

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1888.

The Week.

THE country is to be congratulated on the unanimity with which the Democrats stood by their determination to make the importation of wool free to our manufacturers. The wool duty is, from every point of view, perhaps the least defensible of all the conflicting and injurious provisions of our tariff scheme. Its history has been a continuous history of logrolling and of intimidation of the legislators of the nation by the representatives of special interests. As to its intrinsic merits, no rational theory of protection can justify the imposition of a protective tax on this product of the most primitive of industries, a tax which is a vexation and hindrance to manufacturers as well as a burden upon the whole population as consumers. If this opinion needed any confirmation, it might be found in the fact that though Germany, France, and Austria maintain protective tariffs, and are also wool-growing countries, they impose no duty on wool. We do not believe that high duties on it could ever have been imposed here had it not been for the constant political pressure exercised by the wool-growers, and the "deals" they have been able to effect with the woollen manufacturers. It is interesting to note that on the last day of the debate a letter was read from President Whitman, of the National Association of Woollen Manufacturers, protesting against the relief of his industry from a tax upon its raw material. This is quite in keeping with the history of the wool duty. But Mr. Whitman might profit by reading the extremely cogent and admirably sustained argument which he himself, in the name of his Association, submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury in 1885. We have nowhere seen the cause of free wool more ably advocated, or the burdensomeness of the wool duty to all classes and interests more clearly set forth.

The debate on the rice duty, like that on the sugar duty, shows an interesting condition of mind on the part of the Republican members. They manifest an extraordinary desire to look into the merits of the case in regard to these two Southern products, and consequently develop very contradictory opinions. The only way to avoid such differences is to stick to every duty through thick and thin, which is the policy formally adopted by the Chicago platform. Mr. Hopkins of Illinois argued that the duties should be made lower, because "the statistics show that no business North or South pays any better than the cultivation of rice," and he stated that the production was now fifty per cent. greater than before the war. Then it was pointed out by a Southern member that this was an error, Mr. Hopkins having accidentally got the ante-bellum figure wrong by just one hundred million

pounds, so that in reality there has been a decline of about thirty per cent. And, sure enough, a little further on in the debate, up rises Mr. Bayne and indignantly asks whether the consumers of rice are to be taxed at a high rate for the benefit of a small and retrograding industry. But why bother about the consumer, or go into details of more or less? Has not the Chicago platform given you the simple rule that every protective duty is to be retained, or, if it must be modified to reduce the surplus, it is to be raised to the prohibitory point?

Another respect in which the Republican treatment of the sugar and rice questions contrasts with their treatment of the other items of the bill is, that they talk about the total rate of duty in these cases, and not about the reduction from the present rate. In the case of every other item in the bill they clamor against the slightest reduction, on the plea of its destructive effect upon those engaged in the industries affected. Now, the Mills bill does not commit the inconsistency of leaving the sugar and rice duties untouched; it reduces both of them something like 18 per cent. It may be held that the reductions proposed in the bill are not sufficient; but it is absurd, and especially so for high-tariff men, to estimate the justice of the proposition by considering simply the total rate of duty. The Mills bill is not a free-trade measure; it is a very moderate and conservative measure for the reduction of the present tariff. Mr. Elliott of South Carolina did well to remind the Republicans that "it is a condition we are confronting, not a theory," and that the condition in this case was a duty of something like 113 per cent. imposed by Republican legislation.

An element of picturesqueness is occasionally infused into the tedious discussion of economic questions by Mr. Nelson of Minnesota, whose evident American patriotism does not prevent him from feeling a pride in his Norse ancestors and his hardy Norwegian kinsmen of to-day. In the steamship-subsidy debate the other day, Mr. Nelson began a little speech by saying that he had not intended to take part in the debate, but that while listening to it "thoughts came into his mind of what great navigators his ancestors had been, and what great navigators their descendants still are." He told what high rank the merchant marine of Norway holds, it being next in magnitude to that of the United States, although Norway has a population of less than two millions. He ridiculed the notion that our ocean shipping was in its present low state on account of the operations of rebel cruisers twenty-five years ago, and mentioned that when those cruisers were causing our ship-owners to sell their vessels at a sacrifice, "hundreds of them were purchased by that little country of Norway, and used in her commerce, although she had as good and ample mate-

rial for shipbuilding and as good ship-carpenters as you had." And it was with evident pride that Mr. Nelson replied to a Republican member who asked why they bought them: "They bought them because they could buy them cheaper, under those peculiar circumstances, than they could make them at home, and because they had the privilege of buying them," whereas with us "the trouble is, you have put the American merchant marine in a sort of strait jacket."

