

leaving the slave holding counties in a minority by the first plan by five, on the second plan by eleven; whilst that of Judge CHAMBERS would give a majority of four members to the counties most interested.

Mr. BROWN, of Carroll, interrupting. Will the gentleman tell me what he means by non-slaveholding counties?

Mr. JENIFER said he considered the eight counties composed of Allegany, Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick, Washington, Harford and Cecil, least interested, and yet two of the propositions, one which the gentleman from Carroll had supported, gave those eight counties, with the city of Baltimore, a majority of eleven in the House of Delegates over the thirteen other and more interested counties.

Mr. J. said he did not doubt the gentleman's soundness upon that subject, nor would he question that of any member on this floor. But this Constitution, if ratified, should last for many years, perhaps for ages, for he had no doubt that by this time the people of Maryland were heartily sick of Conventions to frame new Constitutions. We do not know who may come after us and what may be the materials of which the Legislature may hereafter be composed. It is said that the Senate will be a sufficient guarantee. That is but a slight barrier, if the doctrine prevails that a bare majority of the people may, at any time, change, alter or abolish the existing Constitution, without the forms of law. Let there then be no doubt upon this question. Let the counties most interested have at least an equal representation in the protection of their property. With that view, (Mr. J. said,) he would propose to amend the bill, [Mr. Dorsey's,] now under consideration, by adding one representative to each of the smaller counties, having but two, to wit: Caroline, Calvert, Kent. This would make the House of Delegates eighty-six in number, and still leave a majority of two in favor of the Western counties and the city of Baltimore.

Mr. J. said he had indicated his preference for the bill reported by Mr. CHAMBERS, which he believed would be more acceptable to his constituents than any other proposed, but as that had been defeated, and he saw no prospect of its successful revival, he would take as the basis, the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Fiery,] which had been rejected by only one vote; provided the amendment which he, Mr. J., offered when it was under consideration, should be adopted; which was to add one member to each of the small counties, having but two in that bill. This would make the whole number of the House of Delegates 82, instead of 73; and place the small counties on the same footing, by giving to each of these counties three delegates. By this the thirteen counties would have an aggregate vote of 40, and the western counties and city of Baltimore of 42; nearly equally balanced. If those gentlemen who are in favor of the original proposition of Mr. FIERY, and will not accept this, or some other similar one, let them look to the consequences; let them sacrifice the interests of the

smaller counties, and let the members of this Convention from the smaller counties, thus sacrificed, take the responsibility. Mr. J. said his attention had also been called to the two divisions of the State—the Western and Eastern Shore.

By Judge DORSEY's plan, the Eastern Shore would have 23 delegates of 83.

If amended as proposed, 25 delegates of 86.

Mr. FIERY's plan, 20 delegates of 73.

By the proposed amendment, 24 delegates of 82.

Judge CHAMBERS' plan, 28 delegates of 86; by adding 4 to Baltimore city—90.

Mr. J. said, either of these propositions so amended, would place the several sections of the State upon a more equal ground, for it seemed to be conceded that Baltimore city should have ten delegates—a large majority of the Convention having at different times so voted. He himself was in favor of giving to Baltimore as many representatives as a proper discharge of her legislative duties required, and for that purpose ten had been considered sufficient, even by some of her own citizens.

Give her as large a number as some of her ill-judged friends require, and her influence will be lost in the Legislature, except in the mere act of voting. This is admitted by some of her most interested and intelligent citizens. Mr. J. asked when has she ever failed to carry in the Legislature any measure for the benefit of Baltimore, even to the prejudice of the counties? When did an act of the Legislature pass, not acceptable to Baltimore city, in which the counties did not share the disadvantages, if any, except the registry law of 1838. That, he had always considered invidious, if not unconstitutional.

But how many acts have passed which gave a direct benefit to Baltimore, to the injury of some of the counties especially those of the lower Chesapeake and Potomac, and at a time when the city of Baltimore had but two or four members in the House of Delegates.

Her friends claim for her that she pays a large proportion of the taxes into the State Treasury. True, she does, but who derives the benefit of the objects for which those taxes are incurred? It was for works of improvement, in all of which Baltimore city took the leading stand, and the benefit which accrues, enures almost exclusively to Baltimore. So far from those works of internal improvement being advantageous to three-fourths of the counties, they are a direct disadvantage. What advantage do the counties of the eastern shore, on the Chesapeake and Potomac tide water counties derive from those works of internal improvement? None, none whatever, compared to the constant drain from taxes and otherwise, which will have been inflicted on them for more than a quarter if not half a century. There never has been a period, in the history of Maryland, since the days of the revolution, when the eastern shore and lower counties of the western shore have evinced more fortitude, more public spirit, more patriotism than