

MR. HARRIS' CARD

Our article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than ourselves. Yet, until the party shall speak, we shall feel constrained to adhere to the old tenets of its ennobled faith, however painful it may be, from a personal standpoint, to disregard Mr. Harris' claims upon us.

SCHOOL EXAMINATION

We attended by invitation of the Teacher, Louis Ford, Esq., the examination of the colored children of the school of this town, on Wednesday, the 27th ult. The examination was held in the school room, and was conducted in a most judicious and thorough manner. The results were as follows:—

ARRIVALS AT MORSE'S HOTEL.—W. B. Turpin, J. H. McDowell, A. F. Randolph, Mrs. A. P. Randolph, Miss Josephine Randolph, Mrs. J. F. Carter, Chas. M. Cyphers, Mrs. C. M. Cyphers, Mrs. P. Herley, Mr. P. Herley, Miss Herley, George Cortas, W. G. Smit, W. H. Dalton, Dr. A. Behnd, J. H. Shannon, Capt. S. G. Cabell, Miss Cabell, C. F. Wermann, Chas. L. Walker, Mrs. C. L. Walker, Miss M. H. Montgomerie, Washington, D. C.; Miss Maggie Osborne, Mrs. F. W. Jones, Mr. F. W. Jones, Georgetown, D. C.; Jno. Moran, Thos. Montgomerie, Jas. A. Repetti, John Simonton, Jno. O'Dwyer, Master Joseph Moran, Master Geo. Montgomerie, Harry V. Clark, Washington, D. C.; E. V. Murphy, Phila. Pa.; N. Dawson, Balto. Md.; J. Gotthoff, C. Baum, H. Hollander, E. Golomauz, R. Goldschmidt, Miss Baum, Mr. Siegel and family, Washington, D. C.

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH.—We are authorized to state that a *lunch* will be given at St. John's church Saturday, the 15th instant, the proceeds of which are to be devoted to the repairs of that edifice. The ladies of St. John's congregation have obtained such an enviable reputation for their dinners and lunches that their proposed entertainment on the 15th is certain to attract a crowd.

LAND SAKE.—Col. Crane, sold as Trustee Poplar Neck, containing 28 acres of land, located in St. Inigo's district, west of the widow's door, on Thursday, the 30th ult., for \$1,450—over \$50 per acre. Purchaser, Joseph B. Sable. This is, we think, the highest price which has been obtained for St. Mary's land since the war.

We are in receipt of a graphic account of the excursion of the Pilot Boy to Piney Point on Saturday last, which we regret not being able to get in type in time for our present issue. It will appear in our next.

(Correspondence of the Beacon)

St. Clement's Bay, Aug. 1, 1874. Messrs. Editors.—On Thursday evening I was persuaded by a couple of friends to take a trip with them to Blakistone's Pavilion, where there was to be a social gathering or house warming. Being late when we arrived we found them already enjoying themselves tripping upon the light fantastic toe. There was a large crowd of the beauty and gallantry of the day and the adjoining counties assembled, with quite a number from the far-famed metropolis of the country. I also saw one beautiful young lady there, from Baltimore, whose lovely face and unaffected manners had made a captive of the heart of one of our worthy young citizens of St. Clement's Bay. May he succeed in his undertaking, and win bright laurels in his course through life, is the humble wish of your correspondent.

"Richard is himself again." He has recovered his usual health and fine flow of spirits. He was there, accompanied by the "ghost" from Washington, and the "fat man" from California, and they seemed to enjoy themselves " hugely." The Doctor is a jovial host, and one who knows how to attend to the wants and comfort of his guests; he is here, there and everywhere, but always in the right place. He has a large and comfortable house, with splendid bathing grounds convenient, and is well calculated to make his guests comfortable and happy. His bar is stocked with the choicest liquors, from champagne to ager, every thing to suit the taste or alleviate the thirst.

At but one o'clock, after gazing with charm'd eyes upon so much beauty and loveliness, we sadly took our departure, and ere the first streak of dawn began to light the eastern horizon we were home in our bed, dreaming of angels, beautiful girls and round daucos.

MALARIAL INFLUENCES.—During the autumnal months the people who reside along the water courses and tributaries of the Chesapeake bay, east or west, are more or less subject to bilious disorders, for which calomel and quinine are the usual remedies—remedies almost as bad as the disease itself. Change of climate is better than nauseating medicine, and often more effective and speedy as a curative. But many persons are unfortunately as to a conscientious and proper place of resort where they would be rid of such influences.—Washington is that place, within an hour's ride of Baltimore, at a cost of only 95 cents! Here, we are one thousand feet above Baltimore, in a pure atmosphere, board cheap, society good, and those summer pests, mosquitoes and malaria, unknown. We have four trains each way daily, two of them mail trains, morning and evening. Let the invalid of lower Maryland come to Westminster, and try the charm of pure air and fresh water, and you will see how they do not need any other and speedy recovery. We like the Eastern Sea Breeze, and especially its publication, for the information of our readers. Those of them who are afflicted with bilious and fevers, or other malarial diseases, will thank the St. Mary's Beacon for its timely advice.

