

We are authorized to state, that John C. Herbert, esq. declines being a Candidate for Congress at the ensuing election.

Federal Republican Ticket. HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

FOR CALVERT COUNTY.

Dr. John Dare, Samuel Turner, Joseph W. Reynolds, John J. Brooke.

FOR DORCHESTER COUNTY.

Benjamin W. Lecompte, Edward Griffith, Thomas Pitt, Henry Keene.

FOR KENT COUNTY.

Isaac Spencer, Henry Fitzhugh, William Knight, Thomas B. Hynson.

FOR TALBOT COUNTY.

Jabez Caldwell, Thomas Traylor, Nicholas Alsborough, Arthur Holt.

FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY.

George Semms, William D. Digges, Samuel Clagett, James Somervell.

"Examiner" will be attended to next week.

For the Maryland Gazette. THE CHRISTMAS RECESS.

As is usual, a few weeks previous to the election, the democratic editors have opened their floodgates of abuse upon the Federal party. They have, however, been peculiarly unfortunate in the charges which they have this year conjured up. They commenced with making a great outcry about the deficiency of the State Funds, and endeavoured to induce the people to believe that this deficiency was produced by the misconduct of the Federalists. This, however, has completely recoiled upon them—the people are satisfied that the deficiency of state funds was produced by the necessary and indispensable appropriations made during the war, and which appropriations were voted for and sanctioned by a Democratic Senate. Finding then that this charge will not answer their purposes, they begin to make a terrible yell about the adjournment of the Legislature during the Christmas holidays, as if, indeed, this was an unusual thing, or was the exclusive act of the Federalists. It is well known, that the precedent of adjourning at Christmas was established by the Democrats in the year 1807, when they had the majority in the House of Delegates, and the Senate was exclusively Democratic—the truth of this can be demonstrated by a reference to the votes and proceedings for that year. Now, with what consistency, or propriety, or decency, can the democrats alledge as a charge against the Federalists: an act of which they were themselves the first to set the example, and of which a majority of them approved and voted for at the very last session of the Legislature. On a reference to the votes and proceedings for Wednesday, December 17 1817, the day on which the message proposing an adjournment, was sent from the House of Delegates to the Senate, it appears that the yeas and nays were taken on the question, & appeared as follows:—The names of the Democrats are in Italic.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Speaker. Jones, Knight, Eccleston, Neale, Hynson, C. Stewart, H. Dorsey, Gray, Weems, Turner, Grames, Garner, Price, Shorwers, Snowden, Johnson, Stevens, Tenant, Carroll, Lecompte, Keene, Digges, Somerville, Semmes, Clagett, C. Under, Harrison, W. R. Stewart, Roberts, Downey, Buckley, Bradford, Sewell, Steed, Davis, Holbrook, Smilshury, Kell, Woodyear, Sweetzer, Schnelly, Washington, Linthorn. 44.

NEGATIVE.

Causin, Blackstone, Estep, Vahl, Long, Murray, Haynie, Griffith, Pearce, Tyson, Thomas, Beard, Wilson, Handy, Henry, Hawkins, Yates, Kennedy, Forrest, Tomlinson, Scott, Tidball. 22.

