

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1888.

The Week.

THE controversy in the House on Monday over the question of pension legislation serves to emphasize the recklessness with which the Republicans support every scheme of extravagance. Among the bills which they wanted to push through, the most important was one proposing to repeal the arrears limitation, and in this attitude they were only living up to the Republican national platform of 1884, which said: "The Republican party pledges itself to the repeal of the limitation contained in the Arrears Act of 1879, so that all invalid soldiers shall share alike, and their pensions begin with the date of disability, and not with the date of application." The lowest estimate of the amount which such a change would call for is three hundred millions of dollars, and the probability is that it would prove to be a great deal more. Yet there is no doubt that if the Republicans had carried the election of 1884, this immense job would have been carried through, and they are already giving fresh pledges to vote away these hundreds of millions if the people will restore them to power in 1888.

The Prohibition party perceived the fitness of making mention of the tariff in their national platform. It is instructive to observe that the Platform Committee, being under no partisan bias, took the common-sense view of the question—the view that is undoubtedly held by nine-tenths of the unprejudiced people of the country, viz., that the Treasury surplus ought to be reduced by repealing duties on the necessities of life. The resolution reported by the Committee was as follows:

"That an adequate public revenue being necessary, it may properly be raised by import duties and by an equitable assessment upon the property and the legitimate business of the country; but import duties should be so reduced that no surplus shall be accumulated in the Treasury, and that the burdens of taxation shall be removed from food, clothing, and other comforts and necessities of life."

This is what the average citizen believes and is ready to vote for. If the platform of the Prohibitionists had been left as it was reported and unanimously adopted, it would have been complete and satisfactory. But at the evening session a Pennsylvania delegate proposed an additional paragraph which was adopted in these words:

"And imposed on such other articles of import as will give protection both to the manufacturing employer and the producing laborer against the competition of the world."

The platform as thus finished is a concession to protectionism, but is by no means sufficiently so to meet the requirements of the tariff Republicans, whose record as made up in the House of Representatives is against

any reductions of protective duties whatever, whether on the necessities or on the luxuries of life.

There was a long letter in the *Times* on Monday, apparently inspired by somebody in the Treasury, which was doubtless intended to explain "the sugar frauds," but, unhappily, explains nothing. It is simply a very verbose plea that it is a shame to suspect such excellent men as Mr. Maynard and Mr. Fairchild of making mistakes. Some of its statements are really astonishing. But supposing them to be all true, how are we to account for the fact that only three or four underlings in the Appraiser's Department were removed, while the Appraiser himself, Mr. McMullen, and other chiefs who approved of these subordinates and vouched for them, were left untouched? And what about Deputy-Collector Davis, the Broome County politician, and his ten Binghamton "heelers"? Was it all along of those "sugar frauds" that these gentry were allowed to leave their work to run caucuses and conventions and speculate in post-office sites in Binghamton?

The defeat of Mr. J. B. Eustis for reelection to the United States Senate from Louisiana is a matter for congratulation, and carries with it some instructive lessons. Mr. Eustis was, we think, the first leading Democrat in the country to denounce the civil-service policy which President Cleveland adopted at the beginning of his Administration. In an interview to which he subjected himself in April, 1885, before the President had been in office two months, he spoke as follows: "You can say for me—and you cannot say it too strong—that in my judgment Mr. Cleveland, from a Democratic standpoint, has been a conspicuous and humiliating failure. . . . The fact that a horde of unscrupulous, ignorant, dyed-in-the-wool, and offensively partisan radical leaders are permitted to remain in office all over the country under Democratic rule, and in direct violation and contradiction of the very principles of Democracy and the wishes of a majority of the people as expressed at the ballot-box, is a shame and a disgrace, and a reflection on the competency, capability, and character of those whose suffrages placed Mr. Cleveland in the White House. . . . The Democratic element will see to it that this Administration is Democratic in the full significance of the term, or that Mr. Cleveland and his Cabinet shall fall and be buried in the ruins they have made." This talk was eagerly reproduced by the *Sun* and similar advocates of the spoils doctrine, and pointed to by them as the beginning of the revolt that the President was preparing for himself. In private conversation Eustis did not hesitate to say that he cared nothing for the doctrine of the thing, but that he meant to make himself "solid" with the Louisiana legislators. Instead, however, of seeing the President and his Cabinet

"buried in the ruins they have made," he finds himself retired to private life by the very legislators whom he thought his demagogism would please, and this only a week in advance of the date on which the President was to be unanimously renominated. The defeat of such a man as Eustis ought to give the President a good deal of information as to where his real strength in his party and throughout the country lies.

