Port Tobacco Times

AND CHARLES COUNTY ADVERTISER.

VOL. XVII. PORT TOBACCO, MD., THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 1861. NO. 40.

ENOCH PRATT BALTO. FREE LIBRARY

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,

BY E. WELLS,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—For one year, if paid in advance or within six months, $1,50; if not paid within six months, $2.00.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.—For plain matter, one dollar per square for the first insertion. For rule and figure matter, two dollars per square for the first insertion. For each insertion after the first, twenty-five cents per square. Twelve lines or less constitute a square. If the number of insertions be not marked on the advertisement, it will be published until forbid and charged accordingly. The privilege of annual advertisers extends *only* to their immediate business.

Announcements of candidates for office, $1.00 per month, to be paid in advance.

Obituaries, tributes of respect, calls upon persons to become candidates, &c., inserted as advertisements, at the usual rates.

Communications, the effect of which is to promote private or individual interests, to be charged for at the rate of 50 cts. per square.

Selected Miscellany.

Religion for the Times.

We adopt the sentiment of a cotemporary, in commending the following article to the careful consideration of all our readers, and if any of them find the hints applicable to their individual case, let them "put it on." It is from a writer in the *Congregationalist*, and he describes a religion which the times require, in sensible, pointed language:

We want a religion that goes into the family, and keeps the husband from being spiteful when the dinner is late, and keeps the dinner from being late—keeps the wife from fretting when the husband tracks the newly-washed floor with his muddy boots, and makes the husband mindful of the scraper and the door-mat—keeps the mother patient when the baby is cross, and keeps the baby pleasant—amuses the children as well as instructs them—wins as well as governs—projects the honey-moon into the harvest-moon, and makes the happy hours like the eastern fig tree, bearing in its bosom at once the beauty of the tender blossom and the glory of the ripened fruit. We want a religion that bears heavily, not only on the exceeding sinfulness of sin, but on the exceeding rascality of lying and stealing—a religion that banishes small measures from the counters, small baskets from the stalls, pebbles from the cotton bags, clay from paper, sand from sugar, chicory from coffee, otter from butter, beet juice from vinegar, alum from bread, stychnine from wine, water from milkcans, and buttons from the contribution box.

[illegible] will not put all the big strawberries at the top, [illegible] at the bottom. It will not offer more baskets of foreign wines than the vineyards ever produced bottles, and more barrels of flour than all the wheat fields of New York grow, and her mills grind.—It will not make one-half of a pair of shoes of good leather, and the other of poor leather, so that the first shall redound to the maker's credit, and the second to his cash. It will not put Gouvin's stamp on Jenkins' kid gloves, nor make Paris bonnets in the back rooms of a Boston milliner's shop, nor let a piece of velvet that professes to measure twelve yards, come to an untimely end in the tenth, or a spool of sewing silk that vouches for twenty yards, to be nipped in the bud at fourteen and a half, nor the cotton thread spool break to the yard-stick fifty of the two hundred yards of promise that was given to the eye, nor yard-wide cloth measure less than thirty-six inches from selvedge to selvedge, nor all wool delaines, and all linen handkerchiefs be amalgamated with clandestine cotton, nor coats made of woolen rags pressed together, be sold to the unsuspecting public for legal broadcloth.—It does not put bricks at five dollars per thousand, into chimneys it contracted to build of seven dollars materials, nor smuggle white pine floors that have paid for hard pine, nor leave yawning cracks in closets, where boards ought to join, nor daub the ceilings that ought to be smoothly plastered, nor make window-blinds with slats that cannot stand the wind, and paint that cannot stand the sun, and fastenings that may be looked at but are on no account to be touched.

The religion which is to sanctify the world, pays its debts. It does not consider that forty cents returned for one hundred cents given, is according to law. It looks upon a man who has failed in trade, and who continues to live in luxury, as a thief. It looks upon a man who promises to pay fifty dollars on demand, with interest, and who neglects to pay it on demand, with or without interest, as a liar.

