

cenaries as ever existed, and we had an example of what he was able to do with them when, in 1884, he threw almost their solid vote against the Presidential candidate of his party, whom he had repeatedly pledged himself to support. He literally sold his whole Machine vote to the Blaine managers in return for Republican votes for his candidate for Mayor, and nobody can examine the figures of the returns and not be convinced that the bargain was kept by both sides. The failure to deliver quite enough to insure success in the election undoubtedly had much to do with hastening Kelly's death. He had made a final and remarkable demonstration of the perfection of his system, but he had failed in a stake for life or death.

That bargain of 1884 was only an instance on a large scale of what goes on in every municipal election, and what must, from the nature of the case, go on in every election so long as the present machinery is continued. Mr. Ivins shows with great clearness why this must be so. The State has neglected to supply the needed machinery of elections beyond the mere recording, receiving, and counting of the vote. Gradually there have been built up to supply this deficiency three political organizations, composed of men who have taken up this as the most profitable business lying open to them. They have gone into it from no motives of public duty or patriotism, but simply to get a living. The more extravagant and corrupt politics can be made, the better living will they get. They cannot be blamed for this. They have taken up a business which nobody else would touch. They are able to take it up solely because the respectable people have been too indifferent to do it for themselves, and too careless of the public good to provide for its doing by the State. The wonder is not that the Machines are so corrupt and unscrupulous, but that they do any good at all. They do put fit men into office occasionally, though if they were always to combine in favor of bad men, they could win in spite of all obstacles.

There are encouraging signs that the people of this city are waking up to the disgrace of allowing such a state of affairs to continue. We put a tax upon nominations for office which excludes all but rich men from getting into high positions, and we put a premium upon political dishonesty and trickery by throwing all the machinery of elections and all the money for its operation into the hands of the worst elements of our population. We do not mean to say by this that there are no honest men in the Machines. There are many there, but the majority in all Machines is composed of men who have gone into politics because they had no other business, and were unfit for any other. We can never hope to reform this by starting a Machine composed entirely of honest men, simply because the honest men will not do the work. It is useless to talk more about reforming the Machines by infusing into them a larger proportion of what is known as the "better element." That has been tried over and over again, but has always failed and failed ludicrously. Then, too, even if we could reform the Machines, what right have we to put a tax upon

candidates which is so heavy that it excludes poor men and even men of moderate means from public office? The State pays for the registration and reception of the ballot, and on precisely the same principle it should pay for its printing and distribution. Instead of this being, as some persons curiously claim, contrary to the spirit of our institutions, it is in perfect accord with it, for it is the only way by which we can be supplied with a free and untrammelled exercise of the right of suffrage.

Mr. Ivins shows, in the ingenious parallel at the close of his second paper, how completely the evils which we are suffering under Machine control can be eliminated by the adoption of the remedy which is embodied in the English law. In his third and concluding paper he sets forth elaborately and clearly the provisions of this law, whose working in the elections of 1886 can now be studied in a very exhaustive report which has recently been laid before Parliament. This report gives for the first time a detailed statement both of the expenses of the candidates under the heads into which the law divides their outlay, and of the charges made to the candidates by the returning officers. The most significant fact disclosed is, that the grand total of expenditures by candidates is only a little more than one-half of the grand total allowed by the law. Omitting the universities, there were in the election 794 candidates in 460 English constituencies. The maximum scale allowed under the Corrupt Practices Act for all these constituencies was £667,400. The actual outlay on items allowed by the law was only £364,811. In Wales the maximum was £43,675, and the actual outlay was only £18,838. About one-fourth of the elections in England and Wales were uncontested, and the expense of most of these was very small. But had they all been contested at the average cost of the other three-fourths, the maximum would still not have been reached by more than £200,000.

Commenting upon these figures, the *London Daily News* says: "The first thing which they prove is the complete success of Sir Henry James's act. The chief feature of that act was that it laid down a maximum expenditure, to exceed which would be a corrupt practice, voiding the seat. The experts said that the maximum was placed too low—the experience of the last election demonstrates that, as usual, the experts were wrong, and that on the contrary the maximum is too high. It would be possible to reduce by at least one-fourth the sums allowed by law without in any way starving the elections. There are very few cases in which the maximum was reached."

This is a remarkable showing. Within the short space of four years, and after two elections, it has been demonstrated by actual figures that the extravagant and corrupt use of money in elections can be completely abolished by the simple process of forbidding it by law. As extravagant expenditure constantly bred greater extravagance, so on the other hand does honest expenditure breed economy, for if one candidate does not bribe and corrupt, his rival has no need to. Neither do we find

in the English comments on the results achieved any intimation that there is a falling off in the popular interest in the elections. The voters go to the polls with as much eagerness as they did when they were paid for their votes.