The most interesting and encouraging feature of the message submitted to the Louisiana Legislature by Mr. McEnery, the retiring Governor, was the passage devoted to education. It opens with the statement that since the last session of the General Assembly there has been a greater interest manifested in the cause of education throughout the State than at any time in the previous history of Louisiana, and declares that "the people will approve of any legislation that will promote this great interest." Mr. McEnery recalled the fact that in previous messages he had urged legislation in behalf of an enlarged and enlightened system of public education, and insisted that "to effect this the hard fact of local taxation must be resorted to." This is recognized as a necessity in the Constitution of the State, but unfortunately that instrument restricts the amount of taxation and does not permit the parishes (which correspond to counties in the North) to levy so large a local school tax as is required. Mr. McEnery therefore recommended that the Constitution should be so amended as to permit each parish to levy a tax sufficient, with the State tax, to keep the public schools open eight months in the year, and an act proposing such an amendment has since been introduced in the Legislature. The only thing Louisiana has ever lacked to secure good schools was a readiness on the part of the people to tax themselves enough to provide such schools; and the most hopeful feature of the present situation is the evidence that they are at last showing a willingness to put their hands in their own pockets, instead of trying to get them into the Treasury at Washington.

The change in St. Louis journalism which occurred during the week is of far more than local interest. The *Republican*, a Democratic paper which dates back to the early years of the century, and whose name has grown a misnomer during the last generation, has become the *Republic*, and it has a new management as well as a new name. The incoming editor, Mr. Charles H. Jones, has proved his quality by building up the *Florida Times-Union* into one of the most influential papers in the South, and he is excellently fitted to improve the wider opportunity which now opens to him in the West. The policy of the new management, as outlined in the first number, commits the *Republic* to the advocacy

of tariff reform, civil-service reform, and reform in liquor legislation, and the paper promises to be a great power for good. The change is the more noteworthy and hopeful from the fact that the old *Republican* had come to be a Bourbon sheet, while the position which it occupied is one that ought to be filled by a thoroughly progressive journal, such as the *Republic* is sure to be.

"The excitement" in Memphis, Tenn., "is intense," we learn, and "further trouble is feared," which is not surprising, considering that Kennedy Porter, a son of ex-Gov. Porter, who was severely shot some weeks ago by Will Edmunds, for paying attention to Miss Edmunds, having recovered his health, determined on Monday to murder Will on sight. He accordingly "opened fire" on him in the street, and they exchanged nine shots in all, Edmunds being badly wounded and Porter escaping on horseback. Two hours later Alexander White, the cashier of the Commercial Bank of Paris, Tenn., was telling about the fight to a friend in the street, when Dudley Porter, the brother of Kennedy, happening to pass by and overhearing what he was saying, was dissatisfied with his version of the affair, and sought to amend it by informing White that a certain passage in it was a "damned lie." White refused to accept this amendment, and determined to murder Porter for offering it, and accordingly shot him dead. We ought to add that the relations between these two gentlemen were already strained, owing to Porter's having murdered White's brother on a previous occasion. We need hardly say that all the combatants belong to the first families in Tennessee, and that the affair is greatly deplored.

The action of the two Presbyterian Assemblies on the question of organic union has the appearance of a game at cross purposes. The Northern body went to the very extreme of concession and conciliation, adopted a report which had been beforehand freely condemned as giving the whole case away to the Southern Church, and appointed an enlarged committee to renew negotiations. But the Baltimore Assembly dashed the entire scheme by voting by a large majority that organic union was impracticable. This leaves the Northern Church in the very awkward position of having confidently held out a hand only to have it refused. The decision of the Southern Assembly in the Woodrow case certainly lends color to the belief that the Presbyterians of the South are much more sensitively conservative than those of the North. We do not believe that the astounding deliverance on evolution could have been put through the Northern Assembly, even under the spur of theological terrorism with which ecclesiastical bodies are so often ridden. At any rate, with an acknowledged evolutionist at the head of one of its committees, the Philadelphia Assembly would have seemed rather more absurd in passing such a resolution than did the Baltimore gathering.

