to the act to *fix and make permanent* the salaries of certain officers of the Civil Government," and is a supplement to the act of 1805 ch. 86, which is "an act to establish permanent salaries for the Judges of the six judicial districts in this State."

The act of 1804, ch. 55, which established the present judicial system is (like the constitution of the State in reference to the salary of Governor,) silent in reference to the amount of compensation of the Judges, but it provides 'that the salaries of the said Judges shall not be diminished during the *period of their continuance in office*." Do not the Legislature by the very title of the act of 1837 chap. 131, making it a supplement to the act of 1805, ch. 86, clearly manifest their intention to place the salary of the Governor upon the same footing with the salary of the Judges?—But this intention is made clear beyond all controversy by the language of the act of 1837, ch. 131. This act declares (in reference to the salary of the Governor,) "that the Governor hereafter to be elected shall be entitled to receive at the rate of the following annual salary in current money *whilst he continues in office*," and the constitution says "that the Governor shall be elected by the people, and that his *term* of office shall commence on the 1st Monday in January next after his election *and continue for three years &c.*"

The law gives the Governor a certain salary *whilst* he *continues in office*, and the constitution fixes *the period of his continuance in office to three years*. Under the *law and constitution*, therefore, he becomes entitled to receive the prescribed salary for *the period* he is *to continue in office*. By the act above referred to of 1804, ch. 55, the Judges are to continue in office until turned out in the manner prescribed by that act, and their salaries cannot be diminished during their continuance in office; and by the act of 1805, ch. 86, the amount of their salaries is fixed. The constitution, in reference to the Governor, performs the office of the act of 1804, in regard to the Judges,—it fixes his term of service to *three years*, and the act of 1837, ch. 131, performs the office, in reference to the salary of the Governor, which is performed by the acts of 1804 and 1805 in regard to the salaries of the Judges,—it declares that *during his continuance in office* he shall receive an annual salary of $1,200.

Again, is it not clear that the election of a Governor by the people constitutes a contract under the constitution and the act of 1837, between the people and the person elected, by which the person elected is entitled to the prescribed salary? And if so, would not the repeal of the law of 1837, which declares that the Governor shall receive during his continuance in office $1,200 per annum, violate that clause of the constitution of the United States which says that no State shall pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts?

Looking, therefore, to the power of the Legislature to pass the Bill of the last session proposing to lessen the salary to which the Governor is entitled, it is manifest that the Whig Senate were bound by their oath to support the constitution, to reject that bill.

The conclusion to which we come, *that the Legislature has no rightful power to lessen the salary of a Governor elected by the People during the period for which he has been elected*, is not only supported by the liberal construction of the constitution and the act of 1837, but is (as we now propose to show,) essential to the pure administration of the Government.

By the old constitution the Governor was elected *annually* by the *Legislature*, and because of this dependence of the Executive upon the Legislature will, the wise framers of that instrument, thought it essential to the independent exercise of the Executive power of appointment to office, that members of the Legislature should be made constitutionally ineligible to office during the period for which they were elected.

By the amended constitution the election of the Governor of the State was transferred from the Legislature to the People, and (under the supposition of the framers of that instrument that the Executive was relieved from its dependence upon the Legislative branch of the Government,) members of the Legislature were made eligible to office. Now, it is manifest that the Executive is placed immediately under the control of the Legislative branch of the government if you clothe the latter with the power at pleasure to take away the salary which under the constitution and the act of 1837, is assigned to the former. It is certain that the Legislature of 1837, which passed the amended constitution and the act of 1837, (to be construed *in pari materia* with it,) when they declared that the Governor should receive a certain fixed salary *during his continuance in office*, never designed that the salary of that officer should be held at the mere pleasure of a subsequent Legislature.

There is another view of this question, which, in our opinion, places the correctness of the conclusion, to which we have arrived, beyond all doubt.

The amended constitution certainly *designed* to transfer the election of Governor by the *Legislature to the People*, and that the Governor elected by the people should exercise the executive functions for the term of three years. It was certainly not designed that the person to be selected by the people should discharge the important duties of the station assigned him without pay; on the contrary, it was expressly provided that the person to be selected by the people should receive annually whilst he continued in office a *certain* salary.

When the present Governor was elected, a majority of the legal voters of Maryland who cast their votes for him did not *alone* impose upon him the obligation to discharge the *duties* of the office of Governor; they also conferred the right to receive, during the period for which they elected him, the SALARY ATTACHED TO THAT OFFICE. A different construction to the one, for which we contend, would place it in the power of the Legislature to annul the election made by the People, and to assume to themselves (what the constitution designed to take from them,) the appointment of the Governor of the State whenever for *party* or *other purposes* they might desire to throw out of office the person selected by the people.

Under a different construction to ours the process would be a very simple one. A majority of the people elect a Governor—the person selected by the people is, for party or other reasons, obnoxious to a majority of both branches of the Legislature; all they would have to do to defeat the will of the people, and secure to themselves the appointment, would be to pass a law repealing the act of 1837; by which the Governor elected by the people would be deprived of the means of living, and consequently of the ability to occupy the station assigned him by the people of the State. It certainly was not the design to make property a qualification for this office. On the contrary, the increased salary allowed by the amended constitution was designed to enable those who were not possessed of property, to compete for this high distinction before the people. If therefore the people should at any time elect to this office a person of small estate, (and we believe they have heretofore only elected such,) the exercise of this power by the Legislature would force such person (upon whom the people intended to confer a benefit,) either to exhaust his estate in living as it is expected the Chief Magistrate of the People of Maryland should live, or to resign and leave to the Legislature the appointment of his successor.

THE CHRONICLE.

CAMBRIDGE—MD.

SATURDAY MORNING, August, 30th 1845.

The Orphans' Court of Dorchester County will sit on Monday 25th August.

V. B. PALMER,

No. 59 Pine st. Phila., and 160 Nassau st. (Tribune Buildings.) N. Y., and S. E. corner of Balt. and Calvert st., Baltimore, is our authorized Agent for receiving Advertisements and subscriptions to the "CAMBRIDGE CHRONICLE," and collecting and receipting for the same.

WHIG NOMINATIONS.

FOR CONGRESS.

EDWARD LONG.

OF SOMERSET COUNTY.

FOR DELEGATES TO THE ASSEMBLY.

WILLIAM FRAZIER,
JAMES SMITH, S. C.,
JOHN F. ECCLESTON,
DR. JOHN F. BOONE.

FOR SHERIFF.

KENDALL M. JACOBS.

FOR COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

SAMUEL MEEKINS,
BARZILLA SLACUM.

CONGRESSIONAL NOMINATION.—The Convention which met at Barren Creek on Wednesday last, to nominate a Candidate for this Congressional District, on the first ballot nominated Edward Long Esq., of Somerset co.

Want of room prevents us from publishing the proceedings of the Convention this week.

From the Baltimore American.

Communication.

A VOICE OF WARNING TO THE WHIGS OF MARYLAND.

You are already aware that a *Reform Convention* is about to assemble in the City of Baltimore. It has been asserted that this is no *party* movement. If any Whig of Maryland has been deceived by such assertion, we ask him to pause and consider for a moment the following facts:

The revolutionary movement of the nineteen electors in 1836 is fresh in the memory of the people of the State. The professed object of the movement was *Reform;* and the result was the attainment of that object. A Senate favorable to Reform was elected; and at the sessions of 1836 and 1837 a *Reform Constitution* was adopted by the Legislature. Under it the election of Governor was taken from the Legislature, and the election of Senators from the Electoral College, and the choice of both given immediately to the people.—The tenure of the County Clerks and Registers was changed from life to a term of years. The representation in the Legislature was altered; so that instead of each County having four Delegates and Baltimore city but two, the Counties were allowed a delegation of from 3 to 5, and Baltimore city a delegation equal to that of the largest County. The Executive Council was abolished. In short, the whole form of the State Government was changed, and a new Constitution adopted; framed, more nearly than that of any other State, after that best of models, the Constitution of the United States.

The new Constitution went into operation in 1838. In that year and in 1841 the Loco Foco Candidates for the Gubernatorial Chair were elected. During these six years of Loco Foco rule scarcely a murmur was heard against the new Constitution, except an occasional order or resolution offered in the House of Delegates by some new member, ambitious of seeing his name figuring upon the Journal; nothing appeared to indicate that the new Constitution was not generally accepted to the people of Maryland. How does it happen that hideous defects in the features of that Constitution—defects which remained unperceived by them for the last six years—have suddenly been revealed to the vision of these patriotic reformers!!—Let us see if this mystery can be explained.

