ple of chancery jurisdiction in the United States, and also the principle already engrafted in your Constitution. I propose to reduce the number of judges to two, thus cutting down the expense one third.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. Brent, and it was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON moved to amend the proposition by striking out the words "from among those experienced in the laws."

Mr. J. said: The argument of the gentleman seems to presuppose that this proposition of the gentleman from Prince George's requires a Judge to be learned in the law and a lawyer. That is not the language of the substitute. It is one experienced in the law.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. Does it mean one who is not of the legal profession?

Mr. JOHNSON. I mean that I shall vote for this because I think the people have sense enough to judge of their agents, whether they are lawyers or not. I mean precisely what I say, that this thing of putting in one learned in the law is flummery. Where is your court of inquiry; where are your investigators; where your college of examiners? It is the people. Therefore, this is all humbugging, in relation to placing these words in, if you give this power to the people. If my reform friends cannot trust the people; if they must chain them down with iron bars; if I am to be told by a reformer that the people cannot judge who are qualified or who are not qualified agents, I have fought reform battles for little purpose. I say it is a reflection for a man who has been preaching about reform and confidence in the people, to tell the people that they shall take nothing but a lawyer. If the people have not sense enough to discriminate upon that subject, if they are so ignorant as this, in the name of God this Convention ought to be a perfect failure; we have come here on a fool's errand, and ought to have masters over us. I find that there are men every where, and that there are gentlemen here who think that no man has common sense in judgment, that no man in a community can explain or understand a law, unless, perhaps, he has been studying the profession with a sterile brain for five years, and then come out armed *capapie*, like Minerva, to preside over a court of justice. William Wirt said, and said well, the Virginia Convention said, and said well, that the best courts they ever had in Virginia, for sixty years, were those courts made by the old magistrates. No one of them had been educated in a temple; no one of them had perhaps ever read a black letter, but their decisions stood higher and better in Virginia than those of any other court in the State. Therefore I am in favor of the gentleman's proposition. I know a man in my county who has had so many law suits that he has acquired as much experience as one half of the lawyers, and is a better lawyer than one half of the bar of Frederick. I would take him to be the Judge; but let the people judge of that. Is the man who idles away his time, and who has been two years in a law office, and five years advertising for practice, and gets none, fit to preside over the circuit or orphans' courts? But I leave that to the people. I care not what their salary may be; even give them the very lowest allowance. There are in Baltimore county and elsewhere, retired, many good lawyers who have retired on their money. They have made very large fortues and high reputations, and they would accept those offices as a matter of amusement. As Madison said, when he retired, employ me as a magistrate, that I may be employed. Is there no patriotism? Have we got to that point where money, and money alone, is an inducement to office? Have we got to that point when we must turn out one set of judges and see whether a man is or is not a member of the bar, and then select him to preside over the affairs of the court? You may make it a per diem allowance, and enlarge the present Orphans' Court system with little alteration. Then I go for the proposition of the gentleman from Prince George's county, and will give it a ready and cheerful vote. I voted for the proposition of the gentleman from Washington county, (Mr. Michael Newcomer,) but I am willing to divide, to lessen the duties of the district judges. I am willing to vote for this proposition, and I trust whoever and whatever men the people may select in their counties. I will trust them with chancery jurisdiction, for if they make an error the Court of Appeals can correct it. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I think we have used this rule so much that it is pretty well worn out. I move the previous question, and hope it will be seconded.

The previous question was then seconded, and the main ques ion ordered, viz: "Will the Convention adopt the substitute offered by Mr. Bowie for the 10th section of the report?"

Mr. BOWIE asked that the question be taken by yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Lee, Dalrymple, Bond, Bowie, Spencer, Johnson, Kilgour and Anderson—13.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Lloyd Dickinson, John Dennis, J. U. Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, McCubbin, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Gwinn, Stewart, of Balt. city, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Niell, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—65.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the 10th section as an article of the Constitution.

Mr. KILGOUR asked the yeas and nays, which