R'S
D CHERRY,
c Preparation
rk and Tar.
rld for the cure of
Bleeding of the
achitis, Influen-
in and Weak
ide, Liver
stages of
O N.
ses deemed utterly
its vast superiority
ry. It has always
ption," being form
from Wild Cherry
e thickly scattered
evail. We give a
power from a cate
the New York A-
er physicians to die
for months on the
s a sort of bony sub
two months, being
few bottles of this
1844.
. New York cured
anding, certified to
wer, D D.
not slept lying down
in a sitting posture)
siness in the most
ica, L. I. cured of
esville N Y. entirely
ral debility of eigh
n, cured a child of
the lungs after he
vain.
in the history of
e the most convin
ubt—fully establish
y, we select the fol
ukeepsie Gagle one
the State of New
f his own name,
s, of very delecate
uary, 1842, with se
oduced spitting of
erous and alarming
tment and care she
mer. But on the
more violently than
to walk, and was
er every day and
th consumption; at
n of improvement,
TAR'S BALSAM
e took ane it seem
nd and before it was
fect health, which
time, without the
isease.
nder my own obser
to the facts."
FROM A POST-
ED
ne, April 26, 1844
: At the request of
and vicinity, who
l liver complaints, I
ppoint some one in
er's Balsam of Wild
en, as there is none
m this. I have no
ady sale' if it were
t too much expense
months since with
stage of consump
in this section of
n advertised in Au
HERE.
bottle of it, which
much that I sent
as also taken, and
ell for six years as
who have inquired
the Balsam had,
e in this vicinity,
to you.
mail wether you
to whom, mordor
be had.
rs, &c.
WORTH, P. M.
g that eo medicin
f any kind whate
BALSAM OF
ate of Waterville,
James Sage is well
munity. It certain
he sale of the Bal
cures truly flatter
fully,
. D. PALMER.
CURE EVER RE
, April 23, 1843.
ober, 1841, I was
side, near the liver,
s, and was follow
abscess, inwardly,
caused me to throw
tter, and also much
his, I applied to a
he could do but
Mercury Pills which
at they could do me
e then procured by
me any good—and
ion still continued
so offensive that I
seized with a vio
me to raise much
—and my disease
g worse, until Feb
ry was given up;
die of a GALLOP
moment, when my
s close, I heard of
y, and got a bottle,
by the use of only
y pains were remo
od and corruption
s my health was
work at my trade,
his time I have en
MAS COZENS.
subscriber, one of
the said county,
firmed according to
all things true.
y of April, 1843,
J. P.
of this BALSAM
cription,"
ts, as it is prepar
stances which the
own land for wise

The Cambridge Chronicle.

JOSEPH R. BUCKLESTON,] [Editor & Proprietor

NEW SERIES—VOL. 9. CAMBRIDGE, MD—SATURDAY MORNING, MARCH 7, 1846. NUMBER 23.

TERMS.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING

At two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable half yearly in advance. No subscription will be received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper discontinued until all arrears are paid.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the usual terms, and where the number of insertions is not limited, they will be continued until direction to omit them is received, and charged accordingly.

POETRY.

GIVE THANKS—GIVE THANKS.

BY CHARLES SWAIN.

When softly came the wreathing Spring
To dance around the rosy ring,
And still, to raise, the early flowers,
The sky flung down, refreshing showers—
The Lord was pleased to bless our land:
To scatter round His favors kind;
Then praise Him for His liberal hand,
And all His mercies bear in mind!

When Summer came with twilight eyes,
Her path a rainbow in the skies:
Her hands with fragrance dropping sweet,
And roses gathered at her feet—
She brushed the blossoms from the trees,
And left the fruit exposed there,
To court the sunshine and the breeze,
And ripen in the balmy air;

Then Autumn claimed the sovereign day,
And swept the clustering leaves away:
But nourished still the branching root,
And filled the earth with ruddy fruit!
Then raise your fervent hearts to Heaven,
Give gracious thanks to God above,
Who all these glorious gifts hath given:
And praise Him for His mighty love.

And also, on the stormy deep
Our God did watchful vigil keep;
He bade the billows rage no more,
And brought the vessel safe to shore!
Then bless Him for his wondrous grace:
Give thanks for His Almighty care:
And bending low, with veiled face,
Lift up the voice of praise and prayer!

