ate the functions of the Presidential office, are demonstrated by his own letter of acceptance. In that letter he declares that the President is merely an executive officer.

The President on assuming the duties of his office takes an oath to obey the Constitution. The Constitution makes it part of his duty not only to recommend appropriate legislation but to participate in legislation by vetoing measures which do not meet with his approval. To show how potential the framers of the Constitution intended the President should be in the legislation of the country, let us see what his veto power signifies. It requires but a majority of the votes of each House of Congress to pass a bill. In other words, 163 affirmative votes in the House of Representatives and thirty-nine votes in the Senate adopt a bill. If the President returns a bill with his disapproval, before it can then become a law it must receive fifty-one votes in the Senate and 217 votes in the House. So that the President has a voice as great in the United States Senate in the enactment of laws, where the veto power is exercised, as the States of New-York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and Massachusetts combined, and in the House he has as great a voice as the united representation of New-York and Illinois. Yet this so-called "man of destiny" declares that the President is a mere executive officer, and that declaration is the excuse for his failure to speak on the question of protection to American industry, and on many other subjects of vital importance to the country. Would not we assume from reading his letter that the President had no voice in the enactment of legislation, had no responsibility for it, and was a mere puppet to execute whatever laws Congress chose to enact? Yet with strange inconsistency he did proceed to discuss two subjects. He spoke of sumptuary legislation and of our water-courses. The only subjects which occurred to his mind as proper ones for Presidential consideration were whiskey and water.

A FRIEND OF MONOPOLIES.

Is there any foundation for the charge that Grover Cleveland is an enemy of the people, a friend of monopolists, a guardian of the welfare of corporations as against the interest of the people? When a law was enacted by the Legislature prescribing that there should be no distinction in the elevated railroad fares, that there should be no class hours when different charges should be made, and that the rate of 5 cents should be universal, the Governor vetoed it. He gave as an excuse that there was a contract with the companies which would be violated by the enactment of this law, assuming to himself the function not only of the executive, not only of the legislative department, but also of the judicial tribunal. What are the facts? These corporations have an annual income of seven million dollars. They have got far beyond the period of experiment contemplated by the law. They can afford to reduce their fares to five cents, still making a legitimate profit on their legitimate investments. In order to make an apparent case, in order to furnish an excuse to the Gubernatorial guardian, and in order to operate the stock markets, they watered their stock and on the basis of the watered stock it is alleged that their profits had not reached the sum permitted by the Legislature. The Governor accepted this theory and assumed that the companies could not be compelled to reduce their rates until the watered stock paid a certain percentage of profit. If this position be correct when will the companies ever be able to reduce the fares? For when will they cease to water the stocks when it is necessary to prevent the reduction of fares? If the Governor were a friend of the people and not of corporations, why did he not either approve this bill, or without approval permit it to become a law, and let the corporations go to the courts, open their books and show their income? A friend of the people would have taken this course. These corporations are public bodies, using public privileges and franchises, and the public have a right to know their business and ascertain what are their profits upon their investments. Their case is unlike that of a private firm, whose business should not be exposed to the public.

THE CAR-DRIVERS AND CONDUCTORS' BILL.

A law was enacted by the Legislature reducing the hours of labor of the street-car conductors of this city. The Governor vetoed that bill because it was what he termed "class legislation." Every man who is familiar with the business interests and commerce of this great city knows there was something more than welfare of the conductors involved in that measure, although if there were nothing more, common humanity would suggest the approval of the measure. The safety of the entire traveling community is also involved. The strength, the health, the clearness of mind, the nerve of those having control of the public conveyances, are all subjects of interest to the entire public. The custody of human lives is in the keeping of these conductors; their physical and mental conditions are of concern to the public; no portion of it protested against the enactment of this legislation, except that portion included in the monopolists who own and control these street-car corporations. The sentiment of that element had greater weight with Grover Cleveland than the sentiment of the public or the welfare of the unfortunate men whose condition it was sought to elevate by that measure. The Governor says: "It does not prohibit the making of a contract for any number of hours' work, I think; and if it does it is an interference with the employers' as well as the employes' right."

A writer in *The American Protectionist* in reply to this well says: "Even Imperial Austria, which has never been supposed to have any tenderness for the laboring people, has this year passed a law limiting the hours of labor in mines and factories, and it is noticeable that the opponents of the law made the precise objections which Governor Cleveland makes, namely: That it infringes 'the laborer's individual liberty of action.' To this the supporters of the law replied that nobody would be injured by it except 'unprincipled employers whose heartless conduct had made the measure necessary.' The Governor said: "It is distinctly and palpably class legislation, in that it only applies to conductors and drivers on horse railroads."

TEACHING FREE-TRADE DOCTRINE.

