

When their names were called, Mr. FARROW said: I moved the reconsideration of this section expecting an amendment to be offered. Believing that the present law would be much more likely to be abused than this, I vote "aye."

Mr. HEBB said: I desire to state why I shall now vote against this proposition, when before I voted for it. An amendment I offered was accepted by the gentleman from Caroline (Mr. Todd) limiting the operation of the apprenticeship system so as to apply only to those minors incapable of supporting themselves and whose parents are unable to maintain them. Having told the gentleman from Caroline that if he would incorporate that amendment I would vote for the section, I did so at that time. Believing that the law is sufficient and will be much better carried out as it is than with this section together with the other section adopted on the motion of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Audoun,) I vote "no."

Mr. McCOMAS said: I voted for this proposition before; but after more mature deliberation I think it is improper matter to incorporate into the constitution. It is impossible to attach to it here those barriers which should exist against abuse. I therefore now vote "no."

Mr. NEGLEY said: Our friends who are much more interested in this than we are, having deserted it, I feel no hesitation in doing so likewise, and I therefore vote "no."

Mr. PURNELL said: When this section was before the convention I supported it in a feeble way. I have maturely considered it since, and I see nothing whatever objectionable in it. I voted a few moments since for a reconsideration of the proposition for the purpose of giving those who are opposed to it an opportunity of modifying it, improving it, or amending it in any form to make it acceptable to them, preserving the substance and tenor of the section. They have not done so. Seeing no cause whatever to change my tactics in this matter, I shall adhere to my original vote. I vote "aye."

Mr. RIDGELY said: As I understand the laws of the State as they now exist, the orphans' courts have power to bind out such a class of people in their own discretion as vagrants and those that are incapable of supporting themselves. The difference between the existing law and the provision under consideration is this, that this provision restrains that discretion, and limits its exercise only to those who are loyal. The house have voted to strike that out. I think it ought to remain there. I vote "aye."

Mr. TODD said: In offering this proposition I acted from conscientious motives of right and justice. I see no reason whatever for changing my position; and I therefore vote "aye."

Mr. CHAMBERS said: I understand that this

is the question whether to accept the proposition originally introduced by the gentleman from Caroline (Mr. Todd) as it stands, encumbered with loyalty oaths, &c., or to leave the matter as it was before. Is that the character of it?

The PRESIDENT. Ycs, sir; that is the character of it.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I vote "no," not to accept this.

The twenty-ninth section was accordingly rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I understand that that is not the section that imposed the restriction.

The PRESIDENT. I suppose that to be consistent the convention will strike out the other section.

Mr. AUDOUN. When the twenty-ninth section was adopted a few days ago, for the purpose of meeting it, I offered the 30th. The 29th has been stricken out, and I see no use in retaining the 30th section. I therefore move to reconsider the vote by which that was adopted.

The motion to reconsider was seconded by Messrs. CUSHING and HEBB.

The section was the following:

"Sec. 30. It shall be the duty of the judges of the several orphans' courts of this State, before they shall proceed to bind any negroes as apprentices, to administer to the party to whom he or she is to be bound, the same oath as prescribed for voters by this constitution, in the article on the elective franchise, and upon the refusal of the said party to take and subscribe to said oath, the said courts shall hold the person so refusing to be an unsuitable person to have charge of such negro; and the fact of such oath having been taken by the party to whom such negro has been bound, shall be expressed in the indenture."

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The question recurred upon the adoption of the section, and it was rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Will it now be in order to offer the original proposition of the gentleman from Caroline as a new section, and let the house vote nakedly upon it?

The PRESIDENT. That amendment has been virtually voted upon by the house already.

JUDICIARY REPORT.

Mr. HEBB. I move to strike out the word "associate" in section two, line one, being an error. It reads:

"The judges of the several courts, except the associate judges of the orphans' courts," &c.

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. THOMAS, Sec. 42, line 9, was amended by striking out "thirty-third" and inserting "forty-first," a change rendered necessary by the renumbering of the sections.