THE CHRONICLE.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 25, 1847.

FOR PRESIDENT

GEN'L. ZACHARY TAYLOR.

FOR GOVERNOR

WM. T. GOLDSBOROUGH.

FOR CONGRESS.

John W. Crisfield,

of Somerset County.

FOR THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES,

JOHN H. HODSON,
J. BOND CHAPLAIN,
REUBEN TALL,
BENJAMIN G. KEENE.

FOR COMMISSIONERS.

JAMES HAMMERSLY,
JOHN MUIR,
WILLIAM K. TRAVERS.

☞The reader's attention is particularly invited to the political articles to be found on our first page.

JAMES A. STEWART, ESQ.—This gentleman who announced himself a short time since as a candidate for Congress in this (the 6th) district has declined standing a poll. His address will be found on our first page.

☞Some of our Loco Foco friends think it very absurd in the Whigs to charge Mr. Thomas with wishing to curtail the influence of the small counties, and increase that of the large counties and Baltimore city, as he himself lives in a small county and would be as much affected by such a change as any one else. We can, however, inform them that we have good authority for saying that should Mr. Thomas be elected Governor he will remove his residence from the Eastern Shore. It is an understood and settled matter that, in the event of his being elected, he will remove to Baltimore as soon as his Gubernatorial term expires. There is nothing therefore so very absurd in the charge preferred against him, of wishing to augment the power and influence of Baltimore city and the large counties of the Western Shore. If his future residence, however, depends upon the contingency of his election, we feel quite sure he will fix his abode at the extreme head of that very interesting stream called *Salt River*.

A STRANGE DOCTRINE.—The last "Democrat" complains of the repeal of the coupon law, and attempts to make political capital out of the fact that its repeal will enable the Bond holders of the State to realize twelve per centum interest on the amount of their investment. Cannot the plainest understanding perceive at a glance the gross dishonesty of such a doctrine. The State of Maryland borrows a thousand dollars for which she gives her bond at 6 per cent. interest. She fails to pay the interest regularly and promptly, and her credit becomes impaired in consequence.—The bond holder needs money and is compelled to sell his bond against the State for one half of the amount he lent her. Now the doctrine of the "Democrat" is, that as the assignee of the original creditor paid but five hundred dollars for the bond of one thousand dollars, the State ought not to pay interest on any more than the five hundred dollars. Is this Democratic honesty? Is this an honorable fulfilment of the State's obligations? Would such a transaction between individuals be considered just? What is it to the State whether a man pays par for her bonds or buys them at a discount. She has had the benefit of the full amount the bond calls for, and a refusal to pay the interest on the full amount, for the reason assigned by the Democrat, would be to the extent it goes the rankest sort of repudiation. Such we know is Mr. Thomas' plea in defence of his repudiation scheme, and we presume the Democrat is indebted to that source for the idea; but we hope for the sake of poor, frail human nature that the great body of the Democratic party abhor such sentiments.

The Democrat too is strangely inconsistent in complaining of the repeal of the coupon law, as Mr. Thomas violently opposed the passage of that law, and it is upon his opposition to it that he predicates his claim to the character of a State-faith man. And if that law is so beneficial in its effects, will the Democrat inform its readers why Mr. Thomas made a speech against it and voted against it. Certainly he is as much to blame for *opposing* the passage of a good law as the Whigs are for *repealing* it. And we think that paper is equally unfortunate in the assertion that the State debt was created by "Whig legislation." As it appears to know but little of the history of the State debt, we refer it to the House Journal of December Session 1838, pages 668, 684 and 685, where it will be found that Mr. Thomas, the Loco Foco candidate for Governor, *voted for appropriations* to the amount of *three millions, three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars*—and which now form a portion of the State debt. The next time that paper attempts to enlighten the public we advise it to discard *fancies* and deal in *facts*.

