

ticket system. Now, it did not follow that Baltimore city would elect a judge if we adopted the general ticket system.

He believed that such was the progress of prejudice and county hostility to Baltimore city, that he did not believe a Judge or a Governor could be elected now from Baltimore city. And he thought that was one great reason why Mr. Carroll was defeated, some years ago, for Governor. Certain it is, that every Democratic candidate for Governor has been elected, but the one who resided in Baltimore city. That fact speaks volumes of prejudice and hatred in the counties. And he would undertake to say that, under the new Constitution, if they would serve for such inadequate salaries, men could be nominated for the Court of Appeals, whose nominations would be received by the people with acclamation, and command their almost unanimous suffrages. He knew of one gentleman, who, if nominated, would receive the votes of Whigs and Democrats for the office of Chief Justice.

Whatever might be the imputations and suspicions on those who advocated the general ticket, so far as he was capable of divesting himself of party feelings, he had done so and only advocated an election by the whole State, because he saw there was reason in it—because the whole people had a common interest in it. It was not a local election for a local jurisdiction. He had only to say, in conclusion, that in the remark he had made in reference to the gentleman from Queen Anne's, (Mr. Spencer,) he did not intend any thing that was unkind; he wished him to carry out his republican doctrines. He had never heard it said until to-day that the gentleman was instructed by his constituency on the subject of representation.

Mr. SPENCER I did not say so.

Mr. BRENT. He says he did not say so.

Mr. SPENCER. I spoke of the known sentiments of the people.

Mr. BRENT. The known sentiments of his people are confined in county lines, and should not limit republican doctrines of right and justice.

Mr. SPENCER said he regretted that the gentleman (Mr. Brent of Baltimore) had pressed this subject. He (Mr. S.) had sought to avoid it, but it was forced upon him. He had never made reference to the course pursued by gentlemen on the subject now discussed. When he had said to his friend that he thought the subject ought not to be introduced, he had hoped that he would see the propriety of abstaining from it. He had, nevertheless, pressed the matter, and charged him with putting in a demurrer to the jurisdiction. He (Mr. S.) had assigned one good reason to the gentleman for his course; but that was not enough; he would now give him other reasons. He desired it to be understood that in this very city of Baltimore there was a wing of the democracy which the gentleman (Mr. Brent) represented here; but that he, (Mr. S.) in giving his vote, had represented that very wing whilst the gentleman had not. Sir, that wing has, from time to time, proclaimed to the counties that they did not claim representation according to population; that their only claim was, that Baltimore

city should be put on a footing with the largest county. Sir, to this effect they issued their circular.

Mr. BRENT, (in his seat.) Specify.

Mr. SPENCER. The Democratic Central Committee of Baltimore. In all their circulars relating to all matters of reform, not a word was said about representation by population. And when the democratic party of Baltimore poured into the country—except in western Maryland—and when her public speakers engaged in discussing the question of reform, they did not allude to or say any thing in reference to representation according to population. Yes, sir, he said, in voting the vote he had given on that subject, that he not only voted the feelings of his constituency, but also those of democratic Baltimore, and for even more than she had heretofore claimed. And he would ask now, why is it that gentlemen make complaint upon the subject of representation? When the call of this Convention was advocated at the hustings and everywhere, it was known that the people of the counties would never consent to give representation according to population. The members from Baltimore, in the Legislature, in advocating a convention, in order to obtain it, had asserted in debate that it was untrue that Baltimore demanded a representation according to population, and took the same ground as contained in the circulars from the city. Yet some of the same men in the city of Baltimore, who had heretofore held this doctrine, have recently set forth their fulminations against the members of this body, because they have sustained a consistent course here, and have voted in conformity with the pledges these very men had given to the public. He was sorry to say this. The responsibility was on the gentlemen who had forced the debate. When he (Mr. S.) settled his account with his constituency he would have a fair proof sheet. He hoped it would be so with the gentleman.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. The gentleman from Queen Anne's (Mr. Spencer) says he represents a wing of the democratic party of Baltimore. I should like to know what wing, and where he derives his credentials from. I wish to see his credentials.

Mr. SPENCER explained, and said that he had said that the Democratic party of Baltimore had heretofore disclaimed representation according to population, and he believed there was not a Democrat in this body who would not sustain him in the assertion. [Great confusion and noise.]

The only claim it made was for representation equal to the largest county in the State.

Mr. THOMAS rose, but gave way to

Mr. BRENT, who said he would like to see the document to which the gentleman (Mr. Spencer) had referred. Let the gentleman show the document. He had never seen such a document. Now, there had not been any anti-representation doctrine preached in Baltimore on the hustings, or at a ward meeting, or any where else. The gentleman said that the last circular issued by the Democratic State Committee proclaimed no such doctrine. Why not? Because