was this afternoon committed to jail without bail, by the Justice at Keyser, for the next term of the Court.

The committee of boatmen who waited on President Gorman, of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, at Baltimore, were at Cumberland last night, and have invited the shippers and builders to a consultation at 2 o'clock, in regard to a reduction of trippages, etc. They are desirous of returning to work, and say what they want is uniform rates and the right of position in line. It is thought possible that they will not insist much longer in demanding a dollar per ton.

Gen. Barry was in consultation with Gov. Carroll yesterday at the City Hall, in Baltimore, in reference to the use of United States troops in Maryland. It was regarded that the news from the coal miners was not unfavorable to a peaceful adjustment. The case of the canal boatmen presents a more difficult problem to solve just now. It is thought however that they will not be permitted to obstruct the business of the canal much longer. The canal is considered as much a public highway as the railroad, and relatively as important to commerce to be kept open.

The United States troops, which has for more than two weeks been kept on guard at the Camden Station of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, under Gen. Barry, were yesterday withdrawn by orders from the Secretary of War. About mid-day Gen. Barry removed his headquarters to Fort McHenry, taking with him Col. Forrey's command of Marines, about 130 men, who were transported by special cars to Locust Point. There are also at Fort McHenry two companies of the 11th Infantry, under Lieuts. Sage and Ross, and the battery of artillery under Capt. Ramsey. The other troops from Camden Station left for Philadelphia under command of Gen. Accta, whence, it is stated, they will be sent to Scranton, Penn., to assist in quelling the disturbances in the mining regions of Pennsylvania.

ABOUT NEW-YORK.

DONAHUE'S SYMPATHIZERS.

JOHN SWINTON AND DENNIS M'MAHON ARE REFUSED AS BONDSMEN.

Judge Donohue having determined on Thursday to admit Barney J. Donahue, the Hornellsville striker, to bail in $2,000, Dennis McMahon, a well-known lawyer of this city, at once offered himself as bondsman. Some two years ago the lawyers, tired of the solicitations of clients who wished them to go their bail, got a law passed forbidding the taking of a lawyer as security on a bail-bond. This was brought to Judge Donohue's attention, and Mr. McMahon retired in good order.

John Swinton also offered himself as bail, and brought with him proof of his ability to answer for the necessary $2,000. He made his examination somewhat amusing by his answers. When asked what his occupation was he said, "A Manufacturer of Newspapers." When asked in what he considered the manufacture of newspapers to consist he answered, "In processes of mind and mechanism required to produce what is ordinarily known as a newspaper. I work at No. 168 Nassau-st. I would rather not be called an employé of the paper; that is to me a little offensive. I work for it. I am not a proprietor. You may say I am a servant of the Company."

Q. What personal property do you own? A. I own $7,000 in United States bonds, coupon or registered, and some South Carolina bonds.

Q. Then laughing you are a "bloated bondholder?" A. A bondholder, but not I think (glancing at his limbs) bloated. I have with me the bonds or rather the legal evidence of my right to the bonds in certificates of the Safe Deposit Company of New-York. As to the $4,000 South Carolina bonds they are "Conversion" bonds, and I think may be worth two cents on the dollar. I think I may say that I own no real estate. I did once own some town lots in a city I founded in Kansas and one or two farms in Kansas, but I am satisfied they have been long ago forfeited for non-payment of taxes. I think they (denotices alluding to Kansas neighbors) were under the impression (smiling) that I was "a bloated bondsider," and gave me no mercy. Yes, I think I may say I am the owner of no real estate. I have no debts.

The whole examination was conducted on both sides in a pleasant, friendly way, but Judge Donohue held that the law required that a bondsman's property should be something tangible and not readily disposed of without some sign—real estate or tangible personal property—and that bonds which could be secretly and instantaneously transferred were not such property, and therefore Mr. Swinton's bail could not be taken. After waiting until half past three Judge Donohue left the Court-House, as no other bail was offered.

The "Central Council for the People's Safety" (whatever that may be), of which G. W. Maddox and Storm Bennett are President and Secretary, has voted unanimously to offer Donahue, as "a representative of the oppressed laborers of the United States," his sympathy and its pledge of all the assistance in the power of the Association.

DISMISSAL OF TROOPS IN NEW-JERSEY.

The 1st Regiment and the three companies of the 5th Regiment of Newark, who have been doing duty at Phillipsburg and other points on the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad of New-Jersey, returned to their homes yesterday p. m., arriving at Newark about 4:30. They were heartily greeted at the depot, and after marching to the armory they were dismissed. Yesterday morning Private Gee of Company C, 5th Regiment, and the drum-major went bathing in the Lehigh River, just above the dam, at Phillipsburg. The current being very strong carried the men over the dam. The drum-major was rescued, but Private Gee, who was probably stunned, disappeared, and his body has not yet been recovered.

