

But when not instructed, he must suppose that his constituents designed to place some confidence in his judgment, to clothe him with some discretion.

It was his duty to vote now, not as his constituents had voted four years ago, when this Convention was not contemplated by them; but as he, (Mr. T.) believed, they would decide, if the question were now submitted to them. He was of opinion that they would decide differently if they were here and could see the difficulty we have experienced in forming a Constitution; and the probability that many things will be left to future legislation.

Gentlemen have stated time and again that they would not encumber the Constitution, with what they considered legislative provisions. This, he, (Mr. T.) said, was his own opinion. Though belonging to a party which receives scant credit with our adversaries, for confidence in the people, he might say for himself, that when he witnessed the efforts that are sometimes made throughout the land, to inflame the passions, and excite the prejudices of the people for political ends, he ever turned with an abiding trust to their intelligence, virtue and patriotism, as the lasting foundations of our republic. He was willing to leave many things to be considered—much to be done by the legislature, who could better ascertain and follow the wishes of the people than we can.

If we lay down correct principles in the Constitution, the people will follow them out. If we furnish a good plan of government, the legislature will fill up the details as may best promote the interest and prosperity of the State.

Mr T. said, he thought that annual sessions would be necessary for some years at least, before the machinery of this new government could be properly set in motion. He was in favor of annual sessions, and short sessions of fifty or sixty days at most. He had, himself, last winter witnessed what he never before saw in legislation. He had seen bill after bill passed without having been read at all; when he was satisfied that very few of the members knew what they were voting upon. This was in consequence of the number of bills before the body. He had seen much confusion and haste at the close of the annual sessions—but nothing to compare with what he saw last winter. He was not a member, but he saw enough as a mere spectator at the lobby, to satisfy him that the biennial bill had been purchased at a fearful cost—the hazard, if not the loss of sound, deliberate, and judicious legislation.

Gentlemen had argued against leaving too much power to the legislature. What is "too much?" Here we may differ. In one breath we are told that we must obey the potent will of the people, because they have expressed it favorably to biennial sessions. In the next breath it is said that the legislature must not be trusted again with this power, although they come from the people.

If we acknowledge this duty ourselves, why shall we impute a different sense of duty to those who may come after us as representatives of the

people. They obeyed the people on this subject in 1846; why will they not obey again, if this question goes a second time before that high tribunal as is now proposed by the amendment.

Gentlemen had warned the friends of reform that if this biennial feature is not retained, the Constitution will be rejected by the people. This warning might properly enough come upon those who rejoiced in the name of reformers; but he was at a loss how to account for such a voice from Dorchester and Worcester counties. The gentleman from Dorchester, (Mr. Hicks,) had said sometime ago, if he remembered, that the basis of representation and some other features in the present Constitution, suited him. Mr. T. inferred that if the basis and these other features were materially changed, the rejection of the Constitution would not be disagreeable to that gentleman. The gentleman from Worcester, had said he voted for the Convention in June last, and therefore claimed to be a reformer. Yet, the reformers do not take him as one of their brotherhood. His two Eastern Shore friends might go for triennial sessions without risk of being deemed any better reformers than they would be called if they went even for annual sessions. Annual and biennial sessions have little to do with the question of reform, as it is understood by those who claim to be its peculiar friends. Some of the stoutest reformers here are advocating annual sessions. Carroll county goes for them, as carrying out a cardinal democratic doctrine—"frequent elections and strict accountability;" while Frederick county is divided. Mr. T. supposed that his friends from Frederick, (Messrs. BISEL and SHRYVER,) considered themselves none the less good reformers because they happened to disagree with their colleagues on this question of legislative sessions.

But suppose the warning be heeded. It may operate the other way at last. Mr. T. was no prophet, and he gave no warnings to others. He had quite enough—may be too much—on hand in endeavoring to keep right himself. He would, however, venture to suggest, that twenty-five thousand five hundred voters cast their ballots in 1846 against the biennial bill. Suppose all, or a large portion of these, were to cast their votes against the Constitution, if they are not gratified by having the annual sessions incorporated as part of the instrument—it may be rejected. We are not to suppose that these twenty-five thousand five hundred are not of the same mind now, any more than we are to presume that the other thirty thousand, who were for biennial sessions, have not changed their opinion. In about fifty-five thousand votes, there was a majority for biennial sessions of about four thousand six hundred. While, therefore, the reformers are taking warning, they had as well remember, that in 1846, there were nearly one half of all the voters—only twenty-three hundred, less than half—opposed to biennial sessions, and that these same, for aught we know, may make this very feature the ground of invincible repugnance to the ratification of the Constitution.

This was not altogether conjecture, for one of the delegates from St. Mary's states that one rea-