

gentleman, and this Convention was no place for him to bring his private quarrels.

Mr. Gill said that, as the reading had been commenced, it ought to be proceeded with.

Mr. Maulsby asked if the communication of this employee of the State was to go on the journal, whether the speech of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Kilbourn,) to which it was a reply, should not also be entered on the journal, and any further reply which the gentleman (Mr. Kilbourn) had to make to this communication should not also be entered on the journal.

Mr. Nelson was opposed to squandering any further the money of the State on this superintendent, or in printing his communications.

The motion to dispense with the further reading was then put and not agreed to.

The reading was resumed, when

Mr. Mitchell again interrupted, and submitted that the language used towards the gentleman from Anne Arundel was an insult to this body, of which he was a member, and that the communication should not be read.

Mr. Tarr, of Worcester, had voted for the reading of this communication, not supposing it was couched in such language, and would move for a reconsideration of the vote ordering the reading to be continued.

Mr. Motter had also voted for the reading, but now agreed with Mr. Tarr that the reading of such a communication should not be proceeded with.

Mr. Dobbin said that, in all fairness, the communication should be read. He had not heard the words said to have been uttered in debate, but if, as stated, the superintendent should certainly have the privilege of being heard. This officer had been charged with fraud and dishonesty, and he pronounced the charges to be false. He, (Mr. D.,) did not see how he could reply in any other manner, and thought the communication should be read and printed.

The motion to reconsider was lost.

Mr. Rennolds moved that the letter be returned to its author.