CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

GAIL HAMILTON CONTINUES THE EXERCISES.

XI.

THE "DISINTERESTED STATESMANSHIP" OF MR. BURKE AND MR. PITT AS VIEWED BY THEIR CONTEMPORARIES.

Mr. Burke had not the family prestige of Mr. Pitt, yet "his share of the spoil of office," says his biographer, with a cold-blooded disregard of the *meum* and *tuum* of reform phraseology that must give Mr. Dorman B. Eaton a chill, "his share of the spoil of office was a seat in the Privy Council and the Paymaster-Generalship of the forces, *then the most lucrative office in the State.*" His son Richard was appointed joint-receiver of the revenues of the Crown lands, for life, and Auditor of Accounts to Earl Fitzwilliam, and afterward Deputy-Paymaster, and his brother was made one of the Secretaries to the Treasury, and afterward Recorder of Bristol. Later in life, a pension was awarded Edmund Burke, for his own life and that of Mrs. Burke, of $6,000 per annum, and afterward another of $12,500; all of which Burke accepted with gratitude; he even suggested that his pension should be antedated on the Civil List, in order to enable him to pay his debts—which must remind us of Mr. Eaton's salary-grabbers in the very act of grabbing their back pay. Just before Mr. Burke went out of office he applied to Horace Walpole to induce his brother to relinquish the clerkship of the Pells with its sinecure salary of $15,000 a year for life, that it might be bestowed on Burke's son Richard. His first hope after he came into office was "that something might be done for William," his cousin and the friend of his early boyhood. So far from discountenancing patronage, the India Bill, for which Mr. Burke was chiefly responsible, clutched at a mass of patronage for himself and his friends scarcely inferior to that of the Treasury itself. One authority places it as high as $1,500,000 a year, and another still $10,000,000 a year. Pitt pronounced it the "boldest and most unconstitutional measure ever attempted, transferring at one stroke, in spite of all charters and compacts, the immense patronage and influence of the East to Charles Fox (Burke's chief), in or out of office."

All this involves no insincerity or inconsistency on the part of the great politician. Not only were his plans vast and wise, but his own practice was unexceptionable. Mr. Burke in office carried honorably into effect so far as possible, the measures which he had advocated in opposition. His own office, which he could control without waiting for legislation, was the first to feel the pruning-knife. Sums of money, which had been the undisturbed perquisites of previous paymasters, he made over to the Government, and thus saved to the public some $235,000, of which $126,500 had accrued to the paymaster. But this very fact shows how urgent was the need of reform. When Lord North alone, as chief of the Treasury, cost the public $6,500 a year for stationery, and $1,700 a year for pack-thread, official abuse was no idle calumny, Economical Reform was no idle theory. When twenty-four counties sent up petitions, and the Speaker's table was buried under immense rolls of parchment, it was time for Parliament to act. Enormous extravagance had aroused a tax-burdened people, and Burke's Economical Reform had been a response to their real, urgent and just demand. But when Burke had cut off the remorseless and greedy gains of his predecessor, we must not forget that there was still left him the very handsome salary of $20,000 a year. But Burke had always maintained that great services should be greatly paid; that they should be paid not only by rank and emoluments to the men who had rendered them, but to their children also. He argued that sinecures should be retained for this express purpose, in spite of petitions that all sinecures should be abolished, and in his bill he distinctly provided for the retention of places held by the Walpoles and other members of other families who had rendered distinguished service to the State. The reform initiated by Mr. Burke had not one element in common with the reform talked about by Mr. Eaton.

He fares no better when he attempts to marshal William Pitt into line. I have spoken already of the gracious readiness with which Mr. Pitt accepted the "rich perquisites which a vicious civil service system attached to office." In the divorce of politics from office-holding, Mr. Pitt makes no better showing for Mr. Eaton's argument. Where lurks that "disinterested statesmanship" which he sings; where appears anything but such "attempts to gain partisan strength by the prostitution of official authority" as he deplores, in such simple facts as that "when gentlemen in office were found obdurate, the Government informed them that there was no further occasion for their services!" Yet this is made as calmly as aby other political statement, and this "Government" was the typical reformer, Mr. Pitt. Nay, Mr. Pitt says in so many words—casting "high sentiment" to the winds and speaking after the manner of a machine politician of the straitest sect, "it seems very desirable, if Government is strong enough to do it without too much immediate hazard, to mark by dismissal the sense entertained of the conduct of those persons in office who opposed. In particular it strikes me as essential not to make an exception to this line in the instance of the Speaker's son * * * With respect to persons of less note, or those who have been only neutral, more lenity may perhaps be advisable. On the precise extent of the line, however, your Lordship can at once judge on the spot." There was no pretence of malfeasence in office for this dismissal. It was simply that his subordinates had disagreed on political questions with their chief.

