

THE NEWS FROM ANNAPOLIS.—The startling sensation of the week in Maryland politics is the message of Gov. Hamilton to the Legislature on Reform and Retrenchment of Expenses. It had been expected that His Excellency would have called into consultation with him democratic representatives from other departments of our State Government and obtained the benefits of their counsels before speaking out on these subjects with the emphasis he has. He either did not think of this, or thinking of it, distrusted in advance the advice he expected them to give. Having put the cart before the horse and "gone it alone," he is compelled to do now what he ought to have done in the beginning and has been forced to recognize that there are other persons besides himself which are entitled to be consulted before definite and doubtful lines of State or party policy can be entered upon with impunity. At least, he is now reported to be in consultation with these representatives and we have sufficient interest in the democratic party to wish that it may result harmoniously, and that the scandal of a public quarrel between the Governor and his party friends may be avoided to the confusion of the republicans who, from the beginning of the present session, appear to have worked with an eye single to produce this end.

The St. Mary's contested election case, Mattingly vs. Graves, which has attracted great interest ever since the session of the present Legislature began, was concluded on Wednesday night of last week in favor of the sitting member, Mr. Graves, that is, it was concluded as far as the report of the Committee on Elections could conclude it. Mr. Mattingly was represented by Senator Fisher, of Baltimore, and Mr. Graves by his colleagues, Mr. Holmes, Col. Crane, of this county, and Mr. McCulloch, of Anne Arundel. The Committee report unanimously in favor of Graves. We have no protest to make against this decision, but we wish to remark that it appears to us to be a case of great importance in the make-up of election returns by the Judges is sufficient to invalidate the election of a party who has been returned into a democratic one, and thus defeat the will of the people. As regards the technical defects in the returns in the 1st and 6th districts as charged by Mattingly, they were not such as effected the result of the election—that the states which require the Judges of Election to make out two fair and distinct statements on the poll-books were to be regarded as directory and not mandatory. At the close of Mr. McCulloch's speech, Mr. Fisher spoke about 25 minutes in the interest of Mr. Mattingly. He waived the charge of intimidation, admitting it to be insufficient in itself, but contended that the vote of the 1st and 6th districts should be thrown out because of insufficient returns made by the Judges of Election. He contended that it was the duty of the sitting member to supply testimony to show that an election had been held in those districts. He admitted that Mr. Graves could have done so by producing the ballots, but it was too late now. The Committee adjourned to meet the following morning at 9.30 o'clock. After a short consultation by the Committee, when reassembled, it was decided unanimously to report in favor of Graves.

OUR ANNAPOLIS LETTERS.
ANNAPOLIS, Feb. 14, 1880.

Editorial Beacon.—The legislation this week proved to be more than usually interesting, not so much on account of the passage of any important bills as that of testing the strength of the reform element in the House. The bill entitled revenue and taxes which came up last week, it will be remembered Mr. Bannon submitted an amendment to strike out the words "State Tax Commissioner" and insert the words "Comptroller of the Treasury." It was made the order of the day for Wednesday. Mr. Bannon bravely defended his amendment against Mr. Roberts and Mr. Chapman, who contended that if Mr. Bannon was endeavoring to abolish the State Tax Commissioner's office, it was his duty to deal directly with that office, and not to oppose a measure which had no direct bearing upon the State Tax Commissioner's office. Mr. Bannon replied that he knew what he was about, that he intended to oppose any bill which imposed any duty upon the State Tax Commissioner. A vote was finally reached, which resulted for the amendment 35—against the amendment 41. When the vote was announced, Mr. Bannon thought there might be some mistake, and demanded a recount, which gave the same result. It must be remembered, however, that there were two members who did not vote who were friends to the amendment, which, if marshaled in the fight, will make the vote on such measures 40 to 41. While there are 84 members, it is seldom that more than 81 are present at any one time. After this amended discussion, another section of the bill was read, and Mr. Bannon said he wished to "stick" an amendment to that section. The friends of the bill, fearing another contest, insisted that it should be read. Mr. Bannon was writing his amendment as fast as possible, and Mr. W. C. Hamilton, fearing that the bill would be read before Mr. Bannon succeeded, moved an adjournment. His motion was seconded, but by this time there was such an uproar in the House that the Speaker could not hear the motion to adjourn. The reading was progressing rapidly, but Mr. Hamilton's motion finally succeeded in reaching

the Speaker's ear, and on being put, was carried. Thereby, Mr. Bannon will have one more opportunity to test the reform spirit of the House. The contested election case was argued before the Committee in the Hall of the House on Wednesday night. Mr. S. Thomas McCulloch spoke two hours and ten minutes, which was one of the most forcible arguments I ever had the pleasure of hearing. This speech abounded in reason and common sense. He stood before the Committee as a democrat, but such a one as could defend the rights of a republican against the unjust charges of democrats; that he appeared in the interest of Mr. Graves because he believed his cause was just. He believed him as fairly elected a representative as any that sat in this House. Mr. McCulloch read Mattingly's notice to Graves, and contended that it was defective in not stating the place of taking the testimony. He read the acts bearing upon such notices and made it very clear. So far as the charge of intimidation, he asked Mr. Fisher to mention the name of one witness by whom he could prove intimidation. He said, "I pause for a reply," and not receiving any answer, he continued, "Instead of proving intimidation in the 1st district, Dr. John M. Brown, J. Thomas Brown, and Col. Jos. S. Allston, all gentlemen standing in the front ranks of St. Mary's county, and as to wealth the most affluent in that district, and more than this, all democrats. These gentlemen say upon their oath that the 'election was as fair as any ever held in that district within their experience.'" He next paid his respects to the charge of putting tickets which were cast in the 6th district, and on account of which Mr. Mattingly asked the Committee to throw this district out. He said that they had put a pair of scissors and some tickets in the hands of an ardent supporter of Mr. Mattingly; the Judges of Election discovered 15 trimmed tickets in the ballot-box, and Mr. J. F. Ford states that these 15 trimmed tickets were cast for Mr. Mattingly, and it was for the Committee to say who cast the pudding tickets. That supposing Graves' friends to have voted the 15 or 21 trimmed tickets, then his majority would be 64 throughout the county. It was incumbent on Mr. Mattingly to show that Graves' friends voted said tickets, but he was astonished to see that Mattingly attempted to do no such thing—that he refused Mattingly could unseat Graves, he must show that he received a majority of the legal votes cast—that it was not sufficient to say that he would have received more votes had not his friends been intimidated by Graves. Mr. McCulloch here defined intimidation as it is expressed in McCree's on elections, after which he referred directly to Mr. Graves as fighting, not only his battle, but the battle of his party—that this case was only a test case—that should the Committee throw out the 1st and 6th districts and thereby unseat Graves, it would be immediately followed by writs of quo warranto against all those whose election depended upon the vote of these districts and turn a republican victory into a democratic one, and thus defeat the will of the people. As regards the technical defects in the returns in the 1st and 6th districts as charged by Mattingly, they were not such as effected the result of the election—that the states which require the Judges of Election to make out two fair and distinct statements on the poll-books were to be regarded as directory and not mandatory. At the close of Mr. McCulloch's speech, Mr. Fisher spoke about 25 minutes in the interest of Mr. Mattingly. He waived the charge of intimidation, admitting it to be insufficient in itself, but contended that the vote of the 1st and 6th districts should be thrown out because of insufficient returns made by the Judges of Election. He contended that it was the duty of the sitting member to supply testimony to show that an election had been held in those districts. He admitted that Mr. Graves could have done so by producing the ballots, but it was too late now. The Committee adjourned to meet the following morning at 9.30 o'clock. After a short consultation by the Committee, when reassembled, it was decided unanimously to report in favor of Graves.

SEVERAL.
[COMMUNICATED.]

Messrs. Editors.—Mr. Holmes in his reply to my last article published in the BEACON, asks why I do not show that Messrs. Loker and Mattingly fell from 200 to 300 votes behind Mr. Hamilton, then further state that they received a large number of republican votes in their respective districts, and thus give the people some idea of the number of democratic votes he (Holmes) received, which would be between 400 and 500. I will partially oblige the gentleman by stating that Mr. Loker fell behind Mr. Hamilton 243 votes and Mr. Mattingly 139, total 382. But I will not state that they each received larger numbers of republican votes in their respective districts or endeavor to give the public an idea that Mr. H. received 400 or 500 democratic votes, for I do not believe such to be the fact in the general opinion in this county. For Mr. H.'s estimate to approximate correctness we would have to assume that each man voting for Governor also voted for two candidates for the House of Delegates, or that twice the number of votes were cast for delegates in the aggregate that were cast for Governor which the returns prove not to have been the case. The following is the official vote of the county: Hamilton 1,655, Gary 1,708, Loker 1,418, Mattingly 1,516, Holmes 1,796, Graves 1,691, total 6,325. So that we see the vote of the four candidates for House of Delegates aggregates but 6,325 or 401 votes less than would have been cast for delegates had each man voted a full ticket. Of this number, Messrs. Loker and Mattingly lost between them 382. So that it is plain there was this number (401) who voted for one delegate or a few voting blank or for two delegates and a less number voting for one. It is also evident that this number of missing votes was not cast for any one, though Mr. Holmes seems to credit himself with them or the most of them. Further, judging from the solidity with which the republicans support their candidates, does any sensible man cognizant of the way the vote was cast believe that Mr. H. lost in this county 363 republican votes? This he would have to do in order to get 450 democratic since he ran ahead of the republican State ticket but 88 votes.

I am unable to estimate the number that were driven from him by party ties, but this I know, that for some years back the democrats of this county have not exhibited that fidelity to party nominations as have the republicans; this is evidenced by the frequent success of independent democrats, for office, when there were regular nominees of that party, so that it is not surprising that Mr. Holmes should have received a hundred or two democratic votes, but if the management of our school affairs has been as tyrannical and oppressive as he claims, it is surprising that he should not have received more of such votes than he did.

Mr. H. asks me to inform him when before did the democratic State ticket fall behind the party vote in St. Mary's, at least in a contest for Governor. I suppose the gentleman is conscious of having contributed materially to effect this result, which I presume was brought about mainly by prominent democrats accepting the republican endorsement for office—thus carrying strength over to the republicans, especially for officers not voted for by the State at large.

Mr. H. says that years ago, if he judges correct, when I was assailed by county examiner and my salary reduced, he came to my rescue, etc. I will inform

the gentleman that I am not in his debt for any such service.

"How come you with much regret to the present part of his communication, the language used by him leaving me no other resource but to reply, the record as it is. Mr. H. says he wishes to carry favor with tyrannical and oppressive powers that he, (I) surrender friends and wields his (my) pen against what I am sure in his own conscience he believes to be the wishes and interest of the people of his native county." Upon what evidence does he found this accusation? He addresses none and can produce none. If therefor his inception in his own imagination. Experience demonstrates that those who have no evidence upon which to found his aspersions, is apt to judge others by the standard which he himself has erected as his goddess; but he without sufficient proof will malign his fellow man places himself in the position of one who must either substantiate his charges, retract, or be regarded by the public as a slanderer and calumniator. As applied to the present case, the charges are unfounded. I have no favor to bestow with the powers that be and have not been induced to that necessity to defend my name in defense of what I believe to be right and for the best interest of my native county, unswayed by Mr. Holmes or his friends, and I have to surrender friends in so doing it is but another proof of the sincerity of my convictions. I consider I have adduced ample reasons in vindication of the position I have taken; let Mr. H. address himself to a re-statement of his personalities and reflections avail nothing in the argument.

I have little to say in reply to X. Y. Z., the main points in his letter being included in my reply to Mr. H. I will accept his wager of two "beers" if he will let the ascertainment of the vote apply to the whole county. In that case I will wager him that Mr. H.'s name does not appear on as many as 250 Hamilton tickets, as voted for, in the entire county.

RESPECTFULLY,
PROGRESS.

LOCAL DOTTINGS.
Patent Steamers.

The Spring Arrangements of the Patuxent Line of Steamers can be read in our advertising columns to-day. It makes provision for the comfort of the Passenger and Week-end at Saturday, the 21st instant, for the days of which and the hours for starting, we refer the reader to the advertisement itself.

Read Mann's Advertisement.
Read Mann's advertisement in our present issue. Mr. E. Galati, formerly of our Town, and well and favorably known in this county, is now engaged as an employe of Mann's and has recently paid us a visit. He was canvassing in behalf of this establishment and we have been pleased to learn that with very generous encouragement from his old friends and acquaintances.

Fun for the Easter Holidays.
We shall continue to press the question of Pinafore, for the Easter Holidays, for the benefit of the St. Mary's R. R. and Debating Society, and we think there is a probability of its repetition.

Another project is on hand, to have an Ugly Man's Ball here during mid holidays. A delegation of ten will be selected from each district as a representation. We have a goodly number in our mind's eye, but we will have only a voice in the selection of the delegates from this district. Further particulars will be given, provided the plan is consummated.

Commissioner's Court.
This body assembled on Tuesday last, present Ayer, Parsons, Lawrence, Loker and Jones. J. Parra Crane appeared and made application to have Wm. J. Wathen appointed County Surveyor, Mr. Wathen having failed to qualify within the time prescribed. The Court appointed him. The account of Mr. Hope's resignation of the county for \$76.50 was passed, as were also the accounts of Rhodes Sheppard for mowing (\$30.48), Henry Carberry for work on jail (\$2), stationery account of J. T. Newton Kirtz (\$2.40) and road report of J. B. T. Rowland and B. Dawson. The account of John L. Foxwell was taken up, and it was thought best, owing to irregularities, to again defer action upon it. The Clerk was ordered to have the ceiling of the Court room repaired. The Board, after attending to some minor matters, adjourned to meet the 2nd Tuesday of March.

COMMUNICATED.
LEONARDTOWN, Feb. 13, 1880.

Messrs. Editors.—Now that the people in the front part of the meeting had their say about the excellent acting of some of the characters in "Pinafore," we, in the back part of the meeting, will enquire, why it was that one of the best characters was not mentioned, viz., "Dick Deadey"? His part was acted to perfection and was decidedly one of the best rendered in the whole play.

I do not wish to detract one iota from any one but will say, that your elaborate description of the act in the Durland Opera was good and corrected the main. With the exception of not doing justice to the character of Dick Deadey. Also poor Dick! He did not have a pretty part and was very plain," hence the omission of mention of his well-acted part. You will agree with me, Messrs. Editors, that it is difficult for a smart, sensible man to play simpleton.

With practice and study, Dick Deadey's name might be inserted in a book of theatrical celebrities that set below John Owens and Joe Jefferson. Were Barney Williams living he might look to his laurels!

A word of pity, a long drawn sigh, O'er my misfortune of Dick Deadey! Three cheers! We'll raise the pennant high, And sing the praises of Dick Deadey!

A little more and I'll refrain—
A word in favor of the young boatwain;
We'll send the news by Atlantic Cable,
Of the splendid mimicry of young Ben Abel.

