

The question being on agreeing to the amendment,

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

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Blakistone, Dent Hopewell, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Brent of Charles, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Phelps, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubin, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Kilgour, and Waters—31.

Negative—Messrs. Morgan, Ricaud, Donaldson, Sellman, Merrick, Jenifer, Howard, Buchanan, B. H. Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Colston, Crisfield, Eccleston, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Tuck, Bowling, Spencer, Gra-son, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Prestman, Ware, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey, and Brown—61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TUCK rose to offer an amendment to the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Newcomer.) He proposed to amend that proposition by increasing the number of delegates for Baltimore city, from six to ten.

He said that he moved this amendment because, from opinions expressed upon the floor, and from what had been said here of conferences and caucusses held outside of the Convention, he believed there was a majority of that body who were determined to give to the city of Baltimore ten delegates. He was free to say, that ten delegates from that city was not the proposition which he preferred; but if a majority had determined to enlarge that delegation to ten, he deemed it his duty, to place the measure, in all other respects, in a form most acceptable to himself, as between that and the proposition of Mr. FIERY, next to come up, which he feared an organized majority had determined to pass. Mr. FIERY's proposition, (and the Convention would excuse him for mentioning the gentleman by name, as it was the only way in which he could distinguish them.) proposed to give seventy-three members to the House of Delegates.

If they should increase the delegation from the city of Baltimore, to ten, by so amending the proposition of Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER, they would make the number of the House of Delegates 71. Now the difference was this. By Mr. FIERY's proposition, Allegany would have four delegates and Washington five; by Mr. NEWCOMER's, Allegany would have three, and Washington four, so that the section from which he, (Mr. F.) came would have the advantage of this difference. It commended itself very strongly to Mr. T. for another reason. It is based on whole numbers, instead of federal numbers—the basis of Mr.

FIERY—a very important point as far as the principle is involved.

Mr. T. felt called upon to say that the proposition of Mr. FIERY was unjust to his section, and especially to Prince George's. There are only three counties that pay a larger amount of State tax than Prince George's, to wit: Baltimore, Frederick and Washington. The assessment in Prince George's is upwards of \$9,000,000, that in Washington \$11,000,000, and that in Allegany upwards of \$3,000,000. We pay nearly three times as much tax as Allegany, and almost as much as Washington, yet it is proposed to give Washington five members, Allegany four, and Prince George's three, thus reducing the latter county to a number not larger than several counties which pay not half as much tax. He could not but consider this arrangement as unjust, especially in view of the fact that these and other western counties, are deriving benefits from the public works which in all probability will never profit the lower counties.

He had not time, under the five minutes restriction, to go further into the subject. He wished it to go to his constituents that he offered this amendment to avoid a greater evil, which he considered inevitable. The majority is against the lower section of the State, and of the two propositions presented, he deemed it to be his duty to select the one least injurious to his constituents.

Mr. CHAMBERS stated that if this proposition failed, he should propose the number of delegates from the city to be eight.

The PRESIDENT ruled debate out of order.

Mr. TUCK would withdraw his proposition to enable the gentleman from Kent to submit his.

Mr. CHAMBERS then moved to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Newcomer,) by striking out these words, "the same number of delegates as the county which shall be entitled to the largest representation," and in-ert in lieu thereof "eight." The scheme of the gentleman from Washington, would thereby remain unaltered in all respects, except by an increase of two to Baltimore city. He moved this although most decidedly in opposition to what he believed the best scheme, because he feared the Washington county proposition could not be carried without it, and that was the best scheme which the small counties had any chance to secure. Of course, in a choice of evils, they must take the least. He asked the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered,

and being taken, were as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Blakistone, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Sollers Brent of Charles, Merrick, Tuck, Bowling, Harcastle, Fiery and John Newcomer—14.

Negative—Messrs. Morgan, Dent, Hopewell, Lee, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Jenifer, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Ec-