gotiations, it was inexpedient to make public. Referring to the other observations of the noble Earl who preceded him, he said, that stipulations, as between any parties, there was none; but there was a species of understanding which existed between the humblest individual in the Government and the highest, on points of the great system of policy which regulates the affairs of this country.

Lord GODERICH felt himself called upon, by what had been said, to explain the circumstances which occasioned the change of Government. The immediate cause which led to it was an irreconcilable difference of opinion upon a subject of the deepest import, between two members of that Government, holding situations of the highest distinction in the administration of public affairs. It had been intimated to him, be a Member of the Cabinet, that it would be a very desirable thing to place in the chair of the Finance Committee an individual in the other House, whom he knew to be a man of the highest honor and uncorruptible integrity, apt for the business, and conversant with all those points which would necessarily come under the view of the committee. As the matter was not brought regularly before the Government, but only mentioned to him in a casual and incidental manner, he did not conceive that he was called upon to express any other opinion than this:—that being a question especially within the province of the House of Commons, he should entirely approve of the decision made upon it by those Members of the Cabinet who belonged to that branch of the Legislature. It happened that a communication on the subject was made without the knowledge of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. This he thought an oversight, and lamented it; and begged that no time should be lost in explaining to the Chancellor of the Exchequer the whole of the circumstances, which was done by his right honorable friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies. No objection was then made, nor, as far as he (Lord Goderich) had heard, was any offence then taken by him at what had been done. It did, however, so happen, that the next day, after he had the subject under his consideration, he found very strong objections to the proposed appointment. These objections he (Lord G.) understood as with him (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) than to the individual named, to whose appointment, he could not then accede. Explanations and letters followed between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which the latter, as well as he (Lord G.) considered perfectly satisfactory, so far so at least as to have removed the necessity for the person, by whom the objection had been made, resigning office in case the appointment was persisted in. All this occurred between the end of November, and the beginning of December; and on the 22d of December, he first received from the Chancellor of the Exchequer a letter, stating his objection to the proposed appointment in form, and that he felt it his duty to place his office at his (Lord G's) disposal, if it should be any inconvenience to appoint any other person in his stead.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer afterwards constantly referred to that letter, as involving his resignation as the necessary consequence of that appointment; on the other hand, the Secretary of State distinctly and unequivocally stated, that he felt his own honor and character so involved in the appointment, that he could not acquiesce in any change. There was thus an irreconcilable difference of opinion between the individuals holding two of the most important and efficient offices in the State, on a question of vital importance to the proper conduct of the affairs of the kingdom. He (Lord G.) then represented to his Majesty the situation in which the Government was placed. His Majesty decided on sending a communication to the noble Duke (Wellington) and he (Lord G.) ceased to hold the situation in which he had been placed. The noble Lord then entered into a vindication of his own motives and conduct in accepting that situation, in discharging its duties, and in quitting it. While he had the proud consciousness of having always done his duty to the best of his ability, he felt that his honor and character were unassailable. He then entered into a defence of the Treaty of July last, relative to Turkey and Greece; but concurred in the objection to produce the papers now moved for.

The Earl of ELDON contended that the hostilities which had taken place were the necessary consequences of the instructions to the Admirals—to prevent all collision between the belligerents, in pursuance of the treaty of July; and when the question came under the consideration of their lordships, he pledged himself to prove that the treaty was indefensible by the law of nations, as applied to such a subject. It had been represented as something very wrong to give public explanations; but if it was wrong in that House, why was it not so at an election?

