

TO THE HON. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

[Continued.]

I proceed next to exhibit some of the results of the investigation by the committee. When I proposed an enquiry into the conduct of the Bank, I expected to show that it had been guilty of BRIBERY and PARTIALITY; and though, as a private institution, these high misdemeanors did not concern the Government, but, as suggested by you, belonged to the undividedness of the Stockholders; yet, as the Government has most unwisely connected itself with this shaming shop, it behooved it, for the sake of its own reputation, not to be accessory to the corruption of the public press, or the exercise of favoritism to a privileged class of its citizens. All my charges tended to these two objects. How far the enquiry has sustained them, will be briefly submitted in a summary of the evidence.

First as to BRIBERY. It will be recollected that the Bank, with all the devices peculiar to its vast resources, was fully a month in struggling to prevent an investigation, and that made a plausible exhibition of most cheerful acquiescence. Upon the arrival of the committee at Philadelphia, uncollected, and without any previous charge by them against James Watson Webb, he addressed a letter, through the President of the Bank, to one of the committee, earnestly requesting that he and one Silas E. Burrows should be called before the committee, to explain the nature of a transaction, which might be "misconstrued," and in which a considerable loan had been made to purchase a press. He gives a minute and highly-colored statement of the whole matter, and declares, which surely ought to be very satisfactory, that there "is nothing in our accommodation with the Bank which is not of a business character." Pray, who had said otherwise, at that time? The committee had not even gone into the Bank, much less examined its books, when this self-accusation made its appearance, from the hands of the President himself.

