

So much for the organization of the House of Delegates, under the measure adopted by the Convention. It must be born in mind that the Senate is a co-ordinate and co-equal part of the General Assembly—and by the bill the smallest county was placed on an equal footing with the largest counties in the State, and by which a double injustice is done to the more populous and wealthy counties; for each county is entitled to one senator, whatever may be its population, its territory, or its wealth.

Mr GWINN. Had this motion to reconsider occurred at an earlier period in the session, I should have voted for it, and trusted to the chance of a more favorable result after a solemn argument before the Convention. But we are now reaching the close of the session; and if this question be re-opened, it is beyond doubt that the Convention *must* adjourn without coming to any conclusion upon it. Moreover, the gentleman from Kent, has announced his sole purpose to be to endeavor to make such changes as will be still more unfavorable to the populous sections of the State. I shall therefore vote against the reconsideration, and leave this question to the adjudication of some new Convention. Perhaps no part of the State has been more grossly injured than the city of Baltimore. What are the small amounts of population, and of wealth, which have been overlooked in the counties, compared with that which has been neglected in Baltimore? There are gentl men here, I am glad to say, who have not imagined that they came here for the single purpose of saving their own counties; but who have had views more liberal and enlarged. They have not feared to give to Baltimore what was justly her due. Shall we now make ourselves the laughing stock of the whole people of Maryland, by opening again a discussion which must finally defeat the measure we are assembled here to accomplish? Whatever may have been my convictions as to the injustice of this scheme, in its bearing upon the city of Baltimore, I am not prepared to take part in a transaction the direct effect of which will be to renew the agitation upon the whole question, and defeat the small advantage we have gained. I shall vote against the motion to reconsider, and I warn gentlemen of the reform party, that if they re-open the question, there is no probability that it will be settled by this Convention.

Mr. MERRICK. I am very sure that the Convention do not desire to hear a speech upon this subject; nor have I any desire to inflict one upon them. It is a question upon which the minds of all are made up. I merely rise therefore to reply to the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Johnson,) that I think the comparisons which he has attempted to draw as to wealth, ought not to be introduced upon a question of political power, or in apportioning the representation of different sections. If that principle is to obtain among counties, why not among individuals? If the county with its millions of property is to have a greater representation, why not let the individual who owns his millions have a greater representa-

tion? That is the legitimate result. Because they have power by means of their wealth, it is proposed to give them more power still. I thought that constitutions and laws were made to protect the feeble and the weak in their rights. The powerful need no protection: they can protect themselves. When men unite in civilized communities, to associate as brethren, the feelings of humanity and impulses of justice and brotherly love, prompt the establishment of such fetters upon the powerful as shall guarantee and protect the weak in the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges.

The Convention have been informed in plain and emphatic terms by the mover of this proposition to reconsider, of the flagrant injustice done by the present basis, to at least two of the counties of the State, of which the county which I represent is one. With nearly 17,000 inhabitants you cut us off with two delegates, while Allegany, with a fraction above 22,000 has double that number. Is there anything like justice, or fairness, or equality in that? Other counties with very little over half our population, have the same number with ourselves. In what have we sinned? What wrongs and outrages have been committed by the people of Charles county upon the more powerful portions of the State, that she is to be wronged in this way? I shall not prolong the debate. All the faint hopes I cherished of good results from the action of this Convention have long since withered and died away. I cherish them no longer. I leave this question to the judgment of the Convention.

Mr. CHAMBERS made some remarks, which will be published hereafter.

Mr. BROWN moved the previous question, and being seconded,

The question was then stated upon the reconsideration of the vote on the section, submitted by Mr. GRASON, and adopted on the 1st of April, touching the subject of representation.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays,

Which being ordered,

Resulted as follows :

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Bond, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson and Smith—44.

*Negative*.—Messrs. Donaldson, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Mc Lane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson McHenry, Magraw, Nel-