

they will only give one more member for every additional twenty thousand. At the rate of one to every five thousand you come up to the population of twenty-five thousand. Then giving Baltimore county one more for twenty thousand, that brings it up to forty-five thousand, and the population of Baltimore county is forty-six thousand. I will read from the report :

"For every five thousand persons, or a fractional part thereof above one-half, one delegate shall be chosen until the number of delegates in each county and district of the city of Baltimore shall reach five."

That will bring up the population to twenty-five thousand. Then it says :

"Above that number one delegate shall be chosen for every twenty thousand persons, or a fractional portion over one-half thereof, until the whole number of delegates from each county, and district of the city of Baltimore, shall reach ten."

You then give Baltimore county another delegate for twenty thousand, bringing up the population of Baltimore county to forty-five thousand. Now Baltimore county comes forward and claims for sixteen hundred additional people. When your rule adopted gives one additional member for twenty thousand people, they come here and ask for sixteen hundred people an additional member. Where is the position of justice before this convention in the appeal of Baltimore county compared with that of Kent county? Kent county comes with the assertion of facts, and I believe those facts can be substantiated by evidence, by which she is entitled to another member. Baltimore county has forty-five thousand citizens represented here by six members, and then she has sixteen hundred more people, and your rule says that she must have twenty thousand more to claim another delegate. What justice, what right is there in the claim? If Baltimore county is to have an additional member, when the rule requires twenty thousand people, and they have but sixteen hundred upon which to base that claim, I may ask, great God! what shall be done with the people of these smaller counties cut down, some to one, and others to two, where the inequality is greater?

The truth of the matter is, that it would be said that this was an arbitrary rule, and that you might just as well say at the outset that you would have one for every three thousand up to five members. While that would have given my county her three members, it would have given Calvert her two members. Again, should we preserve the present basis, there would have been just as much reason for adopting one for every three thousand up to five, as one to every five thousand, and then going on to twenty thousand. That shows the arbitrariness of the rule; that the rule was adopted and carried

out as an arbitrary rule. If it works against certain portions of the State it is wrong. I regard it as wrong because it was no principle. But the convention have determined to adopt it, and I say let it go on and work out its legitimate results.

I will maintain it in its legitimate results. And least of all will I be placed in an inconsistent position for giving Kent county two because it is entitled to two, and then not giving Baltimore county two when she is not entitled to it, having an additional number of only sixteen hundred out of twenty thousand to entitle her to it. And because we do not under these circumstances vote for another representative for Baltimore county, gentlemen talk about "promises," and making "fish of one and flesh of the other." I must profess, that on one side or the other, I have made no promises. I have no pledges to redeem one way or the other. I have acted throughout upon what I regarded as justice to all portions of the State. If our views had been carried out, every white man in the State would, when this constitution went forth before the people, have stood equal under the laws and the constitution which is to govern us. If they do not stand equal here, it is not because of the position taken here by the opposition of this house. If this constitution should be adopted under the provisions under which it is to be voted for, I thank God there will be one provision here for an organization to rest upon to cry unto the people to rise in their majesty and amend it, and to give equality to every white man under the law, and the right of representation according to population. That is just and right; and even the last convention came up to it except solely in the case of Baltimore city, which they restricted for certain reasons below a representation corresponding to that of the counties. The State of Maryland has been travelling up to it, and in the present constitution had adopted the principle of representation according to population, with that single exception. But this question has taken the back track upon the question of representation.

Gentlemen have told us upon this question of representation, that they were elected to carry out the views of the people. I ask what was the doctrine which the "American," the organ of this body, preached and heralded through the State, if it was not representation according to population. Article after article of that paper went before the people calling that the only true theory or principle. If gentlemen say that in calling this convention or adopting it, the people voted for emancipation, they just as much voted for representation according to population. And these gentlemen, I contend, have violated the instructions of the people.

I have said these things in vindication of the course I have taken, and which