WEEKLY COURIER.

C. DOANE, Publisher.

JASPER, - - - INDIANA.

GOVERNOR HORATIO SEYMOUR.

The Venerable Statesman's Warning Against the Perils of a Centralized Government—The Republican Party's Insidious Encroachments Upon the Limits of the Constitution—The Positions of the Two Candidates Contrasted.

Governor Seymour recently delivered a political address to his fellow-townsmen of Utica, N. Y., from which we make the following extracts, regretting that want of space will not enable us to give in full the words of wisdom that fell from the lips of the "old man eloquent." Governor Seymour said:

"It must not be forgotten that this Government is no longer the simple machinery it was in the early days of the Republic. The Incode age of America is over. The interests the Government has to deal with are no longer those of a small number of agricultural communities, with here and there a commercial town. They are the interests of nearly fifty millions of people spread over an immense surface, with occupations, pursuits and industries of endless variety and great magnitude; large cities with elements of population scarcely known here in the early days, and all these producing aspirations and interests so pushing, powerful and complicated in their nature, and so constantly appealing to the Government rightfully or wrongfully, that the requirements of statesmanship demanded in this age are far different from those which sufficed a century ago."

These are not my words. If I had uttered them, it would be felt that I was making a harsh charge against the Administration. They are the statements put forth by one of its officials, who speaks from his experience as a member of the Cabinet, and as one who formerly had a seat in the Senate. This declaration made by Mr. Schurz is official in character. It will be so viewed in other countries, and will rejoice the enemies of our Government, while it mortifies the American people. The speech from which this extract was taken was made as a leading one in this canvass with a view of directing its discussions. It was received with applause by the journals of the Republican party, and by the leading members of that organization. Its startling declarations force upon our minds the questions: Are the disorders, the temptations, and the confusion which press our Government due to its character and structure, or to the manner in which it is administered? No other subject so grave or so urgent is involved in the pending contest. If it is true that the difficulties in the way of an honest conduct of our affairs are so great that there must be other qualifications for the Presidency of the United States than those of intelligence, honesty, and patriotism; if our Government can only be carried on by an exceptional man, who may not always be at our command, then we have undergone a revolution. When we are told that a statesman is essential in the condition of our affairs, it disturbs our minds as when we are told that a physician of unusual skill is needed in our families. It means disease and danger. They are usually the words we hear but a little while before the crape upon our doors informs our neighbors of the sad result. If our Government is so incumbered with the confusion growing out of fifty millions of people and their varied interests and pursuits, it is clear that when that population within the lifetime of many before me shall have grown to one hundred million and the complicated interests of our country are multiplied four-fold, that our Government must be overwhelmed or there must be marked reform in its conduct. This is not a remote or uncertain danger. It is one that we must confront now; it already taxes our industry and endangers our prosperity.

EVILS NOT DUE TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Is this state of affairs due to the structure of our Government, or to they way it has been administered? It is not necessary at this time that we perplex ourselves with questions about the way our Constitution was adopted. Whether it was formed by a compact between the States, or by the people of States, or by the people in their primary individual capacity, it is enough for our purpose that it is an indissoluble bond of union; that it makes a General Government, and it recognizes the rights of States and of persons; that all these are equally sacred; the dissolution of the Union, destruction of States, usurpation of power, or the wiping out of lines which limit their respective jurisdictions, would each be equally revolutionary and disastrous. When we read the Constitution we find it makes the most conservative government in existence; that, beyond any other system, it protects the rights of persons and of minorities. It measures out with careful terms the jurisdiction of Congress. It gives to each citizen rights of person, of property, of conscience, and of speech, so well guarded that a single man may, with regard to them, defy the Government, although it may act under the impulses of every citizen but himself. It places the President, and Congress, and States under the supervision of the Judiciary. This is to act as an impartial arbiter between them, and upon all questions which concern the jurisdiction or the rights of either. This method of defining and securing the rights of all departments, and the liberties of the people, is unknown elsewhere in the world's history. Even in Britain, proud of what it calls its constitutional law, and of the protection which is thrown around its citizens, Parliament can, if it will, unjustly destroy life, liberty and property; there is no power to resist its decrees. The Judiciary itself is but an instrument to carry out its purposes, however destructive of what they term their constitutional principles. Here, an unconstitutional law is a dead law.

