

addition to the salaries, the amount of which additional compensation is variable and uncertain. Thus in some of the States, fees are allowed to the judges; in some, a per diem allowance is made for actual attendance upon the bench; and in several, the traveling expenses of the judges are paid. The cost of the Judiciary in these States, cannot, therefore, be definitely ascertained; and to estimate it from the salaries paid, would not be to arrive at a correct conclusion. We can, therefore, only properly institute the comparison of expense with the States in which a mode of compensation, similar to our own, by fixed salaries, has been adopted. Such are the States of Massachusetts, Tennessee, Kentucky, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, and others.

The expense of the Judiciary in each of these States, and the population of each, in 1840, appear as follows:

	Cost of Judiciary.	Population in 1840.
Massachusetts,	\$25,750	737,699
Tennessee,	32,400	829,510
Kentucky,	36,000	776,923
South Carolina,	31,500	594,398
Georgia,	21,800	691,392
North Carolina,	18,000	753,419
Maryland,	41,500	469,232

From this comparison it appears, that Maryland, with less population, is paying more for the support of her Judiciary, than either of the States above named. It is true that our Judiciary, in respectability, in legal attainments, in the authority attached to their reported decisions, may proudly compare with the legal tribunals of any of the States of the Union. But the question presented is, whether these advantages may not still be enjoyed, at a reduced expense? If so, how is the retrenchment to be made?

The committee have before shewn, that the salaries paid by Maryland to her judges are not as high as those paid by many of her sister States. They have also shewn, that a reduction of salaries, while our present system exists, would be inexpedient and unwise. In what manner then can a reduction of the cost of our Judiciary be effected?

If such retrenchment is desired, the committee think that the true policy of the State would be, not to reduce the *salaries* of the judges, but to reduce their *number*. By reference to other States, it will be found that it is to this feature, (the comparatively smaller number of Judicial officers,) and not to the lower rate of salaries paid, that the cost of this department in many of them, has been found to be so much less than in Maryland.

The outline of a plan for reducing the number of judges was submitted to the committee, by the order of the House of the 9th of February. Upon due consideration, the committee are not prepared to approve the system proposed by that order. They are aware that the single judge system has been adopted in many of the States of the Union, but they do not think that such a system could be