the report introduced by a member. Another member, under the rules of the convention, called for a division of the question—a division of the section, under the impression that the section contained two questions about which members could differ in opinion, adopting the one and rejecting the other. The adoption of one, and rejection of the other branch, would of course have incorporated the branch adopted to the exclusion of the other branch.

In this state of the case, the question arises, and the chair is of opinion that it has never yet been formally decided by the convention, whether it is competent for a member to move to reconsider that action, who voted for one branch of the section and did not vote for the other.

The object of reconsideration is to enable the convention to retrace their steps, if an error has been committed by surprise or inadvertence, or if there should be a change in the judgment or determination of the convention. There is a very broad latitude allowed by our rules, for the motion to reconsider may be made at any time. This privilege however is conceded only to those who voted in the majority upon a question. It is from them only that this motion can emanate.

The subject then resolves itself into this simple question: Is this section susceptible of division under our rules? Does it embrace distinct subjects? If so, in the judgment of the chair any gentleman voting for either of the branches of this section can move a reconsideration. You cannot divide the section now. If a gentleman that voted for the first branch of the section moves a reconsideration, it opens the entire section. Or if a gentleman who voted in the affirmative upon the second branch, and who may have voted against the first branch, moves a reconsideration, the whole question is open. The effect of it is to give those who voted in the majority upon either of these questions an additional privilege that is not conceded upon a simple isolated question. That is the only effect of the parliamentary law, to give a member a double advantage, in dividing a question; because if a member who voted in the majority upon either branch moves a reconsideration, the necessary consequence of opening that branch is to open the other. It is therefore the judgment of the chair that the motion to reconsider is in order.

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

The question being taken upon reconsidering the adoption of the section of the judiciary report providing for the apprenticeship of colored minors, the result was—yeas 38, nays 23—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Brooks, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Dellinger, Dent, Duvall, Ecker, Farrow, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Henkle, Hopper, Keefer, Kennard, Lansdale, Marbury, McComas, Mitchell, Negley, Parker, Pugh, Purnell, Russell, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Thomas, Wickard, Wooden—38.

Nays—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Belt, Brown, Carter, Crawford, Davis, of Washington, Galloway, Hoffman, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Larsh, Lee, Markey, Miller, Morgan, Mullikin, Parran, Ridgely, Swope, Sykes, Todd, Valliant—23.

When their names were called,

Mr. MILLER said: I conceive the article adopted to be but a recognition of the existing laws of the State in reference to apprenticeship. All negro minors under the emancipation clause after the constitution is adopted, will become free and subject to the operation of these apprentice laws; and it is a matter of perfect indifference to me whether the convention adopt this section or not. Having voted however originally for the proposition to incorporate this provision into the constitution, and supposing that the object of the reconsideration is to strike it out, for the sake of consistency I vote "no."

Mr. SCOTT said: I was not here when this question was up before, and I deem it due to myself to say that as we have abolished slavery by the action of this convention with a considerable flourish of trumpets, I shall with a great deal of pleasure vote to reconsider the matter in order to put an end to an institution which we first declared was abolished, and the existence of which we then covertly attempted to prolong. I vote "aye."

Mr. NEGLEY at first voted "no," but afterwards said: As the gentleman from Worcester moves the reconsideration, and as the section can only affect the Eastern Shore, I will change my vote and vote "aye."

The motion to reconsider accordingly prevailed.

The question recurred upon the adoption of the twenty-ninth section.

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

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 18, nays 43—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Belt, Carter, Farrow, Hoffman, Jones, of Cecil, Larsh, Markey, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Mullikin, Parran, Purnell, Ridgely, Swope, Todd, Valliant—18.

Nays—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Brooks, Brown, Chambers, Crawford, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Dent, Duvall, Ecker, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Henkle, Hollyday, Hopper, Horsey, Keefer, Kennard, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, McComas, Negley, Parker, Pugh, Russell, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Sykes, Thomas, Wickard, Wooden—43.