

to report upon this thirty-ninth section, and not touch any other part of the report.

Mr. CUSHING. Did I say anything about the rest of the report?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. CUSHING. I did not.

Mr. PETER. Far be it from me, as one of the opposition, or minority, in this house, to waste time. I would be unwilling that this whole report should be gone over again. I should be even unwilling that it should be referred to a committee again if they were to spend any time over the rest of the report. I am simply in favor of having this section referred to some committee in order that they may fully investigate it and ascertain what will be the true interest of the State of Maryland in this matter.

I did not know when we assembled as a convention that we were limited as to the matter of time. We were sent here, or at least I conceived we were sent here, to frame a constitution for the best interests of the State and of the people, and whether it takes us three months, or six months, or twelve months, it is our duty to do the best, as far as our ability goes—to frame such a constitution as will advance the wealth and prosperity of our State and of its people. But some of the majority of this house are continually urging upon the convention that we are consuming and wasting time. Better waste time than destroy the State; better waste a little time here than destroy or lose the great public works, a burden which these people have borne for years in the shape of heavy taxes. Now that they are free from that taxation, it is better to spend some time than that we should barter these works away for nothing, and destroy that for which the people have suffered years and years of taxation. We better consume three months on this article and save these great works, than to spend one day only and lose what we have worked and toiled for as a people for twenty or thirty years. Therefore I can see no reason why gentlemen are urging this matter through so hurriedly; why they should be continually talking about wasting time.

This is a matter on which we can differ as politicians. Fortunately for this body the negro is out of this question. We are all equally interested in it, and I presume that upon this subject, at least, we stand here divided upon no party lines. Each and every one of us, I take it for granted, are here seeking the best interests of the State; seek to do that which shall advance this State in her wealth—advance all the different portions of the State so far as they are interested in these public works. I admit that this great canal has involved a debt which has been onerous to the people of this State, and especially, I might say, as some gentlemen have privately said to me, onerous to the city of Baltimore. And we are in a position now

when we are almost relieved from this burden of debt. The work is there; and although it may pay nothing to-day or to-morrow, the day will come when that work will develop the wealth of the State. Where is the wealth of this State save and except in her coal mines? Stop those coal mines, and what becomes of the manufacturing interests of Baltimore? Although she has borne the taxation she has reaped the profit also. But these gentlemen urge that we do not receive our coal through this great canal. I admit that. But stop the canal, and where is the interest of Allegany? What becomes of her working community? If I understand this matter, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad cannot half supply the demand in Baltimore city alone; not for the home consumption of the people there, but the demands of other States and of foreigners.

Then let us take time; let us examine this matter fully and fairly; let us comprehend it in all its bearings; let us endeavor to do our duty here to our several constituencies; and do not let us destroy this great source of wealth to the people of the State by bartering it away for nothing.

Mr. STIRLING. I wish to say but a word or two upon this question. I agree to a great deal that has just been said by the gentleman from Montgomery (Mr. Peter.) But it really strikes me that his argument is an argument against this motion. What is the use of raising a special committee to prepare a section to be engrafted in this report, and different from the one already in there, when the convention has never decided whether they want to sell their interest in these works or not?

Mr. CHAMBERS. That is a mistake.

Mr. STIRLING. There are gentlemen who voted for that report, who are doubtful even now about the policy of selling those public works. The gentleman from Montgomery (Mr. Peter) seems himself to be clearly opposed to the sale of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal interest. Yet he wants to refer that subject to a committee to report a section for the sale of that work. Now I want some decision whether it is better to do that or not.

Mr. NEOLBY. There is no such instruction in the order.

Mr. STIRLING. I would rather sit here and listen to the argument of the gentleman from Montgomery, than to wait for this select committee to report. I do not believe they will give us any more information than we now have. Are there any peculiar sources of information open to them that are not open to every member of this body, and that were not open to the committee on the legislative department? If you appoint another committee of nine, you will be likely to have nine separate and independent propositions, in addition to the hundred or hundred and fifty on the journal now. It is perfectly compe-