that court, and the recognition of the same feature in the law of 1844.

How was this odious, unjust, and oppressive example and action of Frederick county met? How was it answered? First, by the gentleman from Queen Anne, (Mr. SPENCER,) who said that it was a whig measure introduced to deprive Mr. Grason, the then Governor of Maryland, of the patronage of Frederick county, and —Secondly, by Mr. BISER, who declared that he opposed the measure, and introduced a bill to elect the levy court, by general ticket; but Mr. Schley, being a whig, and a majority of the Legislature being whigs, he defeated him, and carried this measure through the Legislature against his vote and against his wishes. Now he, (Mr. D.) did not say a word about this being a whig measure, or a democratic measure. He alluded to it as a reform measure of the county of Frederick, and mentioned the names of three gentlemen, members of this Convention, who were then members of the Legislature, without classing them as either whigs or democrats. It so happened that two of them were whigs, and one a democrat. Now, to weaken the force of this conservative example of Frederick county, who has given us a valuable precedent for the very measure under consideration, it is to be denounced as a whig measure, and party feeling is to be invoked to lessen its influence here, because it is a whig measure—upon no other principal than the unjust and illiberal principal, "that nothing good can come out of Nazareth."

But how stands the case with the honorable member from Frederick, (Mr. BISER.) By looking further into the history of this matter, it appears that in 1842, the honorable gentleman was elected Speaker of the House of Delegates—it is to be presumed not by whig votes—that at that session the democrats being in a majority, a bill was introduced, by a Mr. Crampton of Frederick, to change the number of levy court districts, from three to nine. Was Mr. Crampton a whig?

Mr. BISER. Mr. Crampton was a democrat.

Mr. DAVIS. Very well. That in this bill introduced by a democrat, this same restriction of a residence within the levy court district was retained, but reduced from six months to sixty days, a more reasonable time; and a further restriction of *a six months* residence within the district, to render a person elected *eligible* to the levy court.

Mr. Biser. Did this bill become a law?

Mr. DAVIS replied in the affirmative. He held the laws of 1842 in his hand, and found this bill published as a suppliment to the act of 1838.

Mr. BISER. Did I vote for it?

Mr. DAVIS would answer the gentleman. It does not appear from the journal of the House of Delegates, that the ayes and noes were called upon the passage of the bill, but he took it for granted that two such experienced and astute members, as the gentleman from Frederick, and the gentleman from Carroll, (Mr. BROWN,) who was also a member of that session of the Legislature, would never have suffered so odious, oppressive and unjust a restriction, as a much shorter period of residence is now pronounced to be, without calling the ayes and noes, to record their names against it, unless they were willing for its passage.

Mr. BISER. How could I have called the ayes and noes, when I was Speaker of the House?

Mr. DAVIS. It would have been very easy for the gentleman when he saw so obnoxous a measure, as he now considers this to be, about to pass, to have requested some friend to call the ayes and noes, that he might record his name against it. But, he asked, did the gentleman vote against it?

Mr. BISER replied in the affirmative.

Mr. DAVIS continued. Well, so this bill passed with these now obnoxous and odious features in it, and so it continued the law for Frederick county till 1844, when the whigs being again in power they altered the law so as to reduce the number of districts for the levy court to five, but so pleased were they with the new feature of restriction] introduced by the democrats in 1843, that they incorporated it in the bill of 1844, and so it stands the law of Frederick county, the great reform county of the State now. He held it up as an example, from the hot bed of reform, worthy the consideration and imitation of this Committee, and if he possessed the tact and parliamentary skill and knowledge of the gentleman from Carroll, (Mr. BROWN,)—not now in his seat—and knew how to accomplish it, he would move this conservative Democratic restriction of sixty days, as a substitute for the small restriction of five days now under consideration.

He deprecated the introduction of party feeling or party action, into this debate, or this Convention. It bodes no good to a harmonious result. He was not here for any such purpose. He came not here to elevate the whig party, or to procure the downfal of the democratic party; but for higher and nobler objects. He came here to lend his feeble efforts to the formation of a Constitution for the State of Maryland which will survive the rise and downfal of parties. He was a whig, and known to be a whig. Yet, he should feel himself unworthy the name of whig, if he did not feel that he could so far elevate himself above party feeling, and party action, as to act alone for the honor, the welfare, and prosperity of the whole State, irrespective of party.

Mr. RANDALL indicated his intention at the proper time to offer the following provision, which would, he thought, meet with the views of many gentlemen who were opposed to further restriction upon the privileges of voters.

"Every free white male citizen of this State, and no other, above the age of twenty-one years, having resided twelve months *as a citizen thereof* in the county next preceding the election at which he offers to vote," &c., &c.

The amendment having been read,

Mr. R. remarked, that he wished to say a few words in regard to the universally admitted frauds which were practised upon the ballot box in the State of Maryland. He said, universally, but, perhaps, the more correct term would be, generally, because some gentlemen desired that their counties should be excluded from the