

St. Mary's and Kent Island counties. An equal representation was not given by St. Mary's to Kent Island. One representative was given to one—two to another—three to a third election district, in St. Mary's, and the whole apportionment appeared to have been made with strict reference to population. This example of our fathers, he, (Mr. T.,) was ready and willing to follow, so far as respect was paid to the number of the people, in distributing to them political power. And if other members of the Convention would consent to act on the same obviously fair principle, the Constitution could readily be formed.

After some further remarks from Mr. DASHIELL,

Mr. McHENRY rose, not for the purpose, he said, of prolonging the discussion, but to call the attention of the gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Dashiell,) to the fact that the old bill of rights, framed in 1776, opened with the very words which were reported by the committee on the bill of rights, as a part of the new Constitution. And if it was not thought ambiguous then, was it more so now?

Mr. DASHIELL said, that no such theory as he referred to, was then dreamt of.

Mr. McHENRY said, nor was it dreamt of now, except, perhaps, by a very few persons.

But, Mr. McH. said, he had risen to demand the previous question.

Mr. MERRICK desiring to say a few words,

Mr. McHENRY withdrew the demand for the previous question.

Mr. MERRICK then said:

He should vote against the amendment for a very plain reason. He thought it wisest and best to adhere, as closely as possible, to the language of the old Constitution.

The preamble reported by the committee was as near to the language of the old Constitution, as it well could be. It was abridged by leaving out two or three words, but the substance remained the same. The two preambles, in substance, were identical.

He had never regarded the counties as independent political communities—he had never regarded them as a federative system; and the discussion of the principle upon which the political power of the State was to be apportioned, was inappropriate here.

Mr. McHENRY now renewed the demand for the previous question.

There was a second; and

The main question was ordered.

Mr. DASHIELL asked the yeas and nays;

Which were ordered, and having been taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Morgan, Hopewell, Chambers of Kent, Kent, Bond, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hodson, Bowie, Sprigg, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs and Kilgour.—17.

*Negative*—Messrs. Ricaud, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, Tuck, McCub-

bin, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Shower and Cockey—49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The question was then stated to be on the substitute amendment of Mr. PARKE.

Mr. JENIFER thought that the preamble as it stood, embraced every thing essential. We had lived under it sixty or seventy years without inconvenience, and could still continue to do so.

Mr. RANDALL desired, he said, to point out a substantial difference between the declaration which the Convention was now making, and that which our fathers made in '76. The amendment was in strict conformity with the powers under which this Convention was acting. The delegates of '76 made a Constitution. The delegates in this Convention were to make one, but only to recommend it to the people. The first was the declaration of the delegates; *this*, if ever it became a declaration, was to be the declaration of the people themselves. In adopting the amendment, the Convention would be following a safe precedent, that of the Constitution of the United States, and of the Constitution of several of the States.

Mr. R. then moved to amend the preamble of the report of the committee, by striking out all of said preamble, and substituting in lieu thereof, the following:

“We, the people of Maryland, grateful to Almighty God for our civil and religious liberty, in order to secure the perpetuity of these blessings, do declare.”

Mr. R. said, that the provision was similar to that which had been adopted in seven or eight of the Constitutions of the States. He thought the recognition of our gratitude to Almighty God, for the blessings he had bestowed upon us as a people, would come with a high and holy operation upon the public mind.

Mr. PARKE said, that the great object of his amendment, was to acknowledge our gratitude to Almighty God for the signal blessings which he had bestowed upon us, and to use the words, “we the people,” in connection with the declaration of rights. To ensure the success of that object, he was willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Randall.) The law which called this Convention together, got its vitality by the will of the people. The Constitution which this Convention might make, could receive its vitality only in the same way. And when the members of this Convention were in their graves, this declaration would still stand as the declaration of the people.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER now offered his substitute for the preamble, as follows:

“We, the people of the State of Maryland, by our delegates in Convention assembled at the city of Annapolis, taking into our most serious con-