

# The Anderson Intelligencer.

An Independent Family Newspaper—Devoted to Politics, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

HOYT & CO., Proprietors.

ANDERSON C. H., S. C., THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 20, 1875.

VOLUME X.—NO. 44.

## THE PRESS.

Barry Cornwall's poem on "The Press," which many of our readers may not have seen, was read by C. H. Moise, Esq., of Sumter, at the dinner of the South Carolina Press Association on Friday night, and is published by order of the Association.

"Let there be light!"  
God said, "Let there be light!"  
Grim darkness felt His might,  
And fled away;  
Shone forth seas and mountains cold  
Shone forth all bright in blue and gold,  
And cried, "This day 'tis day!"  
"Fall, holy light," exclaimed  
The thunderous cloud that damed  
O'er daises white;  
And lo! the rose, in crimson dressed,  
Lean'd sweetly on the lily's breast,  
And, blushing, murmured "Light!"  
Then was the sky-lark born;  
Then rose the embattled corn;  
Then flocks of praise  
Flow'd o'er the sunny hills of noon,  
And then, in stillest night, the moon  
Poured forth her pensive rays.  
Lo, heaven's bright bow is glad,  
Lo, trees and flowers all clad  
In glory, bloom!  
And shall the mortal sons of God  
Be senseless as the trodden cloud,  
And darker than the tomb?  
No, by the mead of man!  
By the swart artisan!  
By God, our Sire!  
Our souls have holy light within,  
And every form of grief and sin  
Shall cease and feel its fire.  
By earth, and hell, and heaven,  
The shroud of sorrow is riven!  
Mind, mind alone  
Is light, and hope, and life, and power,  
Earth's deepest night from this bless'd hour,  
The night of minds is gone!  
"The Press!" all lands shall sing;  
The Press, the Press we bring,  
All lands to bless.  
O pallid Want! O Labor stark!  
Behold we bring the second Ark!  
The Press! the Press! the Press!

## A BENEDICTION.

He held her hand one minute in his own;  
Murmured, through parting lips, "God help  
you, sweet!"  
Left her alone, and in his vacant place  
The twilight stole with soft and noiseless feet.

He passed away through dewy garden paths,  
Flooded with waves of moonlight, weird and  
white;  
And mystic scent of leaf-veiled lilac bloom  
Wafting its incense to the soul of night.

Between the setting and the rising sun,  
Adrift her spirit wandered, till the day  
Woke the new story of a life began  
Out of the grave of one that slipped away.

A twilight life, of gentle thought and deed,  
Of selfless purpose and reliant prayer;  
A spirit mooring in the misty light  
Of springtime perfume on the evening air.

Standing alone, her life was doubly blest,  
By this dead love, and love of sorrow born;  
Till tender Death sang all her soul to rest,  
And merged spring twilight in the summer  
morn.

## Our Judges and the Bar.

"It is a custom more honored in the breach than the observance."  
It is an ungracious task to question the propriety of a custom which, in this State, seems to have the sanction of time and the practical approval of the Courts and the Bar. But the custom we have in mind needs, we think, unfavorable criticism, and we know of none who may more properly make this criticism than ourselves, as we are in political and, to some extent, personal sympathy with the Judges of the State.

We refer to the custom of returning thanks to the Judges for the simple performance of the duties of their position. We cannot conceive of anything more undignified, and which to judges and lawyers in their right minds ought to seem more offensive.

Both in the theory and the practice of the law, as we understand it, the Bar constitutes a portion of the Court of Justice. The lawyer is subject at any time to the animadversion of the Court for failure in the performance of his duty, and, therefore, the very appearance of that which may be understood as an attempt to flatter or unduly influence the mind of the Court should be scrupulously avoided. Again, it may happen that at the close of a term, when a resolution or address of thanks is proposed, some members of the Bar will think that, leaving the propriety of the thing out of the question, the thanks are not deserved. Now, see the position in which these dissentient lawyers are placed; they must either sacrifice their convictions and acquiesce in the entire offering, or take the chances of being snubbed and obstructed in the pursuit of their professions by a weak-minded and malicious Judge, for such men do sometimes get on the Bench.