The Duke of WELLINGTON objected to the production of the papers on the grounds urged by the Earl of Dudley, and defended the treaty, which he thought it his first duty to carry into execution. The noble earl (Caernarvon) talked of guarantees. Did he suppose that gentlemen, who had done him (the Duke of Wellington) the honor to connect themselves with him in that service, imagined that he was a person having such principles that they could not trust him without a guarantee that he would not abandon them for some corrupt purpose of his own, after having accepted their support and assistance? Was it to be supposed that the right honorable gentleman alluded to by the noble earl ever used such expressions as were ascribed to him at the Liverpool election? It was much more probable, though he (the Duke of Wellington) had not thought it worth his while to ask for any explanation on the subject, that his right honorable friend had stated, not that he had concluded any wholesale bargain with him, but that the men, of whom the Government was composed, were in themselves a sufficient guarantee to the public that their measures would be such as would be conducive to his Majesty's honor and interests, and the happiness of the people. But if he had given a guarantee to his right honorable friend, what had he done for the other members of the Government? Was there no body else in the Government but his right honorable friend? Every minister, surely, formed a part of it. Every one was equally at liberty to state his opinions on every subject he might propose for the consideration of the Government. The present Cabinet was conducted on the same principles as that of Lord Liverpool, of which, for eight years, he (the Duke of W.) was a member. He was an assenting party to the greatest number of the measures of that Government. His opinions were perfectly well known. He had departed from none of them, nor did he believe that his right honorable friend had departed from any of his—(Hear.)

The Marquis of CLANCARDE regarded the construction of the Cabinet under the noble Duke, as a national calamity. He expressed his surprise at the coalition of the right honorable gentleman, (Mr. Huskisson,) with those whom, only a few month ago, he had declared nothing should induce him to take office with those who had pursued with calumny to the grave his late lamented friend, (Mr. Canning.) In that declaration, it was understood, too, that the noble earl (Dudly) and some others had joined. He was sure that, under no circumstances, would Mr. Canning have given his support to the noble Duke; and in support of that assertion, he would read an extract from a letter addressed to the noble Duke by Mr. Canning, in May last, in answer to a speech made in the House. [The extract strongly expressed the opinion of Mr. Canning, that it was wholly out of the question to think of his Grace ever being at the head of the Government. The union of the whole power of the country, civil and military, in the same hand would be wholly incompatible with a free constitution, and nothing could induce him to serve under a government so constituted.]

The Earl of DUDLEY said it was stated that there were certain persons now in the Government, who, soon after the formation of the late Cabinet, had used angry expressions toward the members of that Cabinet, and particularly towards its illustrious head; and it was therefore said that, as he had been a member of that Cabinet, and had acted under its leader, he ought to have declined participating in the present administration. Now, he would ask their lordships whether the memory of such expressions ought to be revived? and whether there ought to be such a plea as the sacred duty of immortalizing hatred; and whether the grounds of public action ought always to be formed on private enmity or private friendship? He would ask, with reference to a recent example, whether there ever had been sentiments more differing from each other, or opinions more at variance, than those which characterized the differences (unfortunately not entirely political,) between two statesmen, one of whom afterwards acted under the other, and succeeded him in his office?

Yet, notwithstanding the example afforded by the conduct of that noble lord (Castlereagh,) and that right honorable gentleman, (Mr Canning,) what was the lesson of the noble Marquis opposite? After such an example, was it from the noble Marquis that he was to learn the lesson of uncompromising hostility? He saw no grounds of a personal nature sufficiently strong to justify him in disconnecting himself from the Government. In the sense of one man bargaining to give up something to promote his union with another, there had been no "stipulation;" but a conversation and understanding on some important points there certainly had been. It was understood that the present Cabinet, like those which had preceded it, should be neutral upon the question of the Roman Catholic claims; and, with regard to the foreign policy of the country, the noble Duke at the head of the Government had stated, that having found by the councils of his predecessors, that his majesty was bound by treaty to perform certain agreements entered into with other powers, he spontaneously, and as part of his duty, would maintain and perform those agreements, from a proper regard for the honor of his majesty, and the interests of his country. With this understanding he had not felt ashamed to retain, under the present government, the situation which he had held under the last.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said he was perfectly willing to acquiesce in the objection of his noble friend, (the Earl of Dudley,) to the production of the papers. The papers, when produced, would most fully justify the conduct of Sir E. Codrington, by the circumstances under which he led the British fleet into the harbor of Navarino. The peace of the world was the standard by which the policy of the interference in the affairs of the Turkish Government with Greece was to be determined. They must see those papers, and then they might judge whether the law of nations had not been complied with in that particular case.

