REMARKS OF MR. CALHOUN.

On presenting in the Senate, on Tuesday last, his Resolutions in relation to the powers of the Federal Government.

After the bill, providing for the collection of the revenue had been assigned for Monday next—

Mr. Calhoun on rising, said that not agreeing with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that the measures proposed in the bill were of an ordinary character, and such as were sustained by precedents; but, on the contrary, fully according in the declaration of the Senator, from Mississippi, (Mr. Poindexter,) that it would, in fact, be a repeal of the Constitution, should it receive the sanction of Congress, he had risen to offer three resolutions, with a view of *testing the principles* on which the bill rested.

He had drawn them with great care; with a scrupulous regard to the truth of every assertion they contained, which he believed no one who valued his character for candor, could contradict, and that no impartial jury in christendom could, on an issue, refuse to render a verdict in their favor; and he had been equally scrupulous in making no deductions but what were sustained by the clearest and most demonstrative reason.

Mr. C. said that though the bill was couched in general terms, and made applicable to all the States; and though it referred, apparently on its face, to cases only of insurrection, or lawless resistance of individual force, yet it would not be denied that it was intended to be applied particularly to the case of South Carolina, and with the intention, not of putting down the lawless combination of individuals in that State, but the authorized opposition of the people of South Carolina, to an act which they conscientiously believed unconstitutional and oppressive; and as such, exercising the right which belongs to her in the last resort, as a sovereign member of the confederacy, she has declared to be null and void. Whatever resistance then, may be made in the State of South Carolina, is a resistance by the State itself, authorized by her sovereign authority, and not the resistance of a lawless combination of individuals. It is to put down this resistance that the measure now before the Senate has been reported, and in this character, it is wholly unprecedented; there is no example of the kind to be found on our statute book.

Here then said Mr. C., is presented the great, he would say the awfully important question: has Congress the right to pass this bill? There are two views of our Constitution, going back to its fundamental principles; one contained in the proclamation and the message of the President, which have given birth to the bill, and the other in the ordinance and proceedings of the people of S. Carolina. As the one or the other of these views may be correct, the bill must be pronounced to be constitutional or unconstitutional. If it be true, as stated by the President, that the people of these U. States are united on the principle, of a social compact, as so many individuals constituting one nation—if they have transferred to the General Government their allegiance—if they have parted with the right of judging, in the last resort, what powers are reserved and what delegated—then, indeed the States are without sovereignty, without rights, and no other objection can be made to the bill, but what might be made to its expediency.

But if, on the other hand, these positions are utterly false—if, in truth, the Constitution is the work of the people, forming twenty-four distinct political communities—if, when adopted, it formed a union of States, and not of individuals—if the States have not surrendered the right of judging, in the last resort, as to the extent of the reserved, and of course of the delegated powers—then, indeed, there is not a shadow of foundation in the Constitution, to authorize the bill; but, on the contrary, it would be wholly repugnant to its genius; destructive of its very existence, and involving a political *sin* of the highest character—of the delegated acting against the sovereign power—*of the creature waring against the creator.*

In making these assertions Mr. C. said he had the authority of the President of the United States himself. He had tacitly acknowledged that if the views of the Constitution on which the State of South Carolina has acted be correct, then neither this nor any other measures of force could be adopted against her. On no other principle could the long and elaborate argument, (and false he was compelled to say as long and elaborate,) contained in the proclamation, and in the message, be explained. Well might the President feel, that unless the doctrines on which South Carolina had acted could be successfully resisted, it would be impossible for the Government to adopt any measures against her: which presented the great and solemn question—are they truth or not? on which he proposed to make a few remarks; with the intention that the Senate might duly and deliberately reflect on them in the short interval between this and Monday next. (The day fixed for the discussion of the bill.)

The great question at issue is where is the paramount power? Where the sovereignty in this complex, but beautiful and admirable system (if well understood) is lodged; for where the sovereignty is, there too must be the paramount power. A few plain, and simple, and incontrovertible positions will determine this point. That the people of the States, as constituting separate communities, formed the Constitution; is as unquestionable as any historical fact whatever. It stands upon the most durable and unquestionable record—as much so as the records of any court in the universe; and that the Union, of which the constitutional compact is the bond, is a union between States, and not between a mere mass of individuals, rests on authority not less high—on the Constitution itself: which expressly declares, in the article of ratification—that it shall be binding *between the States ratifying the same*—words more explicit—he would say *technical*—could not be devised; yet as certain as these facts are, they cannot be admitted, without admitting the doctrines for which South Carolina contends. They, by the most certain and direct deduction conclusively will show where the paramount power of the system is; where its sovereign authority resides.

No one will pretend that the sovereignty is in the Government. To make that assertion would be to go back to the Asiatic idea of Government, it is scarcely European, as the most intelligent writers in that section of the Globe long since traced sovereignty to a higher source. No the sovereignty is not in the Government, it is in the people. Any other conception is utterly abhorrent to the ideas of every American. There is not a particle of Sovereignty in the Government. If, then, it be in the people, which cannot be denied, unless extinguishing the lights of political science for more than two thousand years, the only possible question that can remain is, in what people? In the people of the United States, collectively as a mass of individuals, or in the people of the twenty-four States, as forming distinct political communities confederated in this Union? The facts already established decide this question, and prove the sovereignty to be in the people of the several States. No such community ever existed, as the people of the United States, forming a collective body of individuals in one nation; and the idea that they are so united, by the present Constitution, as a social compact, as alleged by the proclamation, is utterly false and absurd.—To call the Constitution the social compact, is the greatest possible abuse of language. No two things are more dissimilar; there is not an expression in the whole science of politics, more perfectly definite in its meaning than the social compact. It means that association of individuals, founded on the implied assent of all its members, which precedes all Government and from which Government or the constitutional compact springs; and yet, the President, in the daring attempt to put down our *federal* system, has ventured to confound things so totally dissimilar. The sovereignty, then, is in the people of the several States, united in this federal Union. It is not only in them, but in them unimpaired; not a particle resides in the Government; not one particle in the American people collectively.

The people of the States have, indeed, delegated a portion of their sovereignty, to be exercised conjointly by a General Government, and have retained the residue to be exercised by their respective State Governments. But to delegate is not to part with or to impair power. The delegated power in the agent is as much the power of the principal as if it remained in the latter, and may, as between him and his agent, be controlled or resumed at pleasure.—Now mark the consequence.

No one can deny that the act of the sovereign binds the citizen or subject. The latter is not individually responsible for the act of the political community of which he is a member, and to which he owes allegiance. The community only is responsible. This is a principle universally recognized; but without regarding a principle so obvious—formed upon the highest sense of justice—this bill proposes to make the citizens of South Carolina individually responsible for the sovereign acts of the State to which he owes his allegiance! An outrage more than barbarian, upon the fundamental principle of political institutions, as has ever been recognized by all people so far advanced in civilization as to be formed into political communities.

None can doubt that the Convention of the people of South Carolina is the true organ of her sovereignty. According to our American ideas, sovereignty, instead of lying dormant in the mass or individuals composing a State, and instead of being capable of being called into action by a revolutionary movement only, has a known, organic and peaceable means of action. That means is a Convention of the people.—Through its instrumentality all of our constitutions—State and Federal, were formed and ratified. Through the same authentic voice the people of South Carolina spoke in her late ordinance. Which, as far as her citizens are concerned, is not less obligatory than the constitution itself. It is easy to see that, under this aspect of the subject, this bill presents a question infinitely beyond that of the tariff or its constitutionality; of nullification, or whether the Supreme Court is the tribunal appointed by the constitution to decide questions in controversy between the States and Federal Government. It sweeps away the whole of these questions. It may be admitted, to illustrate this idea, that the tariff is constitutional; that the Supreme Court is the authority appointed by the constitution to judge questions in conflict between the State and Federal Government; and yet this bill cannot be justified.

High as the authority of the court may be, its powers are but delegated powers; it makes a part of the Government itself, and like every other portion of the Government, is destitute of the least particle of sovereign power. As delegated powers may be resumed by the sovereign delegating the same, such a resumption may be a breach of compact—a violation of the faith of the State; but even in that case the State as a community, and not its citizens individually, are liable. The State as a community can break no law. It can, as a sovereign body, be subject to none. It may pledge its faith; it may delegate its powers, it may break one and resume the other; but the remedy, in such cases, is not hostile enactments; not *law*, by which the citizens individually are made responsible, as the bill most absurdly and preposterously proposes; but open force; war itself; unless there be some provision, of a remedial and peaceful character, provided in the compact.

