

grain in that country, this seems like "taking coals to Newcastle." Instead of shipping, would it not be as cheap and feasible for philanthropic Americans to subscribe money to the relief fund, let their agents take it to Russia and there buy bread at the present reduced prices from Russian speculators with which to feed their famishing countrymen?

THE CONVENTION OF 1860.

Now that the agony is over at Minne-
apolis, the politicians and statesmen of
the Republican party are settling down
to effective campaign work. On the
other hand the agony is just commenc-
ing on the part of the Democrats, and
for the next ten days surmise, con-
jecture and opinion will be rife. The
names of Cleveland, Gorman, Carlisle,
Whitney, Palmer, Boies and Gray
will be talked of as old acquaintances,
or long lost friends once more restored.

Any reference to a National Demo-
cratic Convention, naturally takes one
back to the eventful period of 1860. In
that year two conventions were held.
The first assembled at Charleston, S.
C. April 23rd. Every State then in
the Union was represented. Slavery
was the issue of the time. The
question of extending and protecting
it in the Territories gave rise to irre-
concilable dissensions. The delegations
from seven Southern States withdrew.
After fifty-seven ineffectual ballots to
adopt a platform, the convention ad-
journd to meet at Baltimore on June
18th.

Meantime the National Republican
Convention met on May 18th, at
Chicago, and nominated Abraham
Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin on a
platform calling for the preservation of
the Union, State control of State
affairs, reprobation of slaveholder's
administration, slavery not warranted
by the Constitution in the Territories,
condemnation of the "Kansas-Ne-
braska act," and the admission of
Kansas as a free State.

The allusion to Kansas was definite
enough on the part of the Republicans.
It was the peculiar situation in that
Territory which caused dissensions
among the Democrats. When the ad-
journd Charleston Convention re-
assembled at Baltimore on June 18th,
the Northern Democrats decided on
definite action in relation to slavery.
It was finally agreed on by them that
the United States Supreme Court
should be the arbiter on all issues aris-
ing out of slavery, and Stephen A.
Douglas and B. Fitzpatrick were the
nominees. The latter declined, and
the National Committee substituted
H. V. Johnson.

The Southern Democrats would ac-
cept neither the platform nor the can-
didates of their Northern brothers,
and seceded to hold a convention of
their own at Richmond, where John
C. Breckenridge and Joseph Lane were
nominated. A platform was adopted
by the seceders who called themselves
Constitutional Democrats demanding
the right to take slaves into the Terri-
tories, and to protect them there, also
characterizing States obstructing the
fugitive slave law as revolutionary.

In the subsequent election thirty-
three States participated, the total elec-
toral vote was 303. Lincoln carried

seventeen States, giving 180 electoral
votes, and a popular vote of 1,866,352
Breckenridge carried eleven States,
giving seventy-two electoral votes with
a popular vote of 845,763. Douglas
carried only two States, giving twelve
electoral votes, but his popular vote was
1,375,157. The "American" candidate,
Bell, carried three States, giving thirty-
nine electoral votes, and a popular vote
of 589,581.

This election well illustrates the ano-
maly of what is known as the Electoral
College. Douglas who had a popular vote
of over 1,375,000 got only two States
and twelve electors, while Brecken-
ridge who had only 845,000 of a popu-
lar vote got 11 States and 72 electors.
Bell who had a popular vote of 589,581
got three States and 39 electors. These
figures show that the Democratic
party with its 1,375,600 vote for Douglas
did not, as a party, intend to disrupt
the Union. The Breckenridge adher-
ents can no more be called Democrats
than were the Henry Clay Whigs who
voted the Seceders' ticket.

SIDNEY DILLION.

A FEW days ago we made some
comments upon the death of Sidney
Dillon, but were unable, in the absence
of data, to present any details con-
nected with his career. The following
brief sketch from the *Chicago Mail* is
quite interesting:

"Recognizing the almost destitute con-
dition of his father's finances young
Dillon at the immature age of seven de-
termined that he would be a burden to
his progenitors no longer; as he since ex-
pressed it, 'I wanted to strike out for
myself.'