#### "PULLS."

No effect of the spoils system is so striking as the way it distorts people's notions about the relations of the Government to the people. A most curious illustration of this is the apparent novelty of Mr. Cleveland's saying that "public office is a public trust." When one thinks over it a little, this seems so obvious a truth as to wear somewhat the air of a platitude. Nevertheless, when first produced it startled people a good deal, and for some months took rank as a discovery in political science. Indeed, it is still repeated in the newspapers frequently as a valuable addition to the literature of trusts. The reason of this was, that although the doctrine of trust in government had never died out in moral philosophy, or in school and college text-books, it had assumed in American politics the character of what theologians call a "pious opinion"—that is, an opinion which may or may not be true, and which it does one's soul good to entertain, but by which nobody is bound to regulate his conduct. It was open to any good American to look on an office simply as a great responsibility imposed on him solely for the benefit of his countrymen, but at the same time any one who took this view was held by politicians to be a man as unfit for office as one who felt himself bound to give his coat to anybody who had taken his cloak, would be for the dry-goods business. Two-thirds of the work of civil-service reformers has, in fact, consisted in contending with the notion that offices are not private property, and that a man who acknowledges that the public has any interest in them is not an amiable visionary.

Fifty years of the spoils system have had a somewhat similar effect on the political mind about the exercise of the appointing power. The common-sense and ordinary business view of the appointing power is, that anybody who is invested with it is bound to keep in office all persons whom he believes, on due inquiry, to be discharging the duties of their respective places efficiently, and is bound to search diligently for persons qualified, in his own judgment, to fill vacancies. Nine out of ten Mayors and Governors, however, have wholly lost this early human notion of political duty. When they find themselves charged with the duty of filling vacancies, they are very apt to look on themselves simply as the custodians of lost articles, bound to deliver them to all who can identify them, or as officers charged with the distribution of prize money or of an indemnity fund. That is to say, instead of going to work to find proper persons to fill the places, they sit down and wait for "pulls." "Pulls" are among the most curious and interesting products of the spoils system. A "pull" is an occult force by which a public officer is compelled to do something which his judgment condemns, and for which he himself sees no

good reason—such, for instance, as putting in an important place somebody of whom he knows nothing, or whom he knows to be a great rascal. It is only in politics that “a pull” is ever pleaded as an excuse for doing a shameful or absurd thing. A respectable man who excused himself for the neglect or violation of any private duty by saying that he did it in obedience to “a pull,” would be considered insane or a humbug. But if he says that “a pull” has made him in some manner betray the public interest, we are all disposed to go about saying, “You know, poor fellow, he could not help himself. He hated to do it, but so-and-so had a ‘pull’ on him, and he could not stand up against it.”

The performance of Gov. Lounsbury, described in another column, in refusing to reappoint Prof. Hadley, is an almost comic example of the way in which a “pull” works. The Governor found an excellent officer in charge of the Labor Bureau of that State. The chief business of the Commissioner is the collection and arrangement of statistics touching the condition of laborers. Prof. Hadley had remarkable training for the work, was, in fact, a man such as any government is lucky in securing for such work, and, moreover, had during one term given ample proof of his fitness for it. One would expect that, under these circumstances, the Governor of a highly civilized State would at once satisfy himself that it was his duty to reappoint him. But Gov. Lounsbury did nothing of the kind. He knew the vacancy was coming, but he made no preparation to fill it. He simply sat down and waited for “pulls.” They soon began to be felt. There were “pulls” from manufacturers, and “pulls” from labor organizations, and “pulls” from “callers,” *against* Hadley. He supposed of course there would be pulls for Hadley also, and that Hadley himself must have been running about the State starting “pulls” in his own interest. But to his surprise he felt no Hadley “pulls” at all—none came from any quarter. Even Hadley said nothing in his own favor. Accordingly, says the Governor, with delightful simplicity, “in view of all these facts I decided that I should not be justified in making a reappointment.” About the manner in which Hadley had done his work, or about the nature of the work to be done, not one word does he say. His explanation is all about “pulls.” It is evidently inconceivable to him that anybody should expect him to reappoint a man who had no “pulls.” All he says for Hadley’s successor, Mr. Hotchkiss, is that he knows “the men who have endorsed him would not endorse him unless he were worthy of endorsement”; or, in other words, that his “pulls” are strong.

#### A STUDY IN “POLITICS.”

A COMMITTEE of the Legislature of Indiana was lately appointed to investigate the condition of one of the State prisons known as the “State Prison South.” It has made its report, which ought to be in the hands of everybody who still believes that public offices should be used for the reward of party service, and that any sort of politician is good enough to take charge of criminals and paupers.

