

with the clerks of their counties, and would allow whatever the law would permit. It was impossible for this Convention to fix the salaries, and it must be left to the Legislature. He had no intention of imputing fraud upon the clerks now in office; for the fee bill was so drawn up that it was susceptible of various constructions, and there was undoubtedly an honest difference of opinion among those who were in the different offices, upon the construction.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER demanded the yeas and nays,

Which were ordered,
And being taken,

Resulted, yeas 92; nays 48—as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Lee, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Tuck, Grason, George, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, and Parke—22.

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Brent, of Charles, Jenifer, Howard, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Goldsborough, Phelps, McCullough, Miller, Bowie, Sprigg, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Johnson, Gaither, Annan, McHenry, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Waters, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Shower, Cockey and Brown—48.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

The question again recurred on the adoption of the amendment as offered by Mr. FITZPATRICK and amended on the motion of Mr. RIDGELY.

Mr. HOWARD moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays,

Which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Morgan, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Howard, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Grason, George, McMaster, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Annan, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Cockey, and Brown—33.

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Lee, Mitchell, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Bond, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Phelps, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Spencer, Wright, Dirickson, Fooks, Jacobs, Gaither, McHenry, Thawley, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Waters, Smith, Parke and Shower—37.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved to amend the twentieth section by striking out after the word "until" in the twelfth line, to the end of said section, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The general election next thereafter for del-

egates to the General Assembly, when a register shall be elected to fill such vacancy."

Determined in the affirmative.

The twentieth section was then adopted as amended.

Mr. MERRICK moved to amend the report of the committee by inserting as the twenty-first section thereof, the following:

"The legislature shall at its first session after the adoption of this Constitution adopt some simple and uniform system of charges in the offices of clerks of courts and registers of wills in the counties of this State and the city of Baltimore, and for the collection thereof, and for the allowances and payment to said officers respectively, of fixed annual salaries, not to exceed two thousand dollars, and such additional allowances as the local authorities may judge necessary and proper with reference to the amount of business to be done for the compensation of assistants."

Mr. BOWIE moved to amend said amendment by striking out the words "two thousand," and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five hundred."

Mr. SPENCER I ask a division of the question on the motion to strike out and insert. I do not desire to fix any sum. I wish the Legislature to have the whole matter before them, and to fix the salaries of these officers. If you say their salary shall not exceed \$2,500, the effect will be that the Legislature will take this amount as a standard by which to fix the salaries. Therefore I do not wish to have any indication of this kind.

Mr. RIDGELY. I will be glad if the gentleman will withdraw his call for a division, because it embarrasses some of us in our votes. Some of us are willing to insert \$2,500, but are not disposed to strike out the sum named in the section, so as to leave the subject to the Legislature. The division of the question thus embarrasses me.

Mr. SPENCER. I will gratify the gentleman and withdraw my call for a division of the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. There is, in my judgment, a very mischievous proposition on the face of the section offered by the gentleman from Charles, in this particular. We are transferring a sort of legislative power, the authority to fix salaries for the whole State, to the local authorities—not exactly the salaries, but we are authorizing the local authorities to give what is called additional compensation, and to provide what shall be, as I understand it, the compensation for their subordinates. We are about to throw open the election of these various officers to the people. The clerks and registers are to be elected. They will be nominated by the different parties—it may or may not be so—to be elected when the Governor is to be elected, and they are to run on one and the same ticket with officers of the county who are styled local authority.

One is to aid and assist the other. They will have almost the same sympathies, predilections, and animosities, and will come into office with the same feelings. They will be almost one body, one and the same corporation, I may say, elected under the same influences. If you give the pow-