

rather than executive patronage and favoritism.

Mr. SHRIVER said:

It was my intention to have responded to some of the objections which have been urged to the adoption of the first section as reported by the committee, but as the whole subject has been so fully and ably discussed, and as the Convention seem anxious for a vote on this question, I deem it improper to consume more time, and will content myself by reading the second section as I propose to amend it.

[Mr. S. read the section as proposed to be amended.]

That section when amended, taken in connection with the first, will, I think, answer most of the objections made to the first section as reported by the committee.

Mr. PHALPS called for the reading of the amendment,

Which was read.

The question was stated to be, first, on the amendment of Mr. DIRICKSON.

Mr. DIRICKSON with the consent of the Convention so modified said amendment, as to insert the word "thereafter," between the words "may" and "allow."

Mr. D. asked the yeas and nays,

Which were ordered, and

Being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Lee, Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Weems, Brent of Charles, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, McHenry, Carter, Stewart of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick and Smith—30.

*Negative*—Messrs. Buchanan, President, *pro tem.*, Morgan, Jenifer, Howard, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Spencer, Wright, Shriver, Sappington, Nelson, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Kilgour, Brewer, Parke, Shower and Cockey—29.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the substitute as offered by Mr. McLANE, on yesterday for the first section of the report, being in these words:

"In cases required by the public interest, the Governor shall have power to employ counsel under such regulations as the legislature shall prescribe."

Mr. JENIFER then moved to strike out the said first section and substitute the following—

"There shall be an Attorney General appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose term of office shall expire with that of the Governor, and whose duty and compensation shall be regulated by law."

The question was then stated to be on the substitute of Mr. JENIFER.

Mr. SHRIVER asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. GWINN called for a division of the ques-

tion on striking out—but, after some conversation as to the effect of the motion, withdrew it.

Mr. SPENCER renewed it.

A long conversation followed as to the state of the question, and the effect of the amendment.

The question was then taken on the motion to strike out, and the result was as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Morgan, Wells, Sellman, Weems, Jenifer, Crisfield, Williams, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Spencer, Brent of Baltimore city, Kilgour, Hollyday, Smith, and Shower—17.

*Negative*—Messrs. Buchanan, Pre't., *pro tem.*, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Brent of Charles, Howard, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Dashiell, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Shriver, Sappington, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Brewer, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, and Cockey—43.

So the Convention refused to strike out.

The question then recurred on the substitute amendment of Mr. McLANE.

The PRESIDENT, (*pro tem.*) said, that the substitute was not in order—the Convention having refused to strike out.

Mr. WEEMS desired to offer a substitute.

The PRESIDENT, (*pro tem.*) said, it was not in order.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, called the attention of the Chair to the twenty-second rule.

The PRESIDENT, (*pro tem.*) reconsidered his decision, on consulting the rule, and declared the substitute of Mr. McLANE to be in order.

Mr. WEEMS then said, he should offer a substitute for the section, and that, before it was read, he would say a few words.

Mr. W. said, he was opposed to the abolition of the office of Attorney General, and notwithstanding his unwillingness to participate in the discussion of the bill now under consideration, he would, if in order, offer a substitute for the first section. Before doing so, however, he desired to occupy the floor for a few moments, while he stated very briefly the reasons by which he had been influenced. In looking over the tabular statement, showing the amount paid by the Executive to counsel during the year 1850, he found the sum to be very little less than six thousand dollars. This, in his judgment, was a very important item of expense, one in which his constituents as well as the whole people of the State were interested. For one, he had always thought the Attorney General a very necessary and important officer, as the adviser of the Governor and Treasurer of the State. He considered him the proper person to defend any citizen of the State who might be arrested and put upon his trial for an alleged crime beyond the limits of the State. This bill provides for the election of Prosecuting Attorneys by the people in the several counties and city of Baltimore, by which arrangement, (continued Mr. W.,) the duties of the Attorney General will be very much mitigated.