

TEARING THE TARIFF.

JAMES H. WALKER'S VIEWS ON THE MCKINLEY BILL.

The Well-Known Chicago Dry-Goods Merchant Arraigns the Ohio Protection Tinker—He Says Kansas Is Opening Her Eyes to New Convictions.

(From the Chicago Herald.)
James H. Walker, the head of the big Chicago dry-goods house bearing his name, is the writer of the following interesting letter on the tariff. It was written in reply to Capt. B. Rockwell, of Junction City, Kan., and its opening sentences tell in stronger language than words sometimes express themselves the story of how light is dawning upon Kansas and the West. Mr. Walker's letter, or rather arraignment of the McKinley bill, is as follows:

I am sorry to hear that the citizens of Kansas are experiencing so little prosperity in their business affairs. Your conviction that the tariff is largely responsible for their straitened condition is undoubtedly correct. The tariff is the question of the hour and is assuming an importance little suspected by the majority of the citizens of this country. It is scarcely within the scope of a letter to discuss the "pros and cons" of this subject.

The venerable sophistries of protectionists have been current so long that they are reputable through age, and to the thoughtless have the appearance of truth. With touching credulity no farmer has accepted the highest possible tax as his greatest benefactor, and as the cause of our national prosperity. The present tariff, originated for war purposes, was loyally accepted by the people, and the profits which remained above a dollar it was not severely felt, but with wheat at 78 cents in Chicago it has become a burden too intolerable to be borne, and the general conditions of the country are crying aloud for relief. The farmer, knowing that the tariff is the cause of his ever smoldering poverty, is casting about for some alleviation. He feels that what he buys costs him too much, and, believing that his local merchants exact too high a price for the goods they sell, he turns to the protectionists, and, as the cause of "farmers' alliances" in various parts of the country, hoping thereby to purchase his supplies at a smaller percentage of profit than is required by the merchants. This, however, will not meet the difficulty. The merchants' profits are none too large. The trouble is that, on account of being so heavily taxed, the goods originally cost the merchant too much.

The farmer has long been led to believe that the present exorbitant tariff is for the benefit of American labor, in that it enables it to get wages, and thereby create a good home market for the products of the farm. A little investigation will prove to you that the operatives in the mills of the protected industries get far lower wages than the employees of the unprotected industries, and the latter are paid higher wages and salary in this country are in those trades, professions and occupations which are not protected in any manner whatever. The mercantile clerks of this country get the highest salaries in the world. The carpenters, bricklayers, blacksmiths, locksmiths, and all the mechanics engaged in the local industries which exist in our towns and villages get far higher wages than operatives in the mills, and much higher than similar workers in any part of the world. Our farmers are not protected in any sense of the term, and yet the farm laborer is better paid in this country than in any other. These facts seem to prove that high wages depend upon conditions rather than upon a protective policy. The benefits of protection apply to very few people in this country—probably not over 5 to 10 per cent. of the whole population. The other 90 to 95 per cent. pay enormous taxes for the enrichment of that 5 to 10 per cent. and get nothing in return.

Does your community know that the tariff tax on dry goods, such as dress goods, farmers' satin, cashmeres, henriettes and shawls, will average 75 per cent. at the port of entry and nearly 100 per cent. by the time they reach the consumer?

Does your community know that there is a bill now being considered by Congress which is called a revised tariff bill?

The count of large imagines that revision of the tariff means a reduction of the tariff. The facts are that as far as dry goods are concerned it means a still further increase of the tariff of from 5 to 12 per cent.

Does your community know that organized manufacturers are in Washington, D. C., urging the passage of this enormous additional tariff on top of a tariff incredibly large already?

Does your community know that the passage of this bill means that many dry goods when they reach the consumer will cost exactly double what they ought to cost, or double what they would cost if this tariff did not exist?

Cotton warp dress goods pay a duty at the port of entry of 70 per cent. Add the profits of the importer and retailer to the duty, say 25 per cent. more, and when they reach the consumer the tax is equal to 87 per cent. The bill now in Congress proposes to make this tax 102 per cent. in place of 87 per cent., or 15 per cent. more.

All wool cashmeres now pay an average duty of 80 per cent. Add the importer's and retailer's profits, and when they reach the consumer the tax is 100 per cent. The bill now before Congress proposes to increase this duty about 10 per cent. more, making the tax 110 per cent.

Fancy flannels for lawn tennis suits, waists, and shirtings now pay a duty of 75 per cent. With the importer's and retailer's profits added, 100 per cent. Congress proposes to increase the duty by 33 per cent., making the tariff on these goods 133 per cent.

Silk-warp Henriettes now pay 50 per cent. It is now proposed to increase the duty to 60 per cent.

Woolen shawls now pay 80 per cent. It is now proposed to increase the duty to 90 or 100 per cent.

Is it just for any class of American citizens to receive a bounty on the production of any business when 95 per cent. of our citizens receive no bounty at all? Does not this savor of discrimination in favor of a few against the many, and does it not look very much like class legislation in favor of a privileged minority? Our agriculturists sell what they produce on the markets of the world, and the prices which the foreigner is willing to give for what we export makes the market prices for what is consumed at home.

The following are among the very large lists of articles which are heavily taxed by the tariff and which are not produced in this country, never have been produced, and possibly never will be produced, because climatic and other conditions prevent:

Linen goods of all classes (except common crash) pay 35 per cent., and when they reach the consumer the tax is 45 per cent. The present bill before Congress proposes to increase this tax 5 per cent. more.

Linen handkerchiefs, which are not and never have been produced in this country, pay 35 per cent. at the port of entry, or 44 per cent. when sold to the consumer.

Wool veilings, which are not produced in this country, pay a tax of 53 per cent., and in the consumer's hands this tax is increased to 65 per cent. by the intermediate profits as previously stated.

Embroideries, which are not produced in this country to any appreciable extent, pay 40 per cent. Add the importer's and the retailer's profits, the tax reaches the enormous amount of 60 per cent. The same figures apply to cotton veils and many other articles of general use among the masses.

See the disadvantages of our farmers compared with those of foreign countries. Certain styles of common dress goods, which are imported largely into this country, cost in England and France 13 cents per yard. The same goods, with duty added, cost in this country 25 cents per yard. The farmer in England and France gets for his wheat \$1 a bushel. Our farmers west of the Missouri River obtain for their wheat about 50 cents a bushel. In other words, our farmers pay almost twice as much for what they buy as the foreigner, and they only receive 50 per cent. as much for what they sell. Can it be possible that our Representatives and Senators in Congress are aware of these facts? And if they are, will they dare to still further increase taxes to the extent proposed?

Previous to the meeting of the last Republican convention in June, 1893, the Chicago Tribune, in a very powerful editorial, asked the question: "Who will speak for the farmer?" The convention met. It spoke for the politician and for the manufacturer, and for everybody but the farmer, and that great, patient, industrious, loyal, docile class of our country was left unprotected.

It is a fact that the farmer voted according to his own beliefs for a "protective" policy which is little short of robbery.

Not many weeks ago a Congressional committee was appointed to take testimony concerning the workings of the present tariff. The accounts of this investigation seem to indicate that nobody was invited to testify except the manufacturers. The result is seen in the present bill which is before Congress. And what a sight it is. Self-interest in the halls of the Capitol testifies in its own behalf. The collectors of the taxes clamor for more. The payers of the taxes apparently indifferent or ignorant of what is going on.

The present tariff having continued in operation nearly twenty-seven years, it is high time that our infant industries should have placed themselves in a position where they will require less rather than more tariff, as they are now demanding.

Patents, which are the reward of genius and invention, usually run out in seven years. The tariff has lasted twenty-seven years.

No manufacturer is entitled to a bounty of 50, 60, 70, 80 or 100 per cent. for doing business. The manifest injustice of this discrimination in favor of any class of people is only too evident. The tariff should be reduced largely as soon as possible, and if the people desire a policy of protection, it should be of a moderate character, and not a guarantee of enormous profits to anybody who chooses to embark in the manufacturing enterprises. Surely the mass of the people are entitled to some consideration, and equal justice in these matters should be meted out to all.

A reduction of tariff would of course create a depreciation of values in certain directions; but how much have farm lands depreciated within the last five years, owing to the depreciation of crops? The amount is equal to the value of crops, to more than the entire value of all the manufacturing plants in this country. Yet that shrinkage has been borne uncomplainingly, and without any great disaster.

The effect upon the money market of the excessive taxes collected by the Government, under the tariff, has become a very serious matter. The Treasury is full to overflowing and has a very large surplus. Meanwhile, money throughout the country is uncomfortably close, and business enterprises are retarded and jeopardized through a lack of available funds.

In order to get this Treasury surplus into circulation again in the ordinary channels of trade, unusual and unnatural methods are adopted, and in the exercise of those methods the Secretary of the Treasury is invested with a discretionary power which is without parallel in the history of finance. Some secretaries may exercise that power judiciously. Some day we may have a speculating secretary, whose interests will be in the depreciation of the money market and a consequent depreciation of values. Such a possibility should not exist, and would not under a judicious tariff.

Since writing the above I have received a sketch of the proposed tariff bill now being considered by Congress, and find that it contains much greater than anybody anticipated that I herewith append a comparative list of some principal items, being unwilling to do any injustice to the insatiable greed of the tariff "revisers." Specific rates are computed ad valorem, for comparison:

	McKinley bill	Present proposed duty	per cent.
Cotton warp dress goods, costing less than 15c. yd., (goods costing 8d. for 3c. in.)	60	75	81
from 15 to 20c. yd., (goods costing 10c. for 3c. in.)	60	82	90
from 20c. upward, (goods costing 12c. for 3c. in.)	60	85	93
Farmer satins below 15c. yd. (this class includes 3 of our grades) from 15 to 20c. yd.	61	68	86
(this class includes 3 of our grades) from 20c. yd. upward	61	68	86
Ceylon suitings (fancy flannels, value between 10c. and 15c. a pound)	75	85	90
Woolen goods costing 6s. a yard, 30 in.	75	85	90
Rever shawls	66	75	81
English spring shawls	48	58	63
Irish shawls	48	58	63
Cashmere gloves	65	75	81
French all-wool goods costing 1 franc per meter	70	80	86
French all-wool goods costing 1 franc, 30 in. wide	85	110	129
French cashmeres	65	85	110

The Bounty Business.

A bounty on sugar, silk or anything else is a rascally imposition on the people. All the industries in this country, of course, would like to receive bounties, and thousands of them need bounties, but that is no reason why the Government should pay them. Least of all is it a reason why Congress should vote bounties to two public industries and not vote them to 2,000 others just as feeble. If the Government is to go into the bounty business at all it should at least deal out bounties impartially to all the interests that need them.

But if the Government is bent on assisting a few industries at the expense of all the rest, it must be admitted that the method of assisting them by bounties is far preferable to assisting them by a protective tariff. When a bounty of \$5,000 a year is paid to an industry, the country is plundered of only \$5,000. But when a tariff is laid on imports in order that that same industry may raise its prices \$5,000, the prices of imports are raised also, and the people are plundered of perhaps \$5,000,000 that the protected industry may realize \$5,000. By the bounty system, therefore, the people not only lose less, but are able to tell exactly how much they lose. There is nothing so ruinous to a country as a taxation by stealth.

These bounties will also do good by educating the people. Comparisons will everywhere be instituted between bounties and the tariff, and when it is seen that the tariff is even more iniquitous than bounties, and that both confer gratuities upon favored classes, the conclusion drawn must be a salutary one. In this view, we say, let the bounties be piled on.—Chicago Herald.

The Trusts Are Safe.

In the dispatches from Washington announcing the passage in the Senate of the anti-trust bill, it is stated that the measure stands no show of being acted on by the House at the present session. This was doubtless well understood by the Republican Senators, or else they would have found some excuse for killing it.

There is not the slightest doubt that it is a buncombe measure. The Republican politicians do not intend to prevent or punish trusts. If they did they would not discard the most palpable and potent remedy—the withdrawal of the tariff protection under which five-sixths of the trusts organize and prosper.

The object of a protective duty is to enable the home producer to charge more for his product than he would be able to do without it. If the duty fails in this, protection fails to protect. The combination in a protected industry to secure entire control of the home market—in other words, to stop all competition and make the monopoly complete and effective—is the logic of protection carried to its full length.

And this is why the Republican Congress will do nothing to forbid trusts.—Lansing Journal.

Plain Facts Repeated.

Germany has shut out our pork. France has shut out our pork, and now

Canada has put a heavy protective duty on lard. These are all retaliatory measures. The people of these countries want our products and we want theirs. We close our markets against them and they retaliate. The manufacturers, in whose interests this vicious and corrupt policy in this country is pursued, grow rich and the farmers grow poor. How many thousands and tens of thousands of times must these plain facts be repeated to our farmers before they all understand them?—Grand Rapids Democrat.

A NATIONAL SCANDAL.

SCATHING ABRAIMENT OF QUAY AND QUAYISM.

Serious Charges Against the Chairman of the National Republican Committee—An Open Letter from Henry C. Lea to Ben Harrison.

Henry C. Lea, the book publisher, respected as one of the most upright, intelligent and earnest citizens of Philadelphia, has written the following open letter to President Harrison:

"To the President:
"Sir—No graver scandal has darkened our political history than the charges brought against Senator Quay by the New York World in its issue of Feb. 10 and March 5. It would be useless here to recapitulate them further than to say that, with full details of names and places and dates, the World asserts him to be a man whose political career has been a succession of flagrantly dishonest acts, including the temporary abstraction from the State Treasury of \$200,000 in one instance and of \$400,000 in another.

"No such accusations, involving iniquity so varied and so continuous, and supported by such an array of minute detail, have ever before been brought against a politician so conspicuous. If they are true, Senator Quay ought to be in the penitentiary. If they are false, he is a cruelly libeled man; his accuser is a journal of the highest financial standing, and so jury of his countrymen would refuse him any credit as a politician. He would be a man of all future reach of want. Vindication and profit both await him as an incentive to prove his innocence, but although two months have elapsed since the gravest of the charges were made public, no word has been said by him to break silence. It is his own fault if the public should regard him as acquiescing in the truth of the charges.

A NATIONAL SCANDAL.

"It is true that the crimes alleged against Senator Quay are of a heinous character, but your connection with him has rendered the scandal national. You were duly warned in advance from a friendly source of the dangers of such an alliance, yet by accepting his man, Mr. Quay, you have assumed responsibility for both of them. In pursuance of this alliance, you have enlarged Mr. Quay's importance by virtually giving him control of the Federal patronage in Pennsylvania, thus rendering him the dictator of the Republican party in the State. He boasted of your subservience to him when, in explaining his triumph over Representative Dalzell in the struggle for the Pittsburg postoffice, he publicly said that the President, though very anxious to grant the postoffice to Dalzell, had been obliged to yield to the influence of a high official, could not, under all the circumstances, well avoid complying with my wishes. Even Mr. Quay's remarkable silence under the accusations of the World does not seem to have lessened his influence over you. He signified his return from Pittsburg a week or so since by capturing the Pittsburg Surveyors of Customs against candidates urged respectively by Secretary Blaine and Representative Dalzell. Indeed, his power would seem to be as great in Washington as in this State, for the party organs now tell us that he has been endeavoring to buy off a superfluous candidate for the Governorship with an Assistant Secretaryship of War. In thus entering into a political partnership with Mr. Quay, you must share the losses as well as the gains of his career. He is now in Pennsylvania alone, not even the Republican party only, that has a right to protest; every citizen of the land must feel humiliation at the smirch thus inflicted on the Chief Magistracy of the nation.

AN ACCOUNTING DEMANDED.

