

declaration would be a nullity. There is a well-known destination, however, as to the power we have over the officers, we may authorize to hold appointments under this Constitution, and the power we have to restrain our posterity in the exercise of the right of self-government. We may attach conditions to the tenures of these offices. We may declare that a Judge, the Attorney General of the State, or other officer under this Constitution, shall not take a seat in a future Convention until he has first resigned his office. And in such a provision there would not be injustice or hardship. It would have the effect to put all members of a future Convention, on a footing of perfect equality.

For an article in the Constitution having for its object such an end, he could consistently vote. He could readily see that the public interest might require the constant attention of high officers, such as Judges of our Supreme Court, and the Attorney General of the State. He did not object to such functionaries being here, however, on the ground that they might be interested in defeating changes in the form of the government. He would not suppose that any one could be elected as a member of a body of this character, who would be intent upon the promotion of his personal interests only. And agreed with the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) in supposing that aspirations for offices, had full as much influence on the conduct of men as the disposition to retain offices already held. Believing this, he (Mr. T.) was not very unwilling to leave the people of the State at perfect liberty to send to any future Convention, officers who held commissions under the Constitution which was to be changed. Still he would vote with the gentleman from Baltimore city, if he would modify his amendment so as to make it a limitation on the tenures of offices we were about to establish. But he could not vote to incorporate any article in the Constitution that had for its object a limitation on the power of the people, to change, alter or abolish their form of government whenever they may think proper to do so, to promote their safety and happiness.

Mr. CHAMBERS rose merely to remove the impression which might otherwise be produced, if no other reasons were assigned, for those who voted for the amendment, except those assigned by the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) and others who preceded him.

He differed altogether from some of the proposition of the gentleman from Frederick, and, at a proper time, would repeat and enforce his own opinions in relation to them. He was an humble advocate of the doctrine that the Constitution could bind the whole community. His object was to excuse himself and his friends from any erroneous inference. There were two sides to these questions. He did not wish to allow judgment by default to be entered against him.

After some desultory proceedings,

Mr. BRENT, accepting the suggestion of Mr. THOMAS, modified his amendment by adding after the word "Chancellor" the following:

"Attorney General, or of any other civil officer under the Constitution of this State."

Mr. HICKS now moved the following modified amendment, to the amendment of Mr. BRENT:

"Nor shall any member of this Convention accept any office or appointment under the new Constitution, for ten years after its adoption."

Mr. HICKS asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and

After some conversation, were taken and resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Kent, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, Buchanan, Ridgely, John Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Sprigg, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Gaither, Fiery, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Shower and Cockey—32.

*Negative*—Messrs. Dent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Weems, Dalrymple, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Bell, Welch, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Spencer, Thomas, Shriver, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Frestman, Ware, Kilgour, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer and Ege—39.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred upon the amendment as offered by Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city.

Mr. THOMAS moved to amend said amendment by inserting after the word "Chancellor," the following:

"Attorney General or of any other civil officer under the Constitution of this State."

Which amendment was accepted by Mr. BRENT of Baltimore city.

Mr. PARRÉ was excused from voting, having paired off for a limited time, (not yet expired,) with Mr. RICAUD.

The question then recurred on the modified amendment of Mr. BRENT.

Messrs. BUCHANAN and HICKS asked the yeas and nays;

Which were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS said:

He had not given—he did not propose to assign any reasons in support of the opinions he had expressed, as to our entire want of power to limit or restrain the people of Maryland, who are to succeed us, in the exercise of that inalienable right that exists in all political communities, to form for themselves a government. He did not desire to discuss a proposition so universally admitted to be true in this country. He referred to an incident in the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829, to show the opinion entertained on that subject by distinguished members of that body, then present.

At the close of that Convention, one of the members proposed to insert an article in their Constitution, giving power to the people of Virginia to meet by their delegates, in a future Convention. Mr. John Randolph opposed and ridiculed the proposition, saying that the majority of the people would have that right, without such