

# Pittsburgh Gazette.

VOLUME LXXXIV.

PITTSBURGH, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1869.

NUMBER 37

FIRST EDITION.

SECOND EDITION.

TWELVE O'CLOCK P. M.

FOUR O'CLOCK A. M.

## THE CAPITAL.

### A State Can Exact Taxes in Gold and Silver—Mississippi Restoration—Nominations by the President—San Domingo Annexation—Mrs. Surratt's Remains to be Disinterred.

(By Telegram to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)  
WASHINGTON CITY, Feb. 8, 1869.  
SUPREME COURT DECISION.

In the Supreme Court of the United States today Chief Justice Chase delivered an opinion affirming the decision of the Supreme Court of Oregon in favor of the taxes of that State being paid in gold and silver, according to its law. The Court held that legal tender notes, being receivable for all debts, with the exceptions named in statutes, imply a satisfaction of contracts or agreements, while taxes are of a different character with such obligations, and that it is competent for a State to designate the medium of the money in which taxes shall be paid. The following decisions were also given: No. 31. Greene vs. Van Buskirk. Judgment reversed. No. 32. Gillighurst vs. Van Buskirk. Judgment reversed. The decision in this case is that where a chattel mortgage on personal property in Illinois is invalid under the laws of that State, and so held by the Courts, such judgment is a sufficient plea in the bar of a suit of another State to recover against an attaching creditor on whose suit the property is sold, and it makes no difference that the property was mortgaged to the attaching creditor and the mortgagee were all residents of the State where the suit is brought and were at date of the mortgage.

No. 318. Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company vs. Howard et al. Decree affirmed. Opinion by Justice Clifford.

MISSISSIPPI RESTORATION.  
Hon. E. Jefferson, one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Mississippi, presented today an address to the Reconstruction Committee on behalf of himself and others, claiming to represent a large and influential part of the Republican party who opposed the adoption of the Constitution voted down in June last. The address is in the nature of a protest, and is a discussion of the condition of affairs in the State. He proposes a plan for restoration as follows: First, that Congress shall declare all the offices in the State vacant; second, provide for the appointment of a Provisional Governor, with power to fill all the offices then declared vacant, and with power to remove all of his own appointees; third, provide that the proposed Constitution be held for the ratification of the members of the Legislature of the State, and that the ratification of the Constitution be amended, and for the election of State, county and municipal officers.

SEPARATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT.  
The President nominated to the Senate Thomas E. Smith, Consul at La Rochelle, to be Consul at Paris, viz John G. Nicolay, W. D. Spaulding, of New York, Consul at Yeddo, Japan; Edward Stephens, of New York, Consul at Manchester, England, viz Wells George H. Kingsbury, Collector of Internal Revenue, Third district of Massachusetts, viz McCarty, to be removed; Commodore Andrew A. Harwood, Rear Admiral of the United States Navy, to be removed; Leonard A. Frailey, and Assistant Paymaster J. P. Loomis, to be Paymasters in the Navy.

MRS. SURRATT'S REMAINS.  
In compliance with solicitations of friends of Mrs. Surratt, the President has ordered her remains to be disinterred and delivered to her relatives. Her body was buried in the same enclosure with Payne, Atzori and Harold, near the place of internment of Booth's remains. The understanding is there is to be no public demonstration, and whatever funeral services take place must be privately conducted.

SAN DOMINGO ANNEXATION.  
The Confidential Agent of San Domingo is still actively engaged in behalf of the annexation of that country. He today laid on the tables of the members of Congress copies of a pamphlet in furtherance of that object.

## NEWS BY CABLE.

(By Telegram to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)  
GREAT BRITAIN.

LONDON, Feb. 8.—The Standard predicts that the Alabama treaty will be rejected by the United States, and is sure the next administration will not get such favorable terms for the settlement of the question at issue.

## SPAIN.

MADRID, February 8.—Exciting rumors have been circulating all day in regard to the movements of Carlota. One of these reports is that the Carlota attacked Santona, in the province of Santander, but was repulsed after a short fight.

## GREECE.

PARIS, February 8.—A dispatch from Athens says King George has declared that Greece must either accept the Protocol of the Paris Conference or receive his resignation of the Crown.

## FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

LONDON, February 8.—Evening—Consols for money 93 1/4, account 93 1/2. American securities quiet and steady; bonds 75 1/2, Erie 25 1/2, Illinois 93 1/2, Atlantic and Great Western.

FRANKFURT, February 8.—Bonds 90 1/2. Linedollars 42 1/2, Tallows 46 1/2, 94. Linedollars 42 1/2, Linedollars 38 1/2, 60.

ANTWERP, February 8.—Petroleum 50 1/2 @ 59 francs 50.

HAVRE, February 8.—Cotton closed at 142 on spot, 144 1/2 on account.

HAVRE, Feb. 8.—Cotton closed at 142 francs for treasurers on the spot and 144 for low middlings to arrive.

## FORTIETH CONGRESS.

(THIRD SESSION.)

### SENATE: Petition for the Recognition of the Almighty in the Constitution—Adverse Reports from Committee on Pacific Railroad—The Constitutional Amendment Further Discussed—Electoral Vote of Georgia—Bill to Encourage American Steamship Lines.

HOUSE: Variety of Bills Introduced—Bill Regulating the Election of Representatives, Registration and Naturalization Referred to Committee on Election Frauds—The Copper Tariff Bill Passed Finally—The Military Appropriation Bill.

(By Telegram to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)  
WASHINGTON CITY, February 8, 1869.  
SENATE.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition for the recognition in the Constitution of Almighty God as the source of all civil authority, and made a few remarks in favor of such an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. HOWARD, from the Committee on Pacific Railroad, reported adversely upon the same, and asked to be discharged from the further consideration of a large number of bills and memorials granting or asking the construction of railroads and telegraph lines.

Among which were the following: A Bill to aid in the construction of the Central Pacific Railroad from New Orleans to the Pacific Ocean; Bill to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line through Missouri and Arkansas to the Pacific Ocean; Bill to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line to the Pacific Ocean, Eastern Division; Bill to aid in the construction of the Pacific Railroad and telegraph line to the Pacific Ocean, Western Division; Bill to aid in the construction of the Oregon branch of the Pacific Railroad; memorial of the Legislature of Oregon in favor of the construction of a railroad from Salt Lake to the Columbia river; memorial of W. Cornell Jewett, asking that all amiables should be withheld from the Union Pacific Railroad; memorial of the Legislature of Minnesota asking for aid in the construction of the Northern Pacific Railroad; memorial of the Legislature of Kansas asking for aid in the construction of the Santa Fe and Denver Railroads.

Mr. RAMSEY introduced a bill to amend the act granting lands to Minnesota. Referred.

Mr. MORAN introduced a bill to refund to Indiana the interest and discount on money borrowed to equip, pay, supply and transport troops for the war of the United States in the recent war. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill to secure copyrights for painting, drawing and statutory reports.

Mr. WILSON from Committee on Military Affairs, reported adversely the joint resolution in relation to the grades of General and Lieutenant General in the Army, and Admiral and Vice Admiral in the Navy; also adversely to the resolution granting a portion of the military reservation at Ft. Leavenworth to aid in the construction of a railroad and wagon road across Missouri.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill to establish a line of American steamships between the United States and Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

It provides that for the purpose of encouraging American ocean commerce, all money received by the United States from ocean and inland postage on foreign mail matter carried between the United States and Europe, not exceeding two million dollars annually, shall be appropriated as follows: The Postmaster General is directed to contract with citizens of the United States for the transportation of foreign mails on American steamships, numbering not less than two nor more than four departures monthly from Boston, the steamships to be at least two thousand eight hundred tons register; their speed must equal the average speed of steamships of like class now employed between the United States and Europe; they are to carry without compensation all agents of the Government, for whose passage may be requested by the several Departments, and all mail matter offered by the States shall receive the postage therefrom. For all this the Postmaster General is to pay to the owners of said steamships from the fund above provided the sum of twenty thousand dollars for each round voyage to Europe and back, provided the amount derived from postage shall be sufficient therefor, and if not, then such sum may be derived from any other source, but not from the fund above provided for such purpose, provided that the deficiency of any one voyage may be made up from the excess of any other, but not from the fund above provided for such purpose. In times of war or public danger the Secretary of the Navy may take possession of any or all the steamships employed under the foregoing provisions, and use them in the service of the United States, but the owners shall be paid in full compensation for the use of their vessels and for any damage which they may thereby sustain.

