

The main question was ordered to be taken.
Mr. HICKS asked the yeas and nays;
Which were ordered; and
Being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Tuck, President, *pro tem.*, Morgan, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Merrick, Buchanan, Welch, Constable, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Spencer, George, Wright, Shriver, Biser, Magraw, Brent of Baltimore city, Ware, Anderson, Parke, Shower and Brown—26.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dalrymple, Brent of Charles, Bell, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Gaither, Annan, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Prestman, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith and Cockey—50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McHENRY offered the following amendment:

Amend said second section, by striking out all from the word "delegates," in the second line to the end thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

"For the term of one or two years from the day of the general election, as the people may, by separate vote determine at the first of such general elections."

Mr. McH. said, he had seen great evidence of a change in the public mind, not only in his own county, but in the city of Baltimore.

Mr. McH. demanded the previous question on the amendment.

There was a second, and

The main question was ordered to be now taken.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and

Being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Tuck, President, *pro tem.*, Morgan, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Buchanan, Welch, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, Bowie, Sprigg, George, Shriver, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Prestman, Ware, Davis, Anderson, Shower and Brown—28.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Dalrymple, Brent of Charles, Bell, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowling, Spencer, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Thomas, Gaither, Annan, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Harcastle, Stewart of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Waters, Weber,

Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke and Cockey—46.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPENCER moved the following amendment:

"But the legislature shall have the right to provide by law, for annual sessions."

A motion was made, that the Convention adjourn, but was waived to enable

Mr. THOMAS to give notice that he should, tomorrow, move to amend the twenty-first rule of the Convention, by striking therefrom the words "voting with the majority."

And the Convention adjourned, until tomorrow morning, 11 o'clock.

Remarks of Mr. MERRICK, (revised) Monday, Feb. 10, in relation to taxing property beyond the limits of the State.

Mr. MERRICK thought it would be best to leave the section as it stood in the report of the committee. He said there were some descriptions of property beyond the limits of Maryland and owned by some of her citizens, which our revenue laws could not reach, and any attempt to tax which would be ridiculous, yet there were other kinds of property, particularly public stocks of other States and counties, equally beyond our limits, which, if owned by resident citizens of Maryland, we could and did make subject to our revenue laws with advantage to our Treasury, as well as to the benefit of the value of our own State stocks. The effect of this clause as it stood would be to leave to the Legislature full discretionary power over the subject, they would exercise that discretion wisely and with due reference to the circumstances which may exist at the time they may be called upon to act—and it is certainly not to be inferred because the Legislature have full power over this subject, and have to choose between a wise policy and a foolish attempt to reach property which cannot be reached—that they will do the foolish thing, as some of the arguments seem to imply. I think very differently of our State Legislatures. By engrafting upon the section the amendment proposed, you tie up the Legislature, and deprive them of the power to do that which may be wise, proper, and salutary, because you fear they might attempt that which is ridiculous. I have heard of an attempt on the part of some citizens of this State to evade the payment of their fair proportion of the taxes necessary for public purposes—by selling their Maryland State stocks which are subjected by our laws to taxation, and purchasing and holding in its place the stocks of other States; this attempt seems to be improper, and one, the success of which should be prevented by subjecting such foreign stocks to taxation equally with our own—but make the amendment now proposed, and you take away from the Legislature the power to do this. He should, for these reasons, vote against this and similar amendments, and for the section as it now stands.