

PENSION LAWS

And Their Manner of Administration by Evans.

FIGHT OF OFFICIALS

How Assistant Secretary Davis Fought the Soldier Hate and Made Six Radical Changes in Favor of Justice and the Veteran. More Figures, Facts and Specifications.

The GLOBE has heretofore shown the manner in which Assistant Secretary Davis was compelled to approve the fraud of the Pension Department against the veterans in illegally raising the degree of disability higher than required by the act of June 27, 1890, (the new law); by which illegal increasing of the degree of disability 400,000 invalid pensions granted to Civil War veterans under Harrison's administration were illegally reduced or dropped from the roll, and the veteran deprived of part or all of his pension during the last Cleveland administration. In Davis' decisions approving Lochren's order 225 for said illegal reductions, Assistant Secretary Davis was compelled by the Hanna anti-pension syndicate to approve the whole scheme, and to illegally hold that the law required a \$20 degree of disability for a \$12 rate. The GLOBE has shown how bold, unjustifiable, indefensible, illegal and fraudulent that order 225 was and is, and the extent of the fraud done to veterans by that scheme, and the manner in which the G. A. R. committee was brought up to tacitly support it in violation of their specific trust under the Philadelphia encampment resolution. (See GLOBE Dec. 29, Jan. 26, Feb. 2, March 16 and 23, April 20, May 18 and 25, June 1.)

Assistant Secretary Davis was permitted by the Hanna anti-pension syndicate to change the whole practice as to applications and to abrogate the trick of dividing the application of a soldier into two or three or more applications for the purpose of illegally rejecting parts or all of the disabilities; but Commissioner Evans was quietly permitted to ignore Davis' rulings on these points, and thus annual Davis' decision entitled "Instructions" 9 P. D., page 93, of July 28, 1897. Evans disregarded the new precedent set up by Davis and declared in his report of 1898 (next year) that "no new precedent was established." (Annual Report, page 13; GLOBE May 25 and June 1.)

The fight between Davis and Evans continued as to those six radical changes which Davis made in the practice by returning to the just and legal rules of the Harrison administration on proving up disabilities until February 23, 1898, when Davis ascertained that the Hanna anti-pension syndicate was protecting Evans in not only ignoring the rules of the Harrison administration which the syndicate had permitted Davis to return to, but was also permitting Evans to follow and enlarge the most absurd features of order 225 on rating and rerating which Evans had agreed to change to less harsh rules as to readjusting the reduced and dropped pensions. Davis then issued the following order:

"It is directed that the pending appeals from the action of reducing or terminating of pensions granted under the second section of act of June 27, 1890, in accordance with the decision rendered May 27, 1890, in the case of Charles T. Bennett 7 P. D., 1 (Order 225), shall be examined with great care.

"In cases where the evidence filed, or the certificate of examining physician, indicates that the pension originally allowed was warranted under a just and impartial construction of the law, they should be returned to the Bureau of Pensions for a special examination, or another medical examination, or both, as may be deemed necessary.

"It is held to be proper and just that such pensioners shall be granted a fair hearing, and be allowed an opportunity to show by competent proof that they were disabled in the degree, and on account of the causes alleged, at the date when the pension was reduced or terminated.

"It will be understood that this action disposes of the pending appeal in such cases by reversing the action taken by the Bureau of Pensions, and remaining in force until further investigation, the reasons therefor being fully set forth." (See order by Assistant Secretary Davis, of February 23, 1898.)

The above order not only indicates how wickedly and stubbornly Evans defrauded those veterans during almost the whole of his first year of office, but it specifies a course of evidence for righting the great wrong done those veterans by Evans and Lochren, which Evans was refusing to follow although ordered in 1897. Evans, without calling for evidence, continued to drop the pensioners from the roll and to reduce their pension under Order 225, whereas Lochren had failed to find the pension or to reduce it. Thousands were thus dropped or reduced during Evans' first three years, although Evans uttered the bold lie in his official report, denying that he had dropped or reduced any, and saying:

"Under the operations of this order (225) a large number of pensioners were dropped from the roll, and the pensions of many others were reduced. While Order 225 is still in force, the work of readjustment of pensions allowed under Order 164 was only partially done, but it is fair that I should say that the revision of claims allowed under Order 164 has not been done at all during my administration of the affairs of this bureau." (See his annual report of 1899, page 30.)

Evans as a bold liar would take the prize in a contest with the Tagals of the Philippine Islands. Evans knew that Congress would not investigate. But what did Evans do after Davis' order of February 23, 1898, directing Evans to take proof in those cases, as above quoted? He went ahead ignoring the order, and began getting up his new book of practice which the Hanna anti-pension syndicate had approved by the Secretary of the Interior (Bliss), April 9, 1898 (same year), and incorporated in it among other illegal rules which show inherently the intended fraud in each case, the following fraudulent rule in violation of the above order of Davis:

"A new medical examination will not be ordered and no evidence will be called for under such application, but the case will be adjudged upon the sole point involved, viz: whether the evidence in the case showed a pensionable disability to have existed at the time of filing such first application."—Evans' book, April 9, 1898, p. 104, sec. 4.

This is only one instance in which Evans, through the power of the Hanna anti-pension syndicate, reversed Davis. The above rule is fraudulent on its face, and shows the fraudulent intent to refuse to hear evidence of the truth. Evans fraudulently pretends that the law and order of Davis requires

only a review of the old evidence that was in the case at the former adjudication, as a court of review which is not a trial court, and that new evidence can not be heard or allowed. This is all a pretense on his part to defraud the law and the claimants. Recently he has changed the rule after running it over four years, so as to permit evidence, but refuses to permit his clerks to call for evidence or give claimant any notice or instruction how to proceed. He might as well chain his rule to the dome of the Capitol. He knows that too.

Tantalus was chained in a lake of water. When he became thirsty and assayed to drink the waters receded; when he hungered for bread and luscious fruit was on the boughs of trees within his grasp, but eluded him when he reached for the fruit. From this we get our word tantalize.

In the meanwhile Evans was refusing to take the ratings of the medical examining boards in the counties, because of their alleged ignorance and incompetence; and he was, as above in his book, refusing to permit evidence on the subject, although expressly ordered so to do, and the law itself positively requires a readjustment *de novo*. Take his section 3 of his book on the same page and same subject. It bears the inherent marks of fraud.

"3. When the pensioner's name has been dropped from the rolls on the ground of no ratable disability and a new declaration is filed alleging the same or additional causes of disability, the process of the adjudication of such claim will be the same as if no prior application had ever been filed, and pension, if allowed thereunder, will be termed a 'renewal,' and commences at date of filing the new declaration." (Evans' book, page 104, Sec. 3.)

The above section 3 was gotten up by Evans to violate the act of Congress approved March 6, 1896, for rerating all those dropped and reduced pensions. That act of Congress provides that upon filing a new claim for pension the prior rejection shall be readjusted and all orders, rules and practice of the bureau or department to the contrary are expressly annulled by the act of Congress. The above section 3 by Evans was intended and invented to defeat that law by holding that claimant must expressly complain of injustice, or expressly ask to have that law applied. The above invention is based on the known fact that old soldiers are not pension experts, and the requirement of that section required what it was found the veteran was not up to, and not doing. Two hundred thousand claims under act March 6, 1896, were thus ignored. That rule has been followed almost all of Evans' five years. It was set aside once again by Campbell, but Evans revived it again in January 18, 1901. (See GLOBE May 18 and 25, June 1 and 8, Dec. 1 and April 26.)

