

have been in general no perceptible change in the character of the men chosen for the Court of Appeals since the inauguration of the system of election in this state. And in this, the testimony of older members of the bar is given. The judicial ability of one judge and another is debated, of course, but no instance is known of reproach for deficiency in judicial or personal character. Indeed, none is known with respect to any judge in the history of the state judiciary, appellate or trial judge, except these: In 1860 a judge of the Criminal Court in Baltimore City was removed from office for rough conduct and intoxication; the testimony taken is accessible, in print, and it contains no suggestion of a lack of integrity in the man. Later, in 1882, the trial judges in Baltimore City were opposed for re-election and defeated, after a somewhat bitter campaign, but no instances of corruption were charged; the ground of dissatisfaction, and of their defeat, appears to have been, generally, that of too close association by them with local politicians of the time and, with respect to one judge, that he made a practice of assigning a nephew, a lawyer who had political connections, to defend prisoners who asked for the assignment of counsel, and by doing this to some extent obstructed the proper working of the law. No suggestion of any other misdoing or lack of character is found in recorded references to the judges of the past, and living lawyers have heard of no such thing.

And as to the possible, or logical effects of a system of choosing judges by election—which seem hardly to have been realized in Mary-