

EVERY BRAINY MAN.

REFERENCE IS HERE MADE TO EX-SPEAKER JOHN G. CARLISLE.

His Decisions in the House Never Appealed From.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 3.—If you were to ask members of congress, government officials, newspaper correspondents and other close observers the question, "Who is the most intellectual man in public life?" probably a large majority would answer, "Ex-Speaker Carlisle." Neither party nor politics would have anything to do with these replies. It is a singular fact that Carlisle is as much admired by Republicans as by the members of his own party. Without any great personal popularity of the kind that comes from good fellowship, genial manners and the arts of fascination practiced by common men, Carlisle nevertheless has such a hold upon the members of the house that in all probability he could be elected speaker for a score of years could his party but obtain and hold the majority. In the opinion of many statesmen, Republicans and Democrats alike, Carlisle was the greatest speaker that ever presided over the house of representatives. A successful speaker of the house must have many qualities of a high order. He is a judge who must interpret the law—the rules of the house—a score of times a day.

These interpretations must not only be made instantly as occasion requires, but they must be rendered in language that is spread upon the records, in form and habiliments absolutely extemporaneous. Sitting where the fierce conflicts of party culminate, where the passions and selfishness of men clamor loudest for advantage, where the confusion is distracting to the senses and destructive of the nervous forces, where even the physical strength is often sorely taxed, the speaker is called upon to hand down decisions which make or mar his fame. In the nature of the case little or no deliberation is possible; unlike the judge on the judicial seat, he has no opportunity for writing out his conclusions. The war of words rages before him; logic, learning and eloquence are poured out by the leaders of the contending forces in conflicting, distracting profusion, and then there comes a pause.

All eyes are turned upon the speaker. A few seconds pass, and that officer rises in his place—it is an occasion of great importance when the speaker rises to announce a ruling—and the supreme moment has arrived. When Carlisle had such a decision to render, it was curious to watch the faces of the members. These wore an expression which seemed to say, "Now we shall have the truth: the master mind of all will throw a flood of light on this shadowy question, which others have sointillated upon without illumining." With voice clear as a bell and diction as perfect as a Cicero's or a Macaulay's, Mr. Carlisle's decisions were announced.

Once ruled upon by him, a question was forever settled. With unanimous consent all persons conceded the correctness and justice of his of his conclusions. It is a remarkable fact that no decision of Carlisle as speaker was ever appealed from in the house.

Last winter there was a notable struggle over the rules. The point was vital to the life of an important measure. It quickly became a party question, and the leaders of the right and the left joined in the debate. For two or three days the discussion ran on, participated in by Randall, Reed, McKinley, Cannon, Burrows, Crisp of Georgia and many other prominent members. At last the speeches were all made, and every eye was turned toward the speaker. Without a moment's hesitation Mr. Carlisle rapped once with his gavel, rose, and in his usual perfect style traced the origin of the rule in question, described its development, explained its scope and application so clearly, so comprehensively, with such irresistible logic, that every man on the floor, no matter what his previous opinion had been, felt that the speaker was right. Among the hundreds of men close-

ly watching Mr. Carlisle was William McKinley, Jr. Mr. Kinley leaned forward in his seat, intently looking and listening. He appeared like one entranced. As soon as the speaker had concluded, McKinley turned to his neighbor, ex-Governor Long, of Massachusetts, put his hand on the governor's shoulder, and said: "That man never had a cloudy thought."

Carlisle is a great lawyer. In the opinion of good judges he has no equal in mastery of the fundamentals of law, unless it be in Justice Miller of the supreme court. The ex-speaker is not what one would term a studious man. To him everything comes easily. Some years ago Joe Blackburn, now senator but then representative from Kentucky, was a candidate for speaker of the house. So was Carlisle.

"Carlisle is entitled to mighty little credit for what he has done in this world," said Blackburn. "In fact, he is not entitled to half as much credit as I am. The little I know I have worked hard for. I have had to study, dig, grub, toil. Now there is Carlisle. He knows about four times as much as I do, and it has all come to him without an effort on his part. He has all the wisdom of the ancients, and of the moderns, too, rolled together. To say great things, to say things better than anybody else could say them, he has but to open his mouth. This isn't the result of work—he was born that way."

Carlisle's career has been almost meteoric. Only twelve years ago he was a lawyer of Covington, Ky., a town directly across the river from Cincinnati. There he earned a large income in the practice of his profession, principally as advisory counsel in important or difficult cases. During his dozen years in public life he has served three terms in the high office of speaker of the house of representatives, elected thereto the last time without opposition. In twelve years he has firmly established his fame as one of the really great men of his time.

The ex-speaker's mind is distinctly judicial—logical, analytical, keen as a ray of sun-light, but unswerving. A favorite expression among his many admirers is libe unto that made use of by McKinley, from whom praise is praise indeed, on the occasion above described. They say "Carlisle's mind is so constituted it is impossible for him to err." Though a party man, and the champion of an idea, he was never guilty of the slightest partiality. No man knows better than he how, in the speaker's chair, points can be strained in favor of one's friends; not a few of Carlisle's friends have taken offense at his inexorable refusal to strain points in their behalf.

"Carlisle would make the greatest chief justice of the supreme court we have had since Marshall," said a Republican senator. It is not generally known how near Carlisle came to being chief justice. When President Cleveland had a vacancy to fill after the death of Chief Justice Waite he turned first to the speaker of the house. To Mr. Cleveland Mr. Carlisle appeared conspicuously fit for the high post. The appointment had been virtually decided upon, when for some reason or other Senator Vest, of Missouri, appeared at the White House. He told the president Carlisle could not be confirmed by the senate if nominated—an incredible story, which, for a wonder, Mr. Cleveland placed some confidence in.

As soon as Mr. Carlisle's friends heard of this, which was not for some days, they made a systematic and thorough canvass of the senate to see how many of its members would dare vote against the great speaker of the other legislative branch for an office but little higher than the one which he already occupied. Without exception the senators of both political parties announced their willingness to indorse Mr. Carlisle's nomination. Representative Hatch and other devoted friends carried this news to the speaker, whom they found in the barber's chair in the house retiring rooms. When these friends told the result of their inquiries, the speaker, without a turn of his head or noticeable tinge of disappointment or envy

in his voice, replied: "It is too late, gentleman. The nomination of Melville W. Fuller, of Chicago, has been decided on." Within an hour Mr. Fuller's name was sent to the senate.

Why should there be doubt of Carlisle's confirmation as chief justice? This is the question which naturally occurs to the reader unacquainted with the facts, as doubtless most readers are. It is a question which forces home the journalist, the letter writer, the historian of the day, a problem in the ethics of his profession. Fortunately the private lives of public men are not the subjects of idle gossip in the columns of reputable newspapers. If they were, how many idols would be shattered, how many hearts would be filled with sadness, none but the veteran journalist, familiar with all the lights and shadows of life in the capital, is capable of estimating. Merely as an instance of this, there is a nameless but very prominent senator, well along in years, but with glorious possibilities in his future, as well as a great past behind him. Though one of the last men in the world to be suspected of evil, there are a half dozen persons, both male and female, who could, if they chose, blast the private part of his fair fame by simply opening their mouth.

Mr. Carlisle's failing is not of this sort. His reputation is at no man's mercy but his own. His weakness is not a secret, is not a thing that subjects him obloquy. It is simply such a fault as scores of great and lovable men have been afflicted with, as Daniel Webster was afflicted. But for this fault, which manifests itself periodically, and which is to be spoken of always in sorrow and never in criticism, Mr. Carlisle would now be the chief justice of the supreme court of the United States.

When congress meets a few weeks hence, the smooth, classic face of Mr. Carlisle will be missed from the speaker's chair, where it has been seen for six consecutive years. It is safe to say that the new speaker, be he Reed, McKinley, Cannon, Burrows, Henderson or another, will not blush to acknowledge that during the last three congresses he has taken Carlisle as his model, only hoping some day to be worthy of sitting in his chair. The ex-speaker now takes his place on the floor, where without doubt he will at once, by common consent, assume the leadership of his party. There is no loss without some gain, for if the house loses the services of the greatest speaker it has ever had, it will gain an eloquent, masterful debater on the floor.

Mr. Carlisle was a perfect speaker only when he sat as a judge, arbiter of the rights of measures and parties, and guardian of the privileges of individuals under the rules. As a disciplinarian he was not always successful, being at times somewhat indifferent, almost stolid, amid the turbulence of the chamber. Soon his favorite exclamation, delivered always with the same peculiar pronunciation and smart emphasis—"The house will be in order?"—lost its force and effectiveness though often accompanied by sharp tappings of the gavel. But when he chose to rouse himself and to appeal to the members in phrases unusual and therefore indicative of greater earnestness, it was pleasant to see the storm abate and the troubled waters become still. There is much in a voice, and Mr. Carlisle has a voice which impress every one who hears it, not for its great strength or penetration, but by the sincerity and candor which it betokens.

On the floor of the house at the coming session will be three ex-speakers—Mr. Carlisle, Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, and Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania, leaving out of the count S. S. Cox, who was speaker pro tem. at the first session of the Forty-fourth congress, during the illness of Speaker Kerr.

If Mr. Carlisle lives long enough, and he is now 54, he is likely to find himself in the senate. Kentucky has already heaped many honors upon him, and will in proper time deign to heap many more. A country born, Mr. Carlisle's education was simply that of a country school, in which he was afterward

the teacher. An epitome of his career is a ladder, long but quickly climbed—member of the state house of representatives, of the state senate, presidential elector, lieutenant governor, representative in congress, speaker of the house.

ROBERT GRAVES.

FIVE MILLIONS.

A Russian Inheritance Awaiting American Heirs—The Pankin Family in Luck.

News and Courier.

The following in relation to the inheritance by the Pankin family of the United States, of \$5,000,000 through the death of one of the Russian members of the family, comes from Augusta through the resident correspondent of the *News and Courier* in that city:

"A few weeks ago the *News and Courier* published the announcement of the death of a Russian nobleman by the name of Pankin, who left a vast estate valued at five million dollars, which goes to his legal heirs by the name of Pankin in America, and who live in Charleston. The Pankin in Charleston was found out to be Dr. Charles F. Pankin, who has four brothers, who will get an equal share of the estate. One of the brothers, Dr. J. W. Pankin, is a druggist of this city, and he says that his brother in Charleston has written out to relatives in Germany to find out about the estate that is said to have fallen to them, and they are now anxiously awaiting a reply. One of the brothers lives in Texas, and he is the one who first learned of the good news of their sudden and unexpected inheritance. Dr. Pankin has resided in Augusta many years and his innumerable friends here were delighted to hear of the wealth that is in store for him, and it is hoped by all that he and his brothers will be successful in securing the money."

The foregoing was shown to Dr. C. F. Pankin, of this city, yesterday. Dr. Pankin said that it was of course interesting, but that he had but little faith in the result. The nobleman who is reported to have left the \$5,000,000 to his heirs belongs to the Russian family of the Pankins, who resided at Moscow. The family to which Dr. Pankin belongs is direct from Stettin, but is a branch of the Russian family, which emigrated to Germany, the emigration having taken place during the life of Dr. Pankin's grandfather. Dr. Pankin has written to the United States consuls at Moscow and at Stettin and expects to hear from them definitely on the interesting subject.

Printers Exempt From Disease.

Owing to the dust arising from type and metal, and the tendency of compositors to lean over the case while at work, it has been frequently asserted that the printing business is not conducive to long life. This is a mistake. There is scarcely any indoor occupation, when care is taken to eating and drinking is observed, than that of printing. During yellow fever periods in the southern states, they were singularly exempt, and this has also been the case in the cholera epidemics which have recently occurred in various states in South America. Recently the cholera prevailed in Chili, causing great mortality among the people, yet out of one hundred members of the Typographical Union of Valparaiso, not one member had been attacked.

In the visitation of yellow fever in the fifties in Alabama and New Orleans, the printers were the last to leave their post of duty. On one occasion the writer passed through Montgomery, Alabama, where a compositor on the *Alabama State Journal* was the only white inhabitant in the plague stricken city. As we were then returning to New York, we had to pass either through cholera at Nashville and in Virginia, or go through yellow fever at Mobile or New Orleans, so we did not tarry in the city; but on returning next season, we tried to make the acquaintance of this brave type, but found that he had from some other ailment "closed his take" and passed to that bourne from whence there is no returning. During the recent epidemic in Florida, we have heard of but very few printers among the victims, but they have stood nobly up to their posts of duty.—*St. Louis Stationer.*

SAMUEL SULLIVAN COX.

The Death and Last Words of the Distinguished Statesman.

News and Courier.

NEW YORK, September 10.—Congressman S. S. Cox died at 8.33 P. M. His end was quiet, and the dying man breathed his last peacefully as if falling into a light sleep. He had been conscious all day until about a quarter of an hour before the end came.

Mr. Cox's last conversation was about the four Territories, whose Statehood he hoped to father. He mentioned New Mexico and Arizona and said something about making an effort in their behalf at the coming session.

