man matron could flourish in the modern days.

The Marquis spoke of the happy effects of the Revolution & the goodly prospects which opened upon independent America, stated his speedy departure for his native land, and paid the tribute of his heart his love and admiration of her illustrious son. To the encomiums which he had lavished upon his hero and paternal chief the matron replied in these words: "*I am not surprised at what George has done, for he was always a very good boy.*"

Ladies' Magazine.

For the Easton Gazette.

TO THE PUBLIC.

Sensible of his inability to disprove, rebut, or satisfactorily explain one solitary statement *I* have made to the public, Sangston, urged by some inexplicable fatuity, has resorted to the most pitiful shifts—the most despicable insinuations and grossest falsehood, to avert the deep and indelible shame and opprobrium, which inevitably awaits him, and, which he will, however reluctantly, be obliged to submit to. He certainly must be either totally regardless of the respect or good opinion of his readers, or believe them to be as stupid and devoid of common sense and understanding, as himself. He must suppose that they read without reflection, and without investigating the probable truth or falsehood of what he writes, or he could not, surely, write so many palpable untruths for their inspection. His readers are inquisitive and not so very easily imposed upon as Sangston seems to wish or imagine. They will not be satisfied with assertions that carry improbability or falsehood in their face, nor with absurd, and vindictive insinuations, merely because they are advanced with a rashness and desperation apparently reckless of all consequences. Assertion is not proof, and insinuation is worse, and what else, beside scurrility, has Sangston adduced, to disprove or discredit any thing I have stated? And yet he says, he has proved me to be "not entirely regardful of truth," by disinterested testimony, and by my own statement and acknowledgment." Does Sangston know what *truth* is? *I* can hardly believe so, at least, to me, he appears to have waged an interminable war against every thing that bears the least resemblance to it. But if he does know the meaning of *truth*, he must also know that in the above quoted sentence he has made three distinct assertions in direct opposition to it. *In* which of his three communications, or their appendages, is to be found his disinterested testimony, that *I* am 'not *entirely* regardful of truth?' Does he allude to William T. Purnells certificate? That, besides being contradicted by every other living member of the Levy Court, save one whom *I* have never consulted, is contradicted by that very member, on whose alleged authority Mr. Purnell has founded his certificate—In what part of any of my publications, can he point to any statement of mine that can be distorted even by malignity to prove me 'not *entirely* regardful of truth?' And where can he find any acknowledgment of mine, to support the truth of his assertion? I defy him to point either to the statement, or to the acknowledgment. When a man sincerely speaks or writes what he believes, he tells a moral truth, however erroneous may be his belief I have published nothing against Sangston which I did not believe at the time of writing, therefore I have published nothing morally false. If Sangston alludes to my acknowledgment of the error I committed, respecting Major Young's disappointment in a re-election as a commissioner of the village, the ignorance and stupidity of his allusion is below contempt. What has Sangston advanced to prove that I am "not *entirely regardful of truth*," in my statement of his attempt to defraud me of upwards of sixty dollars in 1827? Nothing, but that it is *impossible* for him to have any *distinct recollection* of it. But he can *distinctly recollect* all the minute particulars of the plank contract detailed by him as having occurred two years before, in 1825, except the *particulars of the sharp words* that took place between us. What has he published to discredit my veracity, or the correctness of my statement in the case of his assumption to pay the debt, interest and costs of the judgments &c. of the Bank of Caroline against Clarke, Lecompte and himself? Nothing—He has passed that over in total silence. What has he said to discredit the veracity of my statement in the case of the judgments in Delaware? Why, in this case, he has promised to satisfy William Jones and Joseph Brown, but will not condescend to satisfy Joseph Richardson. He may rest easy on that score, Joseph Richardson is perfectly satisfied already; but I should suppose that a decent respect for the good opinion of his fellow citizens, would draw from him some effort to satisfy the public. What has he adduced to disprove the truth of my statement of his *moral perjury?* Here he has made an attempt to screen himself from the odium of the fact by the certificates of three persons, neither of whom, were present when he took the oath. He has, then, not only, not published any thing to falsify, or invalidate any thing I have stated but almost every thing he has published, tends to his own condemnation. But to take more particular notice of Sangston's last communication in the Whig of the 8th inst. for which he offers the following apology—"he (Joseph Richardson) may not be so well known out of the place & county where he lives, as in it." However unknown I may be either in or out of the county, it will not be for want of my introduction if Sangston should remain unknown to the readers of the Easton Gazette. After his apology, he goes on to say "I must beg the favor again of your paper, to pay him (Richardson) a little attention,—at least to prove that he is not entirely regardful of truth; which I have not only done heretofore, by disinterested testimony, *but by his own statement and acknowledgment.