

requisite to vote for twenty men, if need be, provided all the names were printed upon the one and the same ticket?

Mr. CHAMBERS said, before the matter was disposed of, he desired to have a decision of the House upon the question alluded to by the gentleman from Dorchester, (Mr. Phelps.) If no motion to that effect was before the Chair, he would submit one, to require the elections for the political officers of the State to be held on the same day as the election of Electors for President and Vice-President, the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, and commencing in 1852. He agreed with most of what had been said by both the gentlemen, but he could not adopt the conclusion to which the last one (Mr. Grason) had arrived. If they were to have judicial officers elected—which, said he, may Heaven forefend—nothing could be more desirable than that those elections should be separated as widely as possible from all political questions, National, State, or any other, having any affinity or connection with party politics, in any form or degree. The Judiciary Department, in all its branches and ramifications—whether in the election of an Attorney General, State's Attorney, or any other thing associated with the administration of justice—should be kept at the utmost possible distance in time, as in every thing else, from every political consideration. But with regard to other elections, he could not see how it could be deemed proper to separate them. The very first element in the Republican creed was, that in an election the majority should rule. He should suppose it would be the very first wish of every Republican to have the fullest and largest possible expression of the voice of the freemen of the State in the election of their rulers; and how was this to be done? Why, by affording every reasonable facility to vote, in the first place, and by uniting all possible inducements to invite voters to use these facilities, in the next. Let every motive be concentrated on one point, all the exertion that could be employed, all the feeling that could be excited, every effort exhausted, to bring to the polls every individual voter of the State. Let them come, and come all, from the "top of the Allegany to the shores of the Atlantic," as was said by a friend. We were not to assume that any one entitled to vote was unwilling to exercise the privilege. The right implied the obligation, and he held the obligation to vote as imperative as he held the privilege desirable. He held, too, that it was plainly our duty to give these facilities. We were trustees for the people, delegated to provide for and protect their political privileges and their right of voting amongst others. How was this facility best afforded? Certainly, amongst other means, by lessening, as much as practicable, the expense and loss of time. If it were proposed to charge one dollar to every voter for the privilege of voting, or the employment of one day of his time, it would strike every mind as a monstrous iniquity. How was it more proper so to arrange the election, that a voter must necessarily expend his dollar or waste his whole day before he could vote? If he was compelled to expend his money, it mattered little in the result whether it was by

paying it to his host for his dinner and horse feed, or paying it to the collector. If he was subjected to the necessity of going twice and thus made twice to incur the expense, and lose the time necessary to secure his vote, when it might as well be done by one expenditure, then the second was virtually a tax upon the franchise. This was plain to every man who would think at all. It was doubling an expense, which many voters, and many indigent voters, must encounter, and thus taxing his privilege of voting; and this, too, without any adequate motive or advantage. He might add, also, the unnecessary expense to the county of an extra election, and the loss of time in prosecuting a separate canvass, as items to be regarded in estimating the economy of the one plan over the other.

Something had been said about separating State and National politics. He asked if any gentleman would stand on that floor and in the observation of that House, conversant, as most of its members were, with the history of our political formations, and say that National politics and State politics were different things? Would any gentleman hazard the responsibility of asserting before an intelligent community, that those who composed the party in State politics were not the same persons who composed the National party?—that National Whigs and State Whigs were different men in Maryland?—that the Democrats who, in Maryland, composed the National party of Democrats, were not the same men who composed the State party of Democrats? Could it be denied that they were identically the same, controlled by the same considerations, marching under the same leaders, managed by the same organization, and excited by the same feeling? By whom was the Governor elected, and why? Was it not by the same party who united in national politics, and because he belonged to that party? The National party was the great family; the party in the State was but a branch, a member of it. The President was the great head of it, from whom it had sometimes taken its name. Had we not for years known the "Jackson party?" Was that party only known in contests for national officers? Did not the same party precisely, composed of the same persons, and none others, unite in contending for State officers? Certainly every one knew and no one would deny this. It had been stated by his friend from Dorchester, and he believed the official returns verified the statement, that a larger vote was cast at the Presidential election than on any other occasion. This was but another mode of stating the fact, that there was at that time a more decided expression of the popular will, stronger evidence of the sentiment of the majority—of the whole number of voters. This was what we should desire to have, and to effect this we should shape our proceedings. When an election is to be had, for the purpose of ascertaining the sentiment of a majority, it seemed plainly to be a duty so to arrange matters as best to secure a fair and full expression of that sentiment, to enable that majority to express its opinion, the opinion of a majority of the whole.