The noble Marquis then adverting to recent events, said that he felt as much bound to set himself right with the public as a right honorable statesman who had made statements in another place, in which he had stated the substance of a conversation which had passed between them on the 11th January, connected with the dissolution of the Cabinet that had recently taken place. After that conversation, he (the Marquis of L.) left town, and on his return, the right hon. gentleman saw him again, and commenced the conversation by stating the circumstances which had led him to determine on seceding from the then Cabinet, and that he knew a proposition would be made to him (the Marquis of L.)—he then stated the impossibility of his acting with such a government, after the declarations which had been made last year by those who, it was now said, were to compose the Cabinet. After that determination had been stated, he (the Marquis of L.) as frankly stated his own, declaring the impossibility of his acting with those from whose administration he thought the country could never hope for a beneficial government, and that he would only join a ministry on the express ground that steps should be adopted for settling and tranquilizing Ireland. He did not now complain of the statement which the right hon. gentleman had made. There was nothing unfair or uncandid in it; but he regretted that in his anxiety to set himself right with his constituents, he had, in conveying to them some notion of the dissolution of the government, thought himself bound to withhold that which both the noble earle (Carlisle) and himself (the Marquis of L.) had stated to be the principal cause of it. One thing, however, he must confess, pleased him. The right hon. gentleman's statement went the whole length of saying that the whole foreign and commercial policy of the country was guaranteed to be the same as that of the administration of Mr. Canning. (Hear!) That was a testimony of the strongest kind, that the present administration were convinced of the wisdom of that policy. He was glad that the noble lord (Ellenborough) opposite, was now relieved from the charge of having indulged in a personal animosity against Mr. Canning, and that his strong expressions were declared to have been against the policy of that right hon. gentleman, and not to have originated in personal dislike. When he resigned the seals of his office, he did not feel any thing like an intention to enter upon a course of opposition to the government; still less did he feel it now, when he found that it was to be conducted on principles which he approved. With respect to what was called the Catholic question, he certainly knew that he did not entertain the same sentiments as the noble Duke, but, at the same time, he trusted that it would not, on that account, be allowed to retrograde. He hoped that it would be treated as a neutral question, but he nevertheless waited with anxiety for the result. He would not prejudice any man. He should watch every thing that took place, as a member of the legislature of his country; and he assured the noble Duke that he wished him the most fortunate success in his administration: he also begged leave to assure him, which he did with a firm conviction of its truth, that whatever he might be able to achieve, there was one thing, which, with all his military success, he never could achieve, and against which he warned him—let him remember that he might conciliate, but that he never could reconquer Ireland. (Hear! Hear! Hear!)

Lord ELLENBOROUGH said, that whenever it might be deemed consistent to lay on the table of the House all those papers from which alone they could rightly judge of facts, he should be as ready as the noble Marquis to explain the opinion he had formed on the events of the last six months, and when he assured their lordships that whatever his opinions might have been, they still remain unaltered, he trusted he should be entitled to their belief, till the proper time arrived for a fuller explanation. (Hear! Hear!) It was the fashion to think that all our foreign policy was attributable to Mr. Canning; perhaps the noble Marquis might suppose that the recognition of the States of South America was owing to that Minister: but in fact, it had long before been decided—at the Assembly of Ministers at Aix la Chapelle—that affairs were gradually moving towards that result, and the only question was as to the proper time. The principle, therefore, of that recognition, did not belong to Mr. Canning; with respect to the question of Portugal, the point was not one that turned on the principle of policy, but on the principle of good faith. As to the question of Greece, those who were desirous of promoting Mr. Canning's policy, would, no doubt, persevere in the course he had begun; and, indeed, if his policy was to be limited to the treaty of the 6th July, he (Lord E.) was ready to admit that he should not be disposed to advise his Majesty to violate his plighted faith; but, as to the rest of the question, he did not, by so saying, stand committed. He never was a personal enemy of Mr. Canning's; and indeed he might say that he hardly knew him, for he believed he never met him but once or twice, and then merely in the ordinary way of intercourse. He thought of him only as a public man, and as a public man he held him, and still did so, to be a dangerous man, and if he stood there at this moment he would again oppose him as such. When Mr. Canning's commercial policy was brought forward, the noble Marquis would doubtless recollect that he (Mr. E.) sat by his side and did not oppose it. In what respect then had he gone back from the opinion which he once entertained? With respect to the Catholic question, however paradoxical it might appear to the noble Marquis, he (Lord E.) felt convinced that it was likely to derive more good under the present government, than it would have done under his, and for this reason: because, if brought forward under his, it would have excited those who were against the measure to a strong resistance, which was not so likely to arise under the present administration.