Camp Angel, at New-Brunswick, was broken on Thursday evening. Company C, 3d Regiment, still remains on duty at the railroad bridge, but will probably be dismissed to-day. The Sheriff's posse of twenty-four men, sent from New-Brunswick several days ago to Perth Amboy, are still detained there at the request of H. F. Packer, the Vice-President of the Easton and Amboy Railroad. No disturbance has occurred to demand their interference, but Mr. Packer believes their presence is still required. The other posse is still stationed at Dunellen, guarding the round-house, in which are kept seven or eight engines. These men, ten in number, will probably return from Dunellen this evening.

DAMAGES FOR LOSSES BY THE STRIKES.

An investigation is about being made relative to the losses sustained by the produce merchants of this city by reason of the strikes, with the view of fixing the responsibility and recovering damages for such losses. The agents of the transportation companies refuse to furnish lists of property destroyed at Pittsburg, and say they have no complete lists yet. Even if they had them, they say they would not give them to the press for publication. When full lists are made, the consignees will be duly informed.

In accordance with the action taken by the Board of Managers on Thursday, President W. A. Cole of the Produce Exchange has appointed the following special committee, representing the different trades which have met with losses on perishable goods during the late strikes, to confer with the counsel of the Board of Managers relative to the right of recovery for such losses: A. E. Orr, Chairman; R. B. Livermore, John H. Pool, L. Hazeltine, James F. Joyce, Otto Ahrens, Edgar P. Hill, H. C. Cooke, Amasa Spring.

DISPATCHES RECEIVED BY MR. SLOAN.

Samuel Sloan, President of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, received a dispatch from Kingston yesterday, stating that matters on the Lackawanna and Bloomsburg Railroad were quiet this morning, but the only way to get trains through was by guarding each one with troops. Obstructions were put on the track, and wires were cut at night. Another dispatch received by Mr. Sloan from Scranton said that there was no change in the situation since Thursday. Things were not yet quiet at Plymouth. Wires were cut at that place, so they could get nothing from there. Halstead has just started to go there. About four thousand troops were here and at Lackawanna and Bloomsburg. The feeling was very bitter with a large class of employés, and no resumption was possible for some days.

THE NINTH NEW JERSEY REGIMENT.

Members of the 9th Regiment of New-Jersey are still on duty at their Armory, but they expect to be all relieved next week. Lieut.-Col. Green said to a TRIBUNE reporter last evening that the officers had been doing all they could for those members who had been dismissed by their employers for doing militia duty during the recent troubles. Next Thursday evening the members would hold their monthly meeting, and this question might possibly be brought up; but he had not received any instructions from the Colonel upon the subject.

THE TRIAL OF MR. ELLIS.

THE STATE FINISHES ITS CASE—ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY.

SARATOGA, N. Y., Aug. 3.—In the Ellis trial to-day, Mr. Reid, the examiner, testified that the report regarding the German Savings Bank of Morrisania, of April, 1875, was correct. Testimony was given by Deputy-Superintendent Lamb and Henry J. Hubbard, employed by the Loan and Trust Company, John H. Robertson, Recording Clerk of the County of New-York, Mr. Swayne, Managing Clerk of the Attorney-General's Office and Isaac Smith, a clerk in the department. The latter produced the report of January 1, 1875, of the Security Savings Bank, showing an excess of assets $11,030 51 above the sums due depositors. The examination by Mr. Reid November 27, 1875, shows a deficiency of $890 23. The excess of income was $940.74; January 1, 1876, the Bank reported a deficiency of $27,175; the report was received January 31, 1876, when the bank was in the hands of a receiver. The witness was cross-examined, and said he had not furnished information to John Mack, the complainant, to the Governor, nor to any reporters, nor to counsel.

Wm. R. Bangs, Secretary of the Security Savings Bank, testified that he was appointed Receiver in February, 1876; he thought it would pay sixty per cent. On his cross-examination the witness said the clerk made false entries, and there were discrepancies between the general ledger and the depositor ledger amounting to $68,000. It was understood in the bank that Ellis had been seen by some of the bank officers after Reid's report.

Isaac Smith, Clerk in the Banking Department, testified as to the examination of the Mutual Benefit Savings Bank.

The Counsel for the State rested after considerable debate. The request of counsel for Ellis to adjourn until next Tuesday was granted.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

XVI.

LETTER FROM GAIL HAMILTON.

EXCLUSION OF OFFICE-HOLDERS FROM POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS UNJUST—THE ORDER PLAINLY UNLAWFUL—SINGULAR TESTS OF FITNESS FOR OFFICE—MR. SCHURZ'S PRICE FOR SPEECH-MAKING—TRUE CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: President Hayes has lately taken one very pronounced step towards the enforcement of what he regards as reform in the Civil Service. He forbids any officer of the Federal Government "taking part in the management of political organizations, caucuses, conventions, or election campaigns." He forbids any assessment to be made for political purposes on Federal office-holders. The penalty for exerting any political influence is peremptory dismissal from office.

