

in the American Constitution within a century? It stands now as a firm pillar, round which States and Territories can be organized; it is an object of respect and veneration to all succeeding generations; it gives to your democracy the element of fixity, of duration, which is given to monarchies by a dynasty.

The French Constitution, in its last form, dates from 1875, and it has already been revised. The revision of it is as easy as the change of an ordinary law.

"The Chambers shall have the right, upon separate deliberations, determined in each by an absolute majority of votes, either spontaneously, or at the request of the President of the Republic, to declare that there is need of revising the constitutional laws.

"After each of the two Chambers has taken this resolution, they shall unite as a National Assembly, in order to proceed to the revision.

"The deliberations concerning the revision of the constitutional laws, either total or partial, shall be determined by an absolute majority of the members composing the National Assembly."

Mark in this last article the word *total*. In the intention of the framers of the Constitution, a total revision was a possibility, and it was clearly understood in the deliberations of the Assembly of Versailles that a new National Assembly could substitute, if it chose, a monarchy for the Republic.

Jules Ferry felt that this was a danger for the Republic. He was afraid that a time would come when the representatives of the people might legally and constitutionally put an end to the Republic; and when he was Prime Minister he proposed that the right of revision should be curtailed on this special point; that a special article should be inserted in the Constitution, forbidding any deliberation in the National Assembly on the subject of the form of government. He carried his point, and the Constitution was revised in this sense; an article was inserted which makes it impossible to put to vote the question of the form of government in a National Assembly. The precaution was unnecessary so long as the majority remained Republican in both Chambers, and it would become futile if both Chambers ceased to be Republican. The axe was laid to the tree by the man who wished to protect the tree; for it was seen how easy it was practically to revise the Constitution—that it could be done in a day, with no more difficulty than any small alteration in an ordinary law.

This first revision became a signal; ever since, all the parties in opposition have taken up the cry of revision—the Monarchists in order to abolish the article introduced in the Constitution by the influence of Jules Ferry; the Bonapartists for the same reason; the Radicals because they accuse the Constitution of impotence, and wish to suppress the Senate and even the Presidency. There are obvious reasons why those who desire to substitute a monarchy for the Republic should try to test constantly the fragility of the Republic and to undermine its Constitution; there are reasons also why the Radicals, the Socialists, the Communists, the men whom nothing can satisfy, who are ardent for any change, any commotion, should cry, "Revision, revision!" Still, the cry did not find much echo till it was adopted by General Boulanger and his party.

It is difficult to explain how this party was formed and what are its objects. So far, the programme of General Boulanger is purely negative—"Dissolution, revision!" Once he tried to explain what he meant by revision, and what modifications he would make, if he could, in the Constitution. He was not much listened to, and I suppose that, by this time, nobody remembers the long programme which

he read to the Chamber, and I should not be much surprised if he had forgotten it himself. The electors who vote by thousands for Boulanger, without ever having seen him or heard him, do not look upon him as a framer of constitutions, but as a destroyer of constitutions. Who are they, what are they? They are the discontented of all classes, of all ranks, of all opinions (if they have any fixed opinions); the men who follow instincts rather than ideas, who, for one reason or another, are tired of the present, and want something new, something different—they do not know exactly what. Imagination has more to do in the affairs of men than is commonly supposed, and, strangely enough, General Boulanger has caught the imagination of the people. I heard some time ago an old diplomat, a man who has had a great experience of the world and who has travelled in every part of it, say to some people who were criticizing Boulanger, and were trying to prove that some of his actions would ruin him: "You are mistaken. He is an idol. I have travelled in the East and seen many idols: I always found that the uglier they are, the more miracles they perform."

It would be a long and painful task to show how the Republicans have allowed the tide of discontent to rise to its present level; how the "République aimable" of M. Jules Simon, the "République athénienne" of Gambetta, made way by degrees for the present Republic. It would be even more difficult to analyze the process by which all the discontent crystallized, so to speak, round General Boulanger. He appeared first before the eyes of the people as a soldier on horseback, sword in hand. The people see him still as they saw him first, though he no longer wears his uniform, and has been thrust through in a duel by a lawyer. It was thought that after this duel he was a finished man; a short time afterwards three departments returned him by overwhelming votes. Next year there will be general elections, and committees are already formed in every department. I am told that everywhere the Monarchists are obliged to count with General Boulanger and his party: the popular tide is with him, and they dare not oppose it. We must expect to see in the provinces a coalition of Monarchists, Bonapartists, and Boulangists. They will probably vote together on a purely negative platform, without any definite conventions or arrangements, for the sake of victory.