But the Governor, who could not approve a measure to reduce the hours of labor of these overworked and unfortunate men, because extending relief to them would be "class legislation," approved a bill to reduce by 25 per cent the fees of the pilots of New-York Harbor. When that measure was before him for consideration he forgot his objection to "class legislation." He did not forget, but he was indifferent to the fact that the pilots, at whom this blow was struck, were citizens of the United States, and that 94 per cent of those to be benefited by the reduction were foreign corporations. In his last annual message to the Legislature of the State of New-York he has placed himself on record not only concerning the pilots, but also concerning the question of protection to American industry, a question he so studiously avoided in his letter of acceptance by declaring that the President was "only an executive officer." In the message referred to he recommends this reduction. Mark his reasoning. I quote his language literally. He says: "Representations made to me by both the commercial interests affected and the pilots leave in my mind not a shadow of doubt that it is the duty of the Legislature, in the interest of the State, to regulate these fees so that they will cease to be, as now, higher than at other ports in this and foreign countries. The suggestion is made by the pilots that the extortion is mitigated because the high rates are paid by foreign instead of domestic shipowners. This idea is in direct antagonism to the considerations involved in the creation and maintenance of the commerce of the State, and betrays an entire misconception of the important interests with which the occupation of a pilot is related and upon which its existence depends."

EFFECT OF THE MORRISON BILL.

We are opposed to the success of the Democratic party in this Presidential contest, not only because of our objection to its Presidential candidate, but because we do not trust it on the question of protecting American industry. Its declarations in its platform are a meaningless jumble of words, an evasion of the issue—an issue so important to the wage-workers as well as to the capitalists of this country. We may judge best of its future by its past. It had control of the last House of Representatives. It elected a Speaker on this distinct issue. That Speaker created his Committee on Ways and Means in furtherance of the issue which triumphed in his election. The chairman of that committee, Colonel Morrison, of Illinois, framed a bill representing, doubtless, the best thought and the honest purpose of the party which triumphed in the Democratic House of Representatives. What was the Morrison bill? It was a bill to make a reduction of 20 per cent in the duties on all imports. Was it the result of investigation, of scrutiny, of testimony? Was it logical? Had it any consideration for home industry? Were the manufacturers, the operatives, the importers of this country brought before the Committee on Ways and Means to give testimony before that body? Were the wages and the modes of living in Europe and in America compared by that committee? Were any investigations made to determine what would be the effect of the enactment of the law upon American industry and upon the American wage-workers? Was it ascertained whether or not many manufacturing establishments must close if this bill were enacted into a law? No. It was the blow of a blind man armed with a dagger, rushing madly among his friends, neither knowing nor caring who might be the victims of his steel.

It is said the tariff needs revision. So it does, and the Republican party is committed and pledged to its revision. But there will be no revision by that party without a proper preliminary examination, without an ascertainment of the exact condition of the country. The revision after such ascertainment and investigation will not be a wild one, making the same reduction in all things, but will be a graded one, in some cases perhaps reducing 50 per cent, in others only 5, making such reductions, such modification and, if needs be, such increases as will do justice to all without doing injury to any of the great elements which contribute to our manufacturing and industrial prosperity.

It is said there are strikes and uncertainties all through the land and that the Republican party is responsible for them. I submit the contrary is the case. The responsibility is upon Morrison and those who voted for his bill. Why should there not be strikes? Why should there not be uncertainties? Why should there not be contraction when so dangerous a bill received so enormous a vote in one branch of the National Legislature? We all know that the great industrial concerns of this country, although managed almost exclusively by young and active men, are very largely operated with capital furnished by older and more conservative men, men who have accumulated wealth and retired from active business. These men are necessarily conservative, and are extremely watchful and sensitive. No matter how great their confidence in the individuals to whom they would gladly intrust the management of their capital, they cannot be blind to the fact that it is dangerous to maintain large investments at a time when those investments are clouded with such uncertainty by the possible passage of Morrison's bills or kindred measures. There are hesitating capitalists; there are men who withdraw investments, and consequently there are men insufficiently paid and threatened with idleness. Let the responsibility rest where it should—upon those who have threatened the stability and continuance of our industry and prosperity.

HOW WELL PROTECTION WORKS.

But we are told that the country does not prosper under the protective tariff system. Let us investigate that. Permit me to weary you with a few instructive figures on that subject. In 1860 the number of hands employed in manufactures in the United States was 1,311,246. In 1880 the number employed in manufactures was 2,739,930. In 1860 the number of establishments was 140,433; in 1880 253,840. The capital employed in 1860 was $1,009,855,715; in 1880 $2,790,273,506. In 1860 the total amount paid in wages was $378,878,966; in 1880 $947,919,674. In 1860 the value of material used was $1,031,605,092; in 1880 $3,394,340,029. In 1860 the value of our productions was $1,885,861,676; in 1880 $5,369,667,706. Bear in mind this increase, that is much greater proportionately than the increase of population, was made notwithstanding the four years of civil war that were part of the period mentioned.

