

which so much has been said. Allegany, Frederick, Washington and Baltimore counties have a white population of 114,538—9,519 free colored—a total free population of 124,057—9,841 slaves—making a gross population of 133,898—a property assessed at \$46,552,028—and only twenty delegates and four senators, and will have by the plan of Judge Dorsey twenty-one delegates and four senators.

But the inequality does not cease here. It is still more strikingly displaced when the revenue of the State is examined. The gross revenue which accrued for the year ending on December 1st, 1849, (Treasurer's report, Document A.) was \$1,504,548.98. Of this the city of Baltimore constituted in the shape of a direct tax \$175,762.85—as her portion of the indirect taxes, about \$200,487—and as her proportion of interest in the receipts from public works, &c., (considering her proportion of assessable property as as the basis of her claims,)—about \$99,714,—in all, \$475,964, or nearly one-third of the revenue the whole State. In directing the method of this contribution, and in regulating its payment, the city has but five members out of eighty-two, and one senator out of twenty-one. And the equalization proposed is to give one senator out of twenty-two, and ten delegates out of seventy-three. The relation which its power bears to its interest, is too manifest to need further illustration. The gross contribution of Caroline county, on the other hand, is about \$6,502, all the credits to which it is entitled, being enumerated. Yet it has more than one-half the city's representation in the lower house, and is its equal in the Senate, though one has a population of 169,054—and the other 9,692—the assessed value of the property of one being \$1,418,000—and of the other \$70,000,000. Surely injustice and inequality can go no further than this; and yet such are the results of the compromise of 1836, which, is said to have been very liberal to the city of Baltimore. Under the new plan, it is the equal of the city in the Senate, and has one-fifth of its strength in the House.

These illustrations prove that the basis of representation now existing, and that proposed by Mr. DORSEY are grossly unequal, whether numbers or taxation be regarded as the appropriate standards. I do not desire to be understood as justifying in any manner the claim of Baltimore and of the large counties, to increased representation upon the ground of their large pecuniary interest in the State. But as arguments of convenience and expediency have been repeatedly used in the discussion of this subject, in the Convention and elsewhere, it is right that I should avail myself of the same means to answer those who differ with me in my conclusions.

The differences in the assessed value of property in the counties and city of Baltimore have not been adverted to with any purpose of inculcating the idea that representation should be adjusted upon any scale of property. On this point I cannot do better than adopt the emphatic lan-

guage of Madison\* that "numbers are the only proper scale of representation." For if wealth be taken into the account, those who possess it, ought to have an adequate authority in appointing the agency entrusted with its control. But the whole theory is unsound. A legislative body should not represent land or money—but men only. Property has received full consideration, when it is protected by the law. It is to this conclusion that the States of this confederacy, with few exceptions, are rapidly tending. Maryland stands almost alone in her adherence to a disused system of political disfranchisement. Its constitution, despite the numerous petty charges which have been made, is not essentially altered from what it was when the last proprietary governor abandoned the province. The colonial form of our ancient system, modeled upon an English prototype, retains its unmistakable identity.

Besides, it is certain that Baltimore city, if allowed the fullest representation, would not endanger the finances of the State. It is not likely that experiments, which were, in part, so disastrous, will be again repeated by the Legislature, however it may be constituted. But it is proper to disavow the charge of ingratitude, which some would imply when they allege that the embarrassments of the State were chiefly contracted for the benefit of the city. Our representation at that period was even more limited than now, and if the city exerted any unusual influence, it was attributable to the argument and persuasion of private suitors. But our internal improvement system is a matter of history, and a recurrence to finances of the State, before and after 1836, and to the reasons which inclined the Legislature to enter into such undertakings, will sufficiently demonstrate the reason of the heavy expenditure which the State undertook.

In 1827 the debt of the State was not more than \$87,000. The gross revenue received for the year ending December 1, 1827, was \$266,416. There was a surplus remaining from the preceding year of \$103,284; and on the 1st of December 1827, a balance, after the payment of all liabilities, of \$76,291 in cash, and \$335,104 in United States stock, belonging to the State of Maryland. The direct taxes of the year were only \$16,912. So that it can readily be seen that the financial condition of the State was prosperous in the extreme. Two years before, (on the 14th December, 1825,) there had been a Convention of those favorable to internal improvement in the city of Baltimore, of which Charles Carroll of Carrollton was President. The Erie canal was then completed. Ohio and Pennsylvania had commenced similar works. The Convention recommended the Chesapeake and Ohio canal, and a lateral canal, uniting it with the Patapsco river, to the Legislature, and advocated the extension of the work to Pittsburgh and Lake Erie. It was supposed that, as Buffalo was nearer to Baltimore than to New York, this canal would enable the former city to compete with the latter

\*Federalist, No. 54.