It is needless to show the dangers of such a policy. Lord Palmerston once said that a man on horseback was in coalition with the horse; only, when you form coalitions, you must always be careful to be the horse. Who can tell who will be the horse in this extraordinary coalition of the monarchical forces and of the enigmatical and unnamed forces which go under the name of Boulangism? The real alliance to be feared is the old alliance between Caesarism and democracy, the alliance which placed Napoleon I. and Napoleon III. on the throne, and which has always ended in a deadly struggle between France and Europe. It seems as if, in the face of such dangers, the Republicans ought to learn some prudence and wisdom; they have still in their hands the keys of the house, but now they themselves propose to rebuild it. M. Floquet, who is our Prime Minister, is the new architect; he also cries, "Revision!" thinking that he can shout it louder than General Boulanger. The plan of the ministerial revision is, it must be confessed, most extraordinary. The rights of the Senate are curtailed with regard to the veto of the budget; yet the Chamber of Deputies has not made such a good use of the finances of the

country that a little advice from the Senate should be thought unnecessary. The July number of the *Bulletin de Statistique du Ministère des Finances* gives the amount of the expenses incurred since the war of 1870, outside of the ordinary budget. It is seven milliards, and seven hundred millions of francs. As has lately been said, "The State spends every year five or six hundred millions more than it receives from the regular taxes and sources of revenue."

Still, the prerogative of the Chamber in matters of taxation is a point which can be discussed; but what shall we say of the proposition made by the Government to deprive the President of the right of dissolution—a right which he can use only with the consent of the Senate? This is another diminution of the senatorial power, as well as a diminution of the Presidential power. The most extraordinary part of the scheme of revision, however, seems to me to be the gradual reëlection of the Deputies—one-third going out every two years, so that there would never be a general election. The Ministers appointed by the Chamber would remain in office so long as a partial reëlection of one-third should not have taken place, and could not be upset in the interval of two partial elections by a parliamentary vote. Two years of office would be thus assured to every Cabinet. I leave you to judge if this change can be recommended in a country where the ministerial responsibility is complete, and where the Ministers have to appear every day before Parliament. Everything can be tried in politics; but I can hardly imagine the coexistence of a Chamber and of a hostile Cabinet. This measure is proposed as a remedy for the instability of our cabinets; but the only true remedy is the election by the people of a large and united majority. The present House is cut up into groups and fractions, and cabinets are upset in turn by coalitions of groups. This may be a great evil, but I don't see how it can be remedied except by the electors.

## Correspondence.

### THE PARTY NOT A PERSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: One more word ought to be said to men like Dr. Storrs, who believe that the Republican party is entirely wrong in this campaign, but continue their support because it was right twenty-five and thirty years ago. Their sophistication comes from giving personality to the party. In their conception, the party is a personal existence, that can claim fealty. If this fealty is not given, the person failing to give it is a "traitor to the party." If the party is wrong, its errors are to be condoned, like the errors of an individual, in view of its previous good record, and in the hope that its general spirit of rectitude will speedily bring it back from its lapses from sound political virtue. There is not a greater error enslaving the minds of educated men than this conception of the nature of parties. The correct conception of a party is, not that of a personality which has rights over men, but that of an instrument for achieving political results, to be cast aside whenever it fails to answer one's purpose. It is only an aggregation of men who act together as a party because they have common purposes to achieve. As soon as there are divergent purposes, there should be new combinations of men.

This truth is brought out by a brief history of the Republican party—or rather Republican parties, as there have been a number of them.

Thirty years ago the Republican party was an aggregation of men who stood for the exclusion of slavery from the Territories, for free speech, for a Homestead Law. These purposes have all been achieved, and the men who made that Republican party are mainly dead and buried.

A little later, the men who stood for the Republican party had entirely distinct purposes from the first party. They stood for the carrying on of the war for the preservation of the Union, for the destruction of slavery in the slave States, as a war measure. These purposes have all been achieved, and the men who were that Republican party are largely dead and buried.

A little later, the aggregation of men who, united by common purposes, made up the Republican party, stood for the adoption of certain reconstruction measures and for certain amendments to the Federal Constitution which were to conserve the results of the war. These purposes have also been achieved, and the men who made this Republican party are mainly dead and buried. The issues for which that particular party worked are as extinct as are those of the adoption of the Federal Constitution of 1788.

The next Republican party had for its common purpose the resumption of specie payments. But that issue is as dead as the preceding ones. It is as dead as the adoption of the Copernican astronomy. We all feel that loyalty to the Copernican astronomy should have no controlling power in fixing our present party associations.

During all this history, the aggregation of men who have made up these Republican parties has been a varying one. As men have favored the issues that were called Republican principles, they have united themselves with the like-minded men who constituted the party; as they have disfavored them, they have withdrawn from the party.

Now, in this present year of grace, what does the Republican party stand for? It stands for the perpetuation of tariff abuses. It stands, contingently, for free whiskey. It stands for profuse expenditures of the public money. It stands for the perpetuation of sectional hate. It stands as the firm friend of monopolies, as is conclusively shown by the history of the Republican Senate during the past twelve years. It stands for reckless indifference to cordial relations between the English-speaking peoples. The cause of vital religion and of civil liberty rests largely upon fraternal relations between the English-speaking peoples. The welfare, not of one race like the negroes, but of all races, is involved in their peaceful comity. The men who needlessly put a strain upon the relations of the two foremost English-speaking peoples are traitors to civilization and to the highest interests of mankind.

