Price of Subscription.

In the City, single copy, Two Cents; served by Carriers for *Twelve Cents* per week, payable to the carriers.

Out of the City, single copy, Three Cents; one month, *Fifty Cents*; two months, *One Dollar*; four months, *Two Dollars*; six months, *Three Dollars*; one year, *Six Dollars*, payable invariably in advance.

Orders for the paper, will be received at the office of Publication, No. 74 Baltimore street, near Gay.

The usual deduction to favor of Newsmen and Agents.

All communications should be addressed to the Publisher of *The South*.

The South.

Price of Advertisements.

One Square—one insertion		50
" " twice		75
" " three times		1 00
" " one week		1 50
" " two weeks		2 00
" " one month		4 00
" " three months		10 00
" " six months		15 00
" " one year		20 00

Six lines or less make a square. Contracts to be subject of special agreement. Marriage and Obituary notices, 25 cents.

Advertisements will be received at the office of Publication, No. 74 Baltimore street, near Gay.

Advertisements should be sent in early.

Vol. 1. No. 37. Baltimore, Monday Evening, June 3, 1861. Th. W. Hall, Jr. Editor.

The South.

"Before St. Mark still glow his steeds of brass,
Their gilded collars glittering in the sun;
But is not Doria's menace come to pass?
Are they not *bridled?* Venice, lost and won,
Her thirteen hundred years of freedom done,
Sinks, like sea-weed, into whence she rose!
Better be whelm'd beneath the waves, and shun,
Even in destruction's depth, her foreign foes,
From whom submission wrings an infamous repose."

THE MERRYMAN CASE.

Opinion of Chief Justice Taney.

The following is the opinion in the *Habeas corpus* case of John Merryman, filed by Chief Justice Taney, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in "the Circuit Court of the United States for the fourth circuit in and for Maryland district."

Ex parte John Merryman. } *Before the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the U. S., at Chambers.*

The application in this case for a writ of *habeas corpus* is made to me under the 14th section of the judiciary act of 1789, which renders effectual for the citizen the constitutional privilege of the *habeas corpus*. That act gives to the courts of the United States, as well as to each Justice of the Supreme Court, and to every District Judge, power to grant writs of *habeas corpus* for the purpose of an inquiry into the cause of commitment. The petition was presented to me at Washington, under the impression that I would order the prisoner to be brought before me there, but as he was confined in Fort McHenry, at the city of Baltimore, which is in my circuit, I resolved to hear it in the latter city; as obedience to the writ, under such circumstances, would not withdraw Gen. Cadwallader, who had him in charge, from the limits of his military command.

The petition presents the following case:—The petitioner resides in Maryland, in Baltimore county. While peacably in his own house, with his family, it was, at two o'clock on the morning of the 25th of May, 1861, entered by an armed force, professing to act under military orders. He was then compelled to rise from his bed, taken into custody and conveyed to Fort McHenry, where he is imprisoned by the commanding officer, without warrant from any lawful authority.

The commander of the fort, General George Cadwallader, by whom he is detained in confinement, in his return to the writ, does not deny any of the facts alleged in the petition. He states that the prisoner was arrested by order of Gen. Keim, of Pennsylvania, and conducted as a prisoner to Fort McHenry by his order, and placed in his (Gen. Cadwallader's) custody to be there detained by him as a prisoner.

A copy of the warrant, or order, under which the prisoner was arrested, was demanded by his counsel, and refused. And it is not alleged in the return that any specific act, constituting an offense against the laws of the United States, has been charged against him upon oath; but he appears to have been arrested upon general charges of treason and rebellion, without proof, and without giving the names of the witnesses, or specifying the acts, which, in the judgment of the military officer, constitute these crimes. And having the prisoner thus in custody upon these vague and unsupported accusations, he refuses to obey the writ of *habeas corpus*, upon the ground that he is duly authorized by the President to suspend it.

The case, then, is simply this. A military officer, residing in Pennsylvania, issues an order to arrest a citizen of Maryland, upon vague and indefinite charges, without any proof, so far as appears. Under this order his house is entered in the night; he is seized as a prisoner, and conveyed to Fort McHenry, and there kept in close confinement. And when a *habeas corpus* is served on the commanding officer, requiring him to produce the prisoner before a Justice of the Supreme Court, in order that he may examine into the legality of the imprisonment, the answer of the officer is, that he is authorized by the President to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* at his discretion, and, in the exercise of that discretion, suspends it in this case, and on that ground refuses obedience to the writ.

As the case comes before me, therefore, I understand that the president not only claims the right to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* himself, at his discretion, but to delegate that discretionary power to a military officer, and to leave it to him to determine whether he will or will not obey judicial process that may be served upon him.

No official notice has been given to the Courts of Justice, or to the public, by proclamation, or otherwise, that the President claimed this power, and had exercised it in the manner stated in return. And I certainly listened to it with some surprise, for I had supposed it to be one of those points of constitutional law upon which there was no difference of opinion, and that it was admitted on all hands that the privilege of the writ could not be suspended, except by act of Congress.

When the conspiracy of which Aaron Burr was the head became so formidable, and was so extensively ramified, as to justify, in Mr. Jefferson's opinion, the suspension of the writ, he claimed, on his part, no power to suspend it—but communicated his opinion to Congress, with all the proofs in his possession, in order that Congress might exercise its discretion upon the subject, and determine whether the public safety required it. And in the debate which took place upon the subject, no one suggested that Mr. Jefferson might exercise the power himself, if, in his opinion, the public safety required it.

Having therefore regarded the question as too plain and too well settled to be open to dispute, if the commanding officer had stated that upon his own responsibility, and in the exercise of his own discretion he refused obedience to the writ, I should have contented myself with referring to the clause in the constitution, and to the construction it received from every jurist and statesman of that day, when the case of Burr was before them. But being thus officially notified that the privilege of the writ has been suspended under the orders, and by the authority of the President, and believing, as I do, that the President has exercised a power which he does not possess under the constitution, a proper respect for the high office he fills requires me to state plainly and fully the grounds of my opinion, in order to show that I have not ventured to question the legality of this act without a careful and deliberate examination of the whole subject.

The clause in the constitution which authorizes the suspension of the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* is in the 9th section of the first article

This article is devoted to the legislative department of the United States, and has not the slightest reference to the Executive department. It begins by providing "that all legislative powers therein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." And after prescribing the manner in which these two branches of the legislative department shall be chosen, it proceeds to enumerate specifically the legislative powers which it thereby grants, the legislative powers which it expressly prohibits, and, at the conclusion of this specification, a clause is inserted, giving Congress "the power to make all laws laws which may be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or office thereof."

The power of legislation granted by this latter clause is by its words carefully confined to the specific objects before enumerated. But as this limitation was unavoidably somewhat indefinite, it was deemed necessary to guard more effectually certain great cardinal principles essential to the liberty of the citizen, and to the rights and equality of the States, by denying to Congress, in express terms, any power of legislating over them. It was apprehended, it seems, that such legislation might be attempted under the pretext that it was necessary and proper to carry into execution the powers granted; and it was determined that there should be no room to doubt, where rights of such vital importance were concerned, and accordingly this clause is immediately followed by an enumeration of certain subjects, to which the powers of legislation shall not extend; and the great importance which the framers of the Constitution attached to the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus to protect the liberty of the citizen, is proved by the fact that its suspension, except in cases of invasion and rebellion, is first in the list of prohibited powers—and even in these cases the power is denied, and its exercise prohibited, unless the public safety shall require it. It is true that in the cases mentioned, Congress is of necessity the judge of whether the public safety does or does not require it, and their judgment is conclusive. But the introduction of these words is a standing admonition to the legislative body of the danger of suspending it, and of the extreme caution they should exercise before they give the Government of the United States such power over the liberty of a citizen.

It is the 2d Article of the Constitution that provides for the organization of the Executive Department, and enumerates the powers conferred on it and prescribes its duties. And if the high power over the liberty of the citizens now claimed was intended to be conferred on the President, it would undoubtedly be found in plain words in this article. But there is not a word in it that can furnish the slightest ground to justify the exercise of the power.

The article begins by declaring that the Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, to hold his office during the term of four years—and then proceeds to prescribe the mode of election and to specify in precise and plain words the powers delegated to him and the duties imposed upon him. And the short term for which he is elected, and the narrow limits to which his power is confined, show the jealousy and apprehensions of future danger which the framers of the constitution felt in relation to that department of the government—and how carefully they withheld from it many of the powers belonging to the Executive branch of the English government which were considered as dangerous to the liberty of the subject—and conferred (and that in clear and specific terms) those powers only which were deemed essential to secure the successful operation of the government.

He is elected, as I have already said, for the brief term of four years, and is made personally responsible, by impeachment, for malfeasance in office. He is from necessity and the nature of his duties the commander-in-chief of the army and navy, and of the militia, when called into actual service. But no appropriation for the support of the army can be made by Congress for a longer term than two years, so that it is in the power of the succeeding House of Representatives to withhold the appropriation for its support, and thus disband it, if in their judgment, the President used or designed to use it for improper purposes.—And although the militia, when in actual service, are under his command, yet the appointment of the officers is reserved to the States, as a security against the use of the military power for purposes dangerous to the liberties of the people or the rights of the States.

