

up these bonds; we will get an equal amount of Maryland bonds, and give them to the State of Maryland for our bonds." In this way we will get out of any difficulty without any loss and without any litigation. Therefore I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. PUGH. I think the convention needs no other evidence than that which is transpiring around us daily, to convince them that this is not a proper question to be determined by this convention. In the first place, we have had this subject up before this body on one or two former occasions. It was then pretty successfully cornered, and committed to a special committee; and now that committee have made two reports upon it.

Now, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling,) because it modifies the general proposition to a certain extent, making it more conformable to my views in regard to this matter; that is, that we ought to let this subject entirely alone. And if we cannot let it alone altogether, then I will favor that proposition which lets it alone as much as possible. I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city, because it proposes that we shall not act in regard to at least three of the unproductive works of internal improvement of the State. That more nearly approaches my idea of the way in which we should treat this question. We should look at it, I think, as it claims to be looked at here. We feel strongly upon this question. Every gentleman who speaks upon this question, shows that he feels strongly upon it. As has been ably remarked here, we were not sent here by the people to represent them upon this question. And it is very evident that we do not represent them, because there is no arriving at the fact whether there is a majority here in favor of one or the other systems of disposing of the public works. We show clearly by our action here every day, that we do not properly represent the people of Maryland upon this question, because we do not know what we want.

I have felt undecided upon this matter upon two or three different occasions. So far as I am personally concerned, I am in favor of selling the public works of the State; but that is only my individual notion. I am here in another capacity, as a representative of the people of Maryland, and I was sent here for a specific purpose. And when I find that anything will in the slightest degree interfere with the carrying out of the important purpose for which I was sent here, that may interfere with the main object of my being here, for that reason, if no other, I shall oppose it.

Now, as I stated at the outset, it seems clearer every day that upon this question there is no unity of opinion upon the one side of the house or upon the other. The people did not canvass this question when

they sent us here. They may do so when they send their representatives to the legislature; but with that we have nothing to do. We came here to make a constitution. We came here, after a very general canvass of the State, to do certain work. I am perfectly willing to say, and I acknowledge that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Nezley) in that respect is right enough—that we are here as the representatives of the people in other ways, and should in that capacity consider every subject that is presented to us. But the gentleman knows that there overrides every other consideration that exists as a consideration in the State of Maryland, or that has existed for the last year—there exists a consideration which overrides and sinks out of sight every other one. And I shall not, by any act of mine, injure in the slightest degree, or in any way affect injuriously that great principle, for the carrying out of which this convention was assembled.

For that reason, more than any other, I am opposed to interfering with, or providing any means for the sale of the public works. I throw out of the question my own personal feelings, for so far as I am personally concerned, I repeat I am in favor of disposing of all the public works of the State.

What argument has been urged in favor of disposing of these unproductive works? Every argument tends to the one conclusion that they will bring nothing whatever to the State. Why sell them then? The gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) in his argument upon the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, admitted that the claims of the outside creditors would still exist unimpaired against the work; admitting that they do exist, and that they are \$2,250,000; and that the corporation buying the work, would buy it subject to these claims. Now what corporation in the State, or upon the face of the earth, will give to the State of Maryland one dollar for that unproductive work, if they are at the same time bound to pay those outside creditors? The gentleman says the legislature will provide that those outside creditors will be paid. When the legislature makes that provision it provides at once that the State of Maryland shall receive not one dollar, absolutely nothing for the work. Then why sell it? That is a question, an answer to which I have been listening to hear ever since this discussion was first commenced. No one gives any financial reason for selling it. What benefit is it to the State to sell it, when she will receive nothing for it? How much of the State debt will be paid off by this sale, if nothing is received with which to pay it off?

And on the other hand, is there no injury done by selling it? The representatives from some of the counties of the State claim that very serious injury will be done. Gentlemen upon all sides of this house show by the feeling they exhibit, that there is a pos-