

SPRIT OF THE PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS—COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

Sectional Interest and National Unity.

From the N. Y. Times.

The obvious difference between those whose passions impel them to a continued war of opinion and those whose interests require a restoration of the Union spirit throughout the whole country, is too great to be reconciled. Everywhere there are indications that the men who spin cotton cannot be much longer separated from the men who grow cotton, nor can those who sell goods at the counters of New York safely acquiesce in the continued disability of their Southern customers to purchase and pay for their goods.

The same refusal of relief which punishes the Rebel with a reduction of income indicates the same loss upon his loyal neighbor, and deprives the loyal freedman of employment. Nor is this mischief confined to the population of Louisiana. The sugar crop of 1860 was nearly half a million hogsheads. It has declined to twenty or thirty thousand. The price of cane sugar advanced nearly fourfold. It is now produced almost exclusively by slave labor in Cuba and Brazil.

The restoration of the cotton crop would be much promoted by rebuilding the levees, and yet Congress has forbore to do so lest the restoration of the Union should be thereby postponed. It is not necessary to pursue the effects of these economic crops upon the shipping interest, which, deprived of out-looks by this cause, has lost its great advantage over the commercial marine of England.

People tell us with wise mutterings that Grant is sagacious; that he bides his time; that the politicians will not trap him; that he will run unopposed; that if he takes the Presidential office he will do as he deems best, and rise above party.

How may they be relieved? The Police Jury remark:—"That at the very time this large class of laborers are likely to be thrown out of employment, the banks of the Mississippi will be in the most salutary condition for the reconstruction of the levees, without which our prime fields will soon relapse to their primitive

forests. We consider it a great public misfortune, and source of extreme regret, that so favorable an opportunity for their reconstruction should be permitted to pass unimproved, and cannot but hope that the Major-General commanding this district will, through his efforts and influence, devise some means to give direction to this labor in the manner indicated, thereby resolving a present evil into a public good."

If Congress will take up this proposition, it will do good to a whole people, without regard to color or condition. If it does not, these freedmen may say:—"You give us the ballot to vote for you, but withhold the bread to subsist ourselves and starving families."

General Grant Again!

From the N. Y. Tribune.

General Grant is suffering at the hands of his friends, and no friend so much as the New York Times. That newspaper charges the Tribune with hypocrisy. Let us see who is the real hypocrite.

The Times, in its Tuesday's issue, used these words:—"Through many channels it will be asserted that the general's compliance with the call indicates his approval of Mr. Stanton's removal, and consequently of the policy which exacts that proceeding. On this head, fortunately, the Times is not so ready to believe."

Here is a plain statement. The editor practically says:—"General Grant is a radical. We know it. He supports Congress. We know that. It is a happy thing he does not support President Johnson. We feel very comfortable." No gentleman will make a statement without authority, and no newspaper, especially, will venture to place a public man upon a political platform without reasons for so doing.

These who charge us with assailing Grant entirely misapprehend our position. We are not conscious of having ever, in the slightest degree, done him injustice. The question is one of fact. What is his position? He is named as a radical candidate for the Presidency. Is he a radical? If he is, let it be made apparent. If he is not a radical, very well. In that case we shall not vote for him, although we may respect him none the less.

People tell us with wise mutterings that Grant is sagacious; that he bides his time; that the politicians will not trap him; that he will run unopposed; that if he takes the Presidential office he will do as he deems best, and rise above party.

How may they be relieved? The Police Jury remark:—"That at the very time this large class of laborers are likely to be thrown out of employment, the banks of the Mississippi will be in the most salutary condition for the reconstruction of the levees, without which our prime fields will soon relapse to their primitive

to begin even a greater canvass. Is it too much for us to ask, before we fall in line, what colors are we to wear, and who are our foes?"

The Golden Rule—"Poetic Justice."

From the N. Y. Evening Express.

