

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1888.

The Week.

EARLY in the month of September, when the quotations from the London *Times* and *Spectator* and *Iron Era* began to look rather brassy, somebody in California conceived the idea of getting a letter out of Lord Sackville, the British Minister at Washington, that might be used for campaign purposes. He wrote professing to be a naturalized British-American, named Murchison, who asked for advice how to cast his vote at the coming election. He received a reply, dated September 13, which he held till the 22d of October, and then, though it was marked "Private," gave to the newspapers. Looked at in its true light, the letter is a well-meant although mistaken endeavor to satisfy an inquiring mind, under the seal of private correspondence. But it turns out that there is no such person as "Murchison," and that the writer was probably the local reporter of a California newspaper, who acted as decoy for the Republican managers. In other words, the letter which is now being used as the principal Republican campaign document, is the product of a petty fraud, of which intelligent and respectable Republicans in the earlier days of the party would no more have thought of availing themselves than of sharing in the profits of a confidence man. To this complexion it has come at last!

Next to the wonder which Lord Sackville's Murchison letter occasioned, must be placed the astonishment that Lord Salisbury should have failed to act upon the hint conveyed to him by Mr. Bayard, that the British Minister was no longer *persona grata* at Washington, and that his presence in a diplomatic capacity was henceforth objectionable. Probably Lord Salisbury had conveyed some kind of hint to Lord Sackville, expecting the latter to relieve him from the embarrassment of a formal recall. If so, we may attribute the tenacity with which Lord Sackville clung to his post to the same mental obtuseness that prompted him to write the Murchison letter. Between the British Minister and his chief, the original scandal has grown to considerably larger proportions, and now becomes a somewhat harrowing incident, akin to that which disturbed the earlier days of President Cleveland's Administration, when two European Governments successively refused to receive a particular person as the American Minister at their respective courts.

The dismissal of Lord Sackville is simply one of the train of consequences of the fisheries dispute—a dispute which would never have given the least trouble or uneasiness if there had been no Irish vote at stake. Both parties have been to blame for the use they have made of it; but the Republican party has been most to blame, because it took the

lead in demagogy, and fairly pushed and goaded the Democrats into the same muddy pathway. By rejecting a fair and honorable treaty, by declaring against any treaty or any negotiations for one, by calling aloud for retaliation under an act which avoided all responsibility on the part of Congress for the unhappy consequences that might follow, by deriding the President from day to day, and charging him with want of courage and want of patriotism, they sought to win the votes of a class to whom American citizenship is secondary to their Irish origin, and whose patriotism looks only to means for spiting England. In order to test their sincerity, the President sent in his retaliation message, and then they became straightway dumb until the Sackville letter appeared. What they have done and said since is too fresh in the public mind to need recital.

A new Republican campaign document (not a forgery, but almost as bad) has been brought to our notice. It is dated Philadelphia, October 27, and is signed William W. Justice, Chairman. It is entitled "A Word to Farmers," and it sets forth the advantages to farmers of the tariff on grain, and says that if the Mills bill becomes a law, "grain will undoubtedly be placed on the free list also." Then it states that "with grain on the free list we would find our markets flooded with Russian and Indian wheat whenever the price here was higher than in Europe." The implication of this is that the price of wheat being higher here than in Europe is something of frequent occurrence, and likely to happen at any time. What are the facts? Simply these: that our annual exports of wheat rose steadily from \$643,745 plus \$7,098,570 of flour in 1850, to \$190,546,805 plus \$35,333,197 of flour in 1880, and were last year \$90,716,481 in addition to \$51,950,082 of flour. During this period of thirty-eight years there has been a progressive gain in the exports of wheat and flour, with variations depending upon the state of the harvest in this and other countries. What likelihood is there that the time will ever come when we shall be importing wheat from Russia and India, so that the farmer can have his innings at the game of grab, at which he has been cheated ever since protective tariffs began in this country?

A notable feature of the close of the canvass is the disposition of the Republicans to drop the tariff issue. Invitations from Democrats for joint debates upon this question are declined, as in the case of the Brooklyn Congressional District, where Mr. Coombs, the tariff-reform candidate, is anxious to appear before the people in company with his high-tariff opponent. A member of the New Hampshire Democratic State Central Committee reports that the Republicans in that commonwealth are dropping the tariff issue, and taking to personal abuse of the President and the

waving of the bloody shirt. In Indiana the editor of the leading Republican paper, the *Indianapolis Journal*, is on the stump, devoting all his speeches to the bloody shirt. In Illinois, Gov. Oglesby is delivering speeches of precisely the same order. All this means that the "tariff scare" has not worked, and in their rage the Republicans are falling back on the old "rebel scare," which ceased to frighten anybody years ago.

The notion that the high-tariff men have no theory, is one of the strangest which have made their appearance in the canvass. It seems to have especially taken hold of Gen. Harrison, and to have originated in his mind that very absurd alliteration, "maxims and markets." The Protectionists have, like all human beings who are engaged in any policy or course of conduct, a very distinct theory. A theory is simply the belief that if one does certain things, certain other things will result. Every man acts on a theory from the moment he leaves his bed in the morning. He dresses, breakfasts, goes to business, and does his day's work on four distinct theories. What our simple-minded friend Gen. Harrison means when he calls the tariff reformers theorists, or "men of maxims," and the protectionists, practical men, or "men of markets," is simply that the "men of markets" make money out of their theory, while "the men of maxims" make none. He thinks the reformer's theory or maxim ought not to receive attention, because he does not add to his yearly income by it. What makes this notion very funny is, that it has been used in defence of every abuse the world has seen. The barons on the Rhine opposed the freedom of the river on the ground that the advocates of it had no practical knowledge of the pleasures and advantages of trussing travellers, and merely theorized about free rivers in their studies in Cologne and Antwerp. The proposal to put down blackmailing by the Highland clans on the Scottish border was resisted on the same ground—that the payment of blackmail gave security to the farmers who paid it, and an assured income to the Cateran chiefs, who were all practical men, familiar with affairs of this nature, while the enemies of blackmail were Glasgow and Edinburgh professors, who dreamed dreams and spun theories, and compounded maxims in their libraries. Not one of them had ever been out on a foray, or had ever driven a captured herd, or knew a single trail or ford along the border.

John Wanamaker, the great shopkeeper of Philadelphia, is one of the electors-at-large for the State of Pennsylvania on the Harrison ticket, and is one of the most zealous workers for the Republican party in the country. He is especially concerned for the interests of the American workingman, whom he burns to protect from the competi-

tion of the "pauper labor" of Europe. The amusing discovery has just been made that Mr. Wanamaker employs the "pauper labor" of Europe himself, having a factory for the manufacture of ladies' and children's apparel, jersey jackets, etc., at No. 15 Kurstrasse, Berlin. There is nothing strange about this discovery, however. Mr. Wanamaker has repeatedly urged the people of Philadelphia to buy goods made abroad in a free-trade country by "pauper labor," in preference to goods made by protected labor in this country, on the openly avowed ground that the former were the cheaper. The Philadelphia Press of June 10, 1886, contained a prominent advertisement by Mr. Wanamaker, of which the following extract is a fair sample:

We are often asked why we go 3,000 miles for things we can make at home.

The shortest answer is, "We don't."

There's a heap of meaning in that little word, "thing."

American collars and cuffs, not quite so good as these. We tell of now and then as coming from over the sea, we could get for 50 per cent. more money.

American collars and cuffs are made in Troy. The skill of the country is gathered there. That skill controls the country.

There's a keener skill abroad, or better organization, or better facilities. Better collars and cuffs for the money.

We bring these better collars and cuffs and put them right by the side of the best American. Which will you buy?

The question is answered. You are thinking of money. The money is yours. Is it wholesome to bolster Troy at a cost of a third of your money? Is it worth your while? Will you do it? We are not such nineties as to seriously ask you.

That's the way you reason as buyers. That's the way we reason as merchants.

Mr. Wanamaker now joins Senator Hawley upon the Chinese wall platform. He says that he buys many lines of goods abroad because he can buy them cheaper there; but he would much rather have all foreign goods shut out, so that he could buy everything in this country at higher prices. Undoubtedly, too, his customers would infinitely prefer to have him buy everything at higher prices, because then they could pay higher prices when they went to his shop. The truth is, that what this country really needs to make it prosperous is a general advance of prices. If everybody only had to pay a good deal more every time he bought anything, poverty would be abolished, and economy would no longer need to be practised by anybody. Mr. Wanamaker, as Republican candidate for elector-at-large in Pennsylvania, is ready to do his share towards bringing about the millennium. "The present protection," he says, "is evidently not enough," and for his part he wants to raise duties, "because I want to shut out foreign goods."

The Knights of Labor at Pittsburgh have been investigating the tariff-wages question for themselves, with reference particularly to the wages paid at the Carnegie Steel Rail Works at Braddock, Pa., and at the iron and steel works at Chicago. They find and report that a fair comparison is as follows: At Braddock—blast-furnace department, turn twelve hours, Keeper, \$2.23; first helper, \$1.70; second helper, \$1.60. At Chicago—

Keeper, \$3.25; first helper, \$2.60; second helper, \$2.45. This difference is much less than that reported by Mr. John Jarrett in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor as existing between the wages of the Bethlehem Iron Works and those of the Chicago Mills. But, since the tariff is the same for Chicago that it is for Braddock and for Bethlehem, the question becomes important, What influence does the tariff exercise on wages, anyway? If a man receives \$3.25 for a given amount of work at Chicago, and only \$2.23 for the same amount of work of the same kind at Braddock, all under the same blessed tariff, what are we to conclude that the tariff does for the workingman? Do not all the tables of wages paraded by the high-tariff newspapers and orators, whether true or false, become utterly delusive and nonsensical in view of these great differences in our own country?

A correspondent asks us to examine Mr. Blaine's speech at Rochester, and tell our readers whether his quotations from Edward Atkinson, regarding the great advance in the wages of American workmen "under the protective tariff," are true. We reply that we do not know where Mr. Blaine got his quotations, as he does not refer to any particular work of Mr. Atkinson's; but we do know that Mr. Atkinson utterly repudiates and condemns the idea that the tariff has any effect to increase wages. On the contrary, he holds the very opposite opinion, having been an advocate of tariff reduction for a quarter of a century. According to Mr. Blaine's Rochester speech, the wages of common laborers have increased 66 per cent. "under the protective tariff." Well, if that is true, it does not prove much, for some of the "pay envelopes" that have turned up since that kind of thumb-screw was applied to workmen by their protected employers, have shown weekly wages as low as three dollars per week, or fifty cents per day. One such was recorded by the Plattsburg Republican a few days ago. Many have been produced which show a weekly wage of only five dollars for skilled workmen. To receive such a wage in a pay envelope is doubly insulting. It is an insult to receive the pay envelope at all, but it is a more bitter insult to receive five dollars for a week's work, and then to be told that this is high wages compared with the pauper labor of Europe. A better authority for Mr. Blaine, and one that can be more easily identified, is his own report on the cotton-goods trade of the world, in which he said:

"Undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor. If this should prove to be a fact in practice, as it seems to be proved from official statistics, it would be a very important element in the establishment of our ability to compete with England for our share of the cotton-goods trade of the world."

Mr. Blaine's statements of fact have been so discredited during the present campaign that it seems quite superfluous to say anything more about them. But there is one

