the aggregate vote of the people, and was liable I had never heard the gentleman say any thing to impeachment. And, as he was thus liable, he, (Mr B.,) would confide in so h gh an officer as the Governor. But the Legislature was not liable, and therefore he would not trust a Legislature formed upon a territorial and not a popular basis, for he regarded the present basis as nothing but a mitigation of inequality and injus-And, he would not agree to leave that question to the Legislature. What, he asked would be said by that Legislature ten years hence? He knew what would be said. He had already shown in a speech, which he submitted the other day, that the minority of the people would then, as now, have a majority in the House of Delegates and in the Senate. What would be said by the Legislature? Men would get up then, and say, "if you carry out the injunction of the Constitution and call a Convention, you deprive the counties of power by the new Constitution." They would say, shameless'y and openly, that they would nullify the Consitution.

Now he, (Mr. B.,) would rather make it the duty of the Governor, acting under his solemn obligations to the people of Maryland, to take the vote of the people and call the Convention. He would rather confide to him the authority to issue his proclamation, making it a ministerial duty on his part, which he must perform; whereas, by corrupt influences in the Legislature, we might find the constitutional provision nullified, and no remedy provided for the people For that reason, and that reason only, did he, (Mr. B.,) dissent from the gentleman and the majority of the Convention, and he believed that the Legislature would never call another Convention, if left to them in a new Constitution, such as we are adopting. The gentleman had done him the honor to say the party-th't portion of the people of Baltimore, with which he was politically connected, and of whom the gentleman had represented him as being their leader, had determined to go against the adoption of the Constitution He, (Mr. B,) would say that he did not consider himself to be the leader of any party, he only held him-elf to be an humble member of a great party in which there were no leaders. In that political temple, he was but a pillar. He did not, and never had aspired to leadership of a party had no right to dictate to any one. If there was an individual in that city, suffering at the hands of this Convention, and who were determined to rebel against this Convention, it was their own business, and their right to say so. For himself, he avowed that he would not be prepared to express his opinion or to act until he saw the Constitution come from the hands of this Convention, and then he would not shrink from the responsibility of passing his judgment for or against the new Constitution.

Mr. Sollers said that he was sure when he said the gentleman (Mr. Brent,) was characterized in Baltimore as being the leader of a party opposed to the adoption of the new Constitution, he only meant to give him that name which his friends in that city had bestowed upon him. He (Mr. S.) certainly fell bound to declare that he

that would indicate that he was a leader, but such was the situation assigned him by his political friends. Now, he (Mr. S.) knew that there was something more than appeared on the outside—on the surface—against particular clauses that he had the honor to submit to the Convention. And he must say, and he said it with great truth, that he had never heard a more candid and fair statement than the gentleman had made of his real objections to his (Mr. Sollers') proposition; but the gentleman had shown, at the same time, that the political party to which he belonged, was not content with the power they already possessed, but even grasped at more, with that cormorant-like rapacity. (laughter,) which seemed to be unappeasible and unsatiable. It was for this, and other reasons, he (Mr. S.) did not want this question of reform agitated every ten years, and il sturbing the whole State from one end of it to the other.

Mr. BRENT, of Bal imore city, said he had presented his substitute without consultation with any one. As to being a cormorant, he was a cormorant for equal rights, and would be as long as he lived.

Mr. Sollers replied, that so far as equal rights were concerned, he was as great a champion of them as the gentleman himse f. tu: he was a very different cormorant from that gentleman. The gentleman had develope, becaused it was impossible for him to repress the feeling—the true reasons why he opposed his (Mr. Sollers') He (Mr. B.) desired that the proposition. Legislature should have nothing to do with calling a Convention and that the people should have the subject of reform before them every ten years. And, he told us candidly why: it was because the present basis of representation was oppressive and that the people of Maryland should be appealed to every ten years to correct the evil. What, he would ask, was to become of us gentlemen from the counties?

Was the city of Baltim re never to be satis-Were we to be subject to downright vassalage? What had we done? And he might ask, what had they not done? We had, from the sweat of our brows, contributed to the wealth and prosperity of the city of Baltimore, and now, in the day of her pride and strength, she sought to strip us of the little we had left us. It was a common observation made by the people of Baltimore, or some of them, that they, for the most part, contributed to pay all the taxes, and to construct the public works-the internal improvements of the State.

Now, he [Mr. S] utterly denied that there was any truth in the statement, and he could show to the satisfaction of twelve men on oath, that it had been mainly through the aid and influence of the interior counties of the State, the improvements in question were made. A man who had not been in the city of Baltimore for two years, and who were to visit it now, would be perfectly amazed to see how immensely it had increased in size wealth and population -The fact was, that Baltimore had flourished and