it appear that Mr. Grason their candidate for Governor, was one of this class, and yet, these very consistent gentlemen unite heartily in his support.

From the Boston Atlas:

CONTEMPT OF COURT.—RIGHTS OF THE PRESS.

A case of alleged contempt of court which has recently occurred in Baltimore has excited much interest in that city, and is well worthy of attention throughout the Union.

Our readers may possibly recollect the murder in Baltimore, of a Mr. Stewart a month or two since, an account of which was copied into our columns, together with a statement of certain facts and circumstances going to charge the crime upon a son of the murdered man. The subject was freely discussed in the Baltimore papers of the day; great horror was excited at the enormity of the supposed offence; and a bill of indictment was found by the grand jury against the unhappy young man thus charged by the newspapers with this fearful crime of patricide. The indictment came on for trial; but on application of the prisoner's counsel the case was postponed to the next term of the court.

Subsequently to this postponment, Josiah Bayly, jr. Esq. counsel for the prisoner, caused the following card to be published in the Baltimore Sun.

[We omit here the card of Mr. Bayly, as it has already appeared twice in our columns, and the majority of our readers are presumed to be familiar with its contents.—Eds. Chron.]

In consequence of this publication, and by the procurement of one Mr. Richardson, who rejoices in the appellation of Deputy Attorney General for the city of Baltimore, a rule was served upon Mr. Bayly to show cause why an attachment for contempt should not issue against him, for having written and published the above article.

To this rule, Mr. Bayly put in the following answer:

'In the matter of Josiah Bayly, jr. Esq'r, Baltimore city court—Rule to shew cause why attachment should not issue against him.'

The answer of Josiah Bayly, jr., to the rule of this court of the 14th inst. to shew cause why an attachment should not issue against him for a contempt for having written and caused to be published in a paper called the Sun, an address to the citizens of Baltimore; dated the 13th of the same month, having relation to the trial of a cause then pending in the said court, respectfully states to the court that he admits the writing and publishing of the said address, and that his sole design in the publication was to subside the great popular prejudice which he was informed and believed, was entertained against the accused, William Stewart, and which threatened if not quieted, to deprive him of a fair & impartial trial, of the high crime of which he stands charged in this court. The Respondent had seen some, and he had heard of other statements in the press of this city not only purporting to give an account of the circumstances attending and following the murder of Benjamin Stewart, but expressing in decided terms an opinion of the guilt of his client, and he had witnessed with alarm, (he believing as he then did and now does, in the innocence of his client,) the great excitement produced by these statements, upon the public mind.

As far as he was or is yet advised, these publications were supposed to pass without judicial censure, and in his effort, now made the subject of the present rule to arrest this excitement, and produce a quiet in the popular feeling, he supposed, so far from interfering illegally with the course of public justice, he was only doing an act which was alike demanded by professional duty and common humanity. If, however, the law has been violated by his publication, which however' he by no means admits, and in his opinion he has the sanction of other counsels than his own he owes it not less to himself than to this court to say that his error has been one of opinion and not of intention, for he gives this court to be informed that in the publication complained of in the rule, he had no idea of committing a contempt of this court, or in any way influencing the administration of justice in the trial of the case referred to against William Stewart, or in any other particular, and he prays therefore to be hence dismissed.

REVERDY JOHNSON.
Attorney for Respondent.

Sworn to in open court, by Respondent, this 21st July, 1838.

Teste, WM. M. MEDCALFE,
Clerk Baltimore City Court.

When the case came on for argument, Mr. deputy Attorney General for the city of Baltimore, retailed a quantity of those old fashioned absurdities, by which certain judges, imbued with the spirit of Jeffries and Scroggs, have attempted to impose upon all men a profound silence touching the doings of courts of law; as though in those doings, there were some sacred and holy mystery, at the contemplation of which, the citizens were to bow in silence, without daring to gainsay or even to doubt. Mr. Bayly on the other hand, and, his able counsel, Reverdy Johnson, totally denied the power of the court to found any proceedings for contempt upon the publication in question. They denied that the power to punish for contempt extended to any thing which did not directly impede the proceedings of the court, and least of all to publications in the newspapers. This power of punishing for contempt, they said, in its nature a most arbitrary, and, therefore odious power, was the creation of necessity, and extended no further than that necessity, viz to the preservation of order and decorum in and about the court, essential to its regular and comfortable procedure in the discharge of its functions. If Mr. Bayly had committed any offence, it was not a contempt but a libel. They wholly denied, however, that there was any thing in the least libellous in the publication made by him; inasmuch as it merely consisted in the expression of his opinion and belief that his client was innocent, the finding of the grand jury to the contrary notwithstanding.