ABUSES CAUSED BY THE REPUBLICANS.

As to the evils, corruptions and abuses which are set forth by Mr. Schurz, let us see the positions held by leading Republicans with regard to them. What are those doing who have been intrusted with the duties of administration and who seek to hold power? We have seen that the methods of those who have controlled public affairs and not the Constitution of the United States have caused the dangers which threaten us. In the first place the candidate of the Republican party openly expressed his joy that Congress has thus enlarged its jurisdiction, and, to use his own phrase, he is glad "*that it gravitates toward more power.*" He not only wishes the Government to gain this, but he is willing that it should do so by indirection and subtle construction. He does not say as he should do if he seeks a change in the character of our Government that it should be made by open and direct amendments, but he tries to bring about by the use of doubtful phrases. I speak particularly about his position, as he is now the exponent of the great party which has placed him in nomination for the Presidency. The leaders in the canvass on that side are those that hold places as Senators or as Cabinet Ministers, or important positions under the present Administration. All of them in fact, and in some form, ask that their powers should be increased by taking from the people some of their home rights. They say in effect, Give to us your rights of making laws for yourselves; we can take care of your interests better than you can. Every demand for jurisdiction for the General Government is a demand for the surrender of rights by the people in their towns, their counties or their states. Mr. Garfield openly expresses his satisfaction and his desire, if he is elected President, that the Government should have more power than it had when Washington and Adams and Jefferson and Jackson filled the Executive Chair. He says there has been a gain and that there will be more by force of gravitation, not by the popular will, not by changes in the Constitution in a regular way, but that authority, patronage, and power will add to themselves, will by their weight increase and grow until they are up to the full measure of his desires. He rejoices to see this done in a way against which

BOOMER WASHINGTON WARNED YOU

in his farewell address, which was submitted to Alexander Hamilton and other statesmen before he gave it to the American people:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking, in a free country, should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion by others, has been evinced by experiments, ancient and modern; some of them in our own country, and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular, wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can, at any time, yield."

If I had not stated that these were the words of George Washington, it would be thought I was indulging in a personal attack upon Mr. Garfield, so severe are they upon his methods and the precedents he would make. Prominent as a Republican speaker is Mr. Schurz. When he told of the state of affairs at Washington we looked for a demand for strong and stern dealing with public evils. But he glides off into a suggestion more hurtful to Mr. Garfield in the minds of thoughtful men than any attack made upon him by his political opponents. He intimates that, as Mr. Garfield has been at Washington, where these corruptions have grown up, he has become a statesman and is the best man to deal with them.

Another member of the Cabinet, Mr. Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury, takes a different view of the state of affairs from that given by his colleague. He dwells upon the business prosperity of our country. Overlooking the industry of our people, the favorable seasons that have rewarded their labors with ample harvests, the demand for our products from other countries, he claims for the Administration the gratitude of our people for all their blessings. I have no unkindly feeling for Mr. Sherman; I regret that he does himself a wrong when he is

UNGRATEFUL TO GOD

and unjust to the laborers of the land. It is not the statesmanship of the Cabinet, but the statesmanship of the plow, blessed by a fruitful season, that gives us our growing wealth. Not the skill of the Treasury Department, but of mechanics and manufacturers, that make the springs of our prosperity; not the talk in Congress, but the toil of labor in all its varied fields. In another respect he does himself a wrong. He does not warn our people of the danger which the change of seasons may make. He does not, as he should, admonish them that at this time, when money is abundant, men should throw off the burdens of debt and extricate themselves from positions of peril if times should change. He teaches the false and mischievous doctrine that government policies, and not honest toil and frugal care, that the schemes of the brain, not the sweat of the brow, give competence to men. Much has been said about the absurdity of fiat money. How much more absurd are Mr. Sherman's teachings of fiat prosperity. In this direction Mr. Sherman outstrips Dennis Kearney.

NATIONALISM.

