fees had sometimes been introduced by lawyers, under the idea that they were practising in the art of special pleading.

He could cite instances where enormous costs had been incurred in suits under our forms in Maryland, greater than those in the case from New York, but he would not go into that subject. He left it to the discretion of the legislature, which had the power to correct such evils.

He read the latter part of the amendment of the gentleman from Caroline, and contended that it was not liable to the criticisms made upon it by the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) and repeated what he had said before on the subject of the testamentary system, and the continuance of the increased salary of the Chancellor for many years, in consequence of the negligence of the legislature in not examining the annual bills, (to continue in force certain laws,) before they were passed.

He knew from his own experience that it was a practice merely to read the titles of certain bills to continue bills about to expire for another term, without reading more than the titles. He never read these bills taking the word of the chairman of the committee as to their contents.

When gentlemen argued that a branch of a law might not be amended, without re-enacting the whole law of which it was a part, he asked if this was not running counter to the express language of the article we have adopted? And he read that article that the House might judge.

He remarked on the criticism of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, on the word "subject," and said that if it was susceptible of so many constructions, it would have been better for that gentleman to have moved the substitute of a more distinct word by way of remedying the error. He laid down the principle that it requires much mental discipline to be able to analyse any subject embracing a variety of ideas, so as to separate the elements, and collicate and arrange them; stated that there were few minds competent to the task, and applied it to the work of codification.

He could readily conceive how gentlemen desired to have the laws collected and collocated to their hands, because it saved them the great mental processes of searching up all the laws and going through all the decisions of the Courts of Appeals. It was a labor of such magnitude that but few minds could be found capable of performing it. He had seen many a member of the bar who had lost a case, because his mind had not taken in all the points of which it was susceptible; and he had seen judges, who, from the same cause had delivered false decisions. The popular mind calls for a reform in our legal system.

He was ready to adopt any mode best calculated to gratify popular feeling, to which he responded with all his heart and soul, which demands that the laws shall be made so clear that even the unlettered man may know them, and that the "way-faring man, though a fool, may not err therein." He had great respect for the opinions of the gentleman from Anne Arundel as to the codifying the laws, but he could not, on this important subject, consent to abandon his views.

It was so also, as to special pleading: the gentleman from Anne Arundel was so wedded to old forms, that he thought the present system could not be amended. But the popular demand must be gratified.

Let these changes be made now, in the midst of the nineteenth century, in the form of our laws; and let our system of special pleading, which no one desires to abolish, be revised and so modified as to be in accordance with the advanced intelligence of the age; and let the whole system of our laws, of our forms of pleading, and of our rules of practice, be adapted, as they can be, to the condition and circumstances of society as it is now; and let them not remain, as they obviously are in many respects, adapted to the condition the world was in, Anno Domini, one.

Mr. Dorsey made an explanation in reply. He said, he was inclined to question the expediency, much less the necessity of the legislature inflicting on the State, the enormous expenditure of appointing two separate boards of commissioners on the two distinct subjects under this amendment. He could not allow the construction put upon it, that the commissioners were to make the code, and without submitting it to the legislature, it was to become the law of the land; such an opinion could not for a moment be sustained. The code, until its adoption by the legislature, had no vitality or operation. He had no such intention, as was clear from the subsequent part of the amendment, where it is provided how the legislsture might act with regard to it. The legislature have the power to arrange all the details without any constitutional provision.

He could not pretend to know any thing about the popular feeling on the subject of special pleading. If there really was any such feeling, it was probably got up by politicians to subserve some momentary purpose, and did not originate with the people, and from its nature would soon die away.

It had been asked by the gentleman from Frederick, why, if he objected to the looseness of the words "one subject," he did not propose to substitute a more definite term? He could only answer that he saw no necessity for any attempt on his part, to amend a proposition to which he was altogether opposed. It was certainly no part of his duty to amend the proposition; and, in reply, he would ask, why he did not amend it? Certainly nobody was more competent to do so, than he was. He cited some cases for the purpose of showing that the word "subject" was too loose. It would be better, he thought, to have a variety of subjects, relating to the same object, in one bill, instead of having them scattered through several bills, a separate bill for each separate subject, although relating to one general object. If the act should be either altered or amended,