

and what is not. I say that the sooner that can be decided the better.

I went with the gentleman from Prince George's in all of his propositions. I was willing to tax my own people to have his system, which I thought perfect, though this House voted it down. I voted against giving this third judge to Baltimore city, and only upon that ground.

My friend from St. Mary's, convinced me thoroughly that this judge was not necessary. He spoke with a force of argument that wrought conviction upon my mind, and I wish every man would speak as he has spoken upon this floor—to making his points, and when that is done we get to the end of it. Since then I have conversed with able and distinguished men. I have now risen to change my opinions, not mitigating one word the gentleman said.

The question now is, whether Baltimore—the great city of Baltimore—shall have justice speedily or tardily administered. I desire the whole array of the law applied to her case in Chancery, in common law, and in criminal jurisdiction; and when I am told by these people from Baltimore and others, that they think this thing necessary, I yield my own convictions—I make myself forget the power of argument of my friend from St. Mary's.

Let Baltimore have this court, for it is important that there should be quietude in that city. I was going to divide and subdivide her, had it not been for the assertion made here that it would destroy the Constitution. Therefore, they have cast me from my own vote, and I shall vote against it now though I regret the necessity of doing it.

I am willing to give Baltimore every administrative power necessary to execute all her civil, her municipal, her local and her criminal jurisdiction—to execute them promptly and readily, because if there is any one thing in this world that is important, it is that mobs and excitements should never occur. I am willing to give a great metropolis like Baltimore all the attributes of power for the enforcement of the laws. She is a part of Maryland—the centre of Maryland. I am, therefore, willing to vote one other judge, and to change my vote.

I voted for striking out the third judge for that city, convinced by arguments that it was unnecessary. I must confess these arguments still linger upon my brain. When I am told by gentlemen that this thing is necessary, I will yield up my opinions, and will vote for an additional judge.

Mr. RANDALL. The district which comprehends this county, has been most harshly dealt with, under the present system, and I claim the right to express their grievances here. I think I can satisfy this Convention, that if there has been a district in this State that has been harshly dealt with, it is this. In the first instance, you have combined this district of four counties, when that adjoining, with little more, I believe, than half the business, consists of two counties. You have done this too, upon the assumption that the amount of business now transacted in this dis-

trict, whereas nearly all its equity causes are carried into the court of Chancery.

You now propose to abolish the court of Chancery, and thus to throw back upon this district all the accumulations of chancery business which are now in the Chancery court, but also require this one judge to transact hereafter, all the civil, criminal and equity business of this very large district.

In regard to the equity jurisdiction in Anne Arundel, there has not been, since I have been at the bar, more than one equity cause to my knowledge in that court, and that was a cause in which a relation of the Chancellor was the complainant. There have been an average of from twelve to twenty equity suits tried from this county yearly, in the Chancery court, all of which must hereafter be tried in the County court. So with regard to Calvert, Montgomery and Howard counties, a large proportion of their equity business is transacted in the court of Chancery. You have assumed the quantity of business, existing in this district at this time when the Chancery court decides most of its equity causes as the basis on which this district is composed, and then you propose to abolish that very Chancery court, whose existence is required to reduce our business to the quantity you have assumed.

I believe there is twice the business in Calvert, Anne Arundel, Montgomery and Howard counties, than exists in Frederick and Carroll counties, and yet the former four counties comprise one district, and the latter two counties another. I repeat, I have no doubt that suits in this district on the several dockets, trials or appearances, civil or criminal—are double in number, similar suits in the district composed of Frederick and Carroll Counties, we certainly have just cause to complain of this system.

With regard to Baltimore city, I say that greater facilities have been afforded her in the transaction of her business, by this system, than to our district. In the first instance, you have given Baltimore city two courts; their judges are not required to leave that city, not one day is lost in travelling the district—a very important item in the consumption of the time of the judge which has not been noticed either by this committee, or the Convention. In this district it will require a judge about one month's travel to attend four courts, two of law, and two of equity a year, in each county, which county courts I understand occupied about seventy days. Again, you have cut off Howard county and Baltimore County from that district. There is a separate criminal court in Baltimore city, which greatly facilitates the transaction of business. Baltimore city has much greater means afforded it for its judicial business than this district certainly, and it may be more, than most of the other district.

This system which you adopted was to be carried throughout the whole State as a separate county system, in which every in the State was to have a judge, and it as a part of that system, and in proportion to the facilities it afforded to the whole State, that Baltimore city was to have three