

THE CAUCASIAN

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY THE CAUCASIAN PUBLISHING CO.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES. ONE YEAR, \$1.00 SIX MONTHS, .60 THREE MONTHS, .35

Entered at the Post Office in Raleigh, N.C. as second-class mail matter.

MR. DAVIS' FLEDGE.

It is well known that a majority of the Democratic members of the last legislature, in their campaign, pledged the people, on the stump, that if they were put into power they would not disfranchise anybody, white or black, and they further denounced as a campaign lie every charge made by the Republicans and Populists that they had any such intention.

The House Committee on Elections has just rendered a decision in the Louisiana contest between Hon. W. F. Aldrich, Populist, and Hon. Gaston A. Robbins, Democrat. The vote of the Committee stood six in favor of Aldrich and two in favor of Robbins.

The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections is still investigating the charges of bribery against Senator Clark. No little new and damaging testimony has been given during the past week.

The meeting of the Populist State Executive Committee in Raleigh last Thursday was one of the most harmonious Committee meetings the Committee has ever held.

As the campaign is now on, and as it is the duty of every voter to read up and to educate himself on the issues before the people so that he may vote intelligently, it becomes his duty to read the issues from every standpoint.

In taking the CAUCASIAN, you will get all ideas in a nutshell. For it will state what they are plainly and also wherein they will affect the average voter, either for good or evil.

Every Populist as well as every other voter should read it. The purpose to make it rich, rare, racy, and full of facts and argument from week to week that cannot be refuted.

It will cost \$1 a year or 50c for 6 months; and remember, in reading it, you will get four times the worth of your money. There will be hundreds of facts in it that you will not find anywhere else, facts too that will startle you. Take it and read it.

EPHRAIM BLACKNALL. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of December 1899. (Signed) H. A. FINCH, Justice of Peace.

Of course everybody in Franklin county, and in the whole state, for that matter, is familiar with how Mr. Davis, at the dictates of Mr. Simmons and his ballot box stuffing machine, bowed to the party lash and violated the pledges and voted for the dangerous disfranchising scheme that is now pending.

Can the people trust the new pledges and promises made by men who have so very recently violated their pledges?

Senator Pritchard delivered a speech in the Senate on Monday in reply to Senator Morgan. He took up the various contentions of the Alabama Senator and analyzed and refuted them, one by one.

It is not only an able and exhaustive argument on the proposed constitutional amendment, but, besides, it is an important contribution to the political history of the State and country.

THE CAUCASIAN regrets the speech was delivered too late to publish it in this issue of the paper. It will be published in full in our next issue.

Those who desire to get extra copies containing this speech in full for distribution can get them at the rates of one dollar per hundred. Send in your order early.

In the News and Observer of Jan 21st there appeared a communication signed "A Populist and White Man."

And who is he? If he were in fact either a Populist or a White Man it would seem that he would have signed his own name to his communication.

We think we know who he is, if it be that he is not the editor of the News and Observer, who by the way, has tried more than once to pass at least as a Populist barnacle. He may be some renegade present in the city at the time of the Committee meeting, ordered here by the masters that own him, and for the purpose of writing a communication that he was too cowardly to sign.

We know at least that he is not a Populist, and if he is a white man he is of that doubtful variety which finds it necessary to advertise the fact.

He says that he did not attend the meeting of the Executive Committee on Jan. 18th. The intimation is that he could have had his invitation to attend. In this intimation it is probable that this "Pop. and White Man" tells an ordinary Democratic lie.

The nearest he came, or could have come, to being present at that meeting was to have been in company with other eaves-droppers to whose garbled report he is indebted for his misinformation. His communication is altogether worthy of the sneak that he is.

Elsewhere in this issue appears another able article from Hon. Frank Nash on the amendment. He writes in a clear, vigorous and convincing manner and his contributions will be read with interest. The Raleigh Post says that anything Mr. Nash writes "should receive respectful consideration."

Senator Butler's open letter to Capt. Geo. Wilcox on the proposed amendment has been printed in pamphlet form.

Those who desire to get copies of this pamphlet for distribution can get them by addressing THE CAUCASIAN or Hon. Cyrus Thompson, State Chairman, Raleigh, N. C. They will be furnished at the following rates: 25 cents per hundred, or two dollars per thousand.

The House Committee on Elections has just rendered a decision in the Louisiana contest between Hon. W. F. Aldrich, Populist, and Hon. Gaston A. Robbins, Democrat. The vote of the Committee stood six in favor of Aldrich and two in favor of Robbins.

The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections is still investigating the charges of bribery against Senator Clark. No little new and damaging testimony has been given during the past week.

The meeting of the Populist State Executive Committee in Raleigh last Thursday was one of the most harmonious Committee meetings the Committee has ever held.

As the campaign is now on, and as it is the duty of every voter to read up and to educate himself on the issues before the people so that he may vote intelligently, it becomes his duty to read the issues from every standpoint.

In taking the CAUCASIAN, you will get all ideas in a nutshell. For it will state what they are plainly and also wherein they will affect the average voter, either for good or evil.

Every Populist as well as every other voter should read it. The purpose to make it rich, rare, racy, and full of facts and argument from week to week that cannot be refuted.

It will cost \$1 a year or 50c for 6 months; and remember, in reading it, you will get four times the worth of your money. There will be hundreds of facts in it that you will not find anywhere else, facts too that will startle you. Take it and read it.

EPHRAIM BLACKNALL. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of December 1899. (Signed) H. A. FINCH, Justice of Peace.

Of course everybody in Franklin county, and in the whole state, for that matter, is familiar with how Mr. Davis, at the dictates of Mr. Simmons and his ballot box stuffing machine, bowed to the party lash and violated the pledges and voted for the dangerous disfranchising scheme that is now pending.

Can the people trust the new pledges and promises made by men who have so very recently violated their pledges?

Senator Pritchard delivered a speech in the Senate on Monday in reply to Senator Morgan. He took up the various contentions of the Alabama Senator and analyzed and refuted them, one by one.

It is not only an able and exhaustive argument on the proposed constitutional amendment, but, besides, it is an important contribution to the political history of the State and country.

THE CAUCASIAN regrets the speech was delivered too late to publish it in this issue of the paper. It will be published in full in our next issue.

Those who desire to get extra copies containing this speech in full for distribution can get them at the rates of one dollar per hundred. Send in your order early.

In the News and Observer of Jan 21st there appeared a communication signed "A Populist and White Man."

And who is he? If he were in fact either a Populist or a White Man it would seem that he would have signed his own name to his communication.

We think we know who he is, if it be that he is not the editor of the News and Observer, who by the way, has tried more than once to pass at least as a Populist barnacle. He may be some renegade present in the city at the time of the Committee meeting, ordered here by the masters that own him, and for the purpose of writing a communication that he was too cowardly to sign.

We know at least that he is not a Populist, and if he is a white man he is of that doubtful variety which finds it necessary to advertise the fact.

He says that he did not attend the meeting of the Executive Committee on Jan. 18th. The intimation is that he could have had his invitation to attend. In this intimation it is probable that this "Pop. and White Man" tells an ordinary Democratic lie.

The nearest he came, or could have come, to being present at that meeting was to have been in company with other eaves-droppers to whose garbled report he is indebted for his misinformation. His communication is altogether worthy of the sneak that he is.

Elsewhere in this issue appears another able article from Hon. Frank Nash on the amendment. He writes in a clear, vigorous and convincing manner and his contributions will be read with interest. The Raleigh Post says that anything Mr. Nash writes "should receive respectful consideration."

Senator Butler's open letter to Capt. Geo. Wilcox on the proposed amendment has been printed in pamphlet form.

Those who desire to get copies of this pamphlet for distribution can get them by addressing THE CAUCASIAN or Hon. Cyrus Thompson, State Chairman, Raleigh, N. C. They will be furnished at the following rates: 25 cents per hundred, or two dollars per thousand.

The House Committee on Elections has just rendered a decision in the Louisiana contest between Hon. W. F. Aldrich, Populist, and Hon. Gaston A. Robbins, Democrat. The vote of the Committee stood six in favor of Aldrich and two in favor of Robbins.

The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections is still investigating the charges of bribery against Senator Clark. No little new and damaging testimony has been given during the past week.

The meeting of the Populist State Executive Committee in Raleigh last Thursday was one of the most harmonious Committee meetings the Committee has ever held.

As the campaign is now on, and as it is the duty of every voter to read up and to educate himself on the issues before the people so that he may vote intelligently, it becomes his duty to read the issues from every standpoint.

In taking the CAUCASIAN, you will get all ideas in a nutshell. For it will state what they are plainly and also wherein they will affect the average voter, either for good or evil.

Every Populist as well as every other voter should read it. The purpose to make it rich, rare, racy, and full of facts and argument from week to week that cannot be refuted.

It will cost \$1 a year or 50c for 6 months; and remember, in reading it, you will get four times the worth of your money. There will be hundreds of facts in it that you will not find anywhere else, facts too that will startle you. Take it and read it.

father clause will stand the test in the courts.

Who were the white people that this amendment will disfranchise approximately as many white men as it will negroes in this State, and leave the negro still a factor in politics, with as much power as he now has.

Who were the uneducated white men, both old and young, that this amendment will deprive them of the right to vote and degrade them politically below the educated negro.

This has always been a white man's government, and always will be. There are two white voters to one colored voter; hence the State is in no danger of negro supremacy. And since our present Supreme Court has decided that the Legislature may pass such laws for each county as may be necessary for its proper government, no eastern county need fear negro rule.

The real question presented in the amendment is, whether or not all the white citizens shall participate in elections or whether the uneducated whites shall be forced to stand aside on the day of election along with the uneducated negroes like convicted criminals, while the educated negroes walk up to the polls and vote.

This amendment, if adopted, would end popular government in this State. It would turn the offices over to a select few, who would not feel bound to respect the rights of the common people, because the common people would not be able to enforce respect at the ballot box.

It would build up a ruling class which in time, would become more haughty and tyrannical than the Czar of all the Russias.

Since the issue of the coming State election are above all party considerations, they should be considered from the highest plane of patriotism and self-protection. It therefore behooves all political parties as well as individuals to lay aside all partial feelings and join themselves together for the purpose of defeating the most dangerous proposition ever made to the people of North Carolina.

SENATOR PRITCHARD ON THE AMENDMENT. Discussed it Thoroughly in the Senate. Special to THE CAUCASIAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 22, 1900. Senator Pritchard today addressed the Senate in reply to a resolution that any State that attempted to enforce the right of suffrage by inheritance violated the Constitution of the United States. His speech was an able, complete and convincing answer to Senator Morgan's speech. He argued the question from a constitutional standpoint, quoting numerous decisions from the Supreme Court, proving beyond a doubt that the pending measure in North Carolina will not stand the test of the highest court.

He quoted from the Democratic handbook, which denounced all who charged that the Democrats would pass a disfranchising act as false, and then showed up the base and glaring treachery of the North Carolinians for doing that which they solemnly pledged not to do.

He quoted, with effect, the speech of the lamented Vance who took the position in favor of universal suffrage—and said that since the death of the great statesman, who was beloved by all parties in the State, the machinery of the Democratic party in North Carolina had gotten into the control of those who favored domination of the masses and denial of their right to take part in the control of the state affairs.

As showing the sentiments of those good, honest, liberty loving white citizens of the State who through no fault of their own, can not read and write he quoted with pertinence the remark made by Mrs. Wiley Jones, after the battle of Cowpens to the British officer, Tarleton, said he by disparaging of Washington, said he was Joseph—You appear to think very highly of Colonel Washington, and yet I have been told that he is so ignorant a fellow that he can hardly write his name. "It may be the case," she readily replied, "but no man better than yourself, Colonel, can testify that he knows how to make his mark."

It was at the battle of Cowpens that Washington wounded Tarleton in the hand, and this provoked the pointed and stinging retort from Mrs. Jones. Senator Pritchard said that there are citizens in North Carolina who can not read and write, but they will make a mark that will be felt severely when the time comes to act in order to preserve their sacred rights and liberties.

The speech was an able, strong and convincing defense of the right of the poor, uneducated white man, whose liberties are now in danger.

IF THE MESSENGER BELIEVES WHAT HE SAID IN 1893, CAN HE UPHOLD THE PRESENT ELECTION LAW AND THE METHODS OF THE REGISTER MACHINE?

Looking over my scrap-book, I find that in the early part of January, 1893, the Wilmington Messenger copied a part of a personal letter I wrote to the editor thanking him for the stand he had taken in behalf of honest elections against fraud, and went on to quote that portion of my letter in which I maintained that our liberties rested upon an honest election, and contended that the man who would use dishonest means to place himself or friends in office would sell the interests of his constituents for selfish gain.

