THE CHRONICLE.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 4, 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.

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

FOR COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

JAMES HAMMERSLY,
JOHN MUIR,
WILLIAM K. TRAVERS.

☞The attention of the Whigs is respectfully directed to the advertisement in another column announcing a series of Whig meetings in this County during the present month.

LOCO FOCO DEMOCRACY.—Mr. P. Francis Thomas made a speech at Hagerstown last week in which we find the following remark:

"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."

Now what is the plain English of this remark? It is that a man's influence and standing is to be regulated by the amount of his property. No matter what merit a man may possess—no matter what his talents and abilities—no matter what services he may have rendered his country—no matter how honest and industrious he may be, *if he is poor and destitute of property he can have no influence or standing in society;* while his rich neighbor, however devoid of ability, and however dishonestly he may have acquired his property is to possess an influence and standing in society *solely on account of his wealth.* Such is the legitimate tendency of Mr. Thomas' doctrine—a doctrine that strikes at the very root of republicanism, and the "self-evident" truth of the Declaration of Independence that declares "all men free and equal." Such a doctrine if carried out would create odious and unjust distinctions among men—would constitute men of wealth a sort of *nobility,* and render the poorer classes dependent upon and subservient to the wealthy aristocracy. No poor man, whatever his qualifications, could ever expect to attain distinction or fill an office. Every post of honor or emolument would be filled by men of wealth, because, according to Mr. Thomas' views, they being in possession of property are entitled to influence, while poor men must be content to remain "hewers of wood and drawers of water" because they are not blessed with worldly affluence.

Again, to carry this doctrine a little further it would *deprive every man who does not hold property of the right to vote.* It would disfranchise every poor man and place all power in the hands of the wealthy few. It would establish a "property qualification" that would effectually silence the voice of every man in humble circumstances, and leave him to the mercy of his aristocratic superiors. It would make serfs and slaves of poor men, and elevate rich ones to the rank of nobility.—And it would find its legitimate conclusion in a rank despotism that would trample every poor man to the dust beneath its iron heel, and extinguish the last spark of liberty in this Republican government.

We doubt not such sentiments are congenial to Mr. Thomas, but we did not think he had sufficient hardihood to avow them publickly. And how can any poor man, in view of such sentiments, cast his vote for Mr. Thomas? Freemen of Maryland! in the name of all that is dear to yourselves and your posterity, we ask you to ponder well ere you sustain by your votes a candidate whose doctrines if carried out would reduce you to a worse condition than Russian serfdom.

☞A becoming self-respect forbids us to enter into further controversy with the "Democrat." A man of honor would scorn the attempt to injure the private reputation of an opponent by *indirect means,* and we do not therefore feel called upon to defend ourself against the malicious inuendo of the last "Democrat" which the editor no doubt designed to apply to us, but which in his bungling ignorance he has *applied to himself.*—We feel too secure in the confidence and respect of society to feel annoyed at such insinuations from such a quarter. The article is evidently *a joint production.* The first part is no doubt the editor's own—*it has the "mark of the beast" upon it*—the latter part bears indubitable evidence of a different paternity. We should as readily accuse the editor of being the translator of a Hebrew bible as the author of a paragraph of ten lines that did not "murder the king's English," and do violence to the antiquated rules of Lindlay Murray For the mere *thing*——the miserable tool——the cringing boot-licker and stupid ignoramus who holds the place of *ostensible* editor of the "Democrat," we entertain the most sovereign contempt and scorn—if the *real author* of the latter portion of the "Democrat's" paragraph, who hurls his envenomed shafts at us under cover of an irresponsible place-holder, and who is too cowardly to attack us openly and fairly, will reveal himself, we promise him that retribution shall not be slow to follow his craven assaults. Asking pardon of our readers for having devoted so much space to the notice of the "Democrat" we dismiss all further controversy with a paper that enjoys the contempt of its enemies and the ridicule of its friends.

POWER OF IMAGINATION.—A writer in the "Easton Star" of last week who signs himself "An Independent Voter," speaking of Mr. Thomas, the Loco Foco candidate for Governor, says, "as a spectator I have heard his voice in the Capitol of the nation and have been confounded at the force and reasoning of his speeches."

