

it is based on numbers, and has an uniform ratio all over the State, making invidious distinctions nowhere, and giving two delegates to the smallest county. (Here Mr. Brent read the proposition which he would submit at the proper time.) I would at once propose the district system, but we have not sufficient data to lay off the districts so as to do justice at present, and I therefore proceed for the next ten years on the census returns, and then require the Legislature to district the State. One of the great arguments in favor of districting the State, is its fairness towards both the great political parties.

Thus in Whig counties a Democrat may be elected from a Democratic district, to represent the views of the Democratic minority, which on the present plan is wholly disfranchised. And so in regard to Baltimore city. Whigs might then come to the Legislature from the Whig portions of the city, whereas now a Whig is politically unrepresented in Baltimore city. It will thus be seen that what we would lose in Baltimore, we would gain in the counties, and so *vice versa*. But the gentleman from Anne Arundel, undertakes unjustly to district Baltimore city alone of all the State. I denounce this as eminently oppressive and insulting to our people, but it is only of a piece with that spirit of discrimination in favor of the counties, and against Baltimore, which characterizes this Convention, and which I will never agree by vote of mine, to engraft in the Constitution. I will not waste the time of this Convention, by arguing the proposition of Mr. DORSEY, whose whole conduct seems to regard Baltimore as "a raw head and bloody bones," to the rest of the State.

Why make these distinctions against Baltimore unless to endorse the slanders put upon her people as a floating and foreign population by whig party Conventions?

[Here Mr. BRENT read from the Frederick Examiner, a whig paper, resolutions passed at a whig county Convention last summer, describing the population in Baltimore as a *floating population*.

Mr. BISER. Does the gentleman mean Frederick county?

Mr. BRENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISER. What is the date?

Mr. BRENT. Last summer, in the whig county convention.

Mr. BISER. Ah, yes, not the Democratic. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRENT then read the resolutions of the whig Convention of Kent county, last summer, which stated that Mr. CHAMBERS had approved them and which also described the population of Baltimore as unworthy of equal rights.

Mr. CHAMBERS said:

He really had hoped his former explanation of this piece of personal history to which the gentleman, (Mr. Brent,) was again alluding, would have rendered a repetition of the process unnecessary. He would, however, re-state the facts—which he did. From this it will be perceived that he had the opportunity to read but a part of the paper, and of course, could express his con-

currence but with that part. Not that he now designed to intimate a nonconcurrence with any of the opinions there expressed, for he did not, in fact, recollect, if he ever knew, what they were. His sole object was to disclaim, being fettered by pledges.

Mr. BRENT continued. I certainly was justified in supposing that Mr. CHAMBERS had endorsed the whole platform of the Kent county Convention by which he was nominated, when I found it so expressly stated in the printed proceedings of that Convention. It seems now he did not read the platform on which he was nominated, and therefore, is not responsible for it. I will, however, read it, and he can now say, whether he dissents.

[Here Mr. BRENT read the Kent county resolutions, reflecting on the people of Baltimore as not entitled by the nature of their population, to equal rights.]

Can I agree as a delegate from that city, by any vote of mine to endorse these aspersions on our people? No, sir, I will never so degrade my constituency, for in my opinion, it would be degradation to draw an odious and unjust distinction against them.

This is one of my great reasons for rejecting this much praised Washington county compromise, so misnamed, (Mr. Fiery's proposition,) because I can see no other reason why it should apply the principle of equal representation to all the counties, and deny it to Baltimore city. Gentlemen may not mean it as an endorsement in the Constitution itself of all these *party aspersions* on Baltimore city, which have even been echoed again and again in these halls by the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) who has repeatedly spoken of the rowdy population in that city, as a reason why she should not be trusted with power; but as I said before, I have nothing to do with motives.

I deal with acts and the effect of acts, and I cannot for my life but regard the discriminations of Mr. FIERY's proposition, as necessarily tending to affix a stigma upon my constituency, which I shall ever repel from any judgment in the Constitution itself.

The gentleman from Allegany, (Mr. Weber,) has referred to Maine, Rhode Island and Louisiana, as precedents to justify this odious distinction against Baltimore city, but their Constitutions do not bear him out. The two first States do limit the number of delegates from towns or townships, but we all know that in those States, a township includes county and cities, the whole State being laid off into townships. These States, therefore, do not grant to the rural districts, what they deny to cities, but place town and country under the same limit. But even if they did draw so odious a distinction, why should we follow them when they would stand in gloomy contrast to the rest of the United States.

Mr. B. then showed that New York, regardless of her immense city, and the floating nature of its population, had given equal rights to all, by districting the whole State, and assuming no other basis but numbers. The great State of