At the last October election an unusual event transpired. For the first time a *Whig Governor was elected by the people!!* From that hour the cry of *Reform* was heard through the State. That Constitution, which had before worked well, and given apparent satisfaction to all, was suddenly proclaimed to be rotten to the core. While the Loco Focos could succeed in electing their candidates, and saw the Gubernatorial Chair filled by one of themselves, they were reconciled to the present state of things. The spoils of office enjoyed for six years had operated to convince them that the present Constitution was a most beautiful piece of machinery. It would now possess in their eyes the same attractions—if Mr. CARROLL had been elected!—But alas! how uncertain are human events! THOMAS G. PRATT was placed in the Executive Mansion by the voice of the people of Maryland;—hundreds of worthy Loco Foco office-holders were permitted to retire from the toil and care of public service; and hundreds of others, who had revelled, in anticipation, upon the emoluments of sundry clerkships about to be vacated, alas were doomed to disappointments, and found their cups filled

"With gall instead of honey!"

The late election demonstrated that, at a full poll, the vote of Maryland is Whig. The astute leaders of the Loco Foco party have therefore set about devising new changes in the Constitution; by which they may more certainly arrive at the great object of their patriotic aspirations—the spoils of office! Under the old Constitution, the Governor was often elected by a minority of the votes. He was chosen by the Legislature; and, as we have seen, each County had an equal voice in electing him. A change was demanded.—The Governor is now elected in the most democratic mode, viz: *directly by the whole people*. All the principal officers of the State are thus appointed by an agent selected for the purpose by the direct voice of all the voters of Maryland.

There was a time when this was perfectly satisfactory to the most ultra *democrat* arrayed under the banner of reform. But new things have happened under the sun;—and the progressive democracy, inspired by the glorious example of that illustrious martyr, THOMAS W. DORR, on the one hand, and alarmed by the unusual spectacle of Whig office holders on the other, must now take a new step in the march of improvement. We earnestly invite the attention of every Whig in the State to the changes in our Constitution, advocated by those most active in the present reform agitation.

I. REPRESENTATION ACCORDING TO POPULATION.

On the 2d day of May, 1845, BEALE H. RICHARDSON, Esq., Well known as one of the most active and prominent Loco Foco leaders in Baltimore, made a report to the City Council, from which report we make the following extracts.

"Where shall be found the cause of these evils? and "how shall they be lessened or prevented? This is the "important inquiry to which the committee find them-"selves directed, and in their view the great cause of "all this unequal and unjust legislation *is the inequali-"ty and injustice of our representation*. Baltimore city, "with one-fourth of the population of the State, pay-"ing one-half of all the taxes of the State, has a repre-"sentation of about one-twentieth part. * * * "Baltimore, in fact, is subject to *taxation without repre-"sentation*. If we had been fairly represented in the "Legislature of the State, the obnoxious laws com-"plained of never could have been passed. * * * "Can there be any hope of different action, or a remov-"al of the grievances under which we now labor, un-"til Baltimore demands and receives her rights. * * * * "Let the flag be unfurled; let the watch-"word of *Repeal* and *Reform* be given," &c.

At the same time with the above report, was reported a list of resolutions for the action of the Council;—and among others the following:

"*Resolved*, That *representation according to popula-"tion*, is the creed of Republicans, the only true and "safe basis of government; and ought to be enjoyed by every American."

The above Report and Resolutions were published in the Baltimore American and Patriot, in *extenso*, on the 3d May last; and may also be found in the other city papers.

We believe this was the first public movement upon the subject during the present year. Here we find "*Reform*" and "*Representation according to Population*," uttered in the same breath.

About the first of June last, at a Democratic Convention held in the City of Baltimore, WM. F. GILES, Esq., the present Loco Foco candidate for Congress, offered the following resolutions, which "were adopted by acclamation:"

"Resolved by the Convention, That the present *inequality of representation in the House of Delegates* calls loudly for reform, * * * and that this Convention therefore recommend, that the propriety of calling a Convention of the people by the next Legislature, be brought prominently into view in the discussion of the next political campaign.

"Resolved, "That while this Convention do not desire to view the important subjects here suggested as subjects of *party* action merely, we nevertheless hereby express our opinion that the Democratic party demands reform and retrenchment as *substantial objects of private happiness* and public prosperity."

