

tofore, that this would lead necessarily to an extinction of the counties of the State, to an amalgamation of all the voters, and to a division in the districts, and would ultimately end in representation according to population in the Legislature. He would ask if the counties were not now districted, when compared with Baltimore city?

In that city that were 169,000 people in a mass. Could any one show him any other point in the whole of the State where there was a population of 169,000 who voted in a mass? It could not be found. The very highest was 41,000, which was the population of Frederick county, and where the general ticket system prevailed. Why did they not divide Baltimore city into districts of five or ten, or at least into as many as would make each of them equal to the largest county? If they would compare the number of voters in the counties with the number of voters in the city, they would find that there was no county in the State where the amount of voters exceeded the number of voters in any two or three wards in the city of Baltimore. Nature, if not their ancestors, had districted the counties—their ancestors were already districts of themselves, and they were small enough now, and when compared with the city of Baltimore, he would ask, in regard to the great principle which the distinguished gentleman from Frederick had so ably advocated, that minorities should be represented, he would ask him if he wished to reduce the minorities to a still smaller circle than they now occupied in the counties? Baltimore was one great whirlpool. They had little counties here and there, but in Baltimore there was a great circle of voters large enough to embrace many of the smaller ones.

Why should they not seize upon the idea, a philosophical one, and reduce that large circle into smaller circles? Then they would produce that equal justice which the people had a right to demand from the Constitution makers they had sent here, and not until then, would they have that equal justice. If they would carry out the principle which his friend from Frederick advocated, and in which, as he had before said, he fully concurred, they would then have substantial justice, but they never could obtain it until they districted Baltimore city, *solus*, as a solitary question. As for mingling this question with mere political questions, the idea was ridiculous, and never, in his opinion, ought it be tolerated in this State! He moved the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. PRESTMAN withdrew his motion for a division of the question upon the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, renewed the motion for a division of the question upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. Tuck,) decided that the amendment was not divisible.

Mr. CHAMBERS contended that the proposition was divisible, and appealed from the decision of the Chair, but withdrew the appeal.

The question was then stated to be on the adoption of the proposition submitted by Mr. CHAMBERS.

Mr. BROWN moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays, which being ordered, appeared as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jennifer, Bowling, Fooks, Johnson, Gaither, Annan, McHenry, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Weber and Smith—25.

*Negative*—Messrs. Morgan, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, McCubbin, Spencer, Grason, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Sappington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Prestman, Ware, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, then moved the following as an independent proposition, upon which he demanded the previous question:

"The Legislature shall at its first session proceed to divide the city of Baltimore into ten districts, to be composed of two contiguous wards each, and each of said districts shall elect one delegate to the General Assembly."

The previous question was seconded, and the main question ordered, viz. on the adoption of the proposition.

Mr. THOMAS 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, Weems, Dalrymple, Brent of Charles, Merrick, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Waters and Smith—40.

*Negative*—Messrs. Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Prestman, Ware, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON then moved the following as an independent proposition: