

who were not here? It was their fault they were not here; they should have been here and voted against these resolutions, if they were opposed to them. The gentleman from Montgomery (Mr. Peter,) I think was so unfortunate as not to be allowed to place himself upon the record upon all these resolutions. Of course that is a privilege which I do not wish to deny to him particularly, if it can apply with equal force to all other members of the convention. But it cannot; and since it cannot, it will be giving him a privilege which other members do not have.

I will say for myself that unfortunately I was absent upon the occasion of the second reading of one of the articles of this constitution, and I have sincerely regretted it ever since. Suppose I should now come forward with a paper, and ask of the convention the privilege that my paper should go upon the journal, the paper containing an argument, long or short. That might be granted. After a while another member comes forward, having precisely the same right, and asks permission to put himself upon the record. It might happen that no fifty or sixty of us could unite in one argument, as thirty-five members have done in this case. Now that is no reason why I should come forward with my argument, and another gentleman with his argument, and ask that we be allowed to place ourselves upon the record. And taking this view of the matter, I seriously object to putting this protest upon the record.

And there are other reasons. Some portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers) referred to the fact that one gentleman stood upon the floor for the purpose of calling the previous question—that he took the floor before the secretary had finished reading the resolution. Now that is a direct charge against some member of this convention. I do not know who the gentleman is; but I suppose it is the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Barron.)

Mr. CHAMBERS. Certainly; and the fact is so.

Mr. PUGH. So much the worse, for the gentleman is not here to answer the charge.

The PRESIDENT. What is the charge?

Mr. PUGH. That he was on the floor before the secretary had read the resolution for the purpose of moving the previous question.

Mr. STIRLING. And not only that; but this paper says that before the resolution was read, or at least that is implied, that before the house had heard the resolution read, the previous question was called.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is mistaken in reference to that being a part of the protest.

Mr. PUGH. I did not say it was a part of the protest. I said it was a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Kent.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Stated as one of the reasons

for the protest. I beg leave to correct the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling.) Fortunately I have written down all that I said, that no misrepresentation could be made. I said, as every gentleman who was in the house at the time must know was the fact, that the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Barron) was on his feet before the resolution was read through, for the purpose of moving the previous question, which was moved as soon as the resolution was fairly read through. I do not say, as the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) has supposed, that the motion for the previous question was made before the resolution was completely read.

And to the gentleman from Frederick (Mr. Schley,) I would say that I repudiate the idea of insidious action. It is misapplied, and it is unbecoming the gentleman to appropriate that term to myself, or to any individual who has signed that paper. And he mistakes in calling upon his imagination for the motives which led to the production of this paper. It is intended to develop our views to the State in the only mode in which we think that can be done effectually. It is to perpetuate the motives which led us to produce this paper, and ask its entry upon the journal. It is intended to carry down to posterity the true history of our opinions upon this subject. There is no argument in it, I apprehend, further than to develop the naked reasons in the shortest possible phrase, which have led us to the conclusions expressed upon that paper. And when the gentleman talks about a purpose, a latent purpose, an insidious purpose, I advise him to reserve such terms for persons other than those whose names are found upon that paper. I will not, though perhaps I might, say—"viper you bite at a file."

Mr. SCHLEY. I merely meant to say that if the motives of the author or the signers of that paper were such as I submit, they are capable of being construed to be, then the protest as written would answer the purpose very effectually.

Mr. PUGH. I have but a few words more to say. I indorse all that has been said by the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) in this respect. There is nothing in that paper that I am not prepared to meet here or anywhere else. But that is why I object to it. We decided here, a majority of us, that this is a question about which we would not debate. And here a debate occurs in spite of us, that is to say, the gentlemen upon the other side are all heard in this paper, which we have no opportunity to answer.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman has full opportunity at any time.

Mr. PUGH. I know, after it has been printed. But we have no opportunity now.

The PRESIDENT. The record is open at any time.