

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. Would it be competent for any member to offer an amendment to this article at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The chair thinks not.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. How then is it competent for a committee to do what a member of this body cannot?

Mr. PUGH. I understand that the question before the house is upon concurring in the report of the committee on revision. I do not know that that committee has had any special instructions from this house, as to what they shall do, or what they may report. There seems to be some doubt as to whether these proposed changes come strictly within the purview of the powers of the committee on revision.—They are a committee organized by and acting under the authority of this body. This convention certainly has the right to accept or reject the report of the committee. The committee may report as they see fit, in regard to changes to be made in the articles referred to them. That is my understanding of the matter. If the house shall determine differently, then I shall pursue a different course, and move to suspend the rules, so that these amendments can be received and acted upon. But I think the committee have a right to report to this convention, and we can then adopt or reject their report as we see fit.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Daniel.) The chair is of the opinion that it would be out of order for any member of the convention to offer any amendment to any article after it has been read the third time and passed. But the committee on revision having been appointed for this purpose, more especially to make corrections so far as verbal alterations are concerned, if they choose to report material alterations, it is competent for the convention to take them into consideration and act upon them, and as they may materially affect the provisions of the constitution it is proper that they should be passed upon by yeas and nays.

Mr. EARLE. As the reports from the committee of revision are not to be printed before being acted upon by the convention, I wish to call attention to an amendment recommended by the committee in the first section of the article on the elective franchise. I read that part of the section which is to be affected by the change:

“And in case any county or city shall be so divided as to form portions of different electoral districts for the election of congressman, senator, delegate, or other officer or officers, then to entitle a person to vote for such officer, he must have been a resident of that part of the county or city which shall form a part of the electoral district in which he offers to vote, for six months next preceding the election, but a person who shall not have acquired a residence in such county or city, entitling him to vote at any such election, shall be entitled to vote in the election

district from which he removed, until he shall have acquired a residence in the part of the county or city to which he has removed.”

The committee recommend that the word “not” in this section be stricken out.

With the exception of this word, the language of the section is identical with that used in the first section of the first article of the present constitution.

In general terms, the section provides, that in case any county shall be so divided as to form portions of different electoral districts for the election of congressman, or other officer, to entitle a person to vote, he must have been a resident of that part of the county which shall form part of the electoral district in which he offers to vote, for six months next preceding the election. Baltimore county, for example, is thus divided. Part of it is in the second, and the remaining part in the fifth congressional district. Without a residence of six months in the county previous to an election, no person is entitled to vote there; neither in that part of the county which is embraced in the second, nor in that part which is embraced in the fifth congressional district; neither in an electoral district to which he has removed, nor in one from which he has removed. The county residence of six months is an indispensable prerequisite. Having acquired that residence, a person may remove from one part of the county to another—from one election district in the county to another election district in the same county, without forfeiting his right of suffrage.

The committee having examined the subject with care, are unanimous in recommending, that the word “not” be stricken out.

Mr. CHAMBERS. The convention determined that it ought to be there.

Mr. STRIBLING. The convention can now determine otherwise.

Mr. HEBB. I understand the chair to say that the yeas and nays will have to be called on all these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. On all material amendments.

Mr. HEBB. The yeas and nays are to be called on all articles. The last convention did not take the yeas and nays on these reports of the committee on revision. Some propositions were introduced from the revisory committee by the gentleman from Kent himself (Mr. Chambers,) and no yeas and nays were called on them. If the convention see proper, they have the right to reconsider everything they have done, and make a new constitution. The majority of the convention have the right to do what they please in this matter.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I beg leave to read the fifteenth rule, as follows:

“Every report from a committee containing articles or sections proposed to be made a part of the constitution, shall be read on