

except in one special jurisdiction and in that having limited the amount and provided the source, is it not fair to conclude that no other increase was intended, especially when the framers of the Constitution were so careful to name the amount and source, and to provide that such an increase when made should be absolutely final? If it was contemplated that the matter of increase should be left open, why have particularly limited this increase to be made by the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to \$500?

Again, look at the 1st section of Article 15, title "Miscellaneous." In the latter portion thereof it provides that "*No person holding any office created or existing under the Constitution or laws of this State, or holding any appointment under any Court of this State, shall receive more than three thousand (\$3,000) dollars a year as compensation for the discharge of his official duties except in cases specially provided in this Constitution.*"

How very broad and comprehensive is this language; it applies to all persons holding office under the Constitution or laws of this State—no limit in this respect.

It excepts only persons for whom *special provision* is otherwise made in the Constitution. The Judges hold office under the Constitution and laws of this State; *special provision* had already been made to meet their cases—while some receive only \$2,800, others receive \$3,500.

In the latter case, *special provision* had already been made for a larger sum than \$3,000; with equal distinctness, provision had been made in the other case for a less sum; in the case of the Baltimore City Judges, provision had been made for an ultimate salary of \$4,000. In neither case had any *special provision been made for an increase*, except in the case of the Baltimore City Judges, from \$3,500 to \$4,000.

As broad as this language is, by what mode of reasoning is the Judge to be exempted from the scope and operations of the provision of section 1 of Article 15?

Is he not an officer holding under the Constitution? Has not "special provision" been made for