

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1888.

The Week.

WE can recall no Presidential campaign since slavery was abolished that has been marked by such abnegations of manhood in the higher counsels of the nation as the present. The passage of the anti-Chinese bill in the Senate with only three dissenting votes, after a message had been received from the President saying that the treaty had not been rejected by the Chinese Government, but only held for further consideration, caps the climax. When this message was received, Mr. Stewart of Nevada wanted to know if we were going to put up with an affront like that. Held for consideration! Just Heaven! was such insolence ever heard of? Here was a treaty that had been in the hands of the Chinese authorities a whole week, perhaps even ten days. Not ratified yet? Let us teach these red dragons a lesson in punctuality. There is a commercial treaty lying around loose in Washington—a treaty with Mexico, we believe—that has been held for consideration about four years, and is not yet finally acted upon. Yet we are going to teach the world that treaties are made to be approved or disapproved at the drop of the hat. And the whole Senate, except a minority too small to be counted, voted with Stewart of Nevada. The Senator who sinned most against the light was Mr. Dawes of Massachusetts, the friend of the red man. The Senator who showed most manliness was Mr. Gorman of Maryland—a wonderful see-saw indeed. We owe it to Mr. Gorman that there is still a chance to save some remnant of self-respect out of this fearful degradation.

The Republicans have carried Maine by about the same majority as they had in 1884. Mr. Blaine telegraphs that "it is not simply a great victory, it is almost a political revolution." The *Tribune* says, "Never was there a more certain harbinger of victory all along the line in November." Something very like this happened four years ago, as the following parallel from the *Tribune's* editorial columns of then and now will show:

TRIBUNE, SEPT. 11, 1884.

The news from Maine grows better and better. The Republicans of that State have achieved what Mr. Blaine has justly called "an unparalleled triumph." Well done, Maine! The defeat of Cleveland is writ large in what she accomplished on Monday.

TRIBUNE, SEPT. 11, 1888.

The verdict of Maine is a magnificent response to the victories in Vermont, Oregon, and Rhode Island. . . . Free trade and truckling to Canadian interests have found no favor in Maine, whose right to the motto "Dirigo" can no longer be challenged. Never was there a more certain harbinger of victory all along the line in November.

We are free to say that we think the *Tribune's* interpretation of the returns is as nearly accurate now as it was four years ago. To our mind the figures simply show that party lines in Maine remain substantially as

they were in the last Presidential campaign. This may rejoice the Republicans, and it may not. It may show several things, but the fact which it discloses most plainly is that there is no "cyclone of fear" among the Democratic voters; and we have the authority of so eminent a Republican leader as Mr. Chauncey M. Depew that unless there be such a cyclone, there will be small chance of Republican success in November.

Gen. Harrison's letter of acceptance, as the effort of a man in middle life to deal with a complicated subject to which he has never given any attention, and which is forced on his consideration by circumstances, deserves respectful treatment. It is, however, difficult to criticise it at all without seeming to be uncivil, because any criticism of it will seem rather an examination of Gen. Harrison's mental equipment than of his political economy. Political economy he cannot be said to have. His views about the tariff are the commonplaces which a busy lawyer has probably picked up in conversation or inherited. It is clear enough that he has not studied the question at all. The probabilities seem to be that his mind is as unfitted for such study as that of some men is for the study of mathematics. For instance, what most troubles him in the Mills bill is not "the length of the step" which he thinks this bill makes, but "the direction of it." That is, he does not see what great harm it will do *per se*, but what alarms him is, that he thinks it will lead to a "placing of the tariff laws on a purely revenue basis," or "practical free trade—free trade in the English sense." But it must be apparent, even to a child, that if the Mills bill produces the dreadful effects on trade and industry which its opponents say it will, no other step in the direction of free trade will ever be made. The country will be satisfied with the result of the experiment. The old duties will be restored, and the revenue reformers and "the British free-traders" brought to confusion. So that it is the length of the step, and not the direction, which is really the important thing.

