

Street Theatre. Nightly. Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday. JOHN W. HANCOCK THE ATLANTIC. Sublette, Miss Ella Han- Williams, Carrie Brewer, Murray and Monok. Admission.

Use KENNY'S PURE ROASTED COFFEES. They are the best and cheapest. Roasting tons of coffee daily enables us to give our customers Fresh Coffee that are neither polished, greased or watered. Our prices are the lowest in the city. For sale to the trade and consumers at my stores.

THE SUN. TELEGRAPHIC SUMMARY, ETC.

The signal service prediction for today is fair weather. Saturday fair. The British force at Suakin made a reconnaissance yesterday, and in the neighborhood of the Hasheen Hills they had an engagement with the Arabs, who killed four of the British infantry. The British then retired, the Arabs not following. A battle is expected with Osman Digna's forces near Tamai today. The wife of James Stephens, the ex-head centre of the Fenians, writes that her husband is destitute and dying in Belgium. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal board have made reductions in salaries and pay-roll expenses. The Supreme Bench has decided that colored men cannot be denied admission to the bar. The thirty-third annual commencement of the Maryland College of Pharmacy took place yesterday. The Brydon case, concluded yesterday, was the longest trial in the Superior Court since 1800. A mail wagon upset on Holliday street early yesterday morning. Gus. Matthews, colored, who was burned Wednesday night, died of his burns. In the United States Senate yesterday Senators Wilson, of Maryland, and Gray, of Delaware, were sworn in. H. W. Dunne, of Philadelphia, who for five years past has been the superintendent and engineer of the Lancaster Avenue Improvement Company, has been appointed superintendent of the New York, Philadelphia and Norfolk Railroad, to succeed Jas. McConey, resigned. Mr. Dunne will assume his official duties on April 1 and will have his headquarters at Cape Charles, Va. At Trenton, N. J., yesterday, Judge Nixon filed an order that the receivers of the New York, West Shore and Buffalo Railway may issue certificates of notes at not less than par to the amount of \$3,500,000, to be a lien prior to the first mortgage. Authority is given to purchase such locomotives and machinery as are necessary to maintain and operate the road. A two-story structure in Brooklyn, N. Y., occupied by Travers Storm as a glass factory, was burned last night; loss \$75,000, partially insured. About 250 men are thrown out of employment. Two firemen were badly injured. The bursting of a pot of melted glass caused the fire. Manager Fleischman, of the Walnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia, his treasurer and door-keeper, and Walter Bentley, an actor, were arrested last night before the performance because the manager had failed to take out a license from the State. The earnings of the American Bell Telephone Company for the ten months ended December 31 were \$2,067,544, against \$2,285,594 for the preceding twelve months. The net earnings the last ten months were \$1,350,166, and dividends \$1,440,316. The receivers of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company will make application to the United States Circuit Court today for permission to pay the obligations of the Jersey Central Railroad Company falling due on April 1. In Philadelphia, Tuesday night, Mrs. Wm. Burris, who has been separated from her husband for several years, lay in wait for him on the street and beat him soundly with a cowhide. She said he had been telling stories about her. Col. Francis Eugene Whitfield, general counsel of the Southern Express Company, died Wednesday night of heart disease while on the steamer City of Jacksonville, on the St. John's river, Florida, on route to Jacksonville.

ADMITTED TO THE BAR. DECISION IN THE WILSON CASE. A COLORED MAN MAY PRACTICE LAW.

The Supreme Bench of Baltimore City. Decides that No. One Can be Excluded from the Bar on Account of Color. [Reported for the Baltimore Sun.] The Supreme Bench of Baltimore City yesterday filed its decision in the case of Charles S. Wilson, colored, declaring that colored men who have passed the requisite examination cannot under the amendments to the constitution of the United States be excluded from the bar on account of color. The question was argued on Saturday, February 14, 1885, by Mr. Alexander H. Hobbs, counsel for the petitioner. The opinion, signed by Judges George Wm. Brown, Edward Duffy, Wm. A. Fisher, William A. Stewart and Charles E. Phelps, the entire bench, is as follows: Charles S. Wilson, a person of color, formerly a citizen of Massachusetts, where he was admitted to the practice of law, and now a citizen of Maryland, applies to this court for admission to practice law in the courts of Baltimore city. The act of 1876, chapter 266, which is in this respect only a re-enactment of article 11, section 3, of the Maryland Code, excludes colored persons from that right, and the question is whether he is entitled to admission notwithstanding that act. Section 1 of the fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States provides that: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The case of Strauder vs. West Virginia, decided in 1873, settled the question that by force of the fourteenth amendment of the constitution of the United States, and particularly the last clause thereof, colored men cannot be excluded from the jury on account of their race or color, because as the court says in its opinion, 100 U. S. Rep., p. 305, the amendment "was designed to assure to the colored race the enjoyment of all the civil rights that under the law are enjoyed by white persons, and to give to that race the protection of the general government in that enjoyment whenever it should be denied by the States." On page 307 the court adds that the amendment "is to be construed liberally to carry out the purposes of its framers. It ordains that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, (evidently referring to the newly-made citizens, who, being citizens of the United States, are declared to be also citizens of the State in which they reside.) It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Whether this be declaring that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States, and in regard to the colored race, for whose protection the amendment was primarily designed, that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color. The words of the amendment, it is true, are prohibitory, but they contain a necessary implication of a positive immunity, or right, most valuable to the colored race—the right to exemption from unfriendly legislation against them distinctively as colored—the exemption from legal discriminations, implying inferiority in civil society, lessening the security of their enjoyment of the rights which others enjoy, and discriminations which are steps towards reducing them to the condition of a subject race. "That the West Virginia statute respecting juries—the statute that controlled the selection of the grand and petit jury in the case of the plaintiff in error—is such a discrimination, ought not to be doubted. Nor would it be if the persons excluded by it were white men. If in those States where the colored people constitute a majority of the entire population a law should be enacted excluding all white men from jury service, thus denying to them the privilege of participating equally with the blacks in the administration of justice, we apprehend no one would be heard to claim that it would not be a denial to white men of the equal protection of the laws." The court, therefore, concluded that the statute of West Virginia amounted "to a denial of the equal protection of the laws to a colored man when he is put upon trial for an alleged offense against the State." 100 U. S., 310.

cause to exclude them would be so discriminatory against them as citizens in the enjoyment of their rights, because it would be unfriendly legislation against them distinctively as colored, and because it would be a discrimination which would be a step towards reducing them to the condition of a subject race. If, then, these reasons prevent a colored citizen from being excluded from the jury-box of a State, why do they not equally prevent his exclusion from becoming a member of the bar of a State? Can any sound distinction be drawn between the two cases? We think not. The right of admission to the bar is the far more valuable right of the two. Each is equally a right. It is not a sufficient answer to say that a member of the bar is an officer of the court, and that therefore the right of admission depends on his possessing the qualifications for the office which the State alone has the right to prescribe. A jurymen is equally an officer of the law, for he is appointed by public authority to perform under oath a public duty, for which he is paid, and his qualifications are prescribed by law, but notwithstanding this a colored man has the constitutional right to sit on a jury in spite of any discrimination against his color which the State may impose. A member of the bar is indeed an officer of the court, but he is much more than that, he is also a member of a learned profession, whereby he earns his livelihood, a profession which constitutes a large and essential part of every civilized community, and which is especially influential and indispensable in a republican government. To deny any class of citizens from its membership is not only to prevent their engaging in a lawful calling, but, in the language of the Supreme Court, tends to degrade and stigmatize the whole class by depriving them of a privilege, which all other citizens possess and of the equal protection of the law. If one class may be so debared, so may every other, whether it be on account of nationality, religion, or any other cause, at the will and pleasure of the State. All such exclusions are, as we think, plainly declared by the Supreme Court to be prohibited and unconstitutional. The Court of Appeals of Maryland in the case entitled "In the matter of Charles S. Taylor," 43 Maryland, 30, affirmed the validity of the act of 1876 and excluded the applicant because he was a colored man from the right to be admitted to the practice of the law. The respect which we entertain for the judgments of that tribunal would induce us to accept the conclusion in that case if the condition of the Federal decisions upon which that case was avowedly based had remained unchanged. The argument for the applicant in that case was founded exclusively upon the proposition that the act of 1876 was an abridgment of the privileges and immunities of a citizen of the United States, and upon this ground was repugnant to the fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States. The court went simply by showing that the Supreme Court of the United States had decided in the slaughter-house case, and in Mrs. Bradwell's case, that the privileges claimed was one which appertained to the citizen of the State and not of the United States, and that the clause of the fourteenth amendment relied upon was inapplicable. No reference whatever was made in the argument of the applicant or of the court to the other clause of the amendment, the full effect of which was afterwards for the first time brought to light by the series of decisions in 100th United States Reports. The terms of the Maryland constitution limiting the selection of judges from members of the bar were not alluded to, and no observation was made upon the fact that in the selection of juries they have important ministerial functions which formerly fell within the province of the sheriff's office, both being matters having material bearing upon the question whether the exclusion contemplated by the act in question would be open to objection as denying the equal protection of the laws, but wholly unimportant to the discussion of those clauses of the amendment which alone had been under consideration in the case in 43th Maryland and in those in 12th Wallace upon which it was founded. We think that the later cases in the Supreme Court lead irresistibly to a different conclusion from that in the case of Charles Taylor, and some expressions of the Judges, particularly those already mentioned, and also of Judge Bradley in the civil rights case in 109 United States reports, would seem to indicate such to be the view of the Supreme Court. The Court of Appeals, however, merely decided that the act of 1876, standing alone, was not repugnant to the 14th amendment, and gave no opinion upon its effect when taken in connection of the provisions of the Maryland constitution already referred to. It is to be regretted that the question was not presented anew to the Court of Appeals, in order that that tribunal, rather than a subordinate court, might be the result of the later decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and that we might have an authoritative declaration of the rule to be adopted, and that even the appearance of departure from the precedent of the Taylor case might be avoided. The application, however, having been made to the Supreme Bench, it is

FRO SENATO MARYLAN... Recommendation... Gibbons... (Special) WASHINGTON... Wilson was sworn today, and to the approval of the Senate. Wilson has formerly of Pennsylvania. Senator Bayard... Representative the city to Wardell. O today there tion, indeed, gress and of course, they only of Bourne Coe... the national elegant per the nominal most in the standard-b... ratively spe... President... The only a Maryland w... of the late... cant for the... for the Dist... of intro... A letter was Wm. T. W... appointment... at the port... over to the... dall was at... today, and... several ge... Senator Von... made their... before going... President at... with each o... tremely an... that he w... up a good... Postmaster... ters today... country fro... masters. T... General eli... the control... offices, was... ing up the... Evans, the... revenue, wa... by the extra... impromptu... gratulations... wishes for... were speaki... Miller. At... usual, the... for an hour... of the Senat... and female... ARCHBISHOP... At five o'c... pointment... with Hon. E... Hamilton, o... President... blue parlor... half an hour... entirely of... strained and... ing the Pre... which he had... nent a prelit... should be re... SECRETARY... There is a r... authenticat... Tennessee, w... be First Ass... Porter is her... subject. Gov... nated ability... 1871 he was... dicial circuit... resigned in... elected Gover... candidate be... about 57 year... CONGR... While the e... appointment... ment, are ha... the republic... ing the duties... faction of his... personal mail... day, and left... sions of con... ceived from... land. Mon... (Continued)











by the paucity of water which will be required for the railroads. These are mostly on the east side of California street, where the eye meets them from every direction. These railway magnates succeeded in getting out of the government more money than would twice build the Pacific railroads, and in addition a strip of land besides on each side of these tracks, some strips forty and some twenty miles wide, the government retaining the alternate sections and demanding the government price for these sections. Water gives the only value to the property, and by buying or squatting through their agents where water is, the railroads get control of about all desirable land. The government might as well have given the whole of the land as the alternate sections. No Eastern man can appreciate the value of water until he sees its scarcity out there. Mr. Hannon stopped at the ranch of a man who had been a government contractor, and had settled in a valley as wide and a little longer than the Hagerstown valley. He had 9,000 head of good cattle and 500 fine horses. He had two watering places, for which he had patented possibly a half or a whole section of land. The government owned the land on the east and west of him. He owned the water; the government did not own any. The stream was about the size of a country mill stream. It came up out of the ground at its source and disappeared in the earth at the other end, as is the fashion with water there. The result is in that valley, with its two watering places, the cattle have a range of twenty miles, and Uncle Sam might as well own no land there. The ranchman got the water land at government price, and left the other land, worth nothing, to the government.