We say that none but a weak-minded Judge can be really pleased by such personal and conventional expressions of approval; and we say, further, that he is the very Judge who should not receive them. In one of the upper circuits, quite recently, a vote of thanks of this kind led to a most unpleasant discussion among the members of the Bar.

We know nothing of the inside history of these matters, and suppose that where a vote of thanks is given to a Judge it is because the members of the Bar so voting cannot repress their surprised gratitude at finding that the Judge, in his intercourse with them, has been neither a knave, absolute fool or tyrant. We have been told by lawyers, when discussing this subject with them, that the Judges fish for these compliments.

If this is so, then the action of the Bar in responding to such intimations is only less unworthy than that of the Judge who makes them.

We wish it understood that we have no doubt that there are many judges to whom such formal thanks are but as the idle wind, leaving no impression whatever, except, probably, a feeling of disgust. There are others, however, who prize these things highly, (because Judges are human,) and for that they prize them highly cannot suppress a feeling of dissatisfaction with those who fail to unite with them.

The fact is, disguise it as we may, these resolutions of thanks to the Judges by the Bar are nothing but a species of bribery. And we have no hesitation in saying that it is the duty of the Judges to stop them. The custom has obtained so long that the failure of the Bar to observe it is interpreted by a sensitive Judge as dislike or opposition to him personally, and so the empty but pernicious sham is perpetuated.

Who will be the first Judge to put the seal of his disapprobation upon it? From a very general conversation with members of the Bar, we know that they will be delighted to be relieved from what has grown to be a hateful service. We also know that there are Judges in the State who, now that the matter is called to their attention in this public manner, will be prompt to act, if, as we suppose, their judgment coincides with ours as to the character of the custom.

While we say, who speaks first? we are perfectly willing that they all should speak at once.—Union Herald.

## Economy, the Need of the South.

This virtue differs widely from penuriousness. It is opposed, not to the use of money for promoting the comfort, refinement and respectability of one's self or family, or to the exercise of generosity, but to waste and extravagance. It is the frugal and judicious expenditure of money or other material means. It is not always easy to strike the golden mean between parsimony and prodigality—between the desire to spend and the duty of saving. What may be economy in one man may be waste in another. It may be proper for a person to adopt very different rules of expenditure at different periods of his life. The measure of his expenses should be regulated by a due regard to his possessions, his income, and his claims of his family and of society, and his prospects for the future. The use of money or its equivalent, whether one has much or little, calls for consideration and a conscientious regard to all the responsibilities of life.

There is great need of this virtue in the South. The system of slavery led generally to a self-indulgent and extravagant mode of living. Most farmers and planters expended the full amount of their yearly income or more. Their wasteful habits did not disappear with the abolition of the system. It was difficult for families, accustomed to a certain style of living, to change it with the change in their circumstances. The old indulgences must be continued, even on borrowed capital, and at the peril of bankruptcy. The handsome equipage, the trained servants, the sumptuous dinners, the costly raiment and the sparkling jewelry must be retained, regardless of consequences.

It is easy to perceive that the expenditures of Southern people are disproportionate to their resources. In Europe, one sees everywhere a careful economy. There are plenty and comfort; but everything used to secure them is measured, weighed and nicely adjusted to the necessities of the case. Nothing is wasted. This economy extends to all the departments of life. In some cases, it may appear to be niggardliness; but, in the main, it is a carefulness prompted by necessity and sanctioned by a sound judgment. One of the great evils of the South is the extravagance of its people. They do not limit their expenses by their income. They do not husband and employ to the greatest advantage their resources. This evil is not peculiar to those whose fortunes have been wrecked. The poor live up to their means or beyond them. The freedmen, with rare exceptions, spend their meagre earnings for candles, fruits and trinkets, regardless of the wants of the future. This inconsiderate waste, in former times, might plead some excuse; but in our changed condition it is a folly and a mischief which calls for prompt and earnest correction. Only by rigid and general economy can our fair land be redeemed from its poverty, and raised to its pristine prosperity and independence.