Now, upon an examination of this record, it appears, that of the 44

who voted for the adjournment, there were 23 Democrats and but 21 Federalists, and of the 22 who voted against the adjournment, 17 were Federalists and but 5 Democrats. Now if this can be called a party question, it is actually one for which the Democrats are responsible—for it appears, that of the 28 Democrats who voted on the question, 23 of them voted for the adjournment, and of the 38 Federalists who voted on the question, but 21 of them voted for the adjournment. So that it actually appears that there were more Democrats who voted for the adjournment than Federalists, and more than 3 times as many Federalists voted against the adjournment as did Democrats. But it may perhaps be said, that as a majority of the Federalists present voted for the adjournment, they alone must be considered as representing the sentiments of their party, and must be responsible for their acts.—admit the principle, and it applies with still greater force to the Democrats, for while nearly one half of the Federalists present, 17 out of 38, voted against the adjournment, only about 1-5, 5 out of 28, of the Democrats then present voted against it. Surely then, if 21 Federalists out of 38 are to be considered as representing the views and sentiments of the Federal party, 23 Democrats out of 28 must be considered as representing, in a still stronger point of view, the views and sentiments of the Democratic party. If then, it has been made to appear, as it most unquestionably has, and as a reference to the votes and proceedings of the House of Delegates for 1817 will shew, that this measure, about which so much noise has been made, and so much indignation expressed, is of Democratic origin, that at the very last session of the Legislature, this very same measure was sanctioned and approved of by a majority of the Democrats then present, and that there were actually a greater number of Democrats voted for it, than Federalists, than the proportion of Democrats representing the views of their party, and who voted for this measure, was in a ratio greater than 2 to 1 than the proportion of Federalists representing the views of their party, and who voted for this measure. If all this has been manifested by a plain and uncontrovertible statement of facts, does it not most conclusively appear, that the measure savours more of democracy than of Federalism, and that if there be any thing wrong in it the Democrats are the most culpable? Should the people be of opinion that this is a subject which requires their interference, should they wish to deprive their representatives of the satisfaction and delight which we all experience in being present with our friends and families at that social season of the year, when we commemorate the nativity of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, then must they say to their candidates, be they Federalists or be they Democrats, pledge to us your honour, ere we vote for you, that you will not adjourn the Legislature at the Christmas holidays. Yes this pledge must the Democratic counties of Harford, Queen-Anne's, Caroline, and others, require of their candidates ere they can send the same representation which they last year made choice of. But notwithstanding this plain and undeniable exposition of this subject, there are, we know, men sufficiently devoid of principle, and so callous to the finer feelings of honour and integrity, as to persist in alledgeing this measure as a charge exclusively applicable to the Federalists, when they are convinced in their own minds that the Democrats were equally, or as it has been shewn, in a greater degree, the agents of it. But the reign of delusion we trust is over—the people have become too enlightened to be deceived by artful misrepresentations, or base and calumnious falsehoods. In order to give a more imposing air to this "Federal Peculation," as it has been termed, some calculations have been made to shew what was the expense to the state of the adjournment of the Legislature during the Christmas holidays. This expense has been estimated at \$438 per day. Now, admitting this calculation to be correct, (which however is not the case, as will be presently shewn,) it would be gratifying to know, (for this does not appear in the calculation, as the Federalists are charged with receiving all the money, & which seems to be the great grievance,) how much of this \$438 per diem was pocketed by the Democrats. It appears then, that there were 35 Democrats in the last

Legislature, which at \$4 each per diem make \$140—nearly one third of the whole amount of the per diem. If this money has been unwarrantably taken from the Treasury, as has been said, and if such be democratic doctrine and belief, let these 35 democratic members refund the money they have pocketed, & then we shall have some confidence in the professions as well as the sincerity of democracy. But we have said that the calculation which has been made of the expense of the recess was not correct—his calculation is made on the supposition that all the members and officers of both houses of the legislature were present at the time of the adjournment—now this was not the fact, as appears from the yeas and nays, which were, yeas 44, nays 22—making 66 in the house of delegates; and it appears from the Journal that there were 12 members attending in the senate, making in all 78 members, and which affords the most correct data to ascertain the expense. The estimate will then appear more correct as follows: 76 members at \$4 \$304 00 Speaker & President at \$5 each 10 00 10 clerks, and 4 door-keepers, 14 at \$4 56 00 \$370 00 making an aggregate of \$370 per diem; and there being 23 Democrats present, they received, for their proportion, \$112 per diem. Not is the number of days constituting the recess fairly stated in the calculation before alluded to—in that calculation two Sundays, and Christmas day, are included, and the computation is made for ten days; now it is not to be supposed that the legislature, supposing even all the members to have been present, would so far have offended against common decency as to have transacted business on the Sabbath, or on Christmas day; it will not be denied then, that it is proper that these three days should be deducted—the estimate will then be 7 days at \$370 per diem is \$2590, being \$1790 less than the Democratic computation which has been published. Of this \$2590, which has been computed as the total expense of the Christmas recess, the Democratic members received \$784 every cent of which must be refunded into the Treasury before the agents of democracy can, with any shew of decency, consistency or propriety, charge the Federalists with unwarrantably taking money from the public treasury. But to shew at once the hypocrisy of Democratic professions about economy, let the following extract from the votes and proceedings for February 14, 1818, page 123, bear witness:—On motion by Mr. Kell, the following resolution was read: "Resolved, That the Treasurer of the Western Shore pay to each member and officer of the Legislature of this State, One Dollar for each day's attendance during the present session, in addition to what they are allowed upon the Journal of Accounts, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." This proposition, made by Mr. Kell, the leader of the Democratic party in the House of Delegates, was rejected by the Federalists. Now let it be supposed that at the time this proposition was made, there had been a majority of Democrats in the House of Delegates, and that the Senate had also been Democratic, is there not reason to believe then that in this case this proposition would have been assented to and passed into a law, inasmuch as it was made by the acknowledged chieftain and leader of the Democratic party in the Legislature? And what would have been the additional expense to the state of the last session of the Legislature, had this proposition of Mr. Kell's to raise the pay of the members been assented to? As calculations are now very much the fashion, we will try our hand at this. The Legislature consists of 95 members and 14 officers, making a total of 109. It commenced its session last year on the 1st December, 1817, and adjourned on the 16th February, 1818, a period of 78 days. Now, 199 members and officers at \$1 per day, is \$109 multiplied by 78 days gives \$8502 which would have been the additional expense had Mr. Kell's resolution been passed. Now the whole expense of the recess at Christmas has been estimated at \$2590. Deduct this from \$8502, the additional expense which the democrats would have imposed upon the state had they possessed the power, as

