

THE CHAIRMAN: The Court of Appeals judge on the new basis. I am not sure. This was true.

Delegate Hardwicke, do you know?

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: It is not true on the new basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Rather than equalizing the salaries, are we not really raising the salaries of the Court of Appeals, and also the Court of Intermediate Appeals, and also the circuit court?

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: Yes. You are raising them to the level of the highest paid judge in that tier in the present system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: To the question whether there was a present Court of Appeals judge in that tier that was making \$35,000, your answer was negative?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think that was your question. Your question was: was there any judge receiving more than a Court of Appeals judge's salary, and the answer to that was no.

DELEGATE FORNOS: My next question was whether any Court of Appeals judge is presently receiving \$35,000 a year.

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: We took the figures that are in the Legislative Council bill. The rationale is that we are basing it approximately on the highest judicial salary. In some cases we have gone somewhat over the highest to preserve a differential. We felt there should be a significant salary between the Court of Appeals judge and the judge in the Intermediate Court. I am not sure what you mean; do you want to frame your question again, Delegate Fornos?

DELEGATE FORNOS: I am questioning whether it is necessary for us to increase, as part of the package of the Constitutional Convention, the judicial salaries, or whether we should not just adhere to the two principles that have been spelled out in the judiciary article (a) that they should be uniform and (b) that there shall be no supplementation, and then leave it to the legislature to implement it in view of the fact that they have the legislative authority to do so.

That was my question.

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: Well, Delegate Fornos, I can only repeat the answer that I gave you originally, and that is that we are afraid that two factors together, that the counties, by inflating the salaries on a local basis, coupled with the fact that you cannot increase that salary during the term of office, could compel us when the new constitution goes into effect, to have the State pick up an artificially high salary across the line.

We do not intend that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Could we not state that in one paragraph rather than setting figures for what is indeed a salary increase for the whole judiciary?

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: I suppose you could, but it seems to me that this is a sensible and clear way to express it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Do you know what the cost of the judiciary program is going to be under this new system?

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: Including all four tiers, and assuming that the district court judges pick up approximately the same workload as your magistrates, and so forth, you are talking about a total figure beginning at about 1971 of around \$837,000 in total—

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will have to suspend for a few moments to let the photographer take his pictures.

Will all delegates please take their seats? Will all other persons please leave the chamber?

For what purpose does Delegate White rise?

DELEGATE WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of inquiry and a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the personal privilege.

DELEGATE WHITE: The personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, is this: I would like to announce that fifty-four years ago an attempt was being made in the Post Office to force Negroes out of the service, and in an effort to survive an organization came into existence which was known as the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees, the latter name, "Federal", was included several years ago.