The Massachusetts Ballot-Reform Bill has been presented for enactment in the Rhode Island Legislature, and its passage is earnestly recommended by the leading journals of both parties in the State. As the quality of the new Legislature is unusually good, there appears to be an excellent prospect for the bill to become a law. Certainly there is no State in the Union where such a law is more urgently demanded, for there is none in which the use of money in elections is carried on more openly, or one in which its influence has been more demoralizing and degrading. Even in the South it would be difficult to find a community in which the moral sense upon the crime of corrupting the ballot-box is more torpid than it is in the intelligent and virtuous State of Rhode Island. The argument that the Republicans must use money because the Democrats do, since that is the only way by which to keep the wicked Democrats out of power, has for years carried all before it. The proposed law would put an end to this style of reasoning, for under it no party would use money to buy votes, for the simple reason that it would be impossible to follow the bribed voter to the polls to see if he voted in accordance with the sale.

The substitution of electricity for hanging in the infliction of capital punishment, in the bill which the Governor has just signed, will put an end to a great deal of revolting barbarism. There never was a word to be said by anybody for execution by hanging, except that it gave a chance for the infliction of torture on the culprit through the vigor of his constitution, or the unskillfulness of the hangman, and afforded the spectators a very brutalizing show. In fact, it was its spectacular possibilities which first commended it to English jurisprudence. The criminal was hanged because he could be seen dangling by thousands when the drop fell or the cart moved away, or could be left hanging as a warning to wicked passers by. The preservation of this mode of execution since executions have become private has been a cruel absurdity. Its horrors have been aggravated in this country, however, by our practice of making the criminal a sort of hero, and surrounding him with a savage pomp, after sentence has been passed. His cell has been open to all comers. Reporters interviewed him every day, and took down his observations on his trial, his denunciations of his prosecutors or jailers, and his maudlin reflections on his situation, and reported the flowers he received and the names of his "callers." All this is now to come to an end. There is to be complete seclusion after sentence. The day of the execution is not to be announced beforehand, and the infliction of the sentence to be witnessed by very few, and, although the body is to be delivered to the friends, wakes and public funerals are not to be allowed.

The most exasperating part of the Fishery Treaty to good Republicans is the *modus vivendi* under which American fishermen are

allowed shore privileges by taking out licenses for which they pay \$1.50 per ton per year. Any *modus vivendi* is bad, because there is danger that the fishermen will avail themselves of it, and thus get through the season without any other grievances than the payment of the money. But the worst kind of a *modus* is one which proves the falsity of the oft-repeated statement that we want nothing of Canada except what the Treaty of 1818 gives us. The Treaty of 1818 did not give us the right to buy bait, but expressly excepted that privilege. And now comes the schooner *Druid* from Newfoundland with a catch of 180,000 pounds of cod, and reports that both the American and the French fishing fleets had put in to Newfoundland for bait, and that the Americans had taken out licenses and procured all the bait they wanted, while the French were not allowed either licenses or bait. How much happier the condition of the Frenchmen must be, for they can go home with a grievance even if they have no cod. We have not heard of any retaliation bill in the French Chambers in consequence of this discrimination in favor of Americans, but perhaps it is too early to look for one.

The controversy still raging in England and Ireland over the Papal Rescript is one of the oddest of the many odd things which the Irish question has brought to the surface. The first queer thing about it is the eagerness with which the Rescript has been received by the Ministry and the Tory press as a means of putting down "the Plan of Campaign" and boycotting, in the presence of Mr. Balfour's repeated declarations that the Crimes Act has actually been successful not only in stopping the Plan of Campaign and in suppressing boycotting, but in extinguishing the National League itself, at least in a large part of the country. If this boast is justifiable, the Pope's assistance has very little if any importance. The second queer thing is the fierceness with which even the Unionist press in England maintains that the Rescript is sure to be obeyed both by the clergy and the people, against the vehement assurances of the Irish politicians that it will not be so obeyed. To rejoice over the strength of Papal influence in Irish politics is to run counter to all the strongest traditions of English politics. We believe it would be impossible to name an English statesman or publicist of the last eighty years who has not held that the strength of the Irish allegiance to the Catholic clergy and the Pope constituted the greatest difficulty in the government of Ireland by England. The spectacle of a large and respectable portion of the English public, therefore, chuckling over the continued obedience of the Irish people to the Church in secular matters, and denouncing those Irish laymen who oppose it, is undoubtedly one of the strangest spectacles of modern times. It surpasses in many ways even the spectacle of Horace Greeley running for the Presidency as the candidate of the Democratic party, the report of which, according to Mark Twain's

amusing burlesque, led Dr. Livingstone in the heart of Africa to denounce his discoverer, Stanley, as a liar, in very profane language.

Another very odd spectacle nearer home is the appearance of Mr. Chauncey Depew as a Blaineite candidate for the Presidency with all the appropriate fittings and furniture, considering that in 1872, when there were some remnants of rationality about the "bloody shirt" and other Republican properties, he ran as Democratic candidate for Lieutenant-Governor in this State, but came out 3,533 behind his ticket. It may of course be said, in explanation of this poor show at the polls, that he had not then fully displayed his remarkable powers as an after-dinner speaker, but we maintain, and we are sure that many gentlemen will corroborate us, that his stock of stories was better then than it is now; that the earlier editions of many of them were the best; and that, in short, his place as a humorist was higher about 1872 than it has ever been since. To those who maintain that humorous anecdotes go further in the Republican than in the Democratic party, and that Lincoln owed much of his influence to his "little stories," we answer that even Lincoln could have accomplished but little with his stories in a period of tariff controversy; that jokes in defence of the tariff are all but impossible; and that the only one of the least weight which can possibly be made on that side has already been made by Mr. Evarts, and is known as "The Three-Cent Joke," showing that the tariff only costs us three cents apiece. Mr. Depew may edit this, and put foot-notes to it, but he cannot improve on it, or utilize it for himself.

The complete failure of Gen. Boulanger in the French Chamber on his first appearance with his plan will not necessarily close his political career, but it must greatly discredit him. A Caesar, or "saviour of society," who discusses is lost. None of the others, Julius Caesar, Cromwell, or Napoleon, ever put themselves in positions where they could be answered or inveighed against publicly. The part which Boulanger played on Monday was, in fact, that of a parliamentarian, or "avocat," as the French love to call the glib-talking politician whom he denounces so much; and in a game of this sort, although he has made one or two good hits in debate in times past, he was sure to get the worst of it. Floquet mauled him badly, ruined his "dignity," a very serious matter in France, and presented him to the public in the attitude of a feeble, helpless man, in fact, anything but the stuff for a dictator. He still continues, however, to be the outward and visible sign of a discontent which is stronger in the country at large than in Paris, and which nobody seems quite able to explain further than that the low price of cattle and the failure of the vineyards have something to do with it. The French farmers have not, in fact, been so badly off since 1815, and have not got over the old habit of blaming the Government for low prices, and the doings of the Chambers

have certainly not been calculated to make the Republic seem much of a providence.

Unusually full details of the dream of an era of universal peace may be found in recent numbers of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, which gives up twelve of its pages to an attempt to prove that the neutralization of Turkey would be the long-looked-for remedy for the political evils comprised in the term "the Eastern question." The writer proposes the abrogation of the Treaty of 1841 closing the Dardanelles to the vessels of war of all nations alike, and the adoption of an international agreement granting free access to the Black Sea to warships of all flags. This measure would, in his opinion, be but the prelude to the neutralization of Turkey itself, that is to say, to an international control of the financial, judicial, and religious administration of its European provinces. The throwing open of the Dardanelles, or rather of the Black Sea, to the navies of Europe would be an insuperable barrier to Russian aggression in the Balkan Peninsula, while Turkey, deprived of the control of the straits, would cease to be alternately courted and threatened by the diplomacy of England, Austria, and Germany. The precedent for this kind of neutralization is found in the recently proposed convention relative to the Suez Canal, by which the freedom of the canal is to be guaranteed, through the joint action of the great Powers, to the navies of all nations, in time of war as well as in time of peace. The waters of the Congo Basin were similarly neutralized by the Berlin stipulations of 1885. The author of these suggestions fondly hopes that Russia, having abandoned her designs on Constantinople, would devote herself to the promotion of liberty in Warsaw and Moscow, and that Turkey would console herself for her loss of power in Europe by her new mission as a civilizer of Asia and Africa.

A very curious meeting of the new and the old occurred the other day in Turkey near the Servian frontier, on the opening of a continuation of the line from Belgrade which is eventually to connect with Constantinople. Before the Turkish train on the Turkish side of the line started, there was a delay to enable some Mussulman Imaums to sacrifice three sheep; and as sacrifices are not things which can be done in a hurry, the delay was a long one. The passengers, however, all took it very calmly, and, when the sacrifice was over, got into the cars and went their ways. We suppose the sacrifice was intended to give the train a good send-off, and at the same time to provide some mutton for the sacerdotal families.

In a recent address before the Royal Colonial Institute on "The New Industrial Era in India," Sir Wm. Hunter sounded a new note of alarm to the English farmer and manufacturer. After a rapid sketch of the growth of the foreign trade of India, from £9,500,000 sterling of exports in 1834 to £88,

000,000 in 1884, he dwelt upon the progress made in the culture of wheat, of which the amount exported has increased tenfold since 1873, while the whole area under wheat in Great Britain is less than half that in the Punjab alone. With improved methods of agriculture, which are sure to come, he believes it impossible to set any limits to the ultimate dimensions of this crop. Oil-seeds show a similar increase. As regards manufactures, India's cotton and jute mills, having in 1884 2,000,000 spindles, and employing over 110,000 people, are already formidable competitors of the Lancashire manufacturers. Even iron-smelting has advanced to a stage at which its commercial success seems almost assured. In view of these facts he believed "that the world seemed now to be entering on a new era of competition—the competition between the productive powers of the tropics and of the temperate zone." One of the great economic questions for the coming "commercial Viceroy," who was what India, having had "conquering Viceroys and consolidating Viceroys," now needed, was in respect to the railways, which are a Government monopoly. Should the rates be kept high for the sake of revenue, or would the Government "content itself with the actual interest on its outlay, and thus give an enormous impulse to Indian agriculture, commerce, and manufactures by low charges of carriage? The reduction of railway rates in India meant a cheaper loaf for England." He did not, however, conceal from his audience the conviction that this "development of India as a manufacturing and food-exporting country would involve changes in English production which must for a time be attended with suffering and loss." Still, he was equally sure that it would in the end be a gain to England and to the world.

The British Government is almost at loggerheads with the Australian colonies on the Chinese question. They have for some time past levied a poll tax of \$50 on every Chinese immigrant, and restricted the number to one for every 100 tons of the ship's burden. They now propose to prohibit Chinese immigration altogether, and ask the Imperial Government to follow the example of the United States by negotiating an exclusion treaty with China. This the Ministry thus far has declined to do, and even threatens to veto Australian legislation for the same object; the result is, great excitement in the colonies. Lord Carrington, the Governor of New South Wales, has sent home a despatch at the instance of the Colonial Premier, Sir Henry Parkes, in which the latter makes known that if the proposed treaty be not promptly negotiated, "the Australian Parliament must act from the force of public opinion in devising measures to defend the colonies from consequences which they cannot relax in their efforts to avert." As there is not the smallest interest in the matter in England, the probabilities are that the colonists will eventually have their own way.

MR. BLAINE'S LAST WITHDRAWAL.

WHEN Mr. Blaine's letter to Chairman Jones, from Florence, dated January 25, was published, we said that whether it were sincerely intended to withdraw him from the list of candidates or not, it would have that effect and produce that result, because it would detach a large body of his supporters in every State, who would forthwith make new alliances and commitments. We believed that a man of Mr. Blaine's experience as a political manager must have foreseen this, and hence that there were fair presumptions of an intention on his part to withdraw. Nevertheless, the language used in his Florence letter was ambiguous, since it did not say that he would not accept the nomination if tendered to him, but merely that his name would not be presented to the Convention. It was quite within his power to say that he would not accept the nomination. It was not within his power to say that his name would not be presented to the Convention, because any delegate could present it regardless of Mr. Blaine's wishes, and if one delegate could do so, a majority might do so.

Further doubt was cast upon the seriousness of the Florence letter by what followed immediately after the statement that his name would not be presented, for he proceeded to show what a magnificent gain the Republican party had made in 1884, when he was a candidate, over the result in the Congressional and State elections of 1882, laying especial emphasis on the result in New York, where Cleveland had been elected by 192,000 majority in the latter year, whereas he had won by less than 1,100 majority in the Presidential fight. The implication of this reminder was that his own name was a tower of strength to the party.

The Blaine men and the Blaine newspapers were at first stunned by the Florence letter, and for two or three days they said that it had taken their candidate out of the field. But when they had had time for critical examination of the text, they began to say that it was not a withdrawal, but merely a general declaration that, while not a candidate, he was "in the hands of his friends," and was "subject to draft," etc., etc. On this basis of false pretences his own State of Maine elected delegates in his favor, and, according to the claim of the Philadelphia Press, 377 delegates were chosen in his favor, a goodly number of whom were under positive instructions for him. All these proceedings went on without a word of remonstrance from him.