more item in relation to his Western harangues on Government deposits in national banks that ought to be mentioned. When we pointed out that Secretary Sherman had deposited in national banks much larger sums than Secretary Fairchild had placed there, it was replied that this was done at a time when the refunding of the national debt was going on, and that Secretary Sherman did not put the money in the banks, but merely left it there, and that there was a great difference between the two things. The difference between the two things was merely the difference between drawing a check on the banks and not drawing it. But how was it in 1873, when there was no refunding of the debt in progress? By reference to the report of the Treasurer of the United States for 1887, page 32, a tabulated statement may be found of the balance of Government deposits in national-bank depositories at the close of each fiscal year since the depository law was passed. The balance thus on deposit in 1873 was \$62,185,153.64. This is considerably larger than the sum for which Mr. Blaine thinks that Mr. Fairchild is impeachable, and that any Republican Secretary would have been impeached if the Democrats had been in power. The Secretary of the Treasury was then a Republican, as all Secretaries were from 1864 to 1885. During this period there never was a time when the balance of Government deposits in national banks was less than \$6,900,000; and for this or any other sum there was not, according to Mr. Blaine, "a shadow of substantial authority in law."

"The hope of the Republican party is in the young men," said Mr. Blaine in his speech at Newark on Saturday night. The declaration is no nearer the truth than Mr. Blaine usually gets, the correct statement of the case being that the hope of the Republican party used to be in the young men. The nomination of the party for the Presidency in 1884 changed all that. Many hundreds of young men came of the voting age in Newark between 1880 and 1884, but Newark's Republican vote for President in 1884 was only 526 larger than in 1880, while the Democratic vote was 1,800 larger than four years before. Many thousands of young men were first voters for President in the State of New Jersey in 1884, but the Republican candidate for President had only 2,811 more votes than Garfield in 1880, while Cleveland received 5,213 more than Hancock. The contrast was still more marked in Connecticut. That State had given the Republican candidate for President in 1880 a total of 67,071 votes and a plurality of 2,636, while in 1884, despite the accession to the electorate of thousands of young men, the Republican candidate for President polled only 65,923 votes, and Cleveland had a plurality of 1,276. There were many thousands of new voters in Massachusetts four years ago, but while the total poll was 20,869 greater than in 1880, the Republican candidate for President received only 146,724 votes, against 165,205 for Garfield in the previous election, and a plurality of only 24,372, against 53,245 for Garfield. Mr. Blaine is the last man in the country who

ought to call attention to the influence of the young men voters in view of such a record.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie's naturalization paper has been published at Pittsburgh. It is dated May 28, 1885. So it appears that Mr. Blaine's coaching friend, the author of 'Triumphant Democracy,' was a British subject, by his own choice, until three years ago. The statement is thrown in for what it is worth that Mr. Carnegie's father was a naturalized citizen, although his papers cannot be found, the implication being that Mr. Carnegie may have supposed himself to be an American citizen without naturalization. If this was his supposition, he must have taken steps to have himself naturalized as a British subject when he was a candidate for Parliament a few years ago. We believe that it was "G. W. S." of the *Tribune* who so cruelly derided Mr. Carnegie's aspirations. What Tory Squire could abide the thought of Carnegie making steel rails in Pennsylvania and sitting in the House of Commons for a Scotch borough at the same time? We suspect that the whole truth has not yet been told about the swapping of citizenship by Mr. Blaine's host in the coaching party.

The concern which the woollen manufacturers exhibit for the wool-growers in case raw wool should be admitted free of duty deserves a moment's attention, even in the last week of the campaign. We have given some anxious thought to the matter, and have closely examined the statistics of imports and duties, in order to see what can be done to alleviate the distress of the manufacturers aforesaid. The imports of wool amounted last year to 114,038,030 pounds, of the value of \$16,351,369, and the duties collected thereon were \$5,899,816. The average rate of duties on all wools, including those used for making carpets, was 36.08 per cent. Now, in case wool is put on the free list, what is to prevent the manufacturers from giving to the wool growers the \$5,899,816 which they now pay to the Collectors of Customs? Nothing in the world. Putting wool on the free list does not prevent them from contributing whatever sums they choose to the encouragement of wool-growing in this country. Let them meet the wool-growers in a convention, and agree to pay to the latter ten cents a pound on all the low-grade clothing wool they import, and 12 cents on all the high-grade "in the grease," and double and treble rates for washed and scoured, and the rates for combing and carpet wools as now provided by law. The woollen manufacturers will then be no worse off than they are now, while they can wipe away all tears so far as the wool-growers are concerned.

The Democratic paper in Des Moines reports from the Republican organ of November 3, 1884, a letter by Samuel Merrill, ex-Governor of Iowa, urging every business man in Iowa to vote for Blaine, on the ground that they could not afford to risk a

change in the administration of national affairs, and going on in this style:

"No one can comprehend the disaster that will follow the turning over of this Administration to hands untried and uncertain. Confidence, already shaken by the uncertainty of the present, will be greatly increased, and few men will feel like investing in any enterprise of importance for years to come. No man in Iowa will venture to buy property and build important structures so long as dark uncertainty hangs over us. Real estate will find few sales. Most people will want to sell and few buyers. The result of this 'do-nothing' policy will be disastrous. I confidently believe that, in the event of a change, real estate will depreciate more than 20 per cent within the next year. Most wealthy men will pull for the shore and close up business. They will only do what they feel themselves obliged to do in order to save what they possess. This is the tendency of the human mind, and hundreds of thousands will do it all over the country. None but a lunatic would risk his property in any new enterprise like manufacture so long as the uncertainty incident to a change of Administration should be upon us."

The Administration was turned over to "hands untried and uncertain," but, so far from ex-Gov. Merrill's having "closed up business," his bank is still doing business at the old stand, and lots of it, and its shares are worth \$275 per \$100 in the open market. In addition to this, it is currently reported that the Governor himself has made a cool million in judicious investments in land outside of his regular business.

Col. Elliott F. Shepard has petitioned the newsdealers to allow him a quarter of a cent more for his newspaper than they have been paying heretofore. In support of the petition he says:

"The cost of the paper to us, by weight, with the printers' ink put on it by the press, is more than 1 cent, and you do not believe it is right or necessary that we should sell the paper at a loss, for you yourselves would not do business in that way."

The Colonel, when he speaks of weight, must mean intellectual weight, because if he meant weight avoirdupois, it would be an entire mistake to say that it costs one cent—a mistake due, of course, to inexperience in the newspaper business. A newsdealer, who sends us a copy of the petition, wants to know whether the various proprietors of the *Mail and Express*, during the past six or eight years, have been "selling the paper at a loss," as the petition affirms. We think it is very likely, but not because the cost of the white paper and ink amounted to one cent per copy. The outlay for intellect has been too great, and the Colonel ought to state this frankly to the newsdealers. The discriminating talent shown in the selection of a daily text from the Scriptures is alone a heavy burden. To estimate this as low as a quarter of a cent per copy is both shameful and ruinous. If the Colonel would accept our advice, he would boldly put up the price of his paper to three cents. Then he might afford to publish a whole chapter of the Bible every day.

Canon Taylor again takes up the missionary cudgels in the last *Fortnightly*. He must know that he is inviting even more contradiction and remonstrance than his

Wolverhampton address of last year met with, yet he squarely flings down the gauntlet in his title, "The Great Missionary Failure." The first part of his article is statistical. He figures out various exhibits, more or less striking, as to the rate of advance of Christian missions, showing that it would take 183 years for all the societies to convert as many as are born in one year among the non-Christian populations of Asia and Africa. But all this is nothing new, and amounts only to saying, what advocates of missions perfectly well know, and in fact base strong appeals upon, namely, that the odds are tremendously against the missionary, humanly speaking. But the champions of missions rather boast than otherwise of their not taking the ordinary human view of the situation, and the most overwhelming figures will be wasted on them. What the Canon has to say about missionary methods, however, is worthy of serious attention from all concerned. For him to appeal, as he does, from the scorn of the "well-paid secretaries at home" to the testimony of missionaries in the field is highly suggestive—for the boldness of it, if nothing else. Briefly, he urges the folly of sending out so much poor material to swell incompetent and rival missionary forces, and objects radically to the whole scheme of going among the heathen as a superior race. In any view of the case, it is significant and gratifying that these objections to missionary methods should be made, if they needs must be made, by a clergyman and a dignitary of the Church—himself, moreover, an avowed friend of missions if only rightly conducted.

