

Mr. BROWN, [interrupting] expressed that what he said was, that we were a self-governed people.

Mr. BLAKISTONE resuming, said that he was coming to that. The gentleman from Carroll had said that if the gentleman from Kent, was in England he would say that the people of this country governed themselves, and then, when he came home to Kent county, he would find out it was a fallacy. Was this the idea?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; I believe that the people are capable of self-government.

Mr. BLAKISTONE said, that he meant to demonstrate that the gentleman from Carroll believed no such thing, and his argument would show it.

He, [Mr. B.] thought that man to be capable of self-government, must first have the power and capacity to govern himself, and he contended that the people had the power to govern themselves and that they had also a right to say what kind of government they should have. Now, the gentleman from Carroll had said that a majority could determine everything irrespective of law and Constitution and that the people had no right to govern themselves. If this principle was a correct one, it cut up by the root the principle which he contended for, that the people had a right to self-government, because, by taking away the power to regulate their action, they took away the higher power of sovereignty and the power to control and govern themselves. The honorable gentleman could not escape this necessary consequence resulting from his argument—an argument founded in error, and tending to the destruction of all government.

Can it be contended that any ten men assembled together, could say to the eleventh man, we will have every thing our way and you must do as we tell you, and that he is bound to obey? He subscribed to no such doctrine; for he held, that all men stood upon one common platform of equality. He had as much right to direct the action of the world, as the world had to direct his action. This was quite strong, but he would repeat that he had as much right, apart from all law and government in his natural state. (all men in a state of nature being unrestrained by law or Constitution,) he would say that he had just as much right, possessing all the inherent elements of sovereignty in himself, to direct the action of each and every member of that Convention, as they had to control or direct his action. The principle that a majority can govern, only applied to the formation of any society or government, and then it must be according to the terms upon which the society or government is formed.

He was inclined to believe that the gentleman from Carroll would now think that he was getting in advance of him on the subject of the people's rights but he would not go in for brute force without reference to Constitutional law governing. That was a slavish doctrine, and one which no man could maintain. The tyranny of brute force was the worst in the world. The principle of popular numbers governing, unrestrained by law and constitution, would give to the masses the right to do as they pleased, and

permit them to violate natural and revealed law at their pleasure. How was this to be overcome, if the principle is correct that numbers have a right to govern? They could not overcome it, because it required force to repel force, and they having the most power, would be beyond control. He hoped never to see the day when such tyranny shall be established in any portion of this country.

Let them carry this principle further as regarded this State. If the principle was correct, for which the gentleman contended—that numbers have the right to govern irrespective of law and Constitution—he would ask him to apply it, and carry it out and then see what would be the consequences. Look at the general government, for there was no political principle, as regarded popular rights and power, which would apply to the State of Maryland, that would not apply with equal force to the general government. Apply the principle there, and where would they stand? Why, the non-slaveholding States, if they chose, could wipe off the old Constitution, and substitute another at their pleasure, they being in the majority; for if the democratic principle obtained, they could do it, as also the other democratic principle, that having the right to do this and order submission, the minority, the slaveholding States, would be bound to submit.

Every privilege, every the security of himself and family which they had under the Constitution of the United States, which extended its broad ægis over every citizen, in every clime, would, by this fell swoop, be destroyed by those who professed that they alone were the friends of the people. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, where a man spoke a great deal of his religion, he was very apt to be a hypocrite, and he believed that those who declared themselves to be the peculiar friends of the people, were not more so than those who made less professions.

A great many persons talked of equality and democracy, who never had a poor man to sit at their tables. This was not his democracy. His democracy was that all men (he was speaking of white men,) were equal, and that but this one distinction should be made—the distinction which intellectual and moral worth gave one man over another. As to making all men equal by laws, they might legislate to eternity, and never succeed. "Blood could never be obtained from a turnip," and some men's heads were very much like a turnip. [Laughter.]

He had several times tried to close his remarks, and he would try to close them directly. [Cries of "go on," "go on."]

Government, he believed, was usually formed upon the principle of compromise. He did not think there ever was a government that was not formed upon the following principles:—allegiance and protection. First, that the citizens should sustain the government; and, second, that if the citizens should take care of the government, the government would take care of them. If this was the correct principle, then it was absolutely necessary that the government should be so regulated as to give to each interest, pro-