In the afternoon, while Dr. Lockwood was talking to him, Mr. Cox made some witty remarks, which completely upset the doctor's dignity. Dr. Lockwood said that the immediate cause of death was heart failure and the cause was peritonitis.

Samuel Sullivan Cox was born in Zanesville Ohio, September, 30, 1824. He attended the Ohio University at Athens and was graduated at Brown in 1846. During his stay at college he maintained himself by literary work and obtained the prizes in classics, history literary criticism and political economy. Adopting the profession of the law he returned to Ohio to begin practice, but soon laid it aside and went to Europe. On his return he became, in 1853, editor of the *Columbus, Ohio, Statesman*, and from that time turned his attention to political issues. While editing this journal he published a gorgeous description in sophomore strain, which procured for him the sobriquet of "Sunset" Cox.

Mr. Cox was offered in 1855 the secretaryship of legation in London, but declined it. The opportunity was given not long after of going to Lima, Peru, in a similar capacity, and he accepted. He remained in Peru one year, and on his return was elected three times, serving continuously from December 7, 1857, until March 3, 1865. During three terms he was chairman of the committee on Revolutionary claims. Mr. Cox was a delegate to the Chicago, New York and St. Louis Democratic Convention of 1864, 1868 and 1876. During the civil war he sustained the Government by voting money and men, although he took a prominent part in opposing certain policies of the Administration. In 1866 he took up his residence in New York city, and was elected as a Representative to Congress in 1868, and re-elected three times. He served on the committee on foreign affairs, banking, the Centennial Exhibition and rules.

At the opening of the first session of the 45th Congress, in 1877, he was one of three candidates for the Speakership. Although not elected, he served frequently as Speaker pro tem. In this session he took upon himself, by a special resolution of his own, the work of the now census law. He was the author also of the plan of appointment adopted by the House. He was the introducer and champion for many years of the bill concerning the life-saving service, and finally witnessed its passage. Mr. Cox's work in Congress included the raising of the salaries of the letter-carriers, and granting them a vacation without loss of pay. The latter measure involved an appropriation of \$96,000, but its results justified the action. He was on the committee to investigate the doings of Black Friday, Federal elections in cities, the New York post-office and the Kuklux troubles. He was also for many years one of the regents of the Smithsonian Institution, his term closing in 1865.

In 1869 he visited Europe and Northern Africa, journeying through Italy, Corsica, Algeria and Spain. In 1872 he was defeated as candidate at large for the State, but the death of his successful competitor necessitated another election, which resulted in Mr. Cox's return to his seat. He was re-elected in 1874, 1876, 1878 and 1880, serving twelve consecutive years, making a total Congressional service on his part of twenty years. The last effort of Mr. Cox, for which the Chamber of Commerce of a law uniting all jurisdictions in

the Federal jurisdiction, so as to preserve New York harbor and its tributaries from destruction. This had been passed in the House, but it was defeated on a point of order in the Senate.

In the summer of 1882 Mr. Cox visited Sweden, Norway, Russia, Turkey and Greece. In 1885 he was appointed minister to Turkey, but returned to the United States in October, 1886, after a year's absence, and in November was re-elected to Congress. He has a reputation as an effective and humorous speaker, writer and lecturer. In addition to a large amount of newspaper and magazine work, he has published: "The Buckeye Abroad," (New York, 1851); "Puritanism in Politics," (1863); "Eight Years in Congress," (1865); "A Search for Winter Sunbeams," (1870); "Why We Laugh," (1876); "Free Land and Free Trade," (1876); "Arctic Sunbeams," (1882); "Orient Sunbeams," (1882); and "The Three Decades of Federal Legislation," (1885).

Things Useful.

Italian Cheese: Wash a pound of liver, scald and wipe dry. Chop with half a pound of veal and half a pound of ham, season with a little sage, parsley, minced onion, pepper and salt, mix, press in a greased mold, cover and steam four hours. Remove the lid, drain off the liquor, put in a small pan, and dissolve an ounce of gelatine in it, season, pour over the meat in the mold, and set in a cold place. When melted turn out and slice thin.

Cold tea is the best thing which to clean grained wood. Never use ammonia for this work.

Apple parings and cores should always be saved and jelly made from them.

Buttermilk Pancakes: One quarter of a pound of flour, one small teaspoonful of bicarbonate of soda, made into a light batter with buttermilk; must be put in the pan at once with very little butter or lard, and fried as other pancakes.

Rub salt on the inside of your coffee-pot when washing it, and it will remove the coffee and egg very quickly. Be sure to rinse it thoroughly before using it again.

