THE DAILY GAZETTE.

OFFICIAL PAPER
Of Pittsburgh, Allegheny City and Allegheny County.

GAZETTE BUILDING:
Corner of Sixth Avenue and Smithfield Street.

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1870.

PETROLEUM at Antwerp, 53¾.

BONDS at Frankfort, 95@95¼.

GOLD closed in New York yesterday at 114.

THERE is much philosophising as to what Prince Arthur will do with the Fenian uniform which was presented to him lately as a trophy of the successful repulsion of the invasion of the Dominion. It is said that it is not a suitable garb with which a Prince of one of the most aristocratic families of Europe could array himself. He could not suspend it in his ample wardrobe lest it might defile his royal garments. Nor could he donate it to one of his mother's liege subjects in Canada, for it would be as dangerous for any one to appear in it in that country as it was but a few years since for a colored man to sport a military uniform in Virginia. The best way to dispose of it, then, will be to send it to England as an evidence of his military prowess, and demonstrate his fitness as a gallant soldier for the high position to which he is to be elevated in the English army on his return to his native land.

THE Louisville *Courier-Journal*, in speaking of the establishment in London of a magazine which is to contain the cream of all our American periodicals, says: "This is all very well, but will prove a losing business in the end, as the literary merit of most of the articles which may be cribbed from any of our periodicals is so inferior to the best English reviews that one specimen will fully satisfy those readers in England who may have any desire to dip into the 'best selections from the American magazines.'" We do not agree with this statement at all, for whatever may be said of our serial literature, our magazines contain better short stories and poems than the English once, and there are few writers for foreign publications of a higher standard than Holmes, Lowell, Longfellow, Whittier, Hale or Curtis, of more hearty humor than Clemens or Harte, or of more sensational and popular readiness than Beecher. In fact we think it highly probable that the English scrap book, if well conducted, will be better worth binding for preservation than any of the similar American journals.

OUR exchanges speak kindly of the patriotism which induced our people to lay the corner-stone of a monument that will stand through ages commemorate the bravery of those who fell in defense of the country. We do not think we are worthy compliment for discharging a clear and holy duty, but are nevertheless pleased with the general recognition made through the press of our continued loyalty and devotion and our never-dying gratitude to the nation's defenders, and hence will be pardoned for re-producing the following from the Detroit *Post*:

"Pittsburgh does the proper thing by stepping forward on Memorial Day and laying the foundation for a monument which is to be completed within the year. It is mainly the work of a few patriotic and energetic ladies, who distinguished themselves by their labors in the Sanitary Commission during the war. When the living soldiers had no further need of their services, they turned their attention to paying a worthy tribute of respect to the dead. With its inscriptions and ornaments it promises to be a beautiful as well as fitting memorial, and will reflect not less honor upon the brave ladies who projected it than upon the brave soldiers it commemorates.

PITTSBURGH is probably worse supplied with pleasant country resorts and country boarding places of easy access, than any other city of its size. There must be hundreds of families here who would be glad to find some quiet, cheap, pleasant place—farm-house or inn—in the country, where they could spend a few weeks each summer and gain vigor and rest for the remainder of the year. In fact, owing to the closeness of our town and the constant smoke and bustle Pittsburghers really seem to need such recreation more than most people, yet scarcely any opportunity for so doing seems to be offered them. Some go to the fashionable watering places, some get quiet and rest at Cresson, some have country houses of their own, but of local available family resorts, such as are advertised so extensively in New York and Philadelphia papers under the head of country board, there is a remarkable dearth. That there is a demand for this sort of accommodation we feel assured from the fact that we so frequently hear people complain of their inability to procure it, and men often say that they have to keep their families in town all summer because their wives are unwilling to leave them alone for a long period, and they know of no place to go whence they can come to and from business every day, or week every week. The kind of place that is wanted is what children call "real country," where milk and grass abound, and where there is room for children to get their fill of good fresh air, and long, hearty out-door walks. There is many a farm-house hereabouts where all these requisites exist, and many a farmer to whose means the board money for the summer would be a welcome addition. But the idea of taking boarders does not seem to strike them spontaneously, and the people who want them do not know where to find them.