So too, his power in relation to the civil duties and authority necessarily conferred on him, are carefully restricted as well as those belonging to his military character. He cannot appoint the ordinary officers of government, nor make a treaty with a foreign nation, or Indian tribe without the advice and consent of the Senate, and cannot appoint even inferior officers, unless he is authorized by an act of Congress to do so. He is not empowered to arrest any one charged with an offence against the United States, and whom he may, from the evidence before him, believe to be guilty, nor can he authorize any officer, civil or military, to exercise this power, for the 5th article of the amendments to the constitution expressly provides that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law"—that is judicial process. And even if the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* was suspended by act of Congress, and a party not subject to the rules and articles of war was afterwards arrested and imprisoned by regular judicial process—he could not be detained in prison or brought to trial before a military tribunal, for the article in the amendments to the constitution immediately following the one above referred to—that is, the 6th article, provides that—"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

And the only power, therefore, which the President possesses, where the "life, liberty, or property" of a private citizen is concerned, is the power and duty prescribed in the third section of the second article, which requires "that he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." He is not authorized to execute them himself, or through agents or officers, civil or military, appointed by himself, but he is to take care that they be faithfully carried into execution, as they are expounded and adjudged by the co-ordinate branch of the government, to which that duty is assigned by the constitution. It is thus made his duty to come in aid of the judicial authority if it shall be resisted by a force too strong to be overcome without the assistance of the executive arm. But in exercising this power, he acts in subordination to judicial authority, assisting it to execute its process and enforce its judgments.

With such provisions in the constitution, expressed in language too clear to be misunderstood by any one, I can see no ground whatever for supposing that the President, in any emergency, or in any state of things, can authorize the suspension of the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*, or arrest a citizen, except in aid of the judicial power. He certainly does not faithfully execute the laws, if he takes upon himself legislative power by suspending the writ of *habeas corpus*—and the judicial power also, by arresting and imprisoning a person without due process of law. Nor can any argument be drawn from the nature of sovereignty, or the necessities of government for self-defense in times of tumult and danger. The government of the United States is one of delegated and limited powers. It derives its existence and authority altogether from the constitution, and neither of its branches, Executive, Legislative, or Judicial, can exercise any of the powers of government beyond those specified and granted. For the 10th article of the amendment to the constitution, in express terms, provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Indeed, the security against imprisonment by executive authority, provided for in the fifth article of the Amendments of the Constitution, which I have before quoted, is nothing more than a copy of a like provision in the English Constitution, which had been firmly established before the Declaration of Independence.

Blackstone, in his Commentaries (1st vol. p.137) states it in the following words:—

"To make imprisonment lawful, it must be either by process from the Courts of Judicature or by warrant from some legal officer having authority to commit to prison." And the people of the United Colonies, who had themselves lived under its protection while they were British subjects, were well aware of the necessity of this safeguard of their personal liberty. And no one can believe that in framing a government intended to guard still more efficiently the rights and the liberties of the citizen against executive encroachment and oppression, they would have conferred on the President a power which the history of England had proved to be dangerous and oppressive in the hands of the Crown, and which the people of England had compelled it to surrender after a long and obstinate struggle on the part of the English executive to usurp and retain it.

The right of the subject to the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus*, it must be recollected, was one of the great points of controversy during the long struggle in England between arbitrary government and free institutions, and must therefore have strongly attracted the attention of the statesmen engaged in framing a new and, as they supposed, a freer government than the one which they had thrown off by the revolution. For from the earliest history of the Common Law, if a person was imprisoned—no matter by what authority—he had a right to the writ of *habeas corpus* to bring his case before the King's Bench; and if no specific offense was charged against him in the warrant of commitment, he was entitled to be forthwith discharged; and if an offense was charged which was bailable in its character, the court was bound to set him at liberty on bail. And the most exciting contests between the Crown and the people of England, from the time of Magna Charta, were in relation to the privilege of this writ, and they continued until the passage of the statute of 31st Charles II., commonly known as the great *habeas corpus* act.

