

and their common constituency. He would say to his colleague, that no impeachment of his motives was designed, but he was surprised that a subject having no connection with the issue, and to be decided by a different tribunal, had been introduced.

Mr. HARBINE replied, he was never aware that his colleague intended to impute anything wrong to him, but he did use the words "for effect elsewhere." He, [Mr H.,] still adhered to his former position, that all public officers ought to be elected by the people, and he maintained that was the sentiment of the voters of Washington county. Now if these commissioners were public officers, or were embraced in that term, and he understood the desire of his constituents to be to elect all such by the people, of course this class must be included. He was aware that in discussing that question, not all the various officers were specified, nor was this particular class, but it was certainly included in the general doctrine. Their functions and duties were too important to escape an election by the people, although his colleague said there were not twenty persons in Washington county, that knew any thing about the State's agents. Why there were more than that many agents and officeholders along the line of canal in the county, and they certainly knew to whom they were indirectly indebted for their places. The gentleman had made a great mistake. The people of Washington were too deeply interested in the future benefits to be derived from the public works, to be so profoundly ignorant in regard to the management of the State's interest in them. They have paid too much tax to know nothing about these matters. A board of public works had been spoken of by all parties. It had been advocated by at least one newspaper in Washington, nor should it be forgotten that it constituted a part of the platform of the late whig candidate for Governor, and that gentleman received three hundred of a majority in their county. Now all this went to show that public attention had been turned to this matter and that the gentleman had by far underrated the intelligence of his constituents on this question. Put the question to them, whether they would prefer electing the commissioners to the present system, and he did not doubt there would be a very general affirmative. They believed in the doctrine of the election of officers directly by, and their accountability to the people, else he was very much mistaken. How the gentleman came to introduce the question of representation into this discussion, he could not tell. It had nothing to do with the matter under consideration. He denied the right of any member of this body, to question his consistency, or accuse him of violating the will of his constituents on that or any other subject. That was no man's business but his own, and those who sent him here. With them he was willing to settle. Yes, upon that subject he was willing to go home with the gentleman and meet their common constituency. There was no fear with him that his course would not meet with their approval. But in thus attacking him, the gentleman had forgotten one thing relating to that subject, and had

given "the unkindest cut of all" to his whig colleagues who voted with him on that question.

Mr. GWINN rose to a point of order. When the gentleman from Washington, [Mr Schley,] had the floor, he had left the direct merits of the question before the Convention, to discuss the relative operation of the representation basis. Now that was not the subject before the Convention, and he, [Mr. G.,] therefore, called him to order.

Mr. MORGAN said, that heretofore it had been the practice of the Convention, whenever any proposition was before it, to permit the utmost latitude to the speaker occupying the floor.— There had been many things introduced in debate here, which were not germane to the subject under consideration; nevertheless they had been tolerated. But, in the present instance, a gentleman had given it as his opinion that such would be the operation of the proposed new regulation, for the election of State agents for the public works, that not one-third of the population of the State would turn out and vote for them. The remarks of the gentleman in his [Mr. Morgan's] opinion, were perfectly relevant.

Mr. HARBINE said he would confine his remarks to the question under consideration. He had been asked why not elect commissioners to vote the State stock in the banks, as well as internal improvement companies? Why not offer an amendment to that effect? The cases were not parallel. Our interests in the former, were not to be compared with our interests in the latter. But he was prepared for one, to invest the commissioners proposed to be elected, with the power to vote the State stock in the banks; nay, in all corporations of whatsoever nature or description. There was nothing wrong or inconsistent in that. These commissioners would just be as well qualified to name or vote for directors to represent the State in a bank, as they would be to vote for the officers to control the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. In either case he supposed they would be as competent as those now performing these duties. He was a firm believer in the election of these and all officers by the people. It was a fundamental principle in a republican form of government, and surely nothing anti-republican in its character or tendency, should find a place in our new Constitution.

Mr. DAVIS called for the reading of Mr. HOWARD'S proposition—which was not read.

After some conversation as to the order of proceeding between Mr. BROWN and Mr. HOWARD—

Mr. DAVIS proceeded to address the Convention:

He said the gentleman from Carroll, [Mr. Brown,] and the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Harbine,] had argued, and that with great earnestness, that it was the duty of the Convention to give everything to the people—that they should elect everything; bank directors included.

Mr. HARBINE. I don't say bank directors.

Mr. DAVIS. Why not?

Mr. HARBINE. His statement was simply this