

THURSDAY, May 1st, 1851.

The Convention met at ten o'clock.

Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. GRIF-FITH.

The roll was called,  
And a quorum was present.

THE RULES.

Mr. BROWN rose, he said, to offer an order which would speak for itself; and he demanded the previous question upon its adoption.

The order was read as follows :

*Resolved*, That the mover of an amendment to the Judiciary report, may speak not to exceed ten minutes in explanation thereof, and five minute speeches may be made by any member on a pending amendment, provided that no member shall speak more than twice on one amendment, unless by the unanimous consent of the Convention. No amendment not offered in good faith shall be in order, nor shall a motion to postpone indefinitely be debated, nor a motion to reconsider be entertained by the chair, unless made in good faith.

Some conversation followed on the part of Messrs. BROWN and CRISFIELD, growing out of an enquiry by the latter gentleman, as to the rule by which the fact should be determined whether a proposition was offered in good faith or not.

The PRESIDENT then stated the question to be on the demand for the previous question.

And the question having been taken, there was a second;

And the main question was ordered to be taken, (which main question was on the adoption of the order.)

Mr. SPENCER called for a division of the question,  
Which was ordered.

The question was then put on the adoption of the first branch of said resolution down to the word "Convention," in the 6th line inclusive; and

Determined in the affirmative.

The question was then put on the adoption of the second and last branch of said resolution, and

Determined in the affirmative.

So the order was adopted.

Mr. HOWARD called up the amendment yesterday, offered by him to the 22nd rule.

Mr. HOWARD said he did not think it necessary to say much about this rule, or to say any thing at all. He thought the proposition must be sufficiently prepossessing to every member of the Convention, as to induce him to come to the conclusion that there ought to be a time when they should cease discussing these matters any further. There ought to be a time equivalent to the time allowed when one branch of the Legislature sends a bill over to the other. Now, as there was but one body here—no collateral branch to interchange with, then the Revisory committee was the quarter in which the necessary corrections were to be made. Let us, then, not discuss matters already disposed of, and leave subjects

immediately before the Convention, to re-open others long since disposed of.

Mr. CRISFIELD made some remarks, which will be published hereafter.

Mr. HOWARD replied that his answer to the gentleman's first question was—that his proposition did not affect any pending motion. In answer to the second question, he would say that all the articles of the Constitution had been sent to the Revisory Committee, was easily to be ascertained from the subjects. And another thing, it was necessary to take a vote of the Convention, which had been done already, that the matter should be sent to the Revisory Committee. He would repeat what he had before said—that after a subject had been sent to the Revisory Committee, we should not re-open it, unless that committee found themselves involved in some contradictory sections, or language, which might render it necessary for the Convention to examine into the matter. And, another thing, it might introduce a new practice, terminating in much debate.

Mr. CHAMBERS made some remarks which will be published hereafter.

Mr. HOWARD remarked, that he could only say what his intention was. He could not answer for the construction which the Chair, or the Legislature might put on an article. What he supposed to be the construction would be this: that if this rule passed, forbidding motions for the reconsideration of subjects which had been sent to the Revisory Committee, it would operate so far as to repeal the existing rule allowing motions to be reconsidered at all. That was his view, and that was what he wished to avoid. What the Convention had done, he wished to look over, and put away, and not re-open. Now, as to the motion of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) to reconsider the representation question, that was not the time. But the object of the motion—the rule—the object he had in view, was to prevent a similar motion, in future, to reconsider matters not in committee. How could the committee get along in unwreathing and untwisting these various matters in order to make them harmonious and easily to be understood—how could they make any progress at all, if the Convention was to be undoing as fast as they completed a portion of their work?

He saw no end to our session, if we did not adopt the course he had suggested. If there was one thing in which the Convention ought to be unanimous, it would be, he should suppose, in a determination to bring their labors to a close, and speedily adjourn. He thought, upon that point, there would not be a dissenting voice. Now, the rule he had proposed looked to that object—looked towards a speedy adjournment—by speeding us forward, never letting us go backward. He would not say any thing about the motion of the gentleman from Kent, [Mr. CHAMBERS,] it would come up presently. Those were his reasons for, and explanation of, the order he had just offered.

Mr. CHAMBERS made some remarks which will be published hereafter.