

vention which looked to party, or to anything else than the true interests of the State. He should adhere to that principle. If they should fail to district the city of Baltimore, it would be a wrong to the whole State. They should be put upon an equality with the counties.

Mr. SPENCER. Will the gentleman allow me to inquire whether in putting Baltimore city upon an equality with the counties, he intends to give that city a Senator for every ward.

Mr. JENIFER replied:

That when an advocate of that principle should come from the city of Baltimore, he would answer his demand. He intended to have Baltimore placed upon an equality with the counties, and not placed before every county. The principle now proposed divided the city of Baltimore and the large counties, representing minorities everywhere; and he hoped that it would prevail.

Mr. BROWN said:

That he agreed with the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Jenifer,) that the true issue had now come; but he differed with him in regard to the nature of that issue. The question as he understood it, was between a Constitution and no Constitution. The Convention had been six months making a Constitution, and if they did not now adjourn soon, the people could not have time to understand the Constitution, and could not vote for it. He had voted from the commencement to district the State. He should vote for no motion to reconsider from this time forward to the end of the session, upon any subject which had been distinctly settled by this body. He had voted to give Baltimore city an extra judge. It had been refused, and he could not vote to reconsider that. He should do all in his power to bring the Convention to a close, in order to give the people an opportunity to look at the Constitution before being called upon to vote upon it. He would repeat that the true issue now was—Constitution or no Constitution.

Mr. HOWARD demanded the previous question.

Mr. RIDGELY. I respectfully ask my colleague to allow me to put myself right before he demands the previous question.

Mr. HOWARD withdrew his demand for the previous question.

Mr. RIDGELY. The proposition which I hold in my hand, and which I intended to offer at the proper time to the House, is not exactly the proposition stated by the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Johnson.) I make no distinction whatever between the counties in my proposition, and I therefore wish the House to understand that when the proper time arrives, I will explain the basis upon which it rests. It proposes to district all the counties, and a new districting for the city of Baltimore only. It divides the city into four districts. It is in that respect different from other propositions which have been before this body. I trust that the House will come to the consideration of this question without any excitement. I have come here honestly to perform a public duty. I chose to accept the position of a union candidate for a seat in this House. I voluntarily assumed the position to be a no-party

member of this Convention, and my constituents thought proper to elect me upon that theory. I came here with a firm, fearless determination to perform my duty, without looking to the right nor to the left. I think the House will bear me witness that thus far I have pursued that course, and with the blessing of God, I will pursue it to the end. I, like the gentleman from Carroll, consider the question to be, Constitution or no Constitution. But I can rise above the influence of party, and look as I think all should, at both sides of the question. The gentleman may think the Constitution is not in danger, except from districting the city of Baltimore. I think otherwise. There are two parties in Maryland, and the Constitution is equally in danger from both. I am for a Constitution, and I invoke this Convention to steer between Scylla and Charybdis. We are as likely to meet a concentrated opposition from the Whig party as from the Democratic party in opposition to obnoxious features to either, which may be placed in the Constitution. If we are to be narrowed down to party lines—if political questions are to be opened, that party which believes political advantages are gained by the other, will certainly oppose such a Constitution. To avoid therefore, party opposition to the Constitution, the State ought to be districted, and I shall submit a proposition, if I can get the floor, for that object. I now renew the previous question, as promised by my colleague, who was kind enough to withdraw it.

The previous question was seconded, and the main question ordered, viz:

Will the Convention reconsider their vote on the substitute offered by Mr. THOMAS?

Mr. BROWN moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays,

Which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Ridgely, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Johnson, Gaither, Annan, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Smith and Cockey—44.

*Negative*—Messrs. Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Constable, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Shriver, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown—40.

So the Convention reconsidered their vote.

Mr. SHRIVER, when Mr. BISER's name was called on the yeas and nays just taken, rose in his seat and desired it to be entered on the journal that Mr. BISER had paired off with Mr. TUCK on the question.