# EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE—"Literature well or ill-conducted is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown—RELIGION purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty—Morality refines the Manners—Agriculture makes us Rich, and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all."

VOL. XXVIII. EASTON. (MD.) SATURDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 20, 1845. NO. 51.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
*Saturday Morning,*
BY
Alexander Graham.

**TERMS.**

TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS
Per Annum, payable half yearly in advance

*ADVERTISEMENTS*

Not exceeding a square inserted Three times for ONE DOLLAR, and TWENTY-FIVE CENTS for every subsequent insertion.


*From the Edinburgh Witness, Sept. 14.*

## DR. STARK ON SMALL POX.

ADAM & CHARLES BLAKE, Edinburgh.

We referred some time since, among our literary notices, to a little work by Dr. Stark, of this city, on the "Probable Cause of the continued Prevalence and Fatality of Small-Pox."* The importance of the Subject, however, demands a more lengthened notice; there are few, if any, political matters that bear half so directly on the interests of the human family as the great medical question discussed in the phamplet of Dr. Stark.

It is a fact that of late years deaths from small-pox greatly increased in the British dominions. The formidable typhon that seemed to have received its death wound from the discovery of Dr. Jenner, appears to be fast recovering its old vigor, and assuming its old character. Its ravages have of late been steadily increasing in fatality and extent. During the last ten years the number of deaths from small-pox in Ireland alone has averaged nearly six thousand per annum; and the small pox mortality of London stood last year rather above the average of the first ten years of the present century. These are startling facts, and they have given rise to theories and opinions which have, it is too certain, a direct tendency to increase the evil. By some it is now held that the vaccinating virus has lost much of its protective efficacy; on the mysterious but undoubted principle through which some diseases, that originate no one knows how, after proving a scourge of the human race for ages and centuries, at length become greatly modified, and then wear out and disappear By others it is suspected that the matter originally derived from the cow has been much lowered in its protective qualities, by its transmission, for a long series of years, through the human subject; while yet a third class contend, that at no time was the protection which the virus afforded other than temporary; that in the course of a few years its effects wear out, leaving the system open to infection as before; and that in order to render it efficient, the same individual must be content to submit to periodic vaccinations, repeated every seven or ten years. In accordance with this last view, the Prussian, Hanoverian & Russian Governments have had their whole standing armies re-vaccinated. Fresh matters has been procured from the cow, by the class who hold that, that originally derived has been deteriorated in the progress of its frequent transmissions; while by the class who find, in the increase of small pox, evidence that the vaccinating virus is becoming *effete* on the general principle specified, it has been seriously proposed to return to the fatal, and surely most unjustifiable, plan of inoculating with the virus of the disease which it is the general object to extirpate, or at least rob of its terrors. The state of uncertainty indicated by these conflicting theories among men to whose medical opinions the public attach importance, has not been without effect in shaking the general confidence in the protective virtues of vaccination. The practice has in consequence, become less frequent among the masses of our British population; and we find it conclusively demonstrated by Dr. Stark in his phamplet, on a careful and highly elaborate statistical basis, that in exact proportion to its neglect and decline, has small-pox again revived as one of the fatal diseases of the country.

The truths educed by his researches are of the highest value. In the first place, after previously establishing the fact of the increase of small pox in Great Britain, Dr. Stark goes on to show that there is one special class of Britons, not less exposed to the disease than any other, among whom no increase has taken place. When a recruit is examined for the army, one of the points which the medical examinator first sets himself to ascertain is, whether he has been either vaccinated, or has had small pox, and if found unprotected, he is vaccinated forthwith. Every soldier in the British army has thus been either vaccinated or has had small-pox; and our soldiery are found, in consequence, to resist small pox, even when living in constant intercourse with a people among whom it is committing deadly ravages. This we deem so very important a fact that we must submit it to our readers, quoting from Dr. Stark, in the statistic form:

"From the Government Statistical Reports of the Sickness, Mortality, and Invaliding among her Majesty's Troops,' extending from 1817 to 1836 inclusive, we learn that the dragoon regiments & guards, with an aggregate strength during that period of 44,611, and a total mortality of 627 lost only three cases from small pox.—The troops at Gibraltar with an aggregate t ength during that period of 60,269, and a total mortality of 1291, lost only one from small pox. In the West Indies, the British or white troops, with an aggregate strength, from 1817 to 1836 inclusive, of 86,661, and a total mortality of 6893, had not a single death from small pox, though several epidemics of small pox have ravaged the islands during that period. The black troops on the same station, with an aggregate strength during the same period of 40,934, and a total mortality of 1545, completely escaped that loathsome disease. At Bermuda, at the Mauritius, not a single death from small-pox occurred during these twenty years; and even the whole troops of Western Africa wholly escaped this disease, which was carrying off hundreds of the black unprotected population."

