

There were two minority reports made from the committee on representation; one by Mr. Lloyd, of Talbot county (a Democratic district), giving to Baltimore City five more delegates than the largest county and equal representation in the Senate.<sup>23</sup> The second minority report submitted by Mr. Chambers, of Kent county, was the same plan adopted in 1836 in all respects, except that it adopted the aggregate population as a basis instead of federal numbers.<sup>24</sup> All of these plans for a basis of representation were rejected by the convention.

There were several compromises offered, but none upon which the convention could agree. Baltimore City was willing to compromise on a territorial basis in the Senate; but claimed popular representation in the House of Delegates. They considered this would be a sufficient check to prevent any legislation detrimental to the counties.

The plan of representation, which received the greatest attention and support was known as the "Washington county compromise." It was introduced by Mr. Fiery of that county. The plan was based on federal numbers. If adopted, it would have given Baltimore City four more delegates than the largest county.<sup>25</sup> This compromise was rejected, afterwards reconsidered, and finally lost by a vote of forty-seven to forty-six.<sup>26</sup>

The question of apportioning representation was finally disposed of April 1. The plan was introduced by ex-Governor Grason, of Queen Anne's county,<sup>27</sup> subsequently amended so as to give Baltimore City one additional representative, and finally adopted by a vote of forty-three to forty.<sup>28</sup> Representation in the House of Delegates was apportioned among the counties on a population basis; Baltimore City was limited in the House to four more delegates than the most populous county. No county was to have

---

<sup>23</sup> Debates, vol. i, p. 286.

<sup>25</sup> Debates, vol. ii, p. 19.

<sup>27</sup> Debates, vol. ii, p. 197.

<sup>24</sup> Debates, vol. i, p. 287.

<sup>26</sup> Debates, vol. ii, p. 170.

<sup>28</sup> Debates, vol. ii, p. 199.