

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1888.

The Week.

THE agencies which create a majority at a Presidential election are so numerous, and often so obscure, that everybody is more or less tempted to speculate about them—all the more because an opinion about them which nobody can refute is within every man's reach. The humblest or most ignorant man in New York to-day may have a theory of the cause of Cleveland's defeat which it would be impossible for the most sagacious or best informed to overthrow. If any man chooses to say that it was the tariff did it, or Hill did it, or civil-service abuses did it, who can demonstrate that he was wrong? There could not, in fact, be a better illustration of what logicians call "a composition of causes" than a Presidential election affords. Many things contribute to the result; but nobody can say, with overwhelming authority, unless he has actually bought and paid for the majority—which Matt Quay may have done—which thing was mainly instrumental in bringing it about, or, in other words, which thing was the "causing cause." All this naturally makes many people, after all is over, when they sit down to think about it, take a savage satisfaction in selecting some of their enemies to bear the blame. Nobody who has voted can feel perfectly secure against the charge that it was he who caused the calamity, no matter on which side he has voted. Even if he has voted for Cleveland, the disgust he has excited in other people at seeing him vote for anybody may have driven thousands over to Harrison. The *Tribune*, in fact, accounts for the defeat of Warner Miller in this very way. Thousands, on hearing that the Mugwumps were going to vote for him, determined to vote for his opponent, their feelings about corruption and liquor to the contrary notwithstanding. In fact, the doctrine that votes, under a popular government, have to come from the right people in order to do a candidate any good, has, ever since 1884, played a considerable part in our politics, and will doubtless continue to play a considerable part hereafter.

The Brooklyn *Eagle* thinks that "the figures disprove the statement that Gov. Hill's Democratic supporters went back on Cleveland." Admitting this, the same figures seem to us to prove that Gov. Hill's candidacy caused thousands of independent voters to withhold their votes from Cleveland. It is plain that the Governor's candidacy lost the Democratic State ticket many votes in those quarters of Brooklyn where independent voters are most numerous. Take, for instance, certain election districts of the First Ward, which includes the Heights, and compare their votes for the Presidential and Gubernatorial tickets:

	Cleveland.	Hill.	Harrison.	Miller.
4th.....	212	103	254	350
5th.....	163	110	276	313
8th.....	237	140	278	363
9th.....	177	124	196	239

Here, it will be seen, are election districts where one-fifth, one-fourth, one-third, and even, in the Fourth District, more than one-half of the men who voted for Cleveland voted against Hill, nearly all of them casting their ballots for Miller. This element consisted of lifelong Democrats, who could not endure the saloon candidate nominated for Governor by their party, and of independent voters, chiefly of Republican antecedents, who abominate the Hill type of politician. There were enough independent voters who thus discriminated between the two tickets, and supported the Presidential candidate of a party whose Gubernatorial candidate they could not abide, to save Cleveland the First Ward, although his plurality in it was but 207, against 498 four years ago. But there were other voters who had all along been favorably disposed towards Cleveland, and would have supported him if nothing had happened to disgust them with his party, who simply would not have anything to do with a party which nominated such a man as Hill for Governor. They did not consider that the country would be endangered or disgraced by Cleveland's defeat this year, as they did consider it would have been four years ago by Blaine's election; they did not think that the cause of tariff reform would be lost if Cleveland should not be reelected; but they did feel that a party which would honor a man whose only claim above other men was that he was the devoted friend of the liquor interest was a party which they could not help to keep in power, at Washington or anywhere else.

