THE CHRONICLE.

CAMBRIDGE—MD.

SATURDAY MORNING, September, 6th 1845.

The Orphans' Court of Dorchester County will sit on Monday 8th September.

V. B. PALMER,

No. 59 Pine st. Phila., and 160 Nassau st. (Tribune Buildings,) N. Y., and 3. 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.

In a late Chronicle—a paper on "Lightning rods" by J. E. M.—contained a typographical error—at the first of the 3d paragraph from the bottom.

For "*colume*"—read "*volume.*"

By the arrival of the Caledinia at Boston, we have fourteen days later news from Europe. The weather at the last accounts, had become more favorable, and the failure of the crops is conequently rendered more doubtful. It seems too, that there was a greater amount of grain in the Kingdom than was anticipated, but notwithstanding, there has been some improvement in the price.

AS CONVENTIONAL REFORM has recently received an additional practical importance, on account of the nomination of a regular reform ticket in our county, it would seem very proper at this time, to add some further reflection upon the subject, in addition, to what we have already published. We are led to this, not that we for one moment imagine that there is the remotest possibility of the election of that ticket, but simply, because the action of the party indicates an intention seriously to attempt something. In treating the subject, we do not intend to travel over the same ground which has been previously occupied with much greater ability than belongs to us, but only to mention some points which seem to have been but slightly noticed, if at all, in the articles which have already appeared. First of all, we will quote the fifty-ninth article of our present constitution, which is in the following words—"this form of government and the declaration of rights, and no part thereof, shall be altered, changed, or abolished, unless a bill so to alter, change, or abolish, the same, shall pass the general assembly, and be published at least three months before a new election, and shall be confirmed by the general assembly after a new election of delegates, in the first session after such new election: Provided, that nothing in this form of government which relates to the Eastern Shore *particularly*, shall at any time hereafter, be altered, unless for the alteration and confirmation thereof, at least two thirds of all the members of each branch of the general assembly shall concur." After reading this clause, every one must perceive that as long as it stands unrepealed, we violate the constitution if we attempt *conventional reform*. Yet notwithstanding, this would seem the most natural point, at which to begin the discussion of the question, we have never once heard it examined or even alluded to, by conventional reformers. They invariably commence "a little part the beginning" and while they urge the expediency of their measures, do not condescend to establish that they act in conformity to law. Possibly, they may intend to repeal this clause—which would require two years—and then hold a convention in accordance with another, substituted in its place; but this would require three years, at least, and consequently be more tedious than the mode already prescribed; so that judging from the general tenor of their views as expressed, and the past experience of their indifference as to the observance of constitutional law, we may fairly presume that they intend to have a convention as speedily as possible and to justify it afterwards, by their favorite argument of necessity. We do not pretend to say, that occasions will not sometimes occur "in the course of human events," when revolution is the only practicable means of redressing grievances. But it is childish to say that the present, is such an occasion. We are suffering under heavy taxation it is true, but this is not the result of imperfections in our form of government; yet every man enjoys to the fullest extent, the rights of property and personal liberty. A new constitution can never pay the interest on the State debt, nor cancel the principal. In no light in which we estimate our grievances do they appear so intolerable, as to demand a resort to any other means of redress than that established by law. The constitutional method is slow and delatory, designedly, to prevent those continual changes in fundamental principles, which have proved the blight and destruction of every nation in which they have occurred. But who will say that reform by two successive legislatures is impracticable? They tell us that it has been tried and found inefficient, year, after year. And why? Simply because the people were opposed to it. We obtained whatever changes a majority wanted at the time, but because the legislature has not hitherto altered everything to suit the fancies of every *individual*, they argue therefore, that legislative reform is impracticable. Reform, that will quiet the cry of reform, or satisfy the desires of ambitious aspirants, who will be disappointed as long as an established order of things exists, may possibly be desirable, but we fear can never be obtained, even, through the mysterious agency of a convention. Unfortunately conventions as well as legislatures will have minorities and under any circumstances, the ship of State must from the necessity of the case have, at last, but a limited number of berths. As far as the Eastern Shore is concerned, the *preference* in favor of legislative reform, is too manifest to be argued. The ratio of representation can only be changed by the votes of two successive legislatures composed of two distinct bodies, whereas, a single act of a convention, might be sufficient. And this, to say nothing of that part of the clause of the constitution we have quoted, requiring two thirds of *all the members* of *each branch* of the general assembly, in two successive sessions, to pass any alteration in the government affecting the Eastern Shore "*particularly*," which our own opinion inclines us to consider as applying to the present case, but which, the precedents in some degree, seem to contradict. So far then from the violation of the fifty ninth clause of the constitution's being justified by the overruling urgency of the case, reform as far as desirable can be attained with equal certainty and greater safety, in the mode therein prescribed. It has not hitherto been accomplished, for the best of all reasons, because a majority of the people have not wished it, and not, as is attributed, because of any inherent obstacle in the nature of the legislature.

