The News and Herald.

VOL. I--NO. 15.] WINNSBORO, S. C., THURSDAY MORNING, JANUARY 11, 1877. $3.00 A Year in Advance.

THE WEAKENING CONSPIRACY.

Grant Lowering his Key--A Fair Finger in the Presidential Pie.

Correspondence of the New York Sun.

There will be no war. The woman that hesitates is lost. The Republican confederates hesitate. They will lose.

The question is arithmetical as well as Presidential. If Mr. Morton succeeds in whipping into party traces every Republican Senator, Mr. Hayes will be declared President. If nine Republican Senators value conscience and country higher than party, the will of the people will be respected, and Mr. Tilden will be peaceably inaugurated.

Nine Republican senators—that is the question. There are twenty-nine Democratic members in the Senate; the other forty-six were all elected either as Independents or Republicans. If the Republican confederates lose but nine members, the Conservatives will have a majority of the Senate; a majority that could immediately displace Mr. Ferry; a majority against which the conspiracy could never succeed. The Presidential problem, therefore, practically resolves into the simple question whether these needed nine senators will be forthcoming. My answer, based upon close observation, direct information, and personal conversation with members of the Senate, is that these nine will be found on the right side when they are really needed.

Put down Roscoe Conkling for one. Though carefully bent upon avoiding any public avowal of his position, there is not the slightest reason to doubt what that position will be. It will be in favor of honor and honesty and on the side of the law and Constitution. It will be for the right of Congress to scrutinize the electoral returns and reject those that are fraudulent. It will be against the power of either the Vice President or the Returning Boards to make a President. Those who enjoy the confidence of Senator Conkling know perfectly well that these are his views, though he has obvious reasons for keeping them in reserve until the proper time arrives.

Put down James G. Blaine as another. I see an incredulous smile. "What! Jim Blaine?" Yes Jim Blaine of Maine. I know whereof I speak. Strange as it may or must appear, the two most conspicuous men to thwart the conspiracy and to prevent the counting in of Mr. Hayes will be his two most prominent rivals for the nomination—will be two men who have totally different motives and characters, who are themselves not friends but old and unrelenting enemies. I do not speak of Blaine with the same degree of positiveness with which I speak of Conkling, for the simple reason that the one is more uncertain than the other. But to-day, from trustworthy information, it seems probable that Mr. Blaine will take Mr. Conkling's position in favor of an honest count. I shall analyze his motives some other time. Suffice it to say that they are sound, and if he does take that position, the generous American people will be likely to forgive and forget certain transactions, at present neither fully explained nor fully examined.

There will be no difficulty about seven followers if Conkling and Blaine take the lead. It is thought more than probable, almost certain, that Senator Robertson, of South Carolina, Alcorn, of Mississippi, and Hamilton, of Texas, will be among them. It is known that Senator Jones, of Nevada, entertains the profoundest admiration for the ability and character of Mr. Conkling, and it is probable that Mr. Jones, as well as his colleague, Mr. Sharon, and such men as Harvey, Hitchcock, Wadleigh, Christiancy, Paddock, Burnside, Dawes, and even Edmunds and Frelinghuysen, would be strongly influenced by Mr. Conkling's views.

But the greatest influence, after all, in favor of the peaceable inauguration of Mr. Tilden is the force of public opinion, the silent but salient power of right, the daily increasing evidence of the monstrous fraud committed by the new confederates in order to count in Hayes?

Let me briefly present some evidence of the effective operation of these moral forces upon the minds of some of the most important of the new confederates; let me show conclusively that a change has come over the spirit of their dream; that confidence in the success of their plot has vanished, and serious doubt has taken its place. Here are a few facts:

Grant talks in an entirely new key. In recent conversation he has shown irritation at the "mistaken view of the public," to use his own language, as to his position. I believe that Grant's mind has undergone another change within the last fortnight. I know at least, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that in a recent conversation with a most intimate friend, Grant said that he never expressed or even indicated the opinion that Hayes was elected and would be inaugurated; that he (Grant) "would not mix in the matter," but surrender the Government to whomsoever was legally elected, "glad, most glad, to get out of the White House." How long he will stick to this opinion remains to be seen. In this category I may mention a thing both important and amusing. The friends of an honest count have an ally in the White House. I trust it is no indelicacy (I know it is the absolute truth) to say that Mrs. Grant is most emphatically against the scheme of the new confederates to count in Hayes. The plain sense and womanly instincts of the lady have convinced her that Tilden is fairly elected; and whatever influence she possesses is exercised over Gen. Grant to abate his fierce partisanship and to neutralize the effect of the manipulations of Chandler, Don Cameron & Co. But of this, more some other time.

