

On Resolution and Eight Substitutes—The Tribunal Decides not to Unearth the Louisiana Fraud—Another Steal for Hayes.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16.—The Commission assembled in session at 10 o'clock this morning, and remained in session until about half-past 2 o'clock this afternoon, when they took a recess 15 minutes. Nothing could be ascertained as to the proceedings of the Commission, but at half-past 2 o'clock a prominent Republican told a representative of the Star that one of the Commission had assured him that up to that time nothing had occurred to damage the prospects of the Republicans. He inferred from this that the case would be decided the same as the Florida case, that the Commission would decline to accept testimony except in case of the alleged ineligible Electors.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16.—10 P. M.—The following are the resolutions acted upon by the Commission:

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that so much of the act of Louisiana establishing the Returning Board for that State is unconstitutional, and the acts of the said Returning Board are void. This was rejected by the following vote: yeas, Messrs. Abbott, Bayard, Clifford, Field, Huntton, Payne and Thurman, 7; nays, Messrs. Bradley, Edmunds, Frelinghuysen, Garfield, Hoar, Miller, Morton and Strong, 8.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

Resolved, That evidence be received to show that the Returning Board of Louisiana, at the time of canvassing and compiling the vote of that State, at the last election in that State, was not legally constituted under the law establishing it, in this: that it was composed of four persons of one political party, instead of five persons of different parties, as required by the law.

R. M. STOKES, Editor. UNION, FRIDAY FEBRUARY 28, 1877.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION. 1 Copy, one year, in advance, \$3.00. 2 Copies one year, " " 5.00. 3 " " " " 7.00. 6 " " " " 12.00. 12 " " " " 20.00. ADVERTISING. One square of one inch, first insertion, - - - \$1.00. Each subsequent insertion, - - - .75. Liberal discount made to merchants and others advertising for six months or by the year. Ordinary notices of ten lines or less, inserted free. Over ten lines, charged as Advertising. 25 per cent additional for advertisements ordered not to appear in consecutive issues.

The Union Hotel still keeps up its reputation as the best hotel in the up-country.

About \$125,000 has been received by the Hampton government, from the 10 per cent call.

Senator Cochran, tried last week in Columbia for the killing of Mr. Thomas Dent, was acquitted by the jury.

Allen is the youngest County in the State, but it has paid to the Hampton Government \$3,600. It has set a noble example to the older Counties.

Our friend, J. T. Priscoe hauled a load of wood over four miles to pay his subscription to the Times. Such subscribers always put an Editor in a good humor, and makes him believe that mankind is not so bad after all.

If any of our readers would like to try a crop of Chufas, we would inform them that they can obtain seed from Messrs. Nott & Little at Spartanburg. The Chufa should be cultivated by every farmer in Union.

Hervey Anisansell, Esq., of Laurens, after passing a full examination in open Court, on Thursday, was admitted to practice law in this State. The Committee to examine, consisted of Hon. W. D. Simpson, R. C. Watts, Esq., and B. W. Ball, Solicitor.

In consequence of the delay in organizing the juries and other necessary detentions, there has been so little done in the Court that we have but little report this week. The Court is still in session and a full report of its doings will be published next week.

We thank our friends, T. J. Vinton & I. S. Gregory, for a splendid Shad, the first of the season, for us. These gentlemen have opened a store in the building next to W. R. Davis' bar-room, and propose to supply our citizens with fresh Fish, Oysters, canned Goods, Green Groceries, Fruits and other luxuries. They receive fresh Fish and Oysters every Tuesday and Friday.

On Monday afternoon last a fire broke out in an outhouse of Dr. A. W. Thomson, which consumed two buildings and most of their contents—flour, bacon, 150 bushels select cotton seed, peas, corn, and many other articles of value. Fortunately the wind was blowing strong from the dwelling house or that would have been destroyed also. It is supposed that the fire originated from the kitchen stove pipe.

We regret to state that on Monday last, a spark of fire from the steam engine belonging to Mr. John P. McKisick, about three miles above this town, was blown between some bales of cotton, and the wind being strong it soon blazed furiously. It could be stopped almost entirely destroyed eight bales. The fire occurred at the same time that Dr. Thomson's houses were burning.

A most excellent opportunity is now offered our citizens to obtain finely executed Photographs. Mr. Judd has rented for a short time the admirable room just below the Post office, which was fitted up year before last expressly for a Photograph Gallery, by Mr. Pearson, and invites all who wish Photographs taken to call and examine specimens of his work.

As Mr. Judd will remain with us only a limited time we advise all who wish to secure pictures equal to the best, to embrace the present opportunity. We have seen photographs taken by him and do not hesitate to pronounce them excellent.

The Store of Wm. Storr & Co., 508 Broadway, New York, importers of the finest French Laces and Agents of the famous Lace Manufacturers, Laurens & Son, of Paris, was robbed on Thursday last week, of \$40,000 worth of valuable laces.

Some years ago a similar robbery occurred in New York, and a few months afterward a number of Lace peddlers—men and women—were roaming through the South. It is probable that we shall have a similar visit, and we advise our people to be on the look out.

We thank Mrs. Shodair for a specimen of her delightful bread, and congratulate our citizens upon the fact that they now have a bakery where they can at all times obtain the nicest light-bread, cakes, or any other article made by a city Baker.

Mrs. Shodair is an estimable widow Lady, who has settled among us to earn a living for herself, by honest industry, and we commend her as worthy the patronage of all our citizens. She also keeps a full stock of all kinds of candies, canned fruits, fish, meats, &c. Her store, for the present, is opposite Col. J. L. Young's dwelling.

STOOD THE TEST.—Wilcox, Gibbs & Co.'s Manipulated Guano has stood the test of ten years' use by the leading planters of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida, constantly gaining in popularity, and is now the best and most favorably known fertilizer in use in these States. It has been their aim to furnish a fertilizer that cannot be surpassed, and they have succeeded in doing so, as is evidenced by the high reputation. It is offered on very favorable terms; delivered at depots in the interior; payable in cotton, on the basis of fifteen cents for middling, delivered at planters' depots next fall. Call and see their agents.

The Silver Cornet Band Supper. The young gentlemen of the Union Silver Cornet Band, celebrated the second anniversary of their organization at the Union Hotel, last Thursday night, in an oyster Supper, given up in Messrs Wallace & Allen's best style. It was one of the pleasantest occasions we remember ever to have attended, and passed off in the most temperate manner. The Band has now become a permanent institution of Union, of which the citizens are justly proud. It is composed of young men of character and high social standing in the community, and we hope to attend many of its annual celebrations.

The Court.

The February term of Court was opened last Monday, Judge Northrop and the new Solicitor, Col. Ball, promptly at their posts.

The juries were empaneled and the Judge was about to deliver his charge to the Grand Jury, when H. H. D. Byron, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for Union County, arose and made objections to the jury, claiming that they had not been drawn in strict accordance with the law. Before proceeding further the Judge referred the matter to a committee of lawyers, consisting of W. H. Wallace, R. W. Shaul, W. W. Miller and the Solicitor, with the suggestion that the Committee call a meeting of the bar for consultation upon it. The Court then adjourned to Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock.

The Court met on Tuesday morning and Mr. Wallace, as Chairman of the Committee, reported that the Bar was divided upon the matter of the legality of the juries, but suggested, as the objections were only technical, and did not charge fraud or corruption in the drawing, that the Court proceed upon the Sessions Docket, with the understanding that in any case where the parties interested shall object to the legality of the jury, upon the grounds stated, that case shall be continued.

To this arrangement all parties gave assent, and the Court proceeded to business.

The Judge's charge was in every respect appropriate—plain, practical and impressive. He elucidated the duties and powers of the Grand Jury, the different crimes which would likely be brought before them and the law governing them, in a very forcible and comprehensible manner. His denunciation of the illegal trafficking in whiskey and the intemperate use of intoxicating liquors was timely and in excellent style, and met the approbation of all who heard him. Taken all together we think the charge did Judge Northrop great credit and increased the good opinion before held of him by the people. He is fast restoring the respect for the dignity of the Bench which was almost entirely lost through the imbecility and suspected corruption of his predecessor. We have confidence in Judge Northrop's justice and integrity.

Solicitor Ball has taken hold of his office with an industry and determined will that make him an efficient and acceptable officer. We know him well. He is a man of talent and one of the most lighted, honorable men in the State. As yet he has not had a chance to show his qualities as an officer, but we believe he will become very popular, among all classes, before his term expires.

