

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 is usual in like cases, left blank, to be filled up on the second reading; and consequently, there was nothing on the face of it, as reported, which involved any constitutional question; or which intimated, that such a one was to be propounded. This bill was ordered to be put on its passage, on the first day of February following; but, that day was suffered to pass by, and it was not called up until the 21st of February; when, by a vote of 36 to 26 the blank was filled up with "*the sum of twenty-two hundred dollars,*" as the amount of the Chancellor's salary, and the bill was thus passed, and sent to the Senate.

It will be proper here to recollect, that when the present Chan-