Richmond Dispatch.

SATURDAY.....MARCH 22, 1879.

The Four Objectionable Laws.

There are four laws which the Democrats tried to repeal at the last session of Congress, and whose repeal they are still desirous if possible to effect. These are:

1. The law authorizing two supervisors of election, one belonging to each party, to be appointed by the Federal courts for each voting-place.

2. The law authorizing the marshals to appoint an unlimited number of deputy marshals, all of whom may be of one party, to sustain and support the supervisors in their efforts to secure a fair (!) election.

3. The law authorizing district attorneys and other persons to require grand and petty jurors in the Federal courts to take the iron-clad oath.

4. The law authorizing the President to station troops at the polls to preserve the peace when elections for congressmen are going on.

It is understood that the President is willing to allow the two laws last named to be repealed. As a half-loaf is better than no bread, it would be wise in the Democrats in Congress to pass separate bills repealing those two laws. It would be a point well worthy of being gained—an achievement upon which any Congress might well plume itself—a victory for good government, and a sufficient justification for the extra session, even if nothing else were done. Its passage would lift a burden from the shoulders of the southern people, and make it possible to get jurors in every southern State who are not enemies of the people amongst whom they live. Its passage would also prevent the overawing of the voters by Federal soldiers.

The law authorizing the appointment of supervisors is held by many to be unconstitutional. But Mr. EDMUNDS, who is an able constitutional lawyer, declares that he believes it to be clearly within the power of Congress to pass such a law. The debates in the United States Senate at its last session upon this point were characterized by great ability. The speeches of Mr. MORGAN of Alabama, and Mr. EDMUNDS of Vermont, the one on the one side and the other on the other, were based upon the very fundamental principles of the Government. Mr. EDMUNDS did the best that could be done on his side of the question; and we are apprehensive that if a case involving the point were carried to the Supreme Court of the United States that tribunal might decide that Mr. EDMUNDS is right. Of course no strict constructionist can for one moment concede that he is right. The history of the formation of the Government, and the debates in the convention that framed the Federal Constitution, and particularly the views of the fathers of the republic and all their legislation, prove that it was never intended by those who formed this Government that it should be a consolidated central despotism. But the process of "development" has added to its powers a number that its framers never expected it to have. Let it be remembered that the power to provide for supervisors of elections is not derived by Mr. EDMUNDS from the new amendments, but from the Constitution as it came from the Convention of 1787. We must, therefore, look at facts as they are, not as we would have them. The whole country must first be educated up to the high appreciation of constitutional rights which prevails in the South before the Democrats in Congress can stake too much upon the absolute repeal of the law authorizing supervisors; and to put all four measures of repeal into one bill would be to stake too much. Let it be amended, if it can be, so as to remove some of the objections to it, and then let it go for what it is worth. If the other three laws were repealed, this one could do comparatively little harm.

But the law authorizing the appointment by partisan marshals of an unlimited number of deputy marshals ought certainly to be either repealed entirely or so changed as to alter its whole character. As it now stands, it is a disgrace to the statute-book. It not only authorizes an unlimited number of deputy marshals, but allows professed Democrats to be bribed to work for the Republican ticket. It takes the people's money and uses it to debauch the voters and to set at naught the will of the tax-payers. It makes the money in the United States Treasury a corruption fund to be used for the election of Republican congressmen. It permits deputy marshals to browbeat voters and drive them from the polls, as the villain JOHNNY DAVENPORT has done in New York city at every election for Congressmen held since the law was passed. In a word, it brings the irresistible power of the United States Government into play to aid in the perpetuation of the power of a mere party, and that the worst party which this country has ever known. If such a law can possibly be repealed it ought to be repealed, even at the risk of a dozen extra sessions; but not at the risk of the failure of the repeal of the other three laws. The life of the nation is really involved in the matter; for if the Republicans are allowed ever by its use to regain control of Congress, they will never, never again surrender that control. But the President cannot be coërced to sign a bill repealing it by putting in one bill words that would operate to repeal all four laws. In fact, to put the whole four together would be to give him a plausible reason for refusing to sign the repealing bill; whereas by presenting each question in a separate bill he would be compelled to act upon each upon its own merits.

It is not statesmanship to insist upon the impossible, nor to insist upon an ideal law. True statesmanship does the best that can be done under the circumstances. We commend this sound doctrine to the adoption of our Democratic friends in Congress.

The Vote.

Now that the House of Delegates has decided to take the vote on the debt bill next Monday, it is to be hoped that every member will be in his seat on that day. There is no doubt that a large majority of the members are in favor of the measure. The only trouble will be to secure their presence. It requires sixty-seven affirmative votes to pass the bill, let the negative be as few as they may. Monday is, as a general rule, not a day for a full house; but we trust that next Monday will be an exception to the rule.

Both the Fredericksburg *News* and Fredericksburg *Recorder* agree in the statement that in the meeting at Stafford Courthouse last Monday General LEE's resolution was declared by the chairman to have been adopted.

It is now in order for the "Truthful James" to discover himself who sent to the *Whig* the statement that General LEE's resolution was defeated by a vote of three to one.

Interest on the Public Debt.

Anything approaching a fair or impartial discussion of the debt question is hardly to be expected from the *Whig*; but its leading article of yesterday is so bold and so absurd a misapprehension or misrepresentation as really to be an insult to the intelligence of its readers. It is needless to refer in detail to the column and a half of misstatements, or to show all the errors in its array of figures. The gist of the article is expressed in the following extracts:

"No matter when the refunding takes place, the new bonds are to bear coupons from the 1st of January, 1879, under the express provisions of the bill. * * * Consequently we have interest at 3 per cent. running on $33,000,000, in addition to our present burden of 6 per cent. on about $20,000,000, * * * and there will be matured tax-receivable coupons for 1879 to the fearful total of $2,190,000!"

To show the utter absurdity of this sort of talk, it is only necessary to quote section 3 of the proposed bill. It is as follows:

"The outstanding indebtedness of the State shall be funded in the new bonds to be issued under this act, as follows:

Bonds shall be presented for exchange with all coupons attached, maturing after the date of presentation; and shall be exchanged at the face-value of said bonds, dollar for dollar, for the new bonds *with all coupons attached maturing after the date of such presentation.*"

And this applies to consols and peelers alike.

Just so far as 6 per cent. coupons are surrendered, 3 per cent. coupons will be issued, and no farther. If coupons have been detached from the old bonds, the corresponding coupons must be detached from the new before delivery. In no event can the amount of tax-receivable obligations be increased. On the contrary, just so far as refunding takes place tax-receivable obligations will be proportionately diminished.

Every $9 of new coupons issued must retire $12 of tax-receivable coupons and $6 of peeler coupons or $18 in all.

We shall not enlarge upon so self-evident a point.

We are informed that the extract from the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States published by us yesterday stopped just in time to mislead the reader as to the doctrines laid down by the court. We credited the report to the Alexandria *Gazette* because we were afraid that it might not be a full one. Perhaps we may get a better report of it, as we hear the full opinion is in Judge WELLFORD's hands.

Indiana has followed Ohio and Missouri, and, in accordance with a bill which passed the Hoosier Legislature on Thursday, the State is to be redistricted in the interests of the Democratic party. For many years it has been so gerrymandered by the Republicans that the Democrats were almost as good as disfranchised. Tardy justice has come to our friends at last.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA.

Extra Session---Nineteenth Day.

FRIDAY, March 21, 1879.

SENATE.

Senator QUESENBERRY presiding.

A number of bills were reported from committees.

Mr. PHLEGAR presented a resolution authorizing the Superintendent of Public Buildings to employ an architect to examine the walls and ceilings of the Senate chamber at an expense not exceeding $100. Agreed to.

Mr. SINCLAIR presented a bill authorizing an increase of the salary of the county judge of Loudoun county. Calendar.

Mr. GRIMSLEY presented a bill to authorize the treasurer of Orange county to collect the tax tickets of and county levies for 1875,-'76,-'77. Calendar.

Mr. GRIMSLEY also presented a bill to amend the law for repairing bridges, &c., in Rappahannock county. Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Nelson presented a resolution requesting the Second Auditor to furnish the Senate with a detailed statement showing the whole amount of State bonds, or stocks and bonds, for which the State is liable, now held by schools and colleges, naming them and the character of the obligation, whether funded or unfunded, registered or coupon, the amount of interest paid thereon, and bonds held by the Hampton Normal Academy, Blacksburg College, &c. Agreed to.

Mr. PAUL presented a bill to incorporate the Shenandoah Seminary, at Dayton, Rockingham county. Calendar.

SENATE BILLS PASSED.

To amend the charter of the Valley Railroad Company.

For the relief of J. F. Tompkins, of Rockbridge county.

PERSONAL EXPLANATON.

Mr. MASSEY rose to a question of personal privilege, and read the stenographic reports of the first speeches of each Messrs. SMITH and MASSEY on Tuesday, made just preceding the speech published in the *Dispatch* of Thursday by Mr. SMITH, entitled a "Tilt Between Two Senators," and said: I did not suppose, Mr. President, that even the most disordered mind could distort these remarks into the waving of a red flag to arouse combativeness. Nor do I suppose they were really so considered by even the Nelson Senator.

Mr. MASSEY proceeded with his explanation, and said: I think I am strictly in bounds when I say that for unrefinement, indelicacy, coarseness, misrepresentation, defamation, and vindictiveness, it surpassed anything I ever heard in the halls of legislation.

Mr. SMITH: I call the Senator to order. His language is not parliamentary. My language cannot bear such construction. I again call him to order.

Mr. CHILES, who was in the chair, said he was about to raise the mallet to call the Senator to order. He thought the language unparliamentary.

Mr. MASSEY (continuing): I did not then reply to these offensive remarks as I thought they deserved, for three reasons. First: If I had replied to them in courteous and refined language, such as is generally used among *gentlemen*, the Senator from Nelson would not have appreciated it, and I should have been guilty of folly second only to that of casting pearls before swine.

The CHAIR (the President *pro tem.*, Mr. QUESENBERRY): That language is unparliamentary.

Mr. MASSEY: I hope I may be allowed to proceed and let the Senate pass upon it.

The CHAIR: Read the last sentence over.

Mr. MASSEY repeated the words above reported, and the CHAIR said the language is not permissible, not parliamentary, and not respectful to the Senator.

Mr. MASSEY: I certainly do not intend to be disrespectful to the Senate. I was simply expressing my views, and possibly in strong language. I will waive that for the present, however.

Mr. MASSEY then proceeded. Secondly: If I had characterized the remarks of the Senator as they deserved to be characterized, and used language which *he* could have appreciated, I should have offended against my own taste and that of my brother senators and used unparliamentary language. Thirdly: I knew that my brother senators and all who frequent this chamber understood the habit and animus of the Senator from Nelson too well to allow any statements of *his* to prejudice either their opinions or their feelings towards any other senator.

Mr. DANIEL: I am constrained to object to the Senator's language. I do not think he has the right to speak in the disrespectful language which he——

The CHAIR: The language is plainly unparliamentary, and I am obliged to call the Senator's attention to it.

Mr. MASSEY (proceeding): I will not offend my brother senators by any reference to the past history or life, either public or private, of the Senator from Nelson. Nothing of that kind is necessary to render his attacks powerless to damage me or any other senator in the estimation of those who have observed his course since he has been in the Senate. We all know his constant habit of making offensive attacks upon other senators, and then declaring, with the next breath, "Of course I don't mean anything by what I say; I take it all back," &c.

Mr. SMITH (interrupting): It is a falsehood; a deliberate lie. If the Senator is not called to order when he is unparliamentary I will do so. I denounce him here and before the world as a liar and scoundrel.

The CHAIR rapped loudly and called the Senator to order.

Mr. MASSEY: I'll try to maintain my equilibrium.

Mr. MASSEY proceeded: We know that it is his habit to write laudatory articles of himself, either anonymously or over a fictitious name, and have them published as communications, while he pays for them as advertisements.

Mr. SMITH (interrupting): That's another lie—a base lie—and comes from a scoundrel and dog.

Mr. GRIMSLEY: I think we have had enough of this.

The CHAIR: The CHAIR will not permit this to go on. He does hope that senators will observe the rules which they have made for their government.

Mr. MASSEY (proceeding): He is now one of the most bitter denouncers of readjusters. Yet, when he was a candidate for State Treasurer, and wanted their support, he was willing to pledge himself to "stand by the readjusters forever and forever." I believe these are his own words, over his own signature. I should not now trouble the Senate with any allusion to the subject but for the fact that the *Dispatch* of yesterday contained the Senator's report of his offensive speech, so headed as to create the impression upon the minds of unsuspecting readers that it was communicated by some one *else*, and published by the wish of the editor, when, in fact, it was prepared by the Nelson Senator *himself*, and *paid for by him* as an advertisement.

Mr. SMITH: I deny that I paid one cent for it; and I state further that the report of my speech was made by the official stenographer of this House.

Mr. MASSEY: I was informed by the reporter of the *Dispatch* that you paid for it and had the receipt.

Mr. SMITH: I never paid one cent, and I never intend to.

Mr. MASSEY: The reporter of the *Dispatch* informed me that the Senator from Nelson had told the *Dispatch* reporter that he paid for it.

Mr. SMITH being reminded of the conversation between the reporter and himself, stated to the Senate that it grew out of a misunderstanding of what had transpired [to which the reporter assented].

Mr. MASSEY: I wish to say in conclusion that this is the first time in my legislative experience that I have had thus to trouble the body of which I chanced to be a member, and I hope it may be the last. Senators will bear me testimony that this necessity has been forced upon me. But, sir, for the future I shall try to profit by the experience of old hunters, who have learned that it is better to pass around *some animals* than to contend with them, though they may be perfectly able to destroy them.

Mr. GRIMSLEY: Mr. President, I never witnessed so disgraceful a scene in my life. There certainly ought to be an end of it and the two senators brought to the bar of the Senate and apologize for their language. They should stop right here until some reparation is made to this body for the wrong done it.

Mr. KOINER objected to the scurrilous abuse the senators had used to one another.

Mr. DANIEL objected to the remarks of the Senator from Albemarle in referring to what transpired on Tuesday, and of the fact that Mr. SMITH had then been called to order, said that because the rule may have been violated at one time it was not right that it should be again done and the dignity of the body abused. He hoped that no further such remarks should be allowed. It was not in order for the Senator from Albemarle to avail himself of what transpired on a previous occasion to now rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HURT of Pittsylvania wanted the CHAIR to point out what was wrong in the Senator's (Mr. MASSEY's) remarks.