Another objection to the call of a convention, to alter and remodel the constitution, *entirely*, results from the state of things which has given rise to the clamor and which would doubtless give character to the new instrument, to be the offspring of their deliberation. We all know that we are deeply involved in debt and that the principal *avowed* object of the reformers is to save expense in *every way*. Some of them even attempting to prove by *actual calculation*, that they can save more than the *whole expenses* of the government. Now we contend that the legislature can diminish our burdens as much and as speedily as they, without disturbing the fundamental principles of liberty. Why then should our bill of rights and all our wise constitutional provisions be mapped to suit an unnatural, as it is an unfortunate, period of our history? Do reformers suppose we will be always as much in debt as now. If so our future is truly hopeless. Yet in the establishment of a permanent government for future generations *every thing* is to be sacrificed to the economical principle. The ghosts of a host of revolutionary heroes could tell them that there are some rights paramount to economy.—The cheapest government is not the best, but that which gives the greatest security to the lives, the liberties and the property of the people.—There are more ways of robbing a man of his property, than by taxation, and we trust that *justice* will never be reduced to such a state of poverty, and servility to a dominant party, that no one of us can point to his possessions and say, this belongs to me and my heirs forever. Thus much to illustrate the general principle, but let us see in which case the actual saving will probably be the greatest. The legislature is obliged by law, to adjourn on the tenth of March in every year, and before that time would no doubt accomplish all that is possible in the way of retrenchment. But judging from the *discordant* species of harmony, which has characterized the previous meetings of the "reformers," if once they assemble for purposes of *serious* action, it is but fair to conjecture, that, the nature of their business will constitute them members "during good behaviour" and leaving no Cromwell to dissolve them, the expenses of their session will be added to the *debt* of the *State* until they are dissolved, by being respectively called to pay the debt of nature. So they would be actually increasing our expenses in one way, while they were *attempting* to diminish them in another. Experience teaches us that this argument is far from being rediculous. At their recent convention in Baltimore, when fortunately they were not compelled to act, they were thrown into confusion and disorder, as soon as one, more sincere than the rest, proposed something more specific than "equal laws" and the "general welfare." In regard to these two important and very *definite* principles, every individual in *our* party would argue with them, and cooperate in the most perfect harmony. We should only differ, in denying the necessity of having *conventional* reformers to carry them out.—But as it is a *known characteristic of their party* to go for "principles not men" perhaps we are not justified in supposing that on this point even, there could exist between us, the slightest difference.

Since writing the article above, we have discovered that the same subject has been handled by "A Marylander" with his usual ability. We accordingly publish his views in another column.