[We are very glad to have the opportunity of correcting a mistake or oversight in our description of Pinafore. The description in question was written hurriedly, and in our attempt not to individualize, we omitted the names of Dick Deadey and Boatwain. We think, however, that a careful perusal of the piece will show that this omission was not out of malice. We take pleasure in making this explanation.—Ed.]

To those who are so unfortunate as to become prematurely gray, or whose hair exhibits a tendency to fall off, we recommend a trial of Hall's Hair Restorer. We do so with the utmost confidence because it is everywhere recognized with marked favor, and has built upon its own merits such a sure foundation that it is known and used in all civilized countries.—Edison (N. Y.) Advertiser.

THE SPEAKER'S EAR, and on being put, was carried. Thereby, Mr. Bannon will have one more opportunity to test the reform spirit of the House. The contested election case was argued before the Committee in the Hall of the House on Wednesday night. Mr. S. Thomas McCulloch spoke two hours and ten minutes, which was one of the most forcible arguments I ever had the pleasure of hearing. This speech abounded in reason and common sense. He stood before the Committee as a democrat, but such a one as could defend the rights of a republican against the unjust charges of democrats; that he appeared in the interest of Mr. Graves because he believed his cause was just. He believed him as fairly elected a representative as any that sat in this House. Mr. McCulloch read Mattingly's notice to Graves, and contended that it was defective in not stating the place of taking the testimony. He read the acts bearing upon such notices and made it very clear. So far as the charge of intimidation, he asked Mr. Fisher to mention the name of one witness by whom he could prove intimidation. He said, "I pause for a reply," and not receiving any answer, he continued, "Instead of proving intimidation in the 1st district, Dr. John M. Brown, J. Thomas Brown, and Col. Jos. S. Allston, all gentlemen standing in the front ranks of St. Mary's county, and as to wealth the most affluent in that district, and more than this, all democrats. These gentlemen say upon their oath that the 'election was as fair as any ever held in that district within their experience.'" He next paid his respects to the charge of putting tickets which were cast in the 6th district, and on account of which Mr. Mattingly asked the Committee to throw this district out. He said that they had put a pair of scissors and some tickets in the hands of an ardent supporter of Mr. Mattingly; the Judges of Election discovered 15 trimmed tickets in the ballot-box, and Mr. J. F. Ford states that these 15 trimmed tickets were cast for Mr. Mattingly, and it was for the Committee to say who cast the pudding tickets. That supposing Graves' friends to have voted the 15 or 21 trimmed tickets, then his majority would be 64 throughout the county. It was incumbent on Mr. Mattingly to show that Graves' friends voted said tickets, but he was astonished to see that Mattingly attempted to do no such thing—that he refused Mattingly could unseat Graves, he must show that he received a majority of the legal votes cast—that it was not sufficient to say that he would have received more votes had not his friends been intimidated by Graves. Mr. McCulloch here defined intimidation as it is expressed in McCree's on elections, after which he referred directly to Mr. Graves as fighting, not only his battle, but the battle of his party—that this case was only a test case—that should the Committee throw out the 1st and 6th districts and thereby unseat Graves, it would be immediately followed by writs of quo warranto against all those whose election depended upon the vote of these districts and turn a republican victory into a democratic one, and thus defeat the will of the people. As regards the technical defects in the returns in the 1st and 6th districts as charged by Mattingly, they were not such as effected the result of the election—that the states which require the Judges of Election to make out two fair and distinct statements on the poll-books were to be regarded as directory and not mandatory. At the close of Mr. McCulloch's speech, Mr. Fisher spoke about 25 minutes in the interest of Mr. Mattingly. He waived the charge of intimidation, admitting it to be insufficient in itself, but contended that the vote of the 1st and 6th districts should be thrown out because of insufficient returns made by the Judges of Election. He contended that it was the duty of the sitting member to supply testimony to show that an election had been held in those districts. He admitted that Mr. Graves could have done so by producing the ballots, but it was too late now. The Committee adjourned to meet the following morning at 9.30 o'clock. After a short consultation by the Committee, when reassembled, it was decided unanimously to report in favor of Graves.

SEVERAL.
[COMMUNICATED.]

Messrs. Editors.—Mr. Holmes in his reply to my last article published in the BEACON, asks why I do not show that Messrs. Loker and Mattingly fell from 200 to 300 votes behind Mr. Hamilton, then further state that they received a large number of republican votes in their respective districts, and thus give the people some idea of the number of democratic votes he (Holmes) received, which would be between 400 and 500. I will partially oblige the gentleman by stating that Mr. Loker fell behind Mr. Hamilton 243 votes and Mr. Mattingly 139, total 382. But I will not state that they each received larger numbers of republican votes in their respective districts or endeavor to give the public an idea that Mr. H. received 400 or 500 democratic votes, for I do not believe such to be the fact in the general opinion in this county. For Mr. H.'s estimate to approximate correctness we would have to assume that each man voting for Governor also voted for two candidates for the House of Delegates, or that twice the number of votes were cast for delegates in the aggregate that were cast for Governor which the returns prove not to have been the case. The following is the official vote of the county: Hamilton 1,655, Gary 1,708, Loker 1,418, Mattingly 1,516, Holmes 1,796, Graves 1,691, total 6,325. So that we see the vote of the four candidates for House of Delegates aggregates but 6,325 or 401 votes less than would have been cast for delegates had each man voted a full ticket. Of this number, Messrs. Loker and Mattingly lost between them 382. So that it is plain there was this number (401) who voted for one delegate or a few voting blank or for two delegates and a less number voting for one. It is also evident that this number of missing votes was not cast for any one, though Mr. Holmes seems to credit himself with them or the most of them. Further, judging from the solidity with which the republicans support their candidates, does any sensible man cognizant of the way the vote was cast believe that Mr. H. lost in this county 363 republican votes? This he would have to do in order to get 450 democratic since he ran ahead of the republican State ticket but 88 votes.

I am unable to estimate the number that were driven from him by party ties, but this I know, that for some years back the democrats of this county have not exhibited that fidelity to party nominations as have the republicans; this is evidenced by the frequent success of independent democrats, for office, when there were regular nominees of that party, so that it is not surprising that Mr. Holmes should have received a hundred or two democratic votes, but if the management of our school affairs has been as tyrannical and oppressive as he claims, it is surprising that he should not have received more of such votes than he did.

Mr. H. asks me to inform him when before did the democratic State ticket fall behind the party vote in St. Mary's, at least in a contest for Governor. I suppose the gentleman is conscious of having contributed materially to effect this result, which I presume was brought about mainly by prominent democrats accepting the republican endorsement for office—thus carrying strength over to the republicans, especially for officers not voted for by the State at large.

Mr. H. says that years ago, if he judges correct, when I was assailed by county examiner and my salary reduced, he came to my rescue, etc. I will inform

the gentleman that I am not in his debt for any such service.

"How come you with much regret to the present part of his communication, the language used by him leaving me no other resource but to reply, the record as it is. Mr. H. says he wishes to carry favor with tyrannical and oppressive powers that he, (I) surrender friends and wields his (my) pen against what I am sure in his own conscience he believes to be the wishes and interest of the people of his native county." Upon what evidence does he found this accusation? He addresses none and can produce none. If therefor his inception in his own imagination. Experience demonstrates that those who have no evidence upon which to found his aspersions, is apt to judge others by the standard which he himself has erected as his goddess; but he without sufficient proof will malign his fellow man places himself in the position of one who must either substantiate his charges, retract, or be regarded by the public as a slanderer and calumniator. As applied to the present case, the charges are unfounded. I have no favor to bestow with the powers that be and have not been induced to that necessity to defend my name in defense of what I believe to be right and for the best interest of my native county, unswayed by Mr. Holmes or his friends, and I have to surrender friends in so doing it is but another proof of the sincerity of my convictions. I consider I have adduced ample reasons in vindication of the position I have taken; let Mr. H. address himself to a re-statement of his personalities and reflections avail nothing in the argument.

I have little to say in reply to X. Y. Z., the main points in his letter being included in my reply to Mr. H. I will accept his wager of two "beers" if he will let the ascertainment of the vote apply to the whole county. In that case I will wager him that Mr. H.'s name does not appear on as many as 250 Hamilton tickets, as voted for, in the entire county.

RESPECTFULLY,
PROGRESS.

LOCAL DOTTINGS.
Patent Steamers.

The Spring Arrangements of the Patuxent Line of Steamers can be read in our advertising columns to-day. It makes provision for the comfort of the Passenger and Week-end at Saturday, the 21st instant, for the days of which and the hours for starting, we refer the reader to the advertisement itself.

Read Mann's Advertisement.
Read Mann's advertisement in our present issue. Mr. E. Galati, formerly of our Town, and well and favorably known in this county, is now engaged as an employe of Mann's and has recently paid us a visit. He was canvassing in behalf of this establishment and we have been pleased to learn that with very generous encouragement from his old friends and acquaintances.

Fun for the Easter Holidays.
We shall continue to press the question of Pinafore, for the Easter Holidays, for the benefit of the St. Mary's R. R. and Debating Society, and we think there is a probability of its repetition.

Another project is on hand, to have an Ugly Man's Ball here during mid holidays. A delegation of ten will be selected from each district as a representation. We have a goodly number in our mind's eye, but we will have only a voice in the selection of the delegates from this district. Further particulars will be given, provided the plan is consummated.

Commissioner's Court.
This body assembled on Tuesday last, present Ayer, Parsons, Lawrence, Loker and Jones. J. Parra Crane appeared and made application to have Wm. J. Wathen appointed County Surveyor, Mr. Wathen having failed to qualify within the time prescribed. The Court appointed him. The account of Mr. Hope's resignation of the county for \$76.50 was passed, as were also the accounts of Rhodes Sheppard for mowing (\$30.48), Henry Carberry for work on jail (\$2), stationery account of J. T. Newton Kirtz (\$2.40) and road report of J. B. T. Rowland and B. Dawson. The account of John L. Foxwell was taken up, and it was thought best, owing to irregularities, to again defer action upon it. The Clerk was ordered to have the ceiling of the Court room repaired. The Board, after attending to some minor matters, adjourned to meet the 2nd Tuesday of March.

