

the people—the freemen of the State, should be represented, we must not strike down the property of the State; but that it must be taken into the calculation. I certainly have no objection; and if gentlemen prefer it, let them adopt the South Carolina basis, (now urged in the Virginia Convention by some.) The proposed compromise of the gentleman from Washington, will bear this test also.

I have compiled from the Treasurer's annual report, a statement which I now have in my hands, showing the amount of the direct tax levied upon the property of the several counties and city, and the miscellaneous or indirect taxes paid into the treasury by the several counties and city. The column under the head of miscellaneous taxes is made up of the amounts received from the county clerks, registers and other officers, for the various kinds of licenses, stamps, &c. I would read it if it were not so long, but will content myself with giving the aggregates in the several sections into which I have divided the State, and hand the statement to the reporter; my object being to have it laid before the people.

Mr. W. then read the column in the following table, which shows the amount of miscellaneous taxes received.

STATEMENT

Showing the amount of Taxes paid by the several counties, compiled from the Treasurer's Report.

Counties.	Direct Levy for 1850.	Miscellaneous paid in 1850	Total.
Allegany,	\$9,031 89	\$10,450	\$19,481 89
Washington,	29,142 49	11,540	40,682 49
Frederick,	45,365 84	25,980	71,345 84
Carroll,	16,581 83	2,900	19,481 83
Baltimore,	33,516 00	57,730	91,246 00
Harford,	12,727 74	3,410	16,137 74
	\$146,365 79	\$112,010	\$258,375 79
Cecil,	\$12,849 63	\$5,381	\$18,229 63
Talbot,	10,064 08	3,860	13,924 08
Kent,	8,849 10	2,980	11,829 10
Q Anne's,	9,737 49	3,200	12,937 49
Caroline,	3,610 96	1,900	5,510 96
Dorchester,	10,392 64	4,671	15,062 64
Somerset,	8,335 04	4,790	13,125 04
Worcester,	8,758 19	4,210	12,968 19
	\$72,597 13	\$30,990	\$103,587 13
Howard,	\$8,613 45	\$3,020	\$11,633 45
A. Arundel,	14,409 51	6,200	20,609 51
P. George's,	23,224 44	4,650	27,874 44
Calvert,	5,271 03	1,050	6,321 03
Montgomery	13,045 02	3,470	16,515 02
Charles,	8,280 21	3,320	11,600 21
St. Mary's,	9,728 72	5,000	14,728 72
	\$82,572 38	\$26,710	\$109,282 38
Balt. city,	\$175,762 85	\$137,000*	\$312,762 85

*Exclusive of amount from Lottery Licenses, Live Stock and Hay Scales and Inspections.

Mr. TUCK. I would ask the gentleman a question. Does his table include all the taxes that accrue from year to year, or only the amounts received?

Mr. WEBER. The figures constituting what I term the miscellaneous or indirect taxes are made up from the actual receipts into the treasury during the year. Where it was apparent that arrears of other years were brought in, I have excluded them. It is probable that, in some cases, the full amount that accrued during the year did not come in. I will not say that the statement is correct to the figure—I have not been particular about fractions. But I think it is nearly correct—sufficiently so for the purpose I use it.

Now, sir, if we regard taxation as a proper basis of representation, and test the proposition of the gentleman from Washington by that basis, we will find that the western district would have one delegate for every \$9569 of taxation—the eastern shore one for every \$5179 of taxation—the southern district one for every \$7285 of taxation, and Baltimore city one for every \$31,276 of taxation.

I have now shown the practical operation of the plan of compromise recommended by the gentleman from Washington, in various aspects. And, whilst gentlemen in all parts of the House agree that this is a question which must be compromised, and that it ought to be adjusted on terms fair and equitable to all parts of the State, I cannot but believe that many will concur with me that the proposition which I am now favoring, is the fairest one yet submitted for our consideration.

But there is an exception in the plan against the city of Baltimore. Now, the question arises: Is it fair, is it proper, is it right to make the exception? I think there is some propriety in the exception. But I am free to say here, that if what I believe to be the proper system—the division of the several counties and city into separate and independent representative districts—were adopted, I would not then be for carrying the restriction against Baltimore to the extent now proposed. Indeed, as it is, Baltimore will be more restricted than she would have been had the arrangement of the question been under my control. But compromise is the order of the day, and all must expect to yield something. I believe, too, that the proposition of the gentleman from Washington can command more votes than any other which has been submitted or suggested.

But why do I say there is propriety in making the exception against Baltimore? It is a large city in a small State, and is rapidly growing. Already it embraces about one-third of the population of the State, and if it progresses with the same rapidity that it has for the last twenty years, no gentleman here can close his eyes to the fact, that in ten years from now it may contain a majority of the people of Maryland. If the doctrine of representation according to population were carried out to its full extent, the city would then be entitled to a majority in the popular branch of the Legislature. Self-preservation