

Mr. DAVIS. From McSherry's History of Maryland. Isn't it good authority?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. D. proceeded to read:

"The re-apportionment of the House of Delegates so as to do justice to the populous districts, and at the same time to give to the small counties, and the city of Annapolis, ample power to protect their interests."

This is the language and the ground taken by the Reform Convention of 1836. Ample power to the city of Annapolis and the small counties, to protect their interests. This is all we want. Practically carry out this pledge in practice, he would be satisfied. If the smaller counties could be enabled to protect their own interests, it was all they demanded. The delegates were not to represent the corporeal bodies of men, but the interests of men, and should be so apportioned that the interests of all sections should be fully protected.

The gentleman from Baltimore city [Mr. Gwinn,] in his speech on Monday, had introduced a new element as the basis of representation—he had thought proper to draw a contrast between the wealth of Baltimore, and the wealth of the county of Kent. He, [Mr. G.,] represented in part an interest of seventy millions, and the gentleman from Kent, near me, of about four millions of dollars. He, [Mr. D.] must be permitted to say that wealth as a basis of representation, was to his humble apprehension, a new article in the democratic reform creed. He understood that to be the doctrine of the gentleman from Baltimore, and if he was wrong, he hoped he would be corrected. If that was his theory, let him carry it out; run it through, as his colleague says, and say to the man with \$100,000, you are entitled to ninety-nine more votes than the man who has but \$1,000, and so down to the man with \$100, or less. That was the principle, and he would hold the gentleman to the doctrine, which he had now for the first time heard avowed, that wealth should be the basis of political power. He had been accustomed, ever since he was a voter, to meet every citizen upon the same platform, whether the man who owned his thousands of acres, or the man who was only hired by him as a day laborer. They met at the polls upon an equality.—But now was introduced, from Baltimore city, a new element, which if adopted, would enable that city to swallow up the rest of the State, as well as a basis of population would; for it was increasing in wealth too fast for the counties to rise with it. Baltimore, under such a principle, without even that of representation, would soon aggrandize to herself the whole political power of the State.

The gentleman from Baltimore city, [Mr Gwinn,] had also undertaken to give the history of the connection of Maryland with works of internal improvement. With all the intelligence and research of that gentleman he must take issue with him upon matters of fact. The history presented by that gentleman had neither been

correct with respect to the city of Baltimore or the State of Maryland. He understood him to date back the commencement of internal improvements to 1820, or about that time, to a Convention in Baltimore, at which Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, presided. He had also understood him to say, that Maryland had lost nothing upon any works of internal improvement which connected the country with the city of Baltimore. In the first place, the gentleman had not, by any means, gone far enough back in his researches. The first internal improvement Convention was held in the city of Annapolis, 22nd December, 1784; and who, think you, presided? Not Carroll, of Carrollton, although he was present and participated in the meeting, but the illustrious father of his country, who had lent his aid and his information to mark out what he conceived to be for the future interests of Maryland and Virginia. If it would not take up too much time, he should be glad to read the account of that meeting—he would only give an extract: "That it is the opinion of the conference, that the proposal to establish a company for opening the river Potomac, merits the approbation of, and deserves to be patronized by Virginia and Maryland, and that a similar law ought to be passed by the Legislature of the two governments, to promote and encourage so laudable an undertaking."

Thus, sir, in 1784, originated from the patriot minds, and far-reaching wisdom of Washington and Carroll, of Carrollton, that stupendous work, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, which was only completed in October last.

The next Convention in which the people of Maryland had participated, was held in the city of Washington in 1823, containing members from Maryland, Virginia, and perhaps Ohio and Pennsylvania. The Convention adjourned, and again convened in the same city in 1826. In that Convention the city of Baltimore was represented, and when I read you the names, I think you, sir, will agree with me that Baltimore never was more ably represented in any body. The delegates were Solomon Etting, Benjamin C Howard, William Lorman, Isaac McKim, Joseph W. Patterson, Philip E. Thomas, Thomas Ellicott, Roger B. Taney and Luke Tiernan.

Mr. HOWARD, [in his seat.] We went there to secure the cross-cut canal.

Mr. DAVIS. I know you did, in part, but that was not an original idea. The right to take the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal for a cross-cut, had been provided for by the Virginia charter granted in 1824—two years before.

The gentleman present, as well as others of the delegation, had participated in the proceedings of the meeting. At this Convention, thus so ably represented by Baltimore, the following resolution was *unanimously* passed:

"That it is expedient to substitute for the present navigation of the Potomac river above Tide Water, a navigable canal by Cumberland, to the mouth of Savage creek, at the Eastern bar of the Allegany, and to extend such canal as soon thereafter as practicable, to the highest constant steam boat navigation of the Monongahela or Ohio river."