THE CHRONICLE.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 18, 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 Orphans' Court of Dorchester County will sit on Monday next the 20th inst.

☞The communication signed "F. J. Henry," and the article prefacing it are unavoidably crowded out this week. They shall appear in our next.

☞We ask the careful attention of the readers of the "Chronicle" to the articles upon the first page of this week's paper in reference to the charge made against Mr. Thomas, of advocating the doctrine of "representation according to population"—and also the communication upon the subject of Mr. Goldsborough's agency in defeating the bill regulating the cording of wood sold in Baltimore city.

The last "Easton Star" speaks of the "*known* and *admitted* incompetency" of Mr. Goldsborough. Will that paper inform us what evidence Mr. Thomas has furnished of his competency for the Executive chair? And what avails the brightest intellect if it be directed to the destruction of the best interests of the State? Is *intellectual competency* the only requisite for Governor? Is no regard to be had for the principles of the candidate—no attention paid to his political acts? Mr. Thomas may be all that his friends claim for him in point of intellectual capacity, but how has he exercised his endowments? Not for the glory and honor of his State. When gloom and despondency overshadowed her fate—when a portion of her own degenerate offspring were attempting to sully her reputation with the damning stain of repudiation, did Mr. Thomas exercise his powers to protect and save the character of his State from degradation and ruin? No! He exerted his utmost abilities to accelerate her fall, and fix the fatal stain indellibly upon her name! He took the lead in the emprise against her honor, and would have degraded her into the sink of bankruptcy and repudiation had his measures been sustained. Mr. Goldsborough may not possess the splendid abilities that Mr. Thomas' friends claim for that gentleman, but his lofty virtue—his unfaltering devotion to the honor and interests of Maryland—his fidelity to the constitution—his pure and upright character, and his strong practical sense and judgment, all stamp him as a safer depository of the high trusts he aspires to than the man whose superior talents have been exerted against the honor and welfare of his native State. In the absence of a proper regard for the public faith, and that sound conservatism which seeks to check the mad impulses of popular excitement, great talents only render their possessor more dangerous to the public weal, and for this reason sober, reflecting men will pause and consider well before they clothe with high trusts a man whose "splendid abilities" may be wielded to the destruction of their dearest rights.

MR. THOMAS—AND REPRESENTATION ACCORDING TO TAXATION.

We have charged the Loco Foco candidate for Governor, Mr. P. Francis Thomas, with having advocated the doctrine of "*Representation according to Taxation*" in his late speech at Hagerstown. Some of the Loco Foco journals have denied the *construction* placed upon Mr. Thomas' language by the Whigs, but there has been no denial of the words imputed to Mr. Thomas. In truth it is an undeniable fact that he did use such language. The words were uttered at a public meeting, and the Hagerstown Torch Light refers to Joseph I. Merrick Esq. and other leading Loco Focos of Washington county for the truth of the statement. The friends of Mr. Thomas equivocate and refuse to meet the charge boldly. Mr. Thomas himself cannot, will not deny he said substantially as follows:—

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."

It is true Mr. Thomas has written a letter upon the subject which his friends endeavor to make appear as a positive denial of the charge, but the letter in fact ADMITS THE CHARGE. It will be found in another column, and we ask the reader to examine it carefully and see for himself whether Mr. Thomas does not admit substantially that he is in favor of "Representation according to Taxation." No other construction can be placed upon it. Torture and pervert it as they may, in plain English it amounts to nothing more nor less than "Representation according to Taxation." And no man of intelligence will deny that to carry out such a doctrine it must necessarily lead to "*property qualification.*"

Can the people sustain a man who advocates such odious and anti-republican doctrines? Ye hard-handed sons of poverty and toil, who earn your bread by the sweat of your brows, will you give your suffrages to a man who would deprive you of the dearest right a freeman can boast of? Will the laboring classes sustain by their votes a man who would affix a badge of degradation upon every man who is poor, and deprive him of the right to vote because he is not blessed with a certain amount of property? It cannot be. There is enough public virtue left to break in sunder the shackles of party, and enable the people to spurn the man who under the specious guise of Democracy would deprive them of the most sacred rights they enjoy.

