

session, 1825, when he from Washington county and I from Baltimore county, appeared that year as members of the House of Delegates in the General Assembly of Maryland. He had previously been a delegate but I had not. Our intercourse soon became familiar, and to me it was improving and useful. We generally thought alike, and acted much together—yet our opinions were repeatedly different, and on some of these occasions, even after he had expressed his views decidedly in debate, he gave to my opinions so fair a hearing as to remodel his own, and openly recall them for reasons frankly stated to the House. We served together in the committee on internal improvements;—he framed its report made to the House on the 10th day of February, 1826—see journal of proceedings, folio 219, and the act, ch. 180, entitled ‘an act for the promotion of internal improvements,’ and I framed the bill, then also reported, ch. 166, entitled, ‘an act to create a board of public works—see vol. house documents, 1825, reports of House committee, folio 7. These acts were framed in strict accordance with the prayers of a state convention that assembled in Baltimore on the 14th December, 1825, over which Charles Carroll of Carrollton, presided, and who by their petition, asked that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal should be patronized and continued to Baltimore as the Maryland Canal—see proceedings of Convention, Report of Committee, folios 37 to 42, also house documents, 1825, memorial of convention committee, pages 5, 6, and report of convention committee, page 9: and that the Susquehanna Canal should be likewise patronized—see convention proceedings, folio 42, memorial of committee, 6, and report of convention committee, folios 13, 14: and that a board of public works should be created to ascertain what improvements could be made that would promote the public interest—see journal of convention, folios 42, 43, and its memorial, house documents, 1825, folios 5, 6 and report of convention committee, folio 14.

We of course advocated and voted for these two Laws, and having thus personally participated in pledging the faith of the State of Maryland, according to their provisions; which by grants of rights of way, water privileges, valuable franchises, and promised subscription for the construction of a work that should continue the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal from the Potomac to Baltimore as the Maryland Canal, we would necessarily govern our subsequent action, on this subject, by the obligations which these votes imposed.

Joseph J. Merrick was not a delegate at December session, 1826, but I reappeared as a delegate, was chosen Speaker, and acted as such until towards the close of that session, when the unfinished business from Baltimore county and city having greatly accumulated, to complete the same, I resigned that office a few days sooner than I originally designed, and had told Mr. Chapman I should, with the view that he might be chosen Speaker, and be so when the house should adjourn *sine die*.

During that session, the act to incorporate the Baltimore and