

THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE

(ESTABLISHED 1877.)

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

TO CARE FOR HIM WHO HAS FIGHTED THE BATTLE, AND FOR HIS WIDOW AND ORPHANS.—ARTHUR LINDEN.

TERMS TO SUBSCRIBERS, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE:

Table with 2 columns: Term, Price. ONE COPY, ONE YEAR \$1.00; FIVE COPIES 6.25; ONE COPY THREE MONTHS .50; ONE COPY SIX MONTHS .75; TEN COPIES, WITH EXTRA COPY TO OUTSTANDING OF CLUB 12.50.

A SPECIMEN NUMBER OF OUR PAPER SENT FREE ON REQUEST.

TERMS FOR ADVERTISING FURNISHED UPON APPLICATION.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—WHEN CHANGING YOUR ADDRESS PLEASE GIVE FURNISH AS WELL AS PRESENT ADDRESS, WITH COUNTY AND STATE.

TAKE NOTICE.—IN SENDING MONEY FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS BY MAIL, NEVER ENCLOSE THE CURRENCY EXCEPT IN A REGISTERED LETTER. A POSTAL MONEY ORDER OR A DRAFT ON NEW YORK IS THE BEST FORM OF REMITTANCE. LOANERS BY MAIL WILL BE MOST SUICIDALLY AVOIDED BY THESE DIRECTIONS ARE FULLY.

NO RESPONSIBILITY IS ASSUMED FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS PAID TO AGENTS, WHICH MUST BE AT THE RISK OF THE SUBSCRIBER.

COMMUNICATIONS, SUBSCRIPTIONS, AND LETTERS UPON ALL BUSINESS MATTERS RELATING TO THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE, MUST BE ADDRESSED TO—

THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE, 615 FIFTEENTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The National Tribune

THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE IS PUBLISHED FOR THE UNITED STATES AUTHORIZED BY LAW, PRINTING BEING PERMITTED BY ACT OF CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 23, 1873, CHAP. 25, SECTION 1103, AND BY ACT OF CONGRESS, MARCH 3, 1879, CHAP. 28, SECTION 1103.

ENTERED AT THE POSTOFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 22, 1882.

WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 22, 1882.

In forwarding his subscription for THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE from Lawrence, Mass., Gen. Geo. S. Merrill, Post-Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, says:

The bold advocacy of THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE of the rights of the soldier is my hearty approval. Keep on as you have begun, and do not consider your work unprofitable until every soldier who is called to a pension receives it, and every soldier's widow and every soldier's child are provided for by the Government. (Signed) GEO. S. MERRILL.

Immediately after his election as Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Encampment General Fandervoort forwarded to THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE the following strong endorsement:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 24, 1882. I cordially approve of the endorsement given by Post-Commander-in-Chief Merrill to THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE. I consider it the best paper devoted to the interests of the soldier published in the country. I cordially commend it to all comrades of the Order. PAUL VAN DYKHOFF, Commander-in-Chief, G. A. R.

THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE ought to be in the hands of every ex-soldier and sailor in the land, and it soon will be if our subscribers will but exert themselves to organize clubs in the neighborhoods where they reside. Remember the subscription price until the 1st of October is but one dollar per year.

THE RIVER and Harbor appropriation bill this year takes \$22,000,000 out of the Treasury. We observe that however indignant our Congressmen may wax over the payment of pensions they manifest no compensations of conscience when it comes to securing a slice of this congressional campaign fund.

WE TRUST our comrades of the Grand Army will show their appreciation of THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE in deeds as well as words. Between now and the 1st of October we want to have a club of subscribers in every Post in the country, and to secure that result it is only necessary that our friends in the Order should make a personal canvass among their comrades. Call the roll, and let every man subscribe when his name is called!

SENATOR BECK wants the name of every pensioner published in the newspapers, in order to guard against fraud! But that would cost great deal of money! Why not brand every pensioner with the letters "U. S. P.?" It would be cheaper and doubtless just as agreeable to the feelings of our ex-soldiers and sailors—if, indeed, Senator Beck is willing to admit that they have "feelings" like other people!

