will never be acknowledged, and any attempt to enforce it, will be repelled by the undivided energy of the nation. I pray your Excellency to observe, that my argument does not deny a right to all foreign powers of taking proper exceptions to the governmental acts and language of another. It is to their interference in its consultations, in its proceedings, while yet in an inchoate state, that we object. Should the President do an official executive act, affecting a foreign power, or use exceptionable language in addressing it through his minister or through theirs, should a law be passed injurious to the dignity of another nation, in all these, and other similar cases, a demand for explanation would be respectfully received, and answered in the manner that justice and a regard to the dignity of the complaining nation would require.

After stating these principles, let me add that they have not only been theoretically adopted, but that they have been practically asserted. On two former occasions, exceptions of the same nature were taken to the President's Message by the Government of France, and in neither did they produce any other explanation than that derived from the nature of our Government, and this seems on those occasions to have been deemed sufficient; for in both cases the objections were virtually abandoned. One, when Messrs Marshall, Gerry and Pinkney, were refused to be received; and again, in the negotiation between Prince Polignac and Mr. Rives; in the former case, although the message of the President was alleged as the cause of the refusal to receive the Ministers, yet, without any such explanation, their successors were honorably accredited. In the latter case, the allusion in the message to an apprehended collision, was excepted to; but the reference made by Mr. Rives to the constitutional duties of the President seems to have removed the objection.

Having demonstrated that the United States cannot, in any case, permit their Chief Magistrate to be questioned by any foreign Government, in relation to his communications with the coordinate branches of his own, it is scarcely necessary to consider the case of such an explanation being required as the condition on which the fulfillment of a treaty or pecuniary advantage was to depend. The terms of the proposition need only be stated to show that it would be inadmissible, but the circumstances to which it might be addressed, in the present case, would be unnecessary, as well as inadmissible. France has already received, by the voluntary act of the President, every explanation which the most scrupulous sense of national honor could desire. That which could not have been given to a demand, that which could never be given on the condition now under discussion, a fortunate succession of circumstances, as I shall proceed to show, has brought about.

Earnestly desirous of restoring the good understanding between the two nations, as soon as a dissatisfaction with the President's Message was shown, I suppressed every feeling which the mode of expressing that dissatisfaction was calculated to produce, and without waiting for instruction, I hastened, on my own responsibility, to make a communication to your predecessor in office on the subject. In this, under the reserve that the President could not be called on for an explanation, I did in fact give one, that I thought would have removed all injurious impressions. This is the first of the fortunate circumstances to which I have alluded—fortunate in being made before any demand implying a right to require it; fortunate in its containing, without any knowledge of the precise parts of the Message which gave offence, answers to all that have since come to my knowledge. I can easily conceive that the communication of which I speak, made as I expressly stated without previous authority from my Government, might not have had the effect which its matter was intended to produce, but it has since (as I have now the honor to inform your Excellency) received from the President his full and unqualified approbation; but it is necessary to add that this was given before he had any intimation of an intention to attach it as a condition to the payment of the indemnity due by the Treaty; given not only when he was ignorant of any such intent, but when he was informed by France that she intended to execute the treaty, and saw by the law which was introduced that it was not to be fettered by any such condition. That, that is already done, by a voluntary act, which could not have been done when required as a right, still less when made, what will unquestionably in the United States be considered degrading, as a condition. At this time, sir, I would, for no consideration, enter into the details I then did. If I could now so far forget, what under present circumstances would be due to the dignity of my country, I should be disavowed, and deservedly disavowed, by the President. It is happy, therefore, I repeat, that the good feeling of my country was evinced, in the manner I have stated, at the only time when it could be done with honor; and though present circumstances would forbid my making the communication I then did, they do not prevent my referring to it, for the purpose of showing that it contains, as I have stated it does, every thing that ought to have been satisfactory. Actual circumstances enable me to do this now: future events, which I need not explain, may hereafter render it improper, and it may be nugatory, unless accepted as satisfactory before the occurrence of those events. Let it be examined with the care which the importance of giving it a true construction requires.