Lord WHARNCLIFFE said, that although the noble Lord (Ellenborough) seemed to satisfy himself with the defence he had made, the question was, whether the House would be satisfied with that explanation? Was Mr. Canning indeed a dangerous man, as the noble Lord tried to make him appear? And, if such were the case, what were they to think of those who avowed that they intended to support the principles of that dangerous man? Surely there were some great confusion here, or else the opposition that had been shown by them to Mr. Canning's ministry must have been personal. But it was not enough to tell the country that the treaty of the 6th July should be persevered in. Mr. Canning had been at the head of a certain number of persons in this country, who had thought it wise to adopt a course of conduct proceeding on more liberal principles than had been previously admitted by Government. It was to this that he wanted the present ministers to pledge themselves. It was not because a noble duke and a noble lord consented to the carrying on of the treaty of the 6th of July, and that its principle should be adhered to, that the country was to remain satisfied. He (Lord W.) in the name of that country, (and as having admired that great man when alive, and as lamenting him when dead) demanded to know whether his external policy—whether his Corn Bill, and other measures, were to be persevered in? That was what he would ask of the present ministers, but did he not see, sitting by their sides, the very persons who had defeated the Corn Bill last year? (hear! hear!) And could he have any confidence that those persons would act as was promulgated? No pledge that was given, was, to him, worth one farthing. He wanted to see what would be their measures, and by those it was that he would judge. (Hear! hear!)—He hoped that he might be able to support government and its measures, but as to its adopting a liberal foreign policy, and carrying into effect the Corn Bill, he confessed he had no hope.

The Earl of CAERNARVON observed, that, after what had been said, he would not press his motion; but he still thought there was ample room for the papers for which he had moved.

The motion was then withdrawn.

Richmond Whig.

SATURDAY MORNING, MARCH 22, 1828.

A writer who dates from Lancaster county, in the yesterday's Enquirer, has favored the public with some Presidential calculations by which he gives Jackson 59 majority of Electoral votes without counting upon "rational probabilities." He professes to be extremely caudid, and thinks that every man of "judgment and candor," who "has kept his eye on the whole circumference of progressive political events," will admit that he has not "rendered unto Cæsar, (Gen. Jackson) the things (votes) that are not Cæsar's." His calculations too, are based, so he says, on "well ascertained and *recorded facts*." These are his very modest prefatory professions: now let us look a little into his details.

We have nothing to say to his data until he comes to the State of Illinois. Some people who have kept their eyes "on the whole circumference of progressive political events," think Pennsylvania, which our Lancaster seer has given without ceremony to *Cæsar*, a little *doubtful*—but let that pass. Some again think that Virginia is not absolutely certain for Cæsar—but let that pass too. But Illinois—upon what "well ascertained and recorded facts" has this sagacious political Cocker, concluded that Illinois was for Cæsar. So do not think the Members of Congress from that State—so do not think the Legislature of Illinois, which contained administration majorities. Cook was evicted it is true, and Duncan elected—but from all accounts, not by the force of the Presidential question. All the State Officers are administration, and Duncan himself, is no thorough Jackson man. Pray now Veritas, let us have your "well ascertained and recorded facts," in relation to the vote of Illinois. *These are "skittish" times, and the public will attach* no credit to your arithmetic without seeing your "recorded facts." Score Illinois to John Quincy Adams—We cannot give unto Cæsar, the things that are *not* Cæsar's.

