

his own amendment, and the claims to preference which, in his judgment, it possessed.

Mr. BUCHANAN concurred in part, he said, in the opinion expressed by his friend from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey.) He, (Mr. B.,) thought that the proposition to appoint one or more commissioners, was too indefinite and might lead to difficulty. But he did not concur in the proposition of the gentleman to appoint only two commissioners, no matter how distinguished they might be. It would be safer, (Mr. B. thought,) looking to the grand divisions of the State—the local legislation of the State, and the legal ability of the State, that three should be appointed. At all events, he thought the number should be definite.

He referred to the code of Louisiana, as to the accuracy of which some doubts had been expressed, and spoke of it as a highly valuable and accurate production.

Nor could he agree with the gentleman from Anne Arundel, in the apprehension he had expressed, as to the other portion of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Schley,] that, in the large discretion given to the commissioners, the system of special pleading would be broken down. There was no danger of that result, in the first instance. But if the commissioners should think that a system could be devised by which justice could be better obtained than by special pleading, let us get rid of it. He hoped that the commissioners might conclude that it would be expedient to get rid of a large portion of the system, if not of the whole. The very reason, therefore, which induced the gentleman from Anne Arundel, to go against that portion of the amendment, would induce him, (Mr. B.,) to go against it.

Mr. TUCK moved to amend the sixteenth section, as amended, by inserting in the second line, after the word "commissioners," the words "not exceeding three," also by inserting the same words after the word "commissioners," in the fourth line.

The question was taken and the amendment was adopted.

Mr. DENT said:

I have an amendment to offer, the object of which is to refer to the commissioners to be appointed under this section, the forms of conveyancing now in use in this State, that they also may be simplified and abridged. It has been suggested to me, that this matter is otherwise provided for; but I am not aware of any provision for this object, more than exists in the Legislature by non-prohibition. The Legislature also has the same power, with regard to forms of pleadings, rules of practice, &c., in the courts of record. The power of the Legislature, in these matters, is not questioned. But the object of the section proposed, is to place the Legislature under constitutional obligations, to perform the duties specified in the section. I consider the abridgement and simplification of conveyancing, very important and necessary for general convenience; and as it has been determined to appoint a commission to simplify and abridge the forms of

pleading and rules of practice in the courts of record of the State, an object of which I highly approve, it will add very little to the labors of that commissioner, to prepare a set of simple and abridged forms of conveyancing, which, when once recognized in a formal manner, will immediately obtain general use.

Mr. D. then moved to insert after the word "State," in the fourth line, the following:

"And also to simplify and abridge the forms of conveyancing, now in use in this State."

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, asked the attention of the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Schley] to the language of his amendment. Was it the purpose of the gentleman to revise and codify the private as well as the public laws?

Mr. SCHLEY. It is not.

Mr. CHAMBERS did not intend, he said, to make any motion himself. He merely called the notice of the gentleman to the words of the amendment, which were "whose duty it shall be to revise and codify the statutes of this State."

Mr. SCHLEY, [acquiescing in the suggestion of Mr. Chambers,] moved to amend his amendment by inserting before the word "statutes," wherever it occurred, the words "public general."

The amendment was agreed to.

Some conversation followed in relation to the propriety of the words "public general," in which Messrs. DORSEY, SCHLEY, THOMAS and CHAMBERS, of Kent, took part.

The substitute amendment of Mr. DORSEY, was then again read, as follows:

"Section 16. The style of all laws shall be: "Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland." The Legislature of Maryland, shall at its next session, if then practicable, if not, as soon thereafter as it can be done, contract with two learned jurists of this State, distinguished, as well for their industry as professional ability, to codify or digest and abridge the public acts of Assembly then in force, and every ten years thereafter, and additional code or digest, shall, in like manner, be made of all public acts of the Legislature, passed subsequently to those embraced in preceding codes or digests, and no act of Assembly shall include in its enactments, subjects unconnected with each other, and forming fit subjects for distinct and independent legislation; and the title of every bill shall indicate the nature of its enactments, and no law or any section thereof, shall be continued, revived, amended or repealed by reference to its title only, or the number of the section."

Mr. BROWN said, it was his intention to vote against the substitutes of the gentleman from Queen Anne, [Mr. Spencer,] and the gentleman from Anne Arundel, [Mr. Dorsey,] with the intention of voting for the substitute of the gentleman from the city of Baltimore, (Mr. Gwinn.)

Mr. SCHLEY took two objections to the substitute of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, [Mr. Dorsey,] first, that it proposed either a codification or a digest, (i. e. abridgement.)