EASTERN-SHORE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

VOL. IV.---NO. 26. EASTON, MD.---TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 6, 1832. WHOLE NO. 182.

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

THE TERMS

Are Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per Annum payable half yearly in advance. Advertisements are inserted three times for One Dollar; and continued weekly for twenty-five cents per square.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE,
ON MR. VAN BUREN'S NOMINATION.

SKETCH OF MR. FORSYTH'S SPEECH,
IN REPLY TO MR. MILLER.

Mr. President: We were told by the Senator who has just concluded, in the beginning of his extraordinary speech, that he intended to publish his remarks for his own vindication. No friend of Mr. Van Buren will complain of the fulfilment of this intention.

Of the long list of offences committed by Mr. Van Buren, it was natural that the Senator should begin with those at home. He says Gen. Jackson has been separated from him and his friends by the artifices of Mr. Van Buren, and he tells us of his own zeal and devotion to the hero of New Orleans, and [illegible] extracts from his own speech at the Wax[illegible] when he assured his auditors that "the philosophy of nature" was a "sufficient guaranty" for the General's "local attachments," How does it appear that Mr. Van Buren produced this dreadful separation? No evidence of it is exhibited; and, with due deference to the Senator, I would suggest that he was only mistaken in his theory; "the philosophy of nature" was not so strong a guaranty as he imagined. But, is what is insinuated fact? Has General Jackson forgotten his local attachments, the land of his birth and of his earliest affections, where he has so many devoted and disinterested friends? No, Sir, it is not possible General Jackson has not separated from South Carolina, nor has South Carolina yet withdrawn from him, although the Senator seems to be earnestly hunting up causes for a divorce.

The radical party in South Carolina—the Unionists—have, the Senator says; given in their adhesion from interested motives to Mr. Van Buren for the succession to the Presidency—and this is another of his crimes. Now, Sir, I do not know that this is true that they desire the succession of Mr. Van Buren; certainly they might go further and fare worse, and fare much worse and not go quite so far. For this supposed interested adhesion, they are stigmatised here by one of their Senators. I am treading, Mr. President, upon almost forbidden ground, travelling into a neighboring State to mingle in its party strife; but I feel for these radicals; these unionists; we acted together in by-gone times; we think alike still; and, if I were not to say a word in their behalf, as the two Senators from the State are of the party opposed to them at home, they might chance to be condemned for the want of the plea of not guilty to the charge exhibited against them. Under these circumstances, I stand bound to repel the imputations cast upon the anti nullifiers of South Carolina, and taking up the evidence, shall prove that they are unjustly charged. What is this evidence?—The Senator who makes the charge on the question of the Seminole war, stood by the General with firmness and zeal; defended him *right or wrong*. The radicals were among his censurers, and the question is emphatically asked, where was Georgia then? Georgia *then* was where she is *now*, and where, I trust, she will ever be found, by the side of the unionists, standing up for the right and reprehending the wrong. The Senator seems to imagine that true patriotism consists in favor of one's friends, in ceasing to discriminate between truth and error. Such is not our theory; for violated laws, we hold *all* responsible, *friends* and *foes*. Recent developements have shown that General Jackson had means of defence he disdained to use, but if there is one Georgian, one radical, who regrets the part he took on that transaction, I thank God, to me, he is unknown. I trust, Sir, that to atone for his own error in defending what he *now* insinuates *was wrong*, he does not, under the power of some master feeling, intend to censure every thing that is *right*.

Mr. Cobb and Mr. Crawford have been named by the Senator. Mr. Cobb is no longer amongst us to answer. He did his duty according to his conception of that duty, in this and in every other act of his public life. His friends know that his conduct was open, and his motives pure. The ground he stood upon there he never abandoned while he lived. Mr. Crawford, I am surprised the Senator should think,—[Mr. Miller said he alluded to Mr. Crawford (Joel) a member of the House of Representatives when the Seminole question was agitated.] I am glad to be corrected.—Mr. Joel Crawford acted with his friends, and is guilty of the charge of having voted for inquiry into the Seminole war. He lives to remember, not to regret that act.