☞In reply to the "Easton Star" we would again inquire, what are the evidences of Colonel Thomas' statesmanship? The "Star" refers us to his "public character as a statesman, to his standing at the Bar, and to his triumphant tour throughout the State for evidences of his competency to fill the Executive chair." We presume most persons have heard of Mr. Thomas' measure to transfer the State's interest in the public works to her creditors, and to repeal the tax laws in order to *compel* the creditors to take the works in payment of their bonds—but beyond this his most enthusiastic admirers can point to no acts of a "public character" that evidence the slightest pretension to statesmanship. His "standing at the Bar" is very respectable, we admit, but that does not establish his "competency to fill the Executive chair." He may be a very respectable county court lawyer, and yet possessed of very ordinary intellect, and not at all capacitated for the Gubernatorial chair. Nor does his "triumphant tour throughout the State" furnish any stronger evidence of his Executive talents. He may be an accomplished orator—able to sweep the chords of human passion with a master hand—but that does not prove him to be qualified for the Executive station. Does he possess the clear understanding—the sound judgment—the ripened experience—the practical views—the untiring industry—the diligent application—the indomitable firmness—the unswerving patriotism—the disregard of self—the stern devotion to the true interests of the State regardless of party ends—the self-sacrificing spirit that would enable him to resist the torrent of popular error that sometimes assails the Chief Magistrate of the State—the lofty determination to maintain the faith and credit of the State at every peril, so indispensable to a Governor at the present critical juncture? Such are the qualifications of William T. Goldsborough, to which the Whigs can point with pride as evidences of his fitness for the Executive chair, but what evidence has Mr. Thomas' public course furnished of his fitness in these essential respects? The mere *intellectual* capacity we do not deny him, but judging from his public acts, no man can say he would be a safe custodier of the interests and honor and credit of the State. And in view of his principles upon the question of State faith we should regard his election as a public misfortune, even were his intellectual abilities ten fold greater than they are. The son of Maryland who could calmly look upon the struggles of his native State to resist the dark tide of repudiation and disgrace that threatened to engulph her, and lend no helping hand to rescue her drowning honor—aye, who could deliberately employ all the abilities Heaven had endowed him with to facilitate her ruin, is unworthy to preside over her destinies. Such an event would be an everlasting reproach upon the character of the patriots whose bright deeds and glorious example form the richest inheritance of their descendants. We shall indeed have fallen upon evil times, when the people of Maryland shall honor with the first office in their gift, a man who deserted her fortunes in the dark hour of trial and danger, and raised his parricidal arm to inflict a mortal wound upon her honor!

A PROPOSITION—WHO'LL ACCEPT IT?

We have charged Mr. Thomas with using the following words in his speech at Hagerstown:—*"I am in favor of Representation according to Taxation: that is, if you pay taxes on a dollar's worth of property more than I do, I am willing that you shall have a dollars worth of influence more than I have."*

This charge has been denied, and in order to test the truth of it we make the following proposition, which we dare any Democrat to accept:—

WE WILL PROVE BY THE LETTER OF JOSEPH I. MERRICK, A LEADING DEMOCRAT OF WASHINGTON COUNTY, AND WHICH IS PUBLISHED IN THE LAST "DEMOCRAT," THAT MR. THOMAS DID USE THE WORDS GIVEN ABOVE IN HIS HAGERSTOWN SPEECH, AND THAT THEY ARE ACCURATELY REPORTED. IF WE DO NOT PROVE THIS BY THE LETTER AS IT IS PUBLISHED IN THE LAST "DEMOCRAT," we will *VOTE FOR MR. THOMAS FOR GOVERNOR, provided the Democrat who accepts our proposition will vote for Mr. Goldsborough for Governor if we do prove it.*

Come now, Democrats, no backing out. We charge that Mr. Thomas used the *words* above quoted—what he *means* the people can judge from the language itself. If Mr. Thomas be the great man he is claimed to be he would certainly use the very best words to convey his real meaning. Who will accept our offer? We believe no Democrat will dare do it.

MR. THOMAS AND REPUDIATION—THE QUESTION SETTLED!

We, in common with the Whig papers throughout the State, have charged Mr. Thomas, the Loco Foco candidate for Governor with being the author of a bill which, had it passed, would have repudiated a large portion of the State debt. That bill proposed to transfer the State's interest in the public works to her creditors in payment of their bonds, and in order to *compel* the creditors to agree to the measure, or do worse, the 8th. section of the bill *repealed all* the laws imposing taxes for the purpose of raising revenue to pay the interest on the public debt, and the bill further provided that all interest on the public debt should cease on the 1st of January 1844. This was in effect saying to the creditors of the State—we borrowed your money and have invested it in speculations that have turned out to be unprofitable—we are willing to transfer you the bad bargains we have made, and you *shall* take them, *or nothing*, because we have repealed all the laws that have been enacted for the purpose of raising revenue to pay your interest, and have stopped that interest, and if you refuse to take our bad bargains in payment of your bonds you will get nothing. The glaring dishonesty of such a procedure is too obvious to need comment, and its enormity is enhanced by the fact that the State debt amounts to $15,204,784 98—while the *highest estimated value* of the public works proposed to be transferred to the bondholders in payment of their claims, was $12,360,075—leaving a balance of *three millions* of dollars *due the creditors*, and to pay which no provision was made, and which they would have necessarily lost, because all sources of revenue for the payment of the principal and interest of the public debt were cut off by the repeal of the tax laws. And when it is remembered that this estimated value of the public works was based upon the contingency of their being completed, the flagrant dishonesty of this measure is still more apparent, as they are profitless in their unfinished condition, and would have been a dead loss to the bondholders unless they proceeded to complete them—a thing it cannot be supposed they were able to accomplish, as most of the creditors of the State are *widows* and *orphans* and persons who have invested their *all* upon her plighted faith.

This measure of itself is enough to convict Mr. Thomas of holding repudiating principles, but there is a mountain weight of other testimony against him. By reference to the House Journal, December session 1843, page 244, it will be seen that Mr. Thomas *voted for an unconditional repeal* of the tax laws—a proposition submitted by Jacob Powder of Carroll; an open and avowed repudiator. And if the reader will turn to the pages of the Journal referred to, he will find that on every question involving the principle of State faith *Mr. Thomas voted against it*, and his name *stands side by side with those of Shaw, Stull and Powder—three avowed and notorious repudiators.* It is an old adage and a true one that a man is known by the company he keeps, and when we find Mr. Thomas voting on every question of State faith with rank and admitted repudiators we can form no other conclusion than that he ACQUIESCED IN THEIR VIEWS. Upon no question of State faith do we find him voting with those who nobly sustained the honor and credit of Maryland, and saved her from the shame and ignominy which all just men would have attached to a failure to fulfil her solemn engagements.

Nor is this all. James A. Stewart Esq. was a member of the House of Delegates with Mr. Thomas at the time Mr. T. brought forward his repudiating bill, *and Mr. S. voted against it.* And when interrogated in regard to it at a public meeting here a few days since, Mr. Stewart stated that *he as a State faith man could not conscientiously vote for* Mr. Thomas' bill. He said it did not become *him* to say it was a repudiating measure, but as a man anxious to maintain the faith and honor of the State, he could not give his sanction to Mr. Thomas' bill, and *accordingly voted against it.* Such is the testimony of a distinguished member of the Democratic party; testimony which we presume no Democrat will question.

Nor is this all yet. A few days after Mr. Thomas presented his bill in the House of Delegates, he was warned of its consequences by Mr. Holliday, also a member, and his reply was,—"THE STATE WILL HAVE TO REPUDIATE, AND IT MIGHT AS WELL BE DONE AT ONCE." This affords a clue to the real object Mr. Thomas had in view in presenting his bill and it PROVES *beyond cavil that it was* INTENDED AS A REPUDIATING MEASURE. We publish below the letter of Mr. Holliday in reply to a note addressed to him upon the subject by J. N. Steele Esq., to which we invite attention. Mr. Holliday is a gentleman of high standing and unimpeachable veracity—*a witness Mr. Thomas will not dare to impugn.* And we appeal to all honest Democrats to ponder over these facts and not rush blind-fold upon danger. We believe the mass of that party abhor repudiation; we call upon them to vindicate their character by voting against a man WHOSE PRINCIPLES THEY MUST CONDEMN!

The following is the letter above referred to:—

CHESTERTOWN, Sept. 8, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR:—In reply to yours of the 4th inst., which was received by the last mail, I have to say, that, whilst a member of the Legislature, I had a conversation with Col. P. F. Thomas with regard to the bill which he introduced in the House of Delegates on the 9th of March, 1844—and although I do not deem it at all necessary to show, what his views were, at the time, respecting the State debt, (for the very circumstance of his having introduced and voted for such a bill, would, of itself I should suppose, be sufficient to convince any unbiassed mind what his sentiments were)—yet in compliance with your request, I will now state what took place between us on that occasion.

Shortly after the printed bills were placed on the desks, I me. with Col. Thomas and had a conversation with him, with regard to the bill above alluded to, in which I expressed my astonishment at his having introduced it, and asked if it was possible that he could support such a bill—one that was so well calculated to ruin the faith of the State forever, and his reply was to this effect:—"THE STATE WILL HAVE TO REPUDIATE, AND IT MIGHT AS WELL BE DONE AT ONCE." Here the conversation ended, and he walked off to his seat, for the House was then in session.

I have at different times mentioned this conversation, not expecting to be thus called on, but inasmuch as it has become somewhat notorious, and I have been frequently appealed to on the subject, I feel it my duty to state these facts without further comment.

Yours very respectfully,

GEO. S. HOLLYDAY.

To J. NEVETT STEELE, Esq. Chair'n, &c.

MR. THOMAS OPPOSED TO CONVENTIONAL REFORM AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. Thomas, the Loco Foco candidate for Governor, says in his speeches that Conventional Reform is the only mode by which the people can be relieved from the burthens of taxation; and the Loco Foco papers, including the 'Democrat,' laud it as the great panacea for all the evils that afflict the people. If Mr. Thomas is sincere in what he says, what an outrageous wrong did he commit in voting against Conventional Reform! The people desire to know, and in their name we demand that some of the Loco Foco stump orators, or the "Democrat," shall inform them WHY MR. THOMAS VOTED AGAINST CONVENTIONAL REFORM, *when he says he is in favor of it!*—Read the following synopsis of the proceedings of the House of Delegates and judge for yourselves.

In the House of Delegates, in 1843, Mr. Cathell reported a bill (see page 78 of Journal) to reduce the number of members of the H. of Delegates:—Mr. Cooper moved to postpone the bill indefinitely, for which latter motion Mr. Thomas voted in the *affirmative*.—On page 79, same journal, will be found the following:

Mr. Weber moved that the bill (Mr. Cathell's) be recommitted with instructions to the committee, *to report a bill to call a convention to revise the Constitution*, and amongst other things establish a system of representation upon a fair and equitable basis.

And upon examining the ayes and nays upon this motion, *Mr. Thomas, of Talbot*, voted in the negative, or rather voted AGAINST instructions to report a bill TO CALL A CONVENTION to REVISE THE CONSTITUTION!!!