But let us now present the true history of this transaction, as disclosed by the evidence: On the 26th of March, 1831, Silas E. Burrows, the witness which Webb wanted sworn, and who secreted himself to prevent that object, applied to the President of the Bank for a loan in favor of Webb and Noah, printers of a widely circulating paper in New-York, then the organ of the Democratic party of that great State. This paper had been, and then was, violently opposed to the Bank. Burrows had spoken to them with a view to change their course. They had promised to advocate a "modified charter." He expressed himself gratified at even that much. The President of the Bank informs this agent the money can be had. Not having a use for the money, he advances it himself out of his own pocket. Burrows returns to New-York with the money, not even having left a receipt for it with the President. The President was asked, "Had you any written obligation from Burrows in regard to his responsibility for this loan?" "No; we relied on his assurance." On the 1st of April, he takes ten notes of \$1,500 each, from Noah, endorsed by Webb alone, and due in one, two, three, four and five years—the interest not deducted, as is usual in bank loans; but added to each respective note as it became due—thereby swelling the debt to \$17,975. On the 8th of April, Webb and Noah came out openly for the Bank—their notes are sent back to the President immediately—he keeps them in his private possession nine months—On the 2d of January, 1832, he has them entered "on the books of the Bank, and then receives back his money, originally advanced on account of them. On the 17th of February, the resolution is introduced in Congress to enquire into the Bank. It is strenuously opposed and delay—indications are strong that it must pass. On the 2d of March, Silas E. Burrows applies to the exchange committee not to the Board of Directors—the President is a member of that Committee—obtains a loan of \$32,446 by far the largest loan obtained on that day, and while many notes of the good citizens of Philadelphia were rejected—He withdraws the notes of Noah and Webb without their knowledge, and in order to get this loan off the books they are subjected to considerable interrelations and erasures. Thus ends this "fair business transaction." It is now necessary to go back to the beginning of another business transaction between the bank and Noah and Webb; they protesting that all the foregoing was done by Mr. Biddle and Burrows without their knowledge. They say the only loan received by them from the bank, was on the 9th of August, 1831, for \$20,000 on their own unstrengthened co-partnership paper, at six months. On the 16th of December, following, upon exactly the same paper, they obtain \$15,000 more, on the same time. Now what is the character of these two loans—two persons said to be insolvent, living in a distant city, full of banks, among which is a branch of the U. States' Bank, unable to obtain credit at home—a co-partnership paper with no endorser—a credit of six months instead of the usual time of 60 and 90 days, in violation of the bank's own rules—the largest loans made on these two days—so heavy a pressure upon the money market that their own citizens were turned out of bank—others were called on to pay their notes—these two sums, amounting to \$35,000, thus unsecured, were loaned at a time when Noah and Webb had previously obtained \$17,975 lodged in the pockets of Mr. Biddle, and unknown to the Board of Directors. Does this look like fair business transactions? I appeal to the knowledge of bank men and to the candor of all men to know whether there is any usage, in any institution in the U. States that will justify such a proceeding, unless it has a cause for its irregularity different from that which belongs to the usual banking operations? This question was answered by all the papers of all parties at the time of the disclosure, and all concurred that there was something rotten at the foundation. But let us pursue this matter to its conclusion, though no honest man can doubt upon the above facts, yet it shall be made so plain that even those of a different character shall be left without excuse. We have seen that Silas E. Burrows, on the 2d of March, withdrew Noah and Webb's notes, running to \$32,446. On the 11th of the same month Webb remarks in a letter to the President: "The loan, though strictly defensible, is a large one, and the amount may give rise to the charge of indiscretion on the part of the directors. This, it is not only our duty, but our desire to prevent, if possible; and therefore, with some little inconvenience to ourselves, we have made the arrangements to pay the note of \$15,000 in the course of a few days." Three days thereafter, Burrows obtained another loan of \$14,150, and on the next day Webb and Noah's note, due in June thereafter, was paid off. Now where did this money come from? Mark well all the circumstances of the case—on the first of April in the year before Noah and Webb were so hard run for money, that Burrows benevolently borrows from the President's private pocket \$15,000 for them. On the 9th of August following their distresses continue—they cannot obtain money in New York. They were actually persecuted on account of their advocacy of the bank—make the most lamentable representations to Mr. Biddle, and finally obtain a loan of \$20,000. This is not all, their wants still press upon them, on the 16th of Dec. Webb writes to Mr. Biddle, from the Mansion House, in Philadelphia: "I feel mortified at the necessity of again asking you for a loan, but the circumstances under which the application is made, must be our apology. It certainly does appear that our local institutions, are determined to let us feel their power; but this is our misfortune rather than our fault." The loan is obtained. The bank finds herself under the curse of the proverb, "in for a penny in for a pound." They had gone too far to turn back. But behold! The enquiry was started in Congress. An immediate inspection of the Books would discover Mordecai M. Noah & James Watson Webb, printers of New York, former enemies but now firm friends of the Bank, a mere co-partnership, without credit in New York, without endorser, and under a great pressure of the money market, indebted to the amount of \$52,975. What is to be done? Does any one believe that Webb could raise the wind to help the Bank in its approaching difficulties, after such a distressing exhibition of his own destitution? Is it customary to pay bank debts before they are due, and at great inconvenience? Who does not perceive how all this snifter was arranged? Burrows being a great merchant, a very benevolent man, the friend of Mr. Monroe, the founder of the monument of Washing-