Mr. Ferry, too, talks differently. He, likewise, has changed his mind considerably. It was openly said by Morton that Mr. Ferry would simply refuse to receive the Tilden returns from the disputed States. But Mr. Ferry has received them all without a word of objection. It was openly asserted that Mr. Ferry would count the Electoral votes, and not Congress, and Mr. Ferry for a very long time assented to this at least that studied silence which gives consent. But I hear from a distinguished Senator from the East that Mr. Ferry has quite recently denied that he ever claimed any right whatever to count the Electoral votes. It was generally asserted and generally believed that the majority in the Senate would insist upon Mr. Morton's idea that the Vice-President, and not Congress, had the power to count. But I near from another prominent Senator that this plan is abandoned, and that a majority of the Senate will now unquestionably hold that Congress has the power to count as well as to reject Electoral returns, and not the Vice-President. With the abandonment of this plan or with the impossibility of its execution, the plot must fail. The Republican confederates are weakening all along the line. J. P.

Governor Hampton and the Presidential Election.

Several of our contemporaries out of the State have commented upon the recently published letter of Governor Hampton to Governor Hayes. These comments have all been kind, and have done full justice to the patriotism, good sense and earnest purpose of Governor Hampton. They attribute to his excessive love of his State and anxiety for its rehabilitation and prosperity, and to his general good nature, his admission that Governor Hayes, as a possible President, may possibly be instrumental in settling the vexed political questions which now agitate the public mind. They differ with him upon that point, as we have differed with him, but it may a justly formed conclusion of other minds that it was his duty to enclose a copy of his letter to the Republican candidate. It was prepared and first transmitted to Governor Tilden, but, upon second thought, and from a sense of courtesy, and because of the necessity of constantly making plain and clear the peaceful disposition and law-abiding temper of our people, was likewise forwarded to his competitor. Its burden, in other respects than those mentioned, was that we of the South should discountenance a resort to force in settling the Presidential question; that we need peace, and hope to see it preserved in the most trying circumstances.

So much for the letter. If an error at all, it was one which leant to the side of patriotism and peace.

The Columbus (Ohio) correspondent of the New York *Herald* has done a serious injustice to Governor Hampton, unintentionally, no doubt, and through misconception of the statements of Judge T. J. Mackey as to his position. It must be known that Governor Hampton had not the slightest agency in Judge Mackey's visit to Ohio. He did not know or inquire what took him there. Having informed Governor Hampton he was going thither on private business, the Governor availed himself of the opportunity of transmitting by him a duplicate of his letter to Governor Tilden.

The correspondent may have accepted Judge Mackey's own views to be the same as Governor Hampton's. But that was a great mistake, certainly. Judge Mackey was a warm supporter of Governor Hampton and did good service to the cause of the people of South Carolina in the late campaign. But his opinions are very different from Governor Hampton's. He is a fine talker, but he spoke for himself only, and we are sure did not claim to give anything more than the letter to which we have alluded as coming from him. Governor Hampton, of course, thinks, as all well-informed men must think, that Governor Tilden was fairly elected President of the United States. His opinion to that effect is decided and has been unwavering from the first. He hopes and means that he shall be peacefully inaugurated. On the other hand, he never regarded Governor Hayes as elected, and can never do so until such a claim on the part of his friends and on his own part has been constitutionally established. That is as far off as the Greek Kalends.—*Columbia Register.*

Crime North and South--Demoralizing Influences of Slavery.

A favorite theme of the canting organs of "the party of moral ideas" is the alleged prevalence of crime in the South. According to such papers as *Harper's Weekly*, the Chicago *Tribune*, the Philadelphia *American* and others of their class, the white people of the Southern States are but one degree above barbarians. Murder, especially negro killing, is represented by these journals to be a common pastime with our young men, while all the minor degrees of crime are of universal prevalence among our people. While these pious folks deplore our moral depravity, in their charity they attribute it to "the demoralizing influences of the institution of slavery."

