From the Baltimore Post.

OFFICIAL CORRUPTION.

The new council which has just entered upon its duties in the city of New York have brought to light evidencies of official profligacy in the recent whig administration of the affairs of the city, scarcely exceeded in any developements of political turpitude in the country. Among these acts exposed by the new Mayor, Mr. Varian, in his late message is the enormous expenditure of money for electioneering purposes by the Commissioners of the Alms House, under pretence of distributing it for the relief of the 'out-door poor.

It appears from a tabular statement exhibiting the amount paid out each month, since May 1838, for the relief of the *out door poor*, that in September last, when the November election was yet remote, the amount expended was only $1042,60. But in October, just previous to the election, when the weather was yet mild and the general activity of business afforded ample opportunities for employment, the relief administered suddenly swelled up to the enormous sum of $6318,51. After the election the charities of the Commissioners were as suddenly diminished. In the cold month of December they amounted to but $1978,56; and as the winter advanced and the necessities of the poor increased, their bounties were proportionably stinted; in January they were $1756,50, and in February no more than five hundred and thirty-five dollars.

The genial sun of March, however, wonderfully warmed the hearts of these Commissioners. The April election was also at hand, and from *five hundred* dollars in February, their charities expanded to the round sum of *five thousand one hundred and ninety seven* dollars in March. Thus, in October and March, the two months just preceding the two elections,—seasons of the year when commerce is active, and the poor have every opportunity to obtain employment,—seasons too of genial weather, the amount expended for the relief of the out-door poor exceeded eleven thousand five hundred dollars; whilst in the inclement months of January and February the amount expended for their relief was but little more than two thousand dollars. Concerning these profligate and unseasonable expenditures, the New York Evening Post remarks—

"There is but one explanation that can be given of expenditures so profuse and so preposterously unseasonable The money was expended, not with a regard to the wants & just claims of the poor, but with a view of affecting the election, and securing a majority who would continue the Alms House Commissioners in their places. If the same villainy, the same disregard of right and justice, had been displayed in a private transaction, it would have consigned them to infamy for life. We now see why eighty thousand persons out of the population of this city, as stated by the Secretary of State, were relieved in one year as paupers."

NATIONAL DIVORCE.

The question of an independent sub-treasury will again be brought up for the consideration of congress at its next session. If the manifest expression of public opinion is to be regarded upon the subject, there can be no doubt entertained as to the result. There cannot be an instance pointed out, where this question has been made the issue—and frequent instances have occurred—but what it has achieved a signal victory over the friends of bank and state alliance. The effects of sober reflection has manifested itself in too many instances to be mistaken. Michigan, with a firmness characteristic of her ardent devotion to the cause of democracy, has given the most convincing and irrefragible proof of her desire for a divorce. So strong was this expression at the last general election, that the federal organ in this city, dare not declare the predelictions of its party for any system which had for its object the defeat of the divorce principle. It knew very well that the people were alive to the subject—that the measure was generally understood, advocated and sustained—and that misrepresentation, under the circumstances, would have failed of its effect. It is gravely contended by many, that the founders of our government contemplated that banks should be employed as fiscal agents; this is an erroneous assertion, & cannot be sustained. If they had designed it, it would have been expressed in the law establishing the treasury department; the first United States Bank established, would have been recognized by law as the fiscal agent; but they were sensible of the danger arising from so unnatural an alliance, and solemnly forbade the bans. As appears by a late document prepared by the secretary of the treasury, ours is the only nation that receives *promises to pay* in payment of public dues. We stand alone in the example, and most bitter are the fruits produced by it. But the aristocracy may continue to scoff and revile—the monopolist may clutch his ill-gotten gains and set at defiance the victims of his plunder. They will still find that the people, regardless of the assumption of the one, or supplications of the other, will insist and obtain that administration of their affairs, which will ensure a stable currency in the hands of their public agents, and subserve the true interests of a free government.—[*Detroit Post.*

