

THE LOWEST IN PRICE;

No other County Weekly in the State can be had at the price of THE TELEPHONE-REGISTER.

One Dollar Per Year. AND THE BEST.

# The Telephone-Register.

PROGRESS IN ALL THINGS.

The price of this paper has been reduced to One dollar per Year. Money can be saved now.

Take The Telephone-Register.

FIRST IN THE STATE.

Circulation Guaranteed Greater Than That of Any Other Paper Published in Yamhill County.

REGISTER - Established August, 1881. Consolidated Feb. 1, 1889. TELEPHONE - Established June, 1886.

McMINNVILLE, OREGON, THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1892.

VOL. IV. NO. 8

## UNION HARDWARE CO.

Consolidation of Manning & Ungerman and Martin & Sanders, LEADING DEALERS IN

### HARDWARE, STOVES AND TINWARE,

Largest Stock; Best Goods; Lowest Prices.

WE SELL THE CELEBRATED

### SUPERIOR STOVES AND RANGES.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALERS IN

### AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND VEHICLES

AGENTS FOR

### OVERMAN BUGGIES AND CARRIAGES; WEIR PLOWS AND CULTIVATORS; ADVANCE HAY PRESSES; INDIAN DRILLS; ADA CARTS.

### Gale Disc Harrows!

### King of All Spring Tooth Harrows!

EXAMINE OUR GOODS AND GET PRICES.

J. D. BAKER,

**SURGEON AND HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN.**  
Office Upstairs in the Garrison Building.

RAMSEY & FENTON,

**ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW.**  
McMinville, Oregon.  
Office, Rooms 1 and 2 Union Block.

CALBREATH & GOUCHER,

**PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS.**  
McMinville, Oregon.  
(Office over Braly's Bank.)

J. C. MICHAUX,

**PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.**  
LAFAYETTE, OREGON.  
Jan. 21, '92.

TURNEY & KENT,

**SURGEONS AND PHYSICIANS.**  
Specialty of surgery and diseases of women.  
Union Block - McMINNVILLE, OR.

G. W. GOUCHER M. D.,

—AND—  
A. G. SMITH M. D.,

Have associated themselves together, and will be known in the future as Drs. Goucher & Smith. Professional calls attended to day or night. Office: Two doors east of drug store. Residence within a short distance from the Office.

AMITY OREGON.

**The People's Market.**

Carries the Best Line of Choice Meats in the City. Game and Fish in Season. Poultry, lard, etc., bought for the highest market price and cash paid for same. Your attention is called to the fact that we always serve the best meats to be found. Your patronage is solicited.

BOND & FLETCHER.

J. W. GOWLS, LEE LUGHLIN, I. L. STRATTON, Cashier  
McMINNVILLE NATIONAL BANK.

McMinville, Oregon.  
Paid up Capital, \$50,000.

Transacts a General Banking Business. Deposits Interest Subject to Check. Interest allowed on time deposits. Sell sight exchange and telegraphic transfers on New York, San Francisco and Portland. Collections made on all accessible points. Office hours from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

J. B. ROHR,

**House, Sign, and Ornamental Painter**  
The Only Sign Writer in the County. Homes fitted up in the Neatest and Most Artistic Style.

Designs furnished for Decorations. Remember Paper Hanging and Inside Papering a Specialty.

Work taken by Contract or by Day. Experienced men employed.  
Third Street, McMinville, Oregon.

Tickle

**The Earth**  
With a Hoe, SOW FERRY'S SEEDS and nature will do the rest. Seeds largely determine the harvest—always plant the best—FERRY'S. A book full of information about seeds—how and what to raise, etc., sent free to all who ask for it. Write to-day.

D. M. FERRY, DETROIT, MICH.

DERBY & BOYER,

Proprietors of The McMinville

**TILE FACTORY**

Situated at the Southwest corner of the Fair Grounds. All sizes of First-Class Drain Tile kept constantly on hand at lowest living prices.

DERBY & BOYER, McMINNVILLE, OREGON.

Wm. Holl,

**Watchmaker and Jeweler.**  
Dealer in All kinds of Watches, Jewelry, Plated Ware, Clocks and Spectacles. McMINNVILLE, OR.

McMINNVILLE

**TRUCK AND DRAY CO.,**  
CALLIN & COULTER, Proprietors.

Goods of all descriptions moved and careful handling guaranteed. Collections will be made monthly. Hauling of all kinds done cheap.

For Sale.  
Two miles from McMinville, near St. Joe, a small farm of 16 acres, 13 acres in cultivation, also a good house and barn; about 200 fruit trees, mostly prunes, besides small fruit; one horse and wagon, 2 cows, 2 hogs, 2 pigs, 40 chickens, 7 tons of hay, quantity of potatoes, plows, harrows, etc. Reason for selling declining health. For further particulars enquire of T. BOSOMWORTH

LA GRIPPE

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

**TRIPLE BRAND**

East and South

**Southern Pacific Route**

**SHASTA LINE.**  
Express Trains Leave Portland Daily.  
LEAVE PORTLAND: 7:00 p.m. San Francisco 8:15 a.m. San Fran. 7:50 p.m. Portland. 7:35 a.m. Corvallis. 10:10 a.m. McMinnville. 12:20 p.m. Corvallis. 12:35 p.m. McMinnville. 2:50 p.m. McMinnville. 2:50 p.m. Portland.

Above trains stop only at following stations north of Roseburg: East Portland, Oregon City, Woodburn, Salem, Albany, Tangent, Shasta, Halsey, Harrisburg, Junction City, Irving, Eugene.

Roseburg Mail Daily.  
LEAVE PORTLAND: 8:05 a.m. Roseburg. 8:40 p.m. Roseburg. 6:20 a.m. Portland. 4:50 p.m. Albany Local, Daily, except Sunday.

LEAVE ALBANY: 5:30 p.m. Albany. 8:50 a.m. Albany. 5:30 p.m. McMinnville. 8:50 a.m. McMinnville.

**Pullman Buffet Sleepers,**  
**Tourist Sleeping Cars,**  
For accommodation of second class passengers attached to express trains.

**WEST SIDE DIVISION**  
Between Portland and Corvallis.  
Mail Train Daily, except Sunday.

LEAVE PORTLAND: 7:30 a.m. McMinnville. 10:10 a.m. Corvallis. 12:20 p.m. Corvallis. 12:35 p.m. McMinnville. 2:50 p.m. McMinnville. 2:50 p.m. Portland.

At Albany and Corvallis connect with trains of Oregon Pacific.

Express Train Daily, except Sunday.

LEAVE PORTLAND: 4:40 p.m. McMinnville. 7:25 p.m. McMinnville. 5:45 a.m. Portland. 5:45 a.m. McMinnville. 2:50 p.m. McMinnville. 2:50 p.m. Portland.

Through Tickets to all Points EAST AND SOUTH.  
For tickets and full information regarding rates, maps, etc., call on the Company's agent at McMinville.

R. KOEHLER, E. P. ROGERS, Asst. G. F. & P. Agt.

**From Terminal or Interior Points to Northern Pacific Railroad**

is the Line to Take

**To All Points East & South**  
It is the DINING CAR ROUTE. It runs through VESTIBULE TRAINS. Every Day in the Year to ST. PAUL AND CHICAGO

(No Change of Cars)  
Composed of DINING CARS (uninterrupted) PULLMAN DRAWING ROOM SLEEPERS (of Latest Equipment).

**TOURIST SLEEPING CARS**  
Best that can be constructed and in which accommodations are for holders of First or Second-class Tickets, and ELEGANT DAY COACHES.

A Continuous Line connecting with all lines, affording direct and uninterrupted service.

Pullman Sleeper reservations can be secured in advance through any agent of the road.

Through Tickets To and from All Points in America, and can be purchased at any ticket office of this company.

Full information concerning rates, time of trains, routes and other details furnished on application to any agent or

A. D. CHARLTON, Asst. General Passenger Agent, First St., Cor. Washington, Portland, Or.

**PASTOR KOENIG'S NERVE TONIC**

In Its Worst Form. I have been ill for eighteen months with weakness and terrible nervousness which I could not take any medicine, Pastor Koening's Nerve Tonic; and I often pray for Pastor Koening, as I think I could not have lived without this medicine. The people here have seen the good which I derived from it, and Rev. Galinger recommends it so highly that it is now getting very popular.

JULIA AGNES BYRNE.

A Valuable Book on Nervous Diseases sent free to any address, and poor patients can also obtain this medicine free of charge.

This remedy has been prepared by the Reverend Pastor Koening, of Fort Wayne, Ind., since 1850, and is now prepared under his direction by the

KOENIG MED. CO., Chicago, Ill.  
Sold by Druggists at \$1 per Bottle. 6 for \$5. Large Size, \$1.75. 6 Bottles for \$9.

THIS PAPER is on file in the Philadelphia

THE COMMERCIAL STABLE!

Gates & Henry, Props. McMinville, Oregon.

**Livery, Feed and Sale!**

**Everything New**  
And Firstclass.  
Special Accommodations for Commercial Travelers.

Corner Second and E Streets, one block from Cooks hotel.

Dr. Miles' New Heart Cure at Druggists.

**ORGANS!**  
\$50, \$75, \$95, \$125.

Come and Examine them and see What you buy.

Every instrument guaranteed for five years. A full line of GUITARS.

BANJOS, VIOLINS, ACCORDEONS.

C. GRISSEN. McMinville, Or.

Dr. Miles' Nerve for Nervous Prostration.

**HERE IS A GOOD THING FOR YOU A MAN, OR WOMAN,**

of intelligence and quick-witted enough to get a "GOLDEN BELL" at sight, but who has lost the Most Precious Possession on Earth, viz. GOOD HEALTH, WILL NOT require a SECOND TELLING to be induced to become a purchaser.

**OF DR. GREGG'S ELECTRIC Belts and Appliances.**

Do you know why? Because it is plain to be seen that the TRUTH ONCE TOLD is enough. The Surprising Promptness with which all classes of people respond to our announcements, and the increasing demand for Dr. Gregg's Goods wherever they are introduced is always recognized, and the quality of merit takes care of itself. Metaphorically our statements are the Bottom of the Public Press it, and

**Dr. Gregg's Electric Specialties "DO THE REST."**

The extent of Pressure on the human and nervous system, from the effects of the "DOING THE REST," is most satisfactorily shown in the marvelous growth of our business the past 60 days.

