E R Cooper

...ER COUNTY
...ICAL SOCIETY

EDITED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
TUESDAY MORNING,
By George W. Sherwood.

TERMS:—Two dollars and fifty cents per annum payable within the year. No subscription will be discontinued until all arrerages are settled, without the approbation of the publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding a square inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion larger ones in the same proportion.

☞All communications to insure attention, should be post paid if sent by mail.

☞Postmasters will please give us prompt notice of any refusal to take the paper from their office.

Easton Star.

DEVOTED TO POLITICS, GENERAL NEWS, ADVERTISING, ETC.

Volume 4.—No. 15. EASTON, MD.—TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1844. Whole No. 171.

POET'S CORNER.

SONG OF THE HAYMAKERS.

BY ELIZA COOK.

The noontide is hot and our foreheads are brown,
Our palms are all shining and hard;
Right close is our work with the win and the fork,
And but poor is our daily reward,
But there's joy in the sunshine, and mirth in the lark,
That skims whistling away over head;
Our spirits are light, though our skins may be dark,
And there's peace with our meal of brown bread.
We dwell in the meadow, we toil on the sod,
Far away from the city's dull gloom;
And more jolly are we, though in rags we may be,
Than the pale face over the loom.
Then a song and a cheer for the bonnie green stack
Climbing up to the sun wide and high;
For the pitchers, and rakers, and merry hay-makers,
And the beautiful Midsummer sky.

Come forth, gentle ladies—come forth, dainty sirs,
And lend us your presence awhile;
Your garment will gather no stain from the burs,
And a freckle won't tarnish your smile.
Our carpet's more soft for your delicate feet
Than the pile of your velveted floor;
And the air of our balm swarth is surely as sweet
As the perfumes of Araby's score.
Come forth, noble masters, come forth to the field,
Where freshness and health may be found;
Where the first wind-rows are spread for the butterfly's bed,
And the clover-bloom falleth around.
Then a song and a cheer for the bonnie green stack,
Climbing up to the sun wide and high;
For the pitchers, and rakers, and merry hay-makers,
And the beautiful Midsummer sky.

"Hold fast!" cries the wagoner, loudly and quick,
And then comes the hearty "Gee-wo!"
While the cunning old team-horses manage to pick
A sweet mouthful to munch as they go.
The tawny-faced children come round us to play,
And bravely they scatter the heap;
Till the tiniest one, all outspent with the fun,
Is curled up with the sheep-dog, asleep.
Old age sitteth on the hay-cock's fair crown,
At the close of our laboring day;
And wishes his life, like the grass at his feet,
May be pure as its "passing away."
Then a song and a cheer for the bonnie green stack,
Climbing up to the sun wide and high;
For the pitchers, and rakers, and merry hay-makers,
And the beautiful Midsummer sky.

STATE POLITICS.

THOMAS G. PRATT

Opposed to giving the People the right of electing their own Governor and Senators, as proven by the public records of the State and his own printed speeches.

We cannot conceive why Mr. Pratt was made the candidate of the Whigs for the office of Governor of this State, unless it was to make an effort to obtain from the people, through the agency of the Presidential excitement, a verdict against their right to chose their own rulers. In nominating this gentleman the Whig leaders have overlooked the claims of all their distinguished men, in order to reward with the highest office in our State the man who above all others, has manifested the greatest hostility to the supremacy of the people. By reference to the annexed proceedings of the House of Delegates, it will be seen that Mr. PRATT contended against the principles of Reform from the first day he took his seat in the Legislature, at Dec. session, 1832, up to the day he retired from the Senate in 1842. He fought against every change in the old rotten borough Constitution of this State, *step by step*, without faltering or flinching, and when he discovered he could not make "*steps*," in his determined war upon those changes demanded by the people in their memorials and through their public meetings and conventions, he was content to fight against them *inch by inch!*

When WM. COST JOHNSON—a member of his own party, and to his credit be it said, he was always a thorough-going Conventional Reformer—introduced his resolutions for calling a Convention to reform the Constitution, and leaving it to the people themselves to decide what changes they desired, Mr. PRATT exerted every effort to defeat so fair a proposition, and with the aid of others who followed his lead, did defeat it. At the next session of the Legislature, when Mr. PALMER introduced his bill to reform the Constitution by two successive enactments of the Legislature—the favorite plan of the Whigs when they were compelled to take their choice—we find Mr. PRATT "staving off" action on the bill as long as he could, and in the end rallying all his forces to defeat it. The same session we find him recording his vote against the bill introduced by Mr. FASSITT of Worcester, to give each county in the State and the city of Baltimore, one Senator *to be elected immediately by the people*, thus showing at every stage of the proceedings on the subject of Reform, what anxious determination he exhibited to defeat every meesure proposed to effect a change in our old aristocratic Constitution.

At the session of 1834, when a bill was introduced before the House of Delegates to increase the delegates to FOUR instead of *two*, we find Mr. PRATT amending the bill so as to read thus—"*the same to be referred to the voters of the State*—☞EXCLUDING THOSE OF BALTIMORE CITY." Thus we find this Whig candidate for Governor attempting to drive the people of Baltimore "out of the pale of our communion," and in fact to BASTARDIZE ALL HER CITIZENS! Upon that devoted city, whose brave and gallant sons so nobly maintained the honor of their country during the last war, and drove the ruthless invaders from her neighborhood, Mr. PRATT seemed to concentrate his most deadly fury. HE, by this most odious and unjust amendment, pronounced the people of Baltimore to be unworthy of political association with the people of the counties, just as he pronounced them worthy of punishment by means of an "indemnity bill," because the great losses by one of her banks, impelled a portion of her citizens to seek that satisfaction which our defective laws denied them. Inasmuch as he calls this latter act his "PROUDEST TROPHY," we may infer that he considers his proscription of the voters of that city by means of this most obnoxious amendment as an act too GLORIOUS to be effaced from his recollection.—But as *he* has sought "to lay violent hands" upon the people of Baltimore in these several ways, we hope that they will return the *compliment* on the first Wednesday in October next, by casting several thousand majority of votes against him.

When the next session of the Legislature rolled round—we mean the session of 1835—and when Mr. PRATT had grown a year older, and probably a year wiser, we find Messrs. Elias Brown, Cornelius McLean and Stephen Boyd making another effort to reform the Constitution in three different propositions. What course did Mr. Pratt pursue then? Did he coolly and deliberately think upon the various memorials which has been transmitted to the Legislature by a justly complaining people, and make up his mind *to yield to their prayers!* Far from it! That opposition to Reform which he manifested four years previous, seemed to have "grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength," because we find him voting against all proposed changes at the session of '35, with the same earnestness and eagerness that he did in the opening of the Reform campaign in 1832. After aiding to defeat all these measures of Reform when a member of the House of Delegates we find him in the fall of '36, elected as one of the Senatorial electors, and in 1838 as a member of the new Senate from Prince George's.

His history as a member of the electoral college of 1836, and as a member of the Senate from 1838 to 1842, is distinguished for that malevolence against the Reform party, which he could neither avoid disclosing in his private conversations nor in his Senatorial debates. When the "nineteen" demanded of the "twenty one," a pledge to elect a majority of Reform Senators before they would consent to go into the electoral college, Mr. PRATT is said to have threatned them with a *hempen collar* instead of Reform, and took a bold and decided stand against yielding a single inch of ground to the great reform party of the State. But inasmuch as the "nineteen" proved themselves to be made of that "STERN STUFF" which was the peculiar characteristic of their Revolutionary sires, Mr. PRATT and his colleagues after a two months' resistance, partially acceded to the demands of the "nineteen" from a well grounded *fear* that a longer resistance might ultimately place him in the attitude of the Tories of the Revolution, who so strenuously resisted that change in "Constitution and Government" sought after by the Immortal Patriots of that day. But subsequent events have proved that although Mr. Pratt *apparently* acquiesced in the pledge of his anti-reform colleagues, he did it with the *bitterest malice rankling in his heart* against every prominent advocate of Reform.

