

not too conceited, and should for a while be fed with slick honeyed words, he would cease to consider it an art to circulate the slimy fluid, but would start upon an immediate search for brains to fill an alarming vacancy. R.

---

"JOHN."

---

Must cheap John content himself at home? At present this question is by no means one-sided. With such men as Joseph Cook on one side and David Swing on the other, there will of necessity be many adherents and the contest will drag on for some time. Not many years ago John was welcomed to our shores and was looked upon as a great curiosity. Poetry, too, was then composed, with him as the hero. Scene after scene has been enacted. In the first of these, comedy played the principal part, in the last, tragedy steps to the front. Now another act is placed before the public and, without doubt, before the curtain falls on the last scene John will be compelled by law to content himself with other lands than ours.

This large hearted liberality and humanity which Joseph Cook, Henry Ward Beecher, and others exhibit may do very well for the present, if expressed only to eastern audiences; but if adhered to all over the land, before many years would give posterity the princibal of "reaping the whirl-wind;" for, we are surely "sowing to the wind" so long as we open our country to hords of races which we can *never* assimilate.

Our land has been characterized as an "Asylum for the Poor and Oppressed," and I am one of those who would gladly hail al! the poor and oppressed who come here, *not merely* to better themselves, but to become one of us and aid us in our struggle to maintain a republican form of government. On the contrary, I am as bitterly opposed as any to throwing open our country to races with which we cannot assimilate, which cling tenaciously to their native customs how

ever revolting, and by such means as this are able to live upon that which would starve our own people in a short time.

Let us make our country "An Asylum for the Poor and Oppressed;" but while doing so care must be taken that we do not oppress our own people to such a degree that a conflict of races ensues. To do so, is our own destruction, but first and above this is the fact that while we are throwing the arms of freedom around a heathenish race, we are grinding down people of our own race and blood by the iron heel of despotism. Pray, what sort of liberality and humanity is this? The customs and revolting habits of the Chinese who come to our shores have been sufficiently aired through responsible newspapers and reliable men so that none *need* be ignorant. It is said that the complaints do *not* come from the "better class" of citizens along the Pacific coast and this is *the* argument in favor of "Cheap John." By the "better class" is meant those who find it temporarily advantageous to hire large numbers of these cheap laborers. I say *temporarily*, for cheap labor will in the end pauperize any country. Are we to work in the interests of this "better class" alone, and stop our ears to the cry of the poor laborers who are starving because they cannot live upon filth as this race can?

They tell us "This is a free country and it is contrary to the spirit of the constitution to favor one race and debar another. Is our constitution such a monstrosity that we must fold our arms and allow heathen hordes to overrun our whole land creating internal strife? I cannot believe this to be the spirit of the constitution, neither is it justice nor humanity. Let us then have laws regulating the influx of semi-barbarous races.

And now "Cheap John's" friends ask: "Can we over-ride the provisions of the 'Burlingame treaty' which we in conjunction with other nations, forced upon the Chinese?"

A treaty is binding only so long as both