New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS.

THE DAILY REPUBLICAN

published every day (Sundays excepted) at 92 Camp street. Terms: $10 a year, $6 for six months; $3 for three months—payable invariably in advance. Single copies five cents.

Office—No. 92 Camp Street.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Squares.	One month.	Two months	Three months	Six months	One year.
One	$10	$18	$24	$40	$60
Two	18	26	38	60	80
Three	24	34	48	80	110
Four	30	44	66	100	135
Five	35	54	80	115	160
Six	40	64	94	130	185
Seven	45	74	108	135	210
Eight	50	84	122	150	235
Nine	55	94	136	165	260
Ten	60	104	150	180	285
Eleven	65	114	164	195	310
Twelve	70	124	178	210	335
Thirteen	75	134	192	225	360
Fourteen	80	144	206	240	385
Fifteen	85	154	220	255	410
Thirty	120	250	375	500	750

Monthly advertisements, inserted every other day, to be charged two-thirds of the above rates.

Second page monthly advertisements, each square, $20 per month.

Transient advertisements, having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 per square; each subsequent insertion fifty cents per square.

Second page transient advertisements, each insertion, $1 per square.

Advertisements inserted at intervals to be charged as new each insertion.

Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, will be allowed such discount from above named transient rates as may be agreed upon; provided, that in no case shall such discount exceed twenty-five per cent.

All business notices of advertisements to be charged twenty cents per line for each insertion.

THE WEEKLY REPUBLICAN

is published every Saturday morning, and contains the news by telegraph, miscellaneous reading, editorials, local matters of general public interest, commercial and monetary reports, and everything that appears in the Daily, except such items as are of little or no public moment. The WEEKLY REPUBLICAN is an excellent family paper, valuable as well for instruction and amusement as information on the current topics of the day.

Terms of Subscription.

One year, $5; six months, $3 50.

A liberal commission allowed to those who send in clubs of five or more.

Advertisements.

Transient advertisements same terms as in the Daily. Monthly advertisements inserted for one-fourth of the daily rates.

HAWAIIAN TREATY.

Speech of Hon. Randall L. Gibson, of Louisiana, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, April 6, 1876.

The House being in committee of the whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (House resolution No. 612) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, signed on the thirtieth day of January, 1875—

Mr. Gibson said:

Mr. Chairman—The considerations which have been offered by the members of the Committee of Ways and Means, who reported this bill to carry into effect the convention with his majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, have not been of a character to induce me to support it. It might be imagined, from the remarks which have fallen from gentlemen in favor of this measure, that there was no existing treaty between the United States and his majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, or that some great public exigency had arisen demanding the convention submitted for our approval.

But so far from this being true, we have already a treaty between the United States and his majesty the King of the Sandwich Islands, proclaimed on the ninth of November, 1850, which I venture to assert will be found upon examination to be more satisfactory in every respect than the convention which is before us. I invite the attention of members of this committee to the careful consideration of the articles of the treaty of 1850 before they commit themselves to the abrogation of that treaty, or to the new policy upon which this proposed convention gets.

If gentlemen will examine especially article two of that treaty, they will find that it provides especially that no higher duties shall be placed upon the imports from this country than upon the imports from any other country with which his Majesty may hold relations; that no other State shall enjoy any favor, privilege or immunity whatever in matters of commerce and navigation which shall not also upon like conditions be extended to the people of this country. Look also at article four, which provides "that no duties of tonnage, harbor, lighthouses, pilotage, quarantine, or that other similar duties of whatever nature or under whatever denomination, shall be imposed in either country upon the vessels of the other in respect of voyages between the United States of America and the Hawaiian Islands, which shall not be imposed in like cases on national vessels." Also at—

"ART. 6. Steam vessels of the United States which may be employed by the government of the said States in the carrying of their public mails across the Pacific Ocean, or from one port in that ocean to another, shall have free access to the ports of the Sandwich Islands, with the privilege of stopping therein—"

Now, mark the language—

"To refit, to refresh, to land passengers, and their baggage, and for the transaction of any business pertaining to the public mail service of the United States, and shall be subject in such ports to no duties of tonnage, harbor, lighthouse, quarantine, or other similar duties, of whatever nature or under whatever denomination."

There are also very liberal provisions in favor of our steam vessels. Then there is a rendezvous for our whaling ships and ample provision for their security. Then, sir, the like privilege of frequenting the same ports of the Sandwich Islands named in this article is also guaranteed to the public armed vessels of the United States. Our citizens who are resident in that country possess nearly all the privileges that citizens of one State of this Union enjoy in another—the right to manage their business, liberty of trade, liberty of conscience; in a word, complete protection and security in the enjoyment of all rights and privileges cherished as fundamental by American freemen.