ton's mother, is of sufficient credit to borrow \$50,000. With this the first notes are paid in twelve days after, another loan of \$14,000 enables Mr. James Watson Webb, to pay off \$15,000 more and what is better for the bank, enables you, to say the debt is now reduced to \$18,000 and is perfectly safe, the bank has lost nothing, no one is concerned but the stockholders, and they are entirely satisfied? And do you really think, Mr. Adams, that this is all that belongs to this rank and deep tainted bribery? Is it nothing to corrupt the Public Press of a Government resting exclusively upon the virtue and intelligence of the people? That organ through which they derive all their political information? You have labored through several pages of your report to prove there is no such crime as subsidizing the Press.—That there was a great "want of precision" in my "definition" of that offence? You pretend not to understand it? Indeed! Can this be possible? I am aware that I shall run some risk with your numerous admirers, in suspecting your want of discernment on this subject, and therefore you must excuse me if I place this affectation of yours to a worse deficiency. You have driven me to choose between your ignorance and your insincerity, and the glory that plays around your poetic reputation, utterly forbids the least imputation on the former. You do understand what I meant by subsidizing the Press! It means simply nothing more, nor less than buying it up for corrupt purposes. But by a disingenuous perversion of terms you have attempted to analogize it to the use which is made of it, in the controversies of personal rivals, or the warfare of political partisans; and for these objects you contend it is the subject of fair and allowable prostitution. You are deeply interested in establishing the blameless character of such a doctrine, for besides the instances of its aid to you in past events, you are doubtless not without your hopes of its future usefulness. But if you can believe there is no sin in bribery and perjury, you are in the possession of a creed that sufficiently explains your former political success, though you must confess, it is associated with a morality that is likely never to provoke the envy of any one who has not your thirst for office; and from the short-lived tendency of its prosperity, as effectually accounts for all your political misfortunes. So much for the charge of bribery, and passing over the cases of Robert Walsh, Jesper Harding and several others equally dear, I will proceed to the subject of favoritism, practised by the Bank. This branch divides itself into two classes, favoritism to particular individuals, and favoritism to public functionaries. A case or two of each, is all that can be expected on the present occasion. I shall commence with Thomas Biddle, and as in the case of Webb, shall content myself with a rapid summary of the evidence. Mr. Thomas Biddle, the near relation of the President, and the broker of the Bank, seems to have been the fortunate subject of not less than four distinct instances of peculiar partiality. First, he is the only individual from the commencement of the Bank, to the last day of its investigation, that has ever received interest upon deposits. Thomas Wilson, former cashier of the Bank, most unequivocally declares that he obtained interest in two instances, one to the amount of \$1600, and the other about \$700. He states that the question of "allowing interest on deposits was several times discussed before different Boards. Applications to that effect were made by Mr. Prime of New York, and McEuen, Hale, and Davidson, of Philadelphia, and refused." This was prior to its allowance to T. Biddle. The case of the \$700 was found on the books, but the other of \$1600 no where appears and could not be accounted for. An indirect attempt was made to impeach the testimony of Mr. Wilson on the ground that he was displeased with the President; but as a part of his testimony was very important to discredit another witness, Mr. R. M. Whitney, who had testified to more stubborn facts, the Bank found itself in a dilemma, and was obliged to ease itself down from his too faithful memory, and rely upon the hope that the community could be made to believe it was all a mistake. Be this as it may, the \$1600 has been pocketed, if Wilson can be credited, by Thomas Biddle, and not an entry can be shown for it in all the folios of the Bank.

The second case relates to certain loans on the pledge of Stock, and the discounting of notes by the President, without the knowledge of the Board, and those made on the stock, without interest.—These facts were established by E. M. Whitney.—But so damning are their character, and this you have candidly admitted, that they cannot be evaded in any other way, than that of proving Whitney a "perjured wretch." And this, with all the force of character on your part, the artfulness and overwhelming power of the Bank, and under the supposed feebleness of the witness, you have violently attempted. To those who would wish to be satisfied on this point, as it has produced great excitement in some quarters of the Union, to those who would desire to see one of those blasting effects, which the influence of wealth, the power of office, the force of station, and the ingenuity of fraud, can produce against the humbleness of poverty, and the shrinking weakness of obscurity, when it stands in the way of a gaily or ambitious purpose, let them calmly, and with unprejudiced minds peruse the memorial of Reuben M. Whitney, addressed to the Congress at its last session. I unhesitatingly pronounce it the most unanswerable defence, that was ever made in any case depending upon conflicting and circumstantial testimony, and when the power of the Bank, and the still higher influence of its official advocates shall have passed away, it will so be awarded by an impartial public. Congress refused to publish it, though it was mild and respectful and though they had scattered to the four winds of Heaven, thousands of the accusations to which it was an answer. Thus attacked and then repelled by that body, who should ever guard and protect with impartiality, and treat with tenderness, the character of its citizens, however humble their walk, or destitute their condition, he and his defence have been scorned with contempt by his oppressors, and they have felt themselves safe on the inaccessible eminence they occupy, and the unapproachable dignity that surrounds them. But the simple facts of the case are enough for his purpose, and they shall presently be submitted. Before, however, I proceed to that duty, let me do honor to the courage that could dare to call this individual an "informant." An informant! Shades of Jefferson, and ghosts of departed Federalists, speak peace to this trembling witness, under such a weight of odium. An informant! Scorn of this, where is your indignation!—Pride of Marshall, where is your rebuke? An informant! Noble spirit of Bayard shroud this accuser with your kindest charities, and snatch him from the horror of his own confusion. Can it be possible that Mr. Adams has ventured to call any one an informant? Yes, you have called Whitney an informant, and stated that he was "stimulated to bear testimony against the Bank from abroad," and "the more aggravated his charges" the more "acceptable to the spirit of party would be his services." I will understand to whom you allude, and in a spirit of just retaliation, I will frankly own, have given to your own enquiring genius, for instructive speculation, a subject, much less equivocal in the drift of its meaning, and one you will not dare to misunderstand. Whitney's testimony is to the following effect:—Some time in 1824, he was informed by two of the officers of the Bank, that T. and J. G. Biddle were in the habit of coming to Bank and getting money, and leaving in the Teller's drawer, certificates of stock, to represent it, without paying interest. They also stated, that the Messrs. Biddles had notes discounted in their favor, by the President, not while the Board of Directors were in session, and they were entered upon the books after their regular business was closed. Upon this information they conducted him to the Teller's drawer, and there he found two certificates of stock, deposited by the Biddles, one for \$45,000, dated 25th of May, and one for \$24,000, dated 26th, these sums represented cash. They then carried him to the books, where he found one note discounted for T. Biddle for \$20,000, on the 15th of May, at fifteen days, and one for Charles Biddle on the 21st of May, at sixteen days, for \$38,319; both entered after the regular business of the day was closed and added up; of these facts, he then and there made a memorandum, which was produced to the Committee. He added, he communicated them to the President in his own room, who promised him the practice should cease. The time of the communication was immediately after the occurrence had taken place. He directed the officers to enter these stock loans on the books, which was done, as appears by the books, on the 27th of May. Whitney, at the time, informed Mr. Wilson Hunt of the circumstances, and showed him his memorandum. This transaction occurred when