The gallant old *Constitution Frigate* lies off the Battery and is in excellent condition, her decks mounted with the same armament she had when she took the Guerriere, and with a crew of 500 men; presenting a specimen of naval architecture, and beautiful rig, and neatness of arrangement, which attract many visiters. No one can walk the deck of that noble vessel without the thrilling associations which her splendid achievements awaken. She is the flag-ship of the Pacific quadron, and has an apartment erected aft, on the spar-deck, for the accommodation of Capt. Claxton, the Commodore. The captain of the ship is Daniel E. Turner, who fought with Perry on Erie, and her 1st lieutenant that able officer, Mr. Carpenter. Mr. Ellis, our Minister to Mexico, will take passage in her to Vera Cruz. She will leave Port, it is said, to-morrow.—[*N. Y. Star.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE AURORA.

Mr. Barrow:—

Every man is said to play his own tune upon his own instrument. As was to be expected, therefore, the "Editor of the Chronicle" is out against "A Lover of Consistency" in his usual strain of blackguardism and abuse. This, permit me to tell him, is not my favorite instrument, nor shall I notice his own (self-conceited) delightful canto. To argue the issue in this manner, is to do but injustice to its strength. But let me advise him (if he wishes to make any thing by abuse,) first to establish for himself a character and reputation that will add some responsibility to his remarks, and then, probably, he may feel that vomiting out of *his* "foul throat" his lies, is not so agreeable or so palatable to your correspondent's. But, so long as I bear the name of A Lover of Consistency, I cannot stoop to wound a *prostrate* enemy, nor condescend to insult a convicted criminal.

I shall confine myself to the facts. And first, upon what authority was the declaration, that Mr. Rea received three per cent, made? I answer, upon "Whig" rumor.—And if it lied, who is the blameable party? Did not one of the commissioners himself state that they had nothing to do but appoint a treasurer; that the law affixed the per cent., and they could neither add to, or subtract from, the amount allowed? Did not some of the *knowing* ones, to whom the commissioners communicated the fact, tell Mr. Anderson's friends *it was no use for him to apply at one per cent.*, that Mr. Rea would be appointed, and the law compelled them to give him so much? And when, impartial reader, you learn that it was known Mr. Anderson was to apply at one per cent., at least a month before he sent in his application, is it a difficult matter to see into the drift of this story? No; I feel assured you have already anticipated my answer. It was gotten up to deter Mr. Anderson from applying, as they wanted to keep the loaves and fishes among themselves. But in this they did not succeed. And what do we learn from it? Why, the "Editor of the Chronicle," after quoting and commenting upon some of my remarks, says:

"The amount disbursed by the Treasurer of the school fund, for 1838, was $7,074 36, including the county levy, dividends, free school fund, and surplus revenue; for which, according to the per cent. allowed by law, and which he (Rea) had a right to charge, he was entitled to the sum of $212 33; yet he charged but $92 23 (about 1 1-4 per cent.) thereby making, as a present to the school fund, the sum of $120."

Here, for the first time, we learn Mr. Rea received but 1 1-4 per cent., in contradiction to the rumor set afloat by themselves, and currently believed by every one. Does not this show that, after failing to deter Mr. Anderson from applying, Mr Rea did, to use the Editor's own words, "*present* to the school fund the sum of $120? And must he not have held more than $120 by means of the bargain between himself and the commissioners, before he could have made *that* donation? The very acknowledgment that he made a donation, shows clearly that he must have received more than 1 1-4 per cent., and that, too, by virtue of the agreement made with the commissioners. The former school commissioners gave Mr. Dixon, who preceded Mr. Rea, three per cent; and after the present commissioners found that Mr. Anderson had applied at one per cent., is it unreasonable to say (their consciences not yet hardened) that they were compelled to deduct 1 3-4 per cent. from Mr. Rea's charges, thereby making a present, as the "Editor" is pleased to say, of $120? And I religiously believe, if the hidden truth could be brought to view, it would show in letters of living light what I have here stated—that they were compelled to this step *after* they heard Mr. Anderson would make his application, and *after* they had *agreed to give Mr. Rea three per cent.*—For if this was not the fact, why should they start reports concerning the *binding nature of the law*, and their limited duty to appoint a *Treasurer only*. Thus far, circumstances at least go against them.

