

should continue the law, so as to exclude rogues and thieves. Thad. Stevens and his followers in Pennsylvania would resort to every means to carry the border counties, and they should take such means as would secure them and the State to the gallant democracy.

Mr. McKaig said the majority of the counties did not want and had no need for a registry, but it should exist in Baltimore city and county, and sooner than not have it there, they would go for having it all over the State.

Mr. Gill very much regretted that this motion had been made, and argued in favor of a registry as absolutely essential for the safety and protection of the people of the State. He had, years ago, when suffering under political oppression, come here with others of his fellow-citizens and asked for a registry law. In reference to having it apply to Baltimore alone, he was not willing for it; wanted no such enviable distinction, and if it was not to apply to the whole State he did not want it in Baltimore.

Mr. Maulsby asked if the gentleman represented the views of his delegation on the subject?

Mr. Gill had not conferred with his colleagues, but thought he represented the views of a majority of them.

Mr. Maulsby said if that was the case, he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Vansant did not concur in the views of his colleague, (Mr. Gill.) He (Mr. V.) thought Baltimore would receive graciously this law if applied only to herself. He supposed the gentlemen of the counties knew what suited them, and Baltimore did not wish to impose a registry law on them if they did not desire it; but in Baltimore they certainly needed it.

Mr. Brewer and Mr. Henderson expressed their concurrence in the views of Mr. Gill.

Mr. Brown concurred in the views of Mr. Vansant.

Mr. Peters declared his intention of supporting the amendment of Mr. Maulsby.

Mr. George advocated the propriety of extending the registry throughout the State, but he would not force it upon the counties if they did not want it. He thought,