

money. I know that the sentiment of the people everywhere was against the action of the last general assembly in this respect. I do not care what decision this convention comes to; I as one of its members, entertaining the opinion I do, shall positively decline to take this money out of the State treasury. I therefore vote "no."

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. The gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) submitted an order to the convention, to which the gentleman from Queen Anne's (Mr. Lee) proposed an amendment. Upon which of those propositions is the motion to reconsider?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Purnell.) Upon both.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. There were two distinct motions.

Mr. BELT. I never heard of anybody who doubted on a question of this sort.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I made an inquiry of the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair understood the motion to be to reconsider the whole subject; the order of the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) as amended, on motion of the gentleman from Queen Anne (Mr. Lee.)

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. It was not amended; the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Both the order and the amendment were lost.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Then I vote "no."

The order submitted by Mr. RIDGELY was as follows:

"Ordered, That the president of this convention be allowed a per diem of six dollars, and that the committee on accounts audit his account accordingly."

To which Mr. LEE proposed to add the following:

"And that the committee on accounts be hereby instructed to audit the mileage account of each member of this convention according to the joint resolution of the general assembly of this State at its last session, adjusting the mileage of the members of that body."

The question was upon the amendment proposed by Mr. LEE.

Mr. SCHLEY. I call for the order of the day, the hour of eleven having arrived.

Mr. MILLER moved that the order of the day be postponed until half past eleven o'clock.

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

The question was then taken by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 41, nays 21—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Abbott, Audoun, Barron, Belt, Berry, of Baltimore county, Bond, Brooks, Carter, Crawford, Cunningham, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dellinger, Dent, Duvall, Gale, Hatch, Henkle, Hodson, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Jones, of Somerset, Lansdale, Larsh, Lee, Marbury, Markey, Mayhugh, Miller, Morgan, Negley, Ridgely, Schlosser,

Smith, of Dorchester, Swope, Sykes, Turner, Wickard, Wilmer, Wooden—41.

Nays—Messrs. Annan, Baker, Daniel, Ecker, Farrow, Greene, Harwood, Hebb, Hoffman, Keefer, Kennard, McComas, Mullikin, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Russell, Schley, Scott, Stirling, Stockbridge—21.

The order of the day was postponed accordingly.

Mr. GALE moved the previous question, which was seconded; and the main question ordered.

The question was upon the amendment offered by Mr. LEE.

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

The question was then taken by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 38, nays 33—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Abbott, Audoun, Barron, Belt, Berry, of Baltimore county, Bond, Brooks, Carter, Crawford, Dail, Dellinger, Dent, Duvall, Gale, Hatch, Henkle, Hodson, Hollyday, Jones, of Cecil, Jones, of Somerset, King, Lansdale, Larsh, Lee, Marbury, Mayhugh, Miller, Morgan, Negley, Peter, Ridgely, Smith, of Dorchester, Swope, Sykes, Turner, Wickard, Wilmer, Wooden—38.

Nays—Messrs. Annan, Baker, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Charles, Davis, of Washington, Ecker, Farrow, Gallo-way, Greene, Harwood, Hebb, Hoffman, Horsey, Keefer, Kennard, Markey, McComas, Mitchell, Mullikin, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Russell, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Thomas—33.

The amendment was accordingly adopted. Pending the call of the yeas and nays, the following explanations were made by members as their names were called:

Mr. DANIEL. Believing, as I have already stated, that this proposition is contrary both to law and principle, and calculated, if it prevails, merely to despoil the treasury of so much money, I shall vote against it. And if it is adopted, I shall feel it to be my duty to return to the treasury of the State the amount I may receive under this proposition. I am very sorry to see that a great many members who have been here least are the most anxious in advocating this amendment. I vote "no."

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. Some of my friends around me seem to think that this is a mere question of law. Now I do not differ with them at all in regard to the construction of the law. I believe the law is on the side of those who contend that they have a right to this extra compensation. But I do not believe the people of the State so understood it. I know I did not so understand it at the time of the election. Believing that the people did not understand the law in that way, I am compelled to vote "no."

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall vote against this order in the first place, because, notwithstanding the elaborate arguments by which it is