

It is no where said or intimated, whether the ultimate object of this bill was to expunge from our Code the whole of the principles of equity or not; or whether it was intended to have no separate Court of Chancery; or to have such Courts, but no Chancellor; or where or how those powers and duties, now held and discharged by the Chancellor, were to be deposited and administered. The first sections of the Act of 1804, ch. 55, framed the present six judicial districts; and then the same Act declared that the General Court should be abolished. The Act which destroyed the General Court began by providing an ample substitute. But by this Act, for abolishing the office of Chancellor, there would have been an effectual pulling down; but no building up of any kind whatever.

On contemplating this short bill many inquiries suggest themselves; as, whether it would be expedient to eradicate from our Code every principle of equity or not? whether, if those principles are to remain, they can be administered easier, more speedily, and **600** * cheaper than they are at present? whether it would be better, and cheaper to have six, or eight Chancellors than one Chancellor? The late General Court was deemed a grievance and abolished; because, at great expense and inconvenience, it dragged witnesses and jurymen from all parts of the State to the seat of Government. But the Court of Chancery, like the Court of Appeals, does not call for witnesses or jurymen from any part of the State. It brings before it nothing but the record, documents, and papers belonging to the case. The lawyers may attend in person, or they may send their arguments in writing. These are some of the thoughts suggested by this bill, on which reflections might be carried out to a considerable extent.

This bill to abolish the office of Chancellor was appointed to be read a second time on the 28th of the same month on which it was brought into the House; but, from some cause or other, it was unattended to on that day, and was not called up until the Monday forenoon of the 7th of February, when it was passed, apparently, as a matter of course, without debate, by a vote of 33 to 23, and sent to the Senate—in which house, on the 9th of the same month, it was taken up and read a second and third time, by a special order, and rejected. Upon the whole, then, on considering this first one of the suggestions which originated from the communication of the register in Chancery, it would seem not to have been intended as a regular attack, but as a mere demonstration, as nothing more than a sort of preparatory feeling of the antagonist.

The second bill from this committee, by which it was intended to reduce the salary of the Chancellor, was entitled, "An Act to ascertain and fix the salary of the Chancellor." The place in which it was intended to express the amount of the salary was, as