*, for any station or office in the gift of the Government or the people. Who is Sangston? He is a person lifted from the shades of obscurity by matrimonial alliances with two respectable families,—one whose ephemeral, now evanescent, popularity grew out of the contents of a whiskey barrel—who drifted into public notice on the waves of party commotion—was adopted without choice, as a convenient instrument, by a leading political partizan—'will be discarded without the forms of regret' when he can no longer be serviceable to advance his leaders schemes of policy—and then, like one of his former brother commissioners, will descend to his original insignificance and nothingness.

In the next sentence Sangston refers me to Thomas Saulsbury's certificate, which I have already attended to, and then he continues—

"I have since heard, that you have said that I have been called, upon the public green in Denton, a rascal, a scoundrel and villain"—What I have said on this head, may be seen "per reference" to my statement in the Intelligencer, and Sangston, any public day, need not walk a hundred yards for proof of the truth of what I have there stated—In the mean time, by consulting one of his *certifiers*, he may, probably, gain information, that I am not destitute of evidence to substantiate my statement. "But for a moment admitting it to be so," (says Sangston) "if that is any disgrace, I know that you have in your own office been called almost every thing but a gentleman"—and what is still more in his favor, he can produce proof, if I wish it. It is well for him, that he has proof, for his own word will not pass current: And as he appears to be in great straits, and ashamed to come out boldly with the circumstance he alludes to I will help him along a little. On the first day of the Court, some years past, a rascal, whose character may be found written in the criminal records of Caroline county, insulted me in my office with the epithet of rascal, for which I was in the act of chastizing the puppy, when a justice of the peace, caught and held my arm, and rescued the wretch from the effects of my indignation—Nimrod Barwick, Esqr., was the justice of the peace, who saved the scoundrel from a sound drubbing, and can testify to the truth of this short statement. But if Sangston thinks such insults from such beings as Sovren Dawson or himself either, however at the time, they may ruffle the temper, are in any manner degrading or any way detract from the character of a real gentleman he must make Sovren Dawson's, or his own character the standard, by which he measures that of the *gentleman*. The true gentleman, modesty confiding in the internal evidence of his conscience, is satisfied with the reality, and seldom or never heard asserting his claim to the title. But the would-be-gentleman conscious of his own demerit, seldom omits an occasion to vociferate his pretentions to the appellation with a view to impose on the credulous and the ignorant. I am a gentleman, says every Jack, because, every Jack would be a gentleman; and it is not a very unusual occurrence to hear the coloured sons of the torrid zone, in the public streets, bandying their pretensions to *gentleman* and perhaps, with equal justice, and equal ignorance of the true meaning of the term with James Sangston.

As soon as I conveniently can I will devote some little attention to Sangston's second production in the Whig of the 11th Inst. In the mean time I remain with sentiments of respect, the Public's most obed't serv't

JO. RICHARDSON.

Denton, Oct. 28th 1831.

Sailor's Snug Harbor.—The corner stone of this noble charity has been just laid at New York. It is founded on the liberal bequest of Capt. Robert Richard Randall, and calculated to provide comfortably for 50 aged, decrepid and worn out sailors. The occasion elicited the following Address of Chancellor Wallworth.

"Before we proceed to lay the corner stone of this asylum, which is to be erected and permanently maintained as a snug and secure retreat for the aged and sea worn mariner, it is proper to state that we are not the almoners of the bounty of the public, or even of an association of benevolent citizens who have united their individual charities for such an object. The funds with which this delightful site for the establishment has been purchased, and with which the hospital itself is to be erected and endowed, are derived solely from the munificent bequest of Robert Richard Randall, a noble hearted and generous sailor whose bark, we trust, is now safely moored in the haven of rest, his anchor having long since been cast within the vail.

"This hardy and enterprising son of the ocean, whose liberality and benevolence entitle him to a high rank among the benefactors of mankind, was a resident of N York, and was also a native of that city Like most of his profession, he was in early life left to buffit the waves of adversity alone, and he traversed many a stormy sea, unaided except by that assistance which the kind hearted sailor affords to a brother sailor in distress. By industry, perseverance and successful adventure he soon secured to himself a comfortable independence, which he continued to improve, by investing his wages, primage, and other allowances in new adventures from time to time, during his long and circuitous voyage of life. He also laid in such stores of virtue and piety and so skillfully managed the helm and trimmed his sails to the breeze as to clear the rocks and quicksands of intemperance and vice, which rendered the latter part of his voyage both calm and pleasant.—And when at length he arrived in sight of his port of discharge, he found himself the sole owner of a rich and valuable cargo.

About thirty years since this worthy seaman sailed upon his final and last voyage upon the broad ocean of eternity.—While preparing for that voyage, and a short time before he weighed anchor, he conceived the generous and noble purpose of constructing this snug and safe harbor for such of his brother sailors as might in their old age be driven upon the shore of poverty or cast upon the barren shoals of want. Having in his will provided for such of his relatives and shipmates as he supposed had any claims upon him for bounty and wages, he consigned the residue of the proceeds of all his former voyages to the Chancellor of the State, the Mayor and Recorder of New York, the President of the Chamber of Commerce, the President and Vice President of the Marine Society and the senior ministers of the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches as his agent and factors. He also left orders to have the profit of this valuable consignment invested in the building and outfit of this receiving ship, to be called the "Sailor's Snug Harbor," where at least fifty aged decrepid and worn out sailors might be constantly provided for and comfortably maintained.

