

TERMS:

The Compiler is published every Monday morning, by HENRY J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

THE COMPILER.

A Democratic, News and Family Journal.

By H. J. STABLE.

"TRUTH IS MIGHTY, AND WILL PREVAIL."

TWO DOLLARS A-YEAR.

42ND YEAR.

GETTYSBURG, PA.: MONDAY, JULY 2, 1860.

NO. 37.

The Famous Greeley Letter.

The famous letter of HENRY GREELEY to Senator SEWARD, published in the New York Tribune yesterday, presents a most painful picture of the political spoils-buiter, which may not be without its lesson. That letter, dissolving a partnership originated and followed up with a resolve to the enjoyment of "the cohesive power of public plunder," proves the writer to be a sordid banker after corruption, who, failing to gain that for which he most eagerly greeds, was ready to sacrifice, just like the incorruptible FORNEY the friend and protector of years, who had done him "acts of valued kindness." This singular document commences with a moan and ends with a groan.— It recounts the struggle of the spoilsman, his aspirations and defeats. It details, without stint, filthy and frequent instances of personal abasement, and, at every turn, sorrows and complaints because Mr. Seward did not help his tool to places of profit where plunder was plenty. Mr. Greeley, it appears, commenced his career in 1837 at Albany, on a salary of one thousand dollars. His work was that of the political scullion, but "he loved it and did it well." His paymaster becoming a Governor, the philosopher dreamed of the spoils. But, although offices worth from \$3,000 to \$20,000 per year were being dispensed, he was not thought of by his master.— On this point the incorruptible Horace says:— "I believe it did not then occur to me that some one of these abundant places might have been offered to me without injustice; I now think it should have occurred to you. If it did occur to me, I was not the man to ask you for it; I think that should not have been necessary."

—well intended, but very cutting as addressed by him to me—to say, in substance, "Well, then, make Patterson, Governor, and try my name for Lieutenant. To lose this place is a matter of no importance; and we can see whether I am really so odious."

—He was not nominated for either office, and to add to his grief, Raymond, his bitter foe, was selected for the latter post. This was the straw that broke the camel's back. He concluded "to glide out of the newspaper world as quietly and as speedily as possible, to join his family in Europe and to stay there quite a time—long enough to cool his fevered brain and renovate his over-taxed energies." He ends his sorrowful recital by intimating that hereafter he will take "such courses" as he thinks "best" for himself. Greeley's letter, and the editorial which accompanies it, are beyond question among the most painful evidences of indecent lust for public place and public plunder that this age has yet produced. One strain of complaint prevails both, and that complaint has its origin in the unwillingness of William H. Seward to gratify the corrupt cravings and sordid desires of Mr. Greeley. Its only parallel is found in the case of the bottle-washer of the Republican House of Representatives, who, because Mr. Buchanan would not elevate him as Greeley wished to be elevated, turned upon the friend who had served him and the party which has fostered him, to enjoy the reward which his treachery brought. It is natural that Greeley should sympathize with his confederate, and that decent men should turn from both with loathing. But it is a deep disgrace that the newspaper profession should present such instances of venality, ingratitude, and shamelessness.—*Pennsylvanian*, June 15th.

H. J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

H. J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

H. J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

H. J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

H. J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

Honest Old Abe's Qualifications for the Presidency.

We have been looking over the *Examiner* of last week, and compile the following among the reasons which our handsome friend, who does up the editorials for that paper, sets forth why "Honest Old Abe" should be elected President of the United States:—
1st. Because "Old Abe" and his partner, Tom Hanks, split 8,000 rails in one year.—That is at the rate of nearly nine a day. Well, we have many hard split farmers in Lancaster County who split more than that number per diem, and yet do not claim the Presidency.
2d. Because he has managed a flat-boat on the Ohio River, and tells some rich anecdotes of his experience in the business.
3d. Because he was a soldier in the Black Hawk war, but "never smelt powder."
4th. Because he is a handsome man, ride his portrait in the Lancaster *Union* and *Harper's Weekly*.
5th. Because he stands six feet four in his stockings.
6th. Because he is as simple as a child.
7th. Because he never swore but once in his life, and then he said, "damn am—they shan't do it."
8th. Because he presumes, to some action of those benighted Democrats, from that portion of Illinois called Egypt, in the Legislature.
9th. Because he loves a good dinner.
10th. Because, like a dutiful husband, when he heard of his nomination, he went down and told the "little woman at our house."
11th. Because he has a wife and three children. John does not tell us whether they will "all be Presidents." "Old Abe" will be apt, however, to follow the example of a whilom illustrious Chief Magistrate of our own State, and permit no one but "daddy and mammy" to wear the Presidential robes.
12th. These are the chief recommendations thus far of "Honest Old Abe" for the Presidency, as furnished by his adherents. Should any others be brought to light, we shall cheerfully furnish our readers with the benefit of them.—*Lancaster Intell.*

Lincoln and Hamlin—A Wet Blanket.

