

ed looked around at each other in their endeavor to guess who the missing one was.

After a short silence one of the men mildly inquired, "You don't mean the curly-haired young fellow who used to sit in the corner there?"

"Yes, he's the one," she replied, "and he was only there two weeks too, and seemed to be improving so fast." Here the good hearted woman again burst into tears and when she had recovered herself sufficiently to speak said: "The poor boy was from my own city in the East and he told me that his mother was born right near where I lived in Boston. You all remember me sitting at his table every morning listening to him tell about the city that I have not seen in thirty years. He was so hopeful too. He told me when he got well he intended to send for his mother who he said was supporting him by teaching school. You know he had consumption and could do nothing for himself. It must have been a severe tax on the poor woman, and he was so anxious to get strong enough to help her. Every time I looked at him my dear Bob came back to my mind, and I wondered whether he needed any one to treat him kindly. You know he enlisted last summer after a foolish quarrel with his father. I used to do everything I could for the stranger, and I know you all treated him kindly, too. You and he were becoming great friends, Mr. Blank," she added, looking towards a young man who was seated at one of the rear tables.

"The afflicted always sympathize with each other," replied the one addressed. Then he continued:

"I was with him when he died. He knew he was going, and before he departed he asked me if I would telegraph the news of his death to his uncle in Boston. He said the latter would break the news more gently to his mother than a telegram sent to her would."

All eyes were fastened on the speaker. All present had become deeply interested in the unfortunate young man, whom they had seen day after day occupy a seat in the restaurant and endeavor to eat. He was extremely modest and spoke in a low, soft voice.

"I sent the telegram," continued Mr. Blank, who had been fumbling in his pocket for something which he soon drew forth and which turned out to be a slip of paper, "and here's his uncle's address." Then he slowly read from the paper:

"John H. Martingale, 16 Blank Street, Boston."

A suppressed shriek from the woman behind the counter drew the attention of all to her and she was noticed lying back in her chair pale as death.

"What did you say his mother's name was?" she faintly inquired.

"Mrs. Louise," but Mr. Blank got no further. The restaurant woman quickly interrupted: "She was my sister, and I never knew he was her son," and fainted."—*Denver News, July 16.*

THE TWO GREAT PARTIES.

A few evenings since I read a communication from Prof. J. H. Paul concerning the two great political parties of our country. In this communication he gave some valuable information, and yet there are a few ideas untouched by him which it seems are worthy of consideration. To be well acquainted with an individual, we must know something of his history. By such knowledge we shall be better able to perceive the motives which underlie his actions and give impulse to them. So also with political parties. Political creeds and platforms are but the crystalized ideas of vast masses of men who have, perhaps long before, already discussed these respective political principles.

Happily for the easy explanation of this subject, we may add that, so far as the changed circumstances of our country admit, the republican party of the present day very much resembles the federal party of a hundred years ago. We may therefore, for purposes of illustration, speak of the political parties both then and now as democratic and republican.

The original thirteen colonies in their isolated positions, in some instances separated by trackless forests, as well as in the different conditions of their settlement, had much to lead each to look upon itself as a sovereign state, the affairs of which could be interfered with by nothing except the vaguely defined claim of the sovereigns from whose dominions the colonists had come. The hardy Knickerbockers of New Netherlands (now New York) had no idea of amalgamating with the inhabitants of New England, who spoke another language and believed another religion. Neither was it to be expected that the Quakers of Pennsylvania would affiliate with the sturdy Episcopalians of Virginia, much less with the Catholics of Maryland. In a word, each of the colonies was settled under conditions, either expressed or implied, that no other colony nor all other colonies combined had a right to interfere with its internal affairs.

This was the germ, the pith, the marrow of democracy. This was the idea that permeated society when the colonists formed their first "Articles of Confederation." The second article of that instrument expressly declared "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

From 1777 to 1789 the United States were governed by this compact. But twelve years of unrest was sufficient to prove that the democratic Utopia was impracticable. As soon as the great strain of the war of Independence was over, and the people had time to reflect, they perceived the inherent weakness of their government. The wisest statesmen of America, such as Washington, Franklin Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Morris Rutledge

and William Livingston began to agitate for greater strength to the central government. At this juncture was founded the *Federalist* by Alexander Hamilton, which afterwards proved to be one of the ablest political magazines ever published. Here arose the germ of the Federal or republican party, which, after a few years' agitation, so influenced society that at length the people of the United States laid aside the old "Articles of Confederation" and sent forth the proclamation that—

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, etc., * * do hereby ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of North America."

Here then we see the inherent difference between the two great political parties. The democratic holds that all power originates with the sovereign States and Congress possesses no power except that which these States have delegated to it. The Republicans both then and since have a thousand times declared that the supreme power originates with the people in their collective capacity, and the States possess no powers except those given to them by Congress.

In short then, we may perceive that the Democratic party is the champion of local self-government with a tendency to State independence, while the Republican party is the special advocate of a strong central government with a tendency to imperialism.

Having thus defined the status of each party, it is easy to perceive their tendency in each political movement. In the very constituting of Congress we see three two principles at work. In the formation of the Senate each State is considered as sovereign and independent, and is recognized as having the right to send two senators irrespective of its size or population. Thus little Rhode Island is accredited with two senators, while New York, nearly forty times as large, and with fully twenty times its population, sends likewise two senators.

On the other hand, in the House of Representatives where each member is elected by a constituency irrespective of State boundaries, we perceive the tendency to follow the Republican idea.

So also in the subsequent political movement we perceive the workings of these two antagonistic principles. The purchase of Louisiana, the accession of Florida and the acquisition of Texas were all the logical sequence of democratic action. The formation of a national system of banking, the creation of a navy and the enactment of a high protective tariff are the natural results of republican tendency of centralizing power. The fact that in some parts of the country the democratic party has lately favored a high protective tariff is doubtless owing to this: That in those sections certain industries have been started which demand protection from foreign production, and not any real change in party policy.