We have no idea that any supporter of the Rump Congress, any Republican, or any Northern or Western man, would willingly place himself and his interests under a government of negroes—and of negroes, moreover, who have scarcely acquired the habits or restraints of civilization, and in some cases, still clinging to fetish worship of their native Africa.

Now, what we could never be reconciled to ourselves, we are enforcing upon our own race, our own brethren, in ten States of the Union. Plunging ourselves upon our Christianity, it suits us in this matter to set entirely at naught the golden rule of doing unto others as we would that others, under similar circumstances, should do unto us.

The party by and through whose instrumentality this work is now in process of accomplishment, ostensibly professes to be the exponent of "great moral ideas." Yet it boldly and persistently ignores that fundamental principle of the moral law which enjoins one to love his neighbor as himself. This may be good radical policy, but it is bad Christianity.

We repeat, that under the existing radical machinery established in Louisiana, the white man is placed politically at the mercy of the negro. We have a statistical demonstration of the fact in the returns of the registry lists, now for the first time officially published. Here are the figures:—

Table with 2 columns: Race and Number. Louisiana: Blacks 52,067, Whites 14,752. Black majority 37,315. North Carolina: Blacks 226, Whites 21. Black majority 205. South Carolina: Blacks 404, Whites 151. Black majority 253.

As in Louisiana, so we presume it will be in all the other States. The so-called registry in the formerly good old conservative Whig State of North Carolina has just begun—and the complexion of that beginning, as seen below, is a foreshadowing of the general result:—

Table with 2 columns: Race and Number. Louisiana: Blacks 52,067, Whites 14,752. Black majority 37,315. North Carolina: Blacks 226, Whites 21. Black majority 205. South Carolina: Blacks 404, Whites 151. Black majority 253.

It may gratify the vindictiveness of a "party of great moral ideas" to witness this thorough subversion of the civilized Anglo-American to the semi-barbarous African; but vindictiveness ever brings with it, sooner or later, and in some form or other, its own punishment, and in this case, part of the punishment will be the presence of this new, semi-barbaric element in the halls of legislation (Federal and State), to help make laws for us of the North and West, as well as for the South.

The Coming State Elections.

From the N. Y. Herald.

The great national issue which will overshadow all others in our coming fall elections in the Northern States will be the issue of negro supremacy hereafter in our national affairs, through a Southern negro political balance of power, contemplated and broadly foreshadowed in the Congressional programme of Southern reconstruction.

This is but the swinging of the pendulum from one extreme to the other—it is steering from Scylla to Charybdis. What peace or harmony can we hope for in exchanging the insolent rule of the late three hundred thousand Southern slaveholders for the rule of five hundred thousand Southern negroes, who but yesterday were slaves, and the descendants of ignorant slaves for hundreds of years?

We cannot doubt that this desperate experiment of negro supremacy will be emphatically condemned by the voice of New York in our coming November election. A change of eight or ten thousand votes in the six hundred and add thousands of this great Commonwealth is but a bagatelle; but it will suffice to revolutionize the State.

A very fair prospect of anticipating in October the inevitable November reaction in New York. The substantial yeomanry of Pennsylvania, who could not follow Buchanan in 1860, in behalf of Breckinridge and the Southern slaveholding oligarchy, will not be apt to follow "Old Thad Stevens" in 1867, in behalf of Southern negro supremacy.

No political party, however strong it may have grown in the confidence of the people, or however confident it may be in its strength and resources, can betray the public confidence or outrage public opinion with impunity. The penalty speedily follows the offense. Our political history abounds in such warnings. Take, for example, the nomination of a candidate for Governor in this State through certain party arrangements with a notorious gambler, and mark the result, notwithstanding the unpopularity of the opposing candidate on local issues.

This is the question now awaiting the popular judgment:—The ten excluded Southern Rebel States be reorganized and restored to Congress, each and all under a predominant negro vote from the disfranchisement and disgust of white men, or shall Congress itself be called upon by the people of the North to pause, reconsider and reconstruct its terms of reconstruction so as to give the Southern whites a chance, at least where they constitute the majority of the people, as, for instance, in Virginia, North Carolina, or Georgia? Upon this question we expect a political reaction in the North this fall which will enforce some attention and respect from Congress. It is to the people that we look for a renege; for while the laws stand as they are, President Johnson can do very little to stay their operation, however great the number of removals and changes he may make.

Personal Representation.

From the N. Y. Nation.

The growing feeling in favor of the representation of minorities, both here and in England, is one of the many proofs that, however attached people may be to the principle of democracy, they are not yet satisfied that they have hit on the best mode of applying it. The people, even of New York city, really want a good government; they really want good men in office; if they did not, we should be ready this moment for Mr. Cushing's "man on horseback."

It would appear, at first sight, that a power which, like that under discussion, is exercised by wholly irresponsible private citizens, is of a so purely moral nature that it cannot be reached by legislation, but must be left to the good sense of the people to deal with. But this is precisely what we have been doing now for many years, and with only the result of seeing party despotism grow stronger and stronger. The reason for this is our political organization, being based entirely upon local districts, and multiplying to excess the number of officials chosen by popular vote, affords every facility for the manipulations of wire-pullers. If it is possible, either by statute or constitutional provision, to remove these peculiar opportunities and temptations, the evil will, in a great measure, come to an end of itself.

Mr. Hare's plan of personal representation, at which attention has been so widely directed of late years, promises to accomplish this object; and we wish to suggest what seems to be a feasible way of adapting the leading principle of his plan to our American community and institutions.

This is the simple and philosophical feature of Mr. Hare's plan, which has obtained the unqualified commendation of Mr. Mill and other thinkers; the rest of his scheme consists of devices for obtaining an absolutely equal representation of a community upon this general plan—devices adapted, perhaps, to the English people, but so utterly foreign to the character and habits of our people that they may be passed over without description. It is very certain that a community which has almost universally adopted the principle of plurality in elections, for the sake of the speedy result, will not enter into an elaborate calculation of quotas, and pother over the "distribution of the surplus," in order to the canvassing of votes may be theoretically fair, yet minority exactly represented. What our people want is a legislature repre-

Old Rye Whiskies. THE LARGEST AND BEST STOCK OF FINE OLD RYE WHISKIES IN THE LAND IS NOW POSSESSED BY HENRY S. HANNIS & CO., Nos. 218 and 220 SOUTH FRONT STREET, WHO OFFER THE SAME TO THE TRADE IN LOTS ON VERY ADVANTAGEOUS TERMS.

Their Stock of Rye Whiskies, in BOND, comprises all the favorite brands extant, and runs through the various months of 1865-'66, and of this year, up to present date. Liberal contracts made for lots to arrive at Pennsylvania Railroad Depot, Erie Canal Line Wharf, or at Bonded Warehouses, as parties may elect.

sending them fairly in the main, and composed of honest and able men; and whatever plan will secure this result is so far a salutary reform, even if not theoretically perfect. Indeed, Mr. Hare himself confesses, in his last (third) edition, that "a perfect uniformity in the number of the quota of votes for every member" is "really important." This surrenders the whole point at issue.

If the proposition went no further than this, if every man throughout the State voted for his favorite candidate without regard to his place of residence, and the required number at the head of the list were declared elected, there would probably not be much more inequality than at present. A great disparity would, of course, exist between the number of votes received by the first on the list and the third; but so there is now between Mr. Ward's 17,000 votes and Mr. Morrissey's 9,000. An enormous vote for any candidate would, under this system, be only a natural and, to a certain extent, proper tribute to his popularity. Still it would, no doubt, be wise to establish a definite quota which every successful candidate must obtain, as a security against the accident of persons elected by a mere handful of votes.