Repeated and increasing demands for THE GREGG ELECTRIC "FOOT WARMER" are coming in from all parts of the country with genuine acknowledgments that so much comfort for \$1 (the price) was being had for Dollars for ten cents.

The Rugged Constitution of Man when once broken, becomes pitiable in the extreme, from which there is absolutely no escape without assistance. The Gregg Electric Belts and Appliances in cases of Rheumatism is conquered, sufferers from obesity are speedily relieved, dropsy quickly yields, neuralgias and paralytic affections disappear, and many other diseases of Men and Women are permanently cured fully described in complete catalogue for sale.

We make an elegant little \$3 Electric Belt, which is selling very rapidly and which we will take in exchange for any Higher Power Belt (except \$5 Belt) and credit \$3 on the price of new order. Remember the electric "Foot Warmers" are \$1 a pair, worth \$10.

**THE GREGG ELECTRIC CURE CO.,**  
261 Inter Ocean Building, Chicago, Ill., and mention this paper.

**50% REDUCED**

The accompanying statement will show that the price of our goods is reduced 50% on all the following articles:—

Electric Belts, Foot Warmers, Electric Socks, Electric Caps, Electric Collars, Electric Goggles, Electric Trusses, Electric Supporters, Electric Bandages, Electric Liniments, Electric Ointments, Electric Creams, Electric Soaps, Electric Powders, Electric Pastes, Electric Lotions, Electric Sprays, Electric Inhalants, Electric Expectorants, Electric Diaphoretics, Electric Stimulants, Electric Anesthetics, Electric Antiseptics, Electric Disinfectants, Electric Preservatives, Electric Preservatives, Electric Preservatives, Electric Preservatives.

**Scientific American Agency for**

**PATENTS**

CAUTION: THE MARKS, DESIGN PATENTS, COPYRIGHTS, etc.

For information and free Handbooks write to: MUNN & CO., 36 BROADWAY, NEW YORK. Inventor's papers taken out by us is brought before the public by a notice given free of charge in our

**Scientific American**

Largest circulation of any scientific paper in the world. Published weekly. Price, \$3.00 a year in advance. Address: MUNN & CO., Publishers, 36 Broadway, New York.

FEDERAL RIGHTS OVER STATES.

Republican Supreme Court, Stretching National Powers.

In the early history of this republic many of the most patriotic of its founders expressed fears that the United States supreme court would gradually increase its own jurisdiction and step by step interfere with the rights of the states and the people thereof.

There are even traces of predictions fulfilled in the case of Seay Hayes in the office to which Tilden was elected. The most recent step in the direction named is the decision of the supreme court in the suit of the United States against the state of Texas, and, with the possible exception of the Nagle case in California, it goes further than any other decision rendered since the civil war to do the one thing which the general government to an individual state.

When the act was passed to provide a temporary government for the territory of Oklahoma, in May, 1890, a puzzling question arose as to the boundary between the new territory and the state of Texas. Down in the southwest corner of the tract, claimed by the United States as public land, and which it was proposed to erect into a territory, lay Gregg county, with area as large as the whole state of Rhode Island, nearly a triangle in shape, and enclosed between the north and south forks of the Red river and the 100th degree of longitude. The title to this land has always been in dispute on account of the indefinite character of the boundary of the state of Texas as prescribed by law. The statutory boundary at that stage is the "Red river," but whether the north fork or the south fork is that which is to be taken as the boundary is not clear. Texas has always claimed that her jurisdiction extended to the north fork, but it has been to the interest of the federal government to maintain that it ceased at the south fork; so congress, in order to quiet the title to the disputed tract forever, incorporated in the Oklahoma bill a section authorizing the attorney general to commence in the name and on behalf of the United States, and prosecute to a final determination, a proper suit in equity in the supreme court of the United States against the state of Texas, setting forth the claim of the United States to the tract of land \* \* \* designated \* \* \* as Gregg county; and directing that the case should be "advanced on the docket of said court, and proceeded with as rapidly as the nature and circumstances of the case permit."

Acting on this authority the attorney general began suit, and the state of Texas promptly put in a demurrer, claiming that the United States does not, under the constitution, sue a state. The argument was had at the present term of court, turning upon the construction of the second section of this article of the constitution, defining the jurisdiction of the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and judgment was given for the United States on the demurrer. The only dissenting opinions were those of the Chief Justice and Justice Lamar, which were very short, and based simply on the broad principle of state sovereignty; Justice Field had no vote to raise in controversy. So nearly unanimous a decision on a question whose full force and bearings were appreciated by the court absolutely shuts out the possibility of a rehearing, and it therefore stands now as the supreme law of the land that the United States can sue a state under the constitution, and that the supreme court, the government insisting that the constitution contained no limitation upon the provision giving the court original jurisdiction in cases in which the state should be a party. This view was held to be correct, and