

be the shock absorber, so to speak, to pick up the increase or, as the circumstances may require, to increase its jurisdiction and thereby, to increase its jurisdiction and thereby relieve the court of last resort.

Do I make it clear?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bushong.

DELEGATE BUSHONG: Delegate Mudd, do you contemplate the district court's being a court of record?

DELEGATE MUDD: We have a memo on that, Delegate Bushong, from our very able staff man, and that can be done by the legislature.

It is our thought that probably all four of these courts will be courts of record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blair.

DELEGATE BLAIR: Delegate Mudd, do you have any statistics as to the number of people's courts and municipal courts that you have to compare in ratio to the number of district judges that may be necessary to compensate the manning of these courts?

DELEGATE MUDD: We obtained a wealth of information on that and I have forgotten how much of it is set forth in our memorandum. I do not believe it is.

I might say we had a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judicial Branch headed by Delegate Bradshaw to try to evaluate the cost to the state of taking over and providing the manpower for the system we propose.

In that connection we tried to ascertain how many judges were required but it varies in the jurisdictions depending upon the nature and culture of the area. Obviously an arterial highway through a small populated area can generate a lot of traffic tickets.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blair.

DELEGATE BLAIR: My question is directed mostly to the question of what the financial cost would be to man these district courts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: May I refer that to the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, who may have the facts and figures with him?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bradshaw, can you respond to the inquiry from Delegate Blair?

DELEGATE BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We sought out the assistance of the fiscal bureau, and Mr. O'Dell Smith of that bureau was assigned with Dr. Cooper to develop factual information which we might find useful.

We have a vast amount of research material, most of which has not been correlated or compiled into usable material here for debate on the floor.

But to answer your question quickly, it is Mr. Smith's conclusion that it would cost the State of Maryland, not the locality, because our system, of course, is going to be a statewide system, approximately \$250,000 more per year to inaugurate this fulltime statewide judicial system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blair.

DELEGATE BLAIR: Delegate Mudd, one other question. Was any consideration given to having a court set aside solely for the purpose of traffic matters, as distinguished from the other matters that come before these lower courts.

DELEGATE MUDD: Not at our Committee level, but we feel that the functional divisions which may be created by rule could, for instance, perpetuate in Baltimore City a functional division of a court of limited jurisdiction that dealt only with traffic matters, if that was the desire of a particular jurisdiction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Willoner.

DELEGATE WILLONER: I have a question on section 5.11 on page 4, where you set forth jurisdiction of commissioners. You state: "Commissioners may exercise powers only with respect to warrants of arrest, collateral and incarceration pending hearing, and then only as prescribed by rule."

Do you mean to include in that release on terms other than bail?

DELEGATE MUDD: The complete section is prescribed by rule, but it would be my personal guess that the rule would be liberal in that respect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Willoner.

DELEGATE WILLONER: Except, "only as prescribed by rule" unfortunately refers only to "warrants of arrest, collateral and incarceration pending hearing. . ."

I would assume this jurisdiction cannot be expanded by rule.

DELEGATE MUDD: Our interpretation