

Cecil county, William Matthews and Joseph Baxter, Esquires.
 Prince-George's county, Walter Bowie and Felix Bowie, Esquires.
 Annapolis, James Brice, Esquire.
 Queen Anne's county, John Seney and Joshua Seney, Esquires.
 Worcester county, Joseph Dashiell and John Done, Esquires.
 Frederick county, Thomas Johnson and Thomas Sim Lee, Esquires.
 Harford county, Benjamin Bradford Norris and John Love, Esquires.
 Caroline county, William Richardson and Henry Dickinson, Esquires.
 Baltimore-town, Richard Ridgely, Esquire.
 Washington county, Moses Rawlings and Henry Schnebely, Esquires.
 Montgomery county, Lawrence Oneale and Edward Burges, Esquires.

The ADDRESS of the Corporation
 To SAMUEL CHASE, Esq; recorder of the city of Annapolis.

S I R,

THE mayor, aldermen, and common councilmen of the city of Annapolis, impressed with a due sense of the services rendered to this corporation by you in the capacity of recorder thereof, do take this occasion to assure you of their entire approbation of your conduct in the performance of the duties of that trust, and to acknowledge your ready exertions at all times to promote the interest and welfare of this city. They sincerely regret the occasion of this address, as your removal from the city of Annapolis will deprive this body of a faithful and able officer, and the city of a valuable citizen. You have their warmest wishes for your happiness and welfare.

In behalf of the corporation,
 ROBERT COUDEN, mayor.
 Annapolis, September 7, 1786.

S I R,

THE address of the mayor, aldermen, and common councilmen of this city, presented me this day, affords me great pleasure, as I flatter myself they speak the genuine sentiments of the citizens. As recorder of the city duty and inclination urged me to enforce a due obedience to the bye laws, and assist in the framing ordinance for the regulating the police of the city. In the discharge of this duty, I ever received the ready assistance of my brethren on the bench, and of the other members of the corporation, and but a small portion of merit is due to me. My abilities have been much over-rated by the corporation. I only wish they had been equal to my inclination to serve them.

As one of the delegates of Annapolis my feeble powers were exerted on all occasions to promote the interest and welfare of the city, and supported by my colleague, my endeavours were in some instances crowned with success. I feel myself amply rewarded by the approbation of the body over whom you have the honour to preside. There can be nothing more agreeable to a public character, than to receive the public approbation of his conduct from those who speak the collected and unbiased sense of his constituents, and it is the only reward a free and virtuous people can bestow, and the only one an honest representative can expect.

Be pleased to present the corporation my warmest wishes for their prosperity, and I sincerely hope that the city of Annapolis may be for ever distinguished for the harmony and friendship, the benevolence and patriotism of its citizens.

I have the honour to be,
 With great respect,
 Your most obedient servant,
 SAMUEL CHASE.

To the worshipful Robert Couden, Esq; mayor of the city of Annapolis.

To the CITIZENS of ANNAPOLIS.

" Yet let me flap this bug with gilded wings,
 " This painted child of dirt, that smiles and stings—
 " A lath like mine no honest man shall dread,
 " But every babbling blockhead in his stead—

ONCE more I am compelled to contend with assuming ignorance, empty self-conceit, and incorrigible stupidity. With great reluctance I appear again before the public, to answer the Citizen's very groundless and unprovoked attack, originating from weakness, wantonness, or malevolence. The Delegate is known, and has an established character to support; the Citizen is an anonymous scribbler, who has no reputation to lose. This tool of party and faction, has attempted to calumniate the public character of the Delegate, which has invariably stood firm against the united efforts of malice and abilities, for more than twenty years. This writer, after having violated the truth, and unnecessarily attacked the integrity of a man, at least his equal in every respect, when his folly is exposed, cries out, that the Delegate wants politeness, uses coarse epithets, with ungenerous invective, and speaks in a language improper for a gentleman. The Citizen is the wanton aggressor, who arraigns the probity, and honour of the Delegate, and endeavours to prove him particularly as unworthy of your confidence; this he does without any provocation to gratify his spleen and resentment. The Delegate, in his answer, only refuted and exposed the reasons or arguments of the Citizen, and laughed at his vanity, folly and igno-

