What has general Jackson not done to corrupt the press and make it subservient to his purposes?'

Thus have we given a few samples of Mr. Branch's opinions of Messrs. Jackson and Van Buren, that our readers may see the extremity to which the Democrats are reduced when they erect such a man into a candidate.

From the Baltimore Chronicle.

TORNADO—LOSS OF LIVES.

Between six and seven o'clock on Saturday afternoon, (11th inst.) a gust of wind, amounting in violence almost to a tornado, passed over this city. Its course was from the west by south to the east by north, and it appears to have been confined, so to speak, to a single and very small vein.

The shipping in the stream at Fell's Point felt its effects very sensibly. Two schooners on their way down the river were capsized, and it was only by cutting holes in the bottom of one of them that the crew, consisting of a man and two boys named Harris, were rescued from a horrible death. A boy about sixteen years of age, named John Baggs, an apprentice to a painter in this city, was killed by the falling of some lumber piled upon the deck of the schooner William Washington, upon which he was a passenger for the Eastern Shore.

But by far the most serious loss both of lives and property, occurred in the destruction of the new warehouse which Messrs. Oelricks & Lorman and Messrs. Donnel were erecting at Donnel's wharf, Fell's Point, This large building was nearly completed, and when the storm came up a number of German emigrants who had only arrived a day or two since from Bremen, and the crew of a brig lying at the wharf, ran into it for shelter. Melancholy, however to relate, they had scarcely entered the doors, when the whole fabric gave way and in less than a minute the building was in ruins. Nine persons were buried in the ruins, two of whom were instantly killed, and seven taken out badly but not dangerously wounded.

They were all Germans except one, who was a negro man. A person was in the third story of the building at the time it fell and was thrown several hundred feet without sustaining material injury. The Tornado, continuing its course, unroofed the railroad bridge over Curtis' creek, the sawmill of the Canton company and the car house belonging to the Philadelphia and Baltimore Rail road company. Its course is marked by the destruction of trees, fence and all other obstacles in its way.

Since the above was written, we learn that one of the sufferers was taken alive out of the ruins about one o'clock, having been under them about 20 hours. It is tho't he may recover.

The evening *loco foco* paper of this city has attempted to prove that his party are the exclusive friends of order and law. We will undertake to assist him with proof. In 1831 when we were in great distress in consequence of the removal of the deposites, the Baltimore Republican, the organ of the *loco focos*, attempted to excite the people of Philadelphia to tear down the United States Bank. In 1835 the same paper opened its columns to the admission of articles from a mischievous young lawyer in this city, which excited the passions of a mob and led to the disgraceful riots of that year. In 1836 the same paper was actively encouraging the '19' to violate their constitutional duty, and endeavor to overthrow the legislative department our state. It also encouraged the views of the *blue ticket* convention, which was intended to substitute itself in place of the Executive of the state. In 1838 the same paper wished the senator of Baltimore in the legislature to be 'gibbited with eternal infamy.' In 1831 when the people were assembled, as they have a right to do, to express their opinions of the measures of the general government a band of loco focos, set on by the office holders around the Custom House, attempted to break up the meeting, and make a personal attack upon one of our public speakers, whose mixture of 'German and Irish blood,' however, enabled him to keep his assailants at a distance. In 1835 the same party attempted to break up another town meeting of the people, and had seized upon one of the speakers, who was only rescued from personal danger, by the intrepidity of the then sheriff. In 1836 another band of loco focos broke into the house of a distinguished Whig of the 12th ward, spoiled his furniture and left him for dead. In 1837 they did the same thing to a deserving whig of the 10th ward.—We might produce other instances of the devoted attachment, of the loco focos to law and good order, but we think we have given enough this time for our neighbor to enlarge upon.—Balt. Whig.

A yound lady carried a letter to the Post Office, dropped herself into the box instead of the letter and did not discover the mistake, till the clerk asked her if she were SINGLE

CHRONICLE.

CAMBRIDGE, MD.

SATURDAY MORNING, August 18, 1838.

