

by inserting after the words "Howard District," the following:

"And five days in the election district or ward of the city of Baltimore."

Mr. TUCK, was entitled to the floor.

Mr. T. assumed it as indisputable that the purity of the Elective Franchise lay at the foundation of this and all representative governments, and he expressed his surprise that where frauds were admitted to exist, efforts made to remedy the evil, should be resisted. If but one fraudulent vote had been given, it was sufficient reason for the adoption of such measures as were calculated to prevent the extension of the evil. Some who oppose this restriction have avowed themselves in favor of the largest liberty. He was an advocate for that civil liberty which we enjoy under the restraint of wholesome laws, and without which, republics cannot exist. Any doctrine of liberty inconsistent with this will ultimately reduce the government from a republic to a mere representative democracy.

He adverted to the party allusions that had been made in this debate. One gentleman had stated that the friends of this restriction were influenced by political motives, and that this cry of fraud on the ballot box was only raised when large majorities in the Baltimore elections were cast in a particular way. For himself he regretted the introduction of politics into this debate. He assailed no man's motives. Conscious of the rectitude of his own, he left others to judge of their conduct, and to settle such questions with their consciences and their constituents. But when the gentleman assigned this motive, he must have forgotten that all the questions touching the Elective Franchise, all the members of one party (except two) have united, and voted against the measures designed to protect the ballot box, whereas the other party have never united on any one question since the organization of the Convention. Mr. T. suggested that this fact might furnish some evidence of party design to those who were in search of the motives of others. Yet he made no such charge himself. Gentlemen had alluded to their democracy, and some had appealed to their ancestry to show the purity of their democratic faith. If he were judged by this test, he might claim to belong in some degree to both sides. His whiggery consisted of a proper mixture of principles for both the old parties. He certainly laid no claim to being a democrat of the present day. But it is not prudent for our democratic friends to trace back too far, they may run into a cross that was once considered quite impure, and is now generally repudiated. Many of them would find that their original politics had no better source than the federalism of 1800. Referring to this subject the other day, an honorable gentleman from Queen Anne's had prudently dated his democracy from the Jackson epoch, and disclaimed running into the Jefferson line.

Mr. T. commended the discretion of that gentleman to others of his political friends. The fact is that the times have changed, and men have changed with them. The least said on this

subject the better. We are all more or less party men, and perhaps we show our feelings at times when we ought not. Where we differ let us differ as men should, who honestly disagree. Let us agree to disagree, and have no controversy about it.

It is a mistake to suppose that this amendment would operate invidiously, as regards Baltimore. It applies as well to the counties. Mr. T. had no unfriendly feeling towards that city. We all have a just pride in her growing wealth and prosperity. He would be the last to effect her interests. But the Delegates from Baltimore must remember that if they enjoy the advantage of living in the third city of the Union, and have the honor of representing her here, they must bear the inconveniences of having among their constituents a proportion of that species of population, that is common to all large cities. Mr. T. had no doubt that frauds had been committed on both sides. Proof has been demanded. It is not a case that admits of strictly legal proof. But he had heard enough to satisfy his own mind. He would not exculpate the whigs. Both he believed to be guilty. Mr. T. could mention some instances coming to his knowledge, on reliable information, implicating persons of his own party, and he had no doubt gentlemen of the other side could do the same, if they would. In 1847, a whig of Baltimore informed him that he had received an offer from members of the Empire Club of New York, to carry the election in Baltimore for the whigs for five thousand dollars, and that after conferring with some of the Central Committee, the offer was declined, but his informant thought the arrangement ought to have been made.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, asked for the name of the gentleman's informant.

Mr. TUCK declined giving the name.

Mr. PRESSTMAN understood the gentleman made no charge against the Democratic party.

Mr. TUCK did not charge this against any party.

Mr. BRENT wished to know the name because the gentleman said he was told by a member of the Central Whig Committee.

Mr. TUCK had not said so. He had said that his informant was a whig, and that he had mentioned it to members of the Central Committee, and that they would have nothing to do with it. His informant was not a member of that Committee.

Mr. BRENT. Well—I want to know because the Empire Club is Democratic.

Mr. BISER. They are Democratic, but vote for the side that pays best.

Mr. TUCK. The gentleman's democratic friend from Frederick, (Mr. BISER,) seems to have some knowledge of that club, and I refer my friend from Baltimore to him, for further information.

Mr. T. adverted to the pipe laying fraud, that was attempted some years ago in Baltimore. There were also convictions in Baltimore a few years ago, for fraudulent voting, (which the delegates from Baltimore must remember.) The parties were fined and imprisoned. Whose frauds