Supposing the principle once adopted, the details would be very easy to arrange. The most difficult point to decide would probably be the filling of vacancies, whether occurring by death or resignation, or by the failure of a sufficient number to obtain the quota. It would seem that in these cases the best way would be to let the legislature fill the vacancy, taking as candidates the two or three highest names left upon the list. Party organizations would find a legitimate and very useful sphere of action in assigning candidates to the voters of different localities, and thus preventing voters from being thrown away. It would be easy to calculate the number of members which each party in the State would probably be able to elect, and divide the State roughly into districts for these various candidates, taking due account of the natural and healthy local feeling. Most persons would, as a matter of course, vote for the candidate thus assigned, provided he were personally acceptable; but it would no longer be possible, as it is now, to force an unfit candidate upon an unwilling constituency. Such a candidate would be so sure to run behind his ticket, and fall of an election, that the committees would find their only safe way to put up their best men.

Another way of preventing the loss of votes would be by letting the election continue ten days, as in England. This was suggested by Mr. J. T. Fisher, of Philadelphia, who proposed a plan for personal representation, independent of Mr. Hare, without Mr. Hare's favorite feature of endorsing a second choice upon the ballot, and distributing the surplus votes. At the end of the first day it would be ascertained that certain candidates were surely elected, and certain others in doubt, and the voters of the second day would cast their votes where they seemed most needed. Mr. Fisher's other proposition for meeting the same difficulty by allowing successful candidates to assign their surplus to other candidates who fell short, can hardly be considered practical or desirable. By the adoption of this principle we should secure the chief advantage which the English system possesses, of allowing the choice of non-resident representatives, and thus remove one of the greatest hindrances to the development of a superior of public men. A member would no longer be afraid to offend local prejudices or go against the opinions of his district, and a man of weight and character might be reasonably sure of always finding a constituency to support him, scattered through the State, but able to unite upon their man, and make every vote count for him. Thus local feeling could still be gratified, but without depriving the State of the services of a valuable servant, as is now often done.

It has seemed most natural to speak of members of Congress, as these are the most important and prominent representatives elected by the people. The system can, however, be easily applied to any representative body or board of commissioners of sufficient importance to interest the mass of the people as the legislature of the State or the Common Council of the city. A Board of Aldermen, composed of a very small number, as proposed in the Nation of May 30, would be especially adapted to this mode of election. It may be remarked that, for a legislative body within the limits of a State or city, it might not be necessary to have any fixed number. There is no peculiar virtue in the number 120 or 240.

It cannot be expected, nor should it be desired, that so fundamental a reform as that proposed should be introduced at once upon a large scale solely in virtue of its apparent theoretical advantages. It seems as if an election held in this way could not fail to give us a vastly superior body of legislators to the present, while every portion of the community would be fairly represented. The Republicans of New York city, and the Democrats of the western counties, would now have their rightful share of power. No minority, indeed, not too small to be relatively insignificant, would need to be unrepresented, and no man of power would need to search for a constituency.

Minority Representation in England.

From the N. Y. World.

We are in an epoch of marvellous things. That more thorough Reform bill than was ever contemplated by the Liberals should have been originated and passed by a Tory administration, is wonderful enough; but even this is outdone by the origin in that citadel of Toryism—the House of Lords—of a measure so progressive as the representation of minorities in Parliament. But the wonder ceases, in both cases, when we come to understand the motives. In bringing forward the new Reform bill, Lord Derby's administration have acted as our own Southern statesmen might have done, had they recognized the inevitable doom of slavery, abolished it themselves, enfranchised the negroes, and claimed the credit and gratitude due from the emancipated race. In poli-

tics and statesmanship, it makes all the difference in the world whether you take the bull by the horns or by the tail. Earl Derby and Mr. Disraeli have a keen perception of this difference, and have put themselves in a fair way to guide the animal instead of being gored by him. The introduction into the Reform bill of the principle of minority representation is also a concession to progressive tendencies made in the hope of its "profiting" aristocracy. The new Reform bill puts property and intelligence in the minority, and as the Lords evince great alacrity in adopting a principle which enables the minority to elect some members of Parliament.