"As a Republican by conviction, ardently desiring the success of the party so long as it deserves success, I beg to request you, Mr. President, to take a calm survey of the situation and to order an accounting of your stewardship in this respect. Thirteen months ago you entered upon the duties of the highest office which the world has to bestow; your party was supreme in the control of both houses of Congress and of the executive branch of the Government. You were elected, and useful administration in which you were elected, might earn another term from the confidence and gratitude of the people. The only cloud upon the political horizon was your own party's disunion, and you were elected as a field and Jerusalem shall become heaps.

"The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money, yet will they lean upon the Lord and say, is not the Lord among us? We have not seen, and we shall not see, a field and Jerusalem shall become heaps.

A WARNING FROM THE PEOPLE.

"But it needs no prophet to foretell the result. The elections of last November were a warning that the people would not tolerate your methods. You have not seen, and we shall not see, a field and Jerusalem shall become heaps. The elections of next November will emphasize it. The narrow Republican majority in the lower house will be swept away, and your path for the latter half of your administration will be a path of thorns. You have rewarded the magnificent majority of 80,000 given to you by Pennsylvania by riveting upon her the chains of Quayism. You need not wonder that dissatisfaction is spreading rapidly throughout her borders. There is a man, who may render even her allegiance doubtful. The outlook for 1894 is even darker. Were the Presidential election to take place to-morrow there could scarce be doubt of Democratic success. Let me counsel you, Mr. President, as a friend, to reflect that this has been your work in one short year of misused power.

TIME FOR REPENTANCE.

"If this retrospection should bring with it repentance and amendment, you still have before you three years which may be fruitful for good. Bear in mind that to fail in the work of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful. Discard the advisers who are luring you to your downfall. Recognize that the truest political expediency lies in the application of conscience to public affairs, and that you can serve your party best by stimulating the nobler aspirations of the nation, rather than by pandering to the baser appetites of spoilsmen. Cease to expect to gather figs from thistles, or to touch pitch without defilement. Apply to your public duties the high standard of morality to which you adhere in your private life. Remember that evil can give birth only to evil, and that you, as Chief Magistrate of sixty-five millions of freemen, have on your soul a charge for which you must reckon to posterity and God. I am, Mr. President, your obedient servant.

HENRY CHARLES LEA.

PHILADELPHIA, April 8, 1890.

Not Half So Sure.

The average Republican farmer is not half so sure that a protective tariff is the very best thing on earth for him as he was a few years ago. But when the long-winded protective orators, who are paid by the manufacturers to tell their tale of woe, commence on him again, we wonder if he will have sense enough to follow his own convictions and vote for his own interests, or whether he will add another weight to the load that is already crushing him.—Ypsilanti Commercial.

THE NATION'S CAPITAL.

WASHINGTON VIEWED FROM A MORAL STANDPOINT.

A City Where There Is No Gambling or Sabbath-Breaking—Election Senators by the People—Sam Randall's Religious Belief—Congressman Wiley's Little Romance.

[SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE.]

WASHINGTON, April 28, 1890.

There is, after all, to be some agitation of the subject of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people during this session of Congress. Senator Mitchell, of Oregon, has developed into a champion of a move in this direction, and on last Monday addressed the Senate in a lengthy argument in favor of a constitutional amendment providing for the selection of members of the upper branch of Congress by a majority vote of the people of each State.

An incident in the Congressional life of the late Samuel J. Randall is related by a Washington reporter, touching upon the distinguished Representative's religious opinions and how he silenced a theological discussion in his committee-room. It is said of him that he worked out his religious theories in the same philosophical manner that he brought to bear upon every subject in which he was interested and brought the same power of reasoning into play. That conviction once established could never be uprooted. One day about two years ago his committee-room was filled with Congressmen. Mr. Randall was busy at his correspondence, paying no attention apparently to what was being said apart from his own work. The conversation around him finally took a philosophical turn and launched off into a discussion of the Bible and Christianity, the tone of the discussion being decidedly skeptical. Indeed, there seemed to be a strong atheistical sentiment present. The conversation continued without appearing to interest the Pennsylvanian, when, attracted perhaps by a rather broad and liberal assertion by one of those present, he got up, pushed his letters aside, stood at the corner of the table, with that set look of determination and positiveness on his face so often remarked on the floor of the House, and said: "Gentlemen, Christianity is truth. The man who doubts distrusts his own intelligence." This was said in his most solemn and impressive tone, and at once silenced the discussion. A moment later he left the room.