The objections to the Message, as far as I can understand for they never have been specified, are,

First, that it impeaches the good faith of His Majesty's Government.

Secondly, that it contains a menace of enforcing the performance of the treaty by reprisals.

On the first head, were I now discussing the terms of the Message itself, it would be easy to show that it contains no such charge. The allegation that the stipulations of a treaty have not been complied with, that engagements made by Ministers have not been fulfilled, couched in respectful terms can never be deemed offensive, even when expressly directed to the party whose infractions are complained of; and consequently can never give cause for a demand of explanation; otherwise it is evident that no consideration of national injuries could ever take place. The Message, critically examined on this point, contains nothing more than such an enumeration of the causes of complaint. As to its terms, the most fastidious disposition cannot fasten on one that could be excepted to. The first refusal and subsequent delay are complained of, but no unworthy motives for either are charged or insinuated. On the whole, if I were commissioned to explain and defend this part of the message, I should say, with the conviction of truth, that it is impossible to urge a complaint in milder or more temperate terms; but I am not so commissioned. I am endeavouring to show that not only every proper explanation is given in my letter to M. De Rigny, of the 29th January last, but that, in express terms it declares that the sincerity of His Majesty's Government, in their desire to execute the treaty was not doubted. Suffer me to draw your Excellency's attention to the passage alluded to. In discussing the nature of Mr. Serrurier's engagement I say; "it is clear therefore, that more was required than the expression of a desire on the part of His Majesty's Ministers to execute the treaty; *a desire, the sincerity of which was never doubted, but which might be unavailing, as its accomplishment depends on the vote of the Chambers.*" Again, in speaking of the delay which occurred in the month of December, I say, "It is referred to, I presume, in order to show that it was produced by a desire on the part of His Majesty's Ministers, the better to assure the passage of the law: of this sir, I never had a doubt, and immediately so advised my Government, and informed it, as was the fact, that I perfectly acquiesced in the delay." Thus it must be evident, not only that no offensive charge of ill faith is made in the Message, but that, as is expressly stated in the first extract, full justice was done at Washington to the intentions of the French Government. While the delay is complained of as wrong, no improper motives are attributed to the Government in causing it. Again, sir, the whole tenor of that part of my letter which relates to the execution of the promise made by Mr. Serrurier, while it asserts the construction put upon it by the President to be the true one, and appeals to facts and circumstances to support that construction; yet it avoids charging the French Government with any intentional violation, attributing their delay to an erroneous construction only; for in the letter, (I again quote literally,) I say "I have entered into this detail with the object of showing that although the Ministers of the King, under the interpretations which they seem to have given to Mr. Serrurier's promise, may have considered themselves at liberty to defer the presentation of the law until the period which they thought would best secure its success, yet the President interpreting that promise differently, feeling that in consequence of it he had forborne to do what might be strictly called a duty, and seeing that its performance had not taken place, could not avoid stating the whole case clearly and distinctly to Congress." Thus, sir, the President stating the acts of which he thought his country had a right to complain, does not make a single imputation of improper motive, and to avoid all misconstruction, he offers a voluntary declaration that none was intended.