The Republicans are sobering down sufficiently now to contemplate what has happened in this city and State as well as in the nation, and we trust that they will give the situation here their most prayerful attention. It is probably great fun to laugh at the Mugwumps because Miller was not elected Governor and Hewitt was not elected Mayor; but are the facts of Hill's return to the Executive chair at Albany, and that Tammany Hall has full control of this city, causes for uproarious merriment? What is going to be done to guard us against similar successes in future elections? Does anybody believe that if Hill had been running against Miller on the issue of rum against temperance, in an election in which no other candidacy was involved, the State of New York would have given a majority for Hill and rum? Does anybody believe that if Hewitt had been running against Grant, in an election which was on city issues alone, the Republicans would have been so partially blind to the

interests of the city as to make Grant's election sure by running a candidate of their own? Why should the welfare of the city and State be thus tied up with national politics, and sacrificed whenever the elections occur on the same day? We put these questions to intelligent and patriotic men of all parties, and ask them to consider seriously whether they can devote their energies to a more worthy object than the securing of separate municipal, State, and national elections.

The Harlem Democratic Club has already taken steps to advocate legislation which will give us separate municipal elections. They have appointed a committee to draft a bill to be submitted to the Legislature providing for spring elections for municipal and county officers, and another bill to secure electoral reform within the lines of Gov. Hill's veto of the Electoral-Reform Bill of the last session. As to the desirability of holding municipal elections at such times as no other elections are held, there can be no doubt. As it is now, the interests of the city are almost invariably sacrificed for State or national party interests, and a great flood of unworthy candidates for the Legislature, Board of Aldermen, and minor local candidates is swept into office under cover of the political excitement of the time. Gov. Hill, in his first message to the Legislature, took strong ground in favor of spring elections, and afterwards vetoed a bill providing for them, because it had some other measure conjoined with it. He might be tried now with a simple measure for the same purpose, and see what he would do with it.

As for the imperative necessity of a ballot-reform law, we have already expressed ourselves in favor of that, and are glad to see that a Democratic organization is the first to take the field for it now. Certainly the Democrats of this State, and of the whole country, ought to be impressed with the importance of such a reform to them. It is small use for them to make any attempts to carry the country and elect a President so long as a handful of political gamblers of both parties in this city and State can arrange a "deal," and decide the contest to suit themselves. Other States are already in the field with measures looking to the same end. A ballot-reform bill has been prepared by a club formed for the purpose in Providence, and is now before the Rhode Island Legislature. Michigan, which made an effort to secure such a law two years ago, and passed a bill through one house of the Legislature, will undoubtedly return to the subject this winter, when the Legislature comes together in biennial session.

There is even a prospect that Indiana too may be rescued from the disgrace of being put up at auction every four years. The State has long been in urgent need of a new

election law, but the Democrats have stood in the way of the reform. This year they have lost the State on the Presidential vote, for lack of such a law, as they claim, and the leaders of the party in the press and the organization are demanding that the Democratic Legislature chosen last week shall do something about it. "The supreme duty of the next Legislature," says the *Sentinel*, the most prominent Democratic newspaper in the State, "is to pass an election law which will forever free Indiana from the scandal and disgrace to which it is now exposed every four years." The *Sentinel* points out that the Legislature is Democratic in both branches, and declares that "if a proper election law is not passed, it will be an everlasting reproach to the party." Chairman Jewett of the Democratic State Central Committee takes the same view of the matter as the *Sentinel*. "There is an urgent necessity," he says, "for the passage of a better election law than the one we now have," and he holds that "all men ought to unite in this effort." He thinks that the reform should include provisions limiting the size of voting precincts so that not more than 250 votes should be polled at one precinct; forbidding any one except the voter to approach nearer than 100 feet to the polling place; and the furnishing by the State of an envelope in which each ticket shall be enclosed, with opportunity for the voter to select and seal up his ballot unobserved. He thinks it would also be a great gain if the terms of State and county officers could be so arranged that elections for such offices could be separated from Federal elections. Out of the discussion thus started some improvement ought to come.

It is hardly necessary for us to say to the tariff-reform clubs throughout the country that they ought to continue the work for which they were organized without intermission, that they ought to hold regular meetings, issue such documents as they can find means to publish and circulate, and go on in all respects as living organisms. It is hardly necessary for us to give this advice, because these clubs, unlike mere party clubs, were formed for a continuing purpose. They are like the anti-slavery clubs of old, that worked and fought, not against a party, but against an evil, and allowed themselves no rest so long as the evil existed. The tariff-reform clubs have no party end to gain: it is their object to educate, and it is perfectly immaterial to them whether the reform they work for is carried out by one party, or by the other, or by both together. They are volunteer organizations, moved by a conviction that the tariff is an obstacle and a hindrance to the prosperity of the nation, and an injustice to the great mass of the people. The activity of the past few months, when a national election was pending, cannot be kept up; but the organizations can be continued and improved, and the work carried forward quite as effectively as before.

The year 1892 is a more distant goal than the tariff-reform clubs have in mind at present. There will be an election for Congress-

men in all parts of the United States two years hence. This is the true objective point for tariff-reformers. The recent election has shown where the tariff-reform clubs can put in their most effective work, namely, among the workingmen of the large cities—the very ones who were so pelted during the recent campaign with wage statistics and quotations from English papers, forgeries and other. The returns show that this rubbish was wasted on the workingmen. They didn't believe a word of it. The Republicans, on the whole, lost votes in the manufacturing centres, where people meet and talk, and hear debates and take part in them. They gained in the rural districts, where the poor, tax-ridden farmer is still gulled, and gulled more than ever, with the idea that, by paying taxes for somebody else's benefit, a mysterious subterranean stream of wealth will gush out at his doorway by and by. He has been waiting for it all his lifetime, and it has not come; but apparently his faith in it has grown in proportion to the mystery of the oracles which have promised it to him. The tariff-reform clubs can easily reach the workingmen, and bring more and more of them into a knowledge of the truth; and to this work, in season and out of season, they will continue faithful to the end.

The three largest wool-growing States in the Union are Texas, Ohio, and California. These are the States in which, if anywhere, we ought to look for Republican gains by reason of the Democratic demand for free wool. But what is the complexion of the returns from these States? The returns from Texas are unimportant in any case, the Democratic majority being so large, and are at present insufficient to base a comparison upon; but in Ohio and California, strange as it must appear to the high-tariff mind, the Democrats have actually gained votes. In Ohio, Mr. Blaine's plurality four years ago was 31,802. This year Mr. Harrison's plurality is less than 21,000. In California, Blaine had 13,128 plurality, but Harrison's plurality is several thousand less. So much for the wool-growing States. Let us now glance at the cities and States where wool manufacturing is an important branch of industry. Probably Rhode Island is the most important centre of this industry. What do we find here? In the city of Providence Blaine had 1,864 plurality; Harrison has now only 488. In Pawtucket Blaine had 451; Harrison has 266. In the whole State, Blaine had 6,639; Harrison has 4,427. New Hampshire is also extensively engaged in wool manufacturing. In Manchester, the largest manufacturing town, Blaine had 587 plurality; Harrison now has 391. In the whole State Blaine had 4,066; Harrison has 2,748. The city of Philadelphia is probably the largest wool-manufacturing centre in the whole country. Here Mr. Blaine had 30,000 plurality four years ago; now Mr. Harrison has 18,065. Norwich, Connecticut, is another important wool manufacturing point. In that city Blaine had 431 plurality, Harrison has 99. In Waterbury Cleveland had 491 in 1884; his plurality is now increased to 749. In Bridgeport his

plurality of 576 is increased to 678. In Meriden his plurality of 54 rises now to 341. Throughout Connecticut, as a general rule, the Democrats have gained in the manufacturing towns and lost in the rural districts. They have gained where there was opportunity for discussion and the mingling together of people and comparison of views.

The *Indianapolis Journal* has reached the conclusion that "this is a Republican country, and there is no middle-aged voter now alive who will ever see the Democracy again in control of the national Government." Something may be pardoned to the natural exuberance of the home organ of a successful Presidential candidate, but it is well enough to remind the *Journal* that the Republicans swept the country much more thoroughly in 1872 than in 1888, and that only two years later there was a "tidal wave" which gave the Democrats an overwhelming majority of the House in 1874, and large pluralities on the Presidential ticket in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Indiana in 1876. Also, that Garfield carried New York by 21,000 plurality and received 214 out of 369 electoral votes in 1880, while in 1882 the Democrats carried New York by nearly 200,000, and in 1884 Cleveland received 219 out of 401 electoral votes.

One break has certainly been made in the "Solid South" in the assured election of a Republican Legislature in Delaware, which, although the geographers used always to class it as one of the "Middle States," has of late years in political divisions been ranked with the other late slave States. The result is due primarily to a quarrel between the factions in the Democratic party. This became so bitter that the Saulsbury wing finally helped the Republicans to carry his home county, which holds the balance of power in the Legislature. The political revolution in the little State, thus brought about, will very likely end in giving the Republicans control of the commonwealth. It seems also probable that another break has been made in the Solid South by the election in West Virginia of a Legislature which will send a Republican to the Senate. The Democrats have been losing ground in the State steadily since 1876, and if the Republicans have carried the Legislature this year, they may reasonably hope to secure a majority of the popular vote in the next election, if they have not done so now. The Republicans were sure of controlling the Senate by the casting vote of the Vice President, even if they had not gained a seat in either Delaware or West Virginia. Delaware will make the parties stand 39 Republicans to 37 Democrats, and a change in West Virginia, 40 to 36.

We commend the existing situation to the attention of people who recommend a change in our method of electing a President, so as to have the choice made by popular vote. Under the existing system, it was clear to every experienced student of election-returns before midnight on Tuesday that Harrison had a

majority of the electoral votes, and consequently was elected. But nobody has the slightest idea to-day, or can have for days to come, whether he has also a majority of the popular vote. A long time must elapse before all the voting districts can possibly be heard from in such great and for the most part thinly settled States as Minnesota, California, and Texas. It may easily happen that a candidate may have a large majority of the electoral votes, but a very narrow preponderance of the popular votes, as Garfield in 1880, who had 214 electoral votes to only 155 for Hancock, but led Hancock by only 9,464 votes out of more than 9,000,000. The idea of subjecting the nation to the strain of waiting days and probably weeks to find out who is to be President, while all the back districts are being heard from, is simply preposterous.

Wall Street has not taken a favorable view of the election of Mr. Harrison. There is a tinge of disappointment very clearly discernible in financial circles that Mr. Cleveland is not to be intrusted with the reins of government during the next four years. This arises partly from the fact that the administration of the finances, both under Mr. Manning and Mr. Fairchild, has been prudent and conservative, and always in the direction of economy, and opposed to profligacy of all kinds. It is a great thing to know beforehand what you can rely upon in the Department of the Treasury. It is an unsettling circumstance to have a new man come in, however good his general character may be; it is especially so to have a new man come in backed by a party whose platform calls for large appropriations in order to get rid of the surplus. But we think that the platform will not be much regarded by the politicians, now that the election is past, and that Mr. Harrison will seek, in his Secretary of the Treasury, some man of experience and stability, in whom the best elements of the country may have full confidence; for it is only on these conditions that the Republicans can retain the power they have so narrowly secured in the recent election. It would be a most fatal contrast if it could be shown at the end of two years that in the management of the national finances the Republicans were less trustworthy than the Democrats.

The present Legislature of Georgia is remarkable because of the youthfulness of its presiding officers. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House were both born in the year 1853. They were still mere boys while the war was raging, and entered upon their political career after the bitterness of the reconstruction era had passed away. The bringing to the front of the young men in the South is becoming very noticeable. Gov. Seay of Alabama is only forty-five years old. Representatives Phelan of Tennessee and Simmons of North Carolina are two of the youngest men in Congress. The delegates to the St. Louis Convention from Georgia were almost without exception of the new generation, and two of the Presidential electors just chosen in that State have barely attained their

majority. West Virginia has been for years noted for the youthfulness of its Governors, Senators, and Representatives, but the more southern States are now conferring political honors upon even those who are too young to have had any war record. There is little or no concerted effort to set aside the "old colonels"; on the contrary, they are honored, because, in the first place, they were prominent and worthy citizens before they were colonels; and secondly, because of their gallantry and self-sacrifice. But it is obvious that they are being supplanted by men of fewer prejudices, of fresher ideas, and of greater vigor.

The infringers of the Bell patents can take little, if any, comfort from the decision of the Supreme Court just rendered, upholding the right of the Government to maintain suits to annul patents on inventions which have been granted illegally by means of fraud upon the Government officials. The principal suits for infringement of these important patents have been decided already in favor of the Bell Telephone Company by the Supreme Court, and the points set up in the Government suit to annul the patent virtually cover the same ground. The points determined in the decision just made relate solely to the question whether or not the Government, under the Constitution and laws, could maintain a suit under any circumstances to annul a patent once granted. This decision settles a long-contested point, and probably will meet with general approval so far as the main question is concerned—that is, that the Government has the right to maintain such suits. The decision, however, would have been received with much greater approval if it had been secured under different auspices, and the suit had been instituted or instigated otherwise than by infringers seeking to gain for themselves benefits which should belong only to a meritorious inventor.

England continues to manifest the most provoking indifference to the result of our Presidential election. One would have thought, in view of the tons of campaign literature carried by our post-offices, circulated in our streets and horse-cars, posted on our dead walls, and borne aloft on our banners, that the whole island would now be in agonies over the loss of Cleveland. But so far is this from the present complexion that Lord Salisbury, in a speech at the Guildhall, rather chuckles over the defeat of Mr. Cleveland as a joke in his own favor, while the English press, even the *Times* and *Spectator*, take rather less interest in it than they would in a tribal conflict in Afghanistan. This may be all artfulness, from which the *Tribune's* Tory Squire will tear off the mask in due time, but at present we can only feel a strong sense of humiliation that the English manufacturers and the Cobden Club are not putting on sackcloth and ashes.

What is exactly the present position of the leading Republican organ, the *Tribune*, and its London correspondent about the

Sackville incident, it is a little difficult to make out. Just before the election the *Tribune* described the incident, on the strength of the Squire's despatches, as a conspiracy in the following terms:

"Mr. Cleveland's Bargain with the British Premier—Trading his Country's Honor for Electioneering Purposes—The Whole Shameful Trick Disclosed—A Secret Understanding with Lord Salisbury—The President Did Not Dismiss Lord Sackville until he had been Assured that England would not be Angry—Lord Salisbury Agreed to his Envoy's Dismissal for the Sake of Having Cleveland Re-elected—If Cleveland is Re-elected he will not Forget his Obligations to the British Government."

This makes Mr. Phelps a participant in a "shameful trick," an accomplice with a foreigner in perpetrating a gross fraud on his own countrymen. Had the affair occurred earlier, and in a more barbarous age, Mr. Phelps would probably have felt justified in inflicting corporal chastisement on the Squire for circulating such a story about him, and nearly all contemporary writers would have said that he richly deserved it. But on Sunday the culprit told a different tale. Says he, with extraordinary impudence:

"The facts, however, are still very imperfectly known to the British public. The diplomatic correspondence laid before Parliament and published in the papers gives but a fragmentary account of what really happened. The chief novelty in it is the difference between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Phelps respecting what occurred at Hatfield. Lord Salisbury seems to have understood that no decisive action would be taken by the American Government until a fuller statement of their grounds of complaint had been made. It is certain Mr. Phelps neither gave, nor could give, any such assurance."

But how does this hang together with the story that the dismissal of Sackville was arranged beforehand with Salisbury both as to time and manner, and that Salisbury absolutely consented to the dismissal in order to help Cleveland in the election?

The *Nineteenth Century* prints a protest signed by 417 of the foremost men and women in England, so far as intellectual standing is concerned, against the part played by competitive examinations in English schools and colleges. It is probably, in its way, the most remarkable document in educational history. The protest is followed up by short explanatory and confirmatory articles from Max Müller, Edward A. Freeman, and Frederic Harrison. The contention of the signers is that the persistent use of examinations, as the sole or at least main test of the pupil's progress and the teacher's efficiency, has destroyed or is fast destroying in both teacher and pupil the proper sense of the true object of mental training. They have come to regard success in passing examinations as a sufficient proof of education, whereas it may be achieved in a large number of cases without leaving behind a trace of anything which can fairly be called intellectual culture. Unfortunately, the protestants are very weak in the matter of suggesting a remedy. The less we rely on examinations, the higher the order of men and women must be whom we get for teachers; and no community seems as yet willing to take the necessary pains to find the teachers who are competent to keep examinations in their proper place, or to honor and reward them sufficiently for the work done.

REDISTRIBUTION OF POWER.

WHETHER or not the Republicans prove to have carried their ticket for Presidential electors in West Virginia, the apparent choice of a Legislature which will elect a Republican to the United States Senate practically breaks the "solid South" in a national contest for the first time since its solidity was established a dozen years ago. Virginia in the interval has had non-Democratic legislatures and State officers, but it continued Democratic in Presidential years, and the rise of the Readjuster party was a local phenomenon, rather than a sign of revival of the Republican party as such in the State. The result in West Virginia this year is of an altogether different sort. It has followed a fair fight on the national issue between the two parties, uncomplicated by any exceptional local consideration like the debt question in the Old Dominion. The result surprises no close student of the State's political history. Republicanism was discredited in West Virginia for some years after the war by the virulence at first shown towards the "rebel" element, but it has been steadily gaining ground ever since 1876, when Tilden had 11,148 over Hayes, until Cleveland had only 4,221 over Blaine in 1884, so that the only question before this campaign opened was whether the inevitable Republican victory would come this year or be postponed until 1892.

The solidity of the South, once thus broken, never will be restored. All that held other Southern States in the Democratic column this year was the Bourbonism of Republican Senators in giving support to "Bill" Chandler's policy of threatening to restore the force régime, which enabled the Democratic leaders in that region to arouse the fears of their followers lest the evils of the reconstruction era might return if any of them voted the Republican ticket. The fears were as unreasonable as the threats were ill-advised. Neither will be justified by the event. The irresistible logic of events will prevent anything like a reactionary policy towards the South by the Harrison Administration. Nothing effective could be done under the construction put upon the constitutional amendments by the Supreme Court; nothing in the way of political advantage can be gained by any further agitation of the matter. Chandler is likely to drop out of the Senate next March; but whether he remains or not, his policy will be quietly dropped. Even the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* realizes and confesses that the day of the bloody shirt is over. "Shall we then rush to force the States of the solid South into the rude settlement of the most difficult of all questions, that of races commingled on the same soil?" it asks, and thus answers its own question: "No. Let the Southern States gradually follow the example of old Virginia, where manhood suffrage is almost, and soon will be altogether, established beyond question."

But it is not merely true that the solidity of the South has been broken, never to be restored. The relative importance of the South as a factor in Presidential elec-

tions has passed its highest point, and must show a marked falling off after the next Federal census, and before the Presidential election of 1892. In 1860 the slave States contained 12,240,293 out of a total population in the United States of 31,443,321, or almost 40 per cent.; and in the Electoral College which chose Lincoln, those States cast 120 out of 303 votes, or almost exactly 40 per cent. As New York then had 35 electoral votes, the union of this State alone with the slave States would have made a majority of the Electoral College.

The census of 1880 showed a slight falling off in the relative importance of the South, the population of the old slave States being then 18,507,324 out of 50,155,783 in all, or 37 per cent.; and the electoral votes of those States upon the basis of that census numbering 153 out of 401, or 38 per cent. New York, which has 36 electoral votes, no longer sufficed to turn the scales if cast with the "solid South"; a dozen other votes must be sought elsewhere in the North. In 1884 New Jersey and Connecticut contributed three more than the necessary number, Indiana keeping them company; and this year, if West Virginia has not changed, New York, joined with New Jersey and Connecticut, would have reflected Cleveland, even allowing Indiana to Harrison.