The party stands for blind, stupid opposition to everything that President Cleveland does. When history comes to be written impartially, one of its most ridiculous recitals will be of the stolid stupidity with which the Republican leaders have arrayed themselves against every step taken by President Cleveland, whether right or wrong. Every Republican President for the twelve years preceding the present quadrennial has pointed out the necessity of tariff revision. Every intelligent man knows that tariff revision has been desirable. At last, when it becomes imperative because of the accumulation of a dangerous surplus in the treasury, merely because the subject is brought forward by President Cleveland, the whole party rushes savagely against it, with all the stupid ferocity of a bull in the arena, inflamed by a red flag.

Those who are in favor of the principles of the present Republican party should vote for its platform and its candidates. Those who are opposed to these principles, and still vote for them, have their minds under a worse than negro bondage; for I can see no way of removing their enslaving chains. It is a libel upon Lincoln and the Republican fathers to say that the present Republican party is their party, *for they had the independence of mind to break away from old parties when their course was antagonistic to the welfare of man.*

I cannot refrain from a somewhat rough *reductio ad absurdum* of the claim that one owes loyalty to a party like loyalty to a woman. Men in the attitude of Dr. Storrs would say, "I know that thirty-four years have impaired Polly's beauty—that she now wears a wig, and that her eyes are dull and lifeless; that her cheeks are sunken and hairy, and that her teeth are gone. But she once had raven tresses; once her eyes were full of liquid fire; once her cheeks were round and rosy like a peach; and once she had teeth of pearly whiteness. She will always be the same beautiful Polly to me that she was at first. I shall always cling to Polly." Now, the real question is not one of good looks, but of character. *What if Polly has lost her virtue? What about clinging to her then?* J.

#### DEFINE THE ISSUE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I observe a growing conservatism, not to say timidity, in the statement by Democratic leaders of the position of their party on the tariff question. I do not believe there is anything in the political situation which makes this apparent weakening of the moral nerve either wise or politic.

There is a large element now supporting the Democratic party because it believes that that party has definitely entered upon a course whose destination is practical free trade—tariff for revenue only. The voters composing this element do not believe in absolute free trade, at any time—that is universally admitted to be impracticable. They do not desire the destruction or unnecessary injury of American manufactures, or the endangering of investments therein. They believe that protection is the proper policy for certain stages in the growth of a country, and that when it is abandoned it should be slowly and experimentally. But they also believe that it should never be the permanent policy of any country. They believe that limitations on trade should be a means, not an end, and that when the end has been accomplished they should be promptly discarded; that such restrictions are not in the line of social progress, are being outgrown as parts of the social machinery—like slavery, spoils-of-office, subsidies, standing armies, conquest and war—and will some day be left behind in the march of modern civilization. And they are confident that any great political party, in a great, free, prosperous, and progressive country like this, which makes the permanent retention of such restrictions the chief plank in its platform, will see the day when it will be ashamed of such a record.

These men whom I am speaking for—and whose opinions in this regard I think I am fairly expressing—believe that some of the infant manufactures of this country, which have been protected thus far, are now grown up and can go alone, and that others are getting so well on to their legs that they can manage to get along quite comfortably with less protection. They therefore believe that the time has come to reduce the contributions which the

whole people have been making towards the support of these two classes of manufactures. They are not asking now that the contributions to the first class shall entirely cease (although they cannot quite see why they should not). Out of "abundant caution" they only demand a comparatively slight reduction—a mere loosening of the grasp, confident that it will be promptly tightened if the interests affected shall prove to be injured by the experiment. But what these men insist on, primarily, as the acknowledged end of the course upon which the Democratic party is entering, is this—that, as fast as each protected industry shall reach the point where it can, from its own resources, compete with the world, or where it shall be demonstrated that it cannot be prosecuted in this country without a perpetual bounty, the protection of such industry shall be, gradually and carefully, withdrawn; until, when the last industry shall have passed this point, there shall result what I have called practical free trade.

I believe there is another element now supporting the Democratic party which will not insist upon the definite recognition of this ultimate policy. They are men who are, or were recently, members of the Republican party; and if it should be admitted that the Democratic party hold the same doctrine as to protection that the Republican party now holds, that both parties are for readjustment and reduction of the present tariff along the line of the same general principle, and that the only difference now between them on the tariff question is mere matter of detail as to the specific items upon which the reduction should be made, then I believe that when these men I am speaking of come to understand this as the status of the two parties, they will no longer be for the Democratic party.