This is not the first time that measures of this sort have been attempted, but I believe their success is yet in the future. It is significant of the slight hold it has taken upon the American mind, that this order is to-day considered as novel, and as much an innovation as if it had not been made nearly forty years ago by Daniel Webster when he was Secretary of State under President Harrison; an order which he enforced himself ten years later, when holding the same position under President Fillmore, by visiting with his severest displeasure all Whigs who refused to subscribe to the compromise measures of 1850. That is, Mr. Webster aimed to secure the complete independence of the office-holders by making them support a policy against which their conscience protested and their manhood rebelled. Shall history again repeat itself? I cannot see that the acceptance and adoption of this principle would be creditable to the character or profitable to the interests of the American people.

It would be an undoubted and unmitigated evil and scandal that every man appointed to Federal office should feel himself obliged to wear the livery and do the political drudgery of the Administration appointing him. No position can be more humiliating than this, unless it be the attitude of absolute inaction and neutrality which this order prescribes for the office-holder. Why is it not just as offensive, degrading and humiliating to tell a man he holds office on condition that he abstain from politics, as that he holds it on condition that he take an active and noisy part in politics? Large business firms are sometimes accused of attempting to influence the political action of their employés, but I never heard such attempts pointed out for emulation; it is always for a shame. The Democratic head of a manufactory who should undertake to tell his men what meetings they should or should not attend out of business hours would be held up to Republican execration. I do not see why the President has anything more to do with the manner in which office-holders spend their time outside of business hours than the head of any other business firm. It is true that he, like the dry-goods merchant or the ordinary housekeeper, engages the whole time of his servants; and in an emergency, like them, he commands their whole time. But it is also true that nature requires and custom prescribes only a certain routine of duty within a limited and set time, and outside of that the man belongs to himself alone. The President, like any other master, has the legal power to dismiss a man for any cause whatever; but has he the moral right to dismiss him for anything but neglect of his official duty? especially for doing what every American citizen has been taught to consider one of his first patriotic duties? If politics are to be divorced from the Civil Service, what has the President to do with a man's political work, provided he does thoroughly the Civil Service he was hired to do? For years it has been dinned into our ears that every good citizen should attend primaries and see to it that only good men are put in nomination. Does the office-holder cease to be a citizen? Has he no duties to perform in the way of selecting good men and rejecting bad men? Has he no interest in the integrity and ability of any office but his own?

Indeed, the case is far stronger than I have put it. The President, unlike the head of a business firm, is, with every other office-holder down to the foot of the ladder, himself a servant. A man who absolutely owns a factory has the right to prescribe the terms on which men may work in it; but the President has no such right with officers of the Federal Government, who are but his fellow-servants. The law, which is above President and Department Clerks alike,—the law which is the voice of the people in organic, concrete form, is alone able to do this. I utterly deny that the President has any right to prescribe or prohibit, outside the requirements of the law. He is to execute, not to make the law. One of the grandest and best of the old Revolutionary declarations in New England was that the Colonists made their resistance "to the end that we may have a Government of laws, and not a Government of men." I maintain that the order of President Hayes is directly in the teeth of the letter, and still more of the spirit of that declaration. The President is indeed clothed by the Constitution with the power of appointment, and, inferentially, with the power of removal, but this great power is to be exercised with discretion as well as with conscientious fidelity; and here, in this very power, lies the beginning, if not the ending of Civil Service Reform. Give us good appointments for all offices, and Civil Service Reform is in a fair way to become an accomplished fact. But if this great power of removal is to hang on any arbitrary thread whatever, if it is to be held over the heads of office-holders with the threat from the White House that it shall fall on any one who exercises a right and performs a duty common to all American citizens, it seems to me an abuse which puts the President into the position of an absolute monarch, and clothes him with the power of laying upon persons holding office conditions not required by law, in conflict with their rights as citizens, derogatory to their independence as men.

When a man enters office, he takes a certain prescribed oath as to his loyalty, his obedience to the Constitution and laws of the United States, his solemn promise to perform his duties well and faithfully; and if the office involves care of public money and other property, a bond is also given as additional security to the Government. If the man be unfaithful in any one of these respects, it is the solemn duty of the President, charged as he is with the execution of the laws, to remove him. But I say again, and apparently it cannot be said too often, that the President has no more right than Mr. Hayes of Ohio to add a condition not required by law; no more right than he has to abrogate one that is required by law. If he believes that additional requirements should be made, or additional prohibitions laid upon office-holders, it is his duty to recommend a law to that effect when he communicates with Congress. If Congress be antagonistic or apathetic the only thing that remains is to labor with the people till they elect a Congress that is eager and active. But to make the law of his own motion is, to my thinking, a gross, arrogant and dangerous assumption of power, which, however much it may be applauded by the claquers of the press, will, in the end, be severely condemned by the sober judgment of the people.

But the office-holder gets such a hold on the machine that it cannot be loosed, and he rides rough-shod over the people's will, says the Reformer.

Let me assure the Reformer, who stands hungrily eyeing the machine, and whose fingers are restlessly working, in his longing to clutch it, that it would be more manly in him to go to work the manly way and get the machine into his hands by superior strength, than to stand whining to the President to take the other boy's hands off! Take them off yourself like a man. We the people are not so effeminate that we should fear to be enslaved by thrice the number of office-holders. Your blessed bête noir, Gen. Butler, if you are to be believed, rode us pretty hard in the Essex District, but when the people had once made up their minds, out he went—office-holders and all!

Is it ungenerous to think that the Reformers are seeking to get the machine into their own hands rather than to destroy the machine? Why they say it themselves. Is not a Reformer to be believed even when he speaks the truth? They are so eager that all the motives of prudence cannot restrain them, but they are continually popping up their heads to see what progress is made and pushing little howls of impatience because it creaks along so slowly. "Unfortunately," says one, "the Civil Service Reform policy announced by the Administration has as yet borne no fruits in Pennsylvania. Cameron's satellites are still in office all over the State, and there is therefore no encouragement for the real Reform element in the party to come forward and push the machine men out of the control of the organization. The Cameron men mean to let the election go by default." Wait a moment. How is this? Why do you wish to push the machine men out of the control? You admit that they will let the election go by default. That is, they will take their hands off the machine and let it spin around till it runs down. That is, they will simply do nothing, which is precisely what the President orders them to do! If they were Civil Service Reformers born and bred, they could no more. Not a word is lisped against them in the performance of their official duties; it is only that they will let the elections go by default. And now the President, instead of saying, Well done, good and faithful servants, is informed "that the only way to save the Republican party in Pennsylvania from defeat is for him to speedily put his reform theories into practice, *and make a succession of first-class appointments to the Federal offices in that State*"!!!

What has the President to do with saving the Republican party in Pennsylvania? Is letting the election go by default a "cause" for the removal of an office-holder who is credited to have nothing to do with politics?

The Chicago Tribune breathes out fiercer threatenings and slaughter, far more like the old Luther of patronage than like the young Melanchton of Reform:

"It is believed the Cameron intend to punish the President . . . by ordering their office-holding henchmen to let the election go by default, or to take such a course as will result in the Democrats carrying it. . . . If old Simon and young Don play a game of this sort on the Republican party it will be the bounden duty of the President and Cabinet to remove from office every treacherous Cameronian in the State who contributes to such result, and to fill their places with a different class of men. This will teach them that honesty is the best policy, even in politics."

We, who are yet in the gall of partisan bitterness and the bonds of political iniquity need a special Divine Revelation to explain *how* it is going to teach this. The Reformers do not accuse the "henchmen" of any treachery against the President except cursing him with his granted prayer. The President orders them out of politics and out they go, and therefore it is the President's bounden duty to remove them from office also! The different class of men he is to put in is of course men who will not let the election go by default, and who *will* save the Republican party in Pennsylvania.

Again an Alabama gentleman "who expresses forcibly the sentiments of the best class of Southern Republicans" addresses the President: "To be true to your policy of pacification and reform, you must be true to the friends of that policy. *The retention in office of those who are indifferent to the success of your policy* or an absolute impediment to its success by reason of hostility to it, or want of acceptability to the people, can result only in its failure."

But if politics are to be absolutely divorced from office, what have the opinions of a Customs Clerk regarding a national policy to do with adding up figures on his desk?

"As soon as Secretary Sherman returns from his Northern trip the question of suspending Collectors Arthur of New-York and Tutton of Philadelphia will be brought before the Cabinet for consideration." Both of these collectors then were of course found guilty of malfeasance in office by the Investigating Committees. On the contrary, so late as June 4 "an impression seemed to prevail among officials at the Treasury Department that Collector Tutton of Philadelphia has been successful in instituting many reforms thus far during his administration." Even "his predecessor was an honest, and in many respects efficient officer, but lacked that experience and tact in the transaction of public business which Mr. Tutton has brought to the position." Collector Arthur, so far from being censured by his inquisitors was deputed to form the committees which were to carry out their suggestions. Reform, tact, experience—why, then are these officials to be suspended? Oh! "Some members of the Cabinet are of opinion that these officials are not in sympathy with the President's Civil Service Rules, and that they ought to be displaced by men in active and hearty accord with the administration on this point.

So, after all, the "felt want" of this shrinking, sensitive Administration is "sympathy." The final "fitness" for office is elective affinity. It is not enough that a man have honesty, ability, tact and experience; the competitive examination must ask him, as the exhorters used to ask the "convicted" in the old-fashioned country revivals, "how do you feel in your mind?" The Administration can call into its closest councils a man who fought against the country, and voted against the party; harmony in little matters like State Sovereignty is not essential; but unless one heartily and actively contemplates the spectacle of an Administration turning out a faithful and capable clerk, because his brother, or his brother-in-law, or his cousin happens also to be a faithful and capable clerk, he shall not so much as preside over a Custom House. By all means let us have "sympathy."

