MEXICAN NEWS!

HIGHLY IMPORTANT

From Gen. Scott's Army!

BATTLES OF COUTERAS AND CHURUBUSCO.

TWO AMERICAN VICTORIES!

Gen. Scott Wounded.

Total Defeat of the Mexicans—Eleven Hundred Americans Killed and Wounded—Three Thousand Mexicans Captured—Gen. Scott Encamped within two and a half miles of the City of Mexico—Armistice between the two Armies. &c.

The Sun's "ponies" have again brought us news from New Orleans in six days. The extracts below are taken from the Picayune of the 8th inst:

The U. S. steamship Mary Kingsland, Capt. John Davis, arrived at an early hour this morning. By her we have received our letters from Mr. Kendall from the 22d to the 28th of August, all dated from Tacubaya.

From a map and plan of the battle fields before us, we note that they are called the battles of Contreras and Churubusco—so called from field works of the enemy of those names The victories were decisive, but as far as we can judge from a hasty perusal of a portion of our letters, the proposition for an armistice was made by Gen. Scott—propably at the suggestion of the British embassy. The report we have hitherto given that the city of Mexico was at our mercy, appears to have been unfounded.

Should peace not follow from the negotiations now pending, another battle must ensue, the enemy having a force of from fifteen to twenty thousand men yet left.—But the road appears to be completely open to us, and the city is only two and a half miles from our encampment.

Our victories have been purchased at a vast loss of valuable life.

Our entire loss in killed and wounded is short of eleven hundred; that of the enemy is not well known. His loss in killed alone is believed to be fully equal to our entire loss, and it is estimated that at least three thousand prisoners were taken. The number of his wounded was not ascertained but it is supposed to be very large. Gen. Scott himself received a wound in the leg below the knee, but from the manner in which Mr. Kendall speaks of it, we are led to hope the injury a slight one.

TACUBAYO, (near Mexico) Aug. 22.

The celebrated Archbishop's Palace of Tacubayo is now occupied by General Scott and a portion of the army, after twice defeating the enemy in two of the hardest fought battles of the war, are quartered immediately around him.

To describe the fierce conflict, even now that two days have elapsed, or to give an account of the part taken by the different regiments, were impossible. From the opening of the strife up to the time the Mexicans were entirely routed and in full flight for the city, was one continuous roar of cannon and musketry, accompanied by the loud shouts of the victors as some new vantage ground was gained; and high above the din rose a dense column of smoke, at times completely shrouding the combatants.

The strength of the enemy at this battle is known to have been 15,000 at least, many say 20,000, all fresh troops and in a position of uncommon strength. Opposed to them were about 6,000 Americans, jaded and broken down by marches and countermarches, and by incessant toil before the stronghold of Contreras and San Antonia. At Churubusco, the Mexicans themselves say, Santa Anna commanded in person, but that he left early. The noted battalions of Hidalgo and Victoria, and of Independencia—the *Polkas*, or young men of the capital, from whom so much was expected—nearly all fled without firing a gun.

In the different works (but mostly in the church) taken by Gen. Twiggs, nearly 2,000 troops were captured. Among them were Gen. Rincon, who commanded in person; Gen. Anaya, lately President *Substituto*, and Gen. Arevallon, as also Col. Goresteza, formerly Minister at Washington. Gen. Garay was captured near San Antonia by Gen. Worth, and several influential officers, among them Col. Miramon, by Gen. Shields, at the hacienda; but the most important capture of all was the entire Foreign Battalion, mostly made up of deserters from our own army, with their commander, the notorious Riley himself. They are all now under close guard, and I trust will be strictly dealt with.

The loss on our side has fallen most heavily upon the South Carolina and New York volunteers, the 6th Infantry and Smith's light battalion, attached to Worth's division, and the batteries of Capts. Magruder and Taylor. The South Carolina regiment was nearly cut to pieces, losing 137 out of 272 men, with which it went into action. The 1st Artillery has suffered severely in officers.

The Mexican accounts acknowledge the loss in killed, wounded and prisoners, of no less than 13 generals, among them, 3 ex-Presidents and 45 pieces of cannon. One of our officers says that we have captured more ammunition than Gen. Scott has used since he has been in the country.

