

has so far favored the views, on this subject, expressed by the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers.) At all events, if they did not change positions during the sittings of this Convention they would do so immediately after the new Constitution went into operation.

He had represented Maryland in Congress when there were large States and small States. He had represented, in part, one of the small States, and had felt the controlling force and power of the general ticket system wielded by the large States. Hence, he was ready to predict how the representatives of the small counties of Maryland would feel and act when they had once experienced the power of the large counties and the city of Baltimore, if authorized to elect numerous delegations under a general ticket system.

At this point, in the remarks of Mr. T.,

The PRESIDENT interposed, and announced that the hour, (two o'clock,) had arrived, when, under the order of the Convention, the general debate must terminate.

Mr. MITCHELL desired to move to extend the time to four o'clock. He desired, he said, as other gentlemen did, to express his views.

The PRESIDENT stated the motion to be out of order.

Mr. SOLLERS moved that the Convention adjourn.

The Convention refused to adjourn.

Mr. SHOWER gave notice that he would, tomorrow, move a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment of Mr. FERRY had heretofore been rejected.

Some conversation followed between Mr. PHELPS and the PRESIDENT on a point of order.

Mr. PHELPS. I should have taken great pleasure, if I could have obtained the floor, in arguing at some length in favor of this particular proposition; but I must restrict myself to giving my views upon it, and the reasons for its adoption. It has been objected by some that there is no principle involved in it; that it is a mere arbitrary rule, by which, arrangement we reduce the number of delegates from 82 to 61. Under the compromise of 1836, the rule was to give two delegates for territory, and one for every 15,000 inhabitants, to be increased upon the accession of 10,000, or a fraction over one half of ten thousand. I do not propose to disturb that rule, except so far as to give one instead of two to territory. The same principle which applied to population under the compromise 1836, will attach in full force to the proposition before the House.

I had two objects in view in making this proposition. The first was compromise. Gentlemen may say that they do not perceive in this any thing like a spirit of compromise; but if they will observe, this proposition takes from the smaller counties one-third, from the medium sized counties, one-fourth; and from the large counties one-fifth. That is certainly upon the principle of compromise, for it is yielding a portion of our rights. There is another principle of compromise contained in this proposition,

which is that instead of giving two delegates for territory as under the compromise of 1836, and the other delegates for population, it yields one delegate from that heretofore granted to territory, and thus gives a larger proportion of the whole population. These are the two elements of compromise in the proposition I have submitted.

Let me now say a single word to the members from the smaller counties, Calvert, St. Mary's, &c. They may say that they will lose, if they agree to this proposition, and that it operates unfairly and unequally. I admit it. It operates unequally and unfairly for my county. But I hold that we can get nothing better, and I therefore make this proposition, not because I prefer it, for if we could get the proposition of the gentleman from Kent, I should never have thought of offering this by way of compromise, but because we have been beaten upon the plan proposed by the general from Kent. The House have decided that the present basis should not remain, but that some other basis must be adopted; and it seems to me that the proposition I have offered is more conducive to our own safety and prosperity than any other which has been brought before the Convention.

Again, sir, my other object in offering this plan was to protect the slave interest in this State. Under this compromise, we shall have sixty-one members, and if you will cast your eyes over the apportionment, you will perceive that while the slave counties have thirty-three, the free counties have but twenty-eight. It is to protect the slave interest, that I offered this proposition. This was a very important consideration with me; and I hope it will have its due weight upon my friends of the smaller and lower counties. While I am willing to yield something by way of compromise, I desire to yield nothing which will endanger the interests of the State.

I had still another object in view, in proposing this amendment. I have offered it as a retrenchment measure. We have come here professing a desire to retrench as well as to reform. Here is a measure which will save us from the expense of twenty-one members to the General Assembly, which will be a saving of probably six thousand dollars for each year, when the legislature shall be in session at Annapolis.

In order to accomplish the several objects I have named, I have thought proper to submit this proposition to the consideration of the House, and as I see that the five minutes allotted me are now precisely out, being unwilling to transgress the rules of the Convention, I take my seat.

Mr. PHELPS called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. BLAKISTONE asked for a division of the question.

The question was then stated on the first branch of said amendment, being in these words:

"Each county in this State and the city of Baltimore, shall be entitled to one Senator."

The question being taken, resulted—yeas 58; nays 35—as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricard, Lee,