

the proposition of the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Johnson,) be referred to a committee. If the committee be appointed, does it exclude the reference of any other subject-matters but these propositions? Is it not in order to amend the motion by moving that the committee be instructed to report the articles I have read? The motion is to refer specific proposition to a committee. Have I not the right according to parliamentary law, to amend the motion by moving to incorporate in the reference certain other subject-matters?

The PRESIDENT. The committee has not yet been appointed. If the committee is appointed, it will then be competent to give instructions to the committee as to the nature of its report.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to know whether another motion cannot be substituted—that we go into committee of the whole?

The PRESIDENT. This is a privileged question; and it is not debateable.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to have referred the proposition which I moved some time ago; that it might also go the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I will modify my proposition so as to embrace the proposition referred to by my colleague.

The question was then stated to be on the motion of Mr. THOMAS to refer these various propositions to a committee.

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

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw; Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Cockey, and Brown—38.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pre'st., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Bond, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Howard, J. Dennis, J. U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Grason, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson, Smith, Parke, and Shower—58.

The question was then stated to be on the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON. My original proposition was to district all the counties of the State, the smallest as well as the largest. I therefore prefer that a vote should be taken upon that proposition, with the proviso of my original proposition. In the event of that proposition failing, I will move the proposition which is in writing at the clerk's desk, as an amendment to the proposition of the gentleman from Kent. If these two are carried

or voted down, then the question will recur on the amendment of the gentleman from Kent.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent. I suggest whether the gentleman had not better make his proposition perfect, as he proposes it. I say so, because although it is not my proposition, nor is it perhaps one that I would adopt, as a matter of choice; understanding as I do, from gentlemen who better know the sense of the Convention than I do, that the proposition to district the city of Baltimore alone is not likely to obtain a majority, I mean to vote for the gentleman's proposition as the next best that I can get. I hope the gentleman will put his proposition in a perfect form.

Mr. JENIFER moved to amend the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON, by adding at the end thereof, the following:

“Provided where a county has but two delegates it shall not be divided into districts.”

Mr. TUCK. I cannot vote to divide my county into three districts. I do not believe that the people will be satisfied with the measure. I see no good that can result from it. I have said, and I say again, if gentlemen from the larger counties desire a division of their own counties, I shall not oppose it. Let them take the responsibility of the division. The division should not, in my judgment, give any district less than two members. But, I cannot see how the proposed division is to benefit the small counties. You make each district a separate political community, and probably will break up the harmony that should prevail in all the counties among the people in all sections.

Gentlemen say that such a mode of representation is the true republican doctrine. If it is done now upon this ground, we shall not be many years without representation according to population in all parts of the State. In view of the importance of the measure, and the sudden manner in which it has been presented, he would prefer to let things remain as they are for the present. Some of the counties are already small enough, and to make them smaller, as far as representation is concerned, can result in no present good, and may do harm now or hereafter.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it is very well known throughout this body, that the object my colleague is aiming at, has been one that I have felt a great deal of interest in, and covers the whole subject. I have made repeated appeals to gentlemen of this body, one now in my eye, (Mr. Chambers,) and the gentleman from the county of Charles, (Mr. Merrick,) to produce something like a concert and co-operation among us, with a view to lay off and divide the State into separate elective districts, for the choice of delegates to the Legislature. I am for that proposition now, but I am free to say that I am standing in a very awkward attitude to vote for it in the shape in which my colleague lays it before us.

The proposition of the gentleman from Kent, has prescribed boundary lines and divisions of districts to place upon the face of the Constitution, if it is adopted. The other proposition has more of these advantages. It is a mere abstract declaration that the State ought to be divided