General Advertiser.

REPUBLICAN STAR AND

VOL. XXXI. EASTON, (MD.) TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 6, 1830. NO. 45...1512.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY MORNING
BY
THO. PERRIN SMITH.

TERMS

Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per Annum payable half yearly in advance.—No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.

Advertisements are inserted three weeks for *One Dollar*, and continued weekly for *Twenty-Five Cents* per square.

SALE OF LANDS.

On WEDNESDAY the 18th day of August next, will be sold on the premises, at public sale, to the highest bidder, the following lands, late the property of Lloyd Nicols deceased, consisting of a neat FARM, adjoining Mount Pleasant House, and sundry valuable WOOD LOTS, all within about three or four miles of the Town of Easton.

That is to say:—One Farm of about 123½ acres of cleared arable land and fine meadow, with about 98 acres of Wood and Timber conveniently annexed; having on it a small wooden Dwelling House, with a Barn and Granary.

The land is a kind soil, and containing an excellent body of Meadow and Marle, is capable of being made highly productive and valuable—perpetual streams of flowing water pass thro' it, and it is well adapted to the growth of all kinds of crops and stock; the situation is high and healthy, the neigbbourhood very excellent, and it is a convenient distance from Easton, the Third Haven Creek and the Choptank River.

Also sundry lots of wood land consisting of about 10 acres each—many of them finely timbered, and the others having good portions of timber and generally heavily wooded. Persons desirous of purchasing are invited to view these lands as now laid off—they are worthy the attention of Farmers and Speculators.

Also, on Friday following, being the 20th August, will be sold on the premises several lots in the town of Easton on Harrison Street near the old Market House.

Terms of Sale.—The purchasers are to pass bonds with approved security bearing date from the sale, to pay one fourth of the purchase money in nine months from day of sale with interest on the whole purchase money from the day of sale—another fourth part in eighteen months from the day of sale with interest on the whole balance of purchase money unpaid—another fourth part thereof in twenty-seven months from the day of sale with interest on the whole balance of the purchase money unpaid—and the remaining fourth part thereof in thirty-six months from the day of sale with interest on the whole balance of the purchase money unpaid—conveyances to be executed upon the payment of the purchase money and interest. Possession given to purchasers upon execution of their bonds. For further information apply to

SAMUEL T. KENNARD, Agent.

june 29 8w

CHANCERY SALE.

In pursuance of a decree of Talbot county Court, sitting as a Court of Chancery, the subscriber, as Trustee, will offer for sale at public auction, on the 19th July next, at the front door of the Court House, in the town of Easton, at the hour of 3 o'clock, P. M. of that day, all the Real Estate of which Isaac Jenkinson, late of Talbot county, lately died seized; being part of a tract of land on which the said Isaac died, and on which William Jenkinson now lives.—There are about 200 acres of land to be sold, with extensive Timothy Meadow, highly improved.—Also, a proper proportion of valuable Timber Land sufficient for the Farm, with commodious Brick Buildings and other necessary improvements, such as a smoke and other out-houses.

This property is situated within a mile and a half of Easton. Any person can examine the premises by applying to William Jenkinson and Peter Tarr, who reside thereon.

Terms of Sale—The purchaser or purchasers will be required to give bond with good and sufficient security approved by the Trustee for the purchase money, bearing interest from the day of sale—a credit of twelve months from the day of sale.

All persons having claims against the estate of said deceased, are hereby advised to exhibit them, with the proper vouchers thereof, to the said Court of Chancery; otherwise they will be excluded from all participation in the proceeds of said estate.

GEORGE W. NABB, Trustee.

june 22 4w

PUBLIC SALE.

By order of the Orphans Court of Talbot county, will be offered at Vendue, on TUESDAY, the 6th of July at the Court House door, in Easton, the following articles, to wit: 1 Secretary Desk, 1 Mantle Clock, 1 set Gilt Dining china, 1 Silver Coffee pot, 1 pair andirons, 1 pair Shovel and Tongs, 1 High post Bedstead, and 1 Silver watch.

Terms of Sale.—For all sums of and under $5, the cash will be required. For all sums above $5, a credit of six months will be given the purchaser giving note, with approved security, bearing interest from the day of sale. Sale to commence at 3 o'clock, P. M. and attendance given by

WM. K. LAMBDIN, Adm'r.
of Joseph Haskins, deceased.

june 29 2w

Constable's Sale.