The object of the Hanna anti-pension syndicate in so manipulating the practice that evidence should not be had is to withhold from the medical referee and his assistants (supposed to be doctors) the true history of soldiers' illness, his physical condition and ability to labor. It has been held by more than a thousand decisions that ability to labor is not a mere medical question, but a question which may be proved by lay testimony of neighbors and associates and all the evidence lay and medical taken together. Any person but a fool or a fraud would admit that proposition and those decisions, and call for evidence. Congressman Bell, of Colorado, (the ever-to-be-remembered Evans' bunkie) admitted in his speech on the floor of the House, while praising Evans, that Evans admitted to the House Pension Committee all along that "the office does not pay any attention to the rating of the local boards." (Congressional Record Jan. 13, 1902, page 990; GLOBE Jan. 26.) The necessity of obtaining a full history of the continuance of soldiers' condition from its inception, and especially during the pensionable period is therefore highly material in such cases. This is why Evans would not yield to Davis. Old men with and without wives to support were rejected who were not able to work and who had no property and were supported by charity in part, while rich widows worth from \$4,000 to \$50,000 are pensioned as a sop to the G. A. R. committee. Many of these rich widows are not in law or fact the widows of the soldier when pensioned but the widows of later husbands. Some of these rich widows pensioned under the act of March 3, 1901 (passed by Congress as a sop to the G. A. R. committee as a reward for their perfidy against 400,000 old veterans thrown overboard along with the Philadelphia resolution) have had three husbands since soldier died, and were divorced from those of these husbands. That act of Congress was a pet job of the Hanna anti-pension syndicate. One of Evans' hobbies is that only the widows who were married during or before soldiers' service should be pensioned. The true reason for this contention lies in the fact that soldiers are chiefly young men and marry soon after discharge. Such a law would cut off the majority of widows and place them on the black list. The act of March 3, 1901, was not only a reward to that perfidious G. A. R. committee, but it served (Evans thought) as an educator—an eye-opener—to turn the tide of public opinion against widows even by pretending to favor them. The Hanna anti-pension syndicate look only at general results of the ledger. They will pension anybody or any class however fraudulently if thereby they can defraud a larger class of legal pensioners.

"The whole article is based upon the plotting and planning between Captain Cross and Luscombe, as having taken place in the latter's shed when, as I then informed you, he promised to 'fix it with the major to allow him to write the matter up and assured him that, 'what he would do is Lieutenant Daley, Williams and myself would be plenty.'"

"Now Mr. Ross what could be clearer evidence that Cross fixed things with the major to do as he threatened, than Luscombe's vile article scandalizing Lieutenant Daley, Private Williams, and myself by the most malicious falsehoods ever uttered. If a house should burn down on a day in the future set by me, it would be no clearer evidence of knowledge of arson than this carrying out of his threat, through Luscombe, is evidence of his having planned the article, evidently, re-written by another person. And I want to tell you, Mr. Ross, as one who claims to be an attorney, that if the circumstances leading up to this malicious publication, were as well known to a jury of any twelve sane men on earth, as they are known to you, they could not fail to convict Major Sylvester, Inspector Ashford, Captain Cross, Roger Williams, and others of conspiracy, in aiding and abetting Luscombe, by encouragement to commit this malicious offense. Indeed, sir, I would consider you some kind of a fool if you could not see that the whole push expected to pull out of this thing with their dark skinned Italian dupe.

"Possibly you are aware of the fact Mr. Ross that I have been a resident of the District since 1869, and almost continuously so for the past twenty-six years. I line up with its oldest inhabitants and I defy you character wrecking chief to show that during my long residence here I have conducted myself otherwise than as a law abiding citizen, without so much as a scratch against me in the way of a misdemeanor much less a charge for crime, therefore, I do not have to submit to the vile treatment of which I am being made a victim by your spiteful, daff chief and other unprincipled understappers of the Ashford type.

"Here is an uncovering of the plot, here is the award of vengeance held out to Luscombe, provided he would publish in the famous article subjecting the writer to public hatred and derision, here is a confession from his own lips—a confession, the truth of which cannot be doubted, considering the drift of events, and his anxiety to avoid being enforced to comply with the law regarding his gasoline engine.

"A few days before its publication, Luscombe passed my wife and I on his bicycle and as he slacked up he drew from his pocket some manuscript and with a vainglorious flourish and the look of a demon he shouted: 'This is what does you up with the Commissioners! Ashford and the major told me that after this is published your name will be mud and that they will allow

me to run my saw and engine till Hell freezes over.' I care no more for what Dick Sylvester and Snowden Ashford can do, I replied, than if they were two red ants, so 'let her go Gallagher!' 'I'll do that; and as I am on my way to see them, said he, I will not forget to tell them what you said.' Later on I learned that shortly after this he was closeted with the major.

