

evidence may be taken in his own county, or at any place to which he may ask the commission to be directed; at no time, either at the beginning or during the progress, or at the final hearing of his case, need he be personally present in the court of Chancery. No *personal* vexation, therefore, attends the extensive reach of the Chancery process to defendants in any quarter of the state, and where they chance to reside in various quarters, no more reasonable adjustment for their common convenience could be devised than to afford a central tribunal like the court of Chancery for the site of the contest. No grievance except that of enhanced expense, and that only in some cases, would need to be provided for; and that grievance would exist, as we have endeavored to show, in the equity jurisdiction of the county courts acting on remote defendants. Legislation at all events, can afford ample compensation for the difficulties so incurred, and adequate preventives of vexatious controversy. It will appear it is believed upon a view of the complex functions of a court of common law, endowed with equity powers and operating in a circuit, that with such courts prompt and full remedial action co-ordinate with all the occasions of suitors in equity is, if not impracticable, a matter of ~~any~~ difficult consummation, by any arrangement whatsoever.

Hence the tardy course of equity in several judicial districts, and the embarrassment which in the case of the first judicial district of this State, induced the act of 1831, chapter 309, which authorized the removal thence of causes in Equity, to the Court of Chancery, while the same evils resulting from this compound authority and unwieldy action occasioned the act passed a number of years since, and yet in force and after availed, of which authorized the removal of equity cases from Baltimore County Court. In England, too, the reflections of those intent upon making the judicial power most effective and accessible, have arrived at the same conclusion: that the combination of common law and chancery jurisdiction, is incongruous and inefficient. And hence the Court of Exchequer, which, like our county courts, combines Chancery and common law authority has been or is about to be divested of the Chancery jurisdiction, all which jurisdiction it is proposed there to confine to the Court of Chancery, under it is true, an improved organization—but still retaining it