

THE WEEKLY UNION.

The WEEKLY UNION (second part) is issued this morning. There is no paper on the coast which addresses itself so strongly to the interests of the reader. It is, for instance, the only weekly published in two parts in order that it may reach its subscribers twice a week, instead of once. Thus its readers get news oftener and fresher than through any other weekly paper. It consists of sixteen pages each week, and is the largest paper. It presents all the latest and best European, Eastern and home telegraphic news. It is edited with care and special reference to the advancement of the people and the development of the resources of the State. It presents the market reports of San Francisco and Sacramento, stock sales, local religious, sporting, art, mechanical and political news of the day, and the choicest original and selected miscellany. In short, it is the paper of all others for the general reader, the household, the shop, the office, and the office. Its subscription list has increased with unexampled rapidity, and is constant and reliable. It is issued for one year, postage paid, to any address in the United States for \$2.

NEWS OF THE MORNING.

In New York yesterday Government bonds were quoted at 108 1/2 for 4s of 1897; 103 1/2 for 5s of 1881; 100 1/2 for 4 1/2; sterling, \$4 85/8 7/8; silver bars, 94 1/2; silver coin, 1 discount buying, par selling. Silver in London yesterday, 92 1/2; consols, 98 7/16; 5 per cent. United States bonds, 105 1/2; 4s 110 1/2; 4 1/2, 112.

In San Francisco half dollars are quoted at par; Mexican dollars, 92 buying, 92 selling.

At Liverpool yesterday wheat was quoted at 48 1/2 for good to choice California.

There was rather more business at the Stock Boards in San Francisco yesterday morning, and prices, on the whole, were firmer and a trifle higher in most cases. The advance, however, was from 5c to 7c per share on those showing an improvement, and a similar range of variation on those showing a loss.

The Rev. (New) Gazette has been found for libel, the damages being placed at \$15,000.

Edward Stanley, son of Judge Stanley, of San Francisco, accidentally shot and killed himself Thursday, while out hunting in Napa county.

Wheeler, editor of the Watsonville Transcript, was yesterday arrested on a charge of libel.

English, the Democratic nominee for Vice-President, will be in New York tomorrow.

The Republicans of the Ninth Ohio District have renominated ex-Governor C. C. Carpenter for Congress.

R. P. Palmer has been nominated for Congress by the Greenbackers of the Fifth Missouri District.

At Danville, Va., Thursday night, Thomas De Jarnette fatally shot his sister, whom he found in a bag.

George Allen Price (colored) was hanged for murder yesterday in the yard of the Hamilton (Mo.) county jail.

The Secretary of the Treasury has ordered the Sacramento disaster to be investigated.

The Buffalo and New Western Railway has been leased to the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railway Company, for a term of 99 years.

The severest earthquake yet known in that locality occurred in Switzerland Sunday.

An earthquake in the Azores group resulted in the formation of another island about 1,800 yards in extent.

The Paris Louisianians are apprehensive that their establishments will be closed by to-day.

The abandonment of soldiers in Thessaly, whose time has expired, has been forbidden.

England has sent a physician to Ireland to examine into the famine fever and report to the Government.

Henry Ryan (colored) was hanged yesterday at Waynesboro, Ga., for the murder of a woman.

Philip Shumack and his wife were killed yesterday by a railroad train near Salinas, Pa.

Yesterday was the third and last day of the National Training Association recitals at Philadelphia.

The funeral of Colonel Pelton, nephew of ex-Governor Tilden, took place yesterday in New York from the residence of the latter.

The census shows the population of Tucson, A. T., to be about 7,000.

The track of the Southern Pacific Railroad is now laid seven miles east of Benson, A. T.

Rains have fallen daily during this month in the southern mining districts of Arizona.

Hill, the mining Sheriff of Ormsby county, Nev., has returned to Carson.

A REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN AT THE SOUTH.