The CHAIR said that all the remarks of Mr. MASSEY reflecting on the dignity of the Senate were out of order.

Mr. HURT of Pittsylvania suggested that the personal explanation of Mr. MASSEY be read and the Senate eliminate such matter as may be out of order.

Mr. MASSEY said he'd be willing to let the Chair take the paper and the speech and the Senate strike out what is unparliamentary, or even to refer it to the calm and deliberate action of a committee.

Mr. BROOKE suggested that it would be best to submit the remarks of Mr. MASSEY to the Committee on Privileges, and let that committee say what is objectionable.

Mr. DANIEL offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the stenographic reports of the speech of the Senator from Nelson of Tuesday last, of the reply of the Senator from Albemarle, of the rejoinder of the Senator from Albemarle, and of the remarks of this day made by each in reference to each other, be together referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with instructions to report to-morrow morning what action respecting the same should be taken by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH said he held in his hand the report the stenographer had made of the speech delivered by the Senator from Albemarle, and it was altogether different from the speech made by the Senator on Tuesday. He desired to say in regard to the question of readjustment, that he had been a readjuster (not forcible) all along, and had so stated over his own signature in the canvass.

Mr. LEE read the 28th rule of the Senate, and thought that Mr. MASSEY was out of order.

Mr. SHERRARD presented a resolution as a substitute for Mr. DANIEL's resolution, declaring that the Senator from Albemarle and the Senator from Nelson be brought before the bar of the Senate and reprimanded.

Mr. FULKERSON said that it would be strange, indeed, to refer to a committee the remarks of a senator calling another senator a liar, a dog, and a scoundrel. He thought it would not do. There would have been a personal collision in the Senate to-day if the Senator from Albemarle had not been cool.

Several senators said that the two senators ought to apologize to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH rose in his place, and apologized *to the Senate* for the language that might be construed as disrespectful to the Senate. He had desired to do so before the question was raised.

Mr. MASSEY said he was still willing that the whole matter should be referred to the President or to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. While he had set forth what he thought of the matter, he was willing to abide by the decision of the Senate.

Mr. HURT of Halifax said he was willing to adopt Mr. DANIEL's resolution after Mr. SHERRARD's resolution has been adopted and the two senators brought to the bar of the Senate and reprimanded.

Mr. MASSEY did not think he had used language that would justify such a course in his case.

Mr. DANIEL moved to amend Mr. SHERRARD's substitute by inserting at the commencement of the substitute, after the word resolved, these words: "That unless the unparliamentary language used this day by the Senators from Albemarle and Nelson be retracted by them in the presence of the Senate and an apology be made by each for employing it."

Mr. DANIEL said he was willing to accept Mr. SHERRARD's resolution with the amendment he had proposed.

The resolution and amendment were further discussed

Mr. BROOKE said it was unquestionably true that the Senator from Nelson had used language that was unparliamentary, and he had risen from his seat and admitted it. It was also true that the Senator from Albemarle had used unparliamentary language, and it was but right to bring these senators to the bar of the Senate that they may apologize for their language.

Mr. HINTON thought that Mr. SMITH was not the offended party. He thought the resolution ought to be tabled, and a committee of three be raised to examine the language of Mr. MASSEY and report upon it, and if it be found unparliamentary, then the two senators can be brought to the bar of the Senate. He did not think that there was any unparliamentary *language* in the personal explanation of Mr. MASSEY except by inference or implication.

Mr. TYLER thought the resolution did not meet the case. He indicated what he proposed to offer at the proper time.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that this was a most unfortunate affair, and argued in favor of referring the subject to a committee. He opposed the resolution to bring the senators to the bar of the Senate.

Mr. CHILES characterized the proceedings as disgraceful. He said that the title of the article in the *Dispatch*, "A Tilt Between Two Senators," was a good one. He then went on to speak of the discussion of Tuesday, and to say that he supposed that the *animus* of that day had come to an end. He thought that the proper time for Mr. MASSEY to have replied to Mr. SMITH was on Tuesday; but as he did not do so then, the only opportunity he could have to reply would be this morning in the Senate. He could not remember any unparliamentary language in the explanation of Mr. MASSEY. He hoped the Senate would refer the subject to a committee, and not bring the senators to the bar of the Senate.

Mr. GRIFFIN asked if the best way to end this matter would not be to vote on the question.

Mr. CHILES said that he did want to get at it in that way. He went on to speak of what he termed the disgraceful scene again, and to say that Mr. MASSEY was ever gentle and courteous, and he wanted the two senators to have time to think over this matter and cool down. He hoped it would be referred to the committee for investigation and report.

Mr. MASSEY said he could readily understand that language might be used which, under a strict construction of parliamentary law, would be considered unparliamentary; but that he was justifiable under the circumstances in the language used. He had no desire to offend against the good sense of the Senate. He was at a loss to know what language he should eliminate. But if he could be convinced that he had used improper language he would draw his pen through it and then make proper apology to the Senate. He had spread before the Senate, not in haste, his views about the matter. He had used no harsh terms, but had stated in plain language his vindication against a wrong that had been done him. He should be doing himself a wrong if he should retract without knowing what he was retracting. He would be willing for the committee to take the paper, read it carefully, and then if there was anything unparliamentary he would erase it. He was unwilling to do any man in the Commonwealth injustice; and if when his explanation was read carefully it should be found to contain language that could be construed unparliamentary, he would withdraw it.

Mr. HURT of Pittsylvania asked that the unparliamentary language be read, so that he could vote intelligently.

Ruled out of order.

Mr. HINTON moved to lay the resolutions on the table. Lost.

The debate was continued at great length.

Mr. FULKERSON asked whether the rule was to be adopted here that a senator could get up and call another senator a liar and a dog and then apologize for it? It was time the matter should be ended. If the Senator from Albemarle has used unparliamentary language he ought to be dealt with. If an apology is sufficient, or a reprimand, let's have it.

The pending question was then ordered.

Mr. DANIEL's amendment to come in at the first part of the resolution as reported above was rejected.

Mr. TYLER presented the following substitute for Mr. SHERRARD's resolution:

Resolved, That a portion of the language used this day by the Senator from Albemarle in his personal explanation, and some of the language of the Senator from Nelson in reply thereto, is unparliamentary language, and unless retracted or apologized for by said senators, then in that case the speeches delivered by said senators shall be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to report such action as they may deem best.

The substitute was rejected.

Mr. HURT of Halifax offered the following as a substitute for Mr. SHERRARD's resolution:

Resolved, That the language used by both the senators from Nelson and Albemarle on the floor of the Senate this morning is unparliamentary, and that both of said senators be immediately brought to the bar of the Senate and reprimanded by the President of the Senate.

Rejected.

Mr. SMITH said Mr. SHERRARD's was a grave proposition. It proposed to arraign him before the bar of the Senate, and, too, after he had apologized to the Senate for the language used. He appealed to the Senate to know if any member of the body placed in his position would have remained quiet under such language as the Senator from Albemarle had used in his personal explanation. He (SMITH) said every constituent in his district would take it as an insult if he had remained quiet under the circumstances.

Mr. SMITH wanted Mr. HURT to amend his resolution so as to provide that, as the Senator from Nelson had apologized for his language, then that unless the Senator from Albemarle apologizes he shall be brought to the bar of the Senate and be reprimanded.

Mr. HINTON asked if the resolution could not be amended so as to strike out one of the names.

The CHAIR said it was competent for the Senate to amend the resolution if the Senate desired to do so.

Mr. HINTON moved to strike out Mr. MASSEY's name in the resolution.

The motion was rejected by the following vote:

AYES.—Messrs. Bliss, Chiles, Dickenson, Fulkerson, Hinton, Moulton, Norton, Paul, Powell, Slemp, Spitler, and Wood—12.

NOES.—Messrs. Brooke, Daniel, Elliott, Griffin, Grimsley, Hairston, Hurt of Halifax, Hurt of Pittsylvania, Koiner, Lee, Marshall, Nash, Nunn, Phlegar, Quesenberry, Sherrard, Stuebner, Tanner, Tyler, Walston, Ward, and Wortham—22.

Mr. FULKERSON moved to strike out Mr. SMITH's name from the resolution.

Rejected.

The vote was then taken on Mr. SHERRARD's substitute, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That Senators MASSEY and SMITH be brought to the bar of the Senate and reprimanded for unparliamentary language in debate.

The substitute was rejected by the following vote:

AYES.—Messrs. Brooke, Elliott, Griffin, Grimsley, Hairston, Hurt of Halifax, Koiner, Lee, Marshall, Nunn, Phlegar, Sherrard, Walston, and Ward—14.

NOES.—Messrs. Bliss, Chiles, Daniel, Dickenson, Fulkerson, Hinton, Hurt of Pittsylvania, Moulton, Nash, Norton, Paul, Powell, Quesenberry, Sinclair, Slemp, Spitler, Tanner, Tyler, Wood, and Wortham—20.

Mr. DANIEL's original resolution was then adopted—ayes, 22; noes, 9.

Mr. HURT of Pittsylvania moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution had been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, so as to refer the resolution to a select committee.

Mr. MARSHALL moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. Agreed to.

So the subject was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BROOKE presented an amendment to the 28th rule, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

THE MOFFETT REGISTER.

The Moffett-register bill was taken up amid great confusion.

Mr. PAUL presented an amendment to Mr. FULKERSON's substitute to set apart one fifth of the tax for the teachers' pay of the free schools.

Mr. MARSHALL moved to adjourn.

