

this amendment, and if it is the view of the majority, who supported this recommendation that the language is redundant, I will not resist it being eliminated. On the other hand, it was our view that it is in there to make our intention abundantly clear, and in the absence of objection from those who supported the majority recommendation of the Committee, I have nothing more to say about that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rosenstock.

DELEGATE ROSENSTOCK: It may be redundant. We put it in here to make it evident that there would be a discontinuance if this constitution were adopted by the people of Maryland, and the county would again start subsidization of judges and add to that sum which the State will pay. For that reason, personally, I would like to see it retained.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

*(There was no response.)*

Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition? Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: I have a question for Delegate Rosenstock, if he would yield.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rosenstock, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE ROSENSTOCK: Gladly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: Do you regard the word "remuneration" as being synonymous with "compensation"?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rosenstock.

DELEGATE ROSENSTOCK: Compensation and remuneration, I think, are almost synonymous.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?

Delegate Burdette.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question of anyone who can inform—

THE CHAIRMAN: To whom do you direct your question?

DELEGATE BURDETTE: I really mean any knowledgeable person, perhaps Delegate Marion. Wherein is this language found elsewhere?

THE CHAIRMAN: Lines 15 and 16 of section 5.23.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: And does Delegate Marion feel that there is force in Delegate Rosenstock's point that supplementary salaries are really covered by the language which is alleged to be redundant?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: It is my understanding, and I think the understanding of the Committee that the prohibition against any supplementation of State salaries is contained in lines 15 and 16, which is the first sentence of section 5.23, that the compensation shall be solely by the State; and I see no purpose whatsoever in saying it again. I think saying it once in the constitution is enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: Delegate Marion, will you yield to a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: It just occurred to me that since we voted, although I abstained, I think, might not this sentence if retained here have the effect of preventing the judges from being paid anything during the period they are temporarily recalled?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not certain that he understands the question. Are you saying that the retention of the language in lines 36 and 37 in section 5.24 might prevent payment of remuneration to a judge recalled for active service under section 5.22?

DELEGATE HENDERSON: That is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: As I read the section, as reported by the Committee, Judge Henderson, this sentence refers to judges and not to retired judges, because the second sentence of section 5.24 specifically refers to retired judges. I would think this refers to judges and is purely superfluous in view of the language in 5.23.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Would taking this out permit a county to give expense accounts to judges in addition to the salaries?

THE CHAIRMAN: To whom is the question directed?