Economy should be carried into all the business and interests of life. It should regulate the expenses for our food, our dress, our furniture, our equipage, our journeys, and especially in the needless indulgences of our appetites and fancies. There are few families or persons who might not, in some or in all these branches of expenditure, save many dollars, in the course of a year, to be added to the means of usefulness for the supplies for old age or the day of our adversity.

Unfortunately, when persons are forced or persuaded to economize, they are likely to begin this retrenchment at the wrong point. They abridge their benefactions, but not their superfluities. They have no money for the poor, but ample means for attending concerts. Provision is easily made for pampering and adorning the body, but the culture of the mind and the wellbeing of the soul are neglected. They can spare something for the purchase of tobacco, rum or ice-cream, but nothing for missions. Their dress affords no indication of the hardness of the times, but all appliances for the improvement of the intellect are curtailed. The pew must be given up, the subscription to the pastor's salary must be diminished or withheld, and contributions for church expenses must be reduced to the minimum; but the retrenchment is not likely to be carried any further.

Economy, to be successful, must proceed from principle. We are only stewards of God. We are responsible to him for the use of the possessions which he puts in our hands. We should employ them according to his will and for his glory. To hoard and to waste them are equally displeasing in his sight. They are the means of employment and usefulness, and should be carefully preserved and employed for these purposes. Nor can we reasonably expect that our economy will be availing until it is considerate and systematic. All necessities must be moderately supplied; but, beyond this point, our income should be discreetly divided between the means of comfort and pleasure, the demands of charity and usefulness, the increase of capital for more extended business, and a provision for old age and the aid of children.

"A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children."  
Capital is one of the great wants of the Southern people. It is needed for the improvement of our lands, the development of our mineral resources, the opening of manufacturing, and the payment of our private and public debts. Various plans have been recommended for obtaining it. The founding of banks, foreign immigration, and the cutting of canals, and laying of railroads have all their advocates as the certain means of securing prosperity to the country. We believe that economy, private and public, is the only sure method of increasing our capital and securing our welfare. If all our people, or even a fair proportion of them, should spend less than they make, very soon new life and success would be imparted to all our industries. Enterprise would revive. Our fields, receiving a more generous culture, would flourish and yield bountiful harvests. Our manufactures would become profitable. Our commerce would expand and prove remunerative. The surplus products of our industry, if economically employed, would soon pay our debts, and furnish an ample capital for the prosecution of all our legitimate and judicious enterprise, secular and religious.

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" We fear not. It is easy to preach and to see the duty of economy, but hard to practise it. Old customs are almost ineradicable. Poverty, want, experience, a changed social condition, may slowly teach us frugality, but we can hardly hope for its speedy and general adoption. Still every effort in that direction should be heartily encouraged, and all should feel it a duty to aid the much-needed reformation.—Religious Herald.

—When are stockings like dead men? When they are men-died; when their soles are departed; when they are in holes; when they are past healing; when they are no longer on their last legs.

—Philosophers say that shutting the eyes makes the hearing more acute. Perhaps this is the reason some people close their eyes in church during the preaching.

## A Son of the Wealthiest Planter in the South Convicted of a Great Crime.

"William S. Calhoun, convicted of forgery on evidence of his quadroon mistress, Olivia Williams!"  
This announcement in the Sunday papers supplies the text for a long and instructive moral discourse, and a very interesting chapter of domestic history.

The Calhoun referred to above is the only son of the late Meredith P. Calhoun, for many years before the war the largest and most lordly planter in the South. The wife of Mr. Calhoun was the daughter of Judge Smith, formerly of South Carolina, where he played a very prominent part in the politics and society of that State. Judge Smith was one of the most ancient and respected families in South Carolina, and inherited large estates, which he augmented in value by his judgment and enterprise. In the political arena he was regarded as the only formidable rival of the great John C. Calhoun. Judge Smith was the acknowledged leader of the Union party in the great secession fight of 1835. Shortly after this he removed to Huntsville, Alabama, where he bought large estates and established himself in an elegant residence, which was the home of a large and generous hospitality. The eldest daughter of Judge Smith married Meredith Calhoun, a young adventurer from the North, of polished manners and good address. Mrs. Calhoun received as her dowry a large tract of the rich land on Red River, then held in great demand as the most valuable and productive in the State. This is the land which now embraces the greater portion of what is now known as Grant parish. It extends ten miles on the river, and has been leveled at a vast expense, and possesses unlimited resource for the production of cotton and sugar. Upon this estate Mr. Calhoun expended a very great sum, stocking it with eleven hundred slaves, and all the expensive structures and machinery required to produce cotton and sugar. In the palmy days of this culture the yield of this large investment was highly remunerative. For several years before the war the regular income was between \$250,000 and \$300,000.

Having made several visits to France with his family, Mr. Calhoun acquired a taste for French society and habits, and during the latter period of his life resided in Paris. Here he expended his large income in affording his wife and daughter every opportunity of participating in the elegant and fashionable enjoyments of the gay and luxurious capital. Besides his daughter, an accomplished and elegant young lady, who was born and educated in France, so that she speaks the French language with more facility than her own, Mr. Calhoun had a son who came into this world partially deformed, but not on that account regarded with less affection and tenderness by his parents. No child was ever more carefully and tenderly watched and cared for than the poor little hunchback, Willie Calhoun, preferring to live on the plantation rather than expose himself in the brilliant society of Paris, Willie did not accompany his parents abroad. Devoting himself to agricultural life, he finally became a sort of head manager or agent for his father. This was the condition of the family when the war broke out. Mr. Calhoun was residing with his wife and daughter in France, and Willie had charge of the plantation. Of course the war produced most disastrous effects on the Calhoun estate. The destruction of the slave property alone was enough to swamp the whole estate. Mr. Calhoun died about the close of the war, and the widow had given her power of attorney to Willie. In 1868 she returned with her daughter to Louisiana, and proceeded on a steamboat to the landing now known as Colfax, with a view of seeing her son and investigating the condition of her affairs. Her mind had been greatly disturbed by rumors of her son's "carrying on" from old servants and others. Among other stories which had reached her was one to the effect that he had become a practical as well as a political miscegenationist—that he had been elected by an exclusive negro vote to the Legislature, and had formed a liaison with a buxom quadroon who claimed to be his lawful wife, and who assumed all the airs and authority of the lady of the Calhoun mansion.

It may be imagined with what crushing force these terrible stories fell upon the pride of the high-born mother. Whether it was from the realization of their truth or from some other warning, Mrs. Calhoun, after a brief conversation with some of her old servants at the river landing, came to the conclusion not to expose herself to the humiliation of witnessing the son's degradation and the profanity of the lady's mansion, so with her daughter she returned on the boat to the city, and procuring board for herself and daughter at the Bay of St. Louis, sojourned there for some months. Here Mrs. Calhoun died in the summer of 1868, leaving her daughter alone in the world, moneyless and almost friendless. Nothing could be got from the estate. It had been hopelessly involved by Willie.

Miss Ada had been nurtured with boundless indulgence. She had never known what it was to want anything which money could command; and here she was, totally inexperienced, an orphan thrown upon the world, from a position of long-ensured wealth and high rank, with no other relative but a brother, who was now her most bitter enemy; but the young lady proved equal to her great emergencies. It would perhaps be an intrusion upon her private affairs to refer to shifts and expedients to which she was driven to regain her fortune, and to save her from the miseries of a poverty which would be tenfold bitter to one reared as she had been.

