pro tem., Dent, Hopewell, Mitchell, Wells, Weems, Sollers, Jenifer, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, McMaster, Magraw, Carter, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Kilgour and Waters—27.

Negative—Messrs. Lee, Chamber of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Randall, Sellman. Brent of Charles, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Crisfield, Miller, Grason, Dirickson, Fooks, Shriver, Biser, Sappington, McHenry, Nelson, Hardcastle, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Shower, and Brown—36.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

The question was then put on the adoption of the report of the majority of the committee.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, moved the question be taken by yeas and nays, and being ordered appeared as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Lee, Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Randall, Sellman, Brent of Charles, Howard Buchanan Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Crisfield, Miller, Grason, Fooks, Shriver, Biser, Sappington, McHenry, Nelson, Carter, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown—35.

Negative—Messrs. Blakistone, President, *pro tem.*, Dent, Hopewell, Mitchell, Wells, Weems, Sollers, Jenifer, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Dirickson, McMaster, Magraw, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Kilgour Waters—27

So the report of the majority committee was adopted.

The Convention adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

FRIDAY, March 14, 1851.

The Convention met at ten o'clock.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. GRAUFF.

The journal of yesterday having been read,

CORRECTION.

On motion of Mr. CHAMBERS,

A correction was made in page 442, in the amendment offered by him, to the resolution of the special committee, to allow such clerks as may be dispensed with, their per diem to Monday next, by adding the word "inclusive."

He explained his object to be, to remove any doubt as to the time when the *per diem* should cease.

There being no objection, the correction was made, and

The journal was then approved.

NEW COUNTY.

Mr. SHRIVER presented a petition of eighty voters of Middletown, Hawver's, and Catoctin districts in Frederick county, remonstrating against the creation of a new county from parts of Frederick and Washington counties.

Which was read, and

Referred to the committee appointed on New Counties.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER, presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington county, praying that provision may be made in the new Constitution, that the privilege to sell intoxicating liquors shall not be granted to any person in any part of the State, except the same shall first be sanctioned or approved by a majority of the votes in the election district where the same is to be sold.

Which was read, and

Referred to the select committee appointed on that subject.

BASIS OF REPRESENTATION.

Mr SMITH said:

He rose to submit an order, accompanying which, was a tabular statement which he desired to have printed. This statement contained various views which he, in conjunction with other gentlemen, had been preparing on the subject of the basis of representation.

He hoped this document would be printed and put in the hands of gentlemen as speedily as possible, in order that it might be examined. He thought it important that the Convention should see at a glance, all the various projects on the subject.

He then offered the following order,

Which was agreed to.

Ordered, That the committee on Printing, be directed to have printed for the use of the Convention, in one tabular form, the various plans for a basis of representation of the House of Delegates.

REDUCTION OF CLERKS.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, enquired whether it was now in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the order discharging a portion of the committee clerks was yesterday adopted?

The PRESIDENT, *pro tem.*, replied that such a motion was in order.

Mr. BRENT, then submitted the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MCHENRY moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. PHELPS hoped his friend from Harford would withdraw the motion to lay on the table. Yesterday the previous question was sprung, and no opportunity was afforded to say a word. He gave notice that if the motion to reconsider was laid on the table, he would renew it to-morrow.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, asked for the