The enthusiasm will not up—the people will not shout—in 1860. Such is the sad conclusion of the Abolition leaders as they see the cold indifference with which the nominations are received. The Germans find that they are to be forced, willing or unwilling, to support a Know Nothing for President, although they had proclaimed their choice to be Seward, and had demanded his nomination as the price of their allegiance. The Chase men feel that their candidate was slaughtered in the house of his friends—that even Ohio would not support his pretensions.—The friends of Seward feel that an irrepressible conflict against their favorite has brought him to the ground by the thrust of a "base marauding lance." The prestige of victory is not with the opposition—they have no heart for the war, no stomach for the fight. Their nomination fell like a wet blanket upon the most ardent of the opposition.

Noble Sentiment.—Daniel Webster penned the following sentiment:—

"If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble into dust; but if we work on mortal minds—if we imbue them with principles, with the just fear of God and our fellow-men, we engrave on their tablets something that will brighten through all eternity."
—Scarlet, silk and velvet, have put out the kitchen fire.
—Let well enough alone.
—Nothing dries sooner than a tear.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE Democratic National Convention. FRONT ST. THEATRE, BALTIMORE.

FIFTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.
The convention was called to order shortly after ten o'clock, by the President, Gen. Caleb Cushing. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Schwartz, who implored the wisdom and counsel of the Lord in directing those assembled this morning in all their actions, and implored the direction of our Heavenly Father in the choice of an upright and proper person to fill the position of Chief Magistrate of this Union.
The President stated that before proceeding to the order of business, he would remark that the crowd on the floor was much less than heretofore, and he would request that those who were on the floor, not members, would stand back and leave a clear avenue behind the members of the Convention. There were officers present to enforce this request, but he hoped the good sense of the crowd would suggest to them the propriety of keeping back.
Gen. Cushing then went on to state the exact condition before the house, which was "shall the main question be now put." He directed the Secretary to read the resolutions attached to the several reports of the committee, which was done; the utmost quiet prevailed during the reading.
During the reading of the majority report, Mr. Krum rose to a privileged question. In the hurry of making up the reports there were errors in several of the names, and he desired that the proper corrections should be made, which request was granted.
Mr. Stevens also obtained leave to make a correction in his series of resolutions, which was the insertion of the first resolution of the majority between the eighth and ninth resolutions attached to the report.
The President stated that he had been informed that there were corrections to be made in the resolutions of Mr. Gittings, and as soon as those corrections were read he would call on the gentleman from Maryland to make the necessary corrections.
Mr. Gittings then withdrew his resolutions.
Mr. Krum desired that the corrected list of the names of the Mississippi delegation be now read, and that they were read a few remarks.
The names were read.
Mr. Krum asked leave to file a paper, giving his reasons for making the report he had prepared. [Cries of "No," "No."]
Mr. Krum, of Missouri, stated that if the chair recognized him he would proceed.
The Chair—The chair recognizes the gentleman and he is at liberty to proceed.
Mr. Krum resumed that he desired to place before the convention his views briefly, in relation to a few points in connection with the majority report of the committee on credentials. The gentlemen then proceeded to read from a somewhat lengthy printed communication from the committee.
The following is the review of the minority report of the committee on credentials, as read by Mr. Krum:—
It will be observed that the majority report contains only the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee.—This is the usual course. Committees are the chosen organs for investigation of deliberative bodies. Their reports are confined in, and unless assailed, stand unquestioned. In the matter now before the convention, the report of the committee is assailed by a minority report, (signed by I. J. Stevens and eight others), and a statement of certain premises and labored argument have been presented by the minority of the committee, to support the conclusions of this minority.
The statements contained in this Minority Report, on which the main argument of these gentlemen is founded, are for the most part, naked assumptions, not established by any evidence before the Committee, and depend entirely for their verity upon the mereipse dixit of the gentlemen who make them.
The task of exposing the misstatements contained in this Minority Report is an easy one, and it will be done in the brief space of fifteen minutes the most salient points can only be noticed. If the facts assumed by these gentlemen have no foundation, as a matter of course their argument based upon them falls to the ground. Now to the work:
First, it is asserted that the withdrawal from this Convention of certain Delegates, was not a resignation; that the vacancies referred to (in the resolution of this convention), had reference to the continuing of vacancies at the time of reassembling, &c., i. e. prospective vacancies! A bolder absurdity was never uttered. Now what was the subject matter of which the Committee had jurisdiction? Was it not the "Credentials of all persons claiming seats, &c., made vacant by the Resignation of Delegates at Charleston?"
This Convention decided for itself whether vacancies had occurred. The Democracy of the States, affected by such withdrawal, in every instance, by appointing Delegates anew, virtually admitted that vacancies had occurred. The claimants who appeared before your committee, by accepting a new appointment admitted the fact, and the gentlemen of the minority stultify their own statement by acting on these very cases.
If there were no vacancies by seces-