G. W. K

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH.

☞The young Men's Whig club of this place in a body waited on Mr. Goldsborough, the Democratic Whig candidate for Governor, on Friday evening last.—They were received by him in that plain, easy and unassuming manner for which he is so remarkable. The Club were introduced in a short address by S. P. Tustin, Esq. one of its members, to which Mr. Goldsborough replied in a plain, sensible and farmer-like manner, which done honor to his head and heart. He was then made personally acquainted with each of the members, after which they retired, evidently highly pleased with their standard-bearer —*Hagerstown Democracy*

MR. THOMAS IN CALVERT COUNTY.

The following extracts from a letter received by a gentleman in this city from a friend in Calvert, shows the prospects of the Whig party in that quarter of the State.

After stating that Col. P. F. Thomas had arrived in Prince Frederick on Saturday the 4th inst., for the purpose of addressing a meeting to be held there on that day, the writer goes on to say that Col. T. and his friends were greatly astonished and disconcerted at finding Col. Jenifer, of Charles county, upon the ground ready to reply.

"After considerable manœuvering, it was at last agreed that Col. Thomas should proceed to make his speech, and that Col. Jenifer should follow, closing in time, however, for Col T. to reply. Mr. Thomas, accordingly, took the stand. After commenting, for an hour and ten minutes, upon the sub-Treasury, Bank of the United States, Tariffs of 1812 and '46, and the Mexican War, he then proceeded to State matters, and attempted to defend the bill introduced by himself at the session of 1813. I understood him to advocate the 8th section of that bill, *repealing the tax laws*. He proceeded to show that he could pay the interest on the debt by *re-trenchment* of the salaries of the Judges, &c. This seemed a little strange to my ears, as the whole ordinary expenses of our State Government amounts to about $200,000 per annum, and the interest on the public debt is about $600,000. How he could *save* enough out of the smaller sum to pay the larger, I was rather at a loss to imagine. He denied that he was a repudiator;—said he was in favor of reforming the present judiciary, cutting down their salaries, and removing the present judges, but was opposed to having their successors elected by the people.

"After Mr. Thomas had concluded, Col. Jenifer was called to the stand. I wish you and every Whig in the State could have heard his reply to Col. Thomas — In that kind and frank manner peculiar to himself, he warned Col. T. against the course he was pursuing. He showed that it would, if carried into practice, inevitably lead to the dishonor of our noble State. He said that we had demonstrated our ability to discharge the debt, which Mr. Thomas himself had assisted in bringing upon us,—and asked, if we could now turn back and say that we were insolvent? No! the man who could advocate such a doctrine insulted the freemen whom he addressed—and could never hope by their suffrages, to reach the Gubnatorial chair. After a masterly review of Col. Thomas' speech, Col. Jenifer, concluded amidst the cheers of the audience.

"From the unanimity of the Whigs, and the evident disappointment of the Locofocos, (notwithstanding their assertions to the contrary,) I have no hesitation in saying, that Calvert County will respond nobly in favor of William T. Goldsborough, at the coming election. Should the other counties of the State do their duty, Mr. G.'s election is beyond all doubt. At any rate, Calvert will do hers, by giving to our candidate an unprecedented majority."

The above letter is written by a member of the Calvet bar, and his opinions in reference to our prospects in that quarter, are entitled to the utmost confidence.—*Pat.*

COL. THOMAS' EXPLANATION.

We publish below the letter of Col. Thomas, explanatory of his speech at Hagerstown. It will be perceived that he denies having advocated the doctrine of "property qualification." No one ever charged him with having done so. No one ever imagined that a candidate for any office in Maryland, unless actually demented, would openly advocate the adoption of such a principle.—But it has been charged—and cannot be denied,—(or if denied, can be proven by the oaths of scores of the most respectable gentlemen of Washington county) that Col Thomas in his speech did contend that the *counties of the State should be represented according to taxation*;—and it is further charged that the ultimate effect of such a principle, if carried into practice, would be equivalent to the doctrine of "property qualification." We call the particular attention of our readers to the following sentence from the letter of explanation:

"*I recollect referring to the subject of* TAXATION and REPRESENTATION, and the inequality both in the contributions made to the treasury, and the *benefits derived from it, by the large and small counties, contending that the larger counties, should possess in the popular branch of the Legislature a greater influence than they now have!!*"

Here then is an admission of what has been charged. It will be seen that the gentleman speaks of TAXATION as the basis of representation. He makes no mention of POPULATION. "Taxation" and "contributions made to the treasury" are to determine the relative representatives of the counties in "the popular branch of the Legislature. Now let us look at the practical results of the principle. Let us look at the representatives of the counties as they now stand, and then inquire how they would be effected by the operation of the new doctrine.