But let me quote from him a little further. In the same paragraph, he says:

"Supposing the funds should amount to the same sum for the present year, agreeably to Mr. Rea's charges, he will have given to the school fund $240; when, had the commissioners appointed Mr. Anderson, he would have presented the fund with but $141 49: being $98 51 *less* than Mr. Rea will have presented to the school fund when he shall have disbursed the funds of the present year." And again he says: "Now, we ask, with what sort of justice could the commissioners have disregarded the application of Mr. Rea, who, in the course of a few months, will have presented the school fund with the sum of $240, (for the purpose of educating poor children,) and received that of a man who would have made a donation to the fund of but $141 49."

Lest you should not understand the meaning of these two paragraphs, let me entreat you, gentle reader, to peruse them again.—He admits that Mr. Rea received 1 1-4 per cent, and also admits that Mr Anderson agreed to take one per cent.; yet, in the face of these admissions, contends that Mr. Rea will have paid out to the school fund, at the end of the year, $98 57 more than Mr. Anderson. But, say you, I cannot understand this—he has deceived me. Yes, he certainly has tried to do it, and this is perfectly in keeping with all their other proceedings, which they would willingly conceal from you and me and the people at large. This thing of inspecting their conduct they dread worse than an indolent soldier does the inspecting of his arms. But how has he deceived you? Why, by placing two years to the time of Mr. Rea, and only one to that of Mr. Anderson. The amount Mr. Rea received last year, as he admits, $92 23, doubled, so as to include the present year, makes $184 46—Compare this with the amount Mr. Anderson would have received this year, $70 74, doubled, ($141 48) and you have $32 98 in Mr. Anderson's favor; instead of which, this very wise "Editor" wishes you to believe there is $98 51 to be charged to Mr. Rea's *philanthropy*. Let me advise you, Mr. Editor, the next time you wish to deceive the people, to knit your sophistical net a little finer. The people—yes, sir, the people, having detected your poison, have rejected the dose; and you need not be astonished (if you attempt to physic them again) if they should *dismiss* the *doctor*.

The difference in the amount of the two charges, putting Mr. Rea's at 1 1-4 per cent., is trifling in itself, but the principles which actuate such political intrigues, must be objectionable in the mind of every honest man. Straws show which way the wind blows, and if these "Whig" office-holders were clothed with authority sufficient, they would play such fantastic tricks before "high heaven," *at the people's expense*, that would make even "angels weep." All his remarks about Mr. Rea's philanthropy are worth nothing; for Mr. Rea and every man in Cambridge must have known that Mr. Anderson intended to apply for Treasurer at the sum of one per cent at least four weeks before he sent in his application.

Here, he leaves 'A Lover of Consistency;' and, without altering the tone of his instrument, (except to raise the notes a little higher,) he falls upon our worthy Chief Judge of the Orphans' Court, and gives him no small measure of his abuse. As he has seen proper to couple this part of his remarks with his strictures on my former communication, I feel justified, by the circumstances, in saying a few works in Mr. Breerwood's behalf.—And what is the nature of his charge against the judge? Let him speak for himself:

"Shortly after the organization of the new court appointed by the immaculate Gov. Grason, the crier to the former court was dismissed from office; and on the day fixed for the appointment of the crier, Mr. Geo. Wingate handed in his application offering to cry the court for 25 cents per day. The chief judge of the court 'following in the footsteps' of General Jackson, who pocketed Mr. Clay's 'land bill' and carried it to the 'Hermitage,' also pocketed Mr. Wingate's application, and appointed another crier, giving him such per diem as the *Levy Court (at that time composed of Locofocos)* might see proper to allow."

