THE DALLT EVENING TELEGRAPH-PHILADELPHIA, MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1869.

SPIRIT OF THE PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURBERT TOPICS-COMPILED BYERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

Tea-Protection-Revenue. From the N. Y. Tribune.

"To the Editor of the Tribune-Sir:-If your "To the Editor of the Tribune-Sir:-If your plan of relating less in this constry should prove successful, and this south supply the test con-sumed in this constry, would not the Govern-ment lose the large amount it now receives from duiles on tes? The result would be that the consumer would not get it cheaper, the Government would lose its revenue, and the Southerners, in order to raise the tes, would beye for each ot gay the fast the test, would Boutnerners. In order to raise the lea, would have to give up raising cotton, which (as expe-rience shows) is the most profitable grop they can raise, inasmuch as it requires no protec-tion, whereas tea is not now grown, though it would have 160 per cent, protection. Who would be the gather? If you are right, why not also have a duty on pincapoles and oranges sufficiently high to allow their production under glass? Guba might, with equal wisdom, ex-clude American ice and manufacture her own. "Yours truly,"

Response by the Tribune.

That it is much easier to ask than to answer questions is already well known; and the discouragement in the premises is, that the elaborate response is forgotten and the needless question asked over again, as though it had never been answered. We have an-swered (in substance) the above at least forty times: let us do it once more, and see if it will not stay answered for at least six months.

The fondamental assumption of our correspondent is a thrice refuted fallacy. He assumes that, if we should grow our own tea, our aggregate imports would be reduced by the value of the tea now imported, when experience has repeatedly demonstrated the contrary. In our childhood, we listened from chimney corners to the fireside discussions which attended the unsuccessful attempt to enact a protective tariff in 1822, and the successful attempt to pass a partially protective one in 1824; and the argument of the free traders (in New England) ran thus:-"'If we protect domestic manufactures, we shall cease to import; without importation there can be little commerce and no revenue from imports; so we shall have to resort to direct taxation for the support of the Federal Government; and that will throw the entire burden on the land-that is, on the farmers. In that case real estate must fall, and the rich, selling out their lands, desert the country for the cities." How utterly these doleful forebodings were dissipated by the result, we need not restate. Our most protective tariffs have always produced the most ample and constant revenues. If we had atterly prohibited since 1789 the importation of iron and steel, we have no shadow of doubt that our aggregate revenues from customs would have been greater than they have been, because our people would have been far richer, and thus would have imported far more of tax-paying products. And now, were we to grow all our own tea henceforth, our loss of revenue on that article would be more than made up by the increased importations of other articles consequent on the increase of our general resources. We should have bought more foreign products, because able to pay for more; just as Massachusetts has always consumed a larger aggregate of dutypaying imports than Virginia. Is this hard to comprehend? Then look at

faots which illustrate it: -

For the last eight years we have had a tariff incidentally protective; for the eight preceding we had a much lower tariff, im-posed for revenue only or mainly. Now let us see what have been the aggregates of imports (not revenue) under the lower and the higher tariff respectively :--

The imports at this pert for the month of February of the last sixteen years respectively

him last September or October:-"Charlie, should the people make me President, you and the people may be assured that all mea will be permitted to speak their honest convictions, wherever they may be, within the boundaries of the United States." In truth, to secure protection of individual

rights and freedom of expression for political opinion within the limits of order and law are likely to be cardinal aims of General Grant's administration. Wendell Phillips need not be anxious about "Ku-Kluk outthroats;" the new administration is more bent on putting down villainous combinations to substitute terrorism for tranquillity than he can ever be, and by means more effective, if less noisy and bloodthirsty. It is not only in the instant promotion of Sheridan and the reinstatement of those army officers who were removed in disgrace by Mr. Johnson that we learn the new President's determination regarding "military reconstruction," and the protection of society at the South from the reckless and lawless-we can prefigure it as clearly from his personal charac-ter. For it is a familiar truth in human nature that men of General Grant's slow-stirring and equable temperament are as little liable to swerve and swing away from a deliberate opinion or policy, when once reached, as they are tardy to attain it. General Grant's realization of the importance, as well as the grandeur, of securing individual rights-as, for example, freedom of opinion and an untrammeled career-to every human being on whom American oitu-zenship has been lawfully conferred, was, possibly, like his faith in the policy known as "military reconstruction," of somewhat slower growth than that of more restless thinkers, who, in turn, have their roving fancies now fixed on other ideals; but he is probably more determined than any man in America, at this moment, to establish order, provide security for person and property, enforce the laws, and punish armed and banded law-breakers by military force where the civil arm is still paralyzed.

If General Grant arrived later, we repeat, at some conclusions, it was because he did not jump at them, and arrived to stay. He abides by the views he put forth in his famous dispute with Mr. Johnson at the time of Sh +ridan's removal, and has gone forward on the same line. He seems to know little and care little for wrangling parties at the South, one saying to the other, "I am more loyal than thou;" he has little to say of "political disabilities," and that little not in favor of them; his words regarding Lee, and his act regarding Longstreet, show that vindictiveness towards former enemies is as foreign as ever to his nature; but when it comes to any matter of national legislation aiming to give full rights and privileges of citizenship to every citizen-whether by Civil Rights bill, four-teenth amendment, fifteenth amendment, or what not-his approbation and indorsement are very prompt and hearty. In the history of the Republic for nearly

eighty years, everything was done for State rights and national rights-nothing of consequence for domestic rights of citizenship. But the Rebellion, which revolutionized American destiny in so many respects, did so in none more netably than this. The rights of American citizenship now take the precedence of all others, as they always should have done in a Republic where the electoral people are sovereign. We have lately undertaken to protect those rights even against Statesthat is to say, against that odious local legislation which once imperilled within the Republic freedom of travel, of opinion, and of speech. How vast a political and national tendency this is, our nearness to it may prevent us from realizing; but the historian of the future, who will view it in its just perspective, will comment upon it as not less momentous than the war itself.

lso, may not fully Onr generat

time in another trip from Brazil to Paris and in seeking another confidential chat with Na-polson, the result of which was the final agree-ment under which the French troops were withdrawn from Mexico, our Minister at Parls, as well as our Secretary of State, still being left in the dark until the settlement was ac-

left in the dark until the settlement was ac-cepted by Mr. Lincoln. "Thus," says this exposition from the Chevalier Webb, "thus it appears that the State Department had nothing whatever to do with the settlement of the Mexican question." It was all done through the Chevalier Webb and his old friend. Secretary Seward had the wool pulled over his eyes, and was indulged throughout the French occupation of Mexico in his superfluous and preposterous semibelligerent diplomatic correspondence with the French Minister of State. Poor old man ! What a grim joke was this of Webb against his coulding benefactor, the man who had been the saving and the making of Webb! Is not this requital worse than that of the coursgeous donkey kicking the dead lion ?

But the Chevalier Webb, whether hauled over the coals by the sage of Auburn or treated by him with silent contempt, cannot be allowed to monopolize the glory of backing Napoleon out of Mexico We have no doabl that the Chevaller Colorado Jewett and the Chevalier Thurlow Weed and other volunteer diplomats had a floger in this Mexican pie. For the present, however, we are content in bringing forward the rival claims of the Chevalier Wikoff. He, too, is an old personal friend of Louis Napoleon, and the friendship between these two wonderful men began in the prison of Ham, where a friend in need was a friend indeed. The Chevalier Wikoff can tell a score of personal conversations with Napoleon for every one of these diplomatic interviews of Webb, and he knows all about the entente cordiale of 1853 against Russia between England and France; for Wikoff in this matter was the confidential messenger employed between Napoleon and Lord Palmer-ston. Now, then, for the Mexican claims of the Chevalier Wikoff against the pretensions of the Chevalier Webb.

Under the peaceful dispensation of Andy Johnson the Chevalier Wikoff was seized with the brilliant idea of solving the Mexican problem in a trip to Paris and a talk with his old friend Napoleon, who is always glad to see Wikoff. It was evident that Seward was groping in the dark, and so Wikoff, with or without the advice and consent of the Senate or the State Department, went over to Paris and laid the great mistake and the great danger of Napoleon's "grand idea" of a protectorate over Mexico fairly and freely before the Emperor. We have a sort of an impres sion that the views of Wikoff thus delivered convinced Napoleon that his only course of safety was to back out of Mexico. We have not the exact facts or detail of this mission of Wikeff before us, but we presume that he will oheerfully, if called upon, supply them. Accordingly we call upon him for the facts; for we believe that they will scatter these Mexican pretensions of the Ch. valier Webb to the winds. Let Wikoff remember, too, in putting in his claims, that the issue of this controversy may settle the mission to Brazil for the next four years. Who knows? The ingratitude of Webb towards Johnson and Seward is unquestionab'y dead against him.

Pre-ident Graut and Congress. From the N. Y. World.

The tendency of our politics, for the last four years, has been to dwarf the influence and importance of the Executive Department of the Government, and build up and enlarge the authority of Congress. When General Grant was elected, he seems to have been aware that his office was shorn of its former powers and prestige, and to have desired to recover its weight as a co-ordinate branch of the Government. The methods to which he to secure this desirable result are



are officially valued (in gold) as follows: --

Revenue Tariff.	Protective Tarif.
Revenue Tariff. 1854	1862
1855 12 081,483	1863 12,027 844
1856 16,036,283	1864 21 648,93
1857 20 524,493	
1858	1866
1859 18,848,370	1867 25 630 78
1860 19 858 879	1868 20.848.8.
1861 18,841 767	

Aggregate. \$ 28,993 401 Average..... \$16,499.175 More Imports under protection by \$5,336,633

It will be seen that our imports are not declining-that they have been much larger in the last four years of peace than in the four preceding years of war; and our revenue therefrom also keeps up. In the eight months ending with February of the present and two preceding years, the cash (gold) paid into the Treasury as duties on imports at our city are officially reported as follows:-

1867, \$81,470,238 | 1868, \$71,561,482 | 1869, \$79,458,486 -We trust our correspondent's apprehension that revenue from imports will be destroyed by protection is by this time dissipated.

His apprehension that "the consumer would not get it cheaper" if we grew our own tea is at war with notorious facts. We have naturalized many branches of production among us by the help of protective duties; and that our people are now generally sup-plied with metals, wares, and fabrics far cheaper than they would be if we produced none but imported all, we hold as demonstrably true as that we drink cheaper water than though we imported our entire supply from Europe. If any one doubts this, let him compare the prices paid by us with those paid by our grandfathers sixty to seventy years ago. Doubtless, we might buy some salt, iron, blankets, sheetings, etc., cheaper if we had no tariff: but let us attempt to draw our entire supply from abroad, and the prices would rise far above those we now pay. If our correspondent thinks it smart to com-

pare the growing of pineapples in hot-houses with the growth of tes in South Carolina or Tennessee, very well; but we assure him that is not argument. We do not propose to grow coffee, simply because we have not the proper olimate; we do wish to grow tea, because we have a climate substantially identical with that in which the tes we now drink is grown in China or Japan. And we have every reason to believe that tes, after a few years of ignorance and experiment, would be grown here far cheaper than we now obtain it.

We hope this simple, easy lesson in first principles will not be lost on that large class who are more ready to ask questions than to give careful heed to the answers.

President Grant and American Citizenship. From the N. Y. Times.

The few words uttered by General Grant in response to Mr. Blodgett's delegation, Thursday afternoon, are full of siguificance. 44He wanted to see one thing very much, and that was, all classes of the people protected in their opinions everywhere. He desired to see the speedy establishment of law and order in the South."

This is a repetition, obviously, of the formal and pregnant idea of the Inaugural Address:-"Becurity of person and property, and security for religions and political opinion, in every part of our common country, without regard to local prejudice." And both, let us add, are the paraphrase of the sentiment attributed to General Grant in a letter said to be written by

ciate what lustre and historic grandeur will gather about that administration which shall first establish as one of its main aims the protection of American citizenship, making that citizenship the badge of security for equal rights to all, throwing about the citizen as a citizen-not only in foreign countries, where his rights are now at length acknowledged, but here, especially, in every part of his own country-the ægis of his nationality, and putting into each citizen's hand, as it were, for his protection against all the world, the gathered thunderboits of the nation. Under such an administration, the "Civis Romanus sum" of antiquity will only stand side by side with the safeguard-"I am an American citizen."

That such is the lofty ambition of General Grant we may gather from his various utter-ances, which become more and more distinct. Certainly we may take an augury from the presence as law adviser in the Cabinet of the son of Samuel Hoar. What a change, not more from the South Carolina of 1844 to the Sonth Carolina of 1869, than from the nation o: five-and-twenty years ago to the nation of to-day; from American citizensh ip of the past tothat of the present and that of the future !

From the N.Y. Herald.

We have an extraordinary Minister at Brazil. He is officially recognized as General Watson Webb, Ecvoy Extraordinary James and Minister Plenipotentiary, etc., but is familiarly known as the Chevalier Webb. He has been attending to the affairs of the United States at Rio Janeiro for eight long years, and has managed to keep things very lively down there pretty much all the time, without get-

ting us into actual war. But it appears from a late mysterious exposition, published since the retirement of Andy Johnson and his Secretary of State, that the Chevalier Webb, besides his important questions of diplomatic etiquette and his active labors in the affairs of Brazil, Paragusy, and the Argentine Confederation, and his misunderstanding with Admiral Davis, etc., has had some other diplomatic irons in the fire-that, in short, the country is indebted to Webb, among other things, for the quiet backing out of Louis Napeleon from Mexico.

The case thus made out for Webb is as full of dates and specifications, and is as plausible in the argument as the statement of Canningham concerning the Rogers murder. Briefly summed up, it amounts to this: - That en route to Brazil in 1861, the Chevalier Webb dropped in at Paris to have a little diplomatic tête à tête with his old friend and pitcher the Emperor Napoleon, which resulted in a promise from the Emperor to respect President Lincoln's blockade of the Rebel States. Secondly, that when the said Webb heard of the Franco-Maximilian adventure into Mexico he made another trip across the Atlantic and had another confidential chat with Napoleon, in which he was advised to back out of Mexico, this good advice resulting in a promise from the Emperor to back out i we did not threaten or attempt to bully him out. This secret understanding, it next appears, was confined to Webb, Napoleon, and Lincoln; for, to keep it out of the newspapers, it was not made known to the Secretary of State. So it was that when Andrew Johnson went into the White House in 1865 he and Seward, both being ignorant of Webb's arrangement, commenced to open fire on the French usurpation in a style somewhat alarming. No time was to be lost, and so the Chevalier Webb lost no

such as could have been adopted only by a novice who was not only without experience in politics, but to whom nature had denied the aptitudes by which political ends are accomplished. His first mistake consisted in disclosing, and, as it were, advertising, his intention to emancipate himself from Congressional control. The purpose was praise-worthy; but the means which he selected were calculated to frustrate it. Instead of standing aloof and rejecting the advice of Congressmen, a skilful politician would have sought their assistance, and have won the Con-gressional chiefs to his side by an appearance of deference, and by seeming to take them into his confidence. By flattering their self-importance he might easily have converted them into allies; or, at all events, they would have been more inclined to give him their cooperation as recognized advisers than when treated with repulsive coldness. The true way to weaken Congress was by bringing over to his side the most influential leaders of that body. Every weight taken out of one scale and put into the other would have a double effect. It would have weakened Congress by diminishing the amount of talents against him, and have strengthened himself by enlisting those talents in his own favor. General Grant has played his game badly, inasmuch as he has left Congress as strong as it was under President Johnson, and has gathered around him a set of advisers who are singularly unfitted to cope with and counterbalance that body. In the whole list of the Cabinet, Mr. Bout-

well is the only member who has recently s-rved in Congress; and he is a man who has never had much influence either as a parliamentary or as a party tactician. Mr. Fish has not been in Congress for many years, and his talents were never those of a keen parliamentarian nor of a party manager; Mr. Borie has never been in Congress at all, has never resided in Washington, and is perfectly raw as a politician; Mr. Cox is a young man without connections or influence, who never held any civil office but that of Governor of Ohio; Mr. Hoar is a mere jurist; Mr. Rawlins a mere army officer; Mr. Creswell an insignificant ex-Senator who served part of a term. The only way to have counterbalanced the overgrown influence of Congress was by forming a Cabinet of great political experience and great ascendarcy over the masses of the Republican party. The Cabinet should have been composed of men who had large gifts of leader-ship. If a number of these had been taken out of Congress, the influence of that body would have been weakened in proportion as that of the administration was strengthened, which would have been a double advantage. But as General Grant has managed, Congress is just as strong and just as arrogant as it was under President Johnson, and is confronted by a Cabinet of political ciphers, so far as regards their ability to manipulate and

manage the Republican party. Congress will therefore have the whip-hand of the new President throughout his term of office. All the men whom the Republican party follow and trust as leaders have been passed by and ignored in the composition of the Cabinet. General Grant has organized a small body of raw recruits to oppose the veteran hosts of Congress, who have triumphed in so many battles with the late President. It requires no skill to predict the result. The new Pre-sident will be foiled in every contest with Congress; and the Executive, instead of recovering its lost influence under General Grant, will be merely a set of ministerial agents to

execute the will of the legislative body.