Behind this little logical slip, there is evidently that feeling about the sacredness of the tariff as a valuable national possession, rather than as a form of taxation, which one meets with all over the country among persons who have not given much attention to economical questions—the feeling that the tariff is—like the Gospel, or like education, or like chastisement by a loving parent—something good for people whether they like it or not, or want it or not. To Gen. Harrison, apparently, a country which lowered its tariff, or got rid of it, would be like a country which had relapsed into heathenism, or had plunged into debauchery through the teachings of wicked men. He reproves, for instance, "those who teach that the import duty on foreign goods sold in our

market is paid by the consumer," not so much because what they say is not true, as because "it discredits in the minds of others our system of levying duties on competing foreign products." In other words, it strikes him as one of "Bob" Ingersoll's lectures, or derision of the Scriptures, strikes a pious and moral man. This state of mind is interesting, but it is psychologically rather than economically interesting. Gen. Harrison's refusal to "stop to refute this theory as to the effect of our tariff duties," on the ground that those who advance it "are students of maxims rather than of markets," we must treat with silent respect. We think he is quite right in his reserve. A letter of acceptance is hardly the place for such a discussion, and if it were, Gen. Harrison could not carry the controversy very far without a loss of dignity, because the "students of maxims" are tough customers, and he would get but little glory out of a tussle with them.

A very neat exposure of Mr. Blaine's habitual charlatany is made by the *Boston Herald*. In his recent speech before the citizens of Eastport, Maine, Mr. Blaine congratulated them on their wonderful recuperative energy, as displayed in building anew their town after the great fire a few years ago, and informed them that they could not have done this but for the assistance which they received from the protective tariff. Having done this, says the *Herald*, Mr. Blaine proceeded to hold up for their execration the Mills bill, showing them how it invited Canadians to bring in without duty every form of timber, hewn and sawed and squared and sided. The *Herald* reminds Mr. Blaine that in the record of the Forty-ninth Congress he will find a petition, signed by the Selectmen of Eastport, and dated immediately after the fire, asking Congress to come to the relief of the stricken town, and permit all building materials to be brought in free of duty in order that the work of rebuilding might be done without the burden of protective duties. This petition was presented to Congress by that roaring protectionist, Capt. Boutelle, who accompanied it with a bill granting what the petition asked. Boutelle made a speech in its favor, in the course of which he called attention to the fact that the bill only followed the precedent which had been established when another Maine town, Portland, had been a sufferer by a great fire in 1866.

There are a great many people in a muddle-headed condition about the tariff, owing to the necessity of maintaining for campaign purposes that it enables the manufacturer both to pay high wages and to charge low prices. There is probably nobody who is more muddled on the whole question than Senator Hoar. He has just been doing some "voicing" in the *New York Tribune*, in which he on Monday delivered himself of the following sapient opinion:

“Neither is it true that the tariff increases the burden upon the necessities of life to the working people. Not more than 15 or 20 per cent. of all the articles which a well-to-do workman requires for use in his family consists of articles on which there is any duty at all, and of a large part of that per cent. the price of the article is as cheap in this country as it is abroad, so that the tariff does not increase it at all, while the wages of the workmen in consequence of the tariff are from 40 to 100 per cent. higher.

“The working people of America will easily be made to see these things—indeed, they see them now—and the President's letter will be regarded by them as a feeble attempt to mislead them.”

Now, if 80 per cent. of the articles consumed by the bulk of the population are not touched by the tariff, and the cost of the remaining 20 per cent. is not raised by the tariff, how in the name of common sense does the tariff enable the manufacturer to put up the wages of workmen in this country from 40 to 100 per cent. over those paid to workmen abroad? The tariff is not an unseen influence, like spiritual regeneration, or a tonic, like acid phosphates, to be taken internally. It does a manufacturer good by enabling him to get higher prices for his wares, and his own story is that, because he gets higher prices for his wares, he is enabled to pay higher wages. But if Senator Hoar be right, where do the higher wages come from? Not from the price, because that is about the same here as abroad. Is it possible that we are in the presence of a miracle? Were these tariff verses recited at the Tariff Convention in this city four years ago really a hymn?