From Kansas to within 250 miles of the Pacific coast the country appears to have been upset and tilted and the bed-rock shaken, and when water falls it sinks right down. All the land is used for pasture, and cattle thrive and increase rapidly if they get water. The varieties of the seasons are not well marked, and the cattle range abroad in winter and summer. An Eastern man's appreciation of the country he has left will grow as he goes West. The mountains of Maryland and West Virginia are pleasing to the eye. Ohio, Indiana and Illinois are rich in agriculture. Kansas has fine farming country, but stock raising grows in importance as he travels until he reaches the edge of Colorado, where cropping ceases, and is seen little of until near San Francisco. Stock-raising is all the talk in the cars, and stockmen occupy the sleeping coaches and the best places in the hotels. Politics, religion and science are forgotten in their desire to raise cattle. Sunday is nearly ignored after leaving Kansas City, because the popular calling is to look after cattle, which must be done on Sunday as well as Monday. Stores are open and business is transacted on Sunday as upon any week day. The people are agreeable and intelligent, but they are absorbed in estimating and securing the profits of cattle raising, and all this is because Uncle Sam has so much public land. They say, "Give us free grass, and we do not care for your politics or religion." Three years ago 100,000 buffaloes were slain, and their hides sold at \$1 apiece, and all this was done to make room for domestic cattle. A ranchman who had rented a part of the Indian reservation at \$100,000 a year, said he would make plenty of money if he could get it for a few years more on the same terms.

Mr. Hannon was convinced that the Pacific slope States would go for Mr. Blaine for President. Their railway kings have 175,000,000 acres of land, secured from the government when Mr. Blaine and his friends were in public life. They do not want to take out title to it, because then the States and Territories would tax it. Therefore they want the government to hold nominal possession until they sell it, and then they get patents for it for those who become the buyers. They argued that the republicans, with Mr. Blaine as President, would favor their policy. The railroads are single tracks, with a little dirt ballast in the middle of the pine ties. The trains run at eighteen miles an hour on levels, and the Annapolis and Elkridge Railroad is a first-class concern compared with any of them. First-class fares from Kansas City to San Francisco are \$95, while the Baltimore and Ohio charges \$25 to Kansas City and runs at a speed of 35 miles an hour from Baltimore, and that, too, over the Alleghanies. The best artists and writers are employed to get up delightful views of the canyons and the big trees and boast of the soil and climate to attract people to the coast. But Mr. Hannon missed the forests and foliage of the East, and his eyes grew sore in searching for something green to rest upon. He thinks that after crossing the western border of Kansas there is not much to engage the attention of a man from this section of the country. There is a belt about 1,500 miles wide, running from Missouri nearly to the Canada border, that is a desert. It looks as if the devil has been left in possession of that field, and he has burnt it over and tilted its strata upon end so that rain sinks into the bowels of the earth. The debris of this upheaval is left there, with here and there a rare green spot.

Messrs. Hannon and Walcott made a full report upon the Deer Creek coal fields. A band of 25 men had remained on the ground there for four years, except when the government drove them off, they expecting to keep possession of it. Mr. Hannon said that as to the matter of the publicity given to the estimate of his expenses on the trip, he could guess one or two reasons for it. Either some

more, with representatives in Washington and the other cities, has taken up the matter on contingent terms, and the attorneys will have work to do in establishing the title of the claimants for indemnity for losses sustained in the previous century. It will be necessary in fixing up these cases for the nearest living representatives to take out letters testamentary, and reopen proceedings in the estates of persons who died many years ago.

### COLORED LAWYERS.

#### Views of Members of the Bar as to the Admission of Colored Men.

(Reported for the Baltimore Sun.)

Reporters of THE SUN yesterday obtained the views of a number of lawyers on the question of the admission of colored men to the bar.

Judge Phelps said he agreed with Judges Brown and Fisher, and regarded the exclusion of colored men from the practice of the law as a relic of barbarism. The decision of the Court of Appeals in the case of Taylor, however, was based upon decisions of the Supreme Court as they were in 1877. As to the bearing of these later decisions on the State courts, Judge Phelps said on Saturday last, when the matter was before the Supreme Bench: "Under the Maryland bill of rights the constitution and laws of the United States are binding upon all the courts of this State, notwithstanding anything in the State law to the contrary, and a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon a strictly federal question is a decision within its appropriate sphere of jurisdiction, and therefore binding directly upon the State courts."

Mr. Sebastian Brown, who was a candidate for Congress in the fourth district last fall against Mr. John V. L. Findlay, said he thought colored men ought to be admitted to the bar. He had not examined the recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court, but understood that the right of the State of Virginia to fine a white man for marrying a colored woman had been affirmed. This would seem to imply the right of the States to make race distinctions which might cover the Maryland law excluding colored men from practicing law.

Mr. L. Nevett Steele said he had not considered the subject and was not prepared to give an opinion. He was opposed to admitting women, but as to colored men he had not made up his mind.

Col. Charles Marshall said he had never examined the law on the subject, but personally he had no objection whatever to a colored man practicing law if he is fit to do so. If a colored man is a good lawyer people will employ him, and if he is a bad lawyer they will not. There is no profession in which a man will find his level so surely as in the law. It would be less dangerous to license colored lawyers than colored doctors, because the lawyers' mistakes could be easier corrected.

Mayor Latrobe said: "I see no good reason why colored men, if properly qualified, should not be admitted to the practice of the legal profession. In my judgment all restrictions on the freedom of citizenship should be removed. Colored men can practice medicine, engage in trade, receive holy orders, serve on juries, hold any legislative, judicial or administrative office and legally enter all other avenues of employment. Under the law they enjoy equal protection with the whites in all rights of person and property. Why, then, should they be forbidden to practice law? I am sure if a client wishes the services of an attorney the law should permit him to select the color of his lawyer."

