

“No extra compensation shall be granted or allowed by the General Assembly to any public officer, agent, servant or contractor, after the service shall have been rendered or the contract entered into; nor shall the salary or compensation of any public officer be increased or diminished during his term of office.”

And the last clause of the first section of Article 15.

“And no person holding any office created by, or existing under this Constitution, or holding any appointment under any Court in this State, shall receive more than \$3,000 a year, as compensation for the discharge of his official duties, except in cases specially provided for in this Constitution.”

The latter clause, plainly, does not apply. The answer to the 35th section of Article 3 is, that where the Constitution has prescribed the particular manner in which salaries should be fixed, it had dealt with the subject specially, and a general provision such as this, would not control.

It seems to us that the question was settled when the present language was deliberately adopted, and the former language deliberately discarded. This shows that the intention was, that the Legislature should be as free to increase the salaries of the Judges as Congress is to increase the salaries of the Federal Judges.

Very respectfully,  
COWEN & CROSS.

---

BALTIMORE, MD., Feb'y 29th, 1892.

*The Hon. James P. Gorter, Senate Chamber:*

DEAR SIR:—We notice that the bill to increase the compensation of the Judges has been referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, upon the question of its constitutionality. As this bill was prepared by the Committee on the amendment of the law of the Bar Association of Baltimore city, it is perhaps proper that that Committee should express in this way its views upon that question.

It will be observed that by section 24, of Article 4, of the Constitution, the salaries of the Chief Judges of the Circuits and of the Judge of the Court of Ap-