

the committee. The language of the report of the committee on the subject of reporting was this:

"The committee who were instructed to inquire as to the terms at which a competent reporter could be employed, beg leave to report, that from the offers submitted, the services of a competent reporter can be secured for an amount not exceeding the sum of four thousand dollars; and the whole cost of reports, including printing, will not exceed eight thousand dollars."

After that we had nothing to do with the subject. There being no complaint made to the committee, we had nothing to do but reserve twenty per cent. out of the fund, according to the stipulations. But, (continued Mr. S.) he had risen for the purpose of answering the question of his friend from Caroline, [Mr. Stewart,] and that was in reference to other offers to execute the reporting. His friend was entirely right in his supposition, and that fact was distinctly submitted to the Convention in one of our reports, as the ground upon which the committee said that the reporter would not be entitled to more than four thousand dollars. We thought to have the advantage of that competition. More than two or three persons did offer to do the reporting at a less rate.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline. Why was not the proposition accepted?

Mr. STEWART, of Baltimore city, would make one other remark. As to the question of law which the gentleman from Kent, [Mr. Chambers,] had raised, he seemed to think that we were now in the performance of a new contract. The very moment the resolution of the majority of the committee on printing had been adopted by the Convention, there was a motion made to reconsider it the next day, and before any new expenditure had been made under the contract, so that the reporter was admonished by that pending motion to reconsider, not to enter into any new engagement, based upon the further appropriations.

Mr. HOWARD moved the previous question.

Mr. SPENCER. Does the gentleman insist upon his motion? I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. HOWARD. I hope the gentleman will pardon me. If a man cannot take a liberty with his friends, I am at a loss to know with whom he can. I hope the gentleman will excuse me, for I am endeavoring, as far as I am individually concerned, to progress with the business so as to enable us to adjourn the first week in May.

The previous question was then seconded.

And the yeas and nays being demanded, ordered and taken,

Resulted as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Kent, Ridgely, Dickinson, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Hearn, Fooks, Shriver, Biser, Annan, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardecastle, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—31.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Bond, Brent, of Charles, Howard, Buchanan, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George, McMaster, Gaither, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Davis, Waters, Anderson and Smith—37.

So the Convention refused to reconsider their vote on said resolution.

Mr. McHENRY, when his name was called on the yeas and nays just taken, rose in his seat and stated, that he should have voted in the affirmative, but had paired off with Mr. Jenifer, who is confined by indisposition, but would have been present had he not consented to have paired off with him.

#### PUBLIC WORKS.

The Convention then resumed the consideration of the order of the day, being the substitute offered by Mr. THOMAS for the report of the committee creating a board of public works, and which substitute has been accepted by the Convention.

The question pending before the Convention on yesterday, being on the amendment offered by Mr. SCHLEY to the amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD, to insert after the word "canal," the words "on banking."

Mr. DAVIS, in continuation of his remarks commenced yesterday, said:

The gentleman, (Mr. Howard,) yesterday said that he, (Mr. D.), was unfortunate in referring to the course of the Governor of the State in regard to the public work. The gentleman would allow him to put himself right. He, [Mr. D.] wished to show that the two previous Governors thought it their duty to look into the matter—he mentioned it without intending to express an opinion as to whether they were right or wrong in what they had done, to show the want of necessity to create another board to perform a duty which belongs to the Executive, and to show that we should have no other board to divide the responsibility with the Executive, whose chief duty it was to see that the laws were faithfully executed. That was what, and all, he intended to say on that point.

The honorable gentleman. (Mr. Howard,) in the course of his remarks, also referred to the tolls upon the public works of this State

[Mr. D.] did not think it necessary to open the question of tolls. He would only say to the gentleman however, there were other matters than coal which entered into the consideration of this subject. There was the article of iron and iron ore, plaster, flour, and a great variety of other articles. It was an extremely complicated matter to adjust, but all he meant now to say was, that if the gentleman had any disposition to open the subject, he, (Mr. D.,) would not decline any comparison he thought proper to make. He would be prepared to meet him on that point in regard to tolls. He repeated that if this subject was to be gone into, he should introduce the toll