The Chinese enumeration bill was knocked into a cocked-hat in the Senate, and will be heard of no more this session. Senator Evans, of New York, is given the credit for its defeat. In his speech against it the New York Senator denounced it as a barbaric measure, un-American and despotic in form, and not calculated in any wise to reflect credit upon the nation adopting it. The bill provided for furnishing every Chinese resident with a certificate of such residence at the time of the taking of the census, and the exclusion in the future of every Chinaman not provided with written authority to remain. Senator Wilson, of Iowa, offered an amendment allowing Chinese laborers to pass through the United States bound for points outside, which was adopted. This, in effect, destroyed the original purposes of the entire Chinese exclusion act. In view of this, Senator Stewart, one of the most radical of the anti-Chinese bill supporters, moved to table the enumerating bill, and it was so done by an almost unanimous vote.

Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, the non-partisan temperance worker, was given an elegant dinner last week, at which were present the most noted personages of public life, including President Harrison and wife, Secretary and Mrs. Blaine, and the British Minister. The honor was tendered Mrs. Foster on the eve of her departure for Europe.

The conference committee having in charge the bill organizing Oklahoma under a territorial form of government has settled the differences of the two houses and reported a measure calculated to give entire satisfaction to all parties concerned, unless, perhaps, it be the men who desire the Federal places and who live in the territory. It will be remembered that, some weeks ago, when the Senate was acting upon the Oklahoma bill, Senator Ingalls tacked on an amendment limiting office-holders to actual residents. The reason given for this was that the Kansas Senator had been to the President and asked for a Judgeship for one of his constituents and had been refused. The refusal, it is alleged, was accompanied by the statement that the men to fill the various offices in the new territory had already been picked out. Ingalls said nothing, but the fruits of his thinking were visible in the bill in the provision compelling the appointing power to confine appointments to residents. Since that time, however, the wrath of the Kansas cyclonic Senator has been appeased, the obnoxious feature in the bill has been stricken out, and one of the new judges will come from Kansas.

The usual scramble to get out of Washington during the hot months goes merrily on. Both sides of Massachusetts avenue for five blocks is almost depopulated. Of fashionable life there is not a trace left. This locality is in the finest part of the city, and consists of handsome stone flats rented by the season, after the same manner that cottages and hotel quarters are secured during the summer months at seaside resorts. One of these flats, located on Dupont Circle, rents as high as \$800 per month, and eagerly seized at that. It was occupied last winter by a wealthy merchant of Philadelphia, who, with his wife and two daughters, gave several magnificent receptions just after the holidays.

The next important question to come up for discussion in Congress is the land grant forfeiture bill. This is a measure providing for the forfeiture to the Government of all the lands heretofore granted to railroad companies and which have been unearned by the said corporations. It involves the ownership of several million acres of very valuable lands in Western and Southwestern States. The railroads of course are fighting the bill for all there is in it, and as there are a good many men in Congress anxious to show the country that they are not in sympathy with corporations, a pretty fight may be expected. Perhaps the off-

repeated statement that the Senate is controlled by the bondholding interests of the country will receive practical illustration when this measure comes on for consideration. It will be a pretty good indication of the truth or falsity of the charges.

