

coe, Chambers, Clarke, Crawford, Davis of Charles, Dennis, Duvall, Edelen, Harwood, Henkle, Hollyday, Horsey, Johnson, Jones of Somerset, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parran, Smith of Dorchester, Turner, Wilmer—28.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Baker, Barron, Berry of Baltimore county, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis of Washington, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Hopkins, Jones of Cecil, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Mace, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Noble, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schlosser, Scott, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Thruston, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wood—52.

Pending the call of the yeas and nays, the following explanations were made by gentlemen, as their names were called :

Mr. BERRY, of Baltimore county. I am perfectly satisfied with the article in the bill of rights as reported originally by the Committee on the Declaration of Rights. I shall vote in favor of no amendment to it, and therefore vote "no."

Mr. MARBURY. I consider the principle involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Stirling,) as decidedly the most infamous proposition yet presented to this Convention; and therefore I shall vote for the amendment offered by my colleague, (Mr. Clarke,) as somewhat modifying the horrid nature of that proposition. I vote "aye."

Mr. MILLER. I prefer the original article as reported by the committee; but as I consider the amendment of my friend from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) an improvement upon the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Stirling,) I vote "aye."

Mr. STIRLING. I merely want to say in answer to what was said by the member from Prince George's, (Mr. Marbury), that this infamous proposition of mine—

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. STIRLING—(continuing)—is the original article of the bill of rights of 1776, upon which he pronounced such a eulogy the other morning.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman is not in order; but will take his seat.

Mr. STIRLING. But, Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERS. I hope the rules of order will be enforced, or there is no use in having any.

Mr. STIRLING. Why should the rules of order be enforced upon me, and not upon a member who applies an insulting epithet to a proposition which the Convention has under consideration?

The PRESIDENT. If there is any remark made insulting to the Convention, or any of

its members, the Chair will regard it as his duty to call the one so making it to order. But the Chair did not suppose that the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Marbury) intended to say anything insulting to the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) or to the Convention. I am sure the gentleman did not mean any personal reflection.

Mr. MARBURY. I certainly did not.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair knows that gentlemen sometimes make use of strong expressions, without intending any personal reflection. If the Chair had supposed for one moment that the gentleman from Prince George's intended by the remarks he made to cast any reflection upon this House or any of its members, he would have called him to order and directed him to take his seat, as he will any member, no matter to which side he may belong, who may be guilty of such an act. No gentleman, when his name is called, has a right to respond to any remarks made by any other gentleman; he can only state what his vote is, and give his reasons for it, if he desires to give any.

Mr. STIRLING. I vote "no."

Mr. BILLINGSLEY. I prefer the original article. But as this amendment is a modification of the one submitted by the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Stirling,) I desire to change my vote, and vote in favor of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I desire to change my vote, for the same reason assigned by the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Billingsley). I prefer the original article; but I prefer the amendment of my colleague (Mr. Clarke) to the one offered by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling). I therefore vote "aye."

The amendment to the amendment was accordingly rejected.

The question recurred upon the amendment of Mr. Stirling, to strike out all after the word "That," in the first line of Article 26, and insert—

"No conviction for treason shall work corruption of blood; nor shall there be any forfeiture of the estate of any person for any crime except for treason, and then only on conviction."

Upon this question Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, called the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

The question being then taken, by yeas and nays, it resulted—yeas 49, nays 31—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Baker, Barron, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis of Washington county, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Hopkins, Jones of Cecil county, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Noble, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schlosser,