

the election of Mayor and members of the City Council of said city, their terms of office respectively, the time of entering upon the duties of their offices respectively, and to amend and to re-enact said sections, and to repeal an Act passed at January session 1867, entitled, an Act to repeal section 227, of article 4, of the Code of Public Local Laws, relating to elections in the city of Baltimore, and to re-enact the same with amendments, and to amend and re-enact said section 227;

Mr. Trail raised the following point of order:

Mr. Trail raises the point of order on the introduction of the bill reported by a select Committee, providing for a new election in the city of Baltimore, that a bill of similar tenor and effect having once been passed during this Session of the General Assembly, in due form and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, and then repealed at this the same session, another bill looking to the accomplishment of the same object as that aimed at in the one above referred to cannot be entertained, and in substantiation of this point of order raised, and which he considers to be well taken, cites from page 120 of Manual, Rules and Barclay's Digest, 1863, the following: "In Parliament, a question once carried cannot be questioned again at the same session, but must stand as the judgement of the House. \* \* \*. And a bill once rejected, another of the same substance cannot be brought in again the same session. \* \* \*."

The Chair decided as follows :

The decision of the Chair is, that the introduction of the bill, after having been enacted and repealed at this session, cannot be again presented, without a violation of received parliamentary law. I refer the Senate to page 120 of Barclay's Digest, in which the following language occurs: "In Parliament, a question once carried, cannot be questioned against the same session, but must stand as the judgment of the House. Towns col. 67; Mem. in Hakew, 33. And a bill once rejected, cannot be brought in again the same session. Hakew, 158;" 6 Eng., 392.

The rule is conclusive; and it will hardly be pretended that the present bill is of such vast magnitude and urgency as that quoted in 2 Hats., 99, 100, where, on account of the indispensable importance of the measure, and the fact that it was lost by a majority of one only, the rule was not strictly and virbally enforced.

The reason of the rule is obvious, as, without it, the whole time of the Assembly would be consumed in attempts to revive lost bills, to the exclusion of new and important legislation.

It is true, an enabling act is now pending, (indeed, as I