

A Western republican now in Washington complains that the removals from office in his State are too slow. He says that many of the republican office-holders have become indifferent as to the success of their party; that a change would be of much benefit as the best democratic workmen put into office would not be permitted to remain further aid to their party when once it has helped the republicans in the next campaign.

The total value of domestic breadstuffs exported from the Port of Baltimore for the month of May was \$1,490,001, and for the eleven months of the present fiscal year \$22,453,840, an increase of more than \$300,000 over the same period of the last fiscal year. The value of the breadstuffs exported from Baltimore for the fiscal year to date is fifty per cent greater than the exports from Boston, and more than double the exports from Philadelphia.

Three noted men left New York on the steamer Gallia for Europe last Saturday, and the other passengers of the steamer have before them a feast of wit and wisdom during the passage over, unless sea-sickness lays the great men low. These three are Ministers S. Cox, Roscoe Conkling and ex-Artillery General Brewster. Mr. Cox is on his way to his post of duty in Turkey. Mr. Conkling is going to enjoy a few months' vacation at Weisbaden and Mr. and Mrs. Brewster are on a trip of pleasure and rest.

A republican department clerk, who is said to have voted for Cleveland, recently wrote to a distinguished republican in one of the Eastern States, who is credited with personal influence with the President, requesting the good offices of the latter to keep him in his place. He was rather surprised to receive an answer positively declining to accede to the request, with the expression that in the opinion of the writer the democrats were entitled to the offices, and no republican possessing the elements of manhood should so lower himself as to ask for retention.

On Friday last Bartholdi's statue of Liberty was appropriately welcomed and received by the city of New York. The ceremonies were marked by much enthusiasm, and the representatives of the French republic must have felt delighted at the hearty welcome which was accorded to them. Already the New York World has succeeded in securing \$75,000 toward the pedestal fund, and there is every prospect that the necessary \$100,000 will soon be forthcoming. The World is entitled to much credit for its zeal and persistence, and it is also a noteworthy fact that the majority of the contributors were working men and women, and that the statue may, therefore, be fairly entitled to be called the gift of the people.

Mr. A. McGurk, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore and Master Bart J. Randolph, a student of that institution, called on the President last Friday in company with Second Assistant Postmaster-General Knott, by whom they were presented. They handed to the President with their compliments a copy of his inaugural address translated into Latin by Master Randolph. The President received it with evident interest, and was quite demonstrative in his thanks for the compliment. He said that he had a little rite in his Latin, but he had no doubt the production, which he would read with much pleasure as soon as he had the leisure, would be beneficial to him. He said jokingly to the young translator that if he found any faults in his production he would be sure to let him know.

Just before Gen. Logan left for Washington he said to a friend: "I hope every Republican who asks to be retained by this Administration will be turned out of office. I have received letter after letter from Republicans in office urging me to exert myself to have them retained. I shall not humiliate myself in that way. I would rather help to get Republicans out of that sort out. In fact it is strange to me that a Republican would ask a Democratic Administration to keep him in office. No Republican would ask Cleveland to appoint him, if he was out of office. A petition for retention stands on the same principle. It is virtually asking a Democrat for an appointment. If a Republican would not ask for an office he should not ask to be retained in one. If he is holding an office and is asked to remain on account of his faithful services, it is another thing. In that case he has a right to accept, but he is clearly wrong in asking to be retained."

The Court of Appeals on Tuesday disposed of the Howard Cooper case, involving the claim that the jury law of Maryland discriminates against colored men. The court sustained the ruling of the lower court. Cooper, who is now under sentence of death for assaulting Miss Katie Gray, will, therefore, at an early day, have to pay the full penalty for his brutal crime, unless his counsel should carry the case before the United States Supreme Court. It is to be regretted that the purely technical point involved should be associated with a case of such glaring infamy as this. Cooper's crime was a particularly flagrant one, and was fully proven. He had a fair impartial trial, and the effect of delay has already been to produce a very bad impression, which was most strikingly illustrated in the lynching of Townsend Carroll county. In this case it was distinctly asserted by participants in the lynching that Cook was hanged because Cooper was not, in spite of a fair trial and just sentence. To hold such a case in suspension for an indefinite time for the purpose of merely establishing a theoretical point would, it is natural to suppose, have the effect of lending such encouragement to Lynch law in similar cases as could scarcely fail to have at some time deplorable consequences.—Sun.

Political Changes.

The recent downfall of the Gladstone ministry in England and the quiet succession of the Conservatives under the leadership of Salisbury to power, illustrates the case with which such changes take place under the stable regulations of the British constitutional system. The shifting of power from one political party to another under that government is not unfrequent, it being a rare occurrence for the administration of the government to be retained by one party for a whole decade at a time. These changes are always effected without jar or friction and without disturbance to the varied material and commercial interests of that great empire.

