

**SPRIT OF THE PRESS.**  
Editorial Opinions of the Leading Journals  
upon Current Topics—Compiled Every  
Day for the Evening Telegraph.

**THE DEMOCRATS AND THE NATIONAL  
BONDS.**

From the N. Y. Times.  
The "hardheadedness" of the Democracy was strikingly illustrated in the platform they adopted in the State Convention in Ohio the other day. The party has, if not really, at all events ostensibly, abandoned those peculiar views about greenbacks which were its boast and glory two years ago, and which furnished so striking an illustration of the way it adapts itself to circumstances. During the war, for instance, no firmer opponents of Government paper currency could be found than Messrs. Pendleton, Vallandigham & Co. They stood, with legs far apart, upon the constitutional prohibition of the issue of any legal tender but gold and silver, and raved over the Chase shinplasters like so many howling dervishes. One might reasonably have expected that they never would have accepted them; that they would never have given up denouncing them; and that, the war over, they would have called night and day for their redemption as a matter of constitutional obligation no less than of national honor.

But the war was hardly over when all opposition to the greenbacks was abandoned. One heard no more of "hard money" and constitutional prohibitions. The Democratic leaders were not only satisfied with the irredeemable paper, but while some of them wanted more of it issued, the rest, so far from wanting to see it redeemed, demanded that it should be used in payment of all the Government obligations, including those which were contracted on the express understanding that they were to be paid in gold. In fact, their performances at this period showed that their opposition to the legal tenders during the war was purely fictitious; that it had no foundation whatever in principle, and was begun and carried on solely for the purpose of making an uproar and embarrassing the administration.

The plan of paying off the public debt in paper has completely failed; and the attention of the party now seems to be devoted to the task of finding out whether there is not some other way in which the people who trusted the Government in the hour of its difficulties, can be got at, and outmaneuvered and disgusted, so that the nation shall never be able to borrow at low rates of interest. The Ohio State platform seems to show that the party has found something that will answer the purpose, but it does not seem to have had brains enough to devise anything original, for this last contrivance is one of General Butler's, and was produced in the House by that eminent financier two years ago, for Republican use—but it met with no favor. It consists in subjecting the interest on the bonds to a special tax, over and above the income tax, to which, in common with all other sources of income, it is now exposed. This new tax ought, according to the Ohio Democrats, to equal in amount "the fair average rate of taxation levied in each State"—we presume for State purposes. An effort has been made already to accomplish this through the State Legislatures, which, if successful, would of course have for ever put an end to all borrowing on the part of the United States, as it would have left it in the power of any State to prevent any of its citizens deriving benefit from any loan made to the General Government by simply taxing away all the interest. The new plan proposes to have the General Government do the work of killing its own credit by arbitrarily reducing the interest on its own bonds, by retaining a portion of the money under the name of "a tax;" and it really appears as if some of the Democratic politicians believed giving it this name would deceive people as to the nature of the operation. Nobody, however, would be deceived by it. To pay a man the stipulated interest on his loan, and then have a revenue collector stationed at the door to take five or ten per cent. of it from him as he went out, would be simply cheating, and the simplest and most ignorant would know it. It would be neither more nor less than a roundabout and somewhat impudent way of repudiating our lawful obligations.

What is most remarkable about all this, however, is not the moral obliquity on the part of the Democrats which it reveals, so much as its gross stupidity. What does more than anything else to keep the party out of power is the total want of popular confidence in its honesty. The majority does not believe what it says, questions the sincerity of its indignation, and doubts whether it advocates anything from conviction, or has any settled principles, or has any other aim than "to make trouble." Instead of trying to get rid of this bad reputation, by steady adherence through good and evil report to some plan or other, the party hardly ever opens its mouth without confirming it. If it had stuck firmly to its hostility to greenbacks, it would now have the benefit of whatever opposition has recently shown itself in the Republican ranks to the legal-tender policy. If it had stuck firmly to the hard money and good faith doctrine, it would have had the benefit of the aberrations on these subjects which were witnessed among Republican politicians in 1867-8; and if it were now to take up financial reform, pure and simple, it would make no small impression on the minds of a large portion of the public. But nothing seems to attract it which has not a grain or two of what Irishmen call "divilin' in it." It rarely takes up anything nowadays which cannot be used as a missile. Indeed, the whole party has almost dissolved into a band of "bummers," without order, organization, leaders, or any fixed object beyond the general one of frightening the country, and picking up whatever happens to be lying about, which somebody else is likely to want.

