

Mr. CHAMBERS said, he differed with the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) in regard to the particular facts of the case. The gentleman says he received the intimation in the same spirit as he did on the former occasion alluded to. Sir, I think he is in error. When the gentleman, not now in his chair, (Mr. Bowie,) on that occasion, suggested the striking out Harford, the answer was, "I accept the amendment." The journal, page 563, will show it was accepted. He here read the journal. Now, sir, what was the answer given on the present occasion? The first words we heard were, as I believe, "is this matter to be eternally harped upon?"

Mr. THOMAS asked, was it worth while to waste further time on this subject? But he would say this, the gentleman who sat behind him, (Mr. Bond,) the gentleman from Prince George's, when the gubernatorial districts were under consideration, called his attention to the fact that he, (Mr. T.,) had connected Harford with the eastern shore, and said that would possibly make some members vote against his proposition. He, (Mr. T.,) was not willing to believe that possible, but consented to obviate the objection. That was said privately, and afterwards he said it in open session. Now, if the gentleman from Kent had said in private conversation that members of the eastern shore would vote against this measure because Harford was connected with that shore, he would have yielded again to what he must consider a most unreasonable prejudice.

Mr. CHAMBERS said, of course he knew nothing of any remark made privately, nor had he heard it. He did hear, as every body else did, the exclamation of decided discontent from the gentleman, in the language he had repeated.

As to the alteration, he could only urge it on the ground of positive propriety; he had no such control of votes as to authorise him to pass them away or pledge them for this consideration or any other. The gentleman had thought proper to introduce and enlarge upon the topic of lessening the political power and importance of the smaller counties. I did not invite it, sir, said Mr. C. I never do invite it. But I never retire from it. I will maintain my position, sir, against any attack, whether from the most formidable or the feeblest antagonist, with firmness and decision.

I know too well not to dread this continual, unceasing attempt, on every occasion, to assail our rights. Our proportionate share in the office of Governor is to be diminished, our proportionate share in the legislative department is diminished, our proportionate share in the commissions of public works is to be diminished, and now the gentleman tells us, what I confess is new to me, that we have a superabundant proportion of the judicial department. And, with all this, when a voice is raised to resist these repeated aggressions, the gentleman exclaims, "in God's name, are we never to have an end of these discussions of a local character?" Sir, I had said nothing to excite feeling, nothing which the gentleman could properly charge to a design or desire to excite local feeling. But it seems,

it is arrogance for the eastern shore to ask for six judges. Sir, I have heard this judicial system talked of over and over again; but to this day and this hour I have heard of, I have seen, no scheme which made less than two districts on the eastern shore. Every district, under the present system, has three judges—how, then, with two districts, could we have less than six judges? You have now made two districts on our shore, and besides this, have united one of our counties—Cecil—to a western shore district. The gentleman himself, I believe, approved this arrangement. Where, then, is the propriety of this allegation and complaint that we are supplied with a superabundant share of judicial labor? It is contradicted by the statistical returns which have been furnished by my friend from Somerset, (Mr. Crisfield.) But the gentleman from Frederick says, he would have us give some "argument," instead of this "eternal ringing about the eastern shore." Why, sir, we have thundered out our arguments here at the top of our voices, day after day; this big book, [the Register of Debates.] is full of our arguments, to show the fallacy of that theory, which is relied on to strip us of our political power. We have been urging, for five or six months, arguments which we think yet unanswered, and which we think unanswerable, to show the folly and the danger of pursuing this *ignis fatuus* of meaning and political power and influence to different portions of the State solely on the basis of population.

We have been uniformly met by the unvarying cry of "the rights of the sovereign people." We have pressed upon you the fact that you are departing from all the settled and uniform policy and practice of the government, from its earliest history, under which the State has prospered and flourished, that no complaint had reached our ears of any practical mischief, no man had suffered in his rights of person or property; no man's rights of any description had been stricken down or infringed upon; that the government had answered well, and to the utmost extent of any rational expectation, all the purposes of its creation; and all we had heard in reply was a laudation of great abstractions—"the rights of the people"—"the universal equality of all men"—"the rule of a minority"—"the oppression of a majority." Sir, I believe the most difficult operation that politicians have had to perform amongst us, was that of convincing these oppressed people of the majority, that they were in fact oppressed; and I cannot esteem that oppression very horrible, of which the victim is entirely unconscious, especially, with mind and means to discover it if it exist. And now, sir, after months of labor in this field of argument, so far from operating upon the minds of gentlemen a conviction of the truths we have enforced, the gentleman has even forgotten we have made the attempt. This, to say the least of it, is a cool compliment. I fear, sir, our arguments have fallen upon unwilling ears, "none so deaf as he that will not hear." At all events it does not exactly stimulate me to re-argue these matters at this time, or to say more than is necessary to recall the gentleman's recollection to the fact that we