



CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

csac.history.wisc.edu > Document Collections > The Founding Period and Slavery > The Southern States Debate Slavery and the Constitution > Debates Over the 3/5 Clause

Luther Martin: Genuine Information V, Baltimore *Maryland Gazette*, 11 January 1788 (excerpt)

Mr. MARTIN'S *Information to the House of Assembly*, continued.

With respect to *that part* of the *second* section of the *first* article, which relates to the *apportionment of representation* and *direct taxation*, there were considerable objections made to it, besides the great objection of *inequality*—It was urged, that no principle could justify taking *slaves* into computation in *apportioning* the number of *representatives* a State should have in the government—that it involved the absurdity of *increasing* the power of a State in making laws for *free men* in *proportion* as that State *violated* the *rights of freedom*—That it might be proper to take slaves into consideration, when *taxes* were to be apportioned, because it had a tendency to *discourage slavery*; but to take them into account in *giving representation* tended to *encourage* the *slave trade*, and to make it the *interest* of the States to *continue* that *infamous traffic*—That slaves could not be taken into account as *men*, or *citizens*, because they were not admitted to the *rights of citizens* in the States which adopted or continued slavery—If they were to be taken into account as *property*, it was asked, what peculiar circumstance should render this property (of *all others* the most *odious* in its nature) entitled to the *high privilege* of conferring *consequence* and *power* in the government to its possessors, rather than *any other* property—and why *slaves* should, as property, be taken into account rather than *horses*, *cattle*, *mules*, or any *other species*—and it was observed by an honorable member from Massachusetts, that he considered it as dishonorable and humiliating to enter into compact with the *slaves* of the *southern States*, as it would be with the *horses* and *mules* of the *eastern*. It was also objected, that the *numbers* of representatives appointed by this section to be sent by the particular States to compose the *first* legislature, were not precisely *agreeable* to the *rule* of representation adopted by this system, and that the numbers in this section are *artfully lessened* for the *large* States, while the *smaller* States have their *full proportion* in order to prevent the *undue influence* which the *large* States will have in the government from being *too apparent*; and I think, Mr. Speaker, that this objection is *well founded*.—I have taken some pains to obtain information of the numbers of free men and slaves in the different States, and I have reason to believe, that if the estimate was *now* taken, which is directed, and one delegate to be sent for every thirty thousand inhabitants, that Virginia would have at least *twelve* delegates, Massachusetts *eleven*, and Pennsylvania *ten*, instead of the numbers stated in *this section*; whereas the *other* States, I believe, would not have more than the numbers there allowed them, nor would Georgia, most probably at present, send more than *two*—If I am right, Mr. Speaker, upon the enumeration being made, and the representation being apportioned according to the rule prescribed, the *whole number* of delegates would be *seventy-one*, *thirty-six* of which would be a *quorum* to do business; the delegates of Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, would amount

to *thirty-three* of that quorum—Those three States will, therefore, have *much more* than *equal* power and influence in *making* the laws and regulations, which are to affect this continent, and will have a *moral certainty* of *preventing* any laws or regulations which *they disapprove*, although they might be thought ever so *necessary* by a *great majority* of the States—. . . .

CITE AS: John P. Kaminski et al., eds., *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution*, Vol. XI: Maryland [1] (Madison, Wis.: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 2015), 169–70.