Our authority for making this charge against him is in his declaration on the floor of the Senate, never to vote for confirming any man's appointment to office who had any connection with what is termed the "revolutionary movement of the nineteen."—Why, then, we would ask was this persevering, unchanging and unrelenting opponent of favoring the people with the choice of their Governor and Senators, *foisted* upon his party to the exclusion of more tolerant and deserving politicians? It looks to us as if it was done to say unto the people of Maryland, "*You would not be content with your old rotten-borough Constitution, and elected your "glorious nineteen" to tear it to pieces and frame another—now we (the Whigs) will revenge ourselves upon you by electing the strongest opponent of Reform to rule over you, and apply the lash of correction to your backs!*" No greater insult could be offered to the people of Maryland than this nomination of Mr. Pratt—this searching the southern Gubernatorial District, and selecting the greatest enemy to the *people's right to rule*, to be found—for the office of Chief Magistrate of the State; and we cannot but persuade ourselves that THE PEOPLE—*the entire people of the State*, from the remotest end of Allegany to the farthest point of Worcester—will rise up and resent the insult, by giving him just such a terrible defeat as his opposition to *them* demands at their hands!

As we do not belong to that class of men who deal only in bold assertion and idle declaration, and as we never "extenuate, nor set down aught in malice," we annex hereunto the votes and proceedings of the House of Delegates on several reform bills that were introduced sundry times, in order that the PROOF may accompany every statement we make. If it be true, as the Whig editors say that "the votes and records cannot LIE," then we have Mr. Thomas G. Pratt fairly and fully exhibited to the whole people of the State, in the character of a legislator declaring by his votes and acts, that they are *unworthy* to be trusted with the choice of their own rulers! The time has been when a man who thus *practiced* the British doctrine that the people were "incapable of self-government," would be saluted with the indignant *frowns and hissings* of a patriotic people instead of receiving their votes, and we feel assured that, if the citizens of Maryland are not "degenerate sons of worthy sires," they will visit Mr. Pratt with their severest displeasure by proclaiming JAMES CARROLL their Governor by a triumphant majority. To all Whigs who are anxious to learn the truth and act accordingly, we say, look at the annexed proceedings of the House of Delegates—read the fair propositions of Messrs. Johnson, Palmer and others—see Mr. PRATT recording his vote against every attempt to Reform, and then resolve to vote against him yourselves, and to use every exertion to induce other Whigs to follow your example.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES,
March 9th, 1833.

Mr. Johnson, Chairman of the committee on the Constitution, delivered the following report:

The committee on the Constitution, to whom were referred *the numerous memorials and petitions from different parts of the State*, and of the Reform Convention which recently assembled in Baltimore city, suggesting and recommending that the Constitution ought to be changed in many particulars, and that a convention should be called for that purpose, had the same under consideration, and after bestowing upon the subject that attention which *its importance* demands, beg leave by way of report, to submit the following resolutions:

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That a majority of the people of this State are dissatisfied with many of the features of the preset Constitution, which they deem at war with republican principles.

Resolved, That the Declaration of Rights recognises and asserts "that all government of right originates from the people, is founded in compact only, and instituted solely for the good of the whole; that the people of this State ought to have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof."

Resolved, That the principles thus broadly set forth by the framers of our Constitution, of the right of the people to remodel their organic law, whenever they deem such action necessary, are the true principles of republican government; for the "authority of constitutions over governments, and of the sovereignty of the people over constitutions," are principles too dearly bought by our ancestors, and too firmly engrafted in the hearts of the people to be ever surrendered.

