

Mr. CLARKE. I believe this is the first occasion in which I have opened my mouth in a discussion either upon the adjournment of this House or upon its removal from this place to Baltimore city. Since the Convention met, I think it has taken up more time in the discussion of those two subjects than would have been necessary to dispose of the Declaration of Rights and the various articles of the Constitution which now lie upon our desks for our adoption. I will say further, in reference to the question of adjournment, that if gentlemen measure their popularity at home by the question how they vote upon a question of the adjournment of this body, their constituents must have a very low standard. So far as I am concerned, whenever a question of this sort is brought up, I shall be governed by the reasons which may be assigned in reference to the motion to adjourn. I think, considering the magnitude of the issues which are to be settled in the coming week, courtesy to you, Mr. President, and courtesy to a number of gentlemen upon this floor who are members of that Convention, courtesy to gentlemen who may not be members but may desire to go—and I should like to be present at that Convention myself and see how things work there—taking all things into consideration, I hope members will not be governed in their vote upon adjournment by the idea that their constituents measure their popularity at home by the low standard of such a small issue as this. That is bringing the judgment of the people to a standard by which certainly in one section of the country no one is measured.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I will say to my friend from Baltimore city, (Mr. Cushing), that if we have not been able to convince him of the correctness of our conclusions, it has not been for the want of a trial; and the conclusions of his mind we are not responsible for. It must have been his misfortune and not our fault that he is not now a good States' rights man. And I will say for the minority here, that we scarcely expected any good out of Nazareth. We came here expecting nothing. We came here to see the majority tear down the great fabric which has protected us for so many years; and we hope the day may come when it will be our portion to rebuild it on the same base with the same perfection.

Mr. NEGLEY. Our constituents sent us here and we are bound to do our duty. It is no low consideration. There is a moral obligation resting upon members of this Convention, at least upon the majority. There is no obligation at all upon the minority, for I think their ticket were headed "No Convention," and their province is to tear down what we are attempting to build up. They will do it here and they will do it when they go back. We came here, and it is our duty to the people who sent us here to go to work,

and to work constantly, industriously, until we have completed the work for which we were sent here. If we do not do that we shall not do our duty, and our constituents will have a right to complain.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I rise to protest against the statement just made by the gentleman from Washington county, (Mr. Negley.) I protest against the idea that the majority of the Convention are responsible for any delay that may occur here any more than the minority. Each man who represents a constituency upon this floor is responsible to the people who sent him here for all that may occur in this House, either from his absence or from his votes. I protest also against making the croakings and growls of those who are constitutionally hypochondriacal and fault-finding in all they say, a reason for spurring this Convention into haste in their labors. You may remember the story of the man and his son and the donkey, travelling along the road and attempting to please everybody. The result was that they pleased nobody. We shall be exactly in that condition if we attempt to please everybody. We are to judge, every man for himself whether our presence is required here.

In behalf of those with whom convenience or business have been paramount and prevented their attendance here this morning, I will say that it was generally presumed and understood to be the purpose to adjourn over during the Convention of next week, and they have taken occasion to visit their families. I say it is unjust to bestow on them the seeming censure which has been uttered this morning with reference to them. It may be very convenient for those who are here and who are within a few hours of their families, and can see them every night or every week, to talk against adjournments, and insist upon staying here. Yet the records will show that those very members are absent, considering the circumstances of their nearness to their homes as often as any other members of the Convention. Some consideration ought to be shown for members whose families are a hundred miles from them, and who in order to visit them must go by the cars to Havre de Grace or Wilmington, and then a hundred miles further to their homes.

It is not to be expected that every man will sit here from sunrise to sundown every day during the session, enjoying none of the comforts of family or home, but remaining here, whatever might be the circumstances, during the session of the Convention. We are not impelled by such an immediate necessity to have a new Constitution formed here. Cannot we get along for a little while longer as we are? We have an executive. We have a Legislature if it is necessary to call them together. We have a Judiciary. Do not all the functions of the government go on quietly and peaceably?