

am sure no member of the Convention will feel more gratified at the correction than himself.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline. It was not my intention to go into a discussion as to our having badly treated the Indians. What I said was only by way of illustration. I said that while we proclaimed that all men were born free and equal, our ancestors had not so treated the aborigines who were dispossessed of their lands and were not permitted to participate in the government.

Mr. BLAKISTONE. Well, sir, we will go on and try to do a little more justice to our Pilgrim Fathers. Not only did they land and buy the property of the aborigines, paying a fair equivalent for their possessions, but they went a great deal farther. They established upon the Western coast of North America the first principles of religious liberty; and when you and I and all of us, and when our Constitution and our State—when our country, perhaps, shall have changed its system and form of Government, there will be a monument, aye, reaching to Heaven, in honor of those people, that time cannot efface, and which will survive till all things temporal shall be swallowed up in an ocean of eternity. Now, sir, I will quote again from the same authority, page 197:

“In an age, when perfidy and barbarity but too often marked the advances of civilization upon the savage, it exhibits them to us, displaying in their intercourse with the natives, all the kindnesses of human nature, and the charities of their religion, thus characterizing this colony, as one established under the purest principles, and by the noblest feelings which can animate the human heart; it presents to us in its alter history, a people true to the principles of their origin. At a period when religious bigotry and intolerance seemed to be the badges of every christian sect; and those who dwelt under their oppressions, instead of learning tolerance by their experience, had but imbibed the spirit of their oppressors; and when the howlings of religious persecutions were heard every where around them, the Catholic and Protestant of Maryland were seen mingling in harmony, in the discharge of all their public and private duties, under a free government, which assured the rights of conscience to all.”

Sir, I will now read from page 178:

“The landing of the pilgrims of New England, has been the burden of many a story, and the theme of many an oration. The very rock on which their feet were first planted, is consecrated in the estimation of their descendants; and its relics are enshrined as objects of holy regard. They were freemen in search of freedom. They found it, and transmitted it to their posterity. It becomes us, therefore, to tread lightly upon their ashes. Yet, whilst we would avoid all invidious contrasts, and forget the stern spirit of the Puritan, which so frequently mistook religious intolerance for holy zeal; we can turn with exultation to the Pilgrims of Maryland, as the founders of religious liberty in the new world. They erected the first altar to it on this continent; and the fires first kindled on it ascended to heaven,

amid the blessings of the savage. Should the memory of such a people pass away from their descendants as an idle dream?”

Sir, I have no more to say on that subject. Now, I propose to enter immediately, with these preliminary remarks, into the discussion of the question before us. I listened to my friend from Caroline, [Mr. Stewart,] yesterday, and my two friends from Baltimore city, [Messrs. Brent and Gwinn,] and my friend from Charles, [Mr. Merrick,] as I always do, with great pleasure; but none of those gentlemen, it seemed to me, entertained an opinion as to the plan that should be adopted. There was one remark made yesterday by the gentleman from Baltimore city, [Mr. Brent,] which struck me with a great deal of force. He said he did not care so much about the number—it was not that for which he wished to contend, but it was a principle which would run through the Constitution, not to adopt the principle of representation according to population in the counties as a starting point, and then suddenly stop short. It struck me that there was a great deal of reason in the remark. But, I confess, I cannot go quite so far as the gentleman who said that we ought to have representation according to population. Before a Constitution was formed, when our people were in preparation to throw off the yoke of Great Britain and about to establish an independent government for themselves, you will find that although the different counties of Maryland were not what we would call political sovereignties, but yet, in fact, in every instance of treating with each other, they were treated as separate and independent sovereignties, to the same extent that the States of this Union treated with each other under the old confederation. Now, sir, does it need any historical facts to prove that? I do not want to read it; but perhaps it will be better I should do so. You will find that the first act of the Convention in 1774, was in these words:

“It being moved from the Chair to ascertain the manner of dividing upon questions, it was agreed, that on any division, each county have one vote, and that all questions be determined by a majority of counties.” [See journal of Con. 1774-5-6.]

Thus, it will be perceived, that in the very incipient stage of their proceedings, the principle was adopted of equality among the counties.

You will find further, that in the progress of business, when it became necessary to raise money, they had to adopt a certain course? And what course did they pursue? They recommended each county to furnish a certain amount, consisting of so many pounds, shillings and pence, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the whole colonies. Were they not exactly treating with each other as independent sovereignties to the very identical extent that the States and the general government treated with each other, as separate and independent colonies, pursuing the same course, when they recommended the States to furnish so much money, for the general use? Sir, I am not going to contend that they were actual political sovereignties; but I mean to contend that they treated with each other as such