At the Presidental election of 1840 Caroline county polled 1222 votes—and Prince George's 1620. If we allow to every 400 votes one delegate to the General Assembly, Caroline would be entitled to 3 and Prince George's to 4, which is the number these counties now have. But let the rule be changed and the representatives apportioned according to taxation, and how would they stand? The assessment of Caroline county, under the Direct Tax law of March session, 1841, amounted to $1,407,628,00—while that of Prince George's amounted to 9,875,047,95. Now supposing that every $469,209,00 of property should entitle the owners to one representative, Caroline would still have 4; but the representatives of Prince George's would be increased to 21!! Gives Caroline ONE and Prince George's, by the same rule, would have SEVEN!! The latter, with but one fourth more of "free white male citizens above the age of twenty-one years" would be entitled to seven times as many representatives as the former, because, forsooth, the citizens of Caroline happen to live upon a poorer soil and own fewer slaves. And again, compare the influence which Baltimore city would enjoy in consequence of her having 80 millions of taxable property—and the people will find that Mr. Thomas' doctrine in Hagerstown is still worse than that preached in Carroll.

Well, if the rule be correct in principle, why should it not be applied to *districts* and *wards*—and lastly why not to the *individual* voters! The great question is whether *men* are to be represented or *property*. The framers of our State Constitution thought the Legislature should be composed of the representatives of *men*, and therefore gave to every free white man over twenty-one years of age one vote.—But Col. Thomas has discovered that this is all wrong, and that *property* alone should be represented. Though laws are enacted not merely in reference to property—but also for the protection of the *life, liberty* and *reputation* of the citizen, yet, by this new rule of representation, those only are to control legislation whom birth or chance has endowed with wealth The poor industrious mechanic is to submit to whatever laws his rich neighbor may please to have enacted. The old defender, the soldier returning covered with scars from Palo Alto, Resaca, Monterey or Buena Vista,—those who have fought and bled in the cause of their country, they are to be disfranchised and have no voice in her legislation—because they have devoted that time to her service which others have employed in heaving together something of this world's pelf!! We do not mean to say that Col. Thomas advocated the application of the principle to this extent.—He dared not to do it. But we do say, that such would be the practical results of the doctrine. If sound at all, it is not proper that its advocates should confine its application to counties alone. This would be doing injustice to the tax-party portion of the citizens,—and they would soon contend that the principle should be universally applied. They might, and would rightly contend, that if property alone is to be represented, that they alone should vote who hold property—and should vote according to the value of the property possessed.

We have been informed and cannot doubt, that Col. Thomas in his speech, did use the exact language embodied in the extract at the head of our paper. He might not have intended to have conveyed precisely the meaning which the words themselves impart. These words were used for the purpose of illustration, and if they were uttered "in the excitement of a long speech," and are "liable to misconstruction," it was his misfortune and not our fault. We keep them at the head of our paper, because *we can prove that he did use the expression*. But if in his *speech* be said what he did not not mean, yet in the *letter* he tells us what he did mean to say,—this *explanation* is amply sufficient for our purpose.—We presume the gentleman will have to make a *speech* now to explain away the letter—or perhaps he may prefer coming out with something in the shape of a *commentary* upon this unfortunate apology:

From the Balt. Patriot.

MR. P. F. THOMAS AND THE PRINCIPLE OF REPRESENTATION.

Our readers have seen the language attributed to Mr. Thomas, the Locofoco candidate for Governor, in the speech he recently delivered in Hagerstown. In that speech the Hagerstown Torch Light reported that he said:

"*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 you shall have a dollar's worth of influence more than I have.*"

We published this extract last week, and having afterwards been informed that Mr. Thomas had in a letter published in the papers, denied having used the language, we stated that he had denied it.—We had not seen the letter, but having afterwards got a copy of it, we published it in full, that our readers might decide for themselves whether the letter was a denial in fact, of the language attributed to him. On that point, our readers having the letter before them, cannot have difficulty in forming an opinion.

The editor of the Hagerstown Torch Light (Mr. Bell) is not satisfied to let the matter rest upon the letter of Mr. Thomas, but has taken means to substantiate the report of the speech made in that paper. We have received a letter from his calling attention to the subject, and the following extracts of a letter from him to Mr. S. Sands, which came too late for publication in the Rough and Ready of this week has been furnished to us for publication.

After quoting the words reported to have been used by Mr. Thomas (as given above,) and referring to the paragraph in the Patriot stating that Mr. Thomas had denied having used them, the letter of Mr. Bell the editor of the Torch Light, proceeds:

As the testimony of his (Mr. Thomas') own party would probably be more satisfactory than that of Whigs, I beg leave to refer to the following gentlemen and the circumstances under which they declared themselves.

GEORGE W. SMITH, Esq., one of the most prominent leaders of the Locofoco party, and a late delegate in the Legislature from this county, in the Torch Light office, and in my presence, as well as upon several other occasions, acknowledged that the language attributed to Mr. Thomas was substantially and correctly reported.

JOSEPH J. MERRICK, another and one of the most conspicuous members of the same party, made the same acknowledgement, (in front of Fowlers Tavern, on the same afternoon upon which Mr. Thomas spoke,) in conversation with the undersigned, and in presence of a number of gentlemen. And upon another occasion, when the Hon. JOHN T. MASON was attempting to explain, to a small crowd, Mr. Thomas' meaning, Mr. Merrick was appealed to, and declared that Mr. Thomas had used the language attributed to him.

Col. HENRY LEWIS, a zealous member of the same party, has more than once acknowledged to the undersigned that the report in the Torch Light was candid and honest to an extent that he had no right to expect.*

I could mention the names of many others, of the same party, who have made similar acknowledgments—but it is unnecessary. I regret that it has been necessary to allude to any names, and I only do so because my veracity has been questioned, and because Mr. Thomas has, in an inexcusable manner, attempted to avoid a responsibility which he has brought upon himself.* * * * * *

The above references will I hope, be sufficient to silence Mr. Thomas and his friends in their bold and unscrupulous denial of "*the words*" of his speech. As for his *meaning*, that is a matter for the public, as well as himself, to judge of.

Yours, respectfully,
EDWIN BELL,
Editor Torch Light.

*It may be proper to add, that the gentlemen above mentioned, all contended that Mr. Thomas *did not mean* to convey the idea which *his words imported*.

EASTON GAZETTE.

EASTON, Md.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPT. 18.

FOR GOVERNOR,
Wm. T. GOLDSBOROUGH,
Of Dorchester.

FOR CONGRESS,
JOHN W. CRISFIELD,
Of Somerset.

For Delegates,
THOS. C. NICOLS,
CHAS. H. BOWDLE,
ROBERT L. SETH.

For Commissioner.
NICHOLAS RICE.

☞The meeting in Easton on Tuesday last passed off harmoniously and quietly. Ex-Gov. Saml. Stevens and Col. N. Goldsborough presided on the occasion, and conducted the order of proceedings. Jno. W. Crisfield, Esq., the Whig candidate for Congress addressed the meeting in an able and eloquent speech, and was followed by J. Ll. Martin, Esq., Mr. Lecompte, the Democratic candidate not being present until about 5 o'clock, P. M. Mr. Lecompte then also addressed the meeting. The assemblage was the largest we have seen convened since 1814.