Some American newspapers speak of Lord Cairns' successful amendment as if it embodied the principle of cumulative voting. This is erroneous. Lord Cairns' speech introducing the amendment should have said everybody from this mistake, for in one passage contrasts his proposal with the cumulative vote. The essence of the cumulative scheme is, that an elector may give more than one vote for one person; as, for example, when three members are to be elected, the elector may, if he chooses, instead of giving one vote to each of three candidates, give three votes to one. It is from this concentration or accumulation upon one candidate of votes by the same elector that the scheme takes its name of cumulative voting. Lord Cairns' amendment to the Reform bill is of quite a different complexion. By it, the privileges of the individual voter are not enlarged, but abridged. Instead of enabling an elector to give his three votes to one candidate, it merely takes one of his three votes away. It does this, and does nothing else. The votes that remain to him must be given to separate candidates, the same as his three votes would have been if Lord Cairns' amendment had not deprived him of one of them.

The ostensible object, or pretext, of Lord Cairns in proposing this amendment was not so much the representation of minorities as the equalization of political power among the several constituencies. The greater part of the constituencies send only two members; but there will be eleven constituencies which will send three members each. As a voter in one of these last would have a share in three members of Parliament, while in an ordinary constituency he has a share in only two, Lord Cairns artfully proposed to reduce the inequality by allowing each elector in what he called the "three-membered constituencies" to vote for only two members, the same as the others. Putting the amendment on this ground may not have been disingenuous, but it was certainly dexterous, as tending to conceal the real purpose which was to recover to the aristocracy by the amendment a part of what it loses by the bill. The bill makes the "wages class" predominant in all the great centres of industry. The amendment takes away one of the three members they would otherwise elect, and makes restitution of him to the higher classes. It is not meant as a step forward to a more advanced system, but a step backward from the concession made in the Reform bill. This is the reason why the Lords so promptly supported it; and this, perhaps, explains why the Government opposed it. The Government, which intends to make political capital out of the Reform bill, could not afford to incur the imputation of wishing to back out of a part of it.

In the so-called three-membered constituencies, the majority will elect only two of the three members, and a minority will have a chance of electing the third. If the system is found to work well, the number of three-membered constituencies will probably be largely increased. Thus a great reform bids fair to get a handsome start by the reactionary tendencies of an ancient aristocracy. It will not be the first time in the history of human affairs that men have "built wider than they knew."

The success of minority representation in England will more and more draw attention to the necessity of its introduction, in some shape, into the United States. We believe that a good working plan is yet to be devised; but of the fairness of allowing minorities to be represented in proportion to their numbers, there can be no reasonable question. It must be productive of advantages much greater and more solid than satisfying the sense of fair play. It will introduce into our legislative chambers two classes of men, now generally excluded, whose influence will be most salutary. One of these classes will consist of cool, proud men, of great personal independence, who scorn to play the demagogue by falling in with the popular delusions of the hour. Such men could, of course, be out-voted; but, supposing them to be right, they could not easily be out-argued. Their intrepidity and clearness of head would have a restraining influence at times when the majority were most prone to run wild in some temporary flush of passion. Another and still more valuable class would be brought into the Legislature by the representation of minorities, are men in advance of their time, and therefore condemned by the majority. The great improvements by which society is carried forward gather disciples, but slowly. The adoption of such improvements would be accelerated by giving their advocates an opportunity to explain and defend them on a stage where they would command public attention. The ordeal of thorough debate against well-equipped antagonists would explode pseudo reforms, and advance real ones. We can see nothing but good in minority representation, if some system can be found by which it can be made to work.

FIRE AND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES C. L. MAISER, MANUFACTURER OF FIRE AND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES. LOCKSMITH, BELL-HANGER, AND DEALER IN BUILDING HARDWARE, No. 314 N. 3rd Street. A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF FIRE AND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES on hand, with inside doors, Dwelling-house Safes, Free from Gasolene, No. 314 N. 3rd Street.