

tion in the house of delegates. I think it will create very much surprise, and very much opposition, in various parts of the State. I think that it is not just in itself; I think that it operates upon the smaller counties especially, very oppressively. I think that the true basis of representation for the State of Maryland, for every State must be governed somewhat by its own peculiar situation and interests—would be a basis fixed upon population in the lower house, and having regard to territory, by having the counties equally represented in the senate.

This is the view I take of this subject. I have not given my attention to it very closely, not expecting until the question was taken up for consideration to-day, that it would be taken up so soon. But upon hearing the report read, and with the little reflection I have been able to give it, these objections arise upon the very surface. In my judgment these inequalities exist; and this injustice will be done, if the convention carries out the report of the committee.

On motion of Mr. KENNARD,
The convention then adjourned.

SIXTY-FIRST DAY.

FRIDAY, July 29, 1864.

The Convention met at 10 o'clock, A. M.
Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Owen.

The roll was called, and the following members answered to their names:

Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Barron, Berry, of Prince George's, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Crawford, Cunningham, Dail, Daniel, Davis, of Charles, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Dennis, Duvall, Earle, Ecker, Edelen, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Harwood, Hatch, Hebb, Hollyday, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Johnson, Jones, of Cecil, Jones, of Somerset, Keefer, Kennard, King, Lansdale, Larsh, Lee, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Parran, Peter, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Dorchester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wilmer, Wooden—75.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

ABSENCE OF MEMBERS, &C.

Mr. ABBOTT submitted the following order: *Ordered*, That no entry be made on the journal hereafter expressive of members' views on subjects acted on in their absence, unless they have been excused, or give satisfactory reasons for their absence from the convention according to rules.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I think that order is contrary to all the usages of de-

liberative bodies. A member may very properly and necessarily be absent when an important vote is taken. And I do not think that any rule should be applied in this convention which is not ordinarily applied in deliberative bodies. I therefore move to lay this order on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PURNELL,

It was ordered to be entered on the journal, that if Mr. Purnell, of Worcester county, had been present when the votes were taken upon the order submitted by Mr. Hatch, of Baltimore city, and the order offered by Mr. Schley, of Frederick county, on Tuesday, July 19th instant, the order submitted by Mr. Sands, of Howard county, on Wednesday, July 20th instant, and the resolution offered by Mr. Stirling of Baltimore city, on Thursday, July 21st instant, with regard to the disloyalists, he would have voted in the affirmative upon each of said propositions.

On motion of Mr. GALLOWAY,

It was ordered to be entered upon the journal that Mr. McComas is absent from his seat on account of important business connected with the draft.

Mr. HOLLYDAY asked and obtained leave of absence from the convention until Wednesday next.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I gave notice yesterday that I would to-day move to rescind the order requiring evening sessions to be held. I now submit that motion.

Mr. HEBB. Does not the order of the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Pugh) in relation to the limitation of debate take precedence, notice of that having been first given?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I do not care about precedence; take up that first, if the convention choose to do so.

Mr. ABBOTT. I am not prepared to vote for a ten minute rule, unless evening sessions are to be dispensed with. I would rather vote first upon the motion of the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers.)

The PRESIDENT. Under the rules, the notice of the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Pugh) comes up now for consideration, being first in order.

Mr. PUGH, in pursuance of previous notice, submitted the following:

Ordered, That during the consideration of the report of the committee on basis of representation, each speaker shall be limited to ten minutes, and the time shall in no case be extended excepting upon a concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

Mr. SANDS moved to amend by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "fifteen."

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I thought the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands)