

Mr. PAXSTON made a few remarks, which will be published hereafter.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. I do not rise for the purpose of making any more remarks by way of argument, nor to discuss the matters relative to the claims of Baltimore city upon the justice of the State. If gentlemen are not satisfied now that Baltimore city has claimed nothing but what is equitable, all I can say is, that

"He who is convinced against his will,  
Is of the same opinion still."

The gentleman from Calvert, (Mr. Sollers,) says, in regard to a quotation I had the honor to make at some early period of the session, about "Spirits of Fire"—

Mr. SOLLERS. You recollect it now; repeat it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRENT. In regard to that quotation, the gentleman says he thought I referred to the Baltimore battalion, and he said that Gen'l. Twiggs could tell about that battalion. If the gentleman means to cast any imputation upon the courage of that battalion,—

Mr. SOLLERS. I have not—I had no such idea. Who would cast any imputation upon that battalion, or even a section of it? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRENT. I have no doubt the gentleman would be rash to make any charges. I only say this—that it did seem to me that the gentleman made the remark for the purpose of imputing—at least the imputation might be inferred from it—that the courage of Baltimore city was as much below par as he supposed its sense of justice; but I am glad that he has disclaimed such imputations. I could, if necessary, refer the gentleman to the monuments of Baltimore—to the field of North Point, to Fort Henry, to her Watson and Ringgold, as evidences of her courage, her sense of honor and patriotism. I will not permit the gentleman to class me as a mere local representative. I am not contending for the rights of Baltimore alone. I am contending for the rights and equality of the whole State—not that Baltimore is to wage war against the counties, and the counties to wage war against Baltimore, but that every man in the State should have an equal participation in the benefits of the government and in the treasury of the State. I will not agree to be represented as merely contending for the local rights of Baltimore city. That is least of it, and it would not even be policy here, because this is an anti-Baltimore Convention. I say that every vote given here has been to draw an invidious distinction between Baltimore city and the counties, and the distinguished gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) stated the other day that we already had passed a compromise bill on the subject of representation, which drew a distinction between counties and the city, unfavorable to the latter. It is too true, sir, that such a bill has passed, and I know full well that is too late in the day to try to open the eyes of this Convention to what is due to equal rights and equal justice.

Mr. SOLLERS. I disclaim, utterly disclaim, intending to cast the slightest imputation upon the courage of the Baltimore battalion. I meant

no such thing, and I desire it to be distinctly recorded. Under the shadow of the monuments in the city of Baltimore, it would be rashness, foolishness. I recollect something about North Point and Fort McHenry, and I have seen the inscriptions upon the monuments in Baltimore. My opinion is, that the heroic deeds there commemorated will never be repeated by any people now in that city. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORGAN. I only desire to say one word. I endeavored when I was up before, to show by reference to a single district—(I intended to confine my remarks to the subject under consideration)—that the basis adopted by this Convention was founded upon no principle at all. And that in carrying out the provisions of the Judiciary bill, we would give to Baltimore city infinitely more liberally than we have given to other sections of the State. When the gentleman from Baltimore city rose and stated to this Convention that with the aid of the Chancery court, they could transact their business in the city, I warned gentlemen (and the Convention will bear me witness of it) that they only had to abolish that court and then a similar jurisdiction would be claimed for Baltimore alone. I asked them to come forward and remodel the system, if they desired it, and they should have my assistance. This they refused to do. Upon this refusal, those who have acted with me, told the gentleman from Baltimore, in the language of the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) that the symmetry of the system should be carried through the counties and cities, and what was proper for the city of Baltimore should in fairness and justice be extended to the counties.

I showed that in the first district there were eight hundred and sixty-three original civil cases, and in the second district, one thousand and thirty-one original civil cases, without counting the equity causes, amounting to eleven hundred, and that when the chancery court should be abolished, it would be impossible for one judge to discharge our business. I also showed that Baltimore city, according to the returns, had one thousand three hundred and thirty-six cases, leaving five hundred and seventy-eight of our excess over Baltimore city; and I asked, then, if you gave us but two judges for the transaction of our business, common law and criminal, how could gentlemen claim for Baltimore city more than two judges, divided into separate organizations, with criminal and orphans' court officers? But, sir, for fear that complaints were well founded, we went further, and voted for a proposition which has passed this Convention, that if their necessities required it, the Legislature should give them another judge, and that now is a part of the Constitution. That if these two judges cannot dispose of five hundred eighty-four cases less than we have in the districts in which I practice, they will have the privilege over us (for we have denied the privilege to ourselves) of coming here and claiming a judge of the Legislature.

The answer given to that, by the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Brent,) was that it was useless for Baltimore to come here and ask the