

fullest reports are made of all the proceedings in the State Courts; and, in painful, mortifying contrast, the most defective, irresponsible, misleading reports (if made at all) of the business transacted in the United States Courts.

Trusting that your Committee may provide fully for this just now pressing want in our judicial system, and that Congress may further establish it as a permanent part of the organization of our

I have, &c.,

GEO. S. BRYAN,
District Judge, South Carolina.

SIR,—

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 20th January, 1880.

I have no hesitation in saying, in answer to your letter, that I think the employment of well-trained stenographic reporters in the Courts would be of great value, and, in the saving of time, be found a saving in expense greatly in excess of their compensation. But experience leads to the belief that such reporters of Court proceedings are scarce. I think, however, it would be wise to pass the Bill, leaving the Courts to employ them or not as they deem best. I certainly would employ one if I could find an individual competent, and I should make the effort.

I have, &c.,

WM. BUTLER,
District Judge, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

SIR,—

Chicago, Illinois, 14th January, 1880.

I have your favour of the 10th instant. Bills of the kind you describe have so often been introduced in Congress, and failed, that we have nearly despaired of anything ever being done on the subject. I am of the opinion that the Circuit and District Courts ought each to have its official shorthand reporter. It is true that in most of the important cases which are tried there are reporters present who take the testimony, and sometimes the opinion of the Court; but they are paid by one or both the parties, and are in no sense officially attached to the Court, and over them the Court has no other power than it has over any person who may be present taking notes of the testimony or of its action.

There ought to be a shorthand reporter whom the Court would have a right to call upon to act officially for it, both in taking testimony and in reporting any action of the Court. Of course the employment of such an officer ought not to be an expense to the Judge. Independent of the great value of such reporter to the Court in all its proceedings, there is yet another aspect of the case, where I think the reporter may be of even greater assistance to the Judge, and that is in what constitutes a large part of his labours—namely, Chamber work; and in this such an assistant would be invaluable: in fact, it is almost impossible for the Judges in the more crowded districts to get along without some such aid. We are called upon to examine cases and give opinions in them where, without the aid of a reporter, it would be impossible almost for us to take the time to write out our opinions; and therefore we need, when we have examined a case and made up our minds in relation to it, and the subject is fresh, to have a reporter at hand to take down our views as they may be dictated. In this district it would be impossible for us to do the work we now do without some such assistance. I do not know how it may be with the other Circuit Judges, but a very considerable portion of my time is taken up in answering letters of inquiry in relation to cases and legal matters from other parts of the circuit—a large part of this is connected with railroad litigation—and it seems impossible to avoid this; every one can understand that, in answering letters which are addressed to the Judge about legal matters, it is a great aid which is furnished by the reporter.

Now, it seems to me, if there were an official reporter to each Court, the Judge would have the right to call upon him, not only during the sittings of the Court, but while transacting the business pertaining to his office in Chambers. And I have no hesitation in saying that, if the reporters were appointed, and were made available in the way I have suggested, double the work could be done by the Courts from what could be accomplished without such assistance. I do not think the appointment of such reporters would be attended with any very great expense; certainly it would be trifling in comparison with the facilities which it would afford to the Judges in the transaction of the business of the Courts and in their Chambers.

It will be seen from what I have said that I consider the most important object to be accomplished by the Bill that you refer to is to give assistance to the Judge in the discharge of his duties. It is hardly practicable that one reporter would be able to take the place of those that are now selected and paid by the parties in suits that are tried. That practice will necessarily have to be continued, and it cannot be expected that the appointment of a reporter to the Court will take their place, because it would require several reporters to report the testimony taken in any case in Court where the testimony must necessarily be used immediately after it is closed; but I cannot too strongly recommend the appointment of a reporter as an aid to the Judge in the way I have stated.

I have, &c.,

THOS. DRUMMOND,
Circuit Judge, Seventh Circuit.

SIR,—

St. Louis, Missouri, 15th January, 1880.

In response to your inquiry, I state that, in my opinion, economy and despatch of business in United States Courts will be greatly promoted by the passage of a Bill authorizing said Courts respectively to appoint shorthand reporters.

I have, &c.,

SAMUEL TREAT,
District Judge, Missouri.