

Our counties and our States form, in my humble judgment, one political community, the different parts having reciprocal duties, reciprocal obligations to each other, these obligations having been entered into when they were formed; and they must consult, not only the rights of those going away, but also the rights of those who may remain and form the old political association.

The gentleman laughs. That is the very ground I took when I was arguing the question of secession.

Mr. SANDS. I was smiling because I was enjoying his good Union argument.

Mr. CLARKE. It was the very argument I made upon the question of secession. I did not acknowledge the right of secession, because, having entered into the compact and obligation, the rights of all the community were involved. But I said expressly with reference to this question of war being waged, that it was a question to be decided by both parties. One party had a right to say, go off, you shall not dwell with me; and the other party had a right to make it a *casus belli*. But it becomes a question whether it should be made so, whether it is expedient and just, and whether having made it a *casus belli* that does not acknowledge the fact that they were waging war against them as independent States.

So with reference to the counties. It would be creating in a little portion of a county, all the rights of the county, if a vote taken upon the question were to decide except so far as the men within these particular limits were concerned; and those not within the limits were to have no say at all upon the subject. I say that unless all those interested should have an opportunity to vote, and unless all parties should agree whose rights are involved, they should not have this privilege; because you may be doing as much damage to those portions of the county lying at a distance from the portion to be cut off, as you would do good to those people who desire to form the new county. Let the vote in the county be taken. Let the people vote. They are all subsisting political organizations; and not sovereignties. Let these political organizations determine whether or not, they will divide their limits. If they desire it, well and good. But in the vote upon it, let all the citizens of the county be put upon the same footing of equality.

Mr. BOND. I am very much astonished at hearing the proposition of the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands,) for, if I understood him aright, it is the rankest secession that ever was in the world. From the earnestness with which he denounced such doctrines a while ago, I am surprised to hear him now preaching a doctrine no more nor less than secession. He advocates and maintains that a portion of the people may go out and join others, without consulting those that remain.

If that is not rank secession I do not know what is. Certainly, the people who are left behind have a right to be consulted, whether they shall part with them or not. I rose merely for the purpose of mentioning the inconsistency between the arguments of the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands) to-day, with those I heard him utter a few days ago.

Mr. SANDS. I will just point out to my young friend from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke,) and to my venerable friend from Anne Arundel (Mr. Bond,) what inconsistency they make. My doctrine is not secession, because the legislature, after the people have had the power to vote, are to determine this matter. How does that square with the secession doctrine? Is the secession doctrine that States have a right to vote to go out and may go out, if Congress agrees to it? I merely say that part of a county may go out if they vote that it is their desire, and if the general assembly of Maryland agrees to it. Is that secession? The fact is, that there is not an atom of secession in me, and therefore the gentlemen cannot get a bit out. To me, it is a detestable doctrine; and I won't have it.

What I want is that the people interested in making new county divisions shall come up to the legislature with their petitions setting forth the facts of the case, that they are thus and so situated in regard to their public buildings, their access to places of record, and everything of the sort; and I want them to satisfy the legislature of Maryland, and let the State in its aggregate capacity say whether or not these people shall have what they petitioned for. I only say this now to put myself right on the record, as the phrase goes.

How the gentlemen can make this idea, that part of the people of a county have a right to come to the legislature, and by way of petition setting forth their grievances, ask for redress by new county lines, how they can esteem that idea secession, passes all logic. It is nothing at all of the sort. All I want is this, that the people interested shall have the right to petition the legislature of Maryland, setting forth clearly their case; and then let the legislature of the State act upon the matter for the people. That is all we want.

Mr. KING. According to my understanding of the section, the legislature has nothing to do with it. The vote is taken, and if those desiring to separate have the majority, the legislature is bound to pass it.

Mr. SANDS. It does not say so.

Mr. KING. Yes, it does; it says:

"Section 1. The general assembly shall provide for organizing new counties, locating and removing county seats, and changing county lines, but no new county shall be organized without the consent of a majority of