THE resignation of Mr. Bright deprives Mr. Gladstone of one of the ablest members of his Cabinet, but it is hardly likely that the difference of opinion which has arisen between them on the Egyptian question will result in a permanent estrangement. John Bright is a Liberal by nature, and it would take a revolution to change his political convictions. In fact, he is almost an American in his sturdy belief in the sovereignty of the people and his opposition to the policy of foreign aggrandisement, and we should like to naturalize a few such Englishmen as he for the regeneration of our own politics.

THE death of Mrs. Lincoln, the widow of our first martyr-President, cannot but be regarded as a happy release for a lady who had far more than her share of earthly pain and sorrow. Indeed, it might almost be said that she died by the same bullet that killed her husband, for the shock so wrought upon her nervous organization that she never afterwards regained control of her physical or mental faculties. The story of her seventeen years of widowhood is one of the saddest on record. For her, life afforded no consolation, and Time, which usually is a solace for all mortal griefs, failed to temper the soreness of her affliction. Racked with disease, she sought in vain a way of escape from her sufferings until she found it at last where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." Heaven grant that life may wear a brighter aspect for Mrs. Garfield than it had for Mrs. Lincoln!

Let the Revenues Alone! For the past week the Senate has been struggling with the Kelley Internal Revenue bill—changed now so much, alas! that we fear its author would never recognize it in its present shape—and the further the debate has progressed the more evident it has become that no matter in what form it finally becomes a law the Republicans are not likely to profit by it politically. Indeed, even at this late day, it would be an act of wisdom on their part to lay it over until the December session. The Kelley bill in its original shape was a comparatively unobjectionable measure, and although we have never believed that the time had come when a reduction of internal revenue taxation could be justified on grounds of public policy, the amount involved—less than twenty millions of dollars—was so trifling that we felt indisposed to antagonize it. From the first, however, it was evident that the Democrats as a body, and a considerable number of Republicans also, were in favor of making much more sweeping reductions than the bill contemplated, and but for the able leadership of Judge Kelley it would doubtless have been immediately amended before it left the House.

It is now to be regretted that it passed at all, for when reported from the Senate Finance Committee its scope was found to have been so enlarged by amendments as to provide for a reduction of forty millions in the revenues, or more than twice the amount provided for in the original measure. At present writing the bill is still under discussion in the Senate—where the previous question is unknown and the largest liberty of debate is allowed—and the Democrats, taking advantage of the opening afforded by the Republicans themselves, are making the most strenuous exertions to secure still further reductions. The whisky and the tobacco interests, as well as the sugar interest, have their special champions on the floor of the Senate, and to read the latter's eloquent appeals one might suppose that the country was being ruined by excessive taxation, instead of enjoying, as is the fact, an unprecedented and unexampled prosperity.

Now, if the Government had at this time discharged or made adequate provision for the discharge of all its obligations—if the public debt were paid off and all that is due or will be due in the shape of pensions and bounties to our ex-soldiers and sailors also liquidated—none would more earnestly advocate a reduction of internal revenue taxation than ourselves; but it is contrary to all business principles, the observance of which is quite as essential to the conduct of public as private affairs, to do so while these obligations remain unsatisfied. What would be thought in the business world of a merchant who should release his debtors from their obligations before he had paid his creditors?

It is true that there was a surplus of \$150,000,000 in the Treasury at the close of the last fiscal year, and there is likely to be a goodly surplus also at the expiration of the present year, but every cent will be required to meet the charges upon the Government now existing or that will be created before the dissolution of the present Congress, and to cut off this surplus revenue is practically to stop the process of debt paying and ultimately to create a deficit which will have to be met out of the revenues of some future year. Under the Arrears Act and the provision of this year's Legislative, Executive, and Judicial bill, increasing the force in the Pension and kindred offices so as to admit of the adjustment of all pending claims within the next three years, there will be required some \$400,000,000 to meet the fixed obligations of the Government on account of pensions alone, and unless Congress proposes to repudiate this most sacred of all debts we do not see how it can justify any reduction of the revenue. One may obtain absolution for his sins, but "pay day" is something that neither individuals nor nations can escape.

