

ster would have made the speech he did upon the subject of slavery; and that other equally distinguished gentlemen from the East and the West would have co-operate with him except by compact, and alone with a view of allaying the excitement which was rocking this government from the centre to the circumference? Yes, sir, they risked their reputation at home, that they might pour oil upon the trouble waters; and they have received the thanks of a generous and confiding nation.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, enquired on what authority did the gentleman say that the laws which passed the last Congress of the United States, and which were now known as the compromise laws, were adopted in caucus. He, Mr. C., had no such knowledge, as he had said before; he was nine years in the Senate and never knew a law that was passed in a caucus.

Mr. BREWER. Were not those laws adopted by caucus? Three could compose a caucus, as well as a larger number.

Mr. CHAMBERS said, that what he termed a caucus, was going into a caucus where a majority of the whole body assembled concurred in a proposition, a minority of the caucus sufficient to pass the measure, being bound to support it as adopted by the majority, thus constituting a majority whose opinion were expressed, not because they all held these opinions, but because they were the opinions adopted in caucus by others. He knew of no such proceedings in the Senate of the United States, an any occasion.

Mr. BREWER said, that such a caucus as was described by the gentleman from Kent, did not exist with the reform party of that Convention. The gentleman had mistaken the object and nature of the caucus, if he supposed that the rule he had laid down, was the rule adopted by the caucus which was held in the eastern wing of that building.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Does the gentleman say that no one was bound?

Mr. BREWER. No one was bound. The discussion was free, and no one bound except those who voluntarily pledged themselves.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Ah, ah.

Mr. BREWER said, that he had adopted the measure recommended by the caucus, because he believed it was the only one presented, which would meet the views and wishes of the citizens of the State, and would be adopted by them in June next. He firmly believed, and so declared it, in his place, that unless some such measure was adopted by the reformers, this Convention would have adjourned without effecting any practical good. It was sufficient for him to know, that by adopting the project of the gentleman from Washington, they would obtain that constitutional reform which would be so acceptable to the people of Maryland. He wished not to make a Constitution which would alone be agreeable to the one hundred and three gentlemen, who compose this Convention, but such a Constitution as the citizens of Maryland would and ought to accept. He did not come here merely for the purpose of changing the representation in the House of Delegates. Retrenchment and

reform were the subjects principally discussed in his county. Representation and apportionment were not the only questions before this body. We had assembled together with a hope of making a new organic law, by which the condition of the people might be improved. He was willing, as a delegate from Montgomery, to vote for such a Constitution. When he had performed this duty, he would have accomplished the purposes which he had in view when he consented to run as a candidate for a seat in this Convention. He was a reformer before the gubernatorial election—he was a reformer still, and would go with him who went the farthest in making an organic law, which would satisfy the wishes of the citizens of the State. He thanked the Convention for the indulgence granted him, and hoped they would excuse the desultory manner in which he had discussed the question before the house, as he had been unexpectedly drawn into the debate without a moment's deliberation.

Mr. KILGOUR said, that the gentleman from Montgomery, had alluded to the very large vote by which he was elected to the Convention, and that he should vote for a compromise on the question of representation. He would ask him to state to the house, what was the compromise which he sustained before the people of Montgomery, as the one which he intended to support in the Convention, and whether it was not to restrict Baltimore city to a representation equal to the largest county? He would also ask him another question. If the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, had been submitted to the people of Montgomery, and he had gone before them on that single question, whether he believed he could have been elected to that Convention?

Mr. BREWER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILGOUR. Never, upon the face of God's earth. The only reason why he was elected, in connection with his popularity, was that he sustained the doctrine of restricting Baltimore city, to a representation equal to that of the largest county. If it had not been upon that position, he knew, and his colleagues knew, that he could not have obtained the vote even of the Democratic party.

Mr. CRISFIELD rose and said:

Mr. President,

During the sittings of this body, I have refrained, as far as possible, from occupying its time with any remarks of mine. I have always been reluctant to participate in debate, and I should not be able to overcome my reluctance now, but for what I conceive to be a duty. That people, by whose favor I am honored with a seat on this floor, are deeply interested in questions now presented for our consideration, and it is due to them that their feelings and opinions should be made known to the people of Maryland.

We have arrived at an important crisis. We are now about to lay anew the foundations of the republic—again to distribute the elements of political power, and lodge them in hands we deem safest to hold them. We are about to establish the basis of representation, the most