DISREGARD OF THE LAWS, CRIMES, &c.—The frequent occurrence, in various parts of the country, of popular outbreaks and resistance to the laws, as well as of other crimes, is a subject of deep regret to all who take an interest in the well being of society, and the stability of our institutions. These offences have become so common of late, as to create alarm in the minds of the more orderly and well disposed of our citizens, and to cause them to apprehend the very worst consequences to our social organization, if more efficient steps are not taken to punish those who are guilty of them. Scarcely a day passes that we do not read accounts of the proceedings of some lawless mob, the principals and accessories to which are allowed to escape that punishment which their acts so well deserve. The perpetration of the most atrocious crimes, too, is almost daily of occurrence in some portion or other of the country, and in many such instances the offenders are never overtaken and made to expiate their evil deeds in the way pointed out by the laws. Why is this the case? Why is it that the laws, which have been enacted for the suppression of crime, and the preservation of social order, do not more generally take their course? Why is it that the incendiary, the murderer and other evil doers so frequently transgress with impunity and go scot free? It is not, we are sure, because the community do not view with disapprobation and abhorrence their reprehensible acts. The public sentiment revolts at them, and calls loudly for their condign punishment. Why is it then, let us again ask, that the evil of which we complain is not remedied—nay, why is it (for such is the fact) on the increase? It is, in our opinion, because those who are entrusted with the execution of the laws are not, for the most part, as energetic in the discharge of their duty as they should be. Our Governors, Mayors, and other executive officers are men who either lack resolution and industry in the fulfilment of the important trusts confided to them, or have not a proper appreciation of their duties. We are afraid, also, that not unfrequently political feeling has its influence in restraining them from adopting that rigid course of action, which the nature of their offices so pre eminently demands. Herein, as we conceive, mainly lies the cause of the grievance we have thus briefly hinted at, and which it behooves all those who have important interests at stake in the matter, to endeavor to remove. Let the people, then, see that those who are clothed with executive authority, are men entitled to their confidence. Let them be men who are bold and inflexible in the discharge of their duty—disregarding every consideration in their official action but the good of the community. Let them be men of sufficient force of character to assume all the proper responsibilities of their stations, and our word for it, the records of crime and disorder throughout the country will fill but a small space in our history, and the safety and the permanence of our institutions be greatly promoted.—*Balt. American.*

From the Baltimore American.

COMMUNICATION.

A FEW WORDS TO REFORMERS IN GENERAL.

Our communication of the 21st instant was addressed to the *Whigs of Maryland*. In this we propose to say a few words to those of our fellow-citizens who are ambitious of appropriating to themselves the title of REFORMERS.

It appears that the first object of these gentlemen—that for which they have now convened in solemn council—is to procure from the next Legislature the passage of a law authorising the assembling of a State Convention for the purpose of framing a new Constitution. Their battle cry is *Conventional Reform!* Are these gentlemen aware that they are petitioning the Legislature for that which it has no power to grant?—Yes, we assert that the Legislature of Maryland has no power to pass a law to provide for assembling a Convention to frame a new Constitution; and that any Senator or Delegate who may vote for such a bill can only do so by violating his official oath "to support the Constitution and laws of the State." This may seem a bold assertion. Nevertheless, we think it can be easily proved to the satisfaction of every intelligent and impartial mind.

The forty second section of the Declaration of Rights provides:

"That this declaration of rights, or the form of Government to be established by this Convention, or any part or either of them, ought not to be altered, changed or abolished, by the Legislature of this State, but in such manner as this Convention shall prescribe and direct."

The same Convention which made this *Declaration of Rights* framed the State Constitution: and by the 59th article thereof prescribed the manner in which said Constitution might be "altered, changed, or abolished." That article provides:

"That this form of government, and the declaration of rights, and no part thereof, shall be altered, changed, or abolished, unless a bill so to alter, change or abolish the same, *shall pass the General Assembly, and be published at least three months before a new election, and shall be confirmed by the General Assembly after a new election of delegates, in the first session after such new election; provided* that nothing in this form of government, which relates to the Eastern Shore particularly, shall, at any time hereafter, be altered, unless for the alteration any confirmation thereof at least two thirds of all the members of each branch of the General Assembly shall concur."

The Act of 1836, chapter 197, by which so many radical alterations were made in the original Constitution, left the above provisions unchanged. They are therefore still a part of the Constitution. And can any language from the mouth of man be clearer or more positive? It is not declared, that the Constitution *may* be changed in that particular manner; but it is expressly enacted that it shall *not be altered by any other mode.*

All discretionary power as to the mode of reform is taken from the Legislature; and if that body attempt to change or abolish one jot or title of the Constitution, except in the manner provided by the 59th article of that instrument, the act would be utterly unconstitutional and void. The only mode by which a Convention could be constitutionally authorised, would be by two successive Legislatures (the manner pointed out in the 59th article) to repeal said article. For surely, as long as it remains a part of the Constitution, the Legislature must be governed by it.

