

and the presiding officer of the court stand upon the same platform. One has to make the argument and the other has to give the decision. The only difference is this, that the judge waits for the argument of counsel, but there is no waiting for argument here. They decide first, and refuse to hear the argument even afterwards. That is the position in which we stand here. We can no more discuss questions than if we were in the most distant part of the universe. The poor privilege of a reasonable time to express our views on particular subjects is denied to us. I move to lay the order upon the table.

The PRESIDENT. The chair rules this order to be out of order, being in conflict with the 55th rule, which requires one day's notice, no notice having been given. The rule is:

"Rule 55. No standing rule or order shall be rescinded or changed without one day's notice being given of the motion therefore."

Mr. PUGH. I give notice that I will submit the order to-morrow.

EVENING SESSIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I would propose the reconsideration of an order passed some days since. We have made the experiment of night sessions, I think, to our complete satisfaction. When the order was adopted I had no idea that it was to be a permanent regulation. We were discussing particular subjects; and I supposed gentlemen had come to the conclusion to come to the end of them. This business of having continual night sessions is an exceedingly onerous matter. It is generally conceded that five or six hours of intellectual labor is a fair amount, excepting for a short time under very pressing and urgent circumstances. Legislative bodies, approaching the close of their work, have held night sessions. I have been accustomed in courts of justice, when a session has been prolonged, and there has been a necessity to hold a session at a given time in an adjoining county, or upon any other emergency, to hold night sessions. But as a permanent matter I have no knowledge of such a practice.

It is not only of itself onerous, but in our predicament it is singularly so. The fact is notorious that a comparatively large number of our delegates regularly persist, as soon as the hour arrives, in taking their departure for Baltimore. The result is that the burden falls upon the few who remain. Another consequence is, that even if we have a quorum, our work is incomplete. We cannot carry along with us at any time any assurance that a vote of less than a majority of this body may not be reconsidered; and reconsideration after reconsideration has become our practice. I find myself obliged to retire at my ordinary bed-time. My health requires that I shall not violate the ordinary rules by which I have been governed.

I have come to the conclusion that one of two things must be done by this body, so as effectually to come to a conclusion of their duties. We must either discontinue our night sessions, or we must remove to Baltimore and hold our sessions where the members are to be found. The last has not been acceptable to the decided majority of the body. I have been opposed to it myself, and am so still. But it is essential that some means should be taken by which our work can be accomplished. I move a reconsideration of the vote by which night sessions were ordered.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman is not in order. He voted in the negative upon that order.

Mr. STIRLING. I suggest that under the ruling of the chair it requires a notice of one day to rescind that order.

Subsequently,

Mr. CHAMBERS moved that when the convention adjourns it adjourns to meet to-morrow at ten o'clock.

The PRESIDENT. That is not in order. A standing rule or order cannot be changed without one day's notice.

Subsequently,

Mr. CHAMBERS gave notice that on to-morrow he would move to rescind the order passed July 21st instant (page 253), by which the convention holds evening sessions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. PETER. I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has been called to an article in the Baltimore American of July 22d, 1864, signed "S."

That article has made a direct attack upon a member of this convention from Montgomery county.

The author of it was too base and cowardly to sign his name and assume that responsibility which an honest and upright man would, under any circumstances, rather court than seek to avoid.

Whilst the name of the member from Montgomery county referred to is studiously concealed in this article, it refers in terms to one of them, and may be applied to me. If so, Mr. President, I pronounce this article a base and scurrilous falsehood, the offspring of an evil, contemptible, and malicious heart.

My colleagues are here to speak for themselves; for myself, I can but say that I believe its charges are as false and groundless in regard to them as I pronounce them to be in regard to myself.

Mr. DUVAL. So far as I am concerned, as a delegate from Montgomery county, I pronounce the article, if it refers to me, an unmitigated falsehood, as false and malicious as the author himself.

Mr. LANSDALE. I am implicated in this matter; and I have no doubt at all that I am the party to whom the article refers.