lation to the Executive Department as hereinbefore stated, and in relation to the two Houses of Assembly—and they have instructed their chairman to prepare several bills, and report them to the Senate for consideration In those bills provision will be made for the case of the vacancy, in the office of Governor, by death or otherwise; and various details, which it was not deemed necessary to state here, will be exhibited, in relation to the several proposed alterations.

All which, as a report in part, is respectfully submitted.

WM. SCULLY,
Chairman of the Select Committee on the Constitution.

Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.

ANNAPOLIS, January 27, 1837.

Both branches of the Legislature were occupied chiefly, to-day, in the despatch of local business.

A memorial was presented in the House, by Mr. McLean, from the President and Directors of the American Life insurance and Trust Company, praying a modification of their charter. It was referred to the committee on corporations.

Leave was granted Mr. Ridgely to report a supplement to the charter of the Hamilton Bank.

A favorable report was made by Mr Bringle, from the committee to whom it was referred, the supplement to the charter of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company—which passed the Senate some time since.

In Senate—the committee on judicial proceedings were requested, on motion of Mr. Hillary, to examine the act establishing Magistrates' Courts and to report whether any amendment be necessary, with a view to the relief of the docket of the chief justices of these courts.

The bill reported yesterday by Mr Alexander, supplementary to the charter of the Franklin Bank, provides, I understand, to extend the time limited for the augmentation of their capital.

I send you, to-day, a copy of Mr A's bill relative to an investment of the Surplus Revenue. The printing of the Report of the Committee on Ways and Means is not completed—this document is of considerable length.

INTRODUCTION OF SLAVES INTO THIS STATE

ANNAPOLIS, Jan. 28 1837

The temper of the present House of Delegates in relation to allowing the admission of any more Slaves into this State than is allowed by the spirit of our existing laws, was to some degree tested on Thursday last. Mr. Brand, the Chancellor of Maryland applied to the Legislature for permission to bring in a slave, the *gift* of a friend residing in the State of Virginia. The committee on colored population, to whom it was referred, reported that the existing laws sufficiently provided for the case.

Mr. Alexander proposed as a substitute for that report, that the bill be recommitted with instructions to the committee to report a general bill, allowing the admission of slaves, derived by *gift*, upon the oath of the person *receiving* that the same was a bona fide *gift* to them The law as it is requires the oath of the person *making* the *gift*, to that effect, to authorise admission.

A debate arose upon the subject, in which Mr. Alexander and Mr. Kerr advocated, and Mr. Handy opposed the recommitment. Mr. Alexander considered the oath of a citizen of the State, who could be made responsible to the State, to be a much better security than the oath of a non-resident. Mr. Kerr thought the restrictions against admission altogether too rigid,—they had been adopted at a time of feverish excitement and were now no longer necessary. The current of emigration was incidentally referred to in the debate, and was met by references to the settled policy of the State in regard to colored population.

Mr. Ely proposed to amend the proposed instructions, by requiring the oath of the donor and donee both, hereafter *He* was for having all the proof that was attainable.

The question was taken and this amendment was adopted. Whereupon Mr. Alexander immediately withdrew his proposed instructions, as thus amended against his wishes, and then offered a bill, payable to the individual case applied for, which was passed, as a substitute for the report of the committee.—*Sid Rep.*

From the National Intelligencer.

EXPUNGING.

The proposition to expunge a part of the Journal of the Senate, revived in that body at the present session of Congress has consumed a good deal of the time of the Senate, to the hindrance of such wholesome legislation as the various interests of the country demand If by this consumption of time, any purpose practically useful were, in any event, likely to be accomplished, the time might not be considered as absolutely lost, though some may think that it might have been more profitably employed. The topic which engages so large a portion of the attention of one branch of the National Legislature, however, cannot be wholly uninteresting to our readers, and still less to us, whose vocation makes us daily observers of what is passing in Congress. On the contrary, we have heard and thought so much upon this subject, that the force of our conviction, rather than of our inclination, compels us to commit to paper a few reflections in regard to it.

