paring Acts of Assembly which if passed produced great mischief, but he, (Mr. P.) would not trust to that—the *argumentum ad modestiam* might not be always a safeguard. If any change is to be made in the insolvent or testamentary systems, surely it ought not be necessary to codify in the act of Assembly, looking to a slight alteration, all that relates to the subject contained in any previous act. The Convention will unquestionably provide for a digest and codification of the laws, and if that was done, would not that in effect accomplish all that could be reasonably desired? Not only is there danger from the inexperience of members of the General Assembly, and on that point he might be allowed to say that, when he was in the Legislature ten years ago, and at that time Chairman of the Judiciary committee, he was certainly incompetent to present any act on an important subject. if the amendment now offered had been a part of the Constitution. Very few eminent lawyers are seldom found in the Legislative branch of our State Government, and such men alone are competent to codify a system of laws. But, sir, at present no great evil results by allowing any member of the General Assembly to take part in the preparation of the laws of the State, especially upon the less important subjects.

Mr. Brown said he should vote against the amendment. Either the laws must remain as they are, or they must be codified. There were but few men in the legislature who were qualified for the work; and if the Legislature were to embody all the existing laws in a new code, a hundred men would be employed, and would not do it after all so well as three skilful and experienced men. He was therefore against the proposition.

Mr. Spencer said he was impressed with the importance of the subject, and was apprehensive that the Convention was progressing in a matter which might produce serious evil. He had a strong desire to vote for any proposition, coming from his friend, Mr. Stewart, of Caroline, but he would not support this. It requires the Legislature hereafter, when a law is amended, to re-enact every law bearing on the subject. It was urged, that the purpose was to make the acts of Assembly clear and intelligible to all, so as to supersede the necessity of applying to the lawyers for information. He did not hesitate to say, that if this amendment prevailed, it would have the very contrary result. If we desired to do an act to benefit the lawyers, no scheme could be divined which would redound more to their profit than this. A very few members of the Legislature could be found who would undertake a task of so much difficulty. There would be too much hazard in it. In the enactment of a law, if the Constitution prescribes the mode, it must be strictly followed. If, therefore, an amendment to a public or local law becomes necessary, and this amendment be adopted, then to make such an amendment, you must re-enact, as he had said, every previous Act of Assembly bearing on the subject. In such case, if a single law connected with the subject be omitted, then if the re-enactment be valid, every Act of Assembly which was omitted would be repealed. And, on the other hand, if the law be anulled, because of its failure to re-enact *all* the previous laws existing, then all the legislation on the subject would be lost, together with all the expenses incident to the same Who can fail to see, in such a state of things, that lawyers would be constantly hanging on the Legislature, to be employed in drafting laws for the members, and that interminable controversies would be carried on in the courts, the result of such legislation?

The gentleman from Frederick illustrated by saying, that if that portion of the testimentary laws, relating to guardians, and wards, required amendment, it would only be necessary to re-enact that portion of the law, which referred to guardians and wards. To do even this, would require great labor, time and expense, in making amendments. Could it be necessary, if it became desirable to amend the law of guardian and ward, so as to require more ample security, that the whole law should be re-enacted in every particular? It was inexpedient and unwise to do so.

But he thought the gentleman was wrong in saying, that it would only be necessary to re-enact that part of the act of 1798, which in its subdivision refers to guardian and ward.—Throughout that whole act, there are parts which bear immediately on the subject. In fact, it is one whole system, testimentary in its character, and if the amendment prevail, there is good ground to contend, that any amendment, would require the re-enactment of the whole system. How is it with the laws of insolvency and of attachment? They each make a perfect system, on the subjects to which they respectively refer. And the same may be said of the school system for each of the counties—who, with such a section in the Constitution, would hazard an amendment to alter one of these systems of law, with consequences so alarming, in the event of a failure to provide fully for the evil. Who would undertake a work of such high responsibility, such intense labor and such accurate skill?

But it is proposed to provide in the Constitution for a codification of the laws. Pass this amendment, and until the laws are codified the legislature will be engaged, in the re-enactment of all and every part of every act of assembly, which may require amendment, to be adapted to this Constitution.

This will be done at great expense of time, in the delay of the legislature, and of immense costs for printing. And this, too, at the very time when scientific commissioners will be actually engaged in the very work of arranging the laws.

And again, after the laws have been actually codified, still, whenever an amendment becomes necessary, the same evil of re-enactment is to continue, with its interminable consequences of costs and consequent litigation.

He hoped the Convention would long deliberate, before it adopted such anamendment. He would not enter the ample field of argument which it opened. His purpose being in a plain and practical way to assign the grounds of his opposition.

Mr. Stewart, of Caroline, made some explan-