

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1888.

## The Week.

THE Presidential campaign of 1888 is the briefest in our history. It is less than three months from to-day to election, but Mr. Cleveland has not yet written his letter of acceptance of the Democratic nomination, while as for the Republicans, "the leader of the party" has not arrived in the country, and is not expected to sound "the keynote of the campaign" until he makes his long-advertised speech at Portland, Me., on the 15th inst., which will leave but a trifle over two months and a-half before the day for voting. It was very different in 1840, when the grandfather of the present Republican candidate for care-taker of the White House was running for the Presidency. William Henry Harrison was nominated in December, 1839, and the campaign was well under way before the end of the winter. This year, for the first time, there are no "October States"—that is to say, none that count, for Georgia, which still elects her Governor in that month, is too one-sided to carry any weight. Pennsylvania held its last October election in a Presidential year in 1872, Indiana in 1880, and Ohio in 1884. It is a tremendous gain to the cause of good politics to get rid of the demoralizing influence caused by the attempt of both parties to secure the "moral effect" of a preliminary victory by such tactics as the notorious "soap" campaign of 1880 in Indiana. Vermont and Maine still hold State elections in September; but as the result in each case is a foregone conclusion, they do not count. The same thing is true, not only of the Georgia election in October, but of the Arkansas in September, and of the Alabama last Monday.

The Republican policy becomes more clear every day. It is now openly admitted that, if the Republicans carry the election, the Nominal Candidate is to be merely care-taker of the White House, while the Greatest Living Statesman is to be the real Head of the Administration from 1889 to 1893, and then run for President in name as well as in fact. The programme is thus authoritatively stated in a Washington despatch to the Lewiston (Me.) *Journal*, Congressman Dingley's paper: "It is a part of the Republican writ that Mr. Blaine shall be Harrison's Secretary of State; and further, that after Harrison's day will come Blaine's in the Presidential chair. The call for Blaine's nomination as the next Republican leader will be irresistible."

Senator Edmunds of Vermont is not the "Republican United States Senator" quoted by Mr. Foster in his famous "fat" circular as authority for the statement that "the manufacturers get practically the sole benefit of the tariff laws." The *St. Louis Republic*

states that he has denied the authorship in a letter addressed to a Missouri friend, which has been published by a local paper in that State. The *Republic* adds that "he denied not only for himself but for Senator Morrill," and it makes this further important statement: "The *Republic* is informed on excellent authority that the real author is Senator Plumb of Kansas." Mr. Foster described his Senatorial correspondent as "a Republican United States Senator from a State which never had a Democratic representative in either house of Congress, or a Democratic State officer." A strict interpretation of this language would rule out both Senators from Kansas, as that State had a Democratic Governor a few years ago. But Mr. Foster is not a second Horace Greeley in the matter of election returns, and he has very likely seen in the *Tribune* under its present management a reference to Kansas as a State that always goes Republican, which he blindly followed. At the same time the necessity for further speculation as to the identity of the Senator would be removed if Mr. Foster would accept our invitation, now again renewed, to send this paper an authorized statement as to the matter.

The lengths to which protectionists will go in attributing all benefits to the operation of their fetish it is impossible to tell. We have been sufficiently accustomed to that kind of thing, but we confess to a little feeling of surprise on finding that Judge Kelley, in the August *Forum*, claims that one of the causes of the lowering of transportation charges for Western grain in the last twenty years has been the encouragement given by Congress to the production of steel rails in America. By what possible process of reasoning Mr. Kelley arrives at the conclusion, that our railroads have been aided in the substitution of steel for iron rails by being compelled to pay \$17 a ton more for them than they might have imported them for, is a mystery. In former years protectionists contented themselves with saying that it was a good thing to make all our own commodities, even if it made them somewhat dearer; that we should in time be able to make them without protection, and so forth. But now it has become the fashion to say that things are all the cheaper for having protective duties laid upon them; and probably Mr. Kelley had in mind this new and misty doctrine when he spoke of freight rates having been reduced by the facilities which a 75 or 100 per cent. duty affords for the purchase of steel rails.

We called attention the other day to various signs that the workingmen are mastering the great lesson taught by the Foster circular, that "the manufacturers get practically the sole benefit of the tariff laws," such as the hearty support of the Mills bill by Congressman Smith of Milwaukee, sole representative of the Labor party in the House, and

by others, like Mr. Weaver of Iowa, who were elected in part by labor votes; the change of Congressman Lawler of Chicago from an opponent of the Morrison bill two years ago to a supporter of the Mills bill now, with the hearty approval of his constituents, 95 per cent. of whom he estimates to be wage-workers in the greatest manufacturing district of his city; and the vigorous opposition not only to Gen. Harrison personally, but also and much more to the high-tariff attitude of the Republican party generally, shown by nearly all of the 200 labor papers published in the United States. To these must be added the very striking proof of the political drift of the laboring men shown by the action of their mass meeting in Indianapolis last Thursday. While the resolutions adopted show some special personal feeling against the Republican candidate as a man, they are chiefly directed against the attitude of the Republican party regarding the tariff. Evidently it is not going to be so easy to "work the free-trade racket among the workingmen" as the Republican managers expected.

When Gen. Harrison committed himself to the scheme of subsidizing South American steamers, he overlooked the fact that when this question came before the House only a few days ago, scarcely half of the Republicans could be rallied to the support of a subsidy scheme; and leading men from the West, like Mr. Henderson of Iowa and Mr. Nelson of Minnesota, made it clear that the farmers have concluded once for all that this policy must not be resumed. Gen. Harrison also overlooked the letter sent Mr. Nelson by the ship-owners and importers of Baltimore, commending his course, and protesting against the ruin threatened their business by the proposed subsidy. They can speak from experience, the Garrison and Roach subsidies, in their time, having pretty thoroughly crowded out the Baltimore clippers. By the way, in all this patriotic talk about our flag on the sea, why are our sailing vessels always left out of the account? In building and navigating them we have some chance of holding our own against competitors. The Baltimore clippers are now carrying a considerable part of our South American trade. Their freights can profitably be put at a figure low enough to compete with the English steamers, and their trips occupy but little longer time. New York importers use them much and value them highly. Why should somebody be paid to get their business from them? Gen. Harrison says that if our merchants but had more frequent and more regular mails, they could at once enlarge their business in South America. A correspondent points out that, as transactions of importance are conducted by cable, this is a rather obsolete delusion. He also had to have his fling at "tramp" steamers, apparently not understanding the significance of the presence of "tramp" steamers in all waters. It simply means that the

business of building steamships has been overdone, there being, according to Mr. Wells, an excess of 25 per cent. over the needs of the world's commerce, so that they swoop upon an offered cargo, like a crow upon carrion, cut freights to the lowest point ever known, and make the project of special legislation to get more steamers afloat ridiculous to a degree.

The "rebel-flag incident" was brought into the debate in the House last Thursday. Mr. McKinney of New Hampshire, in the course of a speech on the pension bill, remarked that "the only return of Confederate flags by the Government took place under a Republican Administration." This was disputed by Mr. Boutelle of Maine, but Mr. McKinney affirmed that twenty-one such flags were returned by Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, and that not one had been by Mr. Cleveland's Administration, although a Republican official, to wit, Adjutant-Gen. Drum, had recommended in writing that they should all be returned. Then Mr. Boutelle questioned the Republicanism of Gen. Drum, but did not go to the length of denying it. Mr. McKinney reaffirmed what he had said as a fact within his own knowledge, and repeated that the only rebel flags returned had been returned by Republicans. This incident recalls the confession made by Goy. Fairchild of Wisconsin, after he had invoked "three kinds of palsy" on the author of the rebel-flag order, that his information about it came in a telegram "from his friend Gen. Drum." It is very clear now that when Gen. Drum sent the telegram to his friend Fairchild he expected to receive congratulations in return, and not any kind of palsy.

