supremacy. But it needed no foresight to determine, that the relative numerical strength of the two sections would not remain unaltered. In 1790, the balance of white population in favor of the East was 185,932. In 1820 it was ony 94,965. In 1829 only 43,229. The progression was certain and alarming, and the prophecies, which the delegates from Eastern Virginia, made of the increasing strength of the Western section, were realized in 1840, when the white population of Western Virginia exceeded that of Eastern Virginia, by nearly 2000, although the total aggregate of Eastern Virginia was then 806,942, and of Western Virginia only 432 845. In 1850, the white population of Eastern Virginia was 404,371, and that of Western Virginia, was 494,763, the increase in the former being 34,937—and in the latter 123,203. The gross population of the East, including slaves and free colored persons, was 863,065, and of the West only 565,798.

This result, plainly foreseen in the Convention of 1829, did not interfere with an adjustment more favorable to the Western sections of the State, than that recognised in the old Constitution. No one dreamed of placing the colored population, on an equality with the free whites, in the computation of numbers, although an expedient, so simple, might naturally have suggested itself to the delegates from Eastern Virginia, to increase their representative strength. Chief Justice Marshall, (Virg Deb. p. 851,) said that all had repudiated the idea. The struggle was between those, who desired to base representation on *white* population only, and those who wished to stop at some point short of a principle, which would make Eastern Virginia subordinate to Western Virginia. But so strong was the opinion in favor of the propriety of representation according to white population, that it was lost only by a vote of fifty to forty-six, (Virg. Deb. p. 666) The compromise, which ultimately carried, was introduced by Mr. Gordon,* and was based on the white population of 1820. By this, the principle of representation, on the basis of *white* population, was admitted—because, although the Convention, meeting in 1829, adopted the white basis of 1820, it did not abandon the principle by selecting a particular period for the rule of its application.

It would greatly profit us to dwell more at length upon the important lesson taught us in 1829 and at the present time by the people of Virginia. All the arguments, which can be urged here against the theory of representation on a *white* basis, or on *gross numbers*, exist in a more marked degree in that commonwealth. And it is proper that we should observe, that, in the struggle which is occurring there at the present time, some attempt at least is made by all sections to found their plans upon the sure basis of a principle, whether it could be maintained in argument or not. But in our Convention, gentlemen have not even made pretence of observing other than a purely arbitrary will. Some indeed have unadvisedly talked about representing territory. But I certainly have not discernment to understand, why any number of mere square miles should be equally represented, though in one case they are sparsely settled, and are of small value, and in another are crowded with human beings, and are of tenfold pecuniary value. This notion of territory, vague and erroneous as it is, survives in only four States of this Union. And its want of reason is no where better demonstrated than in our own system Kent county has a territory of 216 square miles—a property of $3,612,000—a white population of 5 595, and a gross population of 11,357. Washington county has a territory of 948 square miles,—a property of $11,656.997, a white population of 26,969.—and a gross population of 30,943. Yet the gentleman from Anne Arundel, not content with attempting to introduce such a section into the senatorial system, desires to introduce the same element into the House of Delegates.

There ar many, who look back with peculiar regard, to the Senate of Maryland, as it was organised under the old Constitution. We have been told that Madison himself, had, in conversation, intimated his approval of the system. There was no need to adduce such recollections. In the sixty-third number of the Federalist, the Senate of Maryland is cited as an admirable example of governmental wisdom. The filtration of power, as it has been elsewhere called, through an intermediate body, was supposed to conduce to its purity and strength. But notwithstanding this high authority, there are many yet living, of both parties, who can bear witness to the inconveniencies resulting from the dominance of a single party, and from the want of local identity and interest which the system entailed.

It is certain, that in 1808, 1811 and 1818, the Senate of Maryland found so little favor with the popular branch of the legislature, that bills were passed to repeal the old system, and providing for a representation from such county and the city of Baltimore, in the Senate. In the year first named, the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) was a delegate from Baltimore city. He voted against the abolition of the old senatorial system. There was a manifest reason to control the action of a delegate from the city. It was usual to take two Senators from Baltimore—and this out of the fifteen, then comprising the Senate, gave the city a share in political power, which it was not wise to part with unless the loss was compensated for by an increased representation in the House of Delegates. The action of the gentleman was, therefore, in strict conformity with his duty to the constituency which he then represented. But the efforts made in 1808, 1811, and 1818, and in subsequent years, proved conclusively that the senatorial system was in no favor with the people of the State, despite the opinions of Mr. Madison, and the reverence with which its now faded glories are regarded. The Senate, itself at an early period began to show a disposition to change its form. In January 1, 1812, when the House Bill of 1811, was under consideration, it was moved to amend it, by providing for the division of the

*For the vote, see Virg. Deb. p. 704. It passed by a vote of 55 to 41. See Chief Justice Marshall's remarks. Virg. Deb. 851.