“Protection, oh Protection, the joyful sound proclaim
Till each remotest nation has heard the Tariff's name!”

An amusing but very interesting explanation is offered by a United States Senator, of the reason why the Senate does not produce its tariff bill. It is neither more nor less than the very reasonable fear that, when the bill saw the light, the President would send in a message recommending its passage, for the relief of the Treasury and of commerce and industry. This, coming on top of the retaliation message, would of course be a terrible blow, and would make the position of the Republican party in the canvass even more ridiculous than it is. We say the fear is a reasonable one, because, the passage of the Mills bill being apparently impossible this session, the President would probably jump at any chance that offered of keeping down the surplus, even if the measure did not in all respects meet his views, and trust to getting something better next year, when the path of revision had once been fairly entered on. The more one thinks of it, the more extraordinary it seems that the Republicans in Congress did not in the beginning concoct a revision bill of their own, and run it in opposition to the Mills bill. Their failure to see the need of this is in fact one of the best omens of the crisis. It looks as if Providence had, after much forbearance, decided on their destruction.

James P. Foster, President of the Republican League of the United States, is still after “fat,” and, judging by the breathless

character of his latest appeal, the chase is getting desperate. He declares that if he can only get “fat” enough, he will show that the League is the “greatest engine of modern political warfare.” If he will allow us to differ with him, we will venture the opinion that he has already made it such an engine by the production of his “Fat” circular alone. There is no such campaign document in existence as that is, and none which has had such a circulation, especially by the enemy. Foster's present scheme is for \$1 subscriptions, and he offers the following powerful inducements:

“Every subscriber to this fund will receive an elegant souvenir which will be worth the money he has given, and the League will allow you to retain for the use of your club 25 per cent. of all the subscriptions you may receive.

“To every club which secures \$200 before the 25th day of September the League will present an elegant silk banner, with pole, cords, etc., containing the official emblem of the League; an elegant affair which any club may be proud to possess.”

Why not offer a Waterbury watch, or an Unabridged Dictionary, or a Library of Universal Knowledge in return for one-dollar subscriptions? What will be left of the dollar after the 25 per cent. reduction has been made and the “elegant souvenir” and “elegant silk banner with poles, cord, etc.,” have been paid for?

We repeat that we think a good electoral law ought to make the circulation of fraudulent or forged quotations or letters, with the view of influencing votes thereby, a criminal offence. Under the law of this State at present, if Mr. H. K. Thurber were to “falsely sign the name of the officer of a corporation or of any other person to a letter, message, or other paper,” or “utter or circulate such a letter, message, or other paper, knowing that the same has been so falsely signed,” with “the intent of affecting the market price of the public funds of this State or any State,” or “the market price of any merchandise or commodity whatever”—say, groceries—he would expose himself to a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment in the penitentiary for not more than three years (N. Y. Penal Code, sec. 435). If such were the intent of the leaflet he has been circulating, he would get three years for his *Times* forgery, and be a ruined and disgraced man. But because the intent of his leaflet is not to run up the price of groceries, or of stocks and bonds, but simply to affect the action of his countrymen on a vast question of government, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, he has been allowed to go on his way and snap his fingers at the police.

The Republican outlook in Minnesota is threatening, to say the least. The farmers of the State made a formal appeal to the Republican Convention, which met last week, to adopt the following as the tariff plank of the platform:

“We protest against the doctrine of high protection, and demand a judicious and radical reduction of the present tariff. We are opposed to free whiskey and tobacco while we are compelled to pay high taxes on sugar and lumber.”