Resolved, That experience having shewn that the mode presented for altering and amending the Constitution, by two successive legislative enactments, is ineffectual for the purpose of giving to our form of government all those republican features which public sentiment desire, and it being proper to take a fair expression of the sense of this State on a subject of such deep concernment to their rights, their welfare and happiness—therefore,

Resolved, by the authority aforesaid, that at the annual election to be held on the first Monday of October next, the judges of each election district or ward in the State, shall ask each qualified voter, when he deposites his ballot for members of Congress, delegates to the Legislature, or for sheriffs; whether he is in favor of a convention for altering the Constitution, or whether he is opposed to a Convention for that purpose; and the clerk shall keep two separate columns; on one side he shall register these votes which are for a convention, and on the other those opposed to a convention, and the judges shall make returns thereof, as is usual in cases of elections, and under like penalties.

Resolved, That should a majority of the people of this State, be found to be in favor of a convention, then the next Legislature which shall assemble thereafter, shall divide the State into districts of convenient size, containing as nearly as may be, an equal number of white inhabitants, without dividing a county; and to each district shall be assigned an equal number of delegates.

Resolved, That as soon as the said districts shall be arranged, and the number shall be designated by law the Governor shall issue his proclamation, to be accompanied by the law requiring the voters to assemble in their respective districts, to elect delegates to a convention to be held at such convenient time and place as may be fixed by law, for the purpose of making a Constitution and form of Government to be submitted to the people of Maryland for ther ratification or rejection.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
WILLIAM COST JOHNSON, Ch'n.
CHARLES CARROLL HARPER,
SAMUEL SUTTON,
JOSEPH HOLLMAN,
JAMES TURNER.

[*See Journal of House*, pages 499, 500 and 501.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES,
March 20th, 1833.

The above report and resolutions being called up for consideration, the question was then put on concurring in the report and assenting to the resolutions therein contained, it was determined in the negative.

On motion by Mr. Jenkins, the yeas and nays were ordered and appeared as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Turner, Ely, Worthington, Holmes, G. A. Thomas, Evans, L. Thomas, Johnson, Unkefer, Hammond, Johns, Sutton, Hope, Jenkins, Harper, Mann, Hollman, Grove, Weast, White, Lantz, Louthan—22.

Negative.—Messrs. Thomas, Harris, Chandler, Heard, Hayne, Wickes, Garreston, Burgess, Duvall of A. A., Jones, Nichols, Gantt, Wright of Dor., Duvall of P. G., ☞PRATT☜ Brewer, Hobbs, Roberts, Cottman, Billingsly, Somerville, Morsell, Merrick, Rogerson, Stevens, Mulliken, Mudd, Dudley, Bruff, Teakle, Wright of Q. A., Larrimore, Burke, Millbourne, Powell, Carter, Charles, Forwood, Harding, Willson, Gittings—41.

[*See Journal of the House*, pages 606 and 607.]

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.
February 21st, 1834.

The hour having arrived for taking up the orders of the day, the house proceeded to take up for consideration the bill reported by Mr. PALMER from the committee on the Constitution entitled "*an act to alter and amend the Constitution of this State*," being the first order of the day.

When on motion of Mr. PRATT the same was *postponed*.

[*See Journal of the House*, page 348.]

March 14th, 1834.

The hour having arrived for again taking up the above bill reported by Mr. PALMER

Mr. Franklin Smith [in order the more certainly to defeat the bill.—ED. H.] moved to refer the said bill to the consideration of the people of this State on the first Monday of October next.

Mr. Scott called for the previous question, and being demanded by a majority of the members present, the said previous question was put, viz—"shall the previous question be now put," and it was resolved in the affirmative.

The question was then put, on the motion of F. Smith, to refer said bill to the consideration of the people of this State on the first Monday of October next, and it was resolved in the affirmative.