The Orphans' court of this county will sit on Monday the 27th 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.

Whig Ticket.

For State Senator,
THOMAS I. H. ECCLESTON,

FOR THE LEGISLATURE.
HENRY PAGE,
HENRY L. McNAMARA,
JOSEP*H* NICOLS,
W*H*ITEFIELD W. WOOLFORD

☞The Van Buren presses throughout the state, and particularly the Aurora have been holding forth Mr. Grason to the people of Maryland, as a 'bona fide and sincere reformer,' 'the indomitable friend of reform'; and have made strong objections to Mr. Steele because he was opposed to reform. We took occasion in the last Chronicle to publish from the Journal of proceedings, Mr. Grason's votes upon electing the Governor by the people—upon electing the Senate by the people, and upon changing the tenure of the office of Clerks and Registers. Against all of which Mr. Grason voted. Where is the evidence then that Mr. Grason is a bona fide and sincere reformer—the indomitable friend of reform? The Editor of the Aurora has already gone too far to come off genteelly by saying that he has 'no precise data at hand, to predicate a positive opinion upon.' It seems strange that the Journal of Proceedings should be considered record evidence against Mr. Steele, when he voted favorable to some of the measures of reform—but when it is applied to Mr. Grason, it does not afford *data sufficient even to predicate an opinion upon.* But the Aurora has evidence that Mr. Grason is a reformer. He voted favorable to the confirmation of the reform bill, and he approved of the course of the glorious 19.—Although some of the Van Buren party had been making a great out-cry for reform—when the reform bill was introduced every Van Buren member of the Legislature but one opposed it. Whether Mr. Grason would have abandoned his party, had he been a member of the legislature at that time, and voted in favor of a measure which he had always opposed before is very questionable. The fact that he advocated the course of the 19 recusant electors, is rather an argument that he is a destructive than a reformer. It proves at any rate, that although the *implied instructions* of his county would not permit him to vote in favor of reform proposed in a constitutional mode, they were not strong enough to withhold him form advocating an unconstitutional and reckless course. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Grason, when he voted, opposed to electing the Governor by the people, &c. was not a reformer in principle,—it is true that the wishes of the people may have wrought a change in his mind upon this subject, but his friends should not claim more for him on the subject of reform, than we are willing to allow him upon the subject of democracy—that is, to come in at the eleventh hour.

☞We publish to-day the proceedings of the convention which assembled in Bucktown, on Wednesday last; and we must say that the result of the meeting has been, a ticket both for the Senate and house of Delegates which could not have been surpassed in this county whether we take into consideration their talents and intelligence, or their true, orthodox principles, and pure and unsullied private character. Mr. Eccleston, our candidate for the State Senate, has frequently been before the people—They know him as the zealous and eloquent defender of whig principles, and the bold condemner of that gross usurpation attempted to be practised upon the citizens of Maryland, by the inglorious 19 destructives. With such a ticket as ours, we shall carry every thing before us—we shall almost entirely wipe off the stain of Van Burenism from the face of Dorchester county. We understand that some of the leaders of 'the party' who have been indulging the false hope of disunion and want of harmonious concert in our party, have been thrown into something resembling the 'delirium tremens,' by the strength of our ticket.

Communications.

For the Chronicle.

Messrs. Eccleston ond Jackson:

I have been at some loss whether to smile at the fatuity of the Editor of the *Aurora*, or to view with abhorrence and disgust the pitiful, lame and shuffling manner in which he attempts in his last paper to explain and get over his miserable charges against Mr. Steele, upon the subject of reform. This immaculate and truth loving editor, in his paper before alluded to, reiterates his insignificant charges against Mr. Steele, and then attempts to apologize for Mr. Grason having given the identical same votes on the subject of reform, in a manner, we think little calculated to reflect much credit on himself for either truth or candor. We have always believed that the suppression of truth was equally culpable and wicked as the assertion of naked and barefaced falsehood. The Editor charges that Mr. Steele has always been against reform, and asserts that Mr. Grason was '*a bonafide and sincere reformer*,' '*the indomitable friend of reform.*'—That '*William Grason, who has stood by you upon this question, and has perseveringly advocated with all his zeal, the wholesome reformation in your constitution.*' Now where does the Editor find any authority for these unfounded and untrue assertions? He cannot put his finger on one solitary vote of Mr. Grason's but what condemns the assertion. Mr. Grason voted against reform in every shape and form, until the late confirmatory act of last winter, and who will give him credit for that vote? Almost every man of every party voted to confirm the reform act. The evidence that Mr. Grason voted against reform was and is contained in the journals of proceedings of the House of Delegates, which the Editor ransacked for the last seven or eight years, to make charges against Mr. Steele. He could not well have helped seeing and knowing it, unless he shut his eyes to keep out the light of truth. Nay we go further—the Editor admits that he di l not know *what were his* (Mr. Grason's) '*individual views upon the subject of reform,*' as he had '*no precise data at hand upon which to predicate a positive opinion*'—yet several weeks before he asserts that Mr Grason is '*a bona fide and sincere reformer*'—'*the indomitable friend of reform*'—That William Grason has '*perseveringly advocated with all his zeal,*' '*the wholesome reformation in your constitution.*'

We wish sincerely, to be truly informed, when and where Mr. Grason displayed this great zeal and perseverance in the cause of reform? The only vote which he ever gave for reform was at the *eleventh hour* last winter, when the reform law was confirmed. Until the Editor proves by the journal of proceedings of the House of Delgates or something else equally entitled to credit, that his assertions are true on this point, he will please excuse us for not believing him.

Voters of Maryland, generally, and voters of Dorset in particular, will you believe such groundless assertions—will you lend your votes to a man or party who attempt to palm their candidate off as a great reformer by bare assertion, without one word of fact to sustain them. You will, I feel confident, on the first Wednesday of October next, satisfy these reckless deceivers that you are not to be humbugged. The Editor finding his friend Grason in a close place attempts to apologize for him by stating that he (Mr Grason) voted against reform under 'implied instructions as he represented a small county.' Very kind indeed, in you, Mr Editor—you allow no such excuse or apology for Mr. Steele, though under the same 'implied' as well as clearly understood 'instructions'. We wish to be distinctly understood as not blaming or censuring either Mr. Steele or Mr Grason for their votes on this subject—on the contrary we believe they both truly, faithfully and honestly represented their constituents by their votes—We do mean to censure severely the attempt to represent one of them as an anti-reformer and the other as a sincere reformer when they both made the identical same votes. The Editor of the Aurora also asserts that 'clouds of witnesses in Dorset will bear testimony to his allegation.'—We truly and sincerely believe that, if the Editor and his 'clouds of witnesses,' were brought to particulars on affidavit, they would dwindle into less than 'the size of a man's hand.' It has been the good fortune of the writer to know Mr. Steele for many years past, and often to have heard him with pleasure make public speeches, upon most political subjects, and he avers that he never in his life heard him make a 'strenuous,' violent or 'bitter speech' on any subject, and that he never heard Mr. Steele oppose reform even moderately, much less with bitterness. Mr. Steele acquiesced in the will of his constituents on the subject of reform, and for this the people of Dorset have always honored him when he came before them, as they intend again doing at the October election, by an overwhelming vote. The people of Dorset do not intend to let their favorite son be put down by assertions—they want facts, and the way they will turn out and vote for Steele and constitutional government, law and liberty will be a caution, in all future time.

NO DODGING.

The State of Michigan has offered a bounty for the production of beet sugar and a large company has been organized for the manufacture.

For the Chronicle.

