

present mode of appointment to a joint ballot vote. From what source could they best derive power? Why, surely from the great body of the people. He went for popular elections in such cases, rather than joint ballot. For years we had been struggling to conquer the disposition to give appointing power to the Legislative branch of our Government. We first had joint ballot, and afterwards we gave to the people the power to elect the Governor. Now, one of the prime—the principle cause for calling this Convention, was to give the power to the people of electing public officers generally. As he had stated before, if you stripped the Governor of his patronage in other respects to return it to the people, why he [Mr. T.] would undertake to say, that there would be a hundred-fold more in taking this power from the Legislature, to return it to the people also. The whole appointing power of the Governor was not of more public moment than the appointing power of these agents who represented the State in those internal improvement companies. It was admitted that the Chesapeake and Ohio canal company was managed wholly in effect by these State's agents as they voted for the president and directors, since this State hold a majority of the stock.

Now, he would ask, could this Convention vote to transfer all this immense power any where but to the people? He agreed with the gentleman, that we should look very cautiously to see whether we should give it to the whole people, voting by a general ticket or by districts. He was in favor of districting.

He was opposed to the multiplication of officers, and in this case proposed to make no increase. Five agents were now authorized. He proposed four. He supposed that they ought to be allowed a sum sufficient to pay their expenses, which was what they now received. This board of commissioners, which he proposed to establish he did not intend, should be in attendance at all meetings of the President and Directors of these internal improvement companies, but should occasionally go there to vote for officers; and the chief question which ought to be considered by this Convention, was whether the stock held by the State, should be voted by the agents elected by the people, or chosen by the concurring vote of the two Houses of the Legislature. He was for the broad platform of the public will, and this could not be had from a Senate and House of Delegates, organized without proper reference to population. One word in reference to a note which had just been put into his hand. Some gentleman had done him the kindness to say in this note, that the bill did not provide for the appointment of the directors of the Susquehanna railroad company. He did not propose this, for the simple reason that the charter of that company did not give us the power to do it. We could not go beyond the charter requirements. We must conform to the charter. According to the charter of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad company, and the Susquehanna railroad company, the State was authorised to name a certain number of Directors in those companies respec-

tively. These directors are now appointed by the concurring vote of the Legislature.

He desired that some other gentleman, coming from that part of Maryland most interested in the management of these Rail Road companies, should submit a proposition—a separate and independent one on that subject. It might be a subsequent and independent clause inserted in the Constitution, or it might be moved as an amendment to the one now under consideration.

And, he trusted that the appointment of these directors also would be so provided for, as that they should be responsible not to one branch of the Legislature of Maryland, but to the people of all Maryland.

That was what we of the populous parts of the State came here to claim. We may struggle and not get it, but our constituents will ultimately have it. Represented as we are to be in the Senate by one member from each city and county without regard to population, it was not to be supposed that the appointment of these agents and directors by the Senate would be submitted to. This could not be expected.

Would gentlemen coming from the small counties agree that this great moneyed power—growing out of the management of these corporations, should be virtually left in the Senate alone? It is a great fundamental question at issue between the people and the Senate.

His proposition was one, he thought well devised to make the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company's Canal totally free from all control of a rival interest in the State. And, he was perfectly free to confess, that he thought the Rail Road interest ought not to have power to appoint the officers who were to have charge of the Canal. He wished to have the State of Maryland so districted and arranged that neither one nor the other interest—the Rail Road or the Canal interest—could crush the interest of the State by crippling, in a contest for supremacy, the prosperity of each other.

Mr. MERRICK made some remarks, which will be published hereafter.

Mr. CHAMBERS had intended to be an attentive listener, in the hope of receiving information on a subject which he did not profess to have studied. Quite unexpectedly he found himself personally involved in the consideration of the subject, and therefore he would say as much as was necessary to vindicate himself. When the gentleman from Frederick, [Mr. Thomas,] was elaborating his system of districting the State for the election of the board of public works, he enumerated amongst them one district for the Eastern Shore. In the belief, said Mr. C., that I was doing service to the gentleman, and making his measure more acceptable at the close of his expression, "the Eastern Shore," I said, in an under tone and for his ear, "and Harford." I supposed he would at once have said, "strike out Harford." My reason for this opinion was that the same thing had but just before occurred. When engaged on the Executive bill, the gentleman had a proposition for districts, of which one contained the Eastern Shore counties and Harford. A sugges-