The following gentlemen of the Bar of neighboring counties have been in attendance: Laurens, Lieut.-Governor W. D. Simpson, John W. Ferguson and R. C. Watts. Spartanburg, J. B. Cleveland and J. W. Smith.

The latest telegraphic reports state that Congress had reached Oregon in counting the electoral vote. The certificates of the republican electors were presented, and objections made in the case of Watts, one of the electors, upon the grounds, 1st, that he was ineligible. The objection closed with proof that he held the office of Postmaster—an office of trust and profit under the United States. Second, that the Certificate has not the certificate of the Governor attached as required by the United States law. Third, that the law of Oregon required the Governor to give a certificate of election or appointment as electors to Cartwright, Odell and Cronin, they being the only eligible electors, who had received the highest number of votes at the election held on the 7th of November, as Watts then held the office of Postmaster at Lafayette, Oregon. It is a knotty question, but the Republicans care nothing for that. If they can't untie the knot by fair means, they have proved themselves as expert in cutting through such knots as burglars are in boring through the door or shutter of a store for robbery.

On Tuesday night the boys of the Union Silver Cornet Band, showed their respect for Lieutenant Gov. W. D. Simpson, Solicitor B. W. Ball and the Hampton Government, by giving those gentlemen a delightful serenade. It was a compliment worthily extended and highly appreciated. The Lieut. Governor was called out and made one of his happiest speeches. Solicitor Ball also responded in excellent style; and as our people never leaves a meeting perfectly satisfied until they hear from their favorite man and orator, Speaker W. H. Walldeer, the boys—and there was a goodly number of old and young boys there—called upon him to speak to them, which he did in his usual eloquent and stirring manner. Three cheers and a tiger, were then given for Simpson, Ball, Wallace and the Hampton government, and all peaceably dispersed.

The white militia companies of Columbia have been drilling lately for the purpose of having a military parade in honor of Washington's birthday, on the 22d inst.; but the commander of the troops stationed at that city has received orders from the White House at Washington, without assigning any reason, to prevent the parade.

Could that tool of Chamberlain, Patterson, Cameron, Morton and other corruptionists, stoop to a more contemptible act? With such an order staring us in the face, what confidence can we place in his pretensions of liberality and justice to the white people of the South. His word is not worth a bauble, if he liespittles around him order otherwise. He will soon leave the high office he has disgraced, and sink out of sight in "his native slime and slough."

France and Frenchmen. Prof. Anisansell, a highly educated Swedish gentleman, now residing at Laurens C. H., will deliver a very humorous and instructive Lecture in the Hall over Hill & Co.'s store, upon France and Frenchmen, this (Friday) night.

Gentlemen from Laurens who have heard Prof. Anisansell deliver this lecture tell us it is admirable, and the Professor delivers it with the characteristic grace of a polished well educated Frenchman, and in excellent style. No doubt it will be a treat, as it will be a recreation, to all the intelligent good humored people of Union.

Price of admission 50 cents. Doors to the Lecture room will be opened at 7 1/2 o'clock.

The Laurensville Herald and Greenville News are to be published by Laurens C. H. to Greenville. We are very partial to our old "stamping ground," Laurens, and should like to see her get beyond the "ragged edge" of obscurity by Railroad communication with all world; but it sounds somewhat queer to hear her talk about building thirty-five miles of railroad while she is awfully puzzled to raise enough money to complete nine miles of unfinished road to Clinton.

Bradley, Miller and Davis.

When we look calmly upon the political events which have transpired since the election in November last, and compare them with the decision of the Electoral Commission, we naturally make the practical inquiry, whose fault is it that the will of a majority of the people of this country, expressed through the ballot-box, as to who shall be President has not been pronounced? The answer is at the head of this article—Bradley, Miller and Davis. The other Republicans on the commission, are political bull-dogs, from whom was expected nothing but a persistent hanging-on to the party, right or wrong. Their teeth had been for years set upon the vital parts of the country, and they had been sucking the Me-blood of the nation ever since they were allowed to insert their fangs, therefore, when the commission was authorized by Congress to decide between a people and their party ascendancy, no one expected they would do an honorable act or cast a magnanimous vote in favor of the people. But the hope of the people rested in the judiciary element of the commission. No one supposed that the whole machinery of the government had become so completely ossified by the influences of party interests that the highest tribunal of the country could not be moved by the combined electrifying powers of honor, justice and patriotism. But, alas! how sadly have the people been mistaken in the source of their last hope; and what depravity has the commission developed, even upon the Supreme Bench of the country. Let us look at it:

Bradley accepted the high position with his eyes fully made up to decide the matter in favor of his favorite candidate and friend, irrespective of the popular vote of the people and in defiance of the infamous frauds so abundantly exposed and substantiated against his party.

