

## An Indian Romance.

THE MODOCS "PAYING BACK" AN OLD DEBT OF REVENGE.

Among the Indian hunters and mountaineers whose names are particularly prominent and well-known there are few, now living, who have had a more extended experience on the various frontiers, and among all the Indian tribes, than old Bridger and our own Jim Baker.

In a recent conversation with the latter, he informed us that he had met the Modocs many years ago, and seen the present redoubtable Captain Jack when nothing but an urchin.

According to Baker, all the Northern portion of California was disturbed by Indian troubles in 1852—he being there at the time.

During this year—'52—a company, under command of Capt. Benjamin Wright, was organized, and proceeded from Yreka to the Indian country around Tule Lake and the lava beds. They fought three unsuccessful battles—the force being insufficient for the subjection of the Modocs. They returned to Yreka, organized a larger force and marched again to the Modoc country.

As the winter came on the Modocs' supply of blankets, ammunition and food became extremely limited, and they were consequently anxious for a cessation of hostilities. In April, Capt. Wright received the Modoc overtures with great cordiality. A peace conference was agreed upon and a place appointed in the immediate vicinity of the massacre of Gen. Canby.

The conference met, consisting of about twenty-five Indians and thirty white men. While discussing the terms Wright gave his men the signal, and in a moment they killed eighteen Modocs and seven Modocs escaped.

Thus perished the fathers of the present Modocs. Captain Jack was nine years old, John Schonchin nineteen, and Boston Charley and Hooka Jim, two years old.

Baker believes that revenge grew with age, culminating in the Canby and Thomas massacre. Some years afterwards Wright was appointed Indian agent on Rogue river. Wright was apprehensive of Modoc vengeance. One night a Modoc chief named Enos murdered and horribly mutilated Wright's body. Enos was afterwards captured and hanged. He died exulting that he had wreaked vengeance on the leader of the massacre of his murdered tribe.

So runs the story as told by one than whom few are better acquainted with everything relating to the history of the frontier.—*Denver Tribune*.

## Cheap Gas.—How Can It be Obtained?

The *Sunday Times* for yesterday contains an article on the price and quality of the illuminating gas used in Chicago. The author of that article assumes that in our city gas is dearer and of a lower quality than it ought to be, and he goes on enumerating several reasons why it is so.

It seems to me, sir, that your reporter has failed to notice two very important causes of the high price it costs to illuminate our streets and our homes by means of gas. If you will be so kind as to allow me some space in one of your next issues, I will try to make them plain to the public at large. In order to avoid anything that would look like taking side for or against the gas companies and the gas inspector, the doings of whom are far from being praised in your article, I will present my proposition as follows:

Taking it for granted that the gas is good, the gas-meters accurate, and the consumption faithfully recorded, it is nevertheless a fact the people and Chicago expend too much money for the amount of light obtained, and this for the two following reasons:

1. The pressure under which the gas is delivered is too high. From repeated measurements I find it to be from 2 to 2.3 inches of water. It has been ascertained by actual experiment that, within certain limits, the illuminating power of a flame increases in measure as the pressure diminishes. The scientists who investigated the subject for the municipal government of Paris found that, all the outer conditions being the same, the maximum of light corresponds to a pressure of one-eighth of an inch. The seven

factories that supply Paris are bound by their charter to deliver a product of such a quality that by burning it in a standard burner, under that pressure, it will give a light equal in power to that of nine star-candles. The amount of gas consumed must be from 3.9 to 4.25 cubic feet per hour; beyond the latter quantity there is a deficiency of illuminating power.

It is claimed by some that it is impossible to get, here, a good, fair light with less than 6 feet per hour. The above given facts dispose of that opinion.

In London, common gas, burning at the rate of five cubic feet per hour, must give a light equal to that of 12 candles.

I read among the statements that our street gas-burners give a flame having the wonderful power of 18 candles; I tried several times; and never by far succeeded in getting so high a figure.

2. The shape of the burner has the greatest influence on the illuminating power of a flame. Supposing that the gas escapes through slits of different widths, the illuminating power of the flames may be as 0.65 is to 1.22 for slits respectively 1-100 and 1-50 of an inch wide. Another experiment made under other circumstances has given to Rignault powers in the ratio of 0.82 to 1.22 by changing the width from 1-62 of an inch to 1-50; there has been an increase until the slit was 1-41 of an inch; beyond that fraction the light diminished.

