

the streets of Baltimore, was a proposition submitted by Mr. Talbot, or by the president of that branch, proposing that the city of Baltimore, in its corporate capacity should build the road, equip it, and then put it up at public auction. At that time I had the charge of the Barnum & Brooks' bill. But I regarded that at the moment, and have thought since that it was the best bill. And laying aside all my predilections in favor of any other bill or system, I recorded my vote in favor of the city constructing the road, and then putting the franchise up to public competition for the highest bidder. At a later period the Travers ordinance was reported at 5 cents fare, and a bonus of \$10 or \$20 per car, as a tax to the city. As a substitute for that bill, if I mistake not, I offered the Brooks bill. That bill contained a clause appropriating \$10 000 a year to the city for this privilege. I was convinced of the financial ability of those named in the Brooks bill, and the known disability of those named in the Travers bill, and I considered the Brooks bill the best for the city. I did all I could to procure its passage over the Travers grant, but it was defeated. And then came the omnibus proprietors' bill. But I believe that preceded this action, and I voted for that bill, although I had the Brooks bill in my possession at the time. Then came the Travers bill, for which I offered the Brooks bill as a substitute, but it was defeated, and the Travers bill was passed with a great deal of earnestness by its friends in the Council to its final passage, but not before its rate of fare was reduced to 4 cents. By the direction of some of the corporators named in the Brooks bill, who were near me in the council-room, I proposed to reduce the fare in the Brooks bill to three cents, and offered that as a substitute for the 4 cent bill, with \$10 license money on each car. But by that sort of legerdemain that men in legislative bodies understand I was ruled out, inasmuch as the bill had already gone to the third degree, and no vote could be taken on the three cent bill. Finding that we could not secure that, we were reduced to a vote on the Travers 4 cent bill. I offered an amendment to strike out "four" and insert "three," in the Travers bill so as to secure, if possible, the cheapest plan for the people of Baltimore, having failed to get the plan of the parties whom I represented. That was defeated. On the final passage the previous question was perpetually moved on me, and I was perpetually gagged in the debates, as the journal will show, and I had no opportunity for explanation. When the bill was put upon its passage, my name being the last upon the roll, as I represented the 20th ward, when my name was called, I rose to explain the vote I was about to give, and I stated that while I abhorred the bill, and while I believed the interests of the people were to be sacrificed by that bill, and while I recognized the many defects in the bill, I would vote for it, inasmuch as I was reduced to a vote for that or nothing. Believing that the Mayor would see fit to veto the bill, I would still give to the people of Baltimore an earnest of my anxiety to secure to them their benefits, and I therefore voted for the bill. The Mayor vetoed it, as I thought he would do; and it came to us for action under his veto, and the engineer of this bill, Wood, as soon as the veto was read indicating what sort of bill the Mayor would approve, indicating