

shall be built out of the bricks of the old; thirdly, resolved, that the old jail shall stand till the new jail is completed.

Mr. CHAMBERS said:

The first thing that struck upon his ear as he entered the House a few minutes since, was a tirade against certain members of the Eastern Shore and the Southern counties of the Western shore. As he understood the gentleman from Baltimore, (Mr. GWINN,) the imputation was that they were guilty of an act of great turpitude.

If the gentleman's assertions were true, they had met here to vote themselves mileage, and to do every thing in their power to defeat the Constitution, but now as the gentleman was pleased to say that they had turned a somerset, and had become the *par excellence* Democrats of the House. He so understood the gentleman, but not wishing to do him injustice, he would ask him to state what were the particular matters of complaint against those gentlemen of the Eastern shore, of whom he was one.

Mr. GWINN said:

That it seemed to him the gentleman was going a good deal out of his way to misunderstand what he had said, or he must have been singularly inattentive, for surely it was difficult to misunderstand the plain proposition which he had stated.

If the gentleman from Kent would rely somewhat less on his quickness of apprehension, give as much attention to the whole argument of an adversary as the Convention accorded to him, he would not be under the necessity of receiving explanations as often as he was. All that he said was that inasmuch as gentlemen of this Convention had recognised all the provisions which the bill contained, as binding upon themselves, he thought it extraordinary that they should wish to depart from the conduct that the law had prescribed in the single instance as to the manner in which the Constitution should be adopted. He made no application of turpitude of motive to any one, and it struck him as somewhat extraordinary that the gentleman from Kent alone, should have thought that he designed a personal reflection.

Were there not others more interested from their share in the previous debate, in such an imputation if it really existed? And did the gentleman suppose that he had so far forgotten his duty to this Convention and the many friends he had from the Eastern shore, as to design a reflection upon any gentleman from that section? This manufacture of issues other than those which arose in debate, had not now occurred for the first time in this body.

He was always willing to accord to any gentleman an explanation of any word spoken, but he thought that members should have at least some kind of reason for applying an interpretation necessarily offensive to others than themselves.

Mr. CHAMBERS said:

He had asked the gentleman to state what he had said, and he had undertaken to do so.

The House had heard the original remarks of

the gentleman and his supplemental statement. It was for them decide upon the accuracy of the gentleman's recollection and the consistency of his statements. The gentleman had thought proper to superadd a long lecture to him personally (as was quite usual with him,) and he had assumed certain facts as to his, (Mr. C's,) course in debate. To this part of the gentleman's statement he gave a flat contradiction.

He, [Mr. C.] had planned no quarrel nor sought altercation with any one. He had on no occasion been the aggressor as he was not now. Another assumption of the gentleman is equally unfounded. He assumes that his remarks were offensive to no other member from the Eastern Shore.

Mr. C. said his friends around him felt them to be as much out of place as they were unjust and unmerited. But the logic of the gentleman is as remarkable as his assumptions are unwarranted. He makes a sling at a class—a whole class of persons, imputing most unbecoming conduct, and when one of the class rises to denounce in his own name and in the name of the whole class the injustice of the slander, he is told forthwith, you are always ready for a quarrel.—Why did not you sit still and submit as the rest do? Would the gentlemen have all rise in mass to repel his insinuations as the only condition on which any one may venture to do so?

He differed from the gentleman's ethics as much as he did from his facts and his logic. And what pray is the inconsistency to which the charge is now reduced? It was said they were denying the validity of the law, or rather the act of the last Legislature, while they were acting under it. Had they not denied its constitutional force and obligation from the first and throughout? Sir, [said Mr. C.,] the first speech I made in this body in the shape of a deliberate argument, was in support of the broad proposition that this act of the Legislature was utterly and entirely without authority from the Constitution, and I know of many highly intelligent members with whom I personally associate, that they concur in that opinion. That argument was made in consequence of my being taunted with the difficulties of my position on this floor; it was published in the newspapers. Feeble as that argument may be, neither the gentleman nor any one else had assailed it on this floor; nor had he heard a voice raised here to vindicate the constitutionality of that act, except from the gentleman's colleague, (Mr. Brent.) I do not know now, sir, where else to find the member who believes the Legislature had any constitutional authority to pass that act. There may be such persons, but I do not know who they are.

It might be quite amusing to the readers of our debates, to find flippant charges of inconsistency as the basis for wit and sarcasm, but no gentleman has a right gratuitously to make opinions for me; no gentleman has a right to make a class of inconsistent persons and put me into it; no gentleman shall do so without hearing one at least, who objects to the proceeding. I repeat, Mr. President, the charge of inconsistency has