The resolution now before the Senate proposes to expunge from the journal of that body, under circumstances of great indignity, a resolution passed three years ago, censuring the conduct of the Executive, in assuming authority, some months before that date, to remove the public deposites from the Bank of the United States.

It will be readily admitted, that the subject of the Resolution proposed to be *expunged* is one upon which there might, when it passed, and may now be an honest difference of opinion. There is in all Governments, at all times, a difference of opinion among the People and among their Representatives (where they have any) as to the true extent and limit of the powers and prerogatives of the Executive branch of Government.—This difference is in fact the usual line of demarcation between parties in States which enjoy any degree of freedom. It is not at all a matter of surprise, therefore, that it should exist here. But, however wide the difference of opinion in the case referred to, the will and voice of the *majority* prevailed, as we hope it will be universally admitted ought to be the case upon all disputed questions in deliberative bodies.

At this time, we all know the constitutional majority of the Senate is of a different opinion from the majority of 1834 This difference of opinion, it does not appear to us to be unnatural, nor very unreasonable, that they should desire to express. As to the *manner* of expressing it, the obviously easiest would be by passing a resolution affirmative of an opinion opposite to that now on record. One resolution would then counterbalance, or set off, the other.—Or, if a more decisive mark of dissatisfaction were desired, a resolution might be passed *rescinding* the obnoxious resolution This is a process not without precedent; and by such a vote the resolution would cease to stand as the act of the Senate, as effectually as by its being 'expunged.' Upon *the resolution*, the effect of each mode of proceeding would be just the same.

The effect of the two modes upon the Journal of the Senate, and upon the Senate itself, would, however, be widely different, as a moment's thought will satisfy any one. By rescinding, the only legitimate object is effected: whilst, by expunging, the record of the proceedings of the Senate must be falsified, mutilated, desecrated. In the opinion of the ablest constitutional lawyers, the act of expunging would be a violation of the Constitution; and in the opinion of eminent statesmen would be a vital stab to the rights, the honor, the usefulness of that body which has been here fore regarded, even by the wildest demagogues and most infuriated partisans, with sufficient veneration and respect to exempt it from indecent outrage.

We need use no argument to show that if the Expunging proposition be fraught with any portion of this mischief, it ought not, either to gratify the movers of it, to propitiate the idol of party, or to satiate vindictive feelings any where, to receive sanction from the Senate, or countenance from the People.

It is said, however, that the People have condemned the action of the Senate in the case before us, and demand that it be reversed or set aside. If this position were contested, it would be difficult to maintain it by any sufficient proof. But, for the sake of argument, we will admit the truth of the statement. Although we do in our hearts believe that no proposition in politics can be more true than that embraced in the obnoxious Resolution, let us admit that the People have condemned it by a decisive expression of opinion. Say that it is so! may, say that they have rightfully condemned it—and what then? Is this the only case in which there has been an undoubted reprobation of proceedings in Congress by the People?—Surely not. Every one who knows any thing of the history of his country can readily call to mind repeated instances of cases, in which no possible doubt could be entertained of their condemnation by the verdict of public opinion—Without going back to the Alien and Sedition Acts—remarkable cases, however—we will instance one of more recent date, within the personal recollection of most of our readers. We refer to the Act familiarly known and politically damned by the title of *the Compensation Law* That act, introduced on the motion of Mr. Johnson, (one of the candidates between whom a choice of Vice President is very shortly to be made,) was passed with little hesitation by both Houses of Congress in March, 1816. It was received with such a burst of disapprobation by the People, that, at the opening of the second session of the same Congress, on the 31 of December following, the roll of Members was hardly suffered to be called over before a proposition was presented for its repeal, on the ground of the odium attached to it, and it *was* repealed. *Repeal* was the remedy, and the true remedy, for a legislative error. Did any one *then* propose to expunge from the journal of the preceding session the proceedings thus acknowledged to be most obnoxious to the People? Was such a thing ever dreamt of, in that case, by way of cure, as an evisceration of the journals of the two Houses? Or has it ever been proposed in any other similar case? If it has, let it be shewn. We know of none such, and do not believe that such a case exists.

