laws; and that, whether it was or not, the Senate of 1834 had no authority to pass judgment upon it: what right has the Senate of 1837, a component part of another Congress, to pronounce judgment upon its predecessor? How can you who venture to impute to those who have gone before you an unconstitutional proceeding escape a similar imputation? What part of the Constitution communicates to you any authority to arraign and try your predecessors? In what article is contained your power to expunge what they have done? And may not the precedent lead to a perpetual code of defacement and restoration of the transactions of the Senate as consigned to the public records?

Are you not only destitute of all authority, but positively forbidden to do what the expunging resolution proposes? The injunction of the Constitution to keep a journal of our proceedings is clear, express, and emphatic. It is free from all ambiguity, no sophistry can prevent the explicit language of the instrument; no artful device can elude the force of the obligation which it imposes. If it were possible to make more manifest the duty which it requires to be performed, that was done by the able and eloquent speeches, at the last session, of the Senators from Virginia and Louisiana, (Messrs. Leigh and Porter,) and at this of my colleague. I shall not repeat the argument. But I would ask, if there were no constitutional requirement to keep a journal, what constitutional right has the Senate of this Congress to pass in judgment upon the Senate of another Congress, and to expunge from its journal a deliberate act there recorded? Can an unconstitutional act of that Senate, supposing it to be so, justify you in performing another unconstitutional act?

But in lieu of any argument upon the point from me. I beg leave to cite for the consideration of the Senate two precedents: one drawn from the reign of the most despotic monarch in modern Europe, under the most despotic minister that ever bore sway over any people; and the other from the purest fountain of democracy in this country. I quote from the interesting life of Cardinal Richelieu, written by that most admirable and popular author, Mr. James. The Duke of Orleans, the brother of Louis the 13th, had been goaded into rebellion by the wary Richelieu. The King issued a decree declaring all the supporters of the Duke guilty of high treason, and a copy of it was despatched to the Parliament of Paris, with an order to register it at once. The Parliament demurred, and proceeded to what was called un arret de partage. "Richelieu, however, could bear no contradiction in the course which he had laid down for himself;" [How strong a resemblance does that feature of his character bear to one of an illustrious individual whom I will not further describe!] "and hurrying back to Paris with the King, he sent, in the monarch's name, a command for the members of the Parliament to present themselves at the Louvre in a body and *on foot*. He was obeyed immediately; and the King receiving them with great haughtiness, the Keeper of the Seals made them a speech, in which he declared that they had no authority to deliberate upon affair of State; that the business of private individuals they might discuss, but that the will of the monarch in other matters they were alone called upon to register. *The King then tore with his own hands the page of the register on which the arret de partage had been inscribed, and punished with suspension from their functions several of the members of the various courts composing the Parliament of Paris.*" How repeated acts of the exercise of arbitary power are likely to subdue the spirits of liberty, and render callous the public sensibility to the fate which awaits us, if we had not been recently unhappily taught in this country, we may learn from the same author. "The finances of the State were exhausted, new impositions were devised, and a number of new offices created and sold. Against the last named abuse the Parliament ventured to remonstrate; but the Government of the Cardinal had for its first principle despotism, and the refractory members were punished, some with exile, some with suspension of their functions. All were forced to comply with his will; and the Parliament, unable to resist, yielded, step by step, to his exactions."

The other precedent is supplied by the archives of the democracy of Pennsylvania in 1816 when it was genuine and unmixed with any other ingredient.

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States and of Pennsylvania, in regard to the obligation to keep a journal, are substantially the same. That of the United States requires that "each House shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, except such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of the members present, entered on the journal." And that of Pennsylvania is, "each House shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and publish them weekly, except such parts as require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members, on any question, shall, at the desire of any two of them, be entered on the journals." Whatever inviolability, therefore, is attached to a journal, kept in conformity with the one Constitution, must be equally stamped on that kept under the other. On the 10th February, 1816, in the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, "the Speaker informed the House that a constitutional question being involved in a decision by him yesterday, on a motion to expunge certain proceedings from the journal, he was desirous of having the opinion of the House on that decision, viz. that a majority can expunge from the journal any proceedings *in which the yeas and nays have not been called*."—Whereupon Mr. Holgate and Mr. Smith appealed from said decision; and on the question, is the Speaker right in his decision? the members present voted as follows: yeas three, nays seventy-eight. Among the latter are to be found the two Senators now representing in this body the State of Pennsylvania. On the same day a motion was made by one of them (Mr. Kelly, and read as follows: "*Resolved*. That in the opinion of this House no part of the journals of the House can be expunged even by *unanimous* consent."