Probably no harm will come from the passage of Senator Cullom's resolution to investigate the relations of Canadian railroads with transportation across the continent, although there was a good deal of rubbish mixed up with it. The Canadian Pacific Railway, we are told, is now carrying 42 per cent. of the tea that we consume. Well, what of that? If they are doing so, they must be doing it at a loss, because they have a more difficult and expensive line to operate than ours. If they are doing it at a loss, they are giving us some of their money, which Senators ought not to object to except upon strictly political grounds. If they are doing it at a profit, then our own railroads are to blame for allowing the Canadians to pick up business under their noses. So as to business taken from American ports on the Pacific to American points east of the mountains: we venture to say that every pound of freight so carried has been carried at a loss, or at least without profit, the Interstate Commerce Law being non-operative as to that traffic. It will probably be found that not more than 5 per cent. of the traffic naturally belonging to American lines has been taken by the Canadian Pacific, and that upon this 5 per cent. the Canadians have no reason to congratulate themselves. But there can be no objec-

tion to the investigation except that it involves a certain amount of useless bickering, and plays into the hands of those who seek to multiply difficulties with foreign countries in order to help the "home market."

The continued indifference of the Post-office Department to the doings of Postmaster Jones of Indianapolis is one of the crying scandals of the day. The impunity he has enjoyed, and continues to enjoy, has done more harm to the Administration than all the "work" of one thousand Joneses could repair in a year. For the President makes a great mistake if he supposes that the mischief done by a man like Jones is confined to the State in which it is carried on. As we long ago pointed out to him, it is not possible, in these days of telegraphs and cylinder presses, to confine the results of abuses to States in which the reform sentiment is feeble. The idea that the spoils system can be allowed to thrive without damage in States in which it is vigorous, provided it be cut down remorselessly in States in which the reformers are numerous and powerful, has been proved to be utterly fallacious. Indiana or Maryland scandals cannot be confined to Indiana and Maryland. The whole Union hears of them. Thousands in other States who supported Mr. Cleveland in 1884 are disgusted or alienated by them, and led to doubt whether he has done any good at all, or to underestimate grossly the good he has done. The reports which the Civil-Service Reform Association in Indianapolis continues to make on Jones's doings are simply sickening, and, as far as we can learn, they are neither denied nor deniable. The last one, besides the record of apparently unjustifiable dismissals among the carriers to make room for Democratic workers, tells of one shocking appointment, that of a man named Tompkins, who had, as shown by the records of the Marion County Criminal Court, pleaded guilty in November of last year to an indictment of giving liquor to a minor—namely, a school-girl of thirteen—whose acquaintance he made at the post-office while he was serving as a clerk, and whom he enticed to "a resort" out side the city. The charge is that, though Tompkins was suspended when arrested for this offence, he was, after his conviction and the payment of his fine, restored by Jones to his clerkship, "and is in that position now," the report says. "Nearly all these facts," it adds, "have been brought before the Administration." We hope and believe this one is not among the number. We cannot believe that the President is knowingly allowing Jones to get full swing.

Signor Cesare Rosmini, in the current number of the *Giornale degli Economisti*, presents the Italian side of the immigration question which is now awaiting solution at the hands of a Congressional committee, reviewing at length the bill introduced into the Italian Parliament by the Crispi Ministry. Such a law has long been demanded by Italian statesmen and economic and statisti-

cal societies, but the steady opposition of Signor Depretis defeated all action in this direction. On July 29, 1887, however, Depretis died, and in the speech with which the King opened the XVI. Parliament, November 16, he announced that the Government would request the assent of that body to an emigration law; and a month later such an act was introduced. Its most important provisions are as follows: The licensing of domiciled Italian citizens as emigration agents for one year by the Minister of the Interior on the proposition of the prefect of the province. The agent must deposit 1,000 to 3,000 lire (\$200 to \$600) as security against sudden losses of emigrants resulting from his action or negligence, to be disbursed on the award of a Governmental commission. A copy of the contract must be given to the emigrant. The agent is forbidden under penalty to ask or receive compensation from emigrants, except for sums actually disbursed on their account; to counsel, induce, or excite emigration; to furnish emigrants with shipping, to mediate between them and the shipping company, or to accompany them to the place of embarkation or destination. Clergymen and local officers who promote emigration, even without the desire of gain, are likewise liable to punishment, as are all who procure or give shipping to emigrants unprovided with proper papers. The spreading of false information, with fraudulent intent to promote emigration, is punishable as swindling. Finally, the Government is armed with full ordinance power.

