

tion was referred this morning, I ask to be excused from voting.

The gentleman was accordingly excused.

Mr. HARWOOD. I have no objection to voting additional compensation to any employee of this house who has faithfully discharged his duties. But I am not willing to pay any member of this house an additional hundred dollars. I vote, "no."

Mr. HOLLYDAY. Being perfectly satisfied, from the arguments I have heard here, that we are justly entitled to this money, and being of the opinion that the convention has the right to fix their own per diem, I vote "aye."

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I shall vote for this amendment solely upon the ground that it is in accordance with what I believe to be the standing law of the State. And I shall vote for the original order, if it is amended in this way, to give the president six dollars a day, because I consider that the compensation of the president, he being an officer of this house, is within the control of the house by the act under which we are called together.

Mr. DANIEL. I call the gentleman to order. We are not voting upon the compensation of the president.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. When my name is called, I have a right to assign my reasons for the vote I give. I should have done so in fewer words, if the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Daniel) had not interrupted me. I am in favor of the original proposition. The president being an officer of the house, appointed by the house, and compelled to be here at the exact time for the meeting of the house, to a minute, I think it but fair to give him the additional compensation which it is customary for every deliberative body to give its presiding officer. I shall vote for this hundred dollars, because I think it is the law of the land. I vote "aye."

Mr. KENNARD. I am of the opinion that this matter is wrong in law, equity and morals. As the question was tied up in such a legal net-work, I think it was the province of this body to cut the gordian knot, and determine not to take this money. I shall therefore vote "no."

Mr. MULLIKIN. I believe that the naked letter of the law would give us this money. But I do not believe the legislature ever intended it for us. I therefore vote "no."

Mr. NEBLEY. Under the unanswerable exposition of the law which we have had here to-day, I believe this to be entirely legal. I further believe that it is entirely right, and that it is not against morals, or law, or virtue, or anything else that is proper and good. I therefore vote "aye."

Mr. RIDGELY. I regret that the original proposition which I offered has been somewhat embarrassed by this amendment. Nevertheless, as I am in favor of both proposi-

tions, I shall vote for the amendment. I would have done so with much greater pleasure, after voting for the original proposition, as an independent proposition. I vote "aye."

Mr. SCOTT. I have views somewhat different from any I have heard yet expressed upon this subject. I believe that if the president were in his place, he would reject the offer to give him this hundred dollars additional compensation. And as I claim to be his particular personal friend, in his name I protest against it. Nevertheless, I believe that he has just the same right, and no more, to this extra compensation than any other member of this house. I shall vote "aye" on this proposition, and then when the question comes up on the amended order, I shall vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. STIRLING. As I said before, I have no doubt as to the legality of this matter, as a question of law. But I know that I did not expect to receive this money when I came down here. I know it can do no harm not to take it. I am satisfied it may do some public harm if the convention does take it. And as the question is submitted to me whether I will take it or not, I shall vote "no."

Mr. WOODEN. Being a member of the committee on accounts, I ask to be excused from voting.

The gentleman was not excused; upon a division—ayes 25, noes 30—and voted "no."

After the call of the roll had been completed, but before the result of the vote was announced, several members changed their votes, as follows:

Mr. CHAMBERS changed his vote to "aye."

Mr. SCOTT. I have come to the conclusion to change my vote to "no."

Mr. PARRAN, who had not voted, now voted "aye."

Mr. NYMAN, who had not voted, now voted "no."

Mr. BELT. I think the course pursued by my learned friend from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) is a very safe one, to advocate a proposition and then vote against it.

Mr. STIRLING. I call the gentleman to order. If he wants any explanation of my vote I will give it to him here or elsewhere. I am not afraid of taking the consequences of any vote I may give.

Mr. BELT. I will change my vote to "no."

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Although I am perfectly clear that the mileage is fixed by law, yet I will follow the good example set by gentleman on the other side. I will change my vote to "no."

Mr. BROWN changed his vote to "no."

Mr. MAYHUGH changed his vote to "no."

Mr. NEBLEY changed his vote to "no."

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Is it in order to examine the vote before it is announced, and then change your vote, if you see it is sure to go against you?