

Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, Tuck, McCubbin, George, Wright, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer and Waters—42.

So this branch of the amendment was rejected.

The next division of the amendment was stated to be as follows:

"And to the city of Baltimore a representation not larger than that given to the largest county."

And the question having been taken,

The result was as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Kent, Weems, Bond, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, Phelps, McCubbin, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Sappington, Nelson, Carter, Fiery, John Newcomer, Kilgour and Waters—31.

*Negative*—Messrs. Donaldson, Sollers, Merrick, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Tuck, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, McHenry, Magraw, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Neill, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown—44.

So this branch of the amendment was rejected.

The question was then stated to be on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

Mr. MERRICK remarked, there was no manner of use in instructing the committee on representation, to bring in the report contemplated by this proposition, as such a report had already been brought in. He, therefore, moved a re-consideration of the vote adopting the first branch of the amendment.

Mr. NEILL concurred in the propriety of this suggestion.

The question, "will the Convention reconsider the said vote?" was taken,

And decided in the negative, without a division.

So the vote was not re-considered.

Some conversation followed on a point of order as to the state of the question under the several votes given by the Convention, when

The SECRETARY, under instructions from the PRESIDENT, read the minutes of the journal, to show the exact position in which the votes of the Convention had left the question.

Mr. MERRICK now again called the attention of the Convention to the fact, that, under the existing state of the question, the reference of such instructions to the committee was a mere repetition of what had already been done. The committee on representation had already made a report, providing for the election of one senator from each of the counties, and one from the city

of Baltimore. Was it not childish to be doing that which had already been done?

The PRESIDENT. That is a question which the Convention must decide for itself.

Mr. MERRICK, continuing. The gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) and the gentleman from Talbot, (Mr. Lloyd,) have both reported *projets* like this, and I will ask whether it is consistent with the dignity and the character of this body, thus to multiply reports and propositions identically the same?

Mr. SPENCER, (to the chair.) Is this in order?

Some conversation followed.

Mr. MERRICK. I move a re-consideration of the vote.

Mr. THOMAS, (to the chair.) Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT. It is not. The previous question is not yet exhausted.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask the yeas and nays on the motion to re-consider.

Some further conversation followed on a point of order, in which Messrs. BROWN, McLANE, THOMAS, and the PRESIDENT took part, after which The question was taken on the resolution as amended, and it was adopted.

The question then recurred on the motion to reconsider, (the previous question being exhausted.)

Mr. MERRICK recapitulated the State of the question, and remarked that nothing remained of the proposition before the Convention but the first branch instructing the committee on representation to report a bill giving one Senator to each county and to the city of Baltimore. This proposition had already been passed upon affirmatively. He moved, therefore, a re-consideration, for the reason that it was idle, and worse than idle, in his judgment, to give instructions to a committee to do that which two of its members had already done. He hoped, therefore, that the reconsideration would be agreed to. The mover himself, (Mr. Jacobs,) had suggested that this course ought to be pursued.

Some further conversation followed on a point of order between Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, and the PRESIDENT.

Mr. JENIFER said, that he should not himself have been in favor of moving such a proposition; but the resolution had been adopted, and a motion to reconsider might leave the committee in an uncertain and embarrassed State, looking to their conflicting views upon this question of representation. He should, therefore, vote against the re-consideration—because the resolution itself embraced a principle which he intended to support. The instruction, he thought, was a guard; it settled at least the point that there was to be one Senator to the city and to each county. The committee on representation had come to no conclusion. They could not agree, and the question was, whether the Convention would adopt its own views, or refer the matter to the committee without instructions. If it was to go to the committee at all, let it be accompanied with instructions.