I am not now, said Mr. C., about to discuss the question of using force on the part of the Federal Government against the State. That question is not now before the Senate; but should it be presented in any stage of this proceeding, I stand ready to prove that this Government has no right, even, to resort to force. The illustrious men who framed our constitution were too wise and patriotic to admit of the introduction of force, in constituting a federal system; they had too profound a knowledge of the human heart; too deep an insight into history, not to perceive that the introduction of force into such a system must necessarily lead to a military despotism. The fabric is too delicate to stand its rude shock. They devised, as a substitute, a far more effectual and peaceful means—one much more consonant to the advanced progress of political science and civilization. He alluded to the provision by which all contests for power, between the Federal Government and the States, may be virtually decided in a convention of the States. That is the true, wise and constitutional means of terminating this controversy. Let the States be convened in convention; let the stockholders, if he might be permitted so to express himself, of this great political partnership be called together, that all conflicts of power between the directors and any portion of the stockholders may be determined in conformity to the provisions prescribed in the character of association.

If, then, in a case supposed, where, for the sake of the argument the constitutionality of the tariff is conceded, and with the same view the authority claimed for the Supreme Court acknowledged, there would be no right to pass this bill of pains and penalties on the citizens of South Carolina for adhering to their allegiance to the State, how much stronger, must be the objection to its passage, when we advert to the fact, that it is not a case of resumption of power delegated to the Government but the defence of reserved powers against unconstitutional encroachment. So far from conceding the constitutionality of the tariff or the powers claimed for the Supreme Court, not only the State of South Carolina, but all the southern States, believe it to be not only unconstitutional, but highly oppressive; and that the Supreme Court, so far from being the tribunal appointed to decide political controversies, is limited by the constitution itself to cases arising in law or equity, and of course, where the parties are amenable to its process.

Mr. C. said that he could not but perceive in the bill itself evidence that there was, on the part of its authors, an internal feeling of the force of these arguments, they have not made it directly applicable to the case of South Carolina nor to the case of a State, opposing, on her own sovereign authority, what she believes to be an unconstitutional act of the Federal Government. If there be guilt, South Carolina alone is guilty. Why then make the provisions of the bill applicable to all the States! Why make it the general and permanent law of the land? The other States have not been even the abettors in the mighty struggle of South Carolina to maintain the Constitution and the liberties of the country! She has been discountenanced even by her sister States, immediately interested in the issue! Why then commit the injustice of including them in its penal enactments? Why disguise the real intention; that it is to coerce a sovereign State exercising her constitutional right of judging in the last resort, of her reserved rights, with a view of protecting her citizens against the encroachments of the Federal Government? Why not meet this mighty issue boldly and manfully? Why confound the movements of a State with riots, mobs, and insurrections? But one reason can be assigned. A conscious instinct of the palpable injustice and absurdity of such a bill.

Mr. C. said, that viewing the bill on its principles, he conceived it a virtual repeal of the Constitution, as much so as if it was expressly drawn on its face with "be it enacted by the authority of the Senate and House of Representatives, that the Constitution be, and the same is, hereby repealed." Should it pass, it will effectually and forever put down our beautiful federal system, and rear on its ruins a consolidated government. The sovereignty of the States would be forever submerged—that sovereignty which constituted ours a federal system, and the loss of which would make it a consolidation.

The issue is now before us; the decision cannot be much longer delayed; the rejection of the passage of this bill will probably decide it forever. Let no one suppose that, in deciding this great question, our system will stop at mere consolidation—it is but a stage in the certain progress to military despotism; and that the most odious and oppressive; as in proportion to the independent, free spirit of the people, must be the sternness of the despotism necessary to hold them in subjection. But two modes of political existence can long endure in our country: the one that formed, by the framers of our admirable constitution, a federal system, uniting free and independent States in a bond of union for mutual advantages, and to be preserved by the concurring assent of the parts—or a Government of the sword. The choice is before us.

Mr. C. said that he had drawn the resolutions which he was about to propose, for the purpose of bringing the principles of this bill distinctly before the Senate; and that he had accompanied them with the few remarks which he had made, with a view of calling the solemn attention of its members to the mighty consequences which he conscientiously believed to be involved in its passage. He conceived it to be impossible to adopt the resolutions and pass the bill, and that it was equally impossible to deny the facts on which they rest or reject the conclusions deduced therefrom.

