

branch of the general assembly. At any rate it certainly can do no harm.

And it strikes me with surprise—I do not like to allude to that sort of thing in argument—that any gentleman upon the majority side of this house should have any objection, particularly at this time when they may think they have a chance to put their friends in office, to having this office created.

Mr. SANDS. I have not declared any hostility to this section, by a great deal.

Mr. STIRLING. I did not refer to the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands;) he only asked a question. But there was a motion made on our side of the house to strike out this section. As I said, the expense is very slight. I really can see no objection to it. And it strikes me that there are substantial benefits to be derived from it. I think upon principle that the idea of giving the people this chance to elect two officers in this manner, is the grand feature which recommends this proposition. It is in accordance with the provisions of the federal constitution; and it is, I think, in accordance with the customs of a majority of the States in both sections of the country. There is a lieutenant governor in Kentucky; one, I think, in Virginia; one in most of the Western States, and in all the New England States.

Mr. SANDS. I am so well satisfied with the reasons presented by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling,) in support of this section, that I shall most certainly vote for it. I merely rise now to ask whether we cannot lessen the number of officers by providing that the lieutenant governor shall discharge the duties of secretary of State? In the twenty-third section of this report we provide for the appointment of a secretary of State. May not one individual—I put it to the judgment of the house—very properly discharge the duties of both of these offices? If we can consolidate them, I think we ought to do so. I shall favor doing so if possible.

Mr. KING. I can see no reason for this section in relation to lieutenant governor, except it be to create a new office. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) says it will be merely a complimentary office. Now I am opposed to all these things, if they are to cost more money.

Mr. SMITH, of Carroll. I had not designed making a single remark upon this question. I submitted the motion to strike out, because I supposed the convention desired to vote directly upon this question. And I wanted them to vote without debate, because I supposed they had made up their minds upon the subject. But as the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) has alluded to me, and has expressed his surprise that any member of the majority should make so impolitic a motion, I will respond to him.

I think, in the first place, the office of lieu-

tenant governor is totally unnecessary. It is a useless expense, and will amount to no practical good. I am opposed to further extending the elective franchise to further extending the power of the people to elect officers. The last convention carried that principle to an extent beyond which I am not willing to go. I rather think that justice, propriety, and the public welfare require that that privilege should be abridged, rather than extended.

I think that the argument made use of by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) that this will give the present majority in the convention and in the State, an additional member of the senate, and an additional officer, is of no practical importance, because in the changes which are constantly occurring in politics, it may be a double-edged sword cutting against us the next time.

It is an unnecessary office. The senate has been organized without it since the formation of the government of this State. There has been no difficulty for the lack of such an officer. The people do not want him; there has not been a single expression in favor of it from any part of the State. And as it is violating a principle which I believe ought to be fundamental in our action here, and is extending the elective power further than I think it should be extended, I must oppose it. And as I have no good reason from the gentleman from Baltimore city, or from any gentleman upon this floor, I shall vote against it.

Mr. THAUSON. I think if there is any office which should be filled directly by the people, it is certainly that of governor of the State. And this provision is giving the people the assurance that they will have the selection of that officer under contingencies that may happen. I think the arguments of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) ought to be satisfactory to this convention, as they are satisfactory to me. With some gentlemen the expense is a terrible thing. But with me the great thing is the securing to the people, in contingencies that may happen, a governor of the State of their own selection; the officer above all others whom the people ought to have the opportunity to select. Should you take away from the people the right to select all officers but one, you certainly would leave to them the selection of the governor of the State. That would be the last officer whose election by the people you would take away. This is a very small expense indeed, in assuring to them the right to select that officer, even in the contingency of death, resignation or other disqualification of the one elected governor. I think the arguments in favor of it are satisfactory, particularly in the present crisis of our national affairs.

Mr. ANBORN. I shall vote against striking