We are glad to see that the Republican leading journals at the West and North are beginning to urge the necessity of a Republican campaign at the South. Our readers know that the Record-Union long since pointed out the grounds for such a policy, and we regard them as so convincing that in our opinion it would be a most serious blunder to neglect this matter. There are in the ten Southern States at the very least a million Republican voters. At the Presidential election in 1876 those ten States gave 700,000 Republican votes. That was the last occasion on which any expression of anti-Democratic views was permitted there, and even then a large percentage of the Republican vote was suppressed. This year it has been regarded as a foregone conclusion that the South will be solid for the Democracy, and that in the ten States to which we have referred, namely, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia, there will be practically no effort to cast any Republican vote. There is indeed to some faint rumor of such intestine troubles in Virginia as may possibly give one Congressional District to the Republicans, but there is nothing like certainty about this, and the presumption is against it. Now it should be apparent that such a surrender of a large portion of the Union to the alleged lawlessness and violence of a faction is equivalent to a far more dangerous and discreditable outcome than secession itself would have constituted. For had secession succeeded, these ten Southern States would have ceased to contribute to the federal revenues, but at the same time they would have ceased to meddle with national affairs; whereas under the existing situation they refuse to obey the Constitution and the laws, yet their claim and receive far more than their full share of political power. Practically the only result of emancipating the Southern blacks has been to give the Southern whites a means of increasing their own political influence, in fact. It should be evident that this condition of things is intolerable, and that the Republican party is under obligations to meet and contend against it. And the first duty of the Republican party is to deny the existence of a solid South, and to act towards the South precisely as it intends to act towards the North and West. It is said the Southern Democrats will not permit any electioneering in their strongholds. That assertion must be tested. The National Republican Committee must send speakers of repute all over the South, and invite the Southern Republicans to come out and hear them. The Red Shirt League must be challenged upon its own ground. If they mean violence and intimidation they must be forced to show their hands. Hitherto all the bulldozing has been done upon negroes and local white residents of little consequence or reputation. It remains to be seen whether the rifle and saber clubs will venture to break up republican meetings presided over by men of national reputation, and addressed by speakers like Blaine, and Hale, and Frye and Ingersoll. In the past the bullying and abuse has been so generally directed against local persons, that it has often been difficult to convince the general public of the reality of the outrages, and the notwithstanding the patent evidence of their occurrence in the election returns. The truth is that Southern bulldozing has been fostered by Republican neglect of the South. The Republican leaders have been content to take all their information concerning that region at second hand, and they have made the natural mistake of partisans in thinking that those outrages could be safely nursed for campaign purposes. The fact is that such Mexican methods as have been employed at the South can never be introduced without endangering the political morality of the whole country. If permitted to continue they breed an indifference to lawlessness which is the first step towards anarchy, and nothing is more difficult than to shake off such habits when they are once acquired.

It is therefore incumbent on the Republican party to force the Southern Democrats to act openly and in the face of the nation. If it is the settled purpose of the Democracy to carry the South by fraud and force, the methods to be employed must be used without concealment. With Northern speakers scattered all through the Southern States, however, it will be anything but an easy task to put in motion the regular bulldozing machinery. If the Southern Republican vote is to be suppressed, it must be first cowed in the campaign. But it is a question whether the bulldozers are prepared to ply their vocation under the eyes of Northern men. The fact that Hancock is their candidate will certainly embarrass this part of their programme still further. How can they affect loyalty and respect for law and order while they are suppressing free speech and trampling upon the franchise at the South? Or if they attempt this inharmonious combination of policies, how can they escape the swift and fatal exposure certain to be visited upon them by their Northern visitors? The truth is that a vigorous Republican campaign at the South is as necessary as it is politic. It must force the Southern Democrats into one of two courses, either of which is certain to make for the Republican cause. They will be compelled to abandon all bulldozing, and then the solidity of the South will be broken up by the casting of a full Republican vote; or they will be compelled to do their bulldozing openly, in which case the solidification of the North will ensue as a matter of course. The Republican policy clearly is to force the Democrats to choose between these alternatives. Any other course would be fatal. To abandon the South altogether is to play straight into the hands of the Democrats. They can then use force and fraud at the South as much as they please, and can deny that they are using any unfair means, all through the North. And in such a case they would find many Northern voters to believe their assurances. The only way to break up the Mexican political methods which have been introduced at the South is to expose them thoroughly and constantly. The whole country must be made to realize that there are ten States may be, and that is the essential consideration.

