

rights and property of her citizens. For three days was that noble, gallant city under the control of a lawless, though "immortal power." Nor was it restrained until the venerable patriot of the Revolution, Gen. Samuel Smith, was called from his quiet abode to take command, and rescue his native city from anarchy and bloodshed. The Legislature of Maryland at its next session passed the indemnity law, by which the sufferers were compensated for the loss of property. Do gentlemen desire that such scenes should recur again? If not, encourage not this morbid appetite for unrestrained license which must result in anarchy.

The gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Johnson,) asks, would you deny to the people of Maryland, what has been done in the monarchical governments of Europe, the right to overthrow their government?

Mr. J. said the gentleman should recollect that our institutions were established by ourselves, and are very different from the monarchic or absolute governments of Europe. Here the people formed their own Constitutions, in their own way; enacted the laws by their accredited agents; prescribed the manner in which those Constitutions should be framed and altered. It required no revolution to accomplish this—it was the free action of the people—their Constitution—their laws. He was surprised that comparison should be attempted between the State of Maryland, and any of the oppressed subjects of Europe. His friend had referred to "France whose people had hurled from power those tyrannical rulers, and taken the government into their own keeping." There was no analogy between the government of France, and the government of Maryland, and, however much he desired to see republican principles prevail, he should not look to the present state of France, as an example worthy of imitation. It is true she had dethroned her monarch—it was equally true that her present condition evinced but little of republican government. At peace with all the world, an army of four hundred thousand soldiers are held in arms to preserve the peace of her own citizens, and it is generally admitted that at no period during Louis Phillipe's reign, was the press under so rigid a surveillance as at the present moment. The government is unstable—her citizens in constant dread of revolution. This, Mr. J. believed to be attributed to the organization of her government, in having but one Assembly, uncontrolled, except by popular will. So long as this state of things existed, Mr. J. had but little hopes of a pure republican administration of the French government. Engraft similar principles upon Maryland, and anarchy will subvert the Republic.

The proposition of the gentleman, as explained by himself, will be productive of revolution; and here, Mr. J. said, he would do justice to his colleague from the city of Baltimore, (Mr. Brent,) who, in his argument yesterday, had taken a sound, statesman-like view of the subject as regards the manner of altering or abolishing the Constitution. It must be done by the provisions of the Constitution and laws, or by revolution. On the two important questions those gen-

tleman differ, though representing the same constituency. The one, (Mr. Brent,) an advocate for representation exclusively on the basis of numbers. Whilst his colleague, (Mr. Preastman,) does not think there is a sensible man in the city of Baltimore in favor of, or who expects the apportionment to be based exclusively on population.

Mr. PREASTMAN said such was the feelings of his constituents, although since he came here he had expressed a willingness to agree to a compromise.

Mr. J. resumed. So far his friend was right, and held sound doctrine, and Mr. J. regretted that he did not go with his colleague, (Mr. Brent,) in favor of "changing or abolishing the Constitution according to the laws of the land."

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, here asked if the new Constitution would be in accordance with the frame of the old Constitution?

Mr. J. replied that the gentleman from Caroline was as competent to answer that question as he was. As for himself, Mr. J. said, he was for such changes in the Constitution as might contribute to the interest and benefit of the whole State, giving to a majority a proper influence; to the minority a safe and efficient protection. With such land-marks, he would not be fastidious as to minor questions.

Mr. J. concluded by saying it was far from his intention to discuss at length all the questions involved in the bill of rights. He believed that, as reported by the Committee, it embraced and breathed throughout, sound, republican, democratic doctrines. He would not, as others had done here, make professions of his love for the people; he distrusted and doubted the sincerity of some of those who were constantly proclaiming their devotion to the rights and will of the people. He preferred to guard the people against the professions of those who were loud in denouncing as enemies those who did not unite with them in administering to popular clamor.

Mr. WRIGHT, without making a speech, felt himself bound to state his sentiments. His friend from Baltimore had expressed opinions in regard to the rights of the people, and he desired to say that he concurred in every word which had fallen from that gentleman. The people have a right to alter, modify or change their Constitution, in any way which they may deem consistent with their interests. But the gentleman from Baltimore did not go far enough. The people would not be sufficiently vigilant over their own rights, if they did not take care to have a clause in the Constitution which would place in their own hands the power to change or alter the organic law at their will. It is our duty, as their agents, to make such provision. But the gentleman from Baltimore did not go far enough; he was for cutting the dam, and letting lose the water, before the reservoir was prepared for its reception. The other gentleman from Baltimore, had gone further; he went about as far as this Convention should go. He would go with both these gentlemen, who had stood boldly forward to assert that the people had rights, and told them how they ought to exercise those rights. The gentleman from Dorchester, (Mr.