Mayor Hewitt announces that he is not a candidate for another term, that he does not want to be Mayor again, does not expect to be, and does not intend to be if he can help it; but that there are things that he wants to see started, and things that have been started which he wants to see carried on to completion, and that "if the people should go ahead and elect me, that would be something I could not help and could not run away from," and he "would have to take it as a matter of duty." There ought to be no doubt about the action of the people. Mr. Hewitt has his weaknesses and infirmities, but the average of his official action is exceedingly high, and the city will be blind to its own interests if it does not command his services for another term, now that it is evident he would obey its command.

The fight between the Liberals and Tories over the Commission Bill, providing a judicial tribunal to inquire into the charges of the London *Times* against the Parnellites, practically ended last week in the reporting of the bill from the Committee of the Whole, after a debate of extraordinary acrimony. The Government has been dragged into proposing it little by little, and little by little has made it as disadvantageous to the Parnellites as possible. The *Times* pamphlet was originally really a campaign document of the kind with which we are very familiar in this country, and fortified, in order to make it more sensational, by a copy of a letter purporting to have been written by



Parnell, expressing satisfaction with the assassination of Burke and Cavendish. Incautiously the Ministers were led, both on the stump and in the House of Commons in the fury of debate, to refer to it now and again as a true description of the Irish Home-Rulers, probably hardly foreseeing the consequences of treating seriously accusations of this kind against members of Parliament, and thinking they could confine themselves to taunting Parnell with not bringing a libel suit—and probably forgetting, too, as they often do in their rage, that the Irish really are members of the House. This gave the Irish an advantage, of which they promptly availed themselves to ask for a Parliamentary Committee of Investigation, which was refused; but the refusal made even fair-minded Tories uneasy about the situation.

The matter then lay quiet for a while, until the Attorney-General, a member of the Cabinet, in another incautious mood, took a brief for the *Times* in the O'Donnell libel suit, and produced the *Times's* pamphlet in his speech, strengthened with more assassination letters from Parnell, and in fact committing himself to the assumption that Parnell was an accessory to a murder. Coming from the highest law officer of the Crown, this was, of course, a prodigious blunder, and really committed him to a criminal prosecution of Parnell, and made the cry, "Why don't you sue the *Times*?" absolutely ludicrous. After this there seemed nothing for it but to grant a special investigation of some kind. The former refusal made it impossible to grant a Parliamentary committee, so the plan of a judicial commission was devised. The Parnellites wanted the inquiry confined, and it looks as if it was originally intended to be confined, to the authenticity of the letters, but the *Times* and the Attorney-General seem to have been greatly alarmed over this, because it is now admitted that the authenticity of the letters cannot be proved, and they therefore induced the Government to extend the inquiry to all the charges made by the *Times*, and to "other persons" besides members of Parliament. In this way, if the evidence about the letters breaks down, the effect will, it is hoped, be neutralized or softened by a cloud of other testimony about the crimes of the National League and the violent speeches of the agitators. The result has been reached by an amount of subterfuge, evasion, self-contradiction and wriggling on the part of the Ministry which makes the affair one of the most discreditable chapters in English politics. But, in spite of everything, the inquiry must do good. The three judges are men who will not be led astray by clap-trap or elocution, and their report will reduce the *Times* charges to the proper dimensions. One has only to glance at these charges to see that a tribunal like this must make sad havoc among them.