Spiced Peaches: Pare and slice peach: to seven pound of fruit add four pound of sugar, alternating a layer fruit in a store jar with the sugar and a little sprinkle of cinnamon and cloves until all is used. Pour over a pint of vinegar, set the jar in a kettle of water, and cook tender.

Rub window glass with a piece of soft linen wet with vinegar, then with a dry cloth, and it will be beautifully clear.

Cracker Pies: For four pies: Take 8 crackers, 2 cups sugar, 2 teaspoonfuls citric acid (or vinegar), 1 egg, 1 pint boiling water; flavor with lemon.

Rules for the Journal of Life.

Never to ridicule sacred things, or what others may esteem to be such, however absurd they may appear to be.

Never to show levity when the people are engaged in worship.

Never to resent a supposed injury till you know the views and motives of the author of it, nor any occasion to retaliate.

Never to judge a person's character by external appearance.

Always to take the part of an absent person who is censured in company, so far as truth and propriety will allow.

Never to think the worse of another on account of his differing with you in politics or religious opinions.

Never to dispute if you can fairly avoid it.

Never to dispute with a man more than seventy years of age, nor with a woman, nor an enthusiast.

Never affect to be witty, or jest so as to wound the feelings of another.

Say as little as possible of yourself and those who are near to you.

To aim at cheerfulness without levity.

Not obtrude any advice unasked. Never court the favor of the rich by flattering either their vanities or vices.

Have Trial Justices Jurisdiction of Petit Larceny?

Trial Justice D. S. Craig holds that his court has no jurisdiction to try cases of petit larceny, thus raising a new question as to the constitutionality of the special Act of 1880, limiting the punishment of petit larceny to a fine of \$100 or imprisonment in the county jail for not more than thirty days, thus bringing it within the jurisdiction of the trial justice court. The case in which Justice Craig made this ruling was that of Mary Mucha-please, colored, who was brought before him last Saturday by Sheriff Moss, on a warrant charging her with stealing a dress, of the value of one dollar, from Miss Mary Maxwell. The State developed a strong *prima facie* case and she was committed to jail to await trial at the November term of Sessions Court.

Justice Craig bottoms his opinion on the alleged unconstitutionality of the Act of 1887, which he holds conflict with Article V of the Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, which prescribes that "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other wise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment by a grand jury." Petit larceny is an infamous offense at common law, a conviction for it disqualifying one as a witness, and hence one can be held to answer for stealing a chicken or a pig only on the formality of due presentment by a grand jury. It is the element of infamy which attaches to a conviction for this crime that carries the trial beyond the jurisdiction of the inferior court. Should this be decided to be the true construction of this provision of the United States Constitution, (and it does seem to us there is something in the point) then the Legislature should at once declare that a conviction for petit larceny would not be followed with the disabilities which it now works. We ought to have a summary mode of punishing these numerous petit thefts, without entailing so much expense on the State.—*Kennec Courier.*

When Women Should marry.

Probably the best time for the average woman to marry would be an age between 24 and 36. It is not said that no woman should marry earlier or later than either of these ages; but youth and health and vigor are ordinarily at their highest perfection between these two periods. Early marriages are seldom desirable for girls, and that for many reasons. The brain is immature, the reason is feeble and the character is unformed. The consideration which would prompt a girl to marry at 17 would, in many cases, have little weight with her at 24. At 17 she is child, at 24 a woman.

Where a girl has intelligent parents, the seven year between seventeen and twenty-four are the period when mind and body are most amenable to wise discipline, and best repay the thought and toil devoted to their development. Before seventeen few girls have learned to understand what life is, what discipline is, what duty is. They cannot value what is best either in the father's wisdom or the mother's tenderness. When married at that childish period they are like young recruits taken fresh from the farm and the workshop and hurried off to a long campaign without any period of preliminary drill and training, or like a school boy removed from school to a curacy without being sent to the university or to a theological hall.

Who can help grieving over a child-wife, especially if she have children and a husband who is an experienced and possibly exacting boy-man? The ardor of his love soon cools; the visionary bliss of her poetical emagination vanishes like the summer mist; there is nothing left but disappointment and wonder that what promised to be so beautiful and long a day should be clouded almost before sunrise.

"Bibulous!" said a Kentuckian, being questioned about the habits of people in his State. "Bibulouses Why, I don't reckon you could find a dozen Bibles in the whole State."—*Washington Post.*