The last message sent by the President of Chili to the Congress of that country reveals the continuance of national prosperity in a high degree. The Government's revenues amounted in 1887 to nearly \$46,000,000, while the disbursements were but slightly over \$37,000,000. For 1889, however, the estimates brought in call for an outlay of \$53,000,000, the increase being due to the great number of projected internal improvements. For the extension of the State railroads alone, \$7,000,000 are asked. In addition, large sums are to be spent in building prisons and school-houses, buying ships of war, and improving the national harbors. The President had already been authorized to negotiate a loan of \$15,000,000 to meet these contemplated expenses; but the large surplus of the past year can now be devoted to that purpose, and no more money is to be borrowed than will be needed to pay for railroad material purchased abroad. The total foreign commerce of Chili, in 1887, amounted to \$108,180,820, being an increase over that of 1886 of nearly \$13,000,000. The Government is paying great attention to the question of education. In 1886 there were 862 national schools, with an enrolled membership of 78,800 scholars and an average attendance of 47,780; in 1887 the corresponding figures had become 950, 81,362, and 55,831. New school-buildings are being rapidly provided; 42 are now under way, with a capacity for 17,000 scholars, and 60 more are planned to accommodate 23,000.

THE REAL SHAME OF IT.

It is quite true, as the *London Daily News* remarks, that there is not one assertion in Lord Sackville's letter of which "an honest man need feel ashamed." He has said nothing in it which is not true, and which is not creditable to our Government. Thus, it is true that "any political party which openly favored the mother country at the present moment would lose popularity," and it is also true "that the party in power is fully aware of this fact." It is also true that the party in power is "still desirous of maintaining friendly relations with Great Britain, and is still desirous of settling all questions with Canada." If these things were not true, it would show that the party in power was not fit to direct the policy of a great civilized and Christian people; and if Lord Sackville had denied them, he would have slandered both the party in power and the best portion of the American people.

But, as the French say, every truth is not good to tell. There are truths which are unseasonable, which are not fit to be told to any person, by any person, at all times; and the foregoing truths are not fit to be told by a foreign Minister, during a canvass, to a naturalized citizen, with the view of influencing his vote. Consequently, Lord Sackville's letter was a sad blunder, but it is one of those blunders which really affect nobody but the person guilty of them. It is a serious matter for Lord Sackville. It discredits him, in the eyes of his own Government and in the eyes of his professional brethren, on the point of tact and shrewdness, about which diplomats are most sensitive, and it discredits him the more because he is not new to the country. He has been through more than one Presidential canvass, and must be more or less familiar with the tricks resorted to at such times to influence votes. To write such a letter to an unknown person, therefore, argues unfitness for his place. He has, in other words, committed a small but inexcusable and fatal professional blunder—such as all men have committed some time in their lives, and secretly blush over when they recall them—which is likely to ruin his diplomatic career.

What makes us blush just now, however, is not Lord Sackville's downfall, but the fact that his downfall should—judging from the Republican newspapers—seem to be a fact of such tremendous moment for the American people. The childishness of some of our newspapers has long furnished material for the sneers of foreign critics, but journalists are notoriously sensitive and emotional. What is humiliating in the present situation is that a great party, numbering almost half the American voters, considers, or pretends to consider, Lord Sackville's blunder one of the great facts of American history, and is bringing it to the knowledge of the world as such. Large vans are running around, laden with copies of his letter; it is printed in leaded type, and kept standing, in some papers, alongside of drawings of the British crown. It is receiving all the honor which

could be given to a despatch announcing a great victory by land or sea, or the outbreak of a great foreign war, or a great scientific discovery, or the farewell address of a great statesman; and yet there is absolutely nothing in it, except that an elderly diplomatist of the second rank, appointed long ago on account of his family connections, and noted in several countries for his dulness, has offended his own Government, and that to which he is accredited, by a piece of small stupidity.

