

There are, also, four terms in this court, which very much expedite the business. It does seem to me that the period even of five years is not sufficient.

Now, with regard to the business done in this court from various parts of the State, I beg leave to call the attention of the convention to some further facts.

The number of chancery suits from the city of Baltimore, in this court for the last five years, has been 521. That city has now performed in the court of chancery most of its chancery business. Anne Arundel and other counties of this district have performed nearly all their business here. You have already fixed upon eight judicial districts, upon the assumption that this very chancery jurisdiction was to continue to perform its functions within this State.

If you abolish the chancery court, you must add one of the counties now of this district to some other district, else you have in the district more duty than any one judge can perform.

Then, when you abolish this court, you throw into the districts a vast amount of old business from the chancery court, which must obstruct the progress of the courts, and prevent your new system having a fair trial.

The committee on the judiciary have taken as the basis for the districting of the state, the amount of business now done in the county courts respectively in the state. They have not taken into their consideration the business done in the court of chancery; and hence it will readily appear that if we throw back upon the county courts the business heretofore transacted by the court of chancery, we shall take away the very foundation upon which your system now organized has been established.

As to the expense of this court to the state of Maryland: the expense of this court is about \$900 a year to the state of Maryland. It receives from court taxes upon commissions, &c., about \$2,100, which it pays annually into the state treasury, thus reducing the only expense, the salary of the chancellor, \$3,000, to the sum of about \$900—as before stated.

These sums would not, probably, be paid into the treasury, but for the facilities which this court affords the public. Business is frequently done or not done according to these facilities afforded him in its transaction.

If a man finds that his suit will lie tied up for years, he will not enter into it at all. He will deny himself the advantages it might bring to him, rather than await a tardy decree.

Generally the power exists to remove cases from the county courts to the court of chancery. Parties and solicitors find that they cannot have performed chancery business in the county courts of this state; hence these laws for removal of causes. And if the county courts could not perform this duty when they had eighteen judges who might be engaged in its performance, how can they do so with the provision now made, with only eight judges? There are also great advantages you now have which you will not have in the new system. The judges now living in most of your counties fa-

cilitate very much the transaction of chancery business in the respective counties, especially in their chambers at their homes.

Now you have decided that there shall be only eight judges in the state of Maryland. These eight judges have all the business of law and equity to transact; and unless you had some court like this to fall back upon for relief, when the courts of law and equity are crowded, you will find your whole system, to use a common phrase, work badly, and out of gear. You would find all your courts so hindered and obstructed as to be unable to proceed.

The certainty of that uniform system of equity which a central court of chancery establishes is very important, and can be attained by it alone. Those gentlemen from different parts of the State who have spoken of the efficiency with which the business of the chancery court is transacted now by its learned, talented, and indefatigable chancellor, have done no more than justice to this court and to its officers. In this whole equity jurisdiction you are now making an experiment at a fearful hazard; for you find that these courts have not been able hitherto to transact their law business and discharge the equity business before them, but the Legislature has had to pass laws for the removal of their equity suits to the chancery court. When the judges are now reduced more than one half, how can those duties be performed? Is it wise to run this risk of great public losses when the sole object to be obtained is to save a few hundred dollars?

It is true that this court performs its duties quietly in this small city, where few are aware of its existence, except in the benefits it confers upon them; and that may be a reason why it has not had that popularity which it really merits with our citizens at large. It has none of the appendages by which publicity is effected and popularity is to be obtained. No jurors or witnesses filling its hall, or exciting criminal trials thronging it with the curious crowd. But the just, patient, constant, and prompt transaction of the very intricate and important business of that court will continue to commend it to all who are engaged in its practice, and to others acquainted with its merits.

As my ten minutes are nearly expiring, I will withdraw the motion which I have submitted, and will move that the time for closing up the business of the court be extended to eight years, upon which motion I believe I am entitled to ten minutes more. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore, raised the question of order, whether it was competent thus to make a second motion.

After some conversation upon which, Mr. RANDALL withdrew his second amendment, and renewed the amendment, extending the time to ten years.

The question being taken upon the amendment, it was rejected.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER withdrew his amendment.

Mr. GRASON said: There is a disposition to reduce the number of judges, because the pres-