

WE APOLOGIZE.

Mr. Howard Evans, cashier of the American National Bank of Denver, with a capital of \$1,000,000 [no charge for this advt.] writes to the editor of the NEWS from Colorado's chief city under date of August 24, as follows:

You will have to change the motto which you print on the first page of your paper, viz: "Truth and Liberty," as you make the following statement in your issue of the 17th:

"DENVER BANK TO RESUME.

"DENVER, Colo., Aug. 17.—The American National bank, which suspended July 1st, resumed business this morning."

I simply wish to state that the American National bank of Denver has never suspended and hope it never will. We have paid all demands made on us so far and are happy to say that we are in better condition now to continue to pay all demands than we ever have been before. Please correct the statement which you made in your issue of the 17th referred to and oblige.

We are gratified to hear so good an account of the bank of which Mr. Evans is cashier, and cordially join in his hope that it never will have to suspend. It gives us pleasure, too, to make the correction he requests—we publish his letter entire. At the same time we beg to insist on retaining our motto, "Truth and Liberty," for it represents the determination to stand up all the time for those sublime and eternal principles.

The mistake as to the name of the bank in the dispatch of the 17th was not our mistake at all. The item was sent to and published by almost every paper in the country having the Associated Press telegraph service, and was an error on the part of that organization not of the newspapers. The latter lay claim to a great deal of knowledge concerning matters and things at home and at a distance; but none of them that we are familiar with makes any pretensions to omniscience.

If cashier Evans and the American National will accept this apology, the gentleman will be permitted to take the floor to apologize for the rather impertinent suggestion with which he begins his letter.

OUR STANLEY ASSAILED.

The story related by African explorer Peters is full of interest, as most tales bearing the outward seeming of truth regarding the dark continent are. So little has really ever been accomplished there and there is so much more to be known than has yet been found out, that all reports emanating from the interior of that vast continent are seized with avidity. The later explorer reflects with considerable severity upon the earlier one, our own Stanley Africanus, and this gives the matter a local interest as well as the other previously spoken of.

It should be remembered that explorations in Africa are in a zone where there are no printing presses, telegraph lines, mails, public records or any of the adjuncts of civilization excepting, perhaps, firearms

and we learn nothing from these. It thus becomes a difficult matter to ascertain exactly what is true and what is not regarding what has been done by explorers or sojourners in such a land and we are constrained to place credence upon their own statements in the absence of better evidence. Dr. Peters claims, however, that it is abundantly shown that Stanley's expedition for the relief of Emin Pasha was a failure and that the former made the latter appear to be dead when in reality he is not, as a kind of cover to the ill success attending the exploit. This may be true, but conviction, like a timid bird, still refuses to settle down upon us.

Dr. Peters describes Stanley as an "eccentric fellow but full of pluck." This much is known to be true. Both these qualities were exhibited by him during our civil war. He first entered the Confederate army and fought valiantly under the stars and bars until wounded and a prisoner; having recovered and with peace and rest hanging heavily upon him, he joined the naval forces of the United States and did as hard work against the Confederacy as he had previously done for it. His whole life had been a series of adventures, some of eminent repute and others not ranking so high. No matter as to that; he sailed forth without experience to accomplish what experienced men had failed at—finding Livingstone—and found him. That one triumph was enough to place him among the modified immortals of the present century.

COURAGEOUS MR. RAWLINS.

The telegraph gives but meager reports of the silver debate now going on in both houses of Congress, but, as a general thing it gives as much as the newspaper reader has time and taste to peruse. Naturally, every community is interested in any remarks that may be made by its particular representative; and hence the pleasure with which fuller reports than the wire brought of the excellent speech of Hon. Joseph L. Rawlins were sought after and read in Utah. We find in the New York *World* just to hand another allusion to the Utah Delegate, that will also be interesting. The speaker was Judge Josiah Patterson of Tennessee, the date was last Wednesday, and the argument was in favor of the repeal of the Sherman act. We will let the New York paper tell the incident itself, merely premising the quotation with the remark that the *World* is strongly anti-silver.

Judge Patterson then took the floor. He is more than six feet tall, and broad and thick in proportion. He wore a pair of baggy trousers that would make a whole suit of clothes for "Charley" Tracey, and a loose black sack coat three sizes too big even for his ample figure. His neck was encircled by a high standing collar with big flaps turned over like the ears of a mastiff. He wore a "string" necktie and big gold-bowed spectacles. His speech was a knock-down argument on the absurdity of an attempt on the part of any country to make a currency of its own from materials not recognized as money in the markets of the world. He examined Mr. Bland's substitute propositions at length and knocked corners off every one of them.

Mr. Rawlins, the ambitious young delegate from Utah, attempted to disconcert Judge Patterson at several points in his speech, but uniformly came out second best. When the judge had described the effect of the increase in the value of gold and silver in the ebb and flow of these metals from the United States to foreign countries Mr. Rawlins thought he saw a chance.

"Have not the laws of France," he demanded, "rather than the laws of the United States, induced the ebb and flow of silver and gold?"

"Very possibly," replied Judge Patterson, with a patronizing wave of his big fat hand; "but my colleague should tell me how that fact improves the situation. Does he not know that this Congress cannot make laws for France, and that it is, therefore, our duty to enact such legislation as will make it impossible for France or any other country to embarrass us?"

Mr. Patterson's rejoinder was received with hearty applause. Then the speaker rapped for order to receive a message from the Senate which announced that that body, doubtless emulating the example of the House in providing for its members, had just passed a joint resolution appropriating money to pay its session employees.

STILL THEY COME.

The NEWS is asked whether or not a postmaster can lawfully be a justice of the peace. He can, if elected or properly appointed and qualified.

Also, an explanation of the words so frequently used in connection with the silver discussion, "sixteen to one," "twenty to one," and so on. In a country where bimetalism, or the use of two metals of unequal values for money, prevails, it is necessary that their relative positions be defined by law and maintained. The ratio thus established is spoken of in figures and has reference to the unit of currency, in this country the dollar. At the present time the ratio is sixteen to one, meaning that there is sixteen times as much refined metal (by troy weight) in the silver as in the gold dollar, the alloy or hardening material in either metal not being considered. Twenty to one would mean of course an increase of four parts of silver over the present arrangement without changing the status of the gold dollar.

LYNCH LAW.

More people know what the term "lynch law" means than know the derivation of it. Indeed, it is not yet established that anybody knows the true beginning of the phrase, though all understand that, as commonly used, lynch law means the punishment of alleged offenses by private and unauthorized persons without a trial according to forms of law. The *Presbyterian Banner*, which has been looking into the subject a little, comes to the conclusion that the origin of the law is traced to several sources. One story is that a farmer in Virginia, named Lynch, caught a thief and, instead of delivering him up to justice, tied him to a tree and flogged him with his own hands. Another is that in 1687 a man named Lynch was sent to the colonies to suppress piracy. The laws were so carelessly ad-