No doubt, Mr. GILES, that the profits of the hundreds of fat offices of the State, would be *"substantial objects of private happiness"* to quite a number of your political friends; and, as we have suggested before, here lies the secret of this mighty agitation.

But it is not by the Loco Focos of *Baltimore* alone that this principle of *"representation according to population"* has been advocated. It seems that it is favoured by the leaders of the party throughout the State. At December session, 1842, of the General Assembly, (Journal H. D., page 45,) the following order was offered by Mr. STARR, then a delegate from Baltimore City:

"Ordered, that the committee on the Constitution be "instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill to provide for representation in the House "of Delegates according to population.

The following table shows the population of each County in federal numbers by the census of 1840, the number of delegates to which each County is *now* entitled, and in the third column is shown the number to which each would be entitled if represented according to population:

Counties.	Fed. pop. in 1840.	Delegates now entitled to	No. according to population.
Allegany,	15,865	4	3
Washington,	27,831	5	5
Frederick,	34,627	5	7
Carroll,	16,791	4	3
Balto. City,	101,033	5	19
Balto. County,	30,307	5	6
Harford,	16,062	4	3
Montgomery,	13,402	4	3
Prince George's,	15,284	4	3
St. Mary's,	10,919	3	2
Charles,	12,349	3	2
Calvert,	7,561	3	2
Anne Arundel,	25,604	5	5
Cecil,	16,601	4	3
Kent,	9,748	3	2
Caroline,	7,505	3	1
Talbot,	10,621	3	2
Queen Anne,	11,049	3	2
Somerset,	17,357	4	3
Dorchester,	17,152	4	3
Worcester,	16,961	4	3
	434,124	82	82

In estimating *federal* numbers all free persons, *white* or *black*, are counted, to which is added three fifths of the slaves. Baltimore has a free negro population of 17,980; consequently she would claim, on account of her free negroes, three delegates;—equal to the number that would be allowed to Caroline and St. Mary's Counties together!!

Baltimore City and County would together have 25 delegates, or nearly one third of the whole number.—Baltimore City and County, with the three counties of Washington, Frederick and Anne Arundel, would have 42 delegates, a majority of the whole.

The above estimate is based upon the census of 1840. The census of 1850 and every succeeding one must show a result still more favorable to Baltimore. While a majority of the counties are nearly stationary, she is rapidly increasing in population. Thus in 1850, instead of 5 delegates, she would claim, according to population, at least 25 delegates, while many of the counties now sending three would rejoice to be allowed a single representative.

We ask the voters of the counties of both political parties, are you prepared for this? You of the smaller counties—Marylanders by birth and in feeling—who stand upon the soil your fathers trod, and feel that your honour and welfare are identified with the glory and prosperity of your native State—are you willing to resign all influence in the direction of her affairs, and see your voices stifled by the vote of a *floating population*, a vast proportion of whom feel little interest in the permanent welfare of a community in which they tarry as mere sojourners? Far be it from the writer of this to desire to excite any sectional jealousies against Baltimore. As a Marylander, he rejoices and will ever rejoice at her increasing prosperity. But they are neither the friends of the State nor of Baltimore who advocate this principle—a principle opposed to that upon which our National Government was formed and has prospered—opposed to the interests and wishes of the people of Maryland—a principle which can never peaceably be carried into practice—and the agitation of which is calculated to alienate the affections of the people of the counties from a city whose prosperity should be their pride, and whose interests they should be ever ready to defend.

But this is not the only change contemplated by these reformers—disinterested patriots who are ever ready to make or unmake constitutions once a year; provided always that by the change their chances are bettered of filling the offices appertaining thereto! To stop here would leave the work but half finished.—The next object is

2. TO TAKE THE APPOINTING POWER FROM THE GOVERNOR AND VEST IT IN THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, OR THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES.

At a meeting of Loco Focos held at the Court House in Bel-Air on the 26th of May last, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That it is inconsistent with Republican "principles, to give kingly patronage to any man, e-"ven for a time, particularly when the appointing pow-"er can be more safely trusted to the people them-"selves, or their *immediate representatives*, and that the "appointment of most of the officers of the State ought "to be taken from the Executive."