Senator Hoar has made an elaborate attack on the Fisheries Treaty, which he calls "a speech," but which is in reality an essay, filling a pamphlet of sixty pages, and containing a history of the American fisheries from the earliest times. We need hardly say that it contains very little that is new, which is no discredit to Senator Hoar, considering what thorough discussion the subject has undergone. He makes one new charge against the Administration, that it refused or failed to communicate the proposals and counter-proposals made while the Commission was in session. To which Mr. Bayard replies that it is absolutely untrue; that no record of the proceedings was kept except the daily protocols drawn up by the Secretary, which were transmitted to the Senate when called for in March of this year. When one extricates the Senator's main complaint from the mass of historical matter that envelops it, it is found to be simply the old one that the Canadians will not allow Americans to carry on the fish trade from Canadian ports. American fishermen wish not only to fish in Canadian waters, and to enter Canadian ports for wood, food, and repairs, but to enter them for any purpose whatever, or, in other words, to enter them both as fishing and trading vessels. The Canadians offer these privileges in return for the free admission of their fish and fish oil to our ports. This Senator Hoar treats as an impudent proposal, and he is not only angry with Secretary Bayard for listening to it, but for failing to override it by threats. No arrangement with Canada will satisfy him, or even be accepted by him as worthy of discussion, which does not compel the Canadians to share with Americans all the advantage and profits of their home fisheries.

Of course, this seems, on its surface, fair enough. But it is in reality most disingenuous. There are no fisheries on our coast in which the Canadians ask to be allowed to share or to fit out in Boston or Gloucester to carry on. When they come to our ports, they come simply as trading vessels with a commodity to sell. They do not seek to make our coast the basis of their fishing operations. In denying them access to American ports, we should, therefore, be denying them privileges accorded to all the world in order to punish them for refusing to let us share in something in which we do not deny them rights of property. The vicinity of fish-

ing grounds is an advantage of the nature of property to the inhabitants of the coast. It would doubtless be churlish to refuse to allow foreigners to share it on any terms. But the Canadians do not do this. They say, "You may share all our advantages; your fishing vessels may enter our ports for any purpose, if you will give us free access to your markets." Sooner than accede to this, however, Mr. Hoar is ready to go to war. To him a proposal from a foreigner that we should take off an import duty on anything, has a savor of impudence about it like a proposal to commit some act of dishonesty or indecency, and he would punish it if he could. He quotes in the opening of the essay Burke's picture of the energy and success of the New England fishermen, and then goes on, with much fuming and fretting, to furnish an excellent illustration of that admirable saying of the same orator, that "a great empire and little minds go ill together."

It is difficult to tell whether the attempts of the *Chicago Tribune* to become reconciled with the programme which its party has this year laid down for itself partake more of the pathetic or the ridiculous. Its repudiation of the ultra-protection plank of the platform is complete, but it is exercising all of its ingenuity to find some way to excuse its support of the ticket on that platform. Its latest attempt takes the form of an argument to prove that the recent National Convention at Chicago had no right to speak for the party. It calls the free-whiskey utterance the "blunder or trick of a platform committee," and lays down the proposition that "a convention called as the agent of an existing political organization with well-known principles and policies must act within its commission, and perform only the specific duties intrusted to it," comparing such a convention to a church synod or conference. It is hardly worth while, perhaps, to argue against so ridiculous a proposition. A political convention is made up of delegates who are chosen just as much to adopt a platform as they are to nominate a ticket. There is, in fact, no other existing authority to set forth the party's principles. "A party's platform can only be changed," says the *Tribune*, "by consent of its members." The *Tribune* has announced that its way of withholding its consent to the free-whiskey platform is going to be to sustain the candidates who have been placed on that platform, and who have in their informal acceptances of their nominations signified their commendation of the doctrines held out to them, and will, of course, do so more explicitly in their formal letters of acceptance. The *Tribune* knows perfectly well that the only way the people can manifest their condemnation of a political platform is to defeat at the polls the candidates selected to put that platform into effect.

