

provide that the legislature should pass laws to carry out this provision; but I thought this would test the sense of the house on this provision. If it is adopted, I will add a clause making it the duty of the legislature to carry it out.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARKE demanded the yeas and nays on his amendment, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 15, nays 36—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Belt, Brown, Clarke, Duvall, Harwood, Henkle, Hollyday, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Markey, Miller, Parran, Peter, Todd—15.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Cunningham, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Hopkins, Hopper, Keefer, King, Mayhugh, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Robinette, Russell, Schley, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge—36.

As their names were called,

Mr. BELT said: As this subject has been discussed a great deal among our people, although I should have preferred the adoption of the amendment offered by my colleague (Mr. Marbury,) yet as the convention has rejected that amendment, and the slaves in the State are set free by our action, I shall vote to exclude them all. I vote "aye."

Mr. NEGLEY said: There might be circumstances under which, as a legislative matter, I would vote for this; but I think it is purely a question for the legislature. If the immigration of this class does at any time become dangerous to the State, I think the legislature is competent to pass laws prohibiting them from coming here, and it might in that case become advisable. Although as a legislative matter, if the increase of these people were to become dangerous to the people, I would vote to shut them out. I vote against this, "no."

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

Mr. MILLER. If this report is ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, will it be afterwards competent to move a reconsideration of the vote by which any section has been adopted? I make this inquiry especially with reference to the vote upon the 5th section, in reference to biennial sessions of the legislature. Will it be in order to amend it?

The PRESIDENT. The 53d rule is as follows:

*Rule 53.* After a report of any committee (embodying proposed provisions for the constitution) has passed through its second reading, the question shall then be put by the president of the convention "Shall this report be engrossed for a third reading?" If objection is made, then a majority of the members will decide upon the question of engrossment. After the engrossment of a

report is ordered, the secretary shall have the same printed as engrossed. After any report of a committee has passed to a third reading, it shall not be in order to amend the same, except by the consent of the majority of the members elected to the convention.

Mr. MILLER. Then I will move to reconsider the vote by which that section was adopted. The previous question was called, and it was passed upon by the house, and the attendance being slim, myself and several other gentlemen voted for it with a view to reconsideration at the proper time. I would prefer that the question should come up when the convention is full. I know that several gentlemen of Baltimore city are in favor of annual sessions, and biennial elections.

Mr. CLARKE. I voted in favor of biennial sessions. I am still in favor of biennial sessions; but I will second the motion.

Mr. BELT also seconded the motion.

The PRESIDENT. The vote will be found in the journal, on page 223, taken July 7.

Mr. MILLER. As I have the assurance of several gentlemen that there will be no objection to reconsidering this hereafter in a full convention, I will withdraw the motion to reconsider to-night.

Mr. HEBB submitted the following amendment:

Insert as an additional section the following:

"Sec. —. The general assembly before authorizing the sale of the State's interest in the Chesapeake and Ohio canal and before prescribing regulations and conditions for said sale, shall pass all laws that may be necessary to authorize the counties of Allegany, Washington, Frederick and Montgomery, or any of them, to create a debt by the issue of bonds or otherwise, so as to enable them, or any of them, to become the purchaser of said interest."

Mr. HEBB. This is the section offered by the gentlemen from Prince George's (Mr. Belt,) page 324 of the journal, slightly modified.

Mr. NEGLEY. I am pretty sure that Washington county will never embark in such a speculation as that.

Mr. HEBB demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 36, nays 15—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Baker, Belt, Brown, Clarke, Cunningham, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Duvall, Earle, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Hopkins, Hopper, Keefer, King, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Markey, Murray, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Robinette, Schley, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Todd—36.

*Nays*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Ecker, Harwood,