"Secretary Schurz advocates the suspension of both officials, on the ground that they represent the bad element in politics. . . . Mr. Schurz believes that the men who ridicule the President's rule are not the right persons to make it a success."

In the competitive examinations which are to determine fitness for office, will Mr. Schurz tell us what is to be the standard of the badness of the element which the competitor represents, and of the degree in which he represents it? We can easily tell whether a man knows the multiplication table, the German dynasties, the genealogies of David, but how shall we find out whether he represents the good or the bad element in politics? "Ridicule" is the only test mentioned by Mr. Schurz in this dispatch. Naughty collectors. Have they been laughing at Mr. Schurz? Have they been nudging each other? Do they have a sudden coughing-fit when the good Secretary comes in? Away with them! These are solemn times. What is there to laugh about, especially now that The Rules have decided to have it set with your wife's father, but not to hunt for nepotism under the bones of your great-grandfather? No. Let Mr. Arthur and Mr. Tutton instantly and permanently smooth down their faces, or go forth into the world, not with Mr. Charles Francis Adam's "stamp of fraud upon their brows," because that has taken four-years' lodgings elsewhere, but branded with Secretary Schurz, his mark: *L'Homme qui Rit!*

And when, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow, they take their solitary way from the Receipt of Customs, if still Mr. Schurz hear through the Summer softness a faint gurgle, a low and sudden smother of sound, why, 'tis but the water lapping on the crag, and the long ripple washing in the reeds!

I do not at all understand on what principle assessments are forbidden to be made upon office-holders. On the one hand they are represented by Mr. Carl Schurz as "an army of political mercenaries living on public plunder;" on the other they are put, by this order, into the list of minors, paupers, idiots and women who are not able to defend their own rights, but must be protected by their superiors. Neither can be quite agreeable to the office-holder, but both together are impossible. If raising money for a political campaign be a proper thing, I do not see why office-holders should not be asked to contribute as well as people who are not office-holders. If raising money for a political campaign be an improper thing, I do not see why all those who knowingly spend and use money so raised are not *participes criminis*. In the public papers I have seen the statement iterated and reiterated that Mr. Schurz has asked and received from the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania $1,500 for making a single political speech thrice in a political campaign. I have again and again heard it stated as a fact so current that no one thought of denying it, that Mr. Schurz habitually, as a regular business, charged, and charged very highly for his political speeches; so that the $1,500 he received in Pennsylvania was not exceptional, was but a small part of the gross receipts for all his years of stump-speaking.

Where did Mr. Schurz think this money came from? Was it any worse for the Republican State Committee to ask a Custom House Officer to pay five dollars towards carrying the Pennsylvania election, than it was for Mr. Schurz to ask the Republican State Committee $1,500 to put into his own pocket? All the partisans, and politicians, and corruptionists that I know make their political speeches without money and without price, and never even asked to have their expenses paid. They help along Civil Service Reform, at least to the extent that no clerk has to be assessed on their account, no clerk's money goes into their pockets, and ten times what any clerk is even asked to give goes out of their pockets into the general fund. It is not, I believe, the habit of political speakers in the United States of the grade of Senators or Cabinet officers to charge their party associates for their efforts in a common cause, and, as a Civil Service Reformer, Mr. Schurz enjoys and is said to deserve the reputation of being alone in the business of selling his voice at a fixed price per hour in aid of the Republican cause—a cause of which he is so much more pure, unselfish and patriotic an apostle than his political compeers, if we may believe his Chamber of Commerce speech, that it is only after his own accession to place that the American people believe once more that they can get an honest Government. Mr. Schurz has chosen to attack wantonly the feelings and the pride of native-born Americans by traversing the whole country, and for the sum of one hundred dollars an evening, less or more, denouncing the corruption and depravity of our Government and our people. With what Mr. Sumner would have called "a loose expectoration of speech," he has characterized all office-holders as "an army of political mercenaries." But in that army of political mercenaries, the first and highest corps, its "Seventh Regiment," is composed, rank and file, private and officer, of Mr. Carl Schurz.

I attribute no dishonor to Mr. Schurz. I do not say that he had not a perfect right to demand any sum whatever for his speeches; but if Mr. William H. Kemble's assertion is true that he paid Mr. Schurz $500 a night for his speech, Mr. Schurz is certainly estopped from characterizing Federal office-holders, no richer than himself, as political mercenaries, because they work for money, and not for love alone. No one would quarrel with any man for any honest way in which he may earn his bread and butter, but so long as Mr. Schurz puts into his pocket thousands of dollars, a part of which he cannot fail to know must have come from the contributions of office-holders, while the Secretary of State of the late corrupt Administration drew out of his pocket hundreds of dollars to save the poorer clerks of his Department from making contributions, it would be becoming in Mr. Schurz, when next he addresses the Chamber of Commerce and the rural lyceums, to make the comparison between his own unselfish patriotism and the selfish greed of his predecessors in office and his comrades in arms a little less sharp!

