

Mr. SPRIGG, when his name was called, also stated that he had paired off and could not vote on the question.

The question was then stated to be on agreeing to the substitute offered by Mr. THOMAS, in the following words:

"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, each county in the State and the city of Baltimore 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, moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays, which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Bell, Chandler, Ridgely, Fooks, Thomas, Johnson, Gaither, Annan, McHenry, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Brewer, Weber, Smith and Cockey—28.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Dent, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Howard, Buchanan, Welch, Lloyd, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Shriver, Sappington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore, Sherwood, of Baltimore, Prestman, Ware, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown—58.

So the Convention refused to adopt the substitute.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, then offered the following amendment as an independent proposition.

"That the Legislature at its first session after this Constitution shall proceed to lay off the several counties into as many election districts as they are respectively entitled to delegates in the General Assembly, one of which said delegates shall be elected in each of said districts; and shall also divide the city of Baltimore into ten districts of contiguous wards and as nearly as may be of equal population, and each of said districts shall be entitled to elect one delegate to the General Assembly."

Mr. C. stated that he would not vote for the first branch of the proposition. He offered it to bring both questions nakedly, distinctly, and individually before the House, and he would now do what he never expected to do. He would ask the previous question without the least intention to arrest debate, but simply to secure a vote upon this proposition independently. He should have them divided, and if any gentlemen could suggest a fairer mode, he would adopt it.

Mr. C. withdrew the previous question at the request of

Mr. PRESSTMAN who moved for a division of the question upon the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS remarked that he had stood in such a relation to this question that he barely wished to say that he could not vote for this proposition, and upon this ground; he could not agree that the Legislature should district the State of Maryland, and for the very obvious reason, that the delegates to the Legislature were to be elected in November, before the districts should be laid off, and they could not lay off districts for themselves. Gentlemen must understand that this was not an old Legislature, but a new one. But in any event, he would not part with this power from the Convention, to give it to the Legislature.

Mr. JOHNSON was in favor of districting the State, and he was unwilling, as a member of this Convention, and as a citizen of the State of Maryland, to suppose that he could not place sufficient integrity in the next Legislature, old or new, to divide this State into proper districts. He differed with his colleague upon this point. He regarded that there was as much honor in the Legislature as here. If the principle was right, this Convention should settle it; and if they had not the time to mature the details, they should not abandon it, but they should trust to those men whom the people would elect—honest and honorable men enough to fill their places in a different capacity and department—that of the Legislature. The principle was right or wrong. If it was right, he would be willing to stay here a month, for the purpose of settling it.

He was in favor of the proposition, and would vote for the entire motion, for he was for districting the entire State. His friend from Kent had given intimation of another proposition which he intended to submit, and he should go for that. He would also vote for the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Ridgely,) with this provision, that all those counties which had more than two delegates, should be divided, but no county with less than two, and instead of having ten districts in Baltimore city, he would have five, so that each district of that city would be equal to a small county.

Mr. BOWIE desired the house to understand the question, and to bring themselves, and all their minds, and all their votes, to one single concentrated point, and that was, whether they would district the State or not—whether they would strike out the counties, and have a new district representation on this floor. He had said, here-