

many inconveniences public and private, independent of the loss of labor or property at this particular time.

I therefore call upon this convention simply to supply a defect which will otherwise exist in our law by virtue of the abolition of slavery. Simply to provide by a law of the legislature a mode of preserving proof and evidence of title in this property, for whatever purposes and reasons that may be demanded hereafter. I ask it as an act of justice to us; as the only mode in which our people may be delivered, I may say, from innumerable difficulties, legal and otherwise. I ask the convention to act upon this proposition independent of all consideration of the rebellion, or from whence the compensation is to be derived, or how it is to be apportioned hereafter. I ask them simply to address their minds to the justice of providing legal safeguards for the rights of the people.

Mr. SYKES called for the previous question.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset, moved that the convention adjourn, and called for the yeas and nays upon that question, which were ordered.

*Yeas*—Messrs. Abbott, Berry, of Prince George's, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Carter, Chambers, Clarke, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Duvall, Edelen, Harwood, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, King, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parran, Peter, Smith, of Dorchester, Wilmer—28.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Annan, Audoun, Barron, Cunningham, Cushing, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Hatch, Hebb, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Kennard, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sneary, Stirling, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wooden—37.

The motion to adjourn was accordingly rejected.

The question recurred upon the call for the previous question by Mr. SYKES.

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

The first question was upon the following amendment to the proposed section, submitted by Mr. TODD.

Amend by adding:

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

Upon this question Mr. MARBURY called the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken, by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 17, nays 46—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Blackiston, Clarke, Dail, Duvall, Harwood, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller,

Morgan, Peter, Smith, of Dorchester, Todd, Wilmer—17.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbot, Annan, Audoun, Barron, Belt, Brown, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Davis, of Charles, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Edelen, Farrow, Galloway, Hatch, Hebb, Hollyday, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Kennard, King, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Smith, of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Valliant, Wooden—46.

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

Pending the call of the yeas and nays, the following explanations were made by members as their names were called:

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think the phraseology of this amendment is exactly what it should be. But I have no doubt the legislature would construe it to mean that whatever might be the mode of proof for perpetuating this title, it should be done at the expense of the owners. Believing that it would be so construed, and that the owners ought to pay this expense, I shall vote “aye.”

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I think it is a rather small business for the convention to occupy its time with; the expense cannot be a very great deal. Still I think it a very important matter that the evidence should be perpetuated. And if that expense is the only obstacle, I do not think that any person who has lost a slave would object. If he does, then he can forego the privilege of having the testimony. I am willing to take it even upon these terms, and therefore I vote “aye.”

Mr. NEGLEY. Under the operation of this section and this amendment the people in our section of the State who have sustained losses are effectually cut out; I therefore vote “no.”

Mr. BELT. I would like to say, in explanation of my vote, that my natural impulse is to vote in the affirmative, for the reason stated by my friend from Somerset (Mr. Jones,) and because the general impulse and the general practice of my people is not to stand upon any mere small question of expense of this sort. If the slaveholders of Maryland were agitating this question, and advocated this change; if they were those who wanted to exchange their negroes for money, or wanted slavery abolished for some purpose or other, I should feel myself compelled, upon every principle, to vote that they should bear the expense of any incidental procedure like this. But since it is not they, but others who are forcing this thing upon them against their will, and against their interest, I think this incidental expense should be borne by the State. I shall therefore vote “no.”

Mr. JONES, of Somerset, moved to adjourn.

Mr. CUSHING. The house is engaged in a vote under a call of the previous question.—