down correctly by the gentleman from Anne upon this matter of common interest—each one a representation of all the interests of the agricultural, manufacturing and laboring classes and the houseless and landless man had as much right to have his wishes represented there as the opulent banker. It was for this purpose that the House of Delegates should be of a sufficient number to represent all interests. The interest of all classes should be expressed there, and for that purpose all portions of the community should be encouraged to send representatives. He would, hereafter, when he commented upon the amendment of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, show that the doctrine was not attained by the amendment.

But he would now explain why he thought the course of the gentleman from Baltimore city was destructive to the dearest wishes of the people whom he represented. He, (Mr. H.,) had a right to say this. The representatives of that city were divided on this subject. Three of them, tried and trust-worthy gentlemen as could be found in the State, had acted as he had, and had acted too, in opposition to the gentleman, [Mr Brent,] from Baltimore city, and they endid. It was time that the people of the city should understand this case. They had a right should understand this case. They had a right to understand it, and would understand it at some period, and it might as well be explained now as at any other time, and here as at any oth-

The Reform party, as such, chose to assemble together, and compared their views upon the question of representation. It had been clear to his mind, ever since the Convention was organised, that this representation question could be settled only on a compromise basis, and in no other way. Look at the position of the State-the vast amount of population in the city, and the small number of inhabitants in the counties, and the inequality in the populations of the various coun-Look at the conflicting interests, and then see if they could adopt any new abstract rule -Adopt any one at all, and they would see that there was a majority against any given rule. Therefore, an absolute necessity existed of making a compromise in the matter among the friends of the measure. This was done. There was a free, frank, candid and generous intercourse between those gentlemen in that body who were known as reformers—those who desired some alteration in the present Constitution—in the origin of which meeting he had not the honor of participating. He found it in existence. How it came up, upon whose invitation, why others were not members of it who were friends of reform, he did not know. Whether it was confined to reformers upon the representation question he was not prepared to say. He found that the friends of reform and representation had come together without regard to parties. Then it was that he dated his knowledge upon this subject. They agreed upon a basis at last.

Each member of that body, to a given number which it was not worth while to state, came for-

yielding a portion of his favorite plan. In this manner, they arrived at the result which had been presented to this body in a practical shape by the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Fiery) This proposition received the united support of all those gentlemen who participated in that meeting, without regard to parties, and who had agreed to stand by a compromise. Now, if it was right, if it was true that this question could be settled as a question of compromise only, then he would say that in his judgment that proposition must prevail or none, because the moment they departed from this common platform, each would stand upon his local preferences. No majority existed in favor of any one proposition. This was why he said that the gentleman from Baltimore city, instanding out, in refusing to concur with those persons who were recognized as reformers in that body, had been one of those (and they had been but few,) who had so far defeated this proposition, and on this proposition now defeated, so the Constitution would stand or fall, in his opinion, when submitted for adoption by the people.

It had been suggested by the gentleman, that they might form a Constitution and make no change in the present representation basis. This appeared to him entirely imperceptible. They This must get over that stumbling block—they must overleap it or fall down upon it. If they did not overlesp it, they would stumble and fall, and not be able to proceed any farther in the formation

of an acceptable Constitution.

Therefore it was that he said that the course pursued by the honorable gentleman, in standing out against this common opinion of his reform associates, and insisting on his own projets, was as well calculated to defend the Constitution as if he had refused to uphold it. Let him illustrate the matter. In analyzing the vote that was taken upon the proposition of Mr. FIERY, it would he found that the nine following counties voted unanimously against it: St. Mary's, Kent, Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, Somerset, Dorchester, Prince George's and Worcester. He thought it would be generally conceded that the representatives of these counties were not classed among the Reformers; for here they were associated in a solemn phalanx against his proposition. Now, the following counties unanimously voted Anne's, Frederick, and Caroline—making six.

Four counties upon the Eastern Shore voted for this liberal proposition to the city of Baltimorevoted to disfranchise themselves, with a generosity scarcely ever surpassed in any deliberative Why did they do this? How came these small counties to vote unanimously for this pro-Why, when these gentlemen who gave this vote should be called upon to vindicate themselves, they could do it triumphantly by pointing to the state of the vote to which he was alluding, and by saying that this was a compromise agreed to by their associates, and as such they supported it, for the purpose of obtaining the other meaward and surrendered his personal predilections adopted, and looking to ulterior results of great