[We think if about several dozen of our subscribers had some of the above mentioned commodity, our pockets would be heavier and our hearts lighter than has been the case for about as long a time as we can well remember.—ED.]

PEARLS OF THOUGHT.—It is a good rule always to back your friends and face your enemies.

Do not be deceived by a facile exterior. Tender men sometimes have strong wills.

It is a pretty saying of Thales, that falsehood is just as far distant from truth as the ears are from the eyes.

Say nothing, do nothing, which a mother would not approve, and you are on a certain road to happiness.

☞ The following is an exact copy of a notice posted up in a New Jersey town:

Lost—a calf red. He had a white spot on one of his behind legs. He was a she-calf.—I will give three dollars to everybody what will bring him home.

☞ A bachelor editor who has a pretty sister, recently wrote to another bachelor equally fortunate: "Please exchange."

The Crisis.

[BY REQUEST.]

Truths Struck from a Blacksmith's Anvil.

PORT DEPOSIT, January 17, 1861.

Hon. John C. Legrand:

SIR: These are perilous times, and among others of our distinguished and respected citizens, you have assumed to offer your advice in regard to them. This is proper and but a part of the discharge of the duty which you owe to your State. "As one of your (very humble) fellow-citizens," I conclude that the discharge of my duty to "the State of my birth" is as obligatory upon me as yours is upon you. Feeling my responsibility then, as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Maryland, I deem it my privilege, if not my duty to oppose some of your views as they appear in your published letter in the Baltimore *Sun* of the [illegible] inst. It is true that your letter was addressed to Hon. Reverdy Johnson, and not to me; nevertheless, it was put forth for public benefit, and is therefore a public property. Therefore, it is my business, as one of the people, very respectfully, to examine your position. In the first place you censure Mr. Johnson for not having proposed a plan for the adjustment of our national difficulties, and yet throughout your long letter, you make no proposition of the kind yourself. You think that Mr. Johnson ought to have "lifted himself above the mere rhetoric of the ordinary political declaimer, and to have pointed out some plan of reconciliation for the adoption of those who value the Constitution." Let me ask, my dear sir, who you mean by "those who value the Constitution?" Do you mean Mr. Johnson and those brave and heroic men all over our country who are fighting so nobly for *its* preservation and that of "the *Union* which it made?" From the tenor of your language I judge you do not. Do you then mean those men (abolitionists and traitors) of the North, and those men (secessionists and traitors) of the South who have been and are now moving heaven and earth and hell to *overthrow that Constitution and to destroy that "Union which it made?"* There are, sir, but the two classes, *patriots* and *traitors*, and both classes will be found more or less in every State in our Union. In the great majority of States the former class largely predominates, while in a small minority of the States the latter seem to predominate. [illegible] these class[illegible]

Now, sir, which of the men who are now in open rebellion against the Federal Government, and who have *determined to put down the Constutution and the laws*, certainly do not "value the Constitution." If they do, they have a strange way of testing that value! No, sir, the man or set of men who will raise their hands to disjoint this Union and to strike down our temple of liberty, together with the best hopes of humanity throughout the world, do not "value the Constitution," but do hate it and have so declared. But the other class (patriots) are the men who "value the Constitution and the Union which it made."

And I may be permitted here, without flattery to Mr. Johnson, to recognize him as one of the "most distinguished" of those men. His great speech, to which your letter is a reply, or which is rather *intended* to be a reply, is enough to give Mr. Johnson, if he had never said another word for his country, a lofty position among the real patriots and benefactors of our great Republic. I, and I may say the great mass of the free citizens of Maryland, will not be able to find the first symptoms of "clap trap," as you say, in that speech. From end to end it is a succession of powerful sentences, big with truth, logic and patriotism!

