WEEKLY EDITION.
$1.00 per Annum, In Advance.

FAYETTEVILLE OBSERVER.

DAILY EDITION.
$4.00 per Annum, in Advance.
2.00 for 6 Months, in Advance
1.00 for 3 Months, in Advance.

OLD SERIES---VOL LXXI---NO 3,996. FAYETTEVILLE, N. C., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1907. NEW SERIES---VOL. XXIII---NO. 2,273.

PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

HASTEN THE ISSUE.

A Washington telegram says:

"The Supreme Court of the United States to-day granted the petition of Edward T. Young, Attorney-General of Minnesota, for a writ bringing the contempt proceedings against Mr. Young in connection with the enforcement of the Railroad Rate law of that State to that court for review and enlarged the scope of the order so as to permit of his admission to bail. He is now under sentence by Judge Lochren, of the Federal Court, on the charge of instituting a proceeding in the Minnesota State courts in the face of a prohibition of the Federal Court. The action of the Supreme Court will bring the entire subject before that court. The important question of the respective jurisdictions of the State and Federal Courts in cases in which State railroad legislation is involved, which has arisen in many States, notably in North Carolina, will necessarily be considered in this suit, and it may prove to be a test case along new lines."

This is a highly important stage in the vital fight which is on now between despotism and democracy. One may await the Supreme Court's decision with comparative equanimity, provided only the decision be clear-cut and free from evasion or incompleteness.

If the court decides in favor of democracy, the Revolution set in motion by the Chicago convention of 1896 will have scored a substantial, possibly a decisive victory. If the court decides in favor of despotism (centralization), the end of the court itself is near.

CURRENT COMMENT.

The Raleigh News and Observer, referring to the President's Thanksgiving Proclamation, which we print elsewhere, wittily remarks: "If Mr. Bryan were not so outspoken in his opinions concerning the Federal courts, he might properly apply for an injunction against the political brigandage of T. Roosevelt. Mr. Bryan's theories have been appropriated for the good of the country. But when the President—in his Thanksgiving proclamation—lays violent hands on 'The Average man,' it is time for somebody to invoke the doctrine of 'vested rights.'"

A PLENTY OF MONEY FOR EVIL PURPOSES, BUT NONE FOR GOOD.

Raleigh News and Observer.]

J. Pierpont Morgan put fifteen million dollars in Wall street in one day and yet they say he cannot borrow money to continue double tracking the Southern Railway. If he will squeeze out the water from stocks and bonds, he will find it easier to borrow.

ORIGIN OF THE FIRST ELEVEN AMENDMENTS.

The origin of the first eleven Amendments to the Federal Constitution is not as well known as it might be. But the Centennial Celebration in Fayetteville of the adoption of the federal constitution in 1789—it was at the old "State House," which stood where the "Market House" has been standing since shortly after the fire of 1831—the Centennial Celebration in Fayetteville helped the world to recall what a prominent part North Carolina had in securing the adoption of that "bill of rights" the first ten Amendments.

The origin of the Eleventh Amendment is the subject of a very interesting article by the Atlanta Journal, which we append. The Journal suspects that many lawyers are ignorant of the origin of this important Amendment. No doubt that is true of the post-bellum lawyer, but what the Journal so interestingly epitomizes now was drummed into the noddles of all the boys at Chapel Hill "before the war," who took the international and constitutional law course under "Old Bunc" of blessed memory.

The Journal says:

Origin of the Eleventh Amendment.

The history of the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and how it came to be adopted is probably known to very few people. We suspect that are some—possibly many—of the lawyers who are not familiar with the origin of this important Amendment and the fact that it was virtually created by the State of Georgia.

Almost immediately after the adoption of the Federal Constitution by the States the Supreme Court of the United State manifested a determination to assume greater powers than were intended to be granted by the States. The principles of State sovereignty had been jealously guarded, and it was thought preserved, by the express terms and provisions of the Constitution. But the adoption of this instrument was scarcely complete before directly opposed constructions were placed upon the instrument by those who constituted the rival political parties. Scarcely more than half a dozen years after the adoption of the Constitution had elapsed before it was found necessary to add the Eleventh Amendment—ten Amendments having already been suggested and added at the instance of the several States.

