

which excited so much discussion was under consideration, this protest was submitted by Mr. Yellott, who was then on the right side of the question. I read from the journal of the senate:

"Mr. Yellott submitted the following protest:

"The senate having been in session this day, from eleven o'clock A. M. until three P. M., and from four P. M. until twenty minutes past nine at night; and the printed copies of three of the important bills reported from the judiciary committee, and made the special order for this day, having been laid upon our desks but a few minutes since, and while we were much engaged with the consideration of the two other important measures, just ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and for the above reasons we have had no opportunity of knowing the exact provisions of the three bills now proposed to be put upon their second reading, or to prepare amendments to either of said three bills; and we have several times moved an adjournment for the purpose of obtaining a reasonable opportunity for the examination of said three bills, and said adjournments have been refused by the majority;

"Now, therefore, we do protest against said three bills, above referred to, being put upon their second reading at the session of the senate of this evening, as such a course of proceedings will practically deny to us any reasonable opportunity of understanding the exact provisions of said three important bills."

[Signed]

ANTHONY KIMMEL,
S. J. BRADLEY,
THOMAS J. GRAHAME,
TILGHMAN NUTTLE,
JAMES F. DASHIELL,
JNO. E. SMITH,
JOHN J. STONE,
CHAS. F. GOLDSBOROUGH,
COLEMAN YELLOTT, and
FRANKLIN WHITAKER.

"Mr. McKaig submitted the following order:

"Ordered, that the protest signed by Anthony Kimmel, and nine other senators, be entered upon the journal; but such entry is not to be construed as an admission, by the majority, of the entire correctness of all the statements made in said protest.

"Which was adopted."

An order similar in character to this has just been offered by the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely,) which it seems to me will answer every purpose.

An earlier protest is found in the journal of the senate of 1842. There was then, as we are all aware there is now, no previous question in the senate. The senate was about passing a number of very important bills, which were being pressed through to a

vote. An order was adopted that at a certain time those bills should be put upon their passage. This protest was submitted, and which seems to have been entered upon the journal without any particular motion to that effect.

"Mr. Frick submitted the following:

"The undersigned, senators of Maryland, hereby protest against the order submitted by the senator from Frederick, and adopted by the senate to proceed to act upon the bills and resolutions before them without debate, while the amendments offered to the bill before the senate providing for the sale of the State's interest in the several internal improvement companies were under debate.

"The effect of the order is to deny the undersigned the right of debate on a bill more important than any other proposed during the session; and it is in the judgment of the undersigned wholly subversive of the constitutional rights of themselves and their constituents.

"We further protest against the extraordinary course of the majority of the senate in forcing the said bill on the senate for their action; and in offering this protest to be entered on the journal, they reserve to themselves their privilege of expressing in any other mode to their constituents, the deep sense which they entertain of the wrong to which they have been subjected."

Signed by Otho Scott, William Frick, and six other members of the senate.

Immediately afterwards, on the part of the majority—

"Mr. Ricaud submitted the following:

"The undersigned, a majority of the senate of Maryland, feel it due to the constitutional obligation under which they act, and that responsibility which they acknowledge to the people of the State whom they represent, to explain the groundwork of their action upon which the order of the senator of Frederick was submitted. There were many and various bills and of great magnitude to the State, which had been received from the house of delegates and which, under the constitutional duty and the uniform practice of the body required, should be definitively acted upon—the same question as that presented in the bill under debate had been discussed in the senate for an entire day preceding the day of final adjournment, and the notice had been distinctly given and the determination expressed to defeat the action of the senate upon the said bill by protracted debate. Under these circumstances the president called the senator from Harford to order, who was then and for more than one hour and a half had been discussing a useless question of order, and called the attention of the senate to the uniform and constant practice of the senate, and the constitutional duty of the senate to act definitively upon all bills received from the house, and then an-