

SOME OF THE PRESIDENT'S HINDRANCES.

THE report of the Committee of the Civil-Service Reform League on the condition and progress of the movement under the present Administration has, we believe, impressed most people as exceedingly fair and impartial. It gives the Administration full credit for the good it has done, and makes full allowance for the obstacles in the way of doing better which it has inevitably encountered, some of which are doubtless much more formidable than Mr. Cleveland anticipated when he wrote his famous letter to Mr. G. W. Curtis and others. He has found that raising the standard of purity and efficiency was a much more difficult task in some States than in others, owing sometimes to the character of the party leaders, and sometimes to pre-existing political conditions which left any attempt at reform without local support. It was, in fact, not possible for either Mr. Cleveland or anybody else to find out how the Democratic party stood towards civil service reform, without the actual experiment of a reforming Democratic Administration. During the ten years before 1884 large numbers of Democrats had persuaded themselves, and persuaded others, that they were in favor of the reform, without knowing very well what the reform was, or without picturing it to themselves as anything but the expulsion from office of all worthless Republicans, who constituted, as they flattered themselves, the great bulk of the office-holders. Nobody who has not had some personal experience of it can well realize what ignorance prevailed among political men, especially in the Democratic party, about the details of what was called "civil-service reform" down to the incoming of the present Administration. Few of them had ever taken the trouble to inform themselves about it, and a large number of those who did know something about it had not taken it seriously or looked on it as anything more than the fad of a body of Republicans, whose votes might be had for the Democratic candidate by humoring them judiciously.

Senator Gorman of Maryland probably stood in this latter category. He was a most useful and energetic man during the canvass, and, in fact, by the time it was over had probably laid the victorious candidate under weightier obligations than any other worker. That he had ever given civil-service reform any serious attention prior to the election, or had the least expectation of seeing it put into practice by Mr. Cleveland, may well be doubted. No sign of it had been discoverable in the management of the party in his own State, or in fact in the management of any party. When he found that the victory was won, therefore, he set about dividing the spoils, probably in as much innocence and as much ignorance of any reason why he should treat offices as public trusts, as any husbandman in the garnering of a crop which he had sown in toil; and, for the reasons we have above stated, he was a very difficult man for a Democratic President to gainsay.

Senator Gorman has, in fact, been shedding a flood of light on the situation in rather an amusing way, in an interview printed in the

Baltimore *Sun*, and containing his view of the report of the Committee of the National League. To him the reason why the signers of the report have censured his doings in Maryland is simply that they are "intense Republicans," and favor "a centralized Government" and a permanent tenure in the civil service. The reason why he likes to make frequent changes in the civil service is not, as some people suppose, because he wishes to reward his henchmen, but because he is "opposed to centralization," and in favor of "government by the people" (of course, through Gorman) "in the broadest sense." "He thinks," he says, "that good government can only be secured through the people" (*i. e.*, in Maryland, Gorman) "having the right and the opportunity to change their public servants high and low at all times within their [Gorman's] discretion." The Committee has denounced some of the appointments made in Maryland by "the people," alias Gorman; but the reason of this is, that they did not know "that he knew it to be necessary to select men who did not profess to be saints to ferret out the rascals whom they (the Republicans) appointed and kept in place."

There could hardly be greater simplicity, we see, than this. No reformer can get angry with a man like Mr. Gorman. When a great rascal appears in office in Maryland, we must not complain, because we do not know the workings, or, if we may say so, the secret purposes, of the Gorman mind. He did one very clever thing at the close of his interview, of which, however, the President is justly inclined to complain. He took up the list—which is a long one—of undeniably good appointments made in Maryland by the Administration, and claimed the credit of them all for his system of government by the people through Gorman. And he even maintained that he was a reformer himself. Nobody would ever guess what the reforms were in which he was engaged, so we will give them in his own words: "To protect the public domain and restrain the rapacity of corporations." It will be seen from all this that Mr. Gorman is really an interesting man, and belongs to a species which is rapidly growing scarce, owing to changes in environment. The natural-history museums will, therefore, do well to keep an eye on him.

GOVERNMENT ON BUSINESS PRINCIPLES.

THE appointment of Mr. Charles S. Fairchild as Secretary of the Treasury is a most notable extension of the system of conducting the affairs of the Government on business principles. The Treasury Department is a branch of the Government preëminently concerned with those features of administration which in any proper view are exclusively business-like in their nature—especially the collection of the money required to maintain the Federal Government, through the customs duties and the internal revenue taxes, and the disbursement of this money through all the various avenues which it must pursue. A small army of officials, scattered all over the country, is demanded for the performance of this work, but the duties of nearly all these are purely fiscal in their nature and have properly nothing to do with politics. The head of the Department and a small number of other high officials are charged with the execution of the financial policy of the Ad-

ministration for the time being, but the work of the great remainder, if properly discharged, has no more to do with financial policies than that of the subordinates in a great business firm. In other words, the Treasury is, of all the executive departments, the one which is by its very nature a business institution, to be conducted upon business principles.