The part of the Message which seems to have caused the greatest sensation in France, is that in which, after a statement of the causes of complaint, it enters into a consideration of the measures to obtain redress, which, in similar cases, are sanctioned by the laws of nations. The complaint seems to be, that in a discussion of the efficacy and convenience of each, a preference was given to reprisals, considered as a remedial, not as a hostile measure; and this has been construed into a menace. If any explanations were necessary on this head, they are given in the Message itself. It is there expressly disavowed, and the power and high character of France are appealed to, to show that it never could be induced by threats to do what its sense of justice denied. If the measure to which I have more than once alluded should be resorted to, and the humiliation attending a compliance with it could be endured, and if it were possible, under such circumstances, to give an explanation, what more could be required than is contained in the Message itself, that it was not intended as a menace? If the measure to which I allude should be adopted, and submitted to, what would His Majesty's Government require? The disavowal of any intent to influence the Councils of France by threats! They have it already. It forms a part of the very instrument which caused the offence, and I will not do them the injustice to think that they could form the offensive idea of requiring more. The necessity of discussing the nature of the remedies for the non-execution of the treaty, the character and spirit in which it was done, are explained in my letter so often referred to, and I pray your Excellency to consider the concluding part of it, beginning with the quotation I have last made. But if I wanted any argument to show that no explanation of this part of the Message was necessary, or could be required, I should find it in the opinion, certainly a just one, expressed by his Majesty's Ministers, that the recommendation of the President not having been adopted by the other branches of the Government, it was not a national act, and could not be complained of as such.—Nay, in the note presented by Mr. Serrurier to the Government at Washington, and the measures which it announces, (his recall and the offer of my passports) the Government of His Majesty seems to have done all that they thought its dignity required; for they, at the same time, declare that the law providing for the payment will be presented, but give no intimation of any previous condition, and annex none to the bill which they present. The account of dignity being thus declared, by this demonstration, to be settled, it cannot be supposed that it will again be introduced as a set off against an acknowledged pecuniary balance.

Before I conclude my observations on this part of the subject, it will be well to enquire in what light exceptions are taken to this part of the Message—whether as a menace generally, or to the particular measure proposed. In the first view, every measure that a Government having claims on another declares it must pursue if those claims are not allowed, (whatever may be the terms employed,) is a menace. It is necessary, and not objectionable, unless couched in offensive language. It is a fair declaration of what course the party making it intends to pursue, and except in cases where pretexts are wanted for a rupture, have rarely been objected to, even when avowedly the act of the nation; not, as in this case, a proposal made by one branch of its Government to another. Instances of this are not wanting, but need not be here enumerated. One, however, ought to be mentioned, because it is intimately connected with the subject now under discussion. While the commerce of the United States was suffering under the aggressions of the two most powerful nations of the world, the American Government, in this sense of the word, menaced them both. It passed a law in express terms, declaring to them that unless they ceased their aggressions, America would hold no intercourse with them; that their ships should be seized if they ventured into American ports; that the productions of their soil or industry should be forfeited. Here was an undisguised measure, in clear unequivocal terms, and of course, according to the argument against which I contended, neither France nor England could deliberate, under its pressure, without dishonour. Yet the Emperor of France, certainly an unexceptionable judge of what the dignity of his country required, did accept the condition, did repeal the Berlin and Milan Decrees, did not make any complaints of the act as a threat, though it called it an injury. Great Britain too, although at that time on no friendly terms with the United States, made no complaint that her pride was offended—her Minister on the spot even made a declaration that the obnoxious orders were repealed. It is true it was a disavowal, but the disavowal was accompanied by no objections to the law as a threat. Should the objection be to the nature of the remedy proposed, and that the recommendation of reprisals is the offensive part, it would be easy to show that it stands on the same ground with any other remedy; that it is not hostile in its nature, that it has been resorted to by France to procure redress from other powers, and by them against her, without producing war: but such an argument is not necessary. This is not the case of a national measure, either of menace or action—it is a recommendation only of one branch of Government to another; and France has itself shown that a proposal of this nature could not be noticed as an offence. In the year 1808 the Senate of the United States annexed to the bill of non-intercourse a section which not only advised but actually authorised the President to issue letters of marque and reprisals against both France and England, if the one did not repeal the Berlin and Milan Decrees, and the other did not revoke the Orders in Council. This clause was not acceded to by the Representatives, but it was complete as the act of the Senate: yet neither France nor England complained of it as an indignity—both powers had Ministers on the spot, and the dignity of neither seems to have been offended.

If the view I have now taken of the subject be correct, I have succeeded in conveying to his Majesty's Ministers the conviction I myself feel, that no right exists in any foreign nation to ask explanations of, or even to notice, any communications between the different branches of our Government; that to admit it even in a single instance would be a dangerous precedent, and a derogation from national dignity; and that in the present instance an explanation that ought to be satisfactory has been voluntarily given; I have then demonstrated that any measure founded on such supposed right is not only inadmissible, but is totally unnecessary, and consequently, that his Majesty's Ministers may at once declare that previous explanations given by the Minister of the United States, and subsequently approved by the President, had satisfied them on the subject of the message.