After this argument, the court, with that miserable tenacity characteristic of mean spirits and narrow understandings, anxious to vindicate a claim of arbitrary power, which however, they have not the courage to enforce, rendered the following extraordinary judgment and opinion.

State vs. Josiah Bayly, jr.

The Court entertained no doubt of its power, on fit occasions, to proceed by attachment, technically called attachment for contempt, and think the Attorney for the State was right in bringing this case to their notice. The publication in question, unaccompanied with any other explanation of the writer's meaning, that appears on the face of the paper, certainly conveys at least an implied censure on those whose duty it was to investigate the facts connected with the late murder, and particularly on the grand jury, whose especial duty it was to diligently and carefully to examine the testimony, and exhibit the charge—and had the defence rested here, the court would have been justified in treating it as an illegal interference with the regular course of justice; but being satisfied, from the traverser's answer, on oath, as also from his public declaration in court, that he had no intention in making the address, to convey any imputation on the grand jury, or other member of the court in any manner to embarrass the proceedings in relation to the trial now pending, but was actuated solely by a desire to do away prejudices he tho't existed unfavorable to his client, (although it does not amount to a justification of the offence,) inclines the court to suspend further proceedings. The rule is therefore discharged without costs.

Against the doctrine set forth in the above opinion of the honorable city court of Baltimore, we beg leave on behalf of the people and the press, to enter our serious protest and remonstrance.

It is quite time for judges, courts, and juries, whether grand or petit, to understand and know that they are only the agents and servants of the people for the administration of justice, and responsible to the people, fully and directly, like all other public servants, for the wisdom and impartiality with which they discharge their respective functions. This responsibility can only be enforced through the press. These functionaries, as much as any others, need to have constantly before their eyes the wholesome dread, of a public discussion of their proceedings; and this doctrine that judges and juries are infallible, and that no man shall question or examine their decisions, is worthy only of the High Commission and the Star Chamber. It is totally out of place in the magistrates of a free and intelligent people, and as Mr. Johnson, in the course of his argument justly observed, any attempt to enforce such a doctrine in communities like ours, would be a sure and rapid means of bringing the whole system for the administration of justice into hatred and contempt.

The parliament of England contended long against the publication of its debates and proceedings. This secrecy was the cover and concealment of all sorts of intrigues, inconsistencies, and corruptions.—The free publication of parliamentary proceedings, and the full and unrestrained discussion of them by the press, has done more, by the confession of all men, whether whigs or tories, to raise the character of parliament, to compel public men to pay attention to the dictates of justice and to regulate their conduct with some tolerable respect to fairness, reason and consistency, than all other causes put together.

Publicity is and will be equally beneficial in courts of law. The temptations of judges, and jurors, are even greater and more insinuating if possible, than those of public men How many partialities, prejudices, antipathies, to say nothing of direct or indirect personal interests, are liable to bias their decrees? How necessary is it that they should act under the impression that the keen, cold, watchful, suspicious eye of the public press is upon them ready to detect their slightest deviation from the path of justice? How necessary is it that they should know that their whole conduct and motives are liable at any time to be cast into the fiery furnace of public discussion, out of which nothing but the pure gold can come unscorched?

All this may not, in all cases, be so agreeable to judges and jurors themselves.—There are we know—

——A sort of men whose visages
Do cream and mantle like a standing pond;
And do a *wilful stillness* entertain,
With purpose to be dressed in an opinion
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit;
As who should say, *I am Sir Oracle,*
And when I ope my lips let no dog bark!

Such men we know there are; but such men are totally unfit to be either judges or jurors, in a community which acknowledges neither personal nor official infallibility; & where the better reason, and the stronger argument is held to be the only true criterion of justice.