Will "an independent voter" please inform the public on what subjects Mr. Thomas made "speeches" during his Congressional career. We have carefully examined the Congressional reports of the two sessions Mr. Thomas served in Congress, and have not been able to discover that his voice was ever heard "in the Capitol of the nation" except to say "yea" or "nay." The compliment "an independent voter" pays to Mr. Thomas in saying he has been "confounded at the "force and reasoning" of his speeches," is to our mind rather *equivocal.* Speeches that are distinguished for "force and reasoning" dispel doubts and enable the hearer to see the subject in a clear light—not confound him. Whether *confusion* is really the effect of "force and reasoning," or whether the idea has been advanced by "an independent voter" in order to prepare the public mind for the natural effect of the "force and reasoning" of *his* remarks, we cannot undertake to say. It is, however, certainly a novel idea, and may be ranked among the "modern discoveries" for which we are indebted to the genius of "progressive Democracy."

☞JOHN W. CRISFIELD Esq, the Whig Candidate for Congress will address the people at the Court House in Cambridge on Monday the 13th inst. It is also expected that *Sam'l. D. Lecompte* and *Jas. A. Stewart* Esqr's., will make addresses on the same occasion. The public are invited to attend.

☞We observe in the last "Democrat" an article over the signature of "B. D. Jackson" that requires some notice at our hands. Mr. Jackson avows himself the author of the articles signed "Plain Dealer" which have appeared in the Democrat. We forbear making any comment upon the propriety of Mr. Jackson's dropping his *incognito* and appearing over his *real name.* One thing, however, we wish to be distinctly understood. The real name of the author has no terrors for us, nor is there any thing so formidable in it as to deter us from expressing our thoughts in our own way. What we would say of "Plain Dealer" we shall say of "B. D. Jackson," with such change simply in the temper of our remarks as may seem proper to rebuke the conceited arrogance and inordinate vanity of the writer. The severity he complains of—the *insignificance* ascribed to him, and the *falsehood* alleged against him, had reference to an *anonymous* writer—to "Plain Dealer"—but if "B. D. Jackson" sees proper to take these remarks to himself, we shall not question the propriety of the application he has made. We repeat that we consider his efforts decidedly beneficial to the Whig party, and the threat of exposure, (unless his efforts were abandoned,) was made for the simple purpose of warning him that his real objects would be revealed, and thus add materially to the service he was rendering his political opponents. The wish to "stop" him proceeded only from charity for the delusion that blinded him to the true consequence of his labored efforts, and not from any change of opinion in regard to his "insignificance," or the effect of his articles. We hope we have untied these "knots" to the satisfaction of Mr. Jackson.

It is untrue that the "Chronicle" has labored "mightily to convict Mr. Jackson of "invading the private circle of the Whig candidate for Governor," and we challenge the proof of the assertion. And it is equally untrue that he has made "*urgent calls*" for the first word or hint expressed or intimated touching the domestic circle or private character of Mr. Wm. T. Goldsborough."—No such "urgent calls" have been made in his articles, as can readily be perceived by reference to them. If Mr. Jackson had examined his own articles and our replies it would have saved him the "confusion" of making assertions unsustained by facts. We are wholly indifferent to *his* opinion in regard to our being "conceited," and we feel very willing to abide the "public judgment" in relation to our recklessness. *His* reasons for pronouncing us "conceited" are, in "public judgment," supposed to proceed from a sense of discomfiture. *He* no doubt considers us "conceited" in daring to measure lances with so redoubtable a knight as himself—in the "public judgment," however, we have never suffered in our former controversies with this gentleman, and to the same tribunal we willingly refer the merits of this one. And we are equally willing the "public judgment" shall decide whether Mr. Jackson has extricated himself from the charge of falsehood and fixed it upon the "Chronicle." If we do not substantiate the charge we invoke upon our head the direst wrath which 'public judgment' may choose to visit upon us. But we are not willing that Mr. Jackson shall pervert the true issues between us to suit his own purposes. We object to his drawing the pleadings on both sides and bringing them to such an issue as his proof will sustain—we prefer to attend to our own case. In order to obtain a "public judgment" in his favor his "proofs" must agree with his "allegations," and to this test we hold him.

Now to the true issues involved in this controversy. In his article in the Democrat of the 28th of July, Mr. Jackson, speaking of Mr. Goldsborough, says—"his *mental imbecility* has so long been an *admitted* fact as to render contradiction at this day useless." This is the charge preferred by Mr. Jackson against Mr. Goldsborough; now what is the character of the proof he adduces in support of it? He asserts that the Hon. Thomas I. H. Eccleston "said in the *streets* of Cambridge (a short time before the meeting of the Whig Gubernatorial Convention) that Wm. T. Goldsborough had not the capacity to justify his nomination, or that he had not sense enough or was not smart enough to be Governor," and refers to Mr. Wm. Clifton to "establish what he asserts." Does this prove that Mr. Eccleston used the language attributed to him? Certainly not. Why did not Mr. Jackson publish the certificate of Mr. Clifton that he heard Mr. Eccleston make the remarks ascribed to him? That would have established the fact that Mr. Eccleston *did* use such language, but the simple reference to Mr. Clifton as a witness proves nothing. For aught we know Mr. Clifton *may deny* he ever heard Mr. Eccleston use such language, and in that event of course Mr. Jackson would not pretend to have established the fact he asserts. But grant, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Eccleston *did* use the language ascribed to him by Mr. Jackson; and does it establish the position Mr. Jackson assumes in saying "some of the leading *Whigs* look upon and have spoken *more disparagingly of Mr. Goldsborough than he ever did!*" If it be true that Mr. Eccleston used the language attributed to him, such language implies that Mr. Goldsborough is not qualified for the high office of Governor, while the language used towards Mr. Goldsborough by Mr. Jackson implies a *total disqualification for any station.* There is a vast difference between the two remarks. Mr. Jackson charges Mr. Goldsborough with "*mental imbecility*"—Mr. Eccleston, according to Mr. Jackson's statement, says Mr. Goldsborough is "not smart enough to be Governor." Which is the most disparaging remark—that of Mr. Jackson in pronouncing Mr. Goldsborough substantially a fool, or that of Mr. Eccleston impliedly admitting Mr. Goldsborough to be a man of ordinary ability, but not "smart enough to Governor?" The public will easily discern the wide difference between the two remarks, and even admitting Mr. Eccleston did use the language Mr. Jackson says he uttered, it fails to support Mr. Jackson's assertion, "that some of the leading *Whigs* look upon and have spoken *more disparagingly of Mr. Goldsborough then he ever did.*" But on this point we refer to Mr. Eccleston's card published in this week's paper, by which it will be perceived that Mr. Jackson has misrepresented the true import of his language. *Mr. Eccleston denies that he ever "uttered such gross and silly language,"* and we willingly consign this part of the subject to him, knowing that he is fully able to defend himself.

The second charge preferred by Mr. Jackson may be found in the "Democrat" of the 11th of August, and is in the following words:—

"The Whig Congressional Convention lately held at Baren Creek *refused to nominate as their candidate a gentleman of acknowledged ability and known integrity* (Theodore R. Loockerman, Esq.) *because he had been free to say Mr. Goldsborough was incapacitated for the Gubernatorial chair.*"

Now what is the proof adduced in support of this charge. Mr. Jackson in his last article *asserts* that "Dr. C. C. Cox, a gentleman residing in Easton, stated here that Mr. Loockerman had pronounced Mr. Goldsborough "an Ass and the Prince of Asses," and the Whigs here gave this remark of Mr. Loockerman's as their reason for voting against him in the Congressional Convention." This is the proof relied upon to sustain this second charge, and what does it amount to? Simply Mr. Jackson's *own assertion* that Doct. Cox made such a statement. Who heard Doct. Cox use such language? To whom did he make such statements? Upon the authority of a gentleman of Talbot we denied that Mr. Loockerman ever used such language, and in order to prove he did Mr. Jackson *simply asserts* that Doct. Cox made such a statement. The only proof therefore in support of the first branch of this second charge, which Mr. Jackson adduces, is his *own assertion* that Doct. Cox stated here that Mr. Loockerman pronounced Mr. Goldsborough "an ass and the prince of asses"—thus making himself his *own witness* and rather a *swift* one too. In relation to the second branch of the second charge Mr. Jackson prefers, we refer the reader to the card published below, by which it will be seen that the delegates from Dorset to the Whig Congressional Convention positively deny the Convention refused to nominate Mr. Loockerman "because he had been free to say Mr. Goldsborough was incapacitated for the Gubernatorial chair," and they also deny they ever "gave this remark of Mr. Loockerman's as their reason for voting against him in the Congressional Convention." Thus it will be seen there is no proof save Mr. Jackson's own naked assertion to support his second charge, and that is rebutted by the positive denial of the delegates to the Barren Creek convention.

