

The gentleman from Baltimore, would learn when he had the benefit of larger experience, that the only safe and sure way to success, is by a straight forward, plain, direct and honest course to the object candidly avowed. The crooked, tortuous path in which that gentleman travelled, occasionally crossed this straight track and brought him in his view, and the gentleman was hence induced to think that he (Mr. C.) was also out of line. It was only an optical illusion. If the gentleman would march boldly, right onward, disregarding the clamors of that large family in Baltimore, alluded to by his colleague, or from any other quarter, his own intelligence would take him in the direct road.

Mr. GWINN asked if the gentleman would point out the direct course.

Mr. CHAMBERS. "Follow me." (a laugh.)

He said the gentleman from Frederick, [Mr. THOMAS.] had renewed the charge against this resolution, that it was an abstraction. He vindicated it at length from this imputation, and maintained that it was eminently practical. That gentleman had indulged in an elaborate address to the House, avowedly to convince them of the great error they had committed by their vote of sixty odd to seventeen, and yet concluded by assuring us that the vote "amounted to nothing." It was very true, as stated that members of a committee, from courtesy to a chairman, often permitted him to report propositions they did not approve. It often occurred too that members presented propositions they did not mean to sanction by their votes.

But in all such cases the fact was announced and known, and the sole object was to bring the House to a vote in which every member could express his actual opinion. It was certainly the first time in the experience of some years he had ever heard it said that on the final passage of a resolution by yeas and nays, the vote was no evidence of opinion, and he was glad to have the endorsement of the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. McLANE,) who had so fully concurred in this view. He had no doubt there would be found of the members voting on that proposition, no more than seventeen, to go for the broad doctrine of representation on the basis of numbers alone.

He repeated the ground he had heretofore urged as to the *cui bono*. Two gentlemen on the Committee would agree to nothing till driven by the House from this claim of a popular basis. When that was disposed of, as it would be by passing this resolution, there remained the alternatives of compromise or the *status anti belum*—the present arrangement. Compromise was an indefinite term. On that subject too the Committee was a divided family. We had a compromise in 1836—the city of Baltimore had the "lion's share." We are now to compromise again and another "lion's share" is to be taken from what was then left us. The House should indicate their views in regard to this one most important item in the compromise. The last vote decides that a reduction must be made from the immense number which would be given to the city by a basis purely of numbers. What was to be the limit? He supposed it must be to an extent

which would avert the danger of bringing the counties entirely under the control of the city. He illustrated how this would be the case if no limit was imposed. This amendment was offered by him in Committee—it was now before the House, and he would stand by it. If the House thought it proper to make the limit that which was allowed to the largest county, then they should adopt this amendment; if they determined any other to be proper let it be made, and the Committee will regard it as an instruction.

Mr. McLANE and Mr. CHAMBERS said each a few words in explanation.

Mr. THOMAS stated, that he had considered these resolutions as presenting merely a negative question until yesterday. The amendment now proposed by the gentleman from Kent, giving Baltimore a specific number of representatives was an affirmative question. So was the vote of yesterday, deciding that population shall not be the basis of representation in the House of Delegates. By that vote the House had fixed one principle: and if it should be decided that Baltimore shall have a representation equal to the largest county in the State, another principle will be fixed.

He went on to state the parliamentary practice in relation to amendments and the manner in which they might be introduced; and asserted that any gentleman had a right to get up and contradict to-day any position which he might have taken yesterday; and even to record his vote in one way, and to argue in another. No gentleman could be required to redeem any supposed pledge contained in his vote of the day preceding.

Mr. McLANE explained.

Mr. JOHNSON asked if the gentleman from Kent objected to going into committee of the whole.

Mr. CHAMBERS said he would not object to that course.

Mr. THOMAS resumed, explaining more fully his views as to the binding effect of the vote of a gentleman in his future action. He adverted to the contemplated reforms which extended to the Executive, the Judicial, and the Legislative departments. It was intended to take away almost all power from the Executive; and he stated that he would not object to this if to that reform were connected an extension of power to the Legislative branch. He stated that he represented a large population, and he would not pledge them or himself to the course they should take when the Constitution was presented to them for acceptance. There might be provisions engrafted in it, such as would compel him to give his own vote against it, and to admonish the people from the hills and the house-tops to reject it.

He concluded with some further remarks, generally reiterating what he had previously said as to the inefficiency of votes given on isolated questions to stand as a true exponent of the final vote of gentlemen on the report as a whole. He considered himself as entirely free to move to amend the report hereafter by the introduction of