

convention shows that we have been paying nearly \$3,000 a year for the services of special judges. That will be gotten rid of in a very great measure by the new system. But it is a part of the cost of the existing system; and will continue to be a part of the cost of any system which takes that as a basis, and makes any such mere modification of it as has been proposed. This will give an annual cost of \$48,000 for the judicial system, taking the basis of the old system as it stands.

Let us see how much we increase that by adopting this system of having a judge for each county. We have five judges of the court of appeals, whose salary we have fixed at \$3,000 a year, making \$15,000. Then we have twenty circuit judges, whose salary will amount, if we take the basis of the other salaries, to \$2,500 each, amounting to \$50,000. Then there are six judges of Baltimore city at \$3,000 a year, reported at \$3,500, and estimated at \$500 less, as we have stricken down the salary of the judges of the court of appeals \$500 below what was reported for them—amounting to \$18,000 for these six judges. This makes the system cost \$83,000 a year.

The difference between that and \$48,000, which the present system costs, is \$35,000. But what do we save in the operation? It is fair and just to take into account what is saved by the adoption of this system. In the first place, we save the salary and the expenses which the counties have to pay to twenty judges of the orphans' court; which would be fairly estimated at \$500 a year, on the average. That will be a saving of \$10,000 a year, in the matter of the orphans' court judges alone. Then we shall save the salary of the special judges; the amount of money paid every year for the salary of special judges, now amounting to about \$3,000 a year. Then we shall save in the matter of criminal expenses alone in the counties, the expense of keeping criminals in jail until the time comes round for the trial of criminal cases, and delays that attend the present system in trying criminal cases, at least \$300 per year for each county. I think that would be a fair estimate of the cost in each county of keeping criminals in jail until we could get a trial under the present system; which would be a saving of \$6,000 more. Putting these three items together, they amount to \$19,000 a year saved by the adoption of this system. Then the difference between the \$19,000 and the \$35,000 which the new system would cost over and above the present system, would be only \$16,000. But if the system of four judges for the city of Baltimore is left as seems to be the desire of the convention the difference between the two systems will be only about \$12,000 a year.

That seems to me to be a fair estimate of the cost of the two systems when compared together. It will be only about twelve or

fifteen thousand dollars, and cannot exceed twenty thousand dollars a year.

Then what do we gain by the adoption of this? In the first place we gain this one great thing. We bring justice home to every man's door. We carry out in good faith that declaration in our bill of rights that every man for every injury done to his person or his property, shall have justice speedily without delay. That item alone, it seems to me, will be worth the whole difference between these two systems.

Then again we save expense by the speedy trial of all causes which may come before the judges in civil and equity cases. We save vastly in the amount of cost and expense in that way.

Then we have upon the bench three judges to determine all causes in which appeals can be taken to the court of appeals, except equity cases. All other civil cases will be decided by putting three adjoining counties into a circuit and letting the three judges sit as a bench, going back to the old system of letting three men decide every case instead of one; so that we shall have less appeals taken to the court of appeals; and the saving of expense to the people of the State will be very large in that way.

Then I say the saving in the cost of equity cases, and lessening the fees, is an item which should be taken into consideration when we compare these two systems.

If we would make our economy apply where it ought to apply practically, we should strike from the court some of the supernumerary officers who are now attached to the courts and now receive a large amount of fees, and perquisites, and *per diem*; and we might save a large sum in that respect. The gentleman from Baltimore city, the chairman of the committee (Mr. Stockbridge,) says that we should save twelve thousand dollars a year in that item alone.

Mr. STIRLING (in his seat.) He is mistaken in the facts.

Mr. MILLER. There is no mode I have of estimating the amount; but I know that in our county there would be a considerable saving; and I know that in the counties of this judicial circuit, were county courts organized, it might be effected, and would be effected by the judge in this county. We would get rid of the offices of criers and other mere ornaments of the court, who loaf about the court and do nothing but take their fees and get their pay. We should turn our economy in that direction; and let the great object which we have in view be to bring home the administration of justice to every man's door, and obtain a speedy trial of causes. If we can obtain that, I say that an additional cost of twelve or fifteen thousand dollars a year ought not to weigh in the estimation of the convention.

Let us compare this with some other things