The 5th article of the Constitution of the United States prescribes the mode by which amendments may be made:

"Congress whenever two thirds of both Houses "shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments "to this Constitution; or on the application of the Le-"gislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall "call a Convention for proposing amendments," &c. Now who, for a moment, would contend that the National Constitution could be amended in any other way than that here prescribed? But in regard to our State Constitution the language is still stronger. Not only is the mode of amending it pointed out, but the Legislature is expressly prohibited from amending it in any other manner.

Those intelligent and patriotic statesmen who were deputed by their fellow-citizens to form a State Constitution, had good and sufficient reasons for inserting the above prohibitory provisions. They declare, in the first article of the Declaration of Rights:

"That all government of right originates from the people, *is founded in* COMPACT *only*, and instituted solely for the good of the whole."

When the Colonial Government ceased in Maryland all political ties between the different sections of the State were of course dissolved. Society was resolved into its original elements. The different counties were under no obligation to unite under one government. They might have formed themselves into several States; or might have united themselves to some of the neighboring States of Pennsylvania, Virginia or Delaware. But, influenced by ties of kindred and blood, it was thought better, if practicable, that the people of all the different sections of the State should unite under one government. Delegates were therefore elected from the different *counties* to meet in State Convention. They met and formed a Constitution.—That Constitution is the COMPACT by which the people of the different counties of the State agreed to unite together as one people. The counties then varied in population almost as much as at present. But the delegates from the smaller counties contended for an equality of representation in the General Assembly, and they succeeded in obtaining it. This provision formed part of the *compact*. Without this concession by the larger counties, it is highly probable that there would have been great difficulty in forming our State Government. There was *then*, as *now*, conflicting sectional interests in different portions of the State.—The local interests of the smaller counties, if represented solely according to population, might have been trampled upon by the overruling power of the larger counties. They therefore contended for an equal representation.

The Eastern Shore, feeling her relative weakness, and jealous of her rights, contended for and obtained a provision that no part of the compact particularly relating to her should be altered without the concurrence of two thirds of each branch of the General Assembly. To provide for changes which might, in course of time, become expedient; a provision was then and added that these changes of the Constitution should be made in a certain manner, *and in that manner only*. Upon these terms the compact was signed by the members of the Convention; the government was formed, and existed, without material alteration, for sixty years. Several important changes were then made; but they were made in the manner pointed out by the Constitution. They were made according to the terms of the compact, and the smaller counties, though their influence was lessened, had no right to complain.

But now a new school of politicians have come upon the stage—ardent patriots whose zeal has been inflamed by the example of that band of worthies, the *Glorious Nineteen*, and who are ever ready to pay to their gallant co reformer, Thomas W. Dorr, as the most illustrious of modern heroes. These gentlemen, for purposes explained by me in a former communication, now call upon the members of the next Legislature to disregard their official oaths, by violating those solemn provisions of the Constitution which have been regarded, as sacred by all parties in the State, for the last seventy years. We have confidence enough in the intelligence and patriotism of that body to believe that this application will stand as little chance of success there as a revolution *a la mode* Dorr would with the people of the State!

A MARYLANDER.

27th August, 1845.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE WHIG CONVENTION AT BARREN CREEK.

The Whig Convention for the nomination of a candidate to represent the Sixth Congressional district of Maryland in the next congress of the U. S. Assembled this day at 12 o'clock M., at Barren Creek Springs in Somerset County.

On motion of A. M. Goldsborough, James Thompson Esq. was called to the chair and Dr. R. R. Ballard, appointed secretary.

The roll being called the following persons presented themselves as delegates of the convention.

