

The Charlotte Observer.

CHAR. R. JONES, Editor and Proprietor. Free from the dotting seraphs that fetter our free-born reason. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1879. A FALSHOOD COSTRUCTED—GEORGE H. PRENTICE.

Our readers have seen a statement going the rounds of the press to the effect that just on the eve of the outbreak of the late war between the States, George D. Prentice had been bribed with \$50,000 in gold to throw the influence of his paper, the Louisville Journal, on the Confederate side; that he received the money and endeavored to carry out his part of the contract; that he wrote an article of the character desired, which was put in type and about to go to press, when the clerk, Mr. Calvert, notified Paul R. Shipman, of the editorial staff, who suppressed the article, and, without the knowledge of Mr. Prentice, wrote and substituted a "loyal" article in its stead, which placed the Journal on the side of the Union and saved Kentucky.

This story is now contradicted authoritatively and in the most positive terms by Gen. G. T. Beauregard and by Col. J. Stoddard Johnston, now Secretary of the State of Kentucky, the latter of whom writes to the Frankfort Freeman and the Louisville Courier-Journal, a lengthy letter setting forth in detail the transaction which gave rise to the false reports. This letter states that "George W. Johnson, a Kentuckian of large foresight and the most earnest conviction that peace should be attained by the acknowledgment of the independence of the Confederacy, made a direct offer to Mr. Prentice, who was then cramped in money affairs, of \$50,000 in gold; but the \$50,000 were to be used in enabling Mr. Prentice to secure enough of the stock of the publishing company to give him free sway, providing the views sought to be advocated by Mr. Johnson were per se the views of Mr. Prentice. The editor listened to the proposition, heard arguments in its support, and turned them over in his mind while sick in bed. News of the defeat at Bull Run had just reached him, but he dictated a strong leader, which claimed that all should fight for the Union to the last, and directed that a copy should be sent to Mr. Johnson as his answer." The Courier-Journal considers this statement of Colonel Johnston a final refutation of the stories that have cast a temporary shadow over the memory of Mr. Prentice.

Accompanying the letter of Col. Johnston is a lengthy double-leaded editorial in the Courier-Journal in reference to its subject-matter, and in this editorial some of Mr. Prentice's habits and characteristics are brought out and dwelt upon. The tribute to his memory—no might almost say criticism of his life and character—is so handsomely worded and is withal so manifestly just and truthful that we cannot refrain from transferring a part of the article to our columns. It was probably written by Mr. Watterson himself, and we extract from it as follows:

That Mr. Prentice's inner self was Southern there can be little doubt. He was pre-eminently a sentimentalist. His wife was Southern. His sons were Southern. His closest friends were Southern. His own nature and habits were Southern. His head and his heart were divided. One went one way, the other went the other. His judgment, which was good, told him the South could not win. It told him that safety lay in the Union, not out of it. All else took the effusive side of the battle. He was in despair, and it drove him into additional excesses. On this point, however, mistakes should not be made; though a hard, he was an occasional drinker only; and the greater part of his time, a hard worker. He could do more in an hour than most men in a day, and then he indulged himself, and he never courted obscurity. No man ever saw him inebriate or disorderly, though many have seen him drunk; and, since this phase can no longer be glossed over, it should be stated that his fatal passion was not at all convivial, but a disease, which, when he was disappointed or fretted, attacked him irresistibly.

It is a sad thing to say, but it explains much that may have happened. He was hopeless. He was wretched. He was not himself. We do not know that he did; but he may have given way. One thing, however, we do know; he was possessed of a little virility as any man who ever lived. He had not the consciousness of the value or the use of money. Anybody might stick a needle in his pocket and take what he wanted, and everybody did. His own wants were absolutely contemptible. We venture to say he spent less on himself than the humblest of his employees. Always meekly clad, always poorly fed, always unostentatious, he literally spent nothing, saved nothing, though he earned large sums, he was perpetually behind hand in his money affairs, as dependent and as helpless as a baby. He was a man of high inspirations merely. His heart led and his head followed; and the nearest he ever came to a principle of action was a prejudice, which he sometimes cherished with a whimsical pertinacity. He was unusually brave and transparent, and, if he were living now would tell the whole story without equivocation or reserve, and, good or bad, in an English style and from which would captivate every reader.

Mr. Calvert, the author of this scandal, has done himself no credit in giving breath to it. The bones of poor, old Prentice should have been allowed to rest undisturbed. If ever the maxim de mortuis had a relevancy, it should be extended to him, who, in life, notwithstanding the quantity of attic soil he scattered right and left, was singularly void of malice and of guile.

The Talmage trial is dragging its slow length along. The only thing of interest that has occurred in it lately was the testimony, a few days ago, of J. N. Hallock, who swore that Talmage had told him a half dozen falsehoods, one right after another, in reference to the Tabernacle troubles, and that he had acted dishonestly in getting out of the Christian at Work in the manner in which he did.

The Democratic State central committee, of Ohio, have fixed the meeting of the State convention at the same time and place as that agreed upon by the Greenbackers, and the opinion seems pretty general that there will be a general platform and ticket arranged. Practically, there was no difference in their platform last year.

ANOTHER SENSATIONAL STORY SEQUELED.

Our readers are very familiar with the history of the case of Miss Amelia Linkhaw, who is in jail at Lumberton for the killing of J. E. Hartman, a Baltimore drummer, in October last. Two or three weeks ago the case came on for trial in the Superior Court of Robeson county, but was continued on account of some informality in the indictment. She was thereupon remanded. Her presence in court, however, served the purpose of making a couple of dollars for some one of the many newspaper correspondents who, hanging upon the outskirts of journalism and bringing all the disgrace they can upon the name, follow a systematic course of lying, caring little what the object or the occasion. One of these, after reciting in the most sensational style, the story of the tragedy and the subsequent events, brings before the mind's eye the scene, which presented itself when Miss Linkhaw was brought up for trial. Writing to some of the sensational papers of the North, he says:

She refused to have anything to do with a lawyer, although her father employed one to defend her. At first she even declined to assist in the trial, but when asked some question by the court she arose and said: "I am not guilty of this crime. My young life was blighted, my every hope crushed by the baseness and infidelity of him whom I had chosen for my life-long partner. My only crime was to love that man, too devotedly and unconditionally. The judge, through his tears, asked her to take her seat and speak through her counsel. The great crowd surged closer and cried, 'Let her go on.' 'Go on, have girl some defect was found, however, in the indictment, and the case rose to the false reports. This letter states that "George W. Johnson, a Kentuckian of large foresight and the most earnest conviction that peace should be attained by the acknowledgment of the independence of the Confederacy, made a direct offer to Mr. Prentice, who was then cramped in money affairs, of \$50,000 in gold; but the \$50,000 were to be used in enabling Mr. Prentice to secure enough of the stock of the publishing company to give him free sway, providing the views sought to be advocated by Mr. Johnson were per se the views of Mr. Prentice. The editor listened to the proposition, heard arguments in its support, and turned them over in his mind while sick in bed. News of the defeat at Bull Run had just reached him, but he dictated a strong leader, which claimed that all should fight for the Union to the last, and directed that a copy should be sent to Mr. Johnson as his answer." The Courier-Journal considers this statement of Colonel Johnston a final refutation of the stories that have cast a temporary shadow over the memory of Mr. Prentice.

Except that such a homicide as referred to was committed, and that such an arraignment was made at the last term of our court, there is no iota or syllable of truth in the entire fabrication of the correspondent. The prisoner was escorted on foot from the county jail by two deputy sheriffs (together with her sister and mother) and placed, in open court, in the felon's dock. There was no lady present except those already mentioned; and there was no demonstration of feeling, either favorable or unfavorable to the prisoner. She returned to the jail on foot accompanied with the same escort, without evoking the slightest manifestation either of sympathy or disapprobation.

WHO DOES THE OSTRACISING.—The Chicago Conservator, organ of the colored people of Illinois, has taken up and exposed the hollowness of the Republicans who are perpetually prating of the outrage committed on the negroes of the South, and particularly the fact of their being unrepresented in Congress. The Conservator, after mildly suggesting that some Northern or Western district might send a colored man to Congress, says:

The negro is far more ostracised by the Republicans than by the most bitter of Southern Democrats. The Northern Republicans close their factories in the face of the black man, merchants refuse to hire him, mechanics refuse to work with him, and common laborers will strike if he dares to intrude, while the Southern negro has a place to work wherever his ability fits him to serve.

The speech of Hon. R. F. Randolph, delivered in the House of Representatives last Thursday in favor of the rights of the House to repeal by a rider on an appropriation bill the section of the Revised Statutes which authorizes the use of troops at the polls, will be read with interest throughout this section of North Carolina, where Mr. Randolph is so well known and so justly admired. It is a manly, dignified, convincing argument.

Memorial from Thomas G. C. To the Honorable the Board of Directors of the Penitentiary of North Carolina: The undersigned memorialists, citizens of the State of North Carolina, engaged in the manufacture of shoes, upon which are dependent ourselves, our families, and, in large measure, the prosperity of this place and section, would represent to your honorable body that they have learned with deep regret that a proposition will be made to assign a portion of the convict labor to the manufacturing of shoes for the general market. Your memorialists would further represent that themselves and many others of the good citizens of North Carolina have made their investments, have served at their occupation and are now endeavoring to carry it on in such a way as to bring credit to the State and benefit to her people; but they would respectfully represent that the course proposed, if adopted, will be a departure from the uniform policy of the State to encourage her manufacturing interests, and will very seriously injure our department of industry.

Our memorialists would, therefore, very respectfully urge your honorable body to reject the proposition referred to, and to employ the convict labor for the advancement of the best interests of the whole State, which has been already so wisely done through works of internal improvements, or in such other ways as will not compete with the ordinary industries of our people and not impede a way as will certainly cripple and possibly ruin an important and growing branch of industry.

And your memorialists, as in duty bound, &c. (Signed) C. M. & G. Lines, J. W. Sample, J. H. Harris, W. H. Wetmore, Thos. P. Harris, W. W. Huske, J. M. Harris, J. A. Leach, J. H. Harris, J. W. Thompson, R. K. Stone, H. C. Yeach, Sam'l. Thompson, A. E. Kennedy, John Suggs, J. F. Jones, J. W. Adams, J. R. Witherington, D. G. Frank, W. A. Stone, H. Embler, C. F. Shelly, R. Thompson, J. W. Witherington, John Lewis, E. Culbreth, Ed. Suggs, F. Thompson, Jno. A. Pease, F. Stone, P. H. Clarend, John Carrell, Jno. A. Hired, Mark A. Hired, K. C. Myers, Robt. Witherington, Thomas W. N. C., April 17, 1879.

A LULL AT THE CAPITAL.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN THE TWO HOUSES.

The House resumed the consideration of the New Hampshire senatorial case and continued it without final action. Carpenter made a legal argument against Bell's admission to the Senate. Mr. Frye, of Maine, had read a letter from the editor of the Okolona (Miss.) States, which Muldrow, of Mississippi, had stated did not represent any respectable element of the Mississippi Democracy, enclosing an extract from that paper of August 28, 1878, supporting Muldrow as Representative from the first district of Mississippi. He had nothing further to say on the subject.

A debate has sprung up as to the propriety of instructing the chairman of the committee of the whole, when the House shall be in committee on the legislative appropriation bill, to award the floor in accordance with the rules of the House and not to be bound by any list of speakers which may be formed. The House went into committee of the whole on the legislative appropriation bill, and after disposing of sixty pages of the bill adjourned until tomorrow.

THE IMPRISONED VIRGINIA JUDGES.

Application to the United States Supreme Court for a Writ of Habeas Corpus—Grounds of the Application. WASHINGTON, April 7.—Petitions for writs of habeas corpus and certiorari were submitted to the United States Supreme Court today by the Governor of Virginia, on behalf of the State, and by J. D. Coles, judge of the county court of Pittsylvania county, for the purpose of bringing up and testing the legality of judicial officers being arrested and imprisoned upon the charge of violating the civil rights of citizens. The petition of the Governor sets forth that Judge Coles was indicted by the Federal Court for an alleged offense against the laws of the United States, the indictment charging that he excluded and failed to select as grand and petit jurors certain citizens of Pittsylvania county, of the African race and black color, who, it is further alleged, possessed all other qualifications prescribed by law, and charging that he excluded them from said jury lists as aforesaid on account of their race and previous condition of servitude. The petition sets forth that in obedience to and by authority of a process issued from the clerk's office of said district court, and styled a bench warrant, Judge Coles was arrested on the 13th of March by a United States deputy marshal, and taken into custody. The petition declares that the district court had no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles, and that the said J. D. Coles is unlawfully detained in custody, and that he is held in custody in violation of the rights of the prisoner, but that he has no jurisdiction of the matter charged against Judge Coles in the indictment, and that the constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State of Virginia, are violated by the arrest and imprisonment of the said J. D. Coles,