

Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Barron, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Ecker, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Jones, of Cecil, Kennard, King, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Parker, Pugh, Purcell, Russell, Schlosser, Scott, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Todd, Wooden—35.

*Nays*—Messrs. Belt, Billingsley, Blackiston, Brown, Chambers, Crawford, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dent, Duvall, Egelen, Henkle, Hollyday, Horsey, Johnson, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Par-ran, Peter, Smith, of Dorchester, Turner—25.

The section was accordingly adopted.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles, when his name was called, said: I was cut off by the previous question from explaining my views upon this question, and I will therefore avail myself of this opportunity to explain my vote. I have heard it said over and over again that gentlemen could not understand why members could not vote for this oath, unless it was because they were traitors. Now I think I have a reason for not voting for this oath, one certainly satisfactory to myself, and I think it will be satisfactory to this convention; at least every member who will divest himself of passion, and let reason have sway. I do not think I am the material of which to make a traitor. That I might be driven to rebellion is possible; but that, thank God, I have never as yet felt the necessity of doing. I hold that this convention has no power to pass one single section, paragraph, line or word in this constitution, and adopt it and make it binding upon the people of this State at the election when this constitution shall be submitted to them for their ratification or rejection, and I shall vote against this oath, because I believe there is no such power in this convention. This oath to me would be just as easily taken, and as easily kept, as the one I took when I took my seat in this body. I can conscientiously take it, and I am sure I would keep it. But I shall refuse to take it, and I expect to vote without taking it, for that is my determination, as I advertise here beforehand. My reason for not taking it is not because it is so very objectionable in its feature or form, but because you have no right to require me to take it. If you will, put it in the constitution, and let it go forth to the people for their ratification. If they ratify the constitution, and the oath with it, then I shall not have the slightest objection, at any subsequent election, to take it; and if I violate it I will abide by the consequences. I vote "no."

After the result of the vote had been announced,

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles, said: I now rise to a personal explanation. When the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Billingsley) was making his speech, the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Barron) interrupted him for a consider-

able length of time. I arose and said that I hoped the gentleman from St. Mary's would take his seat if he was not allowed to proceed without interruption. The chair made some remark in reference to the gentleman from Charles, myself, which I did not distinctly understand. I understood the chair to say that the gentleman from St. Mary's would be allowed to proceed without the interposition of the gentleman from Charles.

The PRESIDENT. The president said that the gentleman from Charles (Mr. Davis) need not interpose, because the chair would see that the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Billingsley) was protected in all his rights.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. When one member interrupts another, particularly for any considerable length of time, I do not think it is at all out of place for any friend of the member who is interrupted to request him to take his seat until he can proceed in order. I thought the remark of the chair was entirely uncalled for, and intended to be very unkind.

The PRESIDENT. The chair had no unkind feelings towards the gentleman; not the slightest. The chair only desired to assure the gentleman from Charles (Mr. Davis) that he need not interpose, because the chair would see that the gentleman from St. Mary's was fully protected in all his rights.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Barron) continued to interrupt the gentleman from St. Mary's.

The PRESIDENT. The chair does not deny that fact, because the chair interposed at once upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Charles.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. I accept very willingly and gladly the explanation of the president.

The PRESIDENT. The president does not know that he has any explanation to make, because there is no difference in point of fact between the gentleman from Charles (Mr. Davis) and the chair. The only point is that the chair assured the gentleman from Charles that he need not interpose as the chair would see that the gentleman from St. Mary's was fully protected.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. I think I had the right.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman has the right, no doubt. But the chair did not interpose from any unkind feeling.

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles. I am glad to hear that. I did not understand the remarks of the chair, and I wished to do so; for the reason that gentlemen on this floor called my attention particularly to the fact, that the chair had been unkind to me in his remarks; and I myself had thought so. I never wish to be cautious, and I never object to anything said to me until I am sure it is intended to be objectionable, or unkind to me.

The PRESIDENT. I assure the gentleman that I do not entertain the slightest unkind