**THE FUNDING BILL.**

From the N. Y. World.  
The new bill for refunding the public debt presented in the House on Monday, has some novel and peculiar features which will be apt to strike the public mind as a financial curiosity, whatever be thought of the merits or practicability of the scheme as a whole.

In our opinion, this ingeniously contrived project is futile, and can serve no other purpose than to amuse the imagination of the country and confirm its low estimate of the financial sagacity of Congress. We should be too only glad to have it succeed; but we know no good reason for supposing that our Government can at present, or for many years to come, borrow money at so low a rate as four per cent. We are perpetually told, indeed, that the English Government borrows at three per cent., which is approximately though not quite strictly true, as the three per cent. consols stand at nine or ten per cent. below par. But the British rate was also three per cent. before our civil war, and nobody then

thought of using it as an argument to prove that our Government could borrow at a rate nearly as low. For ought we can see, it would have been just as valid an argument ten years ago as it is now. It certainly would have been, unless it can be shown that the credit of our Government has improved during these ten years of depreciated currency, financial disorder, and accumulated debt. The lowest rate at which our Government was able to secure loans previous to the war was five percent. It never issued five per cent. bonds, six having been the settled rate; but its six per cent. bonds rose, in 1860, to 12%, and some of them were bought up at that price by Mr. Buchanan's Secretary of the Treasury. Federal bonds were never taxed by State or municipal authority nor by the Federal Government itself, so that in respect the ante-war bonds had the same advantages as those now proposed to be issued. Their only point of inferiority was in having a somewhat shorter period to run. In all other points of comparison the advantage was on the side of the ante-war loans. Our currency was then sound, resting on a specie basis; all the transactions of the Government were in gold; no great strain had been put upon our resources; there had been no talk of repudiation; and the public expenses were less than one-fourth of what they are at present. If the authors of the Funding bill can explain to us why the credit of the Government should be better now than it was ten or twelve years ago, we are very willing to be shown what we cannot discover.

The rate at which a Government in good credit can borrow must bear some proportion to the ordinary commercial rate in the same country. In England, the usual commercial rate is five per cent.; in this country it is seven. The lapse of ten years has made no difference in this respect in either country. Previous to our civil war the rate on Government loans in each country was about two per cent. less than its commercial rate, due allowance being made for the appreciation of the United States six per cent. bonds. It seems absurd to expect that our Government can borrow now at three per cent. less than the ordinary commercial rate. The new Funding bill therefore looks like a piece of Quixotic Congressional buncombe.

The theory on which this bill has been framed is very obvious on its face, namely, that the holders of the five-twentieths would prefer exchanging them for long for long per cent. bonds rather than have them paid and be at the trouble of reinvesting the money. The scheme therefore proceeds upon the idea that its success depends upon the Government beginning to pay, or at least making the offer to pay, the matured five-twentieths bonds at par in gold. To make this beginning, and thus excite the uneasiness of the holders, it was necessary to provide, or make a show of providing funds for this purpose from other resources than the sale of the new bonds. Whatever ingenuity is exhibited in the bill is in its kite-flying provision to scare the bondholders into a belief that the Government will presently be ready to pay them. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to use the surplus gold in his custody in redeeming six per cent. bonds at par; but it would be preposterous for him to do so while their depreciated market value enables him to buy them at a lower rate. The amount of gold which the Secretary has at his disposal is always easily ascertained, and it bears so small a proportion to the whole debt that the bondholders would not feel much apprehension if he should announce a purpose to pay them. A few of them would get something better than the market price of their bonds, and the amount of gold they would receive would be too small to embarrass them much in reinvesting it. The addition of the gold interest on the sinking fund, which the bill also permits to be applied to this purpose, is a bagatelle too insignificant to be considered as part of a grand funding scheme.