How then stands the case? Mr. Jackson in his last article says: "Out of the mouths of two good witnesses have I established this fact—namely—that some of the leading *Whigs* look upon and have spoken *more disparagingly of Mr. Goldsborough than I ever did.*"

Against this we have shewn that even admitting Mr. Eccleston did use the language ascribed to him by Mr. Jackson, his remarks were *not disparaging* to Mr. Goldsborough—because the language itself impliedly *admits* him to be a man of *more than respectable intellectual capacity;* while Mr. Jackson in charging Mr. Goldsborough with "mental imbecility" denies to him all pretension to ability, and substantially pronounces him *disqualified for any station.* Again, in opposition to Mr. Jackson's assertion we publish the card of Mr. Eccleston, in which that gentleman positively *denies he ever "uttered such gross and silly language"* as Mr. Jackson ascribes to him, and let the "public judgment" determine from that whether Mr. E. has spoken "more disparagingly" of Mr. Goldsborough than Mr. Jackson ever did.

Mr. Jackson also asserts that Theodore R. Loockerman Esq. pronounced Mr. Goldsborough "an ass and the prince of asses." We are authorized by an intimate friend and relative of Mr. Loockerman's to deny that Mr. L. ever used such language towards Mr. Goldsborough. But, says Mr. Jackson, Doct. Cox stated here that Mr. Loockerman did make such remarks. Now what proof does he adduce of the fact that Doct. Cox ever said any such thing except his (Mr. Jackson's) *own unsupported assertion?* That is no proof at all, and this charge stands not only unsustained by facts, but rebutted by the strongest evidence. The card of Dr. Cox published below pronounces the charge "false and unfounded."

Mr. Jackson further asserts the "Whig Congressional Convention lately held at Barren Creek refused to nominate as their candidate a gentleman of acknowledged ability and known integrity, (Theodore R. Loockerman Esq.) because he had been free to say Mr. Goldsborough was incapacitated for the Gubernatorial chair." In opposition to this allegation we give the certificate of the delegates from this county, in which they unquestionably *deny* that the Convention refused to nominate Mr. Loockerman for any such cause, and assert that the nomination was given to Mr. Crisfield from other and distinct considerations.

Mr. Jackson further says, "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." In contradiction of this allegation the delegates in their card *deny* positively that they ever assigned such a reason to any one for voting against Mr. Loockerman.

Having thus given a fair statement of Mr. Jackson's allegations, and the proof he adduces in support of them; and having shewn by fair argument and facts that his premises are wrong, his conclusions unjust, his assertions unfounded and his facts but mere fancies—having in fine demonstrated that his allegations are wholly unsupported by competent proof, the entire fabric upon which he has expended so much labor and pains falls to the ground dishonored. And if the "public judgment" is not convinced that we have successfully convicted Mr. Jackson of making unfounded assertions, and thrown back upon him the charge of falsehood, let its indignation rest upon our head.

Having already extended this article to a great length we would willingly here bring it to a close, but justice to ourself requires a brief comment upon the concluding portion of Mr. Jackson's article. Passing over several remarks which evidence the rankling venom in his bosom, in reply to his query, "Who is he that thus speaks?" we would simply inform him that we are but an humble individual, but are "conceited" enough to believe ourself his *equal* in intelligence, standing and influence, but in political recklessness and demagogueism we admit we are his *infertor,* and in these respects enter into no competition with him. And we assure Mr. Jackson we have no desire to "stop his pen." Looking to the success of the Whig Gubernatorial candidate as of vital importance to the future welfare of the State, we have no disposition to deprive him of any influence in his favor, and for this reason we shall rejoice in the continuance of Mr. Jackson's efforts. Nor have we ever commanded Mr. Jackson to "stop." Our language was that of "warning and admonition" and not "defiance," as we expressly declared, and the exposure we threatened was simply our belief of the true objects Mr. Jackson had in view in his assaults upon Mr. Goldsborough. We believed that Mr. Jackson and a few others were attempting to raise a clamor against Mr. Stewart in this county for the purpose of destroying him in the confidence of his party, and subrogating himself in Mr. Stewart's place as the leader of the Democratic party in Dorset.—This is the "exposure" we threatened, and we believed it to be due to Mr. Goldsborough if the onslaughts upon him were continued, that the people might receive Mr. Jackson's statements with some "grains of allowance," and be able to account for his fiery zeal in behalf of Mr. Thomas.

