

they get a *quid pro quo* for it. They get additional comforts and conveniences, and all that. They get more in return for what they pay. And I do not think there is any reason why this discrimination should be made. I am in favor of a uniform system. There is no reason for this discrimination, and I will vote against it. And at the proper time I will move to insert \$2,500 instead of \$3,000.

Mr. ABBOTT. They get \$3,000 now, all except the judge of the criminal court.

Mr. CUSHING. I was very much surprised to hear my colleague (Mr. Abbott) bringing into the argument upon this question of salaries for judges, and using it as an argument against it that his personal income had not increased in proportion to the increase in the value of articles of various kinds. Why the gentleman should bring that in, unless he intended to state to the convention that his income did not amount to \$3,000 a year, and consequently no man should have more than that, I cannot opine. Unless the gentleman says he can live abundantly on less than that in the city of Baltimore, it is without point.

I utterly deny that three thousand dollars a year is at all adequate to keeping up a proper style of living for a judge in Baltimore city. I deny that three thousand dollars a year is a fair compensation for any man in Baltimore city who has legal capacity to qualify him for a seat on the bench. I have voted consistently in this convention to make the salaries in the counties three thousand dollars a year. And I desire that the salaries of the Baltimore city judges should be from four to five thousand a year; nor do I think that that increase would be too much. And when you take a man from the bar to be a judge, and prohibit him from having any other occupation by which he could increase the amount of his compensation, three thousand dollars a year I think is too little. You do not allow him the same privilege that you allow any man outside of an official position of this kind, to increase the amount of his compensation. You cut him off from any fees from his practice, and tie him down to this amount. No matter what may have been the previous style of his living, he must at once conform it to the salary you give him. There is no equity in this at all. There is no reason why, if you want a man to act as judge, you should not give him a fair compensation.

And I do not understand on what plea a reduction is urged of every salary that has been proposed to this house. There has not been a salary reported to this house by any committee, after long consideration, that has not been reduced five hundred dollars. The question what it will cost a man to live in the place where he will have to live, and the fact that he can make nothing but his salary, are not considered at all. But it is from a vague idea that because you give a man enough,

the people will say that you are imposing a heavy tax upon the State. The people are more willing to pay ample salaries for the work they want to have done, than their representatives in this convention are to vote them. Gold cannot be bought for the price of copper. The people know that if you give an inadequate salary, you cannot find a man of the requisite ability to take the position.

I have now a letter from one of the judges of the courts in Baltimore, who assures me that with the salary at present given him he must resign, for he cannot live on the salary now paid him. Whatever may be the bearing of the statement of my colleague (Mr. Abbott,) that his income has not increased in proportion to the increase of prices, here is an actual fact, that the judges of the courts in Baltimore cannot live upon the salaries now given. There is no complaint that these judges are not competent, that they have not done their work. And if they do their work, they are entitled to proper compensation for it. It is a simple question of justice, whether, when you require certain qualifications of a man to perform certain duties, he is worthy to receive a fair compensation.

The question is asked me whether we always have candidates enough at the present salary. Certainly, we have candidates, as I have no doubt we would have, if the salary was as low as one thousand dollars a year.— And I would guarantee that the man who would take the place of judge at one thousand dollars a year would make fifteen thousand dollars a year. I will guarantee to furnish you in Baltimore city with judges at one hundred dollars a year, and I will then guarantee that they will make from ten to fifteen thousand dollars a year.

What did the judges get under the old system? The judges of Baltimore city, under the old system, being allowed fees, got from five to six thousand a year. That system was one contrary to justice, not right. We have had good judges under our present constitution, but it was with a very different style of living from now. Prices have changed very much and very materially. They are going to be very much higher for a great many years to come. If gentlemen think that things are going to settle down to their old condition within the time of the judges under the present constitution, they are very much mistaken. You are making a provision in your constitution which will last only some twenty years at the furthest; probably the legislature, with power to submit amendments to the people at any time, may change it sooner. And the salary of \$3,500 a year would not last perhaps for five years.

I have never seen the time in this State when \$3,500 was too much salary for a judge in Baltimore city, or \$3,000 too much for a judge in the counties. I am perfectly willing, so far as I myself am concerned, if the con-