

The article above referred to reads as follows: "The nomination by both the Republican and Democratic conventions in New York State of two judges for the Court of Appeals who have already been in service on that bench, and one of whom is a Republican and the other a Democrat, gives great satisfaction to the majority of good citizens. Some of the Supreme Court judges have received similarly unanimous renominations. It is highly encouraging to those who believe in separating the judiciary as far from partisan influences as possible. It is also a strong proof of the fitness of the voters to be entrusted with the privilege of electing their own judges. Several severe lessons have been taught the politicians by the voters of New York State when political influences have been too prominent in the selection of candidates for the bench. There are, nevertheless, some in both parties in whom the theory that offices are meant for political rewards is so ingrained that they deprecate the action taken by the conventions of the great parties this year, and there were plenty of men in the conventions who were very reluctant to nominate on their ticket a candidate who belonged to the other party. Nevertheless, good sense and political wisdom combined in overruling those ultra-partisans. The history of judicial elections in New York State has now pretty fully demonstrated that the judges of the higher courts, at least, if they have performed satisfactory service, will be re-elected, making practically a life tenure after the first election until they reach the age limit. Furthermore, frequent rebukes of the politicians when they have made a nomination which the voters thought to be only a reward for political services, and not based on any special fitness for the place, have made it clear that the people are fairly well able to protect the bench from being the gift of the political bosses. It would be too much to say that political influences are of no weight in the selection of judges, but it is not too much to say that the voters have compelled them to be kept well within bounds, and that there is an increasing evidence that they will not tolerate the use of the judicial office as a mere gift of spoils."