

lature to elect a United States Senator, in 1842, Mr. C. did not know that the gentleman of Queen Anne's, (Mr. S.,) ever condemned that failure. Indeed, he supposed—and he thought he had some reason for the supposition—that the gentleman from Queen Anne's did not condemn that failure. The House of Delegates had a majority who were of the political faith of the gentleman, but that majority did not prefer that gentleman for that high station; and Mr. C. had never heard, that the gentleman was dissatisfied at the refusal of the Senate to go into the election. But whether that gentleman condemned or not, it was very certain the Senate was sustained by public sentiment, and at the next election, the majority of the House was of the same party with the Senate, and has been ever since.

Mr. SPENCER said the gentleman from Somerset, in his reference to the session of 1842, had mistaken the facts. There was no gentleman on his, (Mr. Spencer's,) side, who did not regret the failure to elect a United States Senator at that time. The lower house was democratic, and voted to go into the election, but the Senate refused. He had always, privately and before the people, denounced the course of the Senate on that occasion.

Mr. CRISFIELD said his memory was not remarkable for accuracy; but he had supposed the facts to be as he had stated them.

Mr. SPENCER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

WEDNESDAY, March 19th, 1851.

The Convention met at ten o'clock.

Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. GRIFFITH.

The roll was called, and a quorum being present, the journal of yesterday was read and approved.

THE COMMITTEE CLERKS.

Mr. HICKS, in pursuance of the notice he had yesterday given, moved a reconsideration of the vote of the Convention on the resolution heretofore adopted, dispensing with the services of certain committee clerks.

The question was stated to be on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HICKS said he presumed it would be a useless consumption of time to say anything in support of this motion. The members of the Convention had had the subject in their minds, and were no doubt prepared to do justice towards a number of individuals here, who could not make their own defence. He was sure that it was unnecessary for him to urge the propriety of the reconsideration, for he believed it was conceded on all hands, that the vote should be reconsidered, in order to do justice towards individuals to whom injustice would otherwise be inevitably done. He hoped that the motion would prevail. The Convention could then take such action as it might think proper.

The PRESIDENT, (*pro tem.*) stated the question, and the negative vote apparently prevailing;

Mr. HICKS desired to say one additional word. He earnestly requested gentlemen to reflect upon what they had done. The Convention, from the earliest period of its session, had been constantly in the habit of reconsidering votes upon subject-matters which had been passed upon. Surely no question could be more deserving of the calm judgment and considerate action of the Convention than this. It concerned individuals—highly respectable gentlemen, for such he knew them to be—whose characters had been implicated by the action of this body—not designedly, but not the less certainly. And he was sure that there was sufficient good feeling here to prevent injury being done to any individual in the State of Maryland, however humble his position might be. It was with this view that he had moved the reconsideration. He was no more interested in the matter than any other member of the Convention. The only interest that he had was to see justice done all. It was not a mere matter of dollars and cents to these individuals. It was a matter of character and feeling; and he was sure that every gentleman who regarded the subject in this light would cheerfully vote to reconsider—to re-instate these gentlemen—to put them upon an equal footing with their fellows in this body—and then to take such further action as might seem right and proper.

Mr. GWINN said, he thought that the Convention ought to retrace the steps it had taken with reference to the committee clerks. He was aware that the change had been made upon grounds of economy—but it had been construed as a public censure—and in justice to them such an imputation ought to be refuted by the action of the Convention itself.

Mr. JENIFER said that he had voted against discharging the clerks; but as the committee had reported that there was no business sufficient for their occupation, and as the act had been done, he could not see that any wrong had been committed whatever. No imputation was intended by the Convention, and it had so declared. Although he voted against discharging these clerks, inasmuch as the Convention had thought proper to do so, and as he believed there was not sufficient business to occupy them, he should vote against the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HICKS said:

That his friend from Charles, (Mr. Jenifer,) was correct in saying that no reflection was designed to be cast on the clerks who had been discharged. He hoped he was not understood as imputing to the Convention any such motive. On the contrary, he had said, that he believed the Convention had no such design. But he would inquire whether it did not in fact reflect upon these individuals?

Now, it was least in his thoughts, to charge this honorable body with a design to reflect, as he had before remarked, upon the humblest individual in the State of Maryland; but did not this seem to be a reflection upon the clerks who were discharged? Was it not an invidious distinction