Mr. GRIMSLEY demanded the ayes and noes, and being taken the Senate agreed to adjourn—ayes, 15; noes, 10.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

Speaker ALLEN in the chair. Prayer by Bishop Keane.

A number of bills were reported from committees and placed on the calendar.

The House next adopted the resolution offered yesterday, limiting debate on the debt bill to twenty-five minutes.

Mr. HENRY presented a bill to amend the Code in reference to adjournment of courts.

The compromise debt bill was resumed.

A resolution was adopted (by a two-thirds vote) declaring that the House will take a final vote on the debt bill on Monday at 3 P. M.

Adjourned.

The Stafford Meeting.

GENERAL FITZ. LEE ON THE MEETING AT THE COURTHOUSE WEDNESDAY—A FLAT-FOOTED DENIAL—A TRUE ACCOUNT OF THE MEETING.

RICHLAND, STAFFORD COUNTY, VA., March 21, 1879.

Editors Dispatch: Your paper of to-day in its editorial columns says: "The statement is made in the *Whig* that in a meeting at Stafford Courthouse on Monday last General Fitz. Lee proposed to expel the readjusters from the Conservative party, and that the meeting by a vote of three to one defeated the motion." I presume reference is made to the Wednesday's meeting, and I pronounce the whole statement false, whether made upon either day. The resolutions offered by me at the meeting Wednesday have been published, I learn, in the Fredericksburg papers, and speak for themselves. I made no motion referring to that subject.

The position I take is, that those participating in the Mozart Convention, which put in motion the machinery to organize a new party, *belong to it*, and it is a pitiful reflection upon their own work—not ours—which makes *them* "as good Conservatives as anybody," unless it is possible for a party to exist under two separate State organizations. Very respectfully yours,

FITZHUGH LEE.

The following true account of the political meeting at Stafford Courthouse is only given to correct misrepresentations sent for new party capital to the *Whig*:

The State Committee of the Conservative party having advised, in a recent address signed by their chairman, that the party proceed "vigorously and promptly" to perfect and strengthen its local organization in the several counties of the State, General Fitz. Lee called a meeting of the Conservatives in this county for that purpose.

John W. Woltz, the former Federal postmaster of Fredericksburg, but now removed, telegraphed General Mahone that he must send up his speakers (so says the Fredericksburg *Recorder*), and urgent letters were also sent to the same purpose. A favorable reply being received, riders were sent over the country, and Confederate deserters, soreheads, negroes, and *id genus omne* were turned out from every bush to take advantage of the occasion to disrupt the Conservative party in this section, and they were promptly on hand to do their master's bidding.

It had been arranged that General Lee, Hon. J. L. Marye, and Hon. E. M. Braxton should address the people; but Senators Fulkerson and Paul appearing and asking to divide time, it was decided, as there could be but two speakers upon each side, courtesy entitled those from a distance to be selected.

The meeting was opened by Senator Fulkerson, followed by Hon. E. M. Braxton; he by Senator Paul, who, in turn, was succeeded by the Hon. J. L. Marye in one of the most powerful and eloquent speeches ever delivered in this section of Virginia. First removing overcoat, then as he warmed to his work his coat, he spoke for about an hour in his shirt-sleeves in such strains as to thrill and electrify a packed court-house. Every man, woman, and child in Virginia should have heard that speech—replying to a charge made by Senator Paul that the ministers who signed the Royall and Beverley call had paid their taxes in coupons except one, and that the contributions put in the plates by their congregations were put in their own pockets.

Mr. Marye soared to the eloquence of Virginia's Henry, holding his audience spellbound.

It was a grand speech, a noble speech, and good men and honest men everywhere should thank God that while Marye lives the link is still in the chain that binds us to the better days of the Commonwealth.

At the conclusion of the speech, it being too late for further business, General Lee offered the resolutions referred to, confining himself to a few brief remarks in their presentation.

A substitute was then offered by Mr. Green, consisting of some resolutions offered at a previous meeting by Mr. Smith.

The resolutions of General Lee having been put to the meeting, the chairman decided they were passed by a majority of one third. There being much confusion in the house at the time, by the people going out, &c., it was proposed to form outside, and count the number voting upon each side.

The new-party men were to be counted as they passed over a stile and out of the yard, but it being perceived that many returned back over the fence and went over the stile to be counted again, the Conservatives refused to recognize further the proposition, and separated for their homes.

STAFFORD.

ANOTHER ACCOUNT.