The points most conspicuous in the speeches and journals of the Republican party are, first, that this is a Nation, and next, this election is a contest between the Northern and Southern States, in which a victory will be a great gain to the former party. We charge that the denunciations of the South are used to mask their designs to get jurisdiction over all the Union, and mainly over the interests and people of the North, as they are the most important and varied; that the term *Nation* is selected because it is a word of obscure and indefinite meaning, and if it is substituted for the legal and proper title of Government, it will enable them to make changes in its character hurtful to the rights of the people and disastrous to the prosperity of their business and industrial pursuits; that the mischief it will create will not be for the remote future, but that they are pressing upon us now, and will be left in their full force from this time on unless they are averted by the results of the pending elections.

It is a marked and conspicuous fact in the political discussions the past four years that the Republican leaders have sought to bring into use the words Nation and Nationalism when speaking of our country. These have been heretofore used without any special significance, as terms generally applied to different divisions of the human race into communities governed by some forms of law, and in this sense we have used them to avoid the repetition of the term Union, United States, or General Government. But they have now become the shibboleths of the Republican party and of all who have schemes for which they wish to gain public support at the seat of Government. While the men who use these terms never define them, their very obscurity serves the purposes of covering their ultimate objects, and at the same time allowing all who have political theories inconsistent with our Constitution to feel that they favor their views. In its primary sense the word Nation means those of common origin, and applies most aptly to the smaller divisions of tribes or of those of common lineage. In this more correct significance it is certainly not applicable to our country, whose population is made up of mixed races from all quarters of the world. In its more common use it signifies political divisions, ranging from the lowest to the most elevated political organization. When, therefore, it is said we are a Nation, the term gives no idea of the character of our own Government, but it leaves every one to infer what he pleases of its significance.

OBSCURE AND UNMEANING AS IT IS,

it was adopted with the solemnity of a Congressional resolution, as a term which told of the power of our General Government. In 1870 a resolution was offered which declared, among other things, that the people of the United States constitute one Nation. All of the Republican members voted for this, as if it threw some light upon the character of our Union. So far is it from doing this that it simply tends to make that obscure which was clearly stated in our Constitution. There is something in the words United States, the Union, the General Government, which is in conflict with the purposes of Mr. Garfield and his friends. They do not tell us distinctly what they aim at, but we find that those who seek for more jurisdiction use the term Nation, or Nationality, whenever they have occasion to speak of the jurisdiction at Washington. We always find that the men who use the word—and many like Senator Blaine love to call it a Sovereign Nation—are in favor of a different construction of the Constitution than has heretofore prevailed. Mr. Garfield openly states this when he says that the views held by Mr. Hamilton are growing in strength, and he rejoices that our Government is gravitating to more power. We find, too, that they favor the plans of that distinguished statesman of gaining jurisdiction by constructions put upon the words of the Constitution. As they do not like, at this moment, to develop all their plans, which would excite alarm particularly at the North, to mask their purposes and to divert attention by exciting passions and prejudices, they use the word as far as they can in connection with sectional controversies, so that it may be felt they only have in view the strength of the Union. It is this idea which gives their phrases a measure of favor with the Republican party. They also take great pains in their discussions to carry the idea that Nationality means something favorable to the interests of the North. We charge that the purposes of the Republican leaders

ARE IN CONFLICT WITH THE CONSTITUTION;

that they endanger the peace, the order, and the safety of the Union. They draw to the National Capitol hordes of men who have selfish and corrupt objects, who tempt officials to violate duty from motives of ambition and greed for gold. They impair the interests and prosperity of different sections of our Union, by laws framed by men ignorant upon the subject upon which they act, and by legislation not only in conflict with the letter of the Constitution but with its spirit and the genius of all our political institutions, both local and general. I have already briefly sketched the history and features of the Constitution. I have set forth, in the language of Mr. Schurz, the evils which now prevail about the Capitol, growing out of the various and complicated subjects which are improperly carried there for legislation. I have stated that the Republican leaders seek to increase this evil state of things by widening the jurisdiction still more, so that the increase of our population, the growth of all its business interests, so far from giving us greater security, will only create more complication, more disorder, more difficulties. We charge that those who seek covertly to bring about these results are animated by selfish purposes of ambition, love of power, or lust for gain, which make them indifferent to future consequences if they can reach the object of their desires.

Good Republican friends, we pray you do not indulge in sectional hates; but if you will be led into such warfare at least look and see that you are to suffer more than those you seek to injure. Do not shut your eyes to the fact that, while the advocates of Nationality have much to gain, you have much to lose by their policy. You will find they are talking for themselves, and that

THE CONTEST WITH THE SOUTH IS A FEIGNED ISSUE

under cover of which you are warred upon.

It must not be thought that the changes which men seek to make in the character of our Government by the use of the words Nation and Nationalism, and by the constructions which they mean to put upon them, relate only to the theory of politics; that their influences are too uncertain and remote to be of immediate concern. They affect us now. They not only threaten but work disastrous results to the commerce of our country, to the interests of the farmers of the Western States, and to the business prosperity of the whole country. We know that cheap transportation has led to the sale of our farm products in Europe, and has lifted all kinds of business from the depression which a short time since was felt by all pursuits. The ability to send what we make and raise to the markets of the world at cheap rate, is of more importance to the North than to the South. The products of the latter are of a kind that do not suffer from the competition of other countries. Europe must have the cotton of the South. Increased cost of transportation does not prevent their sale; it adds to the consumer. The farmers and manufacturers of the North have to compete with those who make or raise the same products in the markets which we seek to gain. A small difference in the cost of carrying will prevent our grain and provisions from going abroad. But a few years since, these charges were such that we could not export many things which we can now sell at a profit. Whoever will examine the rates for carrying eight or ten years ago, will see how they cut off all sales in a large way to European countries.

We must bear in mind that last year the expenses of the General Government, after deducting all that was paid for pensions, or for interest or principal of the public debt, was more than one hundred and twenty-six millions. This was for the ordinary expenses of Government. This great increase of expenses has grown out of its increase of jurisdiction over subjects which can be more wisely and economically administered at their homes. With all the confessed difficulties set forth by Mr. Schurz growing out of the pushing and varied interests at Washington and in the face of increased taxation, the Republican leaders are urging more jurisdiction with more taxation and more confusion. The ways in which the Government collects its revenues conceal their full sums from those who pay them, but they tell none the less in their results upon their property. You will find these taxes on the sugar in your teacup, in the clothing of your family, in the medicines of your sick, in the varnish on the coffins of your dead. By general consent they are levied upon articles of consumption. This has the advantage of giving protection to home industries, if it is not carried too far. If they are made too burdensome they destroy home productions as they add to their cost. While we cheerfully pay in this way for all necessary expenses of Government, we protest against making them needlessly expensive. Already the amount paid by New York for its support is about twice the cost of the State Government. In making this statement I do not take into account any sums for pensions or for payment of interest and principal of the public debt. The expenses at Washington after making these deduction are, as nearly as I can learn, more than twice the cost of the thirty-eight States of the Nation, yet Mr. Garfield and other Republican officials seek more jurisdiction, more cost, more taxation under the shadowy phrase of Nationalism. They ask that they shall be intrusted with more power, more patronage, and the distribution of larger sums of money drawn from the people in unequal proportions and by expensive methods.

THE POSITIONS OF GARFIELD AND HANCOCK CONTRASTED.

I beg our Republican friends to look at the attitude of Mr. Garfield with regard to the Constitution, and see if it is one that shows loyalty to its provisions. It is the charter of our rights and liberties. He has on many occasions sworn to uphold it. On the 4th of March next he will, as a Senator from Ohio, take a solemn oath to support its provisions. The Senate was organized to assert and defend the letter and its spirit. Does the conduct of Mr. Garfield accord with these oaths? He avoids the use of the titles it gives the Government. These were selected to show its character and object. He uses in a marked way words the framers of the Constitution rejected, and shuns those they selected. What could be thought of a clergymen who should substitute for the grand, clear tones of the Bible, vague and unmeaning words which obscure the law of Christian life? Yet in this way Mr. Garfield treats the law which makes the life of our Union. In view of his efforts to change the Constitution by substituting construction for its language, you doubt if, in his oath of office, he swears for or at the Constitution. You wonder what he seeks, which is rebuked by the title of "United States," the "Union," the "General Government." What leads him to dwell upon the words "Nation" or "Nationalism," which are weak, obscure and trivial? Let us see how Mr. Garfield looks at his interest and position. We can give his ideas almost in his own words when he communes with himself. He says: "I am to be a Senator from Ohio for six years. Hamilton was right when he said that Senators should hold for life. I am glad that his opinions grow in favor. He did not like our Constitution, but said everything depended upon the way it was construed. This heavy volume on my table, called the Civil List, shows the names of more than seventy thousand men paid from the Treasury. This does not include the soldiers or sailors. 'I am glad to see we are gravitating toward more power.' The Senate, of which I am a member, gives most of these men their places directly or indirectly. They depend upon confirmation by us of the President's nominations. In view of this fact, he usually sends in the names of those we want. If he does not, we throw them out. While large numbers of those in the Civil List are not acted upon by our body, yet as a rule they hold under those we confirm, so they all look to us for support. If we can make the Civil List up to a hundred and fifty thousand, we shall be able to hold our places for life. The things most in the way are the words of the Constitution. I have thought much about them. John Quincy Adams once wrote some poetry in which he put in the mouth of Mr. Jefferson these lines:

"'If we can not change the things
I swear we'll change their name, sir.'

"The troublesome terms in the Constitution are the 'United States,' the 'Union.' They tell of States and other rights than those controlled by Congress. I do not like the words General Government, as it tells of other Governments and States; there are some terms such as Nation and National, which those who made the Constitution would not have in it. They were kept out by unanimous vote. They are vague and do not show what is meant by their use. I want them for the very reason that led the Convention to strike them out. If we get our people to use them they will fall into the habit of looking to other Governments than our own for usages and laws. We have got this practice under way. In 1866 all our party in the House of Representatives voted for a solemn resolution that ours was a Sovereign Nation. We all wore grave faces when we did this. It taught us as much about our Government as if to show the prerogatives of the President we had with equal solemnity declared that he was an individual. The world is full of nations. There are many hundreds of them, of all kinds, from the Sandwich Islands up to the Russian Empire. Their habits and usages range from those of the King of Dahomey, who kills a few men each day for his health's sake, to those of the Queen of England, who leads the quiet life of a good woman. There is nothing that Nations do not do in the way of law-making, and no one can define their character as a class. The word Nationalism has different meanings to different men. In due time, if we are firmly seated in power, we can tell the public what we mean by it; our definition will be that we want more jurisdiction for Government; this means more cost for more men to do more duties. The additions thus made to officials will give to Senators more power, patronage and wealth. I will use these words, Nation and National, as often as I can. I will strew them through all my speeches and letters. They are now the shibboleths of our party, and of all who have schemes before Congress. They sound well, and many think they lift us up to a higher rank as a people to be put in the list of tribes and of barbarous or uncivilized Nations. But we must take care that the people do not get alarmed at the idea of more cost and more taxes. We have the most to fear from those of the North, for in rise of their great States there are more than half of the people of the *Nation*. But they have only eighteen Senators out of twenty-six. It was unfortunate that we told them in debate that these States paid three-quarters of the taxes levied by Government. We must keep those facts from their minds. We must stir up the old hate of the South and make them feel that while Nationalism will help them, it will hurt those in the Southern section."

These plain words give you the theories of Mr. Garfield and his friends about this election, and their plans for the future. What they say and do shows you what they aim at. Will it not be wise on the part of the great Republican party to learn and think who will be the victors and who will be the victims if they have their own way in this election? If they do not do this, they may fall into the trap set for the people, and that we all shall feel that Nationalism is a curse.

Turn from Mr. Garfield's letter of acceptance to that of Gen. Hancock. He bows to the decrees of the Constitution. He accepts its teachings, he is imbued with its faith; its terms to him are sacred; his earnestness shines out in every line, and when he swears to support the Constitution in its letter and spirit we know he means to do so. Those who formed it not only chose fitting words to tell its meaning, but patriotism, like religion, has its symbols. No flag which floats in the wind of heaven tells so much as ours of the history and character of the Government it represents. Its stripes recall the names of the States which fought the battle which gave us liberty, and which crowned their glorious work by forming our Union. The States are numbered by the stars which glitter upon its blue field. He who would strike one star from its place or who would blend or blur these symbols, so that they would tell only of obscure Nationalism, has latent treason in his heart.