From several other important millitary stations the returns are rendered still more striking by accompanying statements, derived from other sources, of the deaths from small pox which took place among the people with whom the soldiery were in circumstances of constant intercourse. In Malta, for instance, where the British troops, from 1818 to 1836 inclusive, had an aggregate strength of 15,826, and a total mortality of 655; there occurred among them only two deaths from small pox; whereas in one of these years, 1830, the deaths among the partially protected inhabitants from this disease, out of a general mortality of 3107, amounted to 1169—fully one third of the whole. Again, in Ceylon, where, in one year 1819; there died of small pox of the native population 2945, the British troops in the whole twenty years, in which that year was included, lost but four. "Among the European troops of the southern division of the Madras army," says Dr. Stark, "not a single case of small pox occurred from 1834 to 1838 inclusive, though it prevailed to a considerable extent among the native inhabitants—Indeed, Mr. Morgan, in his Medical Report of the 57th regiment, published in the *Madras Quarterly Medical Journal* for April 1840, states, that although small pox almost constantly exists in Cannanore, or some of the neighboring villages in which the regiment was stationed, not a single case had occurred among the men of that regiment up to the date of that report." Facts such as these, in the present unfixed state of opinion regarding the exact value of vaccination, can we think, be scarce too highly appreciated; and the points which they serve to establish we find borne out by hardly less important auxilary evidence.—It has been ascertained, through the scheme of re-vaccination adopted among the Continental military, that the virus has its effect in as many cases when the individuals operated upon had been previously attacked by small pox, as when they had been previously vaccinated. "According to the official Report relative to the Re-vaccinations in the Hanoverian army for the years 1837-8 9," says Dr. Stark, "it appears that re-vaccination succeeded in only 11 per cent; and was only partially successful in 27 per cent.—completely failing in sixty two out of every hundred. In the army there were a certain number of men who, instead of being vaccinated, had had small pox.—They likewise were subjected to the general vaccination; and, as if nature wished to prove to disbelieving man, that, being *once* vaccinated, or having *once* had the small pox, were identical in preventing a subsequent attack of small-pox, vaccination succeeded with them in the same proportions as with those who had been previously vaccinated." At Wurtemburg, though the percentage of successful & unsuccessful cases was different, nearly the same proportional ratio was maintained between the instances of previous small pox & of previous vaccination. Of 100 vaccinated after small pox 32 cases succeeded, 26 were modified, and 42 failed; while of 100 vaccinated a second time, the number of cases which succeded were 31, the modified cases 25, and the failures 41. It is further shown, that when the disease is once introduced into a community, and assumes a malignant form even the individuals who had been formerly subjected to it cannot be regarded as completely protected.

"It is stated by M. Bousquet," says the Doctor, "that in Marseilles, during the year 1825, out of a population of 40,000 about 2000 had previously had small pox; yet of his number 20 were attacked a second time with that disease, and 4 died. The deaths were therefore in the proportion of 20 out of every 100 attacked or 1 out of every 500 of those who had previously had small pox. In the same population, 30,000 were vaccinated, and of this number 2000 took small pox, or modified small-pox (varioloid) of these only 20 died or in the proportion of 1 out of every 100 attacked or 1 out of every 1500 vaccinated. There are other instances adduced, in which the case is made out still more strongly in favor of vaccination. We find it stated by Mr. Crosse of Norwich, that "of 603 cases of small-pox which had been witnessed by him in that town during the course of his practice, no fewer than 297 had previously had small pox, while only 91 had been previously vaccinated." Who in the possession of facts such as these, would yield a moment's tolerance to the schemes of again returning to the alike dangerous and doubtful protection which inoculation affords?

