Mr. SPENCER then withdrew the last branch of his amendment.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, then offered as a substitute for the ninth section of the report of the committee and amendment offered by Mr. Crisfield, the following:

"There shall be a division of the State into seven judicial districts, in manner and form following, to wit:—St. Mary's, Charles, Prince George's shall be the first district; Anne Arundel, Calvert, Montgomery and Howard shall be the second district; Allegany, Washington and Frederick shall be the third: Carroll, Baltimore county and Harford shall be the fourth; Baltimore city shall be the fifth; Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's and Talbot shall be the sixth; Caroline, Dorchester, Somerset and Worcester shall be the seventh, and there shall be elected as hereinafter directed, one person having the qualifications hereinafter prescribed, for each of the said judicial districts; the said judges shall be styled superior judges, and shall respectively hold a term of their courts at least twice in each year, or oftener if required by law, in each county composing their respective districts; and the said courts shall be called superior courts for counties in which it may be held, and shall have, hold and exercise, in the several counties of this State, all and every the powers, authorities and jurisdictions which the county courts of this State now have, hold and exercise, or which shall hereafter be prescribed by laws made pursuant to this constitution; and the said judges in their respective districts, shall have, use and exercise all the powers, authorities and jurisdiction which the Chancellor of Maryland, as a judge in equity, now has, uses and exercises; and the salary of said judge shall be two thousand dollars annually, which shall not be diminished during his continuance in office."

Which was read.

Mr. BOWIE moved for a division of the question on the substitute, down to the word "seventh," inclusive, in the 9th line.

Mr BRENT, of Baltimore city, demanded the yeas and nays, which being ordered and taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Morgan, Hopewell, Mitchell, Weems, Brent, of Charles, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, Eccleston, Phelps, Tuck, Spencer, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Johnson, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Nelson, Thawley, Gwinn, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Fiery, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Parke, Shower and Brown—36.

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Dalrymple, Sollers, Merrick, Howard, Buchanan, Ridgely, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Sprigg, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Schley, Harbine, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith and Ege—47.

So the first branch of the substitute was rejected.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, then withdrew the second branch of his substitute.

The question again recurred upon the amendment as offered by Mr. Crisfield, to the 9th section of the report.

Mr. SHRIVER moved to amend said amendment, by striking out, after the words "salary of," the words "twenty-five hundred," and inserting in lieu thereof "two thousand."

Which amendment Mr. Crisfield accepted.

The question again recurred upon the adoption of the amendment as amended.

Mr. BOWIE moved for a division of the question upon the amendment, down to the word "district," inclusive.

Mr. SHRIVER demanded the yeas and nays, which being ordered and taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stephenson, McHenry, Thawley, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Ware, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith and Brown—61.

Negative—Messrs. Wells, Randall, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Sappington, Nelson, Stewart, of Caroline, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Kilgour, Anderson, Parke, Ege and Shower—21.

So the first branch of the amendment was adopted.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the second branch of the amendment.

On motion of Mr. SCHLEY,

The second branch of the amendment was amended by striking out, in the twelfth line, these words "having the qualification hereinafter prescribed," and inserting in lieu thereof the following:—"from among those learned in the law, having been admitted to practice the law in this State, and who shall have been a citizen of this State, at least five years, and above the age of thirty years at the time of his election, and a resident of the judicial district," and by striking out, in thirty-eighth line, after the word "knowledge," the word "and," and inserting the words "shall be."

Mr. JOHNSON moved further to amend the amendment by striking out in the fifteenth line the word "twice," and inserting in lieu thereo "thrice."

Mr. W. C. JOHNSON observed that he did no know how it was in regard to the managemen of judicial affairs in the smaller counties of th State, but he knew that in his county there wa much procrastination and delay, and that it no