We are asked why we took a soldier for our standard-bearer. To whom can we intrust it with more safety than to one who has had its deep and grand significance burnt into his very being by the fires of battle-fields?

There is not a color upon its folds, there is not a stripe upon its emblazonry, there is not a star upon its azure ground, that has not been made sacred to him. The appeal which drew him and his fellow-soldiers from their homes to the battle-field was to rally around the Stars and Stripes and to uphold the Union. They will never make our flag an unmeaning thing; they will see to it that it remains a true emblem of the spirit of our Constitution. By the people's vote Gen. Hancock will bear this standard on to victory in this contest as he has heretofore done on the bloody fields of battle. He has learned from it the grand purposes of the Constitution by teachings amid all the solemn lessons of war—by the inspirations of the battle-field, by the sad and solemn aspects of the blood-stained earth and the dying groans of men when the struggle was ended. He has learned the great lesson of statesmanship, not amid scenes of party strife, not in an atmosphere tarnished by personal ambition or schemes of plunder, but where Washington and Jackson learned the lesson of duty to their country and of obedience to its laws and Constitution. It is now charged by our opponents that we are inconsistent when we place a soldier at the head of the Government. The propriety of doing this depends upon the character of the man and the nature of the service upon which he has been engaged. The General who has fought only for victory or a conquest, or has been engaged only to promote schemes of ambition, or gratify feelings of hate, has been taught upon the battle-field only lessons of force and insolence. But those who have dared the perils of war to free their country of oppression, to gain for it an independent Government, to resist hostile invasions, or to uphold it against resistance to its rightful authority, have their minds filled with objects instructive, ennobling and patriotic.

With intellects quickened by all the dangers and excitements of the strife, they see more clearly than other men the value of obedience to laws, and the duty of sacrificing all things for their country's good. It was in this school that Washington learned the grand duty of laying down his sword and retiring to private life when the world thought he would claim a crown as his reward. This act, so constantly referred to in other lands as well as our own, gave him his immortality.

It was in the same school, under like influences, that in the hour of victory Jackson curbed and restrained his fiery spirit, and submitted to injustice and indignity, because it was imposed upon him by a legal tribunal.

"If called to the Presidency, I should deem it my duty to resist, with all my power, any attempt to impair or evade the full force and effect of the Constitution, which, in every article, section and amendment, is the supreme law of the land."—*Winfield Scott Hancock.*

He who has learned to obey rightful authority has been taught the great lesson which fits him to exercise great authority. He who reverences the laws of his country is the right man to administer them. He who has proved his devotion to its interests is the one to whom we can most safely trust the work of guarding and protecting them. Therefore we placed him in nomination, and go into this contest with the firm faith that we shall elevate him to the position of President of these United States.

——The great cities of the North are growing a little restive under the ruffianly warfare the Radicals are making on their best customers. The trade of New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati and St. Louis is so largely from the South and is so rapidly increasing in consequence of the industry and good order of that section, and above all the good temper of Southern merchants, notwithstanding the vile insults constantly heaped on them, that these cities as a matter of sheer decency are disposed to resent the offense offered to their customers. The prospect now is that the merchants will speak with no uncertain voice at the approaching election.—*St. Louis Times.*

——Grant has heard from Maine and his notification to Marshall Jewell that he has revised his programme for the next month, leaving out the political features to which he had been previously committed, is satisfactory evidence that he can read the handwriting on the wall. He is too prudently inclined to board a sinking ship.—*St. Louis Republican.*

——If the country was raked from one end to the other as many men could not be found who supported Tilden in 1876 but now support Garfield as there were Republican Vice-Presidents at the Hancock meeting in Pittsburgh the other evening.—*Detroit Free Press.*

——It will cost the Republican National Committee a large sum of money to explain to the people how Maine happened to be lost to them.—*Concord People.*

PERSONAL AND LITERARY.

VON BULOW, the pianist, has had a stroke of paralysis and lost the use of his right hand.

HERBART SPENCER begins next year a tour of the world, going from England to the United States.

SEVERAL professors of the Kazan University, Russia, are preparing to translate Shakespeare into the Tartar language.

