

1681, the same qualifications were required for delegates as for voters; and these were kept up, as to both, by the same acts, until the revolution."

On page 465 is the following:

"Until 1650, the delegates were elected for hundreds or settlements; and the warrant for each assembly specified the number to be elected for each hundred. There was no regular delegate system before this period, and perhaps this arose from the existence of the right then generally conceded to the freemen of appearing in the assembly in person or by proxy. It was not until 1659, when the lower house was made to consist only of delegates, that its organization became regular. At the session of 1659, four delegates were called from each county, and from this period until 1681, with one exception, the summons permitted the election of two, three or four delegates in each, at the option of its people. In the latter year the number was reduced to two by the proprietary's ordinance; but in 1692, after the establishment of the royal government, the constitution of the lower house was regulated by law, and four delegates were again allotted to each county. The right of representation thus established upon the basis of equality amongst the counties existed without alteration until the American revolution."

They will find by examining this work that the basis of representation which was adopted was, so far as Baltimore city was concerned, no principle at all; but was prompted by the jealousy which existed among the counties against the great city of Baltimore. I do not see why those jealousies should exist. One thing is certain; Baltimore city has never attempted to harm the counties. In this war, Baltimore city has put her shoulder to the wheel, and voted more men and more money for the purpose of suppressing this rebellion than any other section of the State. Her people, tax-ridden as they have been by the State and national debt, have steadily poured the money out of her treasury as freely as water for the purpose of furnishing men and money to suppress this rebellion. And by reference to the comptroller's report, it will be perceived that while Baltimore city has but ten members out of seventy-four under the present apportionment, she pays a tax to the amount of \$321,492, out of a total tax for the State of \$724,456.87; whilst St. Mary's county, with one-fifth the representation of Baltimore city pays but \$9,028. I say that that is unfair. Still I am willing for the sake of harmony to receive what has been given to us, and to vote for this section just as it has been amended by the convention. I shall vote for my own amendment when it comes up; but when the proposition of the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) comes up, I shall vote against it.

Mr. MILLER. I propose to say a few words

upon this section as reported by the committee, and as amended upon the motion of the gentleman from Frederick (Mr. Schley,) to show the injustice which the very principles adopted in this report will work to the small counties. They have assumed 5,000 as the ratio of representation until the number of delegates shall reach five. And then the number of delegates is limited to eighty-two according to the report as it came from the committee, and to seventy-nine as it has been since amended.

Suppose that the white population of the State is assumed as the basis of representation. Let us look for a moment at two counties and see the injustice that is done one of them by the apportionment here established. The county of Kent, with a white population of 7,347, is entitled to but one delegate in the house of delegates. The ratio of representation for the people of that county is therefore 7,347. Now take the county of Caroline, with a white population of 7,604. She is allowed two delegates. Thus upon this very basis adopted here, 257 more population in Caroline than in Kent, gives Caroline two delegates, while Kent has but one. Can a principle which operates that injustice as between those two counties, be the right principle upon which the basis of representation should be fixed in this State? Caroline county is allowed one delegate for every 3,802 white inhabitants; Kent county has one delegate for her 7,347 white inhabitants; and St. Mary's county, the oldest county in the State, has but one delegate for 6,791 white inhabitants. Now compare those three counties together; look at the wealth of the counties; look at the probable future of those counties, now that slavery is abolished. If this principle was fixed for but one, two, or three years, there might be less cause of complaint for this discrimination against the wealthy county of Kent, in favor of Caroline county, which pays less taxes than any other county in the State.

And I will show in a moment that Anne Arundel is treated with equal injustice. For this basis is fixed upon Anne Arundel, Kent, St. Mary's, Prince George's, and all those counties which have hitherto been largely slaveholding, until the returns of the next census, which will not be for ten or twelve years. And yet those rich counties, with their fertile lands, and the inducement for white immigration, and the division of large estates into small farms, are to be saddled with this small representation for ten or twelve years to come. They will be the first counties to improve and outstrip the county of Caroline and the county of Somerset, if there is any truth at all in the theory that the abolition of slavery is to drive away the negro population and induce white immigrants to come into those counties.