By virtue of a writ of venditioni exponas to me directed at the suit of Isaac Atkinson, against Edward Roberts, will be sold on SATURDAY, the 17th day of July next, at the Court House door in the town of Easton, between the hours of 1 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon, to wit:—One negro boy called Dick, to serve until he is twenty-one years old, seized and taken as the property of said Roberts, and will be sold to satisfy the above mentioned venditioni exponas, and the interest and cost due and to become due thereon. Attendance given by

WM. H. FAULKNER, Constable.

june 22 4w

SHERIFFALTY.

Wm. E. SHANNAHAN solicits the suffrages of the Voters of Talbot county at the ensuing election for the Sheriffalty.

june 15 w

MEDICAL AND CHIRURGICAL FACULTY OF MARYLAND.

At the Annual Convention of the Faculty, held on the 7th June, 1830, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

Dr. Robt Goldsborough of Queen Anne's, President.
John Fonerden, Recording Secretary.
Henry W. Baxley, Corresponding Secretary.
William W. Handy, Treasurer.
Jas. H. Miller, Orator.

MEDICAL BOARD.

Examiners for the Western Shore.

Dr. Thos. E. Bond,	Dr. H. W. Baxley,
J. Buckler,	J. Fonerden,
P. Snyder,	E. G. Edrington.
J. L. Yeates,	

Examiners for the Eastern Shore.

Dr. T. Thomas.	Dr. J. Sykes,
P. Wroth,	Geo. Martin.
T. Denny,	

CENSORS.

For the Western Shore.

City of Baltimore.

1st Ward,	Dr. H. Johnson,
2d "	Lucius O'Brien,
3rd "	J. L. Yeats,
4th "	J. B. Taylor,
5th "	A. Dunan,
6th "	I. Cole,
7th "	E. G. Edrington,
8th "	E. Baker,
9th "	G. S. Gibson,
10th "	W. Hitch,
11th "	H. W. Baxley,
12th "	J. H. O'Donovan,
City of Annapolis,	J. Ridgely,
Frederick City,	D. Claude,

Counties.

Allegany,	Drs. J. M. Lawrence, S. P. Smith,
Washington,	W. W. Hitt, W. D. Magill,
Frederick,	W. Willis, J. Baer,
Baltimore,	—— Mosier, J. Marsh,
Harford,	W. Dallam, T. Worthington,
Anne Arundel,	J. Hopkins, J. H. Owings.
Montgomery,	O. Wilson, W. P. Palmer,
Prince Georges,	B. I. Semmes, C. Duvall,
Calvert,	T. Blake, G. Dare,
Charles,	W. Weems, W. Queen,
St. Mary's,	J. Stone, W. J. Edlin,

For the Eastern Shore.

Chestertown,	P. Wroth,

Counties.

Cecil,	Drs. J. W. Veazey, A. Evans,
Kent,	E. Scott, M. Brown,
Queen Ann's,	J. Crane, R Goldsborough jr.
Caroline,	M Keene, S. Harper,
Talbot,	S. T. Kemp, N. Hammond,
Dorchester,	W. Jackson, F. Phelps,
Somerset,	S. K. Handy, H. Hyland.
Worcester,	J. S. Martin, J. F. R. Gilliss

The following gentlemen have been admitted members of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty, since June 1st, 1829:

Jas. Bordley, M. D.	J. F. Williams, L. M.
Robt. Ferguson, M. D.	Chas. McLean, M. D.
Andrew Annan, M. D.	Mad. C. Klein, L. M.
F. Tilghman, M. D.	John A. Craig, M. D.
Tho. Slemmons, M. D.	J. M. Cromwell, M. D.
H. G. Doyle, M. D.	W. H. Oldham, M. D.
J. W. Teackle, M. D.	Chas. H. Lauh, M. D.
John S. Reese, M. D.	S. T. Taylor, L. M.
P. S. Chappel, M. D.	Wm. Marshall, M. D.
John A. Beucke, M. D.	Tho. H. Handy, M. D.
Josias Whitaker, M. D.	Moses L. Knapp, M.D.
Merryman Cole, L. M.	Thos. Littig, M. D.
Leonard Mackall M. D.	P. G. Jones, M. D.
A. R. Ober, M. D.	L. L. Dickson, M. D.
Jacob Shower, M. D.	Caleb Jones, M. D.
Fer. E. Chatard, M. D.	Thos. H. Bond, M. D.
Jacob Gillet, M. D.	

JOHN FONERDEN, R. S.

