

in opinion with his friend from Prince George's on a Constitutional question. Because he adhered to his amendment, he had been charged with being the champion of naturalized citizens. He was the champion of nobody; he had no political aspirations, and had the imagination of his friend been equally free from them, he never would have made such a charge. He did no more than that what he deemed his duty, to make the language of the Constitution so explicit as to prevent controversy hereafter.

Mr. GRASON said, it seemed to him that, upon the question before the Convention, gentlemen on different sides came very nearly to an agreement. For his own part, he agreed in the opinions expressed by the gentleman from Queen Anne, and also with those expressed on the other side, because he was satisfied that either term would answer the purpose. In the Constitution as it originally stood, the word "citizen of the United States," or "citizen of the State" was not to be found. In that instrument we found the term used was "persons"—"people"—"freemen." But in the year 1810, when the right of suffrage was extended, there was a provision that every free white male citizen of the State should be entitled to vote. That term had stood the test of forty years without producing a single inconvenience or difficulty. It appeared to him that there could not be any objection to its use. He preferred it because he thought that the dignity of the State of Maryland would be consulted by acting up to the idea that there was such a thing as a citizen of that State. When the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. RIDGELY) had cited the provisions of the Constitutions of other States, he (Mr. G.) had turned to the Constitution of the State of Virginia, of the history of which he had some knowledge. The words there were "every free citizen of the Commonwealth." He would barely suggest that possibly the words "a citizen of Maryland," were more appropriate than the words "a citizen of the United States." He should always contemplate with painful emotions the possibility that there ever could be a separation of the States of this Union. But it might happen that three or four of the States might withdraw—that there might be a rupture, or even a peaceable separation. The Convention was framing a Constitution which, if it should prove acceptable to the people, and calculated to promote their honor and interest, might endure for ages to come. And, looking to the possibility that either of the events to which he had alluded might occur, he would prefer that a term should be used which was applicable to the people of the State.

Mr. BOWIE and Mr. DORSEY made mutual explanations.

Mr. J. U. DENNIS said, that some of the States had made negroes citizens, and given them the right of suffrage. If other States have this power, it is to be presumed that we have.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. DORSEY, and the vote was declared to be, yeas 39, nays 30.

Mr. SPENCER suggested that there was a mistake in the count (a large number of members

standing up in a limited space in that extreme quarter of the hall which immediately fronts the Committee room.)

Several members called for a re-count.

The CHAIRMAN said, he was sure of the correctness of the count, but was willing to make a re-count, if desired by the Committee.

Mr. BRENT called the yeas and nays.

Mr. PHELPS submitted that it was not in order to call the yeas and nays, after the result of the vote had been announced.

Mr. MAGRAW. We were so thick in the corner here, that we could not get out. (Laughter.)

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. I will state the reason why the yeas and nays should be taken. If the event to which the gentleman has referred of a dissolution of the Union—

Mr. BUCHANAN. (Interposing.) This is clearly out of order, Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no right to speak on that subject.

Mr. BRENT. I have the right to state the reason why—

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh! no, you have no such right.

Mr. JENIFER. If we adopt this principle, why may not a gentleman get up on every question and say he distrusts the count of the chair, and ask the yeas and nays.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair presumes that every member of this body is an honorable man, and would not make such a statement unless he believed it to be true. (Laughter.)

The yeas and nays were then ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricard, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Brent, of Charles, Jenifer, Ridgely, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Sprigg, McCubbin, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Annan, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Waters, Smith, Parke and Cockey—46.

*Negative*.—Messrs. Randall, Buchanan, Chandler, Lloyd, Sherwood, of Talbot, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Shriver, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Neill, Kilgour, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Shower and Brown—37.

So the amendment was adopted.

The question then recurred upon the amendment as offered by Mr. WEBER.

Mr. BUCHANAN, moved that the Committee rise.

Determined in the affirmative.

The Committee accordingly rose, the President resumed the Chair, and the Chairman reported that the Committee had in obedience to order, had the said report again under consideration, and had come to no conclusion thereon.

And the Convention adjourned until to-morrow morning eleven o'clock.