

Virginia. Does any gentleman desire that? It would be a cause of difficulty, unending between these States after this war is over, if that territory should be ceded during the pendency of this civil strife.

If Virginia is restored to the Union, and the people then say that Loudoun county has been wrongfully taken from them during this civil crisis, contrary to their wishes and their desires, we shall have difficulty and interminable quarrels between Maryland and Virginia upon that subject. I say, therefore, that this amendment, in every sense, is just, proper, and right. Do the people of Maryland desire in the midst of this civil war to take from Virginia territory which Virginia herself is unwilling to give up, or may be unwilling to give up when she becomes in the estimation of gentlemen just as loyal a State as Pennsylvania or New York? Does any one desire that that should be done?

Cutting off West Virginia from her, now brings the Old Dominion down to one of the inferior States in point of territory. Still further cutting off the counties of Loudoun, Fauquier, and Fairfax, and Accomac and Northampton upon the Eastern Shore, she would be but a small patch stuck in the centre of this Union. I am speaking of what she will be when in the estimation of gentlemen she becomes a loyal State. Shall this be brought about in the midst of civil conflict? Will not the people of Virginia reproach us forever by saying we have made her necessity our opportunity? that in the midst of a civil war like this, we have taken occasion to despoil her of territory which was justly hers, which she had the right to claim, over which her jurisdiction extended, and over which her loyal people, if you choose to say so, desired to exercise jurisdiction?

If the question is put to the people of Loudoun county now, to vote upon this question, and if we go to Alexandria to obtain the consent of the legislature there, what will be the motive upon which these people would vote now? Would it not be simply and solely to get the protection of the general government, and of the State of Maryland, as against the armies of the Southern rebels? Will they vote now as they would vote if peace was restored, and if they knew they could receive the same protection from Virginia proper as they could from Maryland? We are putting the question to them under the necessities of this war, and under the difficulties they are now suffering, before the question is determined which way or how the war will end, of separating themselves from Virginia, when the result might be, and when the result which is expected by the majority of this convention is, that old Virginia itself will be restored to the Union and become a loyal State. I say that after that time comes, these people will regret that they have been separated from

their own State—Virginia. The old State pride will revive. They will desire to be a part of the State of which they have always formed a part. For these reasons I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Belt.)

Mr. BARRON called for the previous question, which was sustained.

The question was first put upon the pending amendment offered by Mr. Belt, as follows:

Amend section 47 by adding the following words at the end thereof: "Provided, however, that the general assembly shall have no power to accept the cession of any such territory until after the existing civil war shall have been brought to a close."

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

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 18, nays 48—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Belt, Bond, Chambers, Crawford, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dent, Edelen, Henkle, Hollyday, Johnson, Jones, of Somerset, Lee, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parran, Smith, of Dorchester—18.

Nays—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annap, Andoun, Barron, Brooks, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Earle, Ecker, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Keeler, Kennard, King, Lash, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The question recurred upon the adoption of the 47th section as reported by the committee.

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

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 46, nays 20—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annap, Andoun, Barron, Brooks, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Earle, Ecker, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Keeler, Kennard, King, Lash, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—46.

Nays—Messrs. Belt, Bond, Chambers, Crawford, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dent, Duvall, Edelen, Harwood, Henkle, Hollyday, Johnson, Jones, of Somerset, Lee, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parran, Smith, of Dorchester—20.

So the 47th section was ordered to a third reading.

The convention then returned to the consideration of the 19th section, which had been