The Easton Star and Frederick Examiner will please copy the above.

june 22

TO THE FREE AND INDEPENDENT VOTERS OF TALBOT COUNTY.

Fellow-Citizens:

Through the continued solicitations of my friends in the different districts of this county, and in accordance with my own wishes, I am induced to offer myself a candidate for the SHERIFFALTY, at our ensuing October election.—Should I be so fortunate as to obtain so much of your confidence as to give a majority of your votes, I should ever feel grateful for the same; and do pledge myself to discharge the duties incumbent on said office to the best of my ability, with fidelity, impartiality and justice.

The public's obedient servant,

JOSHUA M. FAULKNER.

St. Michaels, June 22—w

SHERIFFALTY.

Jesse Scott respectfully presents his thanks to the free and independent Voters of Talbot county, for the liberal support extended to him on a former occasion; and now solicits their suffrages for the next Sheriffalty.

june 29 w

NOTICE.

We the undersigned Commissioners, appointed by the Judges of Caroline county Court, at the last March Term, to value and divide the Lands and Real Estate of John Stanton, late of said county deceased, amongst his heirs and legal representatives, do hereby give notice, that we have appointed to meet on the premises (now occupied by Daniel Bartlett) on THURSDAY the 22d day of July next, for the purpose of executing said Commission.

WILLIAM POTTER,
ROBT. T. KEENE,
JOHN STEVENS,
JAMES BARTON,
WILLIAM H. RHODES,
} Commissioners.

may 18 w

TAKEN UP ADRIFT

On the 20th inst., about the middle of the Eastern Bay, a BOAT 12 feet long, northern built, much worn, with Harts of Oaks on the out side of the Stearn in black letters.—The owner can have her again (paying charges) by calling on the subscriber at St. Michaels.

EDWARD DODSON.

june 29 3w

FOR RENT

For the ensuing year, 4 or 5 farms in the neighbourhood of the Chapel.—For terms apply to EDWARD N. HAMBLETON.

june 99 w

From the National Intelligencer.

THE VETO.

Before we enter upon the argument of the Message of the President of the United States, returning to the House of Representatives the Maysville and Lexington Road bill, we meet at the threshold of it a passage which strikes us as being exceptionable, though it may be only inadvertently made so. We refer to that part of it in which, after having just before admitted the right of 'diversity of sentiment among public functionaries,' the House of Representatives is reminded that, in his message at the opening of the Session, the President had exhibited *his* views of the subject of Internal Improvement; and that the returned act had, therefore, been passed with a knowledge of *his* views of this question. In the first place, we doubt the propriety of the Executive's undertaking to declare to Congress, beforehand, what in his opinion is permitted or interdicted by the Constitution. The Senators and Representatives are *sworn to support the Constitution*: they cannot be guided, in their action, therefore, by the construction which it may please the President to put upon that instrument, unless it concurs entirely with their own. And in the next place, a declaration, in advance, by the President of the United States, that he will not sanction, by his approbation, any particular measure, is to say to Congress, in effect, 'you need not deliberate on this question, though you are sent here by the People for the express purpose of deliberating upon that with other great interests of theirs.' This anticipation of the deliberations of Congress, we know, is not without precedent; but it is a precedent to be avoided.—Still less would precedent, any more than propriety, approve of any thing like a reproof to Congress, for having, with a knowledge of his views, refused to concur in them. The two Houses of Congress, surely, have as much right to their opinion, as the President to his; and the intimation of their contumacy is, we think, rather a rough rebuke from a Republican President to the Representatives of the People. It is such as an autocrat might use with his serfs, but would hardly venture upon with his nobles. It may be said that this passage of the Message was simply intended to present a fact, and not to imply a censure. If such was the intention, we can only say that it has been very unluckily made to assume a different aspect; and that no independent Member of Congress could read it without feeling that his privilege was invaded, and his freedom of action reproached.

We proceed now to a consideration of the argument of the Message.

Recurring to the language employed in the communication of the Executive to Congress, at the commencement of the late session, and repeating that language, the Message says, in reference to the power of Internal Improvement by the General Government, 'all feel 'that it has been employed at the expense of 'harmony in the Legislative Councils;' and this is now stated as a reason, independently of constitutional considerations, against employing the surplus revenue upon objects of that description. We should like to know what power exercised by the Government is not open to the very same objection? Upon what question of public policy has public sentiment ever been unanimous? Take the Navy, for example. Do we not all, who are old enough, remember what bitter contests there used to be in Congress, in the infancy of the Navy, whether it should be strangled or fostered? Its friends prevailed in its favor; but what sort of harmony existed in the Legislative Councils, when the Navy was saved by majorities of one, two, five, or ten? Federalist, Tory, Monarchist, were epithets not too bad, at one period, to be bestowed on all who dared to support it. The same may be observed of questions concerning the augmentation of the Army. Much more strongly may it be predicated of the Tariff question, the Bank question, the Direct Tax, and the Public Lands. That there are questions which, because of their irritating nature, ought not to be touched in Congress, except under imperious circumstances, we admit: such as the integrity of the Union, or the loyalty of any member of it; and, in a matter interesting to particular States, the condition of slavery. But we cannot recognize the validity of such an objection to any particular measure, as that it benefits one division of our country more than another. What measure does not? In the nature of things it must be so. Will any one pretend that the bill for the removal of the Indians, which passed but the day before this message was sent to Congress, was an exercise of power less 'at the expense of harmony in the Legislative Councils' than the Internal Improvement Bills? Surely not: for, whilst that bill passed the House of Representatives, after a desperate struggle, by a majority of only five votes, one of the bills rejected by the President passed by a majority of two to one—a larger majority than can ever be calculated upon in Congress upon any question that is at all contested. Did the President, because it had been so closely contested, reject the Indian Bill? Far from it. It was his pleasure that it should pass; and it was no objection to that bill, that it was more 'at the expense of harmony in the Legislative Councils,' than perhaps any measure since the long embargo.—With this practical demonstration of its unsoundness, we feel ourselves anthorized to put entirely out of view this objection to Internal Improvement. It can have no influence whatever as a justification of the rejection of the Road Bills.

The message goes on to say, that 'to avoid these evils,' one of which we have shewn is not an evil, but an inseparable incident to legislation, (the other being the constitutional scruple of the minority of Congress and of the People,) 'it appears to me that the most safe, just, and 'federal disposition which could be made of the 'surplus revenue, would be its apportionment 'among the several States, according to their 'ratio of representation.'

This measure, if practicable, is liable to objections, which we will here allude to, rather than attempt to illustrate. In the first place, it would disarm the general government of the means of doing general good, for the purpose of having things, good in themselves, done so partially, (by the States) as to produce evil instead of good, by exciting great and just discontent among the States. For instance: Internal Improvements, Canals, and Public Highways are most wanted, for the benefit of the whole Union, whether for national defence, for commerce, or for post-roads, where there is the greatest extent of fertile country with the fewest natural or established facilities of that description.—Where is that country? Is it New York or Pennsylvania, or is it Missouri, Indiana, Illinois? Is it the populous region on the Atlantic border, or is it the vast Western region? The latter certainly. But this distribution system proposes to allot the surplus revenues, instead of employing them in National works, to the States respectively, in a ratio the direct inverse of the rule of expediency: that is to say, for every thirty-four thousand dollars distributed to the State of New York, the States of Missouri and Illinois are to receive one thousand, and the State of Indiana (greatly favored) three thousand. Will the States—*can* the States submit to legislation so unequal and so inequitable? For what reason are the States *equally* represented in the Senate of the United States but to guard against the smaller States being thus ground down to insignificance by the larger? Another rooted objection to this project is, that it is, in effect, a proposition to vest in the Federal Government the power of collecting and distributing *the revenue of a State*. Certainly, if there be any one power which is reserved to the States, it is the power to lay and collect their own revenue, at their own pleasure, for their own purposes; and the General Government has no rightful authority to collect a revenue beyond the amount necessary to enable it to exercise efficiently its own proper functions. It would hardly be less obnoxious to carry out the idea of distributive justice further, so as to distribute the surplus revenue to *each individual* instead of each State in the Union, in equal proportion; when we should have at once the levelling system—the superfluity of the rich being taken from them to be *distributed* to the poor. However abhorrent the policy of Internal Improvement may be to some of our statesmen, we rather think that they would be the first to hold up their hands against the substitute which the President has been advised to recommend, a second time, for the serious consideration of the Legislature. We refrain from pressing the objections to this part of the Message further; because in the next sentence there is an intimation that even this measure, although preferred to the employment of the revenue in internal improvement, requires an amendment of the Constitution to authorize it.