Messrs. Editors: If the *cutting sarcasm, bitter irony*, and *fearless intrepidity* of the editor of the Aurora, were sufficient to excite my indignation, I should certainly have become exasperated at the tone of his editorial remarks in the last Aurora; but knowing the wit of that editor to be of a dull and pointless cast, I am constrained to smile at his vanity. It seems that this editor has gotten into a considerable passion, on account of two communications published in the last Chronicle, from 'A Whig,' and belches forth 'bile' and 'fœtid discharges,' in awful quantities, to relieve his stomach from the 'bitter pills' contained in those communications. In the communications alluded to I asserted facts which could be established, had the Van Burenites concerned, sufficient political honesty to acknowledge the truth. But this they will not do, nor would they admit the fact, that our saviour died unless a bible was at hand to prove it. But sirs 'a guilty conscience needs no accuser.' If the editor of the Aurora, had the truth to sustain him, he would have replied to those communications in a calm and dispassionate manner, but stung with remorse, he vomits forth envious rancour, and poisonous invective. This *modern would be* 'Junius' should recollect that '*retorquere non est respondere*,' and as his retort places him precisely in the same situation he occupied before, I shall not attempt to prove my assertions, but settle my account with him in his own style.

This '*outward sainted deputy*' advises me to go to a primary school, to learn manners and figures. '*O! tempora, O! mores!*' I do not imagine that a *little* more *learning* and *manners* would injure *him very seriously.* This editor should recollect that it is not a green covered table—an armed chair—the *title* of Editor, a well nibb'd pen, and a *habit* of composition, that can make a critic. To judge from *his style*, I should imagine that HE had mistaken the fury of a diseased appetite for the flame of genius; and with regard to his last productions, I consider them but the idle dreams of a sick man—the fickle fancies of a distempered brain. Had I *known* the editor of the Aurora wielded a pen dipped in such *withering satire*, I should never have entered the lists with him, but I wished to attain a habit of composition, and placing great credit in the old French proverb, 'A barbe de fol, on apprend a raire' (men love to shave on the chin of a fool) I began my career upon the editor of the Aurora, but my instrument being rather too *sharp*, he backs his ears, and vows I shall not trifle with him any longer.

This editor thinks 'a little learning has made me mad.' I presume almost every one will admit that to become rabid from learning is preferable to *being* in *such a state* from the *actual want* of it. I deem it unnecessary to expose the forward and vulgar vituperations of this editor against me; for I consider him as narrow minded and opinionated, as any hypercritic that ever inflicted prosing and dull invective upon any one, since the day of Zoilius. This editor also asserts that 'we have our opinions, which we dare express, no matter who is offended.' *O, si sic omnia!* I am happy to inform this rara avis, that I too 'know my rights and knowing dare maintain them,' and if the Loco Foco's wish to frighten me from the course, they had better bring forward some other champion, for I assure him and them, that I never shall be deterred from my duty by a *chicken of his wing*. I dismiss this subject with the assurance to the editor of the Aurora, that at a period, not very remote, our relations will be such, as to enable me to treat *him* in a manner more suited to his rank; and also enable *him* to judge more minutely of my '*style*' and '*locality*'. In the mean time let him enjoy his fast waning consequence, in the consolatory idea, that all the editors of Maryland stand in awe of his collossal powers, and he is not the first Collossus that was formed of *brass*. A WHIG.

☞We re-publish in this No. from the Journals of the House of Delegates of this State, for the satisfaction of our readers, Mr. Grason's votes upon the subject of Reform.

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 1834, after these votes had been fully and repeatedly discussed, he became a candidate for Congress, and the result of the election aslo 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 Houes 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 fo 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 *We*stern 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, Brookhart, Witmer, Dodnel y, 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.

On motion of Mr. McPherson,

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

Those who voted in the affirmative, are

Messrs. Osborn, Smith, McPherson, Ely, Turner of Balt. co., Buchanan, Evans, Creswell, Shriver, Johns, Moores, Hope, Sutton, Burchenal, Yoe, Brookhart, McMahon, Buskirk, McNeill—19

Those who voted in the negative, are—Messrs. Done, Thomas of St Marys, Hawkins, Turner, Jenifer, Rogerson, Blakistone, Brown, Hynson, Travilla, Stewart, Hood, Sellman, Beckett, Hungerford Goldsborough, Gale, Gantt, Edelen, Semmes, Wells Claude, GRASON, Oldson, Sudler, Roach, Hutcheson, Hughlett, Dudley, Denny, Henrix, Teackle, Irving, Jones, Hicks, Hardcastle, Hitch, Dorsey, Keene, Crawford, Hunt, Nicholas, Whitner, Donnelly, Harding, Gittings, Wilson—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.