no committee was authorized to make a loan, and no loan was made but by the Board of Directors. Opposed to this testimony is the evidence of the two officers of their want of recollection of having given the information to Mr. Whitney, though one of them was in the habit of frequently consulting him, as he was one of the most efficient Directors in the Bank. It further appears that interest was charged on these stock loans. But the objection mostly relied on is the denial of the President, that Whitney ever communicated to him the information stated, and shows that he was in Washington City, from the 23d of May, to the 1st of June, between which dates the events are said to have taken place. The President of the Bank thinks "the dates of a story are its essence," you seem to think, that the charging "the use of the money without interest, is the quintessence" of the crime. Now it is not an uncommon thing to try to divert the mind from the real merits of a case, to some minor features of its history, and then if an inconsistency can be found the whole matter is a fabrication. If you have ever visited courts of justice, you very well understand my meaning.—Indeed, if you have ever been a witness yourself, I have no doubt you have a perfect recollection, that the main object of the examining lawyer, was to convict you of a discrepancy, and if he could have succeeded, he would have told the jury that not one word of your testimony was true, and that you were wholly unworthy of belief. Nothing is more treacherous than the memory, and particularly as to time, and nothing is more common than a disagreement among witnesses, but, if this circumstance were to amount to an invalidation of testimony, courts of justice never could determine a cause, for there never was a case of any great number of facts, in which a conflict of testimony did not occur. Let me bring to your recollection a remarkable case in which you will be apt to feel the full force of the justness of my remarks. In the celebrated case of Harris and Lewis, tried in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in which you were a witness, the testimony of William H. Crawford, then Secretary of the Treasury, directly conflicted with yours, and yet no one believed you guilty of perjury. It was a matter depending upon recollection. But great indeed must have been the discrepancy to have justified Mr. Dallas, then counsel for plaintiff, in using towards you, who had recorded your facts in your black book, these remarkable expressions, "we will show that he (Mr. Adams) has in this case, been the slave of his passions and prejudices, bending the facts to them, instead of controlling them by the facts; and that when he dictated he put down not the facts, but what he wisaz to be the facts." Such a case as this ought to have alarmed your fears, if it did not excite your charity, when you were trying to blast the reputation of a man, whose only crime was the want of a recollection equal to that of some other witness, who, perhaps, recollected what never happened. Have you forgotten the singular discrepancy in the testimony of yourself, Mr. Wirt, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Crowninshield, Mr. Calhoun, and Mr. Crawford, in a late controversy between General Jackson and Mr. Calhoun, in relation to several facts, but particularly as to time, and yet who would accuse any of those gentlemen of the base crime of perjury? What earthly inducement could Mr. Whitney have for testifying to a falsehood? He has been shewn to have maintained a good character. He was a most active and efficient director—he had the full confidence of the President of the Bank—was selected by him to perform some of its most confidential transactions—he did perform them to his satisfaction. The stock loans, as stated by him, are placed on the books, none like them are to be found prior to that time, and none were ever allowed thereafter. The discounts are also found on the books precisely as he represents them—No one was authorized to make loans but the Board—He had not seen them for eight years before—He had left the bank and lived in perfect retirement, almost unknown in the city of Philadelphia—never engaged in politics—had seldom or ever voted at elections—had been unfortunate in business, but paid the government every cent he owed it, to the amount of a million of dollars—showed his memorandum of facts to a person at the time—that person establishes the fact—no cause of quarrel between him and the President, to suppose that all these circumstances could be fabricated to answer a political purpose eight years after they transpired, and that too upon the investigation of the bank by a committee of Congress, which of course was exactly foreseen by the witness, is giving to him a character for management and a spirit of prophecy which can not possibly be received by the weakest credulity of the weakest community in the world. This thing will be well understood and perfectly reasonable when the bank shall have retired to private life, and its influence shall have sunk to its merited oblivion. A third instance of favoritism to the Biddles is their immense loans from the Bank. From the 15th of Sept. 1830; to the time of the investigation their account in the Bank ranged from half a million to nearly a million and a quarter of dollars, at an interest of generally 4 1/2 and 5 per cent. while hundreds of other citizens and those too in the city of Philadelphia, were denied accommodation; and what is very remarkable, that while using money of the Bank at four and a half per cent. the bank were purchasing bills of exchange from them to the amount, in round numbers, of \$1,800,000, at the enormous premium of eleven per cent., and this constitutes the fourth instance of the Bank's favoritism to the Biddles. Connected with this subject is the curious fact, that on the 9th of last April, of the whole sum loaned by the Bank in Philadelphia, amounting to about \$8,000,000 more than two-thirds were in the hands of but ninety-nine persons. Upwards of three millions were loaned to twenty-seven individuals, and one seventeenth part of the whole sum was in the hands of the Biddles, at an average interest of five per cent., when hundreds of honest mechanics and traders were refused even a pittance to supply their pressing wants or support their declining business. Is this the kind of impartiality which a National Bank should observe? I put it to the candor of even the good people of Philadelphia, and I speak from certain knowledge when I say no city in America has a more generous hospitable and virtuous population, do they honestly believe such a course of conduct is either just or judicious? If these things be so is it entitled to their confidence? But this is not all, passing from cases of private favoritism, let us barely glance at those instances extended to public men, and here I am constrained to be extremely brief, for though you have set me the example of tedious prolixity in a publication of eighteen close printed columns, yet mercy to a generous public should spare them from such another infliction. I therefore pass over those heads of department, who have been favored by the Bank, those members of Congress, those Judges of the courts, those popular editors throughout the Union, all of whom have obtained extravagant loans, some upon very slight security, such as the Bank does not receive from its city customers, and at long indulgence; making only this reflection, can it be possible that the people of the United States, attached as they are, to a plain, frugal and republican government, do not perceive the danger of having a great monied corporation running its destructive roots into all the various branches of the government and thereby planting, matting and consolidating its fibres in every institution, so that nothing can uproot or overturn it? What Judicial, Legislative or Executive functionary, can do his duty, in any case when the Bank is concerned, (and in what is money not concerned?) Who is bound to that institution, in the humiliating and dependent relation of debtor? I will mention only one case, because as I conceive, its stands connected with an act of great injustice and hardship to the citizens of Philadelphia, as well as serving to prove the general position I have taken. On the 23d of March, the day the committee of Congress met in the Bank, being the regular discount day, the Honorable Philander Stevens, a member of Congress, who, let me say is an honorable high-minded gentleman and not in the slightest degree censurable in the matter I am about to relate, offered a note made by P. Broyer & Co. of Baltimore, for discount, the amount being 2,500 dollars. This note, instead of its being laid before the Board of Directors, then in session, as General Stevens no doubt expected it would be, was discounted by an assistant Cashier only, upon his own mere motion. In the afternoon of the same day, after the Board of Directors had adjourned, Gen. Stevens obtained another discount, in the same way, upon a note for \$1,000 made by the same parties. And this was done, too, as this very assistant Cashier states, when the Board of Directors had rejected one hundred and thirteen good notes, out of one hundred and fifty-nine, offered on that very day by the citizens of Philadelphia, the regular customers of the Bank, and, as they have lately shown,

