

near the democracy now, and in one respect nearer than the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers.) I certainly object to the term "aristocratic" as applied to the higher branch of the Legislature. I do not think that when a gentleman goes into that body—I have never been there and cannot answer from personal experience—he loses his democracy there and becomes aristocratic. I prefer to regard it as the conservative branch of the democracy, the conservative representation of the people.

Mr. MILLER. I think there is a great deal of force in what has been said by the gentleman from Montgomery (Mr. Peter) and the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers) with regard to annual sessions and annual elections. I am in favor of annual elections and annual sessions; but I understand that the Convention has decided the question of annual elections, and that the question now is simply whether we shall have annual sessions of the Legislature of the State. There is one consideration which has occurred to me why we ought to have annual sessions. We shall elect a Governor probably for four years. I am on the Executive Committee; and it is with me a question whether I shall vote to give him the veto power or not. That subject has been introduced and considered somewhat. It may occur that the Governor elected for four years may be entirely opposed to the wishes of the Legislature of the State in regard to carrying out some very important measures necessary to be passed immediately. If we give him the veto power under the provisions of the Constitution, unless we hold annual sessions, it would prevent such a thing being passed. I want it within the power of the Legislature to meet every year independent of the call of the Governor; and for that reason I shall vote for annual sessions. I was in favor of and should much prefer annual elections for the popular branch of the Legislature, that whenever it meets it might get fresh instructions from the people; but although I cannot get them, I am still in favor of annual sessions.

Mr. THOMAS. There is another reason which occurs to me, which was the main object which induced me to offer this amendment in relation to annual sessions. We do not live in a time of peace. We live in the midst of a convulsion, which brings forth things to-day entirely unlooked for yesterday. We do not know how often the people may require or want the Legislature to meet. The Governor may refuse to call the Legislature together. We must make provision to meet all these things. If there is nothing for the Legislature to do, no business for them to transact, they will adjourn as soon as they please. The time is limited for one of these sessions to sixty days. I propose when we come to that part of the article, to say that after the Legislature has been in session a

certain number of days they shall not receive any pay, as they do in New York and other States. I think in these times, when we do not know what changes are to take place, and what changes the people of Maryland may have to make in their laws, on account of the changes we have made in our organic law, once a year is not too often for the Legislature to meet. By another provision, proposed by the committee on future amendments to the Constitution, if after a while the people find that it is unnecessary for the Legislature to meet annually, they can readily do away with it, and hold biennial sessions if they choose.

The question being taken, the result was—
yeas 17, nays 40—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Abbott, Audoun, Baker, Bond, Brooks, Davis, of Washington, Dent, Earle, Harwood, Hopper, Lansdale, Morgan, Scott, Sneary, Stockbridge, Sykes, Wickard—17.

Nays—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Annan, Belt, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Ecker, Edelen, Galloway, Hatch, Hebb, Hollyday, Hopkins, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Larsh, McComas, Miller, Mullikin, Murray, Noble, Nyman, Parker, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Stirling, Swope, Thomas, Todd, Wooden—40.

MESSRS. BELT, MILLER, and THOMAS, at first voted "aye," but subsequently changed their votes for the purpose of moving a reconsideration when there should be a fuller House.

So the amendment was rejected.

On motion of Mr. DANIEL,
The Convention adjourned.

FORTY-THIRD DAY.

FRIDAY, July 8, 1864.

The Convention met at 10 o'clock, A. M.
Prayer by the Rev. Mr. McNemar.

The roll was called and the following members answered to their names:

Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Barron, Belt, Bond, Briscoe, Brooks, Brown, Carter, Chambers, Clarke, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Dent, Earle, Ecker, Edelen, Galloway, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hollyday, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Lansdale, Larsh, McComas, Miller, Morgan, Mullikin, Murray, Noble, Nyman, Parker, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Dorchester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Wickard, Wilmer, Wooden—65.

The proceedings of yesterday were read and approved.