

same time instructs us, that all governments when subversive of the rights of the governed ought to be abolished or amended.

In our country, we acknowledge no sovereigns but the people, they are the great fount whence flow all political power. The constitution of each State is the supreme law of the land, and has its legitimate existence only when it springs from the fountain head of all power—the *people*. They are our sovereigns; we, but merely representatives, holding for a brief space the delegation of a portion of their sovereignty. Springing as we do from the people, and as their creatures, filling only for a season the place of representatives, they ought in justice and in right to be consulted, and their unbiassed judgment and controlling will, should ever be the rule of our actions.

We hold these truths to be so evident that argument for their support would be but a work of superogation. Our own immediate constituency, and as we believe, a majority of the people of Maryland, have again and again expressed, in language not to be mistaken, that they ardently wish a remodelling, and a thorough reform, of our State constitution.

That instrument more to be respected on account of its age, than for the perfection of its proportions, was formed under the most disadvantageous circumstances. We speak not with irreverence when we say, that at the time of its formation it was an untried experiment. Those who framed our constitution were engaged in a sanguinary struggle for their liberty. Their political horizon was clouded with doubt and uncertainty. Its framers had before them no models of written constitutions as precedents to govern or direct, and they depended alone on their foresight and judgment for its successful operation. Patriots they were, we all acknowledge, but still unschooled in the science of popular government, and the formation of written constitutions. More than half a century has rolled by since the constitution of Maryland was adopted. Its framers, and those who were instrumental in its adoption, have nearly all passed from life, and now rest in that land "from whose borne no traveller returns," while another generation fills their place. And is it at this time an unreasonable wish, or an extravagant desire, on the part of the people, that they should ask for a thorough revision and remodelling of their State constitution, and that too by a convention, freely elected by themselves? Our existing constitution was framed by a convention, and that convention too sprung from the people. And all we now ask, is that the people, our sovereigns, who as we believe, ardently desire a revision of our time worn constitution, shall be allowed to say whether that revision shall be by a convention or not? Who is afraid to know the will of the people? Who fears to hear their voice? And who bows not with reverence to the determination of their will when legitimately expressed through the ballot box? Certainly not those who represent the people. Certainly not those who acknowledge the binding force of the popular will. Certainly not those who hail a republican representative