

son, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Sehley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey, Brown—52.

So the Convention refused to reconsider their vote.

Mr. SELLMAN, when his name was called on the yeas and nays just taken, rose in his seat and stated that he had paired off with Mr. DALRYMPLE, on this particular subject, he having been called home by the sickness of his family.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent. I now propose to offer, as a substantive proposition, the following:

"In order that each and every portion of the city of Baltimore may be fairly represented, and its various interests protected in the Legislature, for the purpose of electing delegates therein, the city of Baltimore shall be divided into ten districts, as follows: The first and second wards, as now laid off, shall constitute district No. 1; the third and fourth wards district No. 2; the fifth and sixth wards No. 3; the seventh and eighth wards district No. 4; the ninth and tenth wards No. 5; the eleventh and twelfth wards No. 6; the thirteenth and fourteenth wards No. 7; the fifteenth and sixteenth wards No. 8; the seventeenth and eighteenth wards No. 9; the nineteenth and twentieth wards No. 10."

Mr. THOMAS. Have we not a subject before the Convention?

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent. What is the subject before the Convention?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman must first move to take the subject up, before he can offer his proposition.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I offer this as a substantive proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. The judiciary report was laid aside with the understanding that we should resume its consideration again.

Mr. CHAMBERS. It was laid aside with a view to take up this subject. It was included in the proposition which I stated to the Convention.

Mr. THOMAS. I never heard such an idea.

Mr. GRASON. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman from Kent yesterday, or two or three days ago, gave notice (he yesterday mentioned it particularly,) that he would move a reconsideration of that article which related to representation in the House of Delegates, for the purpose of moving three distinct propositions. One was to enlarge the delegation of two counties, the other was to diminish the delegation of the city of Baltimore, and the third was to district the city of Baltimore. A motion to reconsider was made for that purpose, but it failed. I think, therefore, that the motion now made by the gentleman from Kent is not precisely in order.

Mr. THOMAS. My ground was that the House having refused to agree to the motion to reconsider, there was nothing before the House to which the proposition of the gentleman from Kent could attach. There was a distinct under-

standing, when we laid aside the judiciary bill, that if this proposition should be reconsidered, we would entertain any amendment that might be moved to it, but if it should not be reconsidered, we would take up the judiciary bill.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. I suggest we might as well meet this proposition at once.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider having been lost, there is no other question pending before the Convention. and the question is what is the next business for consideration? Regularly, it would be the judiciary report, but it is competent for the Convention to postpone the further consideration of the report, and take up this or any other subject.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I do not mean to say a single word, but will merely submit my proposition.

Mr. SPENCER. I suggest to the gentleman to move to take up the apportionment bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I desire to make a suggestion. Sometime ago, when the subject of representation was under discussion, I gave notice, that I should move to reconsider the subject, if I found it necessary, for the purpose of offering a distinct proposition, before the Convention should adjourn, to district the entire State. The Convention has now ordered the maps, but I have not had an opportunity to examine them, and if the gentleman would delay his proposition, I should like to vote on the general proposition.

Mr. CHAMBERS could not delay now, and moved that the Convention proceed to consider the proposition he had submitted.

Mr. SPENCER. I move to take up the apportionment bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I object to taking up the apportionment bill. It will open all that branch of the government. If we should take it up, I would take exception to the proposition of the gentleman from Kent, on this ground and would say that it would be out of order, to submit a proposition which had been voted down already, unless he should move to reconsider the vote by which it has been rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As a test vote, I move to lay on the table, the motion of the gentleman from Kent, to take up this proposition.

Mr. SMITH demanded the yeas and nays on the motion,

Which were ordered.

Mr. CHAMBERS of Kent. I desire to propose a question to the gentleman from the county of Baltimore, who made this motion. I understand this to be designed as a test vote, to put an end to all prospect of districting the city of Baltimore?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I can only say that I cannot control other gentlemen, but it will be a test vote with me.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. I should like to say this. If this is to be looked upon as a test vote I shall vote to lay it on the table, but if the question is to be agitated again, I would rather meet it to-day, and will not vote for the motion to lay on the table.

Several members. It is a test vote.