

Mr. NEGLFY. I will withdraw the amendment, and offer it in some other shape, if this injustice shall be perpetrated upon the majority.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, demanded the yeas and nays on the order submitted by Mr. Scott, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 46, nays 36, as follows:

Yeas.—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Barron, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis of Washington, Earle, Ecker, Galloway, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones of Cecil, Keefer, Kennard, Larsh, Markey, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Pugh, Robinette, Russell, Sands, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Smith of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Thruston, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—46.

Nays.—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Belt, Berry of Baltimore County, Berry of Prince George's, Billingsley, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Crawford, Davis of Charles, Dennis, Duvall, Duvall, Edelen, Farrow, Gale, Harwood, Henkle, Hodson, Hollyday, Horsey, Jones of Somerset, King, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parker, Parran, Smith of Worcester, Turner, Wilmer—36.

Pending the call of the roll, as their names were called, the following members explained their votes:

Mr. AUDOUN. I am induced to vote for the proposition of the gentleman from Cecil for this reason. Looking at the Journal of the last Convention, page 439, I see that there was an order offered by the gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Dennis) in these words:

“Ordered, That no member of this Convention be allowed to speak more than thirty minutes upon the question of representation.”

Mr. DENNIS, in reply, asked permission to explain but was ruled out of order.

Mr. BARRON. I should have voted for the half hour rule, but as there are many speakers here, I shall vote aye.

Mr. DENNIS. When my friend from Baltimore city (Mr. Audoun) read the paragraph from the former Journal, I was under the impression that it was a gentleman of the same name with myself who offered that order. I am satisfied that I gave an erroneous vote then. I am satisfied from experience that I was wrong, and shall now vote no.

The order was accordingly adopted.

ADJOURNMENT TO BALTIMORE.

Mr. VALLIANT submitted the following order:

Ordered, That when this Convention adjourn on Saturday next, it stand adjourned to meet on Thursday next, 10th, at eleven o'clock, at the New Assembly Rooms, in the city of Baltimore, and that a committee of five be appointed by the Chair to carry this order into effect.

The PRESIDENT ruled that the motion was out of order, the Convention having already decided one of the questions embraced therein.

Mr. THOMAS. That was a proposition to accept the invitation of the City Council of Baltimore. This is an entirely different order.

The PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair it is substantially the same proposition, being a proposition for the removal of the body.

Mr. VALLIANT. I shall be obliged, very respectfully, to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. DANIEL. I will suggest that if the appeal is withdrawn, we can get at this by reconsideration.

Mr. VALLIANT. I have no objection to that, excepting that the question decided by the Convention before was upon the acceptance of the Baltimore City Council. That invitation, I am now informed, is still extended to us; and I will withdraw my appeal and move to reconsider the vote on page 19 of the Journal.

The PRESIDENT. Did the gentlemen vote with the majority?

Mr. VALLIANT. I did not. I withdraw the motion to reconsider. Subsequently,

Mr. VALLIANT again offered the above order.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair determines that is substantially the same proposition, and for the reasons assigned before, rules it out of order.

Mr. VALLIANT. I appeal from that decision.

Mr. CLARKE. I raise this question: the propositions having before been submitted, and overruled upon the same ground, no appeal being then taken, is it in order for the gentleman again to submit the same proposition and appeal? I take it that the rule is this: The gentleman offers a proposition. The Chair rules upon it. Then the gentleman must make his appeal. If any other business intervenes he cannot take the appeal. He cannot offer the same proposition again, and then appeal.

Mr. THOMAS. This is not the same proposition that was voted upon before. It is different in time. It may not have been expedient at that time to adjourn to Baltimore, but it may be expedient now.

The PRESIDENT said that if insisted upon, he must rule the appeal out of order for the reasons assigned by the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. HEBB suggested that Mr. Valliant had withdrawn the order by unanimous consent, in order to make a motion to reconsider, and could now renew the order and the appeal.

The PRESIDENT considers the appeal as having been withdrawn in order to make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. STIRLING suggested that a motion to reconsider the vote on the proposition having