

ber must do certain things before he can put himself in a position to act.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I do not see the difference between prescribing an entire set of qualifications, and prescribing one particular point of qualification. My own view is that the people have an unlimited right to select whom they please. This convention is a meeting of the people. The theory of the convention is that it represents the whole aggregate mass of the voting population of the State. If they were here in their primary capacity, every individual vote in the State collected at Annapolis, they would be what we are considered to be. The constitution is their work, and will be of no avail unless adopted by the people. And the people who are to govern, are the people who are to choose their representatives. And according to my judgment there should be no restraint upon them in the exercise of that discretionary judgment.

The question recurred upon the amendment of Mr. CHAMBERS.

Mr. PETER called for the yeas and nays upon this question, and they were ordered.

The question being then taken by yeas and nays, it resulted—yeas 15, nays 50—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Chambers, Gale, Harwood, Johnson, Lansdale, Marbury, Miller, Morgan, Paran, Peter, Turner, Wilmer—15.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Brown, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Dennis, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Lee, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—50.

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. I will offer the following amendment in order to bring up the question directly. Insert before the words "be chosen in the same manner," the words "have the same qualifications, and." I do not propose to argue the question at all. But I wish to say simply that my own view is that members of the convention ought to have the same qualifications that members of the legislature have. I think the same reasons that would prevent a person from holding a seat in the senate or house of delegates, should prevent him from holding a seat in this convention. I therefore submit this amendment.

The question was upon the amendment of Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. BLACKISTON called the yeas and nays upon this question, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken by yeas and

nays, and resulted—yeas 23, nays 43—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Blackiston, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Daniel, Gale, Greene, Hebb, Hopkins, Johnson, King, Lee, Marbury, Miller, Morgan, Mullikin, Parker, Parran, Peter, Robinette, Turner, Valliant, Wilmer—23.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Bond, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Dennis, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Harwood, Hatch, Hopper, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Kennard, Lansdale, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Murray, Negley, Pugh, Purnell, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Wickard, Wooden—43.

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

Mr. MILLER, when his name was called, said: I am anxious that this matter should be settled in this constitution, so that this difficulty shall not arise hereafter. As the convention by their previous vote, have determined that this matter shall not be left at large to the people to send whom they please, although it is a matter of indifference to me, I shall vote "aye."

No further amendment was offered to the second section.

Section three was then read as follows:

"Sec. 3. At the general election to be held in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, and in each twentieth year thereafter, the question "Shall there be a convention to revise, alter or amend the constitution?" shall be submitted to the electors of the State; and in case a majority of all the electors voting at such election, shall decide in favor of a convention, the general assembly at its next session shall provide by law for the election of delegates, and the assembling of such convention, as is provided in the preceding section; but no amendment of this constitution agreed upon by any convention assembled in pursuance of this article, shall take effect until the same shall have been submitted to the electors of the State, and adopted by a majority of those voting thereon."

Mr. CHAMBERS. I move to strike out the words "eighty-two," and insert the words seventy-two." I do not want to put off for twenty years the opportunity for the people to say whether they want a convention or not.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. CHAMBERS, it was not agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I move to amend the sentence "and in each twentieth year thereafter," by striking out the word "twentieth" and inserting the word "tenth." I do not understand the principle upon which it is proposed to thus abridge the privilege of the good people of this State by restricting the privilege of voting for a convention to once