And just as the narrow, and the envious, and the malignant to-day attack with slander those whom they cannot foil with argument, so were Burke and Pitt hackled and hindered in their day. Among the "innumerable offences," of which, says Mr. Burke's biographer, Mr. Burke was accused by that party animosity which "ever clings to a great English statesman, as if it were a condition of his existence," was that of being a Papist. And when Mr. Burke, admitting that his wife's father and some of his family connections were Roman Catholics, disavowed that faith for himself and his wife, whose mother was a rigid Presbyterian and had reared her in that faith, and for his family, and pointed to his conduct at Trinity College and his subsequent life in proof of his truth, the enemy only changed ground a little and condemned him for being false to the faith of his wife! For his attitude against Hastings he was pronounced by a member of Parliament, "that reptile, Mr. Burke." When he bought his house his political opponents, simply because they did not know where he got the money to pay for it, promptly attacked his personal integrity and charged him with being "bought." When he accepted his pension the press attacked him with rancorous abuse, and attacked, Mr. Pitt with equal rancor for having secured him the pension. The reforms which he voluntarily made in his own department gave him little notice and no recompense; exactly as the real reforms in our own Civil Service, made by honest business men in a business way, are as little accounted of by the professional Reformer as was silver in the days of Solomon. Indeed, the virtue of England was greatly shocked because Burke restored Messrs. Powell and Bembridge, cashier and accountant, who had been dismissed by Colonel Barré for alleged malpractice, although he did not believe them personally guilty; although the clerks of the office wrote to him saying they could not get through the business on the department unless these gentlemen were restored; although it was by their assistance alone he had accomplished the reform of his office. But the British public had one of its periodical fits of virtue on, and nothing could appease it but the heads of Powell and Bembridge in a charger. Even Burke's magnificent championship of the cause of the American colonies was attributed in open Parliament to his hope of being, on the restoration of peace, again made agent for New-York! So inevitable is it that great men must look small when seen through small men's eyes. Sir Nathaniel Wraxall accused Mr. Pitt of having bestowed the peerage on Mr. Robert Smith "in return for pecuniary assistance," though Mr. Smith himself declares that no money transactions ever passed between them. The Paris press accused Mr. Pitt of the assassination of the French plenipotentiaries. In the House of Commons, after his resignation, Mr. Pitt was charged with "criminality of the deepest dye," and resolutions moved for a committee of investigation into his conduct. *The London Times* accused him of having deserted his post in the hour of danger upon some frivolous pretext or some mysterious intrigue, which he had not the courage to explain or the character to resist. Sheridan declared Pitt's return to office to be the greatest national calamity, and that he "merited the contempt and execration of all good men." Fox called him "a sad stick," a "mean, low-minded dog," and "a mean rascal after all."

His early friend and Cabinet colleague, Lord Melville, first Lord of the Admiralty, infused into the Navy Department a strength and vigor which reduced his political foes to the expedient of attacking his official accounts when he had been treasurer of the navy years before. He had been culpably lax in his official accounts, as he was in his private accounts, but nothing indicated that he had—so Mr. Pitt said—pocketed any of the public money; while all his career and character opposed such a possibility. Mr. Pitt stood by him to the end, although he not only failed to ward off from him the heaviest penalties, but drew upon his own head the charge of having "exerted himself to screen a delinquent though obliged to give him up at last." Indeed a coalition was started against him on this ground of his "screening delinquents, thwarting the inquiries of the Commissioners, and disgracing the House of Commons." Nor did Mr. Pitt himself, with all that indifference to money which was known to have characterized his family, escape the charge of pecuniary dishonesty. Two hundred thousand dollars of the naval money he was asserted to have disposed of illegally, and he was called before the select committee to give account of himself, and afterward a motion was publicly made against him in the House of Commons. I have been told that Mr. Lascelles, the very amiable and accomplished member of the English Legation in Washington in 1877, is a member of the family whose earldom (of Harewood) was bestowed upon the Hon. Henry Lascelles in return for his having moved an amendment to Mr. Whitbread's motion—that Mr. Pitt's action, "though not strictly conformable to law, was highly expedient in the existing circumstances, and attended with the most beneficial effects"—which amendment was carried without division.

Mr. Pitt's Government was also charged with being "a long succession of little tricks and artifices." General Conway, a former colleague of Mr. Pitt declared that Mr. Pitt's ministry existed only by corruption. When Pitt voted on the Benares charge against Warren Hastings, it was widely attributed to petty personal jealousy. Erskine the great lawyer delivered in the House what Lord Mornington pronounced so stupid, gross and indecent a libel against Pitt that the House hissed him. Mr. Fox charged Mr. Pitt with the most dangerous and desperate exertions to harass and persecute himself. He declared that Pitt and his men had not scrupled to break down all the barriers of law, to run counter to all custom, practice and precedent, and strike a blow at the very vitals of the English Constitution rather than not wound the object of their enmity, and with no other wish or inducement, or temptation than to gratify a malignant inordinate and implacable spirit of resentment! And Mr. Pitt retorted by declaring Mr. Fox an apostate, a candidate whose conduct and principles had rendered him detestable to the public. When Mr. Pitt was ill with the gout at Walmer, Mr. Fox declared that he believed "*really*, but half the world say *sham*."

