

State, after 1816, into four senatorial districts, which should be as nearly equal as possible in *federal* population, and which should each elect five Senators. This was reported by the Senators. From Baltimore city. It was defeated by a small vote, considering the nature of the proposition. The question was then taken on the passage of the House Bill, which gave one Senator to each county, and one to the city of Baltimore. It was defeated by a vote of eight to six; the Senators from the city of Baltimore voting in the negative, which confirms the very natural opinion, before expressed, that the senatorial system was to the advantage of that city, so long as it possessed so small a share of influence in the House of Delegates.

It is not material to consider further the history of this question. I shall proceed to the examination of the practical objections which are made to any large increase in our city representation. It is commonly said that the circumstances of Maryland are peculiar, in as much as so large a portion of her inhabitants are concentrated in one community, and that a great departure from theory is justified. They are, indeed, few States, in which the population of the principal city bears so large a proportion to that of the whole State, but still, Maryland is not a single example. In Louisiana there is a gross population, according to the census of 1850, of 450,000 of which the city of New Orleans numbers nearly one-third. The State has increased since 1840 nearly 100,000 inhabitants. The largest proportion of the increase was in the city of New Orleans. It is the necessary outlet for the produce of the State, and the producers cannot escape the market which nature has opened for them. Yet the basis of representation in Louisiana, is regulated, in the House of Representatives, by the number of qualified electors; that people not imagining that the citizens of New Orleans would use their political power in preying upon the labor and industry of the agricultural classes of the State.

It must also be recollected that, although other States do not contain one city which has so large a proportion of the population, that there are instances, besides Louisiana and Maryland, in which *city interests* are as predominant, as they would be in this State, if the theory were allowed full operation. In 1840 there were in the State of New York, 2,428,921 inhabitants. In the city and county of New York, there were 312,000. And in Brooklyn, Albany, Utica, Rochester, Buffalo and the large towns upon the Hudson river, and on the line of the Erie canal, enough additional population to make the *commercial interest* nearly as powerful in that State as in our own. The difference in position is immaterial. Their interests are identical.

And if there was reason to apprehend that an effort might be made to shift the public burden upon the agricultural community, it is likely that New York and Buffalo would act together, because what would be of advantage to one, would equally tend to promote the interests of the other. There would appear also to be a strong reason for restraining the political power of the city of

New York. The lower counties, the valley of the Mohawk, and the territory of Western New York have scarcely any other avenue for the heavier portion of their produce, than that furnished by the Erie canal and Hudson river. The city is emphatically their market. All the pulsations of its great heart are felt along every vein of internal communication. Yet, despite these immense advantages over an agricultural community, scattered through so wide a space of territory, the political power of the State is distributed among the constituent *parts according to their population*.

The objections however, to the system proposed by the gentleman from Anne Arundel, are best indicated by a comparison of the results to which it leads with the practical defects and injustice of the present system. The counties of Caroline, Calvert, Charles, Kent, Prince George's, Queen Anne's, St. Mary's, Talbot, Montgomery, Worcester, Somerset, Dorchester and Anne Arundel, now have thirteen senators out of twenty-one, and forty-six delegates out of eighty-two—a sufficient majority to control the legislation of the state. They have 112,284 white inhabitants—a gross population of 218,665. The *minority* in the House composed of the remaining counties and of the city of Baltimore, and Senate, represent 306,755 white inhabitants—a total population of 364,351, and have only eight senators and thirty-six delegates. Those first named have a property assessed in value according to the Treasurer's report of 1849, at \$57,607,523—and the latter, a property valued at \$133,306,129. In a word, under the present system, the white population of thirteen counties control a population near treble in amount in the remaining sections of the state, and wield the power of taxation over property double the amount of that possessed by the communities which they represent. Under the plan of Judge Dorsey, reckoning Howard county, they have fourteen senators and forty-two delegates, and the remaining eight counties and the city of Baltimore, but eight senators and forty delegates.

The inequality is also strikingly exhibited when *sections* of the state are contrasted. The counties of Caroline, Calvert, Charles, Kent, Queen Anne's, Talbot, Montgomery, Prince George's, Worcester, Somerset and St. Mary's, have a property assessed at \$44,477,180, a white population of 84,954—a free colored population of 25,952—(making a total free population of 109,946,) 57,388 slaves—in all 167,544—and these elements are now represented by thirty-seven delegates and eleven senators—and would under Judge Dorsey's plan be eleven senators and thirty-two delegates. Baltimore city has a property assessed at \$70,305,140—a white population of 141,441—free colored 24,625—a total free population 166,066—2,946 slaves—and a gross population of 169,012—and is represented by five delegates and one senator, and in Judge Dorsey's plan would have one senator and ten delegates. That is the inequality confined to the case of Baltimore only—or produced by "the existence of a large commercial city within the limits of a small state,"—that "peculiar situation," of