

proposition asked us to rescind what was done, and set forth the very arguments and reasons stated in this protest. And the yeas and nays were called on it, and the votes of all the minority who were present were recorded in favor of his resolution.

And there is another thing I wish to say. These gentlemen say they protest in the name of the people they represent, in the name of the law-abiding people of this State, and in the name of certain principles of constitutional law. Now I deny their right, under parliamentary law, of the members of a legislative body to protest in the names of any body but themselves. They are asking as a privileged question to put upon the record their protest against the action of this body. Now they have no right to protest in any but their own names. This convention represents the law-abiding people of this State; and not the minority or any individuals in this convention. And they have no right to put upon this record that they represent the law-abiding citizens of this State. If they are going to protest, let them protest in their own names.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I would call the attention of my colleague (Mr. Stirling) to the fact that this protest says "all the law-abiding people."

Mr. STIRLING. That makes it worse. It should not go upon the journal as long as it characterizes the action of this convention as the action of thirty-three delegates; and as long as it does not confine the protest to the individual members who sign it.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I only rise for a personal explanation to protect myself. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) has used this language, I think: "The gentleman from Kent may say what he pleases in regard to imputing to him motives." And then the gentleman proceeds to say that the notice of the number of votes given was for the purpose of emasculating the resolution. Now the previous language used by the gentleman, giving me the privilege to say what I pleased about imputing motives, would seem to import that the gentleman had some sinister motive to impute to me.

Mr. STIRLING. If the gentleman thinks that saying "thirty-three delegates" instead of "the convention," is sinister, then I impute the sinister motive. I say there was that reason apparent upon the face of the paper.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Certainly avowed, and he must be a fool who does not see it upon its face. The expression is used to show precisely how many votes that resolution had in its favor. Is not that legitimate? There is no secret motive, no curtain, no concealment, no evasion, no anything; it just states how many gentlemen of this body voted for it; and the journal shows that.

Mr. SCHLEY. I call the gentleman from

Kent (Mr. Chambers) to order; he has already spoken twice upon this question.

The PRESIDENT. If any gentleman insists upon the enforcement of the rules, the gentleman from Kent having spoken twice upon this subject, will not be entitled to speak again, if any other gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I have no desire to argue this question. But I do not mean that gentlemen shall throw out unfounded imputations against me. I mean to state what is the fact, and nothing more.

Mr. RIDGELY. If it is in order to amend the motion to enter this protest upon the journal, then I move to amend this motion of the gentleman from Kent, by adding the following:

"Provided, nevertheless, that in permitting said protest to go upon the journal, this convention, so far from conceding that the statement of law or fact made therein, is well founded, on the contrary hereby reiterates its approbation of the justice, right and propriety of the resolutions passed by this body, and referred to in said protest."

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman can offer that as an independent order.

Mr. RIDGELY. I wanted it incorporated into and made part of the order to enter this protest upon the journal.

Mr. SMITH, of Carroll. I did not intend to make any remarks upon this question. But as this debate has gone on to some extent, and as it is a matter of some importance as a principle, and not as a precedent, I will address myself very briefly to the convention. We have witnessed precedents of this kind in the State of Maryland, and I have never known where a proposition of a similar character has been rejected by the majority.

The PRESIDENT. The chair will remind the gentleman of the case in Frederick.

Mr. SMITH, of Carroll. It is true the members of the minority here have had abundant opportunities of explaining their opposition to measures adopted; and they will still have abundant opportunities of expressing their opposition to the views of the majority in the further progress of this convention. But as I have myself enjoyed the privilege of entering protests upon the journal of another deliberative body; and as I believe it is a privilege which ought to be extended to minorities everywhere; and as this protest is couched in respectful language, I shall be the last one to propose any objection to it. As the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) has said, I think this protest is couched in respectful language, in much more respectful language than many of the arguments that have been recorded upon our journal of debates. I think it is a calm statement of what is supposed to be the facts, and of their views upon the subject.

In the session of 1860, when the police bil