Whence, then, arises the necessity for the abrogation of a treaty which has continued to foster friendly and multiplying relations between the people of the two countries for so long a period? Is there anything in the present state of trade and commerce which calls for or will justify a departure from the wise policy which has up to this time been pursued. Let us look for a moment at the facts. According to the tables furnished by the Bureau of Statistics it appears that the value of the imports into the United States from the Hawaiian islands during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1871, was $1,153,154; for 1872, $1,285,320; for 1873, $1,316,270, and for 1874, $1,017,172, while the exports to those islands were in 1871, $840,385; in 1872, $620,295; in 1873, $654,103; and in 1874, $623,280.

And in order that it may be fully seen what commodities enter into these exchanges, I invite attention to the annexed tables marked A and B.

These tables show that the total value of all dutiable commodities imported into the United States from the islands during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1875, was $1,053,420. The value of sugar, molasses and melado amounted to $948,379; of rice, to $60,000; miscellaneous articles to less than $40,000. Their exports consist of sugar and rice. The total value of all commodities imported into the islands from this country for that year amounted to $655,154.

Mr. Charles Nordhoff, on page eighty-nine of his interesting book on Northern California, Oregon and the Sandwich Islands, furnishes the following valuable statements with regard to those islands, showing the supremacy which the United States has achieved under the wise policy of the treaty of 1850. He says:

"The annual report of 1872 of imports and exports made up by the collectors-general of the Hawaiian kingdom, shows how completely the islands depend upon the United States. Of 146 merchant vessels and 2 steamers entered at Hawaiian ports during 1872, ninety were American, one-fifth were English, six were German, and the balance in other nations, and twenty-five Hawaiian. Of a total of 98,642 tons of shipping, 73,975 were Americans, 6714 Hawaiian and but 7741 British. Of forty-seven whaling vessels calling at the island ports two Hawaiian and three British.

"Of a little less than 16,000,000 pounds of sugar exported during the same year, 14,500,000, and of 1,349,503 pounds of rice and paddy exported 1,317,903 pounds came to the United States. All the cotton, all the goat-skins, nearly all the hides, all the wool, the greater part of the peanuts and the molasses, and almost the whole of the products of the islands are sent to the United States. On the other hand, of $1,234,[illegible], the value of duty paying merchandise imported during 1872 into the islands, $806,111 came from the United States, $155,939 from Great Britain and $105,396 from Germany. Besides this, of the total value of bonded goods, $349,435, the large amount of $135,487 was brought from sea by whalemen, almost all of whom were Americans, and $99,567 were goods from the United States. Bonded importations: $235,090 of American products, against $21,801 of British and $23,904 of German.

"It is plain the island trade is so largely in our hands that no other nation can be said to dispute it with us. If our flag flew over Honolulu we could hardly expect to have a more complete monopoly of Hawaiian commerce than we already enjoy. Moreover, almost all the sugar plantations, the most productive and valuable property on the islands, are owned by Americans, and the same is true of the greater number of stock farms. Our political predominance is as complete on the islands as our commercial. In the present cabinet all the ministers except one are Americans. This was true also of the cabinet of the late King. Of the Supreme Court, two of the judges are Americans and one is German. Almost all of the executive or administrative offices are in the hands of Americans or Hawaiians. What the islands are they are because of American effort, American enterprise, American capital. American missionaries civilize them. Americans gave them laws wisely adapted to the customs and habits of their people. American enterprise and Boston capital established the sugar culture and other of the important industries.

"If the islands ever offer themselves to any foreign power, it will be to the United States. Their people, foreign as well as native, look to none their neighbors and friends; and the King last summer courted out-one day, when too much wine had made him imprudent, this truth, that if annexation came, it must be to the United States. As I write, a negotiation has been opened with the United States government for the purpose of offering us Pearl river in exchange for a reciprocity treaty. In our present condition the chief use of distant naval stations appears to me to be as convenient out-of-the-way places for wasting the public money. Pearl river would be an admirable spot for a dozen pleasant sinecures and the expenditure of three or four millions of money. It seems to me, therefore, it would be a dear bargain. For the accommodation of merchant steamers and ships Honolulu offers sufficient facilities. There are ingenious American mechanics who have taken a frigate upon a temporary dry dock and repaired her hull."