It is further shown in this singularly valuable pamphlet, that rather more than 82 out of every hundred deaths which took place from small pox, in Edinburgh in the years 1839, 40 and 41, were those of persons under five years of age; that in Glasgow and Dundee, during the same period, rather more than 85 out of every hundred were under five, and that in Perth the per centage of deaths of the same class somewhat exceeded 87. In the records of the Canongate grave yard of Edinburgh, the ages as well as the diseases of the deceased are recorded. From the year 1780 to the year 1836 there took place the interments of 1068 persons who died of small pox, and of that great number only thirty-six were above five years of age. The English records of mortality yield a resembling result. In the Report of the Register General for 1838, we find that of 8706 cases of small pox, in which the ages were ascertained, no fewer than 7583, or rather more than 85 per cent, of the whole, were of children under five; and of this large per centage, both in England and Scotland, about four-fifths were under one year. It is chiefly among the un-vaccinated young, left unprotected by the cruel carelessness of their natural guardians, that this loathsome and fatal disease committed its ravages. Few possess an addequate idea of the great extent to which, through a still growing neglect, protection is imperatively required at the present time. Of 241 individuals, the members of 73 poor families residing in one parish in Edinburgh, Dr. Stark found that only 116—less than one-half of the whole—had been protected by vaccination. The proportion of unvaccinated here is, however, considerably above that of our population in general; the families visited by the Doctor belonged to the poorer and more reckless classes of a town population, and we may regard the average state of the case as better given by the recruiting statistics of the British army. English, Scotch, and Irish, during the year ending 31st March, 1844. Of 11,511 men enlisted and found fit for service 8418 had distinct marks of vaccination, 2,711 had marks of small pox, and 385 had no distinct marks of either. On these facts Dr. Stark shrewdly remarks—

It is shown by this statement, that of 11,511 men, taken in a manner at random, over the whole kingdom, more than a third had either already had small-pox, or were still liable thereto. In fact, it shows that only two thirds had been protected from small-pox by vaccination. But it proves more. It proves that of every hundred men of the ages of from eighteen to twenty (the usual ages of recruits,) who had not been vaccinated small pox had already seized ninty of them. So true is the observation of Duvilard, that of a hundred men of the age of thirty who have not been protected by vaccination, not exceeding four will be found to have escaped the small pox.

Facts so important as these, and based on so broad and sure a statistical basis, cannot be too extensively spread. It has been calculated, that ere the discovery of Jenner, small-pox in Britain and Ireland swept off annually from forty to fifty thousand of the inhabitants,—considerably more than twice the number the British lost at Waterloo; ann carelessness in the lower classes, in part the result of an inadequate estimate of the real value of vaccination in the middle and upper, is now threating to neutralize the blessings of the discovery, one of the greatest of modern times,—and to bring back to our country the sufferings and mortality of former ages. Nothing can more directly tend to avert the evil than the dissemination of sound views regarding both it and its great antidote, vaccination; and hence the importance of the pamphlet of Dr. Stark, which, will we trust, be a means of saving many lives, and preventing the endurance of much anguish bodily and mental. With the Doctor's suggestion for the extirpation of the disease we conclude.

"Every one who reflects on the subject; but especially on the statistical facts brought forward for the first time in this paper, as to the state of our population, with respect to vaccination, must be convinced that some more efficient measures must be used in order to secure the people from the ravages of small-pox. This could only be done efficiently by passing an act, obliging every medical practitioner or midwife who attends the birth of a child to see that child vaccinated, or give a satisfactory reason, such as the refusal of the parents for its non-performance. In order to carry such a measure into effect, it would be necessary to have a salaried officer under Government, to whom regular monthly, quarterly, or half yearly returns should be directed to be made from all such practitioners and midwives, under a severe penalty; and this Government officer should be bound to return to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and publish annually a list of the number of births and vaccinations, with such other particulars as might be desirable. This officer should also be director or superintendent of a central vaccine establishment in the Metropolis, were a constant supply of vaccine virus should be kept up and transmitted to applicants in all parts of the kingdom. Three such officers would be required, and three such central vaccine establishments,—one in London, one in Dublin, and one in Edinburgh; and if we reflect that such means would undoubtedly have the effect of efficiently propagating the benefits of vaccination, and consequently producing an annual saving of from 15,000 to 20,000 lives, all will admit that an annual grant of £5000 or £6000, which would probably cover the expenses of such establishments,—would be well bestowed."

*This Treatise originally appeared in the July No. of the Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal.

