

meet cases which frequently occurred here. Had he proposed to take away the right to apply the previous question? Certainly not. He only proposed to take it away from any member who might be disposed to use it for unfair and improper purposes. As respected every other member, the power to use the previous question was left as before. He explained the effect which his amendment was designed to have, and corrected the construction which had been put upon it by the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie.) He, (Mr. D.,) thought that every gentleman who desired to arrive at correct conclusions should be willing that an opportunity should be given to those who might dissent from opinions which had been expressed, to show the error of these opinions, the absence of foundation for the facts which might have been stated, or the fallacy of the arguments which had been urged.

Mr. HOWARD. I move that the amendment be laid upon the table.

Mr. BOWIE. That motion will not dispose of it. It may be taken up again. Let us have the direct question.

Mr. HOWARD. It can then come up again.

Mr. BOWIE. Oh! no.

Mr. HOWARD withdrew his motion to lay the proposition on the table.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment of Mr. DORSEY.

Mr. JENIFER thought the necessity for the adoption of a such a proposition had been entirely superseded by the debate which had taken place upon it. The object of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, [Mr. Dorsey,] seemed to have been misunderstood. His object was to prevent any member from making a speech and then cutting off all reply to it by demanding the previous question. He, [Mr. J.,] thought that although there might hitherto have been accidental cases in which such a course had been pursued, the delicacy of every member would hereafter forbid him making a speech and then calling the previous question upon the proposition.

The question was then taken, and the amendment of Mr. DORSEY was rejected:

Mr. BOWIE gave notice that on to-morrow, he should move the following as an additional rule:

"No member shall speak more than a half hour on any subject under debate."

CLOSE OF THE PENDING DEBATE.

Mr. McHENRY offered the following order:

Ordered, That the debate on the article of the Constitution reported by the committee on the Attorney General and his deputies shall terminate this day at two o'clock, P. M., when each amendment pending, or which may be offered, shall be passed upon without any further discussion than explanatory remarks, not extending beyond five minutes by the several proposers of such amendment.

The order having been read,

Mr. MORGAN moved that it be laid upon the table.

Mr. McHENRY claimed the floor.

The PRESIDENT, *pro tem.*, awarded it to him.

Mr. McHENRY said that his object in offering

this order, must be apparent to the Convention. The only part of importance in the report under consideration, had already been determined. The time which, by universal consent, seemed to have been assigned for the termination of the session of this body, had nearly arrived. It was conceded on all hands, that unless the Convention should adjourn by the first of May, the public expectation would be disappointed, and the Constitution, however meritorious in its provisions, seriously endangered. It seemed to him, therefore, to be the imperative duty of the Convention to avoid all useless discussion upon questions in which neither the public nor the members of the Convention could take much interest. If gentlemen were possessed of that spirit of talk which could brook no restraint, let them talk upon subjects of interest to the Convention and to the public, and not waste time and breath upon matters of no especial importance.

He would have preferred that the order should have come from some other source—but he hoped that the Convention would give to it the consideration to which they might think it entitled.

Mr. MORGAN said:

He should not now make the motion to lay the order on the table. He had risen in the first instance to make a motion of that character, because he thought that very little time had been consumed in the discussion of this particular bill. If, as little time had been consumed in the discussion of questions of far less importance, the business of the Convention would have proceeded much more rapidly than it had.

He thought that the gentleman from Harford, (Mr. McHenry,) was mistaken in saying, that, there was nothing of importance left to be disposed of in this bill. If the office of Attorney General was to be abolished, the Convention had to provide for the appointment of some twenty States' Attorneys—and their duties were to be defined. These matters were necessary subjects of consideration. If the gentleman from Harford had all the light upon them which was requisite to enable him to act, he, [Mr. M.,] had not.

He wanted to hear something more upon the bill, before he voted upon it. He thought that it was hurrying matters rather too much, to close the debate at two o'clock. He had seen no disposition to discuss the bill unreasonably. He thought it probable that, without such a resolution the debate might terminate before the time designated in the order.

Mr. SMITH rose to give notice that hereafter he would, on all occasions, call for the enforcement of the rule, which prohibited a member from speaking more than once on any question, until every other member desiring to address the Convention, should have spoken. And he moved that the order be laid upon the table.

The question was taken and the Convention decided that the order should not be laid upon the table.

The question then recurred on the adoption