

I wish to stand upon substantial ground. I am not willing to procure the defeat of it, by refusing to a portion of the people of the State, an amount of judicial labor necessary to transact their business.

There is another view taken of it. Some seem to think that if you grant a court of chancery to Baltimore city, you give to it a privilege which is not enjoyed by other portions of the State. What have you provided for other portions of the State? The system we have devised is sufficient for the transaction of business in the counties. A single judge for St. Mary's county and Somerset county is clothed with the same power which we intend to give to this tribunal in the city of Baltimore. There is no difference. There is a division of labor, but no judicial power is proposed to be given to the city courts which is not conceded to the counties.

I have heard it suggested that this court of chancery for Baltimore city will concentrate to itself all the powers of the high court of chancery. But what is the power which it is intended to give to this court of chancery? It is nothing more than the equity power which is now exercised by the Baltimore county court. The court proposed can entertain jurisdiction of no cases except those which arise in the city of Baltimore. Baltimore county court exercises the same jurisdiction, and so with the Somerset county court. In the system which I proposed, all these judicial duties are intended to be given to four judges. The difference between the gentlemen from Baltimore city and myself is, that they parcel out the jurisdiction, giving the equity jurisdiction to one, the common law jurisdiction to another, and the criminal jurisdiction to another. I was for concentrating it all, and giving it to the four judges altogether. There is no privilege given to the city more than is given to every county.

I warn my friends of the counties not to get up a hostility between the city and counties upon such a proposition. I think they cannot defend themselves upon it. No man will charge me with favoritism to the city of Baltimore. I have given upon questions under debate in this house, the strongest and most conclusive evidence of my feelings towards that city, and my fears of the power she might concentrate to herself. But I can see in this proposition no danger to the counties, and nothing to induce me to withhold the supply of judicial labor necessary for the dispatch of business in that city, promptly and efficiently. I think this proposition ought to pass. I withdraw the motion to postpone.

Mr. BROWN. Motions to postpone indefinitely seem to have great favor with gentlemen.—I have a favorite motion too. I move the previous question.

Mr. MORGAN hoped the gentleman would withdraw it for the purpose of allowing him to make a personal explanation.

Mr. BROWN assented, and withdrew the motion for the previous question.

Mr. MORGAN. I make a motion to postpone the subject indefinitely. My friend from Somerset county, if I understood him in reference to this matter, appeals to his friends from the

counties not to be misled in reference to the motions I have made to strike out a chancellor for the city of Baltimore. He says that he thinks it improper to draw such an issue, and that he has adopted the view of my friend from Baltimore city, who holds this hydra over us, that if you do not give to Baltimore city every thing she asks, she will reject the constitution. I can tell my friend that I had no such intention here; I never dreamed of such a thing.

Mr. CRISFIELD. My friend from St. Mary's will allow me to say that no part of my remarks was intended for him. I have no doubt he made the motion honestly, believing that the judges were unnecessary.

Mr. MORGAN. I do believe so. The gentleman says that it is necessary that Baltimore city should have these judges. How necessary? That is the question to be addressed to this Convention. Necessary only because you have abolished the chancery court. That is the only way in which this judge, that is claimed by my friend from Somerset, became necessary for the city of Baltimore. My friend from Baltimore told you, when he addressed this body, that if the chancery court should be retained here, two judges would be sufficient to transact the business of Baltimore city.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. The civil business.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, the civil business. Then a chancery court becomes necessary for Baltimore city, only because you have abolished that office here. Then comes the argument I have addressed fifty times to this convention. Why is it necessary to abolish the chancery court here which transacts the business of the whole State, to render another necessary in the city of Baltimore? That was my only reason for moving to strike the section out. My friend has remarked that we do not give to Baltimore that which is denied to other parts of the State. I differ with him there. This equity jurisdiction is denied to other portions of the State, and in carrying out that, you but carry out the system introduced by my friend from Somerset, and which has been adopted—that is, that the two systems of common law and equity should be blended in the same judge. That is the system which we have in the counties. Hence it is, to detail the duties which the county judges discharge that it becomes necessary to reconsider this vote now. That was all I had to say. I have no intention whatever of the description mentioned by the gentleman from Somerset. For my part, I vote upon principle. I vote for what I consider is beneficial to the people of this State, without looking to the right or the left, in reference to what may be the peculiar opinions of one side or the other. I am not to be frightened by the threats or intimidations of certain sections of this State being brought into opposition to this constitution. Have not the people of the whole State a right to cast their votes against this constitution upon the same ground, if you take from the city of Annapolis a court which is open to them at all times, and transfer it to Baltimore city where its duties