LOTHAIR.

Lothair is probably the greatest sensation in the world of fiction since the appearance of Hugo's *Les Miserables*. No book was probably ever written with greater impatience or more quickly read after it first appeared. The number of volumes sold during the first week after its publication was positively enormous both in England and America, and this is scarcely to be wondered at as, in spite of the numerous crowned authors, no one of such pre-eminent political importance, excepting Louis Napoleon, has written a work of fiction during this generation at least. And of all who have read this latest novel not one was disappointed with it. It is highly sensational, the characters are taken from the very highest classes of Church and State, the incidents are of the intensest interest and the descriptions of the most glowing and brilliant character, while the immorality in it is of so very mild an order that even the old Scotch Presbyterian guardian of Lothair could hardly object to his daughters reading it. And besides this, all these things are handled in a manner that betokens not merely a master, but one accustomed to and familiar with that of which he writes. Thus we rise from the book with a conviction that it all might have been the Dukes and Cardinals and Bishops act and speak as if they were men like the rest of us, and there is no feeling of nausea and disgust mingled with an impression that English high life must be very like American low life, and English morality about nothing at all, such as is almost sure to be produced by such books as those of Ouida, for instance, which are probably the most dangerous of all novels, and present a coarse and ugly hook for the detractors of modern fiction to hang their complaints upon.

But one of the most striking evidences of the truth of Mr. D'Israeli's delineations of character is the fact that like some of Boz's earlier and better novels, Lothair has been already frequently assailed on account of its personalities. Almost every character is said to mean somebody who doesn't like it, and numerous have been the protests. Of these the latest is a letter from Professor Goldwin Smith, breathing blood and thunder and vengeance fire, because he recognizes his own portrait in one of the subordinate characters, an Oxford professor, superficially profound, unorthodox, pedantic and unpatriotic. The right honorable author will doubtless tremble in his shoes when he reads the Professor's note, but he will accept it as a compliment, and as one more proof that the Prime Minister is also a prime novelist.

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

The Church has always held religious conventions to be of great importance. The first Christian Alliance assembled about eighteen hundred years ago, on one of the mountains of Judea. It was a small but august and brilliant assembly. The Great Founder of the Christian religion presided, and around him were gathered Moses and Elias, and Peter, James and John—the representatives, respectively, of the Old and New Testament churches, or of the church triumphant and the church militant. But one subject seems to have occupied the attention of that illustrious convention, the decease which was about to be accomplished at Jerusalem.

Since that time many Œcumenical Councils have been held, and much discussion, profitable and unprofitable, has been had among ecclesiastics of different nations. The Papal Œcumenical, now in session in Rome, has attracted a large share of public attention since it first assembled in the Eternal City. The Protestant Œcumenical, which will assemble in the city of New York next September, is already engaging the attention of what is called "Evangelical Christians" in different parts of the country, and auxiliary or branch Societies are being organized in many localities.

The "Evangelical Alliance" was formed in 1846. It is not for us to determine whether Dr. Balmer, of Scotland, or Dr. Patten, of New York, is entitled to the honor of originating the Association. In the year 1845 a requisition was signed by a large number of ministers and laymen in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, calling for a General Council of Protestant Christendom, with the view, as was stated, of healing the divisions that exist in the Protestant Church. The call met with a cordial response, and a large preliminary meeting was held in Liverpool, England, in October of the same year.

In the following year, the formal organization was effected, we believe, in the city of London. The original basis comprises the following principles, which are held to be fundamental by the various denominations of Evangelical Christendom: the divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures; the unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of persons therein; the utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall; the incarnation, atonement, mediatorial intercession and reign of the Son of God; the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner; the right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; the divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the authority and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by Jesus Christ, and a future state of rewards and punishments. The article which relates to the immortality of the soul, etc., gave rise to a lengthy, but calm debate, and was added at the suggestion of the Commissioners from the United States.

Since its original organization, the Alliance has held five general meetings, as follows: at London in 1851; Paris in 1855, Berlin in 1857; Geneva 1861, and Amsterdam in 1867. The sixth meeting will be held in the city of New York in September of the present year, and it is expected that the members will make a grand excursion to Niagara Falls, and return to the east by way of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

During the past year Rev. Dr. Schaff made an extensive tour through insular and continental Europe, the principal object of which was to perfect arrangements for the meeting of the Protestant Œcumenical in this country next autumn. Twenty-five of the most distinguished devines in Europe have agreed to prepare papers on Christian Unity; Christianity and its antagonists; the state of religion throughout the world; the religious relations existing between America and Continental Europe; the harmony of science and revelation; Christianity and the Roman Empire; Christianity and the various aspects; Christianity and social evils, and many other subjects.

Among the distinguished foreign divines expected to visit New York, in connection with the meeting of the Alliance, are; Dean Alford, of Canterbury; Doctor Stoughton, of London; Professor Tholuck, of the University of Halle; Doctor Preffense, of the Free church of France; Dr. Dorme, of the University of Berlin; Professor Bromier, of the University of Berlin, and the Earl of Shaftesbury, President of the British and Foreign Bible Society, England. The British Council of the Alliance will defray the expenses of the delegates from Great Britain and Ireland; those of the delegates from the Continent will be paid by the Council of the United States, large contributions towards which have already been made by generous Christian gentlemen in New York and Philadelphia, and other places.

It is not the design of the Alliance, or any of its branches, to establish a new church, or interfere with the internal arrangements of existing churches. Nothing is farther from their intention than to frame or set up a new creed. The great object of the Alliance is to demonstrate the spiritual unity that exists in the Protestant Church, and to counteract, by united force, the movements of superstition on the one hand, and infidelity on the other. In its Constitution it knows nothing of denominations, as such. No one will be recognized as a member of the Alliance who may be sent as a *denominational* delegate. Those only who are members of the parent society, or its auxiliaries, will be entitled to seats as members in the Œcumenical Council.

The meeting of the Alliance, which will take place at the time and place already specified, will be, in our opinion, the most important religious convention ever held in this country.

As would be seen in our local columns yesterday, the Pittsburgh branch of the United States Alliance was formally organized last Sabbath evening in the Third Presbyterian Church, Sixth avenue. On the roll of its officers we notice the names of some of the most distinguished divines and laymen of the two cities, gentlemen who will give character to any association with which they may be connected.

PROTECTION.

Interesting Correspondence Between Samuel J. Reeves, Esq., of Philadelphia, and Hon. D. J. Morrell—The Responsibility of Parties Discussed, &c.

PHILADELPHIA, April 26, 1870.

HON. DANIEL J. MORRELL, *House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I want to tell you, in entire candor, that the Republican party is, in my humble judgment, placing itself in hostility to the industrial interests of the country, and is legislating in the interests of the representatives of foreign industries. There are from thirty to fifty Members of Congress, who are known as Republicans, and who are doing their best to break down home industry. In their speeches they lie and misrepresent facts, tenfold more than even the Democrats. Kelley and a few others call them to account, but where do we hear of New Englanders or Western men taking any interest in the subject of Protection. The subject is so very uninteresting that there is scarcely a quorum of the House found to be on hand whenever it is under discussion.

If Protection and Domestic Industry is no longer a part of the Republican platform, *to be fought for* and maintained and supported against all attacks, then I intend to be counted out of the party. Moreover, I intend to use my influence to induce others to abandon it. I shall tell every man I meet and on all occasions, that the party has tricked and betrayed those who have been their firmest and most ardent supporters. I think you must admit that nine-tenths of the iron manufacturers of the country, and nearly one-half their employes, have voted regularly the Republican ticket straight and sure. I believe that a majority of them are, just as I am, in that condition of mind that only a little more such action as is exhibited by Allison, Logan and Butler, in Committee of the Whole when the Tariff bill is under consideration, is needed to sever them from all party connection.