On motion of Mr. Burchenal, the yeas and nays were ordered and appeared as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Wright, Spencer, Heard, Sothoron, Blackistone, Hayne, Gale, Linthicum, F. Wailes, M. T. Smith, Merrick, Hawkins, Miller of Charles, Bruff, Griffith, McNamara, Day, Wright of Dor., Nicols, Scott, Gantt, ☞PRATT☜ Brewer, Larrimore, Burgess, Dale, Charles, Carter of Caroline, Burchenal, Dudley, Jones of Somerset, Long, Handy, Hyland, White, Gaither, Ridgely, Lantz—39.

Negative.—Messrs. Miller of Kent, Snowden, Hurtt, Price, Hillen, Carroll, Ely, Horney, Spencer, Evans, Knight, Maffitt, Roberts, Fassit, Purnell, Schley, Unkefer, Palmer, Sifford, Johns, Sutton, Moores, Nelson, Fountain, Jones of B., Peregoy, Mann, Wharton, Humrichouse, Willson—31.

So it was resolved in the affirmative—and the bill was thus *defeated* by this reference.

See Journal of the House, pages 542 and 543.]

On the same day, March 14th, 1843, the house proceeded to consider the bill reported by Mr. FASSITT, entitled, "an act, to abolish all such parts of the Constitution and form of government as relates to the time and manner of electing the Senate, and the mode of filling up vacancies in that body, so that each county and the city of Baltimore may have a Senator, *to be immediately elected by the people*," being the second order of the day.

Mr. Blackistone moved an indefinite postponement of said bill, and on the question being put, it was determined in the negative.

Mr. Burchenal moved to amend the said bill by inserting at the end of 7th section, the following:

And be it further enacted, That the per diem of the members of this Legislature, after the adoption of this act, shall be three dollars only, which having been read, the speaker decided the same not to be in order.

The said bill having been read the second time, Mr. Evans called for the previous question, and being demanded by a majority of the members present, the said previous question was put, and the yeas and nays appeared as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Heard, Miller of Kent, F. Smith, Hurtt, Linthicum, M. F. Smith, Lavielle, Wailes, Hawkins, Merrick, Miller of C., Price, Hillen, Ely, Carroll, Bruff, Horney, Dudley, Spencer, Jones of Somerset, Long, Hyland, Griffith, Nicols, Evans, Maffitt, Knight, Day, Scott, Gantt, Roberts, Larrimore, Burgess, Fassitt, Dale, Purnell, Johns, Sutton, Moores, Nelson, Charles, Carter of Caroline, Fountain, Jones of Baltimore, Peregoy, Mann, Wharton, Grove, Humrichouse, Willson, Bruce, Ridgely, Lantz—53.

Negative.—Mess. Wright, Speaker, Blackistone, Gale, Hayne, MacNamara, Snowden, Handy, Wright of Dor. ☞PRATT☜ Brewer, Unkefer, Palmer, Schley, Sifford, Burchenal, Gaither, White—17. So the bill was passed.

[*See Journal of the House*, pages 543 and 544.

MARYLAND LEGISLATURE.
December session, 1835

By reference to the proceedings of the House of Delegates at this session, pages 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366 and 367, it will be seen that THOMAS G. PRATT voted against each of the propositions submitted to that body for so changing the Constitution of this State as to give THE PEOPLE the privilege of electing the Governor and Senators, by *Cornelius McLean, Elias Brown, & Stephen Boyd* of Harford. These propositions were substitutes offered by those gentlemen for the report of the select committee of the House *against* the changes that were demanded by the people in their petitions to the General Assembly. Mr. PRATT sustained the *anti-reform* report throughout, and voted in every instance against a reform of the Constitution no matter in what shape it was presented.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.
March 5th, 1835.

On motion of Mr. Cushing, the House took up for consideration the bill reported by him, entitled, an act to alter and amend the Constitution and form of Government. [To give Baltimore city 4 delegates—ED. H.]

On motion of Mr. Pratt, said bill was amended by adding at the end thereof, the following—"Provided that this law shall be published for 3 months before the first Monday in October next, and provided also that the same shall be submitted to the voters of the several counties of the State, OUT OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE, at their next October elections."

[*See Journal of the House, December session* 1834 page 414.]