We have no desire to abridge Mr. Jackson's rights, nor those of any other man. He may enjoy them to the fullest extent. And we cannot see the necessity of all his blustering declamation in regard to his determination to exercise and defend them. This he should have reserved until his rights had been assailed. It is really surprising to us that Mr. Jackson should so frequently make his firmness and courage the burthen of his songs. Uncharitable persons might conclude from it that he is apprehensive that the public question both, and it is necessary for him to trumpet their existence forth on every occasion in order to convince the community he possesses these qualities.

We now dismiss this subject with the single remark that if Mr. Jackson makes grave charges and expects to prove them by *rumor* and his *own naked assertions,* he must always find himself at fault, and need not be surprised if the "public judgment" should pronounce him "reckless."

A CARD.—The undersigned, members of the late Convention held at Barren Creek for the purpose of nominating a Whig candidate for Congress, deny that the "Convention refused to nominate" Mr. Loockerman "because he had been free to say Mr. Goldsborough was incapacitated for the Gubernatorial chair." The nomination was conferred upon Mr. Crisfield from considerations of policy, wholly distinct from and disconnected with any remarks said to have been indulged by Mr. Loockerman towards Mr. Goldsborough. The language ascribed to Mr. Loockerman formed no part of the reasons that induced the nomination of Mr. Crisfield. And we positively deny that we ever assigned to any one, as a reason for our voting against Mr. Loockerman in the Congressional convention, the remarks ascribed to Mr. L. by B. D. Jackson in his article published in the last Democrat.

J. BOND CHAPLAIN,
J. A. WADDELL,
LEVIN L. KEENE,
JNO. R. MARTIN,
JAMES THOMPSON.

Sept. 2nd, 1847.

A CARD.—Having seen an article in the last "Democrat" over the signature of "B. D. Jackson" in which I am referred to as having stated in Cambridge "that Mr. Loockerman had pronounced Mr. Goldsborough "an Ass and the Prince of Asses"—I authorize you to pronounce the assertion false and unfounded.

Sept. 3, 1847. CHRIS. C. COX.

FOR THE CHRONICLE.

I have read the "Democrat" of yesterday morning, and much to my regret I find therein a communication signed "B. D. Jackson," in which I am quoted as having said "*that Wm. T. Goldsborough had not the capacity to justify his nomination, or that he had not sense enough, or was not smart enough to be Governor.*"

Mr. Jackson's memory may have failed him, or his informant misunderstood me, for, if I know myself, I could not have uttered such gross and silly language. Before the Conventiou assembled to nominate a candidate for Governor, several persons were spoken of as the choice of this or that section of the State, and I, with others, expressed a preference for a gentleman of Kent or Tabot; and at the the same time I said "that in my opinion Mr. Goldsborough did not possess that *high* order of mind and talent requisite for Chief Magistrate *at this juncture.*"

In justice to Mr. Goldsborough I ought here to state that I have had no other intercourse with him, except such as a casual meeting in our county town produced. I have never been in his house, nor he in mine, since he became a man; and therefore I was not qualified to judge of his fitness for the station to which he aspires. It seems, however, that others better acquainted with Mr. G. than I was, and better able, from a knowledge of his public life, to judge of his qualifications, have not only carried his nomination in the late convention, but have witnessed the hearty good will with which that nomination has been received by the Whigs of the State.

Though my personal acqaintance with Mr. Goldsborough is indeed limited, yet my knowledge of his character. derived from those who know him well, induces me to believe that no man who has been raised in this county for the last forty years is more generally esteemed and respected for benevolence, excellent social qualities, open-handed liberality and kindnes of disposition. Wm. T. Goldsborough is one of the very few men of high standing and large fortune, who have reached the meridian of life without some stain or charge of immorality of conduct in some particular. I have never heard even one charge or accusation against him; but his having become the Gubernatorial nominee of the Whig party, and his character, personal, social and political being irreproachable, his Democratic adversaries have become desperate and seek to impugn his understanding!! I have nearly reached my sixty-second year and have known personally or from reputation the Governors of Maryland for the last forty years, and in my opinion there have been but few, a very few of them, whose education, attainments, and general excellence of character have rendered them better qualified for the Chief Magistracy of Maryland than William T. Goldsborough.

In conclusion, I am gratified that the paternity of the communications in the "Democrat" under the name of "Plain Dealer," has been acknowledged by Mr. B. D. Jackson; I had charged them to a widely different personage, and I here apologize to a Democratic friend for the unkind and unjust estimate which I made of his head and his heart.

THOMAS J. H. ECCLESTON.

Bridge Farm, Sept. 2nd 1847.

