

importance to their people, they were willing to compromise on the representation question. This was one way in which these gentlemen could vindicate themselves triumphantly before their people, if the people desired any other reform in the Constitution, no matter what.

How could the gentleman from the city of Baltimore, who sustained the proposition, vindicate themselves? Here was a proposition to give the city twenty-four delegates, made by the gentleman to whom he was replying. He had no doubt that those who sustained the compromise would vote against that proposition, which could command but few votes.

Mr. PRESSTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. Why so? Because these gentlemen were willing, in common with their Reform friends of the counties, to rally around the standard which they had erected by their common efforts. How were the gentlemen from Baltimore to vindicate themselves? They could do it by pointing to this Union as a common bond of brotherhood. This would be done whenever that answer should be given, unless he had mistaken the character of the people of the city very much; both in the counties and the city it would be perfectly satisfactory.

The people of the State had sent them there as a business body, to prepare a Constitution for their approbation, and not to pass their time in discussing visionary questions. If they did not present a practical result, he thought none of them who were living would see another Convention in this State.

Now, how could they obtain this practical result? Was it not the spirit of the age in which we live, that the friends of any project whatever would associate to carry it out? Could a religious, charitable or political association of any kind whatever be carried on without first centralizing the friends of the measure? It was an every day process. If there was anything in this age which characterized it more than any other, it was this spirit of association. Men form into classes and unite for every conceivable purpose, and they must do it, or they never could succeed. Was it not right, then, that these gentlemen who found themselves friends of reform should coalesce, and agree to act together, to see how many would support a common object? The question between the gentleman and himself was this: Whether the people of Baltimore required a Constitution to be made? And if they did, it followed that the friends of the measure must unite in supporting it, so as to carry it out by their common efforts. Was this not true?

Examine the vote, and they would see that Baltimore city, Harford, Washington, Montgomery, Allegany and Carroll counties were divided. Look at the counties for the proposition and those against it, and the condition of the vote in the divided counties, and then any one would see that he was correct in drawing the conclusion, that to defeat this measure, was equivalent to defeating the Constitution itself.

He would now say a few words in regard to the amendment under consideration, which was to district the city of Baltimore. It appeared to

him that the reasonings of the honorable mover of the proposition would have been very good and very strong if they had been confirmed by their experience; but they were not. For example, the proposition was to district the city of Baltimore, that her local interests might be represented there. This was the principle referred to by him just now. When the city of Baltimore came to govern itself, it must govern itself by wards, and distribute its power all over the city; but when the Legislature dealt with the city of Baltimore as an unit. If the honorable gentleman would look over the laws of the State, he did not think he would find one in fifty that recognized and provided for separate local interests of the city of Baltimore. Measures of a local character, such as the opening of streets, &c., were left to the city council. The records would show that the laws passed by the Legislature, were for the city entire, and not for any particular ward. In this respect, the gentleman's remarks were not confirmed by experience. He could not obtain what he very properly proposed—a representation of the different interests—any better than was effected now. According to the present practice, (he thought gentlemen from the city would bear him out when he said,) that in selecting tickets for the Legislature, they almost uniformly presented gentlemen from the different sections of the city and of different pursuits in life. They did this because of its abstract propriety, and they thus presented a ticket which would include all classes of society, and which therefore received general support. He would ask the gentleman if this was not so?

Mr. PRESSTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD said, that under the present system, selections were made from persons residing in all parts of the city, and from different pursuits of life. The gentleman desired representatives of the different interests and different localities of the city. Well, it was so now. How could their interests be better ensured by requiring a little strip to elect one man, and a little strip another man? There would be no co-operation, no co-incidence, for it would very likely happen that they would elect men of the same pursuits, and thus there would not be so many interests represented as in the present system, because there would be no concert in the selection of the delegates.

There was another objection to this proposition, which was that it does not prevent fraudulent votes, and that under this system they would disfranchise a large portion of the people of the city. He would say, with all respect to the honorable gentleman who brought forward the proposition, that the article, if it was made to conform to the effect which it would produce, (and he did not speak of the object of the gentleman in introducing his proposition,) would justify the title of an article "to encourage fraudulent votes."

This would be very easily seen. The city of Baltimore is a unity, and those persons who reside in it for six months are entitled to vote. Mr. H. said, that the proposition did not provide for a residence of six months in any separate district