"Now Mr. Ross you have told me that you always found me on the side of right; and Com. Macfarland has told me that he always found me reasonable in my demands therefore it is clear that I never pursued an aggressive course much less that of a bully, as represented in that infamous article. You know too that it was by my request the warrant for Luscombe was not served, that his wood yard permit was ordered to be issued through my representations, that the affidavit referred to by him was read in his presence and handed to you, that if changed after it went into your possession I had nothing to do with it, that you never branded any paper as false relating to a breach of good behavior on the part of any officer towards Mrs. Raymond, that you never regarded any act of mine as an attempt to blackmail, that instead of extorting money from policemen under threats to expose misconduct they idolize me as one with an eye single to their interests—as one who has done more than his share to create public confidence in and respect for the force, but for which I have been requited by their chief with a stab in the back again and again. You know every circumstance in connection with the Luscombe case, that if he complied with the law by respecting the rights of his poor neighbors he would have had no trouble. You know too that his article is false from start to finish and that circumstances point to Ashford, Sylvester and Cross as the instigators of it, therefore do whatever your conscience dictates, but rest assured that what you fail to do I will not leave undone.

"I believe in open, honest, fearless criticism, but I consider one who resorts to the black brush of scandal a coward and a knave, and after overhearing Cross and Luscombe I told the major that whenever he got ready to take it up I would meet him more than half way in giving him a chance to use it.

"Sincerely and respectfully,
"A. M. RAYMOND."

Now that the battle royal has been fairly inaugurated in these columns we invite both gentlemen to make free use thereof as pretty nearly everybody in Washington interested in the subject matter of the controversy reads the SUNDAY GLOBE. While our sympathies are most decidedly with Mr. Raymond as we believe him to be on the side of justice, they will not prevent us giving Mr. Luscombe fair play and equal space in the GLOBE.

RAYMOND ON FLAGMEN.

Opposes Senate Bill to Abolish Crossing Policemen.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., June 12, 1902. U. S. Senate Committee of the District of Columbia.

GENTLEMEN: As one with an eye single to the interests of Columbia, I wish to enter my most solemn protest against Senate bill 609 to substitute flagmen for crossing policemen, and in doing so I feel that I sound the sentiment of the general public in behalf of an institution from which they are deriving benefits that are beyond all calculation.

Indeed, gentlemen, the bill is not only unworthy of bearing the name of the worthy Senator who introduced it, but its enactment into law would be a glaring act of injustice and ingratitude towards these policemen who have become proficient in their duties and who have rendered praise-worthy service, which we have had reason to believe have not been appreciated by the Congress as it should be.

It is an institution, gentlemen, that is not only an honor to Senator Gorman, its founder but one worthy of imitation by the authorities of every large city throughout the world, and I might add incidentally, that I speak from world wide observation and not as a countryman. Aside from accidents prevented, public benefits and protection derived from their services in ways too numerous to mention they save citizens as well as visitors to the National Capital many thousands of dollars annually, more than the cost of their maintenance, by putting them onto cars by which they reach their destination on one fare, instead of being legally robbed of two or three fares for going the same distance.

A BATTLE ROYAL

Between Messrs. Raymond and Luscombe in the "Globe."

SEE THE FUR FLY

From Now On To a Finish—More Interesting, Entertaining, and More Instructive To the Tax Payers of the District Than Anything Transpiring in Congress—The Champion of the Oppressed vs. The Man With a Pull.

Mr. C. R. Luscombe whom Mr. A. M. Raymond paid his compliments to, through the columns of the SUNDAY GLOBE for the past issue or two, comes back in an extensive statement from which we quote only an opening paragraph or two:

"In the SUNDAY GLOBE of June 1 there appeared, over the signature of Albert M. Raymond, a communication addressed to Commissioner Ross, in which occur certain statements which, in justice to myself as well as to others concerned, I feel it to be my duty to deny. Were Albert M. Raymond as well known to the people of East Washington generally as he is to the writer of this article and a few residents of this section of the city whose attention has been called to the record he has made during the past year or two, any attempt to refute his statements would be wholly unnecessary. Unfortunately, his true character is not known, and hence, as a means of checking his false and slanderous accusations, I ask you, not without reluctance, for sufficient space in your paper for this communication.

