

were at least thirty or thirty-five supervisors on one road. There was no provision made for that.

Mr. CONSTABLE replied, that the sole object was to make the officer elective; and it would leave the number as they now existed by law. He had no idea that the Legislature should appoint the supervisors for his county; he desired that they should be elected by the people.

Mr. Hicks said :

That he knew a section of road in his county, three or four miles in length, upon which there did not reside a white man, and if he should pass this amendment they would have to elect black men to keep the road in repair. To get the road temporarily improved and repaired, the commissioners had been obliged for a number of years to prevail upon some white man living on another road to take charge of that road for the accommodation of those who travelled over it. It seemed to him that they had better permit the matter to remain as it now was, for many counties had laws regulating it, and if they should adopt this amendment, it would change the entire system.

Mr. BUCHANAN thought it was most extraordinary that two quarters of the country should differ so marvellously. The gentleman from Dorchester had said that in his county it was difficult to get any one to serve in this capacity. He would say for his section, that there was a great deal of rivalry in regard to this office.— During the campaign, the people would pass by subjects which he and his colleagues thought were of great importance, and talk of the bad management of the roads. He desired that they should have good roads, and in order to accomplish this object, he wished to get rid of the present mode of appointments of the supervisors. The proposition of his friend from Cecil, [Mr. Constable,] met his views. They should give to the office, in the estimation of the candidate, the importance which the people attached to it; for if they desired to get a man to serve for an office, they should elevate his conceptions of that office.— They should let him know that he was to be judged of for that office by his fellow-citizens—that he was to be put on the same ticket with the judges and other officers of the State and county, and his life upon it, it would inspire him to the performance of his duty, and the roads would be in all particulars much better managed and regulated than under the old system of appointing by the commissioners. Besides, these county commissioners who made these appointments, did not supervise these supervisors; but the people who were interested in these roads, every step they took among these infernally bad roads, would inquire who were these supervisors, who were responsible, and they would make the air resound with their complaints. If they should adopt the elective system, a man's pride would be incited, and he would say, the people will act on my conduct, and therefore I must be up and doing.

Mr. BROWN would undertake to say that in his district there were no less than fifteen super-

visors of roads. If they should undertake to elect supervisors, they ought to limit the number in certain districts. Were they to elect fifteen supervisors to attend to the roads in their district?

Mr. CONSTABLE. One hundred and fifteen, if necessary.

Mr. McHENRY thought it would be a very great inconvenience to elect supervisors for every mile. The plan adopted in the northern States was to elect one for each district, and it was his duty to keep the roads in order. He provided himself with all the necessary implements to discharge his duty, and was a responsible person—responsible to the law and to those who elected him, and in every respect bound to keep the roads in repair. He had travelled a good deal in the northern States, and had been struck with the excellent roads they had there, which was to be attributable to the fact that they had one man, who was responsible to the people and the law, and who was elected by the people.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER moved the previous question, which was seconded, and the main question ordered, viz:—on the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. CONSTABLE.

Mr. CONSTABLE demanded the yeas and nays, Which were ordered,

And being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Morgan, Blakistone, Sellman, Buchanan, Bell, Chandler, Constable, Miller, Bowie, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirickson, Jacobs, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Balt. city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke and Cockey—43.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, pres't.; Dent, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Lloyd, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Thawley, Hardeastle, Kilgour, Waters, Hollyday and Brown—31.

So the amendment was adopted.

The question then recurred on agreeing to the section as amended.

Mr. CONSTABLE demanded the yeas and nays, Which were ordered,

And being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Blakistone, Buchanan, Bell, Candler, Constable, Miller, Bowie, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirickson, Jacobs, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—42.