

gentleman looked to the ulterior consequence which would necessarily follow a general representation on the broad basis of population.

He (Mr. B.) did not say he looked to that, but he would say that no member could have conceived or planned a more certain scheme, or one so necessarily leading to a result of this sort, than this very scheme of districting the State. It would have that effect unquestionably. The gentleman, however, might not have so intended it. He might not desire to have a representation in the lower house on the broad basis of population, including Baltimore city. He has frequently disavowed any such doctrine, but he [Mr. B.] could only say that the gentleman had played directly into the hands of the gentlemen from Baltimore city, [Messrs. Brent and Gwinn.]—And, he [Mr. B.] was surprised that those gentlemen had not come out in favor of the plan. He had understood, however, that the gentleman from Baltimore city, [Mr. Brent,] had declared that if representation should be according to districts, he would go for it.

Now, he had made these remarks, because yesterday, in the hurry of the moment, coming from another theatre, and his mind being occupied with another subject, he was induced to vote for a similar proposition, which on reflection, his judgment condemned, and he thought it his solemn duty to warn gentleman representing counties here, that in his humble opinion, it would necessarily lead to representation according to population, if we undertook to abandon representation by counties.

Remarks of Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, Friday, May 2, 1851.

Mr. BRENT of Baltimore city, observed that he had a few words to say in reply to the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie.) He desired to state in a few words his views, as to the combined proposition, for he regarded it as a combined movement between the advocates of districting Baltimore city alone, and those who were willing to district Baltimore city and the State, upon the basis established by the new Constitution, for, if the proposition, as amended by the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) was adopted, then there would be a combined vote in favor of districting Baltimore city. That was the object if not the design. Now, you propose to divide and neutralize Baltimore city's ten delegates, given under a compromise which you forced upon her by her divided delegation; but he thought they would not force this districting upon her with a divided vote of her delegation. Why, he heard eulogies here upon the system of districting the State. He heard it drawn from the national constitution, or from the general government, where it had operated successfully and harmoniously. He, however, saw no analogy between the cases. None whatever. The district system adopted by Congress for elections on the part of the general government, was based upon population—federal numbers, and he would like gentlemen to get up

there and show him one constitution where a basis was not uniform throughout the State.

Could they, he asked, show him a case, where the gerrymandering process had been adopted in a Constitution? Show him a Constitution, he said, which had adopted an arbitrary basis of representation for one part, and an equivalent basis for another part of a State? None could be shown him. Now, what did gentlemen here propose to do? They proposed by the present scheme of adjustment to give the several counties of the State a representation substantially according to population, preserving a minimum vote for the small counties. The counties of western Maryland were given representation according to population; but they gave Baltimore city no such thing. Why, the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) proposed boldly and directly to reduce that still further—to divide and neutralise her delegation of ten, so that her delegation might be divided in the House of Delegates, against itself.

Now what, he asked, was the other proposition? It was the same thing; and there was little or no difference, and that was, to district the other portions of the State which had a representation according to population, and also Baltimore city which had not.

He, (Mr. B.) said it was a just measure, and if it were applied to the whole State on an uniform basis he would vote for it. Now, he did not mean to address gentlemen, who like the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie,) had arranged the counties into lines against the city. He, (Mr. B.) had never maintained these local doctrines, but he had something to address to gentlemen who had advocated representation according to population, and he would say to them: "Upon what ground was it that you reconciled your consciences to give Baltimore but ten delegates?" It was owing to this; it was that Baltimore being a compact community, if you gave her a delegation of ten, she would wield an influence beyond her numerical strength. That was it; and that argument had been echoed over and over in this hall. And, it was thus ascertained that while she had not her full rights, she had equal practical power in the Legislative Hall.

Now, he would appeal to gentlemen, who used that argument—who preached those doctrines, whether by dividing that delegation, they did not neutralize even what this odious compromise leaves her. He, however, did not rise to argue that proposition, for he considered the time to argue past. He considered argument lost on the majority of this Convention. He knew that the gentleman from Frederick county, had been one of the staunchest reformers. Nearly seventeen years ago, when just of age, he, (Mr. Brent,) appeared in this city as a member of the very first Reform Convention in Maryland, the gentleman was with him then, and had been an earnest, steadfast Reformer ever since.

He knew that his friend was prepared to vote for representation to its full extent at any time, if he could carry it. But we were now divided.