

now have followed civil rights bills, and freedmen's bureau bills and reconstruction bills.

Messrs. Marbury and Jones spoke in favor of the section as reported by the committee.

Mr. Brown addressed the Convention in favor of the substitute.

Mr. Hayden opposed conferring the veto power on the Governor.

Mr. Rider advocated his substitute.

Mr. Groome argued that the section should be inserted in the legislative department.

Mr. Motter spoke in favor of and Mr. Syester against the veto power.

Mr. Stoddert said that the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Wickes) had stated that in the Convention of 1789 the veto principle had given rise to considerable discussion, but the gentleman was mistaken; there was no difference. That Convention had assigned as a reason for granting the veto power the bad laws that had been passed by the thirteen States. Everything since that time proved the wisdom and prudence of their action. The people have always sustained the Presidents in the exercise of this power. In the nineteen States where the veto power existed, there had never been a voice against it, and the experience of those States should be our example. The legislative branch at Washington had swallowed up all the power of the other branches.

He cared only for the protection of the people. The day might come when such assemblages as that lately held at Baltimore would obtain temporary control of the Legislature, and the veto power in the hands of an upright Governor might then save to us the little dignity we had left, and serve to protect the people. If the Governor vetoed a good law, it would go back to the great tribunal of public opinion. The veto power could not invade any other department of the government. No man would have the hardihood to face public opinion without he knew he was right. One man can be controlled by a sense of responsibility if he is a man of honor. But how different it is when this responsibility is divided among a