Mr. C. then moved the resolutions which will be found under the Congressional head.

CONGRESS.

SATURDAY, Jan. 19.

In the Senate the consideration of the bill appropriating for a limited time the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, was resumed,—the question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. Poindexter. Mr. P. addressed the Senate at length, in favor of his amendment, and the original bill; before he had concluded, an adjournment took place.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Cambreleng, from the Committee on Commerce, reported a bill to regulate the compensation of officers of Revenue Cutters. Several private bills were reported and resolutions adopted. The resolutions heretofore offered by Mr. Adams, calling on the President and the Secretary of the Treasury for information relative to the Tariff were further debated by Messrs. Stewart and Adams, until the hour allotted to morning business had expired. The House then went into Committee on the Tariff. Mr. Jenifer addressed the committee about an hour in opposition to some of the features of the bill, and was followed by Mr. Denny, who spoke about two hours against its general principles. Mr. E. D. White moved the Committee rise; which was carried, and the House adjourned.

MONDAY, Jan. 21.

In the Senate Mr. Silsbee presented the credentials of the Hon. Daniel Webster, re-elected a Senator from the State of Massachusetts for six years, from and after the 4th of March next. Mr. Wilkins from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which had been referred the Message of the President of the United States, communicating the South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification, and other documents, reported a bill to amend the revenue laws, in substance as follows:—The 1st Section provides that the President in cases where powerful combinations render it impracticable to collect or secure the revenue may remove the custom-house in each collection district to some secure place on land or on board of a vessel, at which place the duties shall be paid before landing; and authorizes, the President or Collector to repel force by force. The 2nd Section extends the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court to all cases arising under the revenue laws of the United States, and authorizes any person injured in his person or property in the execution of the revenue laws, to sue in the Federal Court; and all property seized under the various revenue laws of the United States shall not be subject to Replevin. The 3d Section authorizes any person sued, officers or others, (in a State Court,) for acts done in execution of the revenue laws, by petition, to remove such suits into the Circuit Court of the United States. The 4th Section provides that where a party is sued in a State Court for any act done in the execution of the revenue laws, and cannot obtain a copy of the Record on application to the Clerk of the State Court, the same may be supplied by affidavit or otherwise, as the case may allow, in the courts of the United States. The 5th Section authorizes the President of the United States to issue his Proclamation and to call out sufficient military force to repel any force which may obstruct the proceedings of the Federal Courts—he being notified of the necessity of doing so by some Judge of the Federal Circuit or District Court. The 6th Section provides that when a State shall refuse the use of its jails and houses for the confinement of prisoners, the Marshal shall, under the direction of the District Judge, provide some other suitable place for that purpose. The 7th Section extends the privilege of the writ of *Habeas Corpus* to the cases of persons confined under a State law for having executed the laws of the United States. The bill was read, and ordered to a 2d reading.

TUESDAY, Jan. 22.

In the Senate, on motion of Mr. Wilkins, the bill reported on Monday, by the Committee on the Judiciary, "further to provide for the collection of duties on imports," was taken up. Having been read a second time by its title, Mr. Wilkins said he was instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to move that the bill be postponed to, and made the special order for Thursday next. Mr. Bibb suggested its postponement to Thursday week, Mr. Mangum named Monday week, and Mr. Clay Monday next. A debate of considerable interest ensued on the question of postponement, in which Messrs. Wilkins, Bibb, Grundy, Mangum, Miller, Clay, Smith; Poindexter, Frelinghuysen, Brown and King took part. The question to postpone the bill to next Monday week, was then rejected by the following vote.

YEAS—Messrs. Bibb, Black, Calhoun, Mangum, Miller, Moore, Poindexter, Rives and Tyler.—9.

NAYS—Messrs. Bell, Benton, Brown, Buckner, Chambers, Clay, Clayton, Dallas, Dickerson, Dudley, Ewing, Foot, Forsyth, Frelinghuysen, Grundy, Hendricks, Hill, Holmes, Johnston, Kane, King, Knight, Naudain, Prentiss, Robbins, Robinson, Ruggles, Seymour, Silsbee, Smith, Sprague, Tipton, Tomlinson, Waggaman, White, Wilkins and Wright—37.

