

Baltimore, a paper which represented more than any other press that he knew the popular sentiment, that the people would not hesitate to give good and fair salaries for the purpose of securing the services of good and competent men on the bench. The Convention in following the suggestion of this paper need not fear that they were deviating from the views of the people.

Mr. Stoddert said justice was now sold in the counties of the State. There was no commodity in the commercial market which was dearer to the poor man than justice. Fees had increased five hundred per cent. since he came to the bar.

Mr. Wallace took the floor in reply to the argument of Mr. Archer in favor of the one-judge system, and denied that the three-judge system was an experiment. The people of Maryland had been accustomed to it for forty years, and he had never, until on this floor, heard one word against it. The proclamation put forth by the nineteen made no charges or complaints against the composition of that system. All that they complained of in regard to it was the life tenure. The system advocated by the gentleman from Harford had been tried from 1851 to the present time. How had it worked? Go into the city of Baltimore, the western part of the State, and the Eastern Shore, and hear the clamor that comes from both bar and people against its continuance. The old Court of Appeals had worked well, and its decisions were more quoted than those of any other tribunal in the land.

Mr. Nelson said that on returning to his home a few days since he had tested the sense of the people as to this matter, and the universal reply to his question had been that they wanted the three-judge system. They were tired of the one judge, and on this point they were almost unanimous, but not one word had been said as to the expense. The other point on which the people were united was the retention of the Orphans' Courts as at present constituted.

Mr. Archer contended that only under the minority report could the present Orphans' Court system be retained, as the expense under the other system would be too great. Under the one-judge system the cost would be \$97,000,