Looking at this increase, can any man be deceived by the declaration that the country has not prospered under protection? Can any man who has experience as to the condition of life and the compensation of the operatives in foreign lands, and the condition of life and the compensation of our own operatives, be deceived by the declarations of theorists that protection is not advantageous to this country? Does any man know of any people who ever wisely governed another people? If no man may answer in the affirmative, and if it is an historical fact that no people ever governed wisely or well another people, is it wise, is it patriotic, will it be beneficial to the workingman of this country to permit the Government which so long sought to control this people and which so frequently and treacherously sought to overthrow this Government to furnish us our political economy, now that she has failed to control our destiny? Do you, who came from your native land to escape not only the government but the blighting influence of the political economy of England on one of the fairest and most fertile lands in the world, desire that that influence should dominate your adopted land? Did you leave English misrule and English political economy to come here and be the tools of English political economists in the Government of the United States? Is English political economy any dearer to you, any more highly esteemed by you, on this side of the Atlantic than it was on the other?

[Mr. Sullivan here read from United States Consular reports descriptions of the homes of the working people in the leading English manufacturing towns and compared them with the homes of American workingmen.]

MR BLAINE AND AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD.

But we are told that Mr. Blaine neglected some American citizens abroad, notably Boynton, Walsh and McSweeney. Boynton had resided in Ireland for years, was a regular organizer of the Land League, and a member of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. It was never established that his father completed his American citizenship or did more than declare his intentions. He was not arrested as a visitor, but as a permanent resident of Ireland, precisely as were Parnell, Dillon and others. McSweeney did business in Ireland and held office as a Poor-Law Guardian. Hepractically reassumed his citizenship, and his counsel, Judge Cooney, of San Francisco, says he has not only no fault to find with Mr. Blaine's course in the McSweeney case, but that, on the contrary, Mr. Blaine did all that could be done and did it cheerfully and promptly. As a result of Mr. Blaine's action in his case, McSweeney was offered release on condition that he would leave the country and return to the United States. This he refused to do, preferring to continue to reside in Ireland. In heaven's name, what is there for any honest man to complain of in this case? And does any honest Irish Nationalist who knows the facts complain? Not one.

As to the Walsh case: On November 16, 1880, at Aughnagower, County Mayo, among the notable persons participating in a very lively Land League meeting was J. B. Walsh, Poor-Law Guardian. December 22, of the same year, J. B. Walsh is recorded at another meeting as an active participant and this time he is a Town Commissioner. He was arrested, and protection as an American citizen was claimed for him. Mr. Blaine promptly prepared and sent to London the following declaration of the position of the American Government in relation to naturalized citizens abroad, and herein is embodied the doctrine concerning the rights which I am authorized to say will be enforced by him as President of the United States; I give verbatim the essential paragraph:

"If American citizens while within British jurisdiction offend against British laws, this Government will not seek to shield them from the legal consequences of their acts, but it must insist upon the application to their cases of those common principles of criminal jurisprudence which in the United States secure to every man who offends against its laws, whether he be an American citizen or a foreign subject, those incidents, to a criminal prosecution which afford the best safeguard to personal liberty and the strongest protection against oppression under the form of law, which might otherwise be practised through excessive zeal. That an accused person shall immediately upon arrest be informed of the specific crime or offence upon which he is held, and that he shall be afforded an opportunity for a speedy trial before an impartial court and jury, are essentials to every criminal prosecution, necessary alike to the protection of innocence and the ascertainment of guilt. You will lose no time in making the necessary inquiries into the cause of Mr. Walsh's arrest and detention, in which it is probable Mr. Barrows, the Consul at Dublin, may be able to aid you."

The doctrine laid down in the Walsh letter is completely satisfactory to every American citizen. It is all we ask, all we have a right to ask. It was the declaration of this doctrine which made James G. Blaine so offensive to the British Government. It was the declaration of this doctrine which has incurred for him the hostility of the British press. It was the declaration of this doctrine in words thus unmistakable which has earned for him the enmity of the entire British Government, and which would prevent him from getting a single vote in the United States if that Government could control the votes of this country. It was the assertion of that doctrine which has earned for him the hostility not only of the British Government but of every other despotic form of government. It was the declaration, in his letter to Minister Osborne, inviting a Peace Conference of the Republics of this continent, which won for him the hatred of every European monarch who seeks a foothold on this continent.

SLANDERED AND MISREPRESENTED.

Perhaps no man that has ever held public office in this country has been more shamefully slandered, more grossly misrepresented, than James G. Blaine, and on no subject has he been more slandered and misrepresented than on his conduct while Secretary of State. It was alleged that his was a blustering, braggadocio, undignified administration. It was alleged that he sought to involve the Republic of this continent in war. Let us read from his own language on that subject:

[Here Mr. Sullivan read from Mr. Blaine's famous Peace Congress letter.]