"Leaving the paternal roof he sought
and obtained work on an eastern branch
then being built, of the Mohawk & Hud-
son road, between Albany and Schnecta-
dy. The road is now known as the New
York Central.

"His first duty was to carry water to
the laborers building the road and for his
services he received the sum of \$1 per
week and his meals.

"Frugality being his chief inheritance
he managed to lay aside the greater part
of his earnings in order to carry out a
compact made with himself that 'one day
I will start for myself and I will become
richer than any 'quire I know.'

"Forty-eight years ago he determined
to marry, and on a visit to Amherst,
Mass., he met a young and brilliant
woman, a member of one of the village's
most respected families. To his wife
Mr. Dillon owed a great part of his suc-
cess. She did not come to him with any
large dowry, but brought him a wife's
love and encouragement.

"When quite a young man Mr. Dillon
came to New York city. He still devo-
ted his attention to carrying out railroad
contracts. It can safely be said that few
men in this country have undertaken
larger contracts. It was he who built
the Fourth avenue improvement tunnel
from the Grand Central depot to Harlem,
New York city. This enterprise was
completed at a cost of \$7,000,000.

At the small village of Promontory,
seventy-five miles west of Ogden, Mr.
Dillon in 1869 assisted in laying the last
rail on the Union Pacific railroad. From
its incipency he has been connected with
the road. When Horace F. Clark died, in
1874, Mr. Dillon was unanimously elected
the executive chief of the road, he was
instrumental in building, and held this
position for the ensuing ten years.

His family consists of two married
daughters and a number of grand-
children. Ex-Judge John F. Dillon, at-
torney for Jay Gould, is his nephew."

THE NEWSPAPER AS A DETECTIVE

NEW YORK CITY has a case that in
some respects resembles that of the
notorious Carlisle W. Harris, the
medical student who was convicted of
murdering his young wife a few
months ago. The evidence obtained
against Harris was principally through
reporters, and the present case is en-
tirely in the hands of New York *World*
reporters.

It appears that a few weeks ago the
wife of Dr. R. W. Buchanan, a promi-
nent physician of New York City, died
under rather peculiar circumstances.
Two reputable physicians certified that
the cause of death was cerebral
hemorrhage. Soon after it was ascer-
tained that Dr. Buchanan married
another woman. The reporters got
scent of what promised to be a sen-
sational affair. They soon dis-
covered that the woman whom
the doctor married was a wife
from whom he was divorced some
years previously. It was also learned
that the dead wife was once the keeper
of a house of illrepute in Newark,
New Jersey. Further disclosures re-
vealed the fact that Buchanan, a
married man, was in the habit of fre-
quenting the Newark house, and final-
ly succeeded in marrying the landlady,
after procuring a divorce from his
wife. The Newark woman had a
large fortune amassed in her objection-
able calling. Before marrying the
doctor had her make a will, bequeath-
ing her fortune to him in case of death.
After her decease he remarried his
first wife.

On the 6th inst. the body of the
Newark woman was exhumed, and an
autopsy held by prominent physicians
under the direction of the district
attorney. The brain was found to be
free from all signs of disease,
thus disproving the cerebral hemor-
rhage cause of death. By the advice
of the examining physicians, Dr.
Buchanan was arrested, and remanded
to await the result of the chemical
analysis of the stomach. The suppo-
sition is that the woman's death was
caused by poisoning.

THE TUSCS' DEFEATED.

THE final decision of Judge Zane
in the case of the Tuscaroras was a
death blow to their impudent attempt
to gain some recognition of their bogus
organization. It was the ringing down
of the curtain over the silly farce in
which Justice Lochrie assumed so
peculiar a part.

It is difficult to determine which
actor cut the most ridiculous figure
— Powers, Hiles, Newton, Loch-
rie or Duke. If it can be determined
who wrote the plot, that is, who made
out the complaint and pleadings in the
case, the question will be settled as to
which made the worst exhibition of
himself.

Hiles declared in court that the
pleader did not know how to plead.
Newton's name appears on the papers,