MR. HARRIS' CARD

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than ourselves. Yet, until the party shall speak, we shall feel constrained to adhere to the old tenets of its ennobled faith, however painful it may be, from a personal standpoint, to disregard Mr. Harris' claims upon us.

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

MR. HARRIS' CARD

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than ourselves. Yet, until the party shall speak, we shall feel constrained to adhere to the old tenets of its ennobled faith, however painful it may be, from a personal standpoint, to disregard Mr. Harris' claims upon us.

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

MR. HARRIS' CARD

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than ourselves. Yet, until the party shall speak, we shall feel constrained to adhere to the old tenets of its ennobled faith, however painful it may be, from a personal standpoint, to disregard Mr. Harris' claims upon us.

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

MR. HARRIS' CARD

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than ourselves. Yet, until the party shall speak, we shall feel constrained to adhere to the old tenets of its ennobled faith, however painful it may be, from a personal standpoint, to disregard Mr. Harris' claims upon us.

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

MR. HARRIS' CARD

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than ourselves. Yet, until the party shall speak, we shall feel constrained to adhere to the old tenets of its ennobled faith, however painful it may be, from a personal standpoint, to disregard Mr. Harris' claims upon us.

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

MR. HARRIS' CARD

It is a pleasure to me to see your article of the 23rd ultimo, under the caption of "The Congressional Outlook" has elicited a two column card from the Hon. Benj. G. Harris, in reply to what he conceives to be an "injustice" upon his position; and, in which he complains, that we charge, that the cause he is now pursuing "must lead to damaging results to the democratic party, as it is present constituted and organized." He states that he is not aware "what the democratic party has undergone any important change in its organization and constitution, from that which it was in 1870, and he quotes at considerable length, and with comments, some of the language of our article, and editorial extracts from the Beacon, published prior to the State elections held in 1870, to show our political inconsistency. Having thrown the gauntlet at our feet, we take it up, in the spirit of the Knights of old, either for friendly jest, or mortal combat, but always maintaining for our brethren the kindest feeling of friendship and regard.

We do not abate a jot or tittle of what we said in our article of the 23rd ultimo, now in the position assumed by us in 1870. We had certain "fixed" principles then and we have them now. We confess that we then agreed, to quite a broad extent, with Mr. Harris; and we claimed then, as we now claim, that until the Democratic party had dogmatized upon the issue involved, we were entitled to the expression of our individual opinion. When the party, however, adopted a platform for the government of its members, we felt duty bound to obey its mandates, and to yield our individual opinion to the popular will.

Four years have since elapsed, and we stand where we ever did. We have ever been politically consistent, we think, and it is a source of personal regret to us that Mr. Harris has been less so. It is far from our wish to charge him with the possession of an undue amount of egotism and conceit; but, we think, it can hardly be offensive to him to say that, for several years past, he has stood upon a self-reared pedestal, far too elevated, to be practical; or, at least, too impracticable, to receive the approval of the great mass of the party to which he claims to belong.

Unless we have been misinformed, near four years have elapsed since Mr. Harris has voted for the Presidential nominee of a Democratic Convention, although, at one time, a member thereof, and ever claiming to be a staunch democrat. At the last Congressional election held here, he refused, we learn, to vote for Judge Merrick, simply because Mr. Merrick advocated the election of Mr. Greeley, who had been duly and fairly nominated by the Democratic party. Is this the man to charge us with political inconsistency, or as wanting in faith to democratic principles? His opinions may be more "fixed" than ours, but have they such a basis as to entitle him to party confidence or democratic support? When he next attempts to arraign the St. Mary's Beacon, for political inconsistency, let him rather look to his own political follies and vagaries;—to the living issues of the day—without seeking to awaken the dead issues of the past!

This rejoinder to Mr. Harris is written in no aggressive spirit. It is simply made to his card, in reply to the charges he has made against us. We believe that he would represent us with good and pure intent in Congress, or elsewhere in any position to which his political ambition might lead him. We are not his personal enemy, but his friend.

We should be very glad to drop this controversy here; and, if the Democratic party of the District shall feel it consistent to adopt the views of Mr. Harris, no one will support him more cordially than