

But let the elections take place as they now do, and those evils would never be corrected. And why? Because those engaged in them are the most efficient instruments of electioneering politicians, and a member of the House of Delegates would neither propose or advocate measures, that suppose from necessity, to remedy the existing evil, lest he might give offence to his friends, and thereby lose the rioters, to which perhaps he owed his elevation to the Legislature, and to which he might look for future similar elevations.

He thought the whole State quite as deeply interested in the city, as it is in the different counties of the State. He was as desirous to see Baltimore prosper and attain the highest eminence for population and wealth, as could be any member of this Convention, not excepting the member from Baltimore, and he anticipated that in ten or fifteen years, its population would be more than doubled.

But, at the same time, he wished to see the legislature composed of such materials, as would lead to such enactments as would foster and promote its prosperity, and preserve its peace and good government.

He thought that districting the city would be in a great degree, a remedy for the existing evils—that if that were done, the jealousies and conflicting interests between the city and counties, would be measurably removed.

If all parts of the State properly represented in the legislature, full and ample justice would be done to all. For the reasons which he had assigned, he advocated this measure, and hoped it would not be rejected without strong reasons being shewn therefor. And, he would say, there was nothing at present that would induce him to give Baltimore an increased representation, without districting it.

If it was necessary that the counties should vote as counties, it was equally necessary that the wards or districting should vote in the same manner. There was the same diversity of interests in relation to both of them. It could not be doubted, that under the present system much fraud and illegal voting was practised, which would be partially prevented by the amendment he proposed. If it was necessary to establish the district system in the counties, he would be willing to go for it.

The large number he proposed to add to the delegation from Baltimore city, was by way of compromising and satisfying the people of the city, that there was no design to take undue advantages of them, rather than from an expectation that any good would result from it, either to Baltimore or the rest of the State.

MONDAY, March 31, 1851.

The Convention met at ten o'clock.
Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. GRIFFITH.
The roll was called.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. CONSTABLE presented several petitions from sundry citizens of Cecil county, asking that a provision be inserted in the Constitution, making the sale of intoxicating liquors dependant on the sanction of a majority of voters in the election district.

Mr. GWINN presented a petition of sundry citizens of the city of Baltimore of similar import.

Mr. SHERWOOD, of Baltimore city, also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the city of Baltimore, of similar import, and

Mr. SHRIVER presented a petition of sixty citizens of Catoctin district in Frederick county, asking that a clause be not inserted in the new Constitution, restricting the sale of spirituous liquors, but that the subject be referred to the Legislature.

Which were severally read, and

Referred to the select committee already appointed on that subject.

EVENING SESSIONS.

Mr. MICHAEL NEWCOMER submitted the following order:

Ordered, That from on after the first day of April next, this Convention will meet every day at nine o'clock, a. m., and sit until two o'clock, p. m.; then take a recess until four o'clock, p. m. when it will meet again for the transaction of business.

Which was read.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved the question be taken by yeas and nays.

On motion of Mr. WEEMS,

The Convention was called.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENSON,

Further proceedings under the call was postponed with.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the order.

Mr. SPENCER moved to lay said order on the table.

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

Affirmative—Messrs. Morgan, Hopewell, Riccaud, Mitchell, Donaldson Dorsey, Wells, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Jewifer, Howard, Welch, Crisfield, Hicks, Hodson, Phelps, Constable, Miller, McLane, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, Hearn, Fooks, Johnson, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Kilgour, Waters and Anderson—35.

Negative—Messrs. Blakistone, Dent, Lee, Sellman, Bell, Lloyd, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Eccleston, Chambers of Cecil, Bowie, Tuck, McMaster, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Gaiter, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Cockey, Shower and Brown—39