The Senate observes that the question arose in a case where the yeas and nays had not been called. Even in such a case there were but four members out of eighty-two that thought it was competent to the House to expunge. Had the yeas and nays been called and recorded, as they were on the resolution of March, 1834, there would not have been a solitary vote in the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania in support of the power of expunging. And if you can expunge the resolution, why may you not expunge also the recorded yeas and nays attached to it?

But if the matter of expunction be contrary to the truth of the case, reproachful for its base subserviency, derogatory from the just and necessary powers of the Senate, and repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, the manner in which it is proposed to accomplish this dark deed is also highly exceptionable. The expunging resolution, which is to blot out or enshroud the four or five lines in which the resolution of 1834 stands recorded, or rather the recitals by which it is preceded, are spun out into a thread of enormous length. If runs, whereas, and whereas, and whereas, and whereas, &c into a formidable array of nine several whereases. One who should have the courage to begin to read them, unaware of what was to be their termination, would think that at the end of such a tremendous display he must find the very devil. It is like a kite or a comet, except that the order of Nature is inverted, and the tail, instead of being behind, is before the body to which it is appended.

I shall not trespass on the Senate by inquiring into the truth of all the assertions of fact and of principle contained in these recitals. It would not be difficult to expose them all, and to show that not one of them has more than a colorable foundation. It is asserted by one of them that the President was put upon his trial, and condemned, unheard, by the Senate in 1834. Was that true? Was it a trial? Can the majority now assert, upon their oaths, and in their consciences, that there was any trial or condemnation? During the warmth of debate, Senators might endeavor to persuade themselves and the Public that the proceeding of 1834 was, in its effects and consequences, a trial, and would be a condemnation of the President; but now, after the lapse of near three years, when the excitement arising from an animated discussion has passed away it is marvellous that any one should be prepared to assert that an expression of the opinion of the Senate upon the character of an Executive act was an arraignment, trial, and conviction of the President of the U. S.!

Another fact, asserted in one of these recitals, is, that the resolution of 1834, in either of the forms in which it was originally presented or subsequently modified prior to the final shape which it assumed when adopted, would have been rejected by a majority of the Senate. What evidence is there in support of this assertion? None. It is, I verily believe, directly contrary to the fact. In either of the modifications of the resolution, I have not a doubt that it would have passed! They were all made in that spirit of accommodation by which the mover of the resolution has ever regulated his conduct as a member of a deliberative body. In not one single instance did he understand from any Senator at whose request he made the modification, that, without it, he would vote against the resolution. How, then, can even the Senators who were of the minority of 1834, undertake to make the assertion in question? How can the new Senators, who have come here since, pledge themselves to the fact asserted in the recital of which they could not have had any conusance? But all the members of the majority—the veterans and the raw recruits—the six years men and the six weeks men—are required to concur in this most unfounded assertion, as I believe it to be. I submit it to one of the latter (looking towards Mr. Dana, from Maine, here by a temporary appointment from the Executive,) whether, instead of inundating the Senate with a torrent of fulsome and revolting adulation poured on the President, it would not be wiser and more patriotic to illustrate the brief period of his Senatorial existence by some great measure fraught with general benefit to the whole Union? Or, if he will not or cannot elevate himself to a view of the interests of the entire country, whether he had not better dedicate his time to an investigation into the causes of an alien jurisdiction being still exercised over a large part of the territory of the State which he represents? And why the American carrying trade to the British colonies, in which his State was so deeply interested, has been lost by a most improvident and bungling arrangement?

