

State for representation. But how is this to be accomplished satisfactorily, except by taking for representation the broad basis of numbers?

The gentleman [Mr. Howard,] has also said that three of my colleagues, if they have not spoken as he has in reference to my course, have acted by their votes as he spoke. Between my colleagues and myself, that gentleman has no right to stand or to place any other construction upon their votes, than that they had voted conscientiously according to their sense of duty. The representatives of the city of Baltimore were equally divided in their votes on this compromise—three to three. The gentleman has no right to draw invidious distinctions between the three who voted for, and the three who voted against it.

If that gentleman, [Mr. Howard,] meant justly to charge me with defeating the dearest wishes of my constituents, why did he not make the same charge against my two colleagues who voted with me? His omission to do so, looks as if he had some personal object in view.

Mr. HOWARD. I have understood that those gentlemen intended to come into the support of this proposition.

Mr. GWINN hoped the gentleman would allow him to explain. He said, that he felt himself rather unexpectedly dragged into the discussion by no intimation of any possible vote he might give in relation to a proposition not before the Convention.

He had only to say, as he had before observed, that he regarded no Constitution which this Convention might adopt as in any way wise, just or equitable, which was not based, both in the Senate and in the House of Delegates, upon population only, nor would any Constitution which they might adopt meet with his moral or intellectual assent, if these principles should be overlooked.

He had said, as he would say now, in order that his own opinions might be fully and clearly understood, that if he ever, under any circumstances, voted for any proposition which did not embody these essential principles, it would not be because he compromised or meant to compromise the principle, in any way, or assented to the justice or equity of the proposed arrangement but only that he might do all that lay in his power to give the people of his native city an opportunity of voting upon the most liberal Constitution, which could be wrung from an unwilling Convention. In so doing he would reserve to himself the privilege of determining, when the whole instrument was perfected, whether it was worth submitting to the people he represented, the responsibility of that final vote he would cheerfully assume.

But he felt no hesitation in saying, that if he ever cast a vote for a plan less popular than that embodying the principle of population only, he should feel neither gratitude, nor sense of obligation; but, in assenting to such an arrangement, would assume the responsibility, only because the relative strength of his city would be increased, and it would be hereafter more able to com-

mand in the next decade, or from the next generation, that extreme justice which your tardiness or fear may now refuse to award her.

He did not design to speak again upon this question, but was willing to deal frankly with all who alluded to, or interrogated him, concerning his course.

Mr. BRENT. I do not trouble myself to know whether my colleagues are going to change their votes. I look at the record, and there it will be seen that two of my colleagues voted with me. This is before the public. Again; I will say that I have a right to suppose that the gentleman from Baltimore county, [Mr. Howard,] has singled me out from my colleagues, who were equally guilty, with a view to gratify some personal object.

The gentleman had better wait until he sees that my colleagues have changed their votes.— But be that as it may, I shall not shrink, even if I stand alone. I have a right to stand upon my conscience and my responsibility to my constituents. The position I now hold, I had taken clearly and explicitly as far back as the 5th of February last, as the Register of Debates will show, and indeed I had taken the same position as this Convention well recollect, before Christmas, when we had no reporter of debates.

My respect for that gentleman's services to his country, and for his years, entitles me to say that whatever may be our personal relations, I cannot suppose that he designs to place himself before this Convention, in the attitude of making a personal attack to force his opinions on me.

That gentleman had not only undertaken to lecture me for my course, but he has publicly told my three colleagues who voted for Mr. FIERY's compromise, "that they must vote against the amendment, of which I gave notice, securing representation according to population."

That gentleman had censured me, because I did not concur in his opinions, but I hold myself responsible to my constituents and not to that gentleman.

I cannot see how it was or why it was, that the gentleman desired to censure me for pursuing consistently and conscientiously the course I have always taken in this Convention upon this great question of popular rights, and which I mean to maintain to the end, regardless of that gentleman's approval or disapproval.

Mr. HOWARD remarked, that he would not trouble the Convention if it did not relate to him personally. The gentleman had alluded to his absence from the Convention. It was upon this subject that he desired to say a few words, in order that he might disclaim all want of respect by being absent so much. He desired to say that in the county convention, after the nomination took place, and where there was a large assemblage of persons from the different districts, when his name was put in nomination, he proclaimed from the hustings that he had engagements which were paramount to all others, and which could not be sacrificed; and that if they chose to elect him, they must allow him to comply with these en-