

Mr. JOHNSON complied, and withdrew the demand for the previous question.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, made some remarks, which will be published hereafter.

Mr THOMAS. I shall vote for the motion to reconsider. I stand on the record voting with some of my colleagues for districting the city of Baltimore. I do not speak for others, but I never intended to give it as a substantive independent vote. I voted for it because I intended afterwards to append to it a proposition districting the whole State. When the proposition is reconsidered, I shall move, with the concurrence of my colleague, the proposition which I withdrew this morning. It will bring the House to a vote, and we can then see whether a majority are for districting the counties and the city of Baltimore. If they are, we can put them together, and they can vote against districting either, if separated.

Mr. BOWIE. It is a mere delusion.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman may so consider it, but I differ with him very materially.

The question was then taken on the motion of Mr. McHENRY, to reconsider the vote of the Convention adopting the first branch of the amendment;

And it was agreed to.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON withdrew it.

Mr. THOMAS then offered the following as a substitute for the proposition of Mr. CHAMBERS:

"In order that each and every portion of the State may be fairly represented, and its various interests protected in the Legislature, for the purpose of electing delegates therein, the city of Baltimore and each county in the State shall be divided into separate election districts of compact, contiguous territory, in the manner hereafter to be provided in this Constitution; the qualified voters in each of which districts shall, at the time and in the manner in which delegates are chosen, elect one delegate, who has, for one year next before his election, been a resident of the district from which he shall be elected; and the residence in a district, requisite to give a right of suffrage, shall be six months next preceding the election, but in case any voter otherwise qualified, shall have less than six months residence in the district of his then residence, he shall not thereby lose his right to vote in the district in which he may have resided for six months next preceding his removal."

Mr. THOMAS. I submit this amendment with a view to ascertain the sentiment of the House. I do not wish to dictate to any body, and if I did I could not do it. I merely desire a vote on the proposition, and then gentlemen can take it into their own hands. My colleagues are unanimously in favor of the proposition, and I think the gentlemen from Washington are, so far as I can judge. I call the previous question.

Mr. PHELPS moved that the Convention do now adjourn;

Which motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, said that he intended to ask for a division of the substitute, so as to

have a vote on districting the city of Baltimore.

Mr. THOMAS modified his substitute, by making it read, "each county in the State and the city of Baltimore," instead of "the city of Baltimore and each county in the State."

Mr. TUCK. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Frederick offered his proposition in this way, that the city of Baltimore and the counties should be districted. He then called the previous question, and after he had done so, he changed his proposition by putting the counties before the city. Does not that change the proposition very materially, else why did he make the alteration? My point of order is, that the previous question does not apply, and that the gentleman from Kent is entitled to the floor.

The PRESIDENT. If the gentleman from Frederick changed his proposition after he moved the previous question, he had no right to make the change without waiving the demand for the previous question.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask consent to change it, and I rise for the purpose of putting myself right. Are we not a Convention of grave old men, forming a Constitution? I think we are. Well, I am only going to say this: Does any gentleman suppose that by any possible argument, that any of us can make, surrounded as I am by intelligent gentlemen, we can prevent an expression of the views of this House. I desire a vote on the proposition to district the counties and the city of Baltimore. If there is a majority against the combined proposition, they can say so. I will quarrel with no one for differing with me. I assure gentlemen I will show no rebellious spirit against the determination of this majority. I shall vote for the Constitution, and submit it to my people to decide whether Baltimore is or is not to be singly districted.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent. I ask the gentleman whether his morning, I was not arrested in the middle of an argument by the distinct concession that we should take a vote, so far as the question was concerned, first, on districting the city of Baltimore, then on the number of districts, then on the arrangement of the districts, and then on districting the counties?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I ask if this alteration was not to defeat that very object?

Mr. THOMAS. I will explain. My friend from Frederick moved a proposition as an amendment to that of the gentleman from Kent. I desired long ago to get the sense of the House, and to see whether it was in favor of districting the city of Baltimore alone, or the city of Baltimore and the counties combined. I appeal to my colleague to say whether we would not get into an awkward dilemma, and travel the circle round, if we took up the proposition of the gentleman from Kent and voted for it and then voted upon the proposition of my colleague? He said that he did not apprehend that, for he believed that a majority of this House was going for both propositions. Then I yielded, of course, to the gentleman from Kent. But, said my colleague, if contrary to my expectations, a majority shall