

this body, (and I presume we are all entitled to that appellation,) would interpolate into remarks given to the reporter anything he would not have spoken if he had had the opportunity. At any rate, should he do so, we could expunge it, and take some measures to prevent it in the future. If the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Daniel) does not desire to have his remarks go down to posterity any farther than they may go down from his remarks yesterday, and the gentleman from Anne Arundel (Mr. Miller) does not desire, of course I do not.

Mr. THRUSTON. I am opposed to the adoption of this order, because it may lead to great latitude, and swell our record of debates to an inordinate size. Besides that objection, it leaves the whole Convention at the mercy of what any member may choose to write, without the Convention hearing it, or having any opportunity of replying to it.

Mr. BARRON. I shall vote in favor of this order, because I have noticed that in Congress gentlemen have been allowed the privilege of printing their speeches. Now to me, speech-making is a very up-hill business, and I have never indulged in much of it, and I really think that after a gentleman has gone to all the trouble of writing out a speech, and putting it into fair shape, he ought to have the privilege of putting it on the record. Something has been said about this leading to great latitude of debate. Why, sir, the other day my friend from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) spoke three hours, and I listened to all of it that I could. Other gentlemen have had, some an hour and a quarter, some two hours. Now I want to see them on paper afterwards, for I do not know but what those very speeches of the opposite side of the house may be of great advantage to me hereafter.

Mr. CLARKE. In reply to my friend from Baltimore city, (Mr. Barron,) I would say that having had the pleasure of listening to him in the Legislature last winter, I think he is quite famous as an orator. He delivered a speech last winter of, I think, an hour in length, and I had supposed he would favor us with a speech here.

Mr. BARRON. I have all the time opposed anything like cutting off debate upon these 4th and 23d articles. They are of very vital importance, and I am willing to give as much latitude to debate upon them that gentlemen may want.

The question was for the adoption of the order.

On this question Mr. BARRON called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

The question was then taken, by yeas and nays, (Mr. Daniel and Mr. Miller being excused from voting,) and resulted—yeas 37, nays 45—as follows :

Yeas—Messrs. Barron, Belt, Berry, of Prince George's, Billingsley, Blackiston, Briscoe,

Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Cushing, Dennis, Duvall, Earle, Edelen, Gale, Harwood, Henkle, Hodson, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, Kennard, Landsdale, Larsh, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Morgan, Parran, Peter, Ridgely, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Dorchester, Smith, of Worcester, Stockbridge, Swope, Turner, Wilmer—37.

Nays—Messrs. Goldsborough, President ; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Brooks, Carter, Cunningham, Davis, of Charles, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, King, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Noble, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Robiette, Sands, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Sneary, Stirling, Sykes, Thruston, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—45.

The order was accordingly rejected.

LIMITING DEBATE ON ARTICLE 4.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I desire to submit an order to the Convention for the purpose of limiting debate upon the article of the bill of rights now pending before this house, so there may be a distinct understanding on all sides when the vote may be taken, and the matter finally disposed of. Of course, if it is thought best to change the time I have named in the order, I shall have no stringent objection, although I designed to give as much time as I thought would be needed. I submit this order :

Ordered, That general debate on the 4th Article of the Declaration of Rights shall cease at half-past five o'clock to-day ; that the chairman of the committee that reported the same shall then be allowed for closing the discussion, such time as he may desire, not exceeding one hour and a quarter, immediately after which the vote shall be taken upon the pending amendment. Should any other amendments be offered, the person offering the same shall be allowed five minutes to explain the purpose and effect of his proposed amendment, and the vote shall then be taken thereon without further debate.

Mr. BARRON. I think that order is out of order. We have already passed an order limiting debate to an hour, and we have not reconsidered that vote yet.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) is in order at this time. The question is now upon the adoption of the order.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I am exceedingly gratified to witness the disposition which seems to manifest itself by these different orders. This subject which has been now debated for several days, is evidently, in the view of the Convention, a subject of very serious importance. There has been all the time in some parts of the House a sort of marked sensibility upon the subject of the waste of time. Now, if I correctly understand our position, we are