You say that those "who composed the great meeting at which Mr. Johnson spoke are again dispersed," and you ask "how it tended in any way to settle our difficulties?" I should think your acknowledged sagacity would enable you to see the tendency of the expression of public sentiment at that meeting is on the side of the Constitution, and if you will look over the broad acres of our noble old Commonwealth, you will see that in every town and hamlet there has been just such an expression of public sentiment as was manifested at the great Baltimore meeting, and, sir, you will acknowledge that if this public sentiment does not tend to adjust "our difficulties" according to the *extreme* ideas of some, that it does tend to prove that our good old State is not going to be driven out of the Union by Abolitionists of the North or dragged out of it by Secessionists of the South. It proves that our people know no North, no South, no East, no West under the Constitution, and that they will not surrender their constitutional liberties for any prospective monarchy, such as is now in Southern embryo! Your assertion, that the great Union meeting was a "*ridiculus mus*," cannot be sustained!—You ask—"What said the meeting on the all-important question whether, with their consent and approval, Southern cities should be demolished and conflagrated, and Southern homes made desolate by the slaughter of fathers and brothers—their natural protectors?" Now, my dear sir, you know that "question" was not before the meeting! If you, sir, had have put 'that question' before that meeting there would not have been among the assembled thousands a single man, I think, who would have answered in the affirmative. I have attended several Union meetings and have never heard that question brought up; nor do I think it likely that it will be. As for "the humiliation and subjugation of our Southern brethren," the people of Maryland will never acknowledge. No, sir, our subjugation cannot be accomplished either by abolitionists of the North or the secessionists of the South. [illegible] cannot be done, sir; we do not value our blood-bought liberty and independence at so low an estimate as that.

You think that "those who are not with the secessionists are against them." That is certainly a very plain proposition and one that will apply as well in a *bad* cause as in a *good* one. Your reference to the murder of Messrs. Gorsuch and Kennedy, of Maryland, in Pennsylvania, does not justify rebellion in South Carolina. If it justifies rebellion anywhere, it is in Maryland, for the citizens murdered, as you say, were respected and honored sons of our State. We have not asked South Carolina to redress our wrongs with other people, and if we did, it is doubtful if she would respond. Maryland has always been a tower of protection for South Carolina against Northern fanaticism, and as a testimony of her gratitude for this protection, she wishes to dissolve our Union and compel us to fight her battles here on the frontier, and thus have our "homes made desolate by the slaughter of our fathers and our brothers" and our friends! Your historical references to "Peggy Stewart" and the respective "tea parties" will hardly be regarded as argumentative or as tending to "settle our difficulties;" neither will your analogy of the intolerable oppression heaped upon the colonies by the Crown of Great Britain, and that heaped upon South Carolina by the North, be admitted. It was not the *people* of England that the Colonies resisted, because it was not them that oppressed the Colonies. It was the British Government that did it.

Here, however, we find that our National Government has never, in a single act, oppressed the South or any portion of our Republic, but that it has, on the other hand, been a common protector of all! Why, then, is South Carolina in open rebellion against the Constitution and the General Government? If my memory serves me right, our great Revolution was not the result of imaginary wrongs inflicted upon our people, nor did they complain especially on account of grievous taxation. They declared that "taxation *without representation* was tyranny!" That was the great principle. And now let me ask you if this is the principle for which South Carolina is contending? Has she not been represented? Has she not stood in the Senate of the United States with a voice equally potent to that of New York? and that while her white population does not rival New York, [illegible] population of nearly four millions? Has not even her slaves, which she regards as property, been represented on the floors of Congress? The property of Northern men is not *represented* in Congress. I do not, my dear sir, mention these things to signifying that they should be otherwise, but rather to show that there is really no analogy between the grievances of the American Colonies and those of South Carolina, and to show that every question has at least *two* sides to it. Had the Government of England been to our American Colonies what our Government has been to the South, as well as to every other portion of our country, this day *might* have found us still under the British crown. At all events, there never would have been any rebellion against a *Government which never did us any harm*. Where, now, sir, is your similitude between the American Colonies and South Carolina?

