

New Orleans Republican

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS NEW ORLEANS, APRIL 23, 1876.

The circus is always round. Whatever is, is apt to be wrong. It was Virgil who cut up Dido. It was a fine day at court yesterday. There will be house cleaning in heaven. There is no more borrowing money when it is no longer Lent. The Irish rifle team will come to this country in August. The tailors of Memphis will set up a bust of Andrew Johnson. The man who wrote the poem "My Soul and I" should shut his eyes. The only thing railroad managers can agree on is to keep up the fares: The Democratic papers are doing the nominating for the Republican party. The city council of Galveston does not want Baxton Bragg for city engineer. New York will get the profit and Philadelphia will get the centennial glory. There is now nothing but good sense to prevent persons from going to the Black Hills. Inquirer is informed that the mattresses used at the South Pass are not for the river bed. A man can get married before a court, but courting is too nice to be disposed with. The New Orleans Democrat promises an evening edition this afternoon, and thereafter daily. A man who subscribes for a religious newspaper should pay for it before being called a Christian. Ajax defied the lightning; but no man has ever been able to get ahead of the lightning rod peddler. The Knights of Temperance are well organized and flourishing. They follow the nights of drunkenness. Since silver change came into use, a Dutchman complains that for five cents he gets nickels about half the dime. Queen was a bella of Spain propose to preside at an ecumenical adjustment between the Pope and her son Alfonso. A remarkable fact connected with Don Pedro's visit is that he pays his own bills, and consequently is welcome everywhere. Every man imagines he can whitewash a ceiling until he has filled his eyes with whitewash and stumbled over the bucket. Northern people are so in the habit of grumbling that some of them have declared the ice crop was ruined by the cold weather. A good or bad sap season never affects the supply of maple sugar. Art does more for that grade of sugar than does the maple tree. Lieutenant General Saigo is chief of the Japanese commission to the centennial exposition. Saigo should be pudding business when he arrives. A ladies' fair, for the benefit of St. Anthony's Italian Church, will commence at Grunewald Hall on Wednesday evening and continue five days. A. T. Stewart never would have a sign on his store. He thought everybody ought to know where his place of business was. Besides, signs cost money. Bates, reading about Much 'n' Faahs, is under the impression that he is from North Carolina, for the same reason that they has the meeet tar he knows of. A Pennsylvania editor, in an appeal to his patrons, says: "The editor wants grain, pork, tallow, candles, whisky, linen, beeswax, wool, and anything else he can eat." The San Antonio Herald objects to the closing of saloons at night. It is said so long as the saloons are open citizens know exactly where to look for a policeman when he is needed. A grumbling car driver said to a passenger: "You always want me to stop when you get off." "No, sir," said the passenger, who had no jumping notions, "I don't care what you do. I only want the car to stop. You can go on." Gentlemen and peasant esters who spend their evenings on the steps around Clay state should go early in order to secure good seats. Some good deacon might pass a contribution box around there every ten minutes in order to disburse the crowd. A man without a wife is of no account as a foreign missionary. Dr. Gulick, who had been much praised for work done at a foreign station, has frankly confessed that his wife learned the language first, and held meetings while he held the baby. Men get good funeral sermons under false pretenses when it is intimated that their wills will show liberal bequests for churches. The will should always be read before the funeral, that the mourners may know and realize the extent of their losses. The only man able to beat the postage law is the Detroit garden seed dealer who saves \$3170 a year by mailing his stuff over the river in Canada, and getting advantage of foreign rates; but then everybody can not afford to go abroad for the purpose of making money at home. If you desire to see a living picture of disgust and suppressed anger, observe closely the face of a street car driver when you hand him a five dollar bill to change.—Dulcinea. All right. Send us the five dollar bill and we will try it on one of the drivers of the Canal street line. The experienced bean is now shrewd enough to wear a linen duster when he goes to dance where the ladies powder their hair, as at centennial balls; he can then walk all night with a partner's head on his shoulder and not spoil his broadcloth coat, which garment can be worn under his duster or left at home.