But, it is argued, the Resolution of the Senate, censuring a particular act of the Executive, was not an act performed in the legitimate capacity of the Senate, and *therefore* should be expunged—If it were true that the Senate had in this case exercised an authority denied to it by the Constitution, still, as we have shown a rescission of the act would be the lawful remedy, and would be the expedient one, even as an alternative.—but the Senate exercised in this case no more nor other jurisdiction than both the Senate and the House of Representatives have exercised on various occasions heretofore, if not without dispute, at least without having their proceedings therein proposed to be expunged. The right to *approve* the conduct of the Executive certainly implies the right to *condemn* it. The affirmative and the negative powers must go together. We remember very well a case of *approval* of the conduct of the Executive, in which the right as well as the expediency of the measure were very gravely questioned, but affirmed by the Senate by a majority composed of more than all its Republican members of that day. We refer to the resolution introduced by Mr. Giles, of Virginia, by which the Senate resolved, in December, 1810, that it would stand by and support the Executive, (in the case of its dismission of Mr. Jackson, the British Minister,) and call into action the whole force of the nation, if it should become necessary, *in consequence of the conduct of the Executive Government* in this respect,' &c Here is a case in which there was no doubt of the Executive having acted, whether right or wrong, strictly within the pale of its constitutional authority; and yet the Senate thought it expedient with the greatest solemnity to *approve* the conduct of the Executive, by a vote to which there were out of the whole body but four dissentients, of whom Mr. Timothy Pickering was one, and Mr. James Hillhouse another; both highly respectable as men, but not much approved as politicians by the Republicans of *that* day. If in this case the Senate had the power to *approve*, does any one doubt that they had an equal power to *condemn*? Are not these powers correlative? Are they not in truth inseparable? No one, who is not blinded by passion or prejudice, can deny it.

Now, then, we put it to our readers, whether, if the Senate have the power of disapproving of the conduct of the Executive in a case strictly within the pale of its constitutional duty, that power can be denied to the Senate *because*, in the opinion of the Senate, the Executive has, in the case in which its conduct is disapproved, transgressed its rightful authority, and done an act which the Constitution does not authorize? We challenge an answer to this question. Yet, though it is a question which can be answered only in one way, it is upon a different presumption that is rested, as we understand it, the argument, the sole argument, to sustain the Expunging Resolution, as an exception to the ordinary action of the Senate and of other Legislative bodies. If it have not this justification, it has none. Confessedly without precedent, it is alike unfounded in right, and unsupported by reason.

We have referred only to isolated cases in Legislative history, because it appears to be needless to multiply illustrations. But the journals of both Houses abound in them. The same resolution, referred to above as originating with an eminent Senator from Virginia, was concurred in also by the House of Representatives, after a long debate, involving the question of principle as well as that of expediency included in the resolution. Both Houses of Congress, indeed, possess, beyond all doubt, the right freely to express their opinion in reference as well to the conduct of the Executive as to any other public matter. Upon any different hypothesis (the power of impeachment being, in the case of the Chief Magistrate, obviously unavailable and illusory) the Executive is under no real effective responsibility whatever for his acts.

If there be no purpose of public utility to be answered by this proposition to mutilate the records of the Senate, and if it be, besides, contrary to usage, as well as to reason, is there any object to be accomplished by it, on pure party grounds, to justify the pertinacity with which this purpose of defacing the journal of the Senate is pressed? The vote which it aims to stigmatize will still stand the recorded expression of the opinion of those who passed it; it will so stand in all the published copies of the proceedings and on the pages of the thousand public journals of our country. Expunging the record cannot undo the fact. The past is beyond recall.

"Not HEAVEN itself upon the past has power,
"But what has been has been."

The measure would show, indeed, that the majority of the Senate now differs in opinion from the majority which passed the resolution. But an objection fatal to it, in the mind of any cool or reflecting man, is, that it seeks to express that difference by a method altogether unusual and highly offensive; a method held to be unconstitutional by a large portion of the Public; a method which has in fact been voted to be unconstitutional by an intervening Senate, when there was a majority opposed in opinion to the resolution proposed to be expunged.—The method whereby it is proposed to express this opinion is, moreover, held by many to be degrading to the body, insulting to the record, an outrage to the feelings of those Senators who dissented from it, and most evil and dangerous as a precedent.