The strength of this charge seems to be in Mr. Breerwood's pocketing Mr. Wingate's application,—the rest of his stuff being only intended to produce the impression upon the public mind that it was done without consulting the associate judges of the court, and without laying Mr. Wingate's terms before them. To meet this charge, I refer my readers to Messrs Dixon and Rowins, who are ready to give any explanation the Editor of the Chronicle, or his friends, may want. I will, however, state, for the satisfaction of those who may not see them, that they both say Mr. Wingate's application was laid before them by Mr. Breerwood, and the whole matter was formally disposed of by the court The *application itself* not being of such a nature as to be filed in the archives of the office, was given to Mr. Breerwood. Now, I ask, was it an important matter that the application of Mr. Wingate, after having been considered by the court, should be returned to him? Is it so despotic an act, and such an enormous assumption of power, as the Editor of the Chronicle is endeavoring to make it? How idle and absurd is such a notion! But what are his motives for pleading so strong in Mr. Wingate's behalf? Let us examine them. When the Orphans' Court appointed by the present Governor first met, Mr. Rea appeared as crier in the place of Mr. Flint, who was engaged at Annapolis.—Mr. Corkran also applied, among the rest, and the court ordered the clerk to enter Mr. Corkran as the crier. Immediately Mr. Hicks raised an objection, and said there was no precedent for turning out the crier. The consequence was, they held a long argument; and finally the Attorney General decided that the court had a *right to turn out their crier*. Let it be remembered that Mr. Hicks was, during the whole of this dispute, contending for keeping in Mr. Flint, *who received one dollar per day*. But when he found he was driven from his position, and a Van Buren man was likely to be appointed, then, O then, comes in the plea for economy: twenty-five cents a day was then sufficient. Such political demagogues merit the frowns of an indignant people, and are the very last to be clothed with authority by a Government whose interests they never regard. Away with such hypocrisy. And in accusing Mr. Breerwood of "appointing another crier, and giving him such per diem as the Levy Court (at that time composed of Locofocos) might see proper to allow," the Editor has not only shown an entire ignorance of the law, but misrepresented facts. The law expressly declares, that the "*Levy Court ,now the Commissioners of the Tax*) shall levy on the assessable property of the county, annually, a sum of money not exceeding one dollar for every day the crier is engaged." Mr. Breerwood had no right to stipulate with Mr. Corkran for one cent, nor did he; and, in fact, he does not even now know what the "Whig commissioners" will give Mr. Corkran. Besides, the Levy Court was not at that time composed of Locofocos, nor has it been for years. That body recommended to the "Whig" Senate by Gov. Grason, and confirmed, were (before they could act in an official capacity) villainously legislated from office by "Whigs." The present Whig commissioners *only* ever had the right to fix Mr. Corkran's salary, and we now have a fine opportunity of witnessing their proceedings, Mr. Thomas Flint having been before allowed one dollar a day. I shall here take the liberty to remark, that the "Editor of the Chronicle" seems to have brought this charge against Mr. Breerwood as an account in bar to the one I alleged against the commissioners; which is, in fact, admitting the justice of my claim.

But, Mr. Editor, it is useless for me to trouble you farther. Your readers cannot but see the ridiculous figure the "Editor of the Chronicle" has cut in thus attacking Mr. Breerwood and myself. I am sometimes led to believe he is affected with a sort of servile imitation, as the same voice which issues from his press can often be first heard at certain other places in our town And I have no doubt they impudently assume the concord of sounds (occasioned by tuning) to be the voice of the People of Dorchester. But on that glorious day when the freemen of Maryland shall walk to the polls in the majesty of their might, the Editor and his band will find all is but a dream!