That impartial and capable judges, or that intelligent and fair-minded jurors will ever suffer from the public discussion of their acts, there is not the slightest danger; and on the other hand, if folly, incapacity and prejudice be held up to merited contumely, will not truth, justice and impartiality be in the end the gainers?

Communications.

For the Chronicle.

Messrs Editors.—It is really amusing to see how the Van Burenites of this county attempt to equivocate about certain measures, and how they dodge certain questions. When the primary school law was first brought into notice, a great majority of the Van Burenites raised a most alarming hue and cry about its odious feature, &c. and to have judged from some of their countenances you would have thought they were about to leave this mundane sphere; and one of the greatest alarmists was the editor of the Aurora. The colums of that paper teemed with objections to, and criticisms upon, that law. But why is the scene so changed? Why is there such a death-like silence preserved at this time about the matter? The question is easily answered. At the time the editor of the Aurora was pronouncing his maledictions upon that measure, some of his political friends waited on him and informed him that he must desist from his complaints—that the law was popular, and it would be impolitic to say any thing more against it. Like one, who is in the habit of being moved by wires and leading strings he obeyed.

The Van Buren candidate for the state Senate raised his *Herculean voice* against that measure, until he discovered that it wa a very popular one, especially in Parson's Creek district, and he then authorized a friend to let the people know that he was favorable to the law.—This is another of his political *shifts*, and I might say *slips*, and a fair specimen of the chamelion like principles of that party. They ara governed by interest and not by principle. They profess to be guided by the motto of "principles and measures, and men by their principles," but in truth they follow the adage adopted by the great Mogul at Washington, "we change with the times." As to the editor of the Aurora, I am at a loss even to *conjecture* what his principles are.—He keeps such a wonderful skipping about, that you had as well attempt to hold an eel fresh from the water, as to confine him to one point. He can be very properly compared to a flea. You see him, put your finger on him, as you think, sqeeze him, remove your finger to behold your prize, but he is where? Gone and boring away at something else. With all his powers of evasion if he does not keep a sharp lookout, he will be caught, and when he is he will be very uneasy for a short time.

If it is not out of place, I will inform you, there is an awful note of preparation in the Loco Foco camp. Their forces are marshalling to the soul stirring gurgle of the bottle and the agreeable scent of ginger cakes. Instead of arms ammunition, and uniforms, you behold broken bottles, mutilated gingers, and fragments of the Aurora. All is bustle and confusion. The soldiers have gotten their spirits up, by pouring spirits down. Liquor flows in profusion, and the Loco Foco's consider it as virtuous as the waters of the Lethe, in which they drown all remembrance of their past defeats. By the by, they have made so many ginger cakes already that molasses has raised to 62 1-2 cents per gallon, & unless they stop carrying *whole boxes of brandy* out of town, that, will take a rise as well.

Messrs Editors, when I first took up my pen to expose the impositions of the Aurora I did not imagine that I should trouble your readers so long. If I have fretted their patience I ask their forgiveness. Whether I have succeeded in exposing the misrepresentations of the Loco Foco presses, I leave to the public, to determine, whom I now bid adieu.

A. WHIG.

A RIDDLE.

These letters, in their proper place,
Will show the world and thee
A cause of sorrow and disgrace,
And source of misery.

P H M
K O M

The solution will be found in folding the upper line over the lower line of capital.

A parsimonious man is one, that stops his paper to keep from paying a small pittance for it.

CHRONICLE.

CAMBRIDGE, Md.

SATURDAY MORNING, August 11, 1838.

The Orphans' court of this county will sit on Monday the 20th of August.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES
HENRY CLAY,
OF KENTUCKY.

Subject to the decision of a National Convention.

WHIG NOMINATION
FOR GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND
Hon. John N. Steele
OF DORCHESTER COUNTY.
Election to take place first Wednesday in October.

WANTED at this Office, as an apprentice to the Printing business, a moral and industrious lad—14 or 15 years old.

☞The delegates to the Bucktown Convention, (appointed by the Whigs in the several districts in this county) are requested to meet at that place, on Wednesday next.☜

At their Tricks.—The "Aurora" lauds Mr. Grason as "a bona fide and sincere reformer,"—"The indomitable friend of reform;" and charges against Mr. Steele that he has always been the "undeviating and uncompromising *opponent* of reform.

