

current jurisdiction in civil business is given. It is absolutely necessary that there should be all three of these courts to have jurisdiction of civil business, as it is civil business which is now clogged in Baltimore, the only exception to the concurrent jurisdiction being the assignment of magistrates cases to one court, which is necessary, to produce uniformity. The only other change is that the five judges are to be elected as a unit, and will determine among themselves the particular court to which each shall be assigned. Everything else of the present system is retained but the two changes which have been mentioned.

Mr. Merryman said several of the city delegates who had voted for the substitute of his colleague, (Mr. Carter,) had done so on the hypothesis that it met the views of the friends of the minority report, and one of them, (Mr. Wilkinson,) had stated that voting for it under this supposition, he did not feel it incumbent on him to support it. The friends of the minority report had been originally in favor of the system as organized under the constitution of 1851, believing that the people of Baltimore and the bar were in favor of it. They had, however, in a spirit of compromise, accepted the report as drawn up by Mr. Ritchie, and he (Mr. M.) had felt bound to sustain that report before the delegation yesterday. The friends of the majority system had argued a great deal about the corruption in the courts of Baltimore city, and had particularly singled out the Criminal Court. Perhaps his memory did not run as far back as some of these gentlemen, but he would say that for a laborious discharge of his duty, no judge in this or any other country exceeded the judge who presided over that bench. He was not to be understood as complimenting the man, but only his administration to which no exception, unless in political cases, could be taken.

He maintained that the statement that the substitute now pending preserved the present organization of the courts in Baltimore was not correct in point of fact. It preserved them in name only, but not in reality. Mr. M. then argued at length in opposition to the substitute and in favor of the amendment of Mr. Ritchie. The system advocated by the minority had met the wants of the