

he intended at a proper time, to renew his amendment.

This system of limiting districts to comparatively small neighborhoods would render it impracticable to commit frauds. He believed that, under its operation there would not be a solitary legal vote lost, while the qualification of a six months' residence would lead to many. He could not but express his astonishment that the Convention should have almost unanimously adopted the cramping amendment of the committee which contained this residence qualification, not only in the counties, but even in every district or ward of the city of Baltimore. He did not intend to detain the Convention by going further into the subject at present. His only design in making these few remarks was to show the ground on which he should vote hereafter. He would vote against all restrictions.

Mr. SPENCER wished to explain to the gentleman from Harford, that his amendment had nothing in it which touched the right of suffrage.

Mr. BREWER suggested to the gentleman from Queen Anne's, at the close of the first paragraph, where it prescribes that the oath shall be taken before the Judge of the Court of Appeals, to substitute a judge of the county.

Mr. SPENCER admitted that it might be proper to make some change in the amendment. He had himself thought it would require slight modification on this point. But it could be amended in the House.

Mr. KILGOUR said the amendment ought to go further. Bribery was not the only offence against which it was necessary to make provision. He was of opinion that the offence of double voting ought to be covered by this proposition.

Mr. SPENCER replied that it covered the whole ground.

Mr. CHAMBERS said that the committee on the elective franchise had reported an additional section which accomplished the object of the gentleman from Queen Anne's in much fewer words.

Mr. SPENCER answered some of the objections which had been made to the diffuseness of his amendment. He would not go into the question whether it was more condensed than the report of the committee. The report contained more words. But it did not cover the whole ground. The report only embraces those who give bribes. What then was to become of those who were guilty of double voting and colonizing? Now, his amendment embraces all these offences. He would submit to the Convention therefore, which proposition was the best.

Mr. DORSEY sent up to the Chair a series of amendments, which he desired might be printed for the information of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that the power to order the printing of a paper was in the Convention, and not in the Committee.

Mr. TRICK suggested that the amendment should be read, but did not press the request.

Mr. MORGAN suggested to the gentleman (Mr. DORSEY) to designate at what particular points the amendments should come in.

After some further conversation,

The question was taken on the amendments of Mr. SPENCER, and by ayes 40, noes 27, they were agreed to.

Mr. SOLLERS offered the following amendments:

Insert after the word "person," in the first line, 3rd section, the words "above the age of twenty-one years;" and after the word "crime," in the second line, insert "unless he shall be pardoned by the Executive."

Mr. SOLLERS explained his object in offering this amendment. Assault, with intent to kill, was an infamous crime. Fighting a duel was an infamous crime. But with reference to these offences, the pardoning power is left in the hands of the Executive, because the innocence of the party may be disclosed by subsequent evidence, which may satisfy the Executive that the punishment should be remitted. An infant may be convicted of an infamous crime, and it may be considered proper that the pardoning power should step in and save him from destruction.

Mr. PRESSTMAN presumed that to the first part of the amendment there would be little objection. But as to the second part, he would suggest to the gentleman from Calvert, that the pardon, according to a known construction of law, purges the offence. It is the general interpretation that if an individual convicted of crime is afterwards pardoned, or has served out his term of imprisonment, he is purged of the crime. If this was not the case, he would not object to the amendment.

Mr. SOLLERS briefly explained.

Mr. SPENCER moved a substitute, for the first amendment of Mr. SOLLERS, and which was read as follows:

"Strike out all after the word 'that' in the first line of said section, to the word 'be,' in the third line."

Mr. DORSEY said, that one of the amendments which he had sent up to the Chair, reached the point contemplated in the amendment of the gentleman from Queen Anne's, (Mr. SPENCER.)

Some conversation followed, as to the order in which Mr. DORSEY's amendments were entitled to be received.

Mr. CRISFIELD expressed great surprise that such an amendment as the one now submitted, should have emanated from such high sources. He was astonished that the gentleman from Queen Anne's, and the gentleman from Anne Arundel should have suggested it. If the right of suffrage be of such high value, are these gentlemen willing to share it with men who have been convicted of crime, and have just left the penitentiary? Are such men as these proper trustees of this inestimable right—men, who, by the sentence of the law, have been pronounced unworthy to be members of society? Are the gentlemen who support this proposition, ready to go with such men, arm in arm, to the polls? Is it safe to entrust the interests of the commonwealth in such hands? If the Convention shall be brought to this decision, the State of Maryland will stand alone on this point. He referred those gentleman to the Constitutions of all the other States, and asked if there was not in all of