March 6th, 1835.

The bill reported by Mr. Kirby, entitled, an act to alter the Constitution of this State, as to the time and manner of electing the Senate, and the mode of filling up vacancies in that body, was taken up for consideration. [This was to give the election of Senators to the people.]

This bill, after ineffectual attempts to amend it, was passed by a vote of 63 yeas to 6 nays—*Pratt* voting in the pitiful minority of six *against the bill*.

[*See Journal of the House, March 6th*, 1835, pages 425 and 426.]

On pages 563 and 564 of the same journal, it will also be seen, that when a similar bill was reported by *Doctor Berry of Allegany*, Mr. PRATT immediately rose and moved to strike out the enacting clause; and being defeated in that, then moved to refer it to the consideration of the next General Assembly, which motion was also negatived.—On taking the vote on *Mr. Berry's* bill, Mr. PRATT WAS FOUND VOTING AGAINST IT, *making six different times he had aided in* STRANGLING REFORM during a single session of the Legislature!! If any man here or elsewhere will deny the correctness of these statements, we are ready to confront him and *put him to shame*, with the votes and proceedings in each case—they being omitted at this time only for want of room. We have given the *time when* and the *place where* the Whig candidate for our suffrage so vehemently and perseveringly opposed the right of the people to choose their own rulers, and those who are disposed to doubt the correctness of what is stated above, are requested to hunt up the documents and examine for themselves.

The Annapolis Republican makes a lame attempt to excuse Mr. Pratt, by saying the above efforts at reform were "*got up by* LILLIPUTIAN, EPHEMERAL POLITICIANS," and that they were "*crude, half-formed, insufficient measures.*" Now we will ventue to say, that though the editors and stump speakers of the Whig party may "*cut, shuffle and deal*" with the facility and skill of their candidate himself, it will be a difficult matter for them to persuade their own party to believe that such men as WILLIAM COST JOHNSON, DOCTOR WILSON and a few other Whigs who united in the reform movement, are '*lilliputian ephemeral politicians*,' or that Mr. JOHNSON's proposed call for a convention, was a "half-formed, insufficient measure." Those who attempt to relieve Mr. Pratt from the charge of being *always against Reform* by stigmatizing WILLIAM COST JOHNSON and other Whigs as "lilliputian, ephemeral politicians," and their strong measures as "insufficient" to effect the objects contemplated, may soon be expected to deny that Mr. Pratt was ever a member of the House of Delegates.

It so happens, however, that we have not to depend entirely on the votes and records to prove Mr. Pratt to be against Reform *first*—against Reform *last*, and against Reform *all the time*. Luckily we have a speech of his before us, in which he endorses every word we have said against him, and with his own hand brands on his forehead the words—"no Reform and no Government of the people!" It is plain, pointed and frank, and of that character which will not *suffer* his friends to make any apology for him. He declared himself to be so opposed to Reform in "conscience and principle," that, if he had thought the creation of *Carroll county* was not the "very best means of resisting the progress of Reform," he would have "*opposed*" the erection of that county. If there are any Reform Whigs now in this State, and may have any doubts about Mr. Pratt's constant opposition to Reform, let them read his own words, and doubt no longer.

Extract from a speech of Thos. G. Pratt of Prince George's, in reply to his colleague, Dr. Benjamin Day, on the bill reported by Mr. Jones of Baltimore, for increasing the delegation of that city to four members; to be found in the Maryland Republican, Tuesday, March 11th, 1834.

"Sir, I have been at least consistent on this question. I am from conscience opposed to Reform, and met the gentleman before the people of our county on that very ground. I told the people that, in my judgment, if they were opposed to Reform, they ought not to trust the question to a person who, though he promised to obey their instructions, yet avowed himself in principle in favor of Reform.—Since we have come here, as the members of this House very well know, I have opposed every Reform measure. Could I have been persuaded that the erection of Carroll county was a reform measure, I should have "opposed it,—on the contrary, I believed it to be the very best means of resisting the progress of Reform. I shall vote against the bill now under consideration, on the ground that it is a Reform measure. The difference between the gentleman and myself, is that he votes against it and speaks against it too, though he believes it to be right—and I vote against it because I believe it to be wrong. He votes contrary to his real principles, and I vote according to my principles."

