

present basis of representation. Now he would say that not a single man was a Reformer, in his judgment, who voted for it, and yet it received a vote in this body, only eight in number wanting to carry it. That, Mr. President, is about the precise state of parties numerically in this Convention. A majority of eight being the whole strength of the Reformers in this body. Certainly not *one* more, though there may be a few less. Time must determine.

Mr. CHAMBERS again explained. The gentleman did not understand him. He (Mr. C.) understood him to assert that the proposition which he (Mr. Chambers) had offered, was not a compromise, but precisely the representation we now had. In his proposition he meant to carry out the compromise made in 1836, which did present a different representation from that we now had, as it anticipated the adoption of a rule therein established to go into effect now.

Mr. PRESSTMAN. He had, he thought, fully appreciated the grounds of the report. He would like to know what sort of a compromise that was which, if carried out, would not vary the apportionment of representation three votes. Look at the list of delegates as assigned by the gentleman's report and see if he was not correct. This mode of attack and defence which does not reach the substance of things, but delights in vague generalities, may suit the minds of sophists, but cannot be approved by the great body of the people. It is but the veil which casuistry seeks to throw over the features of a scheme which will not bear the light. Before concluding, he wished to ask the attention of the Convention to a communication in the Baltimore Argus, signed J. N., not that he was disposed to make any anonymous communication the subject of remark here, except by way of illustration of what was termed public sentiment. He did not know the author; he had nothing therefore to say in praise or blame of him. Now, sir, what do we find are the opinions therein expressed in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Washington? (Mr. Fiery.) Mr. P. here read the article, which disapproves of the amendment because it does injustice to the City of Baltimore and the larger counties.

He would barely make one single comment. It will be perceived that the several counties to which the writer refers as having had injustice done them, have through their delegations, distinguished for their knowledge of the wishes of their own people, whom they represent, as well as for talent and patriotism, advocated and sustained the identical measure. If ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise.

TUESDAY, April 1.

The Convention met at 10 o'clock.

Prayer was made by the Rev. M. Griffith.

The roll was called, and a quorum being present,

The Journal of yesterday was then read.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HOWARD rose and said:—Mr. President, I ask the permission of the Convention to make

a few remarks on a subject which is interesting to myself almost entirely, but which involves also the character of this body, and to which remarks I would request the particular attention of the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Brent.)

The President put the question on granting leave, and unanimous consent was given.

Mr. HOWARD then proceeded as follows:

I would furthermore request the Reporter to take down what I say, and the correspondents of the Baltimore papers—whoever they may be—to copy my remarks and insert them in their notice of the proceedings of the day. I hold in my hand a newspaper, which accidentally came under my notice last night, called "The Sunday Morning Dispatch," professing to be devoted to morals, &c. In that paper I find a letter, which I would not have noticed at all if the writer had merely attributed erroneous opinions to me, which he does. That, however, I should not have brought before the notice of this body, but the letter also contains, what purports to be, an extract from a speech delivered by one of the gentlemen from the city of Baltimore, (Mr. Brent.) Who the writer of the letter is I do not know, and I do not care. He says that he is not a Baltimorean. I am glad of it. I did hope that no one bearing that name would be guilty of such an atrocious slander. It is stated that before this body, in the presence of this Convention, and in my presence, the gentleman from the city of Baltimore heaped numerous personal indignities upon me. Now, every member of the body knows as well as I do that the statement is utterly false. And my object in saying this is a regard for the dignity of this body as well as my own—when I say no such speech was made in the presence of this body. I listened with great attention to the remarks of the gentleman from the city of Baltimore, and I now say that I could discover nothing in them of personal disrespect to myself. And yet here is a letter filled with willful falsehoods; and ushering them to the notice of the community under the name of the gentleman from the city of Baltimore. It is to separate those two—the name of the gentleman from these falsehoods—that I now rise and with that sole purpose, in order that the people of Baltimore may do me the justice to believe that whatever an anonymous letter writer may say, the gentleman who represents the city of Baltimore here did no such thing.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, (speaking by unanimous consent) said—Mr. President: I have only to say that on Sunday last my attention was called to a Sunday paper published in Baltimore. I read the article. I never had seen the paper before. I had heard there was such a paper. Who the author of the letter therein published is, I know not, and cannot suspect. Certain it is, I had no lot, or part, or participation or privity with it. I consulted some of my friends, to whom I read the letter, as to the propriety of my appearing over my own name to correct the coloring given to my remarks, as well as to those of the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) for he says there that the gentleman from Baltimore county