after, cases were presented almost altogether in oral argument, and the judges, generally speaking, did no reading. They did often read authorities for themselves, presumably, when they took cases under advisement; and even in the earlier half of the century they were apparently expected to take under advisement some of the more serious cases. Taney complained [9] that the case of the C. & O. Canal v. B. & O. R. R., in January 1832, was one which should have been carried over for decision, instead of being decided within two days after argument, as it was.[10] But the ordinary, normal presentation of a case was entirely oral, reviewing with the judges in open court all the material for decision. It will be recalled that a brief of facts, one copy only, with a statement of the questions of law, had been after 1806 required of counsel in each case, and after the middle of the century printed records and briefs were given to the judges for their assistance, but, at first short, and only outlining the contentions discussed. In the last three decades of the century both records and briefs were expanded greatly, especially in the nineties, coincident with the introduction of typewriters into general use, and increasing reliance on stenographers as labor savers. In 1889, Chief Judge Alvey [11] expressed surprise and disapproval at the insertion in a record of testimony as it had been taken down by a stenographer, instead of in the form usual in bills of exceptions; but this and other like protests have so far been

9. Semmes, Latrobe, 344.

10. The case was decided in January 1832, but the opinions were not filed until the June term following.

11. Dumay v. Sanchez, 71 Md. 508, 511 to 513.