This Union party which seems to haunt his imagination, if I am not strangely mistaken, had the honor, a short time since, to number him as a member of it, [Mr. Miller denied that he had never been.] Well, Sir, the Senator ought to know: but in this fact I cannot be mistaken -the Senator was a candidate, brought forward by that party for the State Government—and the cause of postponing for two years the elevation of the accomplished gentleman who now stands at the helm of her affairs. The recollection of that fact should have prevented a charge against them of being of selfish motives, love of office, devoted to the dominant power: following, like the sunflower the motions of the risen sun. To this last charge, I do not plead for them, not guilty; they do follow, *like the sunflower*—the sunflower does not change its attitude for the rising, or meridian, or the setting sun. Elevating its broad face to the light of heaven, it stands unchanged and is found when he sets in the western, as it stood when he rose in the eastern sky. Poetically understood, as Ovid describes heliotrope, the Senator is right, (what is good in poetry, is not always good in prose,) and the charge is that for interest sake the South Carolinians, untrienaly to the Senator, know no will but the President's, and are obedient to his whistle.

We are taught to expect shoals of them here, seeking as the rewards of devotion, honors and trusts foreign missions, &c. &c.—one of them being already before us, as the avant-courier of a thousand more. No allusion could have been more unfortunate. Who and what is the gentleman at whom this arrow has been cast, the first of the shoal of office seekers! Why, Sir, the Senator himself speaks highly of his character. Described by his colleague, he is a high minded man, of extensive information and unsullied integrity, in whose hands the nest and dearest interests of the people may be safely confided. And are such men office seekers, and interested devotees to existing power in South Carolina? If so—what are the patriots? They must be angels. They cannot be men. The Senator may eulogize his friends to the utmost of his power, exalt them in the scale of talent and integrity to the highest pitch: I venture to place his opponents by their side, and challenge comparison without fearing or intending to deprecate in the slightest degree, the honor of any of South Carolina's distinguished sons.

The arrangement of the first cabinet did not please the Senator. South Carolina was neglected. Governor Hamilton was told he might have been Secretary of War, but for his violence against the tariff; and what seemed to have aided venom to the sting, South Carolina was not only passed over, but an Attorney General was looked for in Georgia, and all this was the work of the Dom Daniel of New York. The Senator is difficult to please. He liked not the first, and likes less the second Cabinet. But how was the fact in regard to Governor Hamilton? If my memory deceives me not, he has publicly declared he might have had office, had he desired; he did not desire it. In this, and in all other things, he is incapable of deceit. Passing over the unpardonable denial of going to Georgia for a member of the hat is cabinet, does the Senator recollect the [illegible] has left the office of the late Attorney Gen[illegible] was the work of Mr. Van Buren?—[Mr. Miller nodded assent.] The Senator never committed a more egregious mistake.—Of all the men of the day, his equals in professional attainments and talents admitted to be great, I think he is the last man who would have been selected by Mr. Van Buren; and sure I am, Mr. Van Buren is the last man on earth to whose influence the late Attorney General would have been willing to owe his place.

Considered as the originator and the fosterer of the disagreement between the first and second officers of the Government, Mr. Van Buren is to bear the extremity of the Senator's wrath. On this subject, Mr. President, I can only refer the Senate to the explicit and prompt denial of the justice of the charge by the party accused, long since publicly made, and never yet impeached by any one having a claim to character. The facts before the public prove that the charge is the coinage of a distempered brain, baseless as the fabric of a vision. If the Senator has any desire to enter into further inquiry, I repeat here this explicit and positive denial, in the name of an absent friend; and if he ventures upon the investigation, I pledge myself to satisfy even his preoccupied mind, that not a shadow of suspicion can rest upon Mr Van Buren's fame. I speak on the highest authority, when I state to the Senate, that his deportment in relation to that controversy, deserves the respect and admiration of every honorable and delicate mind.

The Globe! the Globe! the official paper, has abused the Senator and his friends. The editor was brought here by Mr. Van Buren, and he is accountable for all it contains: all that is bad, I mean—he gets credit for no good, appear where it may.