MR. THOMAS—GILL NETS, &c.—Mr. Thomas claims to be a full-blooded Democrat—the peculiar friend of the poor man. If his *professions* are alone to be regarded he does indeed possess a lively sympathy for the man of poverty and toil, but, unfortunately, his *acts* contradict his professions, and shew him to be an oppressor of the poor—a despiser of their rights, and a contemner of their interests. On the 8th of March 1844 a law was enacted by the Legislature of Maryland entitled "An act to preserve the breed of Fish in the waters of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes," which prohibits the placing of "any stakes, piles or other pieces of timber for the purpose of attaching seines or nets thereto, with the view of taking shad or fish of any description" in the waters therein named, under a penalty of fifty dollars. MR. P. FRANCIS THOMAS VOTED FOR THIS LAW, as will be seen by reference to the House Journal 1843, page 449, and by reference to the Senate Journal 1843, page 149, it will be seen that WM. T. GOLDSBOROUGH VOTED AGAINST IT.

Now would it be believed that Mr. Thomas who professes so much regard for the rights and interests of the poor, would vote for a law depriving them of the privilege of catching fish in nets? *The law affects only the very poor.* The rich man can have his *haul seine* and supply himself with fish, but the poor man who is unable to buy a haul seine, yet is able to buy a few pounds of thread and make a *gill net* that will supply himself and his family with fish—he is prohibited from using it, under a penalty of fifty dollars. Have we not indeed reached a nice point in this Democratic age when poor men are prohibited by law from using the only kind of nets they are able to obtain, for the purpose of supplying their families with fish—while those who are able to purchase haul seines are left at liberty to use them as they see proper? How many poor men are there in this Congressional district who own gill nets and who supply their families with fish from them, who are not able to purchase a haul seine, and to whom this law would apply? We know many who toil all day and set their gill nets at night, and next morning procure fish enough to serve their families during the day—perhaps have a few to spare which they can sell to a neighbor. But carry out Mr. Thomas' doctrine, and these men would be denied the privilege, and compelled either to buy fish from their richer neighbors or do without them entirely. And yet this man calls himself a Democrat, and asks the people to elevate him by their votes to the Gubernatorial chair of Maryland. Will the poor man whom he would deprive of the privilege of obtaining a supply of fish from the free waters for his family's use—will he support him? Will he thus sanction and endorse the attempt to deprive his family of one of their means of subsistence? Will he sustain a man who by his vote against the setting of gill nets has in effect said, let the man who is able to have a haul seine fish when and where he pleases, but the poor man who can only afford to have a gill net shall not use that for the purpose of catching fish—and if he dares do it he shall be liable to a fine of fifty dollars for every offence.

THAT RED PATCH.—We wonder if Mr. Goldsborough still thinks that "every poor man ought to have a red patch on his back to distinguish him from a gentleman,' and we wonder whether there is any Whig print in Maryland which will deny that this was a favorite sentiment with his aristocratic Sire, and was so forcibly impressed upon the Son, that water cannot wash it out, nor fire burn it out.

We clip the above from the "Democratic Standard" published in Baltimore, and inform that paper there is a "Whig print in Maryland which will deny that" the above "was a favorite sentiment" with Mr. Goldsborough's sire. We knew his sire, and can bear testimony to his uprightness and integrity as a gentleman and a man of honor.—Such a sentiment is in direct conflict with his character—his hospitality and benevolence knew no difference between rich and poor. The same virtues have descended to his son as every man who knows him can attest. His sire never uttered such a sentiment and the "Standard" well knew the fact. The slander originated in Frederick county, and was at first imputed to a gentleman, who once resided in that county, bearing the name of Goldsborough. For party purposes it has been perverted until it is now ascribed to the father of the Whig Gubernatorial candidate, and before the election it will doubtless be imputed to Wm. T. Goldsborough himself. We wonder if the conscience of the "Standard" sends up no answering veto to the conception and circulation of such vile calumnies upon the dead and the living? Or has he surrendered his soul and body to the keeping of the genius of Loco Focoism? If he is capable of shame his cheek should blister at the recollection of the slanders he has promulgated in regard to the Whig Gubernatorial candidate.

☞REPRESENTATION ACCORDING TO TAXATION.—We publish below the letter of Mr. Thomas in relation to the charge preferred against him of having stated in his Hagerstown speech that he is in favor of "Representation according to Taxation." We ask the careful attention of our readers to this letter. It is all the Whigs desire to sustain the charge against Mr. Thomas, and if there be meaning in language it clearly and unquestionably admits he is in favor of "representation according to taxation," while in no single instance does he deny having used the words imputed to him. Mr. Thomas in his letter says:—

"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.*"

Now we submit it to the intelligence of every man if the above extract from Mr. Thomas' letter does not admit he is in favor of "representation according to taxation." He says the larger counties should possess in the popular branch of the Legislature a greater influence than they now have." And why? Because they are more populous? No. On account of their greater extent of territory? No. But on account of their "*contributions made to the treasury!*" Now what are "contributions" to the treasury but *taxes*? And if the larger counties are represented in the popular branch of the Legislature according to the amount of their "contributions" to the treasury—that is according to the amount of taxes paid by them—would not that be "representation according to taxation?"