It seems to be part of the English political belief that these frequent transfers of power from one to another political party are beneficial in preserving the equilibrium of government and maintaining the stability of political institutions. One can but admire the grace and dignity with which the defeated party surrenders the power to the opposition and the quiet acquiescence on the part of sovereign and people on the change. Mr. Gladstone after successfully meeting all adverse criticism as to his foreign policy and being sustained by Parliament in that regard, presents his "budget" or financial statement for approval, and, being defeated by a bare majority, gracefully "steps down and out" and invites the opposition to take charge. And when the opposition, fearful of assuming the government with the support of a bare majority, informs the retiring premier of its fears, he gives it assurance that it will meet no factions opposition from his party. It might be said that the "grand old man" is thus greater than ever in defeat, were it not that his action is a simple recognition of English political ethics.

In this respect the English monarchy presents a very different aspect from that of our American republic in its more recent history at least. There so soon as the representatives of the people fail to approve of the policy of the government in respect to any important economic or political measure, the cabinet surrenders its trust and the opposition is called to power. Here, though, the government is unmistakably a decided majority of the people, it still holds with an unrelenting grip to the power it has atained and will resort to every expedient to prolong its holding. As illustrations of this unhappy truth, we have on y to refer to the enfranchisement of the negro race, which has been denounced by a prominent Republican as "a monster born of party necessity and political insincerity," and to the electoral frauds of 1876, which it has been more than suspected were attempted to be repeated in 1884.

This seems rather paradoxical, that a monarchical government, which in theory at least is supposed not to have a very careful regard for the wishes of the public, should manifest a prompter recognition of an adverse popular judgment and display a greater sensibility to an opposing public sentiment than a republic, which in theory

essence is supposed to be a government of the people, for the people and by the people; yet such is without doubt the fact. In England the true theory and proper office of political parties is realized. There the people are divided upon economic and legitimate political questions. The opposition party operates as a salutary check upon the party in power, and whenever it can demonstrate to an intelligent public judgment that the government is in error, the opposition succeeds to power without force or fraud, unseemly contention or interference with the unseemly interests of the country.

The thoughtful observer will look about for the cause of the failure of our republican government to thus realize the true advantages which result from opposing political parties and to avoid the dangers which are attendant upon them, and will find it we believe in that dangerous political doctrine which is peculiar to our government, that "to the victors belong the spoils." So long as the clerical and other subordinate official services of the government are regarded as spoils from which to reward zealous partisan services, so long will the true office of political parties in this country be perverted and, instead of a safeguard to popular liberty, they will prove to be a menacing danger. When the party in power becomes thoroughly entrenched behind the spoils system it can afford to disregard public opinion. So long as the distribution and prolonged enjoyment of these spoils continue to be the chief inducement to a party to attain and maintain power, the public sentiment regarding economic and legitimate political measures will never be properly respected. So long as this is the price and reward of political success, we may never expect in this country that frequent and easy transfer of the power and responsibility of government from one political party to another which has been recently so happily illustrated in the mother country and which is generally conceded to be the best guarantee of stability in political institutions. On the other hand we may expect the party in power to hold on to its means or foul regard of popular disapproval of its policies and in defiance of the legitimate efforts of the opposition party.

The great evils and dangers of the spoils system being thus recognized, it is expected that the fair minded people of the country will uphold the present administration in its honest efforts to eliminate the civil service of the government as a factor in political campaigns.

On Wednesday, the 5th day of August next, a special election will be held here in which the question of local option will be again submitted to our people. In the three former elections in which this question was voted on by the people the matter was defeated, but the advocates of local option say that, owing to the fact of the vote having been taken at a general election the heat of a political contest has swallowed up this issue, so they induced the last Legislature to appoint a special day for an election in which to decide this mooted question, and the above date was chosen. We presume the temperate people will shy open the campaign in the country.

Death of Hon. Richard T. Merrick.

Hon. Richard T. Merrick, the distinguished lawyer of Washington, D. C., died at his home in that city on Tuesday morning about 10 o'clock. We reported his dangerous illness last week, but expressed a hope, which then seemed justifiable, of his recovery. The crisis of his malady was reached on Monday and, though his remarkable vitality gave his physicians hopes to the last, he died as stated on Tuesday morning, without regaining consciousness, having lain in an unconscious condition for more than a week previous to his death.

In the death of Mr. Merrick the legal profession has lost one of its brightest ornaments and most honored members and the country one of her most public spirited and patriotic citizens. The death of such a man is a public calamity. He was a gentleman of rare intellectual endowments and much culture; a lawyer of great depth of learning; an orator of extraordinary eloquence; an accomplished scholar; an able, self-reliant, but warm hearted and humane man. In no person he was unusual in his hands and attractive and in manner refined, genial and fascinating. He had a host of admiring friends, who were bound to him by the strongest ties of affectionate attachment. While his eminent talents, high integrity of character and distinguished services had made for him a reputation throughout the country as a reliable lawyer and pure and patriotic citizen, his memory will endure longest in the minds of those who from personal contact with him came under the influence of his kind and affectionate nature and genial, fascinating manner. The writer of this, during several years spent as a student in his office, learned well to honor, admire and love the great and good man who is gone and will ever hold him in affectionate remembrance.

Mr. Merrick was a native of this country and he often referred with pleasure to the days of his boyhood here and of *old Maryland*. He is remembered by many of our people who will be numbered among those who loved him living, and who mourn his death.

Richard Thomas Merrick was born January 25, 1828, in Charles County, Md., and was one of three sons of Wm. H. Merrick, a prominent citizen in Maryland politics, and United States Senator from 1850 to 1852. He was educated at the University of Maryland, and took a law course at the University of Virginia. He was admitted to the bar in 1850, and practiced law in Baltimore, Md., until 1852, when he removed to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1854, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1856, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1860, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1862, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1864, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1866, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1868, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1870, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1872, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1874, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1876, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1878, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1880, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1882, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1884, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1886, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1888, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1890, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1892, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1894, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1896, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1898, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1900, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1902, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1904, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1906, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1908, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1910, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1912, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1914, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1916, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1918, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1920, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1922, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1924, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1926, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1928, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1930, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1932, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1934, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1936, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1938, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1940, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1942, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1944, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1946, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1948, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1950, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1952, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1954, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1956, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1958, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1960, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1962, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1964, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1966, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1968, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1970, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1972, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1974, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1976, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1978, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1980, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1982, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1984, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1986, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1988, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1990, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1992, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1994, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 1996, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 1998, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2000, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2002, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2004, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2006, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2008, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2010, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2012, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2014, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2016, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2018, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2020, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2022, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2024, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2026, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2028, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2030, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2032, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2034, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2036, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2038, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2040, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2042, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2044, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2046, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2048, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2050, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2052, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2054, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2056, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2058, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2060, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2062, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2064, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2066, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2068, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2070, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2072, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2074, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2076, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2078, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2080, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2082, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2084, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2086, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2088, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2090, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2092, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2094, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2096, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2098, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2100, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2102, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2104, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2106, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2108, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2110, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2112, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2114, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2116, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2118, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2120, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2122, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2124, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2126, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2128, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2130, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2132, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2134, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2136, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2138, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2140, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2142, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2144, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2146, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2148, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2150, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2152, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2154, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2156, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2158, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2160, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2162, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2164, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2166, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2168, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2170, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2172, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2174, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2176, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2178, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2180, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2182, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2184, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2186, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2188, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2190, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2192, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2194, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2196, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2198, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2200, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2202, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2204, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2206, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2208, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2210, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2212, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2214, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2216, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2218, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2220, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2222, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2224, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2226, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2228, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2230, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2232, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2234, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2236, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2238, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2240, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2242, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2244, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2246, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2248, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2250, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2252, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2254, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2256, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2258, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2260, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2262, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2264, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2266, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2268, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2270, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2272, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2274, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2276, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2278, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2280, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2282, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2284, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2286, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2288, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2290, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2292, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2294, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2296, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2298, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2300, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2302, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2304, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2306, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2308, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2310, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2312, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2314, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2316, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2318, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2320, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2322, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2324, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2326, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2328, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2330, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2332, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2334, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2336, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2338, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2340, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2342, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2344, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2346, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2348, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2350, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2352, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2354, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2356, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2358, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2360, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2362, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2364, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2366, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2368, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2370, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2372, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2374, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2376, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2378, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2380, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2382, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2384, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2386, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2388, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2390, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2392, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2394, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2396, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2398, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2400, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2402, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2404, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2406, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2408, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2410, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2412, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2414, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2416, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2418, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2420, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2422, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2424, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2426, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2428, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2430, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2432, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2434, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2436, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2438, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2440, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2442, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2444, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2446, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2448, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2450, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2452, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2454, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2456, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2458, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2460, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2462, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2464, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2466, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2468, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2470, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2472, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2474, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2476, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2478, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2480, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2482, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2484, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2486, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2488, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2490, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2492, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2494, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2496, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2498, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2500, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2502, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2504, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2506, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2508, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2510, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2512, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2514, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2516, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2518, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2520, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2522, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2524, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2526, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2528, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2530, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2532, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2534, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2536, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2538, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2540, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2542, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2544, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2546, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2548, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2550, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2552, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2554, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2556, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2558, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2560, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2562, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2564, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2566, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2568, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2570, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2572, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2574, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2576, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2578, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2580, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2582, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2584, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2586, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2588, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2590, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2592, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2594, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2596, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2598, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2600, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2602, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2604, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2606, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2608, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2610, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2612, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2614, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2616, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2618, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2620, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2622, when he returned to Washington, D. C., where he remained until 2624, when he returned to his native Maryland, and practiced law in Annapolis, Md., until 2626, when he returned to Washington, D. C