Dorchester county, James Thompson, John R. Keene, J. Bond. Chaplain, James Douglass and Edwin E. Medford. Talbot county, John H. Stevens, James Fitz Jarrell, Gustavus A. Skinner and A. M. Goldsborough. Somerset county, Wm. S. Waters, Levin Phillips, Henry T. Tull, Dr. Robert R. Ballard and Jno. W. Crisfield. Worcester county, Teackle Townsend, Benj. J. Desheild and Wm. J. Long.

On motion of Mr. Crisfield, Resolved, That the delegates from Worcester county here present have the privilege of casting five votes; being the number to which that county is entitled; in any mode they may think right.

The delegates from Worcester county, declined casting more votes than those present.

Mr. Townsend stated that the delegates from Worcester present disagreed as to the wishes of their constituents with regard to who should be nominated and moved that the convention adjourn to some future day.

The question was put and determined in the negative by yeas and nays as follows: Affirmative, Messrs. Harris, Skinner Goldsborough, Townsend and Desheild. Negative, Messrs. Thompson, Keene, Chaplain, Douglass, Medford, Fitz Jarrell, Waters, Phillips, Tull, Ballard, Crisfield and Long.

On motion of Mr. Chaplain, Resolved, That the delegates present do Pledge themselves to support and use all honorable means to secure the election of the nominee of this convention, and that any delegate who shall present the name of a person for nomination shall Pledge himself that such person will acquiesce in the decision of this body.

Before the vote was taken on the above Mr. Townsend said, he could not be governed by the resolution if it should be adopted, and therefore declined acting further with the convention and withdrew from it.

On motion of Mr. Crisfield the convention then went into the nomination of a candidate.

Mr. Waters presented Edward Long Esq., of Somerset co. and Mr. Goldsborough presented Gen. Tench Tilghman of Talbot co., for nomination.

The vote was taken and it appeared that Mr. Long, received ten votes and Gen. Tilghman six votes. Mr. Long was declared duly nominated, and the chairman and secretary, authorized to inform him of the nomination.

Resolved, That the Whig Papers be requested to publish the Proceedings.

JAMES THOMPSON, Chairman,

ROBERT R. BALLARD Sec'ry.

Barren Creek Springs,
August 27th 1845.

THE CAUSE IS MOVING ONWARD.

The Reform meeting which met in this place on Monday last was *large* and *enthusiastic*.

The Chairman, John W. Dail, called the meeting to order at 11 o'clock—B. D. Jackson Esq. (of the corresponding committee) read to the meeting the letter received from Mr. Frazier, dated August the 20th.

The committee of conseltation than withdrew in order to arrange their report. In the absence of the committee Geo. A. Z. Smith Esq. was called upon to address the meeting. Mr. Smith read the resolutions passed by the late reform Convention in Baltimore and enforced them with some happy remarks. Josiah Bayly jr. Esq. was then invited to address the meeting, which he proceeded to do, but was interrupted by the return of the committee. Mr. Bayly requested his name to be withdrawn from the committee which was unanimously agreed to by the meeting.

The report of the committee being called for the chairman, B. D. Jackson, presented the names of S. D. Lecompte and Whitefield Woolford Esqrs., as candidates to be supported by the friends of Reform for seats in the next Legislature of Maryland. The announcement was received with an *earnest burst of applause* from the assemblage. The chairman stated that the committee had reported but two names to the consideration of the meeting, from the fact that communications both verbal and written, which required serious consideration, had for the first time then been placed before them. And as they did not wish to take any step without first advising with the great mass of reformers in the county, they proposed to finish their report on the next Monday. The Reform question was made up of interest to important to be affected by any *party* considerations or confined to *party* limits. It was as *sacred* as *the honor of Maryland and as dear as the liberty and property of her citizens.* The committee had been careful to avoid any party feelings or considerations whatever in their deliberations, and it was with the hope of presenting to the friends of reform a ticket composed of Gentlemen of *both* political parties that they desired a post-ponement until Monday next. The meeting concurred in the report of the committee, and on motion adjourned until three o'clock.

The people reassembled according to adjournment. B. D. Jackson and Samuel D. Lecompte Esqrs., at the call of the meeting advocated in their usual able and eloquent manner the principles of reform. The meeting was indeed an enthusiastic one, giving evidence that with them Reform is no "*humbug*" but a cause worthy of the patriotic throughout the State.