The property thus consigned to us was threatened by the land sharks who infested the stock exchange a few years since, and it has likewise been exposed to the Red Rovers of the sea at other times, but owing to the vigilance of our worthy master and supercargoes, it has been preserved from the depredation of both. The validity of the consignment has also been questioned & contested, but the High Court of Admiralty to which the claimants appealed, has dismissed their libel and declared the consignment valid. And now after paying costs, demurrage, pilotage, port duties, &c. we find the nett produce of the consignment sufficient to enable us to execute the orders of the generous consigner.—While, therefore, we proceed to execute those orders, we cannot but hope his disembodied spirit looks down with delight from aloft, to witness our proceedings in this work of benevolence and charity which his philanthropy dictated, and for which his liberality has thus amply provided.

And may this edifice long remain as a monument to transmit to future generations, and especially to his brother seamen, the name and memory of the benevolent and worthy sailor who projected and endowed this institution. And long may the aged and storm beaten mariner, when he finds himself safely and comfortably moored in this snug and peaceful harbor, continue to bless the memory of Robert Richard Randall his generous benefactor.

Latest from Europe.

FROM POLAND.

The ship Thomas Scatergood, at Philadelphia, brings Hamburg papers to the 21st September, and Warsaw dates of the 13th.

The Russian forces entered Warsaw on the 8th. Praga was occupied on the same day.

On the 11th various Russian regiments passed through Warsaw playing favorite airs.

The Warsaw Courier, of the 12th says that a cessation of hostilities will continue for a fortnight.

There are sixty Russian Generals now in Warsaw.

After the Polish army had left Praga, they spent the first night (the 9th) at Tablouwa, on the Modlin road. On Saturday, the 10th Count Zamviski came into Warsaw as a deputy from the Polish army. This army is at present at Modlin, and is commanded by Gen. Ribinski.

On the 12th the Polish General Dziekaski arrived here from the army at Modlin, and returned immediately back.

It is said that Gen. Romarino has gone to Zamsoc, with part of his corps.

General Cassimir Malachowski has resigned the command of the Polish army but still remains with them.

The Counsellor of State Engel, commissioned to organize a Provisional Government in Poland, is expected to day in Warsaw, and it is said will reside in the Brhul Palace.

The General Director of the Post Office, and the Police of the Kingdom of Poland, Counsellor of State Juminski, is soon expected.

General Kruckiwieki is still in Warsaw. There is no positive information of the present residence of General Skrzinecki, the probability is that he is in Gallacia, in the neighbourhood of Cracow.

STILL LATER.

By the arrival of the packet ship Silas Richards, Capt Holdredge, from Liverpool on the 26th of September, the Editors of the Courier and Enquirer have received London dates of the 25th, Liverpool of the 26th, and Lloyd's and Shipping Lists to the latest dates,

The most important intelligence by this arrival, is the final passage of the Reform Bill in the House of Commons on the morning of the 22d by a majority of 109. The vote stood for the Bill 345 against it 236, Majority 109.

On the same evening it was carried up to the Lords by Lord John Russel, Lord Althorp, and more than one hundred members of the lower house. The particulars will be found in another column.

The great question which now agitates the public mind almost to revolution, is, 'will the Lords reject it?'—Bell's Weekly Messenger of the 25th says, it will pass by a majority of from 40 to 47, whilst other papers evidently fear it will be rejected. Our private correspondent says that although Lord Wellington is pledged to vote against the bill, he will give his proxies—about 13 in number, in favor of its passage. If this is so, there can be but little doubt of the result.

Meetings have been held in all parts of the country, in favor of Reform. That in London, at which the Lord Mayor presided, is said to be the most respectable that could be assembled throughout Europe, for wealth, commercial importance and intelligence. In remarking on this meeting, the Times says—"*The crisis indeed in our political condition has now become one of breathless interest.* The people, on one side, are in movement every where, to put down the attrocious calumny which described them to have betrayed their own cause, by deserting the Government which first opened for them the road to liberty, while on the other side, the agents of corruption are more malignant than ever, and more desperate,—louder and more audacious in their prophecies, that the Lords will throw out the bill."

The Bill was to have been read the second time in the House of Lords, on the 10th of October.

Contrary to our expectations, Paris has become quiet, and the members of the Perrier administration, again firmly fixed in their places. In future all speculations as to the affairs of France will be idle. They present an enigma which even the leaders of the different parties do not comprehend; and a more unsettled state of things cannot well be imagined. A highly interesting debate, which lasted three days, took place in the Chamber of Deputies on the questions put by M. Mauguin to Ministers, respecting the foreign policy of France. At the time when all the Paris & London presses were speculating on the result of the vote—a vote which all parties believed would be a close one—a division was made and stood thus: For Ministers 221; Against Ministers 136; Majority for Ministers 85!!

It will be seen that Ministers are again proceeding against some of the liberal & ultra-liberal presses.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0157.jpg