

**SOME RECENT CRITICISM OF
GELPCKE VERSUS DUBUQUE: BEING
THE SHARSWOOD PRIZE ESSAY FOR
1899, IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649446025

Some Recent Criticism of Gelpcke Versus Dubuque: Being the Sharswood Prize Essay for 1899, in the Department of Law, University of Pennsylvania by Thomas Raeburn White

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

THOMAS RAEBURN WHITE

**SOME RECENT CRITICISM OF
GELPCKE VERSUS DUBUQUE: BEING
THE SHARSWOOD PRIZE ESSAY FOR
1899, IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA**

SYNOPSIS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY	1
SECTION I.—STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
SECTION II.—THE PRINCIPLE UPON WHICH THE CASE WAS DECIDED	3
<i>A.</i> The federal courts are bound absolutely to accept the state court's interpretation of state statutes	3
<i>B.</i> The decision was based on the theory that the state courts' re- versal of interpretation of the statute was a law impairing the obligation of contracts	21
SECTION III.—THE DISSENTING OPINION OF MR. JUSTICE MULLER	28
SECTION IV.—EXAMINATION OF AUTHORITIES FOR THE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED	34
<i>A.</i> The judicial construction of a state statute becomes a part of the statute, as much so as if incorporated into the text	34
<i>B.</i> The federal courts have, in fact, treated the judicial interpretation of state statutes by state courts, as being the law, not merely the interpretation of the law	36
SECTION V.—DISCUSSION OF THE CASE ON PRINCIPLE	55
<i>A.</i> The rule in <i>Gelpcke v. Dubuque</i> has never been disputed by authority	57
<i>B.</i> Is the function of the American courts, when deciding as to the validity of legislative acts, a legislative or judicial function?	60
(1) THE STATUS OF THE POWER TO NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE ACTS IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES	60
(2) AN EXAMINATION OF THE OPINIONS OF THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION, AS EXPRESSED IN THE FEDERAL CONVENTION	67
(a) The end which the framers of the Constitution had in view	67
(b) Methods proposed by which it was intended to accomplish this purpose	69
(c) The clause or clauses in the Constitution, by virtue of which the courts obtained the power to pass upon the validity of legislative acts	74

	PAGE
(3) THE MANNER IN WHICH THE EXERCISE OF THE POWER WAS RECEIVED BY THE COUNTRY	77
C. Concluding observations	81
SECTION VI.—SHOULD THE SUPREME COURT ALLOW WRITS OF ERROR IN CASES SIMILAR TO GELPCKE v. DUBUQUE?	84
A. An examination of the cases similar to Gelpcke v. Dubuque which have come up by writ of error to state courts and have been refused consideration	84
B. An examination of the cases coming up by writ of error to state courts where the act involves a contract	88
C. The question of jurisdiction examined on principle	90

TABLE OF CASES.

	PAGE
Adams v. Nashville, 95 U. S. 19	16
Aicardi v. The State, 19 Wall. 635	16
Amy v. Allegheny City, 24 How. 364	16
Anderson v. Santa Anna, 116 U. S. 356	27, 41
Bacon v. Texas, 163 U. S. 207	86
Bailey v. Magwire, 22 Wall. 215	16
Bank v. Bank, 14 Wall. 9	86
Bank v. Board, 90 Fed. 7	27, 43
Bank of United States v. Daniel, 12 Pet. 32	9
Bank v. Jolly's Adm'rs, 18 How. 503	16
Bank v. Knoop, 16 How. 369	15, 43
Bank v. Skelley, 1 Black. 436	53
Bank v. Smith, 6 Wheat. 131	53
Beauregarde v. New Orleans, 18 How. 497	16
Boyd v. Alabama, 94 U. S. 643	16, 27, 43
Bridge Proprietors v. Hoboken Co., 1 Wall. 116	53
Bryan v. The Board of Education, 151 U. S. 639	53
Burgess v. Seligman, 107 U. S. 20	16
Butz v. Muscatine, 8 Wall. 575	27, 38
Central Land Co v. Loidley, 159 U. S. 102	86
Chicago v. Robbins, 2 Black. 418	14
Christy v. Pidgeon, 4 Wall. 196	35
City v. Lamson, 9 Wall. 477	27, 43
County of Leavenworth v. Barnes, 94 U. S. 70	16, 43
County V. Douglas, 105 U. S. 728	27, 43
Davis v. Indiana, 94 U. S. 494	16
Debolt v. Ohio Life & Trust Co., 1 Ohio, 564	45, 46
Douglas v. County of Pike, 101 U. S. 677	27, 40
Dugger v. Bocock, 104 U. S. 596	86
East Oakland v. Skinner, 94 U. S. 255	16
Elmendorf v. Taylor, 10 Wheat. 159	7, 13, 19, 35