We need hardly say that for our ex-soldiers and sailors this proposed reduction of the revenues possesses a vital personal interest. Should the bill now pending become a law it will not only prove a serious obstacle to all pension legislation in the future, but perhaps embarrass the operation of existing laws. Such a result would not be merely deplorable—it would be ruinous to many thousands whom the inexorable delay in the adjustment of pension claims has kept for months and years in a state between hope and despair, the prey of poverty and the victims of ingratitude. We feel, therefore, that even at this eleventh hour they should make an effort to prevent the passage of the now mis-named Kelley bill, or, failing that, to secure a presidential veto. Let every reader of THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE and our soldiers and sailors generally write at once to their Representatives in Congress and the Senators of the several States and urge them to cast their votes against this measure. It has not been brought forward in response to any public demand, it is designed to benefit the rich manufacturer rather than the poor consumer, and there is not a single business interest in the country that will suffer by its defeat. The banks, the patent medicine makers, and sugar monopolists may miss an opportunity to put another fortune in their already swollen pockets, but that is all. The country, as a whole, was never so prosperous as to day, nor did the burden of internal revenue taxation ever sit so lightly on the shoulders of the people. Let the revenues alone! That is the cry that should go up to Congress from the home of every veteran in the land.

The Pension Bill. The annual Pension appropriation bill passed the Senate on Saturday last in substantially the same form in which it came from the House, none of the amendments adopted affecting the general scope or purpose of the measure. The total amount appropriated by the bill is, in round numbers, one hundred millions of dollars, or all that was estimated for by Commissioner Dudley, and it is a cause for substantial satisfaction that in spite of the hostility of such journals as the New York Herald and Sun, both Houses of Congress have had the manliness to vote the money. Of the amendments to the bill, those which attracted the most attention in the Senate were Section 5, which prohibits the drawing of double pensions except by the express authority of Congress—a provision made necessary by the recent extraordinary ruling of the Attorney-General that the present law sanctions the drawing by the same person of one pension under the general law and another under a special act, even when the language of the act is that the second pension is granted in lieu of the first—and the last paragraph of section 4, which reads as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior shall annually hereafter transmit to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a list of all persons borne on the pension rolls, classified according to their post-office address by States and counties, the amount paid annually to each, and also a statement of each year of those dropped from the rolls and those added to the rolls."

The object of this amendment, we suppose, was two-fold: to guard against fraud and facilitate the labors of the Pension Committees, and we were not disposed to take serious exception to it, although we do not think it was likely to accomplish much good in any direction and we can conceive of circumstances under which it might have been productive of great harm—as, for instance, had copies of the list of pensioners fallen into the hands of "confidence men," the managers of so-called "gift enterprises," and other swindlers of that type. As the amendment was ruled out on a point of order, however, it is now of no consequence what would have been its effect. Mr. Beck's amendment, which was offered in the Senate during the final debate upon the passage of the bill on Saturday last, was to the effect that the Commissioner of Pensions should be required once in each year to publish in at least one newspaper in every county in the United States a list of all pensioners and applicants for pensions residing in that county, and also put the list at every post-office; and, under the pretence that such public advertisement was necessary to the prevention and exposure of fraud and that it was desired and demanded by the soldiers themselves, Mr. Beck made a characteristic speech in its support. He was ably answered

by Mr. Sherman, who pointed out that while it would be well to have a list of pensioners, it would be equally well to have a list of all the people in the country, and that the publication of such a list would be a public exposure of all the secrets of the Government. Mr. Beck's amendment was not adopted, and the bill passed without it. We trust our readers will not fail to give it a most careful perusal. As we have before had occasion to remark, the most dangerous enemies of the soldiers in Congress are not those who openly avow their opposition to the payment of pensions, but men like Senator Beck, who, while pretending to be concerned only in the protection of the Government against fraud, seek to make the whole body of our pensioners the object of public suspicion, and this last attempt cannot but be regarded as the most invidious of all. Hitherto they have contented themselves with making general charges of fraud against the pension establishment, based chiefly upon ex-Commissioner Bentley's ex-parte statements, which the records of the Pension Bureau itself prove to have been essentially false, and demanding the enactment of more rigorous laws for the detection and punishment of these alleged frauds, but this latest proposition is in the nature of an indictment of the entire pension list and its purpose is evidently to bring the very name of "pensioner" into opprobrium. How utterly without justification it was and how clearly prompted by malice may be seen from the fact that the laws and regulations already in force are amply sufficient to protect the Pension Bureau against fraud, and that by the terms of the very bill to which this amendment of Senator Beck's was intended to apply the Commissioner of Pensions is invested with the most extraordinary powers for the investigation of suspicious cases. By section 3, he is empowered to summon through the United States courts any number of witnesses (whose testimony can be taken by any of his employees when he may delegate for the purpose) to prove the fraudulent character of a claim, while the claimant, on his part, is denied that right in toto. If, with such discretionary powers, the Commissioner cannot prevent or detect fraud, it may well be said that it is only because fraud does not exist. It is conceivable, therefore, that Senator Beck's amendment should have been originated as a necessary measure of precaution against fraud, and it is but fair to infer, as we have already done, that it was contrived for the purpose of bringing our pensioners generally into disrepute. Consider what would be the effect of such a public advertisement as Senator Beck proposed. As well might Congress require our pensioners to wear the striped garb of a penitentiary convict or order them to be branded over the manner of the French prison system with the letter "P"—pensioner or pauper, whichever you please! Our ex-soldiers and sailors would feel the disgrace just as keenly. Whatever Senator Beck may think, they, at least, do not consider that in becoming pensioners of the Government they have surrendered any of the rights of citizenship or are less worthy of public esteem and respect than when they were fighting the battles of their country, and they could not but feel humiliated and degraded by having their names paraded before the public through the columns of the newspapers as persons suspected of fraud. It is all very well for Senator Beck to say that no honest man would object to having his name so published; but how, we should like to know, is even an honest man to escape suspicion when the mere publication of the list is equivalent to an announcement that some of those on it are believed to be swindlers? How would Senator Beck like to see his name published in a list of Congressmen suspected of having been bribed to pass certain measures? We can imagine with what a show of virtuous indignation the Senator from Kentucky would denounce such an outrage. Yet it is precisely such a slight that he proposed to put upon the men who preserved the Union. The contempt and scorn of the whole country should go out to the author of that proposition and drive him into permanent retirement.

We have said nothing of the enormous expense in which the adoption of Senator Beck's proposition would have involved the Government, nor do we propose to consider the subject from that point of view. The question of expense is of small consequence compared with that of personal reputation, and it is enough to forever damn any plan for the prevention of frauds in the pension service to show that it implicates the innocent as well as the guilty and places an indelible stigma upon a class of men to whose loyalty and valor this Republic owes its very existence. Rather than that they should ever be made the victims of such a cruel injustice we would have the Government abolish the whole pension service, repudiate all its obligations, and relegate to the States and to individual patriotism the proud duty of caring for our defenders!

rendered any of the rights of citizenship or are less worthy of public esteem and respect than when they were fighting the battles of their country, and they could not but feel humiliated and degraded by having their names paraded before the public through the columns of the newspapers as persons suspected of fraud. It is all very well for Senator Beck to say that no honest man would object to having his name so published; but how, we should like to know, is even an honest man to escape suspicion when the mere publication of the list is equivalent to an announcement that some of those on it are believed to be swindlers? How would Senator Beck like to see his name published in a list of Congressmen suspected of having been bribed to pass certain measures? We can imagine with what a show of virtuous indignation the Senator from Kentucky would denounce such an outrage. Yet it is precisely such a slight that he proposed to put upon the men who preserved the Union. The contempt and scorn of the whole country should go out to the author of that proposition and drive him into permanent retirement.