The woman suffragists appear to have a strong case against Judge Nash of Washington Territory, who recently declared the act giving women the right to vote in that Territory unconstitutional. He took the ground that when Congress, in

the organic act, granted the Territorial Legislature the right to confer suffrage, it did not expect the Legislature ever to confer it upon women, and therefore that no Territory can grant its women a right to vote unless it can be shown that a majority of Congress believed in woman suffrage at the time when they conferred upon the Territory the power to regulate suffrage within its borders. This would be a weak position at best, in view of the fact that three Territories have granted suffrage to women without any question of their power being raised, and that the women of Wyoming have been voting for nearly twenty years; and the opinion loses all claim to respect in view of the experience of Utah. It will be remembered that when Congress two years ago wanted to deprive the women of that Territory of suffrage, it inserted a special section in an act, thereby admitting that the Territorial Legislature had been within its right in granting them the ballot, in the absence of Congressional prohibition of such action, and that the theory of such action being unconstitutional was absurd.

Our Consul at Amsterdam calls attention in a recent report to an interesting movement which has been started in Holland in the shape of an association called "The Foreign Country." This society has been organized by a number of the most prominent merchants and manufacturers of Holland, and by other influential citizens, with a view to keeping up the commercial rank of Holland in competition with the more powerful nations which are now so greatly enlarging their distant markets. The advantage which England and Germany have over Holland "is chiefly due," says the circular of the Association, "to the fact that both these countries possess in the principal markets of the world commercial establishments, entertaining direct intercourse with the mother country. By this means trade and navigation with the English and Germans are constantly stimulated; and their industry is kept informed by countrymen about the wants and requirements of other nations, and obtains fresh opportunities for the sale of its productions." With a view to supplementing the deficient opportunities of the Dutch in these respects, the Association "intends to procure, through personal influence of the members and by the interference of our consuls, for such young men as it shall think fit, appointments with commercial counting-houses in trans-Atlantic places." The Association intends to pay the travelling expenses of these young men, and give them such other pecuniary assistance as may seem necessary, with the understanding that the beneficiaries shall feel themselves morally bound to return the money when they are in a position to do so, and the money so returned will be again employed for the same purpose. We have no doubt that the energetic merchants of Holland will push this scheme of commercial fellowships with vigor, and it will be interesting to observe its development. But why

not first try our plan of giving the foreign consulships to broken-down politicians, men with weak lungs in search of a warm climate, drunkards, ne'er-do-weels whom their friends want to get rid of, and active stump orators?

The *London Economist* has been making very severe strictures upon the mode in which the budget for India is determined. It has complained that the estimates are very loose, being made, in accordance with custom based on the provisions of an old law, some weeks earlier than it is possible to arrive at an accurate knowledge of the returns for the closing year. It also urges that there is no effective outside control over the financial administration of India. "The British Parliament is supposed to exercise supervision and control; but although this is the theory, every one knows that in practice Parliament never devotes more than a few hours at the far end of a session to the consideration of the Indian budget, and then scrambles through the discussion in the most perfunctory and superficial fashion." In the issue of July 7, from which we have been quoting, the *Economist* writer, in replying to a defence of the Indian administration against his charges, made in an official communication by E. J. Sinkinson, one of the Secretaries of the Indian Government, handles Mr. Sinkinson without gloves; but at the same time the high position which the British civil-service system occupies in the public estimation is signally illustrated. After saying that the £70,000,000 of Indian taxation are "spent according to the virtually uncontrolled discretion of a handful of Government officials, there being not even an independent non-official audit of accounts," it is no small compliment for a severe critic to add: "That these officials are a body of honest and honorable men, filled with a sense of their responsibility, and striving earnestly to promote the best interests of the people of India, every one acknowledges. Still they are only human, and prone to err; and it is in the very nature of things that absence of control leads to laxness, and the growing up of practices that are apt to develop into abuses."