Mr. President, what patriotic purpose is to be accomplished by this expunging resolution? What new honor or fresh laurels will it win for our common country? Is the power of the Senate so vast that it ought to be circumscribed, and that of the President so restricted that it ought to be extended?—What power has the Senate? None separately. It can only act jointly with the other House, or jointly with the Executive. And although the theory of the Constitution supposes, when consulted by him, it may freely give an affirmative or negative response, according to the practice, as it *now* exists, it has lost the faculty of pronouncing the negative monosyllable. When the Senate expresses its deliberate judgment, in the form of resolution, that resolution has no compulsory force, but appeals only to the dispassionate intelligence, the calm reason, and the sober judgment of the community. The Senate has no army, no navy, no patronage, no lucrative offices, nor glittering honors to bestow. Around us there is no swarm of greedy expectants, tendering us homage, anticipating our wishes, and ready to execute our commands.

How is it with the President? Is he powerless? He is felt from one extremity to the other of this vast Republic. By means of principles which he has introduced, and innovations which he has made in our institutions, alas! but too much countenanced by Congress, and a confiding People, he exercises uncontrolled the power of the State. In one hand he holds the purse, and in the other brandishes the sword of the country, Myriads of dependents and partisans, scattered over the land, are ever ready to sing hosannas to him, and to land to the skies whatever he does. He has swept over the Government, during the last eight years, like a tropical tornado. Every department exhibits traces of the ravages of the storm. Take, as one example, the Bank of the U. States. No institution could have been more popular with the people, with Congress, and with State Legislatures. None ever better fulfilled the great purposes of its establishment. But it unfortunately incurred the displeasure of the President; he spoke and the bank lies prostrate. And those who were loudest in its praise are now loudest in its condemnation. What object of his ambition is unsatisfied? When disabled from age any longer to hold the sceptre of power, he designates his successor, and transmits it to his favorite! What more does he want? Must we blot, deface, and mutilate the records of the country to punish the presumptuousness of expressing an opinion contrary to his own?

What patriotic purpose is to be accomplished by this expunging resolution? Can you make that not to be which has been? Can you eradicate from memory and from history the fact that in March, 1834, a majority of the Senate of the United States passed the resolution which excites your enmity? Is it your vain and wicked object to arrogate to yourselves that power of annihilating the past which has been denied to Omnipotence itself? Do you intend to thrust your hands into our hearts, and to pluck out the deeply-rooted convictions which are there? Or is it your design merely to stigmatize us? YOU cannot stigmatize US.

Ne'er yet did base dishonor blur our name.

Standing securely upon our conscious rectitude, and bearing aloft the shield of the Constitution of our country, your puny efforts are impotent, and we defy all your power. Put the majority of 1834 in one scale, and that by which this expurging resolution is to be carried in the other, and let truth and justice, in Heaven above, and on Earth below, and liberty and patriotism, decide the preponderance.

What patriotic purpose is to be accomplished by this expunging resolution? Is it to appease the wrath, and to heal the wounded pride, of the Chief Magistrate? If he be really the hero that his friends represent him, he must despise all mean condescension, all grovelling sycophancy, all self degradation and self-abasement. He would reject, with scorn and contempt, as unworthy of his fame, your black scratches and your baby lines in the fair records of his country. Black lines! Black lines! Sir, I hope the Secretary of the Senate will preserve the pen with which he may inscribe them, and present it to that Senator of the majority whom he may select, as a proud trophy, to be transmitted to his descendants. And hereafter, when we shall lose the forms of our free institutions, all that now remain to us, some future American monarch, in gratitude to those by whose means he has been enabled, upon the ruins of civil liberty, to erect a throne, and to commemorate especially this expunging resolution, may institute a new order of Knighthood, and confer on it the appropriate name of The Knight of the Black Lines.

But why should I detain the Senate, or needlessly waste my breath in fruitless exertions. The decree has gone forth. It is one of urgency, too. The deed is to be done—that foul deed which, like the blood-stained hands of the guilty Macbeth, all Ocean's waters will never wash out. Proceed, then, to the noble work which lies before you, and, like other skilful executioners, do it quickly. And when you have perpetrated it, go home to the People, and tell them what glorious honors you have achieved for our common country. Tell them that you have extinguished one of the brightest and purest lights that ever burnt at the altar of civil liberty. Tell them that you have silenced one of the noblest batteries that ever thundered in defence of the Constitution, and bravely spiked the cannon. Tell them that, henceforward no matter what daring or outrageous act any President may perform, you have forever hermetically sealed the mouth of the Senate. Tell them that he may fearlessly assume what powers he pleases, snatch from its lawful custody the public purse, command a military detachment to enter the Halls of the Capitol, overawe Congress, trample down the Constitution, and raze every bulwark of freedom; but that the Senate must stand mute, in silent submission, and not dare to raise its oppressing voice. That it must wait until a House of Representatives, humbled and subdued like itself, and a majority of it composed of the partisans of the President, shall prefer articles of impeachment. Tell them, finally, that you have restored the glorious doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance. And, if the People do not pour out their indignation and imprecations, I have yet to learn the character of American freemen.

