

"two thousand," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "fifteen hundred."

Mr. McM. said: We have decided by a very decisive vote, that the district judges shall not discharge the duties of the judges of the orphans' courts and chancery courts. That being the case, I have moved my amendment to decrease the salary proposed to be given to the judges from two thousand dollars to fifteen hundred dollars. The associate judges at present receive fourteen hundred dollars per annum, but according to the classification, as proposed by the gentleman from Queen Anne's, (Mr. Spencer,) their duties will not be increased in our judicial department. Their duties will be made less, in fact, one county being deducted. If these associate judges discharge their duties for fourteen hundred dollars per annum, I think that the judges, as proposed by the gentleman from Queen Anne's, can discharge the entire duties for fifteen hundred dollars. I call for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. SPENCER. I suggest to the gentleman that the Convention consent to pass over informally that part of the section relating to the compensation of the judges.

Mr. McMASTER declined to accept the suggestion.

Mr. SPENCER. Then I move to pass over the subject informally.

The motion was determined in the negative. The yeas and nays were then ordered on the amendment of Mr. McMaster, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Lee, Mitchell, Sellman, Bell, Sherwood, of Talbot, John Dennis, Dashiell, Spencer, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Thawley, Hardcastle, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Anderson, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Ege, Shower and Brown—35.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Jenifer, Howard, Buchanan, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Colston, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Grason, George, Wright, Johnson, Sappington, Stevenson, McHenry, Nelson, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Ware, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters and Holliday—45.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER moved to amend the section by striking out "ten years," and inserting "six years," so as to make the terms of the judges six years instead of ten years.

Mr. SHRIVER asked the yeas and nays on referring to the amendment, which were ordered.

Mr. BOWIE asked a division of the question on the motion to strike out.

The question was accordingly stated to be on referring to the motion to strike out.

Mr. THOMAS asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Miller, McLane, Dirickson, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, McLane, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Ege, Shower, and Brown—26.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Thawley, Schley, Fiery, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Holliday, and Smith—56.

So the Convention refused to strike out.

The question recurred upon agreeing to the substitute offered by Mr. Spencer, on which the yeas and nays had been ordered.

Mr. RIDGELY asked a division of the question, so that the question might be first taken on that part of the substitute making a classification of districts, and afterwards in that part of the substitute in relation to the equity jurisdiction, and the movable character of the courts.

Mr. CRISFIELD desired to know whether this proposition could be divided. It was offered as a substitute, and must they not take the question on it as an entire section? Suppose that part of the substitute offered should be rejected, then they would have the other part as a substitute for the whole proposition he had offered. He was not very familiar with the rules, but they were now called upon to vote for half a proposition as a substitute for an entire one. If they should adopt this half, then they could be called upon to vote for the other half. It seemed to him that the motion should be to amend and not to divide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER decided that the question was divisible.

The question being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Colston, Spencer, George, Wright, Johnson, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Holliday, Parke and Ege—17.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Dalrymple, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Sherwood, of Talbot, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Grason, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Nelson, Gwinn, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Shower and Brown—62.

So the first branch of the substitute was rejected.