The PRESIDENT. The question is to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, demanded the yeas and nays,

Which were ordered,

And being taken resulted, yeas 35, nays 37, as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Dorsey, Howard, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Lloyd, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Magraw, Nelson, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Fiery, Harbine, Brewer, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—35.

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Weems, Bond, Brent of Charles, Buchanan, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Brent of Baltimore city, Schley, John Newcomer, Davis, Waters and Smith—37.

So the Convention refused to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERS tendered his acknowledgments to the Convention for an act of justice, common justice, the opportunity of defending himself. I have, sir, said he, remained for the last three days a patient listener to this discussion. I have given my votes without assigning any reason for them. And now, the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) has undertaken to give reasons for votes made by me and others without the shadow of authority for so doing. He has not only charged us with the most palpable inconsistency, but has concluded by a motion, which, if successful, would have effectually sealed our lips and denied us the privilege of repudiating his imputation.

Mr. THOMAS explained that when the gentleman from Prince George's had disclaimed having used the argument, he had said, "true, you did not; but you were silent." This was in perfect harmony with what he had already said, that he had divided the members into two classes, one of which had used the argument and the other had remained silent.

Mr. CHAMBERS. When the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie,) was accused of inconsistency, he had replied that he had not used that argument. The answer of the gentleman from Frederick was, "you were silent." Now, if the silence of that gentleman was publicly charged as a sufficient ground on which to impute inconsistency, it will apply with equal force to the rest of us.

Mr. THOMAS said that he had never intended to say that every gentleman who had voted silently, had given his acquiescence to the argument used in open debate. He had divided those who were in favor of this proposition into two classes. One of them had used that argument and voted incompatibly with it. The other had remained silent.

Mr. C. No man here has a right to arraign my vote for inconsistency and above all in this case. I do not disclaim the influence of political feeling. When I perceive no other object to be effected by a measure but to benefit one political party and depress another, I will obey such an influence. I have for three days attentively heard all that has been urged in favor of this measure, and I do solemnly assert, that to my mind, there is no useful purpose to which it can possibly lead, unless it be found in putting out officers of one description of politics and putting in those of a different character, not a particle of advantage to the State either in getting better officers or in getting them at a smaller cost. When capital was to be made by the cry of "retrenchment," we heard it from one end of the State to the other, but when a question is presented of turning out one set to put in another, and gentlemen are appealed to, not to do this by increasing the charge on the treasury, why, "retrenchment is forgotten. What has become of "retrenchment" here and now? We are now advised to turn over to the Legislature "the poor duty" of assigning salaries. Yes, sir, these are the gentleman's words, "the poor duty of assigning the salary." In what, then, does retrenchment" consist? Is it in turning out one class of politicians who receive one hundred dollars and refusing to limit the Legislature as to the amount to be allowed those who are to supply their places? Now, sir, let us see whose votes are most consistent. We have officers who now perform their duty faithfully, and they receive one hundred dollars each as compensation. My desire is to retain them, while the gentleman, who goes for reform and retrenchment, proposes to substitute others. We proceed to vote, and I find myself out voted on the question of putting out the present incumbents. That vote, in my opinion, has the effect, and no other but this effect, to put out the present officers and put persons in who differ from them in politics. This being accomplished, we are called upon to fix their salaries. I say, if you will change the incumbents, do it without incurring additional expense. The existing officers receive one hundred dollars, and I say, let those who are to succeed receive the same and no more. Is there, I ask, sir, any inconsistency in this? I think not. It strikes me, all that is on the other side of the house, an ultra inconsistency, it seems to me, with all notions of retrenchment. The gentleman from Frederick has charged my friend from Washington, (Mr. Schley,) with inconsistency in first expressing in a speech his belief that competent officers ought to receive a larger compensation than one hundred dollars, and then voting to restrict the Legislature to the present salary Now, what may my friend from Washington retort? "You, sir, have made, not one speech only, but fully half a dozen, to prove that 'gentlemen of the highest qualifications could be had for a low salary, and that it would be an unnecessary charge to the State to allow a high one, and if you were a member of the Legislature you would not give more than one hundred dollars,' and yet, by your vote, you leave the Legislature to make the salary just what they please; you re-