We learn from the London *Economist* that

the Telegraph Department of the British Post-office is being worked, not only at a loss, but a loss which is increasing every year. The annual loss was £112,000 in 1881-2, and £471,000 in 1886-7. In the expenditures of the telegraph service is of course included interest (at 3 per cent.) on the capital invested in the purchase of the telegraph lines, for which the State paid, according to the *Economist*, much too high a price. But a very large portion of the deficit is caused, according to the report of the select Committee on Revenue Estimates, by the low rates for press messages, the loss in this branch of the work being computed to reach nearly £200,000. If this estimate is well founded, the *Economist* thinks there ought to be no hesitation in advancing press rates to the paying point, and is of opinion that no self-respecting newspaper would oppose such a step. There is no valid reason, says the *Economist*, why newspapers should receive this disguised subsidy; although they confer great benefits upon the country, they are after all business undertakings, in general amply able to pay their way, and if, while making money, they are performing a public service, the same may be said of the butcher and the baker.

Unionist circles in England either believe, or affect to believe, that the Tammany Society in this city is composed exclusively of Irishmen, and that the chief business of the organization is the planning of raids on the city treasury. We think it was Mr. Arthur Arnold who pointed out in a magazine article that the Tweed Ring also contained Irishmen only, and that its operations afforded a fair illustration of what would go on in all the Irish towns in case Ireland obtained home rule. We need hardly say that this view has obtained frequent and powerful support from our friend Prof. Goldwin Smith, writing from his eyrie in Toronto, and that it has done good service on the Unionist stump. Unluckily, however, the Government investigation into the doings of the London Board of Works has revealed a state of things which shows that even among the Saxons of that city "pulls" and "boodle" are by no means unknown. In fact, it has ruined the Tammany argument against home rule. The *Daily Telegraph*, a furious Tory and Jingo sheet, thus speaks of the revelations now made:

"Nobody will now dispute that probably for a good many years past the chair of the excellent Lord Magheramorne has been planted at the side of one of the most corrupt organizations that the history of any modern community can show. Corruption seems to have been the very oxygen which—if that respectable and valuable gas will excuse us the metaphor—a certain class of the Board's officers and servants habitually inhaled. It was the breath of their official life, the ozone of their administrative existence. All these gross scandals and abuses, all this giving and taking of commissions, all these levying and payments of blackmail, were going on for years under the very eyes—nay, under the very nose—of this blameless official and most estimable man; but no whiff of the vile odor of all these malpractices seems ever to have assailed his nostrils, no faintest jingle of ill-gotten gains seems ever to have reached his ear."

The coöperative experiment in England is of much greater age than might be inferred from noting that the recent Coöperative Con-

gress at Dewsbury was numbered the twentieth. Back at least to 1849 and the Christian Socialism of Maurice and Kingsley, does the movement date. Indeed, we believe that Mr. Neale, the President of the Congress, was himself associated with Ludlow and Maurice in the organization of the first workingmen's coöperative society. However that may be, the Dewsbury meeting served to bring out the great proportions now reached by an enterprise whose beginnings were of the humblest. The United Kingdom now has 1,350 coöperative stores, supplying more than 920,000 members. Their sales amounted to more than \$120,000,000 last year, and the profits shared reached nearly \$15,000,000. This last sum represents the annual saving now effected by dispensing with the profits of middlemen. It cannot be denied, therefore, that the experiment in distributive coöperation has been a great success. Yet, on its face, it is but a partial and self-limited solution of the question it attacks. Distributive without productive coöperation is a one-legged affair, and the record of experiments in productive coöperation is almost wholly one of failures. The Congress voted to take up that work anew, but the past is not reassuring. Merely distributive coöperation, even if carried to the greatest possible extent, and made to reach all of the 5,000,000 families of Great Britain, might not mean a higher standard of living. As Lassalle pointed out, it might mean lowered wages, under the stress of competition, thus really neutralizing the saving now effected by coöperative stores.

