

two days in every week unless they make up their minds to abandon everything at home. It takes me just three days to make a round trip of some 80 miles. To get here on Monday morning, I must leave my home at Ellcott's Mills at 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon; go to Baltimore; lodge there over night; and come down here the next morning to attend to my duties. If I want to go home, I must go to Baltimore city; lay there over night, and then go up to Ellcott's Mills. The experience of a week has taught me that one of two things is almost a necessity. I must abandon my position here or at home.

Now I say that the public good is very often involved in the private individual interest. I can serve the State of Maryland six days out of seven in Baltimore city; but if we meet here, I may do my best, and unless I turn Sabbath-breaker, I cannot serve it more than four. I believe that if we remove to Baltimore the session will be shorter, and money will be saved to the State, for the reason that we shall be able to save the deliberations, and debates, and action of two days in the week; for those who pay the expenses of this Convention. The *per diem* is considerable, of course.

As to the precedents for removal, we have had some very remarkable precedents in late years. We have had the precedent of removing from Montgomery to Richmond; and it is thought by many people that General Grant contemplates another movement; so that we shall not lack for precedents.

In the third section of the bill under which we have met, I find this:

*And he is enacted,* That in case a majority of the ballots cast shall be in favor of the call of a Convention as aforesaid, then the said Convention shall meet at the city of Annapolis on the last Wednesday of April in the year 1864; and shall continue in session from day to day until the business for which said Convention shall have been assembled shall be fully completed and finished.

That we should continue here under all circumstances, against the interests of the members and against the interests of the body politic, was not even contemplated by those who framed this act and made it a law. If they had contemplated it, and desired it, if they had intended to strip us of all power to consult our own convenience and the public interest in this matter, how easy it would have been to insert the little words "in said city" thus:

"shall meet at the city of Annapolis on the last Wednesday of April, 1864, and shall continue in session in said city from day to day."

So far from there being any truth in the idea that the people expected us to continue here from day to day; even their representatives who made the law under which we meet had no such thing in contemplation. To

suppose that if they had they were so ignorant of the use of language as not to know how to effect their end is to suppose that legislative body to have been composed of a very dull set of gentlemen. If it had been the purpose of that Legislature to bind us here, I know there were legal gentlemen members of that body who would have known exactly how to put the fetters around us. I say that it was not contemplated. The very phraseology of the act makes that fact patent; for I repeat that to suppose the Legislature did not know enough to put in these little words "in said city," if that was their meaning, is to suppose them a very dull lot of gentlemen indeed. I know they were not dull. I know there were legal gentlemen among them of great acumen and ability; and if they had desired to keep us here it would have been provided for.

This is a matter then in which there is no law and no principle in the way. If it can be shown that we violate any principle or any law by going away, I will not vote to go. But if it cannot be shown that we are violating any principle, or doing anything upon a wrong principle, the whole matter refers itself back to the ground of the convenience of members and the facilities for the transaction of business. There it rests on those two grounds. Is it more convenient to the majority of the members of this body to meet in Baltimore than here? I think there could be scarcely two opinions about it—that it would be more convenient for us to meet in Baltimore. If that is so, if you settle the question that it is more convenient for the majority of the members to meet in Baltimore city than here, then I say we ought to move, unless you can make this other point that it will delay the proceedings of this body, and thereby entail upon the people of the State an undue amount of taxation to pay expenses. If you can make that point, then I will vote with you; for I will do nothing unnecessarily to encumber the State with taxation. But if, as I believe, not only will the convenience of members be subserved by removal, but the business of the body will be expedited, then what stands in the way of the acceptance of the generous and gracious invitation of our great commercial emporium? Nothing at all.

I am in great antagonism myself with the idea that there is a natural antagonism between Baltimore city and the people of the State. There is no such thing. Their interests are identical. Let our great city grow to its largest limits, and our State will feel the benefit of it. If more brick and mortar go up in Baltimore city, more grass and grain will grow in Howard county. The benefits are mutual. I would like, if we could do it, to do some act which should authoritatively express the opinion that there is no natural antagonism between any part of this State and the centre or any other part of the State.