But now, after all the delegates, or all except an insignificant number, have been chosen, he writes from Paris expressing the surprise with which he learns that, notwithstanding his Florence letter, his name may yet be presented to the Convention. So, after ringing many changes on his astonishment that his valued friends could have so misinterpreted his Florence letter, he says: "Assuming that the Presidential nomination could by any possible chance be offered to me, I could not accept it without leaving in the minds of thousands of these men the impression that I had

not been free from indirection, and therefore I could not accept it at all." There are a few of the Blaine faction who think that there is still room for doubt. They point to the similar language used by Gov. Seymour in 1868, and speculate upon the chances of an interminable struggle in the coming Convention which shall make Mr. Blaine a necessity. We beg to remind these enthusiastic squires of the Plumed Knight that this is not the year 1868, and that Mr. Blaine is not Gov. Seymour, and that the Republican party is not the Democratic party. Mr. Blaine is "out" now. By whatsoever means he got out, he is out for good and all.

We are thankful for this, because we can now look forward to a campaign upon principles. There is reasonable assurance that the next President of the United States will be one upon whose personal character no stain rests. He may be a spoilsman in the party sense. He may be a high-tariff man or anything politically obnoxious to our conceptions of what is best for the country. But he will not be the author of the Mulligan letters, or of any letters that need to be burned in order to qualify him to receive the votes of his fellow-citizens. The country has made that much gain. When we look back at the twelve years' struggle to keep Blaine out of the White House, these letters all the time staring us in the face, we are bound to say that it is a great gain.

The question, Who comes next? is the momentous one for the Republican party. Judge Gresham is, in our opinion, the strongest man in the party. He is strong because he represents the opposite of Blaine both in personal character and in public aims. We believe that his candidacy would give Mr. Cleveland and the Democratic party more trouble than that of any other man who can be named. We say frankly that we hope he may be nominated, not that we should expect to support him—we could hardly do so on the procrustean tariff platform that his party in Congress has made up—but because we desire to see both parties and all parties put the best foot foremost. In this way only do we see the path of true progress, advancement, and enlightenment for the republic.

While our hopes and best wishes go with the supporters of Judge Gresham, we do not see much prospect of his nomination. The Blaine men are still the strongest force in the Convention, and although their first choice is out of the field, their second choice will in all probability be the winner. That second choice may be Harrison, or Alger, or Allison, possibly Foraker, but will not be Gresham. It will not be Sherman, because Sherman stopped the Blaine movement last year in Ohio and furnished a rallying point for opposition, just as he stopped the third-term movement and furnished a rallying-point against it in 1880. Moreover, Mr. Sherman, when holding the reins of power, is not a man of complaisance. When he drives he follows his own way. He is no Garfield, to take another man on the box-seat and let him drive part of the time. The Blaine strength at Chicago will be given to the candidate whose immediate representatives will

offer the best terms to the Blaine cohort of the past twelve years, and that candidate will be nominated unless the cohort shall look upon success at the polls as of more importance than continued control of the party organization. We do not anticipate any such display of the spirit of self-abnegation on their part.

THE "HORDE OF OFFICE-HOLDERS."

THERE was no point in Mr. Curtis's address on Tuesday week which was so loudly applauded by the great audience whom he both charmed and instructed, as his suggestion of a constitutional amendment lengthening the Presidential term, and making Presidents ineligible for reelection. Of course, this is not a new suggestion. It has been often made before, and it is based on the same experience of human nature in politics to which we were indebted for Mr. Cleveland's emphatic condemnation of a second term in his letter of acceptance. It happens just now, however, to receive fresh point from the verification of his own views which Mr. Cleveland is unhappily furnishing to the country. What he said was:

"When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public places once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of office-holders, with a zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the President for reelection a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate, and intelligent action which must characterize a government of the people."

We are sure he must himself regret, even more poignantly than any of his supporters, that he should have so soon furnished that striking illustration of his own doctrine which the civil-service reformers lamented in their meeting on May 30. But when his argument is examined, it is found to be really an argument not against a second term, but against a particular mode of securing it. We doubt if there be anybody in the country, spoilsman or reformer, who questions the desirableness of being able to keep a good President eight years in office, if the interests of the country seem to require it. Nobody thinks eight years a dangerously long period for anybody to fill the highest executive place in this country, particularly if he have, when half-way through it, submitted himself afresh to the popular judgment. What everybody means, and what President Cleveland himself meant, when denouncing a second term, was that it was a bad thing to get a second term by using the Executive patronage to reward party workers and pack nominating conventions. If this practice could be abolished, second terms would really have no opponents. If it had been abolished four years ago, President Cleveland's reelection to-day would, we think, be assured beyond any manner of doubt. What puts his reelection in peril, if in peril it be, is simply the fact that he has allowed his super-serviceable managers to use the public offices, which he said were public trusts, to purchase the support of the delegates to the nomi-