

tion was renewable from year to year, and to any amount, at the pleasure of the Legislature.

By the Act of 1785, ch. 74, the sum of two hundred pounds was given to the Chancellor, as Judge of the land office, for the then ensuing year. The sum of one hundred pounds was given to him, in the same character, by the Civil List Bill of each successive year until 1792; when his salary, as Chancellor, being increased, his compensation, as Judge of the land office, was discontinued until the year 1797; when an addition was again made to his salary of four hundred and sixty-six dollars and fifty-seven cents, in the twofold character of Chancellor and Judge of the land office. And at the next session of the Legislature, the character of Judge of the land office was again dropped, and the whole, with a still **651** further \* addition, was put together and given in the constitutional character of a salary to the Chancellor; similar to that described by the Act of 1792, to which this Act, for greater certainty, was by its title declared to be "a supplement."

In every instance, from the year 1785 to the present time, where it was the express intention of the Legislature to give an additional compensation to the Chancellor, during their pleasure, it was given to him as Judge of the land office. And in all instances, where it was intended to compensate him according to the terms of the Declaration of Rights, the salary was given to him as Chancellor. This is manifest from all the Acts, and the whole course of legislative proceedings from that time down to the 21st of February, 1825. For, it certainly could not have been the intention of the Assembly of 1798 to loosen and set afloat the whole of the Chancellor's salary; to be paid or not according to the mere whim or caprice of every succeeding body of legislators, in utter contempt of the Constitution; after the very solemn, and repeated declarations as to the constitutional obligation the Legislature was under to secure it to him during the continuance of his commission, that had been so carefully expressed and recorded.

But, it may be said, that if the Act of 1798 is suffered to expire, the Act of 1792 will be virtually revived; and, from the nature of the last mentioned Act, it cannot be repealed; and, therefore, the salary cannot be reduced below what the Act of 1792 has given. This position concedes the point, that the Legislature is limited in its control over a part of the amount of the salary. Now, if the General Assembly had intended, by the Act of 1798, to hold a discretionary power over the sum of three hundred and twenty-five pounds, which is the difference between the salary given by the Act of 1792, and that given by the Act of 1798, why was not the well known and established precedent followed, of giving that additional sum to the Chancellor annually as Judge of the land office? But the manner, and the character in which the salary was given, have left not the least doubt about the meaning of the