*" In this short sentence, Sangston has asserted three distinct falsehoods—First—His assertion that he has proved me "not entirely regardful of truth, by disinterested testimony" is false—secondly—that he has proved me so, by my own statement, is false Thirdly—that he has proved me so, by my own acknowledgment, is false. His disinterested testimony, which I have noticed above, is the certificate of William T. Purnell, which is contradicted, by Jacob C. Willson, Esq. one of the two persons, and the only living one, on whose authority that certificate is founded.—However disinterested, then, it may be, being contradicted, by one of the very persons on whose authority it is founded and equally disinterested and respectable with the certifier, it certainly does not prove what Sangston asserts, consequently his assertion is false. His other two assertions, that he has proved me "not entirely regardful of truth, by my own statement, and by my own acknowledgment," are equally false; and I now defy him to point to any one paragraph, sentence or word, in any one of my communications to the public to bear him out in, or to verify either of them. To suppose Sangston ignorant of the falsity of these three assertions, would be to suppose him a little more stupid, than I really believe him to be; and if he was, as I think, he must have been sensible of their falsity, is it not passing strange that immediately following them, as if he intended it as a warning, he establishes a rule, to guard his readers against giving credit to any thing he may afterwards assert? He lays it down as a rule that will generally hold good, "that if a man will prove false in one thing he will in another." What credit, then, can be given to any thing, that Sangston may assert after this? That he has proved false in several instances is I think, satisfactorily established above, consequently, by his own rule he will, prove false in other instances. But having tested Sangston's veracity, more at large, by this rule, in my reply to his second communication, and found it wanting I deem it unnecessary to notice it farther here, and more especially as without its assistance, I shall find no difficulty in detecting more of his aberrations from the path of truth. In the progress of his communication under remark, Sangston in the next place refers his readers to the last Intelligencer "and the certificates below for full satisfaction that, if a man will prove false in one thing he will in another." In the Intelligencer alluded to, I stated a case which will shortly appear in the Easton Gazette, wherein Sangston committed *moral perjury*. To discredit the truth of my statement, he has introduced the certificates of Marcey Fountain, John Ozman and Luther Swiggett, neither of whom were present, when Sangston took the oath. I am not unaware of the difficulty of proving a negative generally and particularly against respectable, positive affirmative testimony; and for the honor of human nature, most cordially wish that Sangston had never committed the offence; I will therefore give all due credit to the testimony he has brought forward in his defence and, in the first place, I religiously believe every word of Marcey Fountain's certificate, as far as it goes, and what does it avail to Sangston's acquittal? Fountain only certifies that he was not present when any oath was administered—true, and that he does not recollect of hearing any required—admitted; and that he has no knowledge directly nor indirectly of any being taken, other than what he subsequently understood from Joseph P. W. Richardson—all granted, and believed. But not believing that Mr. Fountain's certificate embraces the whole of the testimony he is capable of giving, in relation to the case, I must for the purpose of eliciting the balance, be permitted to ask him a few questions—Mr. Fountain certifies that he has no other knowledge of Sangston's having taken the oath than what he subsequently understood from Joseph P. W. Richardson. I will then ask Mr. Fountain when or at what time Joseph P. W. Richardson *first* told him that Sangston had taken the oath? Was it not, immediately after the arbitrators had agreed upon, & made known their award? Was it not the same day, as crossing Denton Bridge (and in answer to the question, "why he allowed Sangston the twenty dollars?") that Joseph P. W. Richardson told him that he allowed it, because Sangston had sworn to the payment? And did not Mr. Richardson further state to Mr. Fountain that, in as much, as Sangston and he had not entered into bond to abide by the award, so he, Fountain, was under no obligation to stick to it? And did not he, Mr. Fountain, immediately turn back, and return to Denton for the purpose of demanding the twenty dollars of Sangston? Does he not believe that Sangston did take the oath? I trust Mr. Fountain will answer these questions—and that he will go further and say whether or not Sangston has ever paid him, or promised to pay, or secured the payment of the twenty dollars; and if so, whether the payment, promise, or security has not been made or given, since, and in consequence of my publication of the case.

