

contemplated in part the giving of an additional delegate to Montgomery. He thanked him for his effort to restore justice to that wronged county. As this subject was up, he desired to state a few prominent facts to show the claim she had for an additional delegate. When this subject was up before, the gentleman from Frederick, [Mr. Thomas,] spoke of the size and wealth of Frederick county, as well as her population, as compared with Calvert, to show why she should have increased representation. He, (Mr. D.,) would take the gentleman upon his own ground, and apply it to Montgomery. The *large*, the populous and *wealthy* county of Frederick, was the language of the gentleman. Now, sir, it so happens that Montgomery is but five square miles smaller than the large county of Frederick. Yet Frederick has six delegates and Montgomery but two. Montgomery is seventy square miles larger than Washington county; yet Washington has five and Montgomery but two delegates. She is sixty square miles larger than Somerset;—yet Somerset has four delegates and Montgomery but two. But to the credit of Somerset, be it spoken, that although she gets a full delegation, as large as she expected, so great was the injustice and iniquity of the proposition adopted, to other counties in the State, that her delegation unanimously voted against it. So in point of size, one of the gentleman's arguments, Montgomery is almost equal to Frederick, and much larger than several other counties which are to have much larger delegations than is recorded to her.

Again, sir, let us try Montgomery by the gentleman's other proposition—wealth and taxation. In this respect she stands higher than the others, being the seventh county in the State in point of taxation and assessment; while she is the eighth in point of size—having twelve counties below her in point of wealth, assessment and taxation, and eleven in point of size. Yet in point of representation, she is put down with the smallest and weakest county in the State. The iniquity of this arrangement will be more striking when she is compared with the smaller counties of the State. Take Caroline, for example. In point of size, but little over half that of Montgomery; only about two-thirds her population, and hardly one-fourth her wealth. Yet in point of representation she is put upon a par with Montgomery. Her assessment and taxation will be found to be larger than several counties which have three delegates, while she gets but two. He hoped that these prominent facts, would induce the Convention to reconsider the representation question, as moved by his friend from Kent, that one act of justice might be done to the deeply wronged and injured county of Montgomery.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was told this morning at my breakfast table, that in the Virginia Convention. Henry A. Wise, has just concluded a speech of five days, the sum and substance of which was that a white man was worth thirty-five cents, and that it took two white men in Virginia to be

worth as much as one negro. [I shall vote against the reconsideration, because I look upon this whole plan as being arbitrary. It is one, which, to me, as a reformer is shocking and monstrous; but I find that the Convention is not in a tone and temper to go as far upon the question of representation as I should be willing to go, and I therefore adhere to the plan as determined upon by the majority of the Convention.]

One of my colleagues has been kind enough to place in my hands a table which I wish to read, showing the amount of taxation paid by each county, for each delegate; and also, the number of voters in each county for each delegate. I will remark that the table is predicated upon the direct taxation paid by each county, and has no relation to the indirect taxation.

Amount of Direct Taxation to each member per Treasurer's Report.

Baltimore city, to each member,	\$47,576
Prince George's,	7,741
Frederick,	7,560
Montgomery,	6,522
Washington,	5,828
Baltimore county,	5,586
Carroll,	5,527
Talbot,	5,483
Queen Anne's,	4,868
St. Mary's,	4,864
Anne Arundel,	4,803
Kent,	4,424
Howard,	4,306
Cecil,	4,283
Harford,	4,242
Charles,	4,140
Dorchester,	3,464
Worcester,	2,916
Calvert,	2,635
Allegany,	2,258
Somerset,	2,083
Caroline,	1,805

Number of voters to each member as apportioned in the Counties and city of Baltimore, (per statement accompanying map):

	VOTERS.
Baltimore city, to one member,	2,041
Washington,	1,072
Frederick,	1,053
Carroll,	1,037
Harford,	994
Cecil,	983
Worcester,	865
Allegany,	835
Montgomery,	816
Talbot,	767
Baltimore county,	765
Dorchester,	732
Howard,	656
Somerset,	619
Caroline,	591
Queen Anne's,	579
Charles,	575
St. Mary's,	517
Prince George's,	505
Anne Arundel,	486
Kent,	467
Calvert,	302