

least one session of the Legislature. Why it was but the other day we were told that three sessions would be necessary for this purpose. When the biennial sessions bill was before us, the Convention had on this very account, determined to hold at least two annual sessions to complete the details necessary to the perfection of our work and to get the new government fairly in motion. As to the idea of putting it in operation without any legislative aid, he held it altogether impossible. The session of the Legislature then would not probably terminate before the month of March or perhaps April, and he would therefore suggest the month of May as the proper period for these elections. It was perhaps the earliest practicable period and it was as remote as any other from the period of the political elections. He should be gratified if the gentleman who had moved the day would adopt this suggestion.

The question was then stated to be on the amendment of Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. SAPPINGTON asked the yeas and nays which were ordered.

Mr. SHRIVER asked a division of the question on Mr. SPENCER's amendment, first on striking out.

The question was taken, and the result was as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Lee, Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Jenifer, Welch, Chandler, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, George, Wright, Stewart of Caroline, Ware, Schley, J. Newcomer, Waters, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, and Smith—25.

*Negative*—Messrs. Buchanan, Pres't., *pro tem*, Morgan, Wells, Weems, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Howard, Bell, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Dirickson, McMaster, Shriver, Biser, Sappington, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Neill, Harbine, Kilgour, Brewer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, and Shower—42.

So the Convention refused to strike out.

The seventh and last section was then adopted.

Mr. HOWARD now offered the amendment he had heretofore indicated [as section 3]—stating that he had now included in it one or two provisions not included in the original proposition.

The amendment was read as follows:

Strike out the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th sections of said report and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

“Section 3. The State's Attorneys in the several counties of the State, and the city of Baltimore shall be elected when the Governor's election shall take place, and in the event of any vacancy occurring in said offices, the court of the county or city where such vacancy shall occur, shall have power to fill such vacancy until the next regular election for Governor takes place, the fees and commissions to the State's Attorneys shall be the same as are now allowed by law to the Attorney General and his deputies, subject to such change from time to time, as the Legisla-

ture may provide by law all necessary rules and regulations in relation to said officers, not inconsistent with the purposes of this Constitution; the first election shall take place for State's Attorney, at the same time and place where the members of the next House of Delegates shall be elected, and the officers then chosen shall hold their offices until the next election for Governor.”

Mr. SHRIVER called for a division of the question on striking out.

Which was ordered.

Mr. SPENCER made some remarks, which will hereafter be published.

Mr. SHERWOOD, of Balto. city, was in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) to elect the State's Attorneys when the Governor was elected. Special and repeated elections were inconvenient as well as expensive to the “men of daily toil.” Time, with the mechanics and working men, is emphatically money; and, if you hold a separate election for each of the various State officers proposed to be elected by the people, under the Constitution we are now forming, you not only keep alive those excitements necessarily attendant upon all political contests, and which engender bad feelings among neighbors and friends, but you virtually tax this class of our citizens, or disfranchise them altogether. As one of that numerous class, he could not give his sanction to any measure that imposed unnecessary burdens, however slight, upon them. Mr. S. alluded to the charge of prejudice which was alleged to exist among the working classes against lawyers, and contended that it was imaginary to a great extent, and that he believed no portion was more ready than the mechanics to render honor where honor was due to any and every citizen in our midst, regardless of creeds or professions. He condemned all invidious distinctions that tended to alienate one portion of the people from the other, or to array them in opposition on questions of governmental policy, merely because of their business professions. Social distinctions might and would exist, but political distinctions, in our country, should be condemned by every lover of constitutional freedom and equality. Merit only should be the political touch-stone. With Burns, it might be appropriately said:

What, tho' on homely fare we dine,

Wear hodden gray, and a' that?

Give fools their silk, and knaves their wine,

A man's a man for a' that.

To hold a separate election from the ordinary or general one, he contended, would not bring out the popular vote of the State. He therefore hoped that the amendment then under consideration would be adopted, from the fact that it would afford the people that opportunity, to which they were entitled, of fully and freely exercising the elective franchise. He would conclude by expressing his hope that all the elections, as far as practicable, might be held on the same day.

Mr. DORSEY said he had proposed to strike out for the purpose of introducing the amendment he designed to offer, because he thought the section