

other objections, I have somewhat modified my proposition. It was also objected that members might be unwilling to attend promptly, and absent themselves frequently from the body, leaving it without a quorum, creating obstacles in the way of legislation. I have therefore embraced in the proposition, both the principle of a salary and of a per diem compensation. I move the following as a substitute for the first part of the section, leaving the latter clause as it stands:

Section 6, strike out the section as far as the word "when" in line 7 and insert, "the General Assembly shall continue its session so long as in its judgment the public interest may require, and each member thereof shall receive a compensation of five dollars per diem, for every day he shall attend the sessions, unless absent on account of sickness; provided however, that no member shall receive a larger compensation than four hundred dollars."

Mr. BOND. That gives no compensation for an extra session.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the effect of that if an extra session is called?

Mr. RIDGELY. It provides \$5 per diem for thirty days, for an extra session?

Mr. MILLER. As the amendment stands, members cannot receive anything for an extra session, for they cannot receive more than \$400.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I move to amend by adding, "and no mileage or perquisites shall in any case be allowed."

Mr. RIDGELY. I consider that embraced in the proposition, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Will the gentleman substitute "any other or larger sum" for "a larger compensation?" That will cover it.

Mr. RIDGELY modified his amendment accordingly.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE withdrew his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. There is another objection to the amendment as it stands now, that it restricts senators to the same amount, \$400, for the four years for which they are elected; for they cannot receive anything more than \$400. There should be something to show that for an extra session called during the year of the recess, or for the second session in the case of senators, there will be compensation allowed.

Mr. SMITH. I am opposed to putting in anything which will give an additional sum for an extra session. It is certainly right that members elected for four years should receive twice \$400. But I would suggest that that is a new General Assembly, so that they would receive a second amount of \$400 for that necessarily.

Mr. DENT. I have really been unable to bring my judgment to approve any of the propositions as being better than the one the

committee reported. But the last amendment proposes, it seems to me, to work manifest injustice to persons living remotely from the seat of government. A member from Annapolis, receives \$400 for eighty days attendance. A member from Allegany or St. Mary's receives no more, notwithstanding the inconvenience to which he would be subjected in travelling a long distance to the seat of government. It is unequal; and therefore the amendment should not be adopted. Only \$400 is allowed, with no mileage or expenses for coming or going; which would work injustice to members living at a distance from the seat of government.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I do not see the injustice of which the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Dent) speaks. If it be designed to cover the expense of travel, that does not differ widely, wherever the members come from in the State. The difference in the actual expense is the merest trifle in the world. I believe the expense of travelling here and back again, for a session of the Legislature is precisely the same in Allegany that it is in Baltimore city, and has been so for several years past, simply because there are commutation tickets for the session, which answer every purpose.

My reason for offering the amendment is, that under the cover of mileage there is a constant swindle upon the public treasury. I will speak plainly; and that is so in this State and in Congress. I suppose that mileage is to cover the expense of travel applied to a member of Congress or of the Legislature. In the present Legislature, members living within a stone's throw of this spot, receive \$100 under the name of mileage. Is that the expense of travel? I do not think these things honest. I think they are a swindle upon the public treasury. It is to take away the possibility of such a thing, to prevent such depredations upon the public treasury, under the name of mileage, perquisites, or any such name, that I offered the amendment that the salary should be fixed. The difference of travel is fully compensated by other considerations.

Mr. DENT. I was not aware that the gentleman had it in his mind to restrict the Legislature from swindling the treasury, as he had not made such a suggestion. I will go as far as himself to restrict any such operations. But I am unwilling in the Constitution to prohibit the payment of mileage; nor am I aware that there has been such swindling as the gentleman speaks of. I do not know that there has ever been, and I trust there has never been, although there may have been. Instead of referring to the expense of travelling to Allegany, I should have referred to the lower counties upon the Eastern Shore, where travelling is more expensive and more inconvenient; and it is not entirely the greater expense but the greater