"My acquaintance with Raymond began in a restaurant, where he posed as the man who, on several occasions had downed the District Commissioners. I saw him often after that, but felt no particular interest in his alleged attainments as an official pugilist. I once employed him to draw up a deed. For which I paid him ten dollars. I subsequently learned that a hundred honest men in town would have done it for half that sum. But that is neither here nor there; I merely mention the matter as an item in the general count against this man who has made his living by means which a fairly well kept conscience would repudiate.

"In his letter to the GLOBE Raymond says, referring to the erection by me of a frame building at 718 Nineteenth street, which I deemed necessary in the conduct of my business: 'You knew that there was something rotten about it, and possibly I told you that when I asked Luscombe how he managed to inclose it with a frame building he replied: 'I kept the inspector drunk until I got it up, and after that he was afraid to squeal.'" I denounce this as a falsehood of the whole cloth variety.

Raymond knew when he made the statement that it was untrue—knew that it was a link in the chain of blackmail which he has been forging in East Washington for months."

Mr. Raymond has evidently read the very lengthy reply of Mr. Luscombe as may be inferred from the following letter to Commissioner Ross, which he heads "An Award of Vengeance."

"WASHINGTON, D. C., June 7, 1902. HON. JOHN W. ROSS:

"DEAR SIR: Find inclosed clippings of a libelous article published over the name of C. R. Luscombe, which you know are absolutely false. The article savors of a conspiracy and is, apparently, the outcome of his interview with the major a few days ago. The manner in which the major's name is suppressed throughout the article, even to the extent of substituting Colonel Biddle's name for his own as being the one who tore the regulations from the permit, not only betrays a guilty conscience, but a desire to avoid suspicion that might result in saddling responsibility for Luscombe's act upon himself.

"The whole article is based upon the plotting and planning between Captain Cross and Luscombe, as having taken place in the latter's shed when, as I then informed you, he promised to 'fix it with the major to allow him to write the matter up and assured him that, 'what he would do is Lieutenant Daley, Williams and myself would be plenty.'"

"Now Mr. Ross what could be clearer evidence that Cross fixed things with the major to do as he threatened, than Luscombe's vile article scandalizing Lieutenant Daley, Private Williams, and myself by the most malicious falsehoods ever uttered. If a house should burn down on a day in the future set by me, it would be no clearer evidence of knowledge of arson than this carrying out of his threat, through Luscombe, is evidence of his having planned the article, evidently, re-written by another person. And I want to tell you, Mr. Ross, as one who claims to be an attorney, that if the circumstances leading up to this malicious publication, were as well known to a jury of any twelve sane men on earth, as they are known to you, they could not fail to convict Major Sylvester, Inspector Ashford, Captain Cross, Roger Williams, and others of conspiracy, in aiding and abetting Luscombe, by encouragement to commit this malicious offense. Indeed, sir, I would consider you some kind of a fool if you could not see that the whole push expected to pull out of this thing with their dark skinned Italian dupe.

"Possibly you are aware of the fact Mr. Ross that I have been a resident of the District since 1869, and almost continuously so for the past twenty-six years. I line up with its oldest inhabitants and I defy you character wrecking chief to show that during my long residence here I have conducted myself otherwise than as a law abiding citizen, without so much as a scratch against me in the way of a misdemeanor much less a charge for crime, therefore, I do not have to submit to the vile treatment of which I am being made a victim by your spiteful, daff chief and other unprincipled understappers of the Ashford type.

"Here is an uncovering of the plot, here is the award of vengeance held out to Luscombe, provided he would publish in the famous article subjecting the writer to public hatred and derision, here is a confession from his own lips—a confession, the truth of which cannot be doubted, considering the drift of events, and his anxiety to avoid being enforced to comply with the law regarding his gasoline engine.

"A few days before its publication, Luscombe passed my wife and I on his bicycle and as he slacked up he drew from his pocket some manuscript and with a vainglorious flourish and the look of a demon he shouted: 'This is what does you up with the Commissioners! Ashford and the major told me that after this is published your name will be mud and that they will allow

me to run my saw and engine till Hell freezes over.' I care no more for what Dick Sylvester and Snowden Ashford can do, I replied, than if they were two red ants, so 'let her go Gallagher!' 'I'll do that; and as I am on my way to see them, said he, I will not forget to tell them what you said.' Later on I learned that shortly after this he was closeted with the major.