The reasons are not far to seek. These men helped to make the history of the Republican party during the war period, and they are proud of the record. It was something of a struggle for them to abandon their share in such portion of the glory of the old party as had been inherited by the new one. The history of the Democratic party during the same period is as obnoxious to them as that of the Republicans is agreeable, and their second sentimental twinge, when they felt themselves compelled to support that party in the present political aspect, grew out of the fear that their individual political careers would sometimes be confounded with the Democratic war record. It is not reasonable to suppose that these men will leave the Republican for the Democratic party if they shall come to believe that there is no difference in principle between the two. Notwithstanding the blunders of the Republican leaders, and the late and probably insincere attempt of some of them to put the party in the line of tariff reduction for the purpose of meeting the exigencies which the campaign has developed, it is probable that these men would prefer in such a case to remain in the Republican party, and strive to reform it from the inside, rather than leave it for a party whose superiority over theirs would consist alone in the fact that this year it is consistent and undoubtedly sincere in its effort to reduce the present tariff.

The men for whom I am assuming to speak are, I think, supporting the Democrats upon the assumption that the following is about the status of the two parties on the tariff question, allowing that the recent action of the Republican Senators is sincere and will be endorsed by their party: The Republicans will not touch the tariff at all unless it shall become necessary to do so in order to reduce the surplus

revenue; and in that case, and for that purpose alone, they will reduce the tariff where the reduction will not affect the protected class—that is, they will make the reduction on such articles as cannot be produced in this country, or, failing enough of these, then on those of which a small proportion (compared with the demand) can be produced in this country. The Democrats say that, while the reduction of the surplus revenue is the first thing to be done, it is merely incidental to the chief thing to be done, which is to commence the readjustment and reduction of the tariff on the line of making the principal reduction in the duties on those articles which can be produced in this country, and the manufacture of which in this country is being protected after the need for protection has ceased, and the largest proportion of which duties is going into the pockets of private parties instead of into the public treasury; and to continue the contest along this line until, through the development of the country's resources, we reach practical free trade. They say, if we are paying more duties than we ought to on articles which cannot be produced in this country, "Very well, that shall be remedied; but all such duties go into the treasury for the benefit of the whole people alike, and so our first duty is to stop those duties which are unjustly received, by private parties at the expense of all."

Here seems to be a well-defined issue between the two parties, on principle, and the men I speak of do not as yet see any reason for obscuring it. You will not catch a New England State by telling its voters that your party was the first to advocate the reduction policy, and that the Republican party only adopted it when they were frightened into it by the developments of the campaign; but you will catch and hold voters all over the country by bravely standing by the great principle which underlies the position of your party on the tariff question, and which will mark the difference between the two parties, not only through this campaign, but all through the coming years, during which this is to be the dominant political issue. It is with this principle that you are furnishing a rallying-point for the men from both parties who have been struggling for years to keep our legislative processes out of the grasp of the powerful monopolistic element.

JOHN W. ELA.

CHICAGO, October, 1888.

#### THE PRESIDENT AND THE VETO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The frequency with which Mr. Cleveland has used the veto power has been the subject of much severe comment by various Republican speakers for some time past, and particularly by Mr. Blaine in several of his recent addresses. I propose, with your permission, to inquire whether or not the condition of affairs has arisen in which its frequent and vigorous use is necessary, and, further, whether the spirit of the Constitution does not imperatively require it.

The power of the negative was conferred by the Constitution with the double object of checking rash and preventing corrupt legislation. Its framers realized how easily, in the rush of business, corrupt legislation might pass unnoticed, unless the responsibility for its examination was definitely located, and how completely this precaution would discourage it. On the other hand, they also realized how liable are large elective bodies to rash and unwise impulses, and how necessary it was to provide an agency by which, without an absolute veto, sober second thought could be enforced. They

did not intend a despotic Executive, nor can any Executive armed with only a qualified veto, with the power of Congress and the Judiciary to contend against, ever hope to become despotic; but it was equally remote from their intention to create a weak one, and the fear of this constituted the objection to an Executive Council. It was not intended to make the President a mere administrative figure-head: the veto power and the privilege, not only of stating to Congress the condition of the country, but of suggesting to it a definite line of policy, would, it was calculated, enable him to affect, not only the administration, but the legislation of the country, and to maintain his weight and dignity in the Federal system.

For some years past, it is now commonly felt, there has been a steady tendency towards that centralization of power which the makers of the Constitution feared; but, instead of concentrating upon the President, it is Congress that has absorbed this additional power, subtracted, on the one hand, from the States, and, on the other, from the President himself. The Supreme Court is gradually winning back for the States the authority of which they have been unknowingly deprived; but the only agency that can reclaim for the President his original prerogative is the President himself. This, I think, has been the effect of Mr. Cleveland's vigorous assertion of his powers; and, so far from being a perversion or abuse of the Constitution, I firmly believe that it was the indifference and weakness of his predecessors which allowed a great abuse to gain firm foothold, the executive power seriously to be impaired, and all the corrupt influences at work in Congress to have unobstructed play.

Alexander Hamilton, in Essay No. LXXIII. of the *Federalist*, in which the veto of the President is considered, has, among other things, this to say in its defence:

"A power of this nature will often have a silent and unperceived, though forcible, operation. When men, engaged in unjustifiable pursuits, are aware that obstructions may come from a quarter which they cannot control, they will often be restrained, by the bare apprehension of opposition, from doing what they would with eagerness rush into if no such external impediments were to be feared."