In the Aurora' of the 6th inst. 'tis said, the fact is *well known* in this county that Mr. Steele was always opposed to reform; that he *frequently discussed the question before the people* and that his views on *this subject are well known*, as declared in his public speeches, &c. The Journal of the House of Delegates is then referred to and copious extracts taken to *prove*, that Mr. Steele is "an undeviating and uncompromising *opponent* of Reform." The *evidence* adduced from the Journal is

1st. That he voted against electing the Governor by the people.

2. Against electing the Senate by the people, and

3. Against any change in the *tenure* of office, held by the Clerks and Registers of the several counties.

On these votes we remark,

1st. That they were *proper* under the circumstances, and it was *obligatory* on Mr. Steele so to vote.

2nd. If these votes were of that quality and character which render Mr. Steele obnoxious to the charge of being "an undeviating and uncompromising *opponent* of *reform*" Mr. Grason is subject to the *same condemnatory charge*, because in the preceding session he made the identically same votes.

We say that these votes were *obligatory* on Mr. Steele, because they were expressive of the will of the people whom he did in part represent. Prior to the year 1830, the question of reform had been but slightly agitated in this county, and Mr. Steele believed the feelings of the people of this county were adverse to the above constitutional changes. The correctness of this belief was fully sustained by his constituents in the Electoral canvass for 1831, for the State Senate. The Jackson Electoral candidates denounced these votes as inconsistent with the wishes of his constituents, and they were fully discussed before the people in their primary assemblies.—Mr. Steele was elected by a majority of about 200 votes over his adversaries, Messrs. Breerwood and Handy, who had perhaps, as much personal popularity as any two gentlemen in the county. In the spring of 1831, after these votes had been fully and repeatedly discussed, he became a candidate for Congress, and the result of the election also manifested, that Mr. Steele had not misrepresented the will of his constituents. After a contested election, he beat Mr. Stewart (who then had, as now, much personal popularity) by a majority of 1168 votes in the district.

It is not our purpose now, to discuss the propriety of these votes in the *abstract*; but only to shew that the votes were proper under the circumstances, *because they were declaratory of the opinions and wishes then entertained by his constituents, whom he was bound truly to represent in the legislative department of the State.*

It may not be improper *now* to state, that controuling circumstances have induced a change in the opinion of the people of this county in the all absorbing subjects of *reform*. At some time not very remote, we will trace the *causes* of this change, and shew by the Journal of proceedings in the legislature that the constitutional reform now existing, owes its being neither to the Whig nor Van Buren party; but to causes unconnected with either party. The slightest inspection of the Journal of the House will shew that it was not a *party question*.—Mr Francis Thomas a distinguished member of the Jackson party always voting in the affirmative *on questions of reform*, and Mr. Grason an equally distinguished member of the same party always, I believe, voting in the negative. The same observation could be applied to distinguished members of the Whig party. But to return from this digression.

2. The next remark that we have to make is, that if these votes made by Mr. Steele in 1831 make him obnoxious to the charge of being an "uncompromising opponent of reform," will not the same identical votes made by Mr. Grason in 1830, only one year before, render him equally obnoxious to the charge?

Mr. Grason voted also against electing the Governor by the people—see Journal of the House December session 1829, page 436.

February, 16, 1830.

The following is the proceedings of the Journal &c.

"The House proceeded to consider the order of the day, in reference to the bill No 54, reported by Mr. McPherson on the 30th ultimo, entitled, an act to alter and amend such parts of the constitution and form of government as relate to the election of council to the Governor."

"Mr. Nicholas moved the following amendment as an additional section, to come in between the 6th and 7th section of the bill, viz:

"And be it enacted, That the Governor of this State shall hereafter be elected by the people by general ticket, and hold his office for three years, and that the manner of holding said election shall hereafter be provided by law.

Which being twice read, Mr. Orell moved to amend that amendment, by adding at the end thereof, the following words:

"That it shall require a majority of the votes of the State of Maryland to elect a Governor of Maryland, and in case of a failure of any person obtaining a majority of the whole votes, that in that case it shall return to the Legislature of Maryland, to be determined on joint ballot, and shall be elected alternately from the *Western* and Eastern Shores."

