

tury, although this generation has no power to bind posterity.

I have one word only to say in regard to the position so often assumed here, and which is very ingeniously elaborated in the argument of Mr. DASHIELL—I mean the position that the existing government is in the nature of a compact between counties. It matters not that there were conventions held by the committees of counties by whom the Constitution was originally framed—that historical fact settles nothing. The whole argument about a confederacy of counties is overturned at once when we see that the counties have at all times been dependant upon and controlled by the people of the whole State, through the legislative action. In what code will you find the reserved rights of the counties? I say then again, to the small counties, make a liberal compromise now, and surrender at least one branch of the Legislature to the sovereign people. Sooner or later this result must follow, and perhaps far more in its train, because the people are omnipotent in proportion as they are aroused to a sense of injustice. Their ultimate triumph may be postponed, but can never be defeated, because they fight under the banners of eternal truth and justice.

There is one great prevailing distinction between Maryland and most of the States, where this question of representation has been violently agitated. In those States the majority of wealth was opposed to the majority of numbers, and the argument was "property against population." But in our State wealth and numbers go hand in hand, and whether you look to the tax payers or the amount of population, the majority is with Baltimore city and Western Maryland, and yet they are in a Legislative minority on the existing basis, and *will be continued in this minority by the compromise of Mr. Fiery.*

Again, Baltimore is a commercial and not a manufacturing city. How can its interests be hostile to the agricultural counties, when all experience proves that commerce is the handmaid of agriculture.

It is also worthy of consideration that Baltimore city, is the natural protector of the oyster beds of the Eastern Shore. It was but the other day that we sent a steamboat and a company of artillery, at the expense of the State, to Somerset county, where "we met the enemy and they were our's." Baltimore volunteers for "the oyster war," broke up and captured the fleet of Northern piratical cruisers. I mention this in no jest, because there is a numerous class of excellent and industrious citizens, on the Eastern Shore, who live and support their families by trading in oysters, and unless they are adequately protected, their business must proportionately suffer. The Eastern Shore gentlemen talk of secession. Where will they go for protection against Northern cruisers, who will swarm in their waters, the moment our steam marine shall cease to throw its protectingegis over their long line of shore? This is another evidence of the identity of interest and feeling between our city and the small counties.

Then, as to slavery, is not Baltimore city sound to the core on this subject, and have not her delegates, with perfect unanimity voted for the fullest guarantee to the rights of the slaveholder? The true security and safety of the counties, will be to unite with us, and restrict the power of the Legislature, to impose taxes on the people for internal improvements, and to deny the power of incurring any State debt except for defence in war.

How, with such restrictions and such harmony of interests, can Baltimore city be dangerous? And yet when we hear that Maryland is a State with a big head, and small body, and therefore the head must be watched or it will eat the small counties up, I am reminded of the catfish which some one said was *all head and its head all mouth.*

I defy gentlemen to show how Baltimore can harm the counties, or would desire to do so, with the restrictions already imposed in the new Constitution.

If the Senate remains as it is by the compromise, Baltimore city has but one Senator out of twenty-one, how then can Baltimore city even if she controlled the House of Delegates, commit aggression on the counties? Could not the Senate protect the counties by rejecting the law if dangerous to the counties? Oh! but says the gentleman from Allegany, (Mr. Weber,) in ten years Baltimore would have a majority in the House of Delegates and might control the whole State by vetoing laws; that is, rejecting laws for the good of the State. Sir, the veto power has always been considered a conservative power—one for defence only and not for aggression.

But the gentleman loses sight of the fact, that the Senate could check the House of Delegates also. In fact the veto power would belong to both branches, mutually, and one would control the other as much as be controlled; but suppose Baltimore city could in ten years control the House of Delegates, it would be by virtue of her having a majority of the people of the whole State within her limits—would it not be her right in such a case to give to her superior numbers, superior weight in at least *one branch, (the half,) of the government?*

But I have a *projet* of compromise which steers clear of even this objection untenable as it is. My proposition which I shall submit, allows Baltimore on one *uniform ratio* through the whole State, but twenty-four members out of eighty-seven, until 1861, when the whole State is to be districted on the basis of population alone, for the purpose of electing delegates. It is therefore clear, that until the State is districted, Baltimore city cannot control even one branch of the Legislature; and then in ten years, I propose to adopt the district system, based on population, which the gentleman from Allegany, [Mr. Weber,] says he is prepared now to adopt. His argument will then fall, and to be consistent he should adopt my proposition which applies the district system in ten years, and in the meantime guards the counties by sixty-three delegates to twenty-four against Baltimore city. The great principle of my proposition is, that