

reached us in a much more aggravated state of inflammation, than was found to exist in the excited imaginations of his recently adopted political friends. And he appears to have exceeded them in the violence of his efforts to hold up to popular execration his former, professedly highly valued political friends. He, [Mr. D.] notwithstanding the denunciations of his friend from Prince George's was quite as sincere a friend to naturalized citizens as he was; and if judged by his acts in this connection, he thought decidedly more so. The only evidence relied on, as showing the contrary, was his vote for delaying the right of acting for a short time after naturalization, to purify the ballot box, and enhance the value of the elective franchise. In this the naturalized and native, both citizens had each an unequal interest.

But the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie,) has said that he, (Mr. Dorsey,) was wholly "inconsistent, being before, the opponent of naturalized citizens, and now their advocate, as in fact, taking the other track." For this assertion there was not the slightest foundation. It would give him much pleasure if a like charge of inconsistency could be repelled by the gentleman from Prince George's with equal truth. But that, in his opinion, was impossible, and he believed he would be able to show it. The gentleman from Prince George's, appears to think that the right to vote is of such an inviolable, inappreciable value, that its suspension, even for five days, is an injury so irreparable, that it admits of no atonement; even though the suspension would accomplish an object of the greatest moral and political importance to the community. To elevate the elective franchise into a treasure so incalculably valuable, his friend from Prince George's must have given to it, a compound value, resulting first to him who should cast the vote for his friend and favorite; and secondly to the friend who, by its means might obtain an office of honor and distinction, and what the friend might not wholly overlook, as an object unworthy of notice, that there was a high salary attached to it. My friend will, with his usual candor, I am sure admit that the right of casting his vote for another is not the only political immunity, which a citizen desires, or on which he sets a value. The privilege of receiving the votes of others, and thus perhaps obtaining a high and lucrative office, is regarded as a right, as dear and inestimable to a freeman of the present day, as the privilege of casting his vote for another. What then, said (Mr. D.) is the difference between the gentleman from Prince George's and himself? Why, the one (Mr. D.) sought to postpone the right of voting in a naturalized citizen for a few months or even five days, to effect an important public object, as beneficial to the naturalized as native born citizen; but leaving the foreigner, after naturalization, having the qualification as to residence equally required of all citizens—both native and naturalized, equal right with every other citizen of the State, of being elected by his fellow-citizens to any office

to which his fellow-citizens might see fit to elevate him.

Whilst the other [Mr. Bowie] although he would not postpone for five days, though for the accomplished of the greatest public good, beneficial alike to all citizens, native and naturalized, the power of voting for others; yet he seeks to rob the naturalized citizen of the privilege of being voted for to fill any office until five years after his naturalization, although he might have resided in Maryland during the preceding twenty years. During this five years he Mr. [Bowie] would leave the naturalized citizen the uncontrolled power of voting others into office, but would deny to him the power of being voted for by others, for a like purpose. This odious discrimination between citizens, being wholly uncalled for, with a view to any public good; he [Mr. Dorsey] regarded it, as impolitic, unjust and inexpedient.

If you wish to attach naturalised citizens to your country and its institutions, as unquestionably you ought to do, admit them to citizenship upon terms of perfect equality with their fellow citizens; casting upon them no offensive insinuations; imposing upon them no restrictions which the public welfare does not require. From the adoption of our Constitution in 1776, down to the present day, no such discrimination ever existed, and no inconvenience has ever been experienced from the want of it. Why, then, should the gentleman from Prince George's seek to insert such an obnoxious feature in the Constitution of Maryland—proverbially, the land, of toleration, of civil and religious liberty, from its first settlement to the day of the meeting of this Convention. His, (Mr. D's,) desire was to place foreigners who settled in our State and afterwards were naturalised, in respect to residence, upon the same platform as regards eligibility to office, with citizens of another State, thus settling amongst us. If a foreigner immigrated to this State, and after residing amongst us the requisite period, (five years,) was naturalised; he desired to see him equally eligible to office with the citizen of another of the United States, who had resided amongst us for five years. Such could not be the desire of the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie.) By the principle he sought to engraft upon the Constitution, if a foreigner had resided in our midst for thirty years and was then naturalised, and a citizen of another State had resided here for five years; the latter would be capable of election to any office in the gift of the people, whilst the former must continue to reside with us five years more, after naturalisation, (thus having a residence of thirty-five years,) before he could acquire such eligibility. Whether, under this fair statement of the case, he, (Mr. Bowie,) or he, (Mr. Dorsey,) was the opponent of naturalised citizens, or guilty of inconsistency in regard to them were questions which, he, (Mr. Dorsey,) was willing to submit to the decision of this Convention, without uttering another word upon the subject, except the single remark, that were he, from what he had seen and heard as well in this Convention