On motion of Mr. EDMUNDS, his resolution in relation to the mode of counting the vote of Georgia for President and Vice President was taken up.

Mr. TRUMBULL maintained that Georgia, having complied with the condi-

tion of admission imposed by Congress, was *prima facie* entitled to have her vote counted, and thought the resolution necessary in any view, if, as it assumes, the vote of Georgia would not change the result.

Mr. EDMUNDS thought the evidence conclusive that Georgia was not entitled to have her vote counted; but as there was a difference of opinion, he had introduced the resolution to avoid the necessity which would exist for a hasty determination of it.

Mr. HENDRICKS briefly discussed the resolution, and said the amount of it was, that for a white in the counting of the electoral vote, the vote of Georgia was to be counted, but finally it was not to be counted.

Mr. WHITE could not see any propriety in raising the question as to the right of Georgia to representation, to have her electoral vote counted, when she already had Representatives sitting in the House.

Mr. CONKLING said those Representatives had been elected before the impediment, if there was any, arose, and he would not be concerned with the expiration of the morning hour, which brought up the Constitutional Amendment.

Mr. SAULSBURY was entitled to the floor, but Mr. EDMUNDS appealed to him to give way for a vote on the resolution to be counted to the vote of Georgia.

Mr. SAULSBURY declined and proceeded to address the Senate on the amendment. He regarded it not as an amendment to the Constitution, but as an attempt at the subversion of it, and he would not be concerned with the fathers of the Constitution had solemnly voted down, in Convention, a proposal to make the Federal Government a national government, in doing that, which the great men of the revolutionary period had so carefully avoided. This amendment, however, was a direct and deliberate attempt to subvert the Constitution, and he would not be concerned with the fathers of the Constitution, who had solemnly voted down, in Convention, a proposal to make the Federal Government a national government, in doing that, which the great men of the revolutionary period had so carefully avoided. This amendment, however, was a direct and deliberate attempt to subvert the Constitution, and he would not be concerned with the fathers of the Constitution, who had solemnly voted down, in Convention, a proposal to make the Federal Government a national government, in doing that, which the great men of the revolutionary period had so carefully avoided.

Mr. SAULSBURY said he would answer the Senator with one of his own analogies. He would give an illustration, saying, "How is it you, who do not believe in punishment after death, are inflicting it upon this poor skunk, and are sending him to the gallows, and are generally believe in punishment after death, or the justice of it, but he is not to be punished, and he is to be bound to give it to him."

So, Mr. Saalsbury, although he had pronounced sentence upon that party, he is to be bound to give it to him.

Mr. NYE suggested that the dead party was not the Republican party, but the other.

Mr. SAULSBURY—No, sir; it lives; it lives; and you saw the manifestations of its life when you took as your candidate for the Presidency a man who was a Democrat, and you found it necessary to take him to carry you through the last election.

Mr. EDMUNDS suggested, in view of the day on which electoral votes would be counted, it was necessary to take some action on the resolution to be counted of counting the vote of Georgia. He therefore asked the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Stewart) to allow the Senate to act on that resolution.

Mr. STEWART consented and the resolution was passed.

The Senate then resumed the discussion of the Constitutional Amendment, on which Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN made a motion to reply to the argument of Senators in favor of States rights, that had been sufficiently discussed in this country, and in regard to it he would only say, if a State which could neither make war, treaties, coin money, and whose territory was subject to the law of another and higher power, the supreme law of the land, was a sovereignty at all, it was only one in name, and he was surprised that Senators on the other side opposed the pending amendment to the Constitution, because they called themselves Democrats and professed to believe in a Democratic Government, and the object of this amendment was to give to four millions of free taxable citizens of the United States a right to be heard—although a democratic objection. There was another reason why they should not oppose the amendment, that portion of the country from this amendment was a proposition to extend the same rule all over the States; thus relieving the South from its peculiar position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because it proposed to take away that right from the States, and because that Senator's objection position, and therefore they ought to support it. He preferred the amendment as reported from the Judiciary Committee (any of the substitutes deprive the States of the right to regulate suffrage, each for itself. He did not like the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner), because