

has come here for the purpose, if possible, of obtaining representation according to population. I believe that this amendment enunciates that principle. And if any plan could be adopted by this convention to carry into effect the provisions of the proposition of the gentleman from Prince George's, I, as one of the delegates from Baltimore city, pledged as I am to endeavor to obtain representation according to population, would feel obligated to vote for that proposition.

But the amendment of the gentleman from Frederick (Mr. Schley,) which was adopted by the convention last night, contains, I believe, the principles upon which this convention has determined to act, and the principles upon which this apportionment is to be made. I voted for that amendment, because it gives Baltimore city at least a PART of what she claims, and more than she had before, whilst I am constrained to say that it does not give Baltimore city all she is entitled to have. But the members from Baltimore city have come to this convention, and have here parted with a part of the representation to which I consider she is justly entitled, in order to produce unanimity and harmony in this convention. I look upon it as a proposition which has already been adopted by this house. And in so far as it creates a basis of representation up to five members, it goes strictly upon representation according to population; but when it leaves that number, it does not go upon that principle. In my opinion, it is an invidious distinction in favor of the smaller counties as against the city of Baltimore and the large counties. Therefore, that is a reason why the small counties should not object to the adoption of this provision. They get more than I say they are entitled to; they get it by this compromise; and therefore the more reason why they should favor it. Baltimore city gets less than she is entitled to; and less than we had any expectation we would get. I am aware it is rather hard on the larger counties; but it is much harder on the city of Baltimore. But for the sake of harmony, she is prepared to throw away her increased representation; and I think the counties should meet her in the same spirit of harmony, and act as a unit upon this subject.

I have a statement here, which was prepared by myself, last night, and compiled from the census, showing the great preponderance which the smaller counties gain over Baltimore city by this measure:

Counties and city	Present rep'n.	Proposed rep'n.	White pop.
Allegany.....	4	5	27,215
Anne Arundel.....	3	2	11,704
Baltimore city.....	10	18	184,520
Baltimore county....	6	6	48,722
Calvert.....	2	1	3,997
Carroll.....	2	5	22,525
Caroline.....	3	2	7,604

Counties.	Present rep'n.	Proposed repr'n.	White pop'n.
Charles.....	2	1	5,796
Cecil.....	3	4	19,904
Dorchester.....	3	2	11,654
Frederick.....	6	6	38,391
Harford.....	3	4	17,971
Howard.....	2	2	9,081
Kent.....	2	1	7,347
Montgomery.....	2	2	11,349
Prince George's.....	3	2	9,650
Queen Anne's.....	2	2	8,415
Somerset.....	4	3	15,332
St. Mary's.....	2	1	6,798
Talbot.....	2	2	8,106
Washington.....	5	5	28,305
Worcester.....	3	3	13,442

That statement shows conclusively to my mind that the proposition of the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) was the better one if it could be adopted, and one which I frankly confess I would vote for if there was any prospect of its adoption.

If gentlemen will look back to the history of Maryland, they will find out that this basis of representation, which has been the basis for years and years past, is a mere distinction without any principle at all. By reference to volume one of McMahon's Maryland, they will find the reasons which first induced the men of provincial Maryland, before Maryland was erected into a State, to adopt this principle. On page 449 will be found the following:

"From the colonization until 1650, the right of representation had no regular character. Sometimes the assemblies had the nature of the 'Ecclesia' of the Athenians. They were assemblies of the freemen generally, rather than of representatives. Every freeman had a right to be personally present; and this right being a personal privilege, like that of a member of the English House of Peers, he might appear in person or by proxy, or join in the election of delegates, at his option. When the assemblies were so constituted, the government was a pure democracy—being administered by the people in person. At other times, the freeman were permitted to appear only by delegates or deputies, elected in the manner prescribed by the warrants of election. The three sessions of 1640, and those of July, 1641 and 1642, were of the latter character; the other sessions were of the former, which was the prevailing character. After the commotions of the civil war had ceased, and the government was restored to the proprietary by Cromwell's commissioners, viz: from 1659, the assembly consisted only of delegates; and from that period the right of making proxies or appearing personally, wholly ceased. Yet it was not until 1681, that any restrictions appear to have been imposed upon the people in the choice of delegates. By the proprietary's ordinance of 6th September,