In a state of affairs, then, in which this hindrance ceases to be dreaded—Congress itself being able but imperfectly to examine the numerous small bills apparently so harmless and plausible that are presented to it—practical immunity is granted to every corrupt influence that is brought to bear upon it. Mr. Blaine, as an old member of Congress—and a member, too, who, if we can judge from extracts published from his private correspondence, must have been quite familiar with this branch of its business—Mr. Blaine must know how many bills are hurried through Congress in the hope and expectation that they will never be exposed to the light of day. Does it not point to a decided impairment of the President's power, to a dangerous departure from the spirit of the Constitution, when Congress has thus learned to count upon the Executive's approval? I lay particular emphasis upon these so-called "private" bills, because the President's vetoes have usually fallen upon measures of this kind; but it is no less necessary that the restraining effect of a possible veto be felt in legislation of a more far-reaching nature. In this, too, Mr. Cleveland has realized for us the kind of President the Constitution designed—a man who should see to the execution of the laws, and the force of whose individuality should be felt in making them. To such a President, Congress must feel a direct responsibility; and whether they work in unison or in discord, the result

must be a definite policy, upon which the country is given frequent opportunity to pass.

I have said that the Presidential office has lost prestige within the last twenty years. The power of the veto and the power of recommendation are of less avail to influence Congress than the judicious distribution of the public offices. Whether or not this be the cause, the President has gradually lost influence over the policy of the Government; he has become merely a machine to execute the will of Congress. The effect of this has been to deprive Congress of the head which the Constitution provided; and I believe that much of the aimlessness and incoherence of our legislation for some years past is due to the fact that the President has ceased to be a force in shaping its counsels. The experience of the Congress just adjourned seems to indicate that, with a man of positive force in the Presidential chair, Congress is bound to evolve some systematic policy. It has been repeatedly suggested of late that this end can be best secured by making the President simply an executive, and enforcing some form of responsibility within Congress itself. The present is not the time to discuss this proposal; but this much we may say—that, whenever the President does become such, whether by a formal amendment to the Constitution or by force of precedent, then the necessity for the entire reorganization of Congress becomes absolute.

It is worth while remarking, under these circumstances, that the great statesman of the Republican party has so little perception of the need for a strong and vigorous President to direct and lead the legislature, that he censures an attempt to revive the strength of the Executive by reestablishing the natural relations between the President and Congress; nay, more, he is not conscious of any imperfections in the perverted system which he seeks to perpetuate. No one who knows Mr. Blaine will be surprised at this; but, for the benefit of those who are still dazzled by his "brilliance," it may be permitted once more to remark that, to the consideration of a question which demands the talents of a statesman, he has brought only the arts of a politician and a demagogue. F.

LOUISVILLE, KY., October 26, 1888.

#### MINISTRIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While we are waiting for the result of the great lesson of the election, it is well not to lose sight of the almost equally important lesson, even for us, which is working itself out in France.

No doubt a great many people regard this as showing how bad it is that the Ministry should have seats in the Chambers, and a conclusive proof that no such thing should be tried with us. It may be answered that the evil is not because, but in spite of, this condition. The present state of politics in France is a part of the long illustration, since 1789, of the impossibility of government by legislature, and the necessity of strong executive power. In the panic which is creeping over the country at the anarchy and impotence of the Chamber, men's minds are turning towards revolution and Boulanger or some stronger man. The one single chance that they have of pulling through peacefully (and this chance is unfortunately growing daily less) is in some Minister arising strong enough by constitutional methods to command the support of the country and compel the Chamber to do his bidding. But this chance is only possible through giving to the Ministry a fighting ground in the Chamber. No one thing could be done more certain to

bring on revolution and a military dictator than to withdraw the Ministry from public contact with the Chamber. The factions would fly at each other's throats in a way which would make the country howl aloud for a saviour, even if that saviour were a Louis Napoleon.

The state of things is best illustrated by the finances. The reason why the English national finance is the best in the world is, that it is practically in the hands of one man. Parliament never enforces an amendment to the budget, or, if it does, does so at the risk of causing the Ministry to resign, and is held in check by a wholesome fear of dissolution, while there is no standing committee on the subject, for which the country cannot be too deeply grateful.

In France the Budget Commission bullies the Finance Minister without stint. It will neither accept his plans, nor make any plans of its own. The result is that the accounts of any year cannot be got settled, no definite control can be obtained, either of revenue or expenditure, and chaos is rapidly settling down over the whole system. But, at least, the Finance Minister, by being in the Chamber, lets the country see where the difficulty is, as is made clear by the comments of the press. If he were excluded, the Budget Commission would at once disappear from the public eye, would carry on its squabbles and jobbery and intrigues in the secrecy of the committee-room, and the ruin would be none the less certain, and more speedy, because unseen. (Perhaps an analogous case may suggest itself, with the modification that a surplus is much more easily dealt with than a deficit.) Moreover, if the Minister's tenure of office were any less uncertain outside of than in the Chamber, it would be because he would become so insignificant as not to be worth the expenditure of force.