This charge is made because the Globe is called the Government paper, Mr. Van Buren and the Government being previously identified. I must not be misunderstood, as defending the editorial management of the Globe. I see with regret many attacks on persons for matters that ought not to be brought before the public. I detest all investigation of the private transactions, all malignant scrutiny into the every day business of political aspirants. Their private characters are known to the people; and so far as character should operate to their prejudice, it will be weighed. Even the defensive recriminations of the Globe, deserve censure. But, Sir, I do not admit that Mr. Van Buren or the administration, is responsible for the lighter offences much less the enormities of any newspaper writer—even for the Globe, which, black as the gentleman may consider it, is as pure as this unsullied sheet, compared with the journals that are published by its side. But does the Senator mean to assert that every one who aids in the establishment of a newspaper, is responsible for its enormities? Will the Senator consent that his friends and *all* his opponents shall be judged by the same rule? I ask him to glance his eye back over the history of the press in this District for a few past years. Does he remember the Federal Republican; the Washington City Gazette, the Washington Republican? Does he know any thing of the National Journal and the United States Telegraph? Has he present to his recollection the atrocious calumnies by which they have been polluted—their dark insinuations and open falsehoods, by which the reputation of the virtuous of both sexes has been wantonly and grossly assailed! Slander has flown—still flies—to all corners of our country as if borne on the wings of the wind. If all these things are present to his view, will he admit that those who patronize these Journals were participators of those hateful crimes? Can he trust the reputation and honor of his friends to the application of his own rule? [The Vice President asked, if the Senator from Georgia had any allusion to the occupant of the Chair? Mr. Forsyth. By what authority, Sir, do you ask that question? The Vice President said the allusion appeared to be so direct, he had a right to ask the question. Mr. Forsyth. I deny the right, and if it is considered as a question of order, I appeal to the judgment of the Senate. The Vice President said if the allusion was directed to him, there was not foundation for it. Mr. Miller rose and addressed the chair. Mr. Forsyth claimed the floor, which he said he was in some danger of losing between the Chair and the Senator. The Vice President said the Senator from Georgia is entitled to the floor. Mr. Forsyth. That being understood, I give way with pleasure to the Senator for any explanation he may desire to make.]

[Mr. MILLER explained, and concluded by saying—as to the rule by which he judged others in relation to the official press, he was willing that it should be applied to himself and his friends.]

Mr. Forsyth replied to an argument as explained, and then said—as to the public press, the Senator consents that he and his friends shall be judged by his own rule. Then God help the Senator's friends; for they are all beyond all human aid, so are all those who patronize and support, in times of high party strife, a thorough-bred partisan newspaper.—Leaving to others to adopt or reject the rule, and to apply it or not to the patrons and supporters of the Journal and the Telegraph, and to the former patrons of the Washington Republican, the Washington City Gazette, and Federal Republican, I deny, explicitly, Mr. Van Buren's responsibility for any articles of the Globe. If the Senator will produce satisfactory proof that he has been instrumental in establishing a press here or elsewhere, for the purpose of dragging down by calumnies any good man's name, my vote shall damn him here—my voice every where.

In the spirit of manly frankness, and not in the spirit of this discussion, I appeal to the Senator to reflect upon the irreconcileable contradiction between all his conclusions to Mr. Van Buren's prejudice, and the character of the Chief Magistrate—not the character of the President with his present friends and the people; but, according to his own conceptions of that character before the President had the misfortune to think that the Senator and his friends were pursuing a policy dangerous to the union of the States. He was, as described by the Senator, all that was good and great, and performed with the purest patriotism, more important services than any man since the days of Washington. His known firmness has been called obstinate self-will, by his adversaries, and he has been held up by his enemies as a roaring lion, requiring implicit obedience from all who venture to approach his den. Take the good or the bad of this description. Judge this matter by the opinion of the President's friends, by the Senator's, or by the President's enemies, and the part allotted to Mr. Van Buren could not have been played here. What, Sir, this pure patriot, this great public benefactor, this self-willed, obstinate man, this roaring lion, to be a wet rag in any man's hands; a nose of wax, to be pinched into any and every shape, by Mr. Van Buren's fingers! If the Senator will calmly reflect, he will be compelled to acknowledge that he is or has been greatly mistaken. The President is not what he declared him to be—what his friends or his enemies believe him to be,—or else flagrant injustice has been done to Mr Van Buren. I will not quarrel with the Senator's choice. He may take either branch of the alternative. He cannot hold both.

The formidable array of facts in support of his charge of corrupt management against Mr. Van Buren, reminds me of an occurrence said to have happened in France. There is, it seems, such a thing as an action to recover damages for seduction, which may be brought by an unfortunate lady who had listened too credulously to a flattering tongue. A pretty lady who had quarrelled and parted with her lover, called on an advocate to bring a suit for the damages she had sustained. She described the origin and progress of the *liason*, the happiness enjoyed while it lasted, and the time of its duration, and *then* its fatal end. The advocate listened with profound attention to the story, and saw that it was one of those cases in which it was difficult to say who was in fault, the gentleman or the lady, and that an action could not be maintained for seduction. How to convey this, without offending the fair one, was the difficulty. All Frenchmen, of all professions, avoid that as the deadliest of sins. The advocate managed it with the proverbial skill of his profession and of his country. Madam, it would give me infinite pleasure to obey your wishes and punish the ingrate who has separated himself from so much beauty; but I am obliged to tell you that the facts are not sufficient to support an action. This seemed very strange to the lady, as she had been very minute in her detail of all the facts. Pouting and petulent she left the advocate to his books and briefs. The whole affair was forgotten by him; but in the course of a few days the lady burst triumphantly into his room, exclaiming with joyful eagerness, another fact, Sir, he seduced me again this morning. And so it is with the Senator. His facts, like the lady's, do not go to the point he must reach to effect his purpose. Each one is like unto the other, and all like the *seduction of that morning*.

From the Banner of the Constitution.

LOAF SUGAR.

Since the duty on tea has been reduced, it is quite natural that those who are fond of that "slow poison" should wish to make it as palateable as possible, at the cheapest rate, and, for our parts, we want to see a poor man allowed to indulge in the luxury of loaf sugar, as well as the rich man. This can be accomplished with perfect facility, and we now intend to prove it, in such a plain manner that nobody can dispute it; and we especally invite our readers who live at a distance from the sea-board to listen to what we have to say.

The art of refining sugar has, within a few years, improved, in common with all other arts. The use of bullock's blood has been entirely done away with, and a process connected with the employment of steam has greatly tended to diminish the expenses of manufacture. In the year 1816, brown sugar, adapted for refining, was as high as $18 per cwt., and is now at $7 and less. In 816 the price of the best loaf was 35 cents per pound—it is now 16 cents. This fall in the price of raw sugar has been occasioned chiefly by the diminished cost of producing it in all the sugar-growing countries of the world and not in any degree by the high duties imposed upon the article, either in France, Great Britain, or the United States. The fall in the price of loaf sugar has been occasioned, in part, by this fall in the price of the raw material, and in part by new discoveries in the process of refining.

There is now manufactured in this city an inferior quality of loaf or lump sugar, which is sold at the sugar-houses, by the quantity, at 11 1-2 cents per pound, and at the grocery stores, by the single loaf, at 12 1-2 cents per pound, which is the price that common brown sugar was sold at a few years ago. This sugar is used by most economical families for their tea, and even the most expensive families find it quite good enough for their office.—Now, if it was not for the duty upon raw sugar, this quality of loaf sugar could be sold at 7 1-2 cents per pound by the single loaf, and those poor families who are now obliged to use in their tea brown sugar, could have loaf sugar at the same price. And, strage as it may appear, whilst the citizens of the Republic are obliged to give 12 1-2 cents per pound for this loaf sugar, *foreigners* are allowed to take it away upon paying only 1 1-2 cents for it, there being a bounty allowed, by the Government, of 5 cents a pound (equal to the duty paid upon the raw sugar) upon all that is exported.