On motion of Jas. A. Stewart Esq., the meeting adjourned till Monday next the eighth of September at 11 o'clock.

On motion it was resolved that the proceedings of this meeting, be published in the Cambridge Chronicle and Somerset Gazettee.

We say to the friends of reform once more to the call, dear friends once more.

JOHN W. DAIL, Prest.

JOSEPH H. BYRS Sec'ry.

"RULE OR RUIN"

Seems to be the maxim of our political opponents, Power and not Principle is the object of their Devotion. Any form of Government administered by them is perfect. It only becomes imperfect and oppressive, when administered by others. Our present Constitution was considered the beau ideal of good Government, and so long as the dispensary power was in their hands it worked well,—no complaint was heard nor grievance alleged. No sooner, however, did the Whigs acquire the ascendency, than they began to bawl out most lustily for *Reform*. Salaries, which under a Grason and a Thomas, were considered but fair equivalents for services, are now denounced as extravagant and oppressive. Powers too, which under the aforesaid gentlemen, were harmless,—nay essential to a faithful and efficient administration of the Government, are now proclaimed dangerous, of Kingly character and hostile to the well-being of the people of our State. - [Annapolis Herald.

The honor of the people and the Government of Texas in money matters is not, we hope, elucidated in the following matter, complied from the Texas National Register of the 10th ultimo. An indefinite portion of the citizens of the new State, it is true, fled to it to be secure against the just laws of some of the old States of the Union, and annexation would be a poor business for them if justice could go along with it; but we should have thought that a proposition like the following could hardly have found favor with a majority of the Legislature:

"Mr. Armstrong, on the 26th June, asked leave to introduce a bill barring certain claims, debts, judgments, &c., which he said he would read, and explain how it was connected with the subject of annexation.

"The object of the bill was to prevent the collection of claims against the inhabitants of Texas by citizens of the United States.

"Mr. Armstrong said there were 'many worthy citizens in many of the counties who would be relieved by a bill of this nature. There were a great many persons in this republic, he had no doubt in the world, *who would oppose the measure of annexation* unless they thought their rights *and interests would be guarded and protected by the action of Congress.*

"Mr. Smith, of Fannin, was opposed to the bill. He said: 'It proposes to do away with all just demands against those who have emigrated to this country from any of the States.' The measure of annexation had been carried by a *parcel of people* who have come into the country very lately; and *now they wanted to get rid of paying their honest debts.*' 'Why, sir, said Mr. S., 'as I came from home on my way here, I passed through a people who were about to hang me; not three out of five of whom had been in the country long enough to take the oath of allegiance; *and these people wanted to control my vote.*' Vote to exonerate us from our just debts or we will hang you.

"Mr. Armstrong replied: "Many have come to this country under adverse and *very embarrassing* circumstances.' "The very idea of being again harrassed is enough to *terrify* them, and *drive* them into opposition to the great measure of annexation.'

"There was a great deal further debate on the bill, and it was somewhat amended, but finally carried by a vote of 22 to 17. So the Texans are pretty effectually *protected* against the creditors in the States."

A LARGE ESTATE—*An Owner Wanted.* An estate in Leicestershire, England, valued at £4,000,000, has been left by will to the descendents of the Townley family in the U. States; but who that family is, appears doubtful. A meeting was held at Newark, N. J., last week, which was attended by some two hundred persons, all claiming to be descendents of the Townley family in England. After searching over old family records for a day they raised a sufficient sum of money for the purpose of sending a person to England to investigate the matter. It appears that the Townley family is a very numerous one, as besides the meeting referred to, various letters from different sections of the country, have been received from individuals claiming a distant or near relationship; among them, one from Annapolis, in this State, from the heirs of the late Judge Chase, who "trace their descent direct from the female branch of the Townley family of England."

(From the N. Y. American Republican.)

SUGAR COATED PILL.

Parents who have difficulty in administering medicine to their children, will find a valuable friend in Dr. Smith's Sugar Coated Pill, which is sold at 179 Greenwich Street. Adults will also be pleased with the