He has mistaken his man when he supposes I belong to the "White washed clique." I am one of those who prefer "truth to falsehood" (as he says) and these are the kind of men he calls on the people of Dorchester to resist. The issue is made between us by *himself*, and as he has assigned me my own position in the dispute, I take it for granted he prefers the opposite, (namely) falsehood to truth. On these grounds, I cannot but meet him.

In conclusion I have only to lay the whole matter in the hands of the people themselves, the only safe guardians of our national independence, and of our civil rights and religious liberties. In drawing my conclusions from circumstances connected with this dispute, I have worked upon the principle "that the proof of certain circumstances, is sufficient to raise a presumption of other facts which are not expressly proved." If any of the facts here stated, or conclusions drawn from certain premises shall be met and answered, I shall respectfully submit. But if not—if *abuse* shall be returned for *reason* and *hard names* for *argument*, I shall (to use the language of another,) smile in the consciousness of my own power; and readily pass over the weakness of a mind that can condescend to *such* weapons.

A LOVER OF CONSISTENCY.

FOR THE AURORA.

DEMOCRACY AND FEDERALISM.

The Editor of the 'Chronicle,' in his virulent attack upon a 'A Spectator,' endeavours to drive him from his post,—not by strength of argument but by raillery.—'A Spectator,' not being frightened by the venom of a mushroom, will join issue with him. If 'A Spectator' should weary the patience of the reader with simplicity, he begs his pardon—as he deems it necessary to lay plain and simple facts before them in order to heal a subject so horribly tortured with sophistry as that of Democracy is by the editor of the Chronicle.

The first proposition I shall notice, is the mooted subject of Democracy and Federalism—the word *mooted* signifies "plucked up by the roots." I am astonished at the imbecility of the editor in using the word before an enlightened public; and his futile remarks lead me to believe that he is unacquainted with the principles of Democracy and Federalism, therefore I will proceed to explain them. Those of Democracy consist in the sovereign power being lodged in the body of the people—equal and exact justice to all men—a jealous care of the right of election by the people—absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—a jealous care of our constitutional rights and privileges, and the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the surest bulwark against anti republican tendencies. Federalism will be best explained by a detailed account of some of the acts and proceedings of that party. Under the administration of Washington we find Alexander Hamilton introducing a bill for a National Bank. On the final reading of the bill, a spirited opposition appeared against it, on the ground that banking systems were useless, but, especially, that Congress was not vested, by the Constitution, with competent power to establish a National Bank. The bill was carried in the affirmative by a majority of nineteen federal voices. President Washington, doubting the constitutionality of the bill, required the opinions of the Cabinet in writing. The Secretary of State (*Thomas Jefferson*) and the Attorney General (Mr. Randolph) considered the bill as decidedly unconstitutional. Under the administration of John Adams, the alien and sedition laws, together with others for raising a standing army, and imposing a direct tax and internal duties were passed, which caused much popular clamour, especially by the Democratic party, and so increased the opposition to Mr. Adams's administration as to prevent his re-election, and greatly to weaken the strength of the Federal party, to whom he owed his election to the Presidency.—the strife of parties during the term of electioneering was spirited,—Mr Jefferson and Mr Burr had each an equal number of votes by the Electoral College,—the ballot was taken several days in succession, (Feb. 1801,) before a choice was made. The Federalists supported Aaron Burr and the Democratic party Mr. Jefferson,—at length after much political heat and party animosity, Mr. Jefferson was chosen President, and Aaron Burr Vice President. At the commencement of Mr. Jefferson's administration he found all the responsible and lucrative offices in the hands of the Federalists. Mr. Jefferson took measures to divide the offices between the parties, which caused the merchants of New Haven to remonstrate against the removal of a Federal collector of that port.—Jefferson said in reply,—"it would have been to me a circumstance of great relief, had I found a moderate participation of office in the hands of the majority, (the Democratic party.) I would gladly have left to time and accident to raise them to their just share, but their total exclusion calls for prompter correctives. I shall correct the procedure, but that done, return with joy to that state of things, when the only question concerning a candidate shall be is he honest, is he capable, is he faithful to the Constitution,"—mark the different course of the modern whigs.) He also recommended the abolition of the internal taxes—the repeal of those acts passed under Adams' administration, and bills in accordance therewith, were passed.