Those who voted in the affirmative are—Messrs. Osborn, *H*ynson, Stewart of A. *A*rundell, Hood, Kent, Stockett, Beckett, Billingsley, Turner of Calvert, King, Rogerson, Turner Balt co, Ely, Price of Balt. co., Shower, Hughlett, Millis, Spencer, Teackle, Donoho, *H*ardcastle of Dorset, Evans, Gale, Townsend, Gannt, Turpin, Roach, Hitch, Kemp, McPherson, Shriver, Hoye, Johns, Sutton, Smithson, Hardcastle of Caroline, Pearson, Willess, Shafer, Yoe, Miller, Beatty, Gittings, Gaither, Hughes, Mcmahon of Allegany, Dilly, Buskirk—48.

Those who voted in the negative are—Messrs. Chapman, Thomas Hawkins, Gough, Blakistone, Brown, Denny, Done, Gibbons, Phelps, Eccleston, Wright of Dorchester, Duvall, Somervell, Crabb, Watkins, GRASON, Wright of Queen Anne's, Oldson, Boyer, Bowlus, Burchenal Lee—23

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?'

Those who voted in the affirmative, are Messrs. Thomas (Speaker) Osborn, Travilla, Hungerford, Brawner, Jenifer, McPherson, Rogerson, Ely, Turner of Balt. co. Buchanan, Denny, Teakle, Jones, Hardcastle, Evans, Creswell, Edelen, Semmes, Wright, Oldson, Sudler, Roach, Hitch, Dorsey, Kinzer, Shriver, Johns, Moores, Hope, Sutton, Burchenal, Orrell, Craford, Yoe, Brookhart, Witmer, Donnelly—38

Those who voted in the negative, are—Messrs Thomas of St. Marys, Brown, Hynson, Kent, Hood, Turner of Calvert, Gale, Wooton, Wells, GRASON, Boyer, Hutcheson, Johnson, Hughlett, Dudley, Henrix, Done, Hicks, Steele, Goldsborough *H*unt, Nicholas, Harding, Willson, Mc Mahon, Swan, McNeill—27

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.

According to the order of the day, the house proceeded to consider the bill reported by Mr. Phelps, entitled, An act to alter and amend the constitution, so as to reduce the number of delegates from each county in this state, and the city of Annapolis.

Several amendments were offered which were determined in the negative.

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

Those who voted in the affirmative are,

Messrs. Thomas, (Speaker] Hawkins, Gough, Blakistone, Osborn, Hynson, Brown, Backett, Billingsley, Turner of Calvert, King, Rogdrson, Millis, Done, Gibbons, Teackle, Donoho, Gale, Townsend, Crabb, Wright of Queen Anne's, Oldson, Smith of Worcester, Hitch, Kemp, Bowlus, McPherson. Shriver, Miller, Beatty, Gittings, Lee, Buskirk—33.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Stewart of *A*. Arundel, Hood, Kent, Stockett, Smith of Calvert, Turner of Balt. co., Ely, Price of Balt co. Shower. Hughlett, *D*enny, Spencer, Phelps, Hardcastle of Dorchester co. Eccleston, Wright of Dorchester, Evans, GRASON, Turpin, Boyer, Roach, Hope Johns, Sutton, Smithson, Burchenal, Hardcastle of Caroline, Pearson, Willess. McMahon of Balt. city, Stewart of Balt. city, *S*hafer, Yoe, Gaither, Gantt, Duval, Somerville, Hughes, McMahon of Alleganv, Dilly—40.

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 sc light as to be withheld because of the supposed insignificance, from the consideration of the people.

BALTIMORE MARKET.

August 16th, 1838.

Corn	80	a	86
Wheat (white)	1,50	a	1,55
——— (red)	1,45	a	1,50
Rye	80	a	
Oats	37 1-2		