

judges of the general court, as it equally applies to them. Surely the services of the last mentioned officers are as important and meritorious as those of any others, and they are as much entitled to a just compensation. Their salaries were fixed when all the necessaries of life were much cheaper than at present, and when the allowance of members of assembly, of jurymen and witnesses, and the salaries of the district judges, and of the other officers of government, bore a relative proportion to the salaries of the chancellor and judges of the general court, being all regulated upon one common standard. It is vain to enact good laws, unless men of talents and integrity can be procured to execute them. While almost all the other officers are attended to, and their services have been thought deserving of some increase, should the chancellor and judges of the general court go unnoticed? Will there not be ground to apprehend that they may consider themselves as slighted by the legislature, or regarded as deficient in their duties, and thus be induced to resign? It is to be feared that the judges of the general court may resign their seats, in order to resume their profession, by which they may be enabled to provide better for their families. You must be fully sensible that nothing contributes more to the welfare of a country, nothing tends more to the security of the citizen, and preservation of public liberty, than an upright, firm and able administration of justice. We submit it to your consideration, whether such an administration can be looked for, should incompetent men, from mere necessity, accept the appointment, and be placed in the seats of judgment. It is declared by our bill of rights, that the independency and uprightness of judges are essential to the impartial administration of justice; to secure that independency it also declares, that salaries liberal, but not profuse, ought to be secured to the chancellor and judges during the continuance of their commissions. We are persuaded you will think with us, that the present salaries of the chancellor and of the judges of the general court, and of the district courts, cannot be considered as liberal under the existing circumstances of the country, and when compared with the increased price of labour, the profits of trade, and the actual depreciation of money. We flatter ourselves that these reasons, and others which your own good sense and candour must suggest, will induce you to make augmentation to the salaries of your above-mentioned officers, as may be really adequate to their services, and consistent with the principles of our constitution.

By order,

A. VAN-HORN, clk.

Which was read.

The following message being prepared, was read and agreed to.

BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, DECEMBER 30, 1796.

GENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE,

WE return you the bill for laying out a road from a place called Bean-town to Port-Tobacco, in Charles county, and hope; upon reconsideration, it will pass your house. The convenience and public benefit arising to the people of that county from the road as contemplated, appeared to us to be well established. If you think the provisions of the bill defective, we will cheerfully accede to any amendments that may render it more perfect; but hope you will consent that the object of the bill shall not be entirely defeated.

By order,

W. HARWOOD, clk.

The house adjourns till 5 o'clock.

P O S T M E R I D I E M.

The house met.

The message and the bill to lay out and open a road from a place commonly called Bean-town to Port-Tobacco, in Charles county, and the resolutions appointing commissioners for ascertaining the direction of the road from the city of Washington to the city of Annapolis, were sent to the senate by the clerk.

The clerk of the senate delivers the engrossed bills No. 13, 19, 42, 46, 47, 56 and 66, with the paper bills thereof; which engrossed bills were severally endorsed; "By the senate, December 30, 1796: Read and assented to.

"By order,

A. VAN-HORN, clk."

The paper bills No. 13, 19, 42, 46, 47, 56 and 66, were sent to the senate by the clerk.

On the second-reading the bill to establish and lay out a turnpike road from the city of Washington to Baltimore-town, the question was put, That the house agree to the second amendment proposed? The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

A F F I R M A T I V E.

Messrs	Hopewell,	Butcher,	Montgomery,	Swearingen,	Bowles,	Savin,
	Campbell,	Clarke,	Brome,	Brother,	Douglass,	McKim,
	Bennett,	Beall,	Spigg,	Shriver,	Spencer,	Metryman,
	Driver,	Tomlinson,	Emerson,	J. C. Thomas,	Barroll,	Ridgely,
	Young,	Jones,	Bourne,	Calvert,	Buchanan,	Wilson.
	Brown,	Hylant,	Key,			93.

N E G A T I V E.

McParnham,	Jarrett,	Quynn,	Ridout,	Hall,	Miller.
McDigges,	Prall,	Oncala,			

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

On progression in reading the said amendments, the question was put, That the house agree to the seventh amendment proposed? The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

A F F I R M A