There are in the ten Southern States under discussion 87 electoral votes, and they elect 67 Congressmen. Thus the balance of power is in the hands of the faction which controls those States, and thus the mathematical axiom that nothing is stronger than its weakest part, is illustrated in the fact that the United States are virtually swayed by a group of States which owe their political power to their insolent and high-handed usurpation. It is in vain that the intelligence and wisdom of the North and West are being exerted to devise governmental reforms of all kinds, so long as this grave and flagrant defect in the very foundations of the Republic continues. The country is to-day an exemplification of the statue in Daniel's vision, of which the body was metal, but the feet clay. We stand upon crumbling clay feet so long as the Presidential succession, the complexion of Congress, the character of the Government, depend upon the action of States which have renounced democratic institutions, and are controlled by force. And we hold that it is the special duty of the Republican party to deal with this evil. The so-called reconstruction of the South has been a failure, but the party that is responsible for that attempt has not therefore absolved itself from its obligations. It is even more incumbent upon it than ever before to find a cure for the evils which have grown—whether directly or indirectly matters little—out of the policy which at the close of the rebellion was thought to be wise and prudent. The most important problem before the country to-day has been missed by even statesmen. It is, the restoration of democratic institutions at the South. That restoration is indispensable to the rehabilitation of the South for which its more enlightened inhabitants have been long looking. The establishment of political and civil security and equality must precede the real renaissance of the South. All other methods have been tried without success. It has been made apparent that leaving the South alone altogether only affords greater scope for Democratic conspiracy, and consolidates the oppression of the blacks. Mere denunciation from a distance is of no effect. Patrimonial work on the spot remains to be tested, and as we have shown above, it cannot last make for the advantage of the Republican cause, whatever its consequences. It is not less clear that such a programme is best fitted to revive the decaying spirit of political freedom in that region. It will compel the Southern Democrats to defend their indefensible positions, or abandon them. In either case it must work well for the South. We trust, therefore, that the Republican Committee will take steps for a vigorous and general Southern campaign, and that a special effort will be made to send the very best speakers down into the bulldozed country.

A VERY VALUABLE EXHIBIT.

We desire to call attention to an extremely interesting and valuable set of tables which we publish this morning, showing the receipts and disbursements of the Government from its organization to June 30, 1875, and exhibiting the amount of defalcations and the ratio of losses per \$1,000 to the aggregate received and disbursed. We recommend our readers to cut out these tables and preserve them for reference, for they contain an infinite amount of suggestive facts, and they constitute the best showing we know of in regard to the relative efficiency and integrity of Republican and Democratic administrations. The first fact likely to catch the attention of the reader is the astonishing increase of honesty and carelessness in the handling of the disbursements and receipts since the era of the rebellion. It will be seen that the smallest percentage of losses, both on disbursements and receipts, occurred during the six years of Grant's administration here recorded. The losses on disbursements in that period were only 31 cents on the \$1,000, and those on receipts 34 cents on the \$1,000. The heaviest losses on disbursements occurred under Andrew Jackson, when they rose to \$5 33 on the \$1,000. The heaviest losses on receipts occurred under Martin Van Buren, and were \$11 71 on the \$1,000. The Postoffice appears to have been worse managed under James Monroe than at any former or later period, the ratio of losses there having been \$11 61 on the \$1,000. During the entire period the losses on disbursements have greatly exceeded those on receipts. The most remarkable fact, however, is that while the aggregate of both receipts and disbursements has increased since the war so enormously, the ratio of losses has decreased in a far larger proportion. Thus in Van Buren's administration there was a loss on disbursements of nearly three millions and a half out of a total of 255 millions; while in Grant's term, out of a total of eight thousand millions, the loss was less than three millions. Out of a total amount involved in disbursements of thirty thousand millions, the loss has been thirty-nine millions; perhaps not much more when we look at the whole sum involved, but nevertheless enough to afford very pretty pickings for the thieves, and to explain why it is that political spoils have always attracted so large a following. If we divide the whole period into two divisions, namely, before and after the war, the showing is equally instructive. Before the war the ratio of losses to every \$1,000 of receipts was \$2. Since the war it has been 34 cents. Before the war the ratio of losses to every \$1,000 of disbursements was \$5 17. Since the war it has been 57 cents. It would be possible to go through the tables and pick out as suggestive facts from almost every line of them, but having shown our readers what can be gathered from these statistics, we

