

rickson, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Schley, Davis, Waters and Smith—32.

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCER moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill in relation to the judiciary, but after some conversation with gentlemen around him, he withdrew the motion.

Mr. JACOBS then moved further to amend the report by adding at the end thereof, as an additional section the following:

"Section 4. And the salary of the said commissioners shall not exceed the sum of one hundred dollars per annum each."

Which was read.

Mr. SPENCER moved the previous question, When some conversation ensued, after which The motion was seconded.

The question pending being on the amendment,

Mr. CHAMAERS of Kent, demanded the yeas and nays,

Which being ordered and taken,

Resulted as follows :

Affirmative—Messrs. Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Lcc, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Randall, Weems, Bond, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Bowie, Tuck, McCabbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Nelson, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Brewer, Waters and Smith—30.

Negative.—Messrs. Chapman, President, Riccaud, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Brent of Charles, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Lloyd, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Sprigg, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, McHenry, Magraw, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Neill, Harbine, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—44.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Tuck then moved to amend the report by adding at the end thereof as an additional section the following :

"Section 4. And the salary of the commissioners shall not exceed the sum of two hundred dollars per annum each."

Which was read.

Mr. Tuck said:

It seemed to be conceded, so far as he might judge from what had been said on the subject by gentlemen, with the exception of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, [Mr. Dorsey,] that not one word could be urged against the State agents. Some of them had been in office for ten years, and had received but \$100 per annum, and had faithfully done their duty. And now it was proposed that new agents should be appointed, and each of them be allowed more pay. He knew that it was proposed they should perform such duties as were prescribed by law, but at the same time, he was aware that they could not perform any that were inconsistent with the charters of these companies. And gentlemen

might rack their brains to find out any other duties than those they now performed that the Legislature could impose. Why had he made this motion? He objected to the whole proceedings, for the effect of it would be to bring the internal improvements of this State into political agitation. The moment they made the office of State agent, the subject of contest before the people, and affixed a salary to it of any value, they would seal the fate of the internal improvement companies. The gentleman from Frederick, [Mr. Thomas,] said, the other day, and he (Mr. T.) confessed that it was a doctrine quite new to him)—that you would get more competent men to perform the duties of the office for a small salary than a large one—that it was an appeal to their patriotism to do public service. He (Mr. T.) had lived long enough to find that these gentlemen in public life, who exhibited most of this kind of patriotism, were those who expected large salaries, not those who expected low ones. And if you put a man, where he desired to be, as between a high and low salary—he would, as he (Mr. T.) had noticed—generally take the profit and waive the honor. (Laughter.) He believed the effect would be to create four large salaries for place hunters; for if we create the office without limiting the salary, we know not what influences may operate upon the Legislature when they come to fix the compensation. We know their duties, let us fix the salary.

He would appeal to the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) who had spoken of this matter all along, as one of great pecuniary interest to the State, for his aid on this question.—Mr. T. knew that he (Mr. Dorsey) differed with the gentleman from Frederick in regard to the compensation. That gentleman thought that a low salary would be best, while the gentleman from Anne Arundel, [Mr. Dorsey,] thought otherwise. How could this be with the views he entertained on the subject as a financial matter. He [Mr. Tuck] wanted to know why this Convention should not exercise the power.—Why they were not better qualified to indicate the duties they should perform, and the salary they ought to receive than the Legislature? We have limited the Governor's salary, and the salaries of the other public officers.

As far as we had said, any thing on that subject, we had proposed to limit those of the judges; and that question was now before the Convention as well as that of protecting the people against the payment of excessive emoluments to office-holders. Was this Convention competent to determine the amount of the salary these officers should receive, and yet be unable to fix the salary of these commissioners? He believed, with the gentleman from Frederick, that the salary should be small; and he also thought, that if the amount were limited now, we should save these companies from the ruinous connection between them and party politics. No man would be willing to canvass his district for this small sum, to mingle the affairs of these companies with political discussions. And he, (Mr. T.,) concurred