This request was not granted, but instead a

platform was adopted which approved the national Republican platform in one part and repudiated it in another, and a candidate for Governor was nominated who is especially obnoxious to the farming and other industrial interests of the State. Two newspapers representing these interests have bolted from the ticket, and announce their intention to support the Democratic candidate. What the ultimate result will be is, of course, uncertain. The Democrats claim that it gives them a good prospect of carrying the State, but the Republicans deny this. A most humiliating aspect of the situation is the attitude of the leading Republican newspaper of the State, the *St. Paul Pioneer-Press*. It has for years been an able advocate of tariff reform, but since the Chicago Convention it has been trying to make its readers believe that there is nothing inconsistent between its former teachings and the declarations of that platform.

By his manly and straightforward stand on the high-license question, Warner Miller is making it easy for independent voters to support him. His speech at Little Valley on Saturday was a much more explicit and courageous utterance on this point than the Republican platform's. He refused to quibble over the terms tax or license, declaring himself squarely in favor of high license, and adding: “In the coming contest I do not hesitate to say that I prefer to be beaten upon that question rather than succeed by subterfuge and double-dealing.” He went on to say that the liquor interests of the State had openly and formally taken the opposite ground, and had forced the issue between themselves and the rest of the people. Their undisguised championship of Gov. Hill, and his undisguised willingness to do their bidding, have also helped to make this question the leading one of the campaign. Mr. Miller is a shrewd politician as well as an honest man. He wisely puts his tariff views out of the contest, for as Governor he would have nothing to do with that question. He stands before the people of this State as the pledged defender of orderly and honest government, and as such is the exact opposite of Gov. Hill. On that issue, every reputable voter in the State, of every party and of no party, ought to have no difficulty in deciding as to which of the two men shall have his vote.

While there is a great deal of force in the Republican taunt that no self-respecting voter can take much pleasure in supporting a party which is capable of nominating a man like “Dave” Hill for Governor, still it should be borne in mind that the Republican party has been guilty of a like offence of even larger proportions. Bad as Hill's nomination will be as a revelation of party depravity, it will not be so bad as was Blaine's nomination for the Presidency by the Republican party. We venture to hope, also, that Hill's candidacy will not involve the humiliating spectacle which Blaine's did of men of high character and correct principles taking

the stump, defending his dishonesty, and declaring that they could see nothing in his career of lying and jobbery which unfitted him for public office. Hill belongs to the same variety of statesman as Blaine, and his re-nomination for office will be, as Blaine's nomination was, only a fresh evidence that the working machinery of political parties, if left to itself without fear of consequences, pays small heed to moral qualifications in candidates. The only restraint, in other words, which the orderly and respectable elements in American politics can exert upon the machine-workers in either party is by uniting against every bad candidate and making his election impossible.

The *World* says that Gov. Hill's faults have been "grossly exaggerated." Well, which faults? It is not possible to have exaggerated his main fault of taking money from a contractor to pay his campaign notes. There are certain "faults" one cannot "exaggerate," and this is one of them. When a Governor of a great State connives at gross jobbery in order to make \$10,000, one cannot say in palliation, as one may say of the theft of a watch, that he did it because he was hungry, or out of work, or had a sick wife, or was led astray by evil companions. Men who are elected Governors of States are supposed to have risen out of the atmosphere in which criminals plead necessity or temptation in extenuation. We are not arguing that Mr. Hill ought to go to jail, or be fined, or impeached, or subjected to any sort of penalty. We simply say that to confer on him a second time the great honor of the Governorship would be a defiance of the morality of the community such as no party in this country has ever perpetrated, except the Republican party when it nominated James G. Blaine for the Presidency. There is always something very comic in the notion that you are persecuting a man if you do not want him raised to the highest place in the State or nation.