Frances Power Cobbe, discussing in the last number of the *Contemporary Review* the effect of scientific views of life on religious thought, mentions as an illustration the growing love of medical publications among the young of both sexes, and the growing interest in surgical operations. This brings her, naturally enough, to the practice which has sprung up within a few years among the doctors, and is particularly common in this country, of describing the patient's condition in detail in their daily "bulletins" when he happens to be a distinguished or well-known man. Formerly the bulletin used to be simply a statement of the patient's condition, whether better or worse, more or less hopeful, than the previous day. Now the attending physicians insert the reasons for their conclu-

sions in the shape of accounts of the patient's temperature, and of the working of various internal organs—stuff, in short, which is of no earthly value to the public, simply satisfies the disgusting curiosity of a low class of newspaper readers, and ought to be confined to the nurse's record. The bulletin, too, is now signed by a larger number of doctors than it used to be. Formerly the principal physician told over his signature all the public needed to know. Nowadays a bulletin without four or five names to it seems to carry little weight. In fact, the multiplicity of signatures has a most unpleasant look of advertising. It produces the impression that the head doctor is trying to give as many of his brethren as possible a chance to get their names before the public in a conspicuous way. The general result is, as Miss Cobbe truly remarks, that—

"The last recollection which the present generation will retain of many an illustrious statesman, poet, or soldier will not be that he died like a hero or saint, bravely, or piously, but that he swallowed such and such a medicine, and was perhaps sick at his stomach. Deathbeds are desecrated that doctors may be puffed and public inquisitiveness assuaged."

Those who remember the bulletins issued during President Garfield's and Gen. Grant's illness, and those of some others more recently, will think this a very mild way of putting it. The bulletins are not the worst of the matter, however. The interviews of the reporters with the physicians are a distinct aggravation, because they always contain fresh particulars—that is, a great deal of diagnosis and prognosis thrown into a popular, and sometimes a humorous form, to which the reporter gives as many journalistic touches as are necessary to make a thoroughly nasty mess. Has not the question an ethical side, which deserves the attention of the Medical Associations? Ought not the doctors to be restrained in the composition and publication of bulletins, as they are now in the matter of advertising themselves by periodicals or by hand-bills?

The proposal of the English Ministry to furnish a commission of judges to try the *Times's* charges against Parnell seems to be most reasonable and well-advised. A commission of English judges is probably the best tribunal for such a purpose that it would be possible to devise, and its decision would be accepted as the best obtainable, by the whole civilized world. The *Times* would of course prefer a London jury, but every fair-minded Englishman appreciates the force of the objections which the Parnellites make to an action at law, restricted by rules of legal evidence, and tried before a body of this kind. The Parnellites will now seek to exclude from the consideration of the Commission everything but the authenticity of the letters indicating complicity with assassins which the *Times* attributes to Parnell, while the *Times* seeks to have all the charges it makes in its pamphlet, "Parnellism and Crime," laid before it. The letters are, however, the only thing a sensible man need feel called on to answer. The rest of the pam-

phlet is an ordinary "campaign document," full of vague insinuation, forced inference, and ingenious collocation, all seasoned with the regular journalistic abuse. It would hardly be possible to get a bench of judges to agree to wade through it.

Nothing in our day could better illustrate the hold which the journalistic superstition has on the modern mind than the importance which the British public attaches to the *Times's* charges. They are really made, and believed in with knowledge, so far as is known, simply by the editor, Mr. Buckle, an obscure young man, formerly an assistant editor, and Mr. Walter, the proprietor, an elderly and dull country squire without any personal weight or influence. If the cry were, "Buckle and Walter believe Parnell was an accomplice of assassins," nobody would pay much attention to it, and most people would be amused by it. But by calling Buckle and Walter "the *Times*," the charges assume in Englishmen's minds great gravity, and compel the Government actually to organize a special tribunal to try them. Respect for the *Times*, without regard to the kind of men who are behind it, is really a discredit to a civilized nation in our day. It is a conversion of the cylinder press into a sort of fetish, such as an African chief would undoubtedly make of it, but of which men in broadcloth ought to be ashamed.