There are few persons, if any, on whose veracity I would rely with more confidence than that of Capt. John Ozmon. His certificate is therefore entitled to perfect credit: but there is nevertheless a small defect in it, which, I have not a doubt escaped his observation and is totally unintentional on his part. From the construction of his certificate a superficial or careless reader might infer that Capt. Ozmon was present at each of the meetings of the arbitrators, and during the whole time of their meeting. But this is not the fact. Capt Ozmon will not say that he was present at each time, and the whole time of the meeting and the sitting of the arbitrators. He may, therefore, very truly certify "that he has no recollection of any oath being taken by the said Sangston, relative to 20 dollars * * * * * or on any other account before the said arbitration" because the fact is, he was not present when the oath was taken, and consequently could have no recollection about it. But Capt. Ozmon, further certifies that he "does not believe the said Sangston was sworn in the case." He may also, in perfect truth certify this, because it is certainly true, that he was not present when Sangston was sworn, and he could not, of course, believe or certify otherwise than that he was not sworn in his presence.

Luther Swiggett certifies that "Having been called on by James Sangston, Esq. to state my recollection of a certain case of arbitration between Marcey Fountain and himself, which was left to John Brown and Joseph P W. Richardson, wherein I was called on as the third person in 1826 or 1827, I do hereby certify that I have no recollection of Mr. Sangston taking any oath relative to the matter in dispute between him and said Fountain, nor do I believe the said Sangston was sworn in the case," I will not say that this certificate was made intentionally to impose on the reader, who may be unacquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, but it certainly is well calculated to do so. Mr. Swiggett certifies that he was "called on as the third person in 1826 or 1827" and then stops, leaving it to be inferred that he actually served, "as the third person," or umpire, in the arbitration and of course had a fair opportunity and must have known it, if Sangston had taken the oath. Now; the fact is, that Luther Swigget was the first and only person the arbitrators, Brown and Richardson, could agree on, to choose as a third person, or umpire in the case. He was accordingly called in, and the case stated to him, refused to serve, told that he was wanted for nothing else—left the room and literally & truly knows nothing more about the matter. This one fact completely destroys any effect which Luther Swiggett's certificate might otherwise have had favorable to Sangston. What he afterwards certifies is nothing to the purpose, for as Sangston was not sworn in his presence it is utterly impossible he can have any recollection of his taking the oath, and as to his belief, it is a mere matter of moon shine.

I consider Joseph P W. Richardson's testimony as good as the testimony of any man, and I am authorised to say that Joseph P. W. Richardson will swear, that Sangston did take the oath—that he himself administered the oath to Sangston, in the presence of John Brown only, no other person being then present, and that his agreement to the award, which deprived Fountain of the twenty dollars was founded solely upon that oath—Joseph P. W. Richardson never believed that the $20 had been paid to Fountain, and therefore refused to agree to any award that would admit the payment, until not seeing any probability, that the other arbitrator would ever concur in opinion with him, that they could select no person that would serve as umpire to decide between them—and the consequent impossibility of coming to an agreement, he proposed, as the only remaining alternative to allow, Sangston the twenty dollars upon the condition, that he would swear, not to the best of his knowledge, but *absolutely and positively*, that the money had been paid to Fountain.—Sangston accepted the condition and took the oath proposed The condition having been complied with Richardson considering himself bound by his own proposition, then, & not till then, & for no other reason agreed to the award, that deprived Fountain of his twenty dollars. We have then respectable, positive, affirmative testimony to the fact, against mere negative conjecture or opinion to the contrary, and the public is very capable to decide which is most worthy of credit.

JO. RICHARDSON.

(*To be continued.*)

A gentleman who heard the address which Mr. Randolph lately delivered to his incomparable constituents, furnished the annexed sketch to the editor of the Lynchburgh Virginian. It is abundantly characteristic.

