

By the House of Delegates, 3d January, 1827.

Gentlemen of the Senate,

We have received your message dissenting from the proposition contained in the message from this house relative to the manner of electing registers of wills for St. Mary's and Washington counties; and cannot agree that a plurality of votes should elect an officer of so much importance--we therefore hope that your honourable body will reconsider the subject, and concur with this house, that a majority of the votes upon joint ballot shall be necessary to the election of these officers.

Which was twice read.

The Speaker having left the chair, at his request it was occupied by Mr. Du Val; and after some discussion, the following was offered by the Speaker as a substitute for the message proposed by Mr. Chapman:

By the House of Delegates, January 3, 1827.

Gentlemen of the Senate,

We have received your message "dissenting from the proposition of this house to require a majority of the whole number of votes to constitute an election of register of wills," and we now waive that proposition, and are ready to go into the election of a register of wills for St. Mary's and Washington counties.

Which being twice read and debated, the question was propounded on the adoption thereof.

The yeas and nays being required by seven members, the number prescribed by the rules of the house of delegates adopted at the last session, they were taken, and appeared as follow:

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs. Speaker,
Millard,
R. Thomas,
Campbell,
Boone,
Stewart,
Compton,
Kent,
Linthicum,
Somerville,
Brooke,
M. Smith,
Turner,
Bennett,
Denny,
Banning,
Teackle,

Goldsborough,
Wright,
Rauleigh,
Harlan,
Thompson,
Maffitt,
Du Val,
Gantt,
Stevens,
Nicholson,
Winchester,
Ridgaway,
Stemmer,
Bishop,
Barnes,
Sappington,

Farquhar,
Sutton,
Montgomery,
Keene,
Saulsbury,
Hardcastle,
Tyson,
Stricker,
Tidball,
Newcomer,
Peter,
Janes,
Ridgely,
Hoblitzell,
Armstrong,
Shaw—49.