Some of them in foreign countries, and yet, all this is to be performed within the brief space of five years, because certain members who have no information whatever on the subject, think that period of time sufficient. Many important chancery causes are now in the Court of Appeals and cannot reasonably be expected to be returned and completed within the time limited.

Where is this unfinished business to go, according to the proposition? To the counties wherein one or more of the defendants reside—the heirs of an insolvent estate or otherwise without any interest whatever in the cause. Suppose none of the defendants reside within the State—which is a very common case. Suppose an equal number of defendants reside in different counties. Who is to decide, when all the officers of the court are abolished, where the causes are to go? These causes generally involve the titles to land in the State—how are these titles to be brought upon the records of the county where the land lies? Who is to have the custody of these valuable papers? Provision for these important matters is no where made in this plan, and hence, the loss of the most valuable original papers may be the consequence. Leave the business with the court where it has originated to be completed, whose decision, it may be, has already been impressed upon some parts of the cause, whose commissions are being executed, and its other proceedings in the course of execution, according to its own established practice, whereby there will be saved much time and great expense to the parties and the business conducted with certainty, security and despatch. As before stated, the expenses of this court, when reduced by the receipts from costs, taxes and commissions arising from its proceedings, amount to less than one thousand dollars a year, less than even the additional fees parties will have to pay the solicitors for the removal of their causes. Under these circumstances, it is a duty the Convention owe to the parties in these causes to extend the time allowed to close up the busines of the court. If the Convention be not prepared to do so, let the matter be left to the Legislature, who will be required to make many other provisions in order to prevent injury and loss otherwise necessarily consequent upon the breaking up of such a court—a court which has existed from the settlement of our country with a general jurisdiction as comprehensive as the limits of the State.

On motion of Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER.

The Convention was called and the doorkeeper sent for the absent members.

Mr. MICHAEL NEWCOMER moved to suspend further proceedings under the call.

Before the question was taken the doorkeeper returned, and reported that he had notified the absent members that their attendance in the Convention was required.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment, as offered by Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER, to the twenty-fifth secton.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays,

Which, being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Dalrymple, Bond, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dashiell, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Jacobs, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, McHenry, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Hardcastle, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Ege, Shower, Cockey and Brown—40.

Negative.—Messrs. Ricaud, President, *pro tem.*, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Williams, Phelps, Bowie, Grason, George, Wright, Fooks, Johnson, Stephenson, Magraw, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Neill, Waters, Anderson and Hollyday—38.

So the amendment was adopted

On motion of Mr. SCHLEY,

The amendment was amended by inserting after the word "Constitution," in the sixth line, the words "the office of Chancellor of this State, and."

Mr. HOWARD moved to reconsider the vote of the Convention just taken on the amendment offered by Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER and amended on the motion of Mr. SCHLEY, stating that the consequences would be very severe upon the people of the State and upon the courts about to be organised, there being two thousand cases upon the chancery docket.

Determined in the affirmative.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER withdrew the amendment offered by him.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER then moved to amend said twenty-fifth section by striking out, in the ninth line the word "five" and insert "two," wherever it occurs in said section.

Mr. BROWN was in favor of the amendment. If the time was fixed at two years, the work could be done within that time; and, if fixed at ten years, it would not be done until the expiration of that time. If the time was fixed at five years, it would take $15,000 from the treasury; if ten years years, $30,000; if two years, but $6000. The whole question of time was at the mercy of those who had business with the court.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, said that upon any agricultural matter, he would not venture to place his opinion by the side of that of the gentleman from Carroll or the gentleman from Washington county. Nor did he think that they could give as clear a judgment upon matters relating to the legal profession, as those who were conversant with it. He had known the present Chancellor, with his rare powers of industry, in three days from the time any important and difficult case was argued before him, to give an elaborate, learned and satisfactory opinion of the case; and he did not believe that the Court of Appeals could work with the despatch of the Chancellor. But he understood that the present Chancellor would not remain to wind up the business of the court; and he did not believe there was another man who could do half the amount of work.