they did the will, and there is a clear saving to the people of Maryland by the federal party of \$5912 for the last session of the Legislature alone, even supposing, as has been proved not to be the case, that the expense of the recess was exclusively chargeable to the Federalists. Such is the difference between Democratic and Federal economy. The Democrats make professions of it, the Federalists practice it. It may not here be improper to remark, that the period of the last session of the Legislature was not prolonged by the recess at Christmas, inasmuch as the House of Delegates had frequent sessions at night, after the recess, as will appear by reference to the votes and proceedings, when as much business was transacted as would have been done had there been no recess.

For the Maryland Gazette.

Consistency is a pretty thing, and no men ought to possess more of it than those who set themselves up as dictators and teachers of the people; for, there are always dozens among us simple folks, who notice and note their actions, and are ready and willing to remind them of the slightest departure which they may make from what they formerly insisted upon as right and laudable, and abused other people for not doing. Now, it is a sad pity our democrats are not a little more consistent; if they were, it is to be presumed, after denouncing every man in Maryland as a "Tory" who happened to be opposed to spending the last farthing in the treasury in support of the late war, and in paying this state's quota of the direct tax, they would not at this moment turn about and say, that Federalists are "speculators" for having advanced, or loaned, the sum of 300,000 dollars to the general government for the express purpose of paying the yeomanry who had gallantly turned out to fight battles, which the "life and fortune gentry," tho' pledged to fight, skulked from.

A Simple Poor Man.

For the Maryland Gazette. Mr. Printer, Suppose the Treasury was really in the bad state which certain office-hunters and other deceptions men from motives of interest represent it, and the people were to call our democratic legislators to an account for their attempt to place it in a worse condition by their motion to raise their pay to five dollars per day, would those Democratic gentlemen try to hubble out of the scrape by saying four dollars each day was not enough to furnish them with "HOT TODDY?"

CONSISTENCY.

During the late war the executive of Massachusetts either neglected or refused ordering out the militia of that state, for which he received the united maledictions & curses of every Democrat in the country. The papers devoted to the same party now liberally lavish their billingsgate slanders on the federal executive of Maryland, for ordering out the militia, and paying them for their services. The impoverished state of the Treasury of Maryland, appears to be the burden, the fruitful theme of Democratic vulgarity. Who declared the War? The Democratic party. Who ordered out the militia of Maryland for the protection of the State? A Federal Governor. Who paid them for their services? The Federal Executive. Who now with black ingratitude raise a hue and cry against the Federalists, and accuse them of rendering the state bankrupt? The Democratic party. Those modest gentlemen it is, who proclaim to the ignorant and uninformed, the ruined state of the finances of Maryland. Eight or ten dollars per month paid to the poor militia man for his services, sufferings and privations, according to the creed of those disinterested patriots, has involved the state of Maryland in utter and irrecoverable ruin! Freemen of Maryland, discard from your confidence the leeches, asps & cockatrice-species, who would thus delude ye, with the sole view of fattening on the public Treasury. Fed. Rep.

From the Federal Republican.

COMMUNICATION. THE TREASURY. The federalists very good naturedly suffer their opponents to be the assailants, and as it is easier to maintain the positive than the negative side of an argument, the democrats have too often succeeded,

They have now succeeded, in attaining a general belief that the treasury of this state has been so managed by the federalists, as to be entirely empty. I deny the fact, and it should plainly and plumply contradict by us all; for, if the general government has not been so badly managed by the democrats at Washington as to be unable to pay its debts, the state of Maryland will pay a very large sum acknowledgedly, and our treasury will be full. If the whole sum advanced by the state of Maryland is not returned by the general government, why that is to be inferred from it, the democrats, who declared war and compose that government are determined that the people should also bear a portion of the expense incurred in the defence of others. This may be the justice and generosity of the democratic general government, to rob the treasury and people of Maryland of their hard earnings, but surely the federal government of Maryland, who are not the means of compelling it to repay us, did act wisely and economically too, in disbursing this money for the people's defence, and militia, than suffer the state to be overrun and pillaged by the enemy which the people would have lost ten times as much, besides the character for courage and honor. I do not know for what purpose money is treasured up by states, in time of peace if not to secure their defence and safety in time of war. But I would ask, my turn, whether the democrats while they governed Maryland, did not fool away much of the people's treasure in erecting state buildings at Baltimore, whilst they had their power to erect charity schools and roads and bridges without to but which they neglected? I am opposed to the erection of penitentiaries or hospitals, nor would I vil at the employment of democratic artists exclusively in building them, but I shrewdly suspect there was more money expended than necessary, because there was no authority to control the expenditure on the part of the state. As much at least, might have been saved then, in my opinion, as has been since taken from us by the general government. To return, however, to the funds in the treasury—what were they during the democratic state government? I answer, certificates of S. stock. What are they now? I promise to pay on the part of the same United States—and the difference is, that which may be thought to exist between the wealth and the bond of a solvent person. But there is the security of the constitution and the law, in both cases, and the personal signature of a clerk or secretary, cannot add much to the solidity of the fund. PACA.