Editors Dispatch: We were present at the public meeting at Stafford Courthouse on the 19th. When the speaking began we estimated the crowd at 300—of all kinds, shades, and colors. When General Lee's resolutions were presented we estimated it at (it was late) about 225 men. When division was called for and the readjusters were called to form on the outside of the court-house in line—those in favor of Mr. Green's substitute on one side and those opposed on the other—Mr. Green called out that he had a majority. Mr. N. W. Ford, chairman of the meeting, stated that those opposite the readjusters were one third more. Green then requested the readjusters to walk over the court-house steps and be counted. After this count Mr. Green announced that the readjusters were 110 in number. There was much excitement, and personal issues were existing. We did not count either side. For argument's sake, whilst not conceding the fact fully, we will accede the claims of the readjusters that their 110 was a majority of the voters present at the division. But can any intelligent man assert that, because 110 were a majority at a public meeting—at a meeting where energy and efforts had been exerted to bring out the readjusting element and assemble it for that particular occasion—that it proves the sentiment of a majority in a county of over 900 Conservative voters?

We have taken time and trouble to reach a conclusion as to Stafford sentiment, and we believe that if the Mozart-Hall platform was put to the people of Stafford to-morrow it would be overwhelmingly defeated. We are also of the opinion—reached by us at the Courthouse meeting on the 19th, and our investigations since—that the bulk of the readjusters' strength was present then; and we are backed in this opinion by many of the best-informed gentlemen in the county of Stafford. It is palpably premature at this juncture to claim Stafford as a forcible-readjusting county.

EDITOR OF RECORDER.

Good Joke on Snyder.

FREDERICKSBURG, VA., March 20, 1879.

Editors Dispatch: The organ of the readjusters—the *Whig*—claims a victory in Stafford county.

After the adjournment of that meeting, an active readjuster said to a reporter: "Well, we cleaned you fellows out. We beat you bad. We had 110 men in the readjusters' line—the bone and sinew of Stafford, sir."

Reporter: "How many men participated in that meeting?"

Readjuster: "At least three hundred. It was one of the largest meetings ever held at the Courthouse."

Reporter: "Oh! ho! three hundred men in the meeting, and you claim one hundred and ten. Well, you can claim all the honor of that kind of victory. We are satisfied with its result."

More anon. R.

"The Lines Drawn."

The address of the State Conservative Committee, which we printed in our last issue, is an able document, well drawn, and to the point, and should be carefully and attentively read by every true Conservative who has the good of the State at heart. The address advises that the lines be sharply and distinctly drawn between Conservatives and those who under that name are in fact inimical to the party, and who whenever the occasion has offered have never hesitated to sacrifice party allegiance for personal ends.

The address likewise calls attention to the Convention which lately met in the city of Richmond, and sounds a note of warning as to its purposes and aims which should not pass unheeded. The address goes on to say: "It is manifest that the aim and effort of those who shaped and controlled the action of that body are to disrupt the Conservative party, and to raise upon its ruins an organization which shall wield the political power of the State, and dispense its offices and emoluments."

Is this so? Is a new party being formed? If so, then it behooves all true Conservatives to be on their guard, and to crush out in its very inception every movement—no matter by whom made—which is antagonistic even in the slightest degree to the Conservative party. We cannot afford to have the old party destroyed. We believe that nothing but evil would result to the State if such a thing happened. And if there are men in the ranks who are only Conservatives in name and who show themselves to be such by their actions, let them be drummed out; better have them open foes than secret enemies. And that there are such men we feel confident; and we feel equally confident that the sooner the party is rid of them the better. We hope, then, that the county superintendents will heed this address, and see to it that in every county in the State the Conservative organization is kept intact and put in efficient operation.—*Farmville Journal.*

Now the success of this party means the destruction of the Conservative party; it means the transfer of the politics of the State from the white people to the mongrel elements thus combined; it means the severance of all ties with the National Democratic party, and the creation of a dominant party in the State, based upon the repudiation of the just obligations of the State. For "to this complexion must it come at last." If the debt is not settled on the fair and equitable basis now proposed, and the purposes of these destructionists are accomplished, it can only be by revolutionizing the whole government, and by the election of more complaisant judges than the pure an able men who adorn the supreme bench; for so long as they stand as a bulwark between rights of creditors and the violence faction there is no method but compromise by which the public debt can be adjusted. Forcible readjustment means revolution—bloodless but violent, and achieved by the destruction of the sanctity of the judiciary. Settlement of the debt under the provisions of the bill now before the General Assembly, with the consent of the creditors, means the conservation of the public faith and honor, and the preservation of that respect for law and its tribunals which has always, under all and the most trying circumstances, characterized the conduct of the people of Virginia.—*Amherst Enterprise*

MARRIAGES.

Married, on the 19th of March, 1879, at the residence of the bride's parents, by Rev. Henry McDonald, D. D., WILLIAM JUNIAS YOUNG, of Melbourne, Australia (formerly of Virginia), and CARRIE VIRGINIA, only daughter of Isaac J. Mercer, of Richmond, Va. No cards. *

DEATHS.

Died, at 8 o'clock yesterday evening, Mrs. JANE C. ROSE, wife of J. J. Rose, in the twenty-ninth year of her age.