The adoption of the Eleventh Amendment grew out of a suit instituted against the State of Georgia by a citizen of another State in the United State Supreme Court. Georgia declined to recognize the liability to suit in the Federal court and denied the authority of the Federal Supreme Court to take jurisdiction in such matters. In consequence of this refusal, judgment by default was rendered against the State, but this judgment was ignored and no effort was ever made to enforce it. As a consequence of this assumption by the United States Supreme Court of jurisdiction over sovereign States in controversies between a citizen and a State, the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution was proposed and subsequently adopted.

The provision of the Constitution under which the litigation arose is as follows:

"The judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution . . . . to controversies between two or more States—between a State and citizens of another State," etc.

Under this provision, Chisholm, executor, brought suit against the State of Geogia in the Supreme Court of the United States at theAugust term, 1792. The United States marshal served a copy of the suit on Edward Telfair, governor, and Thomas P. Carnes, attorney general. Georgia declined to defend or otherwise take cognizance of the suit. At the February term, 1794, judgment by default was rendered against the State, but the judgment was never enforced. This proceeding is elaborately discussed by Judge Benning, of the Supreme court of Georgia, in the case of Padleford, Fay & Company vs. the mayor and aldermen of the city of Savannah, in the fourteenth volume of the Georgia Supreme court reports. The case begins on page 438 of that volume, but particular reference to the Georgia case is found on page 478. This discussion is very lengthy and exhaustive on the subject of the power of Federal and State courts, respectively. It goes fully into the history of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, to show the limits of Federal authority, as fixed by the States in framing the Constitution and the construction placed upon that instrument by both Federal and State authorities at the time of, and previous to, its adoption. In discussing the refusal of Georgia to recognize the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme court and the judgment rendered by that court, Judge Benning says:

"Georgia treated the court with contempt in respect to this case. Her position was that the court had no jurisdiction of her as a party. Georgia maintained that the words, 'The judicial power of the United States shall extend to controversies between a State and citizens of another State,' were not to be construed to extend to controversies in which the State might be DEFENDANT, but only to those in which the State might be plaintiff. . . . In this position, Georgia triumphed. Nothing was done with the judgment which was obtained by default in 1794 until after the Amendment had been adopted in 1798, when the case was swept from the records."

Discussing the character of the Eleventh Amendment, Judge Benning says:

"The language of it is peculiar. The judicial power of the United States shall not be CONSTRUED to extend to any suit in law or equity commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States, etc. It is an Amendment, not to alter the Constitution, but to keep unaltered. . . . It is a rebuke to the Supreme court for daring to change the Constitution under pretense of construing it; for daring to hold the Constitution was not to be STRICTLY construed even in the case of REMEDIAL powers which it delegates."

It will repay anybody to read the case from which we have quoted, from beginning to end. It is the most powerful and unanswerable presentation of the limits of the jurisdiction of the Federal and State courts that has ever come under our observation.

Georgia maintained that the Federal Constitution was to be construed strictly and that the Federal court contained no powers that were not expressly given to it by the States: that the right of a citizen to sue a State was not expressly given, and, therefore, did not exist. In this position she was sustained by practically every other State in the Union, beginning with Massachusetts, which had forced the Tenth Amendment, providing that all powers not expressly delegated to the United States are resrved to the States respectively, etc., and extending through New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and indeed all the States. The position taken by Georgia denying the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and refusing assent to the construction placed by that court upon the Federal Constitution, aroused such a general demand for a more definite limitation of the powers of the Federal judiciary that in 1798 the Eleventh Amendment was adopted.