"Mr. Randolph arrived at the Court House about 1 o'clock in the evening, while the court was in session—as soon as it was ascertained he was there, the court sent two members of the bar to inform him that they had adjourned, to afford him an opportunity of addressing the people in the court House. In half an hour after his arrival, he went up and took the judge's seat, and after thanking the Court, and the two gentlemen for their politeness, he commenced by stating the duties the Representative owed his constituents, & explained why it was he withdrew from the canvass (if canvass it could be called) after having offered his services to the people. He was evidently much dissatisfied with the course taken by Judge Bouldin, said much about him in rather an unfriendly way, did not know before that to declare himself a candidate for the suffrages of the people, would be considered as committing 'a moral outrage on the community.' Had he been at home, and could have been elected, would have been glad of an opportunity to watch the manœuvres of the chaps in Congress. Said John W. Eppes was an honest and consistent politician. The greatest writer on Government the world ever knew was the preceptor of Alexander, who wrote some two thousand years ago; said the Irish have a way of killing with lies and if he had not more lives than any tom cat, would have been dead long ago; was bitter against the Priests their fat salaries, spoke of Paul the tent maker; the Priests would get money from the people and give a draft in payment on St. Stephen; he would not take a draft on Stephen, unless he could first see his acceptance; without seeing the acceptance would not take a draft on James Bruce, the richest man in the county; said he knew something of the English Language & if not a master workman, was at least a very respectable journeyman; had not heard the Gospel preached since the days of Doctor Hoge; was right *here* (touching his heart and looking very sanctimoniously) on the subject of religion.

His incomparable friend, Wm. Lee, purity itself—the first lawyer on the South side of the Potomac, and second to none on the North side; abused the members of the Virginia Legislature for voting in favour of Lewis and against Lee for Judge; Lee is now on the bench where he is an ornament, and I, in private life, where, thank God, I cannot be a disgrace to my country; because Gen. Jackson had the firmness to declare the U. S. Bank unconstitutional, its friends called up their puppies, Tray, Blanch, &c., and put them upon his heels—Tessem boy, tessem boy! (clapping his hands,) offered to read some of Jackson's letters to him.—but had left them in his carriage; should vote for Andrew Jackson, not because he was the best qualified; but because his opinions coincided more nearly with his own; there are *many* better qualified, and whom I would prefer, but they cannot be elected—I shall vote for Andrew Jackson because he is the only man who can keep out your enemy and mine; because he is the only man who can keep out Henry Clay, the most flagitious and profligate man I ever knew, save one. * * * * * * * * Negro Slavery; was reconciled to it. Had seen more lashes given on board the Concord, between Hampton Roads and Spithead, than had been given to his 300 negroes for 37 years. * * * * Lazarus and Dives: Virginia Convention; a nest of corruption and intrigue; there he saw our two Ex-Presidents; one talking for and voting against the white basis; the other, for whom (dropping his head) he had the sincerest respect, giving us all the visionary theories of the French writers on Government. Spoke of his mother, his sheep; dogs; gun and horses; had some very good horses; Nat Turner; his horse Radical; put him on his horse Radical, rough shod, with his double-barrel gun, & his broadsword, and he could drive five hundred negroes across the Roanoke; Internal improvement—fat jobs to contractors "Where's Yancey?—wish to G—d he was here; (Yancey answers) I am not for jobs, Major, nor you either; would not touch Tristram Burgess with a pair of tongs. Encomiated Pennsylvania, & abused her delegation for permitting Roger Mallary to tell Jno. R. Clay that his only recommendation was his sirname; but Roger is now *Clay* himself, and judging from the insult offered young Clay, he thought he was illy prepared to enter into judgment; called Henry Clay, that "cut shuttle and deal man." Mr. Jefferson's learning had made him poor; Calhoun Lowndes, McDuffie, compares the Tariff and U. States Bank to two cat holes one for the kittens, the other for the old cat. Denounced nullification. It was nonsense, Nat Macon, the wisest and purest man that ever lived; had seen men as wise, and had seen some as pure, but had never seen one *so wise and pure*; would cut a grape vine to hang some members of the Legislature; would cut one to hang a man that would vote for the white basis; repeated part of his letter to Wm Lee, and particularly that part wherein he spoke of his "dear constituents; God bless them."—and may his blessing never descend on me, when I cease to pray for blessings on my old constituents.

