

and we go in. The majority determine to report, and we report. Then could they not call again for going into Committee of the Whole? I ask for this information; for if that should be the result of the adoption of this rule, I certainly should be opposed to it. There may be seven or nine men who would rather bring all the proceedings of the Convention to a dead stop than that anything should be done in the Convention.

Mr. STIRLING. The suggestion of my friend from Cecil (Mr. Pugh) is perfectly proper; and in order to show that it may be necessary to adopt the amendment I will suggest that if it is the standing order of the day to go into Committee of the Whole, and if the House does go into Committee of the Whole, either without a vote or upon the demand of seven or nine members, and if the majority vote that the committee rise, the standing order is satisfied, and the House does not go into Committee of the Whole again. It is not the privilege of any one or more members to demand that the House go into Committee of the Whole again. But this rule, as it stands here, has no limitation to it. It says the House are to go into Committee of the Whole not at a particular hour of the day, not once only, but at any time when required by nine members; and it may go back and forth, consuming the time of the Convention. I have seen it done in the House of Delegates time and time again. I have seen the House taken into Committee of the Whole, and taken out again, four or five times in succession. That cannot be done in Congress; when the House votes that the Committee rise, it is done for that day.

Mr. BERRY of Baltimore county. The difference between the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) and the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) I think is settled by one of the rules of the House of Representatives:

"The House may, at any time, by a vote of a majority of the members present, suspend the rules and orders for the purpose of going into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union."

Mr. CLARKE. That does not settle the point between the gentleman from Baltimore city and myself, which is this, that under the standing rule of the House, the House goes once into Committee of the Whole; and after having that privilege under the standing rule once, then the majority does it under this restriction that it is not under the standing order. So that the proposition still remains that every legislative body has the privilege of either going by standing rule, or by some form other than the vote of the majority, into a Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STIRLING moved to amend the last clause of the same rule, by striking out the words "seven members" and inserting in

place thereof the words "a majority of the members present."

The amendment was agreed to.

Rule 22d having been read,

Mr. STIRLING moved to amend by adding: "When a report or resolution is ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, it shall be actually engrossed before being read a third time, unless a majority of the members present shall otherwise order."

Mr. STIRLING said: I move that amendment because it is known that it has long been the custom of the Legislature of Maryland that when a bill is ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, it is not actually engrossed, and very often it is read the third time with the amendments merely stuck on, written on separate pieces of paper. I think we shall have time enough, and that it will prevent mistakes, to have them actually copied over again if amended. If it is deemed important to read anything a third time without waiting for it to be actually engrossed, the majority can dispense with the engrossment. Unless some rule like this is adopted, I suppose that it will not be considered necessary actually to engross the reports, but it will be omitted according to the custom in the Legislature.

Mr. KENNARD suggested that the amendment should be added to the 53d rule.

Mr. STIRLING withdrew the amendment.

Mr. BERRY of Baltimore county submitted the following amendment:

Strike out all after the word "interlined," in the sixth line, and insert "but all amendments shall, when agreed to by the committee, be duly entered by the Secretary, separate paper, noting the page and line, and, through the chairman, be so reported to the Convention, which report, resolution, or other matter, shall again be open to debate and amendment by clauses."

Mr. STIRLING. I do not see why this rule is not made applicable to amendments at any time. I do not see why it should be restricted to reports in Committee of the Whole. They should not be interlined at all. The amendments should always be upon separate pieces of paper.

Mr. CLARKE. Keeping the Journal of the Convention, and the Journal of the Committee of the Whole, are two very different things. When the Convention is in Committee of the Whole, it is not then acting as a Convention. If we have a report pending before the Convention, it would be just as if it was referred to the Committee of the Whole, for the Committee of the Whole have no more right to change that report than any other committee. This provision is intended to keep the action of the Committee of the Whole separate from that in Convention, in order to keep a Journal of proceedings in Committee of the Whole, to be published, as provided for afterwards.

Mr. STIRLING. That is all very proper. All