Mr. Wilkins withdrew the motion for postponement until Thursday next, and the bill was postponed to, and made the special order for Monday next.

Mr. Calhoun then rose, and offered the following resolutions, which he prefaced by a speech of some length reiterating and enlarging upon the views submitted by him to the Senate, on a recent occasion, and in the course of which he commented with much severity upon the character and provisions of the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee, (above refered to,) which, if passed, he declared would operate as an entire repeal of the Constitution.

Resolved, That the people of the several States, composing these United States, are united as parties to a constitutional compact, to which the people of each State acceded as a separate and sovereign community, each binding itself, by its own particular ratification, and that the Union, of which the said compact was the bond, is *an Union between the States* ratifying the same.

Resolved, That the people of the several States, thus united by the constitutional compact, in forming that instrument, and in creating a General Government to carry into effect the objects for which it was formed, delegated to that Government, for that purpose, certain definite powers, to be exercised jointly, reserving at the same time, each State to itself, the residuary mass of powers to be exercised by its own separate government; and that whenever the General Government assumes the exercise of powers not delegated by the compact, its acts are unauthorized and are of no effect, and that the said Government is not made the final judge of the powers delegated to it, since that would make its discretion, and not the Consitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among sovereign parties, without any common judge, each has an equal right to judge for itself as well of the infraction, as of the mode and measure of redress.

Resolved, That the assertion that the people of these United States, taken collectively as individuals, are now, or ever have been, united on the principles of the social compact and as such, are now formed into one nation, or people, or that they have ever been so united in any one stage of their political existence; that the people of the several States, composing the Union, have not as members thereof, retained their sovereignty; that the allegiance of their citizens have been transferred to the General Government; that they have parted with the right of punishing treason, through their respective State Governments; and that they have not the right of judging, in the last resort, as to the extent of the powers reserved and of consequence, of those delegated—are not only without foundation in truth, but are contrary to the most certain and plain historical facts, & the clearest deductions of reason; & that all exercise of power on the part of the General Government, or any of its Departments, claiming authority from such erroneous assumptions, must of necessity, be unconstitutional; must tend, directly and inevitably, to subvert the sovereignty of the States; to destroy the Federal character of the Union, and to rear on its ruins a consolidated government, without constitutional check or limitation, and which must necessarily terminate in the loss of liberty itself.

On motion of Mr. *Calhoun*, the resolutions were ordered to be printed. The Senate then adjourned.

[From the Maryland Republican.]

To the General Assembly of Maryland.

Judging from what we see in the papers from Fredericktown and Baltimore, the General Assembly of Maryland will soon be assailed with memorials from these quarters, pressing on their attention certain alterations in the constitution and form of government as may better fit it for the increased growth in population, strength, and riches of the memorialists—and if the General Assembly will not at once grant them these demands "once more made"—then they desire, that the General Assembly will arrange a call of a Convention to loosen the ligatures by which the growing strength and power of the memorialists are compressed, in order that they may have some room to exert and to direct their energies to control and dictate to the little vassal counties; which must then aspire to no higher privilege, than to walk under and peep through the colossal legs of these overgrown and inflated masters, that are to be.

After a *brief experience* of some fifty-six years, during which time things have gone on well—so well, that the very malcontent counties themselves have grown from almost nothing to towering supremacy, it is now fulminated upon us in a strain, not unequivocally without menace, that the mode of electing all the Executive and Legislative branches of the government is bad, and is entirely in violation of choice republican principles.

The constitution of Maryland, for the last half century, has been generally considered, by all dispassionate men within and without the state, as among the very best of all the state constitutions. It is the most truly democratic in its general character, and combines the free principle and the check in most happy association. That very principle of democratic equality, the equal representation of the counties, which the memorialists complain of, because one county is more populous than another, is one of the preservative equilibriums to keep all sound and firm—it is the shield, the only protection of the small counties against the present plans and future oppressions of the large, wealthy, and populous counties. The memorialists from Frederick and Baltimore complain, that their "well ascertained desires in regard to their local concerns have been repeatedly set at nought by the operation of this system," (equal representation.) If this is true, the small and thinly populated counties may well ask the memorialists the question, viz.—if simple equal representation has enabled the poor and small counties to 'set at nought the well ascertained desires," of the opulent and overgrown counties of Baltimore and Frederick, aided by their powerful allies, the city of Baltimore and the Town of Frederick—pray, when you have diminished our representation by taking away a part of what we have, and have augmented yours by greatly adding to all you now possess, what is to save us one little year from being crushed and trampled in the dust? The memorialists reply—what is to save you? why our moderation—our sense of justice—our mercy—our forgiveness of past injuries as we call them. In truth, you small counties being weak and poor, and powerless; must go the way of all flesh.—You must depend upon us, your rich and powerful neighbours—Let us have the power, and you the weakness, and we will occasionally afford you protection, by way of favor, whenever a question occurs that divides the great counties and the one side or the other may stand in need of your few votes. Such will be the reply at the hearts of the big counties and big cities, whatever may escape from their lips.