The influence of the Floquet-Boulangér duel on French politics, odd as it may seem to us, is likely to be very great. Floquet has shown himself a powerful and skilful debater in the Chambers, and has made mincemeat of poor Boulanger whenever he took the floor; but the French public does not expect a "brave général" to be much of an orator, and it does not discredit him seriously to be worsted in encounters of the tongue with an "avocat"—a well-known term of contempt in French military circles. To be worsted in a duel with swords, however, with an avocat considerably his senior—in fact, not far from sixty years old—is something which they are not likely to forgive in a soldier. Rochefort, who is an extremely French Frenchman, probably expressed the popular feeling very correctly in saying, as is reported: "How wonderful! The youngest general in the army let himself be pinked by a barrister nearly sixty years old!" In other words, whether Boulanger gets well or not, we have probably seen the last of him as a politician, and the Republic will be greatly fortified by having in one way or another disposed of a military pretender who at one time seemed dangerous.

The peculiar circumstances attending the reelection of President Diaz will freshly warn Americans against reading their own political ideas into the Mexican political forms. The fact that a man could be elected President without having ever said that he would accept the office, without ever having been formally nominated, or having put forth a declaration of principles and purposes, or

having one put forth for him by a party whose representative he had been chosen to be, is enough of itself to show how hollow is the pretence of popular elections in Mexico. And when we add to this the fact that the legislative power has been renewed in the same underground manner that has marked the choice of the Executive, so that it can be said of the new Congressmen that their "politics are mostly unknown," we see how impotent universal suffrage may be. In fact, the necessary preliminaries to a real election by the people are wanting in Mexico. The country does not know what a political party is, in our sense of the word. The only thing approaching a party platform known to Mexicans is the pronunciamiento of the leader of a revolution; and that means of political education is now, happily, largely a reminiscence. There is no such thing as public political discussion. The press has been so closely muzzled of late that its limited power as a political educator has been made smaller than ever. The indirect system of voting is a most manageable instrument, and the elections pass off almost in secrecy. Indeed, the hopeless wonder with which intelligent Mexicans regard our own immense fervor and agitation at times of important elections, is proof enough that their popular voting is only a name.

Yet all this is not saying that the choice of Gen. Diaz for a third term is not highly complimentary to him and his Administration of the past four years, nor that it is not probably the best thing that could have happened for the country. He has undoubtedly made a valiant stand for economy and efficiency in the public service. In all international relations, excepting, perhaps, a part of his policy in respect to Guatemala, he has conducted affairs with prudence and dignity. The enormous financial difficulties of the country he has made determined efforts to meet, and if his success here has not been as great as was anticipated, it has been perhaps as great as was possible in the nature of the case. The pronounced favor he has always shown towards plans for popular education and religious freedom will be a guarantee against any serious Catholic reaction under his rule. In fact, he has recently taken occasion to declare anew his opposition to the clerical programme, and has been, in consequence, bitterly assailed by some of the organs of the Church. That his election marks a new step in the centralizing tendencies of Mexico is certainly true; yet it may very well be that the best hopes for the future lie in the establishment of a firmer national power, even if it has to be a personal power, which will enforce order, direct and stimulate internal improvements, and work towards the diffusion of education, and so, at last, towards a recovery by the people of their constitutional right to self-government. That President Diaz is moved more by a desire to accomplish something like this for his country than by personal ambition, is a belief which his attitude during his present term certainly warrants.

WHISKEY.