sion, there was nothing for the committee to do in respect to such cases. Out upon such nonsense!
Secondly, in attempting to show the inconsistency of the majority report, these gentlemen state that delegates were recommended to seats who had not been re-appointed or re-accredited to Baltimore after their secession at Charleston!
To this a flat denial is given. This denial is based upon the evidence that was before the Committee. In every case, to wit: in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas, the parties admitted to seats by the Majority Report had been severally elected, appointed or re-accredited in form, since the adjournment at Charleston. Of this fact, (if the evidence is reliable), successful contradiction is challenged.
The minority gentlemen again stultify themselves, for they show that resolutions took place in three States; but they strangely forgot to state the fact, (established before the committee, that Messrs. Bayard and Whiteley were reappointed according to the rules of the Democracy of New Castle co., Delaware, and the Texas delegation were directed by the Executive Committee of that State to repair to Baltimore. It was in evidence before the committee that this was a customary mode in those States of making nominations and appointing delegates, &c. The committee considered it tantamount to a re-appointment.
But what of Mississippi? Is it not the boast of some of the Mississippi Delegation, that they have been re-appointed since their secession without opposition? If there has not been a new election, how comes it that delegates are here from Mississippi who were not at Charleston? The credentials of this delegation show upon their face that they were appointed by the Convention that sat on the 8th and 9th of May, 1860. This temporary delegation is without parallel. No new election in Mississippi.
ALABAMA.
The following are some reasons which influenced the decision of the majority of the committee in respect to the claimants from Alabama, of which L. P. Walker is chairman. He and his associates claim to have been appointed by a convention that sat on the 4th of June last. Several of these were not seceders at Charleston. Mark this fact! But where were these delegates appointed by the convention that sat on the 4th of June to go to what convention? They were instructed by the convention that appointed them to repair to Richmond and co-operate with the delegates of that convention.
It is written upon the face of the credentials which were before your committee. It is true, a little lower down, in the same paper, they are "accredited" to this Convention!
These gentlemen were considered by your Committee, for this and other reasons, as Delegates to the Richmond Convention and not to this. A roving commission!! Suppose their instructions had included Conventions of the Black Republicans at Chicago, and of the Mormons of Utah—would this Convention allow these seats? They had booked the company under such a roving commission? Your committee said No! and every true Democrat throughout the land will respond No!
ARKANSAS.
In the Arkansas case, the applicants for seats show no regularity of record. The seceders from Charleston having vacated their seats by the act of secession, the committee felt it their duty either to recommend to the Convention the exclusion of both sets of applicants on the score of irregularity, or to admit both; the two District Conventions that are alleged to have sustained the action of the seceders and to have accredited them to Baltimore, had, by their own admission, no power to act in the premises, and therefore their action does not entitle the applicants to seats in the convention. The opposing claimants were appointed by a convention called, upon notice, in the usual way by individuals not possessing an official character, and they are therefore, technically speaking, no more entitled than the others to seats; but the committee, disregarding technicalities and not desiring to leave the Democracy of Arkansas unprotected on the part of the seceders, recommended that all the claimants be admitted to seats in the convention on the terms and conditions specified in their Report.
LOUISIANA.
In the Louisiana case it is clearly demonstrated likewise, that according to strict usage neither of the delegations were entitled to be received by this convention. The seceders from Charleston did not present themselves before a new convention, fresh from the people, but the old convention which had adjourned sine die, (and therefore had by its own act and the usages of the party terminated its legal existence) was called together to endorse the action of the seceders.
That so called Convention had therefore no more right than any like number of individual Democrats to assume to act as the representatives of the Democracy of Louisiana. Their proceedings in any case were of no force or validity, and their action in re-accrediting the seceding Delegation to Baltimore was a gross usurpation of power on their part. On the other hand, the Delegation, whose admission has been recommended by the Committee, was appointed by a Convention assembled at Donaldsonville, composed of Delegates from twenty-one parishes, (including the city of New Orleans), out of thirty-nine parishes in the State.
It is true that the call for the Democracy of the State to send Delegates to

