

selves, they pronounce the same not only false but wholly gratuitous and malicious, the mere expression of political virulence and disappointment. These respondents, personally, are quite ready to compare characters with the complainants, or any of them, as men or citizens, and they feel it to be a criminal abuse of the privilege of proceeding in courts of justice, that the complainants, without the slightest necessity, should undertake to vilify these respondents upon the records of this honorable court, because, as public officers, in the discharge of a sworn duty, they have felt bound to act under a law of this State, with the adoption of which they had no more to do than the complainants, and have not felt themselves qualified or entitled to treat it as null and void, because the complainants are dissatisfied with it.

These respondents admit they have taken steps to discharge their said duty in regard to the election to be held under the law aforesaid, on the second Wednesday of April instant, upon the assumption that said election will be a lawful election, and that they are bound to do all things with a view thereto which they are required to do by law, with a view to and in connection with all lawful elections to be held in the City of Baltimore. They have taken steps to appoint and qualify judges and clerks of election therefor as charged, and propose to proceed therein unless restrained by proper and lawful process. For their said action they bespeak and believe themselves to have deserved the approbation of your Honor and of all good citizens.—And as to the allegation of the bill, in regard to the pretended apprehension of the complainants that they may be appointed judges of election, and being unable conscientiously to serve as such, may be sued and otherwise despitely used, these respondents aver and charge that the said allegations and apprehensions are alike groundless. The complainants, Johns Hopkins, John Clark and William Kennedy, not being residents of any election precinct of the City of Baltimore, are not by law eligible as judges of election therein, and these respondents, being bound by the law to select “discreet” persons as judges, do not feel that they could conscientiously choose the said Deford or the said Rogers as such.

These respondents further deny that the said complain-