Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Sprigg, Fooks and Jacobs—17.

Negative—Messrs. Morgan, Sollers, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Harbine, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke and Shower—47.

Mr. Dirickson moved to amend the section by striking out "ten," and inserting "six," and demanded the yeas and nays on agreeing to his motion.

And being taken,

Appeared as follows:

The yeas and nays were ordered,

Affirmative — Messrs. Buchanan, Dirickson, Shriver, Johnson, Biser, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Harbine and Brewer—12.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Pres't pro tem., Morgan, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Weems, Sollers, Howard, Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Spencer, George, Wright, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Gaither, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Stewart of Caroline, Stewart of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke and Shower—52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Fitzpatrick moved to amend the section by striking out "ten," and inserting "eight."

Mr. Hicks moved to amend the amendment by striking out "eight," and inserting "three."

The question was first taken on the amendment of Mr. Fitzpatrick, (the rule providing that the question shall be first taken on the amendment proposing the longest time,) and it was rejected.

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. Hicks, when

Mr. Hicks withdrew said amendment.

A motion was made that the Convention adjourn, but was withdrawn at the request of

Mr. Chambers who said, in moving to reconsider the vote, on the number of judges ot be provided for the court of Appeals, he would take occasion to say, he did not think it possible, the duty could be satisfactorily performed by a smaller number. He had experience upon this subject and believed the labors of those judges were by no means understood. The length of the sessions of the court had been regularly increasing, and might be expected to be henceforth extended to six months in the year. If three men, of such vigorous health could be selected, as that neither of them should be detained from his duties by indisposition, for any portion of the first few sessions, yet he thought the severe and constant labors, would break down their constitutions at a premature period. But if no remarkable an event should occur, as that neither one of three men, of rather advanced age, should be disabled by indisposition in the course of these long sessions, yet they would probably have families, and, a wife, or a child might require their presence, to minister to them in sickness or affliction. To leave only two judges on the bench of the appellate court, would certainly not be desirable. They could not do the work. The matter of writing opinions, in many cases, is one of great toil and much time. Often many and conflicting authorities are to be carefully collated, and distinguished. They cannot possibly do it. If they could accomplish it; the result would not be, in many cases satisfactory, especially where a division of opinion existed. It might happen too, that more that one would be compelled to leave the bench, at the same time. Under any circumstances, he did not think the business of the court of appeals could be transacted, to the satisfaction the bar, to the satigfaction of litigants, or to the satisfaction of the community, with three judges only. He therefore gave notice of his intention, to move to-morrow, for a reconsideratioa of the vote of the Convention, on the amendment offered by Mr. Crisfield, on the 19th instant, and rejected this morning, in relation to four judges for the court of Appeals.

Mr. Spencer said, that he could not sustain such a proposition as the one advocated by the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey.) He, (Mr. S.,) was unwilling to discriminate between natives and foreigners. But the gentleman would provide that if a man had only been naturalized but one month, he should have all the privileges of a native born citizen, to hold or take office, which he, (Mr. Spencer,) could never sanction.

Mr. Sollers said:

I am extremely anxious to relieve my conscience from the burden which rests upon it; and when I have done that, I am willing to undertake to carry out any measure for the reform of the judiciary department of the State of Maryland, that I think is compatible with my opinion of what is right. I am anxious to be relieved from all sorts of responsibility; I am anxious to wash my hands clear of all this thing. I wish to God it may not prove a terrible thing to some people, and until that is done by a vote of my own, and I care not who votes with me, I will vote in the negative upon every subject touching the judicial system.

I desire to offer an amendment which expresses my opinions upon this subject, and then people may do as they choose. After that, whatever system looking to reform—I beg pardon, I did not mean to use that word—looking to a change in the judiciary may be offered, I will endeavor, so far as my vote is concerned, to perfect in the best manner that my judgment will dictate. The amendment which I offer is this; and I call the yeas and nays on its adoption:

"That the judiciary system of this State, as now established by the Constitution and Laws of