was quadruple, should not prevent the passage of the amendment. The gentleman from Queen Anne's, had said that if would create a great crib for the printers. He,(Mr.S.,)knew not why there ought not to be a crib for printers, as well as one for lawyers, for surely the present mode of legislation is one of the latter kind. But in framing a Constitution for a great and growing State, we should not look to any one class of the community alone, but endeavor to secure the greatest good to the greatest number.

Mr. HARBINE expressed himself entirely favorable to the object of the amendment, but he could not see how the difficulty against which it was directed, could be overcome. One-half the members of the Legislature,would not know where to find these laws. If we are to provide for the codification of our system, then indeed this proper reform might be carried into effect. Without such codification, the gentleman from Caroline, could not get at the object of his amendment.

Mr. BROWN said the difficulty with him was this. If the Legislature put all the laws relating to a subject, which have not been repealed, into one, it would amount to a codification, and it would take a long time, perhaps twelve months, [Mr. Schley, in his seat, "twelve years."] to accomplish it.

Mr. SPENCER thought the subject was surrounded with difficulties. If every time we find a defect in a law, the Legislature is to re-enact it, there will be no end of legislation. Almost every law will have to be re-enacted, and the sessions must become interminable. He refered to the insolvent laws, and the attachment system, which would, in such cases, lead to long discussions, so as to protract the sittings of the Legislature.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, said that he felt a deep interest in the amendment that he had offered, because he thought it would remedy many of the evils that exist under the present mode of legislation, and work great good to the people of the State.

The gentleman from Queen Anne's, (Mr. Spencer,) has said that the adoption of the amendment, would lead to interminable sessions of the Legislature. He (Mr. S.) did not think so. If the plan he had proposed, had been adopted at the commencement of our State Government, the whole volume of laws, instead of swelling out to its present bulk and requiring a lifetime of study to know them, would not now exceed, three or four hundred pages, and would be understood by the most of the people. The existing evil calls for a remedy, and how else can it be applied except by a provision in the Constitution, and what better time can there be, to commence a new system of legislation than when the new Constitution has been adopted? It has repeatedly been urged, against the amendment, that members of the Legislature could not know what the laws were, and the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) has said that they would have to go to a lawyer to get a simple amendment to a law drawn. There could not be no stronger argument in favor of the amendment than this. It is an acknowledgment that incompetent men, under the present system, may draft laws and get them passed in an imperfect form. How, he would ask, could the Legislature pass wise and judicious amendments to laws, when they knew not what the laws were. As well might you expect a man, who knew nothing of mechanics to repair an engine properly, as that the Legislature should amend a law wisely, when they knew nothing of the law that they were amending. Many amendatory supplements, now, require explanatory acts, and thus supplement is added to law, and law to supplement, until it requires judges, lawyers, and jurymen, to find out what the law is. There are many penal statutes that is of vital importance, that they should be understood and yet in many cases, they were so covered up amid supplements and amendments, that it is often difficult to find the true law. If a farmer or mechanic should desire to prove an account to be sent out of the State, or one against a deceased person, he doubted whether they could find the law. The laws are now so voluminous, that but few will incur the expense of their purchase.

The latter part of the amendment has met with the strongest opposition. Is it because it is something new? He was aware that there were many persons averse to change—that prefer old things and customs to new. This is an age of progress and improvement. We cannot look around anywhere in this great and flourishing Union, but what we see improvement and progress. There is no nobility in old usages and customs. Every thing is appreciated for its intrinsic worth.

What, he would ask, does the latter part of the amendment propose? "No law shall be revived or amended by reference to its title only." Is not that right and reasonable? Does not every one know that laws are often amended or revived by reference to their title only? This, then, is to prevent such mode of reviving and amending laws. Then again, "but in such case, all such parts of the act to be revived or amended, that are embraced in the object of the bill, shall be re-enacted and published at length. If this be adopted, the Legislature, before they can revive or amend a law, must have it before them. They must then know what it is they are to revive or amend. It is also proposed to have the laws codified. He was heartily in favor of it, and when they were codified, the amendment he had offered would keep them so. Without it, they would require codifying every ten years.

Mr. SPRIGG moved to amend the amendment of Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, by adding the following:

"And no law enacted by the Legislature, shall embrace more than one object, and that shall be described in its title, and no law shall be revised or amended by reference to its title only."

Mr. DORSEY said he thought it very important the qualifications of the persons employed in this work, should be well ascertained. No man should be permitted to discharge the duty who is not a sound and experienced lawyer. The codification of our system of laws would require great skill and care. The members of the Gen-