

thize with each other, and get the sympathy of relatives and friends, and pretty soon the Congressman finds that he has made enemies because of an appointment that was scarcely considered worth having."

Nor were the post-offices the only source of trouble. There were numberless applicants for foreign missions, consulates, and other offices in the civil service, who thought their Congressman ought to be able to get the places for them, and who held him responsible if he failed, as he must inevitably do in most cases, since there were not offices enough to go round. Mr. Kleiner, who declined a renomination, and is thus able to speak frankly upon the subject, confesses that he has been converted to civil-service reform by his experience. "It is no wonder to me," he says, "that the House was charged with inefficiency last session. The Democratic members were kept so constantly engaged in looking after places for constituents that they had not time to give legislative subjects consideration. I know that I found it impossible to keep the run of current business. The greatest reform that we could bring about would be to free Senators and Representatives from all responsibilities as to the distribution of offices. They should not have anything to do with it."

No feature of the recent elections is more fortunate than the fact that Democrats themselves have thus been brought to see and admit "the curse of patronage." It is no longer a theory of Mugwumps that the spoils system is bad for a party; it is now the confession extorted from Democratic politicians by the results of the recent campaign. It has been demonstrated by the unanswerable logic of figures that civil-service reform "pays" as a political investment, and the spoilsmen find themselves left without any argument.

THE PROHIBITION PARTY'S VOTE.

THE impression which the first returns from the recent elections gave, that the Prohibition movement was losing ground, was entirely misleading. It now appears that instead of suffering a diminution, the Prohibitionists have made gains in nearly or quite every State in the Union in which they have a party organization. Returns of the votes for their candidates are still slow in coming to hand, but enough have been received to indicate that the vote which the party gave to St. John in 1884 has been more than doubled this year. We give in the following table the vote as it was cast in the two previous years in the principal Eastern, Middle, and Western States, together with that for this year, so far as it has been received. Most of this year's figures are semi-official and are not likely to vary much from those of the official count. Those for New York State are based upon returns received by the *Voice*, as are those for several of the Western States:

| | 1884. | 1885. | 1886. |
|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Maine..... | 2,160 | | 3,923 |
| New Hampshire..... | 1,571 | | 2,194 |
| Vermont..... | 1,752 | | 1,832 |
| Massachusetts..... | 9,923 | 4,714 | 8,160 |
| Connecticut..... | 2,305 | | 4,699 |
| Total..... | 17,711 | | 20,808 |
| New York..... | 24,999 | 30,867 | 35,000 |
| New Jersey..... | 6,153 | | 19,579 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 15,283 | 15,046 | 32,422 |
| Totals..... | 46,435 | | 87,001 |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Ohio..... | 11,069 | 28,081 | 28,657 |
| Indiana..... | 3,028 | | 8,975 |
| Illinois..... | 12,074 | | 19,527 |
| Michigan..... | 18,403 | 13,950 | 35,000 |
| Minnesota..... | 4,684 | | 12,000 |
| Totals..... | 49,258 | | 104,159 |
| Grand totals..... | 113,404 | | 211,968 |

It will be seen at a glance that, with the single exception of Massachusetts, there has been an increase in every State over the vote cast for St. John. This is the severest test which can be made, for the St. John vote represented something more than prohibition sentiment. Thousands of Republicans voted for him because they could not conscientiously vote for Blaine, and could not make up their minds to vote for a Democrat. Then, too, in many States this year the Republican candidates were either openly committed to prohibition principles, or they stood upon platforms favoring the submission of the question to a popular vote. In Maine the Republican candidate was pledged to support the prohibitory laws, yet even there the Prohibition vote was nearly doubled. It was perceptibly increased in Vermont and New Hampshire, and though it fell off a little in Massachusetts from St. John's vote, it was nearly double that cast last year. In Connecticut it is more than double what it was in 1884.

In the important States of New York and New Jersey the showing of the party is a remarkable evidence of solidity and increasing strength. The figures for New York are based upon actual returns from half the counties, showing slight gains, and seeming to warrant the statement that the total vote will be two or three thousand larger than the very large vote of last year. When we consider that the only State candidates voted for in the last campaign were those for Court of Appeals Judge, and that the fact of there being a Prohibition candidate in the field was hardly recognized outside that party, this outcome is most significant. There was no dissatisfaction with the Republican candidate to account for the large vote, since Judge Daniels was known to be a Prohibitionist, whereas last year objection was made to Mr. Davenport that he was interested in a vineyard. In a very quiet State campaign, with no canvass conducted by any party, the Prohibitionists have polled over 30,000 votes, or about 5,000 more than they polled in 1884, and a few thousand more than they polled in 1885. Their party is evidently compact, and determined enough to give the Republican managers warning not to attempt at Albany this winter the passage of further legislation in the interest of "protection to Republican saloon-keepers."

