

have some relaxation, at least, from the great physical and mental labor which were inseparable from the task. He hoped the motion would be agreed to.

Mr. HARBINE said that the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. RIDGELY) had made a motion which met with his (Mr. H.'s) decided disapprobation. He accorded to that gentleman, however, credit for the best motives. He believed that that gentleman felt, as he (Mr. H.) felt, the stern necessity of proceeding, without further delay, to the transaction of the public business. But he submitted, in all candor and sincerity, that the motion to change the hour of meeting to 11 o'clock, was calculated not to promote the common object they had in view, but to defeat it. He declared, as he had declared a few days ago, that the motion was one calculated to frustrate the ends for which this Convention had assembled. He could not agree with the gentleman, that the change would have the effect of causing the Convention to get to its substantial work sooner and more earnestly. Why should it do so? Had the gentleman offered any resolution which would so direct the action of this body, as to have that effect? None. What were the facts? Between the hours of ten and eleven, the Convention was engaged in the discussion of motions, which were supposed to have a considerable bearing on its labors. Would not the same propositions be discussed if the Convention met at eleven? What then was gained? The change, if it had any effect, would rather tend to protract these discussions and to multiply the number of motions. Away, then, with all such arguments.

But what were the precedents? He took it for granted that if it worked well, as to other Conventions, to meet at an early hour, it would operate equally well here. If it were good policy in the Convention of the State of Ohio, to meet at ten and at nine; if it was good policy in the Convention of the State of New York, to meet at ten in the beginning of its sessions, and subsequently at nine—it was equally good policy here. After the discussion which had taken place on a former day, he had been at some trouble to see what other Conventions had done. They met at an earlier hour than this body met. How was it with the Convention which framed the old Constitution? They not only met at nine, (shortly after the commencement of the session,) and continued to do so, but they held afternoon sessions.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman be so good as to state at what season of the year the Convention of the State of New York was in session?

Mr. HARBINE. I knew that it was at a different season of the year—the month of June or July. But at what season did the Convention that framed the old Constitution meet? How was it with the Convention of the State of Ohio now in session? It met at nine, and had afternoon sessions also. He earnestly begged of the Convention, if they valued the objects for which they had assembled to vote down this proposition.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, that as regarded the modern precedents which his friend (Mr. HARBINE) had referred, it seemed to him (Mr. B.) that they had not as yet exactly had a fair trial.

As to the real and substantial precedents, they were all the other way. He would like to know from that gentleman, whether any Convention had ever assembled within the limits of the United States, composing more capable business men—men of higher intellectual endowments in every respect, than those who framed the original Constitution of the State of Virginia? Yet that body never met earlier than twelve o'clock, and yet a more perfect or stupendous work never emanated from the brains or the hearts of men. There was another precedent almost equal to that of the State of Virginia. He referred to the Constitution of the State of New York, formed in 1821. The Convention of that day, composed of men quite as industrious and quite as zealous in the cause of their constituents as this body could be, met at eleven and twelve o'clock. They made a perfect work, so much so that the members of this Convention, in the course of its discussions, had been constantly referring to the Debates in that body as guides for their own.

He did not know to what Committee the gentleman (Mr. HARBINE) belonged. But he (Mr. B.) was a member of a Committee (the judiciary) which would be constantly engaged in the business before it, not only after the adjournment, and in the evenings, but in the mornings. It could not dispose of the business before it, unless time was given. So he might say of other committees. It was idle to talk of doing business here, between the hours of ten and eleven. Every gentleman who had been present between those two hours, knew that nothing had been done. They met, and talked—talked—talked; but God knew there was time enough for talk in the other hours, during which the Convention remained in session. Deducting the one hour, they still talked from eleven to three or half past three. The Committee then rose and reported that they had made progress, but "had come to no conclusion," and they would come to none in this way. There were times when work was to be done; there were times when talking was to be done. The talking was to be done after they met here; the work was to be done after night and in the morning when the Committees met. Hence, he would cordially sustain the motion of the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. RIDGELY.)

Mr. BROWN moved that the resolution be laid upon the table.

MESSRS. RIDGELY, BUCHANAN and HARBINE asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

And the question having been taken, the vote resulted as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Dent, Lloyd, Sherwood, of Talbot, James U. Dennis, Eckleston, Grason, George, Wright, McMaster, Hearn, Shriver, Seppington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Cockey and Brown.—29.