☞We observe in the last "Star," of this place, an article charging upon the leading Whigs of this County two sets of opinions in relation to P. F. Thomas, the Democratic candidate for Governor—one set for the public ear, another for private use and dark innuendo. There are many things appearing in that paper which are vexatious and annoying for the time to those to whom it is supposed they are addressed and at whom they are aimed.—but generally they are passed by with the contempt and scorn they merit. In the present instance the same course might very properly be pursued, but we choose not to do so. We know no Whigs in this county, leading or otherwise, exalted or humble, who have any opinions of Mr. Thomas that they will not express any where, and under any circumstances, and for which they are not fully responsible to Mr. Thomas, to the world, and to public sentiment. Let the managers of the "Star" therefore come out boldly with their charges and not stab in the dark.—We defy their threats—we scorn their insinuations. We presume it will turn out like their threatened exposure and disclosures respecting the celebrated Talbot anti-tax meeting. We have never seen the one, nor shall we be favored with the other. We feel bound to acquit Mr. Thomas in his absence of such Hectoring foolery. We believe it to be the work of over zealous and officious friends, whose eyes are so keenly bent on the "flesh pots," the loaves and fishes in anticipation, that they are bereft alike of good sense, taste and feeling. The public here well know these folk—can put their finger on them. They are marked here. Their officiousness must be as unpalatable to the sober, honest, well-meaning portion of their party, as it is amusing to the Whigs. The Whigs desire the defeat of Mr. Thomas because they hold the principles of the party to which he belongs as not calculated to advance the true glory and interest of this State and country. They would oppose the election of any other nominee for the same station for the same reason, but especially do they oppose Mr. Thomas' election because they honestly, conscientiously believe him unsound upon the great subject of State Faith. They believe him to have ever been unsound on this vital question. They believe that in '43 if the horrid doctrine of repudiation had gained ground and been likely to pervade the State, that he pursued such a course as to be ready for *that* side of the question, as he is *now* for *State Faith*, when he finds this sacred doctrine prevailing, and likely to subserve his purposes. No speech of Mr. Thomas at the important crisis of 1843 was ever heard in favor of State faith—no document in its favor can then be traced to his pen—no conversation even in its behalf—no, not even up to 1845. On the contrary, we know that he said to a gentleman of this county of as high character as any in it, "*That it was useless to keep so much clamor about repudiation—that Maryland must repudiate her debt, or a large portion of it—she never could pay it all—that England had repudiated a portion of her debt—France had done the same, and there was no greater disgrace in Maryland's doing it.*"

This conversation, together with one recently testified to by George Hollyday, Esq., of Kent county, a fellow-member of the Committee of Ways and Means with Mr. Thomas in 1843, and a man of the highest character moral and political, must satisfy every man, that at the crisis, the turning point of Maryland's destiny and course on the subject of State faith, he was recreant on this great question. Had Gov. Pratt, William T. Goldsborough and the Whig party held and expressed such sentiments as Mr. Thomas then did, where would our good old State now have been?—Plunged in deep disgrace, instead of occupying the proud position she now does. What saved her from the one and placed her on the other, but the supremacy of Whig principles in 1844 and the election of Gov. Pratt? Nothing—nothing else. The election of such a politician as Mr. Thomas at that period would have been an evil hour for Maryland. The Whig party believe that a man who would not *then* sound his voice in the hour of danger, who would not *then* exert his talents, who would not *then* endanger his popularity—who pursued such a course as to enable him to take either side and to render certificates and endorsements of partisans necessary to prove his position, is not the man for Governor of Maryland, after her honor has been saved. They prefer to entrust it to W. T. Goldsborough, whose course was bold, open and avowed on the subject of State Faith—who, though he cannot mouth so much before the people as Mr. Thomas, yet *always so acted* in public life—*so spoke in private life*, as to render his opinions well known and to require no defences at the hands of his friends on this subject We think the people of Maryland, too, will conclude to continue power in the hands of a party who have done so much for the honor of the State, rather than confide it to one whose arms were heretofore folded and whose voice was mute in the hour of darkest peril. We have spoken thus freely of Mr. Thomas as a public man—of his public acts and doings. Do we now speak plain enough? These are the opinions of the entire Whig party of Talbot county respecting Mr. Thomas' course on this great question. We have heard them expressed by men who usually say but little on the subject of politics. Here his course is known—the people cannot be imposed upon. As regards the charge against Mr. Thomas of using the following language—"*I am in favor of representation according to taxation; that is, if a man pays taxes on a dollar's worth of property more than I do, I am willing that he should have a dollar's worth of influence more than I have*"—we have only to say that when he expressly and positively denies the use of *that langnege, those words*, over his own signature, we shall then require the evidence of *two witnssses* to convict him.—We publish below his letter, which it will be seen does not deny the specific language charged on him by the Torchlight reporter. He denies that he did advocate or intended to advocate a "property qualification." Well, let him deny the use of the language charged. The people will construe it for themselves and draw their own inferences. We shall publish the whole matter in order that the freemen of the county may decide for themselves.

