

Mr. JOHNSON. I will adhere to it as a substitute; because I am sure then that the vote must be taken upon it first, and that is my sole object.

Mr. JENIFER then offered his amendment as an amendment to the substitute, as follows:

"*Provided*, where a county has but two delegates it shall not be divided into districts."

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. Is it in order to offer a substitute to the substitute?

The PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. BRENT. I have only to say that while I am willing to vote for districting the State according to population, I cannot vote for it upon the present basis. I think this whole subject had better be postponed until another day. I therefore move an adjournment.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. It is too late an hour to entertain this question, but my reasons for being opposed to this system, I desire to express to this body in a very brief manner. I hold, in the first place, that it is impossible for this Convention to district the State of Maryland. You may have what maps you please, to lay before this body, but it is impossible to go into the counties and lay off the territories by metes and bounds, so as to ascertain the districts. There will have to be a commissioner in each of the counties to lay off the districts to lay them off by running the lines. My objection to this system is this; that it will interfere with the elective franchise in the counties, and for this reason. On the same day of election, when the people will be called upon to vote for members of the legislature, the Governor is to be elected, the levy courts of the counties and other elections in which the county is interested. He may have a residence in one district to vote for a member of the legislature, but he may have to go to a different place to vote for the Governor or members of the levy court. The same thing occurs in regard to the city of Baltimore. If you undertake to district that city, you will perpetrate upon it the greatest injustice ever committed. Upon the laboring classes, who are constantly changing their homes, you will inflict a great evil, one to which I never can consent. I believe this body has made up its mind, and I have no disposition to keep the question open. I move the previous question.

The demand for the previous question was unanimously seconded, and the main question was ordered to be now put, viz:

Will the Convention agree to the amendment of Mr. JENIFER, to the substitute of Mr. JOHNSON?

Mr. JENIFER moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays;

Which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Bond, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Dickinson, Colston, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson,

Goldsborough, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Davis, Kilgour and Waters—40.

*Negative*—Messrs. Donaldson, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd Sherwood, of Talbot, John Dennis, Hicks, Eccleston, Phelps, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer George, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—54.

So the amendment was rejected

Mr. BLAKISTONE gave notice that he should move to reconsider the vote of the Convention just taken on said amendment.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the substitute offered by Mr. JOHNSON, for the amendment proposed by Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent.

Mr. BROWN moved for a division of the question on the motion to strike out and insert.

The question was therefore first stated to be upon the motion to strike out.

Mr. BROWN moved the question be taken by yeas and nays;

And being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Donaldson, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—53.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Bond, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Fiery, Davis, Kilgour, Waters and Smith—43.

So the Convention agreed to strike out.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment as offered by Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. MERRICK moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays;

Which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Bond, Brent, of Charles, Merrick,