Miller accepted the position under similar feelings and influences. Both knew that they were elected Commissioners, not as partisans but as impartial judges, to decide the most important question ever acted upon by any tribunal of this or any other country, and they accepted the position with the willful and deliberate determination to sacrifice the honor of the Supreme Court, their own self respect and the peace of the country upon the altar of a corrupt and infamous party. Could men fall lower than those two men have?

But what shall we say of Judge Davis? If we were to express our individual convictions we should say he has sold himself and the peace and tranquility of his country for a seat in the Senate. We should say that we believe the terms upon which he was elected Senator over Logan were that he should refuse a position upon the commission, so that the infamous Bradley might be placed there, for party purposes; and we should say that he was aware of the plot.

Davis' refusal to act because he had been elected a Senator is all bosh. He is not a Senator to-day, nor will he be until after the 4th of next month. But he is one of our liberal Republicans! He is one of those men to whom the Democrats have been pinning their faith for many years, as a compromise candidate, and, like all others of that kidney, he has sold them out. In his case one or two things is evident: either he is a deeply dyed corrupt Radical partisan or he has purchased a seat in the Senate to defeat the people in their choice of a President.

Take him as you will, he presents another evidence that no confidence can be placed in any man who has ever sucked Radical sap.

Now, the question is, will the people submit to such a deliberate and infamous swindle? Our opinion was, when Grant was gathering the army at Washington, if the people had assembled in every township in the country and determined, after it was ascertained that Tilden had received a majority of the votes, that he should be inaugurated or there would be a fight, all this delay, anxiety and fraud would have been prevented.

A large majority of the bond holders of this country are Republicans. A fight for the Presidency would endanger the whole value of the bonds, and much as they want their own President, they value their bonds more, and would have yielded to the determination of the people rather than risk all in a fight. The fact is, Grant, Chandler and Cameron have told-dozed the whole Democratic party; and if Hayes is made the President he will do the same thing in the next election—provided another election for President is held.

The Democratic counsel have nearly completed their preparations of the contest over Oregon. They say, they will win there, or utterly disgrace the Commission. Bah! this depending upon liberal Republicans for honesty and decency is like a drowning man catching at straws to save himself. So-called liberal Republicans talk glibly and always vote for the Democrats, for when it requires a vote to save the Republican party they are never found voting against their liberality and honor is sure to ooze out under the party pressure. We would as soon start a dog with our dinner as to expect the most liberal talking Republican to vote against his party interest.

In this State liberal Republicans have been elected to the Legislature by Democratic votes, and in every instance they have turned out to be the most rabid and meanest Republicans in that body. Experience has taught us not to trust a Republican, even when honor and honesty is pitted against party interest. It is strange that all the Democrats have not profited by the many similar lessons they have learned.

GEN. KERSHAW'S POSITION.—In his speech at Lancaster last week Gen. J. B. Kershaw is reported to have said: "Even though the dearest wish of our hearts be defeated by the failure of Mr. Tilden to be declared President I still have full faith that, with Hayes as President of the United States, justice will be done throughout the whole land, and glory and honor and peace will crown our country through his wise and benign administration of its government; and, as to the question of his title to the Presidency, I shall hold the judgment of the high Electoral Commission now sitting at Washington as final and authoritative upon all the issues involved in the great and perplexing problem which it has been assembled to solve." This, we believe will be the position of every man in the South whose position is worthy of notice.—Columbia Union Herald.

Well, Gen. Kershaw is a Christian gentleman, and we admire his character much, but we can't see any Christianity in encouraging fraud and corruption by submitting to it. We don't know that our "position is worthy of notice," but we can assure the Union-Herald fellow that here is one man who will not "hold the judgment of the high Electoral Commission as final and authoritative," for we believe that every member of that Commission feels that the judgment, expressed by the vote of the majority, was founded upon base perjury and infamous corruption.

The Immortal Eight Jugglers.