Now, it is plain that all the commodities which are exported from these islands, that every pound of sugar and rice produced for exportation comes to the markets of the United States, and the entire commerce and shipping of the islands are in the hands of Americans, and that their laws, framework of society and government, have received the impress of America. Why should we desire to make any change in relations so highly satisfactory? Has any power threatened the independence of the islands? No intimation has been made to this effect. Are its institutions, the government, are the people falling into decay and exhibiting any symptoms of dissolution? It is true that the population has fallen off some in numbers. But it was hardly to be expected that a people who a few years ago were untutored savages could undergo the severe schooling, the radical changes, and rigid processes essential to rescue them from their wild state without such a result. Indeed, all estimates of the population until they were brought within the embrace of civilization and a regular government established were conjectural, exaggerated and unreliable. With this exception, which is easily accounted for, they have made marked progress in the arts of peace. They have schools and colleges, a government modeled upon our own, division of labor, and perfect security to life and property.

I repeat then, sir, what are the considerations of a public or patriotic character to abrogate the treaty, under shelter of which the islands have progressed so satisfactorily, under which their independence is assured, and our commercial supremacy complete? What is the convention that is proposed to us to-day? It is in effect that sugar, which is the chief article of production, and every pound of which for exportation it has been already seen comes to this country, shall be admitted free of duty. It has been estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury that the amount so remitted for the fiscal year 1873 is about $320,345. This amount bestowed as a bonus on the twenty-five or thirty American sugar planters would necessarily enhance their profits, raise the price of the article, and stimulate its production. It would be an invitation to those planters to bring in hordes of Chinese into the Hawaiian islands, under the contract system which prevails there, and they would extend the area of sugar culture so as to embrace every foot of arable soil.

I ask gentlemen if it is desirable, looking at the true welfare of the people of the Sandwich Islands, that we should be a party to a policy that shall convert the islands into one vast and crowded Chinese settlement devoted to the exclusive task of producing sugar!

Mr. Chairman, let us reflect upon precisely what the Chinese are and what we have seen them in this country. They are the most immoral of mankind; they have none of the wants of civilized man; they contribute nothing to the real wealth of the State; they have no appreciation of free institutions, and they war upon all the elements that form the basis of the strength, safety and prosperity of free institutions. They come without their families; they merely camp on the soil. They are simply skilled barbarians when we contrast them with American workmen, American freemen. The great factor in modern civilization, the principle which has preserved and borne aloft the banners of Christian civilization and upheld the pillars of the modern state through wars, revolutions and all changes, has been the family tie, the institution of the family.

Sir, open these islands to these eastern hordes, and you condemn its whole civilization, its institutions, its liberties founded upon law, the benevolent auspices under which these people are being gradually trained and growing up into well formed and compact commonwealth, you consign them to a state worse than that from which you have but recently rescued them, to a moral and intellectual sterility in striking contrast to the gardens these Chinese materialists, debased and debasing, will plant upon all the slopes and plains, the hillsides and valleys of these islands.

What markets will be created, for our countrymen under this policy? There will be a demand for steam engines and sugar mills, for rice, and fish, and opium, and wearing apparel, and plantation implements.

Great Britain can sell them sugar machinery at lower prices than we can and pay the ten per cent duty which would be exacted and which is the uniform rate in the island. Rice they would produce for home consumption, or at all events we have none to export to them; of fish, like rice, they have an abundance; wearing apparel is not among the articles admitted free from our country; of opium the government has a monopoly, and it is well known that in tropical countries agricultural implements required are few and inexpensive.

It then appears that notwithstanding this gift to the sugar growers of the islands, we shall not enlarge the demand for our products or confer any genuine benefit upon the people of the islands. It has been insisted upon by the advocates of this bill that it would not cheapen sugar in the markets of the Pacific States. It seems we confer the bounty upon the planters of the island, and the cheap shall be neither to give to our people a cheaper article nor to enlarge the demand for our products. Is it because of the remoteness of the islands that we are not to be benefited by the proposed legislation? Are not these islands, which contain about 6000 square miles, larger than the State of Connecticut and Rhode Island, and though much of the surface is volcanic are singularly adapted to the growth of sugar? Mr. Nordhoff says that the soil appears to be inexhaustible.

"I have seen a field of thirty acres which two years ago produced nearly sixteen of sugar to the acre. Four tons per acre is not a surprising crop, and from all I can hear, I judge that two and a half tons per acre may be considered a fair yield. The sugar product of the islands has constantly increased. In 1860 they exported 1,444,271 pounds of sugar; in 1864, 10,414,441 pounds; in 1868, 18,312,026 pounds, and in 1871, 21,760,773 pounds."

A distinguished Senator from New England, when this convention was under consideration in the Senate, said:

"Their capacity is variously estimated, and will reach from three to five times the amount of the present production, which is stated to be from 23,000,000 to 30,000,000 of pounds, so that from 100,000,000 to 150,000,000 of pounds of the Sandwich Islands sugars will ultimately take the place of an equal amount coming from other places that are now subject to the payment of duties, averaging for the class which will be received not less than three and a half cents per pound, and may soon involve an uncompensated loss to the treasury of $2,000,000, $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 annually. Our market for their sugars is the best they can possibly have, treaty or no treaty, charged with duty or not. The duty is a sheer loss to us and a sheer gain to the twenty-five owners of the sugar plantations, whether they reside in Hawaii or elsewhere. It is an immense subsidy to these wholly private interests, and far more obnoxious than any subsidy which has heretofore found congressional advocates. However honestly intended by the parties to the negotiation, I feel constrained to denounce it as a job, the chief result of which will be to put money into the purses of a few Hawaiian sugar planters, who have captured a good enough king to march at the head of their triumphant procession through the country at our expense, and who, by the by, is to issue his royal proclamation ratifying the treaty. When the rejected Hawaiian treaty of 1869 was before us, it was claimed as a merit that all of the owners but two of the twelve were foreigners, and almost wholly Americans. There is no doubt they are so now."

Mr. Nordhoff says:

"There is room on the different islands for about seventy-five or eighty more plantations on the scale now common, and there are I think still excellent opportunities for making plantations. A planter in his presence described the situation by saying, 'If we had plenty of labor and a free market for our sugar we should be thoroughly satisfied.'"

Mr. Nordhoff speaks of some of these plantations as having cost $100,000, some which cost $250,000, but he adds that they have depreciated in value on account of the improvidence and extravagance of the planters.

It is impossible to say from the data before us what may be the increased production of sugar in the islands under the stimulus of a bonus so great.

The gentleman from New York who introduced this bill predicted that at no distant day, we should have two or more railroads completed to the Pacific sea. Now it may be that the commonest kind of sugar can not be brought to the Mississippi valley or to the Eastern markets by the Central American route, yet it is not impossible that refined sugars from these islands or the Pacific refineries may undersell such sugars of our production in New Orleans, St. Louis and Boston. If the effect would be to cheapen sugars on the Pacific coast, it would be an injustice to tax the people of the whole country for their benefit. Our tariff should be regulated, not by sectional lines or geographical positions, but upon the principle of uniformity and equality of burdens.

So far, then, sir, I have been unable to discover the first single consideration growing out of our trade or commerce to induce us to vote this bonus, to make this donation, exacted from the industry of our tax-burdened people to this alien interest in these distant islands, owned by a few enterprising Americans who do not share with us the difficulties of our situation.

But gentlemen say we should not be controlled by mere questions of trade, that we contemplate the purposes and objects of this convention from the pedestal of a lofty statesmanship, that we shall secure by this convention vast political advantages.

Now, sir, I challenge the gentleman to point out one single right or privilege of a political character secured to our country. Read the article of the convention, article four, in which this precious boon is carefully preserved:

"It is agreed, on the part of his Hawaiian majesty, that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, he will not lease or otherwise dispose of or create any lien upon any port, harbor or other territory in his dominions, or grant any special privilege or rights of use therein, to any other power, State or government, nor make any treaty, by which any other nation shall obtain the same privileges, relative to the admission of any articles free of duty, hereby secured to the United States."

Now, sir, unless the language of this article was intended not to express but to conceal its meaning, I affirm that there is not one word in it that secures to our country any lien or privilege in any port or harbor or on the territory in the dominions of the King of the Hawaiian Islands. It merely guarantees that he will not make any such grants in favor of any other power. It does declare that no other nation shall obtain the same privileges relative to the admission of any articles free of duty hereby secured to the United States. But we have already demonstrated that this provision was wholly without value to us; so that, when you come to examine this clause critically, there is not the first political right or privilege absolutely secured to us. There is nothing of the kind in it. By the treaty of 1850 the King of the Hawaiian Islands could not grant any privileges to foreign powers which we would be entitled to upon the same terms and conditions. Hence it is clear that this convention substantially does no more for us in a political point of view than the treaty of 1850. And in all other respects it is not so satisfactory. It does not secure for our merchant vessels, for our whaling ships, for our war and mail steamers, for our citizens resident in the islands, the same liberal advantages as does the treaty of 1850. And yet the advocates of this convention have discovered in these few barren phrases the basis for our dominion over the islands, a foundation extremely frail for a superstructure so ambitious and imposing.

Gentlemen have delighted us with the spectacle of a proud dependency far out in the Pacific Sea, a half-way house for our caravans laden with the rich treasures of the East; our flag flying over Honolulu; our garrisons passing in reviews before some general officer in command of the islands; our heaviest guns crowning their ramparts, and our invincible monitors quietly sleeping in the harbors of Pearl river, but ready at the first tocsin of war with Great Britain to wake the echoes of those silent seas with their loudest thunders and to drive the British fleet from the track of our commerce.

But gentlemen are mistaken. All this fine rhetoric, these bright visions, these dreams of extended empire, vanish at the touch of fact. Sober-minded men, charged with the responsibilities of government, will appeal from these fancy sketches to the prosaic terms of the convention itself. And when they shall analyze them, they will at once perceive that there are no flag-staffs, no ramparts, not even Pearl river harbors that were to have been offered to us according to Mr. Nordhoff, no emblems of empire, but only sugar, provided we will admit it free of duty. A serious proposition to buy trade; a matter of mere dollars and cents; a vulgar subsidy in favor of a few men and no reciprocity. Where, then is your lofty statesmanship?

But suppose we were to accept the assurances of gentlemen. Let us take it for granted that this convention (violent as the presumption may be) does secure to our country the great political advantages set forth in such glowing language. Is it advisable that we should accept these as a price for this bonus? Is it prudent for our people at this time to raise this bonus in order to secure the extension of our political dominion over these islands 2000 miles distant? Let me ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wood) who attempted to reinforce his argument in favor of this convention, and other gentlemen who have preceded me, have appealed to the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Chairman, the bill and allusions could have been more unfortunate for the success of this measure.

Surely, gentlemen have forgotten that Mr. Webster, as Secretary of State, was the first to recognize the independence of the islands, and has left upon record his opinions upon the point directly at issue. In volume six, page 464 of his works, will be found a message of President Tyler, written by Mr. Webster, dated December 31, 1842, in which the following language is used:

"Considering, therefore, that the United States possess so very large a share of the intercourse with those islands, it is deemed not unfit to make the declaration that their government seeks nevertheless no peculiar advantages, no exclusive control over the Hawaiian government, but is content with its independent existence and anxiously wishes for its security and prosperity."

Again, in replying to a letter addressed to him by Messrs. Timoteo Haalilio and William Richards, expressing the wish of their government that its independence should be recognized by the United States, and a convention entered into for the regulation of their mutual interests and concerns, Mr. Webster employed the following language—speaking as Secretary of State, Washington, December 19, 1842—to be found in volume six, page 478:

"The United States, therefore, are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their government than any other nation can be, and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare as the sense of the government of the United States that the government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest or for the purposes of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing government, or any exclusive privilege or preference with it in matters of commerce."

These were the sober and wise sentiments of one of the purest, firmest and ablest men who ever spoke the English language! Not one word in favor of an extension of our political dominion! Not one word in favor of securing exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce! The treaty of 1850, the first made with the King of the islands, was projected upon the policy so clearly set forth by Mr. Webster.

I beg to refer for one moment to the Monroe doctrine in order to show how completely it has been misapprehended by the honorable gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Money) who has just taken his seat, as well as by the other gentlemen who have spoken. What was the Monroe doctrine? I will read it. In the message of President Monroe to Congress at the commencement of the session of 1822-24, the following passage occurs:

"In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparations for defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration, and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

What were the circumstances, the political events, which called forth this famous declaration? In the fall of 1822 the allied sovereigns of Russia, Austria, Prussia and France, composing the Holy Alliance, held their Congress at Verona. The question to be determined was whether Ferdinand should be reinstated upon the throne of Spain against the will of the people of that country. Canning, then the Prime Minister of Great Britain, had sent the Duke of Wellington to represent the British government:

"The allied sovereigns resolved upon the policy of intervention in the face of the protest of Great Britain. The doctrines proclaimed, the year before at Laybach were to be vindicated. It had been declared there that they had the right to interfere in the affairs of another state and to remodel its government, in order to prevent the effect of its bad example—the bad example being always free government. France thereupon sent an army into Spain, the Cortes was overthrown, and Ferdinand restored to power. No sooner, however, did these events transpire than Ferdinand demanded that upon the same principles he had a right to call upon the allied sovereigns to assist him in the endeavor to recall his revolted colonies in the western hemisphere to their obedience, and to reduce them to subjection to the Spanish crown. The pernicious example of America and its baneful effects were pointed out. Mr. Canning, Prime Minister of Great Britain, informed Mr. Rush, the American minister to the court of St. James, of these designs against free institutions on the American continent, and gave to him at the same time the assurance that, if sustained by the United States, Great Britain would resist. Mr. Rush immediately communicated this to our government. It was received with joy, for it was everywhere felt that if the Holy Alliance should interfere with success with the governments south of us, they would surely turn their attention to us and put forth all their united strength to crush our free institutions."

Mr. Calhoun, who was a member of President Monroe's Cabinet, says:

"I well recollect the reception of the dispatch from Mr. Rush as distinctly as if all the circumstances had occurred yesterday. I well recollect the great satisfaction with which it was received by the Cabinet. It came late, in the year, not long before the meeting of Congress. As was usual with Mr. Monroe upon great occasions, the papers were sent around to each member of the Cabinet, so that each might be duly apprised of all the circumstances and be prepared to give his opinion. The Cabinet met. It deliberated. There was a long and careful consultation, and the result was the declaration which I have just announced."

There, sir, is the famous declaration and the history of it. It was not a declaration by Congress, but by the President, and not against Great Britain, but with her cordial approval, if not by her invitation. It was made for a particular emergency. The Holy Alliance vanished before it, and has not again reappeared upon the stage.

Mr. Calhoun uniformly contended that this government was not bound by this doctrine to intervene whenever there was any disturbance in the internal affairs of our neighbors, nor to extend our supremacy over them whenever we had the power or even if invited by them. Surely it was not intended as a defiance to Great Britain. It was hailed with joy and exultation all over Europe by the lovers of free institutions, but nowhere did it meet with such hearty concurrence as in England. Canning and Brougham expressed themselves to Parliament as proud of their connection with the people of the United States, and the latter observed that the policy disclosed by the message became a great, a free and independent nation.

Mr. Webster, in his speech on the Panama mission, says:

"I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will not blot it nor blur it nor cast a shade upon it. On that page it will remain bright and conspicuous, and I will not, I cannot, I ought not, I do not, wish to see it other than the sagacity of the government, and I will not diminish the honor. Over those hopes I will not bring a shadow, nor will I put that gratified population to shame. But have should it happen that there should arise such a new state of things as to call for the application of the principle of the declaration, this crisis is over; the danger is past. At the time it was made there was real ground for apprehension; now there is none."

[illegible] the declaration, and they both insisted that it [illegible] our government [illegible] uniform policy inexorable in all cases.

Now, sir, there is not one word in that famous declaration which commits us to the policy of extending our political dominion over the Hawaiian Islands. Let us adopt that it applies, in modern parlance, to embark in the policy of intervention and empire. Mark the language.

"It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for defense."

It will not be pretended that our rights are now invaded or seriously menaced. Have we any public information to this effect? Has the President sent to this House any message informing us that Great Britain or any other power was invading or menacing our rights, or the rights or independence of the Hawaiian islands? Sir, nothing of the kind is pretended. It may be that the sugar planters, or their agents are whispering vague rumors of war or intervention in the corridors of the Capitol, but they may be dismissed as the note beneficiaries of the convention. We have no information to this effect. Sir, from the time of the revolution in this country, whenever all other means have failed, our fears and jealousy of Great Britain have been appealed to when a point was at stake to be gained. "Fee, fi, fo, fum, I smell the blood of an Englishman," was the nursery chant of many of us, and now we find the advocates of this convention appealing to our apprehensions of British power.

Well, sir, I do not share these fears, and can not be moved from my sense of duty and right by these appeals. When occasion shall arise, I doubt not, sir, we will put forth, if necessary or proper, another declaration of our principles and policy with regard to the Hawaiian Islands or any other question that may arise, and those who may have faced one another on opposite sides in the decent war—the men of Gettysburg and Perryville, or their descendants—reunited, standing shoulder to shoulder as brethren, as Americans, will take care of the honor and the welfare of our common country on land and sea. Sir, we have outlived the dread of Britain, but I trust we shall never outlive our love of peace and our horror of war.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask gentlemen whether this is any time to be giving away our revenues or embarking in a new policy of entangling alliances? Have we not already upon our hands questions relating to our internal affairs of sufficient magnitude to absorb our whole time and tax all our powers? It may gratify the pride of gentlemen to indulge the dream of foreign dominion; of seeing our power extended across the Pacific ocean; to embrace the Hawaiian islands as the advance post on our way to the conquest of the vast countries beyond. I confess, sir, I have no such ambition. I know too well the lessons of history. I trust I properly estimate the ample dimensions, the magnificent area of my country; but broad and boundless and fertile as it may be, this is neither the source of her happiness nor of her greatness. Other nations extend over a still wider area; and yet how weak amid all the prodigality and richness of nature! No, sir; these are in part the elements of greatness, but there is something more that is indispensable to mighty and lasting achievement.

The only supremacy that will give to our country true greatness and carry her forward foremost in the march of civilization is the moral and intellectual power of the people, coupled with a more thorough appreciation of the constitution and the Union, the duties they impose, and the privileges they confer. We have never yet realized how much we are indebted to these free institutions, nor how great is the task of preserving them in all their original purity and strength, not for ourselves only, but for one portion of the country, but for the whole people, in the South as well as the North, of whatever condition and without distinction, and for those who may come after us.

Never was an American Congress confronted with graver questions, and no member of this House contemplates the condition of public or private affairs without the deepest concern.