You may have Sir Isaac Newton for your ploughman, and Lord Chatham for the leader of your horse; and your land will get worse and worse, if you plough up and down hill. *House keeper's voters* they live out of your corn crib and my meat house; their wives "toil not, neither do they spin"—their daughters (here he made an insinuation too gross for repetition and such as would have excited the indignation of any other constituents but Mr. Randolph's.)

English Peasantry; wretched condition; Scotch Peasantry the most virtuous and intelligent in the word. * * *

Latest from England.

From the N. Y. Courier & Enquirer.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—KING'S SPEECH—RIOTS IN ENGLAND—ARTICLES OF A TREATY BETWEEN BELGIUM AND HOLLAND—OFFICIAL RUSSIAN ACCOUNT OF WAR IN POLAND—CHOLERA MORBUS AT HAMBURG.

The packet ship York, Capt. Burdsley arrived last evening, has brought us our files of English papers from the 16th to 25th October, Shipping Lists and Commercial advices to the same date.

From the extracts we give below, it will be perceived that, as we predicted on Saturday, the King of England has prorogued the British Parliament, announcing at the same time, his intention of again bringing before that body at the ensuing session, the question of a constitutional reform in the representative body. The Speech of the King is highly eulogized in most of the London journals.

The previous rejection of the Reform Bill by the House of Peers, has called forth unqualified marks of the strongest disapprobation in every part of England and Scotland. Meetings have been held throughout those countries, expressive of indignation at the vote of the Lords—approbatory of the conduct of the Government, and urging Ministers to persevere in their project of reform.

It will be seen that some disturbances have taken place in London, and that the Marquis of Londonderry had been severely hurt. Nottingham Castle at Nottingham, the seat of the Duke of Newcastle, had been burned by the people, and the military called in; we have not the particulars of this occurrence, owing to the chasm in the dates of our papers caused by the non-arrival of the packet of the 8th Great excitement has prevailed, particularly against the Bishops, in consequence of their votes against Reform. Mr. Hunt had presented a petition to the House of Commons, praying for the disfranchisement of those individuals of all political power, but it was withdrawn, the Speaker declaring that it involved a question of privilege belonging to the other branch of the Legislature and a comment upon their proceedings, and that it was therefore not proper the House take cognizance of it.

In France, perfect tranquility seems to reign. We were already informed that the Chamber of Deputies had by a large majority declared against the peerage remaining hereditary, but the attempts to limit the selection of peers by the King and other amendments proposed by the liberal party have failed. We see not therefore that much has been gained. It strikes us that this body eminating entirely from the King, will be a more pliant machine in the hands of the monarch than it was before.

At last the conference at London have laid the basis of an arrangement between Belgium and Holland, the particulars will be found below. The Belgians express the utmost dissatisfaction at the terms which are imposed on them; but, as in resisting them, they can look for neither countenance nor aid from France or England, or indeed from any other power, we have but little doubt that they will eventually be compelled to submit.

In relation to Poland the accounts before us complete the picture of the total subjugation of that heroic nation to the autocrat of Russia; we were already in possession of the outlines.

The cholera morbus, we lament to add has reached Hamburg When the proximity of that city to England and its frequent intercourse with that country is considered, it can hardly be expected that it will not be carried thither, and indeed throughout all Europe. It is consolating, however, to find, that as it extends to the most civilized part of the continent, it assumes a more lenient character. Additional precautions had been adopted against its introduction in England, but we are unable to insert it to day. The king of Holland had opened a session States General by a speech which contains notions particularly important.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Prorogation of Parliament.

LONDON, October.—In consequence of his Majesty going in person to prorogue Parliament, preparations were made early in the day for preserving the peace and viewing the spectacle. At 12 o'clock a strong body of police lined the road between the palace and the Houses of Parliament. At this time a considerable number of people had assembled. At the Palace all was bustle, the Bands of the foot guards were mustering in their state dresses, and the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners were strolling about in their gala suits.

At one o'clock, strong detachments of the Horse Guards, both red and blue, marched through St. James' park and lined the road all along; by this time the crowd had become very great in the Park and Parliament st. every window and elevated place of which was crowded by well dressed ladies.

From 12 o'clock, there was a constant throng of corroneted carriages, passing with the Peeresses and ladies of distinction, going to secure their seats in the House of Lords. His Majesty left the Palace at 2 o'clock, and passed through St. James' park and out by the Horse Guards, all along the road his Majesty was much cheered.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0173.jpg