This statute put an end to the struggle, and finally and firmly secured the liberty of the subject from the usurpation and oppression of the executive branch of the goverment. It nevertheless conferred no new right upon the subject, but only secured a right already existing. For, although the right could not be justly denied, there was often no effectual remedy against its violation. Until the statute of the 13th of William III. the Judges held their offices at the pleasure of the king, and the influence which he exercised over timid, time-serving, and partisan judges often induced them, upon some pretext or another, to refuse to discharge the party although he was entitled to it by law, or delayed their decisions from time to time, so as to prolong the imprisonment of persons who were obnoxious to the king for their political opinions, or had incurred his resentment in any other way.

The great and inestimable value of the *habeas corpus* act of the 31st Charles II. is that it contains provisions which compel courts and judges, and all parties concerned, to perform their duties promptly, in the manner specified in the statute.

A passage in Blackstone's Commentaries, showing the ancient state of the law upon this subject, and the abuses which were practised through the power and influence of the Crown, and a short extract from Hallam's Constitutional History, stating the circumstances which gave rise to the passage of this statute, explain briefly, but fully, all that is material to this subject.

Blackstone, in his Commentaries on the Laws of England, (3d vol., 133-134,) says:

"To assert an absolute exemption from imprisonment in all cases, is inconsistent with every idea of law and political society, and in the end would destroy all civil liberty, by rendering its protection impossible.

"But the glory of the English law consists in clearly defining the times, the causes and the extent, when, wherefore, and to what degree the imprisonment of the subject may be lawful. This it is which induces the absolute necessity of expressing upon every commitment the reason for which it is made, that the court upon a *habeas corpus* may examine into its validity, and according to the circumstances of the case, may discharge, admit to bail, or remand the prisoner.

"And yet early in the reign of Charles I. the Court of King's Bench, relying on some arbitrary precedents, (and those perhaps misunderstood,) determined that they would not, upon a *habeas corpus*, either bail, or deliver a prisoner, though committed without any cause assigned, in case he was committed by the special command of the King or by the Lords of the Privy Council. This drew on a parliamentary inquiry and produced the Petition of Right—3 Charles I.—which recites this illegal judgment, and enacts that no freeman hereafter shall be so imprisoned or detained. But when in the following year Mr. Selden and others were committed by the Lords of the Council in pursuance of his majesty's special command, under a general charge of 'notable contempts, and stirring up sedition against the King and the government,' the judges delayed for two terms (including also the long vacation) to deliver an opinion how far such a charge was bailable. And when at length they agreed that it was, they however annexed a condition of finding sureties for their good behavior, which still protracted their imprisonment, the Chief Justice, Sir Nicholas Hyde, at the same time declaring that 'if they were again remanded for that cause perhaps the court would not afterward grant a *habeas corpus*, being already made acquainted with the cause of the imprisonment. But this was heard with indignation and astonishment by every lawyer present, according to Mr. Selden's own account of the matter, whose resentment was not cooled at the distance of four and twenty years."

It is worthy of remark that the offenses charged against the prisoner in this case, and relied on as a justification for his arrest, and imprisonment, in their nature and character, and in the loose and vague manner in which they are stated, bear a striking resemblance to those assigned in the the warrant for the arrest of Mr. Selden. And yet, even at that day, the warrant was regarded as such a flagrant violation of the rights of the subject, that the delay of the time-serving judges to set him at liberty upon the *habeas corpus* issued in his behalf excited universal indignation at the bar. The extract from Hallam's Constitutional History is equally impressive and equally in point. It is in vol. 4, p. 14,

"It is a very common mistake, and not only among foreigners, but many from whom some knowledge of our constitutional laws might be expected, to suppose, that this statute of Charles II enlarged in a great degree our liberties, and forms a sort of epoch in their history. But though a very beneficial enactment, and eminently remedial in many cases of illegal imprisonment, it introduced no new principle, nor conferred any right upon the subject. From the earliest records of the English law, no freeman could be detained in prison, except upon a criminal charge, or conviction, or for a civil debt. In the former case it was always in his power to demand of the Court of king's Bench a writ of *habeas corpus ad subjiciendum* directed to the person detaining him in custody, by which he was enjoined to bring up the body of the prisoner with the warrant of commitment that the court might judge of its sufficiency, and remand the party, admit him to bail, or discharge him, according to the nature of the charge. This writ issued of right and could not be refused by the court. It was not to bestow an immunity from arbitrary imprisonment, which is abundantly provided for in Magna Charta, (if indeed it were not more ancient,) that the statute of Charles II. was enacted, but to cut off the abuses by which the government's lust of power, and the servile subtlety of Crown lawyers had impaired so fundamental a privilege."