The Lancaster Arithmetician has also put down Missouri to Cæsar. Where are the "well ascertained and recorded facts" to justify this disposition of the vote of Missouri? Scott was turned out we admit—but Bates, a firm and high minded supporter of the Administration, was elected in his stead. What does this prove but that the Jackson men had no man whom they could elect? Shall we be told that Benton was reelected to the Senate? Granted—but that was done by the Legislature and not by the people. Bates the sole Representative of Missouri, thinks that the Administration ticket will succeed in Missouri. Whom shall we credit, in the absence of "well ascertained and recorded facts?—Mr. Bates who represents Missouri, or our Northern Neck sage who for aught we know, was never beyond the confines of the Old Dominion? Score Missouri to John Quincy Adams—Cæsar claims more than belongs to him.

Our Lancaster Cocker next arbitrarily gives Gen. Jacksan 20 in New York, and Mr. Adams 16—upon what "well ascertained and recorded facts"? New York gave Mr. Adams 26 votes in 1824—Why should it be supposed that she will give him less in 1828? Jackson's popularity in New York is of the hot bed sort—forced by the exertions of a few managing politicians. It is confined to the cities and the neighborhood of the cities, while the "Lion of the West"—the powerful counties to the west & north of Albany, are almost unanimously for the administration. Why should "Veritas" fix upon the numbers 20 and 16?—how comes he to know so accurately, that Jackson will receive the first, and Mr. Adams the last number? One would think that this *accurate* arithmetician, would not have undertaken to determine *ex cathedra*, a question that poses the New Yorkers themselves—and would have had the modesty to class New York with the doubtful. Not so. He has looked upon the "whole circumference of progressive political events," and he has learned to a certainty that New York will give 20 to Jackson and 16 to Adams—neither more nor less. In point of fact, the whole body of "signs" from New York since Clinton's death, are favorable, and there is no good reason to believe that New York will give Mr. Adams fewer votes than in 1824. We are very liberal in conceding Jacksan 10 votes there—and we therefore score 26 for Mr. Adams in New York—Less will do, but we want that others shall have justice besides Cæsar.

Our Lancasterian next comes to Maryland—Adams 5, and Jackson 6! Upon what "well ascertained and recorded facts" has "Veritas" given to Jackson a majority in Maryland? If we are correct in our reminiscencies, the Baltimore Jackson zealot, Mr. Carr of the Republican, has never claimed more than five electoral votes for the Hero in Maryland. Is the Administration's having a majority in the last Legislature, the "recorded fact," upon the strength of which the Lancasterian claims a majority for *Jackson*? Is that not a *non sequitur*? The Administration men say that at the outside, Jackson will get but 4 votes in Maryland—others reduce it to two, and others with confidence to one. But we will be liberal. Score 6 for John Quincy Adams in Maryland.

We next arrive at the *doubtful* list, of our hopeful arithmetician. Pennsylvania is not doubtful—nor Virginia—nor any State claimed for Jackson—but Veritas thinks Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana, and Kentucky doubtful! It was rather too strong a game to give them all to Jackson—and as this could not be attempted with even tolerable grace, Veritas resolved to make them all *doubtful*. Now we do humbly conceive, that if there is a single State in the Union as little doubtful as any other State, that State is Ohio. Where are the "recorded facts" that bear out the learned Theban from Lancaster, in classing Ohio among the doubtful States? Are they that two thirds of the last Legislature were Administration—that all the officers of the State are administration—that Jno. W. Campbell nominated by the Jacksonians to oppose Gov. Trimble, relinquished the nomination in dispair of success? Or are they that the united Clay & Adams vote in 1824, more than double the Jackson vote—that the members who voted for Mr. Adams were re-elected?—and that the most presumptuous Heroites have ceased to claim Ohio for their idol? We know of no "recorded facts" but these. If these will serve "Veritas," he is welcome to them. As far as our observation extends—& we certainly have tried to keep a heedful eye upon "the whole circumference of progressive political events"—so far from their being any "well ascertained and recorded facts" to justify Veritas in ranking Ohio among the doubtful—there is not a single "sign," big or little—there is not the slightest pretence of any kind or description, for concluding that Ohio is not entirely safe for Adams.

Indiana too is doubtful says Veritas! What are the "recorded" evidences in support of this position? We say there are none—the whole flow and current of signs and indications are the other way. A majority (and we believe a large majority) of the late Legislature was administration—so are the Delegation to Congress. In most of the Jackson estimates, Indiana is resigned to the administration—it was reserved for our Lancasterian to make the discovery that she was in doubt. Score the five votes of Indiana to John Quincy Adams.

Next in the doubtful list stands Louisiana. What are the "well ascertained and recorded facts" in this case? Brent (who lives in the strongest Jackson District in the State) and Gurley, both of whom voted for Mr. Adams before, were re-elected—and if report may be believed, Mr. Livingston goes to the wall at the next election. A majority of the Legislature were for the Administration. It is admitted that Jackson's late electioneering trip to New Orleans, resulted in disappointment and disgust.—Where are the "recorded facts?" There are none. Score Louisiana to Mr. Adams.

We are at a loss for the reasons which induced Veritas to arrange Delaware with the doubtful votes. The last Fall, the strength of the parties was fully tested in the Congressional election, and Mr. Johns, the Administration candidate, was elected by several hundred majority.—What are the "recorded facts" which denote a change since then? None. Delaware will assuredly support Mr. Adams—and we so score her accordingly.

Last though not least of the doubtful, stands Kentucky—and Kentucky is the only one of the five, the indications from which, authorise her being ranked as doubtful. She returned a majority of Jackson men to Congress—but at the same time a majority of Administration men to each House of the General Assembly. The Administration majority in full confidence of triumph, determined to change the mode of voting from the District to the General ticket—and the Jackson minority with real or affected confidence, (the last may be inferred, as they could not help themselves) supported the change. "Recorded facts" certainly authorise the supposition that Kentucky is doubtful—while on the other hand, private accounts speak with absolute confidence of the vote of the state for the Administration, since the change of the law. We have little or no doubt on the subject—yet we are willing to rank Kentucky among the doubtful.

We have followed and we hope exposed the fallacious calculations of this writer. We are far from saying or believing, that he has designed to impose upon the public. We rather believe that he has been duped by his own credulity and wishes, aided by the circumstance of his seeing but one side of the question through newspapers that would consider it treason to Jackson, to "record" any facts unfavorable to him. We, at least, have assigned the "recorded facts" upon which we base *our* conclusions. Veritas has only said that he possessed these "recorded facts." Until he condescends to reveal them, we rather believe our statement will carry more weight than his. We have stated nothing in which we have not entire confidence—unless it be as to the New York vote. In that case, we adopt the opinion of intelligent and judicious New Yorkers.

We have very little question of Mr. Adams' election.—Now according to our calculations, built upon "well ascertained and recorded" *facts*, how stands the matter?

FOR ADAMS.		FOR JACKSON.	
New England	51	New York	10
New Jersey	8	Pennsylvania	28
New York	26	Virginia	24
Delaware	3	North Carolina	15
Indiana	5	South Carolina	11
Illinois	3	Georgia	9
Louisiana	5	Alabama	5
Missouri	3	Mississippi	3
Ohio	16	Maryland	5
Maryland	6	Tennessee	11
	126		121

Leaving Kentucky doubtful then, the vote will stand according to our calculation, based upon "well ascertained and recorded facts"—for Adams 126—for Jackson 121.—Kentucky, if this estimate be right, has the game in her own hands. We are not doubtful how she will decide it. We may give or take five or six votes in New York, without changing the result. We say *all is safe*. We are confident of success. The people of the U. States will postpone the choosing a master indefinitely—at all events to the next generation.

