

posed to re-enact the clause of the old Constitution. The difference between that and the article as proposed, was a substantial one. The amendment inhibited the Legislature from passing any law, taxing property beyond the limits of the State. The attempt to tax property without the State, must, it seemed to him, be a failure in nine cases out of ten. Those upon whom the exercise of the power devolved, had no means of ascertaining the value, or even the existence of that property; and thus the system led to perjury, and to frauds upon the revenue, and hence was wrong in itself.

Another and an unanswerable argument was, that property was responsible for taxes in the community in which it existed. Surely, it was wrong, that a man should be compelled to pay taxes both in and out of the State for the same property. It seemed to him, that there could be, and ought to be no distinction between real and personal property in the State of Maryland. If there was the power in the one case, why should there not be in the other? He contended also, that the system was not courteous to our sister States. He alluded to the injurious operation which this example would have upon our own State stocks, if other States should, in retaliation, follow this example; and argued that no such tax ought to be laid, whether regarded either in the light of justice, or of sound policy. And he referred the Convention to a letter which had recently been presented by Mr. Chambers of Kent, from Mr. Hall, setting forth the evils which resulted from the taxation of property thus situated, and its injurious operation upon the people of Maryland.

Therefore, pending the question,

The Convention adjourned until to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

*Sketch of the Remarks of Mr. BROWN, of Carroll, on the 30th of January.*

The pending question being on the amendment offered by Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, to the amendment of Mr. PRESSTMAN.

Mr. BROWN, said: he came to the House without any intention to make a speech. He usually contented himself with saying what he thought, and sometimes he spoke earnestly, and after expressing what he had to say, he sat down. He recapitulated what he had said yesterday in reply to the reference made to the Dorr case in Rhode Island by the gentleman from Somerset. He adverted to the ridicule which had been cast on the seventeen gentlemen who had voted for the popular basis of representation by the gentleman from Dorset and others; and then went on to state that he had replied that although seventeen was a small minority out of seventy-seven votes, yet the name of the constituents of these seventeen, was "legion." They represented in fact a majority of the white population of the State. The gentleman from Worcester had spoken of the tyranny of a majority. The phrase was entirely new to him; he had never read of it, had never heard of it until he came into this hall; and he was un-

able to convince himself that there was any truth in it. But he had heard of the tyranny of a minority. It so happens, that the majority of members of this body represents less than one-third of the people of the State. He could not comprehend how government, based upon the majority, could be called a tyranny. One of our leading principles is, that majorities shall govern; and that these majorities were tyrants, was an entirely new doctrine. He could easily imagine how a minority could usurp the rights and trample on the rights and feelings of the majority; and this sort of tyranny was the first step to monarchy.

Our forefathers were induced to take up arms, and to resist tyranny to obtain political rights for all! They fought to throw off the yoke of a few who tyrannized over them. He expressed his inability to comprehend some of the doctrines and some of the phrases of the gentleman from Kent. If the doctrines laid down by that gentleman were correct, they should prevail. But the language of that gentleman was new to him. The gentleman spoke of giving the people their rights. He could only reply that his constituents did not come here to ask alms. They understood what were their rights, and those they would not beg for, but demand.

He went on to state that his ancestors settled where, he now resides, when it was called the back woods, and Baltimore was a small town. The population of the State was then principally to be found on both sides of the Chesapeake Bay, and below its head. The Allegany mountains had probably, at that time, never been trodden by the foot of a white man. And what is now the condition of that part of the State? Baltimore city and Western Maryland contain a large majority, (perhaps two-thirds,) of the wealth and population of the State.

Our forefathers had lived under the rule of a monarchy, but they had fought for their liberties, contending against the most powerful nation on earth. The freedom which they achieved, they had handed down to us, and we should hand it down to our children.

He would tell the gentleman from Kent, how this reform question could be settled certainly and quietly. Give us a Constitution that will secure to the people their rights, and nothing more will be heard in the way of complaint.

The state of things was this: two-thirds of the people of the State have no political rights. Could any one suppose they would remain quiet? Could it be permitted that the one-third should tie down and control the two-thirds? Further to illustrate the principle for which he contended, he read an extract from the works of Mr. Jefferson on the subject of Constitutions, and the necessity of changes in laws and institutions to keep pace with the times. That was the principle for which his constituents were contending. They asked no favor of the Eastern Shore. "We outnumber you, and we think we are able to take care of ourselves." But there is no disposition among them to exercise tyranny over the small counties; and was it not an insult to them, when a minority undertook to control and govern them, and talked of giving them their rights?