

of her delegates. The great emporium of our State, with her commercial connexions penetrating every bay, and river, and creek, and visiting every town, village and cross-roads with her political connections, embracing every prominent, influential politician, in every election district, with her social and personal relations—extending to families and fire-sides in every section of the State—with these and above all with these, her wealth and intelligence and power *concentrated*, as it is, and *organised*, she has an influence that pervades every artery of the State, moves, controls and regulates every muscle, nerve and pulsation of the whole body politic. She has delegates in the persons of members from all parts of the State—every where. How has she succeeded in getting her internal improvement measures—her great rail roads? By the numerical force of her delegates? No, sir, but by the votes of delegates from counties, a very small number of whose citizens ever travel on them. How did she induce the State to incur an onerous debt, to promote these improvements? Not by the large number of delegates in the Legislature, but by the aid of other delegates from counties whose citizens had almost no other interest in, or connection with, these matters, than to pay their quota of the annual tax imposed to discharge this debt. And in the same way she always had and always would exert, an immense control in the government. He did not allude to the success of these measures in a spirit of complaint. They were, perhaps, all right, some of them certainly were, but he mentioned them as an illustration of his doctrine that an increase of members from the city was not due as a measure of justice, nor proper as a matter of expediency.

Mr BROWN said:

He had not purposed to make any remarks, but as the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) had thought proper to allude to some observations that had fallen from him, he would say a few words in reply.

It was a bad sign when you saw a great man, like the gentleman from Kent begin to complain of abstract principles. When he, (Mr. B.,) came into this hall, a few minutes since, the gentleman was talking of representation according to population, as being an abstract principle.

Now, he never knew a man in his life who could meet an argument of that kind, and unfortunately the gentleman failed in his abstraction. He had no kind of doubt in the world, that the gentleman knew the character of the people among whom he lived, but he thought that he, (Mr. Chambers,) had not said any thing which went to uphold the right of the people to self-government. Such doctrine as he had advanced would do well in England, where it was known that the people of the United States govern themselves, although they did not believe in the principle of self-government.

The gentleman said another thing—that he could not have any faith in men's statements, that if a man was possessed of political power, he would easily part with it.

Now, he, [Mr. Brown,] agreed with him in that observation, for he thought the gentleman

had clearly established that fact by his own course in this Convention. We gave the gentleman's county, as he said before, a Senator, and each county and the city of Baltimore are to have a Senator. And, yet, the gentleman from Kent, he supposed, imagined their political rights to be in great danger, on account of the political axiom being about to be applied to the House of Delegates, that you must do the "greatest good to the greatest number."

Now, according to his, (Mr. B's.,) proposition, it was "doing the greatest good to the greatest number." The people said, "give us representation according to population," and yet the gentleman deemed this an abstraction. Now, he wanted to correct a mistake into which the gentleman had fallen.

It was true that he, (Mr. B.,) was here in 1836, and it was also true that he took a very humble part in getting a change made in the Constitution of the State. But it was not true—he meant it in no offensive sense—that we would make it a permanent settlement of the matter. He had said in committee and out of committee, that he, (Mr. B.,) did not want to see a revolution in Maryland. He wanted the gentleman from Kent to understand this, because he, (Mr. B.,) might not be in the land of the living when, perhaps, the gentleman might have an opportunity of doing his memory justice on that score. He would vote for the proposition of the gentleman from Washington for the sake of peace.

Mr. CHAMBERS Does the gentleman vote for it, does he mean to say, in Convention, merely to get rid of it.

Mr. BROWN replied, that he did not do that. He would say to the gentleman from Kent, who said that he, (Mr. B.,) was the oldest man, that he did not know that, but thought the gentleman was his senior. The little experience he had had, satisfied him of one thing—that he had no confidence in any government where personal rights were not represented, and when the people were trampled upon they could not be held in check. And he believed Thomas Jefferson on this point; and the attempt making by the gentleman from Kent with gentlemen from other counties to control Baltimore city must prove abortive. It was out of the question. It could not be expected that government of that character would be submitted to at the present day. The gentleman had used another argument, and spoken out very plainly—he declared that if one party in this Convention got a majority of fifty delegates they would represent that fifty.

Mr. CHAMBERS explained.

Mr. BROWN replied that the delegates in attendance on this Reform Convention represented the party as much as the whole people. The gentlemen, on the other side, had made propositions to compromise, which were degrading. As he, (Mr. B.,) had said on a previous occasion, the people of the small counties had lost all respect for this Convention. Here, then, we came forward for the sake of peace and harmony, with the proposition of the gentleman from Washington county in the hope of effecting a compromise. He had voted last winter, and it was the toughest