The Committee found, to begin with, that the books of the prison were falsified and entries omitted, under the direct orders of the Warden; but they nevertheless discovered, without much difficulty, a deficit of \$20,000. What became of the money they were unable to say, because the Warden refused to show his check-book. The Warden himself, A. J. Howard, is a most interesting person. Of course he is a good Democrat. The State being Democratic, the State prison had, of course, to be managed by Democrats, on the Jeffersonian plan. It does not clearly appear through what influences he got his place in the first instance, but the Committee found reason to believe that he used money on the directors, both when he was first elected, and when he was reelected two years ago. The main argument in his favor which could be produced was the very familiar one, that “Jack Howard was honest and big-hearted,” and always stood by his friends, and “never was known to break his word.” When he was reelected two years ago, the directors not only forebore to overhaul Jack’s accounts, but reported the prison as being in beautiful order, and did not require him to renew his bond. So he went to work to steal and misappropriate with renewed vigor.

Jack Howard, like our late friend John Kelly, has a newspaper, called the *Jeffersonville Evening Times*, in which doubtless he denounces, or used to denounce, Cleveland and “snivel-service reform,” and urge upon the President the duty of “turning the rascals out.” Kelly used to make the liquor-dealers subscribe to his paper, in order to procure licenses. But Jack Howard was a more enterprising man than even Kelly, for he made the convicts subscribe to his paper, charging them on his books \$4.50 per annum out of the money they earned. Those who were “hard up” were allowed to subscribe by the month, and the librarian, a convict named Martin, acted as canvasser for the journal among his brother criminals. Jack used also to borrow money from the convicts—that is, appropriate their earnings, and money sent them by their friends and on account of pensions. Sometimes, when a convict’s term expired and he had to be paid what was due, Jack would be terribly embarrassed, and used to have to borrow from his subordinate officers and other “big-hearted” friends. He had other resources, too. He used to appropriate to his own use flour belonging to the prison, and “garden truck and vegetables” raised by convict labor on ground belonging to the State, and used to convert raw material belonging to the State also. Jack never advertised for bids for his jail supplies. He bought them from his friends, one of whom, a Louisville butcher, supplied “quarters and shanks” to the jail, “the choice portions going to other parties”—of course, on prison account. Besides this, Jack used to supply pork from a pork house owned by himself and his brother. He used also to inflict cruel and unusual punishments. Two men died from punishment while under his charge. The body of one was cut up and burnt in the furnace. The body of the other was disposed of without a proper inquest.

The account given by the Committee of the

filth of the prison is too disgusting to be laid before any community which is not responsible for Jack or his doings. With regard to the Prison Directors who appointed him, and who regularly reported that he was behaving in an exemplary manner, the Committee find them guilty of “gross if not wilful neglect of duty,” and recommend that “their immediate resignation be requested.” They also declare that, as usual, Jack Howard had a ring who worked with him inside the prison. It consisted of the Deputy-Warden, the Steward, and the Clerk, each of whom had his own special share of the spoil.

The oddest figure in the affair, who would also be a droll figure, too, if anything or anybody could be droll in such a sink of iniquity, is the chaplain, a certain L. F. Cain. The Committee call him “the Chaplain,” but in his examination the wretched wag called himself “the Moral Instructor.” He “worked” his official position, as politicians would say, or, as the Committee say, “prostituted it,” by “securing the confidence of the convicts and obtaining money from them for the alleged purpose of securing pardons for them.” While he was in the prison he apparently got tired of giving “moral instruction,” and determined to study medicine. Being intrusted officially with the purchase of books for the library out of a fund formed by an admission fee paid by visitors to the prison, he bought medical books exclusively, and charged them to the prison at nearly double the cost price. He was a man of very large views, in fact, and fit for something better than a retail business; for, according to one witness,

“At one time he called the lifetime men together, and told them if they would donate him so much money—some considerable amount, I do not remember just now—that he would go before the Legislature and he would procure the passage of a bill making fifteen years a lifetime sentence; and they gave him the money, and he went to Indianapolis, and when he came back he laughed and said, if they didn’t get their bill through he would get his bill through to raise his salary from \$800 to \$1,400.”

We may add, in conclusion, that the maximum number of times in which Jack Howard was, by the evidence, seen drunk in the jail was fifty. McFadden, the hospital steward, used to get more drunk than the Warden, but apparently not so often, and the guards did a fair retail whiskey business with the convicts.

We cordially commend the report to the perusal of such of our readers as are interested either in the spoils system or in prison discipline. But we would caution those who may feel disposed to reproach the decent people of Indiana for allowing such horrors to exist so long in a State institution, not to roll their eyes over them too much. For they must not forget that a Warden has been appointed to the principal prison in this city whose character and career offer far fewer guarantees of efficiency and integrity than Jack Howard’s did when he got his place. We are displaying to-day to all the young criminals in the city the spectacle of an old and life-long member of the criminal class, known as “Fatty” Walsh, at the head of a great penal establishment. We are denouncing the liquor-dealers as the foes of decency, and order, and morality, and moving heaven and earth to get a bill passed reducing their number and restraining what we consider their infernal