

The question was then taken, and the amendment of Mr. STEPHENSON was rejected.

Mr. BLAKISTONE moved to amend said section by striking out from the word "other," in the second line, to the end of said section.

Mr. B. said, it would be as well to leave to the Legislature to make their rules of proceeding without incorporating them in the organic law. He merely offered the amendment. He should make no remarks upon it.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WELLS said, he was unavoidably absent at the time the question was taken upon his amendment. He understood it had been acted upon as applicable to the end of the section. If in order he would now move to insert the amendment after the word "house," where it first occurred, in the fourth line.

The amendment was read as follows:

"Nor shall any bill originate in either House during the last three days of the session."

The PRESIDENT decided the amendment to be in order on the ground that its effect in that connection would be different from that in the portion of the section to which it had been appended.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Some conversation followed as to the effect of the amendment.

Mr. SPENCER to put the matter beyond question, he said, moved further to amend the section by adding at the end, the words:

"As to reading and originating bills."

The amendment was agreed to.

And the section as amended was adopted.

The Convention now resumed the consideration of the sixteenth section as follows, (a motion to reconsider having been made and agreed to):

*Section 16th.* The enacting clause of every bill shall be, "Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland," and no law shall be enacted except by Bill.

Mr. SPRIGG moved to amend said sixteenth section, by adding at the end thereof, the following words:

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

Mr. Stewart, of Caroline, moved as a substitute for said amendment, the following:

"All laws shall be passed by original bill and not by supplement, and every law enacted by the Legislature shall embrace but one subject, and that shall be described in the title, and no law shall be revised or amended by reference to its title only; but in such case, all parts of the act to be revised or amended that are embraced in the object of the bill, shall be re-enacted and published at length."

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, desired, he said, very briefly to explain why he had changed his proposition in one particular. His first idea was that, whenever a law was to be amended or

revised, the whole law should be re-enacted and published. He believed that there were a number of gentlemen who were in favor of going to that point. But, from conversation with several members, he had come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to get a law passed to that extent.

The greatest objection urged against it was the expense. No man was more ready to save expense to the State than himself; but when looking to the saving of money, we should at the same time, look to the benefit which might result from its expenditure. And if the people of the State were to be greatly benefitted by the insertion of such a provision in the Constitution, notwithstanding the expense which might attend it, surely it would be prudent and politic that it should be adopted. Mr. S. illustrated this idea.

It seemed to him that, in the aggregate, the result would be, to save to the people of Maryland a greater amount of money, by the adoption of the article as originally proposed by him, than would be expended in the printing of the laws.

After referring to the provisions of the Constitution of Louisiana, as sustaining his own views on the subject, he proceeded to enquire what would be the operation of the new article he proposed. In Louisiana, every law embraced one subject, and the object of the law was expressed in the title page. Any law which might be needed, could readily be found. The law, as it was in actual present existence, might be found. Every citizen might know what the law is; whilst in the State of Maryland, it was exactly the contrary.

He referred to the acts passed by the legislature in 1848-9—numbering five hundred and sixty. Many of these, he explained, were supplements—some supplements to supplements, and here and there an explanation of a supplement, and so on; so that to get any knowledge of the object, it was requisite to go back to the original law itself.

Laws should be few, plain and easy of access. With us, the case was precisely the reverse. They were many, complicated and inaccessible. None but a profound lawyer could tell any thing about them, and even he might easily get confused. It was still more necessary that a knowledge of the laws should be disseminated in the State of Maryland, possessing as she did, a criminal code, which, from its peculiarity in some respects, might be infringed without any violation of the moral law. He instanced the case of the oyster laws—laws relating to the fisheries, wild ducks, etc., and in the last named connection, gave some humorous illustrations.

If the laws were codified, it would be easy to look into the code, and see what the laws were which required revision and correction, and then a law could be passed to amend them. In this way, we should have a perfect law, which the people would be able to understand, without the aid of lawyers. He referred to the objection made by the gentleman from Queen Anne, on the ground of the great cost of printing, and re-