You say that the doings at Washington justify you in saying that the Constitution is to be pushed aside, and that in its stead a military despotism is to be erected! As a candid man, do you see any indications of this? There are but about *seventy* Federal troops in the whole State of South Carolina! and the Government only intended to put about two hundred and fifty more there, and that not for the purpose of "demolishing Southern cities" and setting fire to the ruins, but to protect property that belongs to you and me as well as to any citizen in South Carolina.

You cannot see any symptom of a "military despotism" in our Federal Government. If it were so, you would not now see nearly all our Southern fortifications, which belong to the Federal Government, together with all the public property in the Southern States, in the hands of those who have rebelled! No, sir, to use a domestic phrase, "the boot is on the other leg!"

Whoever will open his eyes cannot fail to see that a military despotism is brewing in the South. Have not leading *secessionists proclaimed* that they intended, and do intend, to have a military despotism? or what is the same, "a Consolidated Military Government?" South Carolina is said to have more troops *now* than has the United States Government scattered all over the continent! Where, then, sir, is your "military despotism? A "military despotism" may suit the people of South Carolina, and however much it may conflict with the Constitution of the United States, they are welcome to one for my part, but I think there are too many free white men in old Maryland ever to submit to one. But if our Union is permanently dissolved, how are we to get clear of that military despotism which you deprecate? It cannot be done. Instead of ten or fifteen thousand troops, as we now have, to guard our Western frontier, we *must* have, when divided and subdivided, hundreds of thousands of a standing army (in the aggregate) to defend our little garden spots. And let me here say, that if such a terrible evil does befall us, those who are *responsible* will have to stand from under!

And you think our Governor is very wrong in not convening our Legislature? How is this? do you think it is the wish of the people of Maryland that *their* Legislature shall be immediately called? or that they did wish it at any time previous to this bring the crisis? If you do, you must have a method of obtaining information that others do not understand. I have not seen a single statement where any *public* expression has justified your conclusion. But on the contrary, the Governor is sustained, as far as outward expression is concerned, by proclamation! You certainly would not desire an extra session of the Legislature against the wishes of the people. That would be too much like a "military despotism," which you so much dread. If you can revolutionize and change the opinions of the people, so as to have them *in favor* of an extra session, then it will be time to censure the Governor if he does not second the call of the people, but do not blame him for doing that which he is sworn to do and which he must do conscientiously. If he is in error, then it is very evident that the people are in error, and you will surely not demand (*yet*) that a minority, and a very small one at that, shall rule in Maryland, even though the majority should be all wrong and the minority all right. No sir, we must have the "military despotism," before that principle can be applied!

While I think of it, sir, let me here note the reference you made to the generous people of South Carolina in furnishing contributions of rice to feed the Massacusetts troops on during the Revolution. That certainly was a commendable act, and I note it with great pleasure (for I like gratitude.) that a resolution has been introduced in the Legislature of Massachusetts, providing for an appropriation to buy provisions to send to South Carolina for the relief of the poor! Thus you see, when Massachusetts was in rebellion and was needy, South Carolina sent her rice. Now, South Carolina is in rebellion and needy, and Massachusetts is willing to send her provisions. The resolution did not specify the kind of provisions. Perhaps the Yankees will send fish! That South Carolina is needy is beyond question—as it would be unfair to think that a State of her chivalry and dignity would ask the United States to pay her contingent expenses, and ask or beg a few postage stamps on trust, unless she was absolutely in need! She is in open rebellion against the United States Government, and she is not at war with Massachusetts. [illegible] and therefore seem to require a less exercise of independence and dignity to receive a gratuitous donation from Massachusetts, [illegible] beg favors from the United States Government. It is true, sir, South Carolina is making a great swaggering bravadiy, but if you will reflect for a moment, you will see that she is doing it all at the expense of Uncle Sam! She is using his guns and amunition, and she is eating his bread and meat! She has taken from him nearly all of his provisions, and because he keeps a big bone (Sumter) for himself, she is going to break things!

