

Mr. CUSHING. My object in offering this order is that there may be no further accumulation of committees. I think we may as well put an end to it by appointing such a committee as this.

Mr. BARRON called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. I would suggest to the gentleman that this might be appropriately called the Omnibus Committee.

Mr. CUSHING. Or it might be called a Waste-bag Committee.

Mr. CLARKE. There was a suggestion that there should be a Committee on Emancipation and the Negro Population. I do not know to which Committee that subject belongs under the various assignments. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) suggested that it belonged to the Committee on the Declaration of Rights; and there might be, between that Committee and this some controversy. I merely throw out the suggestion, by way of inquiry to which committee that very important subject belongs.

Mr. CUSHING. I think the Convention will decide whether the Emancipation question, or the question of the Colored Population, properly belongs to the Committee on the Declaration of Rights or to this committee, and I am willing that these subjects should go to whichever committee the Convention prefer.

The question being taken upon the adoption of the order, the result was—yeas 6; nays 71—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Harwood, Abbott, Cushing, Parran, Belt, Negley—6.

Nays—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Hebb, Thruston, Wickard, Robinette, Miller, Bond, Henkle, Hatch, Kennard, Brooks, Stockbridge, Barron, Thomas, Audoun, Berry of Baltimore county, Hoffman, Parker, King, Larsh, Smith of Carroll, Ecker, Swope, Wooden, Jones of Cecil, Earle, Scott, Pugh, Briscoe, Turner, Todd, Carter, Noble, Keefer, Markey, Annan, Baker, Cunningham, Schlosser, Galloway, McComas, Hopper, Russell, Hopkins, Sands, Sykes, Chambers, Blackiston, Holloway, Landsdale, Peter, Clarke, Berry of Prince George's, Marbury, Lee, Brown, Wilmer, Billingsley, Morgan, Horsey, Valliant, Mullikin, Dellinger, Nyman, Mayhugh, Davis, Sneary, Smith of Worcester, Purnell, Farrow, Murray—71.

So the order was rejected.

#### THE EMANCIPATION QUESTION.

Mr. CLARKE submitted the following order: *Ordered*, That all subjects connected with emancipation and the colored population of the State be referred to the Committee on the Declaration of Rights.

Mr. HEBB. I am opposed to that. There is one branch of that subject that belongs more properly to the Legislative Committee, and another branch that belongs to the Com-

mittee on the Declaration of Rights. It will be more proper hereafter, when a proposition connected with this subject comes up for reference, to decide at the time to which committee it shall be referred. I think at present it will be better to have these two committees both consider the subject, the right having been given to committees to confer together.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand the duties of the various standing committees, there is no one which properly has jurisdiction, by its title, of the subject of this order. The gentleman from Baltimore (Mr. Stirling) expressly stated that the committee named in this order would be the committee which would have charge of the subject. It was suggested at the time that there was some query at least how that committee would get jurisdiction over the subject. It was simply that the Convention might refer the subject to some committee that I offered the order. I have no objection to dividing the subject or making any disposition of it the Convention may think proper; but I think it is a subject of sufficient importance to be brought before some committee in a distinct form.

Mr. JONES, of Cecil. Would it not be better, when propositions are offered, to refer them to the committee which may seem more appropriate to those particular propositions at the time?

Mr. KENNARD. In accordance with the view expressed by the gentleman from Alleghany (Mr. Hebb) that a portion of the subject belonged to the Committee on the Declaration of Rights, and a portion to the Legislative Committee, I will state that the Legislative Committee was in session last evening, and that that subject came up in the course of its investigation. I think it properly belongs to both committees; and I think in due course of time the subject will be reported upon to the Convention without its being referred specifically to either of them. If it is to be referred, it would be better to refer it to both these committees, as it belongs to both.

Mr. PUGH. In vindication of the gentleman from Baltimore city, who seems to be absent, (Mr. Stirling) I did not understand him to say that that question properly belonged to the Bill of Rights. I understood him to say that it might be that committee, or it might be some other committee. I endorse the view of my colleague (Mr. Jones) that when the subject comes up, if it does come up, it can be referred to the committee which we think appropriate to the subject. It has not come up yet, except in this present shape. I should be opposed to the suggestion to refer it to those two committees even. There may be and I think there are other committees to which some particular portions of that question—the color question—may be referred; and I should be op-