notwithstanding all its partiality, its warm supporters. What inference is to be drawn from such a transaction? Who believes a private man would have received such an extraordinary favor? What difference is there between this gross instance of favoritism, and still grosser evidence of inequality, and that testified to by Mr. Whitney, about which there is such unusual sensitiveness? There is none, and no fair and candid reasoner, so far as principle is concerned, would contend for any. There are very many other topics it was my intention to discuss, and perhaps another opportunity may be offered to submit them to the public consideration; but at present I am admonished by the length of these remarks to bring them to a close.—One or two other reflections and I have done. I am much more amused than angered at your investigation that the investigation of the affairs of the Bank proceeded upon party and political views, and that to effect the intended object it was found necessary even to suborn witnesses. Can it be possible you are serious, or are you only playing upon the credulity of the pack that are howling and treading upon the heels of the great Bank party? If you intend such a charge for irony, the Bank will not thank you for it, and, if for truth, they will be ashamed of it; so that in any event you place either yourself or them in an awkward situation. As your mind has lately been running much in the way of poetry, it may be one of those flights of the imagination, which habit alone has thrown off from some of its long trained rhapsodies, without an object save that of poetic practice, and has no other connection with either truth or fiction than as it will serve to invigorate your powers of invention, or whet to a keener edge your vivid fancy. If this be the case, I should dislike to disturb the pleasing exercise to which you have so long been the diligent votary. But as plain matters of fact discipline the taste and ripen the judgment, both of which you greatly need as a statesman, if not as a poet, let me tell you that the very reverse of your accusation is strictly true, and that the Bank has determined to make one mighty effort to rise on the ruins of your former rival, and elevate, with its triumph, that horde of expectants whom the wisdom and honesty of the people have heretofore "reformed" from their confidence. Depend upon it the day is just at hand when it will wake to the reality of a most disastrous disappointment.

At the next Presidential polls
When the base coalition tools,
As black as *Ebony* their souls
And noxious as the *Upas*,
Shall sink to infamy at last
With nothing left but their disgrace
Then truth will shine, in native grace,
Resplendent as the "*Topaz*."
A. S. CLAYTON.

BOARDING.
MR. FRENCH has removed to the house adjoining Lawyer Morfit's, Pennsylvania Avenue, and has made arrangements to accommodate a mess of Members. Those Members wishing to make up a mess, are respectfully invited to call and see the Apartments. Members with their Ladies are provided with a private parlor.
Dec. 1—3t

BOARDING HOUSE—Removed.
THE Subscriber having removed from the corner of E and 9th streets, a little nearer the Pennsylvania Avenue, on 9th street, into the three story brick house lately occupied by Mrs. Cottringer, hereby informs the Members of Congress, that he is prepared to accommodate a mess of about 12 Members with good board and comfortable rooms.
Dec. 1—3t WM. GREER.

