

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 45, nays 25—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Barron, Belt, Briscoe, Carter, Clarke, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Dellinger, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Hatch, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Kennard, King, Lansdale, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Nyman, Parker, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Smith, of Carroll, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valiant, Wooden—45.

*Nays*—Messrs. Berry, of Prince George's, Blackiston, Bond, Brown, Chambers, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dent, Duvall, Earle, Edelen, Harwood, Hebb, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parran, Smith, of Dorchester, Sneary, Wilmer—25.

The third branch of the amendment was accordingly agreed to.

The question recurred on the adoption of the amendment of Mr. RUSSELL as amended.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I wish to bear my testimony against this proposition. For the purpose of gratifying a thousandth part, or a ten thousandth part of the community, you are going to give offence to the rest of it. I do not suppose the society of Friends will be offended if we do not adopt this; and they do not bear the proportion of more than one ten thousandth part. Every other christian community is scandalized, in my judgment, by adopting this process of making marriage simply a civil contract, and divesting it of every element of a religious ceremony. I ask the yeas and nays, that I may place my name upon the record in opposition to the adoption of the proposition in any form.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SANDS. I do not see how this is to shock anybody's religious sense. Certainly it does not disturb the existing practice with regard to marriage.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 44, nays 24—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Barron, Belt, Briscoe, Carter, Clarke, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Dellinger, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Hatch, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Kennard, King, Lansdale, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Nyman, Parker, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Smith, of Carroll, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Thomas, Todd, Valiant, Wooden—44.

*Nays*—Messrs. Berry, of Prince George's, Blackiston, Bond, Brown, Chambers, Davis, of Charles, Dent, Duvall, Earle, Edelen, Harwood, Hebb, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parran, Smith, of Dorchester, Sneary, Wilmer—24.

As their names were called,

Mr. DAVIS, of Charles, said: I conceive that this provision will require the legislature to pass a law creating a distinction between the people of Maryland, to allow the judge or clerk of a court of record to marry some persons and not to marry others. Any party who has not conscientious scruples about being married by the minister of one of the religious denominations, under the existing rules now established for marrying, cannot be married in a court of record. They must have those scruples to enable them to go into the court to be married. Those who have scruples about being married by ministers of any denomination receiving pay for preaching the gospel, can go into court and be married; but any other person not having scruples cannot. It confers a privilege upon one class of persons which is denied to others; and for that reason the law will not be general in its provisions. I vote "no."

Mr. JONES, of Somerset, said: If this provision was that members of the society of Friends might be married by some civil officer, I should have far less objection to it. In the form in which it now is, it opens the whole question, and any man may be married by a civil officer who chooses. All he has to say is that he has conscientious scruples. Of course nobody else can judge. His own statement of his opinions must be taken. To make it obligatory upon the legislature to pass a law to this effect, it seems to me will hamper them very much; and I therefore vote "no."

The section was accordingly adopted.

The next section in order was the following, of which Mr. THOMAS gave notice yesterday:

"Section —. Laws shall be passed by the legislature taxing, by a uniform rule, all moneys, credits, investments in bonds, stocks, joint stock companies or otherwise, and also all real and personal property, according to its true or actual value in money, and the tax payable thereon shall be paid to the county or city where the same is located at the time of its assessment or valuation, and the location of all stocks, bonds or other evidence of debt shall be in the county or city where the principal office of transacting the business of such company or corporation is located."

Mr. THOMAS. With the consent of the house I will withdraw that section. I judge from the canvass I have made of the house since, that there is no likelihood of its ever getting through. It is well known to members of this convention that people who own stocks, residing in Baltimore county and other counties, which stocks are located in Baltimore city, carry their stocks along with them, and Baltimore city is annually—I will not say cheated—but does not receive the tax upon those stocks which I think she is entitled to.