

After debate, the Convention refused to entertain the substitute.

Mr. Peters proposed to amend article 24, so as to read:

“Slavery in this State having been destroyed under the policy and authority of the United States, compensation in consideration thereof is due from the United States.”

The Convention refused to entertain this amendment by a vote of 63 to 28.

Mr. Walsh called attention to an apparent inconsistency in the 33d article and the report of the judiciary committee, and moved to open the article to amendment, which was agreed to.

Mr. Carter then offered an amendment that the judges shall not be removed except as provided for in this constitution, which was agreed to.

The third reading of the article having been concluded, Mr. Vansant moved that it do now pass.

Mr. Jones would make an appeal to the members of the Convention who were not satisfied with certain of the sections, to yield their own views to the decision of the majority of the Convention. He hoped they would present a united front, and that their labors should go before the people with the sanction of unanimity.

Mr. Mitchell would like very much to oblige his friend from Somerset, but there were articles in this Declaration which he could not conscientiously approve of, and which the people did not like, and he would be, therefore, compelled to vote against it.

Mr. Brewer, of Baltimore city, would be obliged to record his vote against the bill for the same reasons as those of the gentleman from Charles county, (Mr. Mitchell.)

Mr. Nelson said that, regarding declarations enunciated in this Bill of Rights as a stab against the principles of States rights, and as an abrogation of our long settled policy relative to the negro race, he could not conscientiously vote for it.

Mr. Stoddert would vote for the bill if he could enter his protest against the 24th article, but as he saw no mode of doing that, he was compelled to vote against it.