

Conservatism! where is it found? In the breast of faction, or cabal, or primary meetings, or Conventions, or Legislatures of sovereign States? No such thing. Conservatism has its true home in the hearts of the people. Who was it saved your State when she was trembling on the verge of that fiery gulf into which secession has dragged many of our poor unfortunate sister States. Who saved Maryland—your Maryland and mine? Little cabals? Little cliques? Legislatures? It is a fact notorious to the people of the State that these were doing their best to drag her out of this Union which Washington founded and loved, and bade us with his parting breath cling to. Who saved Maryland? Governor Hicks? I honor him. He is my personal friend. I have a high esteem for him; but his arm was too short. The Legislature of Maryland? Well, that is past history. But answer me, if you can, when the Legislature of Maryland saved Maryland from secession. No, sir, it was the people, the sovereign people, the bone and sinew of the land, the men proposed to be tied up and restricted in their unalienable rights. They were the people who saved Maryland. Who are the true conservatives? The glorious people. I shall never forget the scenes which I, as one humble individual, passed through at the time of the meeting of that Legislature. I went up to Frederick city, knowing some of the members, and trusting in God that I might do some little to prevent the passage of—

The PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it his duty to interpose at this point, considering the gentleman as transcending the rule by going into this minute discussion of matters not involved in the question pending.

Mr. BRISCOE. I hope the gentleman from Howard will be permitted to go on.

The PRESIDENT. If this discussion is permitted to go on, it will lead to a discussion of extraneous matters; for if permission is given to one gentleman, it must be given to another gentleman.

Mr. SANDS. If the President will allow one word of explanation, I will endeavor to make plain what I believe to be the bearing of this argument. The amendment before the Convention says that the people are to be restricted in an unalienable right to reform, alter or amend, at any time they think proper, their organic law. My argument is that they are the safest depositories of that power. I have no disposition to continue it. But I say that, believing that the people can be more safely trusted than any clique, or party, or faction, or Legislature whatever—believing that the people of the State stood by the Government, when these were trying to drag it down—I shall vote against the amendment on the ground that I can trust the people better than I can any man or set of men.

Mr. THOMAS demanded the previous question, and the demand was sustained.

The amendment moved by Mr. Bond was rejected.

The original amendment, moved by Mr. Jones of Somerset, was rejected.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, moved to amend by striking out all after the word "whole."

The CHAIR ruled the amendment out of order, the previous question not being yet exhausted, the vote not having been taken upon the section.

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION.

Mr. CLARKE. I call for the yeas and nays upon the whole section. I understand the rule of order to be this, in relation to the previous question, as adopted by the Convention:

"Its effect shall be to put an end to all debate, and to bring the Convention to a direct vote upon pending amendments, and the special matter to which they relate."

The main question here is the adoption of the section, just as I contended the rule would operate the other day when we adopted it. The rule proposed by the committee would not now have brought us to a vote upon the section at all. We should simply have voted upon the amendments, and the section would then have been open to amendment; and after the amendments were exhausted we should have passed to the next section without a vote upon this. But this rule brings us at once to a vote upon this section, and upon that question I call the yeas and nays.

Mr. DANIEL. It is merely upon the adoption of the section upon its second reading.

The PRESIDENT. It is not usual to take a vote upon a section upon its second reading.

Mr. CLARKE. I agree that it is not under the ordinary parliamentary rule, nor would have been required if the House had adopted the rule reported by the committee. But the House has determined to order the main question upon the section. We have had two amendments and voted upon them, and the rule now requires us to vote upon the special matter to which they relate. These amendments relate to this section.

Mr. STIRLING called the gentleman to order, inquiring whether there could be a discussion on the point of order before its decision by the Chair and an appeal.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair has the right to invite the discussions with a view of eliciting the sense of the Convention before giving his decision. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CLARKE resumed. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. Negley) the other day, when we had this report under consideration, suggested this very difficulty, and stated that if we adopted the rule which was offered by the gentleman from Allegany (Mr. Hebb) and which is now incorporated in those Rules, the result would be that the Convention would