In the autumn of 1806, we find Aaron Burr, their Federal demagogue, detected in a project for revolutionizing the territory west of the Alleganies, and of establishing an independent empire there, of which New Orleans was to be the capital, and himself the chief.—He collected therefore, from all quarters where himself or his agents possessed influence, all the ardent, restless, desperate, disaffected persons who were for an enterprize analagous to their characters,—he also seduced good well meaning citizens by assurances that he possessed the confidence of the government, and was acting under its secret patronage.

Nothing of much interest occurred from that time until the declaration of war, in 1812 In an address of the federal representatives to their constituents, they solemnly protested that the wrongs of which the United States complained, were not of a nature to justify a war, or such as war would be likely to remedy.—In the conclusion of their address they spoke as follows:—"The undersigned cannot refrain from asking what is the United States to gain by this war—will the gratification of some privateersmen compensate the nation for that sweep of our legitimate commerce by the extended marine of our enemy which the desperate act invites." During the war it was stated to our Government that six thousand two hundred and fifty-seven seamen had been pressed and forcibly detained on board British ships of war; and this slavery has been a subject of merriment and a theme for ridicule among the federalists.—They said, "it makes no more difference to a sailor what ship he is on board, than it does to a hog what stye he is in—give us merchants and commerce, and those Jack tars will take care of themselves; for it is not worth while to lose a profitable trade for the sake of a few ignorant sailors, who never had any rights, and who have neither liberty, property or homes but what we merchants give them."

By arguments and threats, they induced the monied men, very generally, to refuse loans of money to the government and to ruin our resources. Did not that party, denominated Federalists, exult at the disasters of our army, and did they not vote in the Senate of Massachusetts that it was unworthy a religious and moral people to rejoice at the immortal achievements of our gallant seamen? In the midst our difficulties, when this powerful enemy threatened us by sea and land, with a powerful force from Penobscot; another through lake Champlain; another landed at the Chesapeake, while nothing but resistance and insurgency were talked of and hinted at within. In this state of things and under these circumstances, did not the Federal party generally, seize hold of this alarming state of our affairs, to call the convention at Hartford, and that not merely to perplex the government, but to be the organ of communication between the enemy and the malecontents? Did they not then talk loudly of our worm eaten constitution, and call the Union a rope of sand that could no longer hold together? Did they not after a session of near three weeks, publish a report consisting of several proposed alterations of the federal constitution, which were calculated to sever the Union,—the report of the convention concluded with a resolution providing for the calling of another convention should the United States refuse their consent to their arrangement. The conclusion of a treaty of peace with Great Britian not long after, being announced, another convention was not called, and on the submission of the above amendments of the constitution to the several States they were rejected. In 1816 they completed that vehicle in which they intended to ride into power, (United States Bank,) but finding the democracy of the country so highly incensed at their treasonable acts during the war, they deemed it most advisable to remain neutral at the election of Monroe, and through his administration, and if possible, to get rid of a name that had become so odious to every patriot in the Union; but, in 1824, they came into the field of battle under the name of Adams men, and used the United States Bank as artillery to clear their way to the Presidential chair. They succeeded in dividing the Democratic ranks, and seducing the political malitia of Maryland and some other States to join them, which will be proven by the following statement.

