patriotism of the separate districts, and as a consequence, a majority was found to pass the compromise measures. Already the larger and more populous counties of the State, were looking to representation on this floor in a mass, the whole delegation in these quarters making a majority, and they would come imbued with whatever infatuation might pervade the great mass. If they should elect them by districts, the delegations would be composed of men of intelligence, and alive to the interests of the State, and the minority would be safe. Thus the Legislature of the State, would be wisely conducted. He now appealed, upon that view of the subject, to the friends of the small counties, to rally to this measure, for the salvation of the great interests of the small counties

Mr. McHENRY oserved:

That he represented, in part, one of the counties entitled, under the new appointment, to three members of the Legislature, and if any species of districting could be felt obnoxious by his county, it would be the one proposed by the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Johnson.) He had voted for every *bona fide* proposition to divide the whole State into single districts, which had been offered, and for several which he did not believe to be *bona fide*, and he would again vote for any such proposition offered in good faith. But for a proposition of this kind, dividing the counties so unequally, (which he was bound to believe, as the gentleman had so testified, was not *intended* to promote party interests,) he could not vote at all. There was no kind of equity in a proposition which provided that a certain portion of a county should be represented by two members, and another portion by one member. It would be violating every principle, upon which the district system is based, and adopting an entirely arbitrary rule upon this subject, which would be received with universal disapprobation throughout the State, and particularly by those counties which would have two representatives on one side and one on the other; thus being liable to a species of gerrymandering surpassing in unfairness, any heretofore known. He preferred the single district system to the general ticket system, but would consent to no partial, half-way measure, sure to cause great dissatisfaction and to be unequal and oppressive in its application.

Mr. JOHNSON thought it was very easy for any man who did not wish to vote for his proposition to vote against it. He had been too much in parliamentary bodies not to know that. He had come here as a reformer, and did not wish to benefit one party or the other. He desired to say to gentlemen here that if they supposed they had the whole thing into their own hands by his vote, he would bring the question directly to them, and he took it for granted there was a great moral sentiment here, and a great many Democrats voted for it upon principle, high, elevated, immaculate principle. By this proposition, he intended to bring the question to a test.

Mr. CHANDLER moved that the Convention do now adjourn, which motion was not agreed to.

The question being on the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. DENT moved the previous question, which was seconded.

Mr. BOWIE moved for a division of the question upon the amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON demanded the yeas and nays on the apoption of his amendment,

Which were ordered,

And being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Lee, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Weems, Dalrymple, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Bowling, Fooks, Johnson, Gaither, Annan, Fiery, Neil, John Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Waters and Smith—27.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Chambers, of Kent, Kent, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Constable, Chamberlain, of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Spriggs, McCubbin, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Schley, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Showers, Cockey and Brown—65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOWIE then offered the following as an independent proposition.

"The Legislature shall 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. JOHNSON. That proposition has been voted down four times already.

Mr. BOWIE. Not in that form. Entirely different, I assure you.

Mr. JOHNSON. I move this as a substitue, and make a pledge that it is the very best one I shall offer.

Mr. BOWIE. You said that before.

Mr. JOHNSON. So I did, but I repeat it now I shall not offer another, nor open my lips upon the subject again. If my friend from Prince George lingers upon the fallacious hope that Baltimore city is to be divided, that hope should have been banished a week ago, because I told him it could not be done.

The substitute of Mr. JOHNSON was then read as follows:

"The Legislature at its first session after the adoption of this Constitution, shall provide by law for laying off and dividing the city of Baltimore into five represenative districts of contiguous wards, and of as nearly equal population as convenient, each of which districts shall elect two members to the House of Delegates. The Leg