a case I would be sent to jail, but the lawyer would go scott-free. I see the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Brent,) smiling. I was about to relate what he once told me, in relation to a precisely similar case, but I will not do it.

Mr. Brent, of Baltimore city. I hope the gentleman will relate it.

Mr. Brown's time here expired, and he resumed his seat.

Mr. Stephenson then withdrew the proposition submitted by him, and substituted therefor the following:

"Every person of good moral character, being a voter, shall be entitled to admission to practice law in all courts of justice."

Mr. Bowie moved to amend the amendment by adding at the end thereof the words "in his own case."

Mr. Brent, of Baltimore city. I shall vote for the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Harford. I believe I handed it to some gentleman who passed it to the gentleman.

This seems to be a war between lawyers and anti-lawyers. I belong to the lawyers, but will vote for the largest liberty. The gentleman from Carroll is a sort of Roderick Dhu, it seems, who

"Rights each wrong where e'er 'tis given,
E'en though it be in the court of Heaven."

The gentleman's blood boils because in a court of justice, a lawyer, when he is arguing the facts and reviewing the evidence, assails the veracity of a witness, as he ought to do perhaps.

Mr. Brown. I said parties, not witnesses.

Mr. Brent. It is the same thing. That because a lawyer is arraigning the conduct of a party in the light of day, and before an intelligent and impartial jury and upon his responsibility out of court, and also his responsibility for an action of slander, the gentleman's blood must boil, to hear a lawyer applying such epithets to the party or witness, because that party has not the right to rise there, and tell the lawyer that he is insulting him. I have only to say that if the gentleman's blood boils at conduct of this kind, the party has a remedy—always has a remedy. Do not let him interfere with the decorum of the court, but let him call the counsel to accountability the moment he leaves the court, and if he has not the courage to do that (and I have no doubt the gentleman from Carroll has courage enough), let him take the legal responsibilty which the law fastens upon the slanderous counsel. The gentleman from Carroll must consider that if the counsel are not protected in this way by the court, it would abridge that freedom of discussion secured to every citizen. It is necessary for the administration of justice. Every time I assail a malefactor in court, (and I do say, upon my responsibility, that though I have assailed many men, I never did so unless I thought they deserved it,) am I to be interrupted by him in my argument, and be told that I am insulting him, or lying? You might as well shut up your courts at once, and exile your judges. These Roderick Dhu opinions do not suit the spirit of this age.

Mr. Tuck made some remarks, which will be published hereafter.

Mr. Stewart, of Caroline. I do not intend to make any lengthy argument, but merely desire to say that I am surprised at witnessing the course this argument has taken—and to find how completely parties are changed. All appear to have gotten on the wrong side. Lawyers, if any one, it seems to me, should be in favor of this proposition, to permit every one to practice law in the courts; but on the other hand, those who are not lawyers, if they are sincere in what they state is their opinion of the members of the bar, should be opposed to the proposition. Without giving all the reasons for this, I will suggest only one. I have heard the gentleman from Carroll, (Mr. Brown,) and others, who are not lawyers, frequently inside of this Convention, as well as out of it say, that lawyers were not to be depended upon, and that they knew how to overreach and take advantage; yet here is a proposition to insert an article in the Constitution, the effect of which will make every citizen of the State a cheat and a rascal, because it will make them all lawyers. (Laughter.)

Mr. Brown. When did the gentleman ever hear me say that lawyers were rascals?

Mr. Stewart. I do not say that the gentleman said it directly, but he has rather insinuated such a thing. The gentleman will not deny that the community entertain rather an unfavorable opinion of lawyers as a class. I dare say that neither he nor any other gentleman would call a lawyer directly a rascal and cheat.

They always take care and speak of lawyers as a class, that know how to manage and cheat the people and obtain large fees. I say that if such practices are known to lawyers, or if those who are not lawyers entertain such an opinion, I call upon them to keep the citizens of the State out of harms way and not make them all lawyers. The lawyers, I have said, might be in favor of the proposition, because they do not entertain the belief that their profession is disgraceful, but that it is honorable, and may be pursued by men of the purest principles and character.

Mr. George demanded the previous question, which was seconded

The question was stated to be on the amendment offered by Mr. Bowie.

Mr. Brent, of Baltimore city, moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays, which being ordered, appeared as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Ricaud, Pres't., *pro tem.*, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Lee, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Buchanan, Sherwood of Talbot, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Hodson, Phelps, Constable, McCullough, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Grason, George, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Shriver, Biser, Stephenson, McHenry, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Smith, Parke, Shower and Cockey—49.

Negative—Messrs. Sellman, Weems, Bond, Howard, Bell, Williams, Fooks, Gaither, Annan, Magraw, Brent of Baltimore city, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Weber and Brown—16.