

considered that there was ample reason for asserting that the vote could be constitutionally taken upon the propriety of holding a convention, and reported a bill to that effect, with provisions to put it in execution.³¹

On the 16th of January, Mr. Causin of Anne Arundel county, from the same committee submitted a minority report, denying the constitutional authority to submit to the vote of the people a proposition relative to a call of a convention. The report was also accompanied by a bill, which provided for the repeal of the 42nd article of the Declaration of Rights,³² and the 59th article of the constitution.³³ If the act for the repeal of these articles of the constitution should be confirmed by the succeeding legislature, then it would be lawful for the legislature to call a convention of the people, to reform or make a new constitution.³⁴

To secure the sanction of the legislature for a convention, it was seen that a compromise must be made between the different sections of the State. Baltimore City and the larger counties maintained that representation in the convention should be apportioned among the counties and city of Baltimore according to population. The Eastern Shore and the smaller counties considered that all necessary changes in the constitution could be made by the legislature, and that their rights and interest would be put to hazard by a convention, having population as the basis of representation. They required, if such a convention should be called, a vote of two-thirds of the convention to pass any constitutional provision touching the interest of the people of the Eastern Shore,³⁵ as guaranteed to them by the constitution.

The radical reformers were unwilling to consent to the delay and uncertainty of the succeeding legislature confirming the amendments proposed by the report of the mi-

³¹ Report of Majority on Constitution, January 15, 1850.

³² See p. 10.

³⁴ Report of Minority on Constitution, January 26, 1850.

³⁵ House Journal, January 7, 1850.

³³ Ibid.