Mr. Cathell's bill, (page 216) "to reduce the number of members of the House of Delegates," was again brought up. Mr. Lynch moved to amend the bill by allowing four delegates, each, to Baltimore city, Baltimore, Frederick, Anne Arundel and Washington counties; three to Allegany, Dorchester, Somerset, Worcester, Prince George's, Harford, Montgomery, Carroll and Cecil; and two to Kent, Queen Anne's, Talbot, St. Mary's, Charles, Calvert, and Caroline.—This amendment of Mr. Lynch, Mr. Thomas voted in favor of laying on the table; and on page 217, near the bottom, is this most remarkable passage:—

Mr. Thomas, of Talbot, moved to postpone said bill (Mr. Cathell's) and amendment, indefinitely. Mr. Thomas voting, of course, for the indefinite postponement or defeat, of the bill.

If we then turn to page 218, we find that Mr. Thomas, of Talbot, voted against Mr. Lynch's amendment.

And on page 220, we find that Mr. Thomas of Talbot voted in favor of referring Mr. Cathell's bill, with Mr. Lynch's amendment, "to the consideration of the next General Assembly of Maryland," which was the defeat of the bill.

Keep it Before the People,

That P. Francis Thomas the Loco Foco candidate for Governor is the author of a proposition to repudiate the State debt, and when warned of the consequences of his measure he replied, "THE STATE WILL HAVE TO REPUDIATE, AND IT MIGHT AS WELL BE DONE AT ONCE."

Keep it before the people, that Mr. Thomas has exerted all his ability to frustrate the collection of taxes imposed for the purpose of paying the interest on the State debt, and thus sought to bring reproach and shame on the character of the State.

Keep it before the people, that Mr. Thomas is in favor of "Representation according to taxation"—a measure that would give *Baltimore city* alone *more than double* the number of Delegates in the Legislature the *whole Eastern Shore would have.*

Keep it before the people, that Mr. Thomas is in favor of every man's having "influence" according to the value of his property—which can mean nothing more nor less than *"property qualification."*

Keep it before the people, that Mr. Thomas when in the House of Delegates voted against a bill to reduce the number of Delegates in the popular branch of the Legislature, and also against the Biennial Session bill—two measures that would have effected a saving to the Treasury of the State of more than THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS *per annum.*

Keep it before the people, that Mr. Thomas voted for a law to prevent poor men from setting gill nets,—a measure that would have deprived hundreds of poor families of their principal means of subsistence.

Keep it before the people, that Mr. Thomas in his speeches says Conventional Reform is the only mode by which the people can be relieved of the burthens of taxation, and yet *when in the House of Delegates* he voted AGAINST a proposition to report a bill to CALL A CONVENTION to REVISE THE CONSTITUTION.

Can the people—the honest yeomanry of the State, with these facts staring them in the face, cast their votes for Mr. Thomas for Governor.

FACTS TO BE REMEMBERED!

That P. Francis Thomas is in favor of "Representation according to taxation"—a measure that would give to Baltimore city *eighty* times as many delegates in the Legislature as Dorchester County would be entitled to.

That Mr. Joseph I. Merrick, a leading Loco Foco of Washington County, *admits* in his letter which is published in the last "Democrat," that Mr. Thomas *did say* in his speech at Hagerstown that he was in *favor* of "REPRESENTATION ACCORDING TO TAXATION; *that is if you pay taxes on a dollar's worth of property more than I do, I am willing you shall have a dollar's worth of influence more than I have*"—and Mr. Merrick further says to the best of his knowledge "*THE WORDS ARE ACCURATELY GIVEN.*"

That "property qualification" is a necessary result of this doctrine, and no other reasonable inference can be drawn from the words as used by Mr. Thomas.

That "representation according to population" will render the Eastern Shore powerless in the Legislature, and rob this section of the State of its just influence in the government.

That Mr. Thomas himself *admits* he did advocate the doctrine of *"representation according to taxation"* in his Hagerstown speech.

We hope the people will remember these facts!