The motives of my Government during the whole course of this controversy, have been misunderstood or not properly appreciated, and the question is daily changing its character. A negotiation, entered into for pecuniary compensation to individuals, involved no positive obligation on their Government to prosecute it to extremities. A solemn treaty, ratified by the constitutional organs of the two powers, changed the private into a public right. The Government acquired by it a perfect right to insist on its stipulations. All doubts as to their justice seems now to have been removed; and every objection to the payment of a debt acknowledged to be just, will be severely scrutinized by the impartial world. What character will be given to a refusal to pay such a debt on the allegation, whether well or ill founded, of an offence to national honour, it does not become me to say. The French nation is the last that would ever appreciate national honour by any number of millions it could withhold, as a compensation for an injury offered to it. The United States, commercial as they are, are the last that would settle such an account. The proposition I allude to would be unworthy of both, and it is sincerely to be hoped that it will never be made.

To avoid the possibility of misapprehension, I repeat, that this communication is made with the single view of apprising his Majesty's Government of the consequences attending a measure, which, without such notice, they might be inclined to pursue; that, although I am not authorised to state what measures will be taken by the United States, yet I speak confidently of the principles they have adopted, and have no doubt they will never be abandoned.

This is the last communication I shall have the honour to make. It is dictated by a sincere desire to restore a good intelligence, which seems to be endangered by the very means intended to consolidate it. Whatever be the result, the U. States may appeal to the world to bear witness, that in the assertion of the rights of their citizens and the dignity of their Government, they have never swerved from the respect due to themselves, and from that which they owe to the Government of France.

I pray your Excellency to receive the assurance of high consideration with which I have the honour to be your most obedient servant,

EDWARD LIVINGSTON.

[*Mr. Livingston to Mr. Forsyth.*]

WASHINGTON, June 29, 1835.

SIR: After having by my note to the Duke de Broglie, dated the 25th April last, made a final effort to preserve a good understanding between the United States and France, by suggesting such means of accommodation as I thought were consistent with the honour of the one country to offer, and the other to accept, I determined to avail myself of the leave to return, which was given by your despatch, No. , rather than to remain, as I had desired to do, in England, waiting the result of my last communication. This step having been approved by the President, I need not here refer to the reasons which induced me to take it. Having received my passports, I left Paris on the 29th of April. At the time of my departure, the note, of which a copy has been transmitted to you, asking an explanation of the terms used in Mr. Serrurier's communication to the Department, remained unanswered, but I have reason to believe that the answer, when given, will be satisfactory.

The principal business with which I was charged having thus been brought to a close, I presume that my services can no longer be useful to my country, and I therefore pray that the President will be pleased to accept my resignation of the trust with which I have been honoured. I shall terminate it by transmitting to the Department some papers relating to matters of minor importance, which I soon expect to receive, and will add the explanations which may yet be wanting to give a full view of the affairs of the mission up to the time of my leaving France.

I have the honour to be, sir, with respect, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) EDW. LIVINGSTON.

The Hon. JOHN FORSYTH,
Secretary of State.

[*Mr. Forsyth to Mr. Livingston.*]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WASHINGTON, 30th June, 1835.

EDWARD LIVINGSTON, Esq. Washington.

