

and among that number was the gentleman from the city of Baltimore. He knew there was an effort being made to obliterate county distinctions in regard to representation, and already notice had been given for districts in the State, regardless of county lines, for that purpose.

The next monstrous notion he expected to hear announced, would be to elect delegates to the General Assembly, by a general ticket system throughout the whole State. Then would soon follow an obliteration of all other county distinctions recognised by the present Constitution. And then, indeed, the counties of old Maryland, which have had, and enjoyed rights, powers and privileges for two centuries, will be shorn of the same, and will experience the sore penalty of their wickedness, for bending their "knees to Baal." The city of Baltimore in a short time will have half of the population of the State; and recognise in her the potency of numbers—cease to protect the counties from her power; and she will have the ability to yield the government of Maryland. Then, whether for weal or woe, the counties will be compelled to submit. They will no longer have an existence, for their separate and distinct interest, to be represented in the halls of legislation. Who is prepared to lend a hand to effect this dangerous innovation? Is there a delegate here, representing any of the counties of this State, willing to give away, or to barter for a mere "mess of pottage," for party consideration, the dearest interest of his constituents? Is there a delegate here with his sword drawn, ready to commit such an atrocious suicide? He vainly hoped the contrary.

Mr. D. said, the gentleman from the city of Baltimore contends that we are not here as "delegates of the counties, but of the State of Maryland." If this be the fact, then the delegates from the counties are as much the representatives of the city of Baltimore, as those of her own choice. She has, according to that theory, the whole delegation of Maryland representing her upon this floor. Why then all of this outcry from Baltimore, for more representation? Why then those treasonable threats we see almost daily made by a public press in that city, because she is denied a larger representation? If the whole delegation of Maryland represent her in the legislative department of the government, all must acknowledge she is now amply represented.

But, said Mr. D., he believed that theory would be modified, or entirely abandoned, when the question of representation came up for discussion. Upon a failure to district the State, for the purpose of representation, which he anticipated would occur, he thought there would be many who now deny his theory in regard to county distinction, who will then become even clamorous in its favor, and perhaps also for county superiority.

Why, (exclaimed Mr. D.) this anxious desire to do away county distinctions? Why this eagerness to adopt a new mode of representation? Ah, Mr. President, it is because of the hope entertained, that if such a thing can be achieved, of getting admitted into the Legislature of your

State, the Herculean power of Baltimore city. Sir, it is to obtain power and the mastery, that such schemes are concocted. Yield to those wild notions and extravagant demands of some, and you will have the anomaly of our city within a State, occupying but a few acres of its territory, with a large population, heterogeneous in its nature, and turbulent in spirit, governing that State. Sir, tell me not, that to concentrate political power, sufficient to control the government of a State, in a single city of the same, there need be no apprehensions of misrule and tyranny. Tell me not, that a single city, possessing the power over other communities, would be less liable to practice tyranny, than a single individual. The old adage, "the greater the number of tyrants, the greater the amount of tyranny," would be fully realized and felt, upon such an event. Much more, Mr. President, would I prefer the category under another old maxim, "*that one tyrant is better than many.*"

But, said Mr. D., the example of other States will, no doubt, be urged in favor of this new mode of representation, and for abolishing that old and well-tried system, adopted by our patriotic forefathers, and under which we have lived and prospered for about two hundred years. Sir, the example of those States, is not a proper example to affect us in the adjustment of this question. Our cases are not at all similar. We have a small State with a large city, which will soon number and contain half of our population, and they have large States, with large cities, the population of which can never exceed one-eighth of that of the whole State. The adoption of the principle of representation based upon population alone will never, in those States, concentrate a preponderance of political power in a single city. But it will be readily seen, that our situation is vastly dissimilar, and experience must induce us to adopt a different rule in the distribution of legislative power. The old adage, "that circumstances alter cases," must be applied to that principle, for which we have an example in other States, and to which some are so warmly attached, or we shall sacrifice justice, and open the door for oppression, by the adoption of a principle in the apportionment of representation, which is in no way suited to our case.

Mr. D. said, he could not agree to the theory advanced by the gentleman from Baltimore city, although in one point of view it may be regarded as a strong argument against the demands of Baltimore city, and the larger counties, for an increase of representation, which he positively opposed. He regarded the delegates in this Convention, as the representatives of the different counties and the city of Baltimore, which elected them, and from whom they derive their authority; and he regarded them also, in the aggregate, as the representatives of the whole State? Each delegate here is the representative of his immediate constituents, *particularly*, and of the State *generally*. He did not look upon the counties as sovereignties, for such a notion would be vain and foolish—the State herself has hardly a principle of sovereignty left her; but he did hold they were separate and distinct communi-