The distinct promise made by the new Emperor, in his speech to the German Parliament, to enact laws for the benefit of the poor, has a partial fulfilment in the measure of socialistic legislation which has recently passed the Bundesrath. The first of Bismarck's laws in the interest of workingmen, along the line of the demands of the Socialists, was, it will be remembered, that providing for a pension to workmen disabled by an accident. The new law extends the system to invalided workingmen and those who may reach the age of seventy years. The scheme is to operate in the following manner: An insurance fund is to be accumulated to which workingmen themselves, employers, and the Empire, each contribute equally. Men are to subscribe five cents per week and women about four cents, each employer of labor is to add as much as the sum drawn from all his work-people, and the Government will give its third. From the sum thus obtained, a pension of sixty-two cents a week will be paid to any who are kept from working by sickness, and to all who have passed their seventieth year. Measures thus purely socialistic seem now to be the settled policy of Bismarck, undertaken in the hope of drawing the fangs of the Socialist party. Thus far he has certainly met with little success in that purpose, as the Socialist vote keeps on growing, and the Socialist party, far from being conciliated by his half-way laws, laughs at them and pushes on its propaganda with redoubled zeal.

## LAODICEAN POLITICS.

DR. STORRS has written a long letter to the *Independent*, explaining the saying attributed to him by Dr. Cuyler, that he was so perplexed and displeased by the Republican platform that nothing seemed left for him but to "take to the woods." He qualifies this now as an "idle word," representing "a real feeling of uncertainty and unrest" from which he has not altogether escaped, "though it becomes increasingly probable that he will again vote for the Republican ticket"; at least, that "seems the conclusion towards which his mind drifts," though his dislike of the platform is as great as ever. But he thinks that, on the subject of temperance, reliance is rather to be placed on the Republican party than on the Democrats, and, as to the tariff, although he again denounces the utterances of the Republican platform as absurd, nevertheless, "in view of the majestic history of the party," etc., he "waits to see if such a revision of the tariff as appears to him demanded will not be accepted by the party as a near and an imperative duty."

The letter is interesting as an illustration of the way in which the mind of a good man who does not give particular attention to politics, and lives under strong habits and traditions, works about election time, and postpones or fends off the disagreeable necessity of taking any positive step in the direction of a change for the better, even when he acknowledges that such a change is needed. It is still more interesting, however, to the student of American politics, as an illustration of the agencies which have brought the Republican party into its present troubles. If we were asked by a young man to explain to him the process by which the party of Greeley, and Sumner, and Lincoln, and Chase, and Seward had become the party of Blaine, and Quay, and Elkins, and Shook, and Reid, and Ford, we doubt if we could do better than put into his hands Dr. Storrs's letter, with some such comment as this:

A party begins inevitably to decline in force when its founders die out and its principal aim has been accomplished; and it must necessarily do so because it is not a church, and is, therefore, not a divinely appointed depositary of revealed truth, or a divinely appointed means of individual edification. It has no corporate existence whatever. It is simply the agreement, necessarily transitory, of a large body of voters to try to embody some particular idea or set of ideas in legislation, or in trust the execution of the laws to the hands of a particular set of men. The only way in which we are made aware of its existence or of its aims is through the pledges it exacts of the legislators whom it elects, the platforms in which it enunciates its principles, and the kind of men it puts in high office.

Except through this manifestation, no one knows anything about a party. Its members have nothing in common but their momentary agreement to say certain things on certain topics, and to support these things by voting together at certain elections. But we inevita-

bly get into the way, in countries of universal suffrage, of talking of the men who take charge of the machinery as "the party"—that is, the men call the conventions together and regulate their proceedings, and we finally come to think of them as "the party." And after talking and thinking of them as the party, for a time, we soon get into the habit of ascribing to them a corporate existence, with a sort of transmitted goodness and purity, or spiritual efficacy, like "holy orders" in the Catholic and Episcopal Church, so that each of them, however unworthy personally, will, in his relations to the party, and in his action for the party, be moved by a special inherent and perpetual grace, of which he cannot, as long as he speaks for the party, divest himself by any ordinary sin or iniquity. Under this view the party, of course, never ceases to be the party of the original founders; and Blaine, Quay, Elkins, Shook, Reid, and Ford continue to be, and are for for all party purposes, Greeley, Sumner, Lincoln, Chase, and Seward, to the eye of the faithful man.