Let us avoid these complications with distant countries; let well enough alone, and let us address ourselves to the work before us. The people are waiting upon us.

I ask permission to annex to my remarks the tables furnished by the bureau of statistics, marked A and B, the text of the treaty proclaimed November 9, 1850, and a letter of Mr. David Wells on the subject before us.

Patrick Donohue Ruined.

Patrick Donohue, publisher and proprietor of the Boston *Pilot*, is reported ruined. Before the fire in 1872 he had an income of $100,000 a year and owned a magnificent block on Franklin street. The fire, however, destroyed that building, and the two offices into which he subsequently moved were also destroyed in the same way. Carelessness and lack of business method did the rest. Instead of going to work to bring chaos out of this financial confusion, he permitted matters to drift along, and to-day his liabilities amount to nearly a million dollars, and his creditors are scattered all over the country, and include all classes of people, from the servant girl to the banker. He was the apostle of his people in this country, and they trusted him implicitly, depositing their money with him and in every way exhibiting their confidence. A correspondent, writing from Boston, says:

That there was no dishonesty, no intention to defraud or misappropriate a single dollar, not a man in Boston doubts. Patrick Donohoe has the reputation to-day, with this unfavorable showing, of being an honest man. As a proof of this, I may cite the fact that out of all his fortune he has not set by a dollar for his own use or that of his family. Every foot of real estate he owned was registered and taxed in his own name, and mortgaged up to its market value. His wife is a creditor to the amount of $1300, the same being transferred from the Emigrant Savings Bank to that of her husband, and his son, who is one of the employes of the establishment, is equally unprovided for. This brings me back to my original statement that the cause of the disaster was carelessness and want of method in administration. I give prominence to this statement in justice to the unfortunate man who once held the highest position of honor and trust among the Irish people of this country, and also in justice to public morality. In this age of defalcation and high-handed fraud, the people are too apt to judge hastily and rashly. Our community is rather sensitive just now over the recent irregularities of "Rev." E. D. Winslow, and it would take little to besmirch the purest reputations. That Patrick Donohoe did wrong I am willing to admit, but I can find no trace of criminality except criminal carelessness. On this basis let his actions be judged. There have been various schemes set on foot to repair the public evils which his actions have brought about. I must also proclaim the fact to the credit of Boston, that none of them have for their object the advancement of the private interests of Patrick Donohoe. They are all designed to make good the deposits intrusted to his care by the suffering poor. The Archbishop of Boston, in whose ears the pitiable tales of misery and despair caused by the collapse are daily poured, some time ago began to cast about for a way out of the difficulty. After consultation with leading men here he entered into a league to pay up the amount by yearly installments. This was to be done by purchasing the *Pilot* and conducting it for that purpose. He offered to put $30,000 cash into the business, and the present editor, John Boyle O'Reilly, agreed to embark $10,000. The proceeds from the paper, after paying all expenses, were to be used to pay each year a certain dividend on the indebtedness to these people, and when this would be wiped out the paper would again return to the hands of the original owner for the sum paid for it with interest. I have within a few days learned that the Archbishop had reconsidered his proposition, and that the arrangement will fall through. In that case the paper could probably be sold to outside parties for the assignees, and thus the last anchor would be lost.

Opinions of a number of the leading [illegible] will be rendered on judgment day.

JONAS JONES.

While waiting here for letter, boys, all clustered round the stove,
I will sing you the ditty of Brother Jonas, as it was in the balmy spring time, when the bluebills are seen,
And Irish fairies blarney Earth into wearin' of the green.

When Jonas Jones, our devil, placed himself outside the door,
Because he thought his bosses out to raise the devil more.

In gorgeous [illegible] o'er his eye,
Refulgent boots and fierce mustache—whereby he used the dye.
A dime solid pin—of gold brass—he carried of a rule—
Unlike the Saturday golden one—a week and much used tool;
And Jonas Jones, he vowed a vow he'd make the name of Jones
Like "Foundered the Tribune" rise above imposing stones.

Years fled. One day in winter, when the yearly war for wood,
And the "Notice to Delinquents" both in the papers stood,
There came a huffed transgressor slowly up the office aisle,
And Jonas queried to his neighbor: "Know ye who saweth there?"
Then the dog swung slowly eggs—trembled there some rag-wrapped bones,
Whence a voice came, faint and husky: "Remember Jonas Jones!"
Then we o'ed once rubbed our glasses and our memory bumps the same,
Jonas Jones!" we queried quickly, and he answered us—"the same!"
The devil (having dressed himself) had seized the office chair;
But we led the wreck of Jonas and placed it kindly there.

