

The Senate Debating the Southern Question.

Speech by Francis Blair on Radical Rule at the South.

Debate in the House Over the Ku Klux Bill.

WASHINGTON, April 17.

SENATE.

Mr. FARRINGTON, (rep. of N. J.), presented a memorial of the Farmers' Union and merchants asking the creation of a National Bank of the United States.

Mr. STANTON, (rep. of N. Y.), offered a resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to inform the Senate under what laws individuals and corporations are allowed to hold large bodies of public lands and destroy them by fire.

The resolution of instruction of Mr. Sherman was taken on, when Mr. BLAIR, (dem. of Mo.), was entitled to the floor.

Mr. BLAIR, quoted from the debates in Congress, where the fourteenth amendment was under consideration, to show the construction placed upon it by the Senate and the House. He said that it was plainly laid down at the time that the only power of legislation which Congress had under it was to provide for the enforcement of the rights of citizens of the States. The measure which was now proposed to amend the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. This Congress, which was now to be amended by Congress, was, in his opinion, a gross violation of State law. This Congress, which was now to be amended by Congress, was, in his opinion, a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. BLAIR, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

THE BROADWAY WIDENING.

Decision by Justice Cardozo Appointing a New Commission.

Constitutionality of the Legislative Act Authorizing the Widening of Upper Broadway—Frauds Under the Old Commission, and How and by Whom Perpetrated.

NEW COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED.

The subject of the widening of Broadway above Thirty-fourth street is such an old one and so familiar to the public, from its frequent repetition in the Press, that it is needless to give an extended recapitulation of them. After the awards and assessments made by the commissioners appointed under the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening were made public the whole thing savored so strongly of a "job" that efforts were at once made to set them aside. Through the urgent protests of leading property owners affected by these awards and assessments, and their alleged gross frauds in making them, the last Legislature was induced to set aside the old commission and its awards and assessments. This last act, it will also be remembered, authorized the appointment of a new commission by a judge of the Supreme Court on application of the Corporation Counsel.

This was made Judge Cardozo. He has now made his decision on the constitutionality of the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway. He has appointed a new commission. He has appointed a new commission. He has appointed a new commission.

Mr. CARDZO, in his decision, said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

Mr. CARDZO, continued his decision, saying that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional. He said that the act of the Legislature authorizing the widening of Upper Broadway was constitutional.

LETTING THE CAT OUT OF THE BAG.

Peter B. Sweeney and the National Quarterly Review.

The Secret of the Attack on the Park Commissioners.

SPICY LETTER FROM MAYOR HALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE:—

Your editorial upon the *National Quarterly* and its attack on President Sweeney, of the Department of Parks, is sprightly. But permit me to question your amusing climax. The article in question appears shortly after Mr. President Sweeney refuses to pay the following bill, which is in the handwriting of Dr. Sweeney himself, and is now on file in the denunciations, but which bears on its face the words, "disallowed!"

Subscription to the *Quarterly Review*, \$12.00 per annum; \$6.00 per half year; \$3.00 per quarter; \$1.00 per month. Received from the Department of Public Parks \$12.00 for advertising estimates of G. Park in *Quarterly Review* for the quarter ending March 31, 1879.

Editor and Proprietor:—
Terms for advertisement:—
\$500 per annum; \$250 per half year; \$125 per quarter; \$62.50 per month. Received from the Department of Public Parks \$12.00 for advertising estimates of G. Park in *Quarterly Review* for the quarter ending March 31, 1879.

Mr. SWEENEY, (rep. of N. Y.), offered a resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to inform the Senate under what laws individuals and corporations are allowed to hold large bodies of public lands and destroy them by fire.

Mr. SWEENEY, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. SWEENEY, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. SWEENEY, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. SWEENEY, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. SWEENEY, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.

Mr. SWEENEY, continued his speech, saying that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law. He said that the fourteenth amendment was a gross violation of State law.