Mr. William Henry Hurlbert, formerly of this city, is among those who assailed Mr. Blaine's policy while Secretary of State. Mr. Hurlbert is now associated with the most malignant enemies of this Government, and especially of that race in this Government whom he seeks to influence against Mr. Blaine. You have seen from what I have already said concerning the Boynton, Walsh and McSweeney cases that Mr. Hurlbert misrepresented Mr. Blaine's conduct in those cases. This misrepresentation was not without a motive. Mr. Hurlbert has an enmity to gratify, a grudge to revenge. You all remember that Mr. Hurlbert's brother (General Hurlbert, of Illinois) was United States Minister to Peru during Mr. Blaine's term of office as Secretary of State. Mr. William Henry Hurlbert of New-York was interested in what was known as the Credit Industriel, a French company organized to get control of the finances of Peru. It ingeniously distributed some of its stock to Americans, that the company might claim to be American and might receive some support from the American Government in its contemplated inroads upon the treasury of the unfortunate people of Peru. Let me read from Mr. Blaine on that subject.

[Here Mr. Sullivan read Mr. Blaine's telegrams and letters to Minister Hurlbut prohibiting the Minister from giving aid to or having any interest in any speculative scheme.]

Mr. William Henry Hurlbert was one of the people disappointed by those letters. He seeks his revenge to-day. He has other causes for revenge. Mr. Blaine rebuked his brother, the Minister, for engaging in an enterprise unworthy of an American Minister. Let me read to you again, that you may see what character of man Mr. Blaine is, the character of his administration of the State Department, and his views as to the dignity and the importance of an American citizen abroad. [Here Mr. Sullivan read more correspondence to Minister Hurlbut.]

AN AMERICAN ADMINISTRATION.

In what I am about to say to you, my fellow-citizens, I speak in no tone of uncertainty, I speak no words of mere conjecture, but I speak by authority and I would not have spoken to you on this occasion without that authority. With that authority fully and unqualifiedly given, I say to you that the next administration of the United States under the Presidency of James G. Blaine will be an American administration. The rights of American citizens at home and abroad will be protected, not in any cowardly, not in any apologetic, not in any hesitating manner, but with firmness, with dignity, with determination, with a due appreciation of the obligation of the country to citizens who swear allegiance to it and from whom it expects obedience to its laws and, if needs be, their lives in defence of its institutions. The administration of James G. Blaine will insist that every American in foreign lands, who is accused of an offence or is sought to be impressed into the military service of the land whose allegiance he abjured when he became an American citizen, or whose right of person or of property is in any way infringed upon, shall be completely, absolutely guarded, that he shall be given a fair trial and an immediate trial; that he shall be given an opportunity to use his own means in his own defence, and that the nearest American Consul or Minister shall be informed immediately of the arrest of any man who is or claims to be an American citizen, that the power of the Government may be used to secure for him complete and immediate justice.

WHAT IT MEANS.

This does not mean, as Mr. Bayard says, that the administration of James G. Blaine will be a dynamite one, or a dagger one. It does not mean that if Irishmen, appreciating the responsibility of the act, choose to re-enter their native land to engage in a struggle there, they either will or will expect to receive the indorsement of this Government. The men who, prompted by a spirit of nationality, go there to engage in such struggles, will never ask this Government to relieve them of responsibility; and it is only those, to-day, throughout the length and breadth of this land, who never served the Irish National race, save on dress parade, and who do not now contribute either by word or means to advance the doctrine of Irish nationality, who, Pharisee-like are protesting against Mr. Blaine's alleged neglect of the men in whose road they always threw obstacles.

All we ask, all we have a right to ask, is that an American citizen who visits any other government and who is accused of violating any law of that government shall be fairly and impartially and speedily tried, and shall receive all the benefits of his American citizenship. All that we have a right to ask we need not bother asking from James G. Blaine, because his whole life as well as his declarations official and individual are a guarantee that all these will be secured without a word of request on our part. We want no favor for those of our race beyond those we would ask for our German or our French friends, or those of any other race. We have no hostility to our fellow-citizens of any other race, and the recent attempt of the leaders of the Democratic party and of its spokesmen in Chicago, not in open convention, but in cowardly secret conferences, held during the convention to array us against the Germans, or against any other race, will fail. We have no war with our German friends. Like us, they are interested in the maintenance of good and free government. Like us, they are interested in the protection of American industry. Like us, they seek the protection of our flag when visiting their native land. Their interests and ours are identical. No demagogue can lead us into any strife with them. The day of color and the day of race and of creed division is gone by and all the efforts of the little creatures of the Democratic party to create such division and distinction will fail, and ought to fail in the coming contest.

WHY SHOULD IRISHMEN BE DEMOCRATS?