But it is the people in the country who would be most benefitted by the repeal of the duty on raw sugar. The loaf sugar which the country merchants buy at 11 1-2 cents, they must sell at a price which will give them the customary profits on their capital. Supposing these to be 25 per cent., they must sell the sugar at near 14 1-2 cents, besides the expenses of transportation—whereas, if there was no duty on sugar, they could afford to sell it, and enjoy the same profits, at a trifle more than 8 cents a pound, (besides the expenses of transportation,) being a reduction of *six cents and a quarter per pound*.

And cannot any body see how great a blessing would be conferred on this community, by permitting people to have loaf sugar for their tea as cheap as brown sugar? Is there any people, on the face of the earth, besides the people of this country, who would deny themselves such a luxury when within their reach? And who could be injured by it? Not, surely, the sugar refiners; they would profit by it immensely: for, with the reduction of price, the consumption would be increased—more sugar houses would be built—and hundreds of persons would find employment in refining sugar, in vending it, in transporting it, in making paper and twine to wrap round it, in making vessels to boil it in, in furnishing fuel in making boxes and barrels to pack it in, to say nothing of the increased demand for agricultural productions to send to the West Indies and Brazil, to pay for raw sugar, and for vessels to carry on the commerce.—A reduction even of the present duty on loaf sugar could not injure the sugar refiners: for that duty has long operated as a prohibition, and, if the raw material were admitted duty free, our sugar refiners would require no protection to enable them to carry on their business. They can now make loaf sugar of an inferior quality, as we have shown, at 7 1-2 cents per pound; and no European nation could obtain supplies of raw sugar from the West Indies, refine it, and bring it to this country, so as to undersell our refiners.

But the sugar planters of Louisiana would be injured by a free importation of raw sugar. To a certain extent this would be so. But, is a population of thirteen millions of people to be deprived of the luxury of having loaf sugar at the price of brown sugar, in order that five hundred rich planters may ride in coaches? It would be better for the consumers of sugar to pension the planters, and allow them a certain sum if they would keep their hands off. Thus, suppose a purse were raised, equal to 5 cents per head upon the population (the amount of the tax upon *a single pound of loaf sugar.*) which would amount to $650,000; this sum would afford a salary of $1,300 for each planter, which, although not enough to maintain a nabob, would amply support a plain country gentleman in comfort and ease.

From the New York Gazette.

FROM JAMAICA.

We have received by the packet ship John W. Cater, Capt. Crane, our regular files of Kingston papers to the 1st instant inclusive. They add very little to our previous intelligence as regards the insurrectionary movements among the slaves. The Courant, of the 30th ult. has [illegible] paragraphs under the head of "*Saint Elizabeth*:"—

General Robertson, in his despatch dated 28th January, states, that the cave into which the rebels had been driven, had other outlets, from one of which they escaped. The sentinel placed by them within the cave defended himself bravely, but was shot, with three others. Capt. M'Neil, of the Westmoreland regiment, with his company, and twenty Maroons were despatched in pursuit, & came upon Greenwich Hall with a party of the rebels, and shot eight of them. One of the prisoners taken says, that in their flight, the rebels had only saved seven stand of arms.

General Robertson had ordered detachments of the St. Elizabeth's regiment, under the command of Col. Farquharson, to join Capt. M'Neil.

Major General Sir W. Cotton had had an interview with Gen. Robertson, and personally inspected the cave and heights, from whence the rebels were driven, and had expressed his entire approbation of the proceedings of Gen. Robertson.

Other detachments of the St. Elizabeth's regiment had been moved to Chesterfield and Eldersley, with orders to scour the woods in those districts.

The Courant of January 31, contains the following notice—

We are happy to learn, that the voluntary offer of capt. Percival, of the U. S schr to be serviceable at this period, has been duly appreciated by Com. Farquhar, who directed an officer to call on board the Porpoise, with a message from the commander of the North Star, stating that Com. Farquhar had requested his thanks might be conveyed to Lt. Comm't Percival of the U. S. schr Porpoise, in the strongest terms, for his attention and protection to the British merchants of Santa Martha, as well as for his politeness in bringing over the British consul from Carthagena; and subsequently for the very handsome manner in which he made a tender of the services of the vessel under his command, in the present exigencies of the Island.

