

tion was accordingly stated to be on the motion to strike out.

Mr. GWINN demanded the yeas and nays on agreeing to this motion, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Constable, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, McCubbin, Spencer, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Balt. city, Presstman, Ware, Schley, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—68.

*Negative*—Messrs. Lee, Buchanan, Williams, McLane, George and McHenry—6.

So the Convention refused to strike out.

The question then recurred on inserting the amendment moved by Mr. TUCK.

Mr. SHRIVER demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Lee, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Buchanan, Welch, Lloyd, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McLane, Tuck, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Gaither, McHenry, Schley, John Newcomer, Kilgour, Waters, Fitzpatrick, Smith and Cockey—34.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Kent, Sellman, Bell, Chandler, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Constable, Miller, Bowie, McCubbin, Spencer, Wright, Fooks, Thomas, Shriver, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Hardeastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Parke, Shower and Brown—38.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOWIE moved to add to the bill the following section:

"The Legislature shall at its first session after the ratification of this Constitution, provide by law for the sale of the State Tobacco Warehouses in the city of Baltimore, and for the withdrawal of the inspections of tobacco from said city; and with the proceeds of the sales thereof, to provide for the building and erection of State Tobacco Warehouses for the inspection of tobacco, in the tobacco growing sections of the State; the surplus, if any, after paying the expenses of building said warehouses, shall be placed to the credit of the sinking fund, to be applied towards the payment of the public debt."

Mr. BOWIE desired to state that the value of the tobacco warehouses in the city of Baltimore was estimated at one million of dollars. The tobacco interests of the State had been for years

united in this opinion—that the concentration of the trade in Baltimore city, and the inspection of the article there, had operated injuriously to their interests, because it placed the entire control of the article in the hands of the speculator and buyer. They desired, if it could be done, to bring back the inspection to the country as it existed prior to the act 1825, which established the warehouses in the city of Baltimore. They believed it to be for their interest, and the very same motive which influenced him to vote against the proposition of his colleague, (Mr. Tuck,) of having a free system of inspection, or allowing property to be submitted for inspection to those who took out license, would induce him, and he hoped it would operate upon the House, to pass some provision of this sort, in order to place under the power and control of the producer, the raw material, and the sale of their own article, they having felt seriously the inconvenience arising from the system of the Legislature, by which they were now forced to send their produce to the city of Baltimore. He believed it to be the true theory—to bring it back to the country, where it was grown. He would say that it could not be a matter of any moment to any other portion of the State than to the planting interest, and the Convention should at least consult their wishes upon the subject. He held, upon that question, that it was not our duty to provide inspections for foreign tobacco within the limits of this State. They had not the constitutional power to prohibit the introduction of tobacco from other States here, and it would be an unwise policy, if they looked to the interests of the growers at home, to provide for the inspection of the foreign article. But he, without being in favor of a law to prevent the introduction of tobacco here, would not aid to establish a protection for foreign tobacco by providing an inspection for it. But he did not touch that question; he would leave it to the Legislature. He desired them now to impose a duty upon the Legislature to withdraw the places of inspection. He did not purpose to alter the system at all one way or the other. He would give it all the character and force that a State inspection could give it. He merely wished to bring it back to those who produced the raw material, and who desired to become their own agents and sell their own article in the way that suited them best, and he would leave the places of inspection in the counties, to be designated by the Legislature.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, said:

That he tried to get the floor upon the other question of inspections, but was not able to do so, and would therefore claim the indulgence of the House one moment while he alluded to some statistics upon this subject. The gentleman from Prince George's seemed to assume that these tobacco warehouses were only of interest to the counties of Maryland. He would furnish the Convention with statistics to show the amount of tobacco inspected in Maryland, which was not grown in the State. He had before him a circular, signed by Oelricks & Lurman, a very large house engaged in the purchase of tobacco for