

earnestness, for they might break up in confusion, or their labors might not be ratified by the people. Where would these dissenting delegates then stand? The finger of odium would be pointed to them, as the men who would not compromise, even when a compromise was offered, and thus defeated the object of the Convention.

He would not say more, because what he had said would apply to every possible amendment that could be brought forward. He had only said this much, because he thought from recent proceedings, that every offering of liberality, would be scorned and thrown back in their faces.

Mr. MERRICK said:

That the amendment proposed by his colleague (Mr. Jenifer,) provided that no county should have less than three delegates. No counties would have less than three under the bill he had reported, except Calvert and Caroline, they lacking but two or three hundred of having a sufficient fraction to entitle them to a third delegate. He saw no great objection to the amendment.

Mr. JENIFER said:

That his amendment did not affect the principle of the bill in any manner whatever. It merely gave to two counties which were excluded by the bill, from having three delegates—that number of delegates, placing them on an equal footing with the other counties.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. JENIFER:

And it was rejected by the following vote:

Ayes 35, noes 49.

Mr. MERRICK called the attention of the Chair to the fact, that two substitutes had been reported to the Convention, from the committee on representation, which he thought were now pending for consideration.

Mr. SPENCER was of the opinion, that these amendments were in fact only pending *ex gratia*, and that they were not known except by the consent of the Convention—referring to the executive report made by Mr. GRASON, to sustain his position.

Some conversation ensued in reference to this point of order, between

Messrs. BROWN, MERRICK, SPENCER, BOWIE, and CHAMBERS, when

The PRESIDENT decided that the substitutes were not before the Convention, and that it was at the discretion of the gentlemen who had submitted them either to offer them or to withdraw them.

The question was then taken by yeas and nays, on agreeing to the second section as amended.

Before the result was announced,

Mr. JENIFER rose and stated that he voted for this section as a compromise measure, to his friends of the city of Baltimore; but as it was not so, he would vote against it; and he accordingly had his vote changed from the affirmative to the negative side of the question.

Mr. BRENT, of Charles also rose and stated, that he individually preferred the proposition of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) but in a decision announced by the Chair, it had been

stated that this vote was not upon the final adoption of this proposition.

He supported it, because he was desirous that the bill, as proposed by the chairman of the committee, (Mr. Merrick,) should be perfected. He did not desire, therefore, to change his vote.

The yeas and nays were then read as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Sellman, Brent of Charles, Merrick and Annan—4.

*Negative*—Messrs. Buchanan, Pres't., *pro tem.*, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Jenifer, Howard, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, John Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Prestman, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—78.

So the section as amended was not agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, moved to insert the following as the second section:

“Every county, having a population of less than fifteen thousand souls shall be entitled to three delegates—every county having a population of fifteen thousand souls, and less than twenty-five thousand shall be entitled to four delegates; every county having a population of twenty-five thousand and less than thirty-five thousand souls, shall be entitled to five delegates; and every county having a population of more than thirty-five thousand souls shall be entitled to six delegates, and the city of Baltimore shall be entitled to the same number of delegates as the county which shall be entitled to the largest representation.”

The question being on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERS asked the yeas and nays, Which were ordered.

A motion was made to adjourn, which was not agreed to.

Mr. SHOWER gave notice of his intention to move a reconsideration of the vote of the Convention rejecting the amendment offered by Mr. FIERY, to the second section of the report.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. CHAMBERS, and it was rejected by the following vote:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond Brent of Charles, Jenifer, John Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Davis, Kilgour, and Waters—34.