shall leave them to such further examination of the figures as they may desire to make. It is perhaps worth indicating that the administrations of the early Presidents do not make a very brilliant showing in comparison with several of the later ones, and that even under the Father of his Country the losses were so high as to justify considerable doubt as to the integrity of the financial department.

Perhaps the most important service to be had from these figures is the convincing lesson they afford of the tendency of party politics to promote unjust judgments of contemporaneous affairs. It has become almost an axiom that the last twenty years have been marked by more governmental corruption than any other period in the history of the country. Yet when we have the inexorable facts and figures placed before us it appears incontrovertibly that there has been a more honest and scrupulous administration of the finances latterly than was ever attained during those administrations which are so frequently referred to as halcyon eras, and which so many people imagine to have been free from all suspicion of wrongdoing. At the same time it is necessary to point out that the losses throughout are quite large enough to justify the most strenuous efforts after further reforms, and that we have by no means yet reached a point where we can afford to rest on our oars and indulge in self-gratulation. The enormous cost of the administration of the Government is a feature which must strike the thoughtful observer, and he may well ask himself whether the country has ever obtained commensurate benefits in exchange for this vast outlay. When the Republican and Democratic administrations are compared, the advantage will be seen to rest with the former altogether. The Democratic Presidents did not at any time succeed in reducing the ratio of losses to anything like the moderate amount which first appears in Lincoln's Government. Some of these Democratic Administrations were among the most extravagant the country has ever had, and in none of them does there appear to have been a rigid system maintained. When Democrats hereafter brag about the superior economy of their party, or when they undertake to arraign their adversaries for extravagance and corruption, it will be in order to refer them to these tables, and to ask them upon what evidence they base their assertions. The figures, which do not lie, constitute the best kind of a campaign document, and we can heartily recommend a careful and prayerful study of them to those Democrats who are preparing statistical exhibits for the coming campaign, and who want facts to give the people. If the facts do not suit them the fault is not ours, but the accuracy of the tables may be implicitly relied upon.

GARFIELD AND THE DE GOLYER CONTRACT.

The Nation goes carefully over the history of General Garfield's connection with the De Golyer contract, concerning which so much nonsense has been talked by the Democrats, and shows conclusively that there is nothing in the charge. The facts are that Garfield's Congressional position did not and could not have exercised any influence whatever upon the case in which he engaged. The Board of Works of the District of Columbia government had fixed the prices at which certain pavements, of wood, and stone, and concrete, should be laid, and had then advertised for bids. The appropriations for the work had been previously made by the District Legislature. Congress had absolutely nothing to do with the matter one way or the other. All that remained was for the Board of Works to decide which pavement it should select. No difference in price was to be made, no matter which competitor was successful. Garfield was asked by Parsons, the lawyer who had the De Golyer patent in charge, to examine the evidence in support of that and other competing pavements, and to prepare a brief for the Board of Works. He did this, and he was paid for it. The De Golyer pavement was not, as has been alleged, a fraud. It was just as good a pavement as any of those which were in competition. The subsequent complaint against the Board of Works was based on the allegation that it had fixed all the prices to be paid for pavements too high. With that, however, Garfield had nothing to do. He was not responsible for the price paid for laying the pavement. He had, as a member of Congress, nothing to do with the matter. The Nation thinks that perhaps the people who employed Garfield in the case may have hoped to gain something by the prestige of a well-known and influential Congressman, but it is careful to point out that this view rests upon developments which were not made for a considerable time after, and which neither Garfield nor anyone else outside the District of Columbia ring knew anything about. It thinks that Garfield may be charged with indiscretion in the premises, but with nothing more, and it concludes, "Let us finally say that in judging 'him on the charge of indiscretion it is 'not fair to judge his conduct in 1871' with the light of 1880. There is not one of us whose views about discretion touching the relations between politics and money have not been greatly clarified by 'the events of the past nine years.' We cannot say that to us it seems necessary to charge General Garfield even with indiscretion in this case. We have no right to judge public men as though they were Buddhist ascetics endeavoring to prepare themselves for Nirvana by gradually renouncing every human foible and affection. We hold that Garfield acted as ninety-nine out of a hundred honest and upright men would have acted under the same circumstances, and that it is little better than affectation to find fault with him at all.

PELTON AND TILDEN.

It is said that Tilden treated his nephew Pelton, who has just died, precisely as though he had been solely responsible for the attempts to bribe the electors at the late Presidential election. It is believed that the old gentleman adopted this course as being necessary to the maintenance of the peculiar reputation which he thought he himself bore, but which probably no other creature living regarded him as entitled to. Concerning the intimacy of his connection with the frauds referred to there has never existed any doubt among dispassionate observers. Pelton was a poor man. He had no means to bribe electors with. Yet, as Harper's Weekly puts it in

commenting upon Mr. Tilden's letter of declination the other day, "it was discovered that the intimate and confidential but poor agent of this modest and quiet but rich citizen, had been trying in every direction with vast sums of money 'to corrupt electors, to bribe and buy and 'smash the Presidency in any way.' Of course Mr. Tilden's disclaimers, which by the way were never offered until the cipher dispatch revelations had brought the scandal to his very door, did not convince anybody of his innocence. The Democrats, or at least some of them, continued to assert their belief in his integrity, as a matter of duty to the party, but they did not in their hearts accept his explanations. Mr. Tilden, however, appears to have thought that all the world had received his version of the story, and inasmuch as he had not broken with the rest of the tools who had been connected with the ugly business, he concluded that it would be a good stroke of policy to make a scapegoat of his unlucky nephew. The latter was poor and comparatively friendless, and so the stern uncle showed him the door, and bade him never look upon his face again. Poor Pelton went to the bad forthwith, and has now died a broken man. The uncle has perhaps not much reason to felicitate himself upon his own survival. He has outlived the popular faith in his probity, and his party has repudiated him with scarcely concealed satisfaction. He cut off Pelton when the latter had failed to buy the Presidency for him, but the bit of affected virtue did not rehabilitate him in the esteem of the people, and he would have probably been thought better of had he continued to cling to the man who had done his dirty work so faithfully, though so fruitlessly.

THE INCREASE OF SUICIDE.

A recent writer in Blackwood's states that a very marked increase in suicide has of late years taken place in Europe. The number of suicides is said to be five times greater than at the beginning of the present century, and it is estimated roughly that about 90,000 people destroy themselves every year, taking the whole of Europe. It is further alleged that this increase of suicide has kept pace with the spread of education in such a way as to make it appear that the tendency to self-destruction has been strengthened by the dissemination of knowledge. This, however, is precisely what ought to have been anticipated. The first effects of knowledge are inevitably depressing. Ignorance is always confident and self-assured. But the man who has learned a little is just capable of perceiving his own insignificance, and of becoming intensely dissatisfied with his surroundings. It is the people who possess a little knowledge who are always the most turbulent and impatient. They are the ones who rebel against social inequalities; who become communists; who affect all kinds of eccentric and absurd governmental and social theories; who are prone to restlessness and insubordination; who are fond of labor strikes; who are ever engaged in some attempt to overthrow existing institutions. To such half-informed minds knowledge brings only torture and despair. They have no balance, and since they have learned only how to crave, but not how to supply their cravings, it is quite easy to understand how they may be tempted toward suicide. They are, in truth, failures in the world, and Nature doubtless takes the quickest method of removing them. They do not harmonize with their environment. They are in an anomalous transition state, which is at odds with both past and present, and they naturally come to the conclusion that the times are out of joint. Statistics of suicide are so imperfect and fragmentary that it is impossible to make any useful comparison of different periods; but we are quite prepared to believe that the proportion is larger now than it has been before during the century, and we do not expect that this tendency will diminish appreciably until another generation has consolidated and digested the knowledge which the present one has hardly had capacity to assimilate.

