these four or five years immediately after the adoption of the new Constitution, more legislation would be required than in perhaps any ten years after; and during that time too, we were to have a body highly incompetent, engaged in codifying our statutes. This period was a most unfortunate one for such an attempt; not only because of the number of laws necessarily acted upon, but because of their importance. He agreed with the several gentlemen who had spoken of the evil consequences of legislative codification, while our laws were in their present condition. It would uproot our fundamental laws. Let a code be prepared by persons of sufficient ability, who could devote time enough to it; and, after its adoption, but not before, would the Legislature be competent to perform the duties imposed upon them by the amendment already adopted. They could then see the law at a glance; but now it was often very difficult to find, and still more difficult to ascertain its meaning, when found. He did not agree with those who thought that the amendment by making it more difficult to legislate properly, would prevent an excess of laws and therefore exert a good influence. That would not prevent legislation. As heretofore, those who did not know the laws in existence, would still frame bills. No one likes to confess his ignorance and inability; and self-esteem, as it so often does, would still urge persons to do that which they did not understand. But his colleague had added to the section, as amended, a clause to codify, and that he would most cheerfully sustain. It would make the section more palateable and he would be compelled to swallow the bitter with the sweet.

Mr. DORSEY desired to say a few words in reply to the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) and in explanation of the substitute which he had moved to the section. He defended the preference which he had expressed for supplements over original bills, because a law, of which the index was imperfect, and which could not be found without great difficulty, when in an original bill, could be found easily when in a supplement, that always giving a direct reference to the bill to which it is supplemental, and, if it could be found through the supplement, why hunt through a mass of original bills to find it? By the supplement, you are referred to the original bill, and then you have the contents of both presented to your view. He referred to the loose and unsatisfactory character of the amendment which was adopted yesterday, and read the following extract from it, "Every law &c., shall embrace but one subject." And yet there can scarcely ever be found a law of any length that does not, of necessity, embrace various subjects. He objected to the amendment, therefore, on that ground. If the meaning was subject matter necessarily brought in connection with each other by the enactment, fifty original bills, might be required to accomplish that for which, without his amendment, a single original bill would be all-sufficient. The expression, "one subject," appeared to him not to express the meaning of its author, and incapable of being reduced to practice. Then the amendment went on to say, "and that shall be described in the title." Now if there happen to be many of these subjects in the bill, the effect of this provision might be to make the title of the bill of useless and intolerable length. It would be much better for persons to look into the bill itself, and read its enactments through. In reply to what had been said by the gentleman from Frederick, in relation to the salary of the Chancellor, he said he had no doubt that the Legislature did not vote inadvertently, but knew very well what they were voting for. But his strongest objection was to the last part of the amendment, which reads "but in all cases all parts to be revived or amended, that are embraced in the object of the bill, shall be re-enacted and published at length." This would render it necessary to re-enact every clause and portion of the whole law, on which the amendment could operate, though entirely abrogated or constructively repealed by the amendment made. Though such be the obvious construction of the amendment, such surely was not the design of its mover. He thought the whole amendment so loosely put together, that, in its present form, it could not be adopted. He regarded the subject of codification as an entirely independent proposition. He approved of some part of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Schley,) but not of the other part, and therefore would be compelled to vote against it.

Mr. STEWART, of Baltimore city, said he concurred entirely in the argument of his distinguished friend from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) and had felt its force from the beginning. He, (Mr. S.,) was at all times unwilling to intrude upon gentlemen, who were addressing the Convention; but he had risen for the purpose of asking a question. Suppose a law, thus re-enacted, should be imperfect by the omission of four or five laws, all relating to the same subject-matter—would the re-enacted law, in this imperfect condition, be a constitutional exercise of the legislative power? He looked upon this amendment as vesting in the Legislature a particular and limited authority. They were to re-enact the whole law—all parts of the law were to be embodied in the re-enactment. If, therefore, they should omit several laws, would not that be an imperfect exercise of the legislative power, and would it not render the law unconstitutional?

He also desired to ask the gentleman from Anne Arundel, another question, whether, in the absence of any repealing clause in the re-enacted law, the laws which had been omitted would not remain in full force and vigor, provided there were no conflict between the provisions of the original laws and of those which had been re-enacted? He assumed, in the first place, that the exercise of this power, was the exercise of a special authority, and that the whole law must be re-enacted, or that it would not be worth the paper on which it was printed; and, in the second place, that if there be not a repealing clause in the re-enacted law, any laws which might be omitted, provided they were not in conflict with any portion of the re enactment, would remain in full and vigorous operation, and that the courts must so decide.