

provides that the salary of no public officer shall be *increased or diminished* during his term of office, the former omits the language forbidding the increase of salary, and provides only that the salaries, under the circumstances in question, shall not be *diminished*. This same difference of language existing in both the 24th and 31st sections of Article 4, we are not permitted to regard as unintentional or idle. The fact that it is repeated in the 31st section, after having occurred in the 24th, is conclusive against any possibility of inadvertence or mistake, and renders it clear, in my judgment, upon ordinary principles of Statutory and Constitutional construction, that the provisions against *increasing* the salaries of officers, contained in section 35 of Article 3, was not intended to apply to the Judiciary. Why forbid *diminishing* in the case of the Judges, if that section already covered their case, as well as that of officers generally? This is made still more obvious by the further fact that, in section 31, after having used the language already quoted, to the effect that the salaries of the city Judges shall not be *diminished* during their term of service, the Constitution goes on to authorize the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to pay to each of the said Judges an annual addition of \$500 to their respective salaries, and then directs that *such addition*, made by the city, having been once granted, "shall not be *diminished nor increased* during the continuance of said Judges in office." This demonstrates, in the most conclusive way, that the difference of language used, in the different parts of the same section, was specifically intended to express a difference in meaning, and that while the restriction upon the Legislature only forbade a *diminution* of the salaries of the Judges, during their term of service, the Mayor and City Council were forbidden to *increase or diminish* their addition to the same, after having once exercised the authority to make it. To state the matter still more pointedly and conclusively, it seems to me only necessary to ask this question. Suppose that section 35 of Article 3, instead of providing that the salary of no public officer should be "*increased or diminished*," during his term of office, had simply provided, as is done in the case of the Judges, that the salaries of public officers should not be "dimin-