

vention, be so amended as to apply the previous question without restriction and without debate to the matter then pending, and to such amendments thereto as may be offered consistently with existing rules, after the call for the previous question has been sustained, and in voting on the matter pending when the previous question is sustained and the amendments thereto as aforesaid, the previous question shall then be exhausted.

"And be it further ordered, That all rules, which allow this Convention to resolve itself into committee of the whole be rescinded."

Mr. BRENT briefly explained the principle which it was his intention to embrace in the order. He expressed the belief that there was a disposition on the part of the Convention not to go into committee of the whole, and in order that some protection at least might be given to the minority, his proposition contemplated that the pending matter, when amendable under existing rules, might be amended. In other words, he was for leaving it to the sense of the majority to say, when the debate should be closed. He illustrated the operation of the amendment. His desire was that the amendment heretofore adopted on motion of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. RANDALL,) should be rescinded so far as it gave the mover the power to designate the matter to which the previous question should apply. He insisted on the expediency of its adoption, and the happy effects it would have on the business of the Convention. Nine-tenths of the discussions here had been but a repetition of the same ideas in a different form. If any gentleman had a better rule to suggest, he would cheerfully take it.

Mr. RICAUD moved that the order be laid upon the table.

Mr. BRENT asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Bond, Brent, of Charles, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Eccleston, Phelps, Bowie, Sprigg, Bowling, Wright, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Weber and Smith—37.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Merrick, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Tuck, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Brewer, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Cockey and Brown—38.

So the order was not laid on the table.

And the question recurring on its adoption,

Messrs. HARBINE and FIERY called for a division on the first and second branches, which was ordered.

Mr. MERRICK now rose and stated that he had acted under a misapprehension of the question, and asked leave to change his vote.

The PRESIDENT said it could be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. TUCK said he had voted against laying the order on the table because he thought that these questions when once introduced should be settled, that the Convention might know what its rules were.

Mr. MERRICK said his intention was to vote for the readiest way of getting rid of the proposition.

Some conversation followed between Messrs. TUCK and BRENT as to the effect the order would have on the amendment adopted on motion of Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. TUCK then addressed a few remarks to that branch of the order which proposed to rescind all rules allowing the Convention to resolve itself into committee. Generally speaking, he said, he was as much opposed to going into committee as any member could be, but he was not in favor of abolishing the power. The debate was at all times within the control of the majority, and there might be cases in which it might be proper that the House should resolve itself into committee. He would, therefore, retain the power.

Mr. THOMAS made some remarks, in which he expressed himself in favor of the first branch of the order; but suggested to Mr. BRENT that it might perhaps be improved by adding the words "they shall be submitted and passed upon without debate."

As to the second branch of the proposition, he dissented entirely from the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. BRENT.) There were advantages in committee of the whole, (of which, he, Mr. T., should perhaps avail himself as little as any member of the body,) which could not be secured in Convention. He illustrated this opinion, and said that he could not, under any circumstances, vote for this branch of the resolution.

Mr. RANDALL suggested that the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. BRENT,) would attain his end by striking out from the amended 17th rule, the words "or amendment." But Mr. R. argued that it would be better to let that rule remain as it was, until the Convention had had an opportunity of knowing something about its practical operation.

He insisted on the importance of retaining the power to go into committee, and contended that to adopt the restriction proposed, would prevent calm deliberation, and lead to precipitate action. He should vote against both propositions.

The PRESIDENT announced the hour of twelve, that being the time appointed for the consideration of the order of the day.

Mr. BISER moved to postpone it, with a view to dispose of the subject matter before the Convention.

Mr. SPENCER enquired of the PRESIDENT, what the order of the day was?

The PRESIDENT said, it was the resolution reported from the Committee on Representation.

The question was then taken on the motion of Mr. BISER, and the order of the day was postponed.

Mr. BRENT contended that the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. RANDALL,) would not accomplish the ob-