

Mr. Merrick said the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Stoddert,) was mistaken in supposing there was no parallel to this proposition. The judge of the United States Supreme Court from California received a much larger salary than his colleagues, on account of his greater expenses.

Mr. Walsh said such a distinction would be a mark of inferiority stamped upon the judges from the counties.

Mr. Carter said the reason why he proposed the larger salary for the judge from the city of Baltimore was because of the difference in the cost of living.

Mr. Ritchie believed that just compensation was the wisest economy, and had been in favor of the highest salaries named, but was opposed to any discrimination towards judges sitting on the same bench.

Mr. Hollyday said several of the judges of Baltimore city were bachelors, and he did not see what extraordinary family expenses they had to provide for. If the married gentlemen of that city were unable to accept judicial position, let the community continue to select their judges from the list of bachelors. [Laughter.]

Mr. Jones doubted if that would be constitutional. It certainly would be contrary to the spirit of the motto of the State, "Crescite et multiplicani." [Laughter.]

Mr. Howison.—And besides that, the single judge system has been abolished.

Mr. Syester had voted for low salaries, but would vote for the \$4,000 because the figures already fixed were so peculiar and fractional that the introduction of another novelty would improve the scale as a curiosity.

Mr. Nelson rose to speak, and an amusing colloquy took place on the subject of salaries, bachelors, &c., between him, Mr. Jones, Mr. Hayden and others.

The amendment of Mr. Carter was then lost.

The salary of the judge of the Court of Appeals from Baltimore city was then placed at \$3,750, the same as that of the chief justices of the circuits.

On motion of Mr. Walsh, the vote placing the salaries of the Baltimore city judges at \$4,000 was reconsidered.