Another resolution was adopted calling for a reform of the Senate, "because that body has ceased to be what it was intended to be!" We presume that the glorious nineteen and their supporters intended it should be a Loco Foco body; but finding that the Whigs still retain, and are likely to retain, a majority there, they would gladly have a change, and apply the principle of representation according to population to that body also.

The above resolutions, though adopted at a meeting *professedly* not of a party character, are *exclusively* Loco Foco in their origin. Not a single Whig (as the writer is credibly informed) was present at the meeting. They moreover bear internal evidence of having been prepared by one of the most acute of the Loco Foco leaders in the State.

Here then we have a shadowing forth of the future sequel of this reform panic. First we are to have representation according to population. Then the appointing power to be taken from the Executive and vested in the people themselves or "their *immediate representatives*," viz: the House of Delegates. Here we must remark that we cannot see how the Legislature is more the immediate representatives of the people than the Governor, considering that both are elected directly by them.

This project certainly does credit to the acuteness and foresight of the Loco Foco leaders. Vest the appointing power in the House of Delegates, and give Baltimore city and county twenty-five members, and there can be little doubt that our Loco Foco friends will, for years to come, be able to enjoy, in full security, "these substantial objects of private happiness"—the salaries of the offices of the State!

If any Whig of Maryland has taken part or lot in the Reform Convention about to assemble, we beg him to pause and consider to what object the whole movement tends. To get up an excitement upon the subject various motives have been suggested according to the feelings of the people in different parts of the State. To the Loco Focos of Harford, the repeal of the direct tax law has been held up as a necessary result of Reform; in Baltimore the Stamp Act is the great grievance which calls for a new Constitution!—For our own part, earnestly desirous of seeing the credit of our State restored, and believing that the revenue bills above mentioned, with others enacted by the last Legislature, will go far to accomplish that object, we should regret to see any of them repealed, at least at the present. But really, admitting the propriety of a repeal of some of the above laws, is it not a novel doctrine, that we are to have a new Constitution for that purpose? The same body which enacted the laws possesses the power of repealing them;—and to effect a repeal is a much easier undertaking than the creating a new Constitution.

We are willing to admit that a retrenchment of some of the expenses of our State government might be made with advantage. But is the destruction of that Government the first step necessary to effect that object? The Legislature already possesses ample power over the subject. If retrenchment, or even a change of any part of the Constitution is desirable, here is the proper and constitutional mode of effecting it. Here the voice of the people can be heard as well as in convention—all the members of the House of Delegates are elected annually, and one third of the Senate every two years. If the people speak upon the object of retrenchment, at the ballot box, their wishes must prevail in the Legislature.

A MARYLANDER.

August 21, 1845.

Communications.

THE ceremony of laying the Corner-Stone of a new M. E. Church in this town took place yesterday according to previous announcement. Though the weather was very unfavourable for a large gathering, still the friends of religion in general and of Methodism collected from various parts of the county to a considerable number, and by two o'clock our town presented a very likely appearance, making a beautiful contrast with the dullness of the weather around and over us. Arrangements having been previously made, by procuring the use of the lot and seating the ground, at a few minutes past 2 o'clock the meeting assembled on the beautiful lawn of Doct. J. Muse, in front of his dwelling. Several Clergymen beside the stated Pastors of the Church in Cambridge, were present and participated in the exercises. The Rev. J. Kenneday D. D. of Wilmington, Del. opened the meeting by reading a very beautiful and appropriate hymn, which was sung by the audience and followed by a prayer by Rev. J. Hazzard of Salsbury Md. The Rev. Mr. Kenneday then arose and read as the foundation of his remarks the 28 chap. & 16 verse of Isiah: "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, &c." From these words he gave a very sensible, appropriate and eloquent sermon, which so far as appearances were indicative gave universal satisfaction.

At the close of the sermon a collection was taken up to aid in erecting the new Church amounting to $45.-00. This was followed by pledges to the handsome sum of $418,00 in all for the day $463,00. The success of this effort exceeded the expectations of the most sanguine, when we consider the threatening aspect of the weather, and especially the fact that the audience present, with but little exception, had already subscribed rising $3700,00 for this laudible and holy enterprize, I regard the contribution of the day, as decidedly the most noble I ever witnessed. I should do the people of the country the justice to say that the pledges of yesterday were principally from this source, the citizens of the town having previously subscribed.

The corner stone being on the spot when the sermon was preached, was carried by the trustees seven in number to the lot where the church is being erected.—These were preceded by the clergymen present, and followed by the building committee, the official and private members of the church, citizens of the town and county with all others in attendence.

When the large concourse present had reached the spot, the large stone was placed at the corner, and in it was deposited by the writer the following articles, viz:—Holy Bible, the Methodist Hymn Book and decipline, the report of the Missionary Society of the M. E. Church, the General Minutes, the Proceedings of the Gen. Con. of 1840 & 44, the address of the American Protestant association, the register of Dickenson College for 1844—5, the Christian Advocate and Journal, the Christian Repository, the female Student, the Cambridge Chronicle, the Baltimore Sun, containing the last illness and death of Ex President Jackson, and the Baltimore Republican. A record also of the following names was made and deposited viz: the President & vice President of the U. States, the Governor and Secretary of the State of Maryland, the officers of Dorchester county, the judges of the district court, and also of the orphans court, the commissioners of the county, and the officers of the corporation of Cambridge. The Bishops of the M. E. Church, the Presiding Elder of the district, the preachers of the circuit, the officiating Ministers of the day, with all the official members of the Church in the Circuit, the board of trustees, the building committee and all the contributors to the church up to the time of making the deposits. I should have named among the articles deposited several pieces of new coin, directly from the mint, and bearing date of 1845, amounting to $1.91 cts.

After sealing the stone the services were concluded by reading the 87 Ps. singing a hymn of praise and pronouncing the benediction.

During the entire service and especially at the close the feeling was general if not universal that this was a proud day for Cambridge, and memorable in the history of the Church of God.

J. D. ONINS.

Cambridge, August 29th 1845.

SPRING DALE, 29 August 1845.

To the Editor of the Cambridge Chronicle.

DEAR SIR:—Having seen a publication in your paper of some few weeks since, (the date not precisely recollected and not having preserved that paper, I can not give the date) charging the members of the whig Convention of the 21st of September last (convened in Cambridge) with political Juggling, wire working corruption &c. And having been often solicited by members of that Convention and others to answer to the Charges therein made; and having understood since from good authority, that Mr. Hayward the author of the publication has charged me individually of having used my influence to his prejudice, and having been called on by several persons to know the facts in that case, induces me very reluctantly to respond to those charges, and hope the foregoing will be a sufficient apology for the few remarks I am about to make:

In reply to the charge first make against the Convention, I do most positively and conscientiously declare that no juggling, wire working, or undue means were used in the least to the prejudice of Mr. Hayward or any other gentleman a candidate before the Convention; that the whole proceedings of that Convention as far as I could possibly conceive were conducted upon fair honorable & correct principles; the merits of no one candidate discussed in that meeting, and each member of the Convention was left to the free and unbiased judgement and conviction of his own mind with regard to the choice of the candidate or candidates before the Convention; and further, I would say in the fear of that God before whom I expect to be judged for my conduct on that occasion, that I do believe that the Gentlemen composing that Convention, were of too high a character to be capable of the injustice charged upon them in that article. I will now say without any fear of successfull contradiction, that there is not one single number of that Convention, (Mr. Hayward's most warmest friends not excepted) but what will say that the whole proceedings of that meeting were fairly and honorably conducted, and that Mr. Hayward's claims were as fairly advoacted as any other member's.

In reply to the specific charge against myself, I will say that I understand Mr. H. accuses me with having been called on by some Gentlemen, Delegates from Hoopers Island who were favorable to his nomination and who were pledged to him, to give my opinion as to which of the Candidates for the Sheriffalty was the most available man, or in other words to that amount, and that I asserted that I believed Mr. Jacobs was the man, and the man of my choice; that was the fact in part, but it seems to require the whole of a sentance to make it intelligible or in other words to state all the facts in a case in order to its understanding.

I will try as far as my recollection serves to state the facts in that case. On the morning of the Convention while I was in the back yard of Major Yates', and coming in from the stable, I met with Mr. Benjamin Travers and Mr. Levin Phillips both highly respectable Gentlemen (Delegates from Hoopers Island to the Convention) who for several years I think had served with me on the Grand Jury of this county, Those gentlemen one or both called on me, and stated that they wished to speak with me and after giving them my hand as is usual on meeting of friends, they