Give thanks to God! Glad homage pay!
He swept destruction from our way;
Forbade that fell disease appear,
And bless'd us with a healthy year!
Then sing loud praises o'er and o'er:
All honor to the Lord Devine—
For He hath overflowed our store
With waving corn and flashing wine!

But more, my gentle friends, have we
To lift the heart and bend the knee:
For mercies rich, and blessings kind,
That cheered the soul, and raised the mind,
Behold! with links of sovereign love,
The Lord our young affections bound;
So light and comfort from above,
Shall ever in our home be found!

With reverent awe, and holy fire,
Exalt the heart, and strike the lyre!
Oh! sing to Him a sacred song,
To whom all sacred things belong!
With fervent love and humble voice,
We'll breathe our thankful prayers to Heaven;
Praise our kind Father, and rejoice
For all the favors He hath given!

RE-APPEARANCE OF Dr. PUSEY.

The celebrated Dr Pusey, at the expiration of a three years' suspension, appeared in the pul of the Cathedral Church, of Oxford; and so eat was the anxiety to hear him, that the strug es at the door for admission savored more of the eatre than the house of prayer. The attendance ceeded all previous experience. Great numbers me purposely from London, and the reporters the daily press were sent down to place the ser on before the world. Dr. Pusey, it will be re mbered, was suspended for preaching the Ro n Catholic doctrine of the eucharist. The in val appears to have worked no change in his ws, for the doctrines of the priestly remission of s and of the "real presence" were as strongly isted on in the present as in the condemned ser on. The one, in fact, was a continuation of the er; and Dr. Pusey seemed delighted to have opportunity of reapeating his opinions in the sence of the judges—the university authori s. Whether any or what notice will be taken this last move on the part of the tractarian lea , who is left alone like the "last rose of sum r," blooming in solitude, remains to be seen.—e "leading journal" yesterday has a pungent ck upon Dr. Pusey, which may be regarded as erably clear evidence that his views had little mpathy with the popular mind in England.

Communication.

[For the Chronicle.]

MR. EDITOR:—I have read in the "Chronicle" of the 31st. of last month and the 14th inst., the remarks in reference to the Oregon question of a writer who signs himself "Civis." The design of the writer appears to be first, to show that war will not follow the giving the notice to Great Britain of the termination of the joint occupancy, and secondly, that if it should follow such notice, that the United States are at least in as good condition for such an event as Great Britain.—To the the latter proposition I shall offer no objections—but I must say it appears to me strange that any man pretending to ordinary intelligence can say this government is as well prepared for war as Great Britain, when we have not a sufficient Navy even to protect our sea-board, and the latter has, in addition to the vessels required for the protection of her numerous and distant colonies, more than three times the number of our vessels of war. I sincerely hope we shall never be forced to the test of measuring lances with Great Britain—and should the period ever arrive it will be time enough to discuss this point. The present humiliating position of our country, forced upon us by a reckless and imbecile administration, is painful enough in a moral point of view, without instituting any comparison in regard to her physical strength, which could only add a darker hue to the picture. But I consider the proposition of "Civis" in reference to giving the notice utterly untenable, and that the people may have the benefit of my humble opinions in making up their judgment upon the policy of Mr. Polk, I respectfully solicit the use of your columns as the medium of communication with the public.

What are the facts in relation to this question? The Oregon territory is claimed by both Great Britain and the United States. Previously to 1818 negotiations had taken place between the two governments with a view to the settlement of the boundary line between them, and during which the United States offered the 49th parallel, which Great Britain rejected. These negotiations terminated in the Convention of the 20th of October 1818, by the 3rd. article of which it is provided that the territory, together with its harbors, bays rivers, &c. &c. shall be free and open for the term of ten years to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two Powers; that the agreement is not to be construed to the prejudice of either; "the only object of the high contracting parties, in that respect, being to prevent disputes and differences among themselves." In 1824 another abortive attempt at negotiation was made, and during which the United States again offered the 49th parallel, and it was again refused by Great Britain.—In 1827 after another ineffectual attempt at negotiation, a convention was concluded which provided for the indefinite extension of the provisions of the 3rd. article of the convention of 1818, first referred to; and also that either party might terminate it at any time it might think fit, by giving one year's notice after the 20th of October 1828. In 1844 negotiations were again renewed, and during their pendency Mr. Polk again offered the 49th parallel, which Great Britain in turn again refused to accept. The latter has recently proposed to refer the whole matter to arbitratio which Mr. Polk declines, and insists upon our claim to the whole of the territory.

It is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the title of either party to the territory in dispute. I believe the title of the United States up to the 49th parallel is good, and that beyond that it is superior to Great Britain's, but imperfect and defective, and that Great Britain has rights beyond the 49th parallel which, although inferior to those of the United States, are yet too strong to be surrendered without an effort to retain them, and should be respected by this government. A portion of this disputed territory is inhabited by British subjects, and within its limits the Hudson's Bay Company have erected thirty forts. Great Britain has the right of joint occupancy of the territory with the United States, secured to her by the Convention of 1827.

How then stands the case? Here is a territory which has been in dispute for upwards of thirty years and which the United States have offered to divide on three several occasions, thus recognizing the right of Great Britain to a portion of the territory. It is now proposed to give notice of the termination of this joint occupancy—the doing which says "Civis" will not produce war, because it is but the "exercise of a right or privilege expressly recognized by the Convention;" and the assertion of the President of "an abstract right to the whole of Oregon," coupled as it is with the offensive tone of the press and public sentiment in the United States, cannot be recognized as an "official act," and in no possible view can it be considered as a cause of war unless connected with "forcible injuries." It will be recollected that the Convention of 1818, by its very terms, was entered into with a view to "prevent disputes and differences" between the parties. At that time, after years of fruitless negotiation, and after Great Britain had rejected the offer of the 49th parallel, if negotiation had then closed, what would have been the result? Either we would have had to *force* England from her joint occupancy, or have ignominiously abandoned our rights. To avoid such an issue what did Mr Monroe do? He entered into a joint convention for ten years. I humbly ask then, was not that measure a *substitute for war?* Or, what is far more wretched and withering, if war was not to ensue, was it not a substitute for national disgrace? After the second prompt rejection of the result of nine years' negotiation by England, our government again consents to an indefinite renewal of the treaty—and why? For the same cause that induced its original formation—to avoid the unpleasant alternative of an appeal to arms; for Great Britain positively, and three times, had refused to yield a joint occupancy of that territory, and, of course, a failure to renew the convention would have forced us either to *drive* her from it, or to *abandon* it to her. I repeat then, that all the facts and circumstances connected with it establish the fact that the convention of 1827, like that of 1818, was a *substitute for war.* And this view is strengthened by the language of Mr. Adams, who has been more prominently connected with the negotiations and treaties than any other man—first, as Secretary of State in 1818 & 1824, and as President of the United States in 1827. Upon this subject, at the last session of Congress, he said: "We had agreed to suspend a final decision on this "subject by the Convention of 1818, twenty seven "years ago. Why had we come to that conclusion at "that time? Because *we did think there was some substance in the claim of the British Government*, and "that it was a fair and honorable proposition to her to "compromise—*to give up our claim as far as the 49th "degree, rather than fight for it.*"

Now, I would simply ask, if the notice be given will Great Britain abandon her rights in Oregon? My opinion is she would not. We have seen how pertinaciously England has adhered to her position upon the Oregon controversy from its very incipiency—so much so as to hold out the alternatives of War or joint occupancy to our government at two different periods; and can any sensible man now expect that after a portion of that territory has become peopled by her subjects, and the field for profitable operations of an important and powerful trading association—after a peaceful occupancy for upwards of thirty years, during which time she has erected forts for the protection of her subjects—and after the repeated implied recognitions on the part of the United States of her rights in the territory—Can it be expected, under such circumstances, that England will give up the commercial advantages she now enjoys in Oregon, and quietly and submissively abandon her rights to this Government? If any man believes so, he must either be ignorant of her history, or exceedingly unhappy in his deductions. England surrender her rights in Oregon without a struggle! Never! It like Byron's Corsair, she has but "one virtue amid a thousand crimes," that virtue is her prompt and indomitable courage. Search her history from the days of Alfred to the present, and not a single instance can be found of her abandonment of her rights without a fierce and sanguinary struggle.—And in respect to the Oregon controversy she would be found true to her ancient name, and would maintain her rights at whatever sacrifice of blood and treasure it might cost. Sir Robert Peel has declared in his place in Parliament that the English government has "rights in Oregon which they are resolved and prepared to maintain;" and after this official declaration from her highest functionary, England could not abandon her claims to Oregon without national disgrace; and he who expects it is blind to the teachings of her history.

