

WEDNESDAY, April 30th, 1851.

Mr. SPENCER. I am unwilling to sit in my seat and hear sentiments expressed which, although not so intended, have a tendency to do injustice. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman who has charge of this bill, (Mr. Morgan,) to one thing. He finds fault with a portion of this Convention, who have voted to abolish the chancery court. Does the gentleman remember that the judiciary committee reported in favor of the abolition of this very court; and that upon that subject there was an entire unanimity and concurrence in the report to be made by the committee. In all the meetings of that committee, so far as my knowledge extended, there was but one individual who was in favor of the continuance of the chancery judge. The chancery court has been abolished by the vote of this body. The gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Crisfield,) neither geographically nor politically connected with the city of Baltimore, in any form or shape, submitted a *projet* which received an overwhelming vote. That gentleman, and those who voted with him, saw the necessity, in districting the state, of leaving the city of Baltimore separate and distinct from all the rest. If any person is to be held responsible for the organization of the present system, for taking away from the districts the three judges, and for blending the chancery court, it is the gentleman from Somerset, and those who voted with him, and not the city of Baltimore.

Now, sir, it is a matter of expediency, and to be considered by us, whether or not we will adopt this district system. In some portions of the state, two counties, and in other portions four counties, have been thrown into one district. I have not the slightest doubt that under this arrangement the judges can perform all the work, and will still be idle at least one-half the year. But Baltimore city has been left separate and distinct. It is utterly and physically impossible for any judge to perform the duties of a common law court and of the chancery court in the city of Baltimore, at the same time. We know it from the present history of that court. We should make provision for them according to their necessities and their wants. If we do not happen to be satisfied with the arrangement made for the counties, is that any reason why we shall do injustice to the city of Baltimore? I appeal to members of this body, if it is not just that they should have a chancery court, to accommodate the vast amount of business of that people. Look at their numerous trusts; at their numerous investments of money; at the various contracts constantly taking place. Look at the records of the chancery court of that city, and see how voluminous they are. I appeal to members of this body, candidly to say whether that city is not entitled to a distinct chancery court? If it is not necessary to administer justice in that city? As one of the committee on the judiciary, I have no doubt that this is demanded in justice; and I feel that it is my duty to vote to give the city of Baltimore that court.

On motion of Mr. SMITH,

The Convention adjourned.

The Convention met at ten o'clock.

Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. Griffith.

The roll of the members was called.

The Secretary proceeded to read the journal, and had read it in part only, when

On motion of Mr. STEPHENSON, the further reading was dispensed with.

Mr. SELLMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of the third election district of Anne Arundel county, praying a change in the license system; which was read and referred to the committee heretofore appointed on the subject.

MICHAEL NEWCOMER inquired of the chair whether it would now be in order to offer an amendment?

The PRESIDENT replied in the affirmative.

Mr. MICHAEL NEWCOMER then offered the following order, upon which, he said, he demanded the previous question:

Ordered, that the Convention take a recess each day during the session, from two o'clock until four o'clock, P. M.

The order having been read,

The PRESIDENT put the question upon the demand for the previous question; and the vote stood ayes 26, noes 23.

So there was not a demand.

As the question therefore recurred on the adoption of the order,

Mr. MORGAN moved to strike out the hour of "two," and insert "three."

Mr. BUCHANAN, (to the chair.) Will an amendment to the amendment be in order?

The PRESIDENT replied in the affirmative.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then I desire to move an amendment to this effect—that every gentleman who votes for this proposition will stand pledged to attend all the time.

Mr. MORGAN. Aye; but gentlemen will not carry out the pledge. We have had experience enough of that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They ought to carry it out, whether they do or not.

The question was then stated to be on the amendment of Mr. Morgan; and being taken, it was decided in the affirmative.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. Buchanan; to wit:

Add to the end of the order the following words:

"Provided every member shall consider himself pledged to remain from the opening to the closing of each session."

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, inquired of the chair whether it would be in order to move to lay the order upon the table?

The PRESIDENT answered in the affirmative.

Mr. CHAMBERS moved the motion.

Mr. MICHAEL NEWCOMER asked the yeas and nays upon it, which were ordered.

The roll was called.

When the name of Mr. SPENCER was called, that gentleman rose and said: I am willing to come here in the morning and stay until night, but I will not vote for afternoon sessions. I