

point of view. It would obviate the unpleasant necessity of non-concurring with others at the hour of adjournment, for if they should pass this order, they would have a fixed hour for adjournment. Whenever he had voted against a question of adjournment, that was desired by a large minority even, he had done it with the greatest reluctance, but he had done so with a high sense of public duty.

As to the personal inconvenience of these sessions to the gentleman from Anne Arundel, nothing would give him greater pleasure than to consult him, but that gentleman could pair off with a gentleman holding different views. If after practice they should find it necessary to change this rule, was it not according to orders that they should act under it until they had voted for or against all propositions that were to be submitted as to how the legislative branch of the government should be formed? After they had done this, and when the judicial question should be taken up for debate, it might then be time enough to abolish the order, and come back to the old system. The public interest demanded this sacrifice at their hands.

Mr. JENIFER remarked, that it appeared to him that there was but one question involved in this proposition. He thought it was the best mode of expediting the public business, and if members would meet at the hours prescribed in the order, he was sure much might be done.— But he had seen it here and elsewhere, as the result of evening sessions, unless they had some specific object in view, he believed it would take more time the next morning to undo the proceedings of the evening before than would be gained by those meetings.

He was, however, willing to try the experiment, or any other, that might expedite the business of the Convention. He was apprehensive, that in a very short time they would find it necessary to rescind the order, as being the means of delaying, instead of facilitating the business of the session. For himself, he was willing to meet at any hour, and sit as late as the most industrious or most impatient member of the Convention; always excepting too early an hour in the morning, as his physician had told him it was very prejudicial to health.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, inquired if the hour had not arrived for the consideration of the order of the day?

The PRESIDENT replied in the affirmative.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved to postpone the order of the day; which motion was agreed to.

Mr. DORSEY said that as the experience of the gentleman from Frederick, had been given in opposition thereto, he would state the result as well of his observation, as of experience.— About the year 1792, he believed, he came to the Annapolis College, and took much pleasure in attending the debates of the Legislature. He saw it frequently in afternoon sessions, near its final adjournment for the year.

If gentlemen had witnessed such scenes then as he had, and if they had had reporters to have placed them on record, public opinion as to afternoon sessions, would have been long since formed.

Mr. D. referred to the experience he had had for many years, when a member of the Legislature, and stated that he had again and again, at sessions held under like circumstances, seen the House adjourn, because the conduct of members was such that it was utterly impossible to transact legislative business. He was confident that the Convention would stand much lower in the opinion of the public, than it now does, if the proceedings of their afternoon sessions should be faithfully presented to the world through their reporters. As to the evening sessions of the Congress of the United States, he had heard such descriptions given of those sessions, as well by newspapers as by members themselves, as were any thing but creditable to that body. He was sure the people expected graver deliberation in the formation of the Constitution, than could be hoped for in afternoon sessions.

He was satisfied that if this order should be adopted, no time would be given to members to prepare themselves to offer the necessary amendments and to vote understandingly upon the great subjects that would come before them, and that more time would be wasted in motions to reconsider, than could be gained by enlarging the number of hours in session, not for grave and deliberate, but for reckless legislation. Such proceedings are wholly inappropriate to a Constitutional Convention. If a legislature acts unwisely, its errors may be corrected at its next annual session. Not so with such a Convention; it holds no such succeeding session.

Mr. WEEMS said:

That he should vote against the adoption of this order; for he did not think they would gain much time by its adoption. If they should meet at ten o'clock and sit until four, they would thus get clear of afternoon sessions and should then have been employed in that hall six hours. This was as long as any gentleman was willing to sit engaged in business at this or at any session.

If they should meet at ten and adjourn at two, they would then be four hours in session. They would then meet at four and he presumed would adjourn by seven, which would be three hours; making altogether seven hours. They should, under this order, if adopted, gain seven hours.— Then the question arose, whether or not, they should in reality, gain any thing, or whether, in reality, they should not lose.

He had attended evening sessions of the legislature, and must confess that in ordinary legislation, he had witnessed scenes of confusion and disorder which he hoped never would be witnessed in that body, having for its object, graver and much more important subjects than ordinary legislation.

He entertained serious doubts whether they