

# The Legal News.

VOL. IV. JUNE 4, 1881. No. 23.

## THE U. S. JUDICIARY.

The *Ohio Law Journal* gives the following table, showing the number of the judges constituting the highest court in each State in the Union, the length of term, and their salaries:

State.	Number of Judges.	Term of Office.	Salary.
Alabama	Three	6 years	\$3,000
Arkansas	Three	8 "	3,500
California	Seven	12 "	6,000
Colorado	Three	9 "	3,250
Connecticut	Five	8 "	4,000
Delaware	{ 1 Chief Justice	For life	2,500
	{ 1 Chancellor	"	2,000
	{ 3 Associate Justices	"	3,000
Florida	Three	4 years	2,500
Georgia	Three	9 "	5,000
Illinois	Seven	6 "	4,000
Indiana	Five	6 "	4,000
Iowa	Five	6 "	3,000
Kansas	{ 1 Chief Justice	6 "	3,000
	{ 2 Associate Justices	4 "	3,000
Kentucky	Three	8 "	5,000
Louisiana	{ 1 Chief Justice	8 "	7,500
	{ 4 Associate Justices	5 "	2,000
Maine	Eight	7 "	3,000
Maryland	Eight	15 "	3,500
Massachusetts	{ 1 Chief Justice	{ During	6,500
	{ 7 Associate Justices	{ good	6,000
		{ behavior.	
Michigan	Four	8 years	4,000
Minnesota	{ 1 Chief Justice	7 "	4,500
	{ 3 Associate Justices	7 "	4,000
Mississippi	Three	9 "	3,500
Missouri	Five	9 "	4,500
Nebraska	Three	6 "	2,500
Nevada	Three	6 "	7,000
New Hampshire	{ 1 Chief Justice	{ Until 70	2,400
	{ 6 Associate Justices	{ years old.	2,200
	{ 1 Chancellor	7 years	10,000
New Jersey	{ 8 Associate Justices	7 "	5,500
	{ 1 Chief Justice	7 "	5,000
*New York	{ 6 Associate Justices	14 "	7,500
	{ 3 Associate Justices	14 "	7,000
North Carolina	Three	8 "	2,500
Ohio	Five	3 "	3,000
Oregon	Three	6 "	2,000
Pennsylvania	Seven	21 "	7,000
Rhode Island	Five	For life	4,000
South Carolina	{ 1 Chief Justice	6 "	4,000
	{ 3 Associate Justices	6 "	3,500
	{ 8 Circuit Judges	4 "	3,500
Tennessee	Five	8 "	4,000
Texas	Three	4 "	3,500
Vermont	Seven	2 "	2,500
Virginia	{ 1 Presiding Judge	12 "	3,250
	{ 4 Associated Judges	12 "	3,000
West Virginia	Four	12 "	2,250
Wisconsin	Five	10 "	5,000

\*Each judge is allowed \$2,000 additional for expenses.

## BANQUETS TO JUDGES.

It appears that in New York there are some who would extend the public dinner business even to the judges. Surrogate Calvin has recently been honored with a "banquet." The *Albany Law Journal* very properly takes occasion to protest strongly against the threatened invasion. "It strikes us," says our contemporary, "as a very improper, undignified and unpleasant

affair. Why should a judge be publicly fed and praised in speeches because he has done his duty? Especially, why should this feeding and puffing be done by the lawyers who are in the habit of practising before him, and who are in some measure dependent on him for patronage? The surrogate has unquestionably been a remarkably faithful, intelligent, and impartial officer, but he should find his reward in private. Let him eat his own victuals and drink his own drink in the consciousness that he has done well; let his friends give him words of praise in private, if they will. Let us reserve these public demonstrations for the winners of boat-races and billiard matches, for acrobats, actors, singers, and the managers of political canvasses. This feature of our society is a disgusting one. If any one has an axe to grind with a public man he gets him up a public dinner, or gives him a cane, or a silver service, and thus assumes to take possession of the public man. In respect to a judge, it is difficult to say who deserves the severest blame—the lawyer who offers, or the judge who accepts such fulsome incense. We are glad to believe there are few of our judges who would so degrade themselves."

## PERSONAL INJURIES.

Some criticism was called forth by the amount of damages for a crushed finger sanctioned by the Supreme Court, (see *ante*, p. 107). On this subject, "The value of the human body and bones," Mr. R. V. Rogers, jr., of Kingston, has penned an essay in his peculiar style, for the *Canadian Law Times*, which shows that juries and judges have permitted themselves considerable range in their estimate of personal injuries. We append a portion of the article.

One of the absolute rights of every British subject is that of personal security; and lawyers mean by that, the legal and uninterrupted enjoyment of life, limb, body, health and reputation. Any one interfering, either by accident or design, with the enjoyment by another of these rights, inherent by nature in every individual (unless, indeed, the interference is authorized by the proper power in the State), is liable to make good to the injured party the damages sustained by him. With questions of life and death, of health and reputation, we do not propose to deal; but we desire to glance at some of the very numerous cases which have been