While the value set upon this writ in England has been so great that the removal of the abuses which embarrassed its enjoyment have been looked upon as almost a new grant of liberty to the subject, it is not to be wondered at that the continuance of the writ thus made effective should have been the object of the most jealous care.—Accordingly, no power in England short of that of Parliament can suspend or authorize the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*. I quote again from Blackstone (1 Comm., 136): "But the happiness of our Constitution is, that it is not left to the executive power to determine when the danger of the State is so great as to render this measure expedient. It is the Parliament only, or legislative power, that, whenever it sees proper, can authorize the Crown, by suspending the *habeas corpus* for a short and limited time, to imprison suspected persons without giving any reasons for so doing." And if the President of the United States may suspend the writ, then the Constitution of the United States has conferred upon him more regal and absolute power over the liberty of the citizens than the people of England have thought it safe to entrust to the Crown—a power which the Queen of England cannot exercise at this day, and which could not have been lawfully exercised by the sovereign even in the reign of Charles the First.

But I am not left to form my judgment upon this great question from analogies between the English government and our own, or the commentaries of English jurists, or the decisions of English courts, although upon this subject they are entitled to the highest respect, and are justly regarded and received as authoritative by our courts of justice. To guide me to a right conclusion, I have the Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States of the late Mr. Justice Story, not only one of the most eminent jurists of the age, but for a long time one of the brightest ornaments of the Supreme Court of the United States, and also the clear and authoritative decision of that court itself, given more than half a century since, and conclusively establishing the principles I have above stated.

Mr. Justice Story, speaking in his Commentaries of the *habeas corpus* clause in the constitution, says:

"It is obvious that cases of a peculiar emergency may arise, which may justify, nay, even require, the temporary suspension of any right to the writ. But as it has frequently happened in foreign countries, and even in England, that the writ has, upon various pretexts and occasions, been suspended, whereby persons apprehended upon suspicion have suffered a long imprisonment, sometimes from design, and sometimes because they were forgotten, the right to suspend it is expressly confined to cases of rebellion or invasion, where the public safety may require it. A very just and wholesome restraint, which cuts down at a blow a fruitful means of oppression, capable of being abused in bad times to the worst of purposes. Hitherto no suspension of the writ has ever been authorized by Congress since the establishment of the constitution. It would seem, as the power is given to Congress to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in cases of rebellion or invasion, that the right to judge whether the exigency had arisen, must exclusively belong to that body." 3 Story's Com. on the Constitution, sec. 1336.

And Chief Justice Marshall, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *ex parte* Bollman and Swartwout, uses this decisive language in 4 Cranch, 95. It may be worthy of remark that this "act (speaking of the one under which I am proceeding) was passed by the first Congress of the United States, sitting under a constitution which had declared 'that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* should not be suspended, unless, when, in case of rebellion or invasion, the public safety might require it.' Acting under the immediate influence of this injunction, they must have felt, with peculiar force, the obligation of providing efficient means by which this great constitutional privilege should receive life and activity; for if the means be not in existence, the privilege itself would be lost, although no law for its suspension should be enacted. Under the impression of this obligation they give, to all the courts, the power of awarding writs of *habeas corpus*."

And again, in page 101:

"If any time the public safety should require the suspension of the powers vested by this act in the courts of the United States, it is for the Legislature to say so. That question depends on political considerations, on which the Legislature is to decide. Until the Legislative will be expressed, this court can only see its duty, and must obey the law."

I can add nothing to these clear and emphatic words of my great predecessor.

But the documents before me show that the military authority in this cause has gone far beyond the mere suspension of the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*. It has, by force of arms, thrust aside the judicial authorities and officers to whom the constitution has confided the power and duty of interpreting and administering the laws, and substituted a military government in its place, to be administered and executed by military officers. For at the time these proceedings were had against John Merryman, the District Judge of Maryland—the commissioner appointed under the act of Congress—the District Attorney and the Marshall—all resided in this City of Baltimore, a few miles only from the home of the prisoner.

In such a case my duty was too plain to be mistaken. I have exercised all the power which the constitution and laws confer on me, but that power has been resisted by a force too strong for me to overcome. It is possible that the officer who has incurred this grave responsibility may have misunderstood his instructions, and exceeded the authority intended to be given him. I shall, therefore, order all the proceedings in this case, with my opinion, to be filed and recorded in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and direct the clerk to transmit a copy, under seal, to the President of the United States. It will then remain for that high officer, in fulfilment of his constitutional obligation to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," to determine what measures he will take to cause the civil process of the United States to be respected and enforced.

R. B. Taney, Chief Justice
of the Supreme Court of the United States

A CARD.

A. C. MATTHEWS,

GENERAL AUCTION COMMISSION MERCHANT.

No. 20 South Charles St.

Will give his personal attention as Auctioneer, to sales of every description, and respectfully solicits from his friends and the public generally, a share of their patronage ap 22

DRY GOODS.

JNO. A. HAMBLETON. T. E. HAMBLETON, JR. T. H. HODGKINS.

HAMBLETON, BROTHERS & CO.

IMPORTERS AND JOBBERS IN

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC

DRY GOODS,

209 BALTIMORE STREET,

ap 23 tf BALTIMORE.

5,000 LOTS NEW YORK

AUCTION BARGAINS.

MOST DESIRABLE AND CHEAPEST

GOODS EVER OPENED IN BALTIMORE.

One Thousand Pieces Dress Goods

LESS THAN HALF PRICE

In Paris BAREGES, plain and printed Grenadine Barege printed (entirely new) in beautiful styles

8-4 BLACK BAREGES, 8-4 WHITE BAREGES, 3-4 BLACK BAREGES, 3-4 BLACK CREPE MARETZ, 3-4 and 6-4 BLACK MOUFFLINES, At much less than usual prices. May at half cost of importation.

DRESS SILKS, all boiled BLACK SILKS, LAWNS and ORGANDIES, SHAWLS, Hemstitched and Embroidered Lawn HANDKERCHIEFS, French CHINTZES. All these lots were bought last week at auction in New York at large sacrifices to the importers, all are new and desirable styles, and will be opened on our retail floors MONDAY MORNING.

HAMILTON EASTER & CO.

ap 22 6m 199, 201 and 203 Baltimore street.

TOBACCO AND SEGARS.

ARMISTEAD, RIGGS & CO.

AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF

VIRGINIA MANUFACTURED

TOBACCO,

No. 57 EXCHANGE PLACE,

ap 23 tf BALTIMORE.

CHARLES BAYNE & CO.

AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF

MANUFACTURED

TOBACCO,

Importers and Dealers in

HAVANA, GERMAN & DOMESTIC

SEGARS,

No. 70 EXCHANGE PLACE,

ap 22 3m BALTIMORE.

WARWICK, FRICK & BALL,

AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF

MANUFACTURED AND LEAF

TOBACCO,

No. 60 SOUTH STREET, BALTIMORE.

Dan'l. J. Warwick.
Frank Frick.
Philip A. Ball. ap 22 d3m

T. C. CLAIBORNE. T. C. S. FERGUSON.

CLAIBORNE & FERGUSON,

AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF

VIRGINIA MANUFACTURED

TOBACCO,

No 20 SOUTH CALVERT STREET,

ap 24 3m BALTIMORE, MD.

DYE WOOD, CHEMICALS, &c.

R. J. BAKER,

Importer and Manufacturer of

DYE WOODS,

DYEING DRUGS,

CHEMICALS, &c.

Used by Woolen, Cotton, Soap and Paper Manufacturers, Tanners, Leather and Morocco Dressers, Machinists and Dyers

36 S. Charles Street.

ap 22 d3m

MARBLE WORKS.

HUGH SISSON,

STEAM MARBLE WORKS,

Cor. North and Monument Sts.,

BALTIMORE,

Monuments, Grave Stones, Mantles,

Table Tops, Tiles for Floors,

Garden Statuary, &c.

Foreign and Domestic MARBLE furnished the trade at low rates. ap 22 tf

FOR FREDERICKSBURG.
AND LANDINGS ON THE RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER.

The Steamboat VIRGINIA, Capt. Noah Fairbank, leaves Baltimore from her wharf on LIGHT STREET, foot of Barre street, EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON, at four o'clock. ap 22

NORTHERN CENTRAL RAILWAY.

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE,
Calvert Station, Baltimore, May 18, 1861.

On and after SUNDAY, May 19th, trains on the NORTHERN CENTRAL RAILWAY Arrive and depart, until further notice, from CALVERT STATION AS FOLLOWS:

TRAINS NORTH.

Mail at 8.15 A. M.
Express at 3.30 P. M.
Harrisburg Accommodation at 8.00 P. M.

The 8.15 A. M. train connects at the Relay House with trains on the Western Maryland Railroad, at Hanover Junction with Hanover and Gettysburg Railroads, at York with York and Wrightsville Railroad, at Harrisburg with Pennsylvania Railroad for all parts of the West, also with Lebanon Valley Railroad to New York direct; at Northumberland with L. & B. Railroad for Kingston and all parts of Wyoming Valley, at Sunbury with Philadelphia and Erie Railroad for all parts of Northern Pennsylvania and New York.

