

resided at least six months next preceding the election in the Levy Court district in which he may offer to vote, shall in such Levy Court district, be entitled to vote," &c.

And on reference to the journal of the House, he found in addition to the gentlemen already named, that Mr. BOWIE of Prince Georges, was then a member; and it no where appeared that he had raised his voice against the oppression, wrong, and injustice done to the people of Frederick county by this restriction which he now thought would be the result of the smallest restriction imposed.

Mr. BOWIE interposed. It was for Frederick county only.

Mr. DAVIS presumed his friend would as soon raise his voice against oppression in Frederick county, as in Prince George's county. He commended this wholesome example of the Reformers of Frederick county to the grave attention of this Convention.

Mr. SPENCER said Governor GRASON had just been elected Governor, and this was the action of the Whigs to deprive him of the patronage.

Mr. DAVIS said it was well known as a matter of history, that the politics of Frederick county have vacillated with the returning season of almost every year. And although it may then have been a Whig measure, the Democrats since had had the power to change it. But so satisfactory was its operation, that it was still to be found on the Statute Book.

Mr. BISER said, the gentleman from Montgomery had held up Frederick as the great Reform county. He thanked him for the compliment, which he properly appreciated. He was sorry it was not Montgomery. He had himself introduced a bill in the House of Delegates to make the election by general ticket. It was rejected in the House. In 1838, when the gentleman from Queen Ann's was Governor, he was not in the House. A gentleman from Washington county introduced a bill, the effect of which would have been to strangle the strength of the county. The vacillation of Frederick was in consequence of the policy adopted by the Whigs.

Loud cries for the "question."

Mr. JENIFER (to whom the floor had been awarded,) said that he had not risen to make a speech, but to give notice of his intention to effect the very object which gentlemen who called for the "question" were so anxious to attain. He notified the Convention that he should tomorrow morning move a resolution, providing that the vote be taken on the amendments to this article at two o'clock.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, made a brief explanation. It had been said that he had justified what is called the colonization of voters. He had not done so. He had said that in general elections, the voter might cast his vote wherever he chose, in the election district, so that he gave but one vote, as the result would be the same. He thought in the election of County Commissioners, the general ticket system the fairest, and therefore the *bona fide* removal of voters from one election district to another, should be unrestricted, except that they should only vote once

at the same election. He preferred that every candidate should represent numbers rather than territory. Baltimore city formed two Congressional districts, and a voter could remove from one district to the other, and vote in his new residence without the limitation of six months residence, which is required in removals from one Congressional district consisting of counties, to another consisting of counties. So the county, of Anne Arundel is divided into two Congressional districts, and a voter could remove from Anne Arundel proper, into Howard district of the county, and vote there without previous residence.

Mr. DORSEY said it had always been held that voters so removing could not vote immediately, and they had been always excluded.

Mr. BRENT, resuming, said he could not see how that was unless by the terms of the special act separating Howard district from Anne Arundel county, for judicial and municipal purposes. Neither the Constitution nor the election laws would justify such exclusion. If we adopt these isolated cases as a rule of action, rather than the general condition of things, then we must carry out the principle whereon the distinction is found. But if a resident of Baltimore is to forfeit his right to vote, because he has changed his ward two or three times before an election, or a citizen of a county because he has removed from one election district to another, it is disfranchisement of a legal voter, for no other reason than that his admission to vote may open the way for colonization of voters from district to district, or ward to ward, for election purposes only. What right have we to do this?

He then referred to the roving character of a portion of the population of Baltimore, living by daily labor, where they could obtain it, from Fell's Point to the Western limits of the city, working and living in one ward to-day, and another to-morrow. They are citizens of Baltimore, and if they come to vote in the ward in which they are employed, it would be gross injustice to disfranchise them.

He then replied to some of the remarks of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. CHAMBERS) as to the effect on party candidates, which might be produced by voters changing their Congressional district, and voting without the required residence, a ground on which the action of this Convention ought not to be based. But even adopting this view, no harm could result from obtaining a full expression of public opinion among the legal voters. The gentleman from Kent said that this restriction, as to residence in wards and districts, was not in the old Constitution, because colonization was then unknown. Mr. B. said he was not old enough to speak of those times, but he had heard old men say that party spirit was fiercer then than now, and frauds were every where practised.

If the argument of the gentleman from Kent was good, what is to become of Dorchester county, one of whose delegates (Mr. HICKS) stated that when he was about to challenge an illegal voter, a friend whispered "let him alone,