

in her power to call a Convention to frame a new Constitution, although every man in all the Counties of Maryland may vote against it. He would repeat, that after ten years, and for all time to come, if this proposition prevail, Baltimore herself, at her own will and pleasure can force a Convention in direct opposition to the will of the people of every other portion of Maryland.

Mr. P. said, he would appeal to gentlemen here, representing the agricultural portion of the State, and ask whether they were prepared to yield up, without a struggle, this principle to the city of Baltimore, which lay at the very foundation of the sovereignties of the counties themselves? For one he would not, and could not consent to it. Baltimore had already been awarded by this Convention, much increased political power. The counties, and especially the section of the State from whence he came, on the contrary was much weakened in the popular branch of the General Assembly, and he was unwilling to see the counties to come still more prostrate. Self-preservation was the first law of nature, and he cautioned gentlemen to pause, and reflect before they traveled farther in this direction.

Again Mr. President, if this amendment prevail, the Constitution cannot be altered, changed, or modified in the slightest degree, without the expense of a Convention. However important it may be to alter or amend a single section, it cannot be done, without a Convention; and sir, who can doubt that when this government is put in operation, that some modification or alterations in some of its provisions, will be deemed right and proper; and yet it cannot be done. Like the laws of the Medes and Persians it will be unchangeable, and must endure forever, unless a Convention be called to change it. Mr. P. said, he hoped never in his life time, to witness another Convention, in Maryland. He was prepared to endure much political evil before he would consent to it. Conventions, and conventional reform, Mr. President, are beautiful things to talk about, and for the declamation of young and aspiring politicians. Like the little book that John eat, "it is sweet in the mouth, but bitter, very bitter in the belly." At all events he believed if now called upon, this would be the judgment of the people of Maryland. The long and tedious labors in these Halls, he was persuaded had dampened much the ardor of many gentlemen here, as well as elsewhere. Conventional reform is not now regarded as the only panacea for all the ills of life, but by some, the reverse of this proposition might, and doubtless would be deemed true. For the reasons above feebly and imperfectly expressed, he should vote against the proposition of his friend from Baltimore, and hoped it might not pass.

Mr. BRENT, of Balt city, demanded the yeas and nays,

Which were ordered,

And being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Howard, Buchanan, Welch, Shriver, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson,

Gwinn, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Neill, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Fitzpatrick, Shower, Cockey and Brown—19.

*Negative*.—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sollers, Ridgely, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Spencer, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Thomas, Annan, Stephenson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer and Smith—47.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the report offered by Mr. Fitzpatrick, as a substitute for the one offered by Mr. Sollers, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BROWN moved to amend the substitute by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The members of which Convention shall be elected by the city of Baltimore and the counties of the State, in proportion to their respective representation in the House of Delegates and Senate of Maryland, at the time the Convention shall be called."

Mr. ROWIE observed that there was not the slightest difference between this proposition and that which had just been voted down, except only that it was made the duty of the Legislature to act upon the question of calling a Convention or not, as to them might seem right. Mr. B., next alluded to the character of the proposition of the gentlemen from Baltimore city, (Mr. BRENT,) and then proceeded to deprecate the calling of a Convention every ten years, as unnecessary, expensive, and not at all required. He hoped that if this Convention made a Constitution acceptable to the people, it would last for ages; but he could not give it his vote, or sanction that it should be subject to such perpetual changes. He, therefore, could not support the substitute of the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Brent.)

Mr. GWINN remarked, in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Prince George's. [Mr. Bowie.] that he certainly could not support the amendment. The basis of the present apportionment was adopted in view of the present arrangement of population. Now, in the course of the next ten years, it was highly probable that the relative population of the city and counties might essentially vary. It did not seem fair or right to take a basis which would control another Convention, and apply to a very different state of circumstances.

Mr. BROWN said that he proposed to amend the substitute, in order to meet the views of gentlemen on all sides.

Mr. GWINN replied that it did not meet his views; for, if the Constitution could not be changed unless by a Convention, as agreed upon, then the basis must stand precisely as it did at present.