☞Considering it due to the Delegates to the Barren Creek Convention that their true position in the controversy which Mr. B. D. Jackson has involved them in should be clearly understood, we ask the attention of the reader to the true issue between them and Mr. Jackson. It will be remembered that Mr. Jackson in the "Democrat" alleged that "the Whigs here gave this remark of Mr. Loockerman's (pronouncing Mr. Goldsborough "an ass and the prince of asses,) as their reason for voting against him in the Congressional Convention." This allegation was denied by the Delegates, and the proof challenged. And how does Mr. Jackson meet the issue? He introduces F. J. Henry Esq. as his witness to substantiate this charge, and attempts by a system of false and confused reasoning to demonstrate that the opinion expressed by Mr. Henry must have been the opinion of the Whig party, because Mr. Henry is an active member of that party, and that as the Delegates to the Convention but carried out the wishes of the Whig party, *therefore*, the opinion expressed by Mr. Henry *must* have been the *reason* why the Convention refused to nominate Mr. Loockerman.

Who did Mr. Jackson refer to when he said "the Whigs here gave this remark of Mr. Loockerman's as their reason for voting against him in the Congressional Convention?" Did he refer to the Whig party generally? Or did he refer to Mr. Henry? We apprehend neither. The word *"their"* must relate to the Delegates, or the whole sentence is nonsensical and ungrammatical, as the Delegates alone voted against Mr. Loockerman in the Congressional Convention. And for what purpose is the name of Mr. Henry introduced?—Mr. Jackson himself admits it is for the purpose of shewing he has "Whig authority" for the "fact" he has stated. The "fact" stated is, "the Whigs here gave this remark of Mr. Loockerman's as their reason for voting against him in the Congressional Convention." Now as no one but the *Delegates* voted "against him in the Congressional Convention," they, and they alone must be referred to. Admitting, then, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Henry did use the language ascribed to him, in the name of common sense we ask how does *that* establish Mr. Jackson's assertion in relation to the reasons alleged to have been assigned by the *Delegates* for *their* vote. But Mr. Henry in the communication below denies the language imputed to him, and he is sustained by James A. Stewart, Esq. to whom Mr. Jackson in his article has appealed for confirmation of his statements. And he further states that he knew nothing of the reasons that actuated the Dorset Delegates to vote against Mr. Loockrman, and did not pretend to impute any to them.

Having thus in justice to the Delegates shewn that Mr. Jackson has no "Whig authority" or any other for his statements in regard to them, we submit it to the public to say where the *"falsehood"* rests.

[FOR THE CHRONICLE.]

MR. EDITOR:—Mr. B. D. Jackson having taken the liberty of introducing my name in the last "Democrat" for the purpose of establishing charges previously made by him, I am compelled to make a brief reply. I positively deny that I said that Mr. Loockerman's having used the language referred to, in regard to Mr. Goldsborough, "was the reason why Dorset opposed him," nor did I use "words to that effect." In the conversation alluded to, Mr. Stewart, after hearing that Mr. Crisfield had been nominated, having remarked that he thought "Dorset ought to have taken no active part, but to have remained neutral in the Convention"—I then stated that *"Mr. Loockerman had no right to expect the vote of Dorset* after having used the language attributed to him in regard to Mr. Goldsborough." This is precisely what I said in *substance* and *meaning*, and the material part in italics I believe is *verbatim.* I merely expressed a *private, individual* opinion, and did not state or *intimate* that I was expressing the opinion of any other man, or of any county or party or set of men. *I knew nothing about the reasons the Dorset delegates had for voting against Mr. Loockerman in the Convention, and did not pretend to ascribe any to them.* I have called on both of the gentlemen to whom he referred the inquisitive for confirmation of his statements.—James A. Stewart Esq. has authorized me to say he did not understand me as expressing any thing else save my *own opinion.* When I called on Mr. Stewart, to whom Mr. Jackson has referred, he expressed his regret that any reference had been made to him by Mr. Jackson, as he did not desire to be mixed up in any way with this controversy—that he did not subscribe to the propriety of introducing into the newspapers casual conversations that take place in the streets—that as reference had been made to him by Mr. Jackson, he stated that he did not understand me, in said conversation, as expressing any thing more than the *private opinion* contained legitimately in the words as I have before given them. Doct. Wm. Jackson admits that I did not *say* I was speaking the opinion of the County or the Delegates to the Barren Creek Convention, or of any one else, and that I did not so intimate in manner or words.

So not only my own recollection is clearly at variance with Mr. Jackson's statement, but the testimony of his own witnesses is directly against him. For the future, if he wishes the community to regard what he writes, I would advise him to be a little more cautious in his assertions, and not to suffer himself to be led away in collecting information for the public, by a hasty and careless enthusiasm.

F. J. HENRY.

The Baltimore Patriot says, the interest felt in the election of Mr. Kennedy, is not confined to our own city and state. It is general throughout the Union. The National Intelligencer copies our article of saturday upon the subject, and says the appeal to the patriotism and public spirit of the Whigs of Maryland thus made appears to it to be irresistible.

The Governor of Kentucky has appointed Rev. Robt. J. Breckenridge, of Fayette county, to be superintendent of Public Instruction, in place of Rev. Ryland T. Dillard, resigned.

A letter from Wisconsin states that the Whig candidate for Congress, is elected by more than 1200 majority, instead of 500 as it was first stated. This is owing to the popularity of Mr. Tweedy and the natural decline of Locofocoism.

A gentleman of high standing in the society of Friends, speaks as follows of the great remedy, Hunt's Liniment:

Newcastle, 11th month, 1st, 1844.

George E. Stanton,

Esteemed Friend:—Thy letter of the 29th ultimo is received. In my reply I would say, that I have been troubled with a lame knee for several years, during which time it has distressed me much. I procured a bottle of Hunt's Liniment at thy store, early last spring, and I have used it freely, and I can say that since that time I have had little or no trouble with my knee. A friend, to whom I sent a bottle, informs me that it was a great benefit to her in a rheumatic affection. I have no hesitation in reccommending it to any persons needing an external remedy.

JACOB GRIFFEN.

Bedford, Sept. 4, 1845.

BALTIMORE MARKETS.—The following is a true report of the markets up to the 24th inst. as contained in the papers received by the steamboat yesterday evening:—

The flour market is rather firm. Howard street sold at $5 50. City Mills at $5 25. Rye flour is nominal at 4 a $4 12. Corn meal at $3 50.—The receipts of all kinds of Grain are small, and the demand for wheat slightly increased; good to prime reds are worth 1 05 a $1 07; white nominal at 1 12 a $1 17. Very little doing in corn; white is selling at 55 a 57 cents, and yellow at 58 a 62 cents, as in quality. Good to prime oats 35 a 40 cents. Rye 70 a 72 cents. Sales of Flaxseed at $1 30 Cloverseed is held at 4 75 a $4-87. Sales of Bacon at 8 a 8 1-2 cents for shoulders, 9 for sides, and 10 1-2 a 11 1-2 cents for hams. Nothing doing in Lard; we quote at 9 a 10 cents in bbls. and 11 in kegs. Whisky is dull at 26 a 27 cents in hhds and bbls.

A CARD: The Ladies and Gentlemen of Cambridge, (who have paironised Mr. Haas;) have read his card returning his thanks to his patrons and annoucing his intention of leaving Cambridge. They feel it due to Mr. Haas to s state, thus publicly the high gratification they feel at the great success which has attended his efforts to present the "living faces" of his patrons in this town.—They are universally regarded as most perfect specimens of the art Mr. Haas so well understands, and we cordialy and with confidence recommend him to the favor of all those who are desirous of dealing with him—we heartily wish him success wherever he may go.

The Ladies and Genilemen of Cambridge.

DYER'S EMBROCATION—a perfect pain destroyer for all pains, cuts, bruises, &c., for sale by S. RUTTER, agent.

The public's obd't. servant,