Mr. I. Parker Veasy, ex-city solicitor, said: "It seems to me quite clear that the decision of the Court of Appeals in this State in the Taylor case must be conclusive of this question until the Legislature modifies the provisions of the code. I think it would be a mistake to oppose such a change in the provisions of the code. I see no more reason for prohibiting colored men from engaging in this than any other business occupation."

Mr. Bernard Carter, city solicitor, said he had not thought about the policy of the matter at all, but that personally he saw no objection whatever in admitting colored men to practice at the bar.

Mr. Archibald H. Taylor said the question of admission of colored men to the bar had been discussed among lawyers at one of the social clubs where he is a member. He concluded that it is a question which will come up for decision, and perhaps may as well be disposed of now, and that was the sentiment of the club discussion. There was no race prejudice expressed. The proper safeguards against the admission of an untrustworthy element should be secured, and this answers for any class without regard to color. He would not oppose any proposition to give men of color an equal chance, but his objections would be made to the indiscriminate introduction of indifferently educated lawyers at the bar. A colored judge, elected in a section where his race predominates, could admit such a class, and perhaps examples of that kind have occurred in the South.

**WHOLESALE DESTRUCTION OF SONG BIRDS.** The song birds of New Jersey, especially in Camden, Salem, Cumberland, Cape May and Atlantic counties, are slaughtered in such numbers by hordes of pot-hunters, who kill them for the sake of their skins, which they sell to parties in New York for trimming ladies' bonnets, that it is stated that an effort

class, has been accepted by the Secretary of the Navy. The resignations of the other cadets who were deficient at the late examination and allowed to resign will be considered and accepted tomorrow, except in the case of Naval Cadet J. C. P. De Kragt, of Iowa, of the second class, who refused to resign, preferring to be "dropped," as recommended by the academic board. Cadet Frick's resignation was sent to Washington in advance of the others. Until the resignation of a cadet is accepted by the Navy Department he is supposed to be in the service of the navy and subject to its regulations, receiving pay up to the time of his leaving the Academy at the rate of \$500 a year. Today Cadet Dashiell, one of the number awaiting action by the Navy Department, was placed on board the prison ship Santee, charged with violating one of the rules of the institution by entering the steam engineering department building without permission Sunday. As the offense is not a grave one, it is thought the only punishment inflicted upon the cadet will be his incarceration on the ship until the time arrives for him to leave the Academy permanently.

Lieutenant-Commander Wm. M. Folger, of the naval proving grounds, is ordered to Washington Wednesday for medical examination preliminary to promotion as commander in the navy to the vacancy caused by the death of the late Commander George D. B. Glidden.

#### Calling Naval Officers to Account.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 9.—The Secretary of the Navy has issued a general order that all petitions, remonstrances, &c., from officers of the navy or marine corps to Congress on any subject of legislation will be forwarded through the Navy Department, and no officer will appear before any committee except by authority of the department. It is understood that the order was prompted by the action of a number of naval officers in uniting in a protest to Congress against the passage of the resolution thanking Commodore Schley and Lieut. Emory, of the Greely relief expedition. The Secretary has addressed a circular letter to the officers who signed the petition, calling their attention to the fact that they have violated the naval regulation which forbids officers of the navy from attempting to influence legislation.

#### Sea Coast Defenses.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 9.—Messrs. Horr, Ellis and Hancock, of the House appropriations committee, have completed the fortification appropriation bill. It appropriates \$4,935,000, as against \$700,000 last year. It provides for the continued construction of those already begun, and for new works at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Hampton Roads, New Orleans and San Francisco. The amount appropriated is \$2,900,000 outside of the New Orleans works. The bill recommends a permanent annual appropriation of \$1,500,000 for five years for heavy steel rifle guns for armament of deep-water ports, to be expended so as to induce American manufacturers to undertake the work of furnishing material.

#### Gen. Swain's New Trial.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 9.—Gen. Swain this morning appeared before the general court-martial which is to try him on the additional charge of unlawfully obtaining and disposing of forage. He asked the court to grant him a delay of a week to secure counsel, his own being engaged on other cases at this time. After consideration the court granted a delay until Wednesday next.

#### Washington Notes.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 9.—The Secretary of State will pay the five per cent. balance due to the beneficiaries of the awards of the Spanish and American claims commission on and after the 11th instant. These payments amount to about \$75,000.

The Court of Claims today made an order directing that until otherwise ordered the existing rules, so far as applicable, will govern the practice in cases arising under the act relating to French spoliation claims.

A call has been issued by the secretary of the national democratic committee for a meeting to be held at the Arlington Hotel in this city on Monday, March 2. The purpose of the meeting is not stated.

#### The Petersburg Bank Dead Hitting.

PETERSBURG, VA., Feb. 9.—In the Hustings Court today Judge E. M. Mann rendered his opinion as to the validity of the deed made on May 19 last by the directors of the defunct Planters and Merchants' Bank. The deed was assailed by the State of Virginia, which had on deposit in the defunct bank \$100,000 and by the Union National Bank of New York and other judgment creditors. Judge Mann, in rendering his opinion, said that the deed as made by the directors of the bank is a valid one, and decrees that the funds now in the hands of the trustees of the bank be distributed pro rata among its creditors. The trustees have on hand \$90,000, sufficient to pay the creditors a dividend of 25 per cent. The petition of J. R. Barkdale, treasurer of the Commonwealth of Virginia, which has been treated as a cross bill, is dismissed, and the demurrer to the bill of the Union National Bank of the city of New York is sustained. Counsel for the State asked for a suspension of the order, with a view of taking an appeal to the Supreme Court of Appeals, which was granted.

#### A Singular Case of Suicide.

READING, PA., Feb. 9.—John Steinman, aged 63, a bachelor of peculiar habits, living near

SUN  
Feb. 10, 1885











Sun  
Feb 9, 1885

**MATTERS.**

and the List  
more Sun, I  
out dismissis  
of the naval  
s. reduces the  
Academy to  
of the first  
e third and 74  
ed in October  
ademy with a  
with 29 mem  
the third with  
at the recent  
recommended  
antage of the  
navy. They  
of Maryland,  
craft, Iowa,  
B. Reilly,  
w Hampshire,  
ontucky, third  
Fourth class:  
with Robert  
od, Connecticut  
H. Scott, at  
w. Maryland;  
r a Catesby  
mp, Virginia;  
L. Lafferty,  
L. Wisconsin.  
t is said, for  
were Miles G.  
s, and James  
fourth class,  
of the three  
class of 1881,  
and were re-  
their inability  
dies.  
up in studies  
nrove before  
be dropped.  
efficient at the  
ok, of Mary-  
at large—also  
ation a year  
be dropped,  
from the navy  
ted as naval  
stated at the  
s of the fourth  
Missouri: D. E.  
V. Fitzgerald,  
Gillespie, Wis-  
ser; Oscar W.  
lowbray, New  
Iowa. A dis-  
been dropped  
deny will not  
are usually  
ing when the  
form or when  
lies, as in the  
out from the  
dismissed, it  
elinquency in  
regulation of  
h-the exami-  
s which grad-  
Academy is as  
the annual ex-  
ation:  
a. re-  
a. re-  
ivania.  
sylvania.  
a.  
rey.  
k.  
s.  
nia.

**FOUR WAREHOUSES BURNED.**

**Cassard's Packing-House and Bergmann's Stable Destroyed—Loss \$72,000.**  
(Reported for the Baltimore Sun.)  
There was a \$72,000 fire in Baltimore yesterday, which burned for seven hours, required the united efforts of eleven engines and over a hundred men to suppress it, and was the cause of six men being injured. The roofs and interiors of four buildings were destroyed, and a large quantity of stock was damaged or ruined. These warehouses are on the south side of Baltimore street, between Paca and Greene streets, and extend back to German street. They are numbered 407, 407, 408 and 411.  
No. 407 was owned and occupied by Joseph Bergmann, who kept a livery stable. Messrs. G. Cassard & Son, pork packers, occupied Nos. 407, 408 and 411. All four of the buildings are of brick, and all except No. 411 are three stories high, the latter being two stories. The damage to Mr. Bergmann's building is estimated at \$1,000, and to his stock of oats, bran and corn \$500. His building is insured for \$5,000 and his stock for \$7,000. The damage to the Cassard buildings is estimated at \$50,000, stock \$40,000 and machinery \$10,000, making a total of \$70,000. The buildings are insured for \$25,000, the stock for \$40,500 and the machinery for \$10,500. The Cassards estimate the value of their entire property of warehouses, stock and machinery at from \$125,000 to \$150,000.  
In addition to the damages already mentioned, No. 413 Baltimore street, owned by the Fitzgerald estate and occupied as a restaurant by Louis Neldbarit, was damaged \$150, and the carpets and furniture \$50. A lot of straw and oats in Louis Coblen's stable, northwest corner Paca and German streets, was damaged \$500 by water. It is insured. According to these estimates the total damage done by the fire amounts to \$72,000.  
The fire is said to have started in the boiler-room of No. 407. It was first seen by policeman Gillespie at a few minutes after six o'clock. Smoke was rising slowly from the building, but by the time the alarm was sounded from box 42, which is at No. 2 truck-house, on Paca street, just above Fayette, flames had burst through the smoke and were spreading rapidly. Four engines and one hook-and-ladder company responded to the alarm and went to work with a will.  
As the fire was hard to get at, it made head-way steadily, and forced its way into the adjoining buildings on the west. When Chief Henrick arrived he saw the need of prompt action and immediately sent in a second alarm, which brought out four more engines and another hook-and-ladder company. Still the fire burned on without apparent check, notwithstanding the firemen were unceasing in their efforts to get the better of it. The chief then decided to sound a third alarm, and in response to this his force was increased to eleven engines, which, with the exception of two engines, which were kept in reserve in case of fires in other parts of the city, comprised the whole department.  
In Bergmann's stable were thirty-five horses, which became excited by the noise of the crackling and hissing flames in the building next door, and would have caused a great deal of confusion and trouble had they not been removed to Miller's place, on German street, before Bergmann's stable caught fire. At nine o'clock the second story back building of the stable became ignited. Four firemen from No. 5 engine got into the building and tried to make their way toward the flames, but they had hardly gotten as far as midway the building when the eastern brick wall of No. 407, joggled over and came crushing through the roof and floors down upon them. A shout of horror went up from those who saw what had happened, and when the