But a few days after the speech, of which the above is an extract, was delivered by Mr. Pratt, Jeremiah Hughes Esq., editor of the Maryland Republican, in publishing Mr. Sothoron's speech on the Carroll county bill, designated said bill "as a test question of Reform." Mr. Pratt not being willing to be even *suspected* of giving the least possible countenance to the Reform party, immediately addressed Mr. Hughes the following letter:

HOUSE OF DELEGATES, MD.
March 15th, 1834

MR. HUGHES:—We have observed in your paper of this morning, the report of a speech delivered by Mr. Sothoron, on the bill for creating Carroll county, which you say was *considered the test question of Reform*;—which speech is *against reform and against the new* county. Being yourself in the House during that debate, you must recollect that each of us supported that bill *as an anti-reform measure*, and that it was *opposed by the whole Baltimore county delegation*. Your assertion that it was considered a *test question of reform*, would place us among the reformers; which we take the liberty of protesting against. How far the Baltimore county delegation will feel gratified by having their *anti-reform* principles tested by their opposition to the new county, we know not.

Respectfully yours, &c.
THOMAS G. PRATT.
BENEDICT I. HEARD.
JOHN A. CARTER.*

[*See Maryland Republican March 18th*, 1834.]

We next find Mr. Pratt arrayed against a report made by John H. Carroll, esq. of Baltimore county—a liberal-minded Whig, and we suppose the Annapolis Republican will also stigmatize him as an "ephemeral, lilliputian politician." This report, like that of William Cost Johnson made in 1833, advocated the call of a Convention to reform the Constitution so as to elect the Governor and Senators *immediately by the people*, and to establish representation according to population—the city of Baltimore not to have more delegates than the largest county. In the course of a long debate on this interesting republican report, Mr. Pratt made several speeches, and in one of them denounced such a Government as Mr. Carroll contended for, as "THE VERIEST OF ALL DESPOTISMS." This shows what a peculiar HORROR he entertained towards a "government of the people," and should subject him to the eternal scorn of every advocate of the people's rights. In proof of what he said, we introduce *his own words* as we find them reported in the Maryland Republican of Jan. 30, 1836, which, at the close of his speech, read as follows:

☞"I now warn gentlemen *on the Reform side of the question*, and especially my friend from Baltimore county, to be prepared and post himself well on constitutional authorities, for I feel strong in the confidence of showing that a government such as his bill proposes, would be ONE OF THE VERIEST OF ALL DESPOTISMS, and that his project would result in scattering the Constitution left us by our forefathers to the four winds of Heaven."

[*See file of Maryland Republican for* 1836.]

In reflecting upon Mr. Pratt's unyielding opposition to the principles of Reform, we wish the people to bear in mind that a denial to them of the precious privilege of voting for their own Governor and Senators, was not the only wrong they were compelled to endure. As we have said before, it was under that old Constitution which he labored so hard to preserve in all its defects and inequalities, that the present heavy and ruinous debt of the State was contracted, and it is due to the nineteen and other prominent champions of Reform to say, that the creation of that debt was one of the chief incentives to their decided and energetic movements to accomplish it. Could they have overcome the opposition of Mr. Pratt and others *several years before*, and secured the Reform asked for by Messrs. Johnson and Palmer, we are confidently assured that the "eight million bill" would never have passed, and no tax gatherers would now be annoying us with their State tax bills.

*(Since that time Mr. John A. Carter became convinced of his errors, abandoned the Whigs, and sustained the "glorious nineteen," against Pratt and his colleagues of the refractory "twenty one."—*Ed. Herald.*)

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc6044_1_93-0001.jpg