But, sir, you think that in order to "settle our difficulties" it will be *absolutely necessary* for the United States to withdraw her seventy men from South Carolina.—Now, sir, let me ask you a question, and I assure you I do it with proper respect. I ask you as a man highly distinguished in jurisprudence. Do you acknowledge, that what is *called* the public property of the United States, which is situated in South Carolina, belongs to the United States Government? If you do not, do you acknowledge that Fort McHenry belongs to the United States Government? If you do, and I think you do, what claim has the United States Goverment on Fort McHenry that she has not on Fort Moultrie? The Federal Government has bought the grounds on which both of these forts stand, and at the public expense, has built these forts. If, therefore, you grant the Government the right to send troops to Fort McHenry, how is it that you deny it that right in Fort Moultrie? All fortifications were built by our General Government, by *authority of all the States* for the common defence. And if you exclude the Government from one you may, I should think, upon the same principle, expel *it from all!* If it is *right* to kick a man out of his own house, you may extend this right and kick him out of his yard and to the dogs! Let me put the question in another shape. If a party of men wished to get possession of my own house, would you as a judge and professor of the law as you are, advise me to take my family and abandon my house, in order to negotiate with this party, and in order to keep them out of it? Such advice would be strange from a man justly eminent in logical science, and certainly would not be taken by me if given. My own crude notion of law and justice would compel me to fortify myself in my own citidel, and to defend my fireside to the last. And the Federal Government has the same right to its own property that an individual has, and can so defend it to the last extremity, I am not, sir, a graduate at the "bar," nor do I know anything about jurisprudence, but my patrons say that I am a "tip top" blacksmith, and I have the vanity to think that I can do a good job, but it is my humble opinion that South Carolina manifests great impudence at the present time in indicating to the United States Government as to the possession of its own property.

And you say, that to discuss the right of secession now, will be productive of no good! When will it answer to discuss it? Shall we discuss it when South Carolina "drags" some six or eight Southern States out with her? Your insinuation that South Carolina has a right to secede because the American Colonies had a right to do so, does not hold good. I have before showed wherein there is no analogy. I will now show another essential difference. There happened to be three thousand miles of water *between* the American Colonies and England, while there is just nothing between South Carolina and the United States. The right of secession is so utterly repugnant and so entirely at war with the interests of the people of the United States, and so pre-eminently ridiculous, that it does seem "unprofitable" to discuss it. Sir, it is a self-evident contradiction.

You have become acquainted with the Monroe doctrine and the Ostend Manifesto, and I suppose you endorse them. If so, how do they agree with secession? If we pay Spain one hundred millions of dollars to-day for Cuba and make a sovereign State of her, can she secede and go back to Spain to-morrow? or even next year? Will you admit that the Territory of Kansas has a right to secede? If not, why not? Is it because she is the property of the United States? Yes, sir, that is a very good reason. Very well, if she is admitted in a few days by Congress into the Union as a State, will she be any less the property of the United States? and can she then secede and join Mexico? I should think that the act of admitting would tend more firmly to *unite* her with the Union—that the change of relationship would be attractive and not repulsive. It will not do to say that South Carolina can secede, while we deny the same right to Cuba and Kansas, for you know the great doctrine of the South and of all *national* men, is the "equality of the States!"

But, sir, there is no such word as "*secede*" in Uncle Sam's vocabulary. If our glorious Confederacy is broken up, it will not be done by good men upon any principle of right, but it will be done by bad men, upon the principle (if it has any) of *high treason!* The whole plan of secession, is a deliberate conspiracy against the people of the United States, to break up their Government and to establish a "military despotism on the ruins of this once powerful and happy Union!" The programme, sir, was concocted long ago by traitors to humanity, but was not generally known until it was proclaimed in the breaking up of the great National Democratic party in South Carolina. I would like to say a few words on the character and powers of civil Government, but I have already said more than I intended to say. I find my letter is getting too long, and will therefore bring it to a close by joining you "in love for the Union and its preservation under the Constitution." "I have written hastily," too, and under [illegible] unfavorable circumstances. You [illegible] pardon me if I have omitted anything that ought to have been said.

With great respect and esteem, I have the honor to be, your very humble servant,

JAMES TOUCHSTONE.