There is one fact which "Civis" either lost sight of in his remarks, or purposely declined to consider. I refer to the language of Mr. Polk in relation to the measures by which the notice is to be followed. Now I am free to confess that the *mere giving the notice* would not *per se*, produce war—but I presume "Civis" did not mean to argue such a proposition. To suppose our government could act so contemptible and timid a part, as to give the notice for the termination of the joint occupancy, and not follow it up by measures to enforce our rights to the "whole of Oregon" would be an imputation upon its dignity and courage which it does not merit, even under the weak and bungling administration of Mr. Polk. Nor will I do so much violence to the candor of "Civis" as to suppose he argued the point in any other light than in reference to consequent measures. And certainly, it would be an aspersion upon his sagacity, to suppose he regarded the mere giving the notice as being all that was necessary to secure to our government the "whole of Oregon."

I wish it therefore to be understood that I am not endeavoring to show that the merely giving the notice would, of itself, produce war, nor do I wish it to be supposed that I am considering the remarks of "Civis" as relating to the simple fact of notice, alone, but also to the consequences growing out of it. My design is to prove that the giving the notice, and the adoption of the necessary measures to enforce our rights, would inevitably involve the two countries in War.

If notice, then, be given to Great Britain of the termination of the joint occupancy of the Oregon territory, it must either be followed by an enforcement of our rights, or an inglorious abandonment of them.—What is the language of the President upon this point? He has withdrawn the offer last made to Great Britain, and says "no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected." He therefore recommends the notice to be given, and then proceeds:

"At the end of the year's notice, should Congress "think it proper to make provision for giving that no-"tice, we shall have reached a period when the nation-"al rights in Oregon must either be abandoned or "firmly maintained. That they cannot be abandoned "without a sacrifice of both national honor and interest, is too clear to admit of a doubt."

It will be borne in mind that all negotiations between the United States and Great Britain upon this subject, have closed, and it is therefore in this connexion that a notice is proposed to be given—given under the express declaration that the *national rights* in Oregon (which mean, since the withdrawal of our offer, the "whole of Oregon") *"must be firmly maintained;"* and the further declaration "that no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected."

It may be contended that the giving the notice will facilitate an early settlement of the question by negotiation, but will Great Britain, proud and powerful as she is, offer to negotiate under such a notice? Can she do it without sacrificing her national honor? A brave, high-spirited man will never condescend to offer an explanation under the threats of another individual, and the same rule applies as well to nations as to individuals. And where would be the use of her offering to negotiate, when our title to the "*whole* of Oregon" is asserted, and Mr. Polk says "no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected"? Even could England act so pusillanimously as to offer to negotiate under a threat of expulsion from the territory, our government would be bound by its position to reject such offer—and if it did not, it would lower us still more in the estimation of other nations, to see us take a position a second time for the "whole of Oregon" and then abandon it to the claims of England.

It will thus be perceived that the notice would essentially close the door to all negotiation in the *interim* between the giving the notice and the expiration of the twelve months, and at the expiration of the twelve months our rights in Oregon would either have to be "abandoned," or "firmly maintained." Let us suppose, then, the notice to have been given, and the twelve months to have expired. We cannot beleive (puerile and undignified as has been Mr. Polk's conduct) that the United States would "abandon" their rights, and must therefore conclude they would "firmly maintain" them. Nor can we suppose from the former policy and history of England—from the pertinacity with which she has insisted upon her rights in Oregon, and her implied readiness to fight for them on two occasions, when she was much worse prepared for war than at present—that she will surrender her rights. On the contrary we must beleive as Sir Robert Peel says "that they have rights in Oregon which they are resolved and prepared to maintain." What then would be the inevitable result? The government of the United States, bound by its solemn and deliberate pledge to enforce our rights to the "whole of Oregon" proceeds to evict Great Britain from her possession and joint occupancy; and the latter, equally bound to maintain her rights, resists the attempt on the part of the United States. If this would not be war, I have yet to learn what war is—and if such would not be the necessary and inevitable result of giving the notice, and the adoption of measures for the enforcement of our rights, I frankly confess I am incapable of drawing a just conclusion from established premises.

