

that court, where would you put this duty? Who would be judge of that office? There must be some one to attend to caveats under the escheats law of the State, and other contested titles.

The gentleman from Queen Anne's (Mr. Grason) told us yesterday that four hundred dollars a year was paid to the judge of that office on the Eastern Shore. We had been told that the late chancellor Bland attended to that business for the Western Shore, for which he was allowed four hundred dollars, thus making eight hundred, when, on the contrary, the present chancellor did that business for nothing, and paid upwards of two thousand dollars a year from his office into the treasury. So that, if the Convention abolished the court for the purpose of giving an additional judge to Baltimore, with a salary of twenty-five hundred dollars, also to create a judge of the land office, at a salary of eight or nine hundred dollars a year, the effect of it would be to take \$3,400 out of the treasury, instead of not costing one cent to the State, when we look to the additional duty performed under the present system. These were the reasons which actuated him on yesterday in opposing the abolishment of the court of chancery. But, sir, there are higher reasons—

[Here the President's hammer fell, the time of the gentleman having expired.]

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, observed that he would claim the privilege of saying a few words. First of all, as to the judicial district composed of the counties of St. Mary's, Charles and Prince George's. It had been said that Baltimore claimed three times that of any other district in the state. The total population of those counties, slave and free—white and black—was only about 50,000, and a small fraction, whereas that of Baltimore was 169,000, which was about three times as much as the population of the counties he had just named. Of course, that went for nothing! Population was not even to have the political influence belonging to them, much less were they to have as much litigation in proportion! So that, according to that argument, Baltimore was entitled to three times as much as that district. There was another thing worthy of consideration: it was this—that on account of the great wealth and commercial enterprise in Baltimore city, there was an immense amount of business created for the courts. Look to the vast number of cases before them, of the highest pecuniary and commercial importance. Why, there was no judicial district in the state to compare with it. No three of the districts had as much property in litigation as Baltimore alone. He would undertake to say that more than half the time of the chancery court had been occupied in the transaction of business from Baltimore city. And, if the whole of that business was to be taken away from the chancery court, and thrown back on the courts of Baltimore, it would require an increased force to do the business. He asserted that under the old system, a great deal of business was done in Baltimore county court, sitting as a court of equity. He would undertake to say that one chancellor would

have all his time occupied owing to the great number of cases in Baltimore city before him. And what did they want? Why, nothing more than the distinguished gentleman (Mr. Crisfield) had proposed in his project.

Now, his friend (Mr. Buchanan) from Baltimore county talks of two weeks only being occupied by the court on appeals in Baltimore city. He (Mr. B.) would take issue with him. He maintained that appealing had increased to an immense amount. There was to be found on the docket upwards of 180 cases in a term. It was most important—it was most vital—and that character of business generally affected the poorest portion of the people; and they should have justice administered to them as well and as speedily as to the richest in the land. That business was increasing every day. Another fact he would state. His friend from Baltimore county (Mr. Buchanan) undertook to make a calculation, (and he would say, with all deference to him, that it was erroneous,) in which he assumed the expenses of the present judiciary, but had left out one of the judges of the orphans' court. And in his calculation he had only given us two judges, when there were three.

Mr. BUCHANAN, (in his seat.) That would make a difference in my favor—that is, in favor of my argument.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. Now, let us see how that is. The gentleman had omitted one judge of the orphans' court under the present system. Why, that increased the expenses of the present system. The boot was on the other leg. Our object was to swell the expenses of the old system by way of comparison with those of the proposed system.

My friend omitted one judge, and that fact was in my favor, and not, as he supposed, in his favor. Again, he entirely overlooked the fees and perquisites paid to the judges of Baltimore county court, and which swelled the compensation of each judge of the county courts to four or five thousand dollars a year. Now, we have a system proposed which did not, while it increased the number of judges, at all increase the expense, but it, in fact, saved thousands of dollars annually. Now, how many judges were there under the present system? Three in the county court. We did not propose to increase the number, and instead of having large salaries, we would give them limited salaries. But there would be an immense saving of expense. We had eight judges, and three insolvent commissioners exercising judicial functions in the city of Baltimore. The business of the Baltimore city courts had increased fearfully, and yet it was proposed to take away the court of chancery. Now, his friend said that \$60,000 were taken off by separating Baltimore and Harford counties. Well, that was true. But on the other hand, look at the increase of our population since the last ten years—at least sixty thousand—and the judiciary could not transact all the business before them, and it had accumulated to an immense extent, even with the aid of the chancellor and the three judges of Baltimore county court acting in separate departments;