TURKEY'S EMBARRASSMENT.

It appears that there is no truth in the reports which have been circulated to the effect that the Porte had sent a note to the Powers refusing to accept the decision of the Berlin Conference in the Greek boundary question. The fact is that the decision of the Conference has not yet been officially communicated to the Porte, and therefore it could not have answered it. As the Conference has given Greece a wider stretch of territory than was originally proposed, it is quite natural that the Porte should object to the adjudication, more especially as it has not been consulted. Should it determine upon resistance, however, it is evident that its contention may be taken advantage of by the Powers to hasten that partition of the Ottoman Empire they all both dread and desire. It is scarcely possible that the Conference would have gone to all this trouble without a previous agreement looking to the enforcement of its decision, however, and of course an European demand for the cession of the disputed territory to Greece would be final. The Porte appears still to hope that the old jealousy which has hitherto prevented any concert of action among the Powers when a crisis approached, may help it yet, but it has little or nothing to hope from the present English Government, and there is no other at all likely to interfere in any event. If the Powers would hold their hands and let Greece and Turkey settle the question in the field the latter might have some chance of escape, but as things are there is no prospect that this solution will be accepted.

INDIANA POLITICS.

The late decision of the Indiana Supreme Court, declaring the constitutional amendment changing the day of election unconstitutional, appears to be bearing fruit. The decision is regarded as a piece of partisan trickery, and it is received with strong resentment. The nomination of English at the same time has fallen as a wet blanket upon the Indiana Democrats, and they appear indisposed to put any energy into the campaign. Whether the Supreme Court decision is or is not a partisan one cannot be determined without careful examination of it. Certainly what we have seen of the argument has led us to doubt the partisanship of it, for if the facts are as stated there would seem little

CLEAN WHEAT.

A Granger's Defense of the California Farmers.

EDS. RECORD-UNION: In the semi-weekly issue of the Record-Union of July 3d the following statement appears: "The honest Grangers have enough black sheep in the flock to give all a bad name by the attempt to fast upon our English cousins 'cheat,' specimens of our unbridled avarice, selected from our streams, fowl, and even, for true grain." The writer also mentions the statement by asserting that their (the Grangers') silence is a proof of their guilt. In order that the public may have a clearer and fuller comprehension of the true state of affairs, I would like to lay before the following facts: By anyone conversant with the cutting of grain, it is well known that during the process nothing of either adobe or sand can be mixed with the wheat. Cheat, oats, and other seeds, having a size unobtainable, though not intentionally, gathered in with the wheat, and with it placed in a sack, where they remain until threshing commences. Then the owner of the thrasher with his employees assumes the responsibility of thrashing, cleaning and sacking the grain, and it is at this time that the adulteration begins. As it is at the time of sowing the "downright dishonesty is practiced." I would ask could any man in his proper senses think for a moment that at this time an adulterator would go to the bed of a stream and haul from there several loads of gravel, and then in the presence of fifteen men, proceed to adulterate it in his grain? It seems to me to be so preposterous that it needs no argument to gainsay it. It would appear that there could be found a more convoluted and unobtainable place than the grain field of the farmer at thrashing time to effect this object. Would he be amiss to stop at the time of thrashing, might not have taken place in San Francisco? The sand hills are in close proximity to the warehouses of the grain rig, and as it is well known that a large percentage of sand enters into the adulteration of coffee, rice, sugar and various other necessities and goods in that city, is there not a strong presumption that cheat can be selected gravel with the wheat shipped to our English kinsmen took place there, rather than in the open grain field of our honest Grangers? It is a great pity that the adulteration of this sand-adulterated wheat is not at hand. It would perhaps lead to the detection of the adulteration of the parties—the Grangers or the grain-dealers. In my mind, however, no doubt exists that a careful analysis would reveal the fact that the sand found in the adulterated wheat is much nearer in quality and character to that forming the sand hills of San Francisco than to that found in the streams of our valleys.