Yet so thoroughly had the spoils system demoralized the public mind that until recently the Treasury Department has been considered the great patronage preserve of the Government. Only seven years ago the head of the Department made public proclamation that he conceived this to be the proper view of the institution, when he notoriously, and almost openly, employed men paid to serve the public in the enterprise of working up Sherman delegations to the Republican National Convention of 1880. Under Mr. Sherman's successor in 1881 the country saw the chief custom-house disorganized, and an efficient Collector of the same party faith with the new President removed in the middle of his term, solely to pay political obligations at the public expense. With such principles unblushingly avowed by heads of the Department, the whole service was inevitably infected, and it was managed throughout as a political machine.

There has seldom been a greater surprise than was afforded by the fact that it was a man of Daniel Manning's antecedents who called a halt in this matter. Mr. Manning had been educated in the same faith as to the disposition of the offices with his Republican predecessors, and when his appointment was foreshadowed, it was generally deprecated by civil-service reformers. But the test of time vindicated Mr. Cleveland's selection. Mr. Manning often yielded to the spoilsmen, and was frequently inconsistent, but when, early in his administration, he picked out that sincere reformer, Edward O. Graves, for Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing—the only great Washington office not under the Civil-Service Law—he asserted what proved the guiding principle of his course. Experience convinced Mr. Manning, against preconceived opinions, that the business system was the true system. His successor has nothing to unlearn. Mr. Fairchild has always believed in the merit system, and he was one of the earliest advocates of its application to the public service in this State. So far as his influence at Washington has gone (and it has gone far during the year that he has been virtually Acting Secretary), he has made the Treasury Department practically what it theoretically is—a great business institution. Even such partisan opponents as the Washington correspondent of the *Philadelphia Press* confess that he is "one of the genuine reformers of the Administration" (observe the unconscious admission that there are a number of such), and says that "in Department matters he has surprised all the old officials by sitting down as promptly on Senator Gorman and ex-Senator Barnum as he did on Eugene Higgins." Now that he is to be the unquestioned head of the Department, he will of course be still firmer in asserting himself. Mr. Fairchild is a man of very uncommon executive talent, and as under our system the Execu-

tary of the Treasury is essentially only an executive officer, possessing none of the power of initiating legislation exercised by a Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, his selection is an exceedingly good one.

We have thus, for the first time since Andrew Jackson introduced the spoils system, the most important department of administration presided over by a man who hates the spoils system, and who will conduct the affairs of the Government on business principles. Already the Bureau of Engraving and Printing at Washington—formerly a loathsome sink of patronage—is upon a business basis; the same thing is true of the greatest custom-house in the country, and as true of those in Boston and many other cities besides New York; and Mr. Fairchild may be trusted to see that as speedily as possible the principles of the merit system shall be everywhere applied. To have a department, which was prostituted to the basest political uses in 1880 and 1881, firmly restored to business uses in 1887, is hardly short of a revolution.

Not less surprising and encouraging is the fact that the wiser leaders of the Democratic party have learned so much, since Mr. Cleveland's inauguration, that they endorse the choice of a genuine reformer for this position. The Washington correspondent of the *Herald* says that Speaker Carlisle and other equally representative Democrats were consulted by the President, and that "every one was content to see Mr. Fairchild placed at the head of the Treasury, and made the official head of the Department whose efficient actual head he has been ever since Mr. Manning broke down." In other words, they saw that, in the present temper of the public mind, the best way for the Democratic party to strengthen itself with the country was to make proclamation of the fact that the Treasury Department was to be conducted by a proved reformer.

Such an incident brings out in strong relief the vast advance which has been made within three years. In 1884 the Republican party was running for the Presidency the man who was really responsible for the scandalous removal of Mr. Merritt and the appointment of Mr. Robertson as Collector in New York, and whose record assured his conduct of the Government upon a spoils basis. In 1887 a Democratic President appoints as Secretary of the Treasury a conspicuous civil-service reformer, with the approval of such prominent Democratic leaders as Speaker Carlisle.

INEFFECTIVE DEMAGOGY.

THE refusal on the part of the Legislature of Missouri to make appropriations for the militia is not merely an example of hostility to the forcible maintenance of law and order: it is a still better example of the childishness of such hostility. The militia already exists. It is in complete organization, officered, armed, clothed. The salaries of the officers are prescribed by law, and if the rank and file are called into active service, their pay is fixed; and, although they could not get their pay until money was appropriated for the special purpose, yet it would exist as a valid claim against the State,

and refusal to pay men for the performance of an extremely disagreeable, not to say dangerous duty, would be likely to result in the election of a Legislature like the one of 1879, which showed its friendly feelings towards the militia by prohibiting the use of blank cartridges except on drill.

