

the gentleman to show me that any statesman of the State of Maryland has ever suggested the idea, even thought of or dreamed of the idea of paying the judges of the court of appeals, for instance, out of the treasury of the particular district from which they come. The gentlemen from Baltimore have talked very freely of the expense to their particular portion of the State. Why, sir, where does Baltimore get her money from? Where do the profits come from which are made in the city of Baltimore? How is it sustained? Is justice sold to each county according to its means? I say there is no precedent for such a state of things. If you go for this, you should let the county regulate its own affairs, adjust the salaries and arrange the whole concern. Are you going to cut up the administration of justice into slices, and divide it among the counties according to their means? I think that we are coming to strange times indeed. Novelties involving the very peace of our communities have been most abundant, from the very day of our coming here. Gentlemen from the city of Baltimore should recollect how much the counties have contributed to build the canals and the railroads that have made her what she is.

Mr. CUSHING. The gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Berry) made the suggestion to the house yesterday; that the counties wanted to pay for them.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Mr. Berry is not here to answer for himself. I heard no such suggestion from him. But I do not care where it comes from; it is a heresy; and I think it shows an enlargement of imagination that I did not suppose Mr. Berry possessed. I protest against it in the strongest terms, as an infringement of the rule of propriety adopted everywhere. The idea that justice is thus to be sliced up and parcelled out, made the subject of bargain and sale to the different counties of the State—I say it is a heresy of the very highest character. I should be exceedingly pleased to see it receive the marked discountenance of this body. I refrain from saying more at this time; for I believe that it cannot find very many advocates here.

Mr. AUDOUN demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 36, nays 40—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Brooks, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Ecker, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Nyman, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Wickard, Wood—36.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Billingsley, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Carter, Chambers, Crawford, Dennis, Dent, Duvall, Edelen, Farrow, Gale, Henkle, Hol-

lyday, Horsey, Johnson, Landsdale, Lee, Mayhugh, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Murray, Negley, Parker, Parran, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Schlosser, Smith, of Dorchester, Smith, of Worcester, Thruston, Todd, Turner, Wilmer—40.

When their names were called,

Mr. NEGLEY said: The first reason why I cannot vote for this is that the county courts are very often used for the collection of debts by persons living in Baltimore; and the second reason is that the State fixes the salary and mode of payment. If they will allow the counties to make their own contract with their own judge, I might vote for it; otherwise I cannot. I vote "no."

Mr. SANDS said: I vote for this proposition because Howard county does not want a judge for itself, and if it did would be willing to pay for it. I vote "aye."

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

The question recurred on Mr. MILLER's amendment.

Mr. KEEFER moved to amend the amendment by striking out the words "several counties," in line two, and inserting "State at large."

Mr. MILLER. We have adopted this as an amendment; and the ruling of the chair has been heretofore that although you may amend by adding you cannot strike out.

The PRESIDENT. This section is not perfected yet. The question is yet to be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Allegany as amended; and it may be still further amended.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question again recurred on the adoption of Mr. HEBB's amendment as amended by adopting Mr. MILLER's substitute.

Mr. PUGH demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 33, nays 44—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Billingsley, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Crawford, Dennis, Dent, Duvall, Edelen, Gale, Henkle, Hodson, Hollyday, Horsey, Johnson, Landsdale, Lee, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Negley Parran, Peter, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Dorchester, Smith, of Worcester, Swope, Thruston, Todd, Turner, Wilmer—33.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Brooks, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Markey, Mayhugh, McComas, Murray, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schley, Schlosser, Sneary, Stirling, Sykes, Thomas, Wickard, Wood—44.

The amendment as amended was accordingly rejected.