

This idea of antagonism is at the bottom of all our modern troubles. We have had antagonism and collision of State against State, and Baltimore city against the counties, and by and by we shall have county against county, election district against election district, and then will come school district against school district, until we shall have universal antagonism, and be a race of Ishmaelites, each man's hand against his neighbor. If we had the right to it, I should like to do some act which would set the seal of disapprobation upon this modern idea that my interests are naturally antagonistic to yours, and that my right necessarily involves the taking from you your right. There is no sound political economy, no stable government, no peace, no law, no order, no principle, nothing that men should prize, that can be safely based upon this idea of antagonism.

Baltimore city does not want to harm the counties, and I know the counties do not want to harm Baltimore city. I believe that if gentlemen will accept this gracious invitation they will find that Baltimore is not antagonistic to them. They will be as free there as here to express whatever thought is uppermost. I see nothing in the way of principle to be sacrificed by the removal, and I do believe the public good will be subserved by it. I for one, and I have no doubt that many gentlemen, will be able to serve the State of Maryland six days out of seven there; and here we could not serve it more than four. This removal does not at all involve the removal of the capital of the State. I should vote against that as heartily as any other gentleman; but I say that for the purposes of this Convention we shall do better there than here. For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote to go there.

Mr. MILLER: In order to bring the matter before the Convention more directly, I move the following as a substitute for the pending order:

*Ordered.* That this Convention, having received the invitation of the committee of the Mayor and City Councils of Baltimore to transfer our sessions to that city, we hereby express our grateful appreciation of that invitation, but most respectfully decline to accept the same.

Mr. MARBURY: I cordially endorse the substitute just offered. At the same time I desire to extend my thanks to the gentlemen from Baltimore city who have so courteously extended this invitation to the Convention. But, sir, on principle, on legal grounds, I must object to the acceptance of that invitation. The gentleman who last addressed this Convention has stated that the people of the State of Maryland did not have this matter under consideration when they sent us to this Convention. I beg leave very respectfully to differ with him on that subject. I consider the people of the State of Maryland as having exer-

cised their judgment on every subject that they voted upon. When they voted for or against a Convention, they looked at that bill as a whole and not in part; and finding in that bill that a place was appointed for holding the Convention, that was a part of the inducement to them to vote for or against the calling of the Convention. If it were not important, why put it in the bill? To illustrate the importance of having some such provision in the bill, had we assembled here to-day without any provision in the bill specifying any place where this Convention should be held, there might be a contest among members of the Convention to a much greater extent than there is as to what should be the place where this Convention should assemble. There might be gentlemen here from Frederick city contending that it would be more convenient to hold it in Frederick city; and even in the out-of-the-way county that I represent I do not know but that in the town of Upper Marlborough we might have found some inducements for bringing the Convention there.

I consider this as a very important provision in the bill; but I will not repeat the strong arguments which have been so ably presented by the gentleman from Anne Arundel (Mr. Miller.)

The gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands) said that there was an antagonism between the people, and that there seemed to be a spirit of antagonism arising between different sections of the State. For my part, I confess that I have no feeling of antagonism against any human being, or against any section of the State. The only desire that we have in our section is that we may have a full, fair, calm expression of public opinion upon all these questions. We want to have the Convention held in this place, under such circumstances as will best ensure to the people a fair expression of public opinion.

What are the arguments for going to Baltimore city? The gentleman says that expense and inconvenience can be saved by so doing. Who comes here at more expense, or at greater inconvenience, than the gentlemen who represent my portion of the State? At every hour of the day or night there are emissaries from some quarter or other who are ready to grab up a species of personal property in that section of the State. There are men at all times engaged in that work. It matters not to us, — it is a matter of no more personal inconvenience to us, to attend the Convention, from our section of the State, at one place than at another; because the damage which is being done to us can be done in a day as well as in a week. It is of no sort of consideration, as to personal expense or inconvenience to us.

I do not deny that this Convention may have the constitutional power, having assembled, to adjourn to any place they may