

see fit. But if the Convention does this, it is guilty of a breach of good faith to the people whom they here represent. The city of Annapolis, one of the oldest cities in the State, a city which has been the location of our Government for more than a century and a half, a city which at the time the Government was located here, had far less facilities for approach than it has at this day, now possessing all the modern improvements, now beautified by the improvements of time, situated in a delightful climate, with a beautiful bay, with everything cool, delightful, and refreshing around us, is in my opinion, the city of all others in the State of Maryland that we ought to be anxious to hold this Convention in.

Yes, sir; this very hall held once some of the brightest sons of the State, who here met and acted for the welfare of the State; and I trust that some of us may gather some of the inspiration of those great and good patriots of the past and be induced to do all in our power to stem the torrent of radicalism and fanaticism which seems on the eve of overrunning our State; and that we shall under that inspiration of the past, prepare such a Constitution for the people of Maryland that they can with their hearts endorse it, and present that Constitution in such a way that there will be no doubt but that they will come up and endorse it.

Mr. NEGLEY. I shall undertake to give a few reasons why I shall oppose this substitute. The admission by the gentleman who has just taken his seat of the constitutional power of this Convention to transfer its sittings anywhere else is an abandonment *in toto* of the constitutional objection to its removal. The very renunciation of the constitutional power of this Convention to transfer its sittings either to Baltimore, Upper Marlborough, Hagerstown, or Cumberland, is an entire abandonment of any constitutional objection.

Then, sir, what are the reasons to be combated? What are the reasons now to operate on our minds in acting on this measure? The Constitution of the State of Maryland has imposed upon the Legislature the duty every ten years to pass a law taking the sense of the people of Maryland on the question of holding a Convention to remodel or reform its fundamental law. In that they authorized and empowered, and made it obligatory upon the Legislature in passing that law, to enact the place and the means of assembling. When the Legislature of Maryland at its last session provided the means, and passed a law for the taking the sense of the people of Maryland, and indicated the place of the assembling of this Convention, they had exhausted the constitutional power they were acting under. It is absolutely necessary, as a matter of convenience, that some place should be indicated where this Convention should assemble. The Legislature had the constitu-

tional power to indicate Baltimore city as the place of the assembly of this Convention, just as much as to indicate Annapolis as the place of its assembling. They chose to indicate this city as the place of the assembling of this Convention. When they had done that, they had exhausted the constitutional power under which they were acting.

As soon as we assembled here, and organized, we became a sovereign body, untrammelled by any constitutional restrictions as to the particular place where we should hold our sessions. This is the whole ground of the constitutional objection.

Then the question is reduced to a matter of mere convenience. Will anybody say here that Annapolis is as convenient for the assembling of this Convention and for its sessions as Baltimore city? I understand that every member from the Eastern Shore of Maryland is compelled to go through the city of Baltimore in order to reach this place. The whole State labors under great disadvantages in getting here. If the gentlemen will refer to the Declaration of Rights in the Constitution of 1776 they will see that the very reason assigned for making Annapolis the seat of government was that it was the most convenient place for the members of the Legislature to assemble in. If convenience was an element operating upon the minds of those who framed the original Constitution of Maryland, in the selection of a place for the sitting of their Legislature, why should it not now, when the whole population of the State and everything in the State is changed, when Western Maryland, that was then a wilderness comparatively, has become populous, be equally regarded in the selection of a place for the sittings of our Convention? So far as I am concerned, I see no rational objection why the people of the present age should not consult their convenience as well as the citizens of Maryland in 1776. There is no difference. The reason of the rule, the reason of the act constitutes the law which governs everything else resting upon that foundation.

Now as to some of the objections to Baltimore. We can have as many conveniences there as we can have here. We can have more. We can have halls that are as airy, as well ventilated, and much less crowded than this hall. My colleagues here are jammed into a corner where they can neither hear nor see scarcely anything. If we go there every one can be accommodated with seats in a roomy, spacious hall, where we can deliberate and come to the end of our work much earlier than here.

Gentlemen say that the members of the Convention will scatter over the city of Baltimore, and that the Sergeant-at-Arms will have great trouble in finding them. Do they not scatter now? When this Convention adjourns do they all stay in the city of An-