tion to the same extent from taxation. But here within our State there is no such compensation, or equivalent exemption proposed nor contemplated—on the contrary all our slaves and heavily taxed for the support of the State Government, while the labor of other portions of the State is untaxed, and still you propose to deny us representation according to the whole number of our people, excluding from the estimate a portion of our slaves Again, sir, though it may be truly said the slaves are an inferior and subordinate race—it certainly cannot be said that they are in any sense an inferior or less useful and valuable class of people in this State, than the free negroes—on the contrary no one here will deny the inferiority and greatly more pernicious character of our free negro population. These two classes are nearly equal in number in our State, but mostly congregated in different quarters; there, the free negroes, are totally exempt from taxation on their persons—property they have none—and you enumerate the whole of them, and estimate them equally with the best people of the State in apportioning representation, while you propose to exclude two-fifths of our slaves. This must be seen to be most unfair and unjust in itself and in its effect and operation upon the different portions of the State. The amendment he had offered, proposed that no county in the State should have less than three representatives, nor should any county or city have more than ten. It was based upon gross numbers, and a ratio of four thousand for each representative. It would prove equal and just in its operation, and he felt persuaded would give satisfact on to all quarters of the State. He concluded by demanding the yeas and nays upon the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Jacobs, Kilgour and Waters—34.

Negative—Messrs. Donaldson, Wells, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Colston, Phelps, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—58.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

Mr. GWINN moved to amend the amendment of Mr. FIERY by adding at the end thereof the following:

"And the said delegates shall be elected by general ticket in each of said counties, and in the city of Baltimore, and not by districts or wards."

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, asked the yeas and nays on agreeing to this amendment, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Blakistone, Dent, Sellman, Colston, Constable, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman and Ware—11.

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymyle, Bond, Sollers, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, John Dennis, James U Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to propose an amendment, not that I will vote for it; but that it will give me an opportunity, for a few moments, to address the Convention. I move that the section be so amended as to give to the city of Baltimore twenty-five representatives, Baltimore county ten, Frederick county fifteen, and Washington county twenty-five. [Laughter.] The first thing that I have to say, before I come to my friends of the Eastern Shore, is to appeal to the gentleman from Washington county. I find upon looking on the records, that in 1790, Allegany county had a population of but 4,809; while Kent county had 12,838. We were then generous. We gave them the same number of delegates that we took for ourselves, although we had three times the amount of population that they had. I appeal to them as Whigs. Are they going to give the State of Maryland to the Democrats? I am as much a Reformer as any gentleman present except on the question of representation. What is the game that is played here? You have the whole State now. You can elect your Governor by the foreign votes in the city of Baltimore, and the best men in the United States are cooped in the different wards, as I have been credibly informed. [Laughter.] What do they want now? They have the "loaves," and they want the "two fishes"—two Senators. I call upon western Whigs to pause before they give representation according to population, as it will give the State to the Democratic party.

I have a few words to say to my friends from Talbot, Caroline, and Queen Anne's. I call