Three things the recent experience of France does show to be necessary, viz.: that the Ministers should have fixed terms of office; that the Chambers should be re-elected at fixed and not too long intervals; and that the President, appointing the Finance Minister, should be elected by the whole people.

(1.) If the Finance Minister is to contend successfully with the Budget Committee, he must be independent of it. Of course, the Chamber will go with the Committee against the Minister every time, not because he is of this or that party, but because he is the executive and they the legislature. If he is dependent upon the Chamber for his tenure of office, he is of course defenceless against and the mere tool of the Budget Commission. If, on the other hand, he receives his office through the President from the nation, and cannot be turned out, he can show fight, and make the country understand that the issue is whether he or the Budget Commission is to control the finances—a problem which I imagine would not long remain doubtful.

(2.) In France, dissolution depends upon the President, with the consent of the Senate; and as he is elected by the Chambers, and, like the Senate, is mortally afraid of the other branch, it is a feeble weapon. Moreover, being uncertain as to time, it is, like death, less feared, and the voters are less prepared for it. If elections came at regular and certain intervals, numbers would have their eyes always turned thither, while the people, knowing they would have to exercise a choice at such a time, would watch the conduct of members. If this is not quite true in this country it is because, owing to the exclusion of the Cabinet from Congress, and the secrecy with which business is carried on, the voters do not and cannot know what their

members are doing, or whether they are doing anything.

(3.) From the way in which President Carnot is received in his tours through France, it does not appear that he is any less popular than Gen. Boulanger, or that if he chose he could not satisfy the demand for one-man power in a perfectly constitutional way. If he would tell the people that the danger lay in the supremacy of the Chamber and of the Budget Commission, and that it was absolutely necessary that his Ministers should be supported, the Chamber would soon begin to get some strong hints. Even the Boulanger scare has had a wholesome effect upon members. But M. Carnot will not do this. He was elected by the Chambers, and they knew their man. He is not the elect of the people, and he will not, even if he could, talk to them as if they were in direct relations.

How different it is in this country! I suppose it will be admitted that the issue of tariff reform in this campaign was almost wholly owing to Mr. Cleveland's message; without that, it would have dragged on with the old generalities and personalities. It is a wonderful instance of the power of a personal appeal from an elected official to his constituents, while Congress and its party managers are eliminated and thrown aside in an amusing manner, and probably not much to the satisfaction of that august body.

I should like to point out how the same power of the President could be used in the detail of tariff reform; but it is too big a subject for the end of a letter, and will, moreover, have more point after the election. G. B.

Boston, October 27, 1888.

#### THE GENESIS OF THE LONDON TIMES FORGERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a copy of H. C. Carey's 'Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign,' printed in 1867, but copyrighted in 1853, appears the following, credited to the *London Times*:

"When the Celt has crossed the Atlantic, he begins for the first time in his life to consume the manufactures of this country, and, indirectly, to contribute to its customs. We may possibly live to see the day when the chief product of Ireland will be cattle, and English and Scotch the majority of her population. The nine or ten millions of Irish who by that time will have settled in the United States, cannot be less friendly to England, and will certainly be much better customers to her, than they now are."

No date is given, and it is therefore impossible to verify the quotation. It is certainly as brutally frank as the famous sentence to the same effect ascribed by Republicans to the same source. This you affirm to be a forgery, and implore gods and men to punish the perpetrator and circulators thereof. H. C. Carey has manufactured the quotation, taken it at second-hand, or it is true. Those who, like the editor of the *Nation*, have watched the drift of English sentiment on Irish affairs, as reflected in the *London Times* and other approved organs of English opinion, will readily admit that, if Mr. Carey's quotation be untrue, it has a remarkable verisimilitude.

Yours, etc.,

E. M.

ENGLEWOOD, ILL., October 20, 1888.

[We thank our correspondent for his not too gracious indication of the probable source of the forged quotation from the *London Times*. We will add that it is to be

found on page 191 of the edition of 1872. One may well be surprised that a work on the 'Slave Trade,' copyrighted in 1853, when the South was astir to reopen the traffic, owing to the rising prices of slaves, should have been thought worth reprinting in 1867, and even as late as 1872. The fact is, however, that the title conceals a protection diatribe against Great Britain as a manufacturing monopolist, in the course of which Mr. Carey reinforced the old pro-slavery "argument" that the poor of Ireland were as truly slaves as the blacks at the South. It is in this section of his work that an article from the *London Times* is disjointedly cited, without any hint of the date of it except that it was after the British census of March 31, 1851, and presumably as soon as the population statistics were made public.

