

The Senate bill entitled an Act to provide for the collection of taxes upon personal property not included in the general assessment.

The unfavorable report was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Gill,

At 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ o'clock, P. M.,

The House took a recess until 8 o'clock, this P. M.

NIGHT SESSION.

SATURDAY, April 4—8 o'clock, P. M.

The House met.

Present at the call of the roll, the following members :

Messrs. Hines, (Speaker,) Bond, Colton, Bird, Turner, of Calvert, Lancaster, Hawkins, Keech, Buchanan, Banks, Seth, Valliant, Sudler, Coulbourn, Duer, Gordy, Johnson, Turner, of Cecil, Etchison, Latchford, Kemp, Pruitt, Merrill, Miller, Lee, Riley, Dawson, Williams, McCosker, T. H. Hamilton, Cooper, McWilliams, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Gill, Greenfield, Groh, Stake, Clark, Wier, Wack, Park, Brace, Waters, Vanderford, Maclin, Stewart, of Howard, Leonard—48.

Mr. Brace, from the minority of a Committee, submitted the following

REPORT.

The undersigned, a minority of the Judiciary Committee, (to which was referred the Joint Resolutions of Mr. Koons, of Frederick county, "that the retention of the word 'white' in the Constitution of this State is obnoxious to censure, because it is in contravention of the National Constitution, and in opposition to the spirit of the age,") are of opinion that said Resolutions should be passed by this House, and submits the following as their reasons for such opinion:

This word occurs in section 1, of Article 1, of the Constitution, and in the following connection: "All elections shall be by ballot, and every "white" male citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years or upwards, * * * * shall be entitled to vote," &c. In the consideration of these Resolutions, two questions arise: First, is the existence of the word "white" in this Article open to censure? Second, is it proper, that if such is the case, this Legislature should take action showing its condemnation of the fact.