The 3.30 P. M. train makes all the above connections except Hanover Railroad, Wrightsville Railroad, and the Lebanon Valley Railroad. The 8 P. M. train makes connections with the Pennsylvania Railroad for all parts of the West, and direct connections with New York.

TRAINS ARRIVE.

Mail at 6.10 P. M.
Express at 7.45 A. M.
Harrisburg Accommodation at 1 P. M.

For TICKETS and information, apply at the TICKET OFFICE, Calvert Station, N. E. corner of Calvert and Franklin streets, Baltimore.

my 21 d JAS. C. CLARKE, Superintendent.

PHILADELPHIA WILMINGTON AND BALTIMORE RAILROAD.

SPRING AND SUMMER ARRANGEMENT.

On and after MONDAY, April 15th, Passenger Trains for Philadelphia will leave PRESIDENT STREET DEPOT daily (except Sundays) as follows, via:

EXPRESS TRAIN at 6.15 A. M., WAY MAIL at 9.45 A. M., EVENING MAIL at 4.45 P. M.

ON SUNDAYS at 4.45 P. M. only. All trains connect with New York Trains except 4.45 P. M., on Saturdays.

A Freight Train, with Passenger Car attached, leaves at 5.00 P. M., stopping at all Stations between Baltimore and Harre de Grace.

From PHILADELPHIA to BALTIMORE at 8.15 A. M., 11.35 A. M., and 10.30 P. M.

DELAWARE RAILROAD FOR SALISBURY AND INTERMEDIATE POINTS.

By leaving in 6.15 A. M. train will connect at Wilmington with 9.45 A. M. train, daily (except Sunday) for Milford, Salisbury and intermediate stations.

NOTICE—All colored persons, whether bond or free, will be required to bring some responsible white person, personally known to the undersigned, who will be willing to sign a bond to the Company, before they will be taken over any portion of the road.

ap 22 WM. CRAWFORD, Agent.

OLD DOMINION STEAMBOAT COMPANY.

FOR FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA, AND LANDINGS ON THE RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER.

The Steamer VIRGINIA, Captain N. Fairbank, leaves Baltimore, from her berth, at Needham's pier, Light street wharf, EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON, at 4 o'clock, and returning leaves Fredericksburg EVERY TUESDAY MORNING, at 3 o'clock, or immediately after the arrival of the train of cars from the Annapolis and Washington. Freight at all the regular Landings on the Rappahannock river going and returning, to land and receive freight and passengers.

THE VIRGINIA

Is comparatively new, and was built by merchants of Fredericksburg and Baltimore, interested in the trade, and by merchants and farmers residing in the counties for letting on the Rappahannock, for the express purpose of keeping a first-class steamer on the route. During the winter the forward deck has been enclosed, thus affording complete protection for horses and other live stock. Carriages of all sizes can be taken on board and carried under deck without taking off the wheels. Her staterooms and berth accommodations are large and commodious, and her capacity for freight extensive. As a passenger and freight boat she has no superior on the waters of the Chesapeake.

Through freight received in Baltimore, and charges paid by R. J. CAPRON & CO., Brady's wharf.

☞ Freight received on board of the Steamer Wednesdays and Thursdays, and on Fridays up to 3 o'clock, P. M.

For further information and Blank Receipts of form used by the Company, apply on board, or to

R. J. CAPRON & CO., Agents,
No. 97 Brady's wharf, Baltimore.

F. Slaughter, President, Fredericksburg, Va.
ap 22

FOR THE WEST AND SOUTH.

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD.

On and after April 14th, 1861, the trains will run as follows:

Leave CAMDEN STATION, Baltimore—Mail train at 3.30 A. M., Express daily at 3.45 P. M.

Both trains go directly for ALL PARTS OF THE WEST, SOUTHWEST AND NORTHWEST.

FOR WAY PASSENGERS

Between Baltimore and Piedmont take the 5.30 A. M. train, between Piedmont and Wheeling take Accommodation train leaving Piedmont at 6.00 A. M., and between Grafton and Parkersburg, take the 9.15 A. M. and 5.30 P. M. train from Baltimore.

THE FREDERICK TRAIN leaves Baltimore at 4.30 P. M. and Frederick at 8.00 A. M.

THE ELLICOTT'S MILLS TRAIN leaves Baltimore at 11 A. M., and 4.45 and 5.00 P. M., and Ellicott's Mills at 7.00 A. M., and 4.00 and 7.00 P. M.