The South needs no vindication from such slanders. We do not claim entire exemption from the crimes and vices that deform humanity and society everywhere. Our people are not free from the promptings of temper and passion, and the bad whiskey of the South is as full of all devilishness as that of the North. But, while this is the case, we do claim that the criminal records will demonstrate that in proportion to our population there are as few murders committed in the South as in any portion of the Union, and that for the lesser crimes such as robbery, burglary, arson and theft, Georgia will compare favorably with any other section of the Union. While this is true in general, it cannot be denied that we are far behind the more civilized and enlightened North in mercenary crime. For the contrivance and execution of mean, heartless and mercenary villainy—for such crimes as the Beecher seduction, the Piper belfry horror, and the Pomeroy murders in Boston, the Charlie Ross kidnapping case, for burglaries and bank robberies, the robbery of graves and the sanctuaries of churches—the loyal, civilized and enlightened North may justly claim pre-eminence. Of this fact the local columns of the newspapers of the great cities afford ample proof.

The latest development of that peculiar talent which has in the North elevated professional villainy to the rank of a fine art is the recent hyena performance in Illinois, the star cracksmen in which exploit were Chicagoans, and doubtless habitual readers of that veracious sheet, brother Medell's *Tribune*. A few days since the country was shocked by the report that an attempt had been made to steal the body of the late President Abraham Lincoln from the sarcophagus in which it reposes in the monument erected to his memory near Springfield. There were various surmises at the time as to what could be the possible object of the resurrectionists who had been baffled in an attempt to steal the remains of the dead President. The conclusion arrived at by the loyal Chicago press was that it was a diabolical plot by Southern rebels to desecrate the grave of the author of the emancipation proclamation, and to "carry out their oft-repeated threat to scatter what remained of Father Abraham to the four winds of heaven." An immense amount of pious indignation was aroused among the loyal Chicagoans against the sacrilegious rebel vandals of the South. But we have now a very different solution of the affair. It turns out that the attempt to steal the remains of Lincoln was a purely local enterprise or speculation, planned and partially executed, not by the Chicago whiskey ring, but by a ring of Chicago counterfeiters, whose object was to secure a large pecuniary reward from the government and to procure the pardon of one of their gang by the name of Boyd, who had recently been convicted and sent to the Illinois penitentiary. Boyd is an engraver of counterfeit plates, and is an important member of the Chicago counterfeiting fraternity, who it was all-important to them should be set at liberty. The plan of the conspirators was to steal the remains of Lincoln and secrete them, when they confidently expected a large reward would be offered for their recovery by the family and by the government. Then they intended to offer through their agent to surrender the remains in consideration of the sum of $200,000 and the unconditional pardon of their confederate Boyd. By a mere accident they failed in the accomplishment of their scheme, and one of the gang having "peached," the others have been arrested, and their whole conspiracy disclosed.

Now we admit that, as a cool business transaction, this affair has no parallel in the annals of Southern crime. Could such a monstrous piece of sacrilegious villainy have been planned and executed anywhere out of loyal, moral Chicago? And yet those Chicago hyenas were never exposed to the demoralizing influences of slavery.—*Savannah Ga., News.*

The Mackey House of Representatives--Is it a Lawful House?

We have received a copy of the report of a special committee appointed by the Mackey House of Representatives relative to the organization of that body and the constitutional validity thereof.

It is an ingenious and able paper presenting the most plausible argument for sustaining the illegal action of Chamberlain and his party in their usurpation of the authority of the State. Summed up in a few words the argument is this:

The Board of State Canvassers had full authority to refuse certificates to the members elect from Laurens and Edgefield. Their action could not be reversed by the Supreme Court. That thus there were only 116 members elect to the House of Representatives; that the Clerk of the late House, having full authority in law to make up the roll of members, was justified in putting this number on his roll, and in excluding all others; that the Mackey House, having been organized with fifty nine members, the majority of one hundred and sixteen, was duly constituted, and that consequently all its action is in strict accordance with the Constitution.