Suffice it to say that, with the aid of a zealous and persevering young lawyer, she has been placed beyond the reach of the perils so much feared by her, and we sincerely hope her fortunes are in a fair train to restoration, and that her future will realize the old dramatic climax of "virtue rewarded and vice punished."

And surely this conviction of the bad brother for forgery would seem to fill the last condition of dramatic and poetic justice. After degrading and disgracing himself and family by a disreputable alliance, and incurring a judgment of breach of promise of marriage of \$50,000, in favor of his quadroon mistress, he sought to rid himself and the estate of this incubrance by an act which the jury had decided to be a forgery.

Truly has the psalmist declared "the ways of the transgressor are hard."—New Orleans Times.

—A letter to the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer says that a man named Peter Peeler, of Cleveland county, hung himself in his barn on Wednesday. It is a singular fact that Crow, the former owner of the plantation on which Peeler lives, hung himself some years ago near the same spot.

—A Whitehall, writing to an acquaintance who is blind, addressed him as "My dear friend," because he said he was a friend without an eye.

## The Phelps-Bowles Libel Suit.

The decision of the libel suit of Mr. Willis Phelps against Mr. Samuel Bowles, of the Springfield Republican, though nominally in favor of the plaintiff, is claimed as an actual victory by the defendant, since the damages awarded (\$100) are only nominal, and in comparison with the amount claimed (\$200,000) insignificant and do not carry the costs; so that each party pays his own costs. The facts are briefly these: The Phelps family were largely interested in a certain railroad enterprise which asked the city of Springfield for a subscription in its aid. In various ways this question of subscription entered into local politics, and was made the subject of newspaper comment. In the course of the discussion the Republican charged the plaintiff with "openly buying votes" and "lobbying bills through the Legislature," and said that "having despoiled the city of a large sum of money he is using it to obtain more." It also called him "the Boss Tweed of Springfield," and "a public robber and public con-upter." This language is certainly specific enough; it has strength, meaning, virility. There was no mistaking the editor's opinion of the offenses against public morals with which he charged these parties. The question to be tried was whether the plaintiff had been guilty of such conduct, and if guilty, whether it was sufficient warrant for the description.

Upon the suggestion of the plaintiff, readily adopted by the defense, the case was tried to the Court instead of a jury. So the work before the counsel and parties was plain and simple, with very little discussion of side issues or introduction of unnecessary testimony. Under the rulings of the Court upon technical questions the defense was unable to introduce testimony to show the common report and belief, or to justify the denial of malicious feeling by cumulative proofs, but was shut up to the necessity of establishing the fact of corruption by the plaintiff himself and his own witnesses. Upon this testimony the Judge in his finding said that though no instance had actually been proved of paying money to voters, the reckless way in which funds were dealt out, the class of men to whom they were given and "no questions asked," made the means employed hardly less culpable, in the moral sense, than if open bribery had been practiced. Whether the election was carried by corrupt means or not, it was plain, he said, that corrupt means were employed in its behalf. And the Judge adds, in commenting upon the vital importance of our very existence that our elections shall be fairly and properly conducted. "If improper influences are exercised upon voters, and they are persuaded by those who have pecuniary ends to accomplish, such elections are a great wrong; and those employing such influences are to be condemned as a class dangerous to the community." Taking the facts as found the Court held that a portion of the Republican's charges was proved true. The charge which was not substantiated was contained in the words, "That, having despoiled the city of a large sum of money, he is using it to obtain more." The defense, having failed to establish the truth of this, claimed that, whether true or false, it was spoken in good faith, without malice and in honest purpose. Upon this point we quote the conclusion of Judge Endicott's decision:

