

tion, providing for the holding of two intermediate terms annually of the circuit courts at which no juries shall be summoned. His primary object was to save time and money to the people of the counties in the administration of justice. There were many cases which did not require the interposition of juries, either by law or by the consent of the parties, and these intermediate terms would serve for the trial of such cases. The great expense of the attendance of juries and witnesses could thus be saved. As the practice was now, jurymen were often detained day after day in idleness in waiting on the courts, and the consequence was that when the sheriff went around there were all sorts of evasions and pretexts resorted to to avoid jury service. Another reason for his amendment was that it would facilitate the determination of litigated causes and save much expense to litigants.

Mr. Syester thought there could be no objection to what the gentlemen desired, but were they not encumbering this constitution too much? Would this not be making it too stiff? Everything wished for by the gentlemen could be accomplished by act of the Legislature. This constitution was not the place for the detailed provisions of the system, and it would scarcely be safe to put in it that in all the counties of the State there should be but two terms a year of the circuit courts at which jurors shall be summoned. He (Mr. S.) thought that there should be three terms in Washington county.

Mr. Carter said the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Syester) was mistaken in the meaning of the amendment. It only provided that there should be two terms at which juries should not be summoned, but contained no prohibition as to the number of times at which juries shall be summoned.

Mr. Ford asked what the amendment proposed?

Mr. Mackubin said he proposed but four law terms during the year, two with juries and two without.

Mr. Ford could not see what benefit would accrue from this limitation.

Mr. Archer thought the objections of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Syester) were well taken. He doubted the propriety of the amendment. The whole sub-