

the last general assembly of Maryland passed this resolution?

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. The expense of traveling by railroad has not.

Mr. DELLINGER. What was the price of gold then, and what is it now?

Mr. PURNELL. I see it stated in the papers that the railroad fare from Philadelphia south has been increased thirty-three per cent.

Mr. DELLINGER. I know very well—at least I am so informed by members of the last general assembly—that board in this city is higher now than it was then. And certainly all the expenses to which members of the convention are subjected, have been greatly increased over those of the members of the last general assembly. If the committee on accounts do not chose to allow the one hundred dollars, let them readjust the mileage, and say what the members from Anne Arundel shall receive, and what the members from Washington and Allegany, who live farthest away from the seat of government, shall receive. Let us have it fair and equitable. I think I am entitled to something more than I am getting, and therefore I must insist upon this order.

Mr. MILLER. Without stating whether I am or not in favor of this proposition as it has been advanced, I merely rise now for the purpose of replying to a remark made by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) in reference to members of the last general assembly, whose homes were within a stone's throw of the State house, on receiving one hundred dollars for their mileage.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I made no such statement. I said that there were members sitting in this hall now, whose homes might be reached by a stone thrown from the steps of this State house.

Mr. MILLER. It may be applied to members of the last general assembly.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. The gentleman may apply it to any one he pleases.

Mr. MILLER. The only gentleman of the last legislature who refused to take the money, but returned the hundred dollars to the treasury, was a senator from Anne Arundel, who lives some twelve or fourteen miles from Annapolis. I am informed, without knowing the fact, that the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) received his hundred dollars extra, although it cost him but a dollar to go from Annapolis to Baltimore.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I propose to reply to this *argumentum ad hominem*. It is known to everybody here, that the moment that infamous proposition was presented in this hall last winter I arose and denounced it. I did my utmost to prevent its passage, uniformly, persistently. The president of this convention knows that I called his attention to it, when it was originally but a mere order, as being without any authority of law that

would justify him, as the comptroller of the State, in paying it. And that gave rise to the joint resolution which was subsequently introduced and put through here.

As to any compensation which I received then, I received not one cent until after the general assembly had adjourned, when a certain amount of money was brought and placed in my hand. Whether it included the hundred dollars or not, I did not know then, and do not now, but presume it did. At that time I was in somewhat of a bad humor. The house of delegates had passed an appropriation for the care of our sick and wounded soldiers. That went to the senate, and the senate cut it down to one-sixth of what we had voted. They sent it back here, and the house refused to accede to their amendment, but returned it to the senate, and asked them to recede. We said that it was due to the soldiers that they should receive from the State that amount of money. We did our utmost to get it through; but we failed, and were obliged at the last moment, late in the session, to accept what we could get—one-sixth of what we had passed. In no very amiable mood when I received the money, presuming that it contained the hundred dollars, I said, "This hundred dollars belongs to the State; I will pass it over to the State where it should be put." And I passed it over to the benefit of the sick and wounded soldiers. That is the history of that hundred dollars. If that is wrong, let it be so.

Mr. ECKER. As I am somewhat interested in this matter myself, I rise to corroborate what has been said by the gentleman from Baltimore city. When that proposition was introduced last winter, that gentleman arose with some show of indignation, as he frequently does, and made a very excellent speech on the subject. The proposition came up before the house of delegates, and was voted down—I think the vote stood 40 to 22. We supposed that that matter was at an end, and turned our attention to other matters. But a very particular friend from Harford county, watched his opportunity, counted noses, and when he found my worthy friend (Mr. Stockbridge,) and those who voted the other way, out of the house, he slipped around to another member from a neighboring county, whose name I will not mention —

Mr. CHAMBERS. Give the name.

Mr. ECKER. No, it is too near home. He slipped around to him and said, "Let us reconsider this matter." And it was reconsidered and carried. When I called for my money, I counted it over, but made no calculation at all, and put it into my pocket. I had a neighbor from Frederick county who sat near me. He took his money and put it into his pocket, intending to keep it, not supposing that Frederick county would notice it. But when he got home he found his neighbors and friends down on him like a