**LOCAL MATTERS.**

**Can Colored Men Be Admitted to the Bar?**  
Mr. Alexander H. Hobbs appeared before the Supreme Bench, Chief Judge Brown and Judges Duffy, Phelps and Fisher, sitting in the Circuit Court, on Saturday in behalf of Charles S. Wilson, colored, who applies for admission to the bar as an attorney. Mr. Wilson is a resident of Massachusetts and a practicing attorney there. He is a graduate of Amherst College, and recently taught school at Sunnybrook, Baltimore county. Mr. Hobbs asked to be heard upon the petition.  
"The whole question," said Judge Brown, "I take it, has been decided by the Court of Appeals, which declares that the statute law of Maryland excluding colored men from practice as attorneys in our courts is not in conflict with the constitution of the United States. The question is not an open one, and we are not at all liberty to review it. For myself, I regret exceedingly that the law of our State excludes colored men from the legal profession. It is a great injustice that no colored man can be admitted to the practice of the law. There is a large colored population in our State, and they ought to be allowed to enter any lawful occupation for which they may be fitted."  
Judge Fisher said: "I concur with Judge Brown. There ought to be no exclusion. It is the duty of the Legislature to remove the restriction. Until the law is changed, however, we cannot without disrespect review the decision of the higher court."  
Mr. Hobbs contended that there are decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which overrule the decision of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, and which would justify the Supreme Bench in hearing the application.  
Judge Duffy: "I don't see how we can decline to hear the application if the Supreme Court of the United States has decided differently from the Court of Appeals."  
Judge Brown: "If you have any subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Hobbs, which overrule the Court of Appeals, we will hear them. But I think the Court of Appeals would be the proper place to present the petition."  
Judge Fisher: "It would be disrespectful for a subordinate court to hear or an attorney to argue a proposition that the Court of Appeals was wrong. I am willing, however, to hear any decisions rendered by the United States Supreme Court since the decision of the Court of Appeals."  
Judge Duffy: "My own view is that a party has as much right to be heard in a case of this kind as in any other."  
Judge Phelps: "If the counsel has any authorities he should produce them. It is the duty of every court to follow the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States."  
Mr. Hobbs asked to be heard orally at a future day, and it was determined to hear his argument on Saturday next at 12:30 P. M.  
**Real Estate Transfers.**—Feb. 7.—John Whiteside and wife to A. Hamilton, two lots, \$3,100. Winfield M. Simpson, trustee, to J. C. Moyston, four lots, \$1,650. Samuel T. Williams to B. Hupfer and wife, lot west side of Wolfe street, near Hampstead hill, 16 feet 6 inches by 50 feet, \$1,000; ground rent \$41 25. Frank W. Trimble to E. W. Gorman, lot east side of Castle street, near Jefferson, 12 by 75 feet, \$900; ground rent \$27. John Kiebe to P. Kiebe, lot south side of Henrietta street, near P. each alley, 13 by 65 feet, \$1,000; ground rent \$25. Henry Schumaburg to J. G. Ehrhardt, &c., lot southeast corner of Barré street and Sterrett alley, \$1,000; ground rent \$25. Wm. E. Whitson, administrator, to M. Stout, lot west side of Paca street, near Lexington, 25 by 105 feet, \$1,000; ground rent \$365. Margaret Stout to M. G. Shoemaker, lot west side of Paca street, near Lexington, 25 by 105 feet, \$5; ground rent \$365. Emily S. Brune, &c., to T. H. Kidgey, lot southeast corner of Harlem avenue and Bruno street.

**Telegraph Matters.**

A meeting of the directors of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company was held on Saturday, at the Central Building, at which a resolution was passed ratifying and confirming all previous action of the executive officers in regard to the expenditures required for the extension of the Baltimore and Ohio telegraph system. It was stated that this action was not taken in consequence of the recent suit commenced in the United States court to discover the relations existing between the railroad and telegraph companies. The action taken by the directors was said to be similar to that taken by other large corporations, who formally vote to confirm the action of the executive in matters of detail which cannot wait for the approval of the directors.  
Hon. Roscoe Conkling, of New York, and General Bradley T. Johnson, of Baltimore, counsel of the Southern and of the Bankers and Merchants' Telegraph Companies, have prepared bills and secured the appointment of receivers in several of the States outside of the eastern district of Virginia. Last December counsel for other parties secured the appointment of a receiver for that part of Virginia which is in the eastern district, including Richmond, Petersburg and Norfolk. Gen. Johnson went South on this receivership business, and it is stated that the receiver took possession of the telegraph lines in several of the States as far South as Alabama, and got control of the whole system outside of the Eastern Virginia district. This was done to secure the business and connection of the Southern Company to the Bankers and Merchants'.  
**The Funeral of the Late John Marshall.**  
The Friends' Mission Meeting House, on Light street, near Cross, was thronged with people yesterday afternoon to witness the funeral rites of the late John Marshall, who died on Thursday evening at his late residence, No. 19 Rountney street. The deceased was the janitor of the mission for seven years, and was well known in South Baltimore. At 2 o'clock the pall-bearers, Messrs. Oliver V. Googhegan, John Cunningham, A. J. Denson, J. Robert Marley, Wm. T. Wilson, D. A. Hodensick, Wm. L. Denly and Philip V. Clayton, of Franklin Lodge, No. 4, I. O. M., of which deceased was a member, left the house of mourning with the casket. They walked slowly through the street to the mission, which was just around the corner on Light street, followed by the family and intimate friends of the deceased. The casket was covered with a profusion of flowers, the centre design having the word "Rest" wrought in white blossoms. As the cortege entered the building the Sunday-school children, who were arranged on either side of the platform, sang in subdued tones "Shall We Meet Beyond the River?" Mr. John C. Thomas read a part of the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, after which Dr. James Carey Thomas, Prof. Harris, of the Johns Hopkins University, and Dr. R. H. Thomas made brief addresses. They referred to the life of the dead, his wanderings about the world as a sailor, and his pious and exemplary life. Miss Mary S. Thomas offered an eloquent prayer, and then the Sunday-school children were invited to view the remains. They passed round the bier and went out of a door in the rear. The whole audience then passed forward and looked upon the face of the dead. After some further remarks the funeral proceeded to Mt. Olivet Cemetery, where the body was buried.  
**The Convention of Maryland Farmers** appointed originally to be held on February 21 will not convene until the following day, Tuesday, the 24th, the committee of arrangements announcing that they have made the change because of representations from a number of gentlemen concerned that on account of the sailing schedules of the steamboat lines Monday is an inconvenient day for such a meeting, and that its selection would probably considerably reduce the attendance.

**A DESTRUCTIVE**

**A Railroad Collision**  
**Fears Burning Oil**  
A collision between iron bridge of the I over the Haritan rive N. J., about 2.30 Satu the death of two men half a million dollars For once the famous failed to protect a gain fortune prevented a disaster than that w prising little New Jor of loaded petroleum the New Brunswick on rear cars occupying a the factory buildings street and the Delawa The fast Southern e does not stop at New behind, obtaining a previous block station of the stationary tra cars, and throwing th three of its own carad below. A swift and d consequence. Two lar ber of smaller buil Frank Dumas, a brake collision, and his body got lost in a burning was either smothered. When the freight tra ing brakemen from th tried to stop the tra sinner whistled for br long and heavy and Seeing that a collisi engineer and fireman jumped and saved th was a terrific crash. through the caboose i into splinters and spr of the track, where th the oil cars were amas were poured in blast stone abutments to th on the ice of the froze great tanks were fore went crashing down f the burning oil spread them fell on the south were smashed in the s of the abutment. Th caught fire as it was d reached the ground th terrific roar, wrecki vicinity.  
One of the tanks w side direction and le over the factory of Jar Company. It t though that obstruct paper, and went thro rrying everything wi Watchman Premier h in a distant corner of the building. He d whether the boiler h the day of judgment dashed out of the wh with him. Every pe factory seemed abla burned a passageway flowed out, to help in. But the impact of t sulted in as much da oil train. The engi stayed on the bridge cars filled with hor two animals in all. T over on the south side them had been smaa and the poor horses y tons. The other was the ground, but wit made kindling wood



IN THE MATTER ) BEFORE THE SUPREME BENCH  
 )  
 OF ) OF  
 )  
 CHARLES S. WILSON. ) BALTIMORE CITY.

Charles S. Wilson, a person of color formerly a citizen of Massachusetts, where he was admitted to the practice of law and now a citizen of Maryland, applies to this Court for admission to practice law in the Courts of Baltimore City. The Act of 1876, ch. 264, which is in this respect only a re-enactment of Art. 11, Sec. 3, of the Maryland Code excludes colored persons from that right and the question is whether he is entitled to admission notwithstanding that Act.

Sec. 1 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The case of Strauder vs. West Virginia, decided in 1879, settled the question that by force of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States <sup>and particularly the 14th</sup> colored men cannot be excluded from the jury on account of their

LAWYERS - MARYLAND



race or color, because as the Court says in its opinion, 100 U. S. Rep:- p. 306, the Amendment "was designed to assure to the colored race the enjoyment of all the civil rights that under the law are enjoyed by white persons and to give to that race the protection of the general government in that enjoyment whenever it should be denied by the States." On page 307 the Court adds that the Amendment "is to be construed liberally to carry out the purposes of its framers. It ordains that no State shall make or enforce any laws which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States (evidently referring to the newly made citizens who being citizens of the United States, are declared to be also citizens of the State in which they reside). It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. What is this but declaring that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States, and in regard to the colored race, for whose protection the Amendment was primarily designed, that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color. The words of the Amendment, it is true, are prohibitory but they contain a necessary implication of a positive immunity, or right, most valuable to the colored race--the right to exemption from unfriendly legislation against them distinctively as colored--the exemption from legal discriminations, implying inferiority in civil society, lessening the security



of their enjoyment of the rights which others enjoy, and discriminations which are steps towards reducing them to the condition of a subject race."

"That the West Virginia Statute respecting juries-- the Statute that controlled the selection of the grand and petit jury in the case of the plaintiff in error--is such a discrimination, ought not to be doubted. Nor would it be if the persons excluded by it were white men. If in those states where the colored people constitute a majority of the entire population a law should be enacted excluding all white men from jury service, thus denying to them the privilege of participating equally with the blacks in the administration of justice, we apprehend no one would be heard to claim that it would not be a denial to white men of the equal protection of the laws."

The Court therefore concluded that the Statute of West Virginia amounted "to a denial of the equal protection of the laws to a colored man when he is put upon trial for an alleged offence against the State." 100 U. S. 310.

Such being the interpretation placed upon the Federal Constitution by the Supreme Court of the United States it becomes necessary to consider whether that decision has any, and if so what, bearing upon the restrictive provision of the Maryland Code above referred to. If it should be found upon examination that the Fourteenth Amendment as thus authoritatively construed in effect overrules that restrictive provision, either expressly or by necessary and unavoidable implication, it is made the imperative duty of this Court by force of the second Article



of the Maryland Declaration of Rights, itself declaratory of pre-existing law, to give full effect to the Constitution of the United States, anything in the law of this state to the contrary notwithstanding. If the authority of our own Court of Appeals is needed in support of this position, it may readily be found in the very recent case of Pinkney vs Lanahan, not yet reported.

What then is the scope and effect of the decision in the West Virginia case?

A juror merely decides in such a case the guilt or innocence of the accused upon the evidence submitted to the jury. The Judge determines what evidence shall be so submitted--he may exclude from their consideration all evidence making in favor of the accused and admit only that which makes against him--if the jury wrongfully find a verdict against the defendant, the Judge may continue the wrong by refusing a new trial--in inflicting the punish-



ment for the offence, the Judge in most cases determines the length of the imprisonment, and in one case he determines whether the punishment shall be imprisonment or death. Moreover, in *this City* the Judges appoint the Grand Jury and select the names from which the petit juries are drawn. If therefore, a law excluding all colored men from the opportunity of becoming Jurors because of their color is a denial of the equal protection of the laws to them, a law excluding them from the like opportunity of filling the judicial office and participating in the selection of juries is likewise a denial to them of that equal protection, and the decision in Strauders case that a law excluding them from the possibility of becoming jurors is unconstitutional and void is equally applicable to a law which removes from the negro race all chance of participation in other branches of the administration of the law quite as essential to their security.

12  
At the time of the adoption of the Maryland Constitution of 1867 the above provision in the Maryland Code was the law governing the admission to ~~the~~ practice. That Constitution in Art. 4, Sec. 2, upon the qualification of the Judges provides that "they shall be not less than thirty years of age at the time of their election or appointment and shall be selected from those who have been admitted to practice law in this State." If then the Code excludes the colored man from the right to be admitted to practice law and the Maryland Constitution requires that the Judges shall be selected from those who have been so admitted, it would follow that the Constitution excludes the colored man from the right to be a Judge. When



therefore the 14th Amendment was adopted in 1868 the above provision in the Maryland Constitution would have immediately become unconstitutional and void if the provision in the Code were still operative. The provision in the Maryland Constitution standing by itself is not in violation of the 14th Amendment--it could only become so by the operation upon it of the exclusion of the colored man made by the Code if that were possible. In other words the provision in the Maryland Constitution, valid when standing by itself, would be made void by the provision in the Code which imports an unlawful distinction. But the Constitution of Maryland is the paramount law overriding the Code and all acts of Assembly. It can make void an Act of Assembly, but it cannot be made void by one and when the two come into conflict the Act of Assembly must fall.

The above considerations present the answer to the suggestion, which might otherwise be made, that since the Statute limits the membership of the bar to white citizens only, the 14th Amendment would operate upon the provisions of the Maryland Constitution, and eliminate the restriction in the selection of Judges from members of the bar alone and open the office in that manner to all citizens irrespective of race. The Statute, and not the Constitution, must give way, if the conjoint effect of both would be to produce a repugnance not incident to the Constitution alone.

The principles of Constitutional Law laid down in the Strauder case in our opinion conclusively settle this case, not only upon the grounds already stated, but upon



others also.

The whole Court concurred in the decision except Judges Clifford and Field, and it is a significant circumstance that the latter in the subsequent case of the Butchers' Union Co. vs. Crescent City Co., 111 U. S. p. 758, decided in 1883 in the separate opinion which he gave assumes ~~that the~~, that the right of all citizens of the U. S. to be admitted to the bar <sup>except by regulations alike affecting all persons of the same age, sex and condition</sup> is a proposition too plain for argument. "It cannot be", he says, "that a State may limit to a specified number of its people the right to practice law, the right to practice medicine, the right to preach the gospel, the right to till the soil, or to pursue particular business or trades and thus parcel out to different parties the various vocations and callings of life."

And it is equally significant that in the same case p. 764, Judge Bradley who although he united in the decision of the Court, gave a separate opinion in which Judges Harlan and Woods concurred, used language equally emphatic." He says "I hold it to be an incontrovertible proposition of both English and American public law that all mere monopolies are odious and against common right," and he adds, "I hold that the liberty of pursuit--the right to follow any of the callings of life--is one of the privileges of a citizen of the United States."

As we have already stated the particular question decided in that case, is that colored men cannot by reason of their race be excluded from sitting on juries, and the Court holds that to exclude them by law from the opportunity of sitting on a jury, when a colored man is put on



his trial for a criminal offence is discriminating against the accused and depriving him of equal protection and is therefore prohibited by the 14th Amendment, but the decision goes much farther than that. It decides that colored men are entitled to sit on juries not only because colored men may be tried before a jury but because to exclude them would be to discriminate against them as citizens in the enjoyment of *their* rights, because it would be unfriendly legislation against them distinctly as colored and because it would be a discrimination which would be a step towards reducing them to the condition of a subject race. If then, these reasons prevent a colored citizen from being excluded from the jury box of a State, why do they not equally prevent his exclusion from becoming a member of the bar of a State? Can any sound distinction be drawn between the two cases. *We* think not. The right of admission to the bar is the far more valuable right of the two. Each is equally a — right. It is not a sufficient answer to say that a member of the Bar is an officer of the Court and that therefore the right of admission depends on his possessing the qualifications for the office which the State alone has the right to prescribe. A jurymen is equally an officer of the law for he is appointed by public authority to perform under oath a public duty, for which he is paid and his qualifications are prescribed by law, but notwithstanding this a colored man has the constitutional right to sit on a jury in spite of any discrimination against his color which the State may impose. A member of the Bar is indeed an officer of the Court but he is much more than that, he is also a member of a learn-



ed profession whereby he earns his livelihood, a profession which constitutes a large and essential part of every civilized community and which is especially influential and indispensable in a Republican Government. To debar any class of citizens from its membership is not only to prevent their engaging in a lawful calling, but, in the language of the Supreme Court, tends to degrade and stigmatize the whole class by depriving them of a privilege which all other citizens possess. *and of the equal protection of the law* If one class may be so debarred, so may every other, whether it be on account of nationality, religion or any other cause, at the will and pleasure of the State. All such exclusions are, as we think, plainly declared by the Supreme Court, to be prohibited and unconstitutional.

The Court of Appeals of Maryland in the case entitled "In the matter of Charles S. Taylor" <sup>48 Md. 30,</sup> affirmed the validity of the Act 1876 and excluded the applicant because he was a colored man, from the right to be admitted to the practice of the law.

The respect which we entertain for the judgments of that tribunal would induce us to accept the conclusion in that case, if the condition of the Federal decisions, upon which that case was avowedly based, had remained unchanged. The argument for the applicant in that case was founded exclusively upon the proposition that the Act of 1876 was an abridgment of the privileges and immunities of a citizen of the United States and upon this ground was repugnant to the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Court met it simply by showing that the Supreme Court of the United States had decided in the

Slaughter House case and in Mrs. Bradwell's case that the privilege claimed was one which appertained to the citizen of the State and not of the United States, and that the clause of the 14th Amendment relied upon was inapplicable. No reference whatever was made in the argument of the applicant or of the Court to the other clause of the Amendment, the full effect of which was afterwards for the first time brought to light by the series of decisions in 100th U. S. Reports. The terms of the <sup>Maryland</sup> Constitution limiting the selection of Judges from members of the bar were not alluded to, and no observation was made upon the fact that in the selection of juries they have important ministerial functions which formerly fell within the province of the sheriff's office--both being matters having material bearing upon the question whether the exclusion contemplated by the act in question would be open to objection as denying the equal protection of the laws, but wholly unimportant to the discussion of those clauses of the Amendment which alone had been under consideration in the case in 48th Maryland and in those in 16th Wallace upon which it was founded.

We think that the later cases in the Supreme Court lead irresistably to a different conclusion from that in the case of Charles Taylor and some expressions of the Judges, particularly those already mentioned and also of Judge Bradley in the Civil Right case in 109 U. S. Rep. would seem to indicate such to be the view of the Supreme Court.

The Court of Appeals however merely decided that the Act of 1876 standing alone was not repugnant to the 14th



Amendment, and gave no opinion upon its effect when taken in connection of the provisions of the Maryland Constitution already referred to. It is to be regretted that the question was not presented anew to the Court of Appeals in order that that tribunal, rather than a subordinate Court, might be placed in position to pass upon the result of the later decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and that we might have an authoritative declaration of the rule to be adopted, and that even the appearance of departure from the precedent of the Taylor case might be avoided. The application however having been made to the Supreme Bench, it is necessary to determine it, and we are of opinion that the applicant, if in other respects duly qualified, is not to be debarred by reason of his color.

*Edw. M. Brown*

*Edw. Duffin*  
*William A. Fisher*  
*William A. Stewart*  
*C. E. Mills*

Supreme Bench  
In the matter  
of the  
Petition of Charles Wilson  
for Admission to  
practice law

Opinion of Court

Filed March 29<sup>th</sup> 1885