

Mr. NEILL said he should then feel himself constrained, if the amendment of the gentleman from Kent, [Mr. Chambers,] should be brought to a direct question, to vote against it.

Mr. NEILL felt himself compelled, under the circumstances, to vote against the proposition of the gentleman from Kent. As one of the representatives of Frederick county, he was not disposed to give Baltimore more representatives than she was justly entitled to. He was prepared to increase the representation of the largest counties in proportion to the increase of their population as exhibited by the new census. The gentleman from Kent had declined to modify his proposition, and he, [Mr. N.] could not vote for it as now presented. He thought it objectionable that the committee should come before the House with these isolated propositions, instead of bringing forward some general proposition. The amendment of the gentleman from Kent was calculated to win the large counties; but such isolated propositions did not embody the general sentiment of the State. He was therefore compelled to give his vote against it.

Mr. CHAMBERS could not agree with the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Neill,) whose proposition related to a subject not at all involved in the amendment now before us and in regard to which not a word of discussion had been had.

He certainly understood his amendment as the precise principle of the Washington county platform. It looked to no particular limitation of number for the larger counties, nor to any principle on which these numbers were to be based, but solely to the equality in the delegation of the largest county and the city. If one was increased, the other would be, and there was nothing in this to commit any one to such increase in the counties or against it.

Mr. BROWN withdrew his motion. He was of opinion that whatever was the intention of the gentleman who introduced this amendment, the effect would be to array Baltimore city against the counties, or, *vice versa*, the counties against Baltimore. He believed that the greatest part of the delegates from Western Maryland were committed, when they came here, to give Baltimore a representation equal to the largest counties of the State.

The amendment of the gentleman from Kent therefore decided nothing. It settled no principle but that Baltimore shall be limited in the number of her delegates to the representation of the largest counties. He referred to the original position of the counties, and asked if it was intended that they should be kept in the nursery for ever. He alluded to the seventeen who had voted for the basis of population, and stated that they embraced more than half the representation of the freemen of the State. If Western Maryland did not exhibit some energy, and throw off the shackles which bound her, he should lose all his respect for her. He hoped the gentleman from Kent would not consume any more of the time of the House by discussing abstractions. The proposition which had now been offered, he could not think quite germane to the subject. The resolu-

tions from the Committee contained two great general principles, while the amendment of the gentleman from Kent is confined to a single proposition; and if it should be adopted, what would have been effected by its adoption? He concluded with protesting against any further waste of time; he was desirous to make a Constitution—to go home and to save the money of the people.

Mr. CHAMBERS now renewed the motion that the Convention resolve itself into committee of the whole, for the purpose of taking up the subject.

Some conversation followed on a point of order, between Messrs. BUCHANAN, CHAMBERS, JENIFER and the PRESIDENT.

After which,

Mr. BROWN enquired of the Chair, whether a motion to lay the proposition on the table was in order, pending a motion to go into committee?

The PRESIDENT stated that that motion was in order, and would take precedence over the motion to go into committee.

Mr. BROWN moved that the whole subject be laid on the table, and asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. HARBINE was proceeding to speak, when,

The PRESIDENT interposed and said that no debate could be entertained on a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. HARBINE. I was only going to remark that I hoped the motion to lay the whole subject on the table would be agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I have been adverted to, I should like to explain the motion that I made, and I hope that the gentleman from Carroll, (Mr. Brown,) will withdraw his motion to enable me to do so.

Mr. BROWN. I will withdraw for that purpose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK said, he wished to place himself right in reference to the motion made by him, to lay the whole subject on the table. He was far from being opposed to a thorough discussion of this question, or of giving his vote upon it, when it should come up in some distinct and tangible form; but in its present shape, being a mere abstract proposition from which no practical result was likely to be deduced, he thought it a mere waste of the time of the Convention and of the people. He wished the matter sent back to the committee for some definite and practical report; or that failing to agree upon any basis of settlement, they might be discharged by the House. He, therefore, moved to lay the whole subject on the table.

The question then being on the motion to lay the whole subject on the table,

The yeas and nays were called and ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Sellman, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Dickinson, Colston, Miller, Me-Lane, Spencer, George, Wright, Shriver, Gaiter, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson,