

The Chatham Record

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1890.

H. A. LONDON, Editor.

SOME recent decisions of the Federal Judges should arouse the soleitude of old fashioned people who still cling to the idea of their fathers that the States of the Union have some jurisdiction within their borders. One people have long since become accustomed to the Federal Congress encroaching upon and usurping the reserved rights of the States, and they are now becoming accustomed to such encroachments by the Federal judiciary. We will cite some of those recent decisions which will forcibly remind our readers that Centralization is monster in whose maw all the rights of the States are being gradually swallowed.

The Supreme Court, as announced last week, has decided in a case from Iowa that one State cannot forbid the transportation or liquor from another State to a person within its borders. This practically decides that a State cannot regulate the sale of merchandise which may be brought there from another State, thereby taking the whole subject of domestic commerce under Federal jurisdiction.

A murderer in New York, named Kummer, was condemned to death and by an act of the New York Legislature hanging has been abolished and electrical execution substituted therefor. Kummer's lawyers contend that the new law was unconstitutional, but on appeal the highest judicial tribunal of that State held that the law was constitutional and that Kummer must die by electricity. But the day before the time appointed for his execution was of habeas corpus was issued by Judge Wallace of the Federal court, returnable some day next month. Tills the Federal government assumes jurisdiction of a murderer regularly tried and condemned by a State court.

A few months ago one man, unarmed, committed an assault upon another at a hotel and was shot dead by a third person. When the murderer was arrested by the State authorities of California the Federal judiciary interceded and released him because the assumed person was a Federal officer.

But a case may be cited right here. North Carolina is well known to our readers. A citizen of Orange county was recently shot dead in front of his own door, and after his murderer had been arrested by State authorities they were released and set free by a Federal judge because they were revenue officers.

whose life is safe, if our State cannot punish a murderer—event though he be a revenue officer—who kills one of our citizens?

A BALLOT REFORM bill has at last been passed by the Legislature of New York and signed by Gov. Hill. It is said to be an improvement on the Australian system, which has recently been adopted by several States. The chief provisions of the bill are said to be the following:

It completely excludes electors, clerks, assessors and informers from the neighborhood of the polls.

It provides for the exclusive use of official ballots, which the voter receives from a sworn election officer upon entering the polling-place and gets at no other place or time.

It requires the voter to retire alone to a secret booth and there select from the full set of ballots given to him, the one which he desires to vote.

It provides perfectly against the "smoke" device and all other tricks by which a voter or informer can discern how his victim has voted.

To shut it perfectly against also to freedom and security to every voter, which is the essential purpose of Ballot Reform.

THE PLAN for holding the next meeting of the North Carolina Press Association is under discussion. It will probably be either Durham or Ocracoke. If the meeting is to be only a pleasure trip—a jamboree excursion—then Ocracoke should be selected. But it is for business, it would be well for the editors to meet at Durham and see the great industries of that phenomenal town. The jamboree votes for Durham.

WE HEARD a prominent republican say recently that if President Harrison was a candidate for constable in the strongest republican township in this State he would be defeated; and that if Gov. Fowle was a candidate for constable in the strongest democratic township he would be defeated. Can this be true?

Our Washington Letter.

From our Regular Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, May 2, 1890.

Senator Voorhees of the Library Committee reported the Senate joint resolution accepting the battle-sword of the late Capt. Samuel Chester Reid tendered as a gift from his son, Samuel C. Reid. It provided for the presentation of a gold medal to the donor. Captain Reid commanded the privates' "team Armstrong" at the battles of Payne and Reliance and resisted with great slaughter the English men of war. Gen. Jackson said that the delay occasioned by this battle enabled him to defend New Orleans. Senator Sherman opposed the resolution for the reason that the victory was gained by a private whose motives, he imagined, could not have been sufficiently patriotic to deserve the honor proposed. Senator Evans introduced the resolution, declaring that—but for Captain Reid the battle could not have been fought, but for him the victory would not have been won. Senators Pugh and Pratt addressed the ground that it would seem preposterous that would be followed by a multitude of cases. A standing vote resulted in 12 years, 26 days. No quorum voting it was understood regarding its place on the calendar.

The committee of the House on the judiciary in reporting the anti-slavery bill said that no system of laws can be devised by Congress which could effectively protect the people against the evils and oppressions of capital and monopolies. And so, ever it agrees that there is no better solution than that put forward by the bill.

Some of your servants are like an old ox in a plow. You won't let me go swimming or riding.

The passing of the "egg-shells" tax started a storm. Mr. C. says: "You want to be a Christian and give only \$200 a year to your church. These things sound extravagant to you, but consider wherefrom they come."

My old schoolmaster is a great

man, but he has a bad temper.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is

not a good master.

He is a good teacher, but he is