The accounts from Montego Bay were very satisfactory. The whole country in that neighbourhood had been scoured by the troops, and the rebels fled without firing a shot. It was supposed that they would all come in and surrender if a conciliatory proclamation were issued.

Sovereign, the Murderer.—We learn by a gentleman from Canada, that this wretch, an account of whose murders we publish'd a few days ago, has starved himself to death in prison. Before his death, however, he confessed the murder of his family. A young child making some disturbance in the night, his wife got up to take care of it. He told her to come to bed, and, upon her saying she could not, jumped out of bed, seized the child, and threw it on the fire. His wife then ran out of the house and he after her—he soon overtook and butchered her on the spot; returning, he met a son a few rods from the house, 17 years of age, whom he murdered, and before he reached the house met a daughter whom he also killed. He then went into the house and murdered three other children in their beds. Having murdered his own family, and his thirst for blood unsatisfied, he started off, and called up one of his neighbors and attempted to kill a father and son, but they defended themselves against him and he was obliged to retreat. Sovereign had, as we are informed, several times threatened to murder his family when drunk; but at this time he stated he was not drunk, and that he had drunk nothing for three days previous.—*Rochester Advertiser.*

GOOD SOCIETY IN—FRANCE.

A correspondent in the New York American gives the following statement:

The Controversy about the will of the Duke of Bourbon.

We are indebted to a correspondent for the annexed translation of a letter in *Courier des Etas Unis*, giving a sketchy account to this scandalous process which occupied all Paris at [illegible] dates.

PARIS, 8th Dec. 1831.

SIR—For several days past, public feeling has been evidently excited by the scandal of a law-suit, in which names the most elevated are compromised, and which produces, at each examination, the most unfortunate disclosures.

An action has been brought before the tribunal of first instance, by the Princes of Rohan, to nullify the will of the late Duke of Bourbon, against the Duke of Aumale, fourth son of Louis Philip, and the Baroness of Feucheres, the avowed mistress of the Duke of Bourbon. The following is a brief analysis of the history of this will.

The Duke of Bourbon was very rich; the Duke of Orleans still richer; but an economist and a father of a numerous family, he desired to augment the fortunes of his children. The families of Bourbon, Conde, & Orleans had been for a long time hostile to each other on account of political animosities. The heir of the name of Conde, considered himself as the representive of the monarchy, & the family of Orleans, lived in his remembrance only as connected with the times of the revolution. The Duke of Bourbon could not conceal his repugnance to his relatives to whose name he attached a sort of fatality. It was not to any of them he destined his wealth, but to the Duke of Bordeux, to whom he had announced his intention, from the death of the Duke of Beri. It is difficult to change a first resolution; this is the way in which it was undertaken.

There lived with the Duke of Bourbon, in the closest intimacy, a woman, who had over his mind the most absolute control. It was a Miss. Dawes, brought from England by the Duke of Bourbon, and married to a certain Baron de Feucheres, who was satisfied in giving her his name. Nothing could be done without the assistance of this woman: with her co operation; it was easy to direct the mind of the old man, to whom long habit and the weakness of age left no power of resistance. They could not gain an auxiliary more useful to them. Madame de Feucheres, loaded with riches, was accessible only through her vanity. Women of character would not see her, and the doors of the respectable houses were closed against her. Every day she was exposed to new humiliations, which destroyed her happiness, although surrounded by enjoyments. The entree to the court was denied to her;—the gates of the Palais Royal were opened to receive her. She was seated near the Dutches of Orleans and the young Princesses. Every idea of decency gave way to interest. Not content with this first complaisance, the Duke of Orleans succeeded, after a long negotiation, in obtaining for Madame de Feucheres the entree to Court. He wrote to her affectionate letters; he went to dine with her. At last, by the assistance of this woman, by her prayers, menaces, and violences, the old Duke of Bourbon, incapable of resisting the tortures inflicted upon him by this Megara, resigned himself to her will.—The will so ardently desired, was made from a copy, prepared under the eyes of the Duke of Orleans by one of his intimate councellors. (Mr. Dupin, the elder,) and set to the Bourbon Palace, to be presented to the Duke of Bourbon Conde, by the honest Madame de Feucheres for his signature. The unfortunate old man for a long time resisted, but at last, after a thousand instances of ill treatment from this woman, he signed, the 29th of August, 1829, the fatal will, which, in the following year, caused his own death.