GAIL HAMILTON.

THE LONG BRANCH RAILROAD ROW.

THE WEST END ROAD MAKING HAY WHILE THE SUN SHINES—WHAT WILL THE TOWN AUTHORITIES DO TO-DAY?

LONG BRANCH, July 12.—There is some curiosity as to the action of our city's Board of Commissioners to-morrow. It will be remembered that at the last meeting a great deal of surprise was expressed by some of the commissioners, at the information that a new suit had been begun in the name of the board. The original ordinance, and the only one ever passed, simply authorized proceedings to enjoin. As these proceedings have been brought and brought unsuccessfully in the Court of Chancery, it was generally assumed that the authority in the ordinance was then exhausted.

The interest of the citizens in the matter has led to several discoveries during the week which add to the local spirit. I give them for what they are worth. It is claimed that the original ordinance was passed when there was no legal quorum. There were but four commissioners present, when the law requires five. It is also claimed that the young counsel of the board is the private counsel of the Stokes estate, and as such openly announced himself and opposed the West End Railroad at the first meeting in May last of the Supreme Court Commissioners appointed to condemn the land taken by the railway. It is further charged that he is not only the attorney of the Stokes estate, who have fought the enterprise most bitterly and have now given notice of an intention to appeal from the award of damages lately made, but that he has an interest in it, as he married one of the Stokes daughters.

I judge there must be truth in some or all of these reports, for the story to-night is that Mr. Porter has told Mayor Cooper that he preferred that some one else should represent the board if further action is directed against the West End Road. This course was not unexpected by Mr. Porter's friends, who have known him as a young man of high character, and have recognized that he chafed under an unfortunate conjuncture of circumstances that enabled his enemies to charge that his great zeal in his public trust was kindled by his direct personal interest in the contest, as attorney and land-owner. Meantime the West End Road has made hay while the sun shone. A petition to the Mayor, asking that opposition to the construction of the West End Road be withdrawn, largely signed by taxpayers, will be presented to-morrow. The West End Road is already completed up to and across Chelsea-ave., and placards are printed ready for posting and distribution to-morrow announcing that the West End Railroad Company will, on Monday, July 15, receive passengers at a depot on that avenue and ticket them through to New-York and intermediate stations. The road would be completed by Monday night to a junction with the Jersey Central at the West End, except that the large damages awarded the Hulicks and Messrs. Brown and Wallack have forced the company to consider the propriety of an appeal.

THE CANADIAN CROPS.

TORONTO, July 11.—*The Globe* to-day publishes eight columns of crop reports from all parts of the Dominion. In Ontario Fall wheat is everywhere spoken of as being either above the average, or extraordinarily large crops, and the area sown is larger than was ever known before in Canada. If this crop is harvested without being damaged by rust it will exceed in quality and quantity what was considered the phenomenal crop of last year. Spring wheat, which in ordinary years exceeds Fall wheat by some twenty or twenty-five per cent, seems likely this year to be exceeded by Fall wheat; and the area under Spring wheat is much larger than usual, both Spring and Fall varieties having been sown abundantly, in anticipation of a European war; but the unusually cold month of May gave to it a shock which deprived it of nearly all the advantages secured by the early opening of Summer. Reports give the condition of Spring wheat as being less promising than that of Fall, and danger from rust and lodging, to which the Fall wheat is exposed, threatens Spring wheat much more seriously. If no evil befalls this crop it will be the most generous of its kind ever raised in the Dominion. Oats are pretty generally, but not invariably, spoken of as a "good crop;" the area under this grain is smaller than usual. The reports of the condition of barley are more uniformly good than those respecting oats, but the area sown is unusually small. Potatoes will be a great crop, despite the Colorado beetle, which is doing some damage, especially in the eastern part of the Province. All the fruit crops, except apples, will be rather short, the severe June frosts having cut off the blossoms. From Quebec come a cry for rain and a much more uneven set of returns than those from Ontario. Very little Fall wheat is grown in Quebec, but what there is of it tals year promises to be the best ever garnered. In the east end of the Province the hay crop is abundant, but in the west local droughts have reduced its promise to not more than an average. Roots are getting along fairly. The fruit crop will be very uneven, having been injured in some sections by frost and insects. New-Brunswick has a fair promise of an abundant harvest of Spring grains, potatoes, roots and fruit, and a more than average crop of hay. Nova Scotia's staple crops of hay and potatoes promise to be above an average, the hay crop much so. Canker worm, which is increasing alarmingly all over the Dominion, has seriously diminished the promise of apples and plums in Nova Scotia, and at the present time the crop looks scarcely likely to yield an average.

One of Hartford's most celebrated physicians the other evening ordered his hired man to "harness up Bucephalus," his favorite horse. Soon after the doctor and a friend were greatly amused to hear the announcement at the office door that "Erysipelas is hitched outside."—[Hartford Times.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE.

GENERAL BARLOW AND THE POTTER RESOLUTION.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I have just seen in THE TRIBUNE of June 15 a Washington dispatch in which it is stated that it has come to light that "Mr. Manton Marble and General Barlow, previously to the passage of the Potter resolution, approached and urged leading Democrats to oust President Hayes so soon as that party should obtain control of both Houses," and that this was a movement "in the interest of Mr. Tilden, for whom these gentlemen are working."

So far as I am concerned, this statement, in all its parts, is absolutely without foundation.

It so happens that I have not seen Mr. Tilden, nor had any communication from or with him, directly or indirectly, since February, 1875. Mr. Marble I have only seen once December, 1876, and that was a casual meeting of ten minutes in the presence of several other persons, at which there was no political conversation.

With none of the other gentlemen referred to have I had any conversation or communication whatever on any such subject, nor, indeed, with any person, unless some printed observations of mine, upon the law of quo warranto as applied to the Presidential office, can be called such communication.

I never heard of the Potter resolution, nor of anything of the kind, until I read of it in London.

Furthermore, although I have freely expressed my opinion that a great wrong was done in giving the electoral vote of Florida to the Republicans, yet I am, as I always have been, a Republican, and vehemently opposed politically to Mr. Tilden and the gentlemen named.

Although this is a matter of no importance, yet as my name has been used in this connection, I shall be obliged if you will print this denial, which I wish to make as broad and strong as language can do. Yours, etc.,

FRANCIS C. BARLOW.

Fontainbleau, France, June 29th, 1878.

THE FIRST STEAMBOAT.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: It is the old—the sad old story, so oft repeated, of injustice and robbery, unintentional sometimes, but no less unjust and saddening; the credit of first discovery taken from the originator, and given to one who borrowed or stole the hint, or the plan and the machinery entire, and gave the invention or the continent his name, so firmly that the world names it by no other. Thus has John Fitch been despoiled, and the crown placed on the head of Robert Fulton. Even Thurlow Weed, as reported in a late TRIBUNE, passes by the unfortunate and injured, and disregarding the "Documentary History of New-York," published by that State, gives the credit to the supplanter. I have not that history by me, but it contains some twenty or thirty pages of narrative and proofs of Fitch's discoveries and inventions, and his communication of them to Fulton. Among other items is a wood-cut of Collet Pond, New-York City (where the Tombs now is), exhibiting Fitch showing his model to Fulton, and practically demonstrating its feasibility. And yet, with all this proof from an impartial and reliable source, Fulton continues to be credited with Fitch's discoveries and inventions!

But some may urge that Fulton was the first to make those discoveries successful, and therefore he is entitled to the credit bestowed on him. This claim is as unfounded as the other, and is but a second robbery of poor Fitch, who was successful in navigating the Delaware by steam repeatedly, and for months together, seventeen years before Fulton navigated the Hudson. But Fitch was poor; the mechanics he employed were unskilled, and therefore breakages were frequent, while charges for work and repairs were very high, so that his scanty means were soon exhausted, and in despair (for he was a despondent man) he went West, hoping to find aid in establishing steam navigation on the great Western waters.

If these statements are true (and there seems no reason for doubt), is it not time to cease defrauding John Fitch of his due, by ignoring the facts of history? And should not the great State of Pennsylvania refuse concurrence in the report of her legislative committee to place the statue of Robert Fulton as the contribution of that State to the National Gallery in the Capitol at Washington? A State founded by William Penn should not indorse such gross injustice, and thus become a falsifier of her own history. Better place there a statue of her Godfrey—robbed of his invention of the quadrant by Hadley, who gave it his name falsely—or of her Rittenhouse; of Robert Morris, who, though not a native, was all his active life a thorough Pennsylvanian, and a resident in her borders until death, which Robert Fulton was not. A. B. G.

Washington, D. C., July 5, 1878.

ANTHONY COMSTOCK'S METHODS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Will you give space once more to a word of dissent from your criticism on Anthony Comstock? To charge him with the occasional mistakes of excessive zeal is one thing; to object to his work as fundamentally wrong in method is another. And this is what your article seemed to do. The phrase which contained the kernel of that criticism, "Tempting people to crime in order to punish them," while, perhaps, literally correct, is practically misleading. Here, for example, is a case. A man publicly advertises (ambiguously, of course, but intelligibly enough), his willingness to commit a crime as often as he shall receive his price. In this and in other ways he diligently seeks opportunity to commit it. The opportunity is given, and on the evidence thus obtained the man is sent to prison. In what real sense is this tempting him to commit a crime? He yielded to temptation when he decided to take up his nefarious business, and when he prepared the material for carrying it on; he has been in the full career of crime for weeks or months. Still more misleading is it to say that this is done for the purpose of punishing him. It is done for the purpose of stopping his crimes. It is tempting him, if you will, to commit one crime in order to prevent him from committing a thousand. It is putting temptation in the way of one man already fallen and sold to work iniquity, that he may be restrained from putting temptation in the way of hundreds of boys and girls as yet innocent and pure-minded.