For years we have been known and it is idle to conceal it as an element belonging *per se* to the Democratic party. Why we should have been, Heaven only knows,—or perhaps, it is the other place which knows. We came to seek liberty. The Republican party demanded liberty for all men. We opposed it. We made the hills of Ireland echo with cheers for O'Connell when he struck the shackles of serfdom from the limbs of black men in the West Indies, and we came to America and cast our votes solidly for the party which sought to keep those shackles on the limbs of black men in this Union. We cast our votes solidly for a party which it was resisting the constitutional amendments making all men equal before the law, as they are equal in the sight of God. We have encouraged the honest prejudice of many people who are disposed to be fair-minded by the building of this wall around ourselves. We secluded ourselves from our fellow citizens. We took no part in their debates. We were mere unsociable factors of a party concerning whose political economy and whose conduct of government we had practically no voice. We followed where it led. Is it any wonder that many of our fellow citizens misunderstood us and censured us, and even hated us? Is it any wonder that we were considered inconsistent, making liberty for ourselves, while not constantly and earnestly fighting for it for others? Happily the time has come when we may remove this prejudice from the minds of those who honestly and without malice aforethought entertained it, without associating with those who have been our malignant enemies, our vilest detractors, our most insolent caricaturists. All of this last class are for Grover Cleveland. They know their man. He knows they are our enemies, and he, doubtless, "loves them for the enemies they have made." But we are told that in leaving the Democratic party, which Mr. Collins says made liberty possible, nothwithstanding that it upheld slavery and was dominated by the slave-owning power of this country—this party which is said to be the party of the laboring man, notwithstanding the fact that its political economy is dictated by foreign enemies of American industry—we are going to the ranks of the enemy. Let us investigate that statement. Let us see what this so-called enemy has done to strike at the welfare of the American workingman. The last Democratic President of the United States vetoed the Homestead bill. The first Republican President of the United States approved the Homestead bill. Under the provisions of that bill, from 1861 to 1883, 80,026,789 acres of land have been settled upon. In other words, a territory equal in acreage to the whole of the New-England States, New-York, Pennsylvania, New-Jersey, Maryland and Delaware, has been placed in the possession of those whom Mr. Lincoln used to love to call "the common people." Homes have been given to the homeless, employment to the unemployed. The great floating populations of the larger cities have not only not been augmented, but have been diminished.

THE RESOLUTIONS.

At the close of Mr. Sullivan's address resolutions against Cleveland were adopted with great enthusiasm. The preamble declares that the Democratic party, in defiance of popular objections and by the unfair use of un-Democratic methods placed in nomination an unknown, incapable person and that Mr. Cleveland has no record upon the great question of protection to American industries. The resolutions are as follows:

Resolved, By this meeting, representing the independence of the laboring classes and Irish Americans, that we do hereby declare ourselves unalterably in favor of protection to American industries, and the election of those wise, brave and patriotic statesmen, James G. Blaine and John A. Logan.

Resolved, That we recommend all those in sympathy with protection to American industries, and all opposed to the election of Grover Cleveland, to organize in every State, county and city of this country, that we may defeat, utterly and forever, the undemocratic unit rule and British free trade.

The audience dispersed after singing the Irish National anthem.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TOPICS.

THE MEXICAN BOUNDARY LINE.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 18.—At the State Department it is said that there need be no fear of any trouble growing out of the decision of the Mexican Boundary Line Commission, which places the line 600 yards north of where it was supposed to run. The reconnoissance made by Lieutenant Symond, of the Engineer Corps, which shows the boundary line to be further north than has heretofore been claimed, was made under the terms of a treaty between the Governments of the United States and Mexico for the ratification of the boundary lines of New-Mexico, Arizona and Southern California, and is preliminary to a full and geodetic survey of the lines by an International Boundary Commission, following which it is proposed to place iron posts or monuments deeply planted, at a distance of three miles from each other, along the whole border, from a point above El Paso, Texas, to a point below San Diego, on the Pacific Coast, a distance of 700 miles.

NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 18.—Lieutenants William A. Hadden and O. W. Lowry have reported their return home, having been detached from the Kearsarge, European station, and have been placed on waiting orders. Lieutenant H. F. Pickabaugh has reported his return home, having been detached from the Lackawanna, Pacific station, and has been placed on waiting orders. Lieutenant F. E. Beatty has been detached from the Nina and ordered to the Ranger, October 9. The leave of absence of Civil Engineer H. S. Craven has been extended one year from October 1.

A CLAIM REJECTED MANY TIMES.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 18.—The Secretary of the Interior has referred the Van and Adair claim to the Court of Claims. The claim is almost historic in the Interior Department, and has been rejected by several Secretaries. The claimants allege that they procured legislation in favor of the Osage Indians, resulting in an appropriation by Congress of $5,000,000 for the benefit of the Indians. Van and Adair received from the tribe $50,000 for their services, and they allege that a balance of $180,000 is due them under their contract.

DECISIONS IN CUSTOMS CASES.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 18.—The following is a synopsis of sundry decisions rendered by the Treasury Department in Customs cases during the past week:

Fire bellows, composed of wood, leather and metal, metal being a prominent and important feature, are dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem, under paragraph 216 (T. L., new) for articles composed wholly or in part of iron or any other metal.

Cigarettes of domestic manufacture, exported and reimported, and remaining in bonded warehouse when the act of March 3, 1883, went into effect, are liable to duty under that act.

The affidavits to be taken in connection with the free entry of articles, under decision 6,011, may be taken by the librarian of a society whenever the collector shall be satisfied that such officer is duly charged by the institution with the business of purchasing articles for its account.

Clock keys for winding clocks are dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 414 (T. L., new) for clocks and parts of clocks.

A natural combination of mica waste and soapstone, but ground, is dutiable at 10 per cent ad valorem, under paragraph 95 (T. L., new) for non-dutiable crude minerals, advanced in value or condition by grinding, etc.

Smoked meats, held to be salted meats within decision 5,882, and the salt used in preparing the same for smoking is, therefore, entitled to allowance of drawback.

WASHINGTON NOTES.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, Sept 18, 1884

REDEMPTION OF BONDS.—Up to the close of business to-day United States called bonds had been redeemed at the Treasury as follows: Under the 122d call, $14,410,300; 123d, $14,167,300; 124th, $9,460,050; 125th, $9,157,700; 126th, $9,180,950; 127th, $8,444,150; 128th, $9,009,650; and 129th, $7,664,400.

JUDGE LAWRENCE GOES TO OHIO.—Judge Lawrence, First Controller of the Treasury, left Washington this evening for a short visit to Ohio.

AN APPOINTMENT FOR LIEUTENANT KISLINGBURY'S SON.—The President has appointed Harry Kislingbury, son of Lieutenant Kislingbury, who lost his life in the Greely Expedition, as cadet-at-large to the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

PROSPECTS OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.—Inspector Haworth, of the Interior Department, has just returned to this city from a four months' trip in the Northwest and Indian Territory, where he went to supervise the equipment of the new Indian schools. He says that the prospects are generally favorable for a considerable increase in the number of Indian pupils this year.

SILVER PURCHASE FOR THE MINTS.—The Treasury Department to-day purchased 400,000 ounces of silver for delivery at the New-Orleans and Philadelphia mints.

PRECEPT AND EXAMPLE FOR BOYS.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM EVERETT CASTIGATED AT HOME.

From The Boston Traveller.

Dr. William Everett's address at Quincy on Saturday evening last, as reported in the Sabbath edition of Mr. Pulsifer's paper, was a most remarkable effort. He felt it necessary, as he did all of Mr. Cleveland's supporters, to excuse the moral character and social record of his candidate, and he did excuse it by halves. The young men of Adams Academy, of which Dr. Everett is the principal, were in front of him in large numbers, and we should have expected to find this topic handled with some regard to the effect upon their minds. This, however, was the quality of moral instruction on the subject of personal purity which Professor Everett gave to the young gentlemen to whom he stands in the relation of preceptor, guide and friend:

"But let us consider. A Republican refuses to cast his vote for any man who has ever been guilty of unchastity. He is an. Go home, my Republican fellow-citizens; run through the list of the Presidents you have voted for; Fremont and Grant, Hayes, Lincoln and Hamlin and Johnson, Grant and Colfax and Wilson, Hayes and Wheeler, Garfield and Arthur. Ask yourselves how many of these men could stand the test you impose on Governor Cleveland. Do not go by what you have heard; but ask those who know, and then see if all in that list, living and dead, stand the test of spotless chastity. Ask those who were in the war whether, in following their generals and colonels to the shock of battle, they refused to be led by any whose lives were not spotlessly pure? I say to my fellow-men, whose family morality will not let them vote for Cleveland, 'he that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone.' I ask all ministers of the gospel, whose conscience will not let them vote for any man who ever sinned in this way, how many sermons they ever had the courage to preach against the vice, and how they, knowing the force of men's passions, can draw such a terribly strict line that it would exclude from power many of the noblest of the people's friends and rulers, Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Franklin, William III. and Henry IV., King Solomon and King David? No, Governor Cleveland is not a bad man. *He has not done that which need make us doubt that his administration will be a virtuous one.*"

Such a palliation of gross immorality was bad enough when first offered by *The New-York Evening Post*, and fully justified the prohibition that was at once laid against the admission of that paper to virtuous homes. But from the lips of Professor Everett, standing at the head of Adams Academy, the instructor and counselor of youth, it is an infinitely more demoralizing thing. He broadly intimates that every Republican President for twenty-four years has been a man of Cleveland's stamp. This is a libel not only on the illustrious line of Presidents elected by the Republican party, but on the whole American people, and Professor Everett should be ashamed to utter it. His raking of history as far back as King Solomon and King David for examples to justify the choice of an inchoate man as President of the United States is a not less pitiable exhibition. Virtually he says to the young Americans, the citizens of a few years hence, whose characters are being moulded by him in Adams Academy, and who listened to this singular apology for incontinence and sensualism: "Boys, our Presidents have been about all tarred with the same brush. The generals of the army were no better. Ministers of the gospel even have to wink at this kind of thing. From Garfield back to Hamilton, and from Hamilton back to William III., and clear back to Solomon, personal immorality and uncleanness have been general among great men. And, after all, what of it? That doesn't make them bad men. Cleveland is not a bad man. Go ahead, young men, gratify your baser passions, pollute all the sacred family relations if you feel like it, revel in uncleanness, be fathers but not husbands if you want to, rob women of their honor, and spread ruin and shame in your path—it will not make you bad men, nor debar you from the Presidency, for you will, after all, have done 'nothing' which need make us doubt that your administrations would be virtuous ones."

