

nia] sessions, as a measure of retrenchment. That was true; but now, when our debt is likely to be paid off, if we check those wisely concocted measures of finance, which have been the means of resting our prosperity, rely on it, the people will cry out against us. If he could see the necessity for annual sessions, he, for one, would vote to return to them, but he thought the business could be done just as well by biennial as annual sessions. The Legislature, if industrious, can pass all necessary laws in sixty days, just as well as six months, and if not, they have the power to extend their session, in view of perfecting changes on account of the Constitution now being made, to six months or longer, if found necessary; and then, if the system may be found not to work well, they can but return to annual sessions. But there is no fear as to the result. The proposition of his colleague was a self-evident one, he thought, and ought to carry conviction to the mind of every one; he trusted it would be adopted, as great good would certainly grow out of its adoption.

Mr. SCHLEY said that when the proposition for biennial sessions was before the people, he voted against it, believing that it was a scheme designed to get rid of a Reform Convention. He had been influenced by the opinion, that elections should be frequent, and that the Legislature ought to meet annually to supervise the accounts of the Treasurer. His first objection was removed by the call of the Convention, and his second, by the action of the people establishing biennial sessions. The more he reflected on the subject, the more was he satisfied with the decision of the people on this question. He would now vote for biennial sessions; first, because as a financial measure, it would lessen the burden of taxation; and, secondly, because the people had expressly sanctioned the system. He could bear testimony to what was yesterday said by the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas.) He had found no man who had raised his voice against this biennial system. It was, therefore, to be regarded as a settled question; and, in his vote, he intended to act in conformity with the will of the people. Another reason which influenced him, was, that nearly half the States of the Union, had adopted the principle; and lastly, he would vote for it from a thorough conviction that it will, if rejected, put in jeopardy the Constitution itself. The people had reflected on the subject, and had made the change, and it would endanger the Constitution to insert a provision in opposition to their expressed will. He desired to make the new Constitution such as they will approve and adopt. He had merely risen to make these brief remarks, and he would now move the previous question. He withdrew the motion at the request of Mr. DONALDSON, who promised to renew it.

Mr. DONALDSON merely desired to say a few words, by way of explanation. Gentlemen on the other side seemed to have understood his argument, as if he meant that the accounts of the Treasurer alone, were to be subject to the inspection of the Legislature. The check to which he referred, was upon all the accounting officers in the State, including the Treasurer,

whose returns were made to the House of Delegates, and there became the subject of various enquiries and orders, which often proceeded from not the most friendly sources. This responsibility, and this apprehension, tended to make those officers prompt, efficient and scrupulous. In regard to the excess of legislation, he repeated that it was his conviction, that the evil was really increased by the biennial system, and, in this connexion, he gave some further illustrations of his views.

Mr. DONALDSON concluded by renewing, (according to promise,) the demand for the previous question.

Mr. BRENT, of Charles, desired to offer an amendment, (which was not now in order.)

Some conversation followed on a point of order, in which Mr. MCHENRY and the PRESIDENT, *pro tem.*, took part.

Mr. SCHLEY now withdrew the previous question, at the request of

Mr. BRENT, of Charles, who, in accordance with the indication he had this morning given, sent to the clerk's table, to be read, an amendment, which he intended to offer when in order, and which is given hereafter.

Mr. B., in accordance with his pledge, renewed the demand for the previous question.

There was a second, and the main question was ordered to be now taken.

The first question was on the amendment of Mr. SPRIGG, as accepted by Mr. MERRICK.

Mr. DIRICKSON asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and having been taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Tuck, President, *pro tem.*, Morgan, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Merrick, Buchanan, Welsh, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, McLane, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Spencer, George, Wright, Shriver, Biser, McHenry, Magraw, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Pressman, Ware, Davis, Anderson, Parke, Shower and Brown—33.

*Negative*—Messrs. Ricaud, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Dalrymple, Brent, of Charles, Bell, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Gaither, Annan, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Waters, Brewer, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith and Cockey—47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRENT, of Charles, now offered the following amendment:

Amend the said second section by striking out all after the words "term of," where they secondly occur in the second line, and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

"One year from the day of the general election, for the first two years after the adoption of this Constitution, and thereafter for the term of two years from the day of each general election, so that the first two sessions of the