rance.—The reply of the Citizen is a declamatory effusion of indigested ideas, in which he repeats, that the Delegate ought not to be intrusted by you, as an elector of the senate.—A plain narrative of a few facts will prove, that the Citizen is the aggressor, and has been guilty of an unnecessary and illiberal attack on the Delegate.—At the last appointment of electors, the Delegate was chosen by Anne-Arundel county, and he proposed the gentleman, who was then elected for the city.—There can be no doubt, but that the Delegate, at that time, could have been appointed for the city, had he thought proper.—Nothing had occurred to induce him (or any one) to believe, that Anne Arundel county had withdrawn their confidence from him, and therefore it was reasonably to be expected, that, if he inclined to be an elector, he would again accept the appointment from the county.—Possibly the Delegate might have been elected by the citizens, had he solicited their votes.—A few weeks before the election he was informed, that a gentleman, to whom the city is greatly indebted, and against whom the Delegate and his friends had no objection, had been applied to, and consented to accept the trust; but he was deserted, and another preferred, without any satisfactory reason.—The Delegate never intended to be the elector for the city, and had not, directly or indirectly, either in person or by his friends, before or since the Citizen's publication, solicited a single vote.—To lay a foundation for a personal attack on the Delegate, it was positively asserted by the Citizen, in his first address, " That the Delegate solicited you to appoint him your elector of the senate."—It was necessary for the Citizen to make this allegation, or the man must be blind indeed, who could not see, that the attack on the Delegate was unnecessary and wanton; if the assertion was false, the attack might with equal propriety have been made against any other person who was eligible for the city.—Is the assertion true or false? Every man in the city must know it to be false.—As the truth of this allegation only could excuse the Citizen for his publication, the Delegate charged him with wilful breach of veracity, to which he replies, " that is not the language of a gentleman."—Every one knows, that a gentleman will not descend so low, as knowingly to publish an untruth.—The Delegate did not know of any established mode of expression in which gentlemen are to contradict a falsehood, advanced against them by a scribbler in the news papers, as the groundwork of a virulent and libellous publication.—The truth or falsity of the assertion is very material, because if true, the Citizen might be justified in offering his reasons, why the Delegate was an improper person to be an elector, but if erroneous, he cannot be excused by any man, as the public conduct or opinions of the Delegate respecting political questions or characters was wholly immaterial to you, and not subject to your examination or decision.—Reports, unfounded in truth, are too often industriously circulated to serve interested or party purposes, therefore the Citizen can only blame his own folly for rashly giving credit to them.—mankind too often persuade themselves implicitly to believe, what they most wish or fear.—The Citizen finding, that he had positively asserted a fact to be true, the falsity of which he might readily have discovered, had he used proper caution, still attempts to justify his publication, because the Delegate, in his answer, said, " if requested to represent Anne-Arundel county, or the city, he would not refuse." How can this declaration, subsequent to the Citizen's address, possibly excuse him? The Delegate could not, with any propriety, accept the appointment from the city, if offered to him, before he had declined to represent the county, or the county had expressed their opinion in favour of some other person; neither event had happened, and the truth is, that the Delegate had not the most distant thought of being the elector for the city, which assertion is confirmed by the uniform conduct of the Delegate and that of all his friends and connexions in the city.—thus the report (if any such was circulated) and the silly conjectures of the Citizen are falsified.—If any gentleman had been proposed for the city, the Delegate would not have permitted himself to have been put in opposition, as he intended to pursue the same conduct, as at the last appointment of electors, and no person being talked of, he requested his colleague to offer himself, which he declined, and soon after informed the Delegate of the application to the gentleman before mentioned.—The Delegate had determined to remove to Baltimore in a very little time, and wished and expected to depart with the warmest sentiments of friendship and affection from the city, to which he was attached from a variety of causes, and which he was compelled to leave with regret.—on his part he most ardently wished carefully to avoid differences with any of the citizens, well knowing that " bulls aim their horns and asses lift their heels."—Above all things the Delegate detests controversy in the public papers; he never yet was the aggressor, but has sometimes been reluctantly compelled to defend himself from false and malicious accusations.—the present one with the Citizen is extremely disagreeable to him, but, being forced into it, the Delegate will resolutely continue to defend himself, and bid defiance to his adversary and all his assistants; he will not be deterred by the observation that " there's nothing blackens like the ink of fools."

The Delegate considered the Citizen's address as an unnecessary and wanton attack, not only on his public

conduct and opinion, but on his private integrity and honour.—The Citizen, in his reply, declares, " that no part of his address can be tortured into an attack of the Delegate's honour and integrity; and that much injustice was done him by the Delegate's supposing, he intended to stab his integrity, the address being aimed at him in the character of a public man."—If any man of common sense, who reads the address, can be of this opinion, the Delegate will admit, that he has been too hasty, and defended his reputation, before it was attempted to be injured.—One of the avowed and principal objects of the Citizen in his address (and in his reply) was to satisfy the Annapolitans, that the Delegate was an improper person to be intrusted by them as an elector of the senate; several reasons are assigned in his address; another is added in his reply in support of his opinion.