It will be observed that the keystone of this argument is the legality of the action of the State Board of Canvassers. If this position be not maintained the whole fabric falls to the ground, and the organization of the House under Mackey and all of the subsequent actions of the Chamberlain Government must per force be illegal. The legality of the action of the Board of State Canvassers depends upon three propositions:

1. Either that this Board heard the protest and contest with regard to the elections in Laurens and Edgefield, and decided that they were fraudulent;

2. Or that, without hearing the protest and contest, they had facts before them which induced the belief that the elections were invalid, and that they, in consequence thereof, refused to issue certificates of election;

3. And that in this they were acting with authority of law.

I. No protest or contest was in fact heard. The idea of a protest or contest involves judicial action upon a case made, in which there are parties complaining and parties defending; the result of which depends upon facts established by legal testimony, governed by law produced and relied upon; it is a trial before a legal tribunal. In the present case the *prima facie* count of the ballots cast in these two counties showed that certain Democrats had the highest number of votes. No notice of protest was served on any of them. No notice of contest was given. No testimony, in a legal sense, was heard. No witnesses were examined. Certain *ex parte* statements, it seems, were somehow made before, or put into possession of, the Board. But there was no pretence of any legal examination into the cases. Indeed the two members of the Board who had characters to lose (the Secretary of State and the Attorney General) voted against the action of the majority in the case of Laurens county, and the former filed his formal protest against the action of the Board in relation to both of the counties, on the ground that they had decided upon an *ex parte* showing.

II. But it may be said that the Board heard no protest or contest, and yet that they saw enough to prevent them from issuing certificates to the members elect from Laurens and Edgefield. It is difficult to catch the distinction between this course of action and one adopted after hearing a protest. The election was either valid or invalid. If valid, the certificates were issued as a matter of course. How could it be declared invalid without the examination of testimony, and how could testimony be examined unless the issue was made as to the validity of the election, and how could the issue be made without a protest or a contest? If the Board of State Canvassers pass at all upon the validity of the election, they must do so in some judicial capacity. In this capacity they decide upon issues raised before them. How can these issues be made, except by parties interested in setting aside the result against parties interested in sustaining it?

It must be borne in mind that there is no pretence that Laurens and Edgefield failed to hold an election. The people met on the day fixed by the amendment of the Constitution; the managers of election opened the polls; the ballot boxes were regularly prepared; the ballots were cast, and after the polls were closed the boxes were opened, the ballots taken out by the managers, and the votes were counted, and the result certified. Under these circumstances could the Board of State Canvassers declare that there was not a valid election?

Fortunately we are not left to any theory of this subject, and we are spared a long examination into the principles of law applicable to it.

In the case of Gilbert Pillsbury and others vs. the acting Board of Aldermen of the City of Charleston (1 South Carolina Reports, 20) the whole matter is discussed. This case was elaborately argued before the Supreme Court by Messrs. Chamberlain and Corbin, and the Court, recognizing the force of their logic, ruled with them. That case decides as follows: The 5th section of the act to provide for the election of officers of the incorporated cities and towns of the State, &c., ratified September 28, providing that "the managers of election shall decide contested cases, subject to the ultimate decision of the Board of Aldermen or Wardens when organized, except the election of a majority of the persons voted for is contested or the managers are charged with illegal conduct, in which case the returns together with the ballots shall be examined and the case investigated by the acting Board of Aldermen, who shall declare the election, and their decision shall be binding on all parties, *does not authorize the acting Board of Aldermen in a case coming properly before it to adjudge the election to be illegal and void.* Its authority is limited to an examination of the returns together with the ballots, and a declaration of the results of the election."

III. The election having taken place the Board of State Canvassers had no warrant in law for hearing any protest or contest, or for passing any opinion upon the validity of the election.

The power of the Board of State Canvassers are derived entirely from the Statute: "The Board shall, upon the certified copies of the statements made by the Board of County Canvassers, proceed to make a statement *of the whole number of votes* given at such election for the various officers, and for each of them voted for, distinguishing the several counties in which they were given. They shall certify such statements to be correct, and subscribe the same with their proper names. They shall make and subscribe on the proper statement a certificate of their determination, and shall deliver the same to the Secretary of State. Upon such statement they shall then proceed to determine and declare what persons have been, by *the greatest number of votes*, duly elected to such offices or either of them."

This is their general duty with regard to all offices—to make a statement of the whole number of votes given at such election for the various offices and each of them; to subscribe on such statement a certificate of their determination, and deliver the same to the Secretary of State. Upon such statement they should proceed to determine and declare what persons have been, *by the greatest number of votes* duly elected to such offices. Such is their duty on the count, and it is manifestly simply ministerial—to count the votes and declare who has received the highest number.

