

Legislature may adopt rules to provide against this difficulty; and the rules prepared by the Legislature do attempt to provide against it. But this body may be more impartial, not having private influences acting upon them, and may make the appeal to the selfishness of members to stop their pay. There is no other way that I know of, to reserve to them the right to continue their sessions if the necessity and importance of the public business requires it.

Mr. BOND. I am in favor of some modification of this article we are now considering. I have observed the Legislature, for I have been much in Annapolis during the sessions, and I am satisfied that some modification of this section, by which members will be induced to go to work a little earlier in the session than they ordinarily do, is required. I have no doubt that every gentleman desires to subserve the public good with the smallest expense to the public. I am not particular whether the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) to pay a certain sum, is adopted, or the proposition of my friend from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) limiting the introduction of new business to some certain point a short time before the close of the session. But in considering this subject it strikes me that I should rather favor the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore county. That would give us eighty days legislation, and pay the members \$5 per day. Eighty days is a larger period than that to which the session is limited by the Constitution now existing. I believe some period ought to be fixed beyond which new business should not be introduced. I know very well that a few members, generally working men of the House, have been able to prepare nearly all the business before the requisite time. But there are a great many gentlemen not industrious enough to go to work in the early part of the session. As my friend from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) says, it is a principle of the human heart to procrastinate, to put off that which can be done at a future day.

I therefore think that some modification of this section ought to be made, and I am indifferent whether it be the proposition to limit the time of the introduction of new business, or the proposition to pay members a certain gross sum.

I will remark in reference to the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) that I think the time is too long, from the 20th of February until the end of March. It strikes me that if there is no business to be acted on by the Legislature between the 20th of February and the last of March, except what has been before introduced, they will have too much time. I would therefore suggest that the limit of the introduction of new business be the 1st of March.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Will the gentleman allow me to say that my amendment does not limit the session to the last of March. The Legislature may adjourn as soon as the business is done.

Mr. BOND. The amendment to the amendment proposes the limit of the 1st of May.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. They may adjourn as much earlier as they see fit.

Mr. BOND. They will sit until the 1st of May always; and the time is too long already. The sessions now, closing in the early part of March, cost the State \$80,000, if I am rightly informed; and if they sit until the 1st of May it will double the expense; so that so far as economy is concerned you may as well have a session in each year closing by the 10th of March.

The PRESIDENT. The sessions closing on the 10th of March have cost the State about \$75,000; and the last session overran that amount.

Mr. BOND. And that would be very nearly doubled, I think, by continuing the session to the 1st of May. I shall vote against that for the reason I have named, that I think the time is too long, and I do not think the State ought to be subjected to the expense. I shall favor the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city, and a limitation upon the time of introducing new business.

Mr. CHAMBERS. It strikes me that if the proposition of the venerable gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) is to be adopted, this question is settled by adopting his proposition. Undoubtedly if a salary is to be given to members of the Legislature, we ought to impose no restriction upon the session. That seems to be a necessary consequence. It would seem therefore that we are precipitately acting upon the subject of limiting the session. And I would suggest the propriety of passing over the preliminary questions to determine at once whether the member of the Legislature is to be a salaried officer or a per diem officer. If he is a per diem officer, the State has an interest in shortening the session. If he is a salaried officer, let him have whatever time he pleases within which to spend his salary. I would suggest therefore that the propositions before us be withdrawn to enable us to decide upon that offered by the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely.)

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE withdrew his amendment temporarily.

Mr. RIDGELY. Several objections have been suggested to me to the amendment which I read, and in my judgment, with some force in them. Perhaps the strongest one is that if the members of the Legislature are made salaried officers, to receive \$400 a year, there might be a possibility of their coming here and spending twenty or thirty days, taking the \$400, and going away, neglecting the public business. To meet that and some