How cheat, adobe and fowl seeds get mixed with our grain is a question of easy solution. When the bottom of the grain rig is reached, thrashing time some portion of adobe is carried up by the derrick forks and, with the grain, is fed into the machine. While passing through the separator, the adobe is not sufficiently pulverized to be blown off by the fan, and consequently it part drops into the sack. Of the other fowl seeds, which are not so easily separated from the wheat by the sieves, or wheat-stalks, as some call them. But as yet we have no screen capable of separating the cheat from wheat, but hope that before long some means will be employed to effect that purpose.

Considerable comment has been made through the press with regard to the carelessness of farmers in cleaning their wheat during the last two years, and it is not to be discriminated between clean and foul wheat during the time mentioned. The quotations were made from the unclean wheat by the buyers, and that was the maximum. Clean and foul wheat were there fore held at the same market value. Is it any wonder, then, for farmers to exhibit an apathy and carelessness in cleaning their grain? If a manufacturer only receives for a well made and neatly-fitting garment no more than the cost of the material, one would be still continue to furnish the farmer, like the manufacturer, cannot be expected to supply a clean article of grain if he can obtain no more than the cost of the grain he does for the mill. In a transaction of this kind there can be no "downright dishonesty," as the parties to the contract see by their very eyes open and are satisfied with the terms of the contract.

But, letting bygones be bygones, it is the intention of the farmers throughout the valley to clean their wheat, and to have it in the best condition for either milling or shipment. This will require additional labor, and will be equal to an extra ten per cent. of the grain value. This excess over what it would be if the wheat was left, as heretofore, in a foul condition, the buyers consent to meet in a liberal spirit, and are expected also to grade the wheat when offered for sale, and fix the rate of each grade according to its quality. It is not to be expected that this will be a proof of their sincerity in endeavoring to obtain for California wheat that prestige it once had in the English market. But should they act otherwise, and not pay the farmers a price for their wheat equal to that which a clean sample is supposed to obtain in England, then they are to be held to some trick or device, and some corner is being contemplated to cheat and defraud the poor raucous. There is but one thing more to be said. It is well known that the reticence of the Grangers in not repudiating the dishonest charges laid against them is a proof of their guilt. In reply I beg to say that the Grangers are not only a happy and healthy people, and have a rough plenty, and to maintain that condition and procure that result, they are engaged in their incessant toil and tireless exertion. They have no time for anything else. Moreover, they are educated to drive the plow and not the pen, and they are intelligent, and they believe in the teaching, that it is better to be good and happy citizens than able and subtle disputants, and respectably.

MILTON JOHNSON, Grange No. 161, Placer, Roseville, July 7, 1880.

GENERAL HANCOCK.

His Tyrannical, Pompous and Overbearing Qualities.

Dr. C. B. Hutchins, of No. 236 Taylor street, San Francisco, contributes the following to one of the newspapers of that city:

In February, 1865, I was Medical Director of the First Division of the Nineteenth Army Corps, and also Surgeon of my regiment, the One Hundred and Sixteenth New York. We were in camp around Winchester, and General Sherman let us up and sent up the Shenandoah valley to join Grant at Petersburg, General Hancock coming down to take command about the 1st of March. The weather was rainy, cold and very disagreeable. But his first order was nevertheless, to the effect that all the overcoats, boots and extra baggage be sent to the rear, as a preparation for the campaign. The order created general indignation and consternation. Both boots and overcoats were greatly needed, and as the custom had been previously to retain the overcoats until active service began, the order was generally disobeyed. In the latter part of March the division was sent to camp at Stephensons depot, and were reviewed for the first time by Hancock. On this occasion some of the shivering companies cried out "Boots, boots; overcoats, overcoats." Hancock was greatly incensed, and in spiteful indignation issued a second order that all the overcoats should be burned. This was enforced, and the next day all the long line of campfires was engaged in the consumption of the objectionable articles. The day after that Hancock apparently regretted his haste and countermanded the order. All the coats were consumed, however, and during the continuance after that of the cold spell the men on picket duty and guard suffered greatly from the exposure and a number went on the sick list. This action, and the pompous, insolent and overbearing qualities which were Hancock's chief characteristics made him very unpopular. If the Democrats rely very much on the soldiers' vote for Hancock it will serve to come from men who did not serve under him, and know him only through the papers.

Garfield is the name of a new Gunnison town in Colorado.

Garfield is the name of a new Gunnison town in Colorado.

Garfield is the name of a new Gunnison town in Colorado.

Garfield is the name of a new Gunnison town in Colorado.

Garfield is the name of a new Gunnison town in Colorado.

Garfield is the name of a new Gunnison town in Colorado.

GRANT ON HANCOCK.

A note, purporting to be written by General Grant, has been published by the Chicago Advance. It is in answer to statements that he had declared himself in favor of Hancock. We cannot say whether the note is genuine, but it certainly sounds like Grant. He is represented as writing: "I have nothing to say against General Hancock. I have known him for forty years. His personal, official and military record is good. The record of the party which has put him in nomination is 'bad.' Whether or not Grant wrote this, it is a forcible way of putting the case, and it contains the whole argument of the campaign in a nut-shell. It is not the record of Hancock, but the record of the party which has put him in nomination, that is in question. It is the record of that party that must decide the preferences of voters. The Democracy cannot hide behind an individual, though it would doubtless like to do so. It will be dragged out and compelled to face the country. Its record is not good, whatever Hancock's may be, and that is the essential consideration.

Grant on Hancock.

A note, purporting to be written by General Grant, has been published by the Chicago Advance. It is in answer to statements that he had declared himself in favor of Hancock. We cannot say whether the note is genuine, but it certainly sounds like Grant. He is represented as writing: "I have nothing to say against General Hancock. I have known him for forty years. His personal, official and military record is good. The record of the party which has put him in nomination is 'bad.' Whether or not Grant wrote this, it is a forcible way of putting the case, and it contains the whole argument of the campaign in a nut-shell. It is not the record of Hancock, but the record of the party which has put him in nomination, that is in question. It is the record of that party that must decide the preferences of voters. The Democracy cannot hide behind an individual, though it would doubtless like to do so. It will be dragged out and compelled to face the country. Its record is not good, whatever Hancock's may be, and that is the essential consideration.

Grant on Hancock.

A note, purporting to be written by General Grant, has been published by the Chicago Advance. It is in answer to statements that he had declared himself in favor of Hancock. We cannot say whether the note is genuine, but it certainly sounds like Grant. He is represented as writing: "I have nothing to say against General Hancock. I have known him for forty years. His personal, official and military record is good. The record of the party which has put him in nomination is 'bad.' Whether or not Grant wrote this, it is a forcible way of putting the case, and it contains the whole argument of the campaign in a nut-shell. It is not the record of Hancock, but the record of the party which has put him in nomination, that is in question. It is the record of that party that must decide the preferences of voters. The Democracy cannot hide behind an individual, though it would doubtless like to do so. It will be dragged out and compelled to face the country. Its record is not good, whatever Hancock's may be, and that is the essential consideration.

Grant on Hancock.

A note, purporting to be written by General Grant, has been published by the Chicago Advance. It is in answer to statements that he had declared himself in favor of Hancock. We cannot say whether the note is genuine, but it certainly sounds like Grant. He is represented as writing: "I have nothing to say against General Hancock. I have known him for forty years. His personal, official and military record is good. The record of the party which has put him in nomination is 'bad.' Whether or not Grant wrote this, it is a forcible way of putting the case, and it contains the whole argument of the campaign in a nut-shell. It is not the record of Hancock, but the record of the party which has put him in nomination, that is in question. It is the record of that party that must decide the preferences of voters. The Democracy cannot hide behind an individual, though it would doubtless like to do so. It will be dragged out and compelled to face the country. Its record is not good, whatever Hancock's may be, and that is the essential consideration.

Grant on Hancock.

Grant on Hancock.