

Raleigh N.C.

Dec. 20 '69.

Dear Judge:

I am detained here by a little business in the Federal Court & will leave to-day.

I see a statement in "The Sentinel" this morning, which calls for a line from me to you.

I need hardly say that the statement, in so far as it alludes to our conversation, is full of mistakes as to time, place & substance. I do not know who furnished Turner with any name, and I suppose he got it in a general sort of way as a rumor.

On coming to Raleigh, after seeing you on the cars, I found the question of hearing our absorbing everything. I was full of in the legislature, in caucus, on the streets - every where. I really took but little interest in the subject, but I mentioned repeatedly to members, & also to Judge Little & Senator Pool what you had told me, as showing incontrovertibly that the Convention intended, no matter what interpretation the first of the Constitution now bore, to hold over for four years. I stated what you said the journals would show, as supporting your recollections &

J. C. Barringer

Concord

N. C.

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY NY HISTORICAL SOCIETY 20

as a reconciliation of the seeming conflict between
the 27th & 29th sections. I remember of relating
your statement & impressions, among others, to
Old Mr. Gabagan & he concurred entirely in them.
I never spoke of it as a fraud in any sense. I
am sure I never mentioned Col. Heaton's name,
as I do not remember that you in any way referred
to him. I spoke of Col. Sweet, never as knowingly
misrepresenting the affair before the Legislature, but as
simply moving to strike out the original clause in the
Revised Article, on the third reading, whereby the present
section was inserted. This is what I understand you
to say, and I am quite certain you made no dis-
paraging allusion to him at all. Indeed, at the time
we conferred, neither of us could know whether
he had represented the matter in any way before the
Legislature. For our conversation occurred the night
of the first day of the session, & neither of us had
yet been in Raleigh. I explained all this to Col.
Sweet last week & he was entirely satisfied. But he
thinks you have confounded what took place in regard
to the judicial tenure with what occurred concerning
that of the Legislature.



I write this note lest you may not
understand Joe's article. If you deem a full
statement necessary, I will furnish it for your
own disposal. But I do not care to give
any statement about, as I have long ago made up
my mind not to notice anything he may say in his
paper.

Yours dr-
V. L. Barringer.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE,

Raleigh, 1869.