The question was then put, 'will the house agree to the amendment, as amended?'

It was determined in the negative.

Those who voted in the affirmative, are

Messrs. Done (Speaker) Hynson, Osborn, Stewart, Hood, Ely, Turner, of Balt Co., Buchanan, Denny, Shriver, Johns, Moores, Hope, Sutton, Burchenal, Orrell, Hunt, Nicholas, Henrix, Evans, Gale, Creswell, Sudler, Brookhurt, Witmer, Dodnelly, McNiell—27

Those who voted in the negative are,

Messrs. Thomas, of St Mary's, Hawkins, Blakistone, Travilla, Sellman, Beckett, Smith, Hungerford, Turner, of Calvert Jenifer, McPherson, Rogerson, Hughlett Dudley, Teackle, Irving, Jones, Hicks, Hardcastle, Goldsborough, Edelen, Semes, Wells, GRASON, Oldson, Roach, Hutcheson, Hitch, Dorsey, Keene, Crawford, Harding, Gittings, Willson, McMahon—35.

The bill having been read throughout and placed in the hand of the Speaker pro tempore.

The question was put shall this bill pass?

It was determined in the negative.

Yeas 19—Nays 46.

Mr. GRASON voting in the negative.

He voted against electing the Senate by the people—see Journal, page 107.

January 20, 1829.

'According to the order of the day, the House proceeded to consider the bill reported by Mr. Sutton, entitled, An act to abolish all such parts of the Constitution and form of Government as relate to the time and manner of electing the Senate, and the mode of filling up vacancies in that body, so that each county and the city of Baltimore may have a senator, to be elected immediately by the people.'

Several amendments were offered, all of which were determined in the negative.

The question was then put, shall the said bill pass?

And it was resolved in the affirmative.

The yeas and nays being required by seven members were ordered and taken.

Yeas—48—Nays 23. ☞Mr. GRASON still voting in the negative.

In December Session, 1829, Mr. GRASON voted against any change in the *tenure* by which Registers and Clerks of county Courts hold their offices—see Journal of the House, page 414.

February 13, 1829.

The call of the house, commenced by the clerk, in reference to the bill, entitled, an act to abolish all and every such part, of the constitution and form of government of this state, as relates to the appointment and tenure of office of Registers of Wills and Clerks of the county courts of this state, and suspended by the consideration of the orders of the day, were resumed and completed.

Amendments were offered and determined in the negative.

The question was then put, 'shall this bill pass?'

Yeas 38—Nays 27. Mr. GRASON again voting in the negative.

And we may add that in the session of 1828. Journal of the house, page 78, Mr. GRASON voted against graduatory representation according to population A vote which we believe Mr. Steele has never given.

In making the above references, we do not do so in a spirit of *objection* to Mr. Grason. He is in no shape responsible for the indiscreet zeal and reprehensible conduct of his friends. The votes made by Mr Grason were in coincidence with the wishes of his *constituents* I have no doubt; and that he believes, their will when distinctly understood, is the legitimate regulator of his conduct in all matters affecting constitutional changes, I have as little doubt. His votes too, I have no doubt, *were proper under the circumstances.*

All that we object to is that *those acts* which shew that Mr. Steele is "the undeviating, uncompromising opponent of reform," should by the same authority be considered insufficient to *create a doubt*—how far Mr. Grason is emphatically a "bona fide, and sincere reformer," the indubitable friend of reform;" that certain well known acts of Mr. Steele should be deemed weighty enough to *prostrate him* and that the same acts of Mr. Grason, equally well known, should be deemed by the same authority so light as to be withheld because of the supposed insignificance, from the consideration of the people.

For the "Chronicle."