Undoubtedly there are oppression and injustice in connection with the levying of political contributions upon office-holders; but I do not see why asking political contributions from office-holders is any worse than asking ecclesiastical contributions. Patriotism and religion are free as air; but brass bands and torch-light processions and Sunday-school picnics and quartette choirs take a good deal of money. No law enforces subscription to the one or to the other. The office-holder, it is said, though the contribution is "voluntary," pays it under fear of being turned out of office. But I know that if I do not pay my "minister's tax" I shall be turned out of church! Yet no one interferes to say that I shall not be asked to contribute, nor do I care to have any one interfere. We generally prefer to use our own judgment as to what and whether we will give for the asking.

My idea of Civil Service would be to have every office-holder know and feel that his place depends not on his doing or leaving undone political work, paying or leaving unpaid political taxes; but on his faithful discharge of official duty. Regarding political work or political assessments, he should be as absolutely free as he is regarding ecclesiastical work. I would no sooner have him forbidden to moderate a convention than to deacon a church. And I would have such men in office that their presence in a convention should be a benefit to politics and a guaranty of fairness and purity, and then they should be left to do exactly what they choose and what the people choose to have them, as is the inalienable right of every American citizen. To concede this seems to me the simple due to freemen; to exact more affixes the badge of servitude. Mr. Webster once said there was nothing, to him so silly as Masonry, except anti-Masonry. It seems to me there is nothing so bad as to make political service the condition of holding office except political non-service.

I do not attribute to the President any intentions to encroach upon individual liberty. Nevertheless this order is a step in that direction, rather than in the direction of Civil Service Reform. True reform necessarily lies in the mode of appointment, in the character of the appointee and in the degree of continuity of office—none of which are touched by this order. Reform does not lie in the conventions an office-holder may attend, and the primaries where like other good citizens he has a natural right and a bounden duty to go. If appointments are made solely for political reasons it is idle to attempt to reform the Civil Service, or to suppose that we, the people, are minors, paupers, idiots and women enough to suppose that the Civil Service is to be reformed by tithing a little mint, anise and cummin out of caucus and convention. How many office-holders must be locked up in their rooms on Convention day to drown the turmoil in the Baltimore Custom House? Col. Wilkins, the Collector of Customs, was appointed less than a year ago. He appears to be a gentleman of high character, and the Secretary of the Treasury publicly acknowledged him to be an officer of great merit and usefulness. Him, an admiring people see turned out to make room for Mr. Thomas, on the assurance of Mr. Fulton, editor of *The Baltimore American*, that with this change they can elect a Reform Mayor the coming Autumn! Adam E. King, the Naval Officer at Baltimore, a gallant soldier of the Union Army, an officer of the highest character and a gentleman to the manner born, points the same moral in the same way. And all this is done publicly. The letters are printed in the newspapers. And all the while and all the same the cry goes up to Heaven, that the President is thoroughly in earnest, and it is only sore-heads that wail!

The lofty and superior patriotism of these various State delegations of Reformers, who are besieging and beseeching the President for offices, wherewith to promote Reform was not surpassed even by that of our own Essex County hero, who wrote to Gov. Andrew in the midst of his great war labors: "I want to do my full share in putting down this infernal rebellion. Won't you appoint me sutler to the 23d Regiment?"

I have been a close observer of political affairs under Administrations that make no professions of being governed by other than the ordinary combination of partisanship and patriotism in their motives. I have deeply deplored what seemed to me grave errors and unwarrantable assumptions; but anything so open, so shameless, so fundamental, and so fatal as this avowed use of Federal patronage to control elections, I have never seen. In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird. If Scripture is to be depended upon in politics, they will not catch a Reform Mayor in Baltimore; and Reform, already bedraggled and travel-worn, will find herself in the plight of the homely, but devout and determined New-England converts, who "rolled in the dirt without hearing Whitefield!"

July 26, 1877. GAIL HAMILTON.

Adolphus, dear, what shall I do? Bridget has struck, and there she stands at the kitchen door with a poker in one hand and a saucepan in the other, threatening to break the head of the new help if she dares to lay her hand to a dish-rag. It's just awful, so it is, too.

THE RESUMPTION ACT.

LETTER FROM DR. LEONARD BACON.

SHALL THE NATION PAY ITS NOTES?—GREENBACKS AN EVIDENCE OF DEBT—THE HONOR OF THE NATION INVOLVED IN THEIR PAYMENT IN COIN—A FOOLISH FEAR OF CONTRACTION.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: There seems to be, in Ohio and elsewhere in the West, something like a reaction by politicians of the Republican party against the law which fixes January 1, 1879, as the day for the resumption of specie payments from the Treasury of the United States. I infer that, in the opinion of those politicians, the current of public opinion is setting or can be turned in that direction.