But, says "Civis," to "give the notice is but the exercise of a right or privilege, expressly recognized by the Convention." This is all very true, but I would ask how the joint occupancy of indefinite extension could ever be terminated, except by the incorporation of such a provision in the Convention? It was hoped and desired that the dispute would eventually be amicably adjusted, and each party put in exclusive possession of its respective rights; and to this end it was indispensable that the articles of the Convention should contain such a provision. But we should keep in view the fact that this Convention of joint occupancy was a *substitute for war*, and if the United States *annul* this substitute for war, it must adopt the only remaining alternative. We entered into the arrangement of joint occupancy rather than fight for Oregon—hence it follows, if we abrogate that arrangement nothing remains but either to enforce our rights with the sword, or ignominiously abandon them.

I have thus endeavored to take a dispassionate view of the position of our government upon the Oregon question, and having shewn, I think, conclusively that if the notice be given and followed up by the necessary measures to enforce our rights, war must inevitably ensue, the inquiry naturally suggests itself, How came the United States in such a dilemma? The answer will be found in the rash and indiscreet and novel action of the late Democratic Presidential Convention upon the subject of the Oregon controversy. That convention saw fit, formally, to resolve that "our rights to the whole of Oregon is clear and unquestionable," and that the re-occupation of that territory is a great American question &c. &c. The query at once suggests itself—if this be a great national question, why belittle it to a mere party football? Why thrust it into the arena of a Presidential controversy? Was the American title to Oregon a party question? Had the subject been mentioned at the Whig Convention? No! Nothing had been said regarding Oregon by the Whig party at any time; it had been left, where it should ever have been left, to the constituted authorities of the land, speaking and acting in the name of the whole people. But this great national question was seized upon by the Democratic party to make votes, and they made them. Mark the result. Mr. Polk is elected, and when he comes to declare the principles and measures of his administration, he finds himself hampered and embarrassed by the resolution of the Baltimore Convention in respect to this great national question—a matter entirely transcending party; and he stands before the world in the attitude of the constrained advocate of a foregone conclusion—maintaining our right to the disputed territory in accordance with a pledge made for him before he came into office, and in order to pave the way for his election. He, therefore, in his inaugural address declares our right to the whole of Oregon to be "clear and unquestionable." Here then is to be found the secret of the difficulties our government has encountered in the settlement of this vexed question, and I hope it will teach "scurvy politicians" in all future time the folly and wickedness of making great national questions the subjects of partisan excitement and warfare. Ill starred is that people whose rulers, having won power by ministering to the worst and most dangerous passions, find themselves goaded ever by the fatal necessity of pandering afresh to the evil spirits they have aroused and stimulated.—Such a people must find in every decisive manifestation of the power of their authorities, new reasons to deplore that criminal ambition which seeks exalted station regardless of principle or public good, and that popular infatuation which leads nations to put their trust in those who thus play upon their weakness, at a fearful cost to their morals, their true dignity, their vital and lasting interests.

But, says the old man verdant" who edits the official paper, and the cry is re-echoed by the whole Democracy of the country. the decision and firmness of the President" have made England relax her haughty front, and evince a disposition to settle this question without a resort to arms. And pray when did England exhibit a different spirit in respect to the Oregon question? She has only insisted upon her rights, and has ever shewn herself ready to respect the rights of the United States. But is it true that the firmness and decision of Mr. Polk have accomplished any thing for the glory or interest of his country in regard to the Oregon question? We have seen that in his inaugural address he declared in a bravado manner our rights to the whole of Oregon to be "clear and unquestionable"—the necessity of doing which was imposed upon him by the pledge of the Baltimore Convention. But when he comes to practical decision upon the subject, he is forced to fling to the wind his bravado promise to exact the *whole*, and the party pledge which had been made for him beforehand. *He offers to give up nearly half of Oregon, provided we be allowed to keep the other half!* How weak and wavering, and vacillating, [illegible] fled, must [illegible] virtue of all [illegible] peared to the minds of British statesmen. How plausible the deduction, that the declaration of the British government that her rights in Oregon should be maintained, had struck terror to our government, and compelled it to recede from its position! Or, to put the most charitable construction upon it, how natural the inference that Mr. Polk had been staggered by the force of the British claim, and compelled, in conscience, to defer it. How easy the presumption, that when a President, so situated, could begin by professing so much, justice would give still more.