Her funeral will take place at 2½ o'clock SUNDAY AFTERNOON from St. Peter's Cathedral. Friends and acquaintances are invited to attend. *

Died, this morning, at No. 517 north Fifth street, Mrs. A. M. PETTUS, relict of the late Hugh Pettus, of Cumberland county; aged about eighty-one years.

Northern papers will please copy. *

☞ THIRD PRESBYTERIAN (Twenty-sixth and Broad streets).—Rev. H. B. PRATT at 11 A. M., and Rev. Dr. C. H. READ at 7:45 P. M.

☞ FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH (corner Twelfth and Broad streets).—Rev. G. J. JOHNSON, D. D., of Philadelphia, will preach on SUNDAY at 11 o'clock A. M., and Rev. A. B. WOODFIN, of the University of Virginia, at 8 o'clock P. M.

☞ GRACE-STREET BAPTIST CHURCH (corner Grace and Foushee streets).—Rev. Dr. T. H. PRITCHARD, of Raleigh, N. C., will preach at 11 o'clock A. M., and the pastor, Rev. WILLIAM E. HATCHER, D. D., will preach at a quarter before 8 o'clock P. M.

At 3½ o'clock P. M. there will be a Sunday-School Mass-Meeting, on which occasion addresses may be expected from distinguished speakers.

☞ SIDNEY BAPTIST CHURCH.—Rev. J. S. HARDAWAY will preach To-MORROW at 11 A. M., and Rev. R. R. ACREE will preach at 7:45 P. M.

☞ MAIN-STREET CHRISTIAN CHURCH (between Pine and Laurel streets).—Preaching by Elder J. A. DEARBORN at 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M.

☞ BROAD-STREET METHODIST CHURCH, SUNDAY, March 23d.—Preaching by Rev. W. G. STARR (pastor). At 11 A. M.—subject: "Who Are the Poor, and What Do They Want?" At 8 P. M.—subject: "The Question of Daniel—What Shall Be the End of These Things?"

☞ TRINITY METHODIST CHURCH. Preaching at 11 A. M. and 7:45 P. M. by the pastor.

☞ VIRGINIA BIBLE SOCIETY.—A meeting will be held in the Centenary Methodist Episcopal church SUNDAY NIGHT in the interests of the Virginia Bible Society.

It is expected that Rev. Dr. CURRY will deliver an address, and Bishop DOGGETT present the cause and take up the collection. Dr. HOGE will preside.

☞ METHODIST SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.—A special meeting of this Society will be held at Nicholson-Street Methodist church, Rockets, on SUNDAY AFTERNOON at 3½ o'clock.

Interesting addresses and other exercises may be expected. A. L. WEST, President.

C. P. Rady, Secretary.

MEETINGS.

A MEETING OF THE CITY MISSION will be held at the Mission rooms TO-DAY (Saturday) at 11 o'clock A. M. A full attendance is requested. mh 22-1t*

HEADQUARTERS RICHMOND COMMANDERY, No. 2, KNIGHTS TEMPLARS.

EXTRACT ORDER No. 21.—SIR KNIGHTS: Attend a called assembly of the Commandery at the asylum (St. Alban's Hall) THIS (Saturday) EVENING at 8 o'clock, in citizens' dress, for instruction and drill.

By order of the Eminent Commander.

I. S. TOWER, Captain-General.

Attest: C. F. DANFORTH, Recorder. mh 22-1t

AN ADJOURNED MEETING OF PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE PROMOTION OF THE BREEDING OF RUNNING AND TROTTING STOCK IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA will be held at the EXCHANGE HOTEL SATURDAY EVENING, March 22d, at 8 o'clock. All persons interested are invited to attend.

J. ARTHUR LEFROY, President.

G. K. MACON, Secretary. mh 21-2t

AMUSEMENTS.

RICHMOND THEATRE.

GRAND KELLAR MATINEE AT 2 O'CLOCK THIS AFTERNOON.

Admission: 25 cents to all parts of the house.

TO-NIGHT,

grand *expose* of the mysterious SPIRIT SEANCE,

And positively last appearance of the GREAT MAGICIAN.

[mh 22-1t*]

FAIR, &c.

THE LADIES OF THE GRACE STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH are making preparations to offer a handsome assortment of articles—CHILDREN'S DRESSES, FANCY GOODS, &c.—the first week in May. mh 22-1t

CANDIDATES FOR OFFICE.

TO THE VOTERS OF HENRICO COUNTY.—I hereby announce myself a candidate for COUNTY TREASURER—subject to nomination by the Conservative party.

mh 20-eod&wts JOHN L. GRUBBS.

NOTICE.—Having qualified as the executrix of the will of the late GEORGE R. CONWAY in the County Court of Henrico county, I hereby give notice to all creditors of the said Conway to present their claims, properly authenticated, for payment; and all persons indebted to the estate are notified to come forward immediately and settle with me, at my home, in Henrico county.

MARY J. CONWAY, Executrix.

mh 14-10t*

BILL-HEADS, $5.50 to $8 per ream, at the DIS