"Now Mr. Ross you have told me that you always found me on the side of right; and Com. Macfarland has told me that he always found me reasonable in my demands therefore it is clear that I never pursued an aggressive course much less that of a bully, as represented in that infamous article. You know too that it was by my request the warrant for Luscombe was not served, that his wood yard permit was ordered to be issued through my representations, that the affidavit referred to by him was read in his presence and handed to you, that if changed after it went into your possession I had nothing to do with it, that you never branded any paper as false relating to a breach of good behavior on the part of any officer towards Mrs. Raymond, that you never regarded any act of mine as an attempt to blackmail, that instead of extorting money from policemen under threats to expose misconduct they idolize me as one with an eye single to their interests—as one who has done more than his share to create public confidence in and respect for the force, but for which I have been requited by their chief with a stab in the back again and again. You know every circumstance in connection with the Luscombe case, that if he complied with the law by respecting the rights of his poor neighbors he would have had no trouble. You know too that his article is false from start to finish and that circumstances point to Ashford, Sylvester and Cross as the instigators of it, therefore do whatever your conscience dictates, but rest assured that what you fail to do I will not leave undone.

"I believe in open, honest, fearless criticism, but I consider one who resorts to the black brush of scandal a coward and a knave, and after overhearing Cross and Luscombe I told the major that whenever he got ready to take it up I would meet him more than half way in giving him a chance to use it.

"Sincerely and respectfully,
"A. M. RAYMOND."

Now that the battle royal has been fairly inaugurated in these columns we invite both gentlemen to make free use thereof as pretty nearly everybody in Washington interested in the subject matter of the controversy reads the SUNDAY GLOBE. While our sympathies are most decidedly with Mr. Raymond as we believe him to be on the side of justice, they will not prevent us giving Mr. Luscombe fair play and equal space in the GLOBE.

ARGUS EYED,

But Sees Double On Congressmen and Senators,

WHILE LAMENTABLY BLIND

To the Real Cause of the Present and Existing Evils in the Departments—Whole Families in Office and the Relatives of Cabinet Officers—The Bad Example Set Appointment Clerks and Underlings.

Editor Sunday Globe: Nothing we are about to say and nothing that can be said on this subject should be considered overdrawn or intemperate, for the reason that the language of vituperation and contumely is too barren and inadequate to fairly and justly characterize much that is done in the way of promotions in the Executive Departments at Washington.

If reform ever comes it will have to come from above. When the head of a department is vigorous and strenuous, the influences of his ideas and views, be they baleful or beneficial, soon makes itself felt all the way down the line to the humblest places under his administration.

If his heads of divisions and chiefs find that he insists on merit being recognized, they quickly take their cue from him; or if they are firmly wedded to methods of mere favoritism or unwarranted partiality, they incur his displeasure and lose their positions.

The reason why many efficient clerks work for years at \$70 and \$80 per year, while inefficient ones go rapidly up to \$1,600 and \$1,800, is that the cabinet officer at the head, himself, encourages this sort of thing by his own example.

Often the big-headed, big-head of the Department, himself makes promotions simply because some influential Senator or Member asks him to do so as a favor, and the Hon. Colossal H. Bighead, Cabinet Officer, by grace of the President of the United States, gains some private advantage for himself very much to the detriment of the service he has sworn to look after. His underlings are quick to follow his example and the meritorious clerk has no more show than a lamb in a cage of crocodiles.

It is the rule and not the exception that cabinet officers, before arriving at that distinction, have all their lives been engaged in political trades and dicker, and naturally they continue the same practice in the departments over which they rule.

It could as reasonably be expected that a hyena should eat grass as that men grown old and gray in the practices of political cunning and log rolling should become the agents of just and manly methods when they find themselves at the head of an Executive Department.

Hence it is that those clerks who are the most efficient scyophants and crawlers stand the best chance of promotion, and it is very evident that there can be no material change in this condition of affairs as long as Senators and members are permitted to exert their influence in executive appointments and promotions.

The interference of the legislative branch of the government with the personnel of the executive in this country has become an all pervading national pest. It turns our legislators and executive officers both into base, low-minded bribers and corruptionists working together in harmony for the peridious purpose of shameful office peddling designed for their own private gain, and resulting in the demoralization of the service.

The system gives us petty office mongers where we ought to have statesmen, and it fills the departments with worthless incompetents who know that scyophancy and subserviency are the cards they must play, instead of striving to become efficient.

Among the women clerks in some instances the bands of Congressmen and high officials are the surest recipients of promotions. Those who have a pull or use their "influence" find that their seats are the safest, nor can it be successfully denied that this is the plain truth and that it ought to be known.

The condition of affairs gives us poor legislation because it nurtures a set of peanut politicians instead of wise and honest statesmen. It also gives us a poor executive force, twice as costly and not one half as efficient as it should be.

Efficient men, often with large families, are even discharged and false charges of delinquency placed on the permanent records against them, just because unscrupulous rogues in and out of office desire their places for subservient tools of their own.

The magnitude of the task of reforming this condition of affairs is so great that no one in this day or generation need expect to see it wholly accomplished, and the piddling efforts now being made to that end are of no avail, because they do not strike at the root of the trouble.

It is a humiliating thought to all the respectable female clerks as they pour out of the big buildings at four o'clock that the spectator knows that some of them belong to the "influence" brigade, but he does not know which is which.

It is suggested that Senators and members of the House should be required to take an oath on entering on their duties not to interfere, however remotely, in executive appointments or promotions.

ARGUS. (Argus does not cover the ground as thoroughly as he thinks, nor is his remedy efficacious. For instance, many of the Cabinet officers appoint their own sons and daughters like Secretary Wilson, and then again, it is not the influence of Senators and Congressmen which fills the departments with undesirable material. On the contrary it is because Senators and Representatives secure so few appointments or promotions for their appointees that the present trouble exists.)

As a rule the Congressman or Senator desiring an appointment for a constituent presents a citizen (male or female) fresh from the people and in every way worthy and deserving of appointment in the public service.

The appointment clerks and higher officials, who set the bad example of filling the departments with their own relatives are the persons responsible and not Congressmen or Senators. It is a notorious fact that whole families of Washingtonians and nearby Marylanders are in office, and that every vacancy is watched and preempted by these office holders for their uncles, their cousins and their aunts. Recently the Civil Service Commission made a report to Congress showing the ratio of appointments by states and Washington city or the District of Columbia had more than one thousand per cent in excess of its

apportionment; and, this per cent had only reference to those appointees who gave their legal residence in the District and did not refer to the thousands of Washingtonians who fictitiously claim residence in states they never put their feet in. No! Mr. "Argus" you are only partially read up on your subject and you fail to grasp the full and the real root of the evil.—EDITOR GLOBE)

A DAMAGING EXPOSE

In Which a Brother Templar Went Back on a Fellow Member.

Editor Sunday Globe: The departments of this city are full of freaks, some harmless, and who retain their positions by reason of their insignificance, and others by reason of their "influence," some good and some otherwise. There are many freaks in the Postoffice Department, some of which will be noticed later, others in the Auditor's Department, and many in the Pension Bureau. Although Evans, the greatest and dirtiest one of all, has left the country—the office is much purer for his absence—there are others not as prominent but of his ilk. One of these is the Dutch chief of the western division. He hails from Indiana, and although an ex-Union soldier, was one of Evans' pets, and one of the few friends among the veterans that Evans had in the bureau. Let me digress and say that Mr. Ware must have noticed the veterans and ladies who, after making him by the hand when he held his reception upon taking charge of the office, expressed their contempt for Evans, who stood at his (Ware's) left hand to say good-by to the clerks, by coolly turning their backs on him and ignoring his presence. Many clerks refused to call upon the Commissioner as they did not wish to see Evans.

But to return to the freak. When Evans took charge of the office a clerk in the eastern division was promoted to be chief of the division, a man thoroughly competent and a veteran. Within a few days, however, Wilhite bobbed up with his "influence," and on the sole ground that he was a veteran was appointed chief. With the appointment of the first chief an elegant presentation of flowers was made, and now the new chief had to be remembered. When the subscription was sent around some declined to contribute, and there was where they made a mistake, for when the promotions were made they were passed by and some of them were reduced in salary. The fact that they were Republicans didn't count.

