

sible benefit could be derived from the adoption of the proposition of the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Jenifer.) He [Mr. S.] did not believe that any benefit was to result from delay. He was not yet convinced that the Convention could not settle the question as well for itself, as by the intervention of any committee. He believed that if such a committee should be appointed, it would be just as little able to act as the Convention itself.

Mr. JENIFER (interposing.) The adoption of the proposition can do no harm.

Mr. SPENCER. Yes, it can and will do harm—for it will cause delay. We are in a better condition now, I think, to harmonize, than we shall be by the interposition of any committee. At all events, let us try one day's more voting before any new project is entertained.

Mr. JENIFER. Well, I am content; and I will move that the further consideration of the order be postponed until to-morrow.

The question on that motion was taken, and decided in the affirmative.

So the further consideration of the order was postponed until to-morrow.

The Convention then resumed the consideration of the order of the day, being the several reports of the committee on Representation.

The question pending before the Convention on yesterday being on the motion of Mr. Shriver, for a division of the question upon the first branch of the amendment offered by Mr. Johnson, for the 2d section of the report of the committee on Representation.

Mr. Dorsey moved to amend the amendment offered by Mr. Johnson, by striking out these words, "to be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, three-fifths of all other persons."

Mr. DORSEY said, that in some parts of this State, for instance, in the city of Baltimore, there were a great number of persons who purchased slaves for a term of years, not choosing to hold slaves for life. In contemplation of law, they were still regarded as slaves, and for all criminal offences they were punished accordingly; yet in the report of the committee now under consideration, they—as respects representation—were placed on terms of perfect equality with a native born white citizen of a slaveholding county. The same practice, he was informed, prevailed in Frederick, Washington, Allegany, and Carroll counties, and, to a limited extent, in most of the counties of the State. Surely, during the time of their continued slavery, no reason can be assigned why, as regards representation in the Legislature, any discrimination should be made between them and slaves for life; much less should they be held on a perfect equality with native born white citizens; for in doing so, great injustice is done to the slaveholding counties by the city of Baltimore, and the non-slaveholding counties which perpetrate it.

He should for this and other reasons, therefore, vote against this unequal and unjust basis of representation in the Legislature.

Mr. PHELPS demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSON, by permission of the Convention, withdrew the first branch of his amendment, and submitted in lieu thereof the following, which was read:

"The House of Delegates shall be composed of _____ members, to be apportioned among the several counties and the city of Baltimore, as follows:"

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, moved to amend the amendment by adding at the end thereof the following, which was negatived:

"Being pursuant to the ratio herein provided according to their several federal numbers as shown by the recent census;"

Mr. JOHNSON, with the consent of the Convention, modified his amendment by striking out after "Baltimore county," the word "seven" and inserting "six," and also by striking out after "Frederick county," the word "seven" and inserting "six."

Mr. DORSEY said that in some parts, &c. [*Vide p. 2.*]

Mr. D. then moved to amend the amendment by striking out the words "as follows," and inserting "according to their population, as shown by the late census of the United States."

Mr. DORSEY demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered and taken, and were as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Dorsey, Kent, Sellman, Howard, Phelps, Tuck, Bowling and Brewer—8.

Negative.—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blackstone, Hopewell, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Williams, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough Miller, McLane, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Ware, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown—64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHN DENNIS asked by what process of reasoning the gentleman from Frederick [Mr. Johnson] arrived at the conclusion by which he apportioned four delegates to Allegany and only three to Somerset, their population being about the same. After a pause, Mr. D. added, that he asked for information only, as he wished to vote understandingly.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Johnson.

Mr. GRASON thought there was so near an approach to an agreement on the subject of representation, that it could be settled as easily in the Convention as in a committee of conference. His objections to the various plans which had been proposed were, that they were defective in the provisions for making apportionments according to the changing population of the counties. The substitute of the gentleman from