

ference to the doctrine of colonization, does my proposition suggest that you are to send them from the State, or under the ties which now exist between husband and wife, parent and child? It simply says that whatever funds may be collected from the violation of this law shall be applied to the colonization of those who may desire to leave the State. Is that bordering on barbarism? Is it a violation of humanity? Or is it simply putting at their disposition a fund which they may employ in going abroad with their own free consent?

I do not propose to go into this question of negro equality which the gentleman has raised, and which it was never the intention of this order to raise at all; for it says not one word with reference to the question of negro equality, which the gentleman has brought into this discussion. The order simply raises the question of the free negroes, of what shall be done with them. My constituents live on the borders of Washington city. We have there congregated thousands upon thousands, who have come up from the South, from all parts of the country. We have now in the State a population of 90,000 free negroes, besides a large slave population, who, it is intimated by the gentleman, are to be set free. Then the State is open to 200,000 now congregated within certain limits of Washington city. The result will be that Prince George's county, bordering on Washington, will be overrun, and flooded with them. My constituents tell me that unless some such provision as this is adopted, they do not know whether they can leave their families in safety with such a class thrown upon the community.

As to the competition between free black labor and free white labor, I do not pretend to say which will triumph. If the State is overrun with free negroes, they will have to work, if they do not want to starve, and they will come into competition with white men. White men will not get the labor which the blacks perform, unless they work at the same wages with the free negro. Unless therefore you adopt some such provision as this, you will reduce the wages of white men down to the level of those of the free negro. I say this as a question of political economy, and not at all as involved in the political question of their franchise. Unless you adopt some such provision, this will be the effect upon the poor white man. Now what will be the result to the land owner? We shall make the State a second Hayti or Jamaica. The land will be held by few, and the land owners will never reap the benefit from a rise in the value of their lands caused by a demand from free white men. There is now in our community a large class of white men who are, in consequence of the loss of slave labor, able to rent land. If the free negroes are admitted the present land owners will continue

to work their lands by free negro labor instead of slave labor. The poor white man will not be able to rent an acre of land. He must work at the rate of free negro's wages or get nothing to do. Thus both the white land owner and the poor landless white man will be injured by admitting an influx of free negroes.

But I did not propose to go into this matter. I had no idea of saying anything upon this subject, nor should I have done so but for the remarks of the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands.) I have said what I have, simply in justice to myself, and to show that I have made no proposition based upon a scheme of inhumanity either to the white or the black.

Mr. SANDS took the floor and desired ten minutes to reply, but the President stating that the hour had arrived for the unfinished business of yesterday to be taken up, Mr. Sands preferred not to ask of the Convention leave to proceed.

#### RULES OF ORDER.

The Convention proceeded to the consideration of the unfinished business, being the report of the Committee on Rules and Orders, the pending question being upon the amendment submitted by Mr. Hebb, as a substitute for Rule 54th.

Mr. HEBB modified his amendment by striking out the words "section of the Constitution then under consideration," and inserting the words "special matter to which they relate;" also, by striking out the words "division of," and inserting "vote upon; so that the amendment should read:

"The previous question shall be always in order in Convention, and shall be in this form: 'Shall the main question be now put?' It shall only be admitted when demanded by a majority of the members present, and its effect shall be to put an end to all debate, and to bring the Convention to a direct vote upon pending amendments, and the special matter to which they relate. On a motion for the previous question, and prior to the seconding of the same, a call of the Convention shall be in order, but after a majority shall have seconded such motion, no call shall be in order prior to a vote upon the main question; and on the previous question there shall be no debate."

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to inquire how this will operate, in taking the vote upon the "pending amendments and the special matter to which they relate." Does it mean this? Suppose we are upon the article on the Judiciary, at the first section, upon the Court of Appeals, and two amendments are offered. While these amendments are before the House and under debate, the previous question is called. Does this amendment mean that if the previous question is sustained we are to vote upon the whole subject of the Court of Appeals without having gone through its