This Amendment in terms declares that the judical power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity against one of the United States by citizens of another State or by citizens or subjects of any foreign State. Georgia may, therefore, be said to be the creator of the Eleventh Amendment. To be sure, her action was in line with the construction placed upon the Constitution by the other States of the Union, and no doubt the Eleventh Amendment would have come in time, any way, but its adoption in 1798, a few years after the adoption of the Constitution, was the immediate result of Georgia's resistance.

The Eleventh Amendment has for more than a hundred years been the bulwark of State protection against Federal aggression. It has protected Georgia against suit for the collection of her repudiated bonds, and saved every State in the Union from what in the early days of the Constitution promised to lead to the assumption of unlimited jurisdiction by the Federal courts over States, as well as individuals.

Another case discussed by Judge Benning was that of Worcester & Butler against Georgia, reported in 6th Peters, page 515. The question was whether the act to establish the judicial courts of the United States which gave the United State Supreme Court the power of revising and reversing judgments and decrees of State courts was constitutional. Worcester and Butler were tried and convicted in Gwinnett Superior court. A writ of error was issued from the United State Supreme Court, on the application of the defendants. The Georgia judge refused to recognize the right to issue the writ. Chief Justice Marshall, of the United State Supreme court, delivering the opinion, said it was "too clear for controversy that the act of Congress by which this court is constituted, has given it the power, and, of course, imposed on it the duty of exercising jurisdiction in this case." The judgment of the Superior court of Gwinnett county was reversed and annulled and a special mandate was ordered to go from the United States Supreme Court to the Superior court to carry the judgment into execution. Georgia refused to recognize the mandate of the Supreme court, upon the ground that the act of Congress was unconstitutional, and she kept the defendants in the penitentiary.

In two other cases, those of Tassels and Graves, involving life and death, Georgia declined to recognise the authority of the United States Supreme court. In each of these cases the Supreme court had issued writs of error on the application of the defendant. No attention was paid to them. "As the case was not reported," says Judge Benning, "it is to be presumed that these writs never got back to the Supreme Court." "And," he adds, with almost a touch of humor, "it is certain that Georgia hung the applicants for the writs." Thereupon, the Georgia Legislature passed resolutions of a drastic nature in reference to both the Tassels and the Graves cases, requesting and enjoining the governor to disregard every mandate from the chief justice or any associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States for the purpose of arresting the execution of any of the criminal laws of this State.

In this view of the powers and limitations of the Federal courts over the States and her insistence upon a strict construction of the Federal Constitution, Georgia was sustained and supported by every State in the Union up to the time when the abolition of slavery became the great issue and changed the views of the north. The effort to enlarge the powers of the Federal judiciary was the work of those who sought by judicial construction to give far greater powers to the general government than were ever intended to be granted by the States.

It would be difficult to find more interesting reading than the case that we have cited in the 14th Georgia report.

THE SOUTH'S PLACE IN HISTORY.

Atlanta Journal.]

Mr. S. S. Williams, of the University of South Carolina, is preparing a monograph on the subject, "What Place in History Will the Confederate States Finally Hold?" and in anticipation of his work he has been gathering a concensus of opinion of this interesting question, to which the Journal is invited to contribute.

Preliminary to any satisfactory reply to such a question it would first be necessary to ask who is to write the history. In all the world's great events in which bitterness and passion have been aroused contemporary witnesses, in the eyes of prosperity, have discredited one another, until the ask, line jesting Pilate, "What is truth?" and will not stay for an answer. When Gibbon was about to address himself to the task of describing the decline and fall of the Roman empire, an accident on a broken bridge in his neighborhood brought out so many varied and conflicting versions as to how the affair had occurred, that he asked himself in bewilderment how he was ever to winnow the truth from the musty annals of two thousand years ago, if eye witnesses could not agree as to the circumstances of a simple accident which occurred but a few hours before. Caesar and Napolean are demi-gods or monsters, according to the partiality of historians. The English Reformation becomes an orgie of blood and heresy when viewed by Lingard or Cobbett.