☞ANOTHER SLANDER NAILED.——It having been reported in some sections of our county that Theodore R. Loockerman Esq. would not support either Mr. Goldsborough for Governor, or Mr. Crisfield for Congress, we take great pleasure in spreading the following letter before the readers of the Chronicle, from which it will be perceived Mr. Loockerman puts a complete extinguisher upon the report. We knew the reports did injustice to Mr. Loockerman, and it affords us great pleasure that he has placed himself *rectus in curia* in regard to them:—

EASTON, Sept. 2nd, 1847.

My Dear Sir: I am greatly surprised at the information received from you, that reports were circulated in your county that I did not intend to vote for Wm. T. Goldsborough as the nominee of the Whig party for Governor, and John W. Crisfield as the nominee of the same party for Congress- I presume I need not assure you, my dear sir, that there is no foundation for such report.—That, my only motive in consenting to run for Congress in this District was to contribute my humble aid to the advancement of Mr. Goldsborough's election, will be fully attested by every leading Whig in Talbot. In addition to this, my letter to the delegates to the Barren Creek Convention will clearly evince such to have been my sole purpose. And to the same letter I refer for the pledge I have there given to support the nominee of the Barren Creek Convention. That no Whig has manifested more ardor in the cause than I have, I again call the Whigs of Talbot to testify. I presume I am among the oldest Whigs of this shore, especially of those who assisted in the earliest organization of the party, and at this day I have seen nothing to induce me to falter, for a moment, in the support of a party with which I have been identified for more than twenty years.

Be assured, therefore, my dear sir, that both of the above named gentlemen will receive my ardent and zealous support, and as far as I may be able to effect it, Talbot shall do her whole duty in the coming election.

My relations with Mr. Goldsborough from an early period of our lives have always been of the most friendly character; and with our fathers, who have left us, and their families, as you know, the like kind relations existed. I have therefore the fullest confidence that Mr. G's. experience in the affairs of the State, his education and intelligence as a gentleman, his integrity and fidelity to the principles of his party will render his administration successful and beneficial to the interests of the State.

As to Mr. Crisfield, as far as I know, the most friendly feelings have been mutually entertained, and I have entire reliance on his firmness as a Whig, and that if elected he will faithfully and ably represent this District,

Very truly my dear sir,
Yours,
THEOD. R. LOOCKERMAN.

To, N. L. Goldsborough, Esq.

N. B. I leave to your discretion the use of this letter. T. R. L.

FOR THE CHRONICLE.

MR. EDITOR:—In casting my eye over the columns of the little "Democrat" of last week, it fell upon a communication seeming to have been copied from the Cecil (Elkton, Md.) Democrat, signed "Dorchester," and although this article is too full of blunders and misrepresentations (designedly made, doubtless,) to merit notice, yet, believing such wanton efforts to delude the unwary deserve rebuke, I have determined to devote a short time only to the consideration of this tissue thus put forth; and being a farmer myself, am unwilling to let the impression go abroad as the friends of Mr. P. F. Thomas the Democratic candidate for Governor it appears to me would have it go, that these men you call Lawyers, because they happen to carry a green bag to the Court House with a docket in it once in six months, have all the sense of the country.

This very far-seeing author ("Dorchester") has by some means found out that it will devolve upon the people of Maryland to cast their ballots for a candidate for Governor in October next; (pretty smart for "Dorchester" Democracy in Cecil;)—then he says, let us enquire what qualifications Mr. Goldsborough possesses which should entitle him to our support. This remarkable author says it is a little singular that we never heard anything about his "strong sense and sound judgment" until his name was placed before people of the State by the Whig Convention; it is *possible* he has not heard it yet, for, judging from his wonderful production found in the columns of the Democrat, I should judge him to be one 'though hearing hears not; for either this author publishes what he knows to be false in relation to Mr. Goldsborough else he is inexcusably ignorant himself, and therefore wholy unfit to judge of the qualifications of others. His assertion that Mr. Goldsborough during the term he so faithfully and efficiently served the State in the Senate was under the guardianship and control of Gov. Pratt, is gratuitous and without foundation in truth, as all know who acted with *them* in that body, and quite as likely is it (nay, more so,) that Francis Thomas Jr., now the Locofoco candidate for governor, danced when Francis Thomas Sr., of late Gubernatorial and McDowel memory pulled the wires, as that Mr. G. should have danced to the pulling of the wires by Gov. Pratt. Again he is false in saying that Mr. Goldsborough beat James A. Stewart Esq. only sixty-eight votes when the