

people sent us here, as a *business Convention*. If so, why has that gentleman not been here to assist us with his votes and counsel, through the long and arduous struggles of the session?—We had had little or no aid from him, and now he comes here when some arrangement has been made about a compromise, and undertakes not only to force the measure through the Convention, but to prostrate every man who may stand up and express his sentiments in opposition. I do regard it as extraordinary that the gentleman should put himself forward to denounce me and my principles, but it is immaterial to me. I have my opinions, and will maintain them.

The gentleman has said, that he supposes I only intended a figure of speech, when I referred the small counties to the fate of Charles the first, and threatened them with the axe and block and he could not conceive how I could bring them to the block, unless by some violent and sanguinary revolution, which would be wholly inconsistent with the character of my office, as the high law officer of the State. I can solemnly declare that I never dreamt of such a thing as force or violence, when making those remarks, and it seems to me that it is uncharitable to place such a construction on them.

The gentleman has further said, that he could not conceive, by what sort of civil revolution the people of Baltimore could rise up and bring the small counties to the block. I should think my meaning could be easily understood. I intended to signify, that if a compromise fair and just in itself were not made now, the force of public opinion and public sentiment—the same public sentiment which had brought the people to the long denied privilege of electing their Governor, and which, after years of struggle, had brought about this Convention—the same public opinion would spread all over the State, until final y the small counties would, at some future day, lose the opportunity which now presents itself, of retaining their control in the Senate. Such a compromise would now be hailed by acclamation, but if you utterly deny to-day the rights of the people, and refuse them representation in either branch of the Legislature, to-morrow the people may have the power to deny you any compromise whatever. I never meant any other revolution which should bring the small counties to the block, but that revolution which is brought about by the force of public opinion, which in my humble judgment, is more powerful than an army marching with banners. That gentleman's own experience should have told him that there was a power above the laws, because it is a power to change the laws—that power is a public opinion based on truth and justice. It may be slow in its progress, but it is certain and inevitable. The gentleman, (Mr. Howard,) has also said that I have twice called this compromise of Mr. FIERY'S, "a crumb." Can I not dare to express my opinion? Yes, sir, I again call it "a crumb from the rich man's table." We are told by the gentleman, that twenty-five years ago, I would not have thought ten delegates to Baltimore "a crumb." But I am not speaking

the sentiment of twenty-five years ago—but the progressive wants of the present generation who cast no look backwards, but have their eyes fixed upon equality and right as objects which they mean to have.

The gentleman, (Mr. Howard,) has explained that representation according to population, meant only the *recognition* of the right of superior population, but that the ratio by which representation was to be carried out was arbitrary, and it was not necessary that it should be uniform. He has also said, that Mr. FIERY'S compromise was a clear recognition of the rights of superior population, because it gives to Baltimore city a greater number of delegates than the largest county.

If the mere recognition of the right of superior population is what is meant by representation according to population, then I am no reformer, because I not only require the recognition of that right, but that representation shall be based on some uniform ratio throughout the whole State.

Mr. HOWARD explained, that he meant to say, and what he did say, was, that this compromise recognised the principle. He did not mean to say it was representation according to population, but merely that it recognised the principle, because it admitted the claims of superior population.

Mr. BRENT. It recognises the principle. "It keeps the word of promise to the ear, but breaks it to the hope." But the gentleman did say that the ratio was arbitrary and need not be uniform.

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly, sir.

Mr. BRENT. I think the true principle and the only principle, is to take a ratio and apply it to the whole people of the State as an uniform thing.

In this Washington county compromise, we find a principle adopted for the counties—a ratio of one delegate to every six thousand inhabitants, but it is utterly disregarded when it comes to Baltimore city. In fact, this compromise cuts its own throat, because it violates the principle which it proclaims for one portion of the people. When gentlemen talk of representation according to population, and will not adopt an uniform ratio, they speak of something which I confess I do not understand.

Gen. Howard has declared that the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) had correctly stated the proposition in his remarks, when he said that all interests and classes should be represented. Why, sir, the plan of Mr. Dorsey proposes to give one delegate to each county and the city of Baltimore for territory, so as to represent territory. Does the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) mean to endorse that proposition?

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly not. I did not say so. I said that the gentleman from Anne Arundel, inasmuch as he said that all the interests of society should have representation, was correct.

Mr. BRENT. I only desire to clearly understand the gentleman's remarks. Nobody denies that the popular branch, at least, of the Legislature should be open to all the interests of the