But, says Mr. Thomas, I did not advocate "property qualification." No one alleges he did advocate "property qualification" in *terms*. His own words are given, and the Whigs contend that "property qualification" is the necessary result of the doctrine of "representation according to taxation." Mr. Thomas himself furnishes the true construction of his language, and the true results of his doctrine. He says: "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 if a man is to have "influence"—that is votes, for no other meaning can be attached to the term—according to the value of his property, does it not follow as a necessary consequence that he who holds no property will have no "influence"—no vote? If a man who holds property has "influence" according to the value of that property—and the man who holds no property has no "influence," what can you call it but "property qualification?" Is not the effect the same? Where is the distinction between them? Mr. Thomas may deny the *inference* that has been drawn from his language, and may contend it does not mean "property qualification;" but other people have a right as well as himself to judge of the true inference deducible from his remarks. The following is his letter referred to:—

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 refered to, which in the mind of any sensible or honorable man, or one not predisposed to misrepresent, if taken in connexion 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.

CONVENTIONAL REFORM.—Mr. Thomas in his speeches on the Western Shore avows himself a thorough-going advocate of Conventional Reform. The Loco Foco papers in the State are constantly ringing the changes upon this subject, and labor earnestly to convince the people that the present Constitution is defective and needs re-modeling. We have ever doubted their sincerity. We have never believed they desired any change or reform except such as would reform them *in* office and reform Whigs *out*. We have on all occasions ascribed their clamor to a hungering and thirsting after the "spoils" of office, and we have as yet seen no reason to change our opinion. We do not believe the people of Maryland are laboring under any evils for which a new Constitution would supply a remedy—much less do we believe that any that could be devised would better secure the rights of property and person and promote the happiness of the people than the one under which we live. But our opponents profess to think differently, and Mr. Thomas himself regards Conventional Reform as a panacea for all the evils in the body politic. By that means he proposes to relieve the people from the burthens of taxation, and bring about a state of prosperity hitherto unknown to them. And he further says he believes Conventional Reform is the only mode by which can be effected the deliverance of the people from the burthens they are groaning under.

Now is Mr. Thomas honest and sincere in declaring such to be his sentiments? We believe not, and are prepared to establish by his own vote that he is *opposed to Conventional Reform.* On the 10th of January 1844 the House of Delegates, (of which Mr. Thomas was a member) took up for consideration the bill reported by Mr. Cathell entitled "an act to reduce the number of members in the House of Delegates." After various motions to strike out and postpone the bill, "Mr. Weber moved that the bill be recommitted with instructions to the Committee, to report a bill to call a convention to revise the Constitution, and amongst other things establish a system of representation upon a fair and equitable basis." The question was put on the motion of Mr. Weber, and Mr. Thomas *voted against the proposition to call a Convention to revise the Constitution.* See House Journal 1843, pages 78 & 79.

Now if Mr. Thomas be honest in his views in regard to the beneficial effects of Conventional Reform, what excuse can his friends furnish for his vote above referred to? If Mr. Thomas is sincere in saying he believes Conventional Reform is the only mode by which the people can be relieved from the burthens of taxation, what apology can be made for his refusal to lend his aid in relieving them? His friends must answer these questions. The people have a right to know, and they demand to know why Mr. Thomas in 1844 voted against Conventional Reform—the only mode that he says exists by which the people can escape taxation? It is thus his *acts* so positively contradict his *declarations*, and prove that like others of his party he either votes against measures he knows to be proper, or advocates those he knows to be improper.

"L. M. N."—This writer makes his appearance again in the "Democrat" and labors hard to excite public odium against Mr. Goldsborough, the Whig candidate for Governor, for defeating a bill whilst he was in the Senate "relating to the measuring of wood in the city of Baltimore." He expatiates largely upon the vast benefits this bill would have effected for the "wood and boating interests," and charges Mr. Goldsborough with sacrificing the "interests of the people of this County" to "promote the interests of those who by their practices were imposing upon us."—What warrant has this writer for such broad assumptions? For what reason does he say such a bill was "intended and calculated to protect a large and respectable interest of this his native County?" Why simply because the *preamble* to the bill says so! The sections of the bill are overlooked and disregarded, and the mere assumption of the preamble taken for gospel truth. What would be thought of "L. M. N." if he were to rise in a Court of Law and contend that the preamble to a law furnished the true and legitimate construction of that law. We apprehend "L. M. N." values his reputation too highly to place himself in such a ridiculous position. Preambles sometimes assist in getting at the true meaning of laws where the language is ambiguous, but we have yet to learn in what Court the law itself is disregarded and the language of the preamble received as the exclusive criterion of construction. This writer has before involved himself in a similar absurdity in regard to Mr. Thomas' repudiating principles, and one we shall not fail to notice if time and space be spared to us.

If the reader will examine the various sections of the bill which "L. M. N." considers so highly calculated to benefit the "wood and boating interests," he will find that the only change it proposed to effect in the practices of wood sellers and buyers and wood corders, is the *prohibition* it imposes upon wood corders to measure wood in carts, and the *requirement* that all wood carried to the city of Baltimore for sale shall be actually measured before the same shall be sold. The bill required *all wood* to be *measured by wood corders* before it was sold, and if wood sellers had been imposed upon, as the preamble to the bill assumes, "by the imperfect and irregular manner in which the same is measured," this bill afforded them no protection, because, if disposed to impose upon them, the wood corders could have effected their object as easily in measuring wood upon the wharves as in measuring it in carts. The great complaint of wood sellers was that the wood corders in measuring their wood were disposed to favor wood buyers at the expense of the sellers: and it will be perceived at a glance that the bill which "L. M. N." lauds so highly fails entirely to protect wood sellers against the grievances they suffered, because the same impositions could have been practised upon them by the wood corders in measuring wood upon the wharves, as they alleged were practiced upon them in the measurement of wood in carts. This of itself was a sufficient reason why the bill should not become a law—it would in no wise have remedied the evils complained of, and would have subjected wood sellers to greater inconveniences than existed under the old system. But there was another reason why the bill should be rejected. By reference to the Journal of the Senate of December Session 1843, it will be seen that on the 7th March 1844 a law was enacted on this very subject, which fully provided for all the evils complained of, by repealing the necessity of having wood measured by wood corders; but if the bill which "L. M. N." refers to had passed it would *have repealed the first bill,* and made it necessary that all wood should be measured by wood corders before it was sold, because the latter bill came up for consideration *after* the first bill had been passed into a law—it having been rejected on the 9th March 1844. See Senate Journal page 181. The following is the law referred to, and may be found among the laws of December Session 1843, chapter 281:—

An act entitled a further supplement to the act authorizing the appointing of inspectors and wood corders, & to regulate the cording of wood, brought to the city of Baltimore.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland, That from and after the passage of this act, it shall and may be lawful for the vendor or vendors of wood brought to the city of Baltimore by water for sale, to dispose of the same without being measured by the inspectors or corders of wood in said city: *provided,* the purchaser or purchasers thereof agree to the measurement of the said vendor or vendors, and that the inspectors or corders as aforesaid shall have no claim for measurement in such case.

It will be readily perceived from a perusal of the above law that it fully provides for and protects the wood sellers against all the evils they suffered at the hands of wood corders, by leaving it optional with themselves either to measure their own wood or employ a wood corder to do it for them; while the bill which "L. M. N." praises so much would, had it not been defeated by Mr. Goldsborough, have repealed the above law, and still left wood sellers liable to the impositions of wood corders. The bill Mr. Goldsborough defeated, notwithstanding the assumptions of its preamble, was *really* intended to benefit *wood corders*—while the law which passed effectually protects *wood sellers* against the injustice formerly practiced upon them. So far therefore from evincing the least disregard of the interests of boatmen and wood sellers. Mr. Goldsborough's course in this matter shews his true appreciation of the real interests of wood sellers, and in gratitude to him every boatman and wood seller should vote for him. We advise "L. M. N." to continue his researches. We feel greatly indebted to him for furnishing us with this fact so strongly illustrative of Mr. Goldsborough's sagacity, and his disposition to protect the boating interests against the injuries heretofore complained of.

☞Justice to ourself requires a brief notice of the article which appeared in the last "Democrat" over the signature of "B. D. Jackson." Mr. Jackson publishes the result of an interview between himself and Doct. C. C. Cox of Easton, and attempts by his subsequent comments to shew that we exceeded the authority given us by Doct. Cox, and instead of simply denying the "*locality*" of the remarks ascribed to him by Mr. Jackson, we so framed the card as to "have the force of a *full denial* both as to *place* and *fact*."—"*Malignity*" and "embittered feelings" towards B. D. Jackson are the motives he ascribes to us for this alleged perversion of Doct. Cox's intention. All this is mere "stuff and fustian." The card of Doct. Cox reads as follows:—

"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.