If the Citizen did not mean, both in his address and reply, to arraign the integrity and honour of the Delegate, and to maintain, that if appointed an elector of the senate, he would be governed by base and unworthy motives, although under the solemn obligation of an oath, he certainly did not understand the necessary consequences flowing from the appointment of the Delegate to that important trust; he denies such an intention, and yet such must be the case, or else he possesses the greatest vacancy of intellect.—A little attention to his objections, will convince every dispassionate person, that the Delegate was justifiable in considering the address as an attack on his integrity and honour.—the Citizen contends, " that a member of the house of delegates ought not to be an elector of the senate, because he may imperceptibly, through the infirmity of human nature, be swayed by his prejudices against former members of the senate."—This objection equally applies to every person who has been a delegate, and the nature of mankind in general is only blameable for its frailties and imperfections, and no peculiar depravity of heart is attributed to the Delegate; he did not consider this dry and trite objection as wounding his reputation, and therefore took no notice of it.—The Citizen's other objections are, that the Delegate differs with the Annapolitans on certain political questions.—1. As to an emission of paper money;—2. As to the payment by the state, of the depreciated paper money carried into the treasury, agreeably to law, by debtors of British subjects, and stipulated by the treaty to be paid in specie;—3. As to the revival of the office of intendant;—4. As to the re-election of particular members of the late senate."—The Delegate does not credit the assertion of the Citizen, that a difference of opinion ever existed on these subjects.—The petition, signed by a number of citizens, and presented last session of assembly, against an emission of money, on any system whatsoever, is in the memory of the Delegate, and the Citizen might have recollected its being obtained by the influence of a few importing merchants, that it was signed by less than one half of the citizens, gave great offence to the house of delegates, and he might have added, that the senate of the city has never since been collected on the subject.—The Delegate has solid grounds to believe, that a considerable majority of the citizens are in favour of an emission.—As to the exoneration of British debtors, and the revival of the office of intendant, the Delegate is convinced, that the citizens never expressed any opinion on these subjects; very few are capable of forming any judgment about them, and the Citizen has very prudently declined entering into any train of reasoning to shew, that the Delegate is mistaken in his opinion.—Indeed, if the Citizen's line of understanding is to be measured by what he has already discovered, these matters are infinitely above his comprehension.—As to re-electing one or more particular members of the senate, the Delegate cannot believe the Citizen's assertion, that the Annapolitans consider the public good concerned in their re-appointment, but begs leave to consider and pronounce it a very impudent one.—That the gentlemen alluded to, were opposed to an emission, and the continuance of the intendant's office, is readily admitted; but it does not follow, that the public good is involved in preventing an emission, or abolishing the office of intendant.—The Delegate never heard of any meritorious services rendered the city by either of the gentlemen; he may admit, that some of the citizens, who are importing merchants, their connexions, and a few monied men, are very desirous, that gentlemen should be in the senate, who will oppose an emission at all events, and upon any plan whatever; but he cannot believe, this reason has any influence with the far greater part of the city.—Some of the citizens may be opposed to the intendant's office, but few of them object to the gentleman who lately filled it.—It is an insult to assert, that abolishing the office, or displacing the officer, is an object with the city.—The Delegate will not be drawn by the Citizen into any controversy with either of the gentlemen, to whom he alluded; with one he wishes to avoid all difference; with the other all public controversy has for some time ceased, and the Delegate disdains contending with a partisan, when the principal declines to commence hostilities.—The Delegate may think one or both of the gentlemen improper for the senate, but he would be ashamed to assign as a reason, their difference of opinion with him on certain political questions.—The Delegate thinks, that the noble character and conduct of a person, proposed as a senator, is to be considered and weighed, not his opinion on particular subjects, and he ap-

peals to a lot of differences had duct.—
 Even admit to be opposed to it is clear, that a substantial objection to the senate, would not content with him in such an abandoned, projects the idea objections are. zen has made standing his peached the in of the Citizen Delegate having detailed principles because he is unless such que The Citizen is " what he was consider the ha the other of the and justify his ters from the questions," an Delegate did of these questi involve the happ by his own real the members of opinion from H questions, the e ance of the in differ in opinio tion of British the legislature, nators on the decision of the of British subje the law in ma man must be a the state depen establishment of the office shoul appointed, who an emission exp in his answer to that several of sim of money, Delegate enter whom he should A difference of would have no any man believe the continuance any weight, be public, than an details and abho him, and hold ed all his abett
 The Citizen calling him of a tizen? Is know safety, and-by deprecate his ver
 " For if a cap
 " Whose air
 " oath—
 " The captai
 " Though hi
 " And with a
 " As Herod's
 " Scarecrow
 " Has yet a st
 " The thing
 " too,
 " And know

To B
 At the P
 A HISTOR
 this state, v
 adions. Price 3/

ALL persons
 A the city of
 make immediate
 desired to bring t
 be paid.

PUBLIC no
 I will be pref
 praying that an
 lic buildings of la

TAKEN u
 mouth of 8
 feet long, 6x
 and has a ring
 have her again by

* * * For
 la