Legislature of Maryland.

FROM ANNAPOLIS.

Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.

Annapolis, Feb. 18, 1837.

In Senate, to-day, Mr. Cottman submitted a preamble accompanied with resolutions on the subject of the resolutions of Vermont, transmitted to the Senate yesterday.

The preamble recites the Vermont resolutions, which declare that neither Congress nor the state Governments have any constitutional right to abridge the free expression of opinions and their transmission through the public mail; and further, declaring that Congress does possess the right to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. C.'s resolutions declare that neither Congress nor the State Governments have any constitutional rights to indulge in the expression of opinions which may endanger the Union, or infringe the rights of individuals, or to interfere with any of the domestic institutions of any of the States—and further declaring that Congress does NOT possess the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the opinion of the Legislature, the abolition of slavery in said District by Congress, would be a violation of the terms and conditions upon which the cession of the District was made to the Federal Government, and, in the event of such violation, the territory included within said District ought, and of right will, revert to the States of Virginia and Maryland respectively. They lie on the table.

In the House—Mr. Gheiscler made a report upon the memorial of the Tobacco Planters, praying such legislation as may afford relief to the Tobacco Trade, accompanied with a bill supplemental to the act relating to the inspection of Tobacco.

Mr. Alexander, from the committee on ways and means, made a report declaring that it was inexpedient, at this time, to act on the memorials of the Frederick County Bank and the Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank, praying an extension of their charters from 1845 to 1860, inasmuch as said charters had several years to run. It lies on the table.

The bill to continue in force the charter of the Eastern Bank of Baltimore, was passed,

The bill providing for the election of Sheriff of Carroll county, was also passed.

Considerable local legislation transpired in both Houses.

Extract of a letter to the New York American, dated

WASHINGTON, Tuesday night.

Chief Justice Taney has not soiled his ermine by following the example set him by President Jackson; *he* has bowed, as was fitting he should, to the supremacy of the laws—to the power of the people, through their representatives,—and, having testified before the Select Committee, authorized to act by the House, he has, by his example put *his* seal of condemnation on the doctrines of R. M. Whitney followed out successively by the President and his household troop. In evidence, given by him recently, to explain the nature of the Treasury Bureau, about to be established, he states that Whitney had schemed it himself; but that *he* had not favored it, neither had he given him any prospect, if he had or should, that he would place him at the head of such a responsible office.

The Chief Justice, therefore, corroborates the statement attributed to him, as is said, on the authority of Mr. Francis Thomas: "that, knowing Whitney well, whilst he was at the head of the Treasury office, he W., should not hold." It was to elicit this refusal of Mr. Taney, that the question was put by Mr. Peyton, which galled the *Immaculate* so much, as to have induced him to adopt the line of contumacious conduct, which led to the after scenes before the Committee.

It was this that led to the grand FARCE, now enacting by the House, and worse than all, to the moral degradation, to be exhibited in the partisan triumph *decreed* in his favor.

Well it is that the office of Chief Justice is independent of Executive favor—were it otherwise, the continuance of the incumbent therein would not be worth an hour's purchase.

To the Disciples of Murray.—Which is the more appropriate expression—to-morrow *is* Friday, or to-morrow *will be* Friday?

AMERICA

CHRONICLE.

"SALUS POPULI SUPREMA EST LEX."

DAVID P. HOGE--EDITOR

Cambridge, Maryland:

SATURDAY MORNING, MARCH 4, 1837.

☞ The Orphans' Court of this county will sit on Monday week, 13 h instant.

The Hon. John S. Spence has been re-elected to the Senate of the United States, for six years from this day.