In this last view, how deeply is this act to be deprecated! What a spectacle will be presented to the world when it shall become the practice for successive parties, as they obtain ascendancy in the Senate, to aim to stigmatise any unpopular proceedings of their predecessors by mutilating and defacing the journal, and thus reciprocating contempts and violence! Yet, if the example is once set, can it be doubted that it will be followed by others? Can there be a single gentleman now in the Senate, however much inclined to support this measure, who is prepared to look with complacency on such acts becoming the common practice of the body? Had indeed, the resolution of 1834 been passed by the political friends of the Chief Magistrate, there might then be some show of reason (though still insufficient) for these same friends, under a change of opinion, seeking to obliterate the record of an act which they repented. But, in the case before us, the vote was the act of those who differed from the Executive then and who differ from him still. As an expression of opinion it cannot be reversed or weakened, except by the recantation of those who avowed it; and it is unjust to them, as members possessing equal rights, to deny them the privilege of placing their opinions on the common record, kept for the purpose of preserving the decisions of each and of all.

If that vote can be rightfully obliterated from the record, any other alteration can be made in it that the majority for the-time-being choose to order. They may as well change a member's vote as to expunge it, because both equally deny the right of the member to show, to those who come after, what that vote was. The majority might, therefore, with the same propriety *change* an *aye* into a *no*, or a *no* into an *aye*, on the record, as to extinguish either one or the other. The extinction and the change would equally infringe a personal, immutable, and constitutional right.

As a party measure, moreover—one having reference solely to the personal feelings or honor of the President of the United States—this violent remedy will, notwithstanding all its violence, be inoperative. It cannot reverse the declaration made by the majority of the Senate in 1834; it will only show that the present majority—a very small one too—differs from the majority of that day. A declaratory resolution, disapproving the opinions expressed in 1834 would be equally efficacious; and such a proceeding, although on several accounts not to be desired would not outrage propriety. It would comport with custom—would be free from all appearance of vindictiveness—free from insult to the minority, and would as effectually heal the wound supposed to have been inflicted on the Chief Magistrate, as the offensive and most unconstitutional course now proposed.

We believe that no question before Congress has ever been viewed with so solemn and painful a feeling by the thinking Public, as the proposition which there is too much reason to fear is about to be adopted by the Senate.—For our own part, we declare, in all sincerity, that we look upon it with more oppressed feelings than we should upon a proposition heedlessly to involve the nation in the calamities of war. We shall look upon its passage with a more painful emotion than we experienced, when, many years ago, we saw the Capitol in flames, and our own individual property committed to the torch of an invading enemy Time can obliterate the evils of war, and industry repair its ravages. But what time can heal a wound inflicted by the Senate on its own honor? It savors, we know, of arrogance, to interpose our humble voice in a question upon which the greatest minds of our country are exerting their powers But in the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh; and it is not without the hope of inducing some of those more considerate gentlemen who are conscientiously approaching this act as an act of duty, to pause and reflect whether there are not some sacrifices too fearful to be yielded to the vindictive exactions of party, or of vindictive party leaders, that we have said thus much! There is indeed scarcely a personal sacrifice which we would not cheerfully make to avert the impending calamity: and God knows that the sacrifice would be made by us with feelings untainted by party influence, and with the sole and only earthly motive of saving the Constitution of our country from a wound, and the Senate of that country from a dishonor, which we have no surety that the Senate itself would long survive.

From the Centreville Times.

THE EASTERN SHORE OF MARYLAND.