In reference to the all-absorbing topic of the day—the great Presidential swindle by the immortal eight political and judicial jugglers—there is, perhaps, nothing in the whole transaction, that has created more surprise, than that the Democratic lawyers in Congress, numbering as they do, some of the most eminent of the profession in the Union, should have permitted themselves to be hood-winked into the belief that Congress possessed the constitutional authority to create that hybrid political monstrosity called a Commission—the legitimate offspring of a genuine Yankee trick.

In regard to the unfortunate recipient of the fraudulent boon, without laying claim to the gift of prophecy, either by direct gift or inheritance, we nevertheless hazard the prediction that the sentence that will be awarded by an outraged community against the authors of this nefarious fraud, will hardly fail to attach to the recipients of its fruits, that is, a load of obliquity equal to, if not greater, than that which was borne to the grave by Benedict Arnold.

When the decision of the Electoral Commission upon the vote of Louisiana was formally announced to the Senate, Mr. Kernan offered the following as a substitute for the Republican resolution declaring "that the decision of the Commission stand as the judgment of the Senate, the objections made thereto to the contrary notwithstanding."

Ordered, That the votes purporting to be the electoral votes for President and Vice-President, and which were given by Wm. P. Kellogg, J. H. Burch, Peter Joseph, L. A. Sheldon, Morris Marks, A. B. Lewis, H. C. Stewart and Oscar Jefferson, claiming to be electors for the State of Louisiana, be not counted, the decision of the Commission to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Bayard, of Delaware, said, as a member of the electoral commission, he had given all that he could give of earnest study, patient labor and devotion to secure a just execution of the law under the provisions of the Constitution. His labors and his efforts had been crowned by failure. Deep was his sorrow and poignant was his disappointment. He mourned his failure for his country's sake, for it seemed to him not only this decision of the eight members of the commission level in the dust all the essential safeguards thrown around the election of a chief magistrate, but it is announced to the people of this land that truth and justice, honesty and morality, were no longer the central basis of their political power.

Sherman's resolution was adopted by a strict party vote of 41 to 28.

The following action of the Southern Democrats, aided by the true Northern Democrats in any action yet taken by that body. It is practical and strikes just where it will be felt most by our political enemies. We sincerely hope those who have made the proposition will be sustained, and that the unscrupulous Republicans will be forced to do justice to the South: A proposition by Capt. Ellis, member of Congress from Louisiana, that appropriations be withheld until self-government to Louisiana and South Carolina was restored, was received with a storm of approbation.

The Southern members of Congress, backed by numbers of Northern Democrats, seem in earnest in this matter.

The speakers in the caucus to-night ranged themselves as follows: For resistance outright, Randall, Mills, Knott, McMahon, Poppleton, Walling, and Jones, of Kentucky. Submission, contingent on the recognition of Hampton and Nicholas, Representatives Ellis, Hooper and Springer. Against any action, Brown and Durham of Kentucky.

The easiest way for a citizen of a place to kill its prosperity is to purchase all his goods abroad, and the easiest way to make people go abroad is to neglect to advertise at home. People who don't believe that advertising pays should not complain if people, attracted by the liberal advertisements of merchants in other places, go abroad to do trading.—Register.

The town of Union is a case in point. We have not two columns of paying advertisements in our columns this week; but if we were to throw them all out we should either have to fill their places with gratuitous advertisements of papers outside the State or incur a cash outlay of \$10 per week to "set up" new matter.

WHO IS GOVERNOR.—On the trial before the Supreme Court, of the case involving the question of who is Governor, The Chief Justice intimated that the Senate had been notified after the decision, and had acted in contempt of this Court in refusing to respond.

Mr. Cavender continued that in any event the presence of the Senate was necessary to a count of the vote, and that Mr. Hampton could not be qualified until such count was made, and that up to that time Mr. Chamberlain had the right to hold over, given him by the constitution.

The Chief Justice asked the pertinent question whether a Senator or House of Representatives by refusing to come together could defeat the will of the people? To this Mr. Hampton replied that he might be excused from answering in view of the fact that he had puzzled some of the wisest in the national councils.

JUSTICE, SLOW BUT SURE.—A New York dispatch reports the arrest of three of the seven skilled burglars who "cracked" the Old Bank at Northampton, Mass., on the morning of January 26, 1876, and carried