Under the most favorable circumstances it will take more than twenty years to restore Alexandria to its former state. In this simple statement is summed up the practical results of the British bombardment. Naval experts may differ as to the effectiveness of the British fire, but it is certain that a single day's cannonading sufficed to reduce the Egyptian forts to ruins and compel Arabi Pacha to beat a hasty retreat with the remnants of his army, under the cover of a flag of truce, to which he resorted, it seems, solely to secure time in which to effect his escape. The destruction of Alexandria, however, cannot be charged to the operations of the fleet, inasmuch as the firing and sacking of the city was the work of the Egyptian soldiers; and any feeling of sympathy that might otherwise be aroused for Arabi Pacha as a leader of the National party is likely to be checked by the contemplation of the city which he displayed.

American patriots are not in the habit of ordering and burning their own cities, or of ordering an indiscriminate massacre of helpless strangers; and even were we disposed to champion the cause of the Egyptian Nationalists, we should be compelled to hang his leader as the first step towards making it respectable! As it is, the contest over the re-establishment of the authority of the Khedive is one that fortunately does not concern this Republic, and we are not likely to run any greater risk of being involved in it than when Admiral Nicholson threatened to fire back if the Egyptian forts attacked the hulks under his command. The Admiral evidently had all the pluck of his predecessors in the days when we really had a navy, but it is a fortunate thing that he was not called upon to make good his word. Otherwise the sinking of two American men-of-war would probably have been among the losses incident to the capture of the city.

We suppose there are those who envy England the position which she occupies as the arbiter of the destinies of nations, and would like to see our own Republic called on, once in a while, to settle international disputes with shell and shrapnel, but to our thinking we are much better off as it is. We have something better to engage our energies than the partition of Turkey, the conquest of Afghanistan, or the subjugation of the Transvaal. The money which other nations expend in keeping up immense standing armies and constructing forts and building navies is in this country needed for the extension of railroads, the development of mines, and the erection of manufactories. The labor that in Europe is impressed for military purposes is with us required for the felling of forests, the taming of the wilderness, and the opening up of all our virgin resources. We have territory enough already; the greatness of other nations does not menace our own security; we have no traditional supremacy to maintain and no legendary insults to avenge. It is all one to us whether Bismarck or Gambetta holds the balance of Continental power; in short, there is no reason why we should envy either the glory or the power of England. If, therefore, any of our fellow-citizens are disposed to bewail our lack of influence in the affairs of the old world and lament that American cannon were not heard at Alexandria, let them console themselves with the thought that we enjoy all the fruits of conquest without any of its responsibilities. The peace of Europe is never sought but an armed truce, liable to be rudely broken at any moment by the intrigues of diplomats and the clash of conflicting ambitions, but with us it is a fixed and stable possession, born of a Government based upon the consent of the governed; and the ever-rising tide of immigration which breaks upon our shores testifies more strongly to the real greatness of the new world than all the triumphs of the sword to the greatness of

the old. While the guns of England bear upon the city of Alexandria and the conference of the Powers is settling the future of Egypt at Constantinople, there is nothing to disturb our tranquillity. We are under no necessity of enslaving a whole nation in order to protect our commerce or secure us against loss in foreign bond speculations, and the mere Powers of Europe wrangle, "snarling at each other's heels," the greater profit which we shall realize from our wheat and corn and beef and pork. Let us be thankful that it is so, and while we deplore the congressional neglect which has effaced the prestige of our navy and dimmed the glory of our mercantile marine, rejoice that as yet we have no enemies to take advantage of what is at once our strength and our weakness.

A Correspondent Answered.