Mr. Editor.—Any man, who will take the trouble to consider for a moment, will be convinced that in a few years hence the E. S. of Maryland (if not the whole state) will be ruined and depopulated, unless some plan shall be adopted to prevent the rapid emigration which is now going on. Persons owning slaves, who have no scruples of conscience upon the subject, tempted by the high prices offered for them, are sending them off in droves, or removing with them to the South.—Our young men of education and business habits are allured to the South and West by the encouragement offered them of soon realizing fortunes. Our laboring and enterprising men with families are also removing to the West, where they are taught to believe their industry will be better rewarded. By a recent law of this state all negroes thereafter manumitted must leave the state or go again into bondage. All negroes sentenced to the Penitentiary for the most trifling offences after they have served out their time or have been pardoned by the Governor are compelled to leave the state with in 90 days or be sold. The Colonization Society is holding out the most powerful inducements for the free negroes to go to Africa; and the great public works going on in our country offer great encouragement to them to leave our shore. By these different means, a continual drain is kept up, taking off yearly hundreds and probably thousands of our population. The reported unhealthiness of our climate deters enterprising and working men from filling up the places thus made vacant. Besides the uncertainty of our crops and the worn out soil of many of our lands seem to hold out no indecements for strangers to come to, or for our industrious citizens to remain.—This being the case, it becomes the landholders to look about themselves and to prepare for those evils, which must soon occur, unless some preventive can be applied. Land must depreciate in value as soon as there shall not be a sufficient number of laborers to till it.—Poor land will of course be abandoned and left out of cultivation. In ten years hence, or in twenty years at the most, if things continue to go on, as they are now going on, thousands of acres of land will be turned out as commons and many widows and children, whose husbands and fathers have toiled hard to procure for them a home and a support will be beggared and ruined. Who that has any regard for the place of his nativity, and is unwilling to abandon the graves of his fathers and dearest friends does not feel a wish to avert this melancholy state of things?

Humanity and religion point out a course which might be adopted to remedy some of the existing evils, but as their dictates are too often unheeded, or smothered by avarice and the love of money, I will not urge them on this occasion—but will suggest other remedies for the consideration of my fellow citizens which under the blessing of Divine Providence may partially succeed in saving our shore from being forsaken. Before making any suggestions however, I will premise that no people can be long happy or prosperous, who are deaf to the appeals of humanity and christianity, and who suffer silver and gold to stifle the whispers of conscience. The first remedy I would propose is that our farmers should divide their farms into small fields and improve them. This would prevent the necessity for many labourers. The other parts of their farms should be appropriated to grazing & the raising of stock & their meadow lands should be cleared up to afford hay for the winter. Attention should also be paid to the planting of peach and apple orchards, not for the purpose of making brandy that destroyer of the families who use it—but for the furnishing of food for cattle & hogs. Our farmers should also turn their thoughts to the raising of mangold wurtzel, cymblins, pumpkins and Ruta Baga, by which a small piece of land may be made to produce a great quantity of feed for stock. Beef and pork will always command a good price at our public works, or in our large cities. In addition to these things they should turn their attention to the raising of beets and manufacturing sugar and molasses from them thereby securing to their families not only these useful wholesome and cheapest articles of diet, but at the same time affording to their stock the most nutricious and fattening food. The best grown finely in our land and the expenses of cultivation are trifling. It is affirmed also by writers upon the subject that the culture of the beet improves the land. Another subject which should deeply interest our agriculturalists is the making of silk No man, who will read carefully on this subject can fail to be convinced that the making of silk is destined to be a source of incalculable wealth to this nation. Every farmer without interfering at all with his other pursuits may in two or three years make from five hundred to one thousand dollars annually from those parts of his farm which are now uncultivated because they are poor or occupied by fences The mulberry upon which the silk worms feed make excellent hedges Any one who wishes to inform himself upon this branch of business is advised to purchase Robert's Silk Manual, which can be had in Baltimore for fifty cents and to take the Silk Culturist, a paper published by the executive committee of the Harford county Silk Company edited by F G. Comstock at Hartford Connecticut and which comes out monthly at fifty cents per year. The Silk culture on a large scale promises not only a good profit for the capital employed; but will afford a decent support to hundreds of women and children, who would otherwise suffer or be dependent upon charity. I am aware that these projects will be considered visionary by those who have not investigated the subject; and so was the introduction of the cultivation of cotton esteemed in former years. Men of the first intelligence in these states (and among the rest the Honorable Daniel Webster) are entering into the silk culture with spirit, and many others of our most intelligent citizens are forming companies for the cultivation of the Beet and the making of sugar—The Queen Ann's county Silk Company which commenced the planting of trees the last spring expect to feed six hundred thousand silk worms, the next season. Should they succeed, these worms would make two hundred pounds of silk, which at the minimum price of raw silk would bring eight hundred dollars. Say they make only half that sum they would be more than paid in one year for their outlay for trees, and will probably have from fifty to one hundred thousand trees for use the succeeding season. The soil and climate of the Eastern Shore are admirably adapted to the raising of mulberry trees and the rearing of silk worms. Should the silk business and the making of sugar succeed well (as I have no doubt they will) there will be no inducements for our citizens to seek other homes. Poor and light land is said to produce the best silk. Women and children are capable of gathering the leaves, feeding the worms and reeling the silk. In N. York I have been credibly informed that two daughters of a farmer did all the house work of a large family and cleared upwards of four hundred dollars each a year by feeding silk worms and making silk It is true it takes good land to raise the beet; but a very small portion will yield a great quantity of beets and consequently of sugar and molasses. The remains of the beet after extracting the sugar and molasses afford excellent food for fattening cattle or for milch cows. It has lately been asserted very confidently that after the extraction of the sugar, a quantity of pot ash can be obtained from the beet, which promises to yield also great profit to the manufacturer.

