

The yeas and nays (which had heretofore been ordered) were taken and resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Dickinson, Colston, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, and Brown—35.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jeifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Bowling, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Thawley, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Waters, and Smith—41.

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

Mr. SPENCER then moved to recommit the report to the committee on representation, with instructions to "report a basis of representation in some fair principle of compromise."

Mr. SPENCER said, he would make no speech, unless any gentleman should attack his motion. In that case, he should feel himself called on to defend it. He had submitted it, because it appeared to him to be proper, and also, because he believed it would have had the endorsement of a large majority of the Convention.

Mr. SCHLEY was of opinion that this proposition would not at all facilitate the action of the Committee, because it had been represented that the Committee cannot agree upon any report, until the House shall come to a vote on the resolutions. He did not look on these resolutions as mere abstractions. They are intended to evoke an expression of the opinion of the Convention. For instance, if the second resolution be passed, it will be the deliberately expressed opinion of the House, that the popular basis will not be adopted. The gentleman from Queen Anne's now proposes an instruction to the Committee to report the plan of a compromise, but it omits to specify what kind of compromise. Now he, (Mr. S.,) was ready, at once, to vote on the second resolution which had been reported. He was prepared when he came to the Convention; the subject had been well discussed among the people, and he had been instructed by the county of Washington. That county he described as opposed to representation according to population, and that he would prefer the Constitution as it is, to the adoption of that basis. He was not so well prepared to vote on the other resolution; on that he desired the light of a further discussion. But he could not see the propriety of sending the resolutions back to the Committee, when the Committee say that they cannot agree. What did the gentleman from Queen Anne's mean by a fair compromise? Would the adoption of the popular basis in the counties, and restricting the city of Baltimore, to the representation of the largest county, for which he, (Mr. S.,) would be willing to vote, be regarded as such by that gentleman? If the resolutions should be re-

committed with this instruction to report a fair compromise, what in the Committee might be regarded as fair, might not be so considered in the House. The Committee certainly *would not* report the popular basis—that point would have been settled.

It had been said that this Convention is doing nothing, idling away its time, and spending the people's money. This was not so, and he repudiated the charge as unworthy of a moment's consideration. The Convention has been, and is busily employed in its laborious and difficult work, and now that these resolutions are before us why should we procrastinate? Why should we delay when there is work before the Convention, as the gentleman from Frederick has given notice that he will not abandon his position without a stern and steady fight. Discussion must take place now or hereafter. He thought it better that it should begin now, and that the Committee should be instructed by a vote of the House. He wished that there should be ample discussion, and he would not stop it by calling for the previous question. He would not shut out a single gentleman, who desired to participate in debate, although the gentleman from Baltimore, (Mr. BRENT,) had ridiculed the idea of the whole hundred and three members of the Convention being permitted to take part in the debate. Whilst he would restrict debate within proper limits, he would not deny to any member the exercise of his right to proclaim and enforce his views.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, said that he was for a postponement of the subject of representation, as he had always been, and he still thought that all the constitutional safeguards which were just and proper, should be adjusted before we act upon this, the greatest of all questions.

But he protested against the course of the anti-reformers, who have availed themselves of this occasion to lay down their platforms in advance of the main question; still he hoped the speeches already made by anti-reformers, might be suffered to go before the public for what they were worth, and that the reformers in this body would forbear until the question came up at a proper time on its merits.

He was not willing to discuss the question now although he disclaimed any disposition to gag other gentlemen. In reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Washington Co., (Mr. SCHLEY,) he, (Mr. BRENT,) would reiterate what he had said before, denying that we were to discuss every question until every member had spoken. He insisted that no true reformer should desire to hear one hundred and three members on every question that might be started, because, at that rate, it would take several years to finish our labors, and such procrastination would effectually kill the present reform movement.

Members must take their chances in securing the floor, and after a reasonable debate has been allowed, it should be stopped by the previous question. Look at the long and protracted debate which has happened on the elective franchise. He meant no disrespect, but for more