

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY MORNING, BY EDWARD MULLIKIN, PUBLISHER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.

THE TERMS ARE TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER ANNUM PAYABLE HALF YEARLY IN ADVANCE.

From the Chillicothe Advertiser. TO POLAND. "O, bloodless picture in the book of time Sarmatia fell, unwet, without a crime."

Sarmatia, Sarmatia! the knell of thy name, Or note of thy triumph rings fearful and high; Around thee, above thee, the sword and the flame Flash bright, & burst fiercely from Muscovy's sky.

Red—red, be the earth with the blood of the Pole, Ere he yield to the slave of a Muscovite lord; Loud—loud be his shout where the battle clouds roll, Till the glory of ages gone-by is restored!

Let Vistula's torrent glow deep with the gore— Of the ruthless invader, whose banner unfurl'd To Tyranny's darkness, thy plains would restore.

May the torch which first glowed through the valleys of France, Burst ruddy and bright on the plains of the north, And the far gleaming flash of its lightning glance,

MR. CRAWFORD'S REPLY. I will now explain the reason why I consider the Vice President the author of the notes appended to my letter in the Telegraph.

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."

Journal formally denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson for his late conduct."