belonged to a denomination which was opposed to the taking of an oath.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. Has not the bill been engrossed?

Mr. TUCK. The bill has been engrossed.

Mr. BOWIE. I am directly opposed to the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. TUCK said that he was instructed by the committee, (it was not his own motion) to suggest that the Convention allow the committee to insert after the words "Diving Being," the following:

"And all persons conscientiously scrupulous of taking an oath on any occasinn, ought to be allowed to make a solemn affirmation in the manner heretofore allowed, and to be of the same avail as an oath."

Mr. BOWIE said that the Convention had heard a great deal about men being tenacious of their opinions. They would recollect well that this Convention had over and over again deliberately expressed their opinion, in the form of the most solemn instructions to this Revisory committee, who come in here, and offered amendments to change the substance of things. They told them yesterday that the Convention understood what they meant—that they did not mean to allow any man to affirm but those who were attached to a religious creed, which would not allow him to take an oath, and if a person was allowed to take an oath, he should have no cause for throwing himself upon his individual responsibility outside of the church, under the shadow of which he might commit all sorts of perjuries.

The PRESIDENT stated that the motion was not debateable.

Mr. BOWIE hoped the Convention would adhere to its former opinions.

The PRESIDENT stated that if this article had heretofore been passed upon, it would require a motion to reconsider.

Mr. TUCK said that if there was no disposition on the part of the Convention to entertain the subject, he would withdraw the amendment.

The amendment was accordingly withdrawn.

Mr. CHAMBERS rose to ask a question which he thought the House was entitled to learn from its presiding officer. He believed now that the House had passed an order that the engrossed copy, stated by the chairman of the committee to be perfect, should be signed by the President and when signed should be delivered to a committee, who were to reprint it as the standard copy of the Constitution of this State. The fact was known to every member that there now laid on the President's table a part of that Constitution, so far as its adoption by the Convention could make it so, which had not been submitted to the revision of the committee, and which had not been engrossed. He desired to know whether the President would sign that as a part of the Constitution?

The PRESIDENT replied that he could only answer the question in this way; when the committee authorised and appointed by this body, should present to him the Constitution, attested and certified to as the engrossed Constitution, passed by this Convention, he would, so help him God, sign it as the presiding officer.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Under what authority is the the President to be certified that it is an engrossed and perfect copy?

The PRESIDENT. When the Constitution is presented to the chair, he will sign it, and return it to the committee.

Mr. CHAMBERS said:

On looking over the bills, the committee on revision discovered an omission that might produce consequences of great magnitude. There was not the beginning of the slightest attempt to provide for a contested election between the judges.

It had been suggested that perhaps the Circuit courts would have jurisdiction in cases of other officers not specially provided for; but there was a possibility of collision between themselves. It would be a sad scene to have one judge enter on one side of the bench, and another judge on the other side, each claiming the judicial chair and no one authorized to decide between them. The Convention had already adopted a mode of proceeding in contested elections of commissioners, and he had now to submit a provision requiring the same proceeding in contested elections for judges; and also in the case of clerks of the circuit courts and registers of wills.

Mr. HOWARD thought this a very strange objection. Here was a committee, of which the honorable gentleman was a member, and they came into this Hall and reported to the Convention that this was an engrossed copy, and they, through their chairman, handed it to the President as such. And now, the order he had submitted was to instruct the Convention to deposit this identical paper, as the work of their hands, in the office of the Court of Appeals. As to the suggestion that some alteration had been made, it was done on the gentleman's own motion, and he certainly could not blame them for making that change.

The amendment was read as follows:

"If in any case of election for judges, clerks of the courts of law and registers of wills, the opposing candidates shall have an equal number of votes, it shall be the duty of the Governor to order a new election; and in case of any contested election, the Governor shall send the returns to the House of Delegates, who shall judge of the election and qualification of the candidates at such election."

Mr. CONSTABLE, said that he was in favor of the first branch of the amendment, but was opposed to the second; he was against leaving to the Legislature the power of settling any contested elections, except those which related themselves. He therefore asked for a division ot the question upon each branch of the article.

The question was accordingly taken on the first branch of the amendment in these words:

"If in any case of election the judges, clerks of the courts of law and registers of wills, the opposing candidates shall have an equal number of votes, it shall be the duty of the Governor to order a new election."