It is deeply to be regretted that we cannot keep up agricultural societies on our shore—The present state of things calls loudly upon every man who expects to live here, (and who does not wish to do so if he can) to turn his attention to our present condition and prospects; and to make vigorous efforts to prevent our lands from being abandoned. Who will be disposed to purchase land, which he sees no prospect of cultivating or renting out after a few years.

If some influential farmers would move in the matter, I feel assured that a general sense of the necessity of the case would prompt the other farmers to unite in any feasible project to advance the general interest. Before I close I would most respectfully propose that meetings be had in every county to petition congress not to remove the duty on foreign grain except in cases of scarcity. These reflections are hastily thrown out for the consideration of Eastern Shoremen by

A FARMER.

Queen Anne's County Jan 20.

The Globe (the Government paper) of the 27th confirms the rumor to which we alluded in our last paper, that General Santa Anna was to be conveyed to Mexico in a public vessel. The *Pioneer* (one of the smaller class of vessels, lately built for the exploring voyage) has been selected for the purpose, and is to take the Mexican General and his Secretary (Col. Almonte) to Vera Cruz. They will embark at Norfolk, where the Pioneer arrived a few days ago from the East.—*Nat Intel.*

CONGRESS.

Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.

Washington, Jan. 27, 1837.

There was a personal scene of the most intense and painful interest in the House to day which has however terminated without any serious consequences, and in a manner regarded by their friends as perfectly honorable to the parties The unfinished business of yesterday was the bill introduced by Mr. Bell, to secure the freedom of elections. This having been taken up at the proper time. Mr. Bell was proceeding to address the *House* but gave way, with his usual courtesy, to several gentlemen who wished to make reports from standing committees, present resolutions, &c. Mr. Jarvis asked the consent of the House to take up a bill providing for the enlistment of boys in the naval service of the United States. Mr. Bell objected. Mr. Jarvis made some remarks in support of his proposal to take up the subject at that time, & referring to the objection of Mr. Bell, and the wish of that gentlemen to go on with the consideration of his bill, he used language which Mr. Bell and many gentlemen around him construed into an impeachment of his motives, and an imputation that Mr Bell sought only to gratify his personal feelings in a speech.

Mr. Bell rose instantly and said, 'it is *false!*'—The Speaker instantly called to order. Mr. Jarvis then replied, in substance, that he had nothing more to say in that place.

There was a dead pause for several minutes. Mr. Mercer, with a view to bringing about a reconciliation, called upon Mr. Jarvis to restate the language he had used, so that the *House* might judge of the extent of the provocation as well as of the retort.—Mr. Jarvis replied that he would not retract, nor say one word more, until the language applied to him was withdrawn.