It is almost too much for the South to hope that the time will ever come when complete and universal justice will be done to her institutions, her motives and her heroism in the hour of trial, and yet it is conceivable that at some distant day, when the last of the participants has passed away and time has completely obliterated all sectional animosities, an impartial analist, seeking the original sources of information for himself, may write the record of the South, based on established facts, which will be generally accepted as truth.

If such time should ever come the South has nothing to fear. She knows in her own heart that the story, as it has been recorded by her own historians, is the truth, but time alone can vindicate her version and win for it a general acceptance.

Detraction itself no longer attempts to deny the heroism and endurance of the men and women of the South during four years' struggle. History records no parallel for the unequal conflict prolonged over such a period, the self-containment of the South practically pitted against the resources of the world. Gladstone marvelled at the work of Jefferson Davis, who he said, had in a short time created "an army and a navy, and what was better, had created a nation." The lofty character and military genius of Lee have been conceded by every civilized country of the world.

The great point of divergence, even among men who have sought to be honest with themselves, has always been motives which inspired the South to take up arms. In the serener atmosphere of the present day the truth is gradually breaking in upon those who are willing to listen and learn, and they are discovering that no greater calumny was ever uttered against a humane and chivalric people than to say the civil war was fought for the purpose of perpetuating slavery.

Imparial students of history realize and concede that the South was contending for a theory of government which lay closest to the hearts of all the Amercan people during the formative period of the republic. It was the very essence of democracy, in its best and broadest sense. It was the right of local self-government. The South espoused no new doctrine. On the contrary, it was the South which kept the very ark of the covenant when ambitious politicians had perverted the original purpose of the fathers and had read into the constitution meanings which were new and strange.

One needs only to read the debates in the various state conventions of the original states, called to consider the the ratification of the constitution, to learn that the one apprehension in the minds of all was that the sovereignty of the states might not be preserved. By every means in their power they safeguarded the rights of the states, before giving their consent to the organic law, and Massachusetts, among other states, especially instructed her representatives in congress to take advantage of every occasion to secure states rights. The State of New York, in ratifying the constitution, specifically declared that her citizens might, whenever they saw fit, resume the powers which had been delegated to the general government. Evidence showing that this was the spirit of the times—the "will of the makers" of the constitution as expressed at the time it was made—might be gathered from a thousand sources.

Slavery was but an incident of the great conflict. The basic issue was the right of local self-government, and the extinction of the Southern Confederacy has no more affected that right than martial law in a mining town has overthrown the constitutional right of habeas corpus. It may be conceded that secession has been settled forever, and the desire for it has long since passed away.

But the right of state sovereignty is as vital to-day as it ever was, and every hour is vidicating the contention of the South of forty odd years ago. It is a right inherent in democracy. It is not peculiar to the South. It is a charcteristic of every federated government under the sun. The individual states of the commonwealth of Australia, with their conflicting and diversified interests, are contending for the principle to-day in a manner which reads like a chapter from our own history, and western Australia has announced it intention to secede. There the question is not complicated by a slavery race. It is simply a demand of pure democracy for the logical right of local self-government.

The centralization of power, under whatever administrative form, cannot fail and has never yet failed to culminate in tyranny and oppression, and in the perpetuation of autocracy. It was so when Augustus Caesar swept aside the last vestige of the republic and became the first of the emperors of Rome. It was so when the republican Bonaparte chose to "wade through slaughter to a throne." This tendency, unchecked, will always reach its logical conclusion.

There are menaces to the government to-day, when the oligarchy of wealth, too often sustained by a complaisant judiciary, is seeking to subvert the principles of democracy. These are perils which need to be watched with unsleeping vigilance. The sheet anchor of our institutions is the south's sustained contention for the very theory of government for which the Confederate states once stood. Though extinguished, the Confederacy did not live in vain. Its destines were guided by men whose intelligence and integrity challenged the admiration of the world. It was free from selfishness and corruption. It was upheld by a love of freedom and equality. It was a final protest against the perversion of that form of government which had been devised by the patriot fathers when liberty and justice were living facts. Its grandeur, its pathos, its patriotism have given it a unique place in the annals of recorded time, and the candor of the future must recognize the truth of its epitaph:

"No nation rose so white, so fair:
None fell so pure of crime."

