

stigated the gentleman from Montgomery, that it was intended for the benefit of the counties. But, he denied that he ever introduced this matter of internal improvements. He was not responsible for it.

Mr. CHAMBERS interposed a remark, that although the gentleman from Baltimore had not addressed him, he gave him an expressive glance which could not be misunderstood. His friend from Montgomery needed no prompting from him. He has mentioned facts which he did not know before. The gentleman from Baltimore was alone responsible for this debate. The gentleman from Baltimore rises and tells us, that Baltimore has borne two-thirds of the whole taxation of the State, and this led to the discussion concerning which he appears so sensitive.

Mr. PRESSTMAN wished it to appear that when he referred to the auxiliary taxation, no one had risen to contradict him. Whatever collateral inferences might be deduced from his remarks, no one could say that he had introduced the subject of internal improvements. He would ask whether Col. Merrick, of Charles, had not introduced and carried through the legislature, the internal improvement act?

Mr. DAVIS resumed. The question propounded by the gentleman from Baltimore is one of these skilful manœuvres, which he so well understands, and which is intended to divert him, [Mr. D.,] from his purpose.

The gentleman from Charles is fully able take care of himself. He should not interfere between him and the gentleman from Baltimore. But he would have the gentleman from Baltimore to understand that he, and he alone, was responsible for his course in this Convention, and what he said in debate, and he held himself responsible for it. The gentleman insinuated that he was prompted.

Mr. PRESSTMAN said, he had certainly meant no personal offence by the remark.

Mr. DAVIS was glad of it. The gentleman had asked with point, if Baltimore had not paid two-thirds of the taxes of the State.

He, (Mr. D.,) asked, in return, what share Baltimore had contributed to create the necessity for these taxes? The gentleman answered, and this led to the discussion which followed. Mr. D. also read an extract from a report of the Board of President and Directors of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company, in which the completion of the canal is used as a measure necessary to the prosperity of the State and to the city of Baltimore.

He had only risen to show, in reference to this great work, this Serbonian bog, as it had been called, which had swallowed up so much of the resources of the State, and from which, according to the gentleman from Frederick and the gentleman from Anne Arundel, the State was never to derive any revenue, where the responsibility of these lost appropriations ought to rest, and having accomplished his object, he would conclude his remarks.

Mr. TUCK made a few remarks, which will appear hereafter.

Mr. HARBINE demanded the previous question. Mr. DORSEY took the floor, and requested the gentleman from Washington county, (Mr. Harbine,) to withdraw the demand, to enable him, (Mr. D.,) to say a few words.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, made a similar suggestion or enquiry.

Mr. HARBINE refused to withdraw, remarking, that if he did so, the debate would be interminable.

Mr. MERRICK now sent to the Clerk's table the amendment which he had indicated his intention to offer,

And which was as follows :

Strike out, in the second line, the word "inviolate," and insert "inviolable," and after the word "sufficient," in the fourth line, insert, "by its regular accumulations," and after the words "payment thereof," insert "by the time it becomes redeemable."

Mr. DORSEY enquired of the Chair, whether the demand for the previous question had been sustained? because, if it had not, he desired to state some facts which he knew were not in the possession of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT stated that the previous question had not been sustained. The question would be put so soon as the state of the question before the Convention had been ascertained.

The question, "is there a second to the demand for the previous question," was then taken, and the vote stood, ayes 32—noes 34.

So there was not a second.

Mr. DORSEY said he should not have said a single word on this subject if he had not thought it incumbent on him to define his position, and to warn the Convention against the dangerous suggestions of the gentlemen from Carroll and Frederick counties, that the next session of the Legislature was the time to commence the repeal of our taxes. These suggestions, Mr. President, have alarmed me and induce me to concur in the proposition of the gentleman from Worcester, as the best means of counteracting them. He thought the proposition of the member from Worcester would be better without the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Merrick.) Who, it is asked, is to judge of the sufficiency of the sinking fund? The Legislature only, are the exclusive judges thereof, and no judicial tribunal can inquire into the correctness of their decision. The proposition of the gentleman from Worcester is the true course for this State to pursue. The people at present pay their taxes without murmur or complaint; congratulating themselves that in the course of ten or twelve years, under the present financial system of the State, its credit and honor being fully redeemed, its entire public debt being fully paid or its payment, at the earliest period, which, by the terms of its creation was practicable, so provided for, that all public taxes or burdens should be discontinued and the State receiving an annual income of some hundred thousand dollars from its works of internal improvement, to be appropriated as it saw fit. He apprehended there was some misapprehension as to the powers of the Treasurer in the manage-