A CARD.
MRS. E. T. ARGUELLES has the pleasure to inform her friends, that her well known and long established House is now elegantly fitted up for the reception of members of Congress, and other gentlemen visiting this city. To her former patrons she would address herself, and inform them, that every convenience and accommodation will be furnished, and that no expense will be spared to give satisfaction. Families can be accommodated with private rooms and parlors handsomely furnished. Mrs. E. T. A. would suggest that her House being equidistant from the Capitol and Public Offices, renders it a desirable residence, and one which cannot fail to please.
Nov. 19—1f

Boarding.
MRS. THOMPSON, (late of Virginia,) having taken the large and commodious house occupied for many years as a Boarding Establishment by Mrs. Blake, on the corner of Eighth street and the Avenue, respectfully informs her friends and the public generally, that she has fitted it up in the best style, with entire new furniture, and is now prepared to accommodate Members of Congress, transient, and other Boarders, promising unremitting attention to the comforts of her guests. She solicits a share of public patronage.
Nov. 29—co2w

BOARDING.
MR. POLK, (13th street, between E and F,) can spare the apartments with which he supplied the Secretary of War, during the last session of Congress, and perhaps a chamber or two besides. Two private tables and parlors can be furnished, if required.
Nov. 26—3aw1f.

REMOVAL.
MRS. COTTRINGER has removed to F street between 12th and 13th streets, in the house lately occupied by John Thornton, Esq., where she can accommodate a few Boarders.
Nov. 14—ed1w

MRS. C. A. OWNER respectfully informs Members of Congress that a mess of twelve can be accommodated with very comfortably furnished Rooms, and good Board, during the ensuing session. Her House is situated on Pennsylvania Avenue, near the corner of 3d street,—one of the most pleasant and healthy parts of the City, and within a few minutes walk of the Capitol.
Nov. 21.—3aw2w*

Boarding, &c.
MRS. S. A. HILL having taken the large and commodious House occupied for many years as a boarding establishment, on Pennsylvania Avenue, (over Mr. Poor's Auction Rooms, and nearly opposite to Gadsby's) respectfully informs the public, that she has fitted it up in the best style, and is now prepared to accommodate Members of Congress, and their families, transient, and yearly Boarders.—Promising unremitting assiduity and attention to the comforts of her guests, she solicits a share of public patronage.
Nov. 30.—co3t

BOARDING.
MRS. IRONSIDE respectfully informs her friends, Members of Congress and other gentlemen, that she continues her BOARDING HOUSE on 7th Street West, immediately North of the General Post Office, and directly opposite the Boarding House of Mr. Nathan Smith, and has rooms prepared for the accommodation of a small mess of gentlemen.
Nov. 30—3t

FOR SALE.
A COMPLETE six passenger STAGE, ironed in the most substantial manner, which runs light and easy. Apply at Trunnell's Coach Establishment, Washington Street, Georgetown; where a variety of Coaches, Barouches, Gigs, &c., may be seen, and completed to order, with despatch. The notice of Mail Contractors is solicited with regard to the Stage.
Nov. 24—Std

Ohio Lands.
THE undersigned, Attorneys and Counsellors at Law at the Seat of Government for Ohio, (Columbus,) offer to non-residents claiming title to lands in this State, their professional services in prosecuting their controverted rights to such lands. Since the year 1823, hundreds of thousands of acres of land, belonging to non-residents, have been sold for taxes. Most of these sales are invalid, and the original proprietor may generally recover his lands by promptly asserting his claims. The Auditor's Office, wherein the assessment, taxing and sales of all lands in the State are recorded, and to which we have ready access, is kept at Columbus. We will answer forthwith all communications addressed to us (postage paid,) and in all cases charge reasonable fees.
ORRIS PARLISH,
LYNE STARLING, Jr.
Sept. 26.—d2w

* On the day this loan was obtained, notes to the amount of 200,631 dollars, in Philadelphia were rejected.

On the 16th of Dec. notes of the citizens of Philadelphia, to the amount of 82,181 dollars were rejected by the bank on the 2d of March, when Burrows obtained his second loan 164,631 dollars were thrown out, and on the 13th of the same month when he received his last loan, 143,225 dollars were also rejected, some of the best notes the city could afford.

* See Paul Beck's evidence, pa. 128, B. Rep.