But even suppose the sentiment of hostility to the militia should dominate the Legislature for years, and appropriations should be withheld until the Missouri National Guard dies of inanition, what then? One of three things must happen in times of riot. The Governor of the State will be compelled to make requisition upon the President of the United States for national troops—a ludicrous result for those who hate military power—or the police must expand in numbers and increase in efficiency until it equals a militia in power, or else an irregular police or militia will be formed by the citizens, under the name of "regulators," "friends of law and order," or any of the names honest citizens are wont to take when the weakness or pusillanimity of their government has forced them to assume extraordinary powers. Order will be restored somehow, militia or no militia, police or no police, law or no law. This needs no proof. It is a settled fact in the history of civilized communities. If a Governor like the present incumbent in Missouri should be as slow in making requisition for United States troops as he was in calling out troops last year, and deputy-sheriffs should prove as ineffective, the right of individuals to combine in self-defence would surely be put to the test. Happily in Missouri this right is guaranteed by the State Constitution, for, although it may seem superfluous to preserve by law a right which will be assumed whether the law preserves it or not, it is, as a matter of fact, an immense assistance in the assumption of extraordinary powers to know that they may be assumed lawfully. For this reason the clause in the Constitution of Missouri which provides "*that the right of the people to bear arms in self-defence and in defence of the lawful authority of the State cannot be questioned*," might well become a rallying-point for the orderly elements of the State. The people may bear arms and may use them in self-defence and defence of lawful authority. Nor is this right limited by the statute against carrying concealed weapons, for that makes an express exception in favor of carrying weapons in defence of person, home, or property. The Missourian who carries a weapon when threatened by such letters as the Knights of Labor sent the engineers and firemen of the Missouri Pacific Railroad last year, is acting under the law, and, what is more, is acting under a right which the Legislature could not take away from him.

But far more important than the right of self-defence is the right to bear arms in defence of the lawful authority of the State. This right, taken in connection with statutory provisions for suppressing riots by the civil authorities, renders it possible for the indignation of law-abiding citizens against mobs and rioters to take formidable and effective shape. Besides the usual authority vested in the mayor of any town or the sheriff of any county to call upon citizens to assist in

suppressing a riot, and providing that the pay of citizens so employed shall be the same as that of militia in active service, there is another remedy, without waiting for the initiative from sheriff or mayor. If a large body of men are assembled in a threatening or riotous manner, a private citizen may give notice of it to the Mayor, a member of the Board of Aldermen, or Legislative Council of any city or town, or to a sheriff, coroner, or marshal, or any of their deputies, or to any justice of the peace. It is then the duty of the officer so notified to approach the rioters as nearly as he can with safety, and command them to disperse, and, if they do not comply, to command all bystanders to arrest them. Now, though the mayor of a city may refuse to do his duty, it would be strange if one decent man among all the officers enumerated could not be found, especially as a refusal to act after notice is visited with a fine not exceeding \$500; and, the right officer once found, citizens armed to the teeth could accompany him for the constitutional purpose of defending lawful authority, and, when called upon by the officer to arrest rioters refusing to disperse, could use all due force to accomplish the arrest. If the citizens should kill or wound any of the rioters in their endeavors to make arrests, they would be held guiltless, while the death or injury of one of the citizens would make all the rioters answerable for it.

This method of suppressing a riot does not appear to be an impracticable one. When, during the Southwestern strike of last year, the large railroad yards in St. Louis were filled by the Knights of Labor on the pretence of protecting them, the corporation might have called upon a friendly justice of the peace to undertake the duty of warning them away, and might have sent armed Pinkerton men with him. If the Pinkerton men were citizens of the State, their right to bear arms in such a case "could not be questioned," and, if citizens of another State, the Constitution of the United States would clothe them with the privileges of citizens of the State. In this way, without the delay and difficulty of getting special police licenses, the corporation would obtain a disciplined force acting under law. Throughout the Southwestern strike the Knights showed a wholesome fear of coming into conflict with the authorities of the United States, undoubtedly because they had been taught by experience that the United States could legally use force, and would use it if necessary. A few trials against armed bodies of men acting under the State law would give them such a respect for its civil authorities that they would welcome back the militia with joy.

SENATOR DAWES ON THE CRISIS.

SENATOR DAWES addressed the Middlesex Club in Boston on Saturday afternoon. With much vigor and earnestness he "arraigned" everybody who had been derelict in promoting the commercial interests of the nation, and especially its foreign trade, and more especially its trade with the countries south of us. He did not confine the arraignment to the Democratic party. On the contrary, he took a