

been successful, particularly in Worcester, where the majority had been overwhelming.³ These men, while firm and aggressive in their policy and expressing a sense of great responsibility,⁴ can seldom be accused of unfairness, as they resorted to high-handed methods in very few instances. Although relying on their large numerical superiority, they sometimes kindly informed the minority at the beginning of a debate that the final outcome was already settled, a statement more forcible than pleasant,⁵ yet, on the whole, more fault could be found with the provisions they carried through than with the manner of doing so.

Very few regular caucuses were held by the majority members,⁶ for they had been largely elected on and pledged to the same platform, so that they were a unit in many particulars, though differing widely on certain subjects, as the judiciary, internal improvements, etc., which will be noted later. Owing to their decided numerical superiority, it was almost entirely unnecessary to use the "party whip" or any other political methods in order to secure a majority vote. Archibald Stirling, Jr., of Baltimore City, may be regarded as their leader. He frequently closed the debate with brilliant and forceful arguments—among the best of those given in the Convention—rather "cutting" at times, but always clear and logical.⁷ He was ably seconded by Henry Stockbridge, of Baltimore City, another of the strongest men in the Convention; John E. Smith, of Carroll; Wm. T. Purnell, of Worcester, and others scarcely less able. As stated above, the Baltimore City delegation was extremely influential as a whole, usually standing

³ 890 "for," 135 "against." We can only repeat the difficulty of saying how much of this had been caused by force or intimidation.

⁴ Deb. i, 351-2.

⁵ The minority often complained of their position in this respect. See Deb., i, 274, 326, 521-2, 569; ii, 764.

⁶ Authority of Mr. Joseph M. Cushing, a surviving member of the Baltimore City delegation.

⁷ For an opponent's estimate of Mr. Stirling, see Deb., iii, 1748.