

agements. They elected him. Therefore, in conclusion, he would say to the gentleman who had brought this matter up, that if he should receive as full an acquittal from the hands of his constituents as he expected to receive from his, his friend might well be pleased.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, said he would cheerfully agree to abide that issue.

The question was stated to be on agreeing to the pending amendment.

Mr. MERRICK said:

That nothing could be accomplished by taking any vote of less than a majority of the whole number. He presumed no member would desire to see the Constitution, or any clause of it, adopted by any vote which did not indicate the sense of a majority of the body.

If, therefore, no gentleman was disposed to go on with the discussion, he would move an adjournment.

Mr. CHAMBERS said he had no intention to interpose, in any respect, in the matter at issue between the gentlemen from Baltimore county and Baltimore city. They must adjust their family differences in their own way, as best they may. But there was one most significant fact stated by the former gentleman, and now for the first time publicly avowed, which deserved marked attention, and which ought not to pass without observation. It would become matter of history, along with the proceedings of this body, and might have the effect to dispense entirely, with the usefulness of a large portion of this body, and indeed, with the necessity of the further and future attendance of many members of this Convention. That fact, thus deliberately and publicly announced, by the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) was, that in a caucus, composed of a portion of the members of this house, to which many of us had not been invited, at which many of us were not present, arrangements had been made, opinions discussed, concessions agreed upon, and measures matured, to be brought into this house for its formal endorsement and sanction, as parts of the new Constitution—and most vital parts of it. He merely rose to rivet attention to the important fact. Its fatal influence upon the free action and impartial judgment of members, must be apparent. But more of that at another time. The fact is not, to be announced, without observation.

Mr. FIERY said that a wrong impression prevailed as to the origin of the proposition which he had submitted, and he desired to correct the error, before it became a matter of history. He wished it to be distinctly understood, that whilst he attended the meetings of a reform caucus, with a view of compromising the question of representation, he never offered a proposition in that caucus, nor did he vote, or pledge himself to vote, for any measure originating in that caucus. The *projet* which he had offered, was offered upon his own responsibility. He had examined the different plans which had been proposed and acted upon by the Convention, and having matured one which he believed would bring to its support a majority of this body, and

give security to all sections of the State, he now bespoke for it a calm and impartial consideration.

Mr. PUESSTMAN made some remarks which will be published hereafter.

Mr. GWINN asked if the gentleman from Kent, who sought to cast in some measure, the imputation of a private combination upon those, with whom he had, for the most part, acted, was not aware that within the last three or four weeks, his own friends from the smaller counties, in one place or another, had met and consulted upon a plan and scheme which they thought ought to be supported in the Convention? If the gentleman did not know it, he was ignorant of that which, possibly, every other gentleman, on both side, of the House, knew perfectly well. He did not choose, when the members of the democratic reform party were charged with having met in caucus, that gentlemen upon the other side should assume to themselves the peculiar credit of having remained apart and acted only in the presence of the Convention and the world.

He did not mean to say that such consultations were improper. Perhaps they were well adapted to the furtherance of public business; but, if there were blame, the gentleman must place it upon the shoulders of those also with whom he had hitherto acted.

Mr. CHAMBERS replied, that he had had no association with, nor had he in any degree formed part or parcel of any caucus or meeting held for the purpose of arranging and agreeing upon any measure designed for the adoption of the Convention. A conference or caucus, as a preparatory measure to the election of officers of the body, was a totally different affair. It was usual in all bodies, if not universal, and often absolutely necessary, to effect an organization. But it was as universal and altogether unnecessary in regard to the measures to be acted upon by the body, after its organization.

The Constitution was to be formed by the Convention, after mature deliberation and consultation, amongst all the representatives of the whole people of the State. The humblest member here, has the right to ask attention to his opinions and his reasons—has a right to know the reasons for the opinions of others. No one portion of the body has a right to deprive any other portion of the privilege of participating in the deliberations which take place. If a majority of the body could retire to another part of State house, and there, by conference and discussion, and under the influence of sectional, or party, or political considerations, not common to others, concur in important measures, by an arrangement which would require a minority of that separate meeting to yield to a majority of that meeting, but who were not a majority of the Convention, it was manifest we must have a Constitution, not in conformity to the opinions of the Convention.

The minority in the caucus, and the excluded members, might constitute a decided majority of this body, and yet their opinions would not avail or prevail. Now, the gentleman from Bal-