COMMUNICATED.
LEONARDTOWN, Feb. 13, 1880.

Messrs. Editors.—Now that the people in the front part of the meeting had their say about the excellent acting of some of the characters in "Pinafore," we, in the back part of the meeting, will enquire, why it was that one of the best characters was not mentioned, viz., "Dick Deadey"? His part was acted to perfection and was decidedly one of the best rendered in the whole play.

I do not wish to detract one iota from any one but will say, that your elaborate description of the act in the Durland Opera was good and corrected the main. With the exception of not doing justice to the character of Dick Deadey. Also poor Dick! He did not have a pretty part and was very plain," hence the omission of mention of his well-acted part. You will agree with me, Messrs. Editors, that it is difficult for a smart, sensible man to play simpleton.

With practice and study, Dick Deadey's name might be inserted in a book of theatrical celebrities that set below John Owens and Joe Jefferson. Were Barney Williams living he might look to his laurels!

A word of pity, a long drawn sigh, O'er my misfortune of Dick Deadey! Three cheers! We'll raise the pennant high, And sing the praises of Dick Deadey!

A little more and I'll refrain—
A word in favor of the young boatwain;
We'll send the news by Atlantic Cable,
Of the splendid mimicry of young Ben Abel.

[We are very glad to have the opportunity of correcting a mistake or oversight in our description of Pinafore. The description in question was written hurriedly, and in our attempt not to individualize, we omitted the names of Dick Deadey and Boatwain. We think, however, that a careful perusal of the piece will show that this omission was not out of malice. We take pleasure in making this explanation.—Ed.]

To those who are so unfortunate as to become prematurely gray, or whose hair exhibits a tendency to fall off, we recommend a trial of Hall's Hair Restorer. We do so with the utmost confidence because it is everywhere recognized with marked favor, and has built upon its own merits such a sure foundation that it is known and used in all civilized countries.—Edison (N. Y.) Advertiser.

THE SPEAKER'S EAR, and on being put, was carried. Thereby, Mr. Bannon will have one more opportunity to test the reform spirit of the House. The contested election case was argued before the Committee in the Hall of the House on Wednesday night. Mr. S. Thomas McCulloch spoke two hours and ten minutes, which was one of the most forcible arguments I ever had the pleasure of hearing. This speech abounded in reason and common sense. He stood before the Committee as a democrat, but such a one as could defend the rights of a republican against the unjust charges of democrats; that he appeared in the interest of Mr. Graves because he believed his cause was just. He believed him as fairly elected a representative as any that sat in this House. Mr. McCulloch read Mattingly's notice to Graves, and contended that it was defective in not stating the place of taking the testimony. He read the acts bearing upon such notices and made it very clear. So far as the charge of intimidation, he asked Mr. Fisher to mention the name of one witness by whom he could prove intimidation. He said, "I pause for a reply," and not receiving any answer, he continued, "Instead of proving intimidation in the 1st district, Dr. John M. Brown, J. Thomas Brown, and Col. Jos. S. Allston, all gentlemen standing in the front ranks of St. Mary's county, and as to wealth the most affluent in that district, and more than this, all democrats. These gentlemen say upon their oath that the 'election was as fair as any ever held in that district within their experience.'" He next paid his respects to the charge of putting tickets which were cast in the 6th district, and on account of which Mr. Mattingly asked the Committee to throw this district out. He said that they had put a pair of scissors and some tickets in the hands of an ardent supporter of Mr. Mattingly; the Judges of Election discovered 15 trimmed tickets in the ballot-box, and Mr. J. F. Ford states that these 15 trimmed tickets were cast for Mr. Mattingly, and it was for the Committee to say who cast the pudding tickets. That supposing Graves' friends to have voted the 15 or 21 trimmed tickets, then his majority would be 64 throughout the county. It was incumbent on Mr. Mattingly to show that Graves' friends voted said tickets, but he was astonished to see that Mattingly attempted to do no such thing—that he refused Mattingly could unseat Graves, he must show that he received a majority of the legal votes cast—that it was not sufficient to say that he would have received more votes had not his friends been intimidated by Graves. Mr. McCulloch here defined intimidation as it is expressed in McCree's on elections, after which he referred directly to Mr. Graves as fighting, not only his battle, but the battle of his party—that this case was only a test case—that should the Committee throw out the 1st and 6th districts and thereby unseat Graves, it would be immediately followed by writs of quo warranto against all those whose election depended upon the vote of these districts and turn a republican victory into a democratic one, and thus defeat the will of the people. As regards the technical defects in the returns in the 1st and 6th districts as charged by Mattingly, they were not such as effected the result of the election—that the states which require the Judges of Election to make out two fair and distinct statements on the poll-books were to be regarded as directory and not mandatory. At the close of Mr. McCulloch's speech, Mr. Fisher spoke about 25 minutes in the interest of Mr. Mattingly. He waived the charge of intimidation, admitting it to be insufficient in itself, but contended that the vote of the 1st and 6th districts should be thrown out because of insufficient returns made by the Judges of Election. He contended that it was the duty of the sitting member to supply testimony to show that an election had been held in those districts. He admitted that Mr. Graves could have done so by producing the ballots, but it was too late now. The Committee adjourned to meet the following morning at 9.30 o'clock. After a short consultation by the Committee, when reassembled, it was decided unanimously to report in favor of Graves.