From the National Intelligencer Aug. 15.

The following amusing memorandum is copied from an old Diary kept by an American gentleman who resided in London during the Revolutionary war. These minutes are taken from a note under the head "Distinguished Characters," and handed to us for publication. "I again met the worthy Doctor Ogle, Dean of Winchester, in Sherburne house Library, with Doctor Price, (which is very near the Dean's house in Berkeley square,) began to rain, and I yielded to Doctor Ogle's solicitation to dine, at Price to attend him to Hackney for a packet." Dr. Franklin, I never partook of a pleasanter dinner, after getting the interesting news of the day at the St. James's Palace, (for the Dean is clerk of the closet to his majesty, and is frequently in waiting on the royal family.) I there met Lord Euston (son to the Duke of Grafton) very soon after his elopement with one of the queen's maids of honour, also, the witty and facetious Mr. Sheridan, then paying his address to Miss Ogle, the Dean's daughter, who was doing the honours of her father's table; and last, though not least in my estimation and regard, Bishop Watson, whom I had known at Oxford, in my visits to Mr. Harford, son of Lord Baltimore, as professor of chemistry, divinity, &c. &c. and had seen at his father-in-law's house, Mr. Wilson, of Dulham tower, near the lakes of Westminster. I shall never forget his

of the crime accused, their law of nation to the idea of the B... is too ridiculous seriously refused. It is stated that a man was late an English nobleman, in a letter to the nobles, "the nobles five or six English officers they failed in the paper news. The parts of England in some parts result has been among the extra be found some attack upon in which he and a short celebrated which the right Westminster and Sir Francis turned by James Hunt, after a muster but 8... Mr. Canning were re-elected, and Mr. Br... the opposition Commons, looking himself ing himself he withdrew the evening balloting. I... sition will of the House of 20 and 20 m... From the... This day for the city... the Seasons... Mr. Grattan... Lafouche, Guinness... ed by the L... ed by Mr. B... was no oppo... electors... men made sp... ill received... Outrage... clock.—We... state, that... into acts of... their Repres... considerable... ed, was pre... tives, but... appeared, th... hisses and g... proceeded to... street, wher... mended. T... front of the... great fury, ... vert their fl... of defence... was short... all direction... with a mixt... horror, that... a confusion... obliged to c... which was... toms. The... took shelter... street, and... FURTHE... Dublin Eve... The peop... continued... house of M... Grattan too... moment a... ferocious ap... Mr. Guin... and others... window, bu... only the gra... Lord Charle... other Gent... window, wh... cognized in... tude, who i... he should a... accordingly... and he, Mr... Charlemon... platform b... When silen... Phillips spo... as follows... My fellow... well that I... amongst yo... do)—and yo... for my cou... In the name... not merely... but of that... you to rede... which this... tude has ca... wrongs, ar... them—but... wreak the... mics, and n...

FOREIGN.

New-York, Aug. 17.

LATEST FROM ENGLAND.

The ship Triton, Captain Holcomb, arrived at Boston on Friday last, in 37 days from Liverpool, bringing London dates to the 4th of July, and Liverpool to the 6th, both exclusive. To Mr. Hooper, our attentive Correspondent in Boston, we are indebted for Billings's Liverpool Advertiser of the 6th of July, and for extracts from Lloyd's List, and other Marine intelligence.

The Queen of England was vi...

in the latter part of June, with another return of disorder, and continued seriously ill all our last dates.

On the 1st of July, their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Kent, with their suite, arrived in their carriages at C. Fremont, in the town of Prince Leopold, who was in readiness with his attendants to receive his Royal Sister and her Household.

The Dowager Queen of Wirtemberg was expected to arrive in England about the 20th of July.

Baron Winzingerode, General of Cavalry, and Adjutant-General in the Russian service, died on the 28th of June. He was on a visit to his relations in Weisbaden, and was presently in perfect health; and at nearly four on the day above mentioned, he was found sitting under a fruit tree, without any sign of life, in the attitude of a person in a general lamber."

The French government has averted to maintain a naval squadron on the coast of Africa, for the object of enforcing the abolition of the slave trade.

A Decree has been issued by the King of Spain, suspending, until some preparatory regulations shall have been adopted, the Decree establishing certain free ports, or ports of deposit, in that kingdom.

On the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambristie, the London Couriers, a Ministerial paper, thus remarks:—If they were really guilty