Doubtless the chapter of Money and Currency is in some respects one of the most difficult in the science of Political Economy. There is no need of my saying that I do not pretend to understand all the mysteries of that subject; but in all humility I may say that the average politician, whether conducting a party newspaper, or arranging for a party convention—perhaps even the average Member of Congress—is not more competent to pronounce an authoritative judgment on financial questions than we common folks are, who can only say what common honesty is, and what is common sense. It is in the presence of the people, and at the level of the people's common sense, that these questions of resumption and the silver dollar are to be discussed and decided. As one of the people, I may, without arrogance or presumption, contribute my part to the discussion. Admitting that, in bank parlors and among capitalists many things may be said—things both true and pertinent—out of the line of my thinking, I remember that, so far as these questions are political, and are therefore questions for the people, they ought to be decided by such considerations as the common sense of the people can understand, and such as the moral sense of the people will appreciate.

What, then, is this question of resumption? It is simply the question whether, in conformity with a definite pledge given by Act of Congress in 1875, the greenback promises of the United States to pay dollars, shall begin to be redeemed in coin on Jan. 1, 1879.

The nation, in the distress of the war for its own existence, wanted money more rapidly than money could be raised by taxation or by the sale of bonds. In addition to all the ordinary expenses of Government, there were the extraordinary expenses of a war in which everything was at hazard. Therefore the Government did just what an impecunious citizen does in similar circumstances: it offered to its creditors its confessions of indebtedness handsomely inscribed on paper. Instead of paying, it gave its promises to pay. Office-holders of all sorts and grades, contractors for the army or navy, soldiers and sailors, pensioners disabled by wounds or disease in the defence of their country, widows and orphans of those who had given their lives to save the nation's life, received from the United States, instead of money, treasury-notes. "Silver and gold have we none," the Government was compelled to say, "but we give you the best that we can, even those promises, secured by the honesty and honor of the people whose authorized agents we are; and inasmuch as it will be impossible for you to wait till it shall be possible for your country to redeem its plighted faith, we have ordained by law that these notes, at their face value, shall be a legal tender in payment of whatever debts you have contracted or may contract hereafter." The notes thus forced into circulation (by a sort of military necessity) were a substitute for money, and were called money—just as a check on some good bank is called money, if the man who signs it has an ample deposit there. In that sense they are money, and in that sense only. I am not aware that anybody, as yet, has been so silly or so audacious in the abuse of language, as to call them coin. Money, properly so called, whether gold or silver, has value of its own, just as a yard-stick has length; and therefore it can be used to measure the value of other things in the market, just as a yard-stick is used to measure the length of a piece of cloth. The greenback, like a bank-note or a check, has no value save as it stands for something valuable. It represents, not the value of the paper which was consumed in printing it, but the value of something else. It represents the value of a certain debt due to the holder from the Treasury of the United States—a debt which has been due confessedly, ever since that greenback note was issued. The note which represents a debt of $10 from the United States to the holder—a debt due years and years ago—is worth to-day $9 95; and such is the present value of that debt. Experience through all these years has shown that in proportion as the prospect of payment brightens and draws near, the price of the paper representing the debt becomes more and more valuable. The prospect now is that the debt will be paid (as payable) in less than eighteen months. In proportion as that prospect shall be obscured by the demagogues who are agitating for a postponement of the resumption, the value of the debt, and of the paper which represents it, will be lessened.

Is the world, then, so badly constituted by its Creator—is the world so unwisely managed by the providence of God, that we as a nation must not pay our debts lest we do some great mischief by so simple an act of honesty? Shall we believe that the foundations will be destroyed, and all things will be out of course, if sometime within the next eighteen months the formally authenticated promise of the United States to pay $10 to the bearer shall be worth exactly $10 in gold, instead of passing, as it now does, at a discount of 5 per cent?

Just this, and nothing else, is proposed by the Act of Congress which ignorant politicians (ignorant of the people's common sense, and of the people's moral sense) are promising to repeal. On the first day of January, 1879—unless the Act shall be, in the mean time, repealed over the veto of "His Honesty" the President—the United States will begin to pay on demand that portion of the National debt which is represented by the greenback notes; and then, and thenceforward, every such note will be of equal value with the gold which it promises. What is there in this to be afraid of? What dreadful thing will happen if these circulating evidences of debt (every one representing value received) cease to be dishonored, as they now are by passing at less than their nominal value?

Professing once more my incompetence to determine whether there will be a rapid contraction of the currency, I cannot refrain from asking what it is that will cause the expected distress. The greenback notes will not have lost their legal-tender quality; they will only have become as good as gold. Nobody will rush to exchange them for gold; because, for all ordinary uses, they are more convenient than the gold for which they can be exchanged. At the same time the "National currency," issued by the National Banks, secured by the bonds of the United States, and payable in greenbacks, will continue to be "receivable at par in all parts of the United States, in payment of all taxes and excises, and all other dues to the United States, except duties on imports," and will therefore continue to be, as now, the "National currency." Mainly, the difference will be this: "The Government will no longer meet its current expenses by giving its own notes payable sometime between now and never. Every treasury note coming into the Treasury will remain there, or be cancelled. For the payment of all salaries and other debts and demands owing by the United States to individuals, corporations and associations within the United States," the notes of the National Banks will continue to be "receivable at par," and being so received will circulate through all the channels of trade as equal in value with greenbacks, and therefore equal in value with gold.

