

would not allow them to attend to their appellate duties. Perhaps it was well to let their arguments answer each other. Each demonstrated the fallacy of the other.

From 1804 to 1851 the system was in operation which they now propose to reorganize. The judges under that system performed the full measure of appellate duty within five months, and ample time was afforded in the spring and fall, in the recess of the appellate tribunal, to discharge their circuit duties. He appealed to the gentlemen from the Eastern Shore to say whether the late Chief Justice from that section had ever been absent from his circuit duties. The relative figures as to the business done in ten years under the old and the new systems had already been given. From 1841 to 1851, under the old system, where the judges performed circuit duties in addition, and sat as an appellate tribunal not longer than five or six months, there were 863 cases disposed of, of which 755 were from the Western and 108 from the Eastern Shore, making an average of  $78\frac{1}{2}$  in each and every year. The appellate tribunal from 1851 to 1861, which had no circuit duties to perform, and whose legal year was about ten months, had only disposed of an average of  $90\frac{1}{2}$  cases per year, and yet the average in its favor was only twelve cases per annum over the old system.

Mr. M. here read from a letter addressed to him by the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, that the number of cases tried at each term of that court, lasting, generally, about three months, was from 125 to 130. These cases were argued before the court by the best talent in America, and involving amounts at times, of millions, required the greatest labor and attention in their consideration. In addition to all this the circuit labor performed by the different judges of the Supreme Court was immense, and this showed what could be accomplished under the plurality of judges.

Mr. Gill offered an amendment to the amendment of Mr. Archer, making a different distribution of the circuits.

Mr. Archer hoped the amendment would not be adopted, as its effect would be to give two judges of the Court of Appeals to the city of Baltimore instead of one, and this