

**Nays.**—Messrs. Goldsborough, President, Greene, Hebb, Wickard, Robinette, Miller, Stockbridge, Stirling, Cushing, Audoun, Berry of Baltimore county, Hoffman, Parker, King, Larsh, Ecker, Swope, Wooden, Earle, Smith of Dorchester, Keeler, Annan, Baker, Cunningham, Schlosser, Galloway, McComas, Hopper, Russell, Hopkins, Chambers, Hollyday, Clarke, Berry of Prince George's, Lee, Brown, Wilmer, Horsey, Mullikin, Dellinger, Nymau, Negley, Mayhugh, Davis, Sneary, Smith of Worcester, Purnell, Farrow, Murray—49.

So the order was rejected.

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following order:  
**Ordered,** That when this Convention adjourns, it stands adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. CUSHING. I think the vote we have just had, has proved that this House does not desire to adjourn over to-day until any day next week. I think it is consuming the time of the Convention to go over a subject which has been acted upon. I would inquire if this is in order.

The PRESIDENT. The former proposition did not designate any particular hour, and this is a different proposition, and in order.

The yeas and nays were demanded and were ordered. The question being taken, the result was—yeas 26; nays 47—as follows:

**Yeas.**—Messrs. Greene, Hebb, Miller, Harwood, Bond, Henkle, Hatch, Daniel, Abbott, Thomas, Turner, Parran, Carter, Noble, Smith of Dorchester, Markey, Hopkins, Sykes, Chambers, Lansdale, Peter, Belt, Marbury, Morgan, Jones of Somerset, Smith of Worcester—26.

**Nays.**—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Wickard, Robinette, Stockbridge, Stirling, Cushing, Audoun, Berry of Baltimore county, Hoffman, Parker, King, Larsh, Ecker, Swope, Wooden, Earle, Scott, Pugh, Todd, Johnson, Keeler, Annan, Baker, Cunningham, Schlosser, Galloway, McComas, Hopper, Russell, Blackiston, Hollyday, Clarke, Berry of Prince George's, Lee, Brown, Wilmer, Horsey, Mullikin, Dellinger, Nymau, Negley, Mayhugh, Davis, Sneary, Purnell, Farrow, Murray—47.

So the order was rejected.

#### EMANCIPATION.

On motion of Mr. CLARKE,

The Convention proceeded to the consideration of the following order submitted by him on yesterday:

**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. CLARKE. I stated yesterday, when I offered this order, that it was done to carry out what I supposed was the understanding of the gentleman who was the chairman of the committee on that subject. (Mr. Stirling.) When the various standing committees were appointed, several gentlemen had some doubt

where this whole subject of the colored population belonged. Yesterday, when the question was again before the Convention, it was claimed by two committees that the subject belonged partially to one and partially to the other. My sole object in offering the order was that there might be some understanding with reference to this question of what committee had the subject under consideration, so that gentlemen might know where to refer any propositions they might have to offer. I do not now desire to enter into any discussion upon the question. When it does come up, I shall meet it with a spirit of frankness, as I question that concerns all the people of the State. I will only say that after conference with the chairman of the Committee on the Declaration of Rights, I really thought that committee would properly consider the subject in all its various branches. It is a question of importance to the people whom I represent, what is to be the future of this population; whether, if free, they are to remain permanently in the State of Maryland, or whether provisions are to be made in reference to their removal, how the old and the young are to be provided for, whether they are to be turned loose on the community and the counties are to be taxed, or whether some system, like a system of apprenticeship, is to be adopted, until they arrive at a certain age. There are also various other considerations of grave importance to the citizens of my county, in reference to provisions hereafter, whatever may be done now upon this subject;—whether the colored people who have left this State and moved into the District of Columbia, the law taking effect upon them there, have a right to return, not being forbidden under the provisions of the code from returning, or whether we shall adopt some provision forbidding their return, or some provision similar to that enacted in the constitutions of various free States, entirely prohibiting this population from coming into the State.

I humbly conceive that the Committee on the Declaration of Rights have various abstract principles of government to discuss which underlies and are the basis of all government, and which may take up all their time. Or if they consider those questions first which properly belong to the Committee on the Declaration of Rights, it will be late in the session before we shall have a report on this subject. My constituents, as agriculturists, feel a deep interest in this subject, to know what provision to make for their crop, for their labor, and they desire to have a committee to which these propositions may be submitted.

I would also inquire, whether, if the Committee on the Declaration of Rights should determine to provide for this subject by a provision like that commonly known as the Jefferson Ordinance, it would not leave these other questions to go to some other committee.