MISS FLETCHER, who has made special study of American antiquities, is to deliver a course of lectures next winter, on Ancient America.

THE Sultan of Zanzibar has sent an order to the Mission Press at Beyrout for a complete font of Arabic type, and for a native compositor to manage his Imperial Press.

JAMES PAYN, the most prolific of recent English novelists, is an incessant smoker. He rarely walks out, and does not consider physical exercise as a restorative of brain power.

SOMEBODY is making an index to the medical literature of the world. It will occupy 10,000 pages, and show what a tremendous amount of writing has been caused by the physical pains and miseries of the human race.

MISS EMMA BURT, well known as the author of several pleasing books of approved excellence for children, and a contributor to *Wide Awake, St. Nicholas, Work and Play* and other magazines, has been removed to the Insane Asylum at Utica, N. Y., for treatment.

SALA pictures Henry Labouchere of the London *Truth* as "a scholar of extensive and well-digested reading, a traveled linguist, a diplomatist of nearly twenty years' training, a shrewd financier, a brilliant conversationalist, a ready, incisive public speaker, a man of wit, a man of sense, and a man of business," and says he has made a palpable hit in the House of Commons.

EDWIN ARNOLD, the author of "The Light of Asia," is the second son of Robert Coles Arnold, a Magistrate for Sussex, Eng. He was born June 10, 1832, was educated at the King's School, Rochester, and King's College, London, and was elected to a scholarship at University College, Oxford, where, in 1852, he obtained the Newdegate prize for an English poem on the "Feast of Balshazzar."

MR. W. E. H. LECKY, the English philosopher and historian, is regarded as a sort of literary phenomenon. Though he has been before the public as an author since 1861, he is only forty-two years old. This is the more singular because his fame rests upon extensive scholarship and earnest investigation of topics that men seldom master until after middle life. He was born near Dublin, decided to be an author at twelve, and had read more books at fourteen than most young men at twenty. When he graduated at Trinity College, his professors said he had the best stored mind of the age who had matriculated within their memory.

HUMOROUS.

WHAT better time to be buried in slumber than at the dead of night?

WE suppose the man who was rocked in the cradle of the deep slept in the bed of the river when he grew up.—*Hawkeye.*

THE oyster would live for eight years if he had a chance, but he is kept in such a stew that he dies young of heart trouble.—*Graphic.*

OUR friend Jones frequently tells of ideas flitting through his mind. Ideas find nothing in Jones' mind to obstruct their flits.—*Boston Transcript.*

IN all the researches at Pompeii men have failed to come across one single sign of "No Trust." Those were the days for an honest man to live in.—*Detroit Free Press.*

THE elephant puts on a lot of style nowadays, but it takes a good deal of conceit out of him to be shown the jaw-bone of a mastodon.—*Chicago Times.*

IT is easy to stump Rhode Island. A grand stand is erected in the middle of the State and the thing is done with a single speech. Parties of the opposition go into Connecticut until the speaking is over.

A CERTAIN little damsel being aggravated past endurance by her big brother fell down upon her knees and cried: "O Lord, bless my brother Tom. He lies, he steals, he swears. All boys do; us girls don't. Amen."

A GREAT many look at life very much as one who rides backward looks out of a car window. Everything seems to be going ahead while he is falling behind, when in fact he is getting ahead all the time, and very rapidly.—*Boston Transcript.*

AN exchange prints a lengthy article on "Science at Breakfast." Valuable space wasted. Science at breakfast is getting away with four slices of ham and half a dozen eggs while your vis-a-vis is unfolding his napkin.—*Keokuk Gate City.*

A WEALTHY Chicago grain merchant, now in Europe, was examining a painting of a heavy thunder and rain storm. "Do you call that from nature?" he asked. "Certainly," replied the agent. "Well, he must have been a fool to sit in a spout like that."

FATHER—"Here, you have only been married four weeks, and almost every day you come to me with complaints about your husband. You ought to be ashamed of yourself." Daughter—"But he fights me all the time." "Foolish child! Haven't your mother and me been fighting every day for thirty years, and don't we get along peaceably and quietly with each other?"—*Galveston News.*