What a signal illustration of the vile servility and mean spirited compliance of the administration members of the American Senate, was afforded by the course pursued in reference to the letter of Gen. Jackson to Mr. Calhoun! Something, said Mr. Grundy—something, responded Mr. Walker, was due to the Senator from South Carolina, for the high-handed, unexampled and despotic interference of the Executive with the rights of the members of the Senate. These tame and willing instruments of the Chief Magistrate did not, indeed, in this manner characterize the strange epistle of his Majesty; they dared not do so. But yet *something*, said they, was due to the Senator from the South, whose privilege as a legislator was outrageously assailed, by the highest officer of the Executive branch of the Government. Now, why did not those staunch and undoubted friends of the President specify that "something?" Why did they not, believing that something was due, propose a resolution asserting the rights of the body of which they are members? Because, forsooth, it would have offended their master, whose ire none may provoke with impunity; and because their lips are forever sealed against the utterance of a word that might seem to reflect the slightest censure upon him whose high behest they are at all times ready to obey. That midnight act of degrading subserviency, to the perpetration of which, in defiance of the most sacred injunctions of the Constitution, they prostituted themselves on the memorable sixteenth of January, has bound them, hand and foot, in fetters, from which nothing but a redeeming sense of justice, of honor and of constitutional obligation rising superior to the grovelling spirit of party, and the debasing sycophancy of the times, can ever extricate them. It was not to be expected that men enchained, as are the administration members of the Senate, would rise to vindicate the honor, the rights, and privileges of that body against the encroachments of one, whom they style "immaculate," and who, of course, in *their* estimation, can do no wrong. Well have they been described as sitting "like criminals with halters about their necks."

With regard to this letter of the Chief Magistrate, we have heretofore spoken of its character. We looked upon it as an insulting, undignified, and disgraceful exhibition of the wrath of an irascible and imbecile old man. But when we take into consideration the station which that man occupies—when we contemplate Andrew Jackson as the highest Executive officer of a free people, entrusted with a certain defined and circumscribed range of powers and duties, stepping out of his sphere and stooping below his dignity, for the purpose of deterring a member of the Legislative Department of the Government, from the free expression of his opinions, we are led seriously to reflect on the dangerous consequences to which such unauthorised conduct *may* lead, if tamely submitted to, by the body whose rights are thus wantonly outraged. The conduct of the President is without precedent. Members of the Legislature have been held *responsible* for words spoken in debate, and by those, too, high in authority. But never before did a President of the United States, who holds in his hands *all the powers* of one branch of the Government, attempt to use those powers for the suppression of the liberty of speech in the *other* Departments. Never before did a President "*demand*" a retraction of words spoken in debate, because they were offensive to *him*—and that, too, upon pain of exposure to popular contempt, ridicule or odium. It is the threat contained in the President's letter, designed as it was to overawe the member to whom, it was addressed, which, in our view, renders it most objectionable. Take back your words, or I will expose you—retract what you have said, or at my bidding a torrent of popular indignation shall overwhelm you. Shall a Chief Magistrate address such language as this to a legislator in a country which boasts of its free institutions? And will it be pretended that this is not a direct, a bold and palpable interference with the freedom of debate? Slaves may defend such conduct, because they are forced to bear it without a murmur; *freemen* never can.

Reuben M. Whitney, who was recently brought to the bar of the House of Representatives, for a contempt, which consisted in refusing to appear before the investigating committee, has been discharged. The House did not inquire into the offence charged against this distinguished or rather notorious personage, but into the conduct of two of its own members (Wise and Peyton) on another occasion, and while acting on a different committee from that before which Whitney had refused to testify. This is the way the House of Representatives administers justice! The majority are, no doubt, anxious to get rid of two exceedingly troublesome fellows; and hence they are ready to seize any occasion that may present itself of doing injustice to the objects of their hate as well as fear. It is somewhat remarkable that Whitney could go before the Committee of which the Virginia and Tennessee gentlemen are members, *immediately* after Mr. Peyton had threatened to put him to death if he dared to insult him, and yet *a day or two* afterwards was seized with such a wonderful fear and trembling that he could not think of risking his precious life by appearing before them. Reuben was certainly very discreet.

OFFICIAL.

Navy Department, Feb. 18, 1837.