THE PRESIDENT'S THANKSGIVING PROCLAMATION.

Once again the season of the year has come when, in accordance with the custom of our forefathers for generations past, the President appoints a day as the especial occasion for all our people to give praise and thanksgiving to God.

During the past year we have been free from famine, from pestilence, from war. We are at peace with all the rest of mankind. Our natural resources are at least as great as those of any other nation. We believe that in ability to develop and take advantage of these resources the average man of this nation stands at least as high as the average man of any other. Nowhere else in the world is there such an opportunity for a free people to develop to the fullest extent all its powers of body, of mind, and of that which stands above both body and mind,—character.

Much has been given us from on high and much will rightly be expected of us in return. Into our care the ten talents have been entrusted; and we are to be pardoned neither if we squander or waste them, nor if we hide them in a napkin; for they must be fruitful in our hands. Ever throughout the ages, at all times and among all peoples, prosperity has been fraught with danger, and it behooves us to beseech the Giver of all things that we may not fall into love of ease and luxury; that we may not lose our sense of moral responsibility; that we may not forget our duty to God and to our neighbor.

A great Democracy like ours, a Democracy based upon the principles of orderly liberty can be perpetuated only if in the heart of the ordinary citizens there dwells a keen sense of righteousness and justice. We should earnestly pray that this spirit of righteousness and justice may grow ever greater in the hearts of all of us, and that our souls may be inclined evermore both toward the virtues that tell for gentleness and tenderness, for loving kindness and forbearance one with another, and toward those no less necessary virtues that make our manliness and rugged hardihood—for without these qualities neither nation nor individual can rise to the level of greatness.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, do set apart Thursday, the 28th day of November, as a day of general thanksgiving and prayer, and on that day I recommend that the people shall cease from their daily work, and, in their home or in their churches meet devoutly to thank the Almighty for the many and great blessings they have received in the past, and to pray that they may be given strength so to order their lives as to deserve a continuation of these blessings in the future.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of theUnited States to be affixed. (Seal.)

Done at the city of Washington the twenty-fifth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seven and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-second.

(Signed.)
THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
By the President:
Elihu Root, Secretary of State.

THE CONFERENCE OF GOVERNORS.

Governor Glenn, so the telegrams inform us, has gone to Atlanta to attend the conference there, called by Governor Smith, to consider the railway question. The purpose of the conference, as outlined by the Atlanta Journal, understood to be Governor Smith's spokesman, is to be commended. Says the Journal:

It has now been definitely arranged that Governor Comer, of Alabama; Governor Glenn, of North Carolina, and possibly Governor Swanson, of Virginia, will meet with Governor Hoke Smith, of Georgia, in this city on Friday for the purpose of discussing the present attitude of the railroads towards the states in question.

It is conceded that this will be one of the most important conferences ever called for the purpose of settling the existing differences with the railroads. The position of the transportation companies in these various states is much the same and it is obviously necessary that some united and harmonious action should be taken by these states in order to safeguard the interests of the people and to protect the authority of the individual states.

The men who are taking the lead in this great crusade cannot afford to sit by supinely and see the power of the federal judiciary extended to a point where it practically nullifies the action of the state legislatures and railroad commissions, and at the same time, whatever action is taken by the states affected should be uniform and harmonious.

Out of these deliberations on the part of the three or four governors who have stood most manfully in the breach should come a settled policy which will ultimately result in the establishment of the authority of the states to regulate their own affairs.

