

which we cannot recognize otherwise than as an intrusion into Maryland politics not to be recommended.

I am indebted to the Convention, I may say it without affectation, for their patient listening to the remarks which I have offered.

Mr. SANDS. Will our friend tell us who is the Connecticut member to whom he referred?

Mr. SCOTT. I suppose he means the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Miller.)

The hour having arrived for closing the debate, under the order adopted on the 14th inst., the Chairman of the Committee on the Declaration of Rights, proceeded under the order as follows:

Mr. STIRLING. I shall endeavor in the remarks which I shall have the honor to submit to the house upon this question, to confine myself as closely as I can to the immediate subject which is under the consideration of the Convention. I am indeed somewhat sorely tempted, by the fact that some portion of the argument has been directly aimed at the humble position which I occupy in this body, to trespass beyond what I consider the legitimate bounds of this debate, for the purpose of replying to that portion of the argument. The gentleman from Prince George's, who opened this discussion, (Mr. Clarke,) did me the honor to throw upon my head, I will not say the vials of his wrath, but a remark of not very appreciatory consideration, to which I did not deem myself entitled; and therefore, sir, after further reflection I did not deem it necessary here, either to review the proceedings of the State Convention of Maryland which elected delegates to the Baltimore Convention to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States, nor the peculiar views of the gentleman who represents the Third Congressional District of Maryland in the Congress of the United States, upon the agitating topics of the day. I shall leave those portions of the gentleman's speech unanswered, to the reason and judgment of those who shall read it, and shall confine myself, so far as I can, strictly to the legitimate discussion of the particular subject that is before this body.

A good deal has been said with regard to the action of the Committee on this article. The gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Clarke,) with the courtesy which always distinguishes him, not only notified but urged me to take the floor, and seemed to consider that I was not performing my duty, in not opening the discussion upon this subject. That line of remark has been carried somewhat further by the honorable gentleman who has just addressed the Convention, in the assertion that this article was complete in all its form, when it saw the light of the Committee room, and they had not the benefit of the views of the members of the Committee who formed the article, in regard to the propriety of its

adoption. I will explain that in a very few words.

Mr. CHAMBERS, (interposing.) If the gentleman will permit me, I will say what I intended to say, that this article never saw the light of the Committee room until it was concocted, acted upon, and adopted by a majority of the Committee out of session. The facts as I understand them were these. For some fortnight or so the Committee were not called together, some of the members being away. When called together, the first information was given us by the Chairman that inasmuch as they were the majority, and inasmuch as they had the responsibility upon them, inasmuch as they knew that we who were in the minority, the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Belt,) and myself, would oppose this article, they had thought themselves privileged to act together and arrange and determine upon these propositions, which they then submitted to us. That I understand to be the state of the case.

Mr. STIRLING. Substantially.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Of course I protest against this as being utterly inconsistent with the orders of the Convention, and usage in the appointment of committees.

Mr. STIRLING. So far as the remarks of the gentleman imply that the majority had adopted that article in a meeting before the Committee had a formal meeting, the gentleman is mistaken. But that they did informally consult together, not all the members of the majority at any one time, with regard to this proposition, and that it was brought before the Committee as embracing the views of the majority, the gentleman is perfectly correct. I am perfectly willing to say still further, that it was introduced in Committee not only with the knowledge upon the part of the majority of the Committee that it met the judgment of the majority of the Committee, but with the knowledge upon the part of the majority of the Committee that it met the judgment of the majority of this Convention. If there is any other statement necessary to be made in regard to that, I am perfectly willing to make it.

I considered it entirely right and proper, that with regard to these matters, upon which the majority of this Convention came here with their views expressed in the canvass before the people of the State, and in regard to which they came here positively instructed by the constituency which sent them, they had a right to place their views in their own form, and submit them to the gentlemen who constitute the minority of this Convention. It was upon the theory, that in regard to the subject matter of both the proposition that is before us and that contained in the 23d article, we had every reason to believe they would not meet the support of the minority of the Committee, that I conceived it would answer no good