

this body. It was his great object to produce harmony here, and final action on every part of the Constitution.

If we cannot effect any thing here by compromise, the result will be to send the Constitution to the people at the polls piece-meal. If we take the sense of the people on this one article, he feared we would follow this evil example on other parts of the Constitution. But if we will take the proper responsibility by finally deciding the question, there will be less cause to fear for the ultimate result of our deliberations.

He illustrated what might be the consequence of this proposition to call upon the people to do what we had been sent here to accomplish, by referring to the report which had been made by a magnanimous representative of one of the smallest counties, (Mr. Lloyd, from Talbot.) In that report it was proposed to give to the city of Baltimore the right to send twelve members to the House of Delegates. This was a liberal proposition, coming from a small county. It was less than he would be willing to give to a city of whose wealth and power Marylanders ought not to be jealous or envious, but proud. This delegation to Baltimore, as a part of a measure that is, in other respects, highly beneficial to the less populous counties, may be sustained by their delegates here as a measure of compromise. But suppose we take this article for Baltimore and submit it by itself to the people, and, at the same time, submit for separate action, to the people, that part of this same report which proposes to each county a right to choose one member of the Senate; can any man fail to foresee the consequences. The small counties would vote against an increase of the Baltimore delegation, while the large counties and the city of Baltimore would vote against giving one Senator to each county, without regard to their representative numbers. And in this way, both articles of the Constitution would be rejected. Then, as to the Judiciary, if the Convention think that we ought to abolish the life tenure of the judges and reduce the number in commission, are we to incorporate articles in the Constitution subject separately to the sanction of the popular vote? The same may be said as to every article in the Constitution. If we are to send it out to have separate votes upon each of its provisions, we shall only make confusion worse confounded, and all our labors will be of no public utility. He preferred biennial sessions, but felt but little zeal on that question when compared with that which he avowed against this distracting proposition to call upon the people to do that which we were chosen to perform.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER remarking, that enough had been said, and that he hoped that the Convention would second the motion he was about to make, demanded the previous question.

And on the question being put, "will the Convention second the demand for the previous question?"

No quorum voted.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

And the question was again put, "will the Con-

vention second the demand for the previous question," and was decided in the negative, as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Dalrymple, Buchanan, Welch, Dickinson, Phelps, Hearn, Annan, Stephenson, Nelson, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Parke and Cockey—18.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Ricaud, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Kent, Merrick, Howard, Ridgely, Lloyd, Sherwood, of Talbot, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Miller, Tuck, Sprigg, Bowling, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirrickson, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Gaitier, Biser, McHenry, Carter, Stewart, of Caroline, Prestman, Ware, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Shower and Brown—44.

So there was not a second.

The question then again recurred on the adoption of the second section, as amended.

Mr. SPENCER said the object at which the gentleman from Frederick, [Mr. Thomas,] aimed was the defeat of this section. In some of the views thrown out by the gentleman, he, [Mr. S.,] entirely accorded; and the proceedings of this day bear testimony, that the sentiment is not peculiar with the gentleman from Frederick—that he is operated upon by high and elevated principles, rising above the reach of party influences. The gentleman from Frederick must be satisfied, that there are other members of this body who are actuated by principles equally high. The man who looks not beyond the sphere of selfish or party considerations, is undeserving of a seat in this body. We should all satisfy ourselves, that the object we have in view is one which must be promotive of the public welfare, and then march boldly to it. He agreed also with the gentleman from Frederick, that the reformers in this body ought to act in union. But when reformers differ among themselves, as to the provisions which ought to be inserted in the Constitution, where is to be the point of compromise? Who is to lead in the attempt to reconcile these differences of opinion? Every man must stand on his own principles. He was one of those who knew no leader. He could not abandon the principles he had adopted from a conviction of their correctness. There are many who consider biennial elections as the proper principle; while there are others who contend for annual sessions; but he was willing, in a spirit of compromise, to make some concession to those who thought differently; and, therefore, he had offered various propositions. The gentleman from Frederick, and his friends, have taken a fixed stand against all compromise, while we who are willing to compromise, have been driven by the course of the gentleman from Frederick, and his friends, to take a separate vote on this question at the polls. It appears, therefore, that there are divisions among us all round. Some of the most distinguished members of reform, and of the whig party, are in favor of biennial sessions, while some of the members of the reform, as well as