

company had been almost microscopic; and, if they had been the owners of the work, they could not have evinced more caution or used more vigilance. This tribute to their zeal and fidelity was due to the zealous and wise discharge of the trusts reposed in them by the State. The argument of the gentleman from Anne Arundel involved the idea that the election of those agents by the people would necessarily invest them with greater intelligence, integrity, vigilance and activity in the discharge of their trust. How such an effect could be produced by the change of the mode of appointment, was to him incomprehensible, and it certainly was unnecessary seriously to combat such a position. The same duties are to be discharged, the same sources of information are open, and the same amount of intelligence can be had under either form of appointment. The argument of the gentleman further assumed that individuals would seek the situation of director of the canal. On the contrary, so far from this being correct, the difficulty would be in finding persons willing to accept the station, owing to the immense responsibility, the consumption of time and the scanty remuneration. So long as the canal had been incomplete, no objection had been raised to western men, but now that it was completed, the cry was raised of antagonistic interests between the western counties and the State itself. If it was desired that no director should be elected from the three western counties, the election by the people would not prevent it any more than the election by the Legislature. The facts would show that those most familiar with such works could but carry them on. The stockholders had recently recommended a reduction of tolls, but the board, composed in part of men from those very counties, had invariably refused it. One of the State's agents, from Washington county, strongly advocated the reduction of tolls, to attract an immense trade from the whole surrounding country; his efforts had been thus far unavailing.

The argument that the road terminated in the District of Columbia, instead of Baltimore was an argument in favor of the construction of a canal from Georgetown to Baltimore, and not an argument against the present mode of electing State's agents. It was his own opinion that it would have been better originally, that the canal should have terminated at the commercial emporium of the State. As to the directors coming from the District of Columbia and from Alexandria, he would say that in his judgment, but for the financial aid of the director from the city of Alexandria, [Henry Daingerfield, Esq.,] the Chesapeake and Ohio canal would not now have been completed.

He could not conceive that there should be any antagonism between the interests of Maryland and Allegany county, because that policy would produce the largest amount of trade over the canal from that county, would bring into the treasury the largest amount of revenue. Would any one suppose that the Baltimore and Ohio rail road should not have any directors in the city of Baltimore for fear they should further

the interests of that city at the expense of the interests of the State? But all this was foreign to the matter under consideration. If the gentleman from Anne Arundel would introduce an amendment embodying his views, he would not say that he should refuse to support it. The question now was upon the election by the people or by the legislature, and we were called upon to consider the arguments for and against each mode.

Mr. THOMAS said, that the gentleman had drawn a parallel between the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio canal, in relation to the appointment of directors of those corporations. There was one very essential difference between the two cases. Baltimore city was heavily taxed on account of the money embarked in the railroad, and had a great interest at stake. They had so large an amount of property there, that they had a right to be represented by their own citizens. The case was different with the District cities. Many years ago Washington, Georgetown, and Alexandria had taken a million and a half of stock in the Chesapeake and Ohio canal. The government of the United States had subsequently paid the whole of the debt contracted in Europe by those cities in order to take the stock. They had now no pecuniary interest in the canal. But the general government had left in their hands the right to vote on account of the stock they had taken, as if they still owed it. Mr. Pugh having gone to Europe and negotiated the loan, it was contended that the honor of the Union would be involved if the interest upon the debt would not be punctually paid; and it was ascertained that the corporations had a great indisposition to pay the interest. For this reason the government has assumed the debt.

He did not hold the opinion that the only way to secure proper men for office was to make it lucrative. On the contrary he believed that men would be obtained of a higher tone of character and a purer patriotism, if the salary was not very lucrative. Electors of President and Vice President of the United States received merely their expenses, and yet there was no want of suitable men to take that office.

He agreed with the gentleman from Anne Arundel, that all this public property invested in the Chesapeake and Ohio canal ought to be watched over by delegates elected immediately by the great body of the people of Maryland. Upon the management of that canal depended the perpetuation or diminution of the tax now inflicted upon the people.

It had been said that this was a mere question of *meum and tuum*; whether one class or another class of gentlemen were to be appointed. But the question could not be narrowed down to that. So far from being surprised at the harmony between the positions occupied by the gentleman from Anne Arundel and himself, he was much more amazed at the contrariety of opinions between the gentleman from Washington county and himself. He had said previously that this question of reform was mainly with a view of