that there be kept constantly in view the fact that the law was intended to give and to establish free schools throughout the Territory. That is the first solid rock on which to build any interpretation of the various parts of the law, and we must conclude therefore at the outset that under no circumstances can tuition be required for the admission of any child of school age in the district or city where he or she lives, and no child can be refused admission to, or discriminated against, in any district school in the Territory."

There is no need to make any particular effort to "harmonize" different provisions of the law, because they will harmonize themselves in an intelligent mind not given to the fabrication of imaginary difficulties. The only thing out of harmony with the law is Jacob Boreman's misinterpretation of one of its provisions, or rather his dictum in direct opposition to the law.

It is true the law was framed to establish free schools in this Territory. But it contains some limitations and restrictions. As to the wisdom or necessity for all of them we will here say nothing. The question is what is the law? The commissioner says, "no child can be refused admission to or discriminated against, in any district school of the Territory." The law says that schools must not be overcrowded, and in order to prevent children from one district crowding into the school or schools of another district, the school board may charge reasonable fees for the tuition of such children. Therefore children may, under given circumstances, be "refused admission" to some "district schools of the Territory."

Mr. Boreman was so given to making law when on the bench that he must needs try his hand at the same business when acting as an executive officer. We advise our friends to stick close to the law, and pay no attention to the commissioner when he states anything contrary to the law.

A little reflection will show that there must be some restriction in this matter, or there will be cases of almost desertion of one school to the overflowing of another. Various causes might contribute to this result, such as the popularity of some particular teacher or the strictness of another; the desire of the children to attend the same school as their intimate friends; the disposition to change in some parents as well as some children, and other reasons or excuses.

If the trustees will read carefully the section of the law we have quoted above, they will understand its requirements and see the reasons why they were made. And they will also perceive that these are not out of harmony with the general intent and scope of a free school law. Nor would there be any necessity for saying this, or directing special attention to the section, had it not been for the insinuations and improper assertions of the school commissioner.

When children belonging to a given school district seek admission to the school of another district, if their presence would cause overcrowding or be otherwise injurious, they may be and ought to be denied admission. And to prevent these evils the *law* says the trustees may charge reasonable tuition fees for such children. What the commissioner says to the contrary does not count.

Also the trustees of a district wherein there are several schools, may make arrangements for the proper distribution of the pupils, and their regulations can and should be enforced, notwithstanding what the commissioner says on this matter.

Trustees of one district may charge tuition fees for the children of another district who come to their schools, and the trustees of districts where it is necessary that some of the children should go to the schools of another district may make arrangements for the payment of such fees.

All this is necessary for the protection of teachers who might otherwise be imposed upon, and of the schools that might be overcrowded and spoiled.

Wherein the commissioner keeps within the lines of the law his instructions should be promptly and fully carried out. Wherein he plainly goes against the law and snarls and finds fault, he should be quietly ignored.

THE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION BILL.

FEW measures ever introduced have excited a feeling so strained and intense as that which has been awakened by the bill providing for Federal control of Congressional elections. The bill is so framed as to give Federal appointees a supervisory control of elections for members of Congress, the certificate of the board constituted under the proposed law to be taken as *prima facie* evidence of title to a seat in the National Legislature. It is a Republican measure, being in line with the platform declaration of the party in 1887 in relation to the protection of the right of the colored people to the exercise of the franchise in the South. As a matter of course, should the measure become law, the Democratic solidity of that section of the country would be broken and the prestige of the party practically annihilated.

The question with which this proposed law is associated is a serious one. It is pertinent to ask whether it would improve the situation or make it tenfold worse than it is, even granting that the law giving the suffrage to the colored people is now rendered nugatory by trickery and intimidation? Will it precipitate the race war which statesmen have been for years predicting, as merely a matter of time? Even some Republicans from the South take the gloomy view regarding the probable effects of the measure, should it become law. Mr. Coleman, member of Congress from Louisiana, and a Republican, is among the number, as indicated by his remarks in the House June 30th during the debate. He said:

"He did not wish to precipitate any trouble, and he was as certain that trouble and bloodshed would follow the enactment of this legislation, and that the law would fail in its purpose, as he was sure that he would vote against it in the House. He wanted to see the solidity of the South broken, and there were signs of disintegration in the Democratic party of the South. Pass a Federal election law and the men now ready to separate from the Democratic party would go back into what they were told was the white man's party rather than risk negro supremacy:

In numbers of sections of the South the colored population are in the majority. It seems therefore that an alternative is involved of a very serious character—shall the legal rights of the colored electors be denied and a bloody conflict of the two races be postponed, or shall this proposed measure be passed and enforced and the horrible struggle be precipitated.

The white race is the superior and for it to be dominated by the inferior is an unnatural position and therefore its peaceable existence is a philosophic impossibility. The voice of natural law would inevitably seek to assert itself and rectify the situation—hence the dilemma the question involves. And yet the law, asserts that the black man shall be protected in the exercise of the suffrage it confers. Thus human enactments have in their operations come to a point where they are confronted by a natural and necessarily insurmountable obstacle. When Mr. Coleman asserts that the white men will not submit to the rule of their colored brethren he is not only supported by the determination of the Caucasian population of the South, but by a natural law that is absolute and unyielding.