COL. "Bob" Ingersoll probably never made so great a mistake as that glowing eulogy on whiskey which he wrote about a year ago, and which we here reproduce:

"I send you some of the most wonderful whiskey that ever drove the skeleton from a feast or painted landscapes in the brain of man. It is the mingled souls of wheat and corn. In it you will find the sunshine and shadow that chase each other over the billowy fields, the breath of June, the carol of the lark, the dews of the night, the wealth of summer, and autumn's rich content—all golden with imprisoned light. Drink it, and you will hear the voice of men and maidens singing the 'Harvest Home,' mingled with the laughter of children. Drink it, and you will feel within your blood the star-lit dawns, the dreamy, tawny dusks of many perfect days. For forty years this liquid joy has been within the happy staves of oak, longing to touch the lips of man."

The objection to this is that, after making all due allowance for the exaggerations of poetry, it gives a radically misleading impression as to the social value of even very old whiskey. If whiskey produced the effects which Col. "Bob" ascribes to it, it would undoubtedly be the best gift bestowed by Providence on suffering, toiling humanity. But unfortunately it does not produce these effects on any, or on more than very few at all events. It may possibly cause some to "hear the voice of men and maidens singing the 'Harvest Home,' mingled with the laughter of children." But what the great majority of people hear when they take it in sufficient quantity to be affected by it, is the voice of men swearing at the maidens, and the yells of children under the application of the paternal poker and tongs. In truth, it affects different people in different ways. Some it makes hilarious and others morose. Some can take a good deal without feeling it, while others are upset by a mouthful of it. It was extremely rash of the Colonel to predict to any particular individual what its effect on him would be. Very likely its principal effect on his friend was to make him feel within his blood simply a passionate desire to lie down and go to sleep.

The solemn truth is, that anybody who would now maintain that whiskey is a convivial drink, in any proper sense of the term, would, as Canning remarked of the man who said he liked dry champagne, maintain anything. It obtained its fame as such in ages and countries in which men who drank together did not converse or expect to converse, or to have any pleasure but that of getting very drunk, or, in other words, of losing the ability to walk steadily or talk coherently. In those days, say, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when men met socially, they always fell to drinking, and in Scotland and Ireland the drink was whiskey; but it did nothing for them in a convivial sense except set them to singing songs in the brief interval before they became absolutely silly. In those days, as any one may see in reading Pepys's Diary, whenever two or three men got together over a bottle or a tankard, they did not talk—they sang, or one sang and the others joined in the chorus. The choruses of the old songs, mostly rigmarole, were intended simply to enable the whole com-

pany to take a hand in the entertainment. For this purpose of starting the singing, whiskey was perhaps as good as anything. But, for social purposes in an age when men meet to talk, and have lost the art of singing convivial songs, all spirituous liquors are well-nigh worthless. They steal the senses and paralyze the tongue too rapidly. Few can drink whiskey for half an hour, even in the smallest sips, without becoming more or less incoherent, if not noisy and quarrelsome.

In a period when men converse when they meet, and have topics of conversation furnished them in great abundance by the newspapers, what is wanted is a liquor that will exhilarate only slightly, and which is only intoxicating when taken in great quantities, and the effects of which pass off rapidly. This is furnished by most kinds of wine or beer. People can "sit over" wine or beer for hours, and get just enough stimulation from it to loosen their tongues, without any fear of a disturbance or disorder or sickness. Whiskey-drinking in the same manner and during the same period would probably produce very disgusting scenes, and break the party up in a row, and send them home as nuisances or terrors to their wives and children.

For this reason the failure of the vine in France and some other countries of continental Europe, and the substitution of whiskey and various forms of brandy for wine, as popular beverages, must be regarded as one of the greatest misfortunes which have overtaken the modern world. We have several times given in these columns some account of the alarm it is exciting in France and Switzerland, and of the energetic measures which have been proposed to check the spread of what is called "alcoholism"—that is, of the passion among the masses of the people for drinks containing 50 or 60 per cent. of alcohol, instead of 6 or 7 per cent. At this moment, both the statesmen and scientists of continental Europe are really at their wits' ends to devise means of saving the health and morals of the population from what we may call the ravages of all distillations from barley, rye, corn, potatoes, beet-roots, or, in other words, what we may generically call whiskey. They do not want to have "landscapes" painted in the brains of the population, especially when the landscapes are generally filled with snakes and demons and all manner of vermin.