This will would have been revoked. The Duke of Bourbon remained under the dominion of the woman whose victim he had become. Soon after the events of July, 1830, he contemplated to fly from this wicked woman, and to quit France; where his opinion on the legitimacy of his relatives, would not permit him to remain with honor under what he considered the usurpation of the younger branch. His plan of escape was arranged M. de Choulet, one of the officers of his palace, was alone in his confidence. He had ordered to St. Leu, where the prince resided, a courier, on the 27th August, 1830, at 10 o'clock in the morning. A large sum was realized in gold, a carriage was prepared by M. de Choulet, who was to accompany him: in in a little time he would have been at liberty, would have been reunited to the elder branch of the Bourbons and would have revoked the odious will made in favor of Madame de Feucheres, and the family the objects of his repugnance. The 26th of August, in the evening, the prince expedited a second courier to M. de Choulet, to order him to be at St. Leu, the 27th at eight o'clock in the morning instead of ten. He perished the following night the victim of the most atrocious cruelty. A door opened into his alcove, one person kept the key of this door. He was found the next day, the 27th, half suspended from the blinds of his sleeping chamber, by a loose cravat, his knees touching the floor. M. de Choulet arrived the 27th, and did not conceal his doubts of this pretended suicide. The opinion of all the persons attached to the house, and of all the inhabitants of St. Leu, accused the baroness of Feuchceres and her nephew, M. Dawes who fled in a few days to England. This man had the impudence within a few months to return to France. He came no further than Calais; he was found dead in his bed the morning after his arrival.

As well as the Parisian public, I have forgotton for the time all political subjects, to occupy myself with this deplorable affair, the details of which you will find in the Journals. It excites here the greatest scandal."

We find in the London Courier, of the 6th Jan. the following paragraph, referring to the same individual.

From the London Courier of the 6th Jan.

"THE BARONESS DE FEUCHERES.—This Lady, whose maiden name, as our readers are already aware, was Sophia Dawes, was born at St. Helens Isle of Wight, where her parents resided. On the visit of the allied Sovereigns to Portsmouth, in 1814, she held the humble situation of bar or chamber maid at one of the inns at that town, where the Prince de Conde chanced to see and become enamored of her. In 1817 Sophia received an invitation to Paris where she became acquainted with an Aid-de-Camp of the Prince named Feucheres, to whom she was married in the following year, her husband at the same time received a Colonel's commission and she herself the title of the Barroness de Feucheres. Owing, however, to her reported intrigues with the Prince de Conde, she was separated from her husband shortly afterwards. Mr. R. Dawes, father of this fortunate lady, was a painstaking pilot and oyster dredger, and was reported to be largely engaged in the *free trade* system. He was at one time in possesion of a gallon measure full of guineas, but the vicissitudes of his mode of life soon reduced him to poverty, and until within three, four, or five years, he was an intimate of the house of industry, from whence he was taken by his daughter, the Barroness, and placed in comfortable lodgings at Carisbrook, where he died about 18 months ago. The Baroness has lately purchased considerable property at St. Helen's, and has taken most of her relations to reside with her. One of her brothers who was formerly apprenticed to Mr. Germain, bookseller at Versailles, is now a Peer of France, with the title of Baron Dawes."

From the U. S Telegraph.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The bill on this subject, has at length been ordered to an engrossment for a third reading, and the ratio, from the numerous votes that have been taken, by yeas and nays, on this question, may now be considered as finally decided by the House at 47,700. We give below a statement showing the number of Representatives which each state will be entitled to according to the new ratio, and the fractions of unrepresented population which will remain.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES UNDER THE FIFTH CENSUS, AT A RATIO OF 47,700.

