find incorporated upon the organic law of nine-tenths of all the States of this Union.

Mr. PHELPS said, before he proceeded to discuss the second branch of this proposition, it being the amendment offered by his friend and colleague, Mr. HICKS, he would say one word by way of defining his position. Those from the Eastern Shore, and the smaller counties, had over and again been denounced as anti-reformers. For himself, he acknowledged he voted against calling a Convention in the Senate, and also at the ballot-box. He had done so upon high constitutional grounds, as well as from expediency. He had witnessed nothing in these Halls to convince him that he was wrong. But if gentlemen suppose he was here to oppose all needful reform, they have mistaken their man. He declared himself a *bona fide* reformer. He intended to be second to no man upon that subject. The Constitution on which they were engaged was intended not only for themselves, but for posterity, and so far as his humble abilities could serve, the work shall be perfect, and shall secure the greatest good to the greatest numbers It should be the pride of every man here, to give the people the best possible government.

But, Mr. President, what is reform? Does it *consist alone*, as has been urged here, of representation, based exclusively upon population? If so, we have only, as indicated by the vote a day or two since, but seventeen in this body, seventeen out of one hundred and three members. These seventeen are the Simon Pures; fine gold, tried in the fire.

Mr. CHAMBERS, (interrupting.) And some of them are backing out.

Mr. PHELPS, (resuming.) Well, let them back out—he was proud to hear it.

Here some explanations took place, in which Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CHAMBERS and Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, took part, and in which Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. BRENT repelled the charge implied in the words, "back out," if directed against them.

Mr. CHAMBERS disclaimed any personal allusions.

Mr. PHELPS resumed, and said, notwithstanding the declaration of his principles, he would doubtless still be denounced by those seventeen gentlemen as opposed to reform. The right, upon the happening of certain contingencies, of the Eastern Shore to secede, was urged before the people of Dorchester during the last campaign, and the proposition has been offered by his colleague in good faith, and he hoped the amendment would prevail. Mr. PHELPS described the Eastern shore as a beautiful champaign country, intersected with beautiful rivers and creeks, penetrating the whole country, and winding around the homestead of almost every man. He contended the interests of the two shores were essentially different. Whilst the Western Shore was greatly dependent upon works of internal improvement for her prosperity, the Eastern Shore required no such public expenditures for her benefit. Already you have your great works of internal improvement, reaching far to the west, and intersecting the State in other directions, bringing into direct competition with our products the products of other and distant States. For one, he denied the almost universally received dogma, that by making the city of Baltimore the great grain market of the West, you would increase the price of our own products. These great works have been constructed by the common treasure of the whole people. The Eastern Shore was made tributary to these works—was taxed to accomplish that which daily contributed to her injury. Mr. PHELPS said he had never assisted to incur the present debt of Maryland, but he was proud to say he had sustained the faith and honor of the State in her darkest hours of adversity, at a time when repudiation found a resting place even in these halls. Mr. PHELPS said the time, in his judgment, for a separation had not yet come; but he desired the Convention to recognize the right we contend for. Whenever representation, according to population, shall be engrafted upon the Constitution of the State, for one, he was prepared to say, the day and the hour of our separation is at hand. He never could, and never would consent, that the Eastern Shore should be compelled to sit powerless at the feet of the city of Baltimore and Western Maryland.

Mr. BROWN said he would make no reply to the gentleman who had referred to the revolutionary movement of Dorr: there was nothing in the condition or character of the State of Maryland to justify any parallel. Nor would he answer the insinuation of the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Jenifer,) that a time might come when Baltimore might call in the aid of Charles county to protect her against her own friends.

These were questions unworthy of notice. Sneers had been thrown out by gentlemen against the seventeen who had voted on Friday for the popular basis of representation. It was true, it was a very small minority. But he would inform those gentleman, that the number of them was great—that their name was "Legion." These seventeen represented 227,000 of the voters of Maryland. Yet their fewness on this vote was made a subject of ridicule. But the effort which had been made, and the names of those who sustained it, will appear on the record, and not all the waters which separate Maryland from Delaware and Virginia will wash it out.

He moved the previous question.

The question was taken, and decided in the negative.

So the Convention refused to second the demand for the previous question.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, desired to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT said, it was not now in order, there being two amendments already pending.

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. HICKS.

Mr. PRESSTMAN asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Lee, Mitchell, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Dickinson, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Phelps,