

rect. The first section of the majority report is now open to amendment.

Mr. STIRLING. There is a needless repetition in this section, on account of recopying the language of the old constitution. I therefore move to strike out the words "free white male," and insert the word "such," also to strike out the words "who shall have been one year next preceding the election a resident of the State, and for six months a resident of the city of Baltimore, or of any county in the State, and." If that is adopted that portion of the section will read:

"And every such person, being at the time of the election in the naval or military service of the United States, shall, when the United States are actually engaged in war, be entitled to vote wherever they may be," &c.

Besides the unnecessary repetition, the section is obnoxious to this objection: as the section now stands, it allows a person in the military or naval service to vote, whether he be a citizen of the United States or not, provided he has been a resident of this State twelve months next preceding the election. Now, I am opposed to that. There are a great many persons, who have come from Canada, and various places abroad, and have entered our armies, who have not been in the State a week before they entered the service. It is not right to give those persons the right of suffrage in this State, in my opinion.

The question being then taken upon the amendment proposed by Mr. STIRLING, it was adopted.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. I move to insert after the words "in all elections hereafter to be held," the words "and all persons shall be considered loyal who have not been convicted, in some court of law, of disloyalty."

Mr. STIRLING. According to that, Jeff. Davis would be considered loyal, because he has not been convicted in any court of law of disloyalty.

The question was upon agreeing to the amendment of Mr. DAVIS, of Charles.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken, by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 12 nays 48—as follows:

**Yeas**—Messrs. Berry, of Prince George's, Brown, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Edelen, Hodson, Hollyday, Lee, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Wilmer—12.

**Nays**—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Brooks, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Keefer, Kennard, King, Markey, Mayhugh, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Robinette, Russell, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stock-

bridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Thruston, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—48.

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. In order to remove what may be an ambiguity in this section, I move to strike out, near the middle of this section, the words "and at all such elections the vote shall be by ballot," and I also move to preface this section by the words—"at all elections hereafter to be held in this State the vote shall be by ballot, and." The section will then read—"at all elections hereafter to be held in this State the vote shall be by ballot, and every white male person of twenty-one years of age, and upwards," &c. A clause has been inserted here providing for votes to be given by soldiers in camp, and if the clause requiring all elections to be by ballot is inserted immediately after the clause relating to soldiers voting, it might by some possibility be construed to refer only to the vote to be taken in camp. I should prefer to have the section modified as I have proposed, in order that it may cover all elections. It is simply transposing the words to the commencement of the section from where they now stand.

Mr. STIRLING. Is not the amendment proposed liable to the same objection? The amendment is—"at all elections hereafter to be held in this State the vote shall be by ballot." Is an election in camp, an election in this State? I think it would be better to let the words stand where they now do, except striking out the word "such," and then it will read, "and at all elections the vote shall be by ballot." I think that will remove any ambiguity there may be.

Mr. SCOTT. I hardly know how to vote on any matter connected with this first section, until I know what action the convention will take on the second section. I will, therefore, move to pass over informally this first section, and take up the second section, and in case the amendment of which the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) has given notice shall be adopted, I shall then move the amendment of which I gave notice day before yesterday. It may be that some gentlemen do not understand exactly my object in making this motion. We are going on now to perfect this first section, which when done will either have to be struck out, or it will necessitate the rejection of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Baltimore city. If we pass over the first section, and determine what we will do with the second section, then our course will be more clear in regard to the first section, because they both embrace and refer to the same subject-matter. That is the object I have in making the motion. After we have considered the second section, we can, without any loss of time, return to the first section and complete that.

The question being taken on the motion to pass over the first section informally, and