Veterans who sought promotion got the cold shoulder, and unless they had strong "influence," got left, and the lady friends of fellow received the plums. He was a chum of Brooks, a prominent clerk, and got what he wanted. Although he was appointed on the ground that he was a veteran, that plea was of no account with him. But that is not the worst. The fellow is a, or claims to be, Knight Templar, wears the malfese cross, and is a member of Alma Temple of Shriners. Soon after his appointment as chief, a veteran and a Knight Templar, who had been reduced in salary by a freak, H. C. Bell, charged with being an offensive partisan, by a traitor, asked to be promoted to his old salary, and, although his record was excellent and mutual friends personally requested his promotion, it was refused. Why? No reason was given, but the veteran had refused to help pay for the chief's flowers. The veteran was in sore distress, his pension had been suspended illegally, to reimburse the Government several hundred dollars, his son was bedfast with typhoid fever, and also his wife with nervous prostration, as a result of her mother's death. These facts were made known to Wilhite, but it was of no use. Soon after the veteran told Wilhite of his distress and finally said to him, they were both Knight Templars, and as such wanted him to help him. Wilhite in reply said that his masonry did not require him to assist him. Months ago the veteran charged Wilhite in his, the veteran's commandery, Washington, I think, with having violated and repudiating his Knight Templars' obligations, and the doors of the commandery were closed against him. This action was reported to Wilhite and although many months have passed, he has failed to take any steps to clear himself. An innocent man would leave no stone unturned to clear himself of such terrible charges. He is, I presume in good standing in Alma Temple, and it is up to them to look after him. He is unworthy of recognition by any self respecting member of the fraternity. Is it any wonder that he was a chum of Evans? What is the matter with Barnes of the Pension Bureau? I have known him for many years and knew him to be a quiet inoffensive fellow, let up on him and turn your guns against bigger game.

ARGUS EYED,

But Sees Double On Congressmen and Senators,

WHILE LAMENTABLY BLIND

To the Real Cause of the Present and Existing Evils in the Departments—Whole Families in Office and the Relatives of Cabinet Officers—The Bad Example Set Appointment Clerks and Underlings.

Editor Sunday Globe: Nothing we are about to say and nothing that can be said on this subject should be considered overdrawn or intemperate, for the reason that the language of vituperation and contumely is too barren and inadequate to fairly and justly characterize much that is done in the way of promotions in the Executive Departments at Washington.

If reform ever comes it will have to come from above. When the head of a department is vigorous and strenuous, the influences of his ideas and views, be they baleful or beneficial, soon makes itself felt all the way down the line to the humblest places under his administration.

If his heads of divisions and chiefs find that he insists on merit being recognized, they quickly take their cue from him; or if they are firmly wedded to methods of mere favoritism or unwarranted partiality, they incur his displeasure and lose their positions.

The reason why many efficient clerks work for years at \$70 and \$80 per year, while inefficient ones go rapidly up to \$1,600 and \$1,800, is that the cabinet officer at the head, himself, encourages this sort of thing by his own example.

Often the big-headed, big-head of the Department, himself makes promotions simply because some influential Senator or Member asks him to do so as a favor, and the Hon. Colossal H. Bighead, Cabinet Officer, by grace of the President of the United States, gains some private advantage for himself very much to the detriment of the service he has sworn to look after. His underlings are quick to follow his example and the meritorious clerk has no more show than a lamb in a cage of crocodiles.

It is the rule and not the exception that cabinet officers, before arriving at that distinction, have all their lives been engaged in political trades and dicker, and naturally they continue the same practice in the departments over which they rule.

It could as reasonably be expected that a hyena should eat grass as that men grown old and gray in the practices of political cunning and log rolling should become the agents of just and manly methods when they find themselves at the head of an Executive Department.

Hence it is that those clerks who are the most efficient scyophants and crawlers stand the best chance of promotion, and it is very evident that there can be no material change in this condition of affairs as long as Senators and members are permitted to exert their influence in executive appointments and promotions.