Once this corporate continuity of character and aims is established in behalf of the party, and men like Dr. Storrs are got to accept it, of course persistence in any line of error or folly becomes easy, and change for the better hard. "The party," for instance, has for twenty years been promising to revise the tariff, but has steadily refused to do so. Dr. Storrs says this ought to be done, but when he asks the party why it is not done, the answer is simple—in fact, he makes it himself. "Matt" Quay will say: "You trusted Lincoln to do what was right eventually, did you not? Then why do you not trust us? For all party purposes we are Lincoln, and Seward, and Sumner, and Chase rolled into one. We are heirs of all their purposes and aspirations, and just as sure to come out right in the end as they were. You admit that our past, including that of Blaine, Dorsey, Shook, and Reid, is 'majestic,' and you must surely see that, this being the case, although we have for twenty years or so never shown the smallest intention of altering the tariff, except to raise it, we are pretty sure to reduce it before long. In fact, we cannot help ourselves. The reduction of the tariff being, as you say, a 'near and imperative duty,' and duties of this sort being very attractive to us, we are almost certain to buckle down to the work within a few years. If we do not, we shall transmit 'the majestic history' which we have received from our precursors, to other managers who will come after us, and, you may rely upon it, the tariff will be revised, either before you die or afterwards. In the meantime, do not lose heart or hope, but vote our ticket as usual. We are as sound on the liquor question as on the tariff, although it may not seem so to the casual observer. Our brothers Shook and Reid may now and again seek to 'give Republican saloon-keepers the protection to which they are entitled,' but this ought not to cause you to mistrust them, because, in virtue of the law of the party's being, the persistence of such men in error is impossible. How often has the Christian

Church fallen into corrupt ways, and made discreditable concessions to sinners; but how surely has she in the end come back to her primitive purity."

## CAMPAIGN LYING.

LATE in the canvass of 1880, after the Republicans had succeeded in making the tariff an issue, the Republican National Committee issued from their headquarters in this city and Brooklyn the following card:

[From a pamphlet issued by the Free-Trade Club of London.]

"Let it be understood, once for all, that the salvation of England depends upon the destruction of American manufactures, and that the only possible way in which American manufactures can be destroyed is by free trade. This can only come through Democracy, and Democracy can only secure control of this republic by the votes of Irishmen. How England must laugh in her sleeve as she sees the men who left their homes vowing vengeance, serve her interests by working for a party which, if it gets control of the country, will inevitably carry out the policy she most desires!"

Mr. David A. Wells promptly pounced on this as a fraud and exposed it, challenging Stephen W. Dorsey, the precious scamp who, as Secretary of the National Committee, then had charge of the "majestic history" of the Republican party, to produce the pamphlet. Dorsey, after waiting three weeks, and submitting to nearly as much prodding as Mr. Foster about the "fat" circular, came forward, and in thoroughly characteristic fashion flatly denied that the Committee had issued any such card. This was too bold, however, for a cloud of witnesses at once appeared to testify to the issue of whole bundles of it, both in this city and Brooklyn, and Dorsey disappeared into the obscurity in which he has ever since lived, except when he was under trial as a Star-route thief. There never was any such pamphlet, or any such club as "The Free-Trade Club." The whole thing was a pure invention, and yet it was simply the most barefaced of many similar ones.

Proofs that our Republican friends are again resorting to the same tactics pour in on us now every day. Devices of this kind are very hard to meet, because they are rarely resorted to through the newspaper press, and therefore one only hears of them in a measure accidentally. The instrumentality is usually oral gossip, or hand-bills addressed to workmen. An illustration of the former of these methods came to us within a day or two, from a respectable correspondent in the West, whose letter we reproduce, suppressing the names.

DEAR SIR: A gray-haired lawyer, formerly of your city, and a friend of Levi P. Morton, always damages my arguments, based upon your facts and lines of thought, by declaring that the *Evening Post* property is mortgaged for \$500,000 to two members of the Cobden Club at 2 per cent. Innuendo that you are bribed.

The statement, to be sure, has nothing to do with the value of the arguments, but hurts me on facts with two doubtful men in our office, and if you can see no objection to denying the statement, you would confer a favor on me by so doing. His name is —, and to my denials he said it was matter of record to his knowledge.

No offence whatever if I receive no answer.  
Yours respectfully,