We wish we could stop here with saying that one of our great parties was acting as if it were made up of schoolboys or half-drunken laborers on pay-day. We wish we could take Dr. Storrs, or Dr. Armitage, or any of the other Republican divines or moralists into a private room, and say, "Your party, reverend sirs, is behaving in a very silly, childish way about this Sackville letter. You see, of course, yourselves, that it has no national or international importance whatever, and affects nobody but Lord Sackville himself; and you are doubtless ashamed to see so much fuss made about it, because it gives the rest of the civilized world the impression that our political contests are managed by children and their nurses, and that American adults go into retirement between the nomination and the election day." But we cannot stop here. We should have to go on, and add:

"It is not, however, the childishness of this Sackville fuss, reverend sirs, which troubles us most. It is the shameful fact that the letter was obtained from Lord Sackville by a petty fraud of the bunco kind—that is, by false pretences such as are used by the species of impostor known as begging-letter writers. It is a fraud, which, had it induced Lord Sackville to send the writer money, would have exposed the latter, if caught, to a term in the penitentiary, and which, were our law what it ought to be, and what you would doubtless wish to see it, would also send to the penitentiary a man resorting to it in order to influence a great national election. You preach vigorously against this sort of sin in your pulpits every day. You give the most solemn sanctions of theology to the lawyer's dictum that 'fraud vitiates everything.' You would not knowingly, or at all events willingly, allow a man to remain in your church who, you know, profited by cheating, and rejoiced over it openly and unblushingly because it gave him either dignity or emolument. You would scornfully reject the plea that the end justified the means, and would never admit that, although it was wrong for one man to lie and forge, it was not wrong for another man to make money out of the lie or the forgery, or get a wife by it. Why, then, are you silent now, in the presence of this miserable effort to convert the crime of a petty scoundrel into a huge national disgrace, to fill the chair of the American Chief Magistrate by the aid of the kind of trick by which 'bunco steerers' empty the pockets of simple-minded farmers? Do not put the question smiling by, or tell us

any stories about 'the magnificent history' of the party. Your concern is, not what the party once was, but the things it is now doing. Moralists have to deal with living men and not with dead ones."

A VERY SERIOUS QUESTION.

WE should like to ask intelligent members of the Republican party who are diligent readers of their own party newspapers and campaign documents, a simple question, which we put in good faith and all seriousness. It is this: Supposing that on the first of last July, through an outbreak of war, or some failure in steam or other communication, the reception of books and newspapers from England had ceased, and you were left in ignorance of what Englishmen were saying and thinking, or had been thinking or saying for some time past, about American affairs, how would you decide which way to vote at the coming election?

Again: Supposing you had not made up your mind how you would vote as late as Sunday week, and Lord Sackville's letter, which the *Tribune* is printing in leaded type as a guide to voters, had not seen the light, how would you get along?

As matters now stand, we think it is the duty of every intelligent American to ask himself these questions, and to formulate some sort of answer to them in his own mind. Thus far the canvass on the Republican side has consisted almost wholly of English news—news of what Englishmen are saying or have said about American politics, and news of what wages Englishmen are paying to their workmen. We see very clearly how this operates on the more ignorant Irish. They are expected to express through their vote simply their hatred of everything English, or, in other words, to do everything which they can discover would be disagreeable to Englishmen. Consequently, English news is all they need in the way of political guidance. When they learn what the *London Times* says, and Lord Salisbury says, and the *London Spectator* says, it is all they need to enable them to take action with regard to American affairs in every department. For instance, if the *London Times* said the Government ought to own the telegraph lines, they would know that American telegraph lines ought to remain in private hands; or if the *Spectator* said eggs ought to be taxed, they would know that in America eggs ought to come in duty free. If Lord Sackville said the weather reports in this country were unusually good, they would know that the American Signal Service ought to be abolished.

It must be admitted, therefore, that the Republican managers have, in the present canvass, made what may be considered sufficient provision for the Irish; but what about the Americans, who have no special quarrel with England, and are too busy with their own affairs to occupy themselves with spitting her? The position of this class of Republicans, and in fact of all who confine their reading to Republican newspapers and documents, is to-day most precarious. Our Protectionist friends talk a good deal of the plight we