Shame, Professor Everett, shame!

THE PARTY OF OPPOSITION.

TROUBLED BY THE TARIFF ISSUE.

COMPLAINING OF THE DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEES BECAUSE THE TARIFF QUESTION IS IGNORED.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Sept. 18.—For some time past frequent complaints have been made by Democrats on account of the management of the campaign by their National Committee, one of the grounds of complaint is that the committee is trying wholly to "ignore" the tariff question. Free-trade Democrats assert that the neglect or refusal of the National Committee to distribute documents bearing on the tariff is due to the investigation of Chairman Barnum, whose opposition to the Morrison bill they have forgotten. They declare that he is not in sympathy with four-fifths of his party on that question, and that with the Republicans pushing the tariff issue in every State and everywhere gaining votes upon it, it is absurd in the extreme for the Democrats to attempt to ignore or dodge it. The mails of both the Democratic Committees are burdened with complaints and protests on this account, not only from campaign speakers who desire a supply of ammunition with which to answer the sharp volleys of their Republican adversaries, but from Democratic Congressmen, who filled hundreds of pages of *The Congressional Record* with tariff speeches last spring in the expectation that they would be sown broadcast during the Presidential campaign. Some of the Congressmen have distributed a great many thousand copies of their own speeches, but most of them do not feel able or willing to do so at their own expense.

The letters received by Secretary McPherson from all parts of the country furnish ample proof that the anxiety of the Democratic speakers to obtain documents on their side of the tariff question is entirely reasonable. The demand for the tariff tracts published by the Republican Committee is enormous and a large proportion of the letters calling for them state that they are required for use among Democratic voters, many of whom have become dissatisfied with the free-trade policy of their party leaders, while others are open to conviction on the subject. Many of the letters received ask how this or that Representative stood on the Morrison bill, and indicate that the records of Congressmen on that question are being investigated with unusual care. In brief, Secretary McPherson says the correspondence shows that there is no need of the Republicans "forcing the tariff issue" on the attention of the voters, their interest in the subject is not only lively, but is intense.

TROUBLE IN A NEW-JERSEY DISTRICT.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

TRENTON, Sept. 18.—There is trouble in the Democratic ranks in the IIId Congressional District over the action of the chairman of the last Congressional Convention in issuing the call for the coming one without the usual notice. The call is dated September 3, but as a matter of fact it was not issued until the 15th, and the convention is to take place on the 22d. A number of Democratic papers will have no opportunity to publish it before the convention meets, and the primaries all through the district will have to be held on one day's notice. Miles Ross, an ex-Congressman, and member of the Democratic National Committee, while professing a determination not to take the nomination himself, has been anxious to control the convention. He is said to declare that the shortness of the time given by the call is a game got up in Monmouth County, to cheat him out of the influence he expected to have in naming the candidate. In Union County it is denounced as a scheme got up to swindle the fifteen or twenty aspiring patriots who want the nomination, and to give it to a Monmouth County man. It is charged that certain Monmouth County politicians were given private notice of the call a long time before it was published, and have taken advantage of the time intervening to secure control of the primaries and the convention. The affair will still further complicate the Democratic situation in the district and make it all the easier for John Kean, jr., who will be renominated by the Republicans, to repeat his feat of two years ago in turning the district politically upside down.

WILLIAM H. BARNUM'S STRATEGY.

SAYING THAT HE DOES NOT EXPECT TO CARRY OHIO IN ORDER TO DECEIVE THE REPUBLICANS.

Ex-Senator William H. Barnum, of Connecticut, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, returned from Ohio on Sunday night and at once instructed his lieutenants to say: "We don't expect to carry Ohio." This cry has been repeated loudly by them all the week. The headquarters of the National Committee may be said to have resounded with it. The cry is Mr. Barnum's last attempt at political strategy. He does hope to carry Ohio for the Democratic party, and will put every dollar he can obtain into that State with the aim of increasing the number of Democratic votes. By the cry of apparent despair he hopes to deceive the Republican leaders and lead them to relax their efforts to win the State. At the same time if the State should be carried by the Republicans, as it is now clear it will be, every Democrat can be able to say that he never had any hopes of gaining a victory in the State.

