

Mr. MERRICK. I withdraw the motion to re-consider.

Mr. THOMAS. I renew it.

Mr. THOMAS said he should vote against the proposition in the form in which it was offered. He could not consent to take it as an isolated proposition. If we send back this subject to the committee it will lead to interminable motions to amend. He would vote for the reconsideration, for the purpose of embracing both branches of the Government in one resolution.

Mr. MORGAN (to the Chair.) Is it in order to move the previous question?

The PRESIDENT. The motion is in order.

Mr. MORGAN. I move it.

SEVERAL VOICES. Move to lay the motion to re-consider on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. I will substitute a motion to lay on the table for the previous question. But, before I do so, I desire to say, that I make the motion because I foresee that the debate is to be interminable, unless arrested by one of these processes which the rules of the Convention place within our reach. Ideas have been thrown out by gentlemen, which, if persisted in, can lead to no practical result, but the discussion may consume an indefinite length of time. I move that the motion to re-consider be laid upon the table, and on that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

Some conversation followed as to the effect of the motion on the part of Mr. BROWN, Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, and the CHAIR.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

And the question, "shall the motion to re-consider be laid upon the table," was then taken, and the result was as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Wells, Kent, Weems, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, Phelps, Tuck, McCubbin, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Thawley, Kilgour, and Waters—32.

*Negative*—Messrs. Donaldson, Buchanan, Bell, Welsh, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, George, Wright, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Magraw, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, and Brown—40.

So the Convention decided that the motion to re-consider should not be laid upon the table.

And the question recurred on the motion to re-consider the vote of the Convention, adopting the first branch of the order.

The PRESIDENT proceeded to count.

Mr. SHRIVER demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, said, that, in addition to the reasons assigned by the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. THOMAS,) he, (Mr. S.) had voted against the proposition because he was opposed to giving instructions to committees upon

any thing. If the principle was adopted on one subject, they might be called upon to give instructions upon all. He desired also to remark that the vote he had given was not to be considered as the expression of his opinion upon any of the propositions, but merely as refusing to give instructions.

The question was then taken.

The PRESIDENT stated that the motion was rejected—yeas 32, noes 33.

Mr. PRESSTMAN called for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT said it was too late, the result having been announced.

Mr. SHRIVER said, he had called for the yeas and nays, before the question was taken.

The PRESIDENT said the chair had not heard the gentleman.

Some conversation followed, when

The PRESIDENT suggested that gentlemen desiring the yeas and nays, might accomplish their object by another motion to reconsider the vote on the resolution.

Mr. PRESSTMAN renewed the motion to reconsider.

Mr. BROWN called the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, submitted as a point of order to the chair, that a motion to reconsider having just been disposed of, there must be some intervening action, before another motion to reconsider could be entertained. Self-protection required this. Otherwise, it would be in the power of every one of the one hundred and three members of the Convention, to move a reconsideration, one after the other, and thus prevent definitive action on any proposition.

The PRESIDENT. Under the rule as it now stands, a motion to reconsider may be made a dozen times.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent. If the motion to reconsider should prevail, it brings back the question to the proposition, whether the Senate shall be composed of one Senator from each county, and from the city of Baltimore. I do not desire to say a word in relation to the chairman of the committee, but I now state that every word the chairman has said—

Mr. PRESSTMAN interposed to a question of order, that it was not competent to review the remarks of the gentleman from Charles, [Mr. Merrick.] or to refer to what had occurred.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Then I will not refer to the gentleman from Charles.

Mr. PRESSTMAN. We will see to what the gentleman does refer.

Mr. DENT, (to the President.) Is this a renewal of the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT. It is.

Some conversation followed on the point of order, between Mr. DENT and the PRESIDENT.

The PRESIDENT said, that a majority of the Convention could, under the rule, give consent to another motion to reconsider. And the Chair would put the question in that form. The question was not debateable.

Mr. BLAKISTONE submitted a further question on the point of order.