The "assertion" which is here pronounced "false and unfounded" may be found in the "Democrat" of the 1st. ult. and reads as follows:—"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." Now it will be perceived that the charge is that Doct. Cox made this statement in *Cambridge,* and what says the card of Doct. Cox?—Does it deny that he made such a statement in *Easton?* No. Does it deny in *general terms* that he made such a statement at all? No. It simply denies that he made such a statement in Cambridge. This was all that was required [illegible]s.—Doct. Cox was charged with having [illegible]d in Cambridge, and the card denied th[illegible] make such a statement *here.* How then does this denial "have the force of a *full denial* both as to *place* and *fact?*" Mr. Jackson complains that we did not *emphasize* the "locality." If we had done so it would have amounted to a virtual admission that Doct. Cox had made such statements elsewhere—a fact that we knew not. How should we know that Doct. Cox made such a statement in the presence of James Ll. Martin and Wm. B. Clarke Esqrs. in Easton. We have not the faculty of *clairvoyance,* to know what statements Dr. Cox makes in Easton. The charge *as made* and *localized* was all we had to repel, and that we met by an authorized denial from Doct. Cox of having made such statements in Cambridge. Mr. Jackson intended to localize the statements in Cambridge—he was so informed, and his object in localizing them here was to shew they had had some effect upon the Dorset delegates to the Barren Creek Convention. He believed at the time he made the charge that Doct. Cox had made the statement in *Cambridge,* and it was not until *after* Doct. Cox's denial appeared that Mr. Jackson learned he had made such statements in *Easton.* The information was a God-send that enabled him to establish the fact of Doct. Cox having made these statements in Easton, and thus to some extent extenuate the falsity of his charge *as made.* The whole matter therefore resolves itself into this: Mr. Jackson *alleges* that Doct. Cox made these statements in *Cambridge,* and puts the allegation in such connexion as to make it appear that it influenced the Dorset delegates to the Barren Creek Convention to vote against Mr. Loockerman, and that they gave these statements as their reason for voting against him. He *proves* that Doct. Cox did make such statements in *Easton* (whether *before* or *after* the Barren Creek Convention it is not stated) to two gentlemen, from whom the Dorset delegates could not have heard it, and upon whom of course it could have had no influence. If this proof establishes the charge *as made* and its *legitimate intendment,* it does so by a system of logic that has never yet been received by Schoolmen.

The imputation to us of "malignity" and "embittered feelings" is entirely gratuitous, and bespeaks the vanity of its putative author in supposing he is of sufficient consequence to excite such emotions. We do not consider him worthy of our hatred. Such venom may rankle in his own perturbed bosom, but there must be some nobleness in the object that excites our "malignity."—The public will readily discern the tergiversation and specious sophistry Mr. Jackson has resorted to for the purpose of extricating himself from the dilemma which his own recklessness involved him in, and in dismissing this subject we feel an abiding confidence that the "public judgment" will condemn his course in making grave charges upon mere *rumor,* and then dragging *private* persons before the public in order to substantiate them.—We have discharged our duty to Mr. Goldsborough and the Whig party—we have shewn that we acted by and within the authority given us by Doct. Cox in writing the card which appeared over his name, and we now leave the whole subject with the people. They will decide for themselves whether Mr. Jackson has substantiated the charges he has made by competent proof, or whether he has not utterly failed to establish his allegations, and been obliged to resort to prevarication and sophistry in order to make out a plausible case of *innocent misapprehension.*

☞Capt. Taylor is raising a company at Frankfort, and Capt. Beard, of Lexington, has reported his company to the Governor.

DIED,

In this town on Sunday night last, JOHN GALE STEELE, in the 25th year of his age.

MR. HAAS, who intends leaving for Easton on Tuesday next, returns his sincere thanks to the Ladies and Gentlemen of Cambridge for their kind patronage, and also for their kindness in expressing their admiration of his daguerreotypes. [Sep. 18, 1847.

SOMETHING INTERESTING TO TAX PAYERS.—Since giving my first Collectors Notice for 1847, I have made an arrangements for the purchase of certain amounts of State Certificates, and I hereby notify the tax payers of Dorchester county that I will allow on their State charges a discount of fifteen cents on the dollar, up to the 27th of this instant. For the convenience of those living in the upper part of the county, I will attend at New Market on Saturday evenings to receive their dues.

KENDAL M. JACOBS,
Sept, 11 3t Col. & Sheriff.