

The result of the change was not only a shortening of the stay of individual lawyers in Annapolis, but a cutting down of the numbers of lawyers arguing particular cases. With the whole bar present, combinations of many in one case were easier and more frequent; when a journey was to be taken for one case, groups of lawyers would not ordinarily take it.

It was inevitable that the constitution of 1864, disfranchising such a large portion of the citizens as it did, should pass with the war. In the summer of 1865 a mass-meeting in Howard County urged a contest in the courts on the validity of the act of 1865, chapter 174, which had carried out the disfranchisement, and the movement resulted in the case of *Anderson v. Baker*, reported in 23 Maryland, 531. It was argued before the full court by Robert J. Brent, Thomas G. Pratt and Reverdy Johnson against the validity of the law, and by the Attorney General, Alexander Randall, and R. M. Williams in support of it. On November 2, 1865, each of the judges filed a separate opinion, Judge Goldsborough, however, merely noting his concurrence with the majority; and Chief Judge Bowie and Judges Goldsborough, Cochran and Weisel decided that the law was valid, while Judge Bartol dissented. On January 24, 1866, another mass-meeting was held in Baltimore, and it included delegates from the several counties chosen by the Democratic Conservative members of the General Assembly, among them one past judge of the Court of Appeals, John Thomson Mason, and three who were to become judges, Richard H. Alvey, John Ritchie and