Business is so very unprofitable and dull at this time that but few manufacturers are able to be absent from home. Their absence is set down to indifference instead of to the right cause. In this emergency they are not as strong as they would wish to be. Because they do not congregate about the lobbies at Washington, while their enemies are there in regiments, it is thought by many members of the party that their interests may be abandoned or feebly supported. I tell you there is a deep indignation pervading their minds, and a determination to avenge themselves against a party which has professed to be friendly, but when the day of action comes is found to be false. There are some, indeed, who are true and valiant men; they will not be forgotten, but they must come out of the party. We are no longer to be tricked by mere names or platforms made to catch votes. We mean to tell the workingmen that neither the Democratic nor the Republican party is their friend. They load us down with taxes and give away our industries to foreigners. They affiliate with importers who are not citizens and who are agents of foreign houses. They act like fools and idiots in not taking care of their own household. The Republican party is paying out rope to hang itself. It is even now choking with a twist around its neck. I say good-bye to it. Its best days are past; it is now becoming useless, or worse. When it abandons Protection to American Industry, as it is now doing, it is a sign that the party is in its dotage.

Yours, truly,

SAM'L J. REEVES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., May 26th, 1870.

SAMUEL J. REEVES, Esq., Philadelphia.

MY DEAR SIR: My time has been so fully occupied of late that such a reply as I wished to make to your letter of April 26th, was impossible at an earlier date than this.

So many false prophets are to-day filling the air with predictions that the Republican party, having served its day, will now pass into a stage of decrepitude and disintegration, that I am not astonished that men of your usual sagacity should lose hope in that organization and cast about for new political associates and combinations. I have myself very frequently felt discouraged to witness the delay of our friends in both Houses of Congress to pass needed measures of financial and revenue reform, but I have at no time felt that relief could be obtained by calling upon our political opponents or any part of them for aid and comfort. Democratic Senators and Representatives have manifested even less readiness and less ability than their Republican colleagues to deal with the important economic questions which the war has left as a legacy to the thinking minds of the whole country, and the press of that party has shown even less inclination to deal fairly and less aptness to deal intelligently with these great questions. A querulous, fault-finding, destructive spirit, similar to that which controlled its utterances during the war, characterizes the course of the Democratic press to-day. A spirit of even-tempered, impartial inquiry would better comport with the necessities of the people and a proper discharge of editorial responsibilities, but we seldom if ever find it in Democratic journals. I see nothing to be gained in the line of wise statesmanship, but much to be lost, by surrendering the control of the Government and the shaping of its industrial and financial legislation to the Democratic party. That party is not progressive in its tendencies, but conservative and reactionary. It hugs the dead past to its bosom and shuts its eyes to the achievements of the mighty present. It would have repudiated the nation's debt and remanded the blacks to slavery two years ago if it had been in power, just as it would have made the war for the Union a failure and a crime if James Buchanan had been President for four years longer. Such a party cannot be trusted to do the work which only a warm-blooded, thoroughly earnest, and wholly progressive organization can well perform. I therefore hold fast my faith in the Republican party, believing that in time it will give us such wise laws as the people need.

It was but natural that the Republican party should make mistakes in the past, and that it should now be slow to perfect measures to meet the financial and other exigencies entailed by the war. As the war presented problems and difficulties that required to be promptly considered, and concerning which there existed no precedents, it was inevitable that many plans should be imperfectly matured, and that occasionally some one should blunder. The rebellion assailed the nation's life with scarcely a note of warning which was heeded, and the officers who led our armies and the legislators who shaped the laws which sustained those armies deserve only the most indulgent criticism for any errors they may have committed. So, too, it may with equal truth be said that reconstruction, payment of the National debt, reduction of taxation, restoration of our commerce, and the harmonizing of our industrial interests were also war problems, as difficult of solution and almost as important as the war itself. But there was a difference between the war and its legacies. While it could not always wait for carefully-matured plans, they did not require adjustments at the expense of thoroughness and accuracy. Hence great care and deliberation have marked the consideration of these entailed questions. There have been many and needless delays, but better this than rash and unwise action.

I have no doubt that Congress at its present session will enact more than one law which will have the effect of relieving the people of many of the burdens they now bear, and this, in conjunction with the prudent statesmanship and far reaching economy of President Grant's administration of the executive office, should and will strengthen the Republican party in the coming campaign.

But you object particularly to the course pursued by Republican Members of Congress during the present session on the Tariff question, and you seem disposed to hold the whole party responsible for what a few only of its representatives have done or failed to do. In this I think you are both illogical and unjust, as I will try to convince you.

If you will analyze the elements which compose the Republican party, you will find that hatred of slavery gave to it most of its adherents up to the breaking out of the war. Love of country swelled its ranks when Sumter was fired upon and during succeeding years. Beyond this hatred of slavery and love of country, those who have acted with the Republican party up to this time have been united by no other common bond. They have differed concerning secondary questions—notably about the funding of the national debt, about specie payments, about a free banking system, about subsidizing American railroads and shipbuilders, and about this vexed question of a tariff. And it was inevitable that they *should* differ. The Republican party is a new party, called into existence by great emergencies. There are in its ranks those who were once Henry Clay Whigs; others who were Andrew Jackson Democrats; others who were Abolitionists with James G. Birney in 1844, and Free Soilers with Martin Van Buren in 1848; others who were Know-Nothings in 1854; and thousands of foreign born citizens who were opposed to Know-Nothingism. Some of its members have always been free traders; others have always been strong protectionists. Some have believed in a hard money system; others have advocated paper issues. All these vote with the Republican party to-day because it was opposed to slavery and crushed the rebellion, and because *they have faith in its future*. But, composed of such diverse elements as have been enumerated, we could not expect it to act in perfect accord in the discussion of new issues. The wonder is, that there has not been more discord during the years that have intervened since the surrender of Lee to Grant.

I would not turn one voter away from our ranks because he does not come fully up to my views on the Tariff question or accept my plan of adjusting our financial legislation to our changed political condition. Rather would I seek to hold fast the friendship of all those who have sustained the national honor, and would aid the country in this era of wider liberty to go forward in peace and prosperity. If we cannot agree on the details of party policy, we at least agree on the essential proposition that there is danger to the country in again confiding power to the Democratic party; while, with the freedom of opinion, of speech, and the press, which a strong, active, intelligent, patriotic, and progressive party can afford to tolerate in its own ranks, we may hope in time for greater homogeneity and a broader comprehension of all the elements which tend to individual comfort and national independence. Therefore, my dear sir, for the reasons that have been assigned, I think you argue from false premises when you hold the Republican party responsible because it has not at the present session of Congress reflected your views and mine in what it has done or left undone.

But you are unjust as well as illogical. You propose to abandon the Republican organization because its representatives in Congress have not passed Gen. Schenck's admirable Tariff bill. As well visit with punishment the brave soldier who fails to win success, as thus to condemn and desert the large majority of the Republican members of Congress who have stood by the noble Schenck in the late prolonged Tariff contest. To whom are the friends of Protection to American Industry indebted for what *has* been accomplished—for what has been *saved*—but to Republican members of Congress? The leading advocates of Protection on the floor of the House—Schenck, Kelley, Maynard, Burdett, Hoar, and others—are Republicans, while the most ultra and uncompromising opponents are Brooks, Cox, Wood, and other Democrats. The only two members of the House willing to acknowledge themselves absolute Free Traders are Democrats—Cox and Mungen. True, several Pennsylvania Democrats have stood by their convictions and the interests of their constituents, while a number of Republicans from other States have as steadily voted against Protection: But the fact remains that the friends of Protection in the House are mainly Republicans, while its enemies are mainly Democrats. The bill of General Schenck, not having passed the House, has of course not been discussed in the Senate, but it is noteworthy that the only speeches made in that body during the present session on the general subject of Protection were delivered by Senators Cameron and Scott, of Pennsylvania, and Senator Morrill, of Vermont—all Republicans. If, therefore, the Republicans in Congress, as a body, have not accomplished all that the friends of a Protective Tariff have expected, they have presented such an array of arguments and votes as to prevent the passage of a virtual Free Trade Tariff. Is this nothing? Is it nothing to have saved the Protective Tariff laws *now* on our statute books, which, you would do well to remember, are the fruits of Republican legislation? Is it nothing to have withstood successfully the blandishments and the bullying of the most determined Free Trade assault ever made by English manufacturers and New York importers on the integrity and intelligence of Congress?

No, sir! The *Republicans* in Congress are not to blame for any failure to enact additional safeguards for the protection of our home industries. Against a subsidized press in many of our large cities; against subsidized and debauched newspaper reporters; against a Democratic allied Press organization; against a powerful Free Trade lobby, which has swarmed about the hotels at Washington and the clock-rooms of the House of Representatives all Winter and Spring, against the sophistries and the treachery of Commissioner Wells, against even the coolness and indifference of professed friends, the *majority* of the Republican members of Congress have been true to the best interests of American Industry, and through all these long and weary months, they have stood like a Grecian phalanx between the people who sent them here and their allied foreign and mercenary American free trade enemies, and they have *conquered*, for they have *saved* the protective policy from the long-meditated and deliberate blow which was intended to crush it.

You concede, sir, that while this tremendous combat was raging, you, and other manufacturers as directly and largely interested in the result as yourself were far from the scene of strife, carefully attending to your own private affairs, and enjoying the comforts of your own firesides. You committed your fate and the best interests of the whole country to a few faithful representatives charged with many other weighty concerns, and always overworked, who received no aid from you in instructing and leading your friends and in combating your foes. Looking back over the varying phases of the strife, and recognizing that great peril has been happily averted, can you say that you did your duty? Is it fair or just, at this time, for you and other eminent Republicans, who have written letters similar to yours, to denounce Congressmen who have defied the obloquy in the defense of threatened industries, and, after exhausting their salaries, have drawn upon their private means to sustain the cause which you have so much at heart; or is it fair or just to assail the party organization which gave them the office and authority, enabling them to render to you and the country such great service?

I have wondered if the men who have written me complaining or angry letters concerning the course of Congress upon the Tariff ever went into primary election to secure the nomination of fit men for office, or took pains to instruct and sustain them after they were elected, or busied themselves with the education of the people in such a way that sound views and earnest sentiments might be of force in the councils of the nation, or, if they minded their own private business, went to dinner at a regular hour, left political matters pretty much to chance or to the management of others, and then abused everybody heartily if everything did not go precisely as they wished.

It is not yet too late to correct mistakes and make the success of the protective policy a fact as fixed and unalterable as the death of slavery or the overthrow of the rebellion. What is required is *agitation and discussion*. If members of Congress from the West and South, who owe their political elevation to their war records, are unfamiliar with the arguments in favor of a protective tariff and unprepared to meet the sophistries of free traders, how much more unfamiliar and unprepared must be the masses of their constituents, whose only education on this subject has been in the direction of free trade. I would not undervalue the intelligence of any of my colleagues from the South and West, nor that of their constituents, but the doctrine of protection is practically new to them, and must be patiently studied to be fully understood. Hence agitation is necessary. To accomplish this, through organization of all the industrial interests of the country, is first of all necessary, and I am hopeful that movements already inaugurated will soon produce this result. The newspaper press which has resisted free trade influences should be liberally sustained, and able lecturers should speak directly to the people in every election district throughout the Southern and Western States. Most especially should the champions of protection in the present Congress be aided to meet the free trade attack with which they are already threatened. The friends of protection should seek opportunity to show their gratitude to such men as Schenck and Bingham of Ohio, Blair of Michigan, Kelley of Pennsylvania, Maynard of Tennessee, and that brave representative of a noble race, and that brave representative of a noble race, and that brave representative of a noble race