The Act then adds: "They shall have power, and it is made their duty to decide, all cases of protest or contest that may arise, *when the power to do so does not, by the Constitution, reside in some other body.*" In other words, no power whatsoever is given to them to do anything but to make up, from the statements of the County Canvassers, a statement of the whole number of votes given at the election, and from such statement to determine and declare what persons have been, by the greatest number of votes, duly elected—except in certain cases of protest and contest, which do not, under the Constitution, reside in some other body. If an election takes place and the managers count the votes, and the County Canvassers send up their statements to the Board of State Canvassers, this Board can, under no circumstances, do but two things: 1st. Make up a statement from the statements of the County Canvassers of the whole number of votes given at such election. 2d. And decide contests and protests in certain excepted cases.

The only inquiry left for us, therefore, is, whether the power to decide contests or protests in the case of an election for members of the House of Representatives, by the Constitution, resides in some other body than the Board of State Canvassers?

By an express provision of the Constitution the House is the sole judge of the qualifications of its members. The Board of State Canvassers, in determining such a question, violated the Constitution; and in determining any question as to the validity of the election not only violated the Constitution, but assumed a power not conferred upon it by the Acts of Assembly.

We have thus demonstrated that the action of the Board of State Canvassers, upon which alone rests the legality of the Mackey House, is illegal and void. But it is said that the Clerk of the late House who by law and usage made up the roll of the House, could not admit any other names upon his roll than those of persons holding the certificates of the Board of State Canvassers.

There is no law conferring this power on the Clerk. We deny the usage. It certainly did not exist under the old Constitution. Nor has it existed under the last Constitution. The first session at which the Clerk assumed to organize the House was in 1872, and he repeated it in 1874. At every previous session the members elect met in the hall of the House of Representatives, called on some member elect to take the chair, under whose direction the roll of elective districts was called, whereupon the members produced their credentials, were sworn in by the Chairman, and when this was done, voted for their Speaker.

In 1872 and 1874, the services of a Chairman were dispensed with and the clerk called the roll. But even in these cases the members elect, when their names were called, produced their credentials at the desk. Why? That the Clerk should pass upon them? Surely not; for the House, as we have seen, is the sole judge of the qualifications of its members. But for the judgment of the House, should they be called into question.

But even admitting that some evidence of election was necessary, some credential for the appearance and qualification of the members elect, what better evidence could be furnished than that held by the members who were excluded? The Board of State Canvassers had, under their hands, certified a statement made up from the certified statements of the County Canvassers of the whole number of votes given at the late election for the various officers, and for each of them voted for, distinguishing the several counties. They had determined and declared what persons had received the highest number of votes at the election. And this statement was a record in the highest Court of the State. Of this record every person in the State had notice, binding upon him. So the acting Clerk knew that there were one hundred and twenty-four members elect to the House of Representatives, and he could not, therefore, declare less than a majority of this number a quorum of the House. So that in any point of view the organization of the Mackey House was illegal, and every act, deed, matter or thing attempted to be done and performed by it was, and is, utterly void.—*News and Courier.*

The Press on Hampton.

The brave, moderate and magnanimous inaugural Message of Governor Hampton, of South Carolina, recently delivered at Columbia, commends itself so fully by its tone to all reasonable men that it would be superfluous to say one word in praise of it. If the Southern Democrats in Congress do not understand that the paramount object of good men at the North to-day is to remit the carpet-bagged common wealths of the South to the management of their own affairs through such men as the author of this message, they gravely mistake the temper of the times and the needs of the nation. It is to secure this end, not only now but for all time to come, that it is necessary that the usurpation of President Grant and of the conspirators who surround him should be rebuked and punished by the supreme law. This is an object far above the election of any individual or the triumph of any political party.—*New York World.*

Every utterance of the legally elected Governor of South Carolina brings his character out in striking and pleasing contrast to that of the man who has stolen the office and whose crime is upheld by the administration at Washington. General Hampton's inaugural address, delivered yesterday, is characterized by the spirit which might be expected of the popular leader, who, under great provocation, has kept his own temper and restrained the just indignation of an outraged people. His inauguration was more regular than that of Chamberlain, which took place a few days ago, but while bayonets instead of ballots rule in South Carolina, Hampton will be Governor only in name, unless the State Senate returns to reason in a recognition of the legal Executive and legal House of Representatives.—*Philadelphia Times.*

Governor Hampton couldn't have been expected to "speak with bated breath" on such an occasion, and he will be better able to restrain and control the passions of his people and keep them within the limits of the law by letting them see how fully he shares their indignation. There can be no doubt that he has acquired such a moral ascendancy over the citizens of South Carolina that there would be no substantial opposition to his government if the Federal troops were withdrawn. He is able to preserve peace, maintain order and tranquilize the State from the instant that the right of local self-government is respected. No intelligent observer can doubt that every South Carolina interest would be promoted under an administration so wise, just and considerate as his certainly would be if outside elements of disturbance were taken away.—*New York Herald.*

Dr. J. J. Lee, a well known citizen of Abbeville county, died very suddenly Friday before last, from what physicians pronounced an attack of apoplexy, induced by congestion of the brain and stomach.

