

he was in favor of low salaries. His disposition was rather to run into the other extreme. In regard to the county court judges, he was inclined to go further than the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Bowie) in the way of compensation. But, inasmuch as the labors of the judges of the court of appeals had decreased, he thought a salary of \$2,500 each was enough for them. His friend seemed to labor under a mistake as to what he supposed might be done hereafter in the way of fees and perquisites to increase the pay of the judges. He (Mr. Buchanan) begged to say that many of the lawyers who practiced in Baltimore had lifted up their voices against that mode of increasing the judges' salaries. Payments in that way were thought to be in violation of that provision of the bill of rights, which prescribes that no judge shall receive fees or perquisites of office of any kind. He did not think there was any danger that an attempt would be made hereafter, as had been intimated, to increase the pay of judges by fees and perquisites of office. He would go with the gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Crisfield) to increase the salaries of the judges of the county court of Baltimore city. The salaries proposed to be given them now are not enough. He would give them their salaries directly from the treasury, and not less than \$3,000 each. They worked faithfully and earned every cent of it and more.

Mr. SPENCER concurred with the remarks of the gentleman from Baltimore county. At the commencement of the session, he remembered, a call was made for information in relation to the fees, &c., which the judges of Baltimore had been in the receipt of. He was opposed to the allowance of those extras, and therefore in the bill which he had read that morning, he had expressly guarded against that practice. It was, in fact, a violation of the constitution. He found a provision also in the bill of the gentleman from Charles (Mr. Jenifer) presented yesterday, and which, by the by, was one of the best framed bills he had ever seen, which provided that there should be no fees directly or indirectly allowed to a judge. But he (Mr. S.) did not agree with him and the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Brent) as to the expense of the judiciary. He held that \$2,500 was an abundant salary. It was not true policy to give luxuriant and extravagant salaries to judges, or any body else. But it was the policy of the State to allow an ample sum to enable the judges to live comfortably, so as to secure their attention to the important trust reposed in them.

He thought a salary of \$2,500 a year was sufficient to command the best talent in the city of Baltimore. In his opinion, we would have just as good judges for \$2,500 as for \$3,000. We had, as he had already stated, the examples of New York and Virginia, where the salary was \$2,500. So in regard to Philadelphia Cincinnati, and in nearly all the States in the Union. He maintained that a sum which would command talent in the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Virginia, and other States, ought to do it in Maryland.

Mr. BOWIE moved for a division upon striking out.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, demanded the yeas and nays; which being ordered and taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Morgan, Kent, Dalrymple, Sollers, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Crisfield, Gwinn, and Brent, of Baltimore city—9.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, Pres't pro tem., Lee, Mitchell, Donaldson, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Bowling, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Stewart, of Caroline, Harcastle, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Anderson, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown—60.

So the Convention refused to strike out.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, then moved to amend the 5th section by inserting after the word "dollars," in the 19th line, the words "except the judge from the city of Baltimore, whose salary shall be three thousand dollars."

Mr. B. then demanded the yeas and nays, and being taken, resulted—yeas 5, nays 63; as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Crisfield, Grason, George, Gwinn and Brent, of Baltimore city—5.

Negative—Messrs. Ricaud, President pro tem., Morgan, Lee, Mitchell, Donaldson, Kent, Sellman, Sollers, Brent of Charles, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Bowling, Spencer, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Davis, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown—63.

So the amendment was rejected.

On motion of Mr. BROWN,

The section was amended by inserting after the word "be," in the 19th line, the words "increased or."

On motion of Mr. BOWIE,

The 5th section was further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"And no fees or perquisites of any kind shall be allowed by law to any of the said judges."

On motion of Mr. BOWIE,

The section was further amended by striking out in the 13th line the word "misdemeanor," and inserting "misbehaviour," and by striking out in the 14th line the words "and such other causes as may be prescribed by law."

Mr. SOLLERS moved further to amend the 5th section by striking out in the 14th line the words