Other investigations have proven, also, that a given quantity of gas will give more light with a wider than with a narrow slit. The numerous kinds of burners may be classified as follows:

1. The Manchester burner. The gas escapes from two small holes bored obliquely through the top of the adjustment. The flame stands very well an excess of pressure. Not economical at all; one of the next shape will prevent an advantage of thirty to forty per cent. on the amount of gas consumed, the illuminating power being the same.

2. The butterfly or the batwing. The top is hemispherical, with a vertical slit, the width of which must be about 1-40 of an inch for a low pressure.

3. The Argand burner, diversely modified; it is used with a chimney, and the light is easily regulated by means of a stopper that diminishes or increases the supply of air that passes at the centre and around the flame. One of the best patterns is the Monnier's. Very advantageous.

From what precedes it is evident that whilst it is the duty of the city to amend the charters of the gas companies so as to get cheaper light, it is none the less that of the citizens to be careful in the choice of their gas fixtures, looking not only at the elegance of them, but also at the best ones, made according to the facts just exposed.

PROF. M. DELAFONTAINE.  
—*Chicago Times*.

## What the Newspaper Men Get.

D. Robt. Barclay, of the St. Louis *Dispatch*, gets the reputation of being the solidest mahogany editor west of the Alleghanies.

Sam Williams, of the St. Louis *Republican*, gets no thanks for his services.

Deacon Richard Smith, of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, gets his religion "over the Rhine."

J. B. McCullagh ("Mack") of the St. Louis *Democrat*, gets \$12,50 per week.

Wm. Hyde, of the St. Louis *Republican*, gets upstairs on the elevator about 11 o'clock in the morning.

Wm. McKee, of the St. Louis *Globe*, gets a whisky punch at "Sazarac's," on his way home in the evening.

Henry Watterson, of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, gets a "queen-full" about once every six months.

W. H. Swift, of the St. Louis *Dispatch*, gets an extra salary of \$6,000 per annum as Clerk of the City Council.

Rev G. C. Harding, of the Indianapolis *Herald*, gets out at the elbows working on a salary and then starts a paper of his own.

J. Adelbert Cockerill, of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, gets up a very poor paper.

Albert Roberts, of the Nashville *Banner* gets mad at Henry Watterson four times a year.

Hon. John Forsythe, of the Mobile *Register*, gets a kink in his head, and then can't get it out again.

E. Buzzard Smith, of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, gets a blowing up between the hours of 2 and 4 every afternoon.

Murat Halstead, of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, gets wrathful four times a week. He has been known to get on his muscle.

George F. Benedict, of the Cleveland *Herald*, gets a new shirt every four months, and, being a firm believer in the principle that the dead past should bury its own shirts, puts it on over the late one.

Chas. A. Dana, of the New York *Sun*, gets anything he can lay his hand on.

Major Eugene Baylor, of the Dennison (Texas) *Herald*, gets more and more shriveled up every day. He is a great lady's man.

Samuel Bowles, of the Springfield *Republican*, gets up the best country paper in America.

Col. W. M. Grosvenor gets—drunk.

If the composers were in a majority in heaven, G. M. Dallas Bloss, of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, would get what is generally supposed to be his due. As it is, their anathemas resemble nothing so much as a legislative minority report.

Whitelaw Reid, of the New York *Tribune*, gets hold of the end of his mustache and swings himself in the air. This is an exercise he takes regularly every morning.

The newspaper men all get very poorly paid for the work they do, except those who don't do any work at all.—*Chicago Post*.