The most notable figures from this part of the country, however, are those from New Jersey. The Prohibition vote there has risen from 6,153 in 1884 to 19,579 this year. A careful examination of it, which we have made by counties, shows that it is drawn almost entirely from the Republicans. Of course, so long as this loss, or anything like it, continues to be maintained, the Republicans have no hope whatever of carrying the State.

In the five Western States for which we give the figures, the gains of the Prohibitionists are uniform and very large. In an off year, in which nobody expected much of them, the

Ohio Prohibitionists have cast a vote nearly three times as large as they gave St. John, and slightly larger than they cast in the exciting campaign for Governor last year. In Indiana the Prohibitionists have nearly tripled their St. John vote; in Illinois they have increased it from 12,000 to nearly 20,000; in Michigan they have made the State an uncertain one by increasing their vote from 18,000 in 1884 to 35,000 this year, and have done the same thing for Minnesota by advancing from 4,600 in 1884 to 12,000 this year.

All these figures are significant, but when we take them by sections, and then by the country at large, their real meaning becomes more apparent. The increase in New England has been comparatively slight, but it has been sufficient to make Connecticut a hopeless State for the Republicans, and Rhode Island, which we have not included in our list because it held no general election this year, a doubtful one. In the three important Middle States the Prohibition vote has advanced from 46,000 to 87,000, and has gained strength enough to make the two "pivotal" States out of the three, pretty surely Democratic in almost any kind of Presidential contest in 1888. In the West, in five States, four of which have hitherto been strongly Republican, the total Prohibition vote has more than doubled, increasing from 49,000 to 104,000, and making at least two of the Republican strongholds "doubtful" for 1888. Taking now the three groups of States together we find the total for this year to be 211,968, against 113,404 in 1884. The *Voice* estimates the total Prohibition vote in the country this year at about 325,000, against 150,000 for St. John, and the estimate is entirely reasonable. The party has, therefore, more than doubled its numbers within two years, and the gain has come mainly from the Republican ranks.

SOME FURTHER ADVICE TO WELL-MEANING PEOPLE.

WE have received several letters from supporters of the George movement, and from friends of "Labor" generally, remonstrating with us vigorously for asking them to furnish specific remedies for the evils they describe in the condition of what we suppose we must call "the working class"—for they insist on being a class—in this country. They particularly object to being asked to embody these remedies in legislative bills, and seem to think it shows a cruel and unfeeling disposition to propose such a thing, and, not only this, but incapacity for seeing the signs of the times. This latter charge is the one on which the purely philanthropic, or what some people have called the "crank," element in the George movement dwells with most relish. Some of them appear to revel in the belief that they see clearly the approach of an immense revolution, resulting in a complete reorganization of society from top to bottom, including the destruction or permanent redistribution of property, to which such wisecracks as the editor of the *Nation* are blind as bats.

With this latter class we do not argue: they are nearly all prophets. Their letters and sermons and speeches are simply predictions of wonderful things such as the world has been made familiar with by thousands of enthusiasts

during the last twenty centuries. It is well settled that there is no use in discussing with a prophet. All you can do with him is to disbelieve him. It is sufficient for us to know that no changes have occurred in the organization of human society during the historic period, except as the result of changes in human nature; that such changes in human nature as have taken place have been but slight, and have been very slow; and that at the rate at which we are now travelling, the change which would be necessary to abolish or greatly modify the institution of property would probably take at least 2,000 years, and would consist in an elevation in human character and an improvement in the human physique such as we now only dream of, or read about in "Utopias." In fact, we shall probably never give up property, or agree to distribute property according to a man's wants, and not according to his deserts or according to the benefits he renders to the community, until every man possesses the qualities which now render the acquisition of property easy.

But we must again urge on the other and saner class, who really believe that great improvements in the condition of manual laborers are possible through legislation, the solemn duty of abandoning vague declamation, whether in the pulpit, press, or platform, about the wrongs of labor. We do not say this by way of a jeer or a sarcasm, but in most sober earnest. They know as well as we do that the assumption that every manual laborer is an intelligent and enlightened person, entirely competent to form rational opinions about his own interests and those of the State, is simply a bit of politician's humbug. They know that the working class in every large city in the Union contains a very large element of ignorance—ignorance not only of letters, but of the Constitution and the laws, and of the central ideas of American society. A very large proportion of them are foreigners, who have either had no schooling at all or had no training whatever in the art of government. They have a childlike faith in the omnipotence of Government, and a childlike belief that the Government is a kind of providence, existing apart from the community, and possessing powers and funds which it does not draw from the community. On these men the vehement suggestions of educated or half-educated orators and writers that the Legislature could, if it would, relieve them from the necessity of pleasing employers with their work, and give them a share of the luxuries enjoyed by a few rich people, with more leisure to enjoy these luxuries, and exemption from the necessity of saving for times of sickness or idleness, and from the need of paying rent and railroad fares, act most mischievously. They are already producing on the minds of workingmen the effect of stock speculation or other forms of gambling—that is, a vague expectation of easily acquired wealth and security, and the always resulting dislike of steady labor and loss of interest in the daily task, to say nothing of envy and hatred of every one who seems more fortunate than they are. We are satisfied that two-thirds of the strikes and other labor disturbances, with all their

barbarizing atrocities, which are working so much injury to business, are due to the unrest produced by vague declamation of people who think themselves benefactors of the race.

We therefore most earnestly urge upon all such to buckle down now, from this day forward, to the drafting of bills to be submitted to the public and the Legislature, showing the exact manner in which they think our existing social organization can be suddenly improved. Of course, nobody will expect these drafts to be anything but rough. They will necessarily, like all first drafts, be capable of revision, but they will give us all a tolerably good idea of the manner in which those who most occupy themselves with that mysterious thing, "the labor problem," expect to solve it. Let them assume that we all agree with them in thinking that the New York Legislature or Congress ought to relieve the workingman from everything of which he now complains as to land, wages, food and clothing, and education. This done, the machinery for the new era must, of course, be provided. The State can only act through laws, and the laws must be drawn up and discussed and enacted and on a certain day put into effect through officers appointed for the purpose. If house-owners are to be compelled to part with their property and lower their rents; if employers are to be compelled to pay higher wages for less work, or to have their laborers selected for them by others; if vendors are to have their prices fixed by public authority, or rich men are to be compelled to live in small houses on plain fare, and give up horses and carriages, of course it must all be set out in black and white by statute, with the penalties for non-performance. These things cannot be accomplished by sermons or public meetings. So let us have the bills. We promise them prompt and respectful criticism, if they come from reformers or philanthropists of note.

HOW NOT TO TAX.

THE next session of Congress will be confronted with a problem that has seldom disturbed the equanimity of a legislature, viz., How Not to Tax. Former reductions of taxation have presented themselves to us in the light of expediency. There has always been some part of the public debt to which surplus revenue might be applied, so that in case of failure to repeal taxes there would not be necessarily any considerable locking up of money in the Treasury. The difficulty confronting us now lies in the fact that there will be no part of the public debt redeemable at par after the 30th of June next. Any excess of revenue over ordinary expenditures after that time must be either locked up, or expended in the purchase of bonds at such premium as the holders choose to demand.

Neither of these alternatives is likely to produce much satisfaction in the public mind. A forced locking up of money would certainly be met by a popular protest, and a perfectly justifiable one. The evils resulting from an artificial contraction of the currency would be serious enough in themselves, but they would be magnified in imagination to an unknown extent. A check would be given to

all new enterprises, and everybody whose business should not be as prosperous as, in his own opinion, he might think it ought to be, would ascribe his shortages to the locking up of money by the Government. Indeed, such a state of business is quite preposterous.

But are the American people likely to view with equanimity the purchase of their own bonds at rates of premium ranging from 12 to 37 per cent.? And supposing they are, how are we to know that the holders will limit their demands to those figures when they find a purchaser in the market who is under the necessity of buying at any rate? The language of the law would seem to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase a sufficient amount to meet the annual sinking fund if there are none redeemable at par, but it is certain that when the words "purchase or payment" were used in the law, no such thing was contemplated as purchasing bonds at a premium. The object of the sinking-fund clause was to improve the public credit, to make the bonds sell well, not to make the Government pay a bonus for the privilege of retiring them. While the Secretary might, therefore, and in the absence of fresh legislation probably would, buy or offer to buy bonds sufficient for the sinking fund, say \$50,000,000 per year, such action would be sure to provoke criticism, and would still come far short of meeting the exigency, far short of getting rid of the surplus money after the 30th of June next.

There can be no further dodging of the question, How Not to Tax? If the present Congress does dodge it, the President will be obliged to call the new one in extra session before midsummer. Here, we presume, is the explanation of the chuckles of the Republican politicians over the happy circumstance that they did not get a majority of the next House. If they had got such majority, they would have been obliged to frame the measures for reducing taxes. This is just the responsibility they want to avoid. Whether the taxes are taken off liquor and tobacco, or whether the reduction is made on the tariff, or both together, they want to be in a position to take advantage of any discontent growing out of the reductions. For, strange as it must appear to foreigners, the only discontent that is likely to make itself felt in the premises will be among the protected classes on the one hand, and the temperance people on the other. We are in a condition which the author of Gulliver never dreamed of, although it would have delighted him if he could have anticipated it—a condition where the only effective outcry, the only one that as yet reaches the ears of Congress, is against any reduction of taxes, and where, accordingly, political parties desire that their enemies may carry the elections.

But the exigencies of politics will not stave off the issue. It must be met, and we shall soon see a rare fight. The protectionists have reached the jumping-off place. They repealed the duties on tea and coffee twelve or fifteen years ago. There is no large source of customs revenue now that does not serve for protection to somebody. But there is one source that offers irresistible temptations, because in the first place it is large and in the second place