Nor is this all. We have previously suggested that it would be a good idea for the railroad commissions of the various states to meet in conference and discuss a uniform course of action. In such union there would be strength. There would be nothing binding in such an agreement, except upon the consciences of the individual conferees, but it would bring out a definite line of action with which to meet the encroachments of the federal judiciary and at the same time compel the railroads to obey the laws of the individual states. While each state would be acting independently in the orders and regulations issued through its railroad commission, those regulations would be uniform and one of the loudest complaints of the railroads—that against varied and unsystematized regulations—would be silenced.

We expect very salutary results from this conference of the southern governors, and we trust that arrangements will be made for a joint meeting, some time in the future, of the railroad commissions of the states.

It is a movement which the railroads themselves should be the first to endorse and support.

ROOSEVELT THE SOURCE OF ALL EVIL.

Here is the funniest thing concerning the President which has found its way into print. Even when he is right, the mere fact that he is causes trouble—according to a press dispatch from Pittsburg, which says:

Frank Haffield, a boy naturalist of Perry street, Alleghaney, disagreed with President Roosevelt's theory on the ground squirrels, but on investigation found that the head of the nation was right. This annoyed the 15-year-old student of natural history that he took a drink and may die in consequence. The Haffield boy, who has studied much natural history, protested vigorously some time ago on reading that Mr. Roosevelt said the chipmunk, or ground squirrel, hibernated. He asserted that he had met the little animal in the depth of winter, and yesterday he started out to disprove the theory of Mr. Roosevelt. He visited all the haunts of the chipmunk within miles of the city, but could not find one. The boy went home in tears, and later went out to join some larger boys, who had a quart of whisky. He drowned his sorows in whisky and was soon senseless. He was later hurried to the Alleghaney general hospital in a patrol wagon, where the physicians worked over him most of the night. He was taken to his home to-day where he lies in a critical condition.

MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE.

The Salisbury Post says:

"A coroner's jury at Greensboro yesterday fixed the blame for the wreck of No. 34, in which five persons were killed, upon Brakeman H. C. Leonard, and Mr. Leonard was ordered placed under immediate arrest. Mrs. Leonard has gone to Greensboro and furnished bond for her son."

The Post quotes a Greensboro telegram as follows:

"The wreck of Southern Railway train No. 34, which collided head-on with southbound freght train No. 83, by running into an open switch on the night of October 17, at Rudd, was investigated by Coroner J. P. Turner and jury of six. The inquest was behind closed doors and four witnesses were examined. They were Engineer Sanders and Conductor Davidson, of the freight, and Brakeman H. C. Leonard, also of the freight, who disappeared and walked from Rudd to his home at Spencer. The other witness was C. D. Benbow, who was a passenger on No. 34. After deliberating two or three hours the coroner's jury reached a verdict, placing the responsibility for the wreck upon Brakeman Leonard, who admitted in his testimony that he left the switch unlocked. The verdict also called the soclicitor's attention to the fact that the freight train crew had been on duty over 23 hours. Upon affidavit of Coroner Turner a warrant was issued by 'Squire D. H. Collins, charging Leonard with criminal negligence, resulting in the death of Mrs. Jane Thomas, D. Allen Bryant and others. Leonard was arrested and will be held in the custody of a guard until his mother arrives from Spencer to-morrow and gives his bond of $1,000."

Now why did not the jury indict the officials of the railway, who have been proved to have used the road's money for corrupt purposes instead of using it to shorten the hours of labor for their employes? The officials who are responsible for a system which keeps men on duty for 23 hours in the position of train crew men, should be jailed.

This jury must have been hypnotized.

Proud of Fayetteville.

Hoxie, Oct. 25th, 1907.

Mr. E. J. Hale,
Fayetteville, N. C.

Dear Sir:

Herewith $1.00 to be applied on my subscription to the Observer.

Proud of her history and with a love for her akin to that of a child for a parent, I am willing to be one out of a sufficient number to contribute $5.00 to a fund sufficient to employ my old and beloved preceptor, Mr. Harry Myrover to write and publish in the Observer a history of Fayetteville with photographs of some of the old landmarks—such as the market house, Liberty Point, Hay Street Methodist church, the old Merchants Mill, old gun house, the Fountain Head spring house from which flowed the water through the "pump logs" and wooden pumps that supplied the town, McKethan's carriage factory, and the old mill (if still standing) at "Mimm's pond, Lutterloh's corner, the Brick row and Myrover's corner and the Donaldson Academy buildings.