We are told that, if the nation shall begin to pay its notes, there will be a contraction of the currency; and we are expected to believe that therefore the Government must continue to force its promises into circulation, and carefully abstain from paying what it promises to pay. I answer: Let those who profess to understand the mysteries of currency say what they will, we common folks, who know only common things, such as the difference between paying and promising, between truth and falsehood in the transaction of business, and between honesty and dishonesty in dealing with one's creditors; we, who hold that simple honesty is, in the long run, a wiser policy for nations as well as for individuals than any scheme the wit of man can devise for getting rid of debts without paying them; we common folks, who have only common sense and moral sense, may comfort one another with the assurance that, whatever contraction of the currency may ensue upon the Government's beginning to pay its long dishonored notes, will be not harmful, but salutary. Anybody who remembers having had the measles, can remember the terrible itching which accompanied his recovery; but he must have been an extraordinary fool if, even in his childhood, he would have preferred the perpetuation of the disease to the discomfort inseparable from getting well.

But is there not, after all, something of absurdity in a demand that the Government shall continue to reissue its own discredited notes for the sake of supplying the people with an expanded currency? I hold a greenback note, the indubitable evidence that the Government owes me ten dollars. An act of Congress has assured me that if, at any time after January 1, 1879, I present that note for payment, I shall receive a gold eagle in exchange for it. But the Democratic Party in Ohio, and loose-jointed Republican politicians there and elsewhere, interpose their veto. "No! No!" they cry in chorus, "the nation must continue to dishonor its own promises; the Government must not, even eighteen months hence, pay that confessed debt of ten dollars, for the payment of such debts will contract the currency." The currency, forsooth! Is the continued expansion of the currency more sacred than the public faith, more important than the honor of the United States, more politic than honesty? Is it the first duty of the Government to accommodate stock-jobbers and speculators with an expanded currency? Look into the Constitution of the United States. Is it there provided or conceded that contraction and expansion of the currency shall be among the functions of the Federal Government?

The power conferred on Congress by the States is defined in the Constitution, the great charter which is to the National Government just what the charter of a city is to its municipal government. Is it made the duty of Congress to supply the people with a paper currency? Let us see. (Art. 1, Sec. 8):

"The Congress shall have power . . . *to pay the debts of the United States*," and to that end the power of raising money by taxation, direct and indirect, is granted. Congress has power to pay and to make all needful provision for payment; nor is that power limited anywhere, by imposing on Congress the duty or by granting it the power of expanding the currency. The power to pay is one thing. The right or supposed duty of withholding payment for the sake of keeping up an inflated paper currency is a very different thing.

"The Congress shall have power . . *to borrow money on the credit of the United States*." Every one of these notes, like every bond, has been issued by virtue of that grant of power. The power to borrow on the credit of the United States is the duty of maintaining the credit of the United States by honest payment of every borrowed dime, whether the loan was voluntary, as in the case of the bonds, or forced, as in the case of the notes. Every note is at once a confession of debt and an explicit promise of payment. "THE UNITED STATES WILL PAY" is the promise. But the Democratic party of Ohio cries out in full Convention: "Don't pay! For mercy's sake—for the currency's sake, don't pay!" Flexible politicians of the other party respond, "Amen."

What more, that may seem to have some relation to this matter, does the Constitution tell us? Just this: "The Congress shall have power . . . to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures." The power to coin money which shall measure values is one attribute of sovereignty, and the Constitution transfers that power from the several States to the United States. But does this grant of power impose upon Congress the duty of flooding the channels of trade with currency? We all know that coined money is "hard money," and that "currency" has a more comprehensive signification, including with money properly so called all circulating representatives of money. What word is there in the Constitution which binds Congress to the duty, or confers on Congress the power of meddling with the currency, to expand it or to keep it expanded? Where is the word which tells us that Congress shall keep the people well supplied with irredeemable bills of credit?

In the golden days of Andrew Jackson "Hard Money" was the war-cry of the Democratic party; and the idea that bank-notes, issued by a National Bank, and redeemable in coin at the pleasure of every holder, were as good as gold and silver for currency, was a doctrine of the now forgotten Whigs. I believe that the Democratic party of to-day swears by the name of Jackson; but how would "Old Hickory" have sworn at the thought of a Democratic party protesting against specie and clamorous for soft money?

It is not to Andrew Jackson, but to Shakespeare's Ancient Pistol, that we owe the motto: "Base is the slave that pays." The old Jackson party seems to have degenerated into an Ancient Pistol party.

LEONARD BAC