## THE OREGON QUESTION.

We are indebted to the New York Tribune for the subjomed digest of the official correspondence, between our own and the British Government, in relation to this vexed question. It presents the points of importance, necessary to be remembered, and will afford to the general reader, the information most to be desired!

The first is a letter from Mr. Fox, the British Minister, to Mr. Webster, United States Secretary of State, dated Washington Nov. 15, 1842, covering a copy of part of a letter from Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Fox, requesting that the United States Minister at London might be furnished with instructions to treat with such person as might be appointed by England, on the North-Western Boundary. Assuring Mr. Webster that England was ready to enter into a fair and equitable compromise of the difficulty.

Mr. Webster replies to Mr. Fox Nov. 25, 1842, informing him that such instructions would be given to the United States Minister at London.

Mr. Packenham writes to Mr. Upsher, United States Secretary of State, dated Washington, Feb. 24, 1844, intimating the anxious desire of the British Government to come to a speedy settlement, and proposing a conference.

Mr. Upsher to Mr. Packenham, Feb. 26, 1844, names 11 o'clock A. M. next day for said conference.

Mr. Packenham writes to Mr. Calhoun, July 22, 1844, announcing that the death of Mr. Upsher (on Feb. 28th) &c. had prevented prompt attention to the Oregon boundary and that now as Congress had adjourned it would be a pr per time to proceed with it.

Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Packenham, Aug. 22, 1844, appointing 1 o'clock P. M. next day for conference, concurring with the English sentiment in desiring a speedy settlement of the question.

Mr. P. to Mr. C. Aug. 22, '44 agreeing to the hour.

The conference was accordingly held on the 23d of August, 1844 and the Plenipotentiaries proceeded to examine the state of the question. Mr. Calhoun desired a proposal from Mr. Packenham, who said he would be able to make a definite one at the next conference and desired Mr. C. to be also ready with his proposal. Adjourned to the 26th August, when it again assembled. Mr. Packenham made a proposal to Mr. Calhoun which Mr. Calhoun declined. They then agreed that a more full understanding of their respective views was necessary to facilitate future proceedings. It was agreed that written statements of the views of both parties should be given before proceeding farther. It was also agreed that the American Plenipotentiary should make his statement at the next conference and when ready, give the necessary notice.

Attached to this Protocal is the offer of Mr. Packenham to take the 49th parallel of latitude to the Columbia River and the River to the sea; and also to make free to the United States any port or ports which they might desire on the mainland or on Vancouver's Island South of 49°.

Sept. 2d, 1844 the third, conference was held at the office of the United States Secretary of State. The American negotiator gave his views of the claims of the United States to the portion of the Territory drained by the Columbia as his grounds for declining the British Minister's proposal.

Sept. 12, 1844, the fourth conference was held at the same place, and the British Minister gave his views.

Sept. 20th, fifth conference Mr. Calhoun delivered a rejoinder.

Sept. 24th, sixth conference.

The British Minister stated he had read with due attention the rejoinder of the U. S. Plenipotentiary; that he did not feel authorized to enter into any discussion relative to the Territory North of lat. 49° which was understood by the British Government to form the basis of negotiation on the part of the United States as the line of the Columbia formed that of England. That his former proposal was offered by Great Britain as an honorable compromise and that it was made with the proviso that in no case in any further negotiations should it compromise or weaken the claims of Great Britain unless accepted by the United States.

Sept. 3d, '44—Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Packenham—declines Mr. P.'s proposal, as it would limit our possessions to narrower bounds than what we had a clear right to. Mr. Calhoun then enters into an able argument on our claims to the territory drained by the Columbia, arising from our proper right and those derived from France and Spain. The former he grounds as against Great Britain, on priority of discovery, exploration and settlement. The prior discovery is claimed for Captain Gray, a citizen of the United States, May 11, 1792, who gave the river its name. This discovery is opposed by those of Meares and Vancouver. The former sailed along the coast through which the Columbia flows, in 1788, in order to ascertain whether the river laid down in Spanish charts as "St. Roc" really existed, and he declares "we can now safely assert that there is no such river."—Vancouver, in April, 1792, explored the same coast. His own journal proves that he failed to discover the river. He even disbelieved Captain Gray's discovery. Gray gave a copy of his chart to Madia at Nootka Sound, and on Vancover's arrival Madia gave him a copy. Vancouver, guided by the chart, entered the Columbia Oct. 20, 1792.—The attempt to prove that Captain Gray sailed in a private, not a United States vessel, shows the strength of our claims.