If such an illustrated history of the dear old town, dwelling on the incidents particularly connected with the commencement of the war and its close, I believe the "dispersed abroad" would quickly respond to his idea, if their attention was called to it. I will never forget the home of my birth, the scenes of my youth are still fresh in my memory. I think I know every spot in the grand old municipality from the Cape Fear river to the little brick store built by John Davis on Haymount, from Massey's Hill on the south to Harrington's Hill on the north. I even hear, at least I imagine I hear the ringing of the market bell morning, noon and evening.

In 1856, on the side of Mallett's pond, in an humble "shack," I came smiling into this good old world of ours and the health and strength given me then, has been with me in the 30 odd years I have been away from there.

"Looking Backward" through those years I see many faces once familiar and friendly to me, some dead and others still on this side, among them: John C. Haigh, Captain Dangerfield, John D. Williams, H. and E. J. Lilly, J. C. Thompson, Capt. J. B. Smith and others, including Dr. Floyd, H. Whaley, W. W. Cole, W. C. Troy, I. C. Bond, J. G. Oehrl, J. W. Atkinson, Col. Broadfoot and hosts of those people whom I love as though they were intimate relatives.

Let the Observer continue to come. It reaches here every Saturday morning and all dailies we take, such as the St. Louis Republic, Globe-Democrat, Memphis Comercial and Arkansas Democrat are laid aside until the 'news from home' has been read. You may consider me a life-subscriber.

Yours truly,
JOHN S. GIBSON.

TRIMMING THE DOUMA TO THE IMPERIAL MEASURE.

The Imperialists in Russia have granted election for a representative assembly three times now. The first was summarily dissolved because it was too representative. The grade of the electors was raised, and the second was less representative, but there were still too many patriots in it—in fact, the patriots still outnumbered the imperialists; and the second Douma was dissolved. At last the imperialists have succeeded, by a still further tightening of the electoral strings, in getting a Douma to suit them; the patriots are in the minority! The so-called constitutional government is launched, therefore, and we shall see how long it will be able to smother the fires of revolution, which are certain to burst forth again—measured in volume and celerity of action by the oppression of the new government.

The character of the new body is indicated by the following dispatch from St. Petersburg:

A large number of the princes, counts, barons and other members of the titled aristocracy have been chosen members, but in the number of men of political experience is small, only a score of former members of the Douma passing, among them being M. Chelnokoff, secretary of the Constitutional Democrats in the second Douma. The Octoberist member, Nikolai A. Khoniyakoff, who was a member of the Council of Empire, probably will be a candidate for President of the Chamber, as also will be the Reactionaries Purikevich and Krupensky, the Anti-Semite Klepoffsky, Bishop Evolgius and Count Bobrinsky.

The notorious Pavel Alexandrovitch Krushevan, the anti-Semite of Kischeneff, was not elected, but Prince Urasoff II, Count Brobrinsky and Prince Shakhoffskoi, prominent leaders in the big landowners' organization and supporters of the League of the Russian People, were successful. Other prominent persons elected include Baron Tiesenhausen, Prince Volkonsky ex-Governor Lodygensky, of Tula, and six German barons of the Baltic provinces, including Baron Hans Rosen, a relative of the Ambassador to the United States, and Baron Voelkersam, a kinsman of the late Rear-Admiral Voelkersam, who was killed in the battle of the Sea of Japan.

M. C. Helnokoff was the only Constitutional Democrat elected, and few of the leaders of that party will pass in the later elections, which include the city strongholds.

The Constitutional Democratic organ Retch will concede the defeat of the party to-morrow, saying that there is not the slightest room for hope for the selection of a progressive Douma, in the Constitutional Democratic sense of the word.