

double the amount of money to my people, to be used for whatever purpose they may see proper in the future, I must still adhere to my position with all due deference to my colleague (Mr. Berry, of Prince George's.)

The question was then taken upon the motion to reconsider the vote adopting the amendment of Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, and upon a division—yeas 26, noes 24—the motion was adopted.

The question then recurred upon agreeing to the amendment, being to amend the sentence reading—"in proportion to their respective population between the ages of five and twenty years," by inserting the word "white" before the word "population."

Mr. TODD. I wish to give notice that if this amendment prevails, I shall move to amend the section by adding the following proviso:

"And provided further, that the property of negroes shall be exempt from taxation for the purposes herein provided for."

Mr. DUVALL. I give notice that I shall move to amend this section by adding the following:

"And provided further, that no portion of the revenue arising from a taxation of the property of the white population of this State for said school fund shall be applied towards educating the free negro population."

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I will withdraw my amendment for the purpose of allowing my friend from Montgomery (Mr. Duvall) to submit his amendment:

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pugh.) The amendment cannot be withdrawn except by consent of the house.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. Then I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HEBB called for the yeas and nays upon the question of withdrawing the amendment, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 32, nays 30—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Berry, of Prince George's, Boud, Clarke, Cunningham, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Duvall, Earle, Edelen, Gale, Harwood, Hoffman, Hollyday, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Kennard, Lee, McComas, Mitchell, Miller, Parran, Pugh, Purnell, Russell, Schley, Scott, Smith, of Worcester, Stirling, Turner—32.

*Nays*—Messrs. Audoun, Baker, Cushing, Daniel, Dellinger, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Hopkins, King, Larsh, Markey, Mayhugh, Mullikin, Murray, Nyman, Parker, Ridgely, Robinette, Sands, Smith, of Carroll, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—30.

The amendment was accordingly withdrawn.

Mr. DUVALL. I have modified my amendment somewhat. I now move to add to the section the following:

"And provided further, that the public schools established by this article of the constitution, shall be schools solely for the white children of the State."

Mr. CUSHING. That raises the same issue as the other amendment. I call the previous question.

The call was sustained, and the main question was ordered.

The first question was upon the amendment submitted by Mr. DUVALL.

Upon this question Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken, by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 18, nays 43—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Berry, of Prince George's, Boud, Clarke, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Duvall, Edelen, Gale, Harwood, Hollyday, Jones, of Cecil, Lee, Mitchell, Miller, Parran, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Turner—18.

*Nays*—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Markey, Mayhugh, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schley, Scott, Stirling, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—43.

The amendment was accordingly rejected.

Pending the call of the yeas and nays, the following explanations were made by members as their names were called:

Mr. SANDS. I desire to state why I do not vote "aye" on this question. The amendment of the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Berry,) which was adopted by the house, applied the school fund wholly and solely to white children. I would have voted heartily for that amendment, and after it had been adopted, I voted against its reconsideration because I wanted to keep it in the constitution. That amendment, however, was withdrawn for the purpose, it seems, of giving certain counties in the State the right of drawing money on the basis of their colored population, and applying the money so drawn exclusively to the whites. Now I cannot agree to vote "aye" on any such proposition, for they propose to draw from the common fund of the State upon the basis of their colored population, draw for each colored child in their county, and then under this constitution they exclude him forever from any benefit of it. I am unwilling that that condition of things should exist. I prefer the section as it originally stood when amended, for it left the whole matter to the discretion of that body to which my friends desire to intrust so much. I therefore vote "no."

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands) has anticipated the reasons which I proposed to give for the vote I am