

habits. I have, however, seen things which I thought militated against him as a Judge; they consisted in his not exacting from counsel the respect due him on the bench, and which fact they appeared, in most cases, to take advantage of. I recollect one case when I was a juror, I thought the Judge ought to have taken signal notice of. The case to which I make allusion was when the State's Attorney, and the counsel for a prisoner were near coming to blows in open Court; both of them on the following day made an apology, yet I thought they both ought to have been committed the day previous, and that it would have produced a good result as to the reputation of the Court and relieved him of much subsequent trouble, including that he now is involved in.

D. H. McPHAIL.

---

*Elias Ellicott sworn.*

Elias Ellicott a witness on the part of Judge Stump being duly affirmed, filed the paper marked Elias Ellicott, as his answer to the interrogatories.

I was acting on the jury in the May term of the Criminal Court of Baltimore city, 1859, and served in that capacity for about six weeks, Judge Stump throughout the whole time presided with dignity, and I think with ability.

He was not intoxicated, and I am certain not under the influence of liquor when presiding in court throughout the whole term.

He was in the habit of entering into conversation with some of our jury as he came in and went out, which would have given us an opportunity of knowing whether he was under the influence of ardent spirits or not.

Through the whole term he appeared to be anxious to expedite the business of the Court; the delay in not having the cases tried was often owing to the witnesses not being in attendance.

ELIAS ELLICOTT.

---

*Joshua M. Myers sworn.*

Joshua M. Myers a witness produced and sworn on the part of Judge Stump, filed the paper marked Joshua M. Myers, as his answer to the interrogatories.