Perhaps in time Washington will become not only the pride of the liberty-loving American, but the boast and living example of the strictest Methodist principles. There is not a public gambling resort in the city, unless some cellar or dingy back room in which are huddled a few darkies playing "craps" for pennies can be called a gambling resort. Indeed, even these are "pulled" by the police with becoming regularity. Every saloon is promptly closed at 12 o'clock. On Sunday business of all kinds is entirely suspended, and for a saloonkeeper to open his shop, only to air it out, is sure death—to his license. The city on Sabbath morning resembles a New England village. Pennsylvania avenue is deserted until church time, when men, women, and children, with prayer-books in hand, are seen hurrying to the various places of worship. Everything is as quiet and subdued as a funeral. There is no other city in the world that can compare with Washington in its quiet nights and peaceful Sabbaths.

The Dolph smelling committee, appointed to investigate the secret-session leakage, made a report recommending severe measures to compel reporters to divulge the source of their information as to the happenings of executive sessions. The Senate refused to entertain the recommendation and the committee was discharged. Several of the newspaper boys who appeared before the committee early in the session, and who refused to testify, were discharged at the same time and walked up to the financial clerk's office and drew \$154 salary. The committee desired to punish them for contempt, so could not discharge them. Some of the reporters who drew witness fees for one day are kicking themselves for not doing likewise.

There is quite a pretty little romance connected with the marriage of Congressman John M. Wiley, of New York, and Miss Cooper, of Indianapolis, which took place the other day. Miss Cooper was visiting in Washington when Mr. Wiley first met her, being introduced in a hotel parlor by the late Thomas A. Hendricks. He fell desperately in love with her, and it is claimed by intimate friends, proposed for her hand the next day. She laughed at him and told him he would forget all about it in a little while. One year from that time he proposed again, and again met with refusal. Three or four years rolled around regularly, and as regularly would he ask her to marry him. His final success is testified by the recent wedding. One of the Congressman's friends asked him if the above story is true, and he laughingly replied: "Well, I have kept pretty close track of her for some time, and I confess for a time I was afraid she'd get away."

By unanimous vote last week, Congress accepted the handsome statue of General Grant, presented by the Grand Army of the Republic, and it will be placed in a conspicuous place in Statuary Hall. The statue was paid for by voluntary contributions, in small sums, from veterans and their families.

JAMES C. MOODY.

Not Sugar, but Meat.

It "was settling day" at a general store in a Louisiana hamlet. Between sixty and seventy negroes were on hand to see how their accounts stood, and the proprietor and his clerk were very busy with the books. As the name of each was called he came forward, and the conversation ran about thus:

"Well, Henry, you have had 100 pounds of meat, 300 pounds of meal, 60 pounds of flour, 20 pounds of sugar, a pair of shoes, a pound of tea, and a hat. Deduct from this your cotton and I owe you ten dollars."

"Yes, sah."

"They had got to the tenth man before any one kicked, and then it was an intelligent-looking black who had a memorandum book in his hand, and who said:

"I hain't dun had no sugar of you, Mars' Thompson."

"You haven't?"

"No, sah. What's the date of it?"

"The 17th of last month."

"We all was dun gone away from home from de 15th to de 20th, an' dat charge hain't right."

"What! Do you dispute my books?"

"I has got to, sah."

"Then I'll—! Hold on, William; I am wrong. Yes, I have made a mistake. It isn't sugar, but meat. That makes—!ef see—that makes forty pounds of meat instead of twenty pounds of sugar, and you owe me \$5."

He had scratched out the false charge and falsified the amount of meat to offset it, cheating the man out of \$4, but William turned to his companions and proudly waved the book on high and said:

"Haven't I dun stuck to it dat eddeshashun puts money in yo' pockets?"—New York Sun.

We need to consider the old elements and the new in every question. There is danger of that too cautious spirit which resists all change because "the past has been good enough." The past has held many errors which modern thought is bringing to light, and, as higher aims and better methods are coming to the front, they rightly claim our assistance and influence.

COMPLIMENTS which we think are deserved we accept only as debts, with indifference; but those which conscience informs us we do not merit we receive with the same gratitude that we do favors given away.

A FLATTERER is said to be a beast who biteth smiling. But it is hard to know them from friends, they are so obsequious and full of protestation; for a wolf resembles a dog, so doth a flatterer a friend.

MANY a man is ready to raise an objection who couldn't raise a cent.