New Hampshire Election.—In this state the Jackson cause, (which if the public had credited the Jackson *Presses* was to succeed) has been successfuly put down—Gov. Pierce was only *suspected* of Jacksonism, and was turned out upon suspicion. The triumph is complete—and the more satisfactory, that Isaac Hill editor of the New Hampshire Patriot, a most scurrilous journal, though a talented one—has lost his seat in the state senate. The new Governor is brother of Mr. Bell, U. S. Senator. When does Mr. Woodbury's election come on? The result of this election we presume *confirms* him on his misrepresentation of the people of New Hampshire in the Senate of the U. States. Woodbury of New Hampshire—Chandler of Maine—McLane and Ridgeley of Delaware—with what face can they ask the support of *Republicans* at any future time? We say nothing of Rowan & Johnson of Ky. or Mr. Smith of Maryland.

From the New Hampshire Statesman of March 15.

THE ELECTION.

The cause of the Administration has triumphed most successfully and honorably. New Hampshire is erect, and as *clear as a Bell*, in her support of good order and civil freedom. It will be seen by the returns given below, that the Hon. John Bell is, without doubt, elected Governor—and elected, we should judge, by a plurality of three thousand votes. Had the simple question been *Administration* or *Opposition*, it would probably have been ten thousand—but it should be considered that the re-election of Gov. Pierce was contested under many disadvantages. He is the present incumbent of the office, which always gives an advantage—has been in but one year, and was, on the whole, more "sinned against than sinning" in his first election. We never blamed him for *accepting*, so much as we did others for putting him into office. Besides, he is a man venerable for his years, and entitled to some consideration for his revolutionary services, and has, moreover, never committed himself by any *open* avowal of his predilection for Jackson, and has passed, where it was deemed expedient by his supporters, as an Administration man. The vote for him is, of course, no test of Gen. Jackson's strength in New Hampshire—Mr. Hill to the contrary notwithstanding. Four out of five of the Councillors chosen—viz. Messrs. Boardman, Pierce, Lord and Keith, are Administration men; and there is some chance, not an even one, that Mr. Morril is elected over Mr. Harvey in Hillsborough District. The Administration Candidates for Senators have succeeded in nine and probably ten of the twelve Senatorial Districts—and it is not certain that the Opposition Candidate has succeeded in any but No. 8. Of the members returned for the House of Representatives, at least two thirds, so far as we have ascertained, are for the Administration.

Mr. Bartlett's speech on Retrenchment is particularly able. We have taken it up out of order; learning that that of Mr. Rives to which it is a reply, was circulating with some industry. We shall publish Mr. Rives' and others hereafter. The reader will perceive that Mr. Bartlett meets Mr. Rives on his own data, and in our humble opinion refutes his conclusions.

Congress is doing but little—chiefly private bills. A resolution of Mr. McDuffie, requiring members to sit with hats off, we are sorry to see, has been laid on the table, 88 to 78. It would add much to the looks of things, and we think to the transaction of business, were the resolution enforced.

We are much obliged to one or two "Subscribers" who have addressed us through the Post Office on the subject of Jno. Randolph and Mrs. M. We have no reason to doubt that their deprecation is sincere—and we hope the reasons assigned for it. We shall not act without consent. If that be given, our resolution is fixed and unalterable. We see no reason for sparing him who spares nobody—and who drags even ladies into speeches that he may make the Baboon Kremer, and the idle frequenters of the gallery, stare with amazement. The papers are already within our reach—we pause only to hear from their author.—That her consent will be given, considering her original purpose and his recent and brutal outrage upon her, we have no reason to doubt.

Mr. Richardson.—The manager of our Theatre takes his benefit to-night, and we humbly conceive the playgoing part of the community are bound to go to it. Without pecuniary ability—having difficulties of every denomination to encounter—Mr. Richardson has during the greater part of the winter and spring, sustained the Richmond Theatre on a very respectable footing, and exerted himself, and succeeded in contributing much to the amusement of the town. He has made nothing by it—for the small profits realized by Miss Fisher's playing, have been expended in subsequent efforts to please the public. Not liberality merely, but justice, would seem to require that they who have derived pleasure from his exertions, should attend his benefit to-night. Those who are fond of the stage should remember, that unless those who have amused them are compensated, they will not have an opportunity of enjoying the play-house hereafter. The bill of fare we learn is attractive, and Mr. Roberts has no comic superior in the U. States.