In consequence of the subjoined letter from Lieut. Samuel W. Downing, of the U. S. Navy, declaring his conviction of the impropriety of his charges and publications against Capt. Thomas ap Catesby Jones, president of the court martial convened in the city of Baltimore, in the month of July, 1835, for the trial of Purser William P. Zantzinger, and against the members of the said court, and their proceedings—his regret that such charges and publications were so made and published by him, and his retraction of them—the President of the United States has been pleased to remit the sentence of the General Naval Court Martial convened in the city of Washington on the 27th of December last, for his trial, and Lieut. Samuel W. Downing has been restored to duty.

Washington, Feb. 13, 1837.

Sir: It having been intimated to me that a retraction is required of my communication, published in the Army and Navy Chronicle, in which it is alleged, or implied, that Captain Thomas ap Catesby Jones violated his oath as a member of the court martial, &c. and that he drew up the sentence of the court, and procured a vote by which the offensive remarks applied to me were made a part of their finding, and inserted in their proceedings; the same having been adjudged by the late court martial, upon an examination of the evidence laid before them to be a libel; and being convinced of the impropriety of those publications I have no hesitation in saying that I submit cheerfully to the opinion of the court, and regret that the charges were made and published, and now retract them, and request that they may be considered as not having been made, hoping that the frankness of my declaration may be satisfactory to the department, to Captain Jones, and the other members of the court, upon whose conduct, these publications reflect.

Most respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. W. DOWNING.

The Hon. Mahlon Dickerson,
Secretary of the Navy.

TRADE AND IETERCOURSE WITH THE WEST.

The following article, from the Wheeling Times of Saturday, contains some wholesome hints and deductions, in reference to Western Trade and Intercourse and the means of assuring the latter to Baltimore, which are well worthy attention in this quarter:

Baltimore Papers, &c.—We notice with much pleasure, (partly from the fact that we have taken an especial liking to the papers of Baltimore,) that the newspapers of the south and west, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Indiana, Ohio, &c., are bearing testimony to the fact that they obtain all their news from the east and south sooner by the Baltimore papers than by any others. This fact speaks well for the enterprize manifested by the Baltimore editors in obtaining and publishing the earliest information. It moreover shows circumstances still more important which are connected with it. These papers are obtained for the whole west by the mail through Wheeling, and their arriving earlier at a given point from the east proves that the mail runs quicker from the Atlantic cities to the Ohio through Baltimore and Wheeling over the national road, than by any other route.

If papers are carried by mail quicker by this route, it conclusively proves that passengers can go quicker, not only quicker to Baltimore from any given point, than they can to Philadelphia or New York, but that they can go to the latter cities over the national road and through Baltimore quicker than in any other way. This will apply to any place from the north line of Ohio to New Orleans, as the advantage gained is between the Ohio river and Baltimore. This advantage is from two to seven days in time, and a proportionable amount in ease and comfort.

There is another consideration attached to this case, which is equally plain and palpable. If the mail, the traveller, or transported merchandise, gains time by going through Baltimore from New York or Philadelphia, is it not evident that the route is the best of any for further internal improvements? If the best way of reaching New York from the whole west, is through Baltimore, what is the propriety in being compelled to pass over, and carry goods over the two hundred miles between Baltimore and New York, or the one hundred between Baltimore and Philadelphia? If it is practicable for stages to go from the Ohio river to Baltimore with more ease and less expense than to Philadelphia or any other sea-port, why is not the route for a rail road equally preferable? Furthermore, why are the friends of internal improvement in Baltimore taking their attention in part from the one great work, and paralizing their power, by turning it to other points, the inferiority of which they themselves must acknowledge; but which will have the effect of delaying, if not totally crippling the principal improvement

Adam Clarke very correctly says that, so far as the mind is concerned, there is no danger of having too many irons in the fire; but where money and labor is brought in requisition, it is very common to have quite too many in the fire, and by having them so it is a very common occurrence that all of them burn. One Æsop, of olden time, has also a very good fable that applies to the situation of our friends in Baltimore, with more force, we fear, than they are aware. He says: a certain dog had a bone in his mouth, upon which we are to suppose there was a tolerable supply of meat, and that the said dog, in crossing a stream, saw the shadow of his bone, and by an avaricious desire to obtain the shadow lost his *own bone*. We fear this is something the situation with Baltimore. Are they not grasping at too many bones, and will they not lose all unless they combine on one great effort.