The United States has had this experience already, and has certainly profited by it. It once had cheap whiskey, and we know what the result was. The *Chicago Tribune* described it thus the other day:

"Wipe out the internal revenue altogether, what would be the result then? Down would go whiskey to 25 cents a gallon, and by retail to 3 cents a glass, as it was in ante-war days, when the best Monongahela whiskey could be had for 5 cents a swig, and common whiskey for 3 cents; and all the evils of those days would be let loose again with redoubled force, because money with which to buy liquor is so much more plentiful now. There are plenty of men living who can remember the 25-cent-a-gallon whiskey days. They can remember how the farmers came to the towns, some with jugs, some with kegs, and some with barrels. Some would give excuses that they were afflicted with all the diseases to which flesh is heir, and

which could only be cured by whiskey. They had malaria, and might have snake-bites to cure. Their drinking water was so poor they could not use it without mixing whiskey with it. Never were farmers in such an unhealthy and moribund condition as in those days. They could not get through harvesting, threshing, ploughing, corn-husking, or log-rolling without it. It was as necessary to the hay-mowing and the harvest as the scythe or the sickle. The whiskey-jug on such occasions was as common in the West as the rum-jug in New England, when every one, from the deacon to the farm hand, had his wet rations. In those days of cheap whiskey there were ten drunkards to one now. Delirium tremens was a common disease; now it is rare. Then every one filled up with whiskey or rum. It was one of the staffs of life in every house."

The *Providence Journal*, discoursing recently on the same subject, said:

"For nearly half-a-century prior to the outbreak of the last war the Government imposed no specific tax on whiskey, and exercised no direct supervision over its production. It was an era of 'free whiskey,' and what was the result? The average market price was twenty-four cents a gallon, and it could be bought by the drink in saloons at three cents a glass. The effect was seen in the pitiable inebriety prevalent in all classes of the community—an evil that was so exceedingly common that the early temperance reformers had great difficulty in making people believe it was an evil at all. In the country districts, especially, where now is the stronghold of temperance, drunkenness was almost universal. Whiskey was one of the chief articles of barter at all the cross-road stores; the whiskey jug was a conspicuous figure in every farmer's market-wagon; and even the women and children were habitual whiskey-drinkers. It is not beyond the memory of men now living when in the country towns it was no more uncommon to meet a tipsy clergyman than to see a woman or half-grown boy staggering under an overload of spirits, or a farm-hand lying 'blind drunk' by the roadside. The Rev. John Marsh, in his 'Temperance Recollections,' describes his flock in Haddam, Conn., a typical New England community, as 'a stanch, well-informed but plain people, whose labors were in ship-yards, coasting, fishing, quarrying, and farming; labors in which ardent spirits were a daily ration at eleven and four as regularly as food was provided at other hours. A pitcher of water, as a part of table furniture, was unknown. No one, not even the most delicate female, used it.'"

We do not care what any one's views about temperance or total abstinence may be; every man who values either law or order, or rational conviviality, must hate whiskey, or must desire, if he cannot banish it from the land altogether, to see it made hard to procure. There is no greater delusion than to suppose that a glass of whiskey can be considered the "social glass," or that real conviviality—that is, the free interchange of ideas, or jokes, or songs, or quips or cranks of any description—is promoted thereby. On the contrary, it is a highly anti-social drink. It rapidly produces either stupor or extreme irritability, and is, indeed, especially adapted to the needs of the solitary drinker. It never tastes so well as in the private jug of the lonely toper. It is a liquor which is probably only drunk in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred by men who wish from the bottom of their hearts they could give it up, and find that it fills their blood not with the "tawny dusks of perfect days," but with awful forebodings of domestic and professional ruin.

GEN. HARRISON'S RECORD.

THE *Indianapolis News*, an intelligent and independent journal, occupies the anomalous position of supporting the Republican can-