

THE RICHMOND DISPATCH

BY THE DISPATCH COMPANY. The RICHMOND DISPATCH is delivered to subscribers at FIFTEEN CENTS per week...

of the Mongols themselves, they ought to be confined to China. The Trade Ship-Railway. The Whig says: "The House Committee on Commerce has recently reported favorably a bill to aid in the construction of a ship-railway, and while it would involve the outlay of a vast amount of money, it would no doubt be a great benefit to our commerce, and would build up and make rich several of the southern States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico."

It is only in this way that the South can recoup herself for the loss which she annually sustains as a consequence of the paying out in the North of such immense sums of money for pensions, &c., &c.—money much of which is collected in the South. If all internal taxes were abolished this condition of things would not be so hurtful to this section. As it is, it is intolerable. Kentucky pays twice as much of internal taxes as do all the New England States together, the former State paying about fifteen millions a year, and the latter States, all six of them, about seven and a half millions.

The FADS ship-railway, once finished, would change the channels of the commerce of the world. Look at New York city, think of its commerce, and see how other great cities are clustered around it growing rich and populous upon the mere drippings of its commerce. A ship-railway across the continent on our southern border would build up great cities on that border. It would also make the Southern Pacific the leading transcontinental railroad, and would enrich Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and, we might say, all the South.

Mr. MANNING'S letter to the House of Representatives explaining his course heretofore relative to the silver dollar and the policy he intends to pursue hereafter, is an able document. He shows great familiarity with the principles of the subject he discusses, and handles his figures and phrases with unusual skill and dexterity. It can do no bimetalist any harm to read such a document. It is creditable to the Ministry which has so accomplished a Minister of Finance.

Nevertheless, we are still of the opinion that as there is no man living who can tell how much currency this country needs, so there is no man living who can tell how much silver will have to be coined before the country falls away from the gold standard.

The Philadelphia News says there is no constitutional authority for the assumption the President makes through Mr. PROSS that a certain document called for by the Senate is not a public document, and adds: "It is purely the arbitrary act of an obstinate man. The Senate cannot force the President to yield the position which he has taken, but popular judgment favors the view of the Senate."

We think the News will find considerable difficulty in proving that popular judgment favors the view of the Senate. However, admitting that the News is well informed and states the situation correctly, the question arises, What is it going to do about it? No man has done more than Senator Morgan to expose the scheme of education proposed by the impractical Blair, Courier-Journal.

And no man ever suffered such a complete defeat at the hands of another as he suffered at the hands of Senator GEORGE. When the Mississippi Senator had concluded the Alabama Senator was entirely used up. We return thanks to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, R. R. FARR, Esq., for a copy of his annual report for the year ending July 31, 1885. It will require only 3,237 petitioners to secure a local-option election in Richmond. That number will be easily obtained, we suppose.

REPLY TO MR. ROYALL.

CHATHAM, VA., March 1, 1886. To the Editor of the Dispatch: Having read the well-considered and temperate argument of Mr. W. L. Royall in the Dispatch of the 29th ultimo, I will, as before, state a few objections to it. It has been effectively answered by a Knight of Labor in your issue of the 28th ultimo, yet as a Knight of Labor may be considered an interested party, and as I have no interest whatever in either side of the question, I will supplement his reply by the following:

Mr. Royall illustrates his view of the "boycott" by stating that if a certain number of people were to blockade Main street accidentally it would be no conspiracy, but if they did so by preconcert it would be a conspiracy. That is true; and I may add that such preconcerted blockade would not only be a conspiracy, but a very unlawful act. Much confusion in the use of terms has resulted from the ambiguity of the word "conspiracy" by confounding it with "boycott." The latter is etymologically a conspiracy, but it must be an unlawful preconcerted action to make it a legal conspiracy. Mr. Royall has thus reasoned in a circle in taking the ground that the "boycott" is a conspiracy because preconcerted. It is a conspiracy because preconcerted, and he is taught by his legal training that a conspiracy is unlawful. He therefore argues backwards, and the preconcerted action of the "boy" is unlawful, whereas he should first establish that it is unlawful before he concludes that it is a legal conspiracy.

