

three different days of the session, previous to its adoption, unless two-thirds of the members present otherwise determine; the first of which readings shall be by the title only, unless a majority of the convention shall otherwise order."

Mr. GOSWICK. I would suggest to the house that that rule does not apply to this case. The revising committee report neither new sections, nor new articles, but simply some slight changes in the phraseology.

Mr. STIRLING. This rule says that reports of committees proposing articles to be incorporated into the constitution shall be read on three several days, etc. That is a rule applicable to the manufacture of the constitution, while in progress of framing. But those committees have now reported; the articles have now been adopted, and have become parts of the constitution, and the rule has ceased to have any further application to them.

Another rule provides for a committee on revision, whose duty it is to take the articles that have been adopted by the convention; that have been made parts of the constitution, that have been read three times, and finally passed by yeas and nays, and examine them carefully and revise them. What does that mean? It means that the committee shall take the articles which you have adopted, according to your rules, examine them and bring them back here with such alterations, amendments, and modifications as may be necessary to carry out the intentions of the convention in passing them. The convention votes either to concur in the alterations proposed by the committee on revision, or not to concur. If they concur, then those alterations are incorporated in the constitution; if they do not concur, then the alterations are left out.

The committee do not here propose any new section or article. What is the meaning of a rule which says the committee shall revise, if they can make no changes? It is not an ordinary committee of this body, whose reports must be read three times on three several days and then passed by yeas and nays. That rule relates solely to the committees whose duty it is to frame the several articles to be incorporated into the constitution. This committee is engaged in the mere matter of recasting the phraseology. And even if they do report a matter of substantial change, it is a matter within the power of the revisory committee. No member can propose amendments now, after these articles have been passed. It is the business of the committee on revision to report such changes and alterations as they may deem necessary to be made. They have reported these changes, and it is now for the house to determine whether they will concur in the report of the committee.

I want the yeas and nays called upon concurring in this report, for I want it distinctly to go upon the journal that this change was

made. Are we to stand here and have all our work paralyzed by the misapplication of a rule requiring these reports to be read on three several days, and passed by the yeas and nays? I stand here ready to defend the work which we have been doing, and do not intend it shall be interrupted by any such sophistical objections.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Daniel.) The chair decides; that the fifteenth rule has no application to the report of the committee on revision.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I protest against this process of doing business.

Mr. BROWN. Is there no matter incorporated in this report by the committee of revision, which was before the convention and rejected?

Mr. EARLE. In answer to the gentleman from Queen Anne, I reply that the convention adopted the last clause of the first section of the article on elective franchise in the following form:

"But a person who shall not have acquired a residence in such county or city entitling him to vote at any such election, shall be entitled to vote in the election district from which he removed, until he shall have acquired a residence in the part of the county or city to which he has removed."

A proposition to strike the word "not" from this clause was rejected in convention. The whole subject was then referred to the committee of revision, and the members of that committee having arrived at the plain, but, as they thought, logical conclusion, that a person who had not acquired a residence in a county or city, should not be entitled to vote in any part of that county or city, respectfully recommended that the word "not" in the aforesaid section be stricken out; this, I presume, is the matter alluded to by the gentleman from Queen Anne.

Mr. STIRLING. As to the word "not," that certainly is a matter for the committee of revision to examine and report upon.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand the report of the committee of revision, they have added an entirely new section to the article on elective franchise.

Mr. EARLE. The gentleman from Anne Arundel is mistaken. No entirely new section has been added by the committee of revision to the article on the elective franchise. Several of the sections have been remodeled. Parts of two or more sections, in some instances, have been consolidated into one section. Some sections have been divided, others transposed, but no entirely new section has been introduced.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. For symmetry's sake the section has been divided into two sections. There is no new matter recommended by the committee on revision.

The PARSONS having resumed the chair, announced that the question was upon con-