

voted here again and again, and almost every member had presented some proposition. He would like to see the sense of the Convention on the pending proposition. He knew there was a difficulty in the minds of many gentlemen on the subject; some, he knew, would vote more liberally for Baltimore city if they thought that the district system would prevail, whilst there were others would also do so if every ten years the question should be taken before the people upon having another Convention. Every gentleman did not vote as if he had the whole programme before him. He knew that there was a difficulty in reference to the small counties, but if some settled principle could be established relative to them, there would not, he took it for granted, be any trouble in regulating Baltimore city.

Mr. SPENCER moved that the Convention adjourn.

Mr. SHRIVER moved for a division of the question upon the first branch of said amendment, down to the "proviso" in the 22d line.

Mr. STEPHENSON renewed the notice of his intention to move a reconsideration of the amendment offered by him on the 28th instant, and rejected by the Convention, as an amendment to the 3d section.

Mr. THOMAS demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered and taken, and resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Blakistone, Hopewell, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Kent, Sellman, Bond, Howard Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Colston, John Dennis, Crisfield, Hicks, Hodson, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, and Brown—43.

Negative—Messrs. Morgan, Ricaud, Mitchell, Donaldson, Randall, Weems, Dalrymple, Lloyd, James U. Dennis, Eccleston, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, McCubbin, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, McHenry, Magraw, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, and Cockey—33.

So the Convention accordingly adjourned until to-morrow morning 10 o'clock.

DEFERRED DEBATE.

Speech of Mr. PRESSTMAN, in Convention, March 25th and 26th, on the Representation question.

TUESDAY, March 25th, 1851.

Mr. PRESSTMAN desired, he said, to put himself, and other gentlemen in their true position, with regard to the imputation of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers) That gentleman

had illustrated, by his remarks, the trite adage, "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." He complains of the action of certain gentlemen who have seen proper under the impression that some concert on the part of the friends of Reform could alone secure any liberal basis of representation, that they have forestalled the judgment of this body by arrangements and binding obligations made outside of the Convention, by which the majority of the members had determined to pass a particular measure. Before meeting that view, which was erroneous and without foundation in fact, he would simply remind the distinguished gentleman that by his own admissions he was a member, and took an active part in the Whig caucus, (called as such,) which led to the organization of this Convention. But while confessing this, he said would persuade us that there is a difference between a caucus for such a purpose and a caucus looking to the adoption of articles in the Constitution. It so happens that no gentleman's name was presented in connection with the Presidency of this body, who did not command by his integrity, and by reason of his qualifications, the entire respect of every member of this Convention for that distinguished position. It was not on personal grounds that the protracted struggle which was carried on through two weeks of our session, was sustained. It would have been an unworthy effort which the people of Maryland would have most justly rebuked. The influence which the presiding officer was supposed to exert in the formation of committees more or less favorable to certain great measures, upon which the sentiment of this Convention is divided, was the most prominent, if not the only defence by which the delay could be justified. If this be true, the gentleman will recollect that the force of his example once set cannot be diminished by his precepts now. But, sir, how stand the facts in reference to this alleged caucus arrangement? The gentleman from Kent had, he would undertake to say, no authority for his assertion. That a majority of this body had agreed in caucus upon any proposition which it was intended should be carried through this Convention.

Mr. CHAMBERS remarked, that he had merely based his remarks upon the assertion of the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard.)

Mr. PRESSTMAN would endeavor to show, that the gentleman had spoken with a great deal of freedom with regard to the action of others, without fully knowing or appreciating the grounds upon which they stood. Had it not been evident that there was not a majority here who had presented any plan which they could say they have adopted? This was a sufficient answer to the allegation.

It is equally evident that the balance of power is in the hands of a small number of gentlemen in this Convention, who may be said to occupy the middle ground. They must be conciliated. This has been the effort of the friends of compromise. In no other spirit was any Constitution