The way in which men like Senator Blackburn go about denouncing the President's civil-service-reform policy is a striking illustration of the difficulties the President has had to contend with in carrying it out. A great many prominent Democratic politicians, like a great many prominent Republican politicians, feel about it just as Senator Blackburn does, and work against it privately, but do not, like Senator Blackburn, blurt out their feelings in public places. They are, however, like Senator Blackburn, generally elderly men, who will never get reconciled to anything but the spoils system, and will die mourning over its decline. Its complete expulsion from the public service need only be looked for from the generation which has grown up since the war. The older men like the system in which they were bred, and will not admit, even to themselves, that conditions which favored their own rise into power or eminence can really be bad,

In considering our relations with Canada, it should be borne in mind that that country is just as badly bestridden and bedevilled with the doctrine of "protection to home industry" as we are. One of the outcroppings of this sentiment, and one of the deft imitations of our own practice, has lately been disclosed in an executive order requiring the collection of duties on boxes and other coverings in which green fruit is shipped to Canada. Green fruit, plants, and bulbs were made free between the two countries by reciprocal legislation last year, and for a time things went well. But lately an order has been issued by the Canadian authorities to their customs officers to collect duties on the boxes, bags, or other coverings, just as we, after the Treaty of Washington went in force, collected duties on lobster cans, although the lobsters were admitted free of duty. It is reported that the British Minister at Washington has remonstrated with the Canadian Government against this evasion. Another bit of protectionism is the rebate of tolls allowed to Canadian vessels passing through the Welland Canal, to which President Cleveland called attention in his recent message. This is intended to protect Montreal grain-shippers. There is no excuse for this discrimination. It is a clear violation of the treaty, and it should either be stopped or the same medicine should be offered to Canada that she offers to us.

The accounts—apparently authentic—which come from Germany, touching the manners and customs of the young Emperor, are undoubtedly enough to make sober-minded people uneasy. He started the other day, at four in the morning, with an aide-de-camp, to several of the cavalry barracks in the neighborhood of Berlin, had "boots and saddles" sounded, and ordered the regiments to march promptly to a point seven miles outside the city, to which he went at full gallop and waited for them, watch in hand. His little sons, too, live in uniform, with high boots, sabres, and spurs, and their plays consist of the attack and defence of little redoubts, and military exercises under the superintendence of two or three gendarmes. These things somewhat resemble the eccentricities of the father of the Great Frederick, and are probably intended to show that the new ruler is a true Hohenzollern, but they seem sadly out of place in an industrial age, and naturally set people asking, What next? or rather, What will happen after Bismarck goes? The great preponderance given to the sovereign in the Prussian Constitution works well as long as the sovereign is a capable and prudent man, surrounded by wise counsellors; but the capable and prudent sovereigns and the wise counsellors die, and the hare-brained young fellows get their innings, and sometimes make an awful mess of it. In earlier days, when the state was made up of farmers, priests, and soldiers, and credit, and commerce, and manufactures counted for little, the brilliant young military monarchs were mischievous enough, heaven knows, but harmless compared to what they might be now if let loose among

the infinite complications of modern society. The great trouble Austria had to contend with between 1848 and 1866 was, as an Austrian statesman said, that she had a "young and chivalrous Emperor," who ran on for twenty years before he had sense hammered into him, and became a sober-minded, peaceable constitutional monarch; but it took Sadowa as well as Magenta and Solferino to do it.

The British Government has just concluded a remarkable experiment in the art of naval warfare, by means of manœuvres between two divisions of the fleet, one supposed to be "the enemy" which the military men are always so dreadfully afraid of, and the other the defender of the coast. The enemy was blockaded in an Irish port, but managed to escape, and then either burned the shipping or levied contributions on all the leading ports of the kingdom, including Liverpool. In fact, if the result showed anything, it showed that it would be impossible, with any force the kingdom could muster, to prevent an active and enterprising squadron from inflicting enormous damage all along the coasts. It has brought home to the British public more clearly than ever before the very unpleasant truth that pitched battles between great fleets will be by no means the prominent or important feature of the next great naval war; that the worst of it, by far, will be the devastation wrought by cruisers, and that the strongest maritime Power in our day is really the Power which has least property afloat, and fewest unprotected seaports.

