

biennial election for Senators and Delegates would be held, and at the same time, that in 1852, the election for Governor would be held. It had been urged that annual sessions would certainly be necessary in 1851-2, and in 1842-3, and probably in 1853-4. The amendments alluded to by him would exactly meet that necessity. The election of 1851 would provide for the first session, the election in November, 1852, would provide for the second session, and as the members then elected would be for two years, they could hold another session the following year if it should be found necessary, which, however, he did not anticipate. He believed two sessions would be found quite sufficient to accomplish all the duties imposed by the new constitution. However, it was manifest the proposed arrangement would meet either contingency, and allow two or three annual sessions, as might be determined on. The supposed difficulty, therefore, urged by the gentleman from Queen Anne's, was entirely imaginary. All our proceedings were in our control, and nothing was more easy than to accommodate every other measure to the proposed arrangement; and indeed, as to the third section of the legislative bill, we have yet to act upon it in any event. In fact, the elections in the years 1851 and 1852, must be held under either scheme, and the difference was simply this, that if a session was held the third consecutive year, it would be composed in the one case, of members elected for two years, in the first year of their official existence; and in the other case, it would be composed of members elected for two years, but in the second year of their term. Another difference was, and he thought both, but especially this in favor of his scheme, that if there was found to be no necessity for a third annual session, then, according to the opposite scheme, the members elected in 1853 would not assemble in session until some fifteen months after their election, and the same would be the case always after. And thus we are asked either to submit to an acknowledged evil, or at a large expense to the State, have an unnecessary session forced upon us, merely to eke out a finish to a plan, seriously objectionable on other accounts. So far from considering any thing in the past action of the Convention as a ground of objection, he really regarded what had been done as an invitation now, deliberately to consider and decide, whether the State and general elections should be held on the same day or not. It was now for decision as an original question, and he must repeat, that upon that question, it appeared the argument was all on one side.— There seemed to be scarcely an effort on the other side to resist the considerations of convenience, economy, and a larger and fuller expression of public sentiment; but it had been said that corrupting influences from Washington had controlled the elections for officers of the United States. This certainly was the first occasion on which he had heard this complaint.— The gentleman who made this complaint looked from a point of view which he (Mr. C.) had never occupied. The subject of corruptions at

the ballot box, had been a fruitful source of denunciation and regret, but this idea of its having its origin in the action of the general government, had not been announced here, nor had he the slightest recollection that it had been expressed elsewhere.

If this was the true cause of the different result which our experience proved had occurred in the election of Presidential electors, and the election for Governor, if the last resulted in one way, because that corrupting influence of the Central Government was not used while the Presidential election was carried in a different way by the use of that influence, what was to become of the other main argument of the same gentleman, that the eloquence of gubernatorial candidates would account for the success of those who had been elected to that office? He would submit to the Convention whether these arguments were entirely consistent. He did not profess to be informed of any particular facts on which either of these arguments must rest. The statement to-day made, of their existence, was the first he had heard of them. But it did appear to him that while the assertion of an active corrupting influence, as the effective cause of success by one political party in the Presidential election, implied that without such an influence the majority was one way, the declaration that the success of a Gubernatorial candidate, of opposite politics, was owing to his oratory, seemed as clearly to imply that the majority was the other way. He would there leave that portion of the adverse argument. In connection with this part of the case, the very pregnant circumstance, alluded to by his friend from Prince George's, (Mr. Tuck,) deserved attention. If voters were ever controlled, as was now intimated, by the corrupting interposition of persons connected with the General Government, it was desirable to have the intelligence, as well as the eloquence of a candidate for the Governor's chair, to assist in detecting and exposing such vile practices. Again, if, as his other friend had said, a torrent of eloquence from such a candidate was likely to occasion voters to disregard matters of political history and fact, by making the worse appear the better cause, why it was well to send along the antidote. Let the candidates for the electoral college, who are to be elected by the same persons, in the same way, by general ticket, and at the same time, let them be along and disabuse the minds of voters, that they be not deluded by the tinsel of fair speech and false logic, however eloquently and fervidly put forth. It was a case in which more safety in numbers might be anticipated. The political patient would probably be more fairly treated than when in the hands of a single practitioner, or perhaps two, in a condition of antagonism. The learned member of the profession before him, (Doctor Bell,) shakes his head, to dissent from the position that there is more safety in a number of surgical or medical attendants. It may be so— he knows best. Perhaps the illustration is a bad one, as doctors not only proverbially "disagree," but in many instances disagree with less