MARRIED, on Tuesday evening, the 18th inst. by the Rev. Jesse H. Turner, Mr. JAS N. FLETCHER, of Brunswick, to Miss MATILDA GOLDEN, second daughter of Mr. Branch Cheatham of Manchester.

On the 13th inst. in New Kent county, by the Rev. Charles Talley, TEMPLE ELLETT, Esq to Miss MARY W. ACKRES.

On the 13th inst. by the Rev. Jesse Armstead, Mr. ROBERT R. WATKINS, of the county of Goochland, to Miss MARY H. daughter of Mr. Thomas H. Walton, of Cumberland.

DIED, on Friday, the 14th inst. at the residence of Mr. Chas. Jones, in New Kent county, Mrs. SUSAN ROPER, wife of Mr. Geo. Roper of this city.

On the 17th inst. (after a severe illness of long continuance,) Mr. ANTHONY WHITAKER, Attorney at Law, of this city, in the 29th year of his age. He was distinguished for the suavity of his manners, the frankness, sincerity, benevolence, and generosity of his heart; and, in addition to these amiable and noble traits of character, he possessed intellectual powers of a very high order. A mother and sister, and a numerous circle of friends and relations lament his premature death.

KNOW ALL MEN and some of the Ladies too, that a great variety of tickets in the 13th Class of the DISMAL SWAMP CANAL LOTTERY, which will be drawn in this city next Wednesday, is offered for sale at the BOOK STORE situated *two doors below* the Richmond Branch Bank of the U. States. There are certainly, among the assortment, many prizes, one or two of which, it is suspected, are *thumpers*. Now, if these tickets should remain unsold, their present owner must unavoidably consider it a slight; and, should a great prize come up to one of them, it is feared he will not have awarded to him any other redress than——to pocket the affront.

March 22 2t

C. & A. WARWICK Have for Sale,

MADEIRA WINE, in pipes and quarter casks, received direct

Port wine in bottles—pale ale in bottles

London porter and brown stout in pint and quart bottles

Tin plate in boxes—braziers' copper

Crates of quart and pint and 6 and 8 oz. bottles

8d. wrought nails, English white lead, London silk umbrellas

German oznaburgs—crates of earthenware.

March 22 w3t

VIRGINIA:

At rules, holden in the clerk's office of the superior court of chancery for the Richmond district, the 3d day of March, 1828:

Elizabeth Richardson, *Plt.*

against

Abel P. Upshur, adm'r, &c. of Thomas Wilson, dec'd, Robert Gamble, Jno. G. Gamble, Charles Ellis and John Allan, merchants and partners, doing business under the firm of Ellis & Allan, Thos. Guy, Wm. Price, David Bullock, Danl. W. and Corbin Warwick, Wm. D. Wrenn Sergeant of the city of Richmond, and adm'r of Christopher Tompkins, dec'd, Wm. McKim, Edward Cahill, John Bryce, John Robinson, Andrew Barrett, Frederick Harris, Edward Cunningham, Richard Anderson, Richard Booker, Thomas Taylor, Wm. Hay, jr. Jacqueline B. Harvie, Wm. Dabney, jr. Edward Hallam, John Wickham, James Currie, Benjamin James Harris, and of George Winston deceased, *Dfts.*

The defendants Robert Gamble, Richard Booker and James Currie, not having entered their appearance and given security according to the act of assembly and the rules of this court, and it appearing by satisfactory evidence, that they are not inhabitants of this country, it is ordered, that the said defendants do appear here on the first day of the next term, and answer the bill of the plaintiff; and that a copy of this order be forthwith inserted in some newspaper published in the city of Richmond, for two months successively, and posted at the front door of the capitol, in the said city.

A copy. Teste, J. E. ABBOTT, D. C. C.