

tribunal, to avail themselves of the last hour, to retrace their steps, where injustice is the consequence of a failure to do so. It is never too late to be just. If that is not an axiom that approves itself to every man's moral sense, it would be a waste of my breath and of your time to undertake to demonstrate it.

But what is the fact with regard to the lateness of the hour. This vote occurred on the first day of April. It had not passed this body one-tenth part of an hour by your clock, before the notice of a motion to reconsider was given. The very next entry upon the journal, is the notice of this motion. There is not a paper in the State that publishes the proceedings of this body, that did not announce it. There is not a member of this body that was ignorant of it. I take it for granted that no member of this body supposed that it had been for a moment lost sight of. It has been postponed merely in order to deal fairly with the body, and to have it acted upon by a full house. And now, because it was not called up when the house was not full, we are told that the occasion has passed by. I had no cause to anticipate such an answer as that. Very sure am I of one fact, that if this proposition had been called up when the house was thin, there would have been no lack of language to indicate the impropriety and indelicacy of such a proceeding. We should have been reminded of it often enough to have distinctly comprehended the idea that it was far from ungenerous for the gentleman from Kent to take that advantage. It would have been ascribed to me as one of those political manoeuvres sometimes practiced in political bodies, and which I did not choose to have attributed to me with justice. Slander, of all things upon the face of the earth, is the last thing to be arrested in its course—the last thing which you can prevent from being harboured and entertained—for of all sorts of fugitives, this alone can never be recaptured and reclaimed.

But why is it too late? We took up the judiciary bill the other day. There are other bills to pass upon. Is it too late to pass upon those bills? In my judgment although it produces much more excitement, it is no more to be compared in its importance with the judiciary bill, than a mole-hill to a mountain.

Your judiciary is to adjust the rights to life, liberty, property, reputation, of the whole people. Yet it is not too late to consider that. I assume that the debate upon the question of representation will end here. No gentleman responded to the invitation to continue it. Why then should we not take the votes? We can take a great many votes especially under the whip and spur as we are now.

I say, then, that the fact, if it existed, is not at all competent to meet the objection; and in the next place, it is an imaginary fabric. Will you go home and tell your constituents, that you have got an unjust Constitution, violating their rights, sacrificing their interests, and opposed to every man's sense of justice? And when they ask you why you permitted it to be so, will you reply—we had not time to do any better? I do not think

it requires a great deal of intelligence to understand that a man would better do nothing than be engaged in mischief. You have one of two alternatives. Take the time or cease your labor. Nothing can justify you in either a political or moral point of view for doing injustice to the people of the State whose rights you profess to take care of.

I did hope and calculate upon the assistance of those who believe the present plan to be wrong. Those gentlemen who wish to increase the the delegation from Charles county should vote for the reconsideration. Those gentlemen who wish to do justice to Montgomery county should vote for it. Those who suppose the plan for any reason to be unjust should vote it. Those gentlemen who wish the city of Baltimore districted should also come to its aid. And thus I thought we should reconsider almost by general consent.

One word as to districting the city of Baltimore. The gentleman from Baltimore city asks why we do not apply the same principle to the counties. The people of Maryland are divided into small portions already by the counties. If there were any county containing 170,000 inhabitants, so that in one community 85,000 had no voice in the legislature of the State, there would certainly be a propriety in districting that county.

Mr. BRENT. I understand then the proposition is this: that because you unjustly separate Baltimore city from the counties in taking a different ratio, you have a right to perpetuate an additional injustice in creating districts.

Mr. CHAMBERS. The gentleman may so understand; but I am not responsible for his understanding.

Mr. BRENT. I was asking for information whether that is the principle?

Mr. CHAMBERS. My ground is this: that from the separate and concentrated condition of Baltimore, in comparison with the counties, its character is peculiar. Its influence pervades the whole State. It is like the veins and arteries of the human system: there is not a spot in which the circulation does not go from and return to the heart. Baltimore city would thus have greater influence with but five representatives than any county in the State with fifteen.

If the number of representatives be not reduced and the districting system be applied to the city, it is to be justified on the ground that the minority there is so large in amount as to distinguish it from the minorities in the counties. No system can be adopted which will not leave some minorities unrepresented. It is a question of numbers and expediency and the case of the city is distinguishable from the counties.

These are my views, which have led me to believe that Baltimore is not entitled to so large a representation, and that it ought to be districted. I have endeavored to carry out these opinions, always keeping in view the great rule—"the greatest good to the greatest number"—having so done, if I find myself in the minority, I can submit with as good a grace and as cheerful re-