The secret council of the Democratic leaders in this city on Wednesday was for the purpose of setting the Democratic "machine" in this State in motion to grind out the money for the Ohio Democratic leaders. Further steps to secure money were taken yesterday, it is said, at a council at the Democratic National Committee's headquarters, which was attended by Hubert O. Thompson, Commissioner of Public Works of this city, and Senator Gorman, of Maryland, Senator Jones, of Louisiana, ex-Senator Wallace, of Pennsylvania, and B. B. Smalley, of Vermont.

THE O'BRIEN DEMOCRACY.

Ex-Sheriff O'Brien's Independent Democracy is organizing for the campaign. A meeting of the executive committee was held yesterday at the office of the chairman, Orlando L. Stewart. Mr. O'Brien, in moving the appointment of a committee to select the head-quarters for the organization, said they should enter vigorously into the campaign before the machines and halls and bosses combine and divide up the municipal offices without considering the interests of the people. Herman Oelrichs is spoken of as the candidate of this wing of the Democracy for Mayor.

BEECHER AND CLEVELAND.

CONSIDERABLE FEELING IN PLYMOUTH CHURCH OVER THE PASTOR'S SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNOR.

M. Beecher's position in regard to the Presidential candidates is causing considerable discussion among the members of Plymouth Church, the great majority of whom are surprised that their pastor should advocate a man of the known moral character of Governor Cleveland. Such members of the church as Assistant Pastor Halliday, City Treasurer Wheelock, Reuben W. Ropes, John B. Hutchinson, S. V. White, Augustus Storrs and H. J. G. Reeve are heartily supporting the Republican candidates, and they are averse to any reopening of the scandal in relation to Mr. Beecher, as appears inevitable in case he speaks for Governor Cleveland. Anxious for the good name of the church, Mr. Halliday wrote to Mr. Beecher, after discussing the matter with some of the prominent members of the church, and represented the feeling on the matter. In his answer, Mr. Beecher resented any questioning of his motives in politics by the members of his church, and said that if the majority of the members of the church thought his course would injure it, he was ready to resign at once, and that he was independent enough to live without Plymouth Church.

City Treasurer Wheelock said yesterday that he felt that Mr. Beecher had made a grievous mistake in politics. The only leading members of the church who supported Governor Cleveland for President were Thomas G. Shearman, General C. T. Christensen, and General H. C. King, the two first-named being members of the Revenue Reform Club, and the last-named a Democrat, and a member of the Governor's staff. Put aside from any partisan considerations, Mr. Wheelock said that many members of the church felt that if Mr. Beecher should persist in his support of Governor Cleveland, with his admitted character, the old scandal in the church would be reopened. While the members of the church were as firmly convinced as ever of Mr. Beecher's innocence, they felt that it would be too much to have that matter raked over again. Mr. Beecher had been misled by his impulses and had got into a false position, weakening his political influence until it did not amount to much.

The matter is causing much discussion among the members of Plymouth Church, and Mr. Beecher's return on Sunday to his pulpit is eagerly looked forward to.

GENERAL BUTLER IN NEW-JERSEY.

GIVING FARMERS ADVICE AT WAVERLY—TWO MEETINGS FOR HIM IN NEWARK.

The fair grounds of the New-Jersey State Agricultural Society at Waverly were crowded with visitors yesterday. A careful estimate placed the number present at from 47,000 to 50,000. The first special premium offered by the State was taken by El Capitan, the famous trick horse of Dr. Asa Trimmer, of Speed Lawn Stock Farm, at Hackettstown, N. J., and the second by his two-year-old stallion, Hamilton Mamorino, standard animal, No. 2,261.

Governor Leon Abbett arrived at noon and held a reception at the tent of President Clark. General Benjamin F. Butler drove over from Newark with C. C. Lathrop, T. P. O'Reilley and Dennis Murray. After a reception at the president's tent he mounted a stand and made a short address. The Democratic managers of New-Jersey have been greatly worried over General Butler's invitation to attend the fair and had warmly denounced all idea of his making a speech. The Democrats regretted these on the head by saying that he never entertained the thought of making a political speech at the fair and that only a person blinded by prejudice would imagine that he would talk politics on such an occasion. He advised the farmers of the State to give up the cultivation of grain and raise fruits and produce.

General Butler spoke at two meetings in Newark. The principal one was at Military Park, where several thousand people assembled long before 8 o'clock, the time announced for the meeting. Colonel T. D. O'Reilly was chairman and made an address. He introduced General Butler and cheers were given which he acknowledged by bowing. At this moment the space surrounding the speaker's stand was a living mass of men, pushing and struggling. A rough estimate made the number of people present 6,000. General Butler was unable to be heard, and finding the end of the platform encumbered by men and boys he peremptorily ordered them off, taking some of the intruders by the shoulders and angrily pushing them back. A space was soon cleared. It became evident, soon after he began speaking, that there was a disorderly Democratic element present bent on creating confusion. No adequate