

government to have the officers of the popular branch go on in the execution of their duty without recurring to their constituency for their approval or disapproval. A member is elected to the House of Delegates and serves for the term. He either does or does not conform to the wishes of his constituents. If he does, let him submit his case to them for re-election. If, on the other hand, he is acting in direct contradiction to their wishes and their will on every important occasion, how can he expect to serve another session? Does that conform to our notions of popular responsibility and the agency of the representative? I think not. I am perfectly willing to have annual sessions of the Legislature; but I am not willing to have the expense of having a second session composed of men not actually representing the constituency which elected them. If there be annual sessions, let there be annual elections. Let the servant be tried, and if found wanting, let him be removed; or if faithful let him be retained, as the case may be.

Mr. DANIEL. How would the gentleman apply that doctrine to members of Congress, who are elected for two years?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I can only say that is a case with which the government of the State of Maryland has nothing to do. I have expressed my views on this question; and I cannot be turned from my conviction by any precedent which may arise in Congress. I think that very often the constituency of Maryland would be apt to relieve the gentlemen elected from serving a second session if they had it in their power.

Mr. SANDS. I am in favor of annual sessions, and I will give the reason. I suppose that the Legislature meeting once in two years is not able in the period of their session to do the necessary legislation for the State. I know that subjects, matter of legislation, often go over from one session to another for want of time, and have to remain unacted upon for two years. I think the convenience and the interests of the people of the State of Maryland are more to be considered than the little bill of expense attending a session of the Legislature which may be necessary to discharge the public business. The objection made by my friend from Montgomery (Mr. Chambers) does not hold good on the score of expense, for he not only wants annual sessions of the Legislature but annual elections. How are those elections to be held, and who is to pay the expense?

Mr. PETER. I am for annual elections upon the principle stated by the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers.) Then we can afford the expense, because we get a second man to work and act for the people, and a fair expression of their feelings.

Mr. SANDS. My answer to that is that the political sentiments of gentlemen elected ought to be no consideration in a legislative assem-

bly, but the wants of the people, whether A, B, or C, shall be made into a corporation for this purpose or for that; whether a road shall be chartered, or something else done. It is not the question of political sentiments. I turn again therefore to my friend and say that upon the score of expense his argument does not hold good for the reason that he asks not only for the expense of annual legislation, but of annual elections. This is all to be at the expense of the people of the State.

My friend from Kent (Mr. Chambers) very properly replied to the objection of my friend from Baltimore (Mr. Daniel) with regard to the election of congressmen. It is true we cannot avoid that. It is not in our power to elect them annually. But how does my friend apply the doctrine to our senatorial elections? Our senators are chosen for four years; and I will accept the suggestion of the gentleman that the constituency of the State of Maryland would gladly, if they had a chance, relieve some gentlemen who are their present senatorial incumbents from the duties and responsibilities of the office. If my friend from Kent will say that he is for annual senatorial elections, as well as for annual representative elections, then the objection, I think, is valid.

Mr. CHAMBERS. The gentleman forgets that he and I do not stand upon the same platform. He is a democrat out and out. I am not. A part of this government of ours always has been, and I hope always will be, aristocratic in its theory. The only conversation I ever had with Mr. Madison in my life was one in which he took occasion to say we had the best Constitution of any State of this Union; and the most brilliant gem in that Constitution was the character of our Senate. It was then, as it was sometimes expressed, the quintessence of the essence. The people elected a college, and the college the Senate. I am for a popular branch to be the representatives of the people who are entitled always to be heard. The aristocratic branch may be elected for six years if you choose. That will be consistent with my theory. They are not a popular branch. They are to restrain, according to the theory, any rash movements on the part of the popular branch, to enable the government to act with its steadiness and uniformity, undisturbed by matters which may excite the popular passion for a moment. Am I understood?

Mr. SANDS. I think so, sir. My friend has told me I am a democrat. I should like to know what kind of one,—peace, war, radical, or what? I think I must follow my friends illustrious example. When he came into this hall, he disclaimed all party affiliation. So far as the democratic party is concerned, I disclaim all affiliation with it; and beg not to be called by that name.

I take issue with my friend from Kent (Mr. Chambers) with regard to the senatorial and