	PAGE
Fairfield v. Co. of Galatin, 100 U. S. 418	16
Farmers' & Mechanics' Nat'l Bk. v. Smith, 6 Wheat. 131	53
Forepaugh v. R. R., 128 Pa. 217	14
Gardner v. Collins, 2 Pet. 58	9
Gelpcke v. Dubuque, 1 Wall. 175	1, 2, etc.
Godcharles v. Wigeman, 113 Pa. 431	77
Green v. County of Conness, 109 U. S. 104	27, 43
Green v. Neil's Lessee, 6 Pet. 291	9, 35
Groves v. Slaughter, 15 Pet. 449	14
Guildhall, The, 58 Fed. 796	14
Gut v. The State, 9 Wall. 35	16
Hall v. De Cuir, 95 U. S. 485	16
Harpending v. Dutch Reformed Church, 16 Pet. 455	9
Havemeyer v. Iowa Co., 3 Wall. 294	27, 37
Hill v. Hite, 29 C. C. A. 549	43
Huntingdon v. Attrill, 146 U. S. 657	53
Inglis v. Sailors' Snug Harbour, 3 Pet. 99	9
Insurance Co. v. Mass., 6 Wall. 611	16
Insurance Co. v. Debolt, 16 How. 416	46, 48, 50
Jackson v. Chew, 12 Wheat. 162	8
Jefferson Branch Bank v. Skelley, 1 Black. 436	53
K. and others v. The Dyke Board of Niedervieland. Decisions of the Reichsgericht in Civil Causes, Vol. IX, p. 233	61
Kennebec River Co. v. R. R., 14 Wall. 23	86
Lee Co. v. Rogers, 7 Wall. 181	27, 38
Leffingwell v. Warren, 2 Black. 599	24, 35
Lehigh Water Co. v. Easton, 121 U. S. 388	86
Lewisohn v. Steamship Co., 56 Fed. 603	16
Liverpool S. S. Co. v. Phoenix Ins. Co., 129 U. S. 397	14
Loeb v. Trustees of Ham. Co., 91 Fed. 37	27, 43, 88
Louisiana v. Pilsbury, 105 U. S. 278	27, 41
Louisville T. Co. v. Cincinnati, 76 Fed. 296	27, 43
Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co. v. Palmes, 109 U. S. 244	53
Louisville Gas Co. v. Citizens' Gas Co., 115 U. S. 683	53

TABLE OF CASES.

vii

	PAGE
Marbury <i>v.</i> Madison, 1 Cr. 178	79
McClung <i>v.</i> Silliman, 3 Pet. 270	9
McCullough <i>v.</i> Com. of Va., 172 U. S. 102	1, 53, 88
McKeen <i>v.</i> DeLancy's Lessee, 5 Cr. 22	6, 12
Mobile & Ohio R. R. Co. <i>v.</i> Tenn., 153 U. S. 487	53
Nesmith <i>v.</i> Sheldon, 7 How. 812	16
New Orleans Water Works <i>v.</i> La. Sugar Ref. Co., 125 U. S. 19	86
Nichols <i>v.</i> Levy, 5 Wall. 433	16
Notley <i>v.</i> Buck, 8 Barn. & Cress., 160	62
Oakland <i>v.</i> Skinner, 94 U. S. 255	16
Ohio Life Ins. & Trust Co. <i>v.</i> Debolt, 16 How. 416	46, 48, 50
Olcott <i>v.</i> Supervisors, 16 Wall. 678	27
Palmer <i>v.</i> Marston, 14 Wall. 10	86
Pease <i>v.</i> Peck, 18 How. 599	54
Pine Grove <i>v.</i> Talcot, 19 Wall. 666	27, 39
Piqua Bank <i>v.</i> Knoop, 16 How. 369	15, 45
Polk's Lessee <i>v.</i> Wendell, 5 Wheat. 293	7, 12
Porterfield <i>v.</i> Clark, 2 How. 76	16
Provident Ins. Co. <i>v.</i> Mass., 6 Wall. 611	16
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Gaines, 97 U. S. 697	16
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Georgia, 98 U. S. 359	16
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Lockwood, 17 Wall. 357	14
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> McClure, 10 Wall. 511	86
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Palmers, 109 U. S. 244	53
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Rock, 4 Wall. 177	85
Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Tenn., 153 U. S. 487	53
Randall <i>v.</i> Brigham, 7 Wall. 523	16
Ray <i>v.</i> Gas Co., 138 Pa. 576	27, 42, 58
<i>Re</i> Jacobs, 98 N. Y. 98	77
Rice <i>v.</i> Railroad, 1 Black, 374	16
Ross <i>v.</i> Duvall, 13 Pet. 45	9
Ross <i>v.</i> McClung, 6 Pet. 283	9
Sanbourne <i>v.</i> Co. Comm'rs, 97 U. S. 181	16
Shelby <i>v.</i> Gny, 11 Wheat. 361	9, 35
Shipp <i>v.</i> Miller's Heirs, 2 Wheat. 315	6, 12
South Ottawa <i>v.</i> Perkins, 94 U. S. 261	16, 27, 43