Nothing, as we have frequently had occasion to remark, affords us greater pleasure than to answer the inquiries propounded to us by our readers and subscribers. Their letters testify to the interest which they feel in THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE and its work, and are, upon the whole, a pretty reliable index of the sentiment of the country at large. Indeed, our Soldiers' Column has grown to be one of THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE'S most attractive features, and did space permit we could fill a whole page weekly with opinions of our veterans on matters connected with their interests. Among the most interesting letters which we have lately received is one from a member of "Company E, Eighty-seventh Indiana volunteers," who writes us in deprecation of the way in which some of our correspondents speak of the bondholders. He writes: "By some means a sample copy of your paper reached my humble home a few weeks ago, and so well pleased was I with it that I immediately subscribed for it and am well satisfied with the investment. I find many things to admire in the several departments, and especially in 'Our Soldiers' Column.' There seems, however, to be one feeling largely prevailing the minds of correspondents to this column which I exceedingly regret to observe. Reference is intended to the stereotyped fling at the 'bondholders.' Where would these soldier correspondents have been had our capitalists withheld their money and refused to become bondholders during the dark days of the rebellion? Could they have lived on patriotism alone? Could the Government have supported the army without the bondholders' money? Certainly not. And again, would these same soldier correspondents be proud of a Nation of fifty-millions of people with boundless resources who would break faith with the men—grand, patriotic men—who furnished the wherewithal to clothe, feed, and shelter its army, taking as security its bonds, notwithstanding that nearly one-half of its inhabitants were in arms against it? Not so! I am sure these correspondents don't want the Government to break faith with its capitalists, but somehow they have dropped into a rambling style of making invidious comparisons between the bondholder and the soldier, etc., etc."

The complaint which our correspondent makes is far from groundless, but he fails to take into account the fact that it is the pensioners rather than the bondholders who have generally been the objects of attack in the newspapers and in Congress, and the invidious comparisons were first made by enemies of the soldier, who sought to defeat his claims by charging that if granted by the Government they would cost almost as much as the public debt. So far as THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE is concerned it has always stoutly affirmed the sanctity of the Government's obligations to the bondholders—indeed it carries that motto at the head of its editorial columns—and all that it has asked for the soldier is that he should be placed on an equal footing with the latter. It is very true that without the aid of our capitalists who invested their money in United States bonds the Government would not have been able to equip and maintain its land and naval forces in the late war, and the rebellion could not have been put down, but we are not prepared to admit that the services which they rendered were more worthy of recognition than those which were performed by the men who placed their lives at the disposal of the Republic. The bondholders were regularly paid a handsome rate of interest on their loans to the Government, as indeed the terms of their loans required, and they reaped a profitable reward as a result of the confidence which they displayed in the stability of the Union. The war enriched instead of impoverishing them, and we doubt not that they would jump at the opportunity to lend their money again on such favorable conditions. The men who gave their lives in stead of lending their money to the Union died very differently. They received only the ordinary army wages during the war and were dependent upon the gratitude of the Government for the care of their families in case of death; those who survived at the close of the rebellion found themselves under the harsh necessity of beginning anew the struggle for existence, and compared with their position the position of the bondholders was an enviable one indeed. All that they have demanded or have asked from the Government is that it should make good its promises in regard to the pensioning of their disabled comrades and the widows and orphans of the dead, and if some of them have shown a disposition to make "invidious comparisons," as our correspondent charges, it must be borne in mind that their claims have been subjected to a delay which the bondholders were never made the victims of. They felt, as was but natural, that they had a right to expect equal consideration, and they can scarcely be blamed for regarding the latter as an unduly privileged class. They saw the settlement

of the claims pending in the Pension Bureau deferred year after year purely from the lack of a sufficient clerical force to dispatch the business of the office, while a force of sufficient strength was always employed in the Treasury Department to pay the bondholders with the promptness and regularity of clock-work, and they would have been less than human had they not made some comparison between the two. The comparisons, moreover, were just and we are fair to believe that they have had a wholesome effect upon the action of Congress. It would be a grave mistake, however, to suppose for a moment that our soldiers are now or have at any time been in favor of repudiation. On the contrary, they have steadily and consistently upheld the sanctity of the national debt and they ask nothing more than that the Government shall display the same sense of honor in dealing with its soldier creditors that it has shown in its treatment of the bondholders.