But it is already clear that a solid South, even if it could be kept solid, combined with New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, will not furnish enough electoral votes to choose a President after the next apportionment. Since 1880 the region west of the Alleghenies and north of the Ohio River line has been growing far more rapidly than any other part of the country. It has received the greater part of the immense immigration from foreign countries during that period, and it is still largely recruited, as of old, from the New England and Middle States. On the other hand, the South has received but an infinitesimal percentage of the foreign immigration, and, outside of Texas, Arkansas, Florida, and isolated districts in other States, has gained but slightly from the Northern States.

In 1860 the region beyond the Alleghenies contained only 8,608,760 people, or not much more than a quarter of the whole population. In 1880 it had 17,141,052, or more than a third. Its growth in political power was still more striking. In the Electoral College of 1860 the West cast but 73 out of 303 votes—a trifle less than one-quarter; Kansas, Nevada, Nebraska, and Colorado not then being States. Under the apportionment following the census of 1880, that region has 135 out of 401 votes, or a trifle more than one-third. The proportion is certain to be still higher under the census of 1890, upon the basis of population alone.

But another element enters into the account, which must operate decidedly to the advantage of the West in the matter of political power. It is certain that new Territories will speedily be admitted to the Union from the Northwest. North and South Dakota and Washington will undoubtedly be made States during the Fifty-first Congress; probably Montana also; possibly Wyo-

ming with them. The greater the number of States in any part of the country, the greater its relative power, since the smallest State must have three electoral votes, corresponding to its two Senators and one Representative. On the basis of the existing States, the South must inevitably lose proportionally to the rest of the country after the next apportionment. The admission of three, four, or five new Western States will materially increase this relative loss. The gain of the North will be the gain of the West. New England, which in 1800 constituted more than one-fourth of the Electoral College, had sunk by 1860 to but a trifle over one-eighth, and was reduced by the last census to less than one-tenth. New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, which had one-fourth the electoral votes in 1800, had fallen below one-fourth in 1860, and have less than one-fifth now. The solid South, if it could endure, would fall far short of 38 per cent. of the Electoral College after 1890, while the West is certain to raise its proportion far above 34 per cent.

The change will tend still further to eliminate the sectional controversies which grew out of the divisions of the slavery era, and is therefore to that extent cause for congratulation.

THE ENGLISH MISSION.

ONE of the difficulties with which General Harrison will have to contend is the difficulty of finding a suitable person for the English mission in place of Mr. Phelps. For some years back the Republican party has made a show of hostility to England a prominent portion of its outfit, partly to please the Irish, and partly to reassure the manufacturers who are afraid of "British free trade." But it is no easy matter to find any one who will represent this feeling diplomatically in London without disgracing the country. The most prominent candidates for the London mission are generally wealthy men who desire—or whose wives and daughters desire—to cut a figure in London society. The men whom every Administration since the war has tried to send have been men of some intellectual or professional distinction. Reverdy Johnson, Motley, Edwards Pierrepont, John Welsh, and James Russell Lowell have all been men with other claims to social favor than their money. The same thing may be said, but with less emphasis, of Gen. Schenck. President Cleveland maintained this good tradition by sending Mr. Phelps.

But every one of these has given offence to the Irish by maintaining good relations with English society, and to Americans by not pushing Americans who wished to get into English society with sufficient vigor, and has in this way indirectly brought odium on the Administration at home. Presidents Hayes and Arthur suffered much from Mr. Lowell's popularity in London, and President Cleveland has suffered from Mr. Phelps's. Indeed, we believe it is hardly a secret that Mr. Phelps's nomination for the Chief Justiceship was fully determined on,