

teen hundred years ago, the doctors and the lawyers persecuted the Saviour.

Now, as to the doctors, said Mr. B., whether doctors of divinity as was intimated by the gentleman from Kent, or doctors of medicine, as was charged by his colleague—he had nothing to say—no defence to make. He was uninformed on the subject; and besides, the doctors are generally able to take care of themselves. But as to the lawyers, so gallantly defended by his friend from Kent, [Mr. Chambers,] he, [Mr. B.] desired to know of his colleague, who was Joseph of Arimathea? He, [Mr. B.,] was aware that his colleague was an accomplished Bible historian, and he called upon him out of the fullness of his biblical knowledge to instruct the Convention in this—who was Joseph of Arimathea?

He was, (said Mr. B.,) a lawyer—a counsellor. Who was it, he would ask his colleague—who, in that dread hour, when the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in twain, and the earth did quake, and the graves were opened—that stood firmly and faithfully by the side of his crucified Redeemer? It was Joseph of Arimathea, a lawyer.

Who was it when all the followers of the Saviour had fled in alarm, saving only his mother and a few faithful women—whilst the pierced body still hung upon the accursed cross—that went boldly unto Pilate and craved the body of his God? It was Joseph of Arimathea, a lawyer.

Who was it that took down the body of the Saviour from the cross at the risk of his own life, wrapped it in fine linen, and laid it in his own new sepulchre, hewn out in the rock? It was Joseph of Arimathea, a lawyer. Beware then, after the high example, how you traduce the lawyers as a class.

These are the questions in kindness I desired to put, and these the remarks I desired to make.

Mr. JENIFER briefly congratulated the gentleman from Baltimore county, for his research into the history of the lawyers, which had carried him back nearly to the commencement of the world.

Mr. BELL. I rise not to defend the lawyers, but to say a word or two on the subject of physicians. He would not go as far back as his honorable colleague, but if he did, he thought the comparison would not be unfavorable to the physician. He only desired to say a word in reply to his respected colleague on his left, who had addressed the Convention a short time before, and hinted at the impropriety of professional gentlemen neglecting their special duties and engaging in politics. He desired to state a subject within his own knowledge. He was himself a physician of long experience; he had attended, he thought, faithfully to his calling, and to his patients, but it sometimes so happened that he was compelled to leave them, being called off on business for a few days; yet on his return, to his great astonishment he mostly found them improving, he thought faster than if he had been in constant attendance—they having taken the advantage of his absence in recruiting their health.

He, therefore, felt no conscientious scruples in leaving his patients, and holding a seat in this body. And he doubted if lawyers and physicians were more frequently absent, whether their clients and patients would be much the losers.

The question was then declared to be on the modified amendment of Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. C. asked the yeas and nays, Which were ordered, and

Being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Bond, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Colston, Fooks, Shriver, Biser, McHenry, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael, Newcomer, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Weber and Parke—22.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Sellman, Weems, Merrick, Jenifer, Ridgely, Lloyd, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Phelps, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Grason, George, Wright, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Gaither, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Gwinn, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Shower and Brown—44.

So the amendment was rejected.

The ninth section was then adopted.

Mr. MERRICK moved a reconsideration of the vote on the twenty-first section, (that which relates to loans on the credit of the State,) with a view to offer an amendment, (of which he had heretofore given notice.)

The PRESIDENT, *pro tem.*, (Mr. Blakistone,) finding that notice of a motion to reconsider had been made on a former day by Mr. McHENRY, stated that fact.

Mr. McHENRY made the motion to reconsider. He did so, he said, with the concurrence of the mover of the amendment, which had been adopted, and of other gentlemen who had voted for it, and with the intention to move, if the motion to reconsider prevailed, that the consideration of the section should be postponed, until after the other sections of the report had been disposed of.

After some conversation,

The question was taken on the motion to reconsider.

But no quorum voted.

The question was again taken.

But no quorum voted.

Mr. KILGOUR moved a call of the House.

Mr. PRESTMAN enquired of the Chair, how many members were present?

The CHAIR replied, fifty-one.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. KILGOUR;

And decided in the negative.

So a call of the Convention was refused.

Mr. MERRICK asked the yeas and nays, on the motion to reconsider;

Which were ordered, and

Being taken, resulted as follows: