

Mr. SOLLERS had also voted for a proposition of this kind. His opinion had not been changed in reference to the principle, but he found that he could not vote for it conscientiously with other votes he should give. He was for keeping the Judges in the offices where they are until they die, and then give the Governor the power to appoint other Judges in their places, and keep them there until they die. He could not vote for the proposition, because it would come in conflict with his opinions upon that subject.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. RANDALL, and it was rejected by the following vote:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Sprigg, McMaster, Hearn, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Brewer, Waters, Smith and Cockey—24.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Howard, Buchanan, Welch, Dickinson, McCullough, Miller, Tuck, Thomas, Shriver, Biser, Anan, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Harbine, Anderson, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Shower and Brown—36.

Mr. BLAKISTONE, rising to a correction of the Journal of yesterday, moved to insert after the decision of the President ruling out of order the amendment submitted by him in relation to the calling of a future Convention to form a new Constitution, the following: "Mr. BLAKISTONE appealed from this decision, but afterwards withdrew said appeal."

Mr. B. to show that the appeal taken by him yesterday from the decision of the Chair, was not made captiously, referred to precedents in the proceedings of the Convention to sustain his points.

The motion to correct the Journal was then agreed to.

The question recurring on the adoption of the report on further amendments and provisions of the Constitution

Mr. HICKS moved to amend it by adding at the end thereof, as an additional section, the following:

"No member of this Convention, shall take, hold or receive any office, that has been or shall be created, made vacant, or otherwise regulated by the constitution now in preparation, within the space of five years after such constitution shall go into operation."

Mr. HICKS said, that the people looked upon them as a most august body; and he would be very glad if they could only be here to see how far they were mistaken. The people thought that they had come here as patriots second only to their revolutionary sires, their bosoms swelling and ready to burst with love for the people—full of the spirit of sacrifice and devotion to those whom they represented on this floor. Hav-

ing then made so great a sacrifice, he called upon them to make a still greater, that their praiseworthy course might go down to posterity, who would look upon them as the best men that ever lived. In order that their course hereafter should comport with this great end, he hoped his amendment would be adopted. Do this, he said, and their constituents could not fail to believe them sincere in their professions of love for the dear people, but to go on here creating new offices and affixing to them high salaries, will at last incline the belief, that there is selfish motives here; and by way of sending out some evidence of propriety, self-sacrifice, of patriotism, he hoped his amendment would prevail.

Mr. SOLLERS, moved to amend the amendment by striking out these words, "within the space of five years," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "forever."

Mr. S. called for the yeas and nays on the adoption of his amendment, stating that his object in so doing was to afford the best opportunity presented this session for gentlemen to show to the people their disinterestedness and patriotism in the work they were about to adopt.

Mr. BUCHANAN was perfectly willing to show the people what he meant to do. He should vote for the amendment of his friend from Calvert. He should then, most cheerfully and gladly vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. MERRICK would also vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Calvert, and then most unquestionably he should vote against the whole proposition. Almost all the important offices in the State, were to be created by the Constitution. He had no desire to deprive the State of the benefit of the services of the members of this Convention. As for himself, he expected to hold no office under any Constitution.

Mr. HOWARD said, that it appeared to him that the gentleman who had moved the proposition had confounded two things, essentially distinct. That was, the patronage which flowed from the Executive, and the patronage which was conferred by the people. Now, all the theories that were formed to banish the influence of patronage exercised by the Executive, from the hall of a deliberative body which created offices, had no application to offices subsequently bestowed by the people. However impure a man's motive might be, when he comes into a body of any kind which created offices, when he went before the people, he had to wash himself in a clean spring, and thus become purified.

Mr. TUCK concurred with the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) that they had the perfect right to restrict members of the Legislature as to executive appointments, but not for the reason assigned. He did not agree with that gentleman as to the purity of the spring in which candidates bathed when they came before the people. When we consider the means that are sometimes resorted to, to obtain nominations, we cannot deny that candidates not unfrequently have been washed in rather turbid waters. He