

It appeared that when the yeas and nays were asked, but *not ordered*, it was not usual to enter the motion on the journal.

Mr. DORSEY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Howard district, of Anne Arundel county, praying that said Howard district may be constituted a separate county.

Referred to the select committee appointed on new counties.

Mr. DONALDSON also presented a petition of sundry citizens of said district, of similar import.

Referred to the same committee.

Mr. D. said he would take occasion to remark that he heartily concurred in the prayer of the petitioners.

The Convention therefore passed to the order of the day.

#### THE BILL OF RIGHTS.

Then Convention then resumed the consideration of the order of the day, being the report submitted by Mr. DORSEY, on the 11th ult., as chairman of the committee on the declaration of rights.

The immediate question was on the amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL, yesterday, and pending at the hour of adjournment, to the 13th article.

Mr. DONALDSON held the floor, but, on his suggestion, the article was informally passed over for the present, (Mr. Randall being engaged in the argument of a case in court.)

The fourteenth article was then read as follows:

*Art. 14.* That sanguinary laws ought to be avoided, as far as is consistent with the safety of the State; and no law to inflict cruel and unusual pains and penalties ought to be made, in any case, or at any time hereafter.

No amendment being offered, the article was adopted.

The fifteen article was read as follows:

*Art. 15.* That retrospective laws, punishing acts committed before the existence of such laws and by them only declared criminal, are oppressive, unjust and incompatible with liberty; wherefore no *ex post facto* law ought to be made.

Mr. DENT moved to amend the article by striking out the words "*ex post facto*," (which, he said, was mere vulgar Latin,) and to insert the word "such," in lieu thereof.

Mr. DORSEY thought it would be better that the amendment should not be adopted. The expression "*ex post facto*," was so well understood by the profession, and by all law-givers, and he thought it would be inexpedient to change it. The word "such," was more indefinite.

Mr. DENT withdrew his amendment.

No further amendment having been offered, the fifteenth article was adopted.

The sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth articles were read, and, no amendment having been offered thereto, was adopted, as follows:

*Art. 16.* That no law to attain particular persons of treason or felony, ought to be made in any case, or at any time hereafter.

*Art. 17.* That every free man, for any injury done to him in his person or property, ought to have remedy by the course of the law of the land, and ought to have justice and right, freely without sale, fully without any denial, and speedily without delay according to the law of the land.

*Art. 18.* That the trial of facts where they arise, is one of the greatest securities of the lives, liberties and estate of the people.

The 19th article of the bill was read as follows:

*Art. 19.* That in all criminal prosecutions, every man hath a right to be informed of the accusation against him; to have a copy of the indictment or charge, in due time (if required) to prepare for his defence; to be allowed counsel, to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have process for his witnesses; to examine the witnesses for and against him on oath; and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury, without whose unanimous consent he ought not to be found guilty.

Mr. MERRICK moved to amend it, by striking out the words "if required."

Some desultory conversation followed, in which Messrs. BLAKISTONE, MERRICK, BUCHANAN, DORSEY, GWINN and BOWIE took part—after which

Mr. MERRICK withdrew his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL moved an amendment, inserting after the word "counsel," the words, "whether admitted to the bar or otherwise."

Mr. MITCHELL said, he made the amendment, in behalf of a very modest class of persons, who might not be able, often, to avail themselves of the privilege contemplated by it—but he desired that the privilege should at least be extended to them.

Some conversation followed between Messrs. PHELPS and MITCHELL.

Mr. DORSEY thought this was rather an extraordinary amendment. There was an old saying at the bar, that a suitor who was his own counsel, had a fool for his client. He cited a case within his own experience in which a distinguished citizen of Anne Arundel had undertaken to manage his own case, which was unquestionably good in itself—but which became so involved by the manner in which it was conducted, that the jury must have given a verdict against him. (Laughter.) The court then recommended him to let his counsel take charge of the case.

Mr. D. thought that the adoption of such an amendment would be attended with very injurious effects, and that, not for the sake of the profession, but of the parties themselves, it ought not to be adopted.

Mr. MITCHELL. I withdraw the amendment. I feel that I should be in a very bad predicament myself. (Laughter.)

So the amendment was withdrawn.

And then the 19th article was adopted.

Mr. DIRICKSON rose to offer an amendment to it.

The PRESIDENT said, the question had been finally taken, and the article adopted.

Mr. DIRICKSON. I was desirous to offer an