

debates of Saturday last, had been understood in a sense, which he was not willing to have imputed to him, and which it was not his design to convey. The gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Gwinn,) had been understood, in the committee room, as expressing his fixed determination to make an argument in the House, on the question of popular representation. He understood the gentleman afterwards to have announced his determination, on the floor of the House, to the same effect. Subsequently, when the gentleman united in the effort, made by other members to have the subject recommitted, without discussing the merits of the general question, he had thought it fair to retort this change of position upon the gentleman, in reply to his assault, (if he might so term it,) upon him. It was to this, and this alone, he designed to refer as the "crooked and tortuous course," of the gentleman. The charge of the gentleman, on Saturday, and his defence, were both made in good temper, and certainly nothing would be more foreign to the fact, or more unpleasant to him, than to have it supposed he designed to impute to that gentleman, any habitual evasion of duty or responsibility. Their relations had always been most friendly, and had not been in the slightest degree interrupted by the little good humored pass between them on Saturday, and he hoped nothing would occur to change these relations, as he professed high respect, both for the intellectual and honorable character of the gentlemen. It was with regret, therefore, he had heard that in the incompleteness, necessarily growing out of the parsimonious mode of reporting, there had been found room for a construction of his remarks, which would be as unjust to him, as to the gentleman. Of course he had resolved to correct any error on this subject, the moment it had been suggested to him, by the kindness of a friend.

Mr. GWINN said that he was satisfied with the explanation of the gentleman from Kent. When the debate referred to was in progress, he had risen to an explanation, without attending to the peculiar language in which the observations of the gentleman were couched. Yesterday, however, he had read the printed report of his remarks, and perceived that the language was capable of a graver meaning than he had supposed, and has therefore requested a friend to call the attention of the gentleman to the passage in question, in order that he might explain its true meaning. He did not suppose that the gentleman ever designed any unpleasant imputation, and took it for granted that he would place it in a proper light, when he was made aware of the circumstance. His ready courtesy had shown him that he was not mistaken.

For himself, he could only say, that, if in the debate of the many exciting topics which might arise, he encroached in any manner, however slight, upon the feelings of any gentleman, he would be glad to have his attention called to the circumstance, in order that he might accord that explanation which he should always take the privilege of requiring from others.

The PRESIDENT called for reports of committees.

Their being no reports,

Mr. RIDGELY moved that the Convention proceed to the orders of the day.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS.

The motion having been agreed to, the Convention resumed the consideration of the order of the day, being the report submitted by Mr. DORSEY, on the 11th ult., as Chairman of the committee on the declaration of rights.

The pending question was on the adoption of the 21st article, as yesterday amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment was adopted.

The 22nd and 23rd articles of the bill were read and adopted as follows :

Art. 22. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel or unusual punishment inflicted by the courts of law.

Art. 23. That all warrants, without oath, or affirmation, to search suspected places, or to seize any person or property, are grievous and oppressive; and all general warrants to search suspected places, or to apprehend suspected persons, without naming or describing the place, or the person in special, are illegal and ought not to be granted.

The 24th article was read as follows :

Art. 24. That there ought to be no forfeiture of any part of the estate of any person for any crime except murder, or treason against the State, and then only on conviction and attainder.

Mr. JENIFER moved to amend the said section, by striking out all after the word "crime."

Mr. J. said he did not see that any case could arise in the State of Maryland where a forfeiture of property should take place after a criminal execution. It would be a hard case that a family already suffering the bitter results of the criminal acts of its head, should be visited also with this additional infliction.

Mr. DENT offered a substitute for the said motion, to read as follows :

Strike out all the 24th article to the word "treason," in the second line, and insert in lieu thereof, the following :

"That no conviction shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture of estate except for."

Mr. JENIFER expressed his willingness to accept the substitute as a modification of his own proposition.

Mr. MERRICK desired to suggest to his colleague, (Mr. Jenifer,) that it might possibly be well that he should modify his amendment. He, (Mr. M.,) did not know exactly the scope of his colleague's views. But he, (Mr. M.,) would suggest, that the time might come when it not only might be good policy, but due to justice, that there should be a forfeiture of property in case of treason. If it met the views of his colleague, he, (Mr. M.,) thought that the object might be answered by simply striking out the words, "murder or."

He could not contemplate any crime as to