

mittees, authorized on April 28, were appointed on May 4, and to them were at once referred the many suggestions that had already been made by various members, as to provisions to be embodied in the new Constitution. On the same day a committee of six from the Baltimore City Council, three from each branch, presented unanimous resolutions passed by that body, inviting the Convention to hold its sessions in Baltimore, and offering to engage a hall for that purpose at the expense of the city. There was a short debate as to the advisability of the step, it being urged that Baltimore would be a much more convenient place of meeting, for the Eastern Shore members in particular. Although the contrary ground was taken that it would be illegal to move the Convention from Annapolis, yet motives of expediency really prevailed, and the invitation was declined by a non-partisan vote of 51 to 35.¹³

On June 2 an unsuccessful attempt was made by several members to reconsider this action, but nothing further came of it.¹⁴ On May 12, Mr. Kennard, of Baltimore City, made the report of the Committee on Rules.¹⁵ This report embodied the usual rules governing legislative bodies, and was finally adopted with slight amendments on May 23.¹⁶ Provisions for the Constitution were required to be passed by a majority of the members *elected* to the Convention, but this was afterwards changed by motion of Mr. Cushing, of Baltimore City, to a majority of those *present*.¹⁷ The minority strongly opposed this, claiming that, as fifty members would make a quorum, twenty-six out of the ninety-six elected could thus put a final provision in the Constitution.¹⁸ The first vote on the question was adverse, but being brought up again under a slightly different form, it was passed by a vote of 47 to 33, though several of the majority opposed the measure. The majority based their

¹³ Proceedings, 19-21.

¹⁴ Proc., 147; Deb., i, 300-1.

¹⁵ Proc., 46-56.

¹⁶ Proc., 90.

¹⁷ Proc., 109-10, 115-8; Deb., i, 180-5, 202-12.

¹⁸ Deb., i, 181.