We have to face the terrible fact that our children are led to ruin, homes are blighted, brothels are stocked, by the secret dissemination of a poisonous literature. Doubtless it would be safe to say that Mr. Anthony Comstock has done more within the last ten years to save society from this pestilence than any other man in the country. He has done it by arming the law with the evidence without which it is helpless and which the real victims of these vampires will never give. If this method is wrong will THE TRIBUNE show us a better way? Or shall the case be given up, and this plague whereof your article on "Effie Da Costa" paints a sample of the results, be left to rage unchecked? Yours,

South Orange, N. J., July 5, 1878. Q.

DECOY LETTERS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: In your article of this date headed "Detective Methods," you make mention of "decoy letters" in connection with the operations of Post Office agents. I think that your remarks are calculated (not, of course, intended), to mislead your readers as to what "decoy" letters really are, and in what manner and under what circumstances they are used in the detection of crime in the post office; and I ask the favor of being allowed to say a word or two on the subject.

In the first place, "decoy" letters, so-called, are not "decoy" letters at all. They do not answer, in any particular, to the definition given to that word by Webster, which is "anything intended to lead into a snare; any lure or allurement that deceives and misleads into evil, danger or the power of an enemy." Is it fair to call a letter sent to or through the hands of a clerk, and which is the fac simile, outwardly, of the thousands of other letters with which he is daily officially intrusted, a "lure" or "allurement," or to claim that it is "intended to lead into a snare" or to "deceive and mislead into evil?" If it is, then every letter deposited in the Post Office by the public is a "decoy," and citizens of tender conscience must confine their correspondence to postal cards. The merchant who misses money from his till, naturally places marked money therein as a means of detecting the thief; and I have never heard the propriety or morality of that device questioned. The cashier is no more tempted or lured by the marked money in the till than is the Post Office clerk or carrier by the marked money placed in a letter by the Special Agent.

Secondly—As a matter of fact, "test" (miscalled "decoy") letters are never sent purposely or specially through the hands of unsuspected persons, and

Thirdly—Their use is the only sure method, in the great majority of such cases, of detecting the individual whose dishonesty is casting suspicion upon the entire force of a Post Office.

Fourthly—Is there a case on record of an honest Post Office clerk having come to grief through the use of the most crafty of decoys, by the most malignant of Special Agents? Very respectfully, INSPECTOR BUCKET.

New-York Post Office, June 24, 1878.

HARD TIMES AND THEIR CURE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Congress has adjourned, and many people will feel thankful for the great blessing of rest. "Times are hard—people are out of work," is still the cry, and has been for many weary days and months, until we have come to regard it as an old sore or chronic toothache. Now shall we not make an effort—will not THE TRIBUNE open its columns, and by its editorials help to remedy this great evil? Let us all put our shoulders to the wheel, and make a "long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together," and see if we cannot start this cumbrous load that has so long stuck in the mire of doubt and despondency, and been rendered still more immovable by the friction produced by tricks and political agitation of shysters, who are always ready to "sell out" for the "thirty pieces of silver," or if they cannot get thirty, will take a consulship in a "warm climate," in the vain hope probably of acclimating themselves, preparatory to the sojourn in the still warmer climate that Bob Ingersoll is trying to cheat them out of.

You struck the key-note, it seems to me, when you sought to urge capitalists to use their money. But have you sufficiently insisted on this very important point? Are the people yet educated up to it, or are they not still looking through false colors? Only yesterday a gentleman said to me: "Why should I invest the money I have idle, or improve my property by building? Houses of all kinds, buildings for business purposes, are to let. There are one hundred houses to every fifty tenants now. Then why should I build?" In reply let me say: You lock up your funds because you suppose property will not rent. You have driven, and are driving people to Brooklyn, Harlem, Jersey City and elsewhere, in search of cheaper rents, because you are still looking for 7 and 10 per cent on cost on buildings put up at war prices, and then growl because they pay slowly.

I trust I have said enough to call attention to this subject and draw out criticism and thought. I am well aware that there are other important factors in this great problem, such as the glutted labor market abroad; but as our pastors often tell us, "If men will only stop and think, they will be saved." So if this driving Yankee nation gets fairly to thinking, it will doubtless solve the problem, notwithstanding the difficulties, even if it has to get up a machine to solve it. B.

