Mr. BLAKISTONE suggested Thursday week, as the boat from the Eastern Shore came up on that day.

Mr. THOMAS expressed the hope that the gentleman from Talbot, (Mr. Lloyd,) would adhere to his original motion. It was impossible to accommodate the action of this body to the various and conflicting private engagements of its members. He, [Mr. T.,] could not be here next week. Let each gentleman who was compelled to be absent, pair off with some other gentleman of opposite opinions.

Mr. MERRICK said, he could not possibly be here next week.

Mr. DORSEY suggested that there was another special order, besides that which had been alluded to by the Chair, and which he, [Mr. D.,] believed had precedence of the report of the committee on the executive department. He alluded to the report which had been made in relation to Howard district.

The PRESIDENT, on enquiry, stated that the report alluded to by the gentleman from Anne Arundel, [Mr. Dorsey,] had been simply made the order of the day, [in parliamentary phrase,] and not a *special order* for any particular day.

Mr. GWINN submitted to the Chair, whether the consideration of a special order might not be postponed, by a vote of a majority of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT indicated the opinion that a vote of two-thirds would be required to postpone the consideration of a special order.

Mr. LLOYD, [to the Chair.] If I should now move that the report of the committee on representation be made the special order of the day for Tuesday next, will it come up immediately after the report on the executive department shall have been disposed of?

The PRESIDENT. It will.

Mr. LLOYD. I make the motion.

Mr. MERRICK moved to make the report the special order for Tuesday week. It was impossible, he said, that gentlemen should receive notice, and be here by the time designated in the last motion of the gentleman from Talbot, [Mr. Lloyd.]

The PRESIDENT stated, that the question would be taken first on the most distant day.

And the question was stated to be on the motion of Mr. MERRICK, to make the report of the committee on representation, the special order of the day for Tuesday week.

Mr. WARE asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative — Messrs. Chapman, President, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Merrick, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Bowie, Sprigg, Bowling, McMaster, Fooks, Sappington, Stephenson, Thawley, John Newcomer, Davis and Kilgour—33.

Negative—Messrs. Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Lloyd, Colston, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Spencer, George, Thomas, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Ege, Cockey and Brown—34.

So the motion of Mr. Merrick was rejected.

The question then recurred on the motion of Mr. Lloyd, fixing Tuesday next.

Mr. DENT moved to amend the motion, by making the report the special order of the day for the first Monday in April.

Mr. D said, that some time ago, many gentlemen were anxious to postpone the consideration of this subject, until after the other business of the Convention had been disposed of, who were now anxious to take it up.

The question was stated to be on the amendment of Mr. DENT.

Mr. KILGOUR moved to amend it by designating *Monday week.*

Mr. WELLS asked the yeas and nays,

Which were ordered.

Mr. RICAUD moved that there be a call of the Convention.

A call was ordered.

The roll of the members was called, and the names of the absentees were then called over.

The Doorkeeper was sent to notify the absent members who were in the city to attend.

After some time the doorkeeper returned, and the President informed the Convention that all the members in the city, not sick, had been notified to attend.

Further proceedings on the call were then dispensed with.

The question then recurred on the motion of Mr. KILGOUR, designating Monday week, and being taken,

The result was as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Chapman, President, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Sollers, Merrick, Jenifer, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, McMaster, Fooks, Sappington, Stephenson, Thawley, John Newcomer, Davis and Kilgour—37.

Negative.—Messrs. Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Colston, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Gaither, Biser, Annan, McHenry, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Presstman, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Smith, Parke, Ege, Cockey and Brown—31.

A tie vote.

So the motion of Mr. KILGOUR was rejected.

The question then recurred on the motion of Mr. Lloyd, designating Tuesday next.