

did not mean to say that candidates were to blame. Generally they could not help it without declining the contest—and there were many—most of the cases the other way. Indeed the state of things would be deplorable, if it were not so, for then fraud and corruption would pollute all our institutions. If the people in the masses made the elections, there would be little weight in the objection. But, unhappily, this is so only in theory; all elections are more or less of a partizan character, and the people at the polls too often merely register the edicts of party leaders. Caucus nominations too generally make the appointments. Mr. T. did not object to such conventions, but he alluded now to the improper means sometimes employed in these bodies by designing partizans, to accomplish personal or political ends. In such cases they become the sources of favoritism and intrigue, if not of corruption. He could not, therefore, agree with the gentleman from Baltimore county, as to the purity of the waters in which our candidates have bathed.

Mr. T. would vote for the amendment of the gentlemen from Dorchester, in order that offices might be filled by candidates clear of all suspicion of having acted here to as to promote their own aggrandisement.

Mr. JENIFER said, that as gentlemen had given in their experience, he would make a few remarks him-self. If the gentleman's observation had satisfied him that being a member of this Convention was in effect looking to ulterior objects, then his proposition was right, and the gentleman had placed himself right. If, on the contrary, he thought that no member had given votes with any ulterior object, then it would be casting a stigma on them. He (Mr. J.) would give no countenance to a proposition containing this as an expression of the opinion of the Convention—one which would cast a stigma on him-self, if he should vote to disfranchise gentlemen of the highest order of talent and unimpeachable character, merely because they were members of this Convention. How did they come here? By the people; and because they were here, it was attempted to disqualify them for office for a term of years. If he voted for any proposition, it would be for the one offered by the gentleman from Calvert, [Mr. Sollers,] to disfranchise them forever because it would show that they had misrepresented their constituents, and were unworthy to hold office hereafter. He would go further. This could have no good effect. The people would say, and justly say, we sent men there whom we thought trustworthy, but by their acts, they have evinced a consciousness of their own unworthiness.

Mr. J. said he might have voted for a similar proposition at the commencement of the session, because he was willing to indulge gentlemen in their protestations that they come here free and purged from all disposition to create offices in which they would be interested. But the session now was nearly over, and they had done almost all the harm that they could do—indeed, he doubted whether they could no any more. But,

should this stigma be fixed upon the members of this Convention, they should also have attached to them something by which they may hereafter be known—like the Romans of old, when they turned loose wicked animals, they guarded the community against them, by letting it be known—*“habet fenum in cornu.”*

Mr. Hicks only had to say, “evil be to him who evil thinks.” It was an old and a trite saying, “set a rogue to catch a rogue.” He was perfectly sincere in proposing this amendment. Had they not already prohibited members from accepting the emoluments of any office which might be raised or increased by this Convention? Had they not attempted to put prohibition upon prohibition? If they had the power to restrict one, had they not the power to restrict all? Was there an individual in this body who did not know that since they had been here, a good deal had been said about *that* nice office, and *this* nice office? They could not even get the support of the people at home, who seemed to think that they were here wasting their money and making places for themselves to be filled hereafter, becoming distinguished as they were. If they were so self-sacrificing as many of them thought they were, let them show their faith by their works. He believed this would be creditable to themselves and gratifying to the people, for they would then think that they were in earnest. If ever he should desire any thing, he would go to the people to give it to him. In sober seriousness, he hoped that a proposition like the one he had just presented, would be engrafted upon the Constitution. He believed they owed it to themselves and to the people, to incorporate it in the Constitution.

Mr. SOLLERS. What possible principle can the gentleman find in making the limitation five years?

Mr. HICKS. I consider it the principle of self-denial to ourselves and evidence of confidence in the people, and would have preferred it longer.

Mr. SOLLERS. Say, forever.

Mr. HICKS said yes, but would rather have a half a loaf than no bread at all.

Mr. SOLLERS. Perhaps you will get the whole loaf if you will try.

Mr. JENIFER. The gentleman should say that we should have no office under the government, or be elected to either branch of the Legislature.

Mr. McHENRY presumed that there was no important business ready for their action. He presumed that no man having the interests of the people at heart would wish to consume the time of this body in such movements as the one which they had before them, unless it was because they had no business, really, to transact. It did seem to him, without any imputation on the motives of the mover, that this was the most barefaced appeal to Boncumbe that could be made in this body. Believing this, he would move to lay the whole subject upon the table.

Mr. McH., at the request of Mr. Hicks, withdrew his motion.

Mr. HICKS said:

That he had no idea of taking the gentleman