LETTER OF COL. THOMAS.

CUMBERLAND, Aug. 27th, 1847.

Dear Sir: Upon my arrival here on yesterday, I received your letter of the 25th inst., informing me that a charge was very generally circulated to the effect, that in that part of my speech at Hagerstown, in which I discussed the Reform question, I advocated the doctrine of "property qualification," and that such an inference was drawn from the following language, said to have been used by me—"that the man who paid five dollars into the Treasury ought to have more influence than he who paid nothing." As I have never entertained an opinion favorable to a property qualification, I can state, with the most positive certainty, that I did not, either at Hagerstown or at any other place or time, advocate a doctrine which I, in common with the democratic party, have ever viewed as odious and absurd.

It is utterly impossible for me to remember the precise language used in the course of a long speech. I recollect referring to the subject of taxation and representation, and the inequality both in the contributions made to the treasury, and the benefits derived from it, by the large and small counties, contending that the larger counties should possess in the popular branch of the Legislature a greater influence than they now have; but how, in any manner, my remarks could be tortured into an advocacy of a principle which I abhor, I am at a loss to imagine.

It is quite possible that in the excitement of a long speech, a sentence may have been uttered, which in the abstract, was liable to misconstruction. I undertake, however, to say, that there was not one word or syllable uttered by me on the occasion referred to, which in the mind of any sensible or honorable man, or one not predisposed to misrepresent, if taken in connection with the context and subject-matter of discussion, could have induced even the remotest idea of an intention on my part to favor the doctrine of property qualification. The assertion, therefore, is a base and infamous falsehood, and one which no truly honorable man would ascribe to me.

I am, very truly, your friend,
P. F. THOMAS.

Hon. JNO. T. MASON.

☞Much has been said about the "Easton Gazette," and its being controlled by a committe etc., once for all we desire to say the "Easton Gazette's," *press, type, fixtures, all belong to us.* Can the "Star" say as much—or rather can the man at its head say as much for that press? Is he hired to edit it, or does he rent? He has so much curiosity about our affairs, lets hear a little about yours neighbor. Which press is most likely to be independent?—Has not that press always belonged to the party, and been controlled by a committee? When we want aid, and we confess our poor deficiencies and weakness, we get assistance we frankly admit from friends. But we publish no assaults on character—we blunder along as well as we can, and we will always see that justice is done to friend and foe. We hardly suppose the editor of the "Star" thinks that the world supposes he writes all his editorial? If he does he greatly errs. We never heard him suspected of it. But we care not who writes for him, it gives us no concern, we read his articles, and care no more about the matter. We would not have said even this much, knowing that both of us are very small men with the Public and occupy little of their consideration, but for the interest our neighbor seems to take in us. We will endeavor to attend to our own affairs and advise our neighbors to do the same.

☞The following correspondence relates to a subject of vital interest to the people of this state, and at this time particularly important. We therefore take the earliest occasion to present it to our readers.

BALTIMORE, Sept. 4th, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR.—Much attention has been recently attracted by a conversation alleged to have taken place between the Hon. Philip Francis Thomas and yourself at the December session 1843 of the Legislature, on the subject of the bill then introduced by him, in relation to the payment of the public debt. The Whig State Central Committee, deeming it very important that the views under which Mr. Thomas acted introducing that measure, should be correctly understood by the people, have directed me to ask, that you will be kind enough to state in reply to this, what conversation, if any, did occur between him and yourself on the subject referred to.

With great respect,
Your obedient serv't.
J. NEVETT STEELE, Chair'n.

To GEORGE S. HOLLYDAY, Esq.

CHESTERTOWN, Sept. 8h, '47.

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 into 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 met with Col. Thomas and had a conversation with him, with regard to the bill above alluded to in which I expressed my great astonishment at his having introduced it, and asked him 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

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11032-1164.jpg