Such are the evils resulting to our country from the unworthy juggle performed in the Baltimore convention for the purpose of catching votes. It is a painful, a humiliating and melancholy reflection for an American citizen to indulge, that his country where honor is as dear to him as the "ruddy drops" that warm his heart, has been degraded from the high position she once occupied among the nations of the earth, and made to appear as the ambitious and unscrupulous panderer to an inordinate popular lust for territorial aggrandizement. It fills the mind of the patriot with the most direful forebodings, and causes him to tremble for the safety of his country, when great national questions are made the mere play things of party strife—and the policy of our government upon questions vitally connected with our honor and interests, is shaped to suit the views of a reckless and ignorant partisan caucus. I say ignorant because I feel assured that not half a dozen persons in the Baltimore Convention, that declared our rights to the whole of Oregon to be clear and unquestionable," were aware of the various grounds on which the claims of either the United States or Great Britain were supported. Until the appearance of Doct. Greenhow's book, I am convinced there were not fifty persons in the United States who understood the merits of the Oregon controversy. The knowledge was confined almost entirely to the American Plenipotentiaries and leading Statesmen who participated in the discussions from 1818 to 1827. The community felt no interest in the matter, and the documents relating to the controversy were never collected so as to have a united weight, until the publication of Doct. Greenhow's volume.

And now by way of conclusion let us take a retrospective glance at what has been said. I started with the proposition that the giving the notice would produce war. I have shewn that for upwards of thirty years England has tenaciously adhered to her rights in Oregon, and that she is bound by her public declarations to maintain those rights. I have shewn that Mr. Polk now claims the "whole of Oregon," and says "no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected." I have shewn that the Convention of 1827 was a *substitute for war*, and if the United States *annul* that substitute, we must adopt the only remaining alternative Now I submit to the common sense of every man, does it not inevitably follow that if the United States give the notice and thus close the door to all further negotiation, and follow up the notice, as they are in honor bound to do, with the necessary measures to enforce our rights to the whole territory, that war must ensue. If we attempt to *force* England from her foothold in Oregon will it not be an act of aggression, and will she not resist it? and what are acts of aggression and resistance but hostilities? Every man must admit the truth of the deduction, and contemplate with horror the awful results of such a step. The first act of aggression on our part to enforce our rights to the whole of Oregon, would be the signal of a fierce and sanguinary struggle which would only terminate with the sacrifice of thousands of valuable lives—the expenditure of millions of treasure—the destruction of our commerce the ruin of hundreds who are now living in comfort and plenty—the demoralization of the people—and our retardment in civilization for the next half century. The shriek of the orphan and the wail of the widow would resound throughout the land—our alms houses and hospitals be crowded with maimed soldiers—and the legacy of ignorance and vitiated morals entailed upon the youth of the country. And all for what? Honor—"that blood stained god at whose red altar sit war and homicide"—a point of honor not necessarily growing out of the question, but one forced upon the government by an ignorant political conclave for selfish and sinister purposes. The whole country must now be convinced that this question has been dragged into the political arena by the Democratic party for no purpose but to strengthen their present ascendency, and secure it for the future:—not the 49th or the 54th parallel of latitude, but a parallel of power in '48 was the one object of their belligerent resolutions and noisy declamations. They have raised the whirlwind, let them direct the storm.

The circumstances of this Oregon controversy belong to history. Men now "see through a glass darkly," but when public excitement has subsided—when the dominion of passion and prejudice has been terminated, and reason again ascends her throne, then, and not till then, may we expect an impartial judgement upon the conduct of Mr. Polk and those who used the Oregon question for party purposes. If the sturdy sense of patriotism and stern independence which once characterized the American people still remain, the sentence will be one of universal condemnation. After the expiration of his presidential term Mr. Polk will be consigned to obscure retirement—here to spend the remainder of his days with the indignant hissings of an outraged people ringing in his ears—an object of pity rather than contempt—the victim of his own corrupt and unscrupulous ambition.

More anon.

A CALM OBSERVER.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc6044_1_64-0373.jpg