New York had only one work on hand when she completed her canal.

VENDUE.

BY virtue of an order of the Honorable Orphans' Court of Dorchester County, will be sold, at public sale, on

Wednesday, 15th of March, instant, at the late residence of Samuel Keene, of E., deceased, all the said deceased's

Personal Estate,

(negroes excepted,) consisting of Horses, Cattle, Sheep and Hogs; Farming Utensils; Household and Kitchen Furniture; one four wheel Carriage and Harness; one Gig and Harness; two Wagons; two Carts; a very fine Sleigh; blade and top Fodder; a quantity of Pork and Lard; crop of Wheat on the ground, and many other articles unnecessary to mention.

The sale will commence at 10 o'clock, A. M; and the terms will be made known on the day of sale. Attendance given by

ROBERT F. TUBMAN,
Adm'r. of Saml. Keene, of E., dec'd.

F March 4 2w

☞ P. S. The Farm whereon the deceased resided will be offered for rent on the above mentioned day; and, on the same day, several negroes will be hired out. R. F. T.

NOTICE.

The Commissioners of the Tax for Dorchester County, will meet at their office, in the west end of the Court House, at Cambridge, on Monday the third day of April, and continue to set twenty days successively, (Sundays excepted,) to hear appeals and note transfers. By order,

WILLIAM REA, Clerk.

Commissioners' Office, Cambridge.
March 4 3w

PHILADELPHIA

Saturday News.

FINDEN'S TABLEAU.

This elegant and costly annual was published entire in the last number of this paper. The price at the bookstores is *twelve dollars* per copy. To our subscribers it was furnished at a fraction less than four cents! Something of a difference, truly. Since the 26th of November, we have published in the Saturday News, the following annuals:

Friendship's Offering—store price,			$4 00
Forget me-not,	"	"	5 50
The Keepsake,	"	"	5 00
Gems Of Beauty,	"	"	8 00
Flowers Of Loveliness,	"	"	8 00
Heath's Book Of Beauty,	"	"	8 00
Finden's Tableau,	"	"	12 00

Making a total of nearly fifty dollars worth of books, in little more than two months.—Not one of these annuals, nor indeed any part of them, was given to the American public, except in the form they were offered by the booksellers, previous to our reprint of them; so that our readers not only have received the choicest productions of English literature, but they have received them in advance of all other republications.

During the period we have been engaged in publishing these annuals, we have not neglected the variety necessary to give interest to a periodical like ours. With the aid of *mammoth double numbers, extracts, and supplementary sheets*, we have been enabled to publish an immense amount of miscellaneous reading, and to keep our readers constantly advised of all important news—foreign and domestic. Since the first day of January of the present year, we have published *original* contributions, prepared expressly for our paper, by the following distinguished writers:

Mrs. Frances Anne Butler.
Miss L. H. Medina,
Alexander Dimitry, A. M.
Willis G. Clark,
Thomas G. Spear,
Rev. W. T. Brantley, D.D.
William A. Smith,
Rev. J. H. Clinch,
Miss C. E. Gooch,
Dr. R. M. Bird,
N. C. Brooks, A. M.
Hon. Robert T. Conrad,
Richard Penn Smith,
William E. Burton,
Constant Guillou.

Besides many others, whose names we are not at liberty to mention, but whose articles have been generally admired and praised.

Since the commencement of this publication, we have carefully avoided furnishing to our readers matter with which they were already familiar. Our object has been to give both freshness and interest to our columns, and such shall be our aim hereafter. In part fulfilment of this purpose, our English agent is at this time engaged in selecting for our use a catalogue of foreign books, suitable for republication in our paper, none of which are known on this side the Atlantic. Some of these will, no doubt, reach us by early arrivals.

We have also securred the services of a number of valuable correspondents, in addition to those mentioned above, whose assistance will keep us constantly supplied with the choicest original matter. We shall, moreover, make a proposition to the public in a short time, which we feel confident will greatly enhance our means of making the *News* what we are determined it shall be—the most varied, interesting, agreeable and instructive—as it is now, undeniably, the cheapest weekly paper published in the United States.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc6044_1_63-0116.jpg