

Mr. Calvert a slaveowner, and did you not vote for him? Was he not a good Union man?

Mr. SANDS. I have been at school for the last three years—a terrible school; the teachers were major generals and lieutenant generals, and all that sort of thing, and they have shown me many things I did not see then.

Now I have no more to add upon this question. I am sorry for the vote of this morning, because it has necessitated all that has followed; and whilst I shall never vote to repeal the section which we adopted yesterday, because I could not honorably do that, I can honorably vote against any section which discriminates in favor of the class of people of whom I have spoken. I can honorably do that, and I will do it.

Mr. PUGH called for the previous question.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not want to make a speech, but if the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Pugh) will give me an opportunity—

Mr. PUGH. This discussion is very likely to be endless. After the reconsideration there will probably be another discussion. In my estimation the subject is getting worn utterly threadbare. I must insist upon my call for the previous question.

The call for the previous question was seconded, and the main question was ordered.

The question was upon agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

Upon this question, Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, asked the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken, by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 40, nays 29—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Barron, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Hatch, Hebb, Hopkins, Hopper, Kennard, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Russell, Sands, Smith, of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wood-en—40.

*Nays*—Messrs. Berry, of Prince George's, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dent, Duvall, Edelen, Harwood, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Jones, of Somerset, King, Lausdale, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Par-ran, Peter, Ridgely, Smith, of Dorchester, Wilmer—29.

The motion to reconsider was accordingly agreed to.

Mr. KING, when his name was called, said: I consider myself fully pledged to use all honorable means towards getting compensation from the general government. I therefore vote "no."

Mr. TODD, when his name was called, said:

I shall vote to reconsider for the purpose of moving the following amendment to the sec-

tion: "Provided, that the expense of such census and registration in each case be met by the owner of such slaves." I therefore vote "aye."

The question recurred upon adopting the section.

Mr. TODD moved to amend by adding the following to the section:

"Provided, that the expense of such census and registration in each case be met by the owner of such slaves."

Mr. ABBOTT offered the following as a substitute for the section:

"Sec. —. The legislature, at its first session after the adoption of this constitution, shall provide a mode by which those colored persons who have been liberated from slavery by its adoption shall be registered for the purpose of receiving, *pro rata*, any money or other appropriation made by the general government or otherwise for their benefit."

The first question was upon the amendment submitted by Mr. TODD.

Mr. DENT. I endeavored to get the floor a few minutes, while the motion to reconsider was under discussion, for the purpose of offering some objections to the views proposed and submitted in support of the motion to reconsider. But I failed to do so on account of the call for the previous question, which has become so very fashionable in this body. More so, I am sure, than ever before in any deliberative body that ever assembled in any State of the Union for the purpose of forming a constitution for the government of the State; or, I might add, for any other purpose. It has amounted in many instances to the ostracism of those who entertain opposite views to those of the majority; so much so that we have been entirely unable to offer our reasons for opposing the action that has been taken here, and yet they were reasons which were convincing to us, and which we desired to have read by the people, but which we were warned beforehand were not to be appreciated by those who control the action of this body. We were willing to differ in opinion; but we desired an opportunity to express that difference of opinion, and it was for that purpose that I rose and endeavored to get the floor, but was cut off by the call for the previous question.

Gentlemen who advocated the reconsideration of this section, seemed not to be able to understand that there is any difference between the classes of losses of property which have been spoken of. The gentleman from Washington county (Mr. Negley) speaks of those in his section of the State who have been great losers from the invasion of the public enemy. I regret that they have been losers. He speaks of some who have been robbed on the highway of their watches, money, and other things, as being in the same position with regard to their right to compensation as those who have