	No. Members.	Fractions.
Maine	8	17,833
New Hampshire	5	30,326
Massachusetts	12	38,907
Rhode Island	2	1,799
Connecticut	6	11,465
Vermont	5	42,117
New York	40	5,101
New Jersey	6	33,722
Pennsylvania	28	12,472
Delaware	1	27,732
Maryland	8	24,243
Virginia	21	21,803
North Carolina	13	19,647
South Carolina	9	25 745
Georgia	9	511
Kentucky	13	1,732
Tennessee	13	5,163
Ohio	19	29,532
Indiana	7	9,130
Mississippi	2	14,953
Illinois	3	14,047
Louisiana	3	28,804
Missouri	2	25,019
Alabama	5	24,008
	475,478	

From the Columbia Times.

A table showing the population of each State and Territory; the number of persons in each over one hundred years of age, and what proportion these bear to the population of each State and Territory according to the census of 1830.

	Pop. Over 100.			
Maine,	399 462	5 pro.	1 to 79 892	
N. Hampshire,	269,533	15	1	17,963
Vermont,	280,679	14	1	20,048
Massachusetts,	610,014	12	1	50,834
Rhode Island,	97,210	6	1	16,201
Connecticut,	297,711	20	1	14,885
New York,	1,913,508	130	1	14,719
New Jersey,	320,779	14	1	22,912
Pennsylvania,	1,347,672	130	1	10,366
Delaware,	76,739	38	1	2,019
Maryland,	446,913,	262	1	1,705
Virginia,	1,211,272	479	1	2,528
N. Carolina,	758,470	301	1	2,422
S. Carolina,	581,458	248	1	2,422
Georgia,	516,567	236	1	2,188
Alabama,	308,997	87	1	3,551
Mississippi,	136,800	47	1	2,919
Louisiana,	215,575	125	1	1,724
Tennessee,	784,622	172	1	3,981
Kentucky,	688 844	166	1	4,149
Ohio,	937,679	42	1	22,325
Indiana,	351,582	19	1	17,987
Illinois,	157,575	12	1	13,131
Missouri,	140,074	51	1	2,746
D. of Columbia,	39,858	18	1	2,214
Michigan Ter.	31,260	1	1	31,260
Arkansas, do	30,383	7	1	4,340
Florida do	34,729	2	1	17,364

P. S.—In the above calculation, fractional remainders are left out.

From hence we discover that the prospect for longevity is much greater in the middle and southern States than in the north and eastern States. A fact very much at variance with the generally received opinion of the good people of the latter States. Indeed we have no doubt but that the proportian of good health and long life, are altogether on the side of the middle and southern states.

A MERCHANT.

From the Village Herald.

THE PUBLISHNG OF NEW LAWS.

We incline to the opinion, from the expression of public sentiment on the subject, which has through various channels come to our knowledge, that our Legislature would perform an acceptable service to the people by passing an act requring the Governor and Council to cause every new law, necessary to be known by the citizens of more than one county, to be inserted in every newspaper throughout the State, or at least in one in each county, and in several in each of the cities of the State. And every new law, affecting the people of one county only, to be printed in every newspaper of such county. The cost of this could be a matter of but small moment to the State, which would thus be elevated, above the condition that suffers her citizens to grovel in the dark till the gratis publications of editors inform them of the laws by which we are to be governed. It is a well known fact, and one of which we have frequantly heard grievous complaints, that many of our laws actually go into operation, sometimes even before the distribution of the limited number of copies usually sent to magistrates and a few others in authority, and while the people in general remain ignorant of the import of the new enactments. We know that the want of such information does not prevent the operation of the laws, or in other words, that the breach of them is not excused upon the plea of ignorance, but it is exceedingly unjust that men should be subject to the penalty of laws which have never been duly promulgated. However, as this is a matter, the reasonableness which will suggest itself to

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0333.jpg