Mr. Mercer then offered a resolution that both the gentlemen should be called upon mutually to pledge themselves to the House that they would not prosecute a quarrel growing out of the words employed by them. At this point, it was suggested that Mr. Bell had misunderstood the language of Mr. Jarvis and that the latter had not intended to impeach the motives of the former. Mr. Bell then rose, and reciting the language which he understood Mr. Jarvis to use, namely, 'that the gentleman from Tennessee had submitted a proposition which he must know could not lead to any public good, but only to the private gratification of himself.' He said he could put no other construction on this, but that the gentlemen meant to impeach his motives and insult him. If, however, the gentleman would disclaim any such intention, he would withdraw the epithet he had used.—Several gentlemen rose in their places and corroborated the accuracy of the language of Mr. Jarvis, as recited by Mr. Bell, and agreed that they had placed the same construction on it Other gentlemen rose and stated their impressions as to the language employed, which were different in some respects from the construction of Mr. Bell; but there seemed to be a general concurrence that the words 'gratification of personal feeling' were employed, and these, you will understand, were exactly the words to which Mr. Bell took the strongest exception, and used the strongest expression in order to repel

A great deal of desultory conversation arose in which several members participated, making appeals to Mr Jarvis to re state his language and to Mr Bell to withdraw his language. Mr Phillips made an earnest and solemn appeal to both gentlemen and to the *House*, to have the matter reconciled. Mr. Peyton, in reply to these appeals, reminded the *House* of what Mr. Bell had voluntarily stated, and he now repeated in his behalf, that if Mr. Jarvis would say he did not intend to insult him he would withdraw all he said by way of retort Mr. Jarvis made no reply—but again a great deal of desultory conversation took place, which it is perfectly useless to report. Motion after motion was made to adjourn—it being regarded by many members that the speeches made by the members who had interposed only made matters worse, and rendered a proper understanding more and more difficult. But these motions were successively defeated. There was a general desire to have the matter settled before the House should adjourn. In the mean time, while all was confusion around, both the gentlemen interested sat with perfect coolness and composure, and left it to their friends to talk.

At last Mr Wise, who had been assiduously engaged during the whole day, in the business of the investigating committee, and who had not been present during the proceedings until late in the day arose and took up the part of peace-maker—and I am glad to say, with perfect success. Mr Jarvis yielded to his solicitations. He rose, and said he was prepared to make an explanation provided the objectionable epithet was withdrawn so as to enable him to make it Mr. Wise then said that in the name of his friend he would withdraw it *for the time*, and for the purpose of affording Mr. Jarvis the opportunity to explain.

Mr Jarvis replied that the load was now taken off, and he could proceed easily. He proceeded then to give an explanation every way satisfactory. He meant to say that Mr. Bell must be aware that his proposition was of such a character that no legislation could grow out of it—and that it could have no effect but to gratify personal feeling"—but he did not mean to make any personal reflection or allusion, on the contrary, notwithstanding political differences, he had always held the character of Mr. Bell in high respect

Mr. Wise repeated this disclaimer to the House, and said he thought his friend (Mr. Bell) ought to be perfectly satisfied with it—and therefore in his name he withdrew the objectionable language.

Mr. Mercer congratulated the House on this happy settlement of a painful subject; and on motion the House immediately adjourned.

D.

JUDGE DANA'S SPEECH.

The following is the *speech* or part of the speech of Mr. Senator Dana, on the expunging resolution.

"Andrew Jackson has no *equal*: his whole life is a *miracle*. See him in youth, a fatherless, friendless, pennyless boy, the son of a foreigner, a stranger in a strange land. Examine him in every stage of his existence, and we are impelled to exclaim, *wonderful man!* reared by Providence to guide the destimes of his country, and to exhibit the perfection and moral grandeur of human nature. I am not clear, sir, but it was necessary to the perfection of his character that he was thus violently assailed and condemned by this resolution."

"I said sir, that Andrew Jackson *stood alone*. Where can you find his fellow! Look among the sovereigns of the earth. Look where you will, and you look in vain. Go to the records of the *mighty dead*, and where will you find his equal? Shall such a man stand condemned on the records of this honorable Senate, *unaccused* and *unheard?* "*Tell it not in Gath.*"

The *perfection* of General Jackson's character is singularly derived—if scripture is to be

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11031-0098.jpg