SEVERAL.
[COMMUNICATED.]

Messrs. Editors.—Mr. Holmes in his reply to my last article published in the BEACON, asks why I do not show that Messrs. Loker and Mattingly fell from 200 to 300 votes behind Mr. Hamilton, then further state that they received a large number of republican votes in their respective districts, and thus give the people some idea of the number of democratic votes he (Holmes) received, which would be between 400 and 500. I will partially oblige the gentleman by stating that Mr. Loker fell behind Mr. Hamilton 243 votes and Mr. Mattingly 139, total 382. But I will not state that they each received larger numbers of republican votes in their respective districts or endeavor to give the public an idea that Mr. H. received 400 or 500 democratic votes, for I do not believe such to be the fact in the general opinion in this county. For Mr. H.'s estimate to approximate correctness we would have to assume that each man voting for Governor also voted for two candidates for the House of Delegates, or that twice the number of votes were cast for delegates in the aggregate that were cast for Governor which the returns prove not to have been the case. The following is the official vote of the county: Hamilton 1,655, Gary 1,708, Loker 1,418, Mattingly 1,516, Holmes 1,796, Graves 1,691, total 6,325. So that we see the vote of the four candidates for House of Delegates aggregates but 6,325 or 401 votes less than would have been cast for delegates had each man voted a full ticket. Of this number, Messrs. Loker and Mattingly lost between them 382. So that it is plain there was this number (401) who voted for one delegate or a few voting blank or for two delegates and a less number voting for one. It is also evident that this number of missing votes was not cast for any one, though Mr. Holmes seems to credit himself with them or the most of them. Further, judging from the solidity with which the republicans support their candidates, does any sensible man cognizant of the way the vote was cast believe that Mr. H. lost in this county 363 republican votes? This he would have to do in order to get 450 democratic since he ran ahead of the republican State ticket but 88 votes.

I am unable to estimate the number that were driven from him by party ties, but this I know, that for some years back the democrats of this county have not exhibited that fidelity to party nominations as have the republicans; this is evidenced by the frequent success of independent democrats, for office, when there were regular nominees of that party, so that it is not surprising that Mr. Holmes should have received a hundred or two democratic votes, but if the management of our school affairs has been as tyrannical and oppressive as he claims, it is surprising that he should not have received more of such votes than he did.

Mr. H. asks me to inform him when before did the democratic State ticket fall behind the party vote in St. Mary's, at least in a contest for Governor. I suppose the gentleman is conscious of having contributed materially to effect this result, which I presume was brought about mainly by prominent democrats accepting the republican endorsement for office—thus carrying strength over to the republicans, especially for officers not voted for by the State at large.

Mr. H. says that years ago, if he judges correct, when I was assailed by county examiner and my salary reduced, he came to my rescue, etc. I will inform

the gentleman that I am not in his debt for any such service.

"How come you with much regret to the present part of his communication, the language used by him leaving me no other resource but to reply, the record as it is. Mr. H. says he wishes to carry favor with tyrannical and oppressive powers that he, (I) surrender friends and wields his (my) pen against what I am sure in his own conscience he believes to be the wishes and interest of the people of his native county." Upon what evidence does he found this accusation? He addresses none and can produce none. If therefor his inception in his own imagination. Experience demonstrates that those who have no evidence upon which to found his aspersions, is apt to judge others by the standard which he himself has erected as his goddess; but he without sufficient proof will malign his fellow man places himself in the position of one who must either substantiate his charges, retract, or be regarded by the public as a slanderer and calumniator. As applied to the present case, the charges are unfounded. I have no favor to bestow with the powers that be and have not been induced to that necessity to defend my name in defense of what I believe to be right and for the best interest of my native county, unswayed by Mr. Holmes or his friends, and I have to surrender friends in so doing it is but another proof of the sincerity of my convictions. I consider I have adduced ample reasons in vindication of the position I have taken; let Mr. H. address himself to a re-statement of his personalities and reflections avail nothing in the argument.

I have little to say in reply to X. Y. Z., the main points in his letter being included in my reply to Mr. H. I will accept his wager of two "beers" if he will let the ascertainment of the vote apply to the whole county. In that case I will wager him that Mr. H.'s name does not appear on as many as 250 Hamilton tickets, as voted for, in the entire county.

RESPECTFULLY,
PROGRESS.

LOCAL DOTTINGS.
Patent Steamers.

The Spring Arrangements of the Patuxent Line of Steamers can be read in our advertising columns to-day. It makes provision for the comfort of the Passenger and Week-end at Saturday, the 21st instant, for the days of which and the hours for starting, we refer the reader to the advertisement itself.

Read Mann's Advertisement.
Read Mann's advertisement in our present issue. Mr. E. Galati, formerly of our Town, and well and favorably known in this county, is now engaged as an employe of Mann's and has recently paid us a visit. He was canvassing in behalf of this establishment and we have been pleased to learn that with very generous encouragement from his old friends and acquaintances.

Fun for the Easter Holidays.
We shall continue to press the question of Pinafore, for the Easter Holidays, for the benefit of the St. Mary's R. R. and Debating Society, and we think there is a probability of its repetition.

Another project is on hand, to have an Ugly Man's Ball here during mid holidays. A delegation of ten will be selected from each district as a representation. We have a goodly number in our mind's eye, but we will have only a voice in the selection of the delegates from this district. Further particulars will be given, provided the plan is consummated.

Commissioner's Court.
This body assembled on Tuesday last, present Ayer, Parsons, Lawrence, Loker and Jones. J. Parra Crane appeared and made application to have Wm. J. Wathen appointed County Surveyor, Mr. Wathen having failed to qualify within the time prescribed. The Court appointed him. The account of Mr. Hope's resignation of the county for \$76.50 was passed, as were also the accounts of Rhodes Sheppard for mowing (\$30.48), Henry Carberry for work on jail (\$2), stationery account of J. T. Newton Kirtz (\$2.40) and road report of J. B. T. Rowland and B. Dawson. The account of John L. Foxwell was taken up, and it was thought best, owing to irregularities, to again defer action upon it. The Clerk was ordered to have the ceiling of the Court room repaired. The Board, after attending to some minor matters, adjourned to meet the 2nd Tuesday of March.

COMMUNICATED.
LEONARDTOWN, Feb. 13, 1880.

Messrs. Editors.—Now that the people in the front part of the meeting had their say about the excellent acting of some of the characters in "Pinafore," we, in the back part of the meeting, will enquire, why it was that one of the best characters was not mentioned, viz., "Dick Deadey"? His part was acted to perfection and was decidedly one of the best rendered in the whole play.

I do not wish to detract one iota from any one but will say, that your elaborate description of the act in the Durland Opera was good and corrected the main. With the exception of not doing justice to the character of Dick Deadey. Also poor Dick! He did not have a pretty part and was very plain," hence the omission of mention of his well-acted part. You will agree with me, Messrs. Editors, that it is difficult for a smart, sensible man to play simpleton.

With practice and study, Dick Deadey's name might be inserted in a book of theatrical celebrities that set below John Owens and Joe Jefferson. Were Barney Williams living he might look to his laurels!

A word of pity, a long drawn sigh, O'er my misfortune of Dick Deadey! Three cheers! We'll raise the pennant high, And sing the praises of Dick Deadey!

A little more and I'll refrain—
A word in favor of the young boatwain;
We'll send the news by Atlantic Cable,
Of the splendid mimicry of young Ben Abel.

[We are very glad to have the opportunity of correcting a mistake or oversight in our description of Pinafore. The description in question was written hurriedly, and in our attempt not to individualize, we omitted the names of Dick Deadey and Boatwain. We think, however, that a careful perusal of the piece will show that this omission was not out of malice. We take pleasure in making this explanation.—Ed.]

To those who are so unfortunate as to become prematurely gray, or whose hair exhibits a tendency to fall off, we recommend a trial of Hall's Hair Restorer. We do so with the utmost confidence because it is everywhere recognized with marked favor, and has built upon its own merits such a sure foundation that it is known and used in all civilized countries.—Edison (N. Y.) Advertiser.

THE SPEAKER'S EAR, and on being put, was carried. Thereby, Mr. Bannon will have one more opportunity to test the reform spirit of the House. The contested election case was argued before the Committee in the Hall of the House on Wednesday night. Mr. S. Thomas McCulloch spoke two hours and ten minutes, which was one of the most forcible arguments I ever had the pleasure of hearing. This speech abounded in reason and common sense. He stood before the Committee as a democrat, but such a one as could defend the rights of a republican against the unjust charges of democrats; that he appeared in the interest of Mr. Graves because he believed his cause was just. He believed him as fairly elected a representative as any that sat in this House. Mr. McCulloch read Mattingly's notice to Graves, and contended that it was defective in not stating the place of taking the testimony. He read the acts bearing upon such notices and made it very clear. So far as the charge of intimidation, he asked Mr. Fisher to mention the name of one witness by whom he could prove intimidation. He said, "I pause for a reply," and not receiving any answer, he continued, "Instead of proving intimidation in the 1st district, Dr. John M. Brown, J. Thomas Brown, and Col. Jos. S. Allston, all gentlemen standing in the front ranks of St. Mary's county, and as to wealth the most affluent in that district, and more than this, all democrats. These gentlemen say upon their oath that the 'election was as fair as any ever held in that district within their experience.'" He next paid his respects to the charge of putting tickets which were cast in the 6th district, and on account of which Mr. Mattingly asked the Committee to throw this district out. He said that they had put a pair of scissors and some tickets in the hands of an ardent supporter of Mr. Mattingly; the Judges of Election discovered 15 trimmed tickets in the ballot-box, and Mr. J. F. Ford states that these 15 trimmed tickets were cast for Mr. Mattingly, and it was for the Committee to say who cast the pudding tickets. That supposing Graves' friends to have voted the 15 or 21 trimmed tickets, then his majority would