New-York, July 1, 1878.

AN HONEST MAN'S COMMUNISM.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I have been a Communist and a reader and advocate (am now a subscriber) of THE TRIBUNE thirty-six years. I highly appreciate its general character and purposes, its superior mentality and great influence. I cherish with you the memory of its illustrious founder, Horace Greeley, who, nearly forty years ago, said: "Our evils are not political but social, and a social reform only can eradicate them." The true Communist seeks to effect this social reform which the founder of THE TRIBUNE saw so clearly the need of, and for which his lectures and writings did so much to prepare the way. In view of the foregoing facts, I am sorry to see your unjust, unauthorized, indiscriminate use of the word "Communist" in various phraseology and connections, and your bitterness of feeling toward those you call "Communists."

I presume there are other readers of THE TRIBUNE who, like myself, are Communists—in theory at least—and believe most sincerely that Communism will be and must be an important factor in the salvation of the world from both its social and political evils. A true Communist is not an incendiary, a rioter, a rowdy, a violater of peace and order, a Fenian, a Molly Maguire, or an advocate of physical resistance and oppression—unless driven to it by aggression and compression, after all legal and moral means have failed to obtain a redress of wrongs and grievances. The true Communist would educate the people up to an enlightened and comprehensive view of man's highest relations and duties, and apply the fundamental doctrines of Christ to the practical, every-day duties of life. True Communists would institute a form of society which shall practice the Golden Rule, and illustrate "the religion of humanity" by "giving to each according to needs and receiving from each according to ability." Is there anything hateful, repulsive or alarming in such desires and aspirations? Are Communists, as such, responsible for the want, woe, misery, disaffection and reaction of the unemployed and starving in the midst of plenty? Communists expect to be misrepresented and disparaged by the ignorant and undeveloped; but I did not expect THE TRIBUNE to allude to them in a denunciatory spirit. Is it not barely possible that there are ways and means of helping humanity to live a better life which even the far-seeing TRIBUNE has not perceived and appreciated?

I protest against your making Communists, whose lives, aims and aspirations are as noble as yours, responsible for the sayings or doings, incipient or prospective, of persons, clubs, cliques or unions, who have no knowledge of or sympathy with them. I would most respectfully suggest that you call men and things by their right names, and, like a true philosopher, refer effects to their true causes, which are obvious and of long standing. I am impressed that you have not made the principles and spirit of Communism the subject of serious thought, study and investigation, but, "now see it through a glass darkly." Is Professor Huxley any authority for you? Has he not said virtually, in public, that science leads to Communism; and that "the reconstruction of society on a scientific basis is the only object worthy of political action"? I refer you also to the writings of Professor Draper, and other eminent scientists and philosophers.

Why, my sage old TRIBUNE, you are now in the midst of, are blessed by and constantly blessing Communism; and all that is most valuable and worth preserving in our Republic is its Communism! We only extend, enlarge and apply Communism to every department and relation of life. Do not be afraid of us, we'll not hurt you. Yours, for truth from all sources, and true progress in every sense, J. H. COOK.

Columbus, Kan., July 1, 1878.

OUTRAGES UNDER THE DOG LAW.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Your remarks criticising the morality and common sense of the dog laws of this city met the hearty approval of thousands of readers, and would have won it still further had you also alluded to their shocking inhumanity. The outrageous manner in which this law has been carried out has not only fallen upon the poor helpless animals, but almost equally upon their owners, men, women and many little children, from whose laps their pets have been dragged with scandalous violence, as they held them on their own parents' steps and in their gardens. A muzzle and the payment of a license has been no protection whatever. Ladies have been unable to cross the street to call upon a neighbor with one of these animals in their arms without running the risk of having it dragged violently from them, and of being made the centre of a street encounter. Minnie Potter, a loving little girl of five years, holding on her lap a small black and tan which she loved as the apple of her eye was almost clubbed by one of these brutal ruffians, as he tore it away from the screaming child, and the mother passed the night watching by the little one's bed, as she went into one convulsion after another, until near morning. A man has just righteously sent one of these thieves in a dying condition to Bellevue Hospital; if things go on as they have been doing, worse tragedies will startle the city.

And what is all this done for? Everyone knows that the greed of gain is the sum and substance of the whole affair; that the fear of hydrophobia is merely the pretext made use of; that each year, just before the issuing of the dog ordinance, a few hypothetical cases of hydrophobia ostensibly and with a great flourish of trumpets are made public, scarcely one of which on investigation proves to be valid. Especially have the outrages attending this dog law fallen upon the poor and the middle classes, as the rich can pick up their possessions and go out of town. Is there no remedy? Is there no way of teaching these men that our dogs (which in many instances cost large sums of money) are as much our own as the watches in our pockets? JUSTICE.

New-York, July 12, 1878.