"I think that a declaration by one citizen, relating to matters that he knows are made in good faith, may be privileged. But the law also requires that it shall be exercised within certain rules and restrictions. I have admitted the testimony upon which Mr. Bowles is said to have acted, but no proof upon this point has been brought forward. Direct malice, if proved, is the end of privilege; I can't say on the evidence that there was no express malice. Mr. Bowles had been engaged in a heated controversy with Mr. Phelps, and, as the evidence is very decided that there was, therefore, express malice—that state of feeling which the law defined as such. The extent of it I do not consider important, or that Mr. Bowles may have been actuated by other motives than this. The result then is, no evidence having been adduced on the third count, and the plea of justification by truth and privilege having failed, there must be a finding for the plaintiff. I was careful to enumerate in the earlier portion of my opinion somewhat in detail the evidence brought in concerning the elections, because it becomes important when the claim for damages is considered. In assessing damages that amount shall be awarded which the plaintiff, as he appears in the evidence before the court, is entitled to the injury done to his good name. I do find that Mr. Willis Phelps was guilty of illegal and improper practices, and was a party to influences corrupting to the community; and the only question is what a man is to receive when such facts are published. He is certainly not to receive large damages; judgment is therefore entered for \$100."

Mr. Bowles, not content with anything but a clean decision in his favor, proposes to take the case up for review, the present result having been reached upon purely technical grounds. This he does in the interest of the press of the country as well as of the honest voters and tax-payers who look to the press for truthful information and timely warning. In his review of the case he says:

"There has never been a better time or a better case for the purpose. The issue is as simple and clean-cut as could be desired. We think the formal verdict should have gone with the moral verdict. We intend to consult the highest judicial authority in Massachusetts as to the correctness of that opinion. If the Justices of the Supreme Bench decide against us, if the law is in such a state that a newspaper can be condemned and punished, even in the smallest and most formal degree, for discharging a conceded public duty of the plainest obligation and for rendering a conceded public service of the highest utility—then the sooner the fact is definitely ascertained the better."

Mr. Bowles has made in this matter a manly and straightforward fight, meeting the issue squarely and without any evasion, and deserves the thanks of the press of the country for it.—New York Tribune.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.

## The Wheeler Compromise in Louisiana.

Congressman Wheeler has recently written a letter to the New York Times, in which he justly claims that the Louisiana Democrats have acted in good faith, and that the compromise has proven a success. We give the telegraphic summary of his letter, which will afford a correct idea of the present situation in Louisiana:

NEW YORK, May 10.

Mr. Wheeler, of the Congressional Louisiana Committee, in a letter in relation to the adjustment of differences in that State effected under the award of that committee, says there is a class of people who seem to have expected that the adjustment was to inaugurate a political millennium in Louisiana; that henceforth that State was to be wholly free from the friction which attends the workings of political parties elsewhere. This class will probably pronounce the adjustment a failure, for undoubtedly party warfare will continue to be waged in Louisiana very much as it is in New York and other States of the Union. She will have her dishonest officials and corrupt legislation, as other States have, and she will years to come stagger along under the load of her accumulated financial burdens, and her obligations may at times go to protest. Louisiana, from her existence as a State, had an exceptionally stormy record—this condition of things arising from a diversity of race and character in the State, with almost unavoidable disturbances growing out of the war, and the upheaval and very foundations of labor and society is not to be changed in a day by any one act, however beneficial; nevertheless, I firmly believe that even Louisiana has at last caught inspiration from the new order of things, and that, exhausted as she is with tumult and violence, yet with a just government and the education of her people—the last just now her greatest need—she will, with steady but slow pace emerge from what seemed to be her utterly helpless condition.

