

ult was—

President;
ers, Cun-
ashington,
Galloway,
Hopkins,
r, King,
Mitchell,
Russell,
of Carroll,
n, Todd,

, Blackis-
g, Dennis,
Kennard,
er, Pugh,
1, of Dor-
ng, Thom-

," prefer-
preferring

against this
0. I like
t in favor
ructors for
eep up the
value. I

y disposed
ate for the
vents con-
e show at
that there
easing the
old system
and the as-
med to be
ever heard
fice during
to \$2,000;
occurring
equateness
ot been in-
no reason
increased.

against this
consider a
n or eleven
ntitled to a
e who per-
han three,
year. The
e judge of
rough the
0 any com-
efore vote
though I
cannot get
agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL moved to insert after "annum" in line two, the words "except the judges of the thirteenth and eighth circuits, who shall receive \$3,000 per annum."

Mr. STIRLING. Those are fixed in a separate section of the report. That may as well be left until that section comes up.

Mr. DANIEL withdrew the amendment.

Mr. DUVAL moved to amend by inserting after "annum," in line two, the words "except in those counties constituting special districts, wherein the salaries shall be \$2,000 per annum."

Mr. PETER. The reason why I advocate that amendment is that I think it is just and right. In a district composed of three counties, look at the labor which the judge has to undergo, and look at the expense which he is put to. For instance, as the judicial circuits are now arranged, the judge elected for Prince George's county will have to visit Montgomery county and remain there some three months in the year to transact our business, which will subject him to great additional expense. His board would absolutely absorb the \$500 additional, besides the labor he would undergo in visiting our county. How is it in Baltimore city, where a judge is elected for that city alone? He is at home all the time, from the commencement of the year to the end of the year. He is put to no additional expense for board. He has not this additional labor and toil. I think it is fair and right, if there is to be any difference whatever made in the compensation, that it should be in that ratio. Where the judges remain at home, and their districts consist of but one county, they should receive less, because they are not put to additional expense. Instead of that I see the idea is that the gentleman from Baltimore county, and the gentleman from Baltimore city shall have a larger salary. I can see no just reason for that. The services of a lawyer acting as judge are worth as much in the county as in the city. Are they better there, that they must be paid more? I see no reason for it. On the contrary I see urgent reason for paying them less.

Mr. DUVAL modified his amendment to read as follows:

"Insert after the words 'per annum,' in the second line, the words 'except in those circuits composed of one county, wherein the salary shall be two thousand dollars.'"

Mr. MILLER. There is fairness about that proposition, and I think it ought to be adopted. The gentleman from Baltimore city is ready to take care of his judge. We wish also in other parts of the State to take care of our judges. Judge Price, in Baltimore county, has now in his circuit Baltimore, Harford and Cecil counties—three counties. He has to travel over these counties, and perform his duties, holding terms of the court in each of these counties twice a year. He receives

now but \$2,000 a year. By this system he will be relieved of all duty in Harford and Cecil counties, and will have no travelling expenses at all. He will reside in Baltimore county.

Mr. STIRLING. He resides in Harford county.

Mr. MILLER. Then he will have to remove his residence to Baltimore county. He will have to live in Baltimore county.

Mr. THOMAS. There will be a new election in Baltimore county.

Mr. MILLER. Then a new judge will be elected in Baltimore county, and that new judge will be relieved of all travelling expenses, which I suppose in the course of the year must amount to \$500. There is a separate system for Baltimore city. This is merely a matter for the counties. I am opposed to cutting down the salaries, but if it is to be done this proposition is a fair one.

Mr. SCHLEY. I cannot allow so unfair and monstrous a proposition to go here unanswered. I scarcely supposed that anything so manifestly unjust as this, could find an advocate in this house. How does the gentleman's own district compare in population, in taxation, or in extent of territory, with some of the large counties? Taking Prince George's and Montgomery, the largest perhaps, and the wealthiest district, which has more than one county to compose it, how does it compare with the large counties?

Mr. PETER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment? How does the district of Montgomery and Prince George's compare with Allegany county?

Mr. SCHLEY. In white population it is some seven thousand inferior. In taxation, I think it is about one-half. And in extent of territory I do not think it will compare favorably with Allegany at all. There are no two parts of that district so remote from each other as the extremities of the county of Allegany, and not half so remote from their county seat in either county as the distant portions of Allegany. Then, sir, comparing them with my own county, I find that the white population of those two counties is little more than one-half of the population of Frederick, while the taxes are about the same. The cost of living is less in those two counties, the population being not so dense. I think that quite as much labor will be performed, while the cost of living is greater in the counties forming separate districts. For that reason I think a higher salary ought to be allowed in Baltimore.

Mr. SANDS. I have examined the statistics, and I will inform my friend that Allegany has exactly one thousand more white inhabitants than Prince George's and Montgomery combined.

Mr. PETER demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 19, nays 50—as follows: