

napolis? Do they not go away on the boat and cars? On every Sunday this city will be as empty of members as it can be. And will not the Sergeant-at-Arms have the additional trouble of going on the boat to Baltimore to hunt up members, and of going to Baltimore by railroad to hunt them up? If we were in the city of Baltimore, he might have to run over the city, but that would be about all. If we stay here he will have to traverse both lines, by railway and steamboat, to hunt up the scattered members. I positively and honestly believe that the labors of the Convention will be completed at a much earlier day if we go to the city of Baltimore than if we remain here. The members will have time enough for recreation and for meeting in committee. They will go to Baltimore in spite of your determination to stay here. There is no power that will keep them here. I have heard many say they will go there and board, coming here in the morning and going back in the evening; and where will their labors on the committees be? If we go to Baltimore they will have abundance of time both for recreation and for attending to their duties on committees; and the labors of the Convention will be much earlier completed.

Looking at the question, then, in all points of view, the constitutional objection being abandoned, and the convenience being greater there, I do not see why we should not go to Baltimore, unless upon the idea that we shall not be allowed freedom of debate there. That is an imputation as much upon the spirit of fair dealing on the part of members of this Convention as it is upon the city of Baltimore. I would do just as much against the city of Baltimore in that city as in any other spot in Maryland. Being there would not influence my vote one particle; nor would it influence the vote of any other member of this Convention. They will act on their solid convictions, free and independent of any outside pressure. I shall be the last to believe that any outside pressure or outside interference would be at all attempted. I have a better opinion of Baltimore city.

I, too, with the gentleman from Howard, (Mr. Sands) am entirely opposed to the spirit of antagonism, of regarding the interests of Baltimore city as antagonistic to the interests of the State, and arraying the counties against the city of Baltimore. As well might the arm or the head mutiny against the stomach, and declare that they would have no community of interest. The life of Baltimore city is a life that ramifies through every county in the State. The prosperity of Baltimore is *pro tanto* the prosperity of the entire State. If you affect deleteriously the interests of any portion of Maryland the entire State suffers to some extent the consequences. It is irrational, it is unfair, it is unfraternal, to be eternally attempting to array a spirit

of sectionalism in this State. It is that terrible spirit that now involves this country in the bloodiest civil war that in the annals of time was ever witnessed. It has arisen solely from that sectional spirit that will not acknowledge that the individual good is necessarily involved in the general welfare.

Mr. BELT. The grounds upon which I shall vote against the proposition to remove the Convention have been, as a general thing, so fully stated by my friend from Anne Arundel (Mr. Miller) that I shall detain the Convention but a few moments to advert to one or two considerations upon which he has not touched.

First, in reference to the remarks that have fallen from the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Negley) and the gentleman from Howard, (Mr. Sands) in deprecation of any hostile feeling between the different sections of the State, and more particularly between the rural districts and Baltimore city. For one, I am a stranger to any such sentiment; nor can I appreciate the earnestness with which both of those gentlemen have joined in such deprecation of that spirit. I have heard no member on this side of the House or the other say one word in derogation of Baltimore city. I know the prosperity of Baltimore is the prosperity of my county and of every other county in the State. I know that she is the centre of exchange and trade. I know that like all great cities she draws to her a large proportion of the moral and intellectual worth of the State, and an equally large proportion relatively of the capital and industry. I am proud of the city. I am proud of her achievements, of her standing, of her prospects; and I yield to no other Marylander in my admiration of her as a commercial emporium, within the proper sphere of her activity. I have the happiness to agree in sentiment, particularly on subjects of a political character, with the large majority, as I believe, of the people with whom we should come in contact if we were to remove to Baltimore. We should have then the additional advantage, which would be a matter in which I should greatly delight personally, of mingling with and daily conversing with a great many gentlemen of talent, professional men of experience and ability on the very subjects to which our attention will be here called. So I dismiss any consideration of antagonism to Baltimore city in the vote which I shall give on this question. So far from entertaining such a feeling, I should personally prefer the city of Baltimore for our sessions, for the reasons to which I have referred.

To avoid any misapprehension, and at the risk of separating myself from perhaps a majority of gentlemen on both sides of the Convention, I will state that I base my opposition to this removal, first, upon the ground that we have no legal right, in my humble judgment to make this change. I am perfectly familiar with the doctrine which has been