

ready for trial. On the other hand, in Judge Martin's court, as has been stated by my colleague, a thousand or twelve hundred cases go over pretty much every term, he not being able or if able not being willing to try them. This amendment gives to Judge King's court a jurisdiction \$500 greater. It now comes up to \$500; and I propose to increase it to \$1,000; which takes out of Judge Martin's court all the cases between \$500 and \$1,000 and places them in Judge King's. Judge Martin's court has jurisdiction over all cases of replevin, no matter what the amount.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Not if it is under \$100.

Mr. DANIEL. That is a matter of small importance. They generally go before a magistrate. Judge King, I believe, never has a replevin in his court. I think he has no jurisdiction over replevins at all. He simply has the decision of cases under \$500, and appeal cases, and insolvent cases. I think even with this distribution as proposed, to continue Judge Martin's jurisdiction over equity as well as common law just as it now exists, if we give Judge King this increased jurisdiction, Judge Martin's court will still be much more crowded with business than Judge King's court will be, and that the court of common pleas will easily get through its business up to \$1,000; and that the business in the superior court will be much facilitated. I therefore think the amendment proper as I have offered it, and hope the amendment to the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) said that the court of common pleas usually adjourns for eight weeks before the end of the term.

Mr. DANIEL. No, sir; my colleague said that it had frequently eight weeks leisure, and sometimes more.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Eight weeks sounds very big; but everybody connected with law business in the city of Baltimore knows that all business is practically suspended from about the first of July until the September term of the court. There are your eight weeks. That is in fact nine weeks.

Mr. STIRLING. I mean independent of the usual summer vacation. I know that Judge King adjourns his court every day at half past one o'clock; and I could give a reason for it if it was proper.

Mr. ABBOTT. My colleagues know more about the workings of the courts than I do. Yet I have been so unfortunate as to have been in the courts and to have spent considerable time there as juror, and occasionally as a witness. The reason why I made this proposition to amend is that I thought this was going too far; that it was taking away too much from the superior court, and putting too much into Judge King's court. You double the sum; and as a matter of course

you double the amount of business. The great bulk of the cases that are tried are between five hundred and one thousand dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. By another amendment which will be offered in relation to the court of common pleas, we should take from the jurisdiction of the court of common pleas all magistrate's cases of a criminal nature, or embracing fines, penalties or forfeitures. My colleague who once held the same position I now do (Mr. Stirling,) knows that that amounts to considerable in the course of a year.

Mr. ABBOTT. If you propose to cure the difficulty in another way, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I now move to amend by striking out "one thousand" and inserting "five hundred," and upon that I hope a vote will be taken. But I wish to say one word before the vote is taken. Gentlemen are referring to private conversations with judges, and all that sort of thing, the amount of which is, that the judges on a certain occasion in the street made no objection to such a modification. I should have thought it very stupid in him if he had. No such thing was seriously proposed; and he might not have thought he could control the convention if he had opposed it. Some other judge might as well attempt to restrain us by an injunction. My colleague has been speaking of his private conversations with the judges, and of their approval of the present system. Did not they include the jurisdiction as well as other things. I wish my colleague would tell me that now; when the judges were in favor of retaining the existing system, did not they wish the jurisdiction retained too?

Mr. STIRLING. So far as I had conversation with them, it was with regard to the proposition in the report, and the general features of the present system. I have a very decided impression what the views of the judges are; but I had no specific conversation.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I state as a fact that I have on more than one occasion heard every judge there complain of being overworked as it now stands. The judge whose jurisdiction you now propose to much more than double, has now original jurisdiction from one to five hundred dollars, a range of four hundred dollars. You propose to add to that a range of five hundred dollars more. My observation is, and I think it will be sustained by that of every gentleman present, that during the general course of the year, four-fifths of the civil business in the courts of Baltimore city is between five hundred and one thousand dollars.

Mr. STIRLING. I think about one-half.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I think at least four-fifths. But according to the estimate of my colleague, you propose to take one-half of the