

evil. The amendment of the gentleman from Harford, (Mr. McHENRY,) with that which he, (Mr. P.) now proposed added to it, would go far to meet the case. It would have the effect of making every one who attempted this fraud known, and be wholesome in its effect on the elective franchise. His motion was to add the words, "and the wards in the City of Baltimore."

Mr. GWINN thought the security against fraud would not be increased by this amendment. The Judges had the power to enquire into the fact of residence. If an individual was not a resident of a ward, he could only get his vote in by a false oath, as to his term of residence. He might be asked if a man would swear falsely, that he had lived in a ward one day, would not as readily perjure himself as to a residence of thirty days. There were several large establishments in Baltimore, which employed a great number of hands. There was the Clare Factory, the Canton and others. The persons employed there generally reside, while in this employ, in the wards in which establishments are established, and he considered it would be very hard upon these persons whenever they were transferred to another ward.

Mr. PHELPS made a few remarks in reply, in which he stated that it was his desire to give the largest liberty to the largest number. But it had been charged against the City of Baltimore, by the gentleman from the county, that frauds had been perpetrated there by double voting, he thought the amendment would check that evil.

Mr. BRENT, (in the absence of his colleague,) expressed regret that his colleague was not in his seat. The gentleman who had just spoken had asserted that his colleague had charged on the City of Baltimore, that frauds were perpetrated there by double voting.

Mr. PHELPS said he had so understood him.

Mr. BRENT resumed. The gentleman was mistaken. His colleague did not say so. His language was that it had been stated to him as an allegation. He would now take occasion to say that he was opposed to all attempts to impose restrictions on the elective franchise. It was a restriction of freedom, and he was opposed to it. Does a man by a residence in a place for thirty or sixty days become more enlightened, than by a residence of one. He who is entitled to the right of suffrage, is as much entitled to exercise it in one county as another, and in one ward as another. Why is it considered necessary that he should have been a local resident in a particular district, to entitle him to vote? He is as much entitled to vote at a general election, after a residence of thirty days, as of six months. By the existing laws a residence in a ward, or a district, for one day is sufficient. If there was to be any difference, it ought, in his opinion, to be in favor of a commercial city, where are so many laborers who are compelled to sleep where they are employed. If the Judges do their duty all this illegal voting may be prevented. He was ready to impose any penalty to put down illegal voting; but he would never be willing to

restrict the franchise. If there was to be any distinction, it should be in favor of a large commercial city.

Judge DORSEY expressed his concurrence in the views of the gentleman from Kent, (Judge CHAMBERS,) as to the impossibility of so framing any legislative rule, as it should in no case bear hardly on an individual. If he could adopt the views of the gentleman from Baltimore, who had just taken his seat, he should be ready to vote with him throughout. But there were reasons which operated in his mind strongly in favor of a six months residence. A residence of that extent was necessary to make an individual competent to give an intelligent vote, by making him familiarly acquainted with the true interests of the county, so that he may be guided to a wise selection of a candidate. He would have been ready to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Harford, (Mr. McHENRY,) if he would have accepted two amendments, which he had thought proper to be added to it. One of these was to insert the wards in the City of Baltimore. He had understood the gentleman from Baltimore to say that the persons in the wards ought to be allowed to vote. He agreed with him. As he viewed the law, no one had any right to prevent the voters in the City of Baltimore, from voting in any of the wards. It was sufficient, if he was a citizen of Baltimore. But he objected to the latitude of construction which would allow the resident of a State to vote in any county he may choose. He referred to the period when a number of persons then called the blue light federalists, were brought into the City of Annapolis, for the purpose of defeating a popular candidate. They were paid so much per month, but they were treated so badly by the people, and so thoroughly hooted by the boys, and made so uncomfortable, that they violated their contract, and left the city without remaining to effect their object. They were not in force enough to carry the election of their federal representative; their funds gave out, and the opposition candidate was elected. If no residence is to be required, what will prevent the sending into any particular county as many men as might be necessary to turn the election? We ought to secure the purity of the ballot-box. We ought to insist that the voters in the counties, and City of Baltimore, shall be residents of the election districts and reside in the wards in which they vote. Without such restriction the voters may come out from the large in numbers sufficient to overwhelm the public aspirants of the small counties. Without residence, all the small counties will be made subject to the large counties, and the voice of the people will be there annihilated.

These remarks were produced by a suggestion that the required residence in the counties, and City of Baltimore should be abolished.

He referred to the practice which prevailed of raising funds for the purpose of carrying on elections. If the voters are not required to be residents of the wards in the City of Baltimore, in which they vote, what is to prevent them from