

months, and shall thenceforth cease to hold the office or appointment of which he may be then the incumbent."

Mr. McLANE remarked, that the chairman of the committee on Revision offered an order last night from that committee, that when they adjourned, they should adjourn until to-day at nine o'clock, and then proceed to dispose of the business from the committee on Revision. There must have been a general understanding throughout the Convention that they would not be called upon to take up any new business, and if they should open the rule for this order, they would have to open it for others. He knew that if this report should come up it would give rise to a good deal of debate. There were other orders, the judiciary bill, and several other subjects, which there was a great desire to bring before the Convention, and why should they bring in this? Besides, this order made a provision which it was competent for the Legislature to make whenever it pleased, and it was not necessary that it should be engrafted upon the Constitution. They had now closed their accounts, and had come to dispose of the business from the committee on Revision, and would be detained here until one or two o'clock to-night. If they should agree to this motion, the whole thing would have to be undone, and they would have to reopen the accounts. Unless they confined themselves to the order passed last night, they would be delayed here until to-morrow.

Mr. DORSEY very much doubted whether the Legislature had the right to disqualify a judge, or the Governor or any other officer of the State from acting in this way. It appeared to him to be in the nature of a disqualification, for it deprived them of the power of acting in any such capacity, and he thought it was not in the power of the Legislature to impose this qualification upon Constitutional officers of the State. He asked the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Blakistone, Dent, Lee, Dorsey, Wells, Sellman, Dalrymple, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Sprigg, McCubbin, John Newcomer and Waters—16.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Weems, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Hicks, Constable, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowling, Spencer, George, Wright, McMaster, Fooks, Thomas, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Neill, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Conkey and Brown—47.

So the Convention refused to suspend the rule.

Mr. DORSEY then moved to suspend the order adopted on the 8th inst., for the purpose of taking up the report of the committee on new counties; which motion was not agreed to.

Mr. RIDGELY said:

That he had a proposition to submit to the House, and he would not do so but for the fact that since the vote had been had upon the subject, a very respectable number of the members of the House, had intimated to him that they had voted misunderstandingly, and would be glad to have an opportunity to correct their votes. He referred to the proposition adopted by the House, to make stockholders and directors of banks liable to the amount of their respective shares for all the debts of the corporation. To that proposition he had no objection, but the Convention had adopted a further provision that the Legislature should grant no bank charter except upon the condition that no director or other officer of the corporation, should borrow any money from the corporation, and a further amendment was adopted, on the motion of the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Brent,) providing, that "if any director or other officer shall be convicted, upon indictment, of directly or indirectly violating this article, he shall be punished by fine or imprisonment, at the discretion of the court." It was the two latter amendments which he desired to have expunged.

He had no disposition whatever to consume the time of the Convention, at this late hour of the session; but persuaded as he was that these two latter amendments could be productive of no good, but would operate to the prejudice of the constitution, he would move to suspend the rule for the purpose of enabling him to ask a reconsideration of the legislative report, with a view to strike out the two last amendments adopted to that provision. It was apparent to him that the retention of so obnoxious a restriction upon banks in the constitution, would array a powerful element of strength against its adoption, which otherwise might be passive, if not in its favor. Beside which, the Legislature was perfectly competent to impose such restraints upon the banks, if the popular voice should demand it.

Mr. SPENCER said that a construction of the amendments had gone forth, which, if true was something, never intended by this body. The construction given by lawyers and persons out of the House, to that portion which related to stockholders and their liabilities, was that the stockholders, by that section, were not only made answerable for their stock—

Mr. THOMAS rose to a point of order, and desired to know whether this was a debateable question.

The PRESIDENT decided that it was not a debateable question.

Mr. SPENCER said that he would vote for the motion.

The question was then taken on the motion to suspend the rules, and it was not agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERS of Kent, from the committee on revision, made a report on the report of the committee on the elective franchise.

Which was read and concurred in.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER, submitted the following resolution: