THE UNDEFILED DOCTRINE.

HOUSE LEADER TELLS WHAT DEMOCRATS WILL DO.

John Sharp Williams Discusses President Roosevelt's Last Special Message and Points Out the Recommendations That Democrats Will Support and Which They Will Oppose.

Washington, March 26.—Representative John Sharp Williams of Mississippi, as leader of the minority in the house of representatives tonight issued to the press a written statement defining precisely the attitude of the Democratic party in the house towards legislation urged by President Roosevelt in his message to congress at the present session.

The statement describes what Republican legislation the Democrats will support, what they will oppose and what concession they demand on the part of the majority as the price of refraining from an organized filibuster throughout the remainder of the session. Mr. Williams opened his statement by saying:

"Some things in the president's recent message are so immediately important to the interests of the entire country as to pass the bounds of partisanship and to make it excusable if not necessary for me to say something concerning them, with the view of assuring the president himself and patriotically inclined Republican members of the house and the country of the support and endorsement or the opposition of the Democratic minority. In so far as the things urged by the president are good things I would like the country to know that all he has to do is to deliver 20 or 25 Republican house votes in favor of them. These conjoined with the solid Democratic votes will put them through."

Mr. Williams notes the following statement as one which will "command virtually the solid Democratic vote within constitutional lines:"

"To compel publication of campaign contributions; prohibition of child labor in the District of Columbia and the territories; an employers' liability law, drawn to conform to the recent decision of the supreme court; federal liability to government employes; a law to prohibit the issuance of injunctions without notice to the party enjoined; removal of the tariff on wood pulp and printing paper; imposition of a federal charge for every water power right granted on a navigable stream.

These principles and measures urged by the president with which Mr. Williams as minority leader, takes issue, are enumerated as follows:

The penalizing of the boycott; the right of the attorney general to nominate receivers when a common carrier is thrown into the hands of a receiver; the modification of the Sherman anti-trust law so as to permit within limitation the maintenance of trusts and the making of trade agreements between combinations of capital; the appointment of a commission to prepare data for a revision of the tariff.

Mr. Williams frankly states that he does not know whether a majority of the minority favors the creation of a permanent waterways commission.

Referring to the president's declaration that child labor ought to be prohibited throughout the nation, and his recommendation that "at least a model child labor bill should be passed for the District of Columbia," Mr. Williams says:

"Child labor should be prohibited throughout the nation, but the States are the sole authorities having constitutional power to prohibit it. If those who could protect the children on the land, and through them the generations to come, would waste less of their time in the useless agitation for invalid and unconstitutional federal legislation and would devote more of their time in the several States, it would be better for all. But the president is right in saying that we can act for the District of Columbia, and for the Territories as well, and that we ought to do it."

Commending the president for his recommendation of the "immediate reenactment of an employers' liability law," Mr. Williams says:

"There is no excuse for the delay on the part of the Republicans of the house judiciary committee to report an employers' liability law. Their delay at least arises, if it does not justify, a suspicion that they are having a lot of useless hearings simply for the purpose of using the bill as a buffer to prevent the serious consideration of other bills before the committee. For example the Clayton bill to put an end to temporary restraining orders of courts invalidating State laws, and the various bills there pending to recognize the police powers of the States in dealing with alcoholic stimulants when introduced into prohibition territory. I have given notice in the house that no legislation shall be enacted by unanimous consent until an employers' liability bill is at least reported for the consideration of the house."

Respecting the pending bill, to prevent the issuing of injunctions without prior opportunity for the enjoined party to be heard the minority leader says: "Of course, I take it that nobody will understand the president or me to mean that there should be any limit upon temporary restraining orders when intended to prevent the immediate destruction of property, life or limb. When I say property I do not mean judicially construed 'property rights.'"

One of the most vigorous portions of Mr. Williams' statement regards the boycott. After quoting the president's declaration that "nothing should be done to legalize a blacklist or boycott that would be illegal at common law," Mr. Williams says:

"It is a sad commentary upon this utterance of his that while the federal courts have held that a boycott is a combination in restraint of trade and therefore illegal, they have virtually upheld the employer in his assertion of a right to blacklist; because the federal courts went so far as to say that because the employer had a right to discharge without giving any notice at all, therefore he had a right to discharge because the discharged man was a member of a labor union. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways. Another decision of a federal court—the decision of Judge Gould— has gone so far as to say that a labor man's newspaper should not publish the name of a firm under the heading 'We Don't Patronize.' A man has a right to patronize or not patronize anybody, according to his own sweet will, and he therefore has the right to publish those whom he does not patronize."

The president's recommendation of a law to place wood pulp on the free list, "with a corresponding reduction upon paper made from wood pulp, when they come from any country that does not put an export duty upon them," meets with Mr. Williams' approval, "except that it does not go quite far enough. Not only ought wood pulp to be placed upon the free list," he says, "but print paper ought to be placed there also. The publishers will not be very much benefitted by the placing of wood pulp upon the free list if there be only a slight reduction of the duty upon print paper."

"There are other things in the president's message," says Mr. Williams "which one might naturally expect, considering his education in the line of Hamiltonism and his tendencies toward federalism, cannot meet with Democratic approval. One is his idea that the attorney general representing the government should have the right to nominate receivers when a common carrier is thrown in to the hands of a receiver. That right ought to rest in a court—not in the executive.

"The president's utterances concerning the anti-trust law are an indication of his inability to see that which will appear plain to a Democratic mind, to wit: That anything approximating a private monopoly is intolerable and undesirable in a free government. His attempt and that of others to classify trusts as good trusts and bad trusts is abhorrent. There can be no such thing as a good trust. There may sometimes be a good trust magnate who uses his powers benevolently, but the power is too much fraught with danger to be vested in a few men. We ought simply to provide that organizations of labor and of workingmen for the purpose of securing shorter hours of labor or higher pay or more equitable treatment shall not be construed to fall within the inhibition of any existing law.

"The president's idea of letting the substantial part of the anti-trust law remain as it is but giving to some branch of the executive government authority to determine when a trust is a good trust and when it is a bad one—in effect to license one and to restrain another—is so very vicious in its ultimate effects if adopted that it would seem that no friend of a well ordered government could stand for it.

"As to the president's proposition for tariff revision by consideration at the hands of a commission composed of members of the house and senate and so-called 'experts,' it is both cumbersome and useless. The very best possible tariff commission is a commission consisting of the representatives of the people selected by the people in the interest of the people. Even that body has too many men selected by private interests in the interest of private interests. If the Republican party cannot furnish a ways and means committee with sufficient intelligence to revise the tariff then it will surrender the reins of power to us of the minority and let us see whether we can or not."

Death Was on His Heels.

"Jesse P. Morris, of Skippers, Va., had a close call in the spring of 1906. He says: "An attack of pneumonia left me so weak and with such a fearful cough that my friends declared consumption had me, and death was on my heels. Then I was persuaded to try Dr. King's New Discovery. It helped me immediately, and after taking two and a half bottles I was a well man again. I found out that New Discovery is the best remedy for coughs and lung disease in all the world." Sold under guarantee at Sibert's Drug Store. 50c. and $1. Trial bottle free.

Private rights must yield to public convenience in case of necessity

AN IMPORTANT DECISION.

A CIRCUIT JUDGE CAN PUNISH FOR AN INTERFERENCE.

Supreme Court of South Carolina Holds it is in Jurisdiction to Handle Cases Tampering With Jurors

The supreme court rendered an important decision Tuesday holding the right of a circuit judge to punish for contempt any one who attempts to improperly influence, by personal means, the conduct of a petit juror. The case was that of L. J. Moore and T. J. Blalock, of Laurens county, who were accused of attempting to influence jurors in the case of G. Wash Hunter, on trial for murder. It will be recalled that after several trials in Laurens county, where both Hunter and his victim have large family connections, this case was removed to Greenwood and the trial there recently resulted in a conviction. It seems that in the spring of 1907 J. K. Templeton was drawn as petit juror in Laurens county for the approaching term of court at which it was expected that the Hunter case would be tried. Templeton made an affidavit which was presented to the trial judge, Judge Watts, at that term of court, that caused the judge to issue a rule to show cause why Ludie J. Moore and Thomas J. Blalock should not be attached for contempt of court for interfering or attempting to interfere with a juror in the discharge of his duty. The order was made returnable before the judge presiding at the next term of court for Laurens county and was argued before Judge Earnest Gary, who adjudged Moore and Blalock guilty of contempt and imposed a fine of fifty dollars on each and in default of payment imprisonment in jail until they had purged themselves of contempt. An appeal was taken to the supreme court.

The supreme court, in the opinion by Justice Jones, declares that this is a proceeding in criminal contempt and the court cannot review the questions of fact; that it must only inquire as to the jurisdiction of the court and as to whether there was error of law. The jurisdiction of the court, however, was not disputed, and the court then directs its attention to the question, show contempt; for if there was no such evidence, there was error of law.

The affidavit of J. K. Templeton is reproduced in the opinion of the court. He swears that he was drawn as juror for the May term, 1907, and that he was approached by Tom Blalock and asked to favor Blalock's friend, G. Wash Hunter, on his trial for murder; that he replied that he did not know whether he would be on the jury but that he would listen to the evidence and go thereby. Later Ludie Moore approached him and also asked him to do all he could for Hunter and he made the same reply as to Blalock.

The supreme court holds, from this affidavit, that there was evidence of an attempt to influence a juror, calculated to obstruct justice. Such conduct, says the court, is punishable as contempt. It is not essential that this conduct be made in the presence of the court. It was contended for the appellants that this is an indictable offense and that appellants are not amenable for contempt but should have been given a trial by jury. The court holds that the statute in question forbids an attempt to corrupt a juror by presents or bribery and does not strictly apply to an attempt to exercise personal influence. The offense punishable under the statute is not the precise offense in this case. Therefore the judgment of the lower court is affirmed.

He Got What He Needed.

"Nine years ago it looked as if my time had come," says Mr. C. Farthing, of Mill Creek, Ind. Ter. "I was so run down that life hung on a very slender thread. It was then my druggist recommended Electric Bitters. I bought a bottle and I got what I needed—strength. I had one foot in the grave but Electric Bitters put it back on the turf again, and I've been well ever since." Sold under guarantee at Sibert's Drug Store. 50c.

A man may have one foot in the grave and still do a lot of kicking with the other one.

"One Touch of Nature Makes the Whole World Kin."

When a rooster finds a big fat worm he calls all the hens in the farm yard to come and share it. A similar trait of human nature is to be observed when a man discovers something exceptionally good—he wants all his friends and neighbors to share the benefits of his discovery. This is the touch of nature that makes the whole world kin. This explains why people who have been cured by Chamberlain's Cough Remedy write letters to the manufacturers for publication, that others similarly ailing may also use it and obtain relief. Behind every one of these letters is a warm hearted wish of the writer to be of use to someone else. This remedy is for sale by all druggists.

There are nearly 5,000,000 subscribers' telephones in operation in the United States, or one for every 18 persons in the country.

Let your relations be manful.

FOR AUTOMATIC DIVORCE.

French Senate Concurs in Bill Passed by Deputies.

Paris, March 24.—The Senate has concurred, by an overwhelming majority, in the bill recently passed by the Chamber of Deputies to convert automatically a decree of separation into a divorce at the end of three years when either party in the separation requests it.

The constantly growing number of divorces in France since the restoration of the divorce law in 1886 (marmariages having been indissoluble throughout French history except from the beginning of the revolution to the restoration on 1816) has been thoh subject recently of an intensely interesting and latter controversy Paul Bourget, as the champion of the traditional indissoluble union, precipitated it with hit problem play, "A Divorce" in which he portrayed the wreck following the separation of parents.

The dispute took wide range in the newspapers and a "referendum" was held at the theatre where the play was given. A statement attributed to M. Briand, now minister of Justice, in favor of "trial marriages," but which the minister repudiated, added piquancy to the controversy. Men and women—married, unmarried and divorced, old and young, came forward and told pathetic stories of life tragedies in support of their contentions.

In the end the friends of greater freedom of union and disunion had the better of it in Parliament, the "referendum" and the public prints.

M. Bourget, while reaffirming his irreconcilable opposition to the principle of divorce, says he is not surprised either at the Senate's action or the expression of public opinion.

"As a student of moral science," said, "I long ago foresaw what France was coming to. We are hurrying toward 'free union.' France as demonstrated by the polemic which has just closed is divided into two camps—one, the feebler, opposes divorce; the the other, the stronger favors free union.

The new law voted by the Senate is the first step, for it frankly establishes divorce upon the demand of husband or wife—a principle not only contrary to morality, but contrary to the rules of society

"As a Frenchman I am profoundly grieved to witness this further step into the abyss."

Chamberlain's Has the Preference.

Mr. Fred. C. Hanrahan, a prominent druggist of Portsmouth, Va., says: "For the past six years I have sold and recommended Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy. It is a great remedy and one of the best patent medicines on the market. I handle some others for the same purposes that pay me a larger profit, but this remedy is so sure to effect a cure, and my customer so certain to appreciate my recommending it to him, that I give it the preference." For sale by all druggists.

A lovebird, no larger than a canary, has taught 'tself to speak as fluently and as distictly as the best of talking parrots at the village of Ambleside.—London Daily Mail.

For Constipation.

Mr. L. H. Farnham, a prominent druggist of Spirit Lake, Iowa, says: "Chamberlain's Stomach and Liver Tablets are certainly the best thing on the market for constipation." Give these tablets a trial. You are certain to find them agreeable and pleasant in effect. Price 25 cents. Samples free. For sale by all druggists.

We live and learn until we are forty, and then we live and unlearn.

A Healing Salve for Burns, Chapped Hands and Sore Nipples.

As a healing salve for burns, sores, sore nipples and chapped hands Chamberlain's Salve is most excellent. It allays the pain of a burn almost instantly, and unless the injury is very severe, heals the parts without leaving a scar. Price 25 cents. For sale by all druggists.

A man isn't absolutely a fool unless he can be fooled the same way twice

Rheumatic Pains Relieved.

Mr. Thomas Stenton, postmaster of Pontypool, Ont., writes: "For the past eight years I suffered from rheumatic pains, and during that time I used many different liniments and remedies for the cure of rheumatism. Last summer I procured a bottle of Chamberlain's Pain Balm and got more relief from it than anything I have ever used, and cheerfully recommend this liniment to all sufferers from rheumatic pains." For sale by all druggists.

It is possible for a young man to be so fast that he never gets to the front.

Plenty of Trouble

Is caused by stagnation of the liver and bowels. To get rid of it and headache and biliousness and the poison that brings jaundice, take Dr. King's New Life Pills, the reliable purifiers that do the work without griping. 25c at Sibert's Drug Store.

He who doeth iniquity shall not have equity.

Foley's Orino Laxative is best for women and children. Its mild action and pleasant taste makes it preferable to violent purgatives, such as pills, tablets, etc. Cures constipation. Sibert's Drug Store.

Dispensary Situation.

Columbia, March 25.—There was much speculation today as to the effect on the South Carolina dispensary case of the decision of the United States supreme court, published today, in the North Carolina and Minnesota rate cases. The attorney general was not in the city today and his view of the matter could not be obtained. While the cases which went up from North Carolina and Minnesota are different in several respects from the South Carolina case now pending before Judge Pritchard, it is evident that the decision of the federal supreme court in these cases displays a tendency of that court to broaden the powers of the federal judiciary and to disregard the matter of State's rights. The protesting minority opinion of Judge Harlan brings out that fact very clearly. It is also most likely that whatever the legal effect of the decision may be, the moral effect is not going to be favorable to the position assumed by the attorneys for the State, and it is not now considered likely that Judge Pritchard will recede from his position. The motion to vacate his orders is to be argued before him at Asheville on the 27th instant, and his decision on the motion may be expected without delay as the other matters involved are to be argued within a few days following this hearing if the orders are to stand.

Counsel for the State have already informed Judge Pritchard that if he does not vacate his orders they will advise the dispensary commission, or what is left of the commission, to obey the mandate of the State supreme court, and not that of the federal circuit court, in which case the members of the commission will place themselves in contempt of Judge Pritchard's court, and if the procedure in the Minnesota case is followed the attorneys may themselves be in contempt, as the attorney general was in that case ruled for contempt of the federal court because of his having instituted in the State court a mandamus proceeding to compel officers of the State to violate the orders of the federal court. Attorney General Lyon has taken much the same position in this case.

Of course, the fundamental question is whether or not the federal court has jurisdiction at all, and the contention of the State of South Carolina is that the federal court has not jurisdiction on the ground that the actions instituted by the whiskey houses are suits against the State. On this same ground Justice Harlan protested against the decision of the majority in these other cases.

Another point of difference is that the act of the legislature in the South Carolina case has been construed by the State supreme court, and it is held the federal supreme court follows the decisions of the State supreme courts in construction of State laws, whereas in these cases from North Carolina and Minnesota the cases did not go before the State supreme courts, but before inferior State tribunals.

It is also generally recognized that while the decisions published today indicate the supreme court's tendency to get away from the doctrine of State's rights, that tendency will be still further emphasized if the supreme court should uphold the position of Judge Pritchard in this South Carolina case, as admittedly there is better ground for invoking the doctrine in this case than in the others just decided.—Correspondence News and Courier.

A STRONG STORY.

An Onion That is Not an Onion, Since it Lacks the Distinct and Offensive Odor.

Wing Hop, a Chinese gardner, who owns a small truck farm near Fresno, Cal., has made the startling announcement that he has out-Burbanked Burbank, and produced an odorless onion.

For years Hop, who formerly worked for Burbank, has been experimenting to produce an onion which would have all the taste and other qualifications of the normal vegetable, but would be free of the disagreeable odor offensive to many persons. Now he asserts he has succeeded, and his contention is borne out by the statement of his neighbors.