But the last section of the bill attempts to hold out these lame resources. It makes the Treasury a sort of bank of deposit, to receive and pay out gold; and on the same principle that an ordinary bank can use a large part of its deposits, it is proposed that the Secretary of the Treasury may employ seventy-five per cent. of the gold deposits for the payment of bonds, retaining the remaining twenty-five per cent. as a reserve for the redemption of the certificates. This hopeful fetch is the novel feature of the bill. But its ingenuous framers are a little sanguine if they expect that the owners of gold will be eager to deposit it with the Government on terms that would preclude their recovery of it if a turn of the exchanges should create a brisk demand for its use. Gold is freely deposited with the Treasury now, because it all lies safe in the Treasury subject to call. But when the Government uses the greater part of such deposits to pay its own debts, the feeling of security will have vanished, and its owners will be likely to prefer the custody of the banks. If this bill passes in its present shape it will be of no more practical account than a piece of blank paper.

**A SHOCKING AFFAIR IN CHICAGO.**  
From the N. Y. Herald.

We are not unaccustomed to hear tales of horror from Chicago. They are, in the ordinary language used in newspaper paragraphs, "too numerous to mention." Violations of the marital relations, elopements, stories of bigamy sometimes thrice multiplied, poisonings in the domestic circle—all these things are made familiar to us from the columns of the Chicago papers as the prevailing condition of that Western emporium of immorality, grain crops and vice. The latest pieces of news from there, however, which strikes every one with horror and disgust, is the discovery that the students and officials of a medical college have been accustomed to pile up on the roof of their building, as the despatch says, "a vast collection of human remains in a condition of disgusting putrefaction, including bones and flesh of grown persons and infants." The Health Department was appealed to by numerous residents in the vicinity of the medical college, who complained that an intolerable odor pervaded the neighborhood, dangerous to health, and of course destructive of all comfort. When a sanitary officer visited the premises he was assured that the nuisance did not arise from that quarter, but when he insisted upon making an examination the horrible result as above stated was found.

Chicago medical colleges and medical students possibly may not be worse than those in other cities, although this fact tells hard against them, and presents a case of gross outrage upon public health without a parallel in this country. Apart from the shocking indecency of treating human remains in this way, after they had been used for purposes of science, in a sanitary point of view the disposition made of them by the students of this Chicago college were atrocious. It is only another evidence, however—and we say it with regret—that there is great carelessness noticeable in this particular in many of our medical colleges, from which an intelligent consideration for the public health should be supposed to come. The exposure of human

remains in public places is not an uncommon complaint with the police. The transportation of the same from dissecting-rooms to distant points by railway and steamboat, packed in boxes and barrels, is an occurrence of which we frequently hear. This is a practice which should be put a stop to. The disposition of these human debris in Chicago suggests one of the various but dangerous and most disgusting ways of getting rid of them. The violation of law in robbing graveyards of the dead has long been winked at, because it was done in the interest of medical science, and therefore in the interest of humanity. The rule which permits the unclaimed dead in public hospitals and in the Morgue to be delivered to the medical colleges and schools cannot be objected to; but the public have a right to demand that when the bodies are used for the legitimate purposes designed the remains shall be disposed of as not to endanger public health or shock public decency.

If the discovery of this Chicago outrage shall have the effect of correcting the prevailing evil in this respect, it may be regarded as a public benefit.

**THE PROPERTY RIGHTS OF CONNECTICUT WOMEN.**  
From the N. Y. Tribune.

In New York the property rights of married women are most sedulously guarded, and so is the sanctity of the marriage tie. In Connecticut married women are too often treated as if they had no property rights which their husbands are bound to respect, and divorcees are easy and frequent. We do not think the arrangement a good one, and hope, right earnestly, that the present Connecticut Legislature may be trusted to better it.

We do not ask that the laws of New York should be slavishly copied. As we have had occasion to show, it might be urged by people of a dissatisfied turn of mind that there is some need here for a movement in behalf of men's rights. Certainly, on the theories of equality now so popular, it must be admitted that the laws of New York, in some most important particulars, display a favoritism towards the fair sex far removed from the equal and exact justice of which we hear so much.

For ourselves, we are entirely satisfied, however, with the advantages given women over men by the laws of our State; we prefer that they should continue to enjoy them; and we can assure our neighbors that, thus far, they work well.

Connecticut still maintains the old-time property discriminations against women, and denies them the legitimate control of what they may be able to acquire, as well as of what they may become nominal owners of in other ways. While they are charged with the responsibilities pertaining to other property, they are deprived of the corresponding franchises. In recent years, however, there have been frequent efforts—all of which have failed—to obtain such legislation on the subject as would bring the laws of Connecticut into accord, more or less, with the liberal laws of other States, or rather with the even-handed justice now accorded to women elsewhere. But at last there is a prospect that the Legislature will take favorable action upon a bill which will be brought under consideration this week, "for securing the protection of married women in the enjoyment of their property." In its main principle the bill resembles the existing law of this State, though differing from the latter upon several points of detail. The fundamental provision is that the real and personal estate, and all property of any description, belonging to married women, whether acquired by gift, bequest, devise, purchase, or in any other way, shall be her sole and separate estate, notwithstanding her marriage; and that all rents, interest, and income accruing from it or its use, shall belong to her in her own right, exactly as if she were sole and unmarried; no part of this property being liable to be taken for the husband's debts or liabilities. The subordinate features of the bill are in reference (1) to a wife's special right to lease or sell her property; and (2) to the life-estate of husband or wife in case of the death of either. If a married woman possessed of real estate desire to lease or sell it, and her husband refuse to unite with her in its conveyance, she may bring the matter before a county court, which is empowered to authorize her to execute the deed in her own name. In case of the death of husband or wife the survivor is entitled to a life estate in one-third of the property of the deceased—this provision, however, not being allowed to affect ante-nuptial agreements.

In regard to these points of legal detail, and to the authority of courts in the alienation and entail of property, we offer no opinion here. But we earnestly hope there may be no doubt of the enactment at the present session of the Legislature of the leading principle of the bill, by which married women are entitled to the legitimate ownership and control of their own property, and guaranteed those rights which are necessarily associated therewith. As to the intrinsic justice of the principle, there cannot be any doubt. Why should the marriage of a woman deprive her of her rights of property, or the control of her own earnings? Why should a husband be allowed to squander his wife's estate without her consent? Why should he have the power to seize her income against her will?

Why should she be held responsible for his liabilities, in the accidents of his life or folly? Why should she not legally own what she properly possesses, and why should she not control what she owns? Let the Legislature of Connecticut do justice to the women of the State!

**REPUTATION AND THE INCOME TAX.**  
From the N. Y. Sun.

The Republican National Convention, held at Chicago in May, 1868, laid down in its platform the fundamental law of that party. Among the principles thus set forth is a solemn denunciation of every proposition to repudiate the obligations of the Government. "We denounce all forms of repudiation as a national crime," said the convention; and as next to this in importance the platform declares that "it is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized."

By way of commentary on this platform, the bill to reduce taxation which was debated in the House of Representatives last week, and finally passed on Monday, receiving the votes of the great majority of the Republican members, begins with repudiation. It repudiates the solemn pledge of Congress and of the Republican party that the income tax should not be continued after the year 1870; and it proposes, in violation of that pledge, to impose that odious, unconstitutional, and unjust tax upon the country for an indefinite period.

Having thus thrown to the winds the pledge of the Government made when the internal revenue system was first devised, and having also trampled under foot that article of the Chicago platform which denounces every form of repudiation as a national crime, the Republicans in Congress proceed by a sort of natural logic to violate that other fundamental principle of their platform which affirms that taxation ought to be equalized. The income

tax provided for in the bill is the most unequal that could possibly be contrived. Indeed, it sets out with flouting equality in taxation as unworthy of the least regard. It exempts from taxation all incomes up to \$2000 a year, and levies its imposts upon incomes above that sum; while, if the principle of equality, which the Chicago platform affirms, were to be followed, there could be no exemption at all.

It is evident that none of the Republican Representatives who voted for this bill can any longer be considered members of the Republican party. They have set at naught and pitched overboard two of its most important principles; they have made themselves repudiators, and they have voted against equality in taxation.

**POLITICAL.**  
**HEADQUARTERS UNION REPUBLICAN CITY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, No. 1105 CHESTNUT Street.**  
TUESDAYS, at 8 o'clock P. M., for the government of the Union Republican Party, "the registering officers will meet at the regular places of holding elections, on purpose of adding the names of all persons claiming the right to vote at the ensuing Delegate election."

The Nominating Conventions, will be held on TUESDAY, June 14, between 4 and 8 o'clock P. M., at the usual places of holding elections, on purpose of adding the names of all persons claiming the right to vote at the ensuing Delegate election.

The Convention will meet on the day succeeding.

Delegations, at 10 o'clock A. M., except the Ward Delegations, which meet at 9 o'clock P. M.

Sheriff.—At National Hall, Market street, above Twelfth.

Register of Taxes.—At Concert Hall, Chestnut street, above Twelfth.

Register of Wills.—At Washington Hall, southwest corner of Broad and Spring Garden streets.

Clerk of Orphans Court.—At Broadway Hall, Broad and Spring Garden streets.

City Clerk.—At Musical Fund Hall, Locust street, above Eighth.

Judicial—At the new Court-house, Sixth street, below Chestnut.

Third Congressional Conventions as follows:

1st District—Court-house, Sixth and Chestnut.

2d " Assembly Buildings, Tenth and Chestnut streets.

3d " American Mechanics' Hall, Fourth and George streets.

4th " Spring Garden Hall, Thirteenth and Spring street.

Third Senatorial Convention—At Town Hall, Third street, above Willow.

Representative Conventions as follows:

1st District—At Franklin and Dickinson.

2d " Andrews' Jefferson Avenue and Prime street.

3d " O'Hallow's Hall, Tenth and South streets.

4th " O'Neill's Hall, Broad and Lombard streets.

5th " N. W. corner Merrick and Market.

6th " N. W. corner of Franklin and Buttonwood streets.

7th " N. W. corner Broad and Race streets.

8th " N. W. corner of St. John and Buttonwood streets.

9th " N. W. corner of West and Coates streets.

10th " S. E. corner of Fifth and Thompson streets.

11th " S. E. corner of Eleventh and Girard streets.

12th " S. E. corner of Front and Master streets.

13th " S. E. corner of Broad and Race streets.

14th " S. E. corner of Front and Master streets.

15th " Amber and Ella streets.

Town Hall, Germantown.

16th " S. E. corner of Broad and Unity streets.

17th " Frankford, above Twelfth, Schuykill Rose House.

18th " Northwest corner of Merrick and Market streets.

19th " Northeast corner of Broad and Race streets.

20th " Northeast corner of St. John and Buttonwood streets.

21st " Frankford, above Green.

22nd " Franklin and Buttonwood streets.

23rd " Spring Garden and Franklin streets.

24th " Chestnut and Franklin streets.

25th " Frankford and Broad streets.