

ley, Gwinn, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Parke, Ege, Cockey and Brown—60.

*Negative*.—Messrs. Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, McMaster and Fooks—5.

So the amendment of Mr. PRESSTMAN was adopted as an additional article.

Mr. BLAKISTONE. I believe we have now finished the legislative report. I move that the Convention proceed to the consideration of the executive report.

Mr. RIDGELY. I have another article to offer to the legislative report. I do not intend to invite discussion. I ask that the amendment may be read, and I call the previous question.

The amendment was read, as follows:

“The Legislature, at the first session after the adoption of this constitution, shall provide for the substitution of salaries in place of the fees and perquisites of office, now payable to the clerks and registers of these several courts of law, equity and probate in this State, and for reducing and regulating the rates of fees, costs and legal charges in said courts.”

There was a second to the demand for the previous question.

The main question was ordered,

And having been taken, the amendment of Mr. RIDGELY was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER moved a re-consideration of the vote taken this morning, adopting the first branch of the amendment offered by Mr. BLAKISTONE, as an additional section to the report.

Mr. SPENCER said, the amendment requires that the internal improvement stock should be disposed of in a certain way. It takes the internal improvement companies, out of the hands of the State authorities, and places them under the control of the counties. Wherever the most stocks would be found, there the works could be contracted. If there was a disposition on the part of the Convention, to take the control from the State, let it be so understood. But he now made the motion to reconsider the vote, because he desired to have the deliberate sense of the Convention on the propriety of adopting the principle of the amendment. He was certain it was not understood.

Mr. BLAKISTONE expressed his fear that the Convention was falling into the old track. After a question has been adopted by a solemn vote, and by an overwhelming majority, these motions to reconsider on the part of those who stand in a minority, are the cause of immense and unprofitable delay. Last week a vote was taken by which a proposition made by the gentleman from Queen Anne's, [Mr. George,] was adopted. He, [Mr. B.,] concluded, as a matter of course, that that question was disposed of, when suddenly a motion was made to reconsider the subject. From that moment, we have gone backwards, and we are now precisely where we were eight days ago, and if we continue to go on in this way, the Convention will be found sitting here from June till January, and from January till June, and after all no Constitution will be made. It had been

intimated to him that the city of Baltimore, is hereafter to have the control of the internal improvements of the State. This he did not believe.

But, [said Mr. B.,] if she has contributed to their erection, as it is claimed she has done, let her have the benefit of them to that extent. He was willing. All that he would ask is, that the counties should receive their fair proportion. Baltimore should only have the proportion she pays into the revenue. She does not contribute more than the counties do. He believed she only paid in one-third of the whole amount. It had been thrown out that if Baltimore gets the public works under her control, she will stop the canal. But she would have too great an interest in that work, to permit her to do this, because she must have some five or six millions before she could have the control. It would not be very wise in her to stop the canal when she can make ten per cent. on her capital embarked in that work, if the calculations of its projectors shall ever be realised. She may perhaps apply to the Legislature for a cross-cut to Baltimore: and this might be very wise in her, and she might apply her own means to its completion. He had no objection to this. He was a Marylander, and he would be willing that Baltimore should have her share. He held in his hand a law of the Legislature known as the tax bill, which shows the existence of a contract between the counties and the city. If Baltimore helps to pay the debt of the State, let her have the benefit of these internal improvements. The people have contributed liberally towards these public works, and he diverted that the revenue from them should not be divided to other purposes than those specified in the contracts. Many seem to think that Baltimore will have a controlling interest over these works, but this he doubted. To talk of her shutting up the canal even if she had the power, is to talk of that which in the nature of things, is scarcely possible. After she has contributed millions to this magnificent work by a tax upon her people, the idea of her closing the canal is too absurd to be believed.

Mr. B. concluded by moving the previous question.

There was a second.

The main question was ordered to be now taken, [being on the motion to reconsider.]

Mr. BLAKISTONE asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*.—Messrs. Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Jenifer, Lloyd, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Goldsborough, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Hardcastle, Schley, Fiery, Neill, Hollyday, Parke, Ege, Cockey and Brown—37.

*Negative*.—Messrs. Chapman, President, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Solters, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Colston, Eccleston, Bowie, McMaster, Fooks, Thawley, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore