

Mr. BROWN. It was then a part of Baltimore county.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Yes; but Baltimore county was not then what it now is, but far, very far from it. I do not mean to go into any minute statistical examination, but to say in general terms, that the population of what are now the larger counties, was then comparatively small, when this fund was acquired, and had not contributed to the original accumulation of this fund; on the contrary it was furnished by the counties now comparatively small, and that, therefore, these funds were justly, honestly, fairly and conscientiously distributed upon the basis which had been assumed. I allude, of course, Mr. President, to that portion only of the school fund which is now thus equally distributed. As to that part of it which we all contrived to acquire, I am content we all rateably enjoy. This is done now to the full and more. I rose simply to put my veto on the most unqualified position that there was "no justice" not a "pretence of justice" in the present system. The gentleman from Carroll had so furiously announced this position, and had backed it by such a flourish of that tremendous index of power, [laughter, as the remark referred jocosely to Mr. Brown's uplifted arm] that it seemed to be rather dangerous to dispute it; yet, sir, with becoming diffidence, but with decided firmness, I take leave to dispute it—every word of it.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. BRENT,

And resulted as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Welch, Annan, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick and Brown—11.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers, of Cent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Sollers, Howard Buchanan, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Bowie, Sprigg, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Biser, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Schley, Fiery, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Smith, Shower and Cockey—51.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. BLAKISTONE as forty-third section to the report.

A motion to adjourn was made and negatived.

The question again recurred upon the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. BLAKISTONE.

Mr. McHENRY asked the yeas and nays on the amendment;

Which were ordered,

And being taken, were as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Sollers, Buchanan, Sherwood,

of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Bowie, Sprigg, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Biser, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Schley, Fiery, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday and Smith—46.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Howard, Welch, Annan, McHenry, Magraw, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Shower, Cockey and Brown—16.

So the amendment was adopted.

On motion, the Convention then adjourned.

THURSDAY, April 10, 1851.

The Convention met at ten o'clock.

Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. GRAUFF.

The roll was called, and a quorum being present, the journal of yesterday was read.

Mr. RIDGELY presented two petitions, one signed by thirty-two, and the other fourteen citizens of Baltimore county, praying for constitutional protection in the matter of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Which were read, and

Referred to the select committee appointed on that subject.

The convention then resumed the consideration of the unfinished order of the day, being the report submitted by Mr. JOHNSON, chairman of the committee on the legislative department.

The question pending being on an amendment offered by Mr. LEE, as the forty-fourth section to said report.

Mr. RICAUD moved that said amendment be passed over informally.

Determined in the affirmative.

Mr. McMASTER, (in accordance with the notice given by him on yesterday) moved to reconsider the vote of the Convention on the article creating "Howard county."

And on this motion, Mr. McMASTER called the yeas and nays.

Mr. RIDGELY said, he should be glad to hear the gentleman who had made the motion to reconsider, assign some reason why it should be adopted.

Mr. McMASTER said that his reasons were very plain and very short. He was utterly opposed to the creation of new counties in the State, either upon the Western or Eastern Shore, and thought that they had a goodly number of them already. He was of the opinion that in dividing Anne Arundel county, and creating Howard District a county, they had increased the strength and power of the city of Baltimore. He looked upon it as the object of that city to obtain the additional number of representatives, to which that county would be entitled from a division of the territory, and therefore moved for a reconsideration.