## Judging the Mormon People.

Is it quite fair to judge the Mormon people by the single trait of polygamy? If it is, then the City of New York lies open to condemnation any day, on the score of its grog-shops, gambling halls, and other institutions of deeper infamy. What are the facts? Brigham Young gives them in the summary of his life, as telegraphed to the *Herald* this morning. A desert has been made a home for one hundred thousand temperate, frugal, hard-working people. Two hundred cities have been founded, with schools, factories, mills, and other industrial interests tending to benefit the whole country. Though the Indians could have swept away the colonists at any time, they have made no trouble because they were treated with even justice. By these fruits of twenty-six years, the Mormons ask that they shall be judged. But the impatient people of the East, eager to cast the first stone, set up the one changeless cry of polygamy. Will it prove effectual in fact, or even in argument? The Mormon prophet points to the cities of the East, and proclaims that their civilization is a lie; that it fosters drunkenness, promotes lust, and tends to murder; that the open polygamist is better than the secret sensualist; that the statistics of crime are proof of the failure of the old, monogamous Christianity. He uses no declamation, but points to the murders of Goodrich, Fisk, Richardson, and many another; to the looseness of divorce laws, and to the wholesale slaughter of unborn children, as the irrefragable evidence of his position. Who shall answer him, so that well informed men shall be satisfied? If it cannot be done at once, it may be well enough for people to be patient with Utah and its religion. \* \* \*

Happy would it be for ourselves if the same certainty of a better order of social morality were imminent here.—*New York Graphic*.

## Startling Social Reform.

WHAT THE MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN PROPOSE.—PLURAL MARRIAGE FOR THE INDUSTRIOUS AND STEADY—THE SURPLUS OF SPINSTERS TO BE UTILIZED.

To the Editor of the *Daily Graphic*:

It has been a subject of much interesting comment here of late years to decide what shall be done with the surplus female population. When a stranger enters one of our manufacturing cities, he is immediately struck with the preponderance of the gentler sex. They overflow our factories, fill our stores, overrun our streets, and hasten by the score to answer any advertisement for an employee. Once, the energies of a Massachusetts girl were bent on securing a husband; now they are given to getting a living. Once, the young men of the Old Bay State turned their attention to ag-

riculture and trade at home, but now-a-days they sell out their farms as soon as the old folks are dead, and go West to build railroads and concoct Credit Mobiliers. They do not so much as take a wife with them, but leave the maidens with whom they went hand in hand to school, to live in single loneliness and earn their own living. Thus, year by year, the roll of unmarried women increases, and the prospect for husbands grows more gloomy. Girls that might become radiant through motherhood, grow selfish and soured in mind, and wither and disappear like the leaves of November. The native population of Massachusetts lags far behind the foreign, and statisticians grow appalled. But the fault is not with the women, but is due to circumstances and perhaps to prejudice.

I use the word prejudice because I understand there is a movement on foot among the women of Lowell to petition the Legislature—or, strictly speaking, to present their grievances—on the subject of matrimony. For some days there have been rumors of this matter flying around the community, and I have been at some pains to trace them out. In doing so I have been struck with the fact that men and women speak freely now on topics that were tabooed ten years ago. Even the most refined women will talk interestedly and unreservedly of marriage, love, social good and evil, and all the questions which pertain to the relations of the sexes. There seems to be a fermentation beneath the surface which will break out before long in an open movement towards larger liberty for both man and woman. This is only my surmise; but, that it may not appear to be merely a piece of guess-work, I send you a copy of the document above mentioned. It is one of the most remarkable papers of the period. It comes, too, at a strange time, when Mormonism seems to be yielding to monogamic pressure from without, and Salt Lake City is preparing to accept the higher civilization from the East? Yet, in this connection, it must not be forgotten that a work on Polygamy was published in Boston some years ago, and was greeted with words of approval by some of the most eminent men of the seaboard States, including Mr. George William Curtis, of your city. The seed then sown was a small one, but it appears to have taken root, and circumstances have developed it into fruitage very quickly.

The following is a copy of the petition prepared for submission to the State Legislature:

LOWELL, April —, 1873.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The undersigned, citizens of the State, respectfully set forth the grievances under which they suffer as women who are not permitted to vote, hold any and all offices, and engage in the occupations opened to men, and are otherwise restricted in the opportunity of earning a living, and herewith beg your permission to suggest the remedy for these evils, upon which they pray your honorable body to act.

The law which now governs society says, practically, that women should be married, should engage in work at their own homes, and should look to their husbands for support. On the other hand, the census shows that it is impossible to carry out this unwritten but recognized law, for the reason that there is a large excess of women in the commonwealth, and many of the men of lawful age are idle, vicious, incompetent, or otherwise unfit to be the heads of households. Yet your petitioners hold that the matter is not without remedy. Prejudice and custom have decided in favor of restricting the husband to a single wife, yet without justice and authority, as we believe. In the Book which lies at the foundation of all law recognized in this country, there is no injunction against a plurality of wives, while there are many examples therein recorded in its favor. Men's wives appear to have increased in number in proportion with their flocks and riches. Such a rule even now holds in the land from which the Christian nations received their religion.

Your petitioners have no desire to interfere with the regulations of any existing household, but simply to present their claims to the marriage state for your respectful consideration. They deem it their privilege and their duty to suggest the abolition of the law against the marriage of a man to more than one wife, in cases where the first wife does not object, and where it is made evident that the man is able to support the additional burden laid upon his resources. They are aware that it may take years to remove prejudices, and that those who take a second or third place in the household may be looked upon with disfavor; but, confident that their proposed action will ultimately do away with much of the social evil that afflicts and distresses all communities, they are willing to be the first to engage in the work of this reform. Society, which now insists that woman shall be married and look to her husband for support, will, after mature reflection, countenance this effort to carry out its laws practically.

It is far from the design of your petitioners to ask legislation in behalf of free love or any loosening of the marriage bond; We ask that the marriage of the second wife shall be made as binding and permanent as that of the first, and that all the children

of the household shall have equal honor. And in asking this, we believe that we have taken a long step toward doing away with founding asylums, preventing ante-natal murders, and lessening the vagabond child population of our large cities.

For the reasons enumerated, your petitioners respectfully ask the passage of a law permitting plural marriage in the cases above enumerated, and under such other conditions as to your judgment shall seem wise and proper.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c., &c.

This remarkable document, at the time it was put into my hands, bore one hundred and sixty-two names. They appeared to me to be genuine signatures. All of them seemed to belong to women of American parentage, and many of the family names have been well known in New England for a century. This, too, I will say for them: the handwriting was far better, generally, than in the petitions presented to the Legislature by men, not a few of the signers being evidently ladies of education and culture. The lady to whom I was indebted for a sight of the document assured me that the large majority of them were educated women, though many of them earned their own living, and she herself is a leader in society. If these revolutionists have the courage to go forward (and there is no reason to believe that there is any mere "fun" in the matter), their petition will astonish the descendants of the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay, even if it does not enlighten them.

After taking a copy of the petition, I was puzzled to know where to send it, but, happening to take up a copy of the *Daily Graphic* containing an editorial on the Goodrich murder, which suggested some social reforms, it occurred to me that you might possibly venture to print it. The question presented by these ladies is in advance of the times—and yet not very far in advance, after all. Somebody has got to meet it at some time, but I am glad a reply does not fall to the lot of your correspondent.

MONOG.

Lowell, Mass., April 24.

—*New York Graphic*.

## Why Mr. Spurgeon Rejected the Lecture Offer.

We have already stated that Mr. Spurgeon has rejected a tempting offer to lecture in America. The other day Mr. Spurgeon gave his own version of the affair, and how it ended. He said: "I will tell you one little thing that happened to me this afternoon. I had a letter from a gentleman well known in America, giving me this offer: \$5,000 for twenty-five lectures—that is \$200 for each lecture. On these terms the twenty-five nights would give me \$5,000, and in a hundred nights I should have \$20,000. Besides this, I should be allowed to lecture for as many more nights as I chose, so that I might in the course of a year be worth \$40,000, and no doubt the persons who undertake this would earn ten times the amount. I have nothing to do but to leave you for a year and come home with \$20,000 or \$40,000, while, if I stay here, I shall have nothing like that. What do you suppose was my answer to this offer? I wrote, 'If you were to multiply that offer by one hundred times and again a hundred times I should feel it as easy to decline as I do now when I say I cannot cross the ocean to lecture upon any subject whatever. I am a minister of the Gospel, and never lectured for money, and do not intend to do so now, and if my people cannot support me it is a pity.' Some people would say, 'Why not go over to America and get the money to build the college?' I shall not do so, because I would not do one thing to degrade myself or disgrace you. I shall not make any appeal to another country to do what you can and ought to do. There are two brothers here to-night who have received offers from America. Each man can lecture as well as preach, and there is no harm in their having \$500 and a month's holiday. If I were in their position I should do the same thing; but as I am I cannot leave you. I cannot leave the college nor the orphanage, not if my house were filled with silver and gold from top to bottom. I should feel if I went to America that I should go not to preach the Gospel, but to lecture; and I cannot do that, not for the national debt."—*Liverpool Mercury*.