

plain that you propose to abolish a court, which is now actually performing in a manner most acceptable to the Baltimore bar, most of their chancery business, and at the same time that of our own district, and of some parts of the State requiring its aid, and yet it is again and again urged upon the Convention to create a new court in the city of Baltimore to transact their equity business. In other words, you abolish a court which performs most of the equity business in Baltimore and this district, and much from the other parts of the State, and you establish another at a like expense in Baltimore for the benefit of Baltimore alone. You break up an established court now in full operation under officers approved of and commended here by every one, and scatter its important business to the imminent peril and great cost and delays of parties every where, or leave it unprotected here, and you run the hazard of having half as efficient a court in the city of Baltimore. Even for the service of Baltimore itself, this accumulated business left unfinished, and the equity business of this district disregarded. It is a measure impolitic, unwise and oppressive to every part of the State, except the city of Baltimore. We call upon this Convention to retrace their steps, continue in full operation this valuable court, and thereby you remove not only the grievances of this and other adjoining districts, but of the city of Baltimore itself.

But permit me to remind the gentleman that this House has two or three times determined not to give to the city of Baltimore another court. Yet the gentleman has again and again urged upon the House the reconsideration of that determination. If the action of this House is to be settled as to one of these points, the denial to us of the Chancery court as stated, why not have it also settled in its denial to Baltimore another judge? Our grievance is this; I repeat it, because I am compelled to do so, as the gentleman from Baltimore again and again brings the same subject before the House. We have four counties in this district, and you have assigned to our four counties but one judge to do all the judicial labors—civil, criminal, and chancery—I believe I can satisfy any one who will look at the business of these counties, that it exceeds what is proposed to be performed, by any one of these judges in the city of Baltimore.

First, you apportioned the judicial services in these districts on the basis of the number of days the judges of the county courts were occupied, regardless of the fact, which the reports to this Convention establish, that the equity business of this district was taken to the Chancery court, and did not add to the number of days, the county courts were in session—the very and only basis by which you apportioned our judicial services. This would be all correct if the Court of Chancery was to be continued. But that you propose to abolish and thus you take from us the aid of a court which has greatly reduced the number of days our county courts are required to sit and substitute nothing to supply this great loss of judicial facilities in this district.

Another item has never been taken into the consideration of the Convention, that is, the time

consumed by the judge in travelling to and from the various courts in this district, composed of four counties. There are fixed by this Constitution, at least, two sessions yearly of the courts of law in each county, they must also have at least two sessions of courts of equity, as they now have in each county, thus making sixteen terms a year to be attended by the judge. Suppose the time consumed in going and returning to and from each court to be three days—a fair average—this will require from one to two months *without accident or delays* to be consumed in travelling.

Now, sir, the judges in the city of Baltimore, are saved all this time as well as expense. Formerly, the judges of that district of which Baltimore city was a part, had to attend the courts of Baltimore county and Harford county, which according to the reports occupied about seventy days—equal to nearly three months of time.—Such is not now to be required of the Baltimore city judges. All this is so much gain to the city of Baltimore by this judicial system, over that which formerly existed.

The judges of the city of Baltimore, being also now released from all criminal jurisdiction in and out of court for Baltimore and Harford counties, relieves them from many of the engagements which formerly occupied much of their time and attention, and are now to continue to be discharged by the judges in the counties.

The permanent location of a judge's official duties within the city where a few minutes enables parties to obtain his aid, adds greatly to the facilities of the community in the transaction of all their judicial business whereas we shall have journeys of days to make in the counties to accomplish the same object.

The city of Baltimore has retained more nearly than any portion of the State, the judicial power which the bill as originally introduced by the committee contemplated to afford to the various parts of the State, at that time too, it was proposed to give to each county one judge exclusively—now we have one judge where that bill proposed to give us four, and Baltimore city has four judges where that bill proposed to give her five—we have one fourth of what was intended for us and Baltimore has four-fifths of what was intended for her. Thus Baltimore city is the only part of the State which is to have the full benefit, or nearly so, of the provisions made in the original bill, as introduced from the judiciary committee.

When it was proposed to give each county a separate judge, it was at that time that this bill contemplated giving to the city of Baltimore this additional judge, because it contemplated that the orphans court should be abolished and all the powers it exercised were to be conferred on this judge. Then we were to have a separate judge for each county to exercise all these powers.

This Convention has been pleased to determine, (and I am gratified at it,) that the orphans court system shall remain as it was, to be executed by a separate tribunal, thus at once dispensing with the necessity, which, in the opinion of