	PAGE
State <i>v.</i> Goodwill, 33 W. Va. 179	77, 96
State of Iowa <i>ex relatione v.</i> Co. of Wapello, 13 Iowa, 388	2
State Bank of Ohio <i>v.</i> Knoop, 16 How. 369	15, 45
Stone <i>v.</i> Wisconsin, 94 U. S. 156	16
Sturgis <i>v.</i> Crowninshield, 4 Wheat. 122	94
Swift <i>v.</i> Tyson, 16 Pet. 1	11
Taylor <i>v.</i> Ypsilanti, 105 U. S. 60	43
The City <i>v.</i> Lamson, 9 Wall. 477	27, 43
The Guildhall, 58 Fed. 796	14
Thompson <i>v.</i> Lec Co., 3 Wall. 327	27, 38
Town of S. Ottawa <i>v.</i> Perkins, 94 U. S. 261	16, 27, 43
Town of Venice <i>v.</i> Murdock, 92 U. S. 494	14, 16
Township of Pine Grove <i>v.</i> Talcott, 19 Wall. 666	27, 39
Union Bank <i>v.</i> Board, 90 Fed. 7	27, 43
Union Bank of Tenn. <i>v.</i> Jolly's Adm'rs, 18 How. 503	16
United States <i>v.</i> Morrison, 4 Pet. 124	9
United States Bank <i>v.</i> Daniel, 12 Pet. 32	9
University <i>v.</i> The People, 99 U. S. 309	53
Van Rensselaer <i>v.</i> Kearney, 11 How. 297	16
Venice <i>v.</i> Murdock, 92 U. S. 494	14, 16
Walker <i>v.</i> State Harbor Comm'rs, 17 Wall. 648	35
Ware <i>v.</i> Knowlton, 3 Dall. 199	78
Watson <i>v.</i> Tarpley, 18 How. 517	14
Webster <i>v.</i> Cooper, 14 How. 488	16, 36
Williams <i>v.</i> Bruffy, 96 U. S. 176	91
Williamson <i>v.</i> Berry, 8 How. 495	16
Wilson <i>v.</i> Mason, 1 Cr. 24	12
Wilson <i>v.</i> Perrin, 11 C. C. A. 66	43
Winthrop <i>v.</i> Lechmere	91
Wright <i>v.</i> Nagle, 101 U. S. 791	53

TEXT-WRITERS REFERRED TO.

	PAGE
Austin, John, "Jurisprudence"	63
Battle, Hon. Kemp. P., Address Before the North Carolina Bar	78
Blackstone's Commentaries,	62
Bowyer, "Readings Before the Middle Temple"	63
Cooley, "Principles of Constitutional Law"	20, 23, 48
Cooley, "Federal Limitations"	19
Constitution of the United States	18
Coxe, Brinton, "Judicial Power and Unconstitutional Legislation"	71, 75, 92
Elliot's Debates, Vol. IV	79
Elliot's Debates, Vol. V	69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76
Hamilton, Alexander, "The Federalist"	18, 80
Hare, Hon. J. I. Clark, "American Constitutional Law"	24, 39
Hobbes, cited in "Austin's Jurisprudence"	63
Hornblower, William B., in American Law Review	23
Locke, "Of Parliament"	62
McMurtrie's Observations	79
Merlin's Repertoire	61
Patterson, Prof. C. S., "Federal Restraints"	23
Pepper, Prof. George W., "The Borderland of Federal and State Decisions"	6, 23
Rand, William H., Jr., in Harvard Law Review	23
Reed, Hon. Henry, "The Rule in Gelpcke v. Dubuque," in Harvard Law Review	22
Reno, Conrad, in American Law Review	23
Story, "On the Constitution"	23
Taylor, Hannis, "The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution"	59
Thayer, Prof. J. B., "The Case of Gelpcke v. Dubuque," in Harvard Law Review	22
Vincent, J. M., "State and Federal Government in Switzerland"	62