

fore his election been a resident of the district from which he shall be elected; and the residence in a district requisite to give a right of suffrage, shall be six months next preceding the election; but in case any voter otherwise qualified shall have less than six months residence in the district of his then residence, he shall not thereby lose his right to vote in the district in which he may have resided for the six months next preceding his removal."

Mr. JENIFER said that the proposition provided that the districts should be of contiguous territory. No such provision was made in regard to Baltimore city.

Mr. JOHNSON said that it was understood to be contiguous, and it could be arranged hereafter.

Mr. TUCK moved for a division of the question upon the third branch of the amendment down to the word "Constitution," in the eighth line inclusive, and moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays.

Which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Donaldson, Dorsey, Randall, Sellman, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Howard, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, McLane, Spencer, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Anan, McHenry, Magraw, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Smith, Cockey and Brown—38.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Wells, Kent, Weems, Bond, Jenifer, Buchanan, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke and Shower—55.

So the third branch of the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON, with the consent of the Convention, then withdrew the fourth and last branch of the amendment, giving notice that he should move to reconsider the vote in relation to the districting of the city of Baltimore.

Mr. McHENRY moved the Convention reconsider their vote taken on the first branch of the amendment, and said:

I voted for the first branch of this proposition under the impression that the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Frederick, was received on all sides in good faith, with the intention of districting the whole State. I find now that most of the gentlemen who voted for the amendment have voted against it as a portion of the article, and is due to myself and to other gentlemen, that we should have an opportunity of placing our votes upon a proper footing. I could not vote to district the city of Baltimore alone, both because such a measure, if

carried would be fatal to the Constitution, and because it will be an act of unjust and oppressive discrimination which the people of that city ought not and will not submit to. I therefore make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. JENIFER. The gentleman had thought proper to defend himself from his vote; I desire to defend myself. I voted to district the whole State, but when I found that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Frederick county had stricken out the city of Baltimore and tied down the counties, leaving them to be districted, without including the city of Baltimore; which may or may not be embraced in the pending amendment, I felt compelled to vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was anxious to make a motion to reconsider, for the purpose of giving gentlemen an opportunity, if there has been any error, of correcting their votes. It will be remembered that my motion was made as an amendment to the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Kent. As he had made an arrangement for the districting of Baltimore city, it was not necessary, in my amendment, that I should include that city. Hence, I struck it out of the original proposition, because I considered that the gentleman had sufficiently guarded that in his own proposition. The gentleman's proposition divided the districts in Baltimore city. That was rejected by the Convention; hence it left the balance, without saying that the districts should be contiguous. I took it for granted it was his purpose to have them contiguous. I should vote for no proposition to district Baltimore city, to gerrymander, as it is called. I should only vote for one that would plainly district the city, with contiguous territory.

Mr. SPENCER. I call the attention of the Convention to the fact that this very amendment provides every thing that the gentleman from Charles requires. It is a mistake in him that it is not provided that the districts in Baltimore should be composed of contiguous territory.

Mr. S. read the amendment to show that it did provide that the districts in the city of Baltimore and in the counties, should be composed of contiguous territory. It was clearly provided for.

Mr. JOHNSON. Be that as it may. Gentlemen (and I take it for granted they speak with the candor which becomes members of this Convention,) say that they did not vote understandingly, because of the ambiguity of the propositions. I shall vote for the motion to reconsider, and if the motion is agreed to, I shall take occasion to put it beyond the question of doubt or cavil, that the districts shall be of contiguous territory, both in the counties and in the city of Baltimore.

Mr. THOMAS. It is so now.

Mr. JOHNSON. I consider it so now, but if it is necessary to make it any stronger, I shall, if the motion to reconsider prevails, take good care to settle it. I call for the previous question on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, requested the gentleman to withdraw the demand for the previous question, to allow him to say a few words.