FOR WASHINGTON AND THE SOUTH.

Leaves Baltimore at 4.00 and 8.00 A. M., and 3.10 and 8.00 P. M. On Sundays at 4.00 A. M. only. Leave Washington at 6.25 and 7.00 A. M., and 2.45 and 3.45 P. M. On Sundays at 7.45 P. M. only. The second and fourth trains only from Baltimore and the second and third from Washington connect with trains on the Annapolis road.

For further information, tickets of every kind, &c., apply to J. T. ENGLAND, Agent, at Camden Station, or at the Ticket Office. W. P. SMITH, Master of Transportation.

L. M. COLE, General Ticket Agent. ap 22

NEW FREIGHT ROUTE TO LYNCHBURG, KNOXVILLE, MEMPHIS AND OTHER POINTS ON THE SOUTHWESTERN RAILROAD

The STEAM PACKET LINE to ALEXANDRIA have formed a connection with the ALEXANDRIA AND LYNCHBURG RAILROAD, by which Goods will be forwarded to all points on the Southwestern Railroad, with great expedition, at rates as low as any other route.

For rates and other information apply to CHARLES WORTHINGTON, Commerce street Wharf.

ap 22

FOR WASHINGTON, ALEXANDRIA, GEORGETOWN AND THE POTOMAC RIVER LANDINGS.

The Steamer COLUMBIA, Captain James Harper, will leave Commerce street wharf on SATURDAY AFTERNOON, at 3 o'clock, stopping at her accustomed landings on the Potomac river.

Freight received from Friday morning until three o'clock on Saturday. ap 22 CHAS. WORTHINGTON, Agent.

FOR THE PATUXENT RIVER.

The steamer MARY WASHINGTON will leave her wharf for the Patuxent River, commencing on WEDNESDAY, February 6th, and continue every Wednesday thereafter until further notice. MASON L. WEEMS, Master.

The steamer GEORGE WEEMS will leave her wharf every SATURDAY MORNING, commencing March 16th, for the same place. THEO. WEEMS, Master.

N. B.—Tobacco landed at either No. 1 or 2 Tobacco Warehouse, as shippers may desire.

All freight must be prepaid.

FOR FREDERICKSBURG, VA., AND LANDINGS ON RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER.

Baltimore and Fredericksburg Steamboat Company's new Steamer LOGAN, W. B. Kerwin, Captain, leaves Baltimore from her wharf, foot of South street, every TUESDAY, at 4 o'clock, P. M.

☞ For information, freight or passage, apply to JOS. WHITE, Agent, Foot of South street, Baltimore, or of ADAMS & FRENCH, Agents at Fredericksburg, Va.

ap 22

NOTICE.

OFFICE ADAMS EXPRESS COMPANY,
164 BALTIMORE STREET, Baltimore, Md.

GOODS FOR THE CONFEDERATE STATES must pay duties after this date.

Business will be conducted as heretofore, and Blank Receipts will be used by the Agents.

THE ADAMS EXPRESS CO.

Baltimore, March 20, 1861.

FOR ANNAPOLIS, WEST AND SOUTH RIVERS—Leaves City Dock, Light street wharf, on every WEDNESDAY and SATURDAY MORNING, at 9 o'clock, returning Thursday and Monday, leaving South River at 7 o'clock and West River at 9 o'clock, direct for Baltimore. WM. T. ELIOT, Agent.

P. S.—For West River every Tuesday and Friday, returning at 7 o'clock, returning same day, leaving West River at 12½ o'clock.

CITY COLLECTOR'S OFFICE, Baltimore, May 1st, 1861.

Tax Bill.—To Parties who have not received their bills, the City Collector begs to state that they will be found at his office, on and after the FIRST DAY OF JUNE NEXT, ready for delivery to the owners or their agents, when they can be informed of the amount of taxes and water rents for which they are respectively liable, and receive their bills. The attention of the public is respectfully invited to the following table, showing the hours and places at which the City Collector will be in his office for the purpose of receiving taxes, viz:

The City Collector will be in his office from 9 o'clock A. M. to 5 o'clock P. M. The City Collector will be in the Western District on the last two days of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the Eastern District on the first two days of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the Northern District on the third day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the Southern District on the fourth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the Central District on the fifth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the sixth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the seventh day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the eighth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the ninth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the tenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the eleventh day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the twelfth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the thirteenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the fourteenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the fifteenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the sixteenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the seventeenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the eighteenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the nineteenth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the twentieth day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City Hall on the twenty-first day of every month, during the period he may be in his office at the City Hall.

The City Collector will be in the City H