Now is it to be expected, that Charles, St. Mary's, Calvert, Montgomery, Prince Georges, Anne Arundel & Allegany counties with all the counties on the E. Shore will give up, surrender their present fair & protecting equality, to place themselves in a state of inferior subjection to a few powerful counties and cities—to make the weak, weaker, and the strong more powerful? Is it to be presumed, that there is a county on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, which will thus jeopard and subject itself—or put at risk or surrender its sustaining *ratio of the two-fifths* and the pledge that nothing in the constitution *which relates to the Eastern Shore particularly* shall be altered or abrogated, without a vote of two-thirds of all the members of both branches? Will any county on the Eastern Shore be so faithless to itself and to its sister counties—be so mad as to throw away all this protection to the people of that shore, and leave them stript and defenceless to live on charity—the charity of pampered wealth, that feels its powar and is arrogant of it? Let their good sense and love of homes answer.

Besides, are you, of the small counties all blind? When the work is begun where will it end? Like poor, fallen, abject Poland—once holding rank among the surrounding nations, she fell an unprotected victim to power—now cut up—divided and parcelled out—her soil enriched with her own blood and bones, now converted to the use of others. This is the history of the fate of the weak whenever they fall by any means into the hands of the strong.

It was but the other day you saw the daring attempt of arrogant party power, to engross this project as its own, as a means of subserving the party cause, called Jacksonism. These haughty projectors could not bear union with opponents—coalitions were dangerous—allies were faithless—Heretics ought never to be trusted—besides, how could they trust all to opponents, and give them a chance for the spoil. But more skillful managers hushed this up.—Some of the allies insisted upon being let in as originals, and the Lambs and the Lions are now crouching together to leap together upon their prey.

Beware! ye men of the lesser counties—O beware! If a brother's blood is to be shed by a brother's hand elsewhere, O! let it not be so in

MARYLAND.

LATEST FROM EUROPE.

From the N. Y. Jour. of Commerce.

We have just received Havre papers to Dec. 11th inclusive, and Paris to the evening of the 10th, containing Antwerp dates to the 9th.

The Citadel still held out; the fighting had become more severe and the loss greater. Sallies were frequently made by the besieged, with various success.

It is reported that the citadel had surrendered—but there is no mention of the circumstance in the Paris papers of the 10th, or in the Havre of the 11th. This report is brought by the Captain of the Havre.

Antwerp, Dec. 7—nine in the morning.—"The last night has not produced all the advantages that were expected. In the evening orders were issued for taking the Lunetta St. Laurent by storm, as its possession by the French army, or at least its evacuation by the enemy, is indispensable for the success of the seige.

Six o'clock in the evening, from another correspondent.

During the last thirty-six hours the defence of the citadel has assumed a more serious character. The slight resistance offered to our works, the mildness of the early firing from the besieged, and the promptitude with which the guns were dismounted, has rendered the present change more remarkable.

About five o'clock yesterday evening three or four companies came out of the citadel and fired upon our working parties, and early this morning a fusillade was commenced, and has been kept up nearly throughout the day, from Fort Saint Laurent, which has much annoyed us.

We can distinctly see the soldiers approach the parapet at regular intervals, with great promptitude, discharge their muskets and retire. They also make great use of mortar batteries, placed more in the rear, and which we have great difficulty in reaching, whence they discharge upon us a great number of shells, thrown with such precision that they nearly all fall into our batteries.

From time to time they also send us showers of grape, which we suppose to be fired from small pieces brought forward for the moment, discharged two or three times and then withdrawn.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0407.jpg