The resolution of the English Trades Union Congress in favor of "the nationalization of land" doubtless does not mean much, but it is a natural outcome of what are called the Allotment Acts of recent years, through which local authorities are empowered under certain conditions to appropriate land in small lots to be let to workingmen—to say nothing of the very exceptional treatment of the Irish land question. The expropriation of individual owners for the benefit of other people, and the interference of the Legislature in the contracts between landlord and tenant, are both impressive acknowledgments that land is a very peculiar kind of property, with which the State may take peculiar liberties, and it is not surprising that the workingmen have taken the lesson to heart, and think that there is something more to be got out of it. But what gives the land question its importance, both in England and Ireland, is the fact that it has until now been a monopoly in the hands of a small number of owners, who were able to exact rent for its use. Rent is, however, rapidly disappearing under the competition of the remoter parts of the globe, and when it has gone, the land will no longer dazzle workingmen or anybody else in England. What makes them think its nationalization would be a good thing is the fact that they have seen the land hitherto supporting in great luxury and leisure a large class besides the cultivators. But this class is gradually disappearing.

MR. CLEVELAND'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

THE Republican newspapers have been long anxious to see Mr. Cleveland's letter accepting his renomination, and have latterly been inclined to chide him for delay in writing it. They now have it in full, and there yet remain two months in which to analyze it. We venture to predict that they will not like it. We suspect that they could have endured a still greater delay in the production of it. No campaign document of the year will make so strong an impression, for although the arguments presented do not differ in any marked way from those of other debaters on the same side, they are stated in a very felicitous manner for reaching the ear of the common people, and the rostrum from which they are delivered is, of course, the most commanding of all. Mr. Cleveland's statement of the issue presented by the free-whiskey clause of the Republican platform is perfectly fair, and his comment upon it appeals powerfully to the common sense of the people.

"The implication," he says, "contained in this party declaration, that desperate measures are justified or necessary to save from destruction or surrender what is termed our protective system, should confuse no one. The existence of such a system is *entirely consistent with the regulation of the extent to which it should be applied* and the correction of its abuses. Of course, in a country as great as ours, with such a wonderful variety of interests, often leading in entirely different directions, it is difficult if not impossible to settle upon a perfect tariff plan. But in accomplishing the reform we have entered upon, the necessity of which is so obvious, I believe we should not be content with a reduction of revenue involving the prohibition of importations and the removal of the internal tax upon whiskey."

Here is the issue of the campaign in a nutshell. We have a protective system. No party, nobody, considers it perfect. The Republican party in 1884 promised to revise it and correct its inequalities. But after neglecting this duty for years, and after preventing anybody else from doing it, the party has taken the ground that the existing tariff is a sacred thing, and that its protective features cannot be amended at all except in the way of increasing the taxes. The duties on particular articles may vary all the way from 10 to 100 per cent., but these inequalities can only be corrected by lifting the lower ones to the level of the higher—never by reducing the higher in any degree whatever. Rather than reduce any such tax, let tobacco and whiskey be made free.

This position is so absurd, so utterly nonsensical, that it needs only the touch which the President gives it to show us what it really is. It is like one of those ancient mummies that have the semblance of the human form till somebody breaks the crust and lets in the air, when the whole thing collapses and turns to dust. The President says that the existence of the protective system is entirely consistent with steps for its adjustment to the present exigency of a surplus revenue. "Nothing of the kind," says the Chicago platform. "The existence of a protective system is con-

sistent only with increased rates of duty and a repeal of the whiskey tax."

There are some situations in politics which upset the gravity of impartial witnesses, and this is one of them. It is impossible to add anything to its comic features. It is possible only to point out the incongruity of things in a few plain words, and leave the rest to the common sense of plain people. This is what the President has done in his letter of acceptance. More than this it would have been useless to attempt. "It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us," he said in his message to Congress. How the Republican party would meet this condition is stated in the Chicago platform. "We would meet it," say the Republicans, "when it becomes flagrant and unbearable, by adding to the taxes on the necessities of life when imported from abroad, and by repealing those on intoxicating drinks when produced in our own distilleries." There is the cap-sheaf of your protective system. There is its crown of glory. Mr. Cleveland holds up this crown of glory as a spectacle for mankind, and says that he is content to abide by the judgment of the American people upon the principles of his message, as contrasted with those of the advocates of dearer food and clothing and cheaper drinks.