the Convention was made by individual Democrats and by two distinct Democratic clubs, but in as much as the State Executive Committee refused to call a new Convention, and thus appeal to the Democracy to endorse or condemn the action of their Delegates at Charleston there was no other course to be pursued than for known and distinguished members of the party to issue the call, and for the Democracy to sustain it by the appointment of Delegates in accordance with such call.
An emergency had arisen, and inasmuch as the executive committee had refused to act, it seemed to the committee that there was no other course left to the Democracy of Louisiana, but to assemble in convention upon the spontaneous call of individuals Democrats.
GEORGIA.
The admission of both of the Delegations presenting themselves from Georgia, was recommended because the Committee believed that each of those Delegations represent the opinions and sentiments of a part of the Democracy of the State. The withdrawal from the Convention of a part of its members was occasioned, as the evidence before the Committee demonstrated, by a difference of construction between them and their associates upon certain points in the Democratic platform.
Two Conventions, each claiming to be the correct and only exponent of the Democratic sentiment of the State, were held, and each appointed a delegation to this Convention. The regularity of both of these Conventions was involved in doubt. At all events one does not seem more regular than the other.
After a full investigation of the facts in this case, the Committee, deeming it of the highest importance that the harmony of the party in Georgia required that both delegations should be admitted upon the floor of the Convention, with equal privileges, so recommended the Convention in their report.
It is undeniable that the appointing power in both cases was composed of delegates fresh from the ranks of the Democracy, and in the opinion of the committee, the irregularities alleged in either case were not sufficient to justify the exclusion of either of the delegations.
The committee consisted of twenty-five members, and the majority report received the sanction of sixteen, as to the greater portion of it and the whole is approved by fifteen. The minority report is approved altogether by nine and partially by one member.
Practically, then, the question is presented by the minority report, shall the statements and opinions of nine gentlemen outweigh and overbalance the statements and opinions of fifteen of equal respectability, touching the same matter?
Cries of "question," "question."
The question now before the convention was upon the minority report as a substitute for the majority report, as a whole.
The vote was then taken by States, with the following result:

MAINE. Ayes 5, Nays 0.
NEW HAMPSHIRE. Ayes 5, Nays 0.
VERMONT. Ayes 5, Nays 0.
MASSACHUSETTS. Ayes 10, Nays 0.
RHODE ISLAND. Ayes 4, Nays 0.
CONNECTICUT. Ayes 3, Nays 0.
NEW YORK. Ayes 25, Nays 0.
NEW JERSEY. Ayes 2, Nays 0.
PENNSYLVANIA. Ayes 10, Nays 0.
MARYLAND. Ayes 1, Nays 0.
VIRGINIA. Ayes 1, Nays 0.
NORTH CAROLINA. Ayes 1, Nays 0.
SOUTH CAROLINA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
FLORIDA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
ALABAMA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
LOUISIANA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
MISSISSIPPI. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
ARKANSAS. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
MISSOURI. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
ILLINOIS. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
INDIANA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
MICHIGAN. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
WISCONSIN. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
MINNESOTA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
CALIFORNIA. Ayes 0, Nays 0.
OREGON. Ayes 0, Nays 0.

First Ballot. Ayes 173, Nays 5.
Second Ballot. Ayes 172, Nays 5.
It will be seen that the States of Delaware, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, Texas, California, and Oregon, did not vote. Eleven members who remained on the floor declined voting.
Mr. Stansbury, of Maryland, withdrew his vote for Mr. Brookridge, and declined voting for any one.
Mr. Church, of New York, offered a resolution to the effect that Stephen A. Douglas, of the State of Illinois, having received more than two-thirds of the votes of this body, in accordance with the usages of the Democratic party, is now declared the choice of this Convention as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.
Mr. Church, of New York.—Mr. President, I offer for the consideration of the Convention the following resolution:—
Mr. Flournoy—I want to insist that we take at least another ballot before we pass any resolution. If we pass another ballot, it will make it stronger, a great gain. Many Delegates—Agree, Agree, another ballot!
Mr. Church—Let me say to my friends

were five of the delegates, the speaker among the number, who had determined to retain their seats, but would take no part in the proceedings until they found they could do so with honor.
Mr. Reed, of Kentucky, as one of the Kentucky delegation who remained in the Convention, rose to explain why he and his friends remained. He referred to the sectionalism now manifested in the North and South, and said he and his friends were determined to stand as a wall of fire between the two sections to save the Union.
Mr. Clark, of Missouri, arose before the question be put, to announce to the convention the result of the deliberations of the Missouri delegation.
Gov. King wished to suggest to the gentleman, before he proceeded that he give only the result of the deliberations of a portion of the delegation, as there were some here who were not desirous of retiring to consult upon any such purpose.
Mr. Clark resumed. He only desired to allude in his remarks to a portion of the delegation, as there were a number of them who did not design withdrawing from the Convention. He was, however, authorized to announce to this Convention, that two of the Missouri delegation did design withdrawing, both of whom were high minded and honorable gentlemen, who, he undoubtedly believed, would not have taken such a step except under a conviction that they were right in so doing. Whenever he found that the National Convention now assembled departed from the old and time honored usages of the Democratic party, he would retire, but till then, he did now feel at liberty to do so.
He had not as yet been of opinion that such had been the case, and therefore felt it his duty to remain, at least until that should transpire. With these remarks he would respectfully repeat, that two of the delegation, U. G. Corwin and W. J. W. McElhany, would not withdraw.
Mr. Cosan, of Pennsylvania, said he had last evening moved to proceed to ballot for President, and on that question had demanded the previous question, and the only matter before the Convention now was the ballot.
Gen. Cushing here rose amidst the utmost silence. He referred in a feeling manner to the entire action of the Convention. The delegations of more than half the States, either in whole or in part, had left the body, and he was compelled to look the true issue in the face. He came here the friend of no man or set of men, but determined to support the nominee whoever he might be. A deep sense of self-respect compelled him at this time to most respectfully resign the honor conferred upon him at Charleston, as President of the body, and retire to the floor and act with his colleagues of the Massachusetts delegation.
He was now sure he did not represent the feelings of a majority of the body, as now constituted, and he would therefore make room for someone else. In leaving the chair he would return thanks to the body for the many courtesies extended to him. He left his place with no ill feeling towards any one, but on the contrary he had the best of feeling for all present.
Gov. Todd, of Ohio, took the chair, when the entire convention rose to their feet and joined in one shout of applause continuing for some fifteen minutes.—It was with feelings of emotion that he assumed the temporary position of chairman of this convention, but when he informed the gentlemen that he had labored for twenty-five years with a Democratic banner in his hand, he felt sure he would be entitled to at least the respect of the convention. (Loud and prolonged applause.) If there were no other motion now before the house he would suggest that they proceed to express their wishes.
Mr. Butler, of Mass., took the floor for the purpose of announcing that a portion of the Massachusetts delegation desired to retire.
The question was then put on the resolution to ballot for President, and it was adopted.

RESULT OF THE FIRST BALLOT.
The Secretary here announced the result of the first ballot as follows:—
Whole vote cast, 1904.
For Douglas, 1729.
For Guthrie, 173.
For Breckinridge, 1.
For Seymour, 0.
For Beckwith, 0.
For Wise, 0.
For Dickinson, 0.

First Ballot. Ayes 173, Nays 5.
Second Ballot. Ayes 172, Nays 5.
It will be seen that the States of Delaware, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, Texas, California, and Oregon, did not vote. Eleven members who remained on the floor declined voting.
Mr. Stansbury, of Maryland, withdrew his vote for Mr. Brookridge, and declined voting for any one.
Mr. Church, of New York, offered a resolution to the effect that Stephen A. Douglas, of the State of Illinois, having received more than two-thirds of the votes of this body, in accordance with the usages of the Democratic party, is now declared the choice of this Convention as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.
Mr. Church, of New York.—Mr. President, I offer for the consideration of the Convention the following resolution:—
Mr. Flournoy—I want to insist that we take at least another ballot before we pass any resolution. If we pass another ballot, it will make it stronger, a great gain. Many Delegates—Agree, Agree, another ballot!
Mr. Church—Let me say to my friends

THE COMPILER is published every Monday morning, by HENRY J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.

THE COMPILER is published every Monday morning, by HENRY J. STABLE, at \$1 75 per annum if paid strictly in advance—\$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Jos. FAIRBANKS done with neatness and dispatch. Office in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wampler's Tanning Establishment—"Compiler" on the sign.