Messrs Editors, Entertaining the utmost contempt and abhorence of the "billingsgate slang" and frothy style, of most of the Van Buren editors in this State, I shall never condescend to notice any assertions made by them, unless they bear the additional evidence of some *respectable* persons; but when an assertion is made by the editor of the Aurora, who enjoys a good reputation, and that assertion wants truth, I feel bound to notice it. Palled in the dunnest smoke of Loco Focoism, he *sometimes* descends from his *usual* correct course, into that pursued by most of his political compeers. I cite his editorial remarks of the 4th of June for an instance. In those remarks, after saying a great many pretty things, he goes on to say; "And the annual expenses of the State, under their administration of affairs, (meaning the whigs) exceed the income, about 75 thousand dollars." What palpable absurdity, and such little regard for public opinion and indignation does he evince, in perpetrating such enormous assertions, in direct contravention to the Treasurer's last official report!

By that report it appears that for the year 1837 the revenue of the State amounted to $430,250, and the expenses, *other than for the payment of the interest and reduction of the principal*, of the State debt, amounted to $211,483,67. A sinking fund is provided to pay the interest of, and reduce the State debt. In 1830 this fund amounted to $30,000, and up to May 1837 it had increased to the astonishing sum of $794,000, merely from the interest at a compound ratio, and when the bonds due from the State shall become due, this fund by its regular operation, will amount to $30,597,319. *For a more particular and correct view of this matter, I respectfully refer my readers to a statement in the Chronicle of July the 28th.* And in the face of this official statement the editor of the Aurora has the unblushing affrontery to assert "that the State's expenses exceed the income about 75 thousand dollars." I ask the editor of the Aurora for the proof of this assertion, and unless he fully establishes it, he stands convicted before the people of Dorchester of wilful misrepresentation. It is passing strange, that when the Van Buren presses throughout the State, make their charges about the State's bankruptcy, they never say one word about the sinking fund. And what is the reason? They know that by its certain operation it will amount to more than double the State debt when that debt becomes due, and therefore it would counteract the effects of their charges. They know it is a dangerous item to dwell upon.

Does the editor of the Aurora expect his bare assertions to go forth as gospel, undented and undeniable? Does he expect to gull the people of Dorchester, by such enormous statements? If he does I pity his delusion. I admit, that for a long time his assertions have passed unnoticed, and lulled into fancied security by these pleasing reflections, he becomes bolder and bolder, and to judge from the absurdity of some of his remarks, he believes they cannot be denied successfully. But his day of judgment has arrived, and he will be called upon to answer for all the sins and errors of his political life. His premises are untenable and it requires no depth of thought to perceive it.

Again I would ask, do the Van Burenites expect to elect Mr. Grason by publishing wanton and palpable misrepresentations? Do they expect to make proselytes by torturing truth in this manner? If they succeed, I feel sure, that the humblest individual in the whig ranks would not envy his situation. But I cherish the idea, that he never can reach the gubernatorial chair. The people are sick, deadly sick, of Van Burenism. They are unwilling to trust the destiny of our great ship of State in the hands of such a political puritan as Mr. Grason. They know that his course has been as uncertain and erratic as that of any man in our State.

We present to the Voters of the State, the Hon. *John N. Steele*, who may be emphatically, styled the people's candidate, and we rely upon the virtue of truth and honesty to support his claims, without descending to the petty abuse and miserable invective that characterizes the Van Burenites. We are well convinced of the rectitude of our principles, and have flung aloft the banner of *Steele*, and under it we mean to conquer or die. If we conquer, then we may congratulate our friends upon the triumph of pure and correct principles, and if defeated, of which we have no fear, we have the pleasing consolation, that we used every exertion to preserve the character of our State—the people's rights—and our free institutions from the grasp of the rapacious minions of Van Buren, and his political slaves.

A WHIG.

Mr. ex-Secretary Dickerson has left Washington and the skunk of the Globe has dismissed him with an awful valedictory. He has certainly gone off in bad odour.—U. S. Gazette.

Protestant Episcopal Convention.—The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland, which met in this city on Thursday, on Friday elected to the office of Bishop of the Diocese, the Right Rev'd Jackson Kemper, at present Missionary Bishop in the valley of the Mississippi. The Convention has adjourned sine die.

Lord Durham has become so thoroughly convinced of the importance of the Canadian Provinces to Great Brttain, that he has recommended to the home government a loan of £250,000 to the Welland Canal company, and the same amount to improve the river St. Lawrence.

Newspapers in Missouri.—There are twenty two Newspapers published in the state of Missouri, of which seven are in the city of St. Louis; of these, 4 are daily—two German.