Governor Hampton's Record Without a Stain.

From the New York World.

In its issue of Wednesday the New York *Times* published a letter from a correspondent in South Carolina, substantially, and at great length, charging Gen. Wade Hampton with dishonesty in settling with his creditors after the war. That General Hampton like very many Southern planters was forced into bankruptcy by the total loss of all his slaves, the terrible depreciation of property and the damages incident to war, is undoubtedly true—otherwise the statements in the *Times* letter are a mere tissue of falsehoods. Gen. Hampton's largest creditor, who appears as such in the schedule of his liabilities as printed in the *Times*, happens to be now in this city, and yesterday denounced the letter as atrociously false and libellous. "Gen. Hampton's settlement with us," said he, "was strictly and in every respect honorable. The *Times'* statement that 'the creditors have never received a cent' in satisfaction of their claims is no less untrue than the whole tenor of the letter. He gave up every dollar of his property to his creditors, and I received a considerable proportion of my claim. It does not need," he added, "that Gen. Hampton's creditors should oppose their denials to these libellous assertions in the *Times*, for no man who knows his singularly scrupulous and high-minded sense of honor but would pronounce any assertion to the contrary as false; but, in the face of such a publication as this, I cannot refrain from protesting against it as utterly base and unfounded. Had Gen. Hampton occasion now to call upon me for assistance, most certainly I should not hesitate to give it."

In contradiction of the entire substance of the *Times'* charges, it may be well to state—a fact well known to all his friends—that, having surrendered all his once large fortune to his creditors, he lived for some time after the war in circumstances of actual poverty, being forced to sell even the furniture from his rooms and the carpets from his floors to support his family. In this he shared the common lot of very many neighbors and of planters generally throughout the South who were utterly impoverished by the war.

In the *Times'* publication Gen. Hampton's schedule of liabilities foots up over a million of dollars, while his assets, as returned, fall very greatly short of that amount. This discrepancy is easily explained. The larger part of his debts was for money borrowed upon cotton and for the working of his plantation. During the war he had over five thousand bales of cotton destroyed by fire, which at a low estimate were certainly worth over $1,000,000. In slave property Gen. Hampton before the war was worth fully $500,000, while his landed estate was very large and very valuable. It was upon this property, which the war reduced to a comparatively insignificant value, that the moneys were loaned. His case is the same as though a New York merchant had borrowed a large amount of money upon property which was considered by both borrower and lender as worth far more than the amount of the loans, and as if that property had afterward been destroyed by causes of which neither borrower nor lender had any thought and for which neither had considered a provision necessary.

The charge in the *Times* that Gen Hampton, in making a settlement with his creditors, so arranged it that a debt to his wife had precedence of all claims is pronounced by a gentleman in this city, who is thoroughly conversant with Gen. Hampton's affairs, as both false and malignant. Mrs. Hampton's property, which she had inherited in her own right, had been turned over to her husband, and was swallowed up in his own losses by the war. That she did not have precedence over other creditors is sufficiently proved by the circumstances, already alluded to, in which her husband, herself and their children were forced to live after the war.

One other statement—that Gen. Hampton is not a citizen of South Carolina, but of Mississippi—is also denounced as utterly false. Gen. Hampton has never been a citizen of Mississippi, and has never ceased to be a citizen of South Carolina.

A newspaper in England, speaking of American affairs, makes a very ridiculous blunder. It says, "As an evidence of the important part that American women are assuming in politics, the widow Butler has just been elected to the United States Congress." A Paris journal makes a mistake equally ridiculous, when it informs its readers that Messrs. Edgefield and Laurens have been excluded from the South Carolina Legislature.

Forty years ago there was a man in Boston who had six or seven very corpulent daughters. When asked how many children he had, his answer was generally something of this kind: "I have three boys and about thirteen hundred weight of girls."