

pington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Kilgour, Ege, Cockey and Brown—46.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Randall, Crisfield, Bowie, McCubbin, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Gaither, Annan, Thawley, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Harbine, Davis, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith and Parke—28. So the amendment was agreed to.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment, as amended.

Some conversation followed on a point of order, [arising out of some confusion as to the state of the question.]

To obviate the difficulty in which the Convention had become involved—

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, moved a reconsideration of the vote by which the modified amendment of Mr. McHenry had been adopted.

Mr. THOMAS suggested that the object [which was to get at the judgment of the respective propositions of Messrs. Spencer and McHenry,] could be attained by a division of the question.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, assented and withdrew his motion to reconsider.

Mr. SOLLERS moved to amend said amendment by striking out the first branch thereof—being that portion of the amendment offered by Mr. SPENCER.

The question then recurred on the second branch of the said amendment.

Mr. SOLLERS moved to amend by adding at the end thereof, these words:

“Or making any appropriations therefor.”

The amendment was agreed to.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the second branch of said amendment, as amended.

Mr. THOMAS asked the yeas and nays,

Which were ordered, and

The question having been taken, the result was as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Sollers, Merrick, Welch, Chandler, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Constable, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, McMaster, Fooks, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Hardcastle, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour and Cockey—42.

Negative—Messrs. Bell, Ridgely, Lloyd, Colston, Crisfield, McCullough, Miller, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Harbine, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Ege and Brown—31.

So the second branch of the amendment, as amended, was adopted.

Mr. SPENCER then moved as a substitute for the amendment just adopted, the following:

“The legislature shall not hereafter appropri-

ate the public money, or pledge the public faith, or make loans or subscriptions to any association corporation or work of internal improvement; and they shall not use or appropriate the proceeds of the internal improvement companies, or of the State tax now levied, or which may hereafter be levied, to pay off the public debt, to any other purpose, until the interests and debt are fully paid.”

Mr. CRISFIELD gave notice that at the proper time, he should offer the following amendment:

Strike out after the word “dollars,” in the tenth line, to the word “the” in the thirteenth line, and insert:

“Nor shall the legislature hereafter create any debt, or pledge the credit of the State, except for the purpose of education, as hereinafter may be provided, to or for the use of any association or corporation, or for or on account of any work of internal improvement, but after the payment of the public debt as provided by law, the revenue which may accrue from the State's investments in works of internal improvement, may be appropriated to the improvement of existing, and the construction of additional works.”

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. SPENCER.

Pending the question on this amendment;

The Convention adjourned until to-morrow at ten o'clock.

DEFERRED DEBATE.

In Convention, Feb. 11, 1851.

Remarks of Mr. DASHIELL on his amendment to the preamble of the bill of rights, proposing to add the words “representing the counties and city of Baltimore.”

Mr. DASHIELL said:

That the gentleman from the city of Baltimore, (Mr. Gwinn,) desires to know what theory, he, (Mr. D.,) proposed to inculcate by the amendment he had offered. He would say, the amendment itself, developed his theory; and he was somewhat surprised at the inquiry. The remarks also which he had made at the introduction of his amendment gave a further and fuller exposition of the same. What further explanation the gentleman desired, he could not conjecture, unless he wished, at this time, to enter upon the discussion of the great question of representation. The amendment which he had proposed, contains nothing but a plain and notable fact, which he presumed the gentleman would not undertake to dispute or deny; and from that fact, but one true theory can be deduced, and all others are spurious. Now, the gentleman from the city of Baltimore, with a suspicious fear, seems to discover in the amendment, a phantom, and starts at it, as if it were his “evil genius.” Ah, Mr. President, truth, that mighty and faithful reality, is sometimes startling, and calculated to inflict much terror; and it is manifest the gentleman betrays much of its power working upon him, and evidently to his disquietude.

Mr. D. said, that he was aware that his amendment conflicted much with the fond notions of some, in regard to the question of representation,