

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, inquired whether this would preclude all further amendments.

The PRESIDENT replied in the affirmative.

On motion of Mr. BLAKISTONE, the Convention was called, and the door-keeper sent for the absent members.

On motion of Mr. PRESSMAN, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. JENIFER stated that the proposition now under consideration had given a majority to the anti-slaveholding counties.

Mr. WELLS demanded the yeas and nays on the call for the previous question, which were ordered and being taken, resulted—yeas 42; nays 38—as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Colston, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Pressman, Ware, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown—42.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hodson, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Sappington, Stephenson, Kilgour, Waters and Smith—38.

So the previous question was sustained.

The question was then stated upon the substitute offered by Mr. GRASON for the amendment as offered by Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. PHELPS demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted—yeas 43; nays 40—as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Donaldson, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Colston, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Pressman, Ware, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown—43.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Hodson, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Sappington, Stephenson, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Fiery, Kilgour and Waters—40.

So the Convention accepted said substitute.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, gave notice that he

should move to reconsider the vote of the Convention just taken on said substitute.

The question then was stated on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DIRICKSON demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted—yeas 43; nays 40—as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Donaldson, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Colston, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Pressman, Ware, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown—43.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hodson, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Sappington, Stephenson, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Kilgour and Waters—40.

So the amendment was adopted.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the proviso, as offered by Mr. JOHNSON, to the amendment offered by him.

Mr. JOHNSON withdrew his proposition in order to give time to consider it, believing that it would gain strength by consideration.

Mr. CHAMBERS moved a proposition submitted by Mr. RANDALL, for districting the city of Baltimore, but after some conversation, withdrew it.

Mr. PHELPS gave notice that on to-morrow he would move to reconsider the order limiting the debate on the representative question to 5 minutes. A new feature of the question had come up which had never been discussed.

Mr. BLAKISTONE moved to take up the report of the committee on the judiciary department.

Mr. CRISFIELD stated that he would be obliged to leave to-morrow, and he would prefer that it should be postponed to Monday week, if taken up. There were other subjects sufficient to occupy the attention of the Convention in the interim.

Mr. SPENCER was in favor of the postponement. Three distinct bills had already been acted upon, and were incomplete. It would be proper to complete those bills before taking up the Judiciary question, to prevent every thing from being crowded into the last moments of the Session. He desired therefore that the Convention should proceed to the consideration of the Executive bill, in order to complete that portion of it which had been passed over informally. He believed the Convention to be nearly as full as it would be for the remainder of the session; and that there was not a member absent who had not paired off. He would favor the postponement until Monday week; and would then move to take up the report of the Committee on the Executive.