

as to the extent of the difference between the two propositions.

Mr. MERRICK suggested that there was no sort of incompatibility between the two propositions. Both were excellent. Let them go together. If they did so, it seemed to him that they would receive the almost unanimous vote of the Convention.

After an explanation by Mr. DAVIS as to the effect of the proposition.

Mr. DORSEY urged the propriety of leaving the matter to the Legislature. They would make such provision as they deemed right and proper, and the Convention, he thought, should not check or control their action in this respect. The local situation of each county and of the parts of counties were subjects to be considered by the Legislature, and he was for leaving them untrammelled. If the design was to abolish all local legislation, and to say that all elections should be general, the provision would interfere unjustly with the Legislature, and impose restrictions upon the community which should not be imposed. We should be much better protected by leaving the power there than elsewhere. And such a mode, it appeared to him, would do justice to every part of the State.

Mr. MERRICK then offered the following amendment, as a substitute for the said section:

"The Levy Courts or Commissioners of the several counties of the State, shall be elected by general ticket and not by districts, by the voters of the respective counties; and said commissioners shall exercise such powers and duties only as the Legislature may prescribe, but such powers and duties as shall be uniform throughout the State—and the General Assembly may provide for the election or appointment of such other county officers as may be required, and are not provided for by this Constitution, and prescribe their powers and duties, but their tenure of office, their powers and duties and mode of appointment shall be uniform throughout the State."

Mr. THOMAS. I will accept that. It is precisely the idea I was aiming at.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent. It does not answer the proposition I had in view. But I do not desire to create any difficulty. And I will, therefore, accept it.

CONSTABLE moved to strike out the words "or appointment," [but withdrew the motion]

After some conversation on the part of Messrs. THOMAS, CHAMBERS, of KENT, CONSTABLE, and BUCHANAN,

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, moved to strike out the words "or commissioners."

Mr. BLAKISTONE suggested that, if uniformity was going to be provided for, the time of election and the tenure of office should be fixed.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER opposed the suggestion.

Mr. DAVIS suggested some considerations why the provision proposed would operate injuriously.

The question was then taken on the motion of Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, to strike out the words "or commissioners."

The amendment was rejected.

The question recurred on the amendment of Mr. MERRICK.

Mr. CRISFIELD moved to amend the amendment, by striking out the words "Levy Courts or," [so as to let it stand "commissioners."]

Mr. RIDGELY said, he saw what the idea which the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) desired to carry out was, and it was a very proper one. To remove all difficulty, he would offer a proposition, that all these particular authorities should be known by one name throughout the county.

Mr. RIDGELY then moved to amend said amendment, by striking out these words: "the Levy Courts or Commissioners of the several counties of the State," and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

"That the county authorities now known as levy courts or county commissioners, shall hereafter be styled commissioners, and;"

Mr. THOMAS said, that the proposition was acceptable to him.

Mr. MERRICK accepted the amendment as a modification of his own proposition.

Mr. CRISFIELD suggested that instead of the words "county commissioners," the words "commissioners of county" should be inserted.

Mr. RIDGELY said, the idea was the same.

Mr. CRISFIELD withdrew his amendment to strike out the words "Levy Courts or."

Mr. McMASTER moved to strike out the words "by general ticket, and not."

Mr. DORSEY seconded the motion of Mr. McMASTER, and stated his objections to the general ticket system.

Mr. PHELPS replied, and stated that no such evils as the gentleman spoke of had, within his knowledge, attended the general ticket system.

Mr. WRIGHT moved the previous question.

The PRESIDENT proceeded to ascertain whether there was a second.

Mr. BUCHANAN desired to submit an amendment.

The PRESIDENT said it was not in order.

Mr. BLAKISTONE moved a call of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT stated that no motion was in order while the Convention was dividing.

And the question having been taken, the Convention refused to second the demand for the previous question.

Mr. McHENRY indicated his desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, suggested that it would be better that the vote should be taken on the single question of Districts or Counties, and that other amendments should come in afterwards.

Mr. McHENRY said, that a committee of which he was a member, had had under consideration a general plan of local organization. It seemed to be almost the only subject which had been entrusted to the keeping of that committee. The amendment before the Convention took one branch of that subject (relating to County Commissioners) out of the hands of the committee, thus dislocating and throwing into confusion the whole subject. If the Convention thought pro-