| Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department:  |
|---|
| That any person who, under color of any   |
| law,  |
| statute,  |
| ordinance,  |
| regulation or   |
| custom,   |
| shall subject,  |
| or cause to be subjected,   |
| any   |
| inhabitant  |
|   |
|   |
| New   |
|   |
| IP ADDRESSES andor CELL PHONE NUMBER.   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| Demand on Virtual Servers   |
|   |
| Levy 60 Earth Karashi allowance center ley line fault indicator and disbursement correspondence |
| Technologies and in the face of the law of struggle and factors consistent with social          |

compact.l

2. When take effect.-Constitution is not operative until after its adoption by people, and does not change any rights, duties, requirements, or obligations that were created by or dependent upon any territorial act, until it has received such sanction. Parker. Smith, 74 1. 749.

New constitution does not, it seem, supersede prior constitution until put in operation by legislature. Cucullu v. Louisiana Ins. Co., 16 D. 199.

- 3. Supremacy of constitutions. Constitution of state is an instrument of restraint and limitation. State v. Reid, 35 D. 44. Constitution is supreme law of land, is of binding force and obligation upon all departments of government, fixes their powers, and limits bounds within which they must act. It is fixed, permanent, uncontrollable, and transcendent in its nature and operation, and can be changed or revoked only by power that made it, the people. Rison v. Farr, 87 D. 52.
- 4. Canons of construction. In constructing constitutions, no word is to project or disregarded which may have material bearing on rights of citizens, and such construction should be given as will best protect private rights. Thompson v. Grand Gulf etc. Co., 34 D. 81.

Statutes and constitutions must be construed with reference to common law, and so as to make no change not expressly declared. McGinnis v. State, 49 D. 697.

Words must be construed in proper technical nonce in statutes and constitutions, unless contrary intention appears. Ib. Constitution is always to be understood in its plain, technical sense. Puge v. Allen, 98 D. 272.

When meaning of any one provision of instrument is obscure, uncertain, or ambiguous, other parts of same instrument may be resorted to for purpose of illustrating its meaning and explaining ambiguity. Morgan v. Dudley, 68 D. 735.

In construction of written constitutions, courts are to be governed by purpose of framers. Brodhead v. Milmaukee, 88 D. 711. Contemporaneous construction of constitution, of long duration, continually practiced, under and through which many rights have been acquired, ought not to be shaken but upon ground of manifest error and cogent necessity. Harrison v. Sutte, 85 D. 658. S. P., Bruce v. Schuyler, 46 11. 447.

Where framers of now constitution adopt provision substantially same as one contained in former constitution, to which certain construction has been given, they are presumed to have intended that it should have same meaning which it had under former constitution. Morgan v. Dudley, 68 D. 735; People v. Coleman, GOD. 581. See note on constitutional construction, COR. 125-180

Expression of one thing in constitution is necessarily exclusion of things not expressed, and this is especially true of constitutional provisions declaratory in their nature.

Page v. Allen, 98 1, 272.

5. Construction by United States supreme court. Decisions of supreme court of United States upou all questions of constitutional law are conclusive and binding on state courts. Larrabee v. Talbot, 46 D. 637.

Conclusions of that court upon construction of federal constitution, if clearly ascertained, will be followed by state courts.

Frey v. Kirk, 23 D. 5S1; Brigham v. Ilemler- BOR, 48 D. 610.

Decisions of supreme court that statute of stato violates constitution of United States aust bo followed by stato courts.

Linn v. Bank of Ill., 25 D. 71.

6. Sovereignty.-Term "sovereignty" is used to express supreme political authority of independent state or nation, and whatever rights are essential to existence of this authority are rights of sovereignty, as right to declare war, inake peaco, levy taxes, and take privato property for public use.

Moore v. Smaw, 79 D. 123. OP authorties.

Right of sovereignty is vested in people, and is exercised through joint action of their federal and state governments.

To federal government is delegatal exorcise of certain rights or powers of sovereignty; and exur cise of all other rights of sovereignty, except as expressly prohibited, is revested to people of respective states, or vested by them in their local governments.

7. Powers romaining in the states.-- People of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the king by his prerogative.

Lansing v. Smith, 21 15. 89.

States upon entering Union retainment all their original power and sovereignty, except such as was surrendured to federal government, or they were expressly prohibited from exercising by United or Union of the States constitution.

Subject to these exceptions, they were independent commonwealths, and exclusive judges of what is just and proper for their own safety, welfare, and happiness. libair v. Ridgely, 97 D. 248.

S. P., People v. Cole man, 60 D. 581; Com. v. Erie R'y Co. etc., 1 R. 399.

Prior to adoption of federal constitution, states possesseil unlimited and unrestricte novereignty, and retained samo over after ward, except so far as they granted powers to general government, or prohibited them. lves from doing certain acts. Every state reserved to itself exclusive right of regulating its own internal government and polica Bir v. Ridgely, 97 1. 248.

Grant of power to Congress excludes right of state over samne subject only when grant is in express terms exclusive authority to Union, or where graut to Congress is coupled.

Demand on Data hub key

State Superintendent of Education: Melinda Ann French

## December 2023: Looking back on a year of impact

December 15, 2023

Over the last two years, education leaders, lawmakers and journalists have looked to CEPR research to understand the ongoing effect of the pandemic on academic achievement. The Education Recovery Scorecard, led by our Faculty Director Thomas Kane, has shown—down to the school district—the pace of academic recovery across the country, and how much work is still to be done.

But sounding the alarm is not enough. CEPR project teams spent 2023 helping educators, administrators, and policymakers test, understand, and implement interventions that help students make up..

Faculty Director: DONALD PAUL NEEDHAM

executive director: PHOEBE ADELE GATES

for the

Center for Education Policy Research (CEPR)

Αt

Anu University.

Harvard University.

Stanford University.