Commenting upon the above, the editor, Dr. Kingsbury, then wrote: "The Democrats of North Carolina simply cannot afford to countenance ballot-box stuffing, ballot-dozing or ballot cheating. Men who do this will go to the wall under an appeal to honesty and fair play. There are tens of thousands of good and true Democrats in North Carolina who are indignant above any party to see their way by fraud and corruption. The Republicans were rejected in part because of this very corruption."

I ask if the Doctor can uphold such election laws? I would seem to my mind that any man who has one cent of respect for honesty that any one could write such in 1893 would either have to condemn the present outrageous election law, born of and through corruption or prove to the world that what he writes now is not to be trusted or depended upon if honesty and fair play is to be sought.

CITIZEN. Wilmington, N. C., Jan. 16, 1900.

SUPFRAGE QUESTION.

SOME PLAIN FACTS ABOUT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

The Lineal Descendent Section Clearly Unconstitutional.

SUPREME COURT NOT THE CREATURE OF FLEETING PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

This Silly Cry of Negro Domination—Interesting Article on the Campaign. Issue by Frank Nash.

Editor of The Gazette.

In reading the opinions of judges whom I have never seen, I have the habit of forming some mental conception, not only of the ability, but of the appearance and personality of those judges. Of course as I discover afterwards, I miss as often as I hit the mark; yet there is something fascinating in the operation, while at the same time it gives interest to and fastens the attention upon those opinions.

Now, Mr. Simmons in his latest collection of arguments for the proposed suffrage provision, has saved me all this trouble, for I likeness of his author accompanies each one of them. These authors, however, are not judges, but by any manner of means, but simple advocates of the pro side of a legal and political question. All are either politicians, or, or have held political office. Some of them are old sinners in this regard. Others have here before taken what they fondly imagine to be a rear seat in the cynical and unscrupulous, and of this they are not proud. They should be forgotten and not be invited to come up higher. All of them are, of course, able men, men of reputation and character; and, as their Great Leader, Mr. Bryan, makes politics a profession, so they, too, should be their followers, should not be politicians, if they want to be; but it is always well to be wisely cautious in giving full credence to interested judges or advocates, or witnesses or politicians.

Mr. Jarvis is a man of much more than ordinary ability as a man and political manager, well balanced and generally wise, and he is withal kind and benevolent. I think there is no hypocrisy in his making a profession, and of this art he is past grand master. But to save my life, when reading his article, I could not prevent the memory of an illustration in Dickens' "Martin Chuzzlewit" from haunting me. It represents a man, Pecksniff, strolling along a pathway in a wood, the bare boughs of whose trees made an archway over his head and a vista of light beyond. His hands, with palms together, were turned toward the sun, and there was about him an indistinguishable atmosphere of benevolence, of goodness and of wisdom. Underneath the last year's leaves the placid Pecksniff smiled.

Mr. Jarvis has an enviable reputation in the State, as a lawyer, as a judge and as a man. But compare his bar association address with his article on Section 5, published about the same time. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

His dignity and self-respect, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

Having given these general impressions, I proceed now to examine more minutely some of the positions taken by these gentlemen. Judge Pecksniff's sentiment, after his argument, if argument it may be called, is enveloped in a haze of words. He lays down principles that are not sustained by either the history of our country or the logic of the case. He seems to join in the hue and cry against his colleagues against those who dare to differ with them as to the constitutionality of Section 5. They, too, are either interested politicians or "wretches" concentrated all in one.

in the opinions of the court, occasioned generally by conflict between strict construction and liberal interpretation of the constitution and a change of the personnel of the court. But all this was to a great degree settled by the war, when the federal idea triumphed and the United States was made a nation by the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

There is a wide difference between the license cases, 15 Howard and the two cases, Robbins vs Taxing District (the drummers case) and Leisy vs Hardin, (the original packing case), yet these latter cases were not decided by the constitutionality of any public sentiment, however wise or just or conservative that public sentiment may have been for the foundation principles of those decisions were enunciated long ago, by Judge Marshall in Brown vs. Maryland.

Taking the most recent cases, the income tax cases, as an illustration, I believe the income tax idea to be founded upon a wise, just and conservative public sentiment; yet the court, disregarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting. It is as unstable as the sea. What is to it now wise just and conservative may not have been so ten years in the past, nor may not be so ten years in the future. Besides, regarding the public sentiment, through its chief justice, himself, a Democrat, declared it unconstitutional, and thus almost hopelessly crippled the Democratic party. I might go on indefinitely, but this sentiment is constantly shifting.