And I do not see what ground he can for a moment be contented that the preconcerted action of employees in order to get remunerative prices for their labor is unlawful. The illustration of Mr. Royall is also inapplicable for the additional reason that it leaves entirely out of view the fact that capital is a monopoly, and has for centuries a greater or less extent been itself the boycotter; each capitalist or firm, or company of capitalists, being a powerful combination within itself, and opposing labor when not restrained by a counter-combination. Mr. Royall's illustration would have been more nearly correct if he had supposed that one man had barricaded the street with a power beyond the reach of the law, and that the rest of the community had then combined by their united strength to overthrow the barricade. This concentration of capital seems to exist only in manufacturing and commercial centers. In the country the sub-division of capital allows the competition resulting from the relation of supply and demand to adjust the price of labor, and this is done in this portion of the State so much to the advantage of the laborer that farmers to protect themselves against the risk of loss have to resort to the share partnership system in the employment of their laborers. The same may be said of the relations between landlords and tenants—the advantage being decidedly in favor of the tenants. But this is much better than the state of things existing in Ireland, where the eviction of a tenant means to him and family exposure to the pitiless storm, starvation, and death.

But in a company of capitalists, in a city, control vast accumulations of capital just as the landlords of England and Ireland do. One such firm employs 1,500 hands. Now, this firm proposes to fix its own prices for labor, and to force the laborers to accept them, attempts to deal with them singly. But the laborers say: "We do not deal with you singly, for by so doing we would not be trading on quality. Your ability, by virtue of your capital, to employ 1,500 men makes you 1,500 times as strong as each one of us taken singly, and we will therefore be entirely at your mercy; you will simply deal out to us on business principles the least possible amount you think we can live on, as you would regulate the food of your horse or cow; but we are human beings, and claim to possess the same intelligence, and propose to some extent at least to be ourselves the judges of how we should live and the comforts we should enjoy. To obtain those rights we must deal with you on equality, and we therefore propose to deal with you in a body—as 1,500 men against your capital."

But Mr. Royall argues in effect that when they have done this the laborers will cut their own throats by forcing capital out of profitable employment. The bill before the Legislature, when passed, would be a modification of the channels of trade by which it is made accessible to laborers, which argument of Mr. Royall's I will illustrate for him by the fable of the man who cut open the goose to get the golden egg. But Mr. Royall seems to forget that this argument is based on the assumption that the laborer has no more sense than the man in the fable. For as much nearer the act of the case to assume that laborers will not push their demands to that extent, but that as soon as they are placed in a situation to contract with capitalists on terms of equality they will endeavor to make their contracts intelligently for their own permanent interests, which will be upon a basis approximately fair for both capital and labor—approximately, for exact equality is not possible in human affairs. But each side in this equal conflict of opinions and interests may occasionally get a slight temporary advantage of the other. But the average result will be fair and equitable. Nothing, it appears to me, however, could be fairer in the adjustment of such a conflict of interests than for an intelligent committee representing the whole body of employees in commercial and manufacturing centers and the capitalists employing them to meet together and fix for a definite period, after a fair and dispassionate hearing of both sides, the price of labor in that line, both sides having regard to the laws of competition, the relations of supply and demand, the profits of the business, &c. That is the way two intelligent men trading on equality come to terms and close any other contract; and why should not capital and labor be placed in a similar situation to trade on equal terms? But when capital undertakes arbitrarily to fix the price of labor by virtue of its own power as capital, it is acting the part of a tyrant, and as such should be met and fought with all available weapons.

Mr. Royall uses the further argument that an individual laborer, by joining labor unions, &c., places himself in a position in which he can never rise above the rank of a laborer. That may be true; but when it is remembered that not one laboring man in a thousand ever does or can rise under any conditions above the rank of a laborer, I do not see the force of the argument. Arguments to have weight cannot be based solely upon extremely rare and exceptional cases. They may catch some aspiring youth who, more ambitious than brains, but can have but little effect upon the great mass of the laboring population.