There is another class who will regard the adjustment as a failure—those who sought in it simply partisan advantages. Without arrogating anything to the gentlemen who composed the late Congressional Committee on Southern Affairs, I think I may safely claim for them that they are not of this class. Regarding the allegation that one of the provisions of the adjustment has already been violated by the Democrats, Wheeler says he cannot subscribe to the truth of this allegation; the arbitrators had nothing to do but to pass upon the claims of the members and Senators who should sign the agreement. Of course, the award could affect no one else. It was merely advisory to the Republican members of the General Assembly. It could not and did not seek directly to interfere with the rights of the members then sitting, and who had certificates of the Returning Board, but whose seats were claimed by Democrats.

After the Democrats left the House on the 4th of January, and some time during the winter session, the Republicans unseated four Democratic members, who held certificates of the Returning Board, and whose names were on the list of members used by the Republican Clerk. At the attempted organization in January, no one of these four Democrats, who were re-seated at the recent extra session of the Legislature, of which complaint is made, was a party to the article of adjustment; no one can be found in Louisiana to assert that, at the time these four Democrats were unseated, there was a quorum of the House present. So these four Democrats had never been legally deprived of their seats; but it is replied by those who impute bad faith to the Democrats, that the agreement contains this provision: "The House of Representatives, as to its members as constituted under the award, shall remain without change except by the resignation or death of members until a new general election, and this condition has been violated."

The Democrats never questioned the action of the Returning Board except in the cases referred to the committee. They were willing, with these exceptions, to abide by it. My understanding of the above provision is that the House of Representatives was to be returned by the Returning Board, after the errors of that board had been corrected in cases specified in the agreement by the award of the committee and its adoption by the House of Representatives. The parties to the agreement having made no stipulation in these cases, cannot be fairly asked to deprive these four members of the seats to which they had been declared elected by the Returning Board, and of which "less than a majority of the members" of the House of Representatives had attempted to deprive them. These four men being legally entitled to their seats, having done nothing to forfeit them, their reinstatement was an act of simple justice, which all fully understanding the acts must approve."

Mr. Wheeler says, touching the allegations of bad faith by the Democrats, that they did not act covertly. He details the opposition manifested upon the first acceptance of the articles of adjustment and says: "On the day preceding the meeting of the late extra session of the Legislature, I met at the rooms of Gen. Sheridan prominent Republican officials and Col. Leonard, of the Shreveport Times, who had been a leading man in the negotiations on the Democratic side. The matter of the four members was fully discussed in Gen. Sheridan's room, and Leonard distinctly informed us that he wished no concealment, and that it was due to us that if he should inform us that if the award of the committee should be adopted by the House, the Democrats would promptly reseat the four members. This statement was but simple justice to Col. Leonard and those whom he represented. I can easily perceive how parties at a distance, without knowledge of the facts in detail, should deem the Democrats guilty of non-obviance of the provision which I have cited. But I cannot think them in fairness obnoxious to the charge, and common justice, which ought to characterize parties as well as individuals entitled to this explanation. The Republican party has now put itself in the right in Louisiana. The action of both parties in the future will be watched by the country, and the future will mete out to each the judgment which, by its acts, it shall have entitled itself, and to that tribunal the matter may safely be confided."

—Scientific men say the deeper we go into mines under the earth the hotter it becomes. We wish they would stop talking that way.

## The Highest Mountain in the World.

For many years past Mount Everest, in that portion of the great Himalaya range which occupies the western part of the strange kingdom of Nepal, immediately north of India, has been regarded as the highest mountain in the world. It is known to the Nepalese as Gaurisankar, but the English named it Everest, in honor of a distinguished officer of the British Indian topographical survey. Its snow-capped summit is 29,093 feet, or nearly five miles and a half, above the level of the sea. Of course no one has ever ascended it to this height, but its altitude, like that of the other lofty peaks of the Himalaya, was ascertained by triangulation; and until the present time it has not been supposed that any higher land existed on the earth.

