

yet if a constitution is formed, I would look at it as an *entire instrument*, and if I should approve it as a *whole*, I reserve the right to vote for the new Constitution, though it may not give us our full and equal rights. But the new Constitution is not yet formed, and until I see it complete I cannot say whether it will receive my support. In the meantime, let us postpone this subject until we have completed our action on the elective franchise, and then let us have full and thorough discussion in all its latitude, and if we cannot change a vote here, the seed will be sown among the people, which, at some future time, will bring forth the harvest of reform, if it shall fail now.

Gentlemen who are favorable to the doctrine of representation based on population, have said that it ought to be pressed at all times and under all circumstances, and that we ought to begin its consideration even if we have to break off time and again. I beg leave to differ with them, and shall contend that more justice will be done to the subject by postponing it now and taking it up hereafter, when we can bestow on it our single and undivided attention.

One gentleman, from Caroline, has spoken of those who are for postponement now as generally acting to postpone every thing, and he has used the unsavory metaphor of a flock of sheep following the one which first bleats. If he means to apply such a comparison, however general, to me, he is much mistaken, as I am always for action, prompt and speedy, and utterly opposed to those who would procrastinate the work of reform.

Mr. PRESSTMAN wished the Convention to understand the position he occupied as a delegate from the city of Baltimore. He wished also that his constituents and his colleagues should understand it. He was against postponement. He was against the practice of members of the committee, who took an opportunity to rise in the House, and make an exposition of their views, and then to abandon the ground they had taken.

[Mr. GWINN disclaimed any such intention.]

Mr. P. said, he did not allude particularly to his colleague. He reminded his colleague, who was very fond of looking into Convention proceedings, that it had always been permitted to each member of a committee to make a report embracing his views: he might avail himself of that privilege. He referred to the statement made by the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. MERRICK,) that no agreement could take place in that committee: and stated that the views of his colleague were opposed to those of a majority. He intended, when he had the opportunity, to move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the subject, because he wished to offer a plan, and he knew other gentlemen would offer plans, for the purpose of obtaining the vote of a majority of the Convention in favor of some principle. He thought it the proper course for every gentleman in committee, or a minority, to make separate reports, and then let them be considered by the House. He did not allow that he had been instructed to vote for the basis of

population; his constituency undoubtedly preferred it; but he felt at liberty to make terms.

Mr. TUCK called for the previous question.

There was a second, and the main question was ordered to be now taken; which main question was on the motion of Mr. SOLLERS, to refer the said report to the committee of the whole.

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

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, President. Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Dalrymple, Bond, Ridgely, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, McLane, Tuck, Bowling, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Schley, Davis, and Smith—34.

*Negative*—Messrs. Donaldson, Sellman, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Buchanan, Bell, Welsh, Chandler, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Bowie, Sprigg, Spencer, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Brent of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Kilgour, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—46.

So the Convention refused to commit the report to the committee of the whole.

The question then recurred on the motion of Mr. SPENCER, to recommit the said report with the instructions he had indicated.

Mr. THOMAS moved to amend said motion by striking out the instructions to the committee.

Mr. THOMAS referred to the order which had been adopted by the Convention on motion of Mr. GRASON, restricting the committees from reporting reasons; and suggested that the object of that order was to prevent any influence which a statement of opinions might have on the Convention. The committee had made no report in the shape of an argument on this, what he must call, vital question, for vital he considered it, and one on which he had taken ground which he would never abandon without a severe struggle. He thought, however, that the committee had violated the spirit of the order, by coming forward and throwing the weight of their opinions against the course which he should advocate. He desired that the resolutions should be recommitted, with instructions to report a practical measure. He deprecated discussion on the abstract propositions, whether representation should be based on popular numbers; whether it should be based on federal numbers; or on popular numbers for the House and federal numbers for the Senate. He did not wish to waste time on abstractions. The members of the committee appeared to be as various in their opinions as their numbers. They were not likely to make any report. Had the committee reported any practical plan, some progress might have been made. But constituted as the committee are, the better plan