The next several paragraphs of the Message contain reasoning, the force of which, we think, no one can dispute. It is shewn very clearly what has been the uniform action of the Government, in opposition to mere theorizing, in regard to the power of appropriation, and it is wisely admitted and well said, that 'the public 'good and the nature of our political institu- 'tions *require* that individual differences *should* 'yield to a well settled acquiescence of the People 'and confederated authorities, in particular con- 'structions of the Constitution, on doubtful points. Not to concede this much to the spirit of our institutions, would impair their stability, and *defeat the objects of the Constitution itself*'

In this doctrine we heartily concur, and we are glad to find it where it is, not only on account of its applicability to the appropriation of money for objects of internal improvement, but also to other questions on which it has been apprehended, from prior indications, that the mind of the President was fixedly made up. The power of appropriating money for any object not embraced in the specific grants has been *doubted* at an early period of the Government, from 'deservedly high authority;' it has been doubted in later times also: but whatever *doubts* have rested upon it, the point is conceded, in this Message, to have been settled in practice, and especially by the purchase of Louisiana and the construction of the Cumberland Road, both measures of Mr. Jefferson's Administration.—From this reasoning, we are glad to arrive at the conclusion that the President, when he was advised to suggest the plan of a National Government Bank, to substitute the People's Bank of the United States, giving, as one reason for this recommendation, that the constitutionality of the Bank of the United States had been 'well doubted,' did not mean to declare that the existing Bank is not constitutional, or that it may not be constitutionally re-chartered. We cannot but infer, from the passage just quoted from the late Message, that the President meant to say, in his former Message, that, though others had doubted, he did not doubt the constitutionality of the Bank of the United States, after the 'well settled acquiescence of the People and Confederated Authorities' in regard to that matter. If this doctrine of 'well settled acquiescence' be, as we agree that it is, applicable to the purchase of Louisiana and the Cumberland Road, *a fortiori* it is conclusive as to the Bank question, which was decided by Congress a dozen years before those two questions, and has been uniformly sustained by the judicial tribunals and acquiesced in by the People, to this day.

Admitting, however, in terms, the power to appropriate money in the manner and for the purposes proposed by the rejected bills, the Message declares the Maysville Road not to be of a character so National as to authorize his signing the bill concerning it; and, by assigning the same grounds for the rejection of the Rockville and Frederick Road, he places that Road on the same 'local' ground.

We do not feel much interest in examining the question of the *nationality* of the Roads, it being made clear, in the sequel of the Message, that the want of nationality was not the influential cause of the rejection of these bills. And yet we must say, after much consideration of that point, that we think the objection to the nationality of either of these Roads is insufficient, upon the Cabinet's own ground, to justify their advising the President to put his *veto* upon them. What constitutes a *National* Road? Must it traverse the whole Union, or what proportion of it? Is it not sufficient, to make it generally and nationally beneficial (the definition quoted by the Message from Mr. Monroe's Exposition) that a Road is an important link in a line of communication in which the country at large is deeply interested? With regard to the road between Maysville and Lexington, the U. S. Engineers, Col. Long and Maj. Trimble, in their report to Congress 1827-8, remark, that that Road is more travelled than any other of the same extent in Kentucky; and the great Mail between the Atlantic States and Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and other Western States, passes over it, for the transportation of which over this route the Post Master General actually pays more than eighty dollars a mile. From an accurate register of the travelling over it, kept for thirty days, during the last year, at a point near Maysville, it appeared that within that period there passed over this Road, besides pleasure carriages and droves of cattle, &c. not counted, 9,400 persons, 12,800 horses, 1570 wagons and carts, giving an average of 317 persons, 427 horses, and 52 wagons and carts per day. Surely such a link in a great post road, so much travelled besides, is sufficiently important to make its improvement nationally beneficial. If that be not sufficiently national, however, beyond question the Rockville Road is; being a gap of only 25 or 26 miles in the whole chain of communication with the Western wilds and waters, which is in certain seasons of the year almost impassable, and not susceptible of profitable improvement by individual means.—By the condition of this road, the People of the West are, at certain seasons of the year, almost cut off from the Capital of the Union; and, if Gen. Jackson had travelled over it at the proper season for judging of it, instead of the delightful season of June, we opine he would have returned to the Palace with a much clearer perception of its nationality than he entertained when he returned to the Senate the bill appropriating money for its improvement.

Will any one argue with us that the appropriations proposed by those bills are less national in their character than a number which have at the late session of Congress received the President's unhesitating approbation? Is the appropriation of 25,688 dollars for the improvement of the navigation of Cape Fear River, in North Carolina, more national than the Maysville Road? Or that of 8,000 and odd dollars for removing sand bars at or near the mouth of Black River, in Ohio? Or that of 6,000 and odd dollars for improving the navigation of Conneaut Creek, in Ohio? Or that of 15,000 and odd dollars for removing obstructions at the mouth of Big Sodus Bay, in the state of New York? These and many others were approved before the Executive took *a new departure* in a direction hostile to this wise, beneficent, and truly useful policy of improving our ways and water courses. The reasoning and the conclusion of the Message are at right angles to the whole previous demonstration of the intentions of the President.

But not to go back so far in the session as the date of these bills, let us compare them, on the ground of nationality and locality, with the Indian Bill, the approbation and signature of which followed the rejection of one of these bills, and preceded the rejection of the other. [Let it be recollected that the Message places the rejection of the bills ostensibly on the ground of their being not nationally beneficial.' How is it with the Indian Bill? If that mode of reasoning is permitted, of what importance to Pennsylvania or to New Hampshire, for example, is the removal of the Choctaws from Alabama and Mississippi? Are not the advantages to flow from this measure to redound to the benefit of these respective States only? Or, if national in any sense, is this appropriation of 500,000 dollars (to begin with) more so than would be the appropriation of a like sum for draining the Dismal Swamp or removing obstructions from lands in any State, that these 'reclaimed' lands might be 'settled and improved' by 'white men' and citizens? And, since we have compared these measures in one view, let us compare them in another. If the two Road Bills are so objectionable on account of their liberality or latitudinarianism—for these, after all, are the only tangible grounds of exception to them—what shall we say of this Indian law which encountered no misgivings in the Executive mind? Each of the first mentioned bills proposed the appropriation of a specie sum for a definite purpose. The Indian law gives unlimited power to the President to give and guaranty, to the Indians removing West, any part, or the whole, of the Public Lands West of the Mississippi, (and not in any State or Territory:) and in this donation to be made by the President, be it more or less, there is no ingredient of benefit to the United States 'nationally,' because the President will give to the Indians at least as large and valuable a tract of land West, as that which they now occupy East, of the Mississippi: that is, he will do so, if he acts, as it is to be presumed that he will, in the spirit of the law and of humanity. And this enormous power the President may exercise 'without asking the advice of the Senate' as formerly. In addition, moreover, to the five hundred thousand dollars in money, already appropriated, he may pledge the United States to any amount, and then may call on Congress 'to redeem the pledge.' What was there, in the principle of the Rockville Road Bill, in which, besides the general interest of the whole Union, about one half of all the states are specially interested, so far as the communication with the Seat of Government is of any interest to them, that was less national than the Indian law? What is there in either of the Road Bills that involves any thing like the same sweeping powers? The main distinction that we perceive between them is that the Road bills involve *definite*, and the Indian bill *indefinite*, expenditure: that the Road bills proposed the exercise of a limited power, the means and bounds of which were prescribed in the bills themselves, whilst the power to be exercised under the Indian law is undefined and unlimited by any thing but the Executive discretion. Grant that this discretion has been properly given, and will be wisely exerted: still it is difficult to understand why it is that a bill, vesting in the Executive 'almost unlimited discretionary power,' received the prompt sanction of the President, whilst bills, of much narrower scope, expressing the 'precise intention' and 'positive will' of the Legislature, and leaving nothing to discretion, received their death-blow at his hands! How shall we account for their different fates?

(To be continued.)

WASHINGTON AND ADMIRAL VERNON.

When the Admiral was attacking Porto Bello, with his six ships only, as is inscribed on the model struck on the occasion, he observed a fine young man in appearance, who with the most intrepid courage, attended with the most perfect calmness, was always in that part of the ship which was most engaged. After the firing had ceased, he sent his captain to request he would attend him, which he immediately obeyed; and the admiral, entering into conversation, discovered by his answers and observations that he possessed more abilities than usually fall to the lot of mankind generally. Upon his asking his name, the young man told him it was George Washington; and the Admiral on his return home, strongly recommended him to the attention of the admiralty. This great man, when he built his house in America, out of gratitude to his first benefactor, named it Mount Vernon; and at this moment it is so called.

A distressing accident occurred in the neighborhood of Bartram's garden, last week. A pet Monkey got loose, and attacked a child about a year old, who was sitting at a door; bit off its ear, and lacerated its head in a shocking manner. The shrieks of the child alarmed its parents who rescued it just in time to save its life. [Poulson.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc3923_scm2847-0116.jpg