

inconveniences, for which mileage makes compensation. Members from the lower counties have not the same facilities of travel with those in Baltimore city, or those who are immediately contiguous to their homes, who can see their families frequently, and can attend to other business which would be necessarily neglected by those who come from other portions of the State. I think we should not restrict the Legislature from giving something in the nature of mileage, even though we limit them to avoid imposition upon the treasury of the State.

Mr. SCHLEY. In the 28th section of this article, as reported by the committee, there is a provision made for a per diem of \$5 as contemplated by the amendment moved by my friend from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely.) If the question of the mileage allowed by law be an objection, when we come to the consideration of the 28th section, that also will be disposed of then. In other respects I prefer, with the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Dent) the report of the committee in the 6th section to any of the amendments proposed. The object of the gentleman from Baltimore county is to obtain certainty that the sessions shall not be too greatly extended; but I think it works inequality in many respects. There are times when the public exigency will require a long session of the Legislature; and I am not in favor of asking any public servant, in any capacity, to do his duty without proper remuneration. It was contemplated by the committee in making this report, that there would be a necessity for a prolonged session of the Legislature at their first meeting after the adoption of this Constitution. I think it would be very unfair to require a prolonged session, and to require them to perform all the work of that prolonged session for a fixed stipend; when other subsequent Legislatures which will not have this labor to perform, or this responsibility to incur, but whose duties may properly be discharged in a few days, will receive an equal remuneration for their services.

Again, sir, so far as public economy is concerned, I believe it will bear the test of demonstration, that the public economy is subserved by the section as reported; that it will actually cost the State less for the sessions of the Legislature than if we adopt the amendment. These are a few general reasons why I shall oppose the amendment, and support the section as reported. Others may be suggested. I do not care to dwell on them. It is a fact, nevertheless, that if a fixed remuneration or salary be attached to this office, there will always be found some, and perhaps influential members of the Legislature, who will be disposed to hurry through the public business and will not be so much impressed with the importance of mature consideration, as per diem members would be.

Mr. DANIEL. This amendment does not

propose to give members of the Legislature a salary. It proposes to give them five dollars a day for the actual number of days they shall sit. But their compensation in no case is to exceed four hundred dollars for the term of the delegate.

Mr. SCHLEY. If the gentleman chooses to be critical about words, I will say that there is a limited salary, which may be insufficient. A compensation or per diem is already provided in the report. But I objected to unlimited sessions, and I object to them now—except in the case of the first session after the adoption of this Constitution. In the case of the first session, I am willing that the session shall be unlimited, because I cannot foresee what the public necessity for legislation will be. I shall oppose the amendment, and support the report of the committee.

Mr. BRISCOE. I shall vote against the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) at this stage of the consideration of this question, because I think the settlement of the question of compensation more appropriately comes in, as has been indicated by the chairman of the Legislative Committee (Mr. Schley,) under the twenty-eighth article. I am in favor of the general proposition for the limitation of the sessions of the Legislature of this State. I am perfectly prepared to vote for this section as it now stands; and then meet hereafter the question that is covered by the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore county. I think that this subject of the limitation of the sessions of the Legislature was introduced by the framers of the Constitution, with a view to economy. Now, I am willing to vote for a proposition looking to the question of economy, if it can present the matter as fairly as it is now covered by the law; but not otherwise.

The question was upon the amendment submitted by Mr. RIDGELY.

Upon this question Mr. RIDGELY called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

The question being then taken, by yeas and nays, it resulted—yeas 40, nays 24—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Barron, Bond, Brooks, Carter, Chambers, Cunningham, Daniel, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Larsh, McComas, Miller, Mullikin, Murray, Noble, Parker, Peter, Purnell, Ridgely, Sands, Schlosser, Scott, Smith, of Dorchester, Stirling, Stockbridge, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Wickard, Wilmer—40.

Nays—Messrs. Baker, Briscoe, Brown, Clarke, Cushing, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Dent, Earle, Ecker, Edelen, Gallo-way, Hollyday, Lansdale, Mitchell, Morgan, Nyman, Pugh, Russell, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Sneary, Swope, Wooden—24.

The amendment was accordingly adopted.