"Year not, my boy," spoke Jonas, "once, a foolish devil, I
Left this place for to wander; now I've wandered back—to die!
In Victoria's dominion I've spelled wagon with two g's,
In New Orleans I have wrestled with their cussed b-e-r-r-e-d-o's."
"Sampled any crooked whisky?" "Yes, but more of whisky straight
And I've sampled the tobacco, too, of each and every State."
"Haven't chaw?" "Well, now you tempt me—touch me in a spot that's a-fire!
Have some lager?" "Sob, you really are an honor to the crafe."

There's a grave down in the valley, but no grand imposing stones,
Bear the name of boyhood's promise o'er the bonest of Sonas Jones.

—The Reporter.

Brace Up, America!

The London *Times* is very hard upon this poor country, and thinks that there is no nice sense of honor among our public men. The London *News*, the organ of the Manchester school, is very much afraid that republican institutions have proven a failure. The London *Standard*, the synonym of journalistic stupidity, thanks heaven that there are very few governments under which such official corruption as is prevalent here could have occurred. All this sad but severe condemnation of this country arises from the fact that a Secretary of War has been turned out of office for selling a post tradeship. For that offense the United States is to be wiped off the map of the world. Americans are to dig their own graves and commit suicide in them, and republicanism, as a form of government, is to vanish from political history!

It must strike the impartial observer that such a punishment is monstrously disproportioned to the offense, and that the *Arcadian* is justified, under the circumstances, in calling upon the country to brace up and look the facts squarely in the face. First of all, it occurs to us that the time when a nation is in danger of death from corruption is not the period when the corruption is being discovered and removed. Boils are not pleasant, as Job has informed mankind, but they are healthy, because through them the system throws off its dangerous humors. Belknap is only a boil. Before we get through with the investigations at Washington there may be a general eruption of boils, but they mean health, and will lead to health. Exposure is not only the evidence of crime, but its remedy. If official corruption were prevalent at Washington with the consent of both parties and the majority of our people, then there might be some excuse for all this fine writing about the failure of republican institutions; but just now, when the whole country is hounding down the few rascals who have disgraced us, foreign critics should bite their pens and turn their sharp eyes upon their own domestic affairs. There is more official corruption to-day in England than in America, but it is quiet, deep-seated, and, therefore, deadly. Their rats and mice have nibbled into the very heart of the national cheese, where nobody discovers or disturbs them. Our rats and mice are nibbling at the outside rind, and we are having a grand rat hunt to chase them away. Of course there is a great deal of noise here—the rats squeal, the terriers bark, the traps click, things are upset and nervous people scream—and, of course, there is a remarkable contrast between our hubbub and confusion and the English calm and order; but we are getting rid of our vermin and the English are protecting theirs. This is the truth of the contrast.

French critics have been very guarded in their comments upon the Washington scandals, as well they may be, partly because they are also trying a republican experiment, and partly because the corruption of despotism has been so recently and terribly demonstrated as to render comparisons awfully odious. The Russian press says little, and very timidly, since the ink is scarcely dry upon the ukase which proclaimed one of the imperial family a common thief, and the records of the contractors' accounts during the Crimean war are not difficult of access. Prussia, also, is very reticent—not only because Bismarck knows better than to suppose that one corrupt official means national ruin, but because there are official reasons why too much discussion about war departments is not pleasant. It is reserved for England, the Peckniff of governments, the most notoriously, viciously and irradicably corrupt country in the world, to throw the first stone, and a whole heap of stones, at America. But the *Times*, the *News* and *Standard* forget that although Americans may be an abandoned people, they are a reading people. We have an ex-Secretary of War who sold a post tradeship, but we have not yet produced one who sacrificed an entire army by his corrupt contracts. Our Secretary of the Navy is being investigated, but not upon such charges as building iron clads which promptly sink, drowning innocent pleasure-seekers with the Queen's yacht, and sending sailors to sea in coffin-ships to get the insurance money. A congressional committee has summoned our Secretary of the Treasury, but nobody accuses him of having paid $20,000,000 to maintain such an outrageous fraud as the Khedive of Egypt, nor of paying the Rothschilds five per cent a month for advancing such a sum of money. There is a real estate pool at Washington, but we do not make Boss Shepherd a duke, nor does Congress pay each Mr. Hunt one per cent upon the cost of all public building sites. It is not necessary to ransack history, and go back to Lord Bacon in order to prove the assertion that the English government is the most corrupt in existence. Peckniff was a conscious swindler, but he gave stern rebuke to Martin, and upon the same principle the English are always ready to find fault with American affairs.

We must beg to remind our foreign critics that they are themselves responsible for the most of the corruption with which they charge this country. They breed criminals like maggots, and send them over here to annoy America. Whenever our reformers get hold of a ring, and break it up, they find upon it the English trade mark. This