

DEFERRED REMARKS.

Thursday, March 20th.

Mr. SPENCER, rising to a personal explanation, read from the Baltimore "Sun," of to-day, a paragraph in the report of the proceedings of the Convention of Saturday last, in that paper, setting forth the absence of certain gentlemen from their seats and commenting thereon.

Having read the paragraph,

Mr. S. proceeded: Among the list of the members absent on that day, he found the name of his colleague, (Mr. GRASON,) and himself. This was untrue. Both himself and colleague were present at the meeting of the Convention that day. They were present when the Sergeant-at-arms was sent after the absent members, but were excused by the Convention. He rose, therefore, as a matter of privilege, to deny, so far as he was concerned, this entire letter.

Mr. MORGAN said that he had been reported as absent on that day. He would say that from the first commencement of the Convention, up to a fortnight ago, he had never left its sittings for one day. He believed his name had been recorded upon every vote. About two weeks ago he left the Convention to attend the Court in St. Mary's county, having paired off with the gentleman from Allegany, (Mr. Fitzpatrick,) and they both returned to their seats very nearly the same time. As they were opposite in views, so far as the effect his vote had influence here, he might not have been considered absent a day. He said this much in justice to himself, as he believed the fact of his having paired off, had not been noted on the journal during his absence. He had nothing to say of the publication in the newspapers; it was a matter of no concern to him if his absence was noted daily by every paper in the State.

[The remarks of Mr. M. were published on a former day, but in the absence of the connecting link in the debate. They are, therefore, re-published.]

MONDAY, March 24th, 1851.

The PRESIDENT of the Convention took the Chair at twelve o'clock.

Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. GRAUFF.

The roll was called, and a quorum being present,

The journal of Saturday was read and approved.

LICENSE SYSTEM.

The PRESIDENT laid before the Convention a petition of sundry citizens of Dorchester county, praying for a modification of the license system.

Mr. RIDGELY presented two petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore county, one signed by sixty citizens, and the other by thirty citizens, praying

for a provision in the Constitution against licenses to ordinaries, &c., and

Mr. COLSTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of the second election district in Talbot county, of similar import.

Which were severally read, and

Referred to a select committee appointed on that subject.

BASIS OF REPRESENTATION.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the special order of the day, being the several reports of the committee on representation.

The pending question at the adjournment of Saturday last, was on the amendment offered by Mr. DORSEY, as a substitute for the amendment of Mr. SCHLEY, to the second section of the report submitted by Mr. MERRICK, as chairman of the committee on representation.

Mr. DORSEY was entitled to the floor, (in continuation of his remarks on Saturday last.)

Mr. WEBER said :

Did I believe that this body was prepared and ready to enter upon the adjustment of the representation question, without further debate, I certainly would not trouble it with any of my plain remarks. I should reserve them for another occasion, and before another portion of the people of Maryland—I mean my immediate constituents. But, sir, it is evident that the Convention are not willing to arrest this debate and proceed to vote; I therefore feel it to be my duty—a duty I owe to the people who sent me here, to present in a plain way, what I believe to be their views in reference to the settlement of this question. If, sir, I understand the opinion of the people of Allegany county, I think that I am prepared to say they subscribe to the doctrine that population should be the basis of representation—not that population, which some would have us include under the term numbers—but the population recognized throughout the length and breadth of this land, as constituent parts of the government. I mean the white population. But, sir, whilst I believe that this is the doctrine and the sentiment of my constituency, they nevertheless regard this as a proper subject of compromise. We are prepared to compromise this question. We deem it to be our duty to do so, and desire to aid in making a fair compromise.

It may be proper for me here to remark that, although the county of Allegany contains within her boundaries but seven hundred slaves, the fell spirit of abolitionism cannot raise its head in that portion of Maryland. Sir, I feel that my constituents—notwithstanding that slavery scarcely exists among them—are as sound upon this question as are the people of St. Mary's, or of Worcester. But what, I ask you, sir, would be a fair compromise of this question?

Let us look to the basis. I hold that it would be no compromise, entertaining the views that we do, to adopt a principle which is recognised in no part of this Union—a principle, which, so far as the basis of representation is concerned,