If the news be true, however, which has lately come to us from the more distant East, there is a loftier peak than Mount Everest in the great island of Papua or New Guinea. This vast region, extensive enough to form six States as large as New York, is as yet almost wholly unexplored, except along its coasts. Lying close to the equator, where the Indian Ocean and the Pacific meet, it is the home of the casowary and the bird of paradise, a country grand in its scenery, rich in its vegetation, and abounding in curious and beautiful forms of animal life—the veritable wonderland of the globe. An attempt to explore the unknown interior of the island was made from Torres Strait, which separates it from Australia, by Capt. J. A. Lawson, in the year 1872; and if we may believe his published narrative of the journey, which has just appeared in London, he advanced several hundred miles inland, and about midway between the north and the south coasts discovered a mountain 32,783 feet high, which he named Mount Hercules.

The height of this mountain—over six miles—is not the only remarkable thing about it. Its apparent elevation is but little less than its actual elevation; for, instead of rising from a table land like the plateau of central Asia, it stands in a comparatively low plain only about two thousand feet above the ocean, and this gives a clear rise of more than 30,000 feet above the surrounding country. The traveler standing at its base could look up and see its snow peak towering 30,000 feet skyward from where he stood. Under such circumstances the altitude of a mountain is appreciated.

Captain Lawson tells us that he undertook the ascent, formidable as it appeared. He did not reach the top, but we believe the achievement which he relates is unparalleled in the records of mountaineering. Accompanied by one servant, he set out from the foot at four o'clock in the morning. They passed through dense forests in the first two thousand feet of perpendicular progress, found the limit of tree growth at eleven thousand feet, and by nine o'clock had reached a point fourteen thousand feet above the sea level—almost as high as the famous Matterhorn. A thousand feet higher was the snow line, and they began to suffer from the cold. As they pressed on drowsiness began to overcome them. "Nothing was visible but snow of the most dazzling whiteness. Every peck and crag was covered with it, and it hung over the edges of the cliffs in long fleecy masses." Their eyes were affected by the glare, and they felt themselves growing more and more lethargic.

"At length blood began to flow from our noses and ears," says Capt. Lawson, "and my head ached in a distracting manner. I saw that our only chance of preserving life was to retreat without delay; for we were in a pitiful plight. Our lips and gums and the skin of our hands and faces were cracked and bleeding, and our eyes were bloodshot and swollen to an alarming extent. The thermometer had sunk to twenty-two degrees below the freezing point, and the air was so rarefied that we were gasping rather than breathing. Our staves fell from our grasp, and we could not pick them up again, so benumbed were our arms and hands. It was now one o'clock, and the greatest elevation we had attained was 25,314 feet."

They then turned back, descended to the limit of the snow in three hours, and arrived at their camp at the base of the mountain about half past seven in the evening. Thus, in fifteen hours and a half, they had ascended an absolute height of 23,000 feet, to an elevation which we believe is greater than any ever before attained by man upon the surface of the earth, although balloonists have occasionally gone higher.

These are wonderful stories, and the reader may desire to know whether we altogether trust in their authenticity and accuracy. The fresh, spirited, and interesting narrative in which we have found them is published by one of the most respectable firms in London, and is put forth as a genuine book of travels. The author's account of the flora, the fauna, and the inhabitants of New Guinea, contains much that is marvellous, and that certainly has hitherto been unknown and unsuspected. Some of his statements, also, are difficult to reconcile with our previously acquired knowledge concerning the island. Under these circumstances, his narrative is likely to be regarded much as we should view the testimony of a single, strange witness to a startling fact: we do not disbelieve it, but we should like to hear some corroborative evidence. This will probably be afforded by subsequent explorations.—N. Y. Sun.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.

—A Whitehall, writing to an acquaintance who is blind, addressed him as "My dear friend," because he said he was a friend without an eye.

—A Whitehall, writing to an acquaintance who is blind, addressed him as "My dear friend," because he said he was a friend without an eye.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.

—A Washington correspondent declares that Grant is exceedingly fond of absinthe. It is very likely he is; but if there should be but one liquid left upon the whole face of the earth, he would be mighty sorry it wasn't whiskey.