Mr. Calhoun then proceeds to consider the discoveries of the Columbia's branches by Lewis and Clark, long before any British subject visited these parts, and asserts our clear right by the discovery of the mouth and head waters of the Columbia river.

He next describes the question of settlement by our citizens in 1809, '10, '11.—The taking possession by the British during the war, and restoration after peace.

He then proceeds, "We have added to our claims those of France and Spain by the Treaty of Louisiana and the Treaty of Florida. The cession of Louisiana gave an undisputed title to the summit of the Rocky Mountains and by *Continuity* to the Pacific, founded on the Treaty of 1763.

He then dwells on the argument of *Continuity*, instancing the contest between Great Britain and France which was terminated by the Treaty of 1763. The fact that Great Britain claimed this continuity for her colonies (now the U. States) forecloses her contesting this principle against us.

He then examines the treaty of 1763, which fixes the Mississippi as the boundary between Great Britain and France, extinguishing the claims of Great Britain West of that Boundary. The right of continuity was transferred to us by France in the Treaty of Louisiana. France held this right by the extinguishment of Great Britain's claim by Treaty of 1763.

He then proceeds to defend our claims on the discoveries of Spain which we have acquired. In place of conflicting with each other they naturally blend together forming a strong chain of title against all opposing claims.

He then takes up the restoration of Astoria and quotes the admission of Lord Castlereagh to Mr. Rush, admitting our ample right to be reinstated, and our right to possession while treating of title.—Our claims have since been strengthened, by increase of our population by emigration. He concludes by stating that the same cause which peopled the valley of the Mississippi will yet cause emigration across the Rocky Mountains, and that the whole region drained by the Columbia is destined to be peopled by us. Mr. Calhoun closes his able paper by stating that he refrains "from presenting the claims which the U. S. may have to other portions of the territory" than those drained by the Columbia River, and by renewing assurances of high consideration, &c. &c.

Sept. 12, 1844, Mr. Packenham writes to Mr. Calhoun in reply to the above.—That he has no evidence that Louisiana extended West to the Pacific, but that the Rocky Mountains was the Western boundary, for which opinion he quotes Mr. Jefferson. Even if the boundary did extend Westward of the Rocky Mountains, that France transferred to Spain in 1762, and Spain to England, by treaty between Great Britain and Spain in 1796, which abrogated the claims of Spain.

He denies that the claim of continuity can effect the claim of right. He acknowledges that Spain, in 1819, tranferred her rights North of 42 degrees, but that did not invalidate her former concessions in 1790.

In regard to the discoveries of Heceta and Gray they conflict, and if Heceta's claim be good it favors Great Britain owing to the treaty of 1790.

The United States had no claims when they became a nation. Those of France were worth nothing. He urges the commercial intercourse of Great Britain with the North-west coast, the voyages of Cook and Mears, the survey of the coast by Vancouver, which makes Great Britain's claims to discovery and exploration very strong. He sets the accuracy and authenticity of Cook and Vancouver's survey against the dicovery of the mouth of the Columbia by Capt. Gray. Of the exploration of Lewis & Clarke he says that McKenzie, a British subject, crossed the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific in 1793, and discovered the upper waters of Frazer's River, near lat. 49 deg., and puts this against Lewis and Clarke's.

He meets the authority of Lord Castlereagh by the despatch of Lord Castlereagh himself to the British Minister at Washington, when giving up Astoria, claiming the whole territory.

Great Britin and the United States are in joint occupancy; one cannot divest the other but by an equitable division of what is jointly occupied.

In claiming the Columbia as the boundary, Great Britain is not influenced by ambition of possessing large territory, but by considerations of utility if not of necessity, which cannot be lost sight of.

Mr. P. concludes by requesting a proposal from the United Sattes and statement of farther claims alluded to by Mr. Calhoun.

Sept. 20, 1844, Mr. Calhoun rejoins to this rebutting the British claims on the discoveries of Cook, Mears and others, on the Nootka Sound convention, and on McKenzie's explorations. The Frazer's River is an inferior stream and cannot effect the discovery of the Columbia.