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. The leasest appropriation. They are told that if the Democratic House votes a bill to appropriate \$1,000,000 for the levee, the party can not carry the North next fall, and even Mr. Holman would scarcely be re-elected to Congress. Of course they can not resist such weighty reasons, and the party work of "intending" has been against the President, his Cabinet and all eminent Republicans goes on at the expense of the treasury, while the "unscrupulous" Mississippi rolls down his angry flood forty miles wide! If the people in the overflowed districts of Louisiana, Mississippi and Arkansas are so bound to an old name that they are willing to risk their lives and property in such a manner, they hardly deserve sympathy. No doubt if Holman or Kerr were a candidate for President, they would take a boat or wade from their submerged plantations to higher ground, where they could vote for him to beat any Republican, even though a supporter of Mr. Gibson's levee bill. And the Democratic papers will raise their voices in singing hosannas to the success of the enemies of this section, as they did when Kerr, Holman, Cox and Wood were elected—the precious quartette who stand between the people of this State and assistance at this moment. Such is modern Democracy.

A NEW HAND WITH AN OLD STORY. According to the St. Louis Times, as reported by telegraph, Sergeant George Prender, of the signal service has just returned to mind a little story which he thinks entitles him to have his expenses paid to Washington, with the prospect of a month's pay after he reaches the capital. He will, if he is ever called before a committee, relate a marvelous discovery which he made more than seven years ago, and which he tried to impart to Treasurer Spigner, Senator Edmunds, Secretary Boutwell and perhaps a few other well known gentlemen. It may not strike either the Times or Sergeant Prender himself as at all singular, though it may seem so to others, that he made no attempt to spring his wonderful story upon the country until after he ceased to be a treasury clerk. The Times overlooked this and several other facts when it admitted the Sergeant's statement to its columns, and the latter having already received his summons from the House Committee on Expenditures of the Treasury Department was not particular, possibly, as to the light in which he would be regarded, as he had already achieved the first step in the direction of success. In point of antiquity, Prender lays over all the informers that have yet been thrown up in the investigating mania which has ripened into a universal upheaval. He carries us back to the "good old days" when Andy Johnson was President, Hugh McCulloch Secretary of the Treasury, and himself debt statement clerk. As there is nothing in it implicating any member of the Republican party, the story is not likely to receive much notice from the virtuous Democrats who are now offering high wages to journeyman witnesses. And as the matter was called to the attention of General Spigner, Senator Edmunds and Secretary Boutwell as soon as Prender lost his place in the Treasury Department, it is reasonably safe to conclude that they did not believe what he said. The only thing we can see at all remarkable in this business is the alleged fact that even the chairman of a Democratic committee could be stupid enough to summon a witness with such a old story. But they are in need of information in Washington, and don't care what it costs so long as Uncle Sam pays for it.

IT WAS NOT SERIOUS. The Democrat says that its argument in favor of exchanging "our miserable, vile and corrupt" Republican government for an emperor was a "sentence" extracted from a "facetious paragraph," and actually charges the REPUBLICAN with a "want of integrity," in assuming imperialism as "the serious opinion of this paper." Regarding such reckless avowals of the Democrat as serious, and finding this expression so perfectly deducible from other doctrines of the paper, we regarded it as a joyful recognition of a chance to beat Grant" by foreign intervention, since there seems so little prospect to effect this object by domestic means. We thought it would pay any price for "a thoroughbred gentleman" to assume the direction of affairs in this country. We are compelled to protect the innocence of our motives, and hasten to correct our construction. The usual appellation imposed upon words which tend to deception innocent belief is that they are deceptive. While, therefore, journalistic courtesy prevents us from employing unparliamentary language, we will, in the words of the Democrat, say "some people call this sharp journalism," but do not apply to the saying one thing and the meaning another. The Couthatta phrase, "We call it lying," is not, according to our vocabulary, applicable to the double interpretation of which the article quoted is liable. Seriously we do not see why the Democrat should care what interpretation may be put upon its expressions. Is it not a Democratic organ? May it not support any man of any political antecedents? Has it avowed any opinion that separates it from the support of any candidate calling himself a Democrat? It is in politics "a chartered libertine, with right" "illimitable as the wind," to blow upon whom it lists. It impugns the right of the majority to govern, and claims, as we understand, the inalienable right of the minority. What, then, remains except some form of government different from our own? "A thoroughbred gentleman" for emperor would at once suspend the republican rulers to whom such unpromising objection is made and the majority rable whose right to control the property of the wealthy is disputed. Nor is the imperial idea altogether unpopular among us. There were, until within a year or two, some sixteen thousand alien males, within the fighting and

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the Southern Democracy with fine speeches, are taken into the popular affections as though they were liable to do a kindly act for the section of their country they have done their best to ruin. They lured the South into a war and left them to fight alone. They have artfully kept up strife between the two races, by drawing odious comparisons and appealing to the prejudices of the whites. And for thus making the Southern Democrats appear as egregious asses, their deluded victims wish to reward them by making Presidents and Senators of them. Our members of Congress find no friends among the Northern Democrats in the House. They are virtually bound hand and foot, required to vote for all the resolutions of investigation, the object of which is to serve the personal interests of Democratic aspirants to the presidency, and required to hold their tongues about

THE LEVEE APPROPRIATIONS. There is no subject more interesting to the people of this State than the proposed appropriation to build the levees and keep the Mississippi within bounds. And at this season of the year, when the floods are pouring down from a thousand streams and valleys, when the stage of the river is the object of anxious scrutiny, there should be made something like a united effort to secure success. Do we see anything that looks like even an attempt in this direction by the Democratic party? Has any politician of that party taken the pains to ascertain the sentiments of any one of the twenty or more possible candidates for the presidency on the Democratic ticket upon this vital matter? Can any of our contemporaries who regard with more or less favor the probable success of either of such men as Hendricks, Tilden, Bayard or Thurman, tell us how they or any of that ilk stand. We know as a matter of record that Senator Gordon did not vote for the levee appropriation of last year, though his friends explain that he was not in his seat when the vote was taken. We know he was not there, but have never heard why. It is the duty of Senators to stand to their business, especially when important questions are pending. Is there any guarantee that all the old dyed-in-the-wool hardshell Democrats are not, like Messrs. Kerr, Holman and others, so wedded to the ancient traditions that they will refuse to give a dollar in aid of internal improvements in the Southwest? Our neighbor, Texas, is about to elect a Senator in place of Morgan C. Hamilton. A seignior Republican will, by this election, be retired to make room for an avowed Democrat. Governor Coke will probably be chosen. How much better off will the friends of the levees be by such a change? Though nobody can answer this question, there will be plenty to cheer the successful candidate, and hurrah for a Democratic triumph. Mr. Coke will vote with Holman, Kerr, Lamar, Gordon, Wood, Cox, Bayard, and men of their ilk, on every other question. Why not go with them in refusing appropriations in which Louisiana has such a vital interest? He belongs to the Texas school of politicians who believe that by crippling New Orleans, Galveston may be built up, and would doubtless vote more to dredge Galveston harbor, shallow, sandy, shifting as it is, than for the whole levee system from Memphis to the bar. But his election to the Senate will be a tremendous triumph over radicalism, whatever disasters to the overflowed people of Louisiana may follow as an offset. How many destroyed plantations and ruined homes can this State afford to contribute to the success of the great Copperhead party of the North—that party of plausible, honeyed words, but never a good deed for the South? How much have we gained by the partial Democratic success in 1874? We lost our levee appropriations and received Speaker Kerr, Heister Clymer, Tucker, Hill, Cox in return. It must be glorious intelligence to shriek into the ears of a Louisiana planter escaping from his ruined home that the ancient traditions have become ascendant again in Washington, and not a dollar can be voted out of the treasury except to pay salaries and spies and informers who tickle the ears of investigating committees with their wonderful fictions. We call this robbing the people upon sentiment. Worthless old Democratic hulk who flatter the