"THOUGH LOST TO SIGHT, TO MEMORY DEAR."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Noticing in your paper of yesterday the statement of Mr. Bartlett, quoted from *The Evening Post*, concerning the origin of the above familiar line, I take the liberty of inclosing you an article cut several years ago from a paper, whose name I regret I cannot now give, assigning another, an earlier and a very different origin to it, which indicates that Mr. Linley used it only as a text or sentiment for the song he composed for Mr. Braham. The article says:

Than the following line no one that we wot of is more frequently quoted: "Though lost to sight, to memory dear;" and yet how comparatively few—no, not one in ten thousand—are aware of its origin. It will be found in a song composed of two stanzas, written about the year 1700 by a Mr. Ruthven Jenkyns—a poet entirely unknown to fame—and published in *The Greenwich Magazine* for mariners. As the production is short, and the poetry good, we may as well give it entire:

"Sweetheart, good-bye! the fluttering sail
Is spread to waft me far from thee;
And soon before the favoring gale
My ship shall bound the sea.
Perchance all desolate and forlorn,
These eyes shall miss thee many a year;
But unforgotten every charm—
Though lost to sight, to mem'ry dear.

"Sweetheart, good-bye! one last embrace!
O cruel fate, two souls to sever!
Yet in this heart's most sacred place
Thou, thou alone shalt dwell forever.
And still shall recollection trace
In Fancy's mirror ever near,
Each smile, each tear upon that face
Though lost to sight, to mem'ry dear."

Bridgeport, July 1, 1878. Respectfully, J. N. I.

VOLTAIRE AND THE MOONS OF MARS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The following passage from Voltaire's *Micromégas* is curiously apropos of Professor Hall's recent discoveries:

But let us return to our travellers. On leaving Jupiter, they traversed about a hundred million leagues of space and arrived at the planet Mars, which, as all know, is five times smaller than our little globe; they saw two moons, satellites of that planet, which have eluded the search of our astronomers. I know very well that Father Castel will deny, in his charming way, the existence of these two moons; but I will leave it to those who reason by analogy. These latter sensible philosophers know how difficult it would be for Mars, which is so far from the sun, to get along with less than two moons.

Frenchmen, particularly at this moment when all France is enthusiastically celebrating the centennial of its great philosopher's death, are accustomed to attribute all the progressiveness of the age to Voltaire, and, I venture to say, if some of them chanced on this passage, Professor Hall would be in danger of losing his astronomical laurels. T. S.

Paris, June 24, 1878.

TOO MANY RELATIVES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I have been married fifteen years. I have seven children. My husband lives (and I with him, of course) on the old home-place. Every Summer during all these years the house has been over-full with my husband's relatives. His mother comes, and his brothers and sisters with their children. I can say nothing against it, because they are my husband's kindred. Once when my husband told me that he had heard from his mother and that she would be with us to-morrow, I said, "Oh dear!" "Oh dear what?" said he. "I don't know how to take any more trouble," said I. "My mother never made any trouble anywhere," said he. "I mean that I can't take any more work." "My mother won't make any more work. All you have to do is to put on another plate." I said no more. But from that day to this each year, she comes with her children and grandchildren. They sit on the cool piazza and I cook for them over the hot kitchen stove, with one child in my arms and another hanging at my skirts. It is a cruel way to treat any woman. If it were not for my children I should run away. I hope other women will show how they are imposed upon, and that you, Mr. Editor, will help them through THE TRIBUNE. AN OVER-VISITED WOMAN.

——, Mass., June 19, 1878.

BARNUM NOT AT CONEY ISLAND.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: There is not a particle of truth in the announcement which has been made through the newspapers that I have purchased land at Coney Island and contemplate opening a show there. This false report has probably been started by land speculators. Respectfully yours, P. T. BARNUM.

New-York, July 10, 1878.

[The information which Mr. Barnum characterizes as false was obtained from Mr. Johnson, the auctioneer who sold the land. Evidently Mr. Barnum does not know precisely what he is preparing to do, or Mr. Johnson does not know to whom he is selling his lands.—*Ed.*]

MRS. WERTHEIMER'S FATE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Your correspondent from Albion, N. Y., writing of Mrs. Wertheimer's death as the result of accident, may be interested to know the following facts, as they tend to convince me that his theory is the correct one. A few years ago I was sitting on some shelving, slippery rocks, just such as have been described in connection with this lady's death, engaged in fishing. One fish wriggled off the hook before I could secure him. The next bite found me more alert—a little too much so; for, turning suddenly, to make sure of my fish, I slipped down into the water. Had I been alone, I should have drowned, as I was unable to swim, and the water was very deep. I have never had a doubt that Mrs. Wertheimer turned suddenly for some reason, just as I did, slipped from the rocks, and met the death from which I so narrowly escaped. J. H. MACKAY.

Brooklyn, July 10, 1878.

REVERSES IN BUSINESS.

FAILURES IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS.

AN INCREASE BOTH IN NUMBER AND AMOUNT OVER THOSE OF THE FIRST SIX MONTHS OF 1877.

The report of Dun, Barlow & Co. just issued shows that there were 5,825 failures in the United States for the first half of 1878, against 4,749 in 1877, an increase of over 1,000 in number, equal to nearly 25 per cent. The liabilities for the same period of 1878 were $130,000,000 against $99,000,000 in 1877—a percentage of increase still greater. The report thus presents the favorable indications for the future:

The enormous amounts realized from both natural and manufactured products exported, the certainty of magnificent crops, the continued success attending the development of mineral resources—all point to a steady gain in national wealth. The probability of early resumption of specie payments is another most encouraging circumstance, and taken in connection with the likelihood that values have touched their lowest point, will result in begetting a degree of certainty and stability to which the trade of the country has been a stranger for some time past. The repeal of the Bankrupt Law, it is thought by some, will have a good effect in weeding out of business that class of persons—both traders and officials—who have hitherto availed themselves of its provision to make money by failures; and though the evils incident to the preferences permitted by the action of various State laws are serious to contemplate, nevertheless the experiment of the abrogation of the National law will, for the time being, at any rate, remove a cause to which has been attributed—whether justly or not—no small portion of the troubles which it has been our duty to chronicle."

The following shows the comparative failures by quarters for the past four years:

FIRST QUARTER.

YEARS.	No. Failures.	Amount of Liabilities.	Average Liabilities.
1875	1,982	$43,176,953	$21,784
1876	2,806	64,644,156	23,038
1877	2,869	54,538,074	19,010
1878	3,355	82,078,826	24,464

SECOND QUARTER.

YEARS.	No. Failures.	Amount of Liabilities.	Average Liabilities.
1875	1,581	$33,667,313	$21,295
1876	1,794	43,7[illegible]1,273	24,398
1877	1,880	45,068,057	23,972
1878	2,470	48,753,940	19,738

TOTAL FOR THE YEAR.

YEARS.	No. Failures.	Amount of Liabilities.	Average Liabilities.
1875	7,746	$201,060,333	$25,960
1876	9,092	191,117,786	21,020
1877	8,872	190,669,936	21,491

RECENT EMBARRASSMENTS.

W. A. Ransom some time ago made an assignment for the benefit of creditors to W. W. Law. Since then proceedings in bankruptcy have been taken against Mr. Ransom, and Mr. Law, desiring to be relieved, obtained, yesterday, from Judge Larremore, in Common Pleas, Special Term, an order substituting for him John W. Barrow, and releasing his bondsmen.

The creditors of John G. Hitchcock, dealer in gentlemen's furnishing goods, failed to elect an assignee yesday, and John H. Platt was appointed to the position. Seven claims were proven. The bankrupt's liabilities amount to about $77,000.

The Brooklyn Library Association the rooms of which are Nos. 131 and 133 South Eighth-st., has become embarrassed financially. The building is mortgaged for $6,000, and there is a floating debt of over $800, while the receipts have fallen off nearly one half in three years. A meeting of the directors will be held on July 17, to take action in reference to this subject.

SEVERAL WITNESSES FOR PORTER.

A RETREAT DENIED—THE FAILURE TO MARCH AT 1 A. M. ATTRIBUTED TO THE DARKNESS.

WEST POINT, N. Y., July 12.—At the opening of the Porter hearing this morning, Brigadier-General M. R. Patrick, who commanded a brigade in King's Division, Fifth Army Corps, was called to the stand. His testimony showed that previous to and about dark on the 29th, there seemed to be considerable confusion among the Union troops in the vicinity of Warrenton Pike. His brigade joined Porter's Corps in the morning on the march from Manassas to Gainesville and passed to a point beyond Bethlehem Church, but he was afterward ordered to march to the Sudley Springs road. Then he received order after order, sometimes by McDowell, once by one of Pope's staff officers, then again by McDowell, till about dark, when his brigade got mixed up with rebel soldiers near Groveton. Relating to Porter's battle on the 30th, he said it was the hardest fighting he ever saw.

On his cross-examination, General Patrick stated that on the 30th he reported to Pope and McDowell that a column of troops had fallen back to Gainesville from the woods, but that a large number of rebels still remained in the woods. From this, he said, Pope and McDowell strongly inferred that the enemy was on the retreat, while he thought otherwise. To General Schofield witness stated that he heard no heavy musketry firing on the 29th till near evening, when King's Division and the Harris Light Cavalry made an attack, and he also said darkness came quick that night.

This evidence, with previous testimony, was significant, because it conflicted seriously with Pope's dispatch to Halleck on the morning of the 30th, and corresponded with the evidence of previous witnesses.

Fisher A. Baker, a lawyer of New-York, who was Adjutant of the 18th Massachusetts, attached to the First Brigade of Morell's Division in 1862, testified that