

salary to \$2000, were placed in the executive chair, he would find it impossible to resist the example of his predecessors. No Governor can save any thing out of his salary. Whatever he receives, is distributed in some form or other among the people of the State. But the gentleman from Anne Arundel complains of the heavy taxes under which the people are suffering, and desires to relieve them from their burdens by taking away a part of the Governor's salary. This would, indeed, afford considerable relief, as it would appear, by an accurate calculation, that each tax payer would save annually at least one-fifth of a cent. But a few weeks ago, the gentleman viewed our system of taxation in a different light. He then described the prosperity of the State in glowing colors; and spoke of the alacrity with which the people of every county, and especially of his own district, paid their taxes; and of the regret they would feel at any reduction of their burdens till the public debt was entirely extinguished. The gentleman compares the salaries of the executive and judges, and, of course, is of opinion, that the superior abilities of the latter entitle them to a higher compensation. Admitting this superiority, in deference to the gentleman from Anne Arundel, it must be remembered that judges have been appointed for life, and have never been under the necessity of increasing their expenses, or changing their residences; whereas the Governor is elected for a short time, and subjected to great additional expenses, which do not always cease with a termination of his salary. And what, after all, is a salary of \$4000. The clerks of many of the counties receive as large a compensation, and the cashiers of banks half as much, without being under the necessity of increasing their expenses or neglecting their private business. Why, then, should we reduce the compensation of the Governor, whose salary is expended in hospitality, while the profits of other offices are added to the private fortune of the incumbents. The Governor of Maryland is exposed to an expense, from which the Governors of other States are exempt. Ships of our own navy, as well as foreign vessels of war, frequently anchor in Annapolis roads; and whatever might be the opinion of members, the people of the State expected the hospitality of the State to be exercised on every such occasion, and that the Governor should incur the necessary expense. The gentleman from Calvert, (Mr. Sollers,) had clearly shown, that a material reduction of the salary, would exclude men of limited means from the office. The proposition to reduce the salary to \$2000, ought to be entitled a bill to prevent a man, without a fortune, from being Governor of the State.

Mr. PHELPS vindicated the part of the Eastern Shore, which he represented from the charge of desiring to establish the doctrine that five hundred dollars was a sufficiently high salary for any public officer. He and his colleagues were in favor of the reduction of the number of officers, but they were equally in favor of giving sufficient compensation to those who were necessary.

Mr. TUCK would not prolong the discussion. He believed that the opinion of the Convention was that the salary of the Governor should be liberal, and that he should reside in Annapolis. He moved the previous question.

Mr. CHAMBERS requested the gentleman from Prince Georges to withdraw the motion for a moment to enable him to offer an amendment.

Mr. TUCK waived the motion for the moment. Mr. CHAMBERS then moved to amend the section by striking out "four thousand," and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty-six hundred."

The previous question was then seconded.

The question being on the first branch of the amendment on striking out,

Mr. SAPPINGTON called for the ayes and noes on the question, and they were ordered.

The question was then put on striking out, and decided as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Dent, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Dorsey, Dalrymple, Brent, of Charles, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Eccleston, Phelps, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, Nelson, Carter, Hardcastle, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Brewer, Weber, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Shower and Cockey—35.

Negative—Messrs. Blakistone, President, *pro tem.*, Hopewell, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Sollers, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Hicks, Hodson, Chambers, of Cecil, Bowie, Tuck, Grason, McHenry, Magraw, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Kilgour, Waters, Hollyday and Brown—32.

So the motion to strike out was agreed to.

The question was then put on the motion of Mr. CHAMBERS to insert \$3,600, and it was decided as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Blakistone, President, *pro tem.*, Dent, Hopewell, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Hicks, Hodson, Phelps, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Grason, Shriver, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Hollyday and Brown—43.

Negative—Messrs. Lee, Dorsey, Dalrymple, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Eccleston, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Gaither, Sappington, Nelson, Carter, Hardcastle, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Weber, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Shower and Cockey—26.

So the blank was filled with "thirty-six hundred"

The question then being on the adoption of the section as amended,

Mr. DIRICKSON asked for the ayes and noes on the question, and they were ordered.