

Mr. DANIEL. The committee inserted the provision that they should hold their sessions at Annapolis, in order to prevent their travelling about.

Mr. BOND. If the amendment I propose be adopted, it would then read in this way: "and perform such other duties as have been used and practiced by the existing board, or as may be hereafter prescribed by law."

Mr. SCHLEY withdrew his amendment.

The question was upon the amendment submitted by Mr. BOND.

Mr. DANIEL. That amendment will entirely change the provision we have made, that this board shall hold its sessions at Annapolis four times a year. This other board was accustomed to meet at Barnum's hotel and other places about which the people knew nothing. And it was to meet that difficulty that the committee provided that they should meet four times a year, and hold their sessions in Annapolis so that the whole State might know where they met and when. If this amendment is adopted, then they can travel over the whole State, as the old board used to do.

Mr. BOND. In reply to the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Daniel,) I will say that my amendment only relates to the powers of the board, not to the times or places of meeting at all. It leaves all that part of the section obligatory upon the board, as much so as without my amendment.

The question being taken upon the amendment submitted by Mr. BOND, it was rejected.

Mr. PARRAN moved to amend by striking out the word "hereafter," so that it would read—"and perform such other duties as may be prescribed by law."

The question being taken upon a division—ayes 27, nays 21—no quorum voted.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the vote is put again, I would like to say that this amendment seems to me to be subject to the same objection as the other. "As may be prescribed by law;" that is, as may now be prescribed by law, whether in the constitution or by the legislature. As I have said, the committee has proposed to alter the times of meeting, and several other particulars. Now, if this is changed to what is now prescribed by law, the old constitutional provision will take precedence, and therefore it indirectly strikes out what we have done. We have made material changes, and now you go on to say here that they shall be subject to the operation of such powers and duties as are prescribed by law; that is, as are now prescribed by law. By striking out the word "hereafter," it is made to apply not so much to future legislation; but you let in the law as it now stands upon the subject, as well as what may be provided in the future.

The PRESIDENT. As I understand it, there is no legislation on the subject.

Mr. DANIEL. There is constitutional law.

The PRESIDENT. If the new constitution be ratified by the people, it will repeal the other.

Mr. PUGH. If this constitution is adopted, will it not destroy the other one?

Mr. DANIEL. It seems to me that by striking out this, you reaffirm the other.

Mr. STIRLING. "As may be prescribed by law," refers to present, past, and future.

Mr. DANIEL. Then what is the use of striking out "hereafter," if it means simply to refer to future legislation. If that is left in, it will exclude past and present legislation. Leave the word "hereafter" in, and then I have no objection to it; I think it is exactly right.

The PRESIDENT. As I understand it, there is no legislation upon the subject. The meetings of the present board is a mere matter of arrangement between themselves.

Mr. DANIEL. We have added provisions in this constitution which are not in the other, and which I think will conflict with this amendment.

The question being again taken, upon a division—ayes 27, nays 32—the motion to strike out the word "hereafter" was not agreed to.

Mr. SCHLEY. I move to strike out the word "legislature" wherever it occurs in this section, and insert the words "general assembly," in order that the phraseology of the constitution may be uniform. We have used the term "general assembly" every where else.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STIRLING. I move to insert after the word "governor," the words "lieutenant governor," and after the word "treasurer," the words "and commissioner of the land office." I do not care particularly about arguing this proposition. The reason why I offer this amendment is that I think a board of five members will probably be better than a board of three. And particularly in this respect; by having officers exercising different functions and elected at different times, you distribute the matter better throughout the State, and make this board more a representative of all the interests of the people. And I think it will have a beneficial effect upon all the officers here at the capitol, if they are all placed upon the same footing, so far as regards the performance of their independent duties, and also in reference to their responsibilities in this board. The commissioner of the land office is an officer elected by the people. And if we provide in this constitution for a lieutenant governor, which I sincerely hope we shall, from the very essential necessities of the case, I think it eminently proper he should be a member of this board. That will make the board only one more than the present board, and it strikes me it will do no harm, and would likely be a better representative of the people.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know that I have