SIR: Your letter of the 29th inst. has been laid before the President, and I am directed to reply, that the President cannot allow you, who have been so long and usefully employed in the public service, to leave the trust last confided to you without an expression of his regard and respect—the result of many years of intimate association in peace and war. Although differing on some points of general policy, your singleness of purpose, perfect integrity, and devotion to your country, have been always known to him. In the embarrassing and delicate position you have lately occupied, your conduct, and especially your last official note in closing your correspondence with the French Government, has met his entire approbation, exhibiting, as it does, with truth, the anxious desire of the Government and the people of the United States to maintain the most liberal and pacific relations with the nation to which you were accredited, and a sincere effort to remove ill founded impressions, and to soothe the feelings of national susceptibility even where they have been unexpectedly excited—while, at the same time, it discourages, with a proper firmness, any expectation that the American Government can ever be brought to allow an interference inconsistent with the spirit of its institutions, or make concessions incompatible with its self respect. The President is persuaded that he will be sustained in these opinions by the undivided sentiment of the American people, and that you will carry into a retirement, which he trusts may be temporary, the consciousness not only of having performed your duty, but of having realized the anticipations of your fellow-citizens, and secured for yourself and your country the just appreciation of the world.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant.

(Signed) JOHN FORSYTH.

NOTICE.

THE subscriber having removed to the country, has placed his business in the hands of James H. Watkins, Esq. who is fully authorised to receive all sums of money which are due to him.

JOHN S. SELBY.

July 2.—tf.

NOTICE.

ALL persons indebted to the late firm of James Williamson and Thomas Swann, prior to the 20th of October 1832, are requested to make payment without delay, to Mr. F. M. Jarboe, as it is necessary to collect all accounts as speedily as possible.

ANN JANE SWANN,
Adm'x. of T. Swann.

June 4. 4w

☞ All persons indebted to the above Firm prior to the above date, to whom accounts have been presented, are earnestly requested to call at the subscriber's office and settle the same; and those at a distance are also respectfully requested to remit the amount of such accounts as have been forwarded them, on or before the 1st day of August ensuing.

FRANCIS M. JARBOE.

June 4.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN,

THAT the subscriber hath obtained, from the orphans court of St. Mary's county, in Maryland, letters of administration on the personal estate of Joseph L. Williams, late of said county, deceased. All persons having claims against the said deceased are hereby warned to exhibit the same, with the vouchers thereof, to the subscriber, at or before the 2d day of June next, they may otherwise by law be excluded from all benefit of the said estate. Given under my hand this 10th day of June 1835.

JO. SPALDING, Adm'r.

June 18—4w.

Maryland Gazette.

ANNAPOLIS:
Thursday, July 9, 1835.

There will be a meeting of the South River Temperance Society, at Providence Chapel, on Wednesday the 15th of July next, at 10 o'clock, A. M. when it is expected that an address will be delivered by a friend of the Temperance cause.

CONGRESSIONAL CONVENTION.

The delegates who met on the 30th ult. at Waterloo Tavern, Anne Arundel county, agreeably to a public notice, recommending a joint convention of the friends of the General Government in the cities of Baltimore and Annapolis, and Anne-Arundel county, to nominate two candidates to represent this double district in the next Congress, having understood that a more remote day would meet the approbation of their friends in Baltimore, and those in Anne-Arundel county who had not appointed delegates, proposed that the meeting adjourn to the 1st *SATURDAY in August* at 12 o'clock. M. It was also agreed that the convention be held in Annapolis, and that the delegates from that city be requested to make suitable arrangements for its reception.

The delegates from Anne-Arundel county and Annapolis, are requested to meet at 11 o'clock.

POLITICAL.

The Jackson Republican voters of the *First Election District* A. A. county, are requested to meet on *Saturday the 18th instant*, at 10 o'clock A. M., at Butler's Tavern, for the purpose of appointing Delegates to the Convention, to be held in Annapolis, on *Saturday the 1st of August next*.

Extract of a letter dated July 1st, 1835, from Barnesville, Ohio:—

"The Thompsonians are sweeping the calomel and blue pill gentry by the board in these parts. 'Tis said that two M. D's. of some eminence in an adjoining county set fire to their shops last week and went off by the light thereof. The Thompsonians have a very Ajax at their head. His voice is thunder, his eye lightning, and his pen the Death-Angel to the fellows of the old school."

The William's-port Banner of the 6th, says "The harvest has commenced in this county. The prospect of a fair average crop in the county is very good."

COURT OF APPEALS---June Term 1835.

Thursday July 2d.—Present as yesterday.