These statistics showed an extraordinary falling off in the population of Ireland, as the result of the famine and the consequent wholesale emigration to the United States. We infer from the fragments reproduced by Mr. Carey that this exodus was made the text of an article in the *Times*, which, observing the rate of a quarter of a million a year, anticipated a thorough evacuation—as did the *Connaught Western Star*, also quoted by Mr. Carey on page 189. The *Times* saw in this a providential remedy for "the inveterate Irish disease" ("surer . . . than any human wit could have imagined"). Convinced that Ireland under the Celts could never be prosperous and happy, the *Times* viewed with satisfaction the prospect of the Irish forsaking their country to mingle with the Anglo-Americans, and giving place at home to the "more mixed, more docile, and more serviceable race" inhabiting Great Britain.

This may be thought an unsympathetic, calculating, and selfish view of the great westward movement, but we do not ourselves find it "brutally frank." The *Times* wished no harm to the emigrants, but, on the contrary, predicted for them across seas a degree of prosperity and happiness such as seemed unattainable in Ireland. If we compare the sentiments of this Tory journal with those held at the very same time by Mr. Carey's great chief, Henry Clay, and by Northern and Southern divines in plenty, with regard to colonizing the free or emancipated blacks of this country under compulsion—and for their commingling, not with a higher race, but with the barbarous natives of Africa—we must admit that the American inhumanity was unspeakably the greater.

Since our correspondent pretends that the extract which he restores in its true language, if not in its connection, and the base counterfeit to which the Republicans have given unblushing circulation, are "to the same effect," it is necessary to print the latter once more, even if *ad nauseam*:

"The only time that England can use an Irishman is when he emigrates to America and votes for free trade."

If "E. M." thinks the true extract as well qualified as the false to serve campaign purposes in winning over the Irish vote, let him use his influence with the Republican managers to substitute it in their lying documentary appeals to race hatred.—ED. NATION.]

## HIGH-PRICED BREAD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I notice that some of the labor organizations have adopted resolutions protesting against the recent advance in the price of bread, and denouncing "Old Hutch" as a public enemy. So far as these organizations are supporters of Harrison, is not this action somewhat inconsistent? They object to cheap clothing, because, as Mr. Harrison says, a cheap coat implies a cheap man under the coat. Or, to take the ordinary Protectionist view, if high-priced wool and woollen goods benefit the laboring man by stimulating industry, is not this much more true of high-priced bread? We produce ourselves but a moiety of the wool and woollens we consume; but we produce all, and much more than all, the wheat and flour. If, therefore, it is an advantage to workingmen to make woollen goods artificially dear, it should be a much greater advantage to make bread artificially dear. Assuming that "Old Hutch" is really responsible, instead of denouncing him as a public enemy, they should laud him as a public benefactor. J. M. L. S.

DAYTON, OHIO.

## THE NORTHERN CONSUMER'S VIEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is frequently urged by Republicans (I see by your issue of the 25th inst. that the *Boston Commercial Bulletin* has recently taken up the cry again), that the Mills bill sacrifices Northern to Southern interests, the contrast being usually made between wool and sugar. As regards these articles, certainly, there is an answer to be made which must appeal to every man and woman who is not above counting the cost of the necessaries of life.

Sugar is probably used to the same amount per head in all parts of the country (unless, indeed, its presence in mint juleps raises the Southern average), so that, while all who look at the tariff from the consumer's standpoint would have been glad had the Mills bill done more for them in this respect, Northerners cannot complain that they are worse off than Southerners.

With wool the case is different. That part of the country which would be most benefited by any lowering of the present exorbitant price of all kinds of woollen goods is obviously the North, because, being the colder region, it uses far more wool, both for clothes, blankets, and carpets, than does the sunny South.

I believe that, as a matter of fact, the South raises more wool than the North (Mr. Mills's own State, as you point out, raising the most of all), so that the charge of sectionalism is groundless; but, even apart from this, it is clear that, as far as free wool—the most radical and probably the most criticised feature of the Mills bill—affects the interests of the mass of the community, the North is favored by that measure far more than the South. C. C. B.

PHILADELPHIA, October 26, 1888.

## A CORRECTION FROM BISHOP BECKWITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of October 18, page 305, I find what purports to be a quotation from me in these words: "The old-fashioned Gospel of Christ and Him crucified has satisfied the world for centuries, but a new era is upon us." I certainly never intended to make such a statement, nor do I think that I ever did. What I tried to say—and thought I did say—was, that "the old-fashioned mode of preaching the

Gospel of Christ and Him crucified has satisfied the world for centuries, etc." I think that the sentence with which I am credited in the *Nation* conveys the idea that, in my judgment, the new era which is upon us demands some change in "the old-fashioned Gospel of Christ and Him crucified." Nothing can be farther from my belief. I do not think that those who heard me misunderstood my meaning, which was simply this: The faith of many of our young men in the fundamental truths of the Christian religion is being shaken; therefore, instead of the old-fashioned mode of preaching the Gospel, which took for granted the soundness of this faith, our preaching should be in defence of the faith and in answer to those who deny it.

My faith in the "old-fashioned Gospel of Christ and Him crucified" is the very foundation of all my hopes; and the study of the "new theories" which characterize this age has only strengthened my belief in the statement of the great master of induction—the Apostle Paul—that "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity."

Trusting that you will pardon my troubling you, and that you will do me the favor to make for me the desired correction, believe me

Most respectfully yours, etc.,

JOHN W. BECKWITH, Bishop of Georgia.  
ATLANTA, GA., October 26, 1888.

## PROF. PAYNE ON GERMAN BOOKS ON EDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I leave it for your readers to judge whether the two sentences quoted below in parallel columns are equivalent. The first contains what Prof. Payne *did* say, the second what, according to his letter in your last issue, he *intended* to say:

"To be even approachable, a German work on the philosophy of education needs to be translated twice, first into English and then into English common sense."

"The speculations of a German educational philosopher frequently need, not only to be turned literally into English, but to be paraphrased in order to come within the ready comprehension of the ordinary reader."

The sentence at the right, as I understand it, expresses a commonplace which applies to any book in any language, if "the ordinary reader" means one reading his own language only. I neither took Prof. Payne's original utterance in that sense, nor do I look upon the teachers in whose midst it was made as ordinary readers. Rather than charging one who fails to give to his original statement the sense of his subsequent interpretation with "a gratuitous assumption . . . for an unworthy purpose," it behooved Prof. Payne to say what he intended to say, and to state the *worthy* purpose for which it was said.

Mr. Drew's remarks are for the most part irrelevant; the question is not one of the merit of German literary style, especially not of the style of authors who lived and died before the vast majority of the most valuable works on education were written. I felt justified in bringing this subject to the notice of your readers, considering that it must be of some interest to them to know how far university students of pedagogy are encouraged to pursue that science in a broad and scholarly spirit. On this point Mr. Drew's letter throws no light whatever. Yet he will admit that Matthew Arnold and Mr. Hosmer could not have given us their valuable contributions to the study of

German education and literature, had they been frightened in their early manhood by the horrors of the "awful German language." It is also clear that occasional criticisms of the defects of German style from the pens of such writers can neither appear ungracious nor repel any student. Y.

## Notes.

A. D. F. RANDOLPH & Co. will publish immediately 'The Historical Memorials of Canterbury,' in a limited large-paper edition uniform with Dean Stanley's 'Memorials of Westminster,' 'The Autobiography and Memorials of Samuel Irenæus Prime,' edited by Wendell Prime; 'The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity,' by the Rev. Geo. T. Purves; 'The Only Way Out,' a story of doubt and belief, by Leander S. Keyser; and 'The Peerless Prophet,' a Life of John the Baptist, by the Rev. Archibald McCullagh.

Additional announcements by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. are 'The Witch in the Glass, and Other Poems,' by Mrs. S. M. B. Piatt; 'A Blockaded Family,' a story of the war from the Southern side, by Mrs. Parthenia Hague; and 'People and Countries Visited in a Winding Journey Around the World,' by O. W. Wight.

T. Y. Crowell & Co. have nearly ready an unabridged translation—the first ever made—of Tolstoi's 'What to Do,' in an inexpensive popular form; 'Her Only Brother,' from the German of "Heimburg" (Bertha Behrens); and 'Scotch Caps,' by J. A. K., a story for young folks.

The Victor Hugo furore still prevails. Estes & Lauriat of Boston and W. R. Jenkins of New York have in hand a magnificent illustrated two-volume edition of 'Notre Dame de Paris'—the former firm in a new translation by A. L. Alger, the latter in the original French, with adornments in common. There will be nearly 200 illustrations, sixteen of them aquarelles. The University Press, Cambridge, will manufacture the work, of which there will be 500 copies in each set.

Encouraged by the great success of their most beautiful edition of 'L'Abbé Constantin,' with photogravure illustrations by Mme. Madeleine Lemaire, MM. Boussod, Valadon & Cie. are going to issue this year a similar edition of M. Guy de Maupassant's 'Pierre et Jean,' with illustrations by M. Duez and M. Lynch. The choice of book is not so happy. M. Halévy's novel was delightfully brisk and perfectly proper, while M. Maupassant's is sombre, analytic, and rather unpleasant in tone.

'The Curse of Marriage,' a novel by Walter Hubbell, is in the press of the American News Co.

Much interest should attach to 'The Life and Letters of Mary Howitt,' edited by her daughter, of which the English publishers will be the Messrs. Isbister; and to 'Dante Gabriel Rossetti as Designer and Writer: Notes by W. M. Rossetti,' which Cassell & Co. will issue.

We learn with great pleasure that Macmillan & Co. are about to issue, for the Society of Dilettanti, a new edition of Penrose's invaluable 'Principles of Athenian Architecture,' the result of the author's recent year in Athens. The greater part of the present book will remain as it is, but there will be much new matter relating to the Erechtheion; the temple adjoining it, of which the remains were brought to light not long since; the Propylæa; the older