

members of the Legislature elected the State agents. Thus they were in the second degree from the people, and would any person tell him they felt their responsibility to as much as if elected directly by them?

Certainly not; for they were responsible to those who put them in power, and could say to the people we have nothing to do with you, *others put us here and we will answer to them.* Now we propose to bring these officers one degree nearer to the people, to elect them by, and make them responsible to the people, and could any person doubt the beneficial results of such a change from the present system? He thought not. It was too plain for doubt.

How was it in New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio? Did their legislatures elect their canal commissioners and board of public works? No, sir, the electors of the State made the selection. They practised the doctrine of direct responsibility to those most interested.

True it is, that we do not own any internal improvements, as they do, we only hold stock in them, but that in one company, at least, gave us the entire control, and did not effect the great principle he was discussing.

He would not have spoken were it not that he came from a section of the State deeply interested in this subject, and on that account it was proper that he should make known his views here. It was most judicious to adopt the proposition of the gentleman from Frederick, and wherever circumstances would permit, elect all officers by the people.

Mr. BROWN said:

If the gentleman from Frederick, [Mr. Thomas,] was in bisseat he would not have had a single word to say, nor occasion to allude to what was said by the gentleman from Washington. It, therefore, in some degree, devolved upon him to take care of that measure. When he accepted the nomination for a seat in this Convention, he set forth his views in a communication, which he published in a newspaper in Carroll county, on the subject of Constitutional reform, and mentioned, at the same time, orphans courts, and designated many of the changes and next features that ought to be introduced in the new Constitution.

Mr. HOWARD asked the gentleman from Carroll to give way for one moment?

Mr. BROWN bowed assent—when

Mr. HOWARD said:

That with the permission of the gentleman from Carroll, who had kindly yielded him the floor, for a moment, he begged leave to submit an amendment which he thought might meet the views of gentlemen all round.

He moved to amend the substitute by inserting after the word "stockholders," in the fifth line of first paragraph, the following:

"And shall appoint the directors in every rail road or canal company in which the State has the power to appoint directors; it shall also be the duty of this Board to review from time to time, the rate of tolls adopted by any company, and use all legal powers which it may possess, to obtain

the establishment of a rate which may prevent an injurious competition with each other to the detriment of the interests of the treasury of the State, and report their acts annually to the legislature."

The PRESIDENT. The amendment cannot now be received. It will go upon the journal, and be received when in order.

Mr. BROWN continued. He was about to say he was committed to the people of his county, in the late canvass for delegates to this Convention, through the medium of the public prints, in which, as he had already stated, he had published his views about constitutional reform. He had also committed himself in the same communication to vote to give the people the election of all officers, that hold offices of such importance as to justify it, or that could be elected without too much inconvenience to the people. He, therefore, was in favor of the proposition of the gentleman from Frederick. Now, the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Schley,] who first addressed the Convention, and whom he did not see in his seat, took exception to language which was absolutely not in the report itself. It was not called a "board of public works." It was the substitute for the printed bill that contained that language.

Mr. SCHLEY explained, that the language which he had cited was contained in a resolution in relation to the public works.

Mr. BROWN then read the resolution and proceeded by saying that the argument, as far as the language of the report was concerned, was not applicable. The heading, as thus expressed, would not be inserted in the Constitution—that only which was on the journal would find a place there. He was in favor of the proposition for another reason, and which to his mind, was very conclusive on the subject. He did not want to leave any patronage whatever in the hands of the Legislature—none—not in the smallest degree, nor did he desire to leave any power to the Legislature to amend the Constitution, or by the exercise of any particular legislation, or action, to effect a change in the relative political power of the State. He was opposed to any patronage whatever, beyond that which belongs to the presiding officers of both branches of the Legislature, as in his opinion, it would have a corrupting and baleful tendency. And another reason he had, was that the exercise of it would consume their time. They were to hold a session once only in two years, and he wanted their time to be wholly devoted to making laws, and let the people exercise all the power they could conveniently to themselves. There was another reason conclusive to his mind. The people were parties in interest, and they could exercise the power as easily as the Legislature. They were the taxpayers, and they had a right to the power. The gentleman from Washington ran a parallel between the case of the President and Vice President of the United States and those men—he meant the board of directors of the public works—and in relation to the electors of the two official persons he had named. Now the people who elected them, would take good care to learn