

the average number of suits commenced, and the number of trials; and with all deference to the gentleman from Baltimore county, he could not think the statistics would mislead us, or that more time would be required to transact the business than he had stated. The statistics were sent here by sworn officers, and he, (Mr. C.) presented them for what they were worth. Upon his own mind they were conclusive.

Mr. BROWN again rose and insisted on his point of order being decided by the Chair. It was this:

"That no member has a right to speak unless he submits a proposition or amendment, and then he is limited under the order adopted on the 18th inst., to ten minutes."

The CHAIR decided, that Mr. Spencer, having made a motion to reconsider, it was competent for him under the order adopted on the 18th inst., to speak ten minutes on the proposition.

Mr. SPENCER regretted that so much time had been consumed on a point of order. He was about to conclude his remarks, when the gentleman from Baltimore county requested to be allowed to make some remarks, and he announced to the gentleman, that to give him an opportunity, he would withdraw the motion.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he would renew the motion.

The PRESIDENT stated that the gentleman from Baltimore county having exhausted his ten minutes, could not debate the motion again, unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked leave to proceed.

Mr. STEPHENSON objected.

The question was then stated to be on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. McLANE. I desire to know to what extent this motion to reconsider is to go. The gentleman from Baltimore county made the motion to reconsider, as I understand it, with a view of displacing Cecil county, as arranged in the proposition of the gentleman from Somerset, and putting her somewhere else. He has not assigned her a place. His motion was to reconsider that part of the vote taken. The gentleman from Queen Anne's (Mr. Spencer) availed himself of the opportunity to move a reconsideration of the whole subject. What I wish to know is, whether it is competent for the gentleman from Baltimore county to move to reconsider a division of the vote simply, in order to get at his point—or whether it is not necessary for him to move to reconsider the whole vote? My purpose in asking the question is this: If there is no other object for reconsideration than that avowed by the gentleman from Baltimore county, I am opposed to it, and must vote against it. The only mitigation in the proposition of the gentleman from Somerset is, in my view, the position he has assigned to Cecil county. But if it be necessary, in order to reach the subject, to move a reconsideration of it, as the gentleman from Queen Anne's has done, I have no objection to vote for the motion to reconsider, because our objects are identical.

Mr. BOWIE. If the motion to reconsider pre-

vails, will it be in order to move any amendments?

The PRESIDENT. If the motion to reconsider prevails, the whole first branch, which has been adopted, will be open.

The yeas and nays were then ordered on the motion to reconsider, and being taken, were as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Randall, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Sherwood, of Talbot, John Dennis, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Spencer, Wright, Fooks, Thawley, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Holliday, Parke, Shower and Brown—32.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Hopewell, Wells, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Merrick, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, McCubbin, Grason, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Gwinn, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Slicer, Fitzpatrick and Smith—41.

So the Convention refused to reconsider their vote on said amendment.

Mr. HOWARD. Will it be in order to give a notice that it might be entered in the journal?

The PRESIDENT. It will be in order.

Mr. HOWARD. As at present advised, I will, to-morrow morning, move to change the rule allowing every gentleman who moves an amendment ten minutes to debate it, so as to allow every member of this Convention to speak five minutes upon all motions which are debatable under the former rules.

Mr. BUCHANAN demanded the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Morgan, Hopewell, Wells, Sellman, Merrick, Howard, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Grason, George, Dirickson, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Ware, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Weber, Fitzpatrick, and Brown—33.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Buchanan, Ridgely, Sherwood, of Talbot, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, McCubbin, Spencer, Wright, McMaster, Hearne, Fooks, Jacobs, McHenry, Magraw, Thawley, Schley, Neill, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Anderson, Holliday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, and Shower—41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred on agreeing the second branch of the amendment as amended.

Mr. BOWIE. I think it utterly impractical for these county courts, or circuit courts, constituted as they have been by the Convention to attempt to exercise chancery jurisdiction.