A REMINISCENCE OF 1775.

GEORGE TOWN, D. C., Jan. 1, 1861.

MR. WELLS,—*My Dear Sir:* Your excellent paper I have taken and read regularly for many years, with great satisfaction and pleasure, as it has kept me in fresh memories of my native county, that like a Scotsman I love so well, my relatives, its business and its people. I have not resided, or rather, have been absent from it for more than *thirty* long years, during which, in the course of nature, almost an entire generation have passed away, and, who once, knew every body in the county, know personally, hardly any one, save perhaps a few gray-headed old men like myself, and a few gray-headed old negro servants, who open wide their eyes when they see me, and wonder "if dat can be massa Walter."

At the burning of the Library of the U. States Capitol some years ago, a great many valuable books, maps, manuscripts, &c., were destroyed. At that time, as the chief of the Division of Claims in the Third Auditor's office of the U. S. Treasury, I had under my direction a very worthy gentleman from Springfield, Massachusetts, who was afterwards silly enough to become an Abolitionist, by which he lost his situation, for which I was very sorry, for except this crochet of "niggerism," he was a remarkably estimable and worthy man. Coming by the smoking mine of the destruction of the Library, he observed a large pile of smouldering burned books and papers, and being of a curious literary turn, he extracted from the heap a large book, minus only the outside cover, and a few of the first and last pages. This burnt and mutilated volume, the next morning (it having been made a present to him by the watchman in charge) he laid upon my table, as a literary curiosity, and carelessly turning over the half bound leaves, I discovered what I herewith enclose, and which I immediately copied. It is, as you will see, an account of a public meeting of the best citizens of my dear old native county, at a time of public danger more than eighty-five years ago, which I respectfully request that you will publish as most opportunely and appropriate in these times of revolution and public peril now.—Let the gallant people of old Charles county see what their fathers and grandfathers did in former times of political peril, far less in my opinion than the present, and have their blood stirred and their hearts fired by their noble example. Charles county has been called the "cradle of the Revolutionary war," and certainly sent more soldiers, in proportion to population into that intrepid "Maryland Line," than any other county in the then thirteen Colonies. The bones of her brave children are at this moment mouldering away in the bosom of most of the original States. Long Island saw them bayonetted by the Hessians and the English. Camden and Eutaw, saw them standing sternly up, not with their fingers upon triggers in distant fight, but man to man, looking their enemies in the face, and though overpowered and outnumbered, *steadily* and *unflinchingly* plying the bayonet. When Northern fanaticism, *intermedling*, and inciting servile insurrection brings forth the occasion, the sons of my dear, gallant native county, will do as their fathers did before them.—The *cold steel* and the savage arms of battle will then have no terrors to them.

About the list of the names of the meeting of the 12th of September, 1775, more than eighty-five years ago—all, long ago, gone to "that bourne from whence no traveller returns," I wish to address to their descendents a few inquiries, and I hope, Mr. Editor, they will be answered and thereby make your paper, for the next six months, the most interesting of any in the United States.

Of the names that I send you, who was *William Smallwood, Kinneman Trueman Stoddert* and *John Gwinn?* Let Major John Trueman Stoddert, who for so many years has led public opinion by his talents, experience and wisdom, answer. Who was *Thomas Stone*, the signer of the Declaration of Independence, and *John Hoskin Stone*, the commander of one of the famous regiments of the Maryland Line and afterwards Governor of the State? Let Major William B. Stone, General Walter Mitchell and Frederick Stone, Esq., answer. Who was *Robert Sennett?* Let the honorable and respected Robert Sennett Reeder answer. Indeed, let the descendants of all these honorable and distinguished names, tell through your paper, who their ancestors were.

For myself, I claim kinship with many of them, and to show my title to such kinship, Mr. Editor, I subscribe myself, for *the first time in my life, with my full name.*

Most respectfully, yours,

WALTER HANSON STONE TAYLOR,

a native of Charles County, and born on Poynton Manor.

Meeting of the Inhabitants of Charles County, Maryland.

At a meeting of the Inhabitants of Charles County, at the Court House in Port Tobacco Town, on Tuesday, the 12th day of September, 1775, Daniel Jenifer, John Dent, Robert T. Hooe, *William Smallwood*, Samuel Hanson, (son of Samuel,) *John H. Stone*, and William Harrison, members of the late Convention, attended, when the people proceeded to choose thirty-two persons for a Committee of Observation, agreeably to a resolve of the late Provincial Convention, and the following gentlemen were elected, to wit: Francis Ware, Josias Hawkins, *William Smallwood, George Dent*, Robert T. Hooe, Samuel Hanson, jun., Benjamin Philpot, John [illegible] Thomas Hanson Marshall, Zephaniah Turner, Richard Barnes, Joseph H. Harrison, *John H. Stone*, William Harrison, Thomas Simms, Harrison Dent, Samuel Love, Bennett Dyson, Joshua Saunders, Richard Speake, THOMAS STONE, Alexander McPherson, jun., Samuel Hanson of Samuel, Walter H. Jenifer, Robert Sennett, Daniel Janifer, Charles S. Smith, and Henry Smith Hawkins, or any seven or more of them, to be a Committee of Observation for this County for the term of one year. And immediately after the said election, the following five gentlemen were chosen by ballot to represent this County in Provincial Convention, for the term of one year, to wit: *William Smallwood*, Francis Ware, Josias Hawkins, *Thomas Stone*, and Robert T. Hooe.

At a meeting of the Committee for *Charles County*, on the 27th of September, 1775. *William Smallwood*, Esq., in the Chair, and John Gwinn, Esq., Clerk; Messrs. *William Smallwood*, Francis Ware, Josias Hawkins, George Dent, Samuel Hanson, jun., John Dent, and Warren Dent, were chosen by ballot, to license suits, in this county, agreeably to an order of the late Convention, and Messrs. Robert T. Hooe, Daniel Jenifer, *John Hoskins Stone*, Walter H. Jenifer, and Zephaniah Turner, were chosen a Committee of Correspondence.

At the same time, the Committee appointed Messrs. Robert T. Hooe, Samuel Love, and Samuel Hanson, to receive gifts and contributions, agreeably to a Resolve of the Provincial Convention.

Resolved, That this Committee *unanimously* accord to the Resolutions of the late Provincial Convention, held at Annapolis on the 26th of July last, and will, so far forth, as lies in their power, carry the same into execution.

Whereas, great numbers of executions have issued and may continue to issue on judgments obtained against many of the inhabitants of this county, to the great vexation of some, and the ruin of others, who have it not in their power to pay their just debts at this time of general stoppage of our trade, when their effects would not command money at half value, were they offered at public or private sale; and as much distress, disorder and ruin may happen, before the Provincial Convention can have the particular situation of this county, under their consideration, and grant relief, we think it our duty in the meantime, to apply such remedies for the ease and quiet of the people as seem to us most just and reasonable. Therefore,

Resolved, That where executions are already served, and the debtors cannot pay the debt, or supercede, of which the committee for licensing suits shall judge, the debtor ought then to offer to the creditor the best security in his power, before the aforesaid Committee, which, if the creditor, unreasonably refuse, they are then, to direct the sheriff of the county to enlarge the debtor, at the risk of the creditor;

That the Committee for licensing suits, immediately give notice to the sheriff to return all such executions, as he has not already served, to the creditor, or persons who put them into his hands, and desire them to order a return of command thereon, unless they can show cause to the said Committee why, without oppression, they may be served;

That it be recommended to the Clerk of this County to deliver no execution on any judgment already obtained, without leave of the Committee aforesaid, that if any execution on judgment obtained in the Provincial Court should hereafter come to the hands of the sheriff, he is hereby desired not to serve the same, but give notice to the creditor or creditors, or person or persons, who put the same into his hands to countermand or appear as aforesaid, and show cause why, without oppression, such execution may be served. Signed by order,

JOHN GWINN, Clerk.