

Mr. DORSEY said, his amendment left it discretionary with the Legislature, to contract either for one or the other, as they might think proper. He, [Mr. D.,] had no doubt what their choice would be.

Mr. SCHLEY said, what was wanted, was a codification.

The second objection to the substitute of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, was that it omitted any provision in relation to pleadings, &c.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, desired, he said, to see some proposition adopted which might lead to a codification of the laws of the State, under the sanction of the Legislature. He had no preferences as to its paternity; nor had he regarded the question of so much importance as some gentleman had. He had not risen to make an argument, but only a suggestion. It was easier to codify a part of the laws, than the whole of them. It was more likely that an early result would be reached by confining the code, in the first place, to public general laws. If the commissioners should accomplish that portion of the work, the Legislature would very probably make provision for codifying the public local laws. And he suggested to the Convention the propriety of deciding that question. With a view to bring it distinctly before the Convention, he would move an amendment.

The amendment was not now in order.

The question then recurred upon the substitute as offered by Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. BUCHANAN, stated to the Convention that Mr. SPENCER had informed him that he had been compelled to leave the city on pressing business, and desired him to ask the Convention to pass over the sixteenth section informally, until he could be present.

The question was then taken on the substitute of Mr. SPENCER, and it was decided in the negative.

So the substitute was rejected.

The question then recurred on the substitute of Mr. DORSEY.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, offered the amendment he had indicated, but, on a suggestion by Mr. THOMAS, and after some conversation, withdrew it.

The question, therefore, again recurred on the substitute amendment of Mr. DORSEY.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, called for a division on striking out the section, which was ordered.

Mr. DORSEY asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered and, being taken, were as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs Chapman, Pres't., Morgan, Blakistone, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Sellman, Weems, Merrick, Williams, Goldsborough, Phelps, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Hearn, Jacobs, McHenry, Gwinn, Ware, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, and Brown—26.

*Negative*—Messrs. Dent, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Hodson, Miller, Bowling, Wright, Dirickson, Thomas, Shriver, Stewart of Caroline, Brent of Baltimore city,

Schley, Fiery, Harbine, Brewer, Weber, Holiday, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Ege, and Shower—36.

So the Convention refused to strike out.

Mr. GWINN then offered the substitute of which he had given notice, as follows:

"All laws shall be passed by original bill, and every law enacted by the Legislature, shall embrace but one subject—and that shall be described in the title,—and no law or section of law, shall be revived, amended, or repealed, by reference to its title or section only, and it shall be the duty of the Legislature at the first session after the adoption of this Constitution, to appoint two commissioners, learned in the law, to revise and codify the laws of this State, and the said commissioners shall report the said code so formed to the Legislature, within a time to be by it determined, for its approval, amendment or rejection, and if adopted after the revision and codification of the said laws, it shall be the duty of the Legislature, in amending any article or section thereof, to enact the same as the said article or section would read, when amended; and whenever the Legislature shall enact any public general law, not amendatory of any section or article in the said code, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to enact the same in articles and sections, in the same manner as the said code may be arranged; and to provide for the publication of all additions and alterations which may be made to the said code; and it shall also be the duty of the Legislature to appoint one or more commissioners, learned in the law, whose duty it shall be to revise, simplify and abridge the rules of practice, pleadings, forms and proceedings of the courts of record in this State."

The substitute having been read,

Mr. GWINN made some remarks (which will be found embodied in a report of some other remarks at a later period of the day.)

Mr. THOMAS expressed his hope that no motion would be made to divide the question. The effect of a division would be that the question would first be taken on striking out, leaving them at liberty to insert any article hereafter, and the vote on that motion, should it prevail, would be no indication of the sense of the House on the merits of the particular proposition now offered. For this reason he hoped that there would be no division of the question.

The question was then stated to be on the substitute amendment of Mr. GWINN.

Mr. DORSEY moved to amend the substitute by striking out the word "general"

The amendment was rejected.

The question recurred on the amendment of Mr. GWINN.

Mr. STEPHENSON asked the yeas and nays which were ordered.

Mr. DORSEY called for a division, so as to take the question separately on that portion of the amendment which related to pleadings, &c.

Some conversation followed on a point of order.

On a suggestion by Mr. TUCK,

Mr. DORSEY withdrew the call for a division.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, gave his views of the