General Jackson had 99 votes in the Electoral College, John Q. Adams but 84, Crawford 41, and Henry Clay 57. On the 9th February, 1825, the House divided itself into state sections, and proceeded to the election of a President: On the first ballot, Adams had the votes of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, New York, Maryland, Kentucky, Ohio, Louisiana, Illinois, and Missouri, (being 13 states); Gen. Jackson had the votes of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Indiana, Alabama, and Mississippi, (seven states); Crawford had the votes of Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia, (four states). If the reader will reflect for a moment, he will discover that the principal part of the states that voted for Mr. Adams have always been opposed to a democratic administration, although in some of the states which voted for Crawford there was a mixture of Democrats and Federalists; for many of the Federals wished to get clear of Federal principles, as well as the name—and the Democrats, many of them, that supported Crawford, afterwards espoused the Federal cause: for, in 1828, we see them join the Federals in opposition to General Jackson and Democracy; and to prove that fact, we will notice the canvass for 1828. In the Electoral College, General Jackson had one hundred and seventy eight votes, and Adams eighty three. Now, where are the Democrats who joined the Federalists in support of Crawford, in 1824? Are they not crying out that they are Adams men, with the rest of the Federalists? Adams had only the Federal states, (which are the New England states,) sixteen from New York, and five from Maryland—all the other states voted for General Jackson. During the time of electioneering, the Federalists kept up a spirited warfare through the presses, of which, rising three hundred, were kept up by the patronage of the United States Bank. Ye Federalists, under the assumed name of Whigs, if ye failed of riding into power when you had the patronage of the bank, desperate must be your case without its aid, when the democracy of the country are awakened to a true sense of your monopolizing schemes! The reader will please pardon 'A Spectator' for the simple course he has taken to lay Federal principles before them; he has done it with a design that the most ordinary reader should comprehend it, as he is well aware that there are many of the Whigs who would shudder at the idea of Whiggery, when they become sensible that it is based upon Federal principles.

I will return to the course of the Editor, upon the banking system and Jackson, where, upon a thorough examination, I find nothing but perversion and contradiction, in terms.—By the bye, he would like to know where the *pyrian* spring is situated: The *pyrian* spring which 'A Spectator' had reference to, is a spring of Federal principles, where the youthful and uninformed part of the community are constantly imbibing intoxicating draughts. The spring is situated in the above named states, near Boston.

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the *pierian* spring:
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again."

The Editor endeavors to satisfy 'A Spectator' that he knows nothing; but 'A Spectator' knows that he has never shot a ball through his new beaver yet for the sake of mushroom popularity, which is raised without merit, and lost without a crime, and then charged it to a midnight assassin of the Democratic party. *'Tis not to be expected that 'A Spectator' should write with that elegance of style that those do who are concerned in editing the Chronicle*, for he never has had the advantage of graduating in the Bucktown college. The advantage to be derived from graduating in that college is a caution to David Crocket. For cheapness and expedition, it excels any other on the terraqueous globe. Men that are quite unlearned and ignorant can graduate there in one day, and come out ready qualified for statesmen; and even those who go there to superintend their graduation, return to their homes with a language that requires an Editor to interpret.—Some who go there to superintend the graduation, call it "*an invention*;" and 'A Spectator' believes they are very near right,—that it is a Federal invention to defraud the public out of their rights and privileges. 'A Spectator' thinks it will be needless for many to graduate there this year; that if they do, and come out, they will not get certificates to go to Annapolis, as usual.

If the Editor should stoop as far beneath the dignity of a gentleman in replying to this, as he did to 'A Spectator's' last communication, 'A Spectator' will not deign to take any further notice of him, in this way.

A SPECTATOR.

CAMBRIDGE:

MONDAY, MAY 27, 1839.

DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES

FOR SHERIFF.
JOHN W. DAIL.

FOR THE ASSEMBLY.
GEORGE A. Z. SMITH.

COMMISSIONERS OF THE TA
1st District—HENRY W. HICKS.
2d District—HENRY COOK.
" " LEVI D. TRAVERS
3d District—SOLOMON FOXWEL

☞The communication from our c
pondent, "A Lover of Consistency," v
found in our paper to-day. We ask fo
attentive perusal.