The United States had the first settlement, had that right restored, were acknowledged to be in possession while treating of title, &c. Mr. C. also replies to the argument drawn from Jefferson, and reinforces the argument of continuity, and states that the United States must be considered as in possession of the whole of the territory drained by the Columbia while treating of title, in which character he insists on being considered, and not in the character of a joint occupancy merely. He can make no proposal based on the supposition of a joint occupancy. Their must be a full discussion of the title before proposals can be made. With the opinion that the United States have a clear title, the British proposal in the second conference falls far short of what they can accept.

As to our claims to other parts of the Territory than those drained by the Columbia, they extend as far as the Treaty of Florida with Spain can warrant.

Jan. 15, 1845, Mr. Packenham to Mr. Calhoun states that he has sent the discussions already had to his Government, but that, in the mean time, he is authorized to offer arbitration, leaving the choice of arbiters for after consideration.

January 21, 1845, Mr. Calhoun says he has laid the offer of Mr. P. before the President, and he cannot accede to the proposal. He hopes the question may be settled by negotiation. Arbitration might rather retard than expedite the settlement.

July 12, 1845, Mr. Buchanan having been appointed Secretary of State, and seeming to overlook the later proceedings and replies to Mr. P.'s letter of Sept. 12, 1844, rests our title on that of Spain, contending that at the date of Spain's transfer of her rights to us she had a good title to the whole of Oregon against Great Britain. The Nootka Sound Treaty conferred no right on Great Britain but to trade with the Indians, was transient in its nature, and did not touch the sovereignty of Spain over the territory. That it was annulled by the war between Great Britain and Spain in 1796, and has never since been renewed, and consequently Great Britain is destitute of any claim to the Oregon territory. Having defended these views at length, and enforced our title to the whole of Oregon, he says the joint occupancy treaty excepts our title from being impaired.

In this view of the subject the President, considering the action of his predecessors & embarrassed by their offer, to show also to the world that he is actuated by a spirit of moderation, *has authorized him* (Mr. Secretary B.) *to offer the 49th parallel to the sea as a boundary, with any port in Vancouver's Island South of that latitude.*

July 29th, 1845, Mr. Packenham replies to Mr. Buchanan combats strongly Mr. B.'s position, particularly the claim of the United States to the Valley of the Columbia, to be older than the treaty of 1819. He examines the Spanish title—the American offer to divide the territory—the United States can found no claim, or discovery, or exploration or settlement prior to the Treaty of Florida, without admitting the principles of the Nootka Sound Convention, and the parallel claims of Great Britain. He contends that the Nootka Sound Convention continues in force, and even if that Convention had never existed, the claims of Great Britain are as good as those of the United States.

He then goes into a history of the discoveries, from which it might appear that American citizens discovered the Columbia River, while British navigators discovered Frazer's river, and Vancouver's Island. He repeats the British claims to the territory, *and declines the offer made by Mr. Buchanan.*

August 30, 1845, is the date of the last despatch. It is from Mr. Buchanan in reply to Mr. P. He quotes the declaration of Messrs. Huskisson and Addisonton that "Great Britain claims no exclusive sovereignty over any part of that [Oregon] Territory." Mr. B. makes a very long argument in reply to Mr. P. maintaining the rights of the United States to the whole of the Territory, and concludes by withdrawing his offer.

—Thus ends the correspondence, and the next step to be taken depends on the future.

The above abstract is but very limited; you may get it as soon as any other. The correspondence is able and voluminous—Mr. Calhoun's views are expressed in his usual strong and condensed language, and shows that the interests of the country might safely be trusted to him in the present crisis. I doubt whether some of the leaders of the party want his despatches published just at present, for fear they might make it appear that he is the fittest man to take the head of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

---

*Architectural Novelty.*—The large stores lately built at the head of Foster's wharf, Boston, are roofed in a noval manner—an invention of necessity. A writer in the Boston Courier thus describes the improvement:

"Two enterprising builders have erected at the head of Foster's wharf, on Broad street, five large stores, and covered them with bricks instead of slate, from necessity rather than from choice; for their great depth about one hundred feet, would have required thirty feet elevation for a pitched roof. About eighty feet of these roofs have a small descent, just enough to shed the water. We are thus indebted to accident, for an important improvement a real fire proof roof—all the more important, considering the growing compactness of our city buildings. These roofs are made very stiff and double-boarded, then covered with tarred paper laid on with hot pitch, shingle fashion, three thicknesses. This operation

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11032-0789.jpg