"I never saw a woman like Mrs. Jones. She sits at the window all day as placid as a May morning, and her five small children playing hide-and-seek on the back stairs." "Don't you know? She's invested 25 cents in a bottle of Salvation Oil."

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show that you are prepared to pray for them who "despitefully use you and persecute you," if any such there be.

THE LABOR QUESTION.

THE DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION TO THE PETERSBURG CHARTER. To the Editor of the Dispatch: Twenty members of the present Senate voted in the session of 1883-'84 for the present charter of Norfolk, which provides for four wards, one of which, with a voting population of 1,800 (mostly negroes), has only six councilmen, while the other three have twenty-four councilmen, divided among 2,000 voters—these three (white wards) make up a very handsome majority.

Petersburg, with the following unequal proportions of population—First Ward, 3,645; Second, 2,599; Third, 3,222; Fourth, 4,198; Fifth, 4,476; Sixth, 2,816—all four members each—asked that these be remedied by proper amendments to her charter, which is refused by twelve Democratic senators coalescing with the ten Republicans of the Senate. This city, whose tax-rate is 1.60 on the assessment; whose real estate sells at 30 per cent. below the assessed value of the commissioner of the revenue; a large per cent. of whose stores are frequently vacant and for long periods; whose flour-mills have almost ceased to operate; whose cotton trade, from 40,000 bales since the war, has fallen to 18,000 per annum now; whose bank-rate of discount is 8 and 9 per cent., and loans difficult to negotiate at that, and whose future is menaced by the control of a class which is a curse to any community—this city, whose experiences and surroundings are without a parallel in calamities—asked for a constitutional change in her organic law, and is refused by Democratic senators whose vanity is reflected in the streams of their turgid rhetoric. Those senators declare a minority should never control a majority. Stuff! Do majorities never change to that side which has the specific advantages? Who can tell whether an amended charter will be to the benefit of the one or the other party? Can charters be passed or amended by any other than party agency, and is either ever done without any regard to political purposes? Why should Norfolk be granted an amended charter and Petersburg refused the same application in quality and effect? Do those senators know that our present charter, secured under the auspices of Mahone and Cameron, legislated into effect nearly twenty-four Democratic councilmen twelve months beyond the time they were elected by the people? If legislated in, can councilmen not also be legislated out with propriety and lawfully?

These senators, secure in their sense of immunity from curses which rest upon us and at ease with themselves, care nothing for others, whose necessities are not felt by them, and in their indifference split hairs about political questions. How I would like to see their ox go! WILLIAM A. KIRKHAM, Petersburg, March 2, 1886.

THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTE. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The bill establishing the Virginia Mechanics' Institute is now pending as a special order in the House of Delegates. It must not escape the attention of your readers that a magnificent manufactory existence has taken the place of the old agricultural relations in this State. Our school system—the dearest system to the people that exists—is imperfect in not providing a course of industrial education. An intelligent comprehension of the relations of labor to its objects is necessary to place our mechanics on an equal footing with northern enterprise; and yet there is not a school in our State which meets the bill. It is a crying evil, and one which Practical mechanical principles receive but little attention at any of our colleges. Ask any M. A. of your acquaintance educated at our great University the weight and dimensions of an ordinary brick, and he can't answer you satisfactorily. Here in the city of Richmond we have a grand opening for a splendid industrial school. The great workshops are so many class-rooms inviting the students to instruction. The bill before the Legislature, when unanimously reported by the Committee of the House on Manufactures, and has received also the approval of the Finance Committee. It asks the State for the sum of \$50,000 for building purposes on condition that the city appropriates \$20,000—a sum which she has already provided for without awaiting the action of the Legislature. For as much nearer the act of the case to assume that laborers will not push their demands to that extent, but that as soon as they are placed in a situation to contract with capitalists on terms of equality they will endeavor to make their contracts intelligently for their own permanent interests, which will be upon a basis approximately fair for both capital and labor—approximately, for exact equality is not possible in human affairs. But each side in this equal conflict of opinions and interests may occasionally get a slight temporary advantage of the other. But the average result will be fair and equitable. Nothing, it appears to me, however, could be fairer in the adjustment of such a conflict of interests than for an intelligent committee representing the whole body of employees in commercial and manufacturing centers and the capitalists employing them to meet together and fix for a definite period, after a fair and dispassionate hearing of both sides, the price of labor in that line, both sides having regard to the laws of competition, the relations of supply and demand, the profits of the business, &c. That is the way two intelligent men trading on equality come to terms and close any other contract; and why should not capital and labor be placed in a similar situation to trade on equal terms? But when capital undertakes arbitrarily to fix the price of labor by virtue of its own power as capital, it is acting the part of a tyrant, and as such should be met and fought with all available weapons.

Mr. Royall uses the further argument that an individual laborer, by joining labor unions, &c., places himself in a position in which he can never rise above the rank of a laborer. That may be true; but when it is remembered that not one laboring man in a thousand ever does or can rise under any conditions above the rank of a laborer, I do not see the force of the argument. Arguments to have weight cannot be based solely upon extremely rare and exceptional cases. They may catch some aspiring youth who, more ambitious than brains, but can have but little effect upon the great mass of the laboring population.

PARIS, March 2.—M. Clemenceau caused a sensation in the Chamber of Deputies to-day by demanding that the French Princes be expelled from the country. He denied that their expulsion would be contrary to republican principles. Those principles, he said, were based upon the rights of man. The Princes claimed by virtue of their birth more rights than other men enjoyed, and they therefore condemned themselves by placing themselves outside of democratic society. M. Clemenceau was enthusiastically applauded. A majority of groups in the Chamber of Deputies are now in favor of the expulsion of the Princes.

CHARGES AGAINST AN ARMY OFFICER. The Washington Republicans say that charges have been filed with the Senate Committee on Military Affairs against Second Lieutenant John F. McBair, which, if sustained, will not only defeat the pending nomination of that officer to be first lieutenant, but may result in his being court-martialed and dismissed the service. McBair enlisted in 1872 in the Second Cavalry, and served as an enlisted man until 1880, when he was promoted to be a second lieutenant and assigned to the Ninth cavalry. Prior to his promotion he married a young lady in West Philadelphia, and is charged that after his promotion he wrote to his wife informing her that his promotion placed him so far above her in the social scale that it would be better that she should be divorced, as he could not introduce her into the society of his brother-officers and that of their families, and that finally he obtained a divorce in a California court—a State in which he never had a domicile. His wife directed suit to be brought to set aside the divorce was illegally obtained. Judge Kelley brought the matter to the attention of General Logan when McBair's nomination was sent to the Senate a few days ago. Senator Logan agreed that the charges should be looked into, but the committee, during the absence of General Logan, and not having been informed of the charges, reported the nomination to the Senate and it was confirmed. Upon ascertaining that fact, Judge Kelley called on Senator Logan, who immediately took steps to have the nomination recalled from the President, and the case is again before the Senate.

GRAND ENTERTAINMENT AT COLOMBIA HALL, THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, MARCH 4th and 5th, 8 o'clock. The Grand Entertainment at Columbia Hall, Thrusday and Friday, March 4th and 5th, 8 o'clock. The Grand Entertainment at Columbia Hall, Thrusday and Friday, March 4th and 5th, 8 o'clock. The Grand Entertainment at Columbia Hall, Thrusday and Friday, March 4th and 5th, 8 o'clock.

THE GREAT EASTERN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY. OPERATED BY THE GREAT EASTERN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY. OPERATED BY THE GREAT EASTERN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY. OPERATED BY THE GREAT EASTERN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

THE LABOR QUESTION.

