

Mr. BOWIE moved for a division of the question upon striking out.

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

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chaudier, Sherwood, of Talbot, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Dirickson, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Gwinn, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown—37.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Prest, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Merrick, Ridgely, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, McCubbin, Grason, George, Wright, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Annan, Thawley, Schley, Fiery, Neill, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Holliday and Smith—41.

So the convention refused to strike out.

Mr. BUCHANAN moved to amend the first branch of the amendment offered by Mr. Crisfield to the 9th section of the Report, by inserting after the words "Baltimore county" the words "and Harford."

The PRESIDENT decided the motion not to be in order. The gentleman could get at his object by a motion to reconsider the vote which had just been taken.

Mr. BUCHANAN then moved to reconsider the vote of the convention on the first branch of the amendment offered by Mr. Crisfield, to the 9th section of the report, and adopted on yesterday. He said his impression was that that district was disproportionate to the amount of business done in it. He wanted the two counties he had named put together. There would be business enough, from the county of Baltimore alone, to occupy the court four or five months in a year. What were the facts? The court was now in session, and had been for a month. He had the honor to practice in that court. He was engaged on one side or the other of most of the suits, and every one of those cases had been postponed or continued, in consequence of his absence. Of course none of them had been tried. The court was at present engaged in criminal business, and he was sure that if Cecil county was added to the proposed district, the judge would be worked to death. God pity a judge with this amount of labor to perform.

Mr. B. said his object was not to disconnect ourselves from Cecil county, in kindly feeling and sentiments, but only in respect to this matter of judicial arrangement, which was unjust to Cecil, as well as to us. If there was any county he would like to be associated with more, perhaps than any other on the Eastern Shore, it was the county of Cecil. But he was satisfied the district was too large, and he therefore protested against the arrangement.

Mr. CRISFIELD asked if the gentleman (Mr. Buchanan) would withdraw his motion to reconsider? If he would consent, he (Mr. C.)

would renew the motion with pleasure, after closing the few words he had to say.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will withdraw if the gentleman will renew the motion to reconsider.

Mr. CRISFIELD proceeded. The gentleman had moved to reconsider, because, in his judgment, a district composed of Harford, Baltimore and Cecil would be too large. He held in his hand some statistics, as far as he had been able to collect them, and he would read for information. He would refer the Convention to them with a view to show what time was required to discharge this service.

In Harford county, in the five years from 1845 to 1849, both inclusive, the court sat an average of twenty-three days per annum. We have no returns of the amount of business in that county; none have been made; but from the number of days required to transact it, a fair estimate can be formed of the amount of business. In Cecil the average number of days which the court sat per annum in the same years was nineteen; in the same time the average number of civil suits commenced was 156; number of jury trials, civil and criminal, 20; criminal cases, including those tried by jury, 31; insolvent petitions, 22. In 1846 there were five bills in Chancery filed in that court, and none since.

In Baltimore county we had no means of determining how many days were required to discharge the business, for the returns did not distinguish when the court sat for city and when for county business. But the returns did show the amount of county business. In five years, from 1845 to 1849, both inclusive, the average number of suits was 200 per annum; and the number of jury trials, civil and criminal, had averaged 25 per annum. As he had said before, there was no means of ascertaining the number of days occupied by Baltimore County Court. But he found that Baltimore County Court had not much more business, according to the returns, than Queen Anne's. The average number of suits in Queen Anne's was 190 per annum for the five years referred to; and the average number of civil and criminal cases tried before a jury was 20 per annum in five years; and in that county the court sat an average of 31 days; and he did not think, judging from the comparative amount of business, a much longer time would be required for Baltimore County.

Mr. SPENCER. Tell me the average number of suits in Somerset county, and the average number of trials.

Mr. CRISFIELD said he could not, for no returns had been made; the average number of days, however, which the court sits in Somerset county is twenty. It would be found from the statistics referred to, that there would be ample time to do all the work required to be done in a judicial district composed of Harford, Baltimore and Cecil counties. He thought the statistics were against his friend from Baltimore county, (Mr. Buchanan,) and if he would be pleased with an association with those counties, he did not see why his friend should be deprived of that pleasure for want of time to transact the business.