ELSEWHERE in these columns we have set forth at some length the reasons why it would be unwise, in our judgment, to pass the bill now pending in the Senate for the reduction of internal revenue taxation, but we desire to call special attention to the fact that while the object of the measure is ostensibly to lighten the burdens of the people its effect is simply to cut down the revenues. Consider the items separately. The repeal of the tax on bank capital involves a reduction of \$81,000; how are the public to be benefited thereby? The revenue sacrificed by taking off the tax on bank deposits is \$2,950,000; the banking business is profitable enough without this extra plum. The check-stamp tax—which costs nothing to collect—yields a revenue of \$2,254,000, and it falls upon a class that are abundantly able to bear it. The tax on matches produces \$3,278,000; the chances are that the match monopolists will pocket this sum without making any reduction to the consumer, unless driven to it by the competition of smaller dealers. Proprietary medicines, perfumery, &c., pay an annual tax of \$1,843,000, and the manufacturers openly admit that they do not intend to reduce the price of their goods if the tax is taken off, and for the simple reason that their articles are generally retailed at twenty-five or fifty cents and it would be impracticable to make a change of a cent or two in these prices. Here, then, is a total of \$11,135,000 reduction in the revenues without practically any reduction at all in taxation. In the case of tobacco, the consumer really will benefit to some extent by the proposed reduction; but even then there is this drawback, that it will cost the Government just as much to collect a fraction as the whole of its present revenue from this source, so that either the tax on tobacco should be abolished entirely or left as it is. As for sugar (\$10,000,000 reduction) and Bessemer steel rails (\$1,338,000 reduction), we confess our total inability to account for the sudden change of front which some of our Republican friends exhibit in regard to these articles. It amounts to an acknowledgment on their part that now that they have created a Tariff Commission they are unwilling to await the results of its deliberations. It is a shocking mess all round, and the best thing Congress can do is to let the revenues alone.

ALTHOUGH that feature of Mr. Beck's amendment to the Pension bill which related to the advertising of the Pension lists in the newspapers was the principal subject of attack during the debate in the Senate last Saturday, it was not a whit more obnoxious than the provision for the posting of the lists "in some conspicuous place" at every post-office in the country, side by side, no doubt, with bills offering rewards for the arrest of horse thieves and murderers. It is idle to pretend that this would only be treating our pensioners as the Government is in the habit of treating all its employees, whose names and salaries are regularly published in the Blue Books, or in the latter case the newspapers made to Congress only. As Senator Logan well said: "This thing of publishing the names in the newspapers, and posting them up in the post-offices all over the country, is as offensive to any man of reasonable nature. I do not mean an offense intended; I mean that it is the effect of it, and it would have that effect upon me if I were a pensioner and my name was posted up in my neighborhood, so that my neighbors could look at it and examine and see whether I was a thief or not." But the offense that it would give our pensioners is not, in our judgment, the strongest objection that could be urged against it. The personal humiliation to which it would subject them is a small consequence compared to the mental injury which it would cause them. The millions would jump at the opportunity to cast discredit upon the legality of their claims, and every man who did not bear upon his person the visible signs of his disability,—as well as every widow and orphan,—might be put to the hardship of re-establishing his eligibility merely to satisfy a private grudge. It would be shameful, even, and barbarous to place our pensioners at the mercy of all the gossip, title-tattlers, and slanders in the country, and no one but an inveterate enemy like Senator Beck would have the heart to propose such an outrage.

Now is the time to subscribe for THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE. The fall elections are approaching and THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE will be "highly interesting reading" for the balance of the year. Until October 1st we will receive subscriptions at one dollar per year.

We enclose a large amount of space this week to the "Soldiers' Column." These letters from comrades will be found interesting reading, and as they reach every member of Congress our efforts in behalf of the soldiers are supplemented by their publication.