peated the reply he gave yesterday, that it was as well to have a crib for printers, as one for lawyers. In the framing of a Constitution, we ought not to be looking to see who were to be fed; it is our duty to feed the people by giving them a wholesome code of laws, under which they may be satisfied, and grow in prosperty. By a proper codification and a good index, any man will then be able to find what the law is.

Mr. SPENCER said he believed the proposition of the gentleman from Caroline, was about the same in principle as that offered by the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Sprigg,) except that it was a little more in detail. He compared the two amendments to shew that they were, in fact, one and the same. There was a portion of the proposition, for which he was willing to vote, while he could not give his vote for the other part. He wished to have the amendment divided. Reference had been made to the Constitution and laws of Louisiana, but if he were not mistaken, they were formerly printed in French, that being the language of the inhabitants when it first became part of the United States. The change which had taken place in the character of the inhabitants of that State, combined with other circumstances, furnished good reason for printing them now in the vernacular. But what might be sound policy in the State of Louisiana, might be very imprudent in Maryland. Their position was entirely dissimilar.

Mr. PRESSTMAN asked if all the testamentary system was embraced in the laws which were within the contemplation of the amendment of the gentleman from Caroline?

Mr. STEWART replied that it was all embraced in the laws.

Mr. PRESSTMAN said, that in that case the amendment was altogether impracticable. If a gentleman desired to look into a particular law, it would be necessary for him to examine the whole mass.

Mr. HICKS, (in reply to Mr. Presstman,) said he happened not to be a lawyer. He might, therefore, be considered as perfectly disinterested in this matter. He agreed with the gentleman from Caroline, in all he had said on the subject of simplifying, collating, and codifying our whole body of laws, so as to make it intelligible to the people. A large portion of the people of his county, did not possess a great deal of legal learning, but they were plain, intelligent farmers, merchants, mechanics, &c., perfectly competent to understand common sense matters. Instead of making it necessary to go to these lawyers with a fee of five dollars, ten dollars, or fifty dollars, for lawyears know how to charge, as well as other people, he would put the people in a condition to know for themselves what is the law. He looked upon lawyers as being a highly respectable class of men; had no prejudice against them, though some say they are necessary evils, for we cannot do without them; and he yet would go to them as seldom as possible. The testamentary system had been referred to by the gentleman from Baltimore, (Mr. Presstman.) That system contained several branches, but it would not be necessary to go through the whole system, in order to look in to the branch concerning inventories, or the laws of descents, individual wishes to perfect his title to land which he has purchased. Sometimes it is covered with mortgages. He examines the records, and thinks he is going to make out a clear title, when he finds some supplement enacted fifty years back, which at once comes in conflict with his hopes and clouds over what seemed previously to be clear. Then he is compelled to go to the lawyers, and they do not always know every law that has been passed on the subject. As to the charges for printing, he had no doubt that his people would be more willing to pay a small additional tax for the printer, than to give a fee of perhaps five hundred dollars to a lawyer, to tell him what he would understand himself. The money would be well laid out, if it produced the effect of simplifying the law, so that every business man might be able to judge for himself of the validity of his title, when made. He hoped the amendment would be passed, as great good would inure to the people from it.

Mr. SPENCER called for a division on the substitute, which was ordered.

Mr. S. also asked the yeas and nays, remarking that the question was one of infinite importance and that he hoped, therefore, the Convention would give them.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARBINE desired, he said, to move an amendment.

The amendment was not now in order.

Mr. HARBINE briefly stated, that his view of the effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Caroline, (Mr. Stewart,) was not altered. He had heard no reason to change the opinion he yesterday expressed. A state of things might occur, in which it would be highly politic and popular, but that could only arrive after a codification of the statutes of this State, and until then, the amendment, if adopted would produce evil consequences and great confusion in legislation. After a codification of our laws, there were many powerful considerations in favor of the effect of the amendment, and the cost of printing, which seemed to be the main objection to it, would have to give way to these considerations. It would be better to pay to printers large sums of money, in order to make the laws plain to every man, than to pay thrice the sum to lawyers to have them explained and understood. But his object in rising was to say, that if the proposition pending should be adopted he intended to offer an amendment which would postpone its effect, until our statute laws were codified. He regarded a codification as a matter of great public utility, and when the proper period arrived, if no one else did, he would submit a proposition to that effect.

The question was then stated to be on the first branch of the amendment, as follows:

"All laws shall be passed by original bill, and not by supplement."

Mr. SPENCER said he did not ask the yeas and nays on that branch.

Mr. DIRICKSON asked the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.