

self undertook to administer, and did administer an oath to the Judges of Election, the only one they took at all; and that the oath which he so administered, was not the oath prescribed by law, but another one of his own concoction, or at best an oath mutilated and abbreviated in many most important respects. This action of the Board is ascribable either to gross and culpable ignorance of the law, or, which is more probable, to unworthy motives. They were not anxious, as their whole course shows, to remind the judges by administering to them the full and proper oath of their specific duties, but they were anxious to keep all knowledge of their appointments from the public, and within their own office. This explanation is in keeping with their admitted and persistent refusal of information regarding these appointments to the public prints, their sworn reason for which, being that it would probably have caused a great deal of trouble and unnecessary objection and stir, (see Major Gilmore's testimony,) it is also in keeping with the fact that after having promised the Committee of the Reform party, to consult with them in regard to the appointment of Reform Judges, and to give one Reform Judge to each precinct, they violated their promise, cut loose from the Committee and its recommendations, superseded, without proper cause, many men already agreed upon, and yet kept the notices of such changes from the parties removed. until the very morning of the election, November 2d, 1875. But, however, their action is to be accounted for, it is indefensible, and these conclusions are unavoidably reached from a consideration of the law and the evidence before this House.

First. That the law was violated in regard to the boxes for rejected ballots.

Second. That the official oath required by law was not administered to the Judges of Election.

Third. That the oath which was administered to them was administered by a person entirely without authority so to do.

Fourth. That the returns themselves are consequently defective, from the want of a certificate of the oath from a proper person.

Fifth. That the law expressly declares either one of the above defects to be sufficient to make any election in the City of Baltimore void.

Sixth. That the responsibility for this state of things rests entirely upon the Police Commissioners, and shows the Board, as then constituted, to have been unworthy of public confidence, or of being entrusted with the execution of laws vital to the general welfare.