

tion by a long argument. I merely wish to occupy a few moments in an attempt, in my rude and feeble way, to adduce some reasons why I do not think that this doctrine, which had been so emphatically asserted, of the unqualified right of majorities to rule, was not founded in truth. But, in the mean time, I would ask why these gentlemen desire this change? Had they any complaint to make of the old system of representation, other than that it was not according to population? Had it worked evil for Baltimore city or the upper part of Maryland? No. Their prosperity had been built up by the sweat of the brows of the people of lower Maryland—by their means and by their labor.—By their liberality and generosity they have largely contributed to the prosperity and increase of Baltimore, and to reveal and make available the hidden treasures of western Maryland. And this is the return which is to be made for that liberality. If there was no other reason than the injustice and ingratitude manifested by it, they would be sufficient to induce me to oppose this plan of representation to the uttermost.

Why then, had this question been raised in Maryland? Why the tremendous excitement upon this subject alone? For I have learned since I came here that there was no other question than this by which a reformer was to be tested. Every other species of reform had vanished like mist before the morning sun.

The whole subject of reform had been boiled down into this single question of the basis of representation. If they had not suffered injury under the old system; if they could not point to a single instance in which they had been wronged, or in which injustice had been done, or their interest sacrificed by the Legislature—why had this excitement been raised by the reform party of the State?

We have been told that party spirit should have nothing to do with our deliberations here; that we should drive it from our midst as a demon of discord. But if the plain unvarnished truth were told (I mean no disrespect to any gentleman,) party spirit would be seen to be the beginning and the end of the whole question.—This, sir, is a struggle for party ascendancy. Party is the prompter behind the scenes that directs the movements of the actors.

It is this spirit which has actuated the reform party heretofore—which actuates them now, and which will actuate them until the Democratic party gain the ascendancy in the State; and then we shall hear no more of it. The troubled waters will become calm as an unruffled lake. Believing this, sir, as a Whig party man, I intend to combat this thing.

If what I have said be true—that there are no oppressive evils to remedy, or to get rid of, this great reform could have taken its rise but from one of two causes—a struggle for party ascendancy or hostility to the institution of slavery, which prevails in that part of our State from which the power is to be taken.

Talk not to me of the abstract right of the ma-

ajority to rule? This is not a motive sufficient to have caused all this excitement and trouble.

Men are not so bound to, and governed by, abstractions. They are but the veils behind which the real designs and feelings of men, in their movements, are concealed; as, in the name of liberty, many a damning deed is done. Gentlemen of the reform party disavow any hostility to slavery. All are pro-slavery men from the top of the Alleghenies to the Atlantic shore. This is no reason then. Therefore, we have but one to fall back upon—party ascendancy.

Gentlemen had said, over and over again, that representation according to population was the true theory of republican government—but they have not shown the principles upon which it rests its claims to truth.

Every doctrine which cannot stand the test of reason and analysis—which does not bear right and justice upon its face—is untrue. Can this theory stand such a test? Can these gentlemen, who preach it so loudly and assert it so emphatically, trust it to this test? Why shun debate then—why close this matter up so soon, without giving us the benefit of the process of reasoning, by which they have convinced themselves that it is the true theory. They need not fear the expense which the discussion would bring about. It would be worth far more than it could possibly cost, (and the people themselves would think so,) to have the minds of the whole people of the State satisfied in regard to this vital and important question.

I hold, sir, and will attempt to give some reasons for it, that the theory of the abstract right of majorities to rule, does not rest upon a sound basis—a basis of truth and justice. In the first place, it is not true because it is impracticable. In the practical operation and working of government, it is impossible for this principle, though recognised in its Constitution, to be carried out.

Any thing that is impracticable is untrue. Any thing that cannot stand the test of practical application, wants that element of truth which alone renders it valuable. Truth, in its majesty and beauty, in its teachings of right and justice, is simple, not complicated, not involved in specious dogmas that, while they proclaim right and justice as the elements of their being, work out the grossest wrong and injustice. Truth is a unit—one part cannot be separated from another. Any thing proclaimed as a truth, existing in the nature of things, must stand or fall as a whole.

Will any gentleman say that this theory, as a whole, can possibly be practically applied? Was it ever carried out in the history of any government, however democratic or republican it professed to be. If it ever has, I should like to have the instance pointed out. It never has been since the creation of the world.

We all acknowledge the government of the United States to be a free, republican government. We sing hallelujahs to the glory of its institutions. From every mountain top, and every valley of our blessed country, praises and thanksgivings to God were raised by the people for having had their lot cast in such a land, under such glorious institutions. Gentlemen would