THE SEASONS.—The weather, for t
week, has been very favorable to vege
and we learn that in all parts of the c
the crops promise the husbandman an
dant reward for his toil.

VIRGINIA.—An election for mem
Congress, and delegates to the Gene
sembly, took place on Thursday last
shall, probably, be able to lay the resul
our readers in our next.

NEW YORK, *Tuesday*, M

By the arrival of the ship Azel
night, from Rio Janeiro, we have dat
that port to the 9th ult., giving us so
ther particulars of the capture of two
can vessels by the French Admiral, c
ding the fleet off Buenos Ayres, for a
ed infraction of the blockade establish
that port, to the river Da Prata, and s
count of which had before reached
translate the following from the Jou
Commercio, of the 4th ult., on the s
of which, that paper states, every
may be placed.—[*Balt. Repub.*

The two American brigs, the Ame
Eliza Davidson, had sailed from Mo
with full cargoes for Loberia Chica,
port on the coast of Patagonia belo
the Argentine republic, but which is
the limits of the blockade, publishe
French Admiral, which only includ
from the port of Buenos Ayres, to th
south of the river Da Prata.

The vessels in question, had, it
discharged, and were taking in carg
a French man-of-war arrived at Lob
ca, having been despatched by Adm
blanc for the purpose, which at once
session of the brigs, and brought the
to Montevideo, without their flags, a
for an infringement, adds the Jo
Commercio, of a blockade which n
existence, either de facto, or on pape

The consignees of the captured ve
applied in vain to the French Ad
their release, who would only grant
condition that bonds to the full a
their value should be given, until th
the brigs had been decided by the A
tribunal of France—a proposition w
consignees at once rejected.

The American Admiral had, i
quence, written to Admiral Leblanc
ing in the strongest terms against su
ceeding, which he plainly stated
be tolerated by the government of th
States, and demanding an immedia
of the captured vessels. At our la
however, no reply had been receive
are consequently yet in ignorance
result of this gross outrage on our f
matter has excited much interes
where the conduct of the French A
severely censured.

U. S. Sloop of War Hornet.—
not recollect the intense interest f
fate of this vessel and her gallant
how long and how anxiously eve
from the south was looked for to s
intelligence there was of her melan
At length the news came that bu
tarpaulin, and a few planks were
the tale—they were picked up i
of Mexico, and bore marks of havi
ed to the ship. She went to the b
not one, it was thought, had been
count the story of the sad cata
There is one survivor at least, a se
serts the New York Dispatch unhe
A gentleman just returned from t
of Illinois has seen him. He foun
tivating the land, upon the twelve
rie, near the Kaskaskia river. He
he was saved in a boat with five o
they were drifted ashore upon th
Cuba, whence, after different ch
fortune, he is found at the West.
that the Hornet was making fo
when she struck on a rock, and tha
of the escape from the wreck of
except himself and his five compan
doubt this story, but there is a pe
may be true. So many years ha
and so much anxiety expressed, th
to us ere this the history must hav
if a survivor existed. The Disp
ever, insists that it is so, and is
put any of the friends of the ill-fa
a way to obtain more particular i
—*Balt. Sun.*

The Wedding Finger.—The
objects among the productions of
plated with such lively interest by
ier a certain age, as the weddin
been the theme for poets of ever
for geniuses of every wing, from
duckling to the solar eagle T
antiquary can tell the origin of
with which it is connected, and
why a ring is round, and accoun
circumstances concerning the cere
circlet, on the most conductive e
amidst all that has been said o
reference to the ring, we believ
lovely part engaged in the mysti
the taper residence of this orn
been neglected. Now this is ra
as there are facts belonging to the
which render it in a peculiar ma
propriate emblem of matrimonial u
ten to a celebrated anatomist;—"I

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc6044_1_62-0188.jpg