TARIFF REFORM A MORAL ISSUE.

WITH one or two exceptions, the religious newspapers are pretty consistently refraining from taking any part in the canvass. This is due, they tell us, not to the disastrous nature of their fooling with political questions four years ago, but to their clear conviction that there is no moral issue involved in the coming election. In 1884, they say, there was such an issue—the personal character of the candidates. Then they felt called upon to speak out. But now that it is a mere question of economic policy, a choice between opposing theories of the tariff, they think there is no reason for their impairing their religious influence by assuming a partisan position.

Far be it from us to quarrel with this conclusion. There are the best of reasons why the religious press, as such, should abstain from partisan activity. But we cannot at all admit that the reason offered is one of them. It is an altogether antiquated and inadequate conception of morality that is unable to see that the pending issue of tariff reform is, in large part, a moral issue. To deny that it is, smacks of what may be called the lurid school of moralists—we mean the men who feel an appeal to their moral instincts only when it is a clear case of heaven against hell. For them to be able to recognize right and wrong on the two sides of a battle, it must be an Armageddon. Right must be enveloped in a heavenly halo, or they do not know it, and wrong must be wrapped in sulphurous gloom, or they will not be sure of it. This is very largely, we suppose, the attitude of the Prohibitionists. They are men who, so to speak, pine for a moral issue—and they want it to be one that they can see a mile away. Since

the Republican party has ceased to stir their enthusiasm, as it did in the days when it stood for human liberty, they have been casting about for a new cause to awaken their passionate devotion, and they have apparently found it. They regard it as the height of absurdity to talk about a question of custom-house regulations, as they call it, being a question largely moral.

Yet tariff reform is a moral issue of a most positive and commanding sort. We may even say that it is so on whichever side of the question a man takes his position—provided he takes it honestly; for every honest and intelligent voter, next November, will believe that he is voting for national prosperity. But national prosperity means national improvement in morals. No teaching of scientific ethics is more clear than just this intimate connection between the physical condition and the moral state. Thus it has been shown, for example, that suicide varies with the food supply. The introduction of gas in the streets of London was followed by an immediate decrease in public crime. We have to distinguish here between morals and religiosity. In times of national distress the churches are more resorted to, it is true, than in periods of prosperity. From this fact it has been inferred that a commercial panic, like that of 1857, is a great quickener of morality because it is of church attendance. But this is to overlook the immense increase of crime, which is always the other pole of the social movement originated by public calamity, and also to be blind to the true influence of a series of prosperous years in raising the standard of comfort and of intelligence, in ameliorating manners and putting a premium upon good habits. The surest way of hitting the moral is to aim at the physical, and the citizen who is really persuaded that the prosperity of the country is to hinge, very largely, upon the result of the voting two months from now, may be certain that the morals of the people will be affected in the most important ways.

In fact, if we admit that the reasoning of the advocates of tariff reform is sound, we cannot well deny that they have ground for entering into the contest with the loftiest moral enthusiasm. It is conducive to morality to have public measures rightly named and clearly understood by the people. A part of the work of tariff-reformers, in the present campaign, consists in exposing hypocrisy and deception. They are helping to fix the label "favoritism," "class legislation," "bounty system," on the thing that has falsely been called "protection." They stand for economy in national administration, and economy is a public virtue and a source of private morality. They are striving to restore our true political ideal of equality before the law, instead of the present system of legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. They are working to prevent, in the most direct way possible, the creation of permanent class distinctions in this country, and of persistent social antagonisms. They labor for simpler and directer political