The Court affirmed the decree of the Chancellor, with costs in both courts, in No. 30, Vanderkemp, exr. of Busti, vs. The Cape Sable Company, et al.

The argument of No. 68, Thomas, adm. of Bradlee, vs. The Visitors of Frederick County School, was continued by Johnson for the Appellees, and Wm. Schley for the Appellant.

Friday July 3d,.—Present as yesterday.

Archer, Judge, delivered the opinion of the Court in No. 8, The Farmers' Bank of Maryland vs. Richard Duvall—*Affirming the Judgment of the County Court.*

Stephen, Judge, delivered the opinion of the Court in No. 80, Thomas Allen vs. Negro Sharp.

[*Judgment reversed and procedendo awarded.*

The same Judge delivered the opinion of the Court in No. 37, The Union Bank of Maryland vs. Deborah Cochran, et al.—[*Reversing the decree of the Chancellor with costs.*

Spence, Judge, delivered the opinion of the Court in No. 45, Joseph Stewart vs. James Lockhart.

[*Reversing the decree of the Chancellor with costs.*

The Court reversed the Judgment of the County Court, and awarded a procedendo, in No. 2, Benjamin G. Cole vs. James Hebb, d. b. n. of Wm. Guyther.

The Court reversed the decree of the Chancellor, with costs, and dismissed the bill without prejudice, in No. 35, Wm. R. Adair vs. David Winchester, et al.

Chambers, Judge, delivered the opinion of the Court in No. 13, Boteler & Belt vs. the State, use of Chew, use of Brookes, *dismissing the appeal with costs.*

The Court affirmed the decree of the Chancellor with costs, in No. 30, Schnebly and Lee vs. Richard Ragan et al.

The Court reversed the decree of the Orphans' Court of Anne Arundel County in No. 365, Elizabeth Lee vs. Robert Welch, of B. and others.

The argument of No. 68, Thomas, adm. of Bradlee, vs. The Visitors of Frederick County School, was concluded by Wm. Schley for the Appellant.

No. 104. The State of Maryland vs. Negro Jesse Evans. This case was argued by Brooke for the plaintiff in error, and McMahon for the defendant in error.

Archer, Judge, delivered the opinion of the Court in No. 20, Daniel Kent's ad'rs. vs. Thomas Lyles.

[*Judgment affirmed.*

The Court reversed the Judgment, and awarded a procedendo in No. 43, Grafton Bowvall vs. The Farmers' Bank of Maryland.

In the case of William G. Ridgely and others vs. The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore and others, in which case an appeal had been allowed, from the order of the Chancellor dissolving the injunction, the Court ordered the injunction to stand revived until the further order of this Court.

The Court then adjourned until the Court's course.

The observance of the recent National Anniversary in Baltimore was marked by the universal suspension of business. Agreeably to arrangements, the uniformed corps assembled in the morning and repaired to Christ Church, where after an appropriate introduction by the Rev. Mr. Jones, the Declaration of Independence was read by Joseph Willey, Esq. who performed duty with a series of eloquent remarks. The Oration was delivered by the Rev. R. C. Howard, and is spoken of in high terms of praise by those who enjoyed the gratification of listening to it.

We are pained to state that in the after-part of the day two occurrences of a melancholy and fatal character took place. The first, which resulted in the regretted instantaneous death of Midshipman Thomas W. Magruder, —younger son of the Hon. R. B. Magruder of this city,—happened on board the Revenue Cutter Campbell, lying off Fell's Point. It appears that the deceased, in company with several young friends, went on board the Cutter in the afternoon by invitation, and had been there an hour or two when the fatal event occurred. The party were in the cabin, and Magruder had thrown himself into a lower berth, near the cabin door, when one of them was bantered by another that he could not raise to his shoulder, at a level, a ducking gun which stood in a corner. The young gentleman took the gun, and was about bringing the muzzle round, in order to point it out of the cabin door, when, at the very instant that it passed on a line with the berth in which the deceased was reposing, and only within perhaps a foot of it, the gun went off, and the entire load of large shot was discharged into the right side of his head! The skull was torn in a most shocking manner, and instant death was the consequence. This truly deplorable accident,—as is shown by the statement, which we have derived from the Coroner's Inquest,—occurred before the gun was pointed or could be raised to the shoulder, the cabin being so limited that it could not be done without bringing the muzzle to the floor for that purpose.

