

subscriptions to an amount, which, with the State's subscription, would be adequate to the completion of a costly work of internal improvement, it must be assumed that the Legislature expected that the private subscribers should be men of reasonable ability in fortunes or credit, to pay for the stock subscribed by them, and it is right that some officer of the State should be clothed with the responsible office of enquiring into, and determining such sufficiency.

The undersigned dissents entirely from the suggestions made by the majority, in regard to the propriety of withholding from the view of the house, the evidence which the committee have collected in reference to the condition of the affairs of the Maryland Canal Company. Every committee who have been charged by the house with the duty of collecting evidence in relation to matters of general concern, are bound to report the evidence which may have been collected. And it is the privilege of the house itself, to determine whether it is expedient that the testimony so taken, should be published or suppressed.

If the rule of Parliamentary law was less strict, the undersigned would still believe that the peculiar character of the enquiry which was confided to the committee, and the peculiar circumstances under which their examinations were conducted, required of the committee a full, particular and minute account of all their proceedings, and an expression of their opinions upon every important question which was agitated before them. The order of the house, under which your committee acted, has been denounced as unconstitutional, and great pains have been taken to mislead the public into the belief, that the committee have exercised their powers with unexampled harshness.

A plain narration of the proceedings of the committee, would have put at rest these most groundless imputations, and in the opinion of the undersigned, it ought to have been given as an act of duty to the house, and in deference to the public opinion.

The majority propose to retain the evidence in their possession, upon the ground of its incompleteness. The accuracy of this position depends upon the view which may be taken of the character of the enquiry, and the relevancy of the evidence taken, and proposed to be taken to the questions involved in the enquiry. In the opinion of the undersigned, the evidence is complete for all practical purposes. But if incomplete, why was it not perfected? This is a question which very naturally arises. It is not answered by the report of the majority. For the resolutions of the house, which are supposed to have suspended the action of the committee were not passed until more than two months had elapsed from the date of the order instituting the enquiry.

How were the committee employed during these two months?— This might have been explained by a more particular account of the proceedings of the committee and of the measures adopted from time to time to collect all useful information. The undersigned will not trouble the house with a long detail of particulars which might have