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show that you are prepared to pray for them who "despitefully use you and persecute you," if any such there be.

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show that you are prepared to pray for them who "despitefully use you and persecute you," if any such there be.

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show that you are prepared to pray for them who "despitefully use you and persecute you," if any such there be.

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show that you are prepared to pray for them who "despitefully use you and persecute you," if any such there be.

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show that you are prepared to pray for them who "despitefully use you and persecute you," if any such there be.

THE LABOR QUESTION. A Letter from Rev. William W. Laidman. To the Editor of the Dispatch: The following letter, although written some time ago, may be of interest to some of our readers. It is a copy of the editorial copy sent to your issue of Sunday, I believe this letter will show the position in point in its true light, because the reverend writer began at the beginning of the question and not in the middle, as Dr. Sprigg has done. G. Mr. J. M. Shelton: My Dear Sir,—You place me under obligations for your generous references to my discourse of last Sunday evening. Indeed you do me too much honor in attributing to me sentiments which, in your judgment, are unwarranted, or, in fact, labor to be observed, are those which usually proceed from our city pulpits. Without ever consulting my ministerial compeers of my own and other denominations on the subject, I take it as a matter of course that the truths which I threw out Sunday night are just such as their conceptions of Scriptures and ordination obligations require them to utter on all proper occasions. My deliverances were made in the spirit of my Master without malice toward none and with charity for all, and solely for the instruction of my people on a living question involving practical righteousness. In this I have done nothing more than my duty, which I strive always to do so far as I have light and liberty. Christianity, as it seems to me, offers the only practicable and peaceful solution of the difficulties growing out of the conflict between capital and labor. When the issue is joined it is for the Church of Christ to place one hand on capital and the other on labor to call a truce, and afterwards become mediator and reconciler. Jesus was the friend of the poor. His religion is the defence of the oppressed, the support of the weak, the educator of the ignorant, the champion of the obscure, the redeemer of the sinful and erring, the only bond of genuine, hearty, self-respecting fraternity among men. These great and blessed truths are fundamental to the Christian system, and to conceal them, to modify them, or to hold them in abeyance, or to fail to fearlessly publish them, is treason to Jesus and a repudiation of his system for the harmonization of society. The principles of association and dissociation for mutual protection and aid enunciated in the Acts of the Apostles are at the foundation of most of the modern cooperative brotherhoods whose tenets I have examined. Without affirming it, without knowing it, perhaps, or even being willing to confess the fact, your "Union" is, in the example of the early Christians, a fraternal, fraternal, honorable, and peaceful in the method you employ for counteracting the aggressions of corporations or capital in the position of superintendence or command. So far as you depart from those methods you become unchristian, antagonize Christian sentiment, and being opposed to the fixed law of omnipotence, must inevitably fail of achieving lasting success. It was my aim to point out certain errors of what, I deemed, honorable and Christian instances of progress and triumph on the part of cooperative brotherhoods. I declared that, as I do now, and will always and everywhere, that it is the right and, in my judgment, the duty of laboring-men to withdraw their patronage from any body, association, or firm which knowingly and willingly pursues a course injurious to their inalienable rights. "Essentially" it is, can be incontestably established that such body or association, or firm or private or corporate concern, and supports the employment of convict labor in competition with honest, sober, and industrious workmen. These propositions appear to my mind so plain, reasonable, Christian, that I can hardly see what New-Testament ground there is left for any who might have the temerity to oppose them. Their adoption and enforcement universally, so far from promoting discord or strife or alienation between the magnanimous rich and the honest poor, will happily and speedily restore mutual confidence, respect and cooperation. Against all revolutionary measures I lift up my solemn protest. In advocating the right of withdrawal of patronage from any clear, unmistakably-demonstrated example of unchristianity, I do it with the understanding that it is unchristian to seek revenge, to traduce reputation or character, or to produce in any way except by quiet, orderly, peaceful, self-respecting ostracism. Even when ostracism is resorted to care must be taken to preserve the spirit of charity and to show