The report of the Coroner's Inquest is as follows:

"Coroner's Inquest was held by James B. Stansbury, Esq. on Saturday afternoon last, on board the Revenue Cutter Campbell, Capt. Jones, over the body of Midshipman Thomas W. Magruder of the United States Navy. Verdict of the jury, that he came to his death by the accidental discharge of a fowling piece, loaded with shot, in the hands of William Meredith, which entered the head, detaching the right side and upper portion of the skull bone.

The second fatal occurrence took place at Govanstown, about four miles from the city, whither the troop of Light Dragoons had gone to dine, after the morning's parade. The accounts of this occurrence are various and contradictory, and as they will be duly investigated before the legal tribunal, we shall not notice them further here than to state, in general terms, that during an affray that happened in the tavern after dinner, Charles R. Ridgely, a Justice of the Peace, was knocked down, or fell down. The blow, or the fall, proved fatal soon afterwards. One of the parties attributing the death of the deceased to the contact of the Dragoon corps, and the surrounding that it was occasioned by the violent striking of his head against a piece of furniture, as he fell.

Immediately after this unhappy affair, Cornet Devries returned to the city, and immediately went before Judge Purviance, of the County Court, and voluntarily placed himself at the disposal of the law. He has since been admitted to bail.

The verdict of the Coroner's Jury of Inquest in this case was—that the deceased came to his death from a blow or blows inflicted in an affray by William Devries."

Balt. Amer.

From the Philadelphia Enquirer.

DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHAL.

It is with emotions of the deepest regret that we announce to our readers that JOHN MARSHALL, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, departed this life at half past six o'clock yesterday afternoon, at the Boarding House of Mrs. Crim, Walnut st. below Fourth, Philadelphia. This painful intelligence cannot fail to produce a strong sensation throughout the whole country.

Mr. Marshal was born in Virginia, on the 24th of Sept. 1755; and, as early as the Summer of 1775, received a commission as Lieutenant of a Company of Minute men, and was shortly after engaged in the battle of the Great Bridge, where the British troops, under Lord Dunmore, were repulsed with great gallantry. He was subsequently engaged in the memorable battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth; and, in 1780 obtained a license to practise law. He returned to the Army shortly afterwards, and continued in the service until the termination of Arnold's invasion.

In the spring of 1782 he was elected a member of the State Legislature, and in the autumn of the same year, a member of the Executive Council, and married in 1783. In 1788 he was elected as Representative of the city of Richmond, in the Legislature of Virginia, and continued to occupy that station, for the years 1789, 1790, 1791, and upon the recall of Mr. Monroe, as Minister, from France, President Washington solicited Mr. Marshal to accept the appointment as his successor, but he respectfully declined. In 1799 he was elected and took his seat in Congress,—and in 1800 he was appointed Secretary of War.

On the 31st day of January, 1801, he became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, which distinguished station he continued to fill with unrivalled dignity, and pre-eminent ability, until the close of his mortal career. His biographer eloquently observes—"What indeed strikes us as the most remarkable in his whole character, even more than his splendid talents, is the entire consistency of his public life and principles. There is nothing in either which calls for apology or concealment. Ambition never seduced him from his principles—popular clamour never deterred him from the strict performance of his duty. Amid the exasperancies of party spirit, he stood with a calm and steady inflexibility,—neither bending to the pressure of authority, nor bounding with the elasticity of success. He lived such as man should live, by and with his principles. If we were tempted to say in one word in what he excelled all other men, we should say in wisdom; in the practice of that virtue, which ripens and matures the hardy principles of principles, with that of knowledge which patiently sifted and refined its old treasures, and as patiently gathered new—The Constitution, since its adoption, owes more to him than to any other single mind, for its true interpretation and vindication. Whe-