DEMOCRATIC IMPERILMENT.

Continued from First Page.

sons for doubting that have in the course of the past year been expressed in private by many of the wisest men in the Democratic party.

II.

First of all, and invariably the first to be mentioned by men who talk about this matter, is the fact that neither the party nor any of its leading men know anything at all about Mr. Cleveland's capacity, purposes, or intellectual qualifications. It has been one of the most common observations and subjects for comment that the party should have nominated a man of whom they knew nothing except that he had been elected Governor of New York by an abnormal majority, and was the favorite of some men who but a month before his nomination attended the Republican Convention. A distinguished Democratic Senator said, just before the election: "For myself, I have not yet got over my surprise, my amazement, when I think what we did—why we have gone into this blindfolded. We have deserted from Democratic traditions and have gone into the lottery business. Mr. Cleveland may prove a splendid prize, if we elect him, and he may prove the blank that will ruin us. We have staked everything on the chance that he will prove to be the man we want, but it looks to me like tempting Providence to run such risks. I have tried hard, but have yet to find the first man who can give me anything near a good second-hand impression about our candidate."

It did not fail to cause a great deal of comment, that with a few exceptions every Democratic leader who called upon Mr. Cleveland while the canvass was pending went in absolute personal ignorance of the character of man he would meet, and came away with no well defined opinion about him except a vaguely favorable impression that was generally based on Mr. Cleveland's genial manners. Since the election it has been observed that but little more is known. Whether he has thorough knowledge or conception of the great questions of the day, or a superficial acquaintance with them that will not be sufficient to enable him intelligently to act upon them, is something that many who have visited him have tried to learn and have confessed their failure to do so. The opinion is not infrequently expressed by Democratic leaders that they fear Mr. Cleveland has but slight conception of the responsibilities he has to assume, and of the great difficulties of party leadership that are before him. Many Democrats are inclined to believe the best of him, because of the fact that the party are beginning to entertain great hopes that he will indeed be the party's Moses. Yet, after all, it is pointed out over and over again that hope is not conviction, and implies uncertainty. In a recent gathering of Democrats Mr. Cleveland was likened to Lincoln in respect to the comparative lack of prominence in their respective party ranks at the time of their nomination, but it was at once argued by an astute Democrat that such a comparison was unfair to Lincoln and unjust to Cleveland—unfair to Lincoln, because he had demonstrated his intellectual capacity by his wonderful debate with Douglas and his peerless presentation of the slavery and disunion issue in a Cooper Institute speech; unjust to Cleveland, because he has no such portentous and stupendous national crisis to grapple with on the threshold of his Administration as Lincoln had.

It does not engage notice either that the eminent men who visit Mr. Cleveland speak of their impressions as though there was more or less mental reservation. Mr. Bayard says that he was favorably impressed by Mr. Cleveland's manner; Mr. Hendricks thinks he will meet all the requirements of his high station; Mr. Bissell formed a favorable opinion of him; Mr. Voorhees is disposed to regard him as a man of nerve; Mr. Vilas is more and more convinced that the party has made a fortunate selection; Mr. McLean believes that he will make an admirable President; Mr. Pendleton that he is a frank, candid gentleman and a right good fellow, and so on. Old politicians, while gladly receiving these favorable opinions, do not forget that if Mr. Bayard, Mr. Thurman, Mr. Randall, Mr. Hendricks, or Mr. McDonald had been elected, nobody would have thought of asking any one what his opinion was of the capacity or character of any of these men. The very fact that every Democrat of consequence who visits Mr. Cleveland is beset with questions about his impressions of him indicates that the party has a President of whom it has only the vaguest ideas, and it is this that makes Democrats who have longed for a Democratic opportunity afflicted with doubts now that the opportunity has come.

A waggish Democratic Senator said recently that it had occurred to him that the first step towards the relief of the remote party hoped to compass was to get acquainted with its chosen leader, as rural axiom is situation, he added, as any political organization ever found itself in.

In view of this unprecedented situation, that the men who have hoped for a Democratic victory simply as a means for reform do hesitate, with an undiscovered President, as one eminent Democrat recently termed Mr. Cleveland, is it not possible that we may find ourselves reasoning without our host, they frequently? It seems so.

Mr. Cleveland is in fashion that the duties of the President were in the nature of the executive work of a month ago very greatly puzzled and to some extent annoyed Democratic leaders. Many of them assert that he was unfortunate in the expression of his ideas, which was not that which his words conveyed; while others are not so sure that he did not mean precisely what he said. But the fact that no one can say positively what he really meant adds not a little to the perplexity to which the issue of the coming fight has given rise.

If the President-elect shows less precisely what Democrats on whom he ought to lean are saying about him, he would learn that they dare express nothing else now than the hope that he will be just the man the party needs; and yet it is generally suspected, and to confess their inability to predict whether his Administration will be successful or not.

III.

Another matter that has caused some anxious doubts is the difficulty of determining precisely what the party means by reform. Moreover, we do not overlook the very harmful personal antagonisms that have arisen between party chiefs who ought to be working in perfect harmony, and the tendency to radical differences in the party upon principles that are held to be of supreme importance.

One of the first of Democratic statesmen received an inquiry from a Republican who put on oath to tell the truth, he could not answer the question, What is the Democratic party? He could, he said, very easily tell what it was, and he could tell what it was not, but his answer would agree with that of Mr. Thurman, Horatio Seymour, and a dozen other Democrats and hosts of men of equal prominence, that other Democrats in Congress have stimulated with no little alarm that some of the younger men seem to have very vague ideas of what the democracy of Jefferson, Jackson, and Tilden was, and of what Democrats mean when they speak of the Jeffersonian democracy with the notes and legislation of many of the men who have spoken. What has often been said and denied of the Democratic doctrine about the tariff may be, it is said, for example, the subject of Democratic eloquence for years to come. Protection, free trade, and the subversion of the Republic have been the cries of Congressmen for years, and both houses of Congress have passed tariff revenue reform bills. Yet it is to be noted that within the past five or six years legislation has been urged by those very men, and, in the opinion of many, surely not to be resisted, if the party is to retain its strength in the party rectitude. The preservation of the rights has been a cardinal doctrine with the Democrats, and it made a plank in the other members of Congress rub their eyes in wonering and enthusiastic Democrats, who, in the Forty-first, passed the bill providing for the National Board of Health, the penal bill to protect the rights of the freedmen, and some of the proposed new appropriations for river and harbor improvement, especially on the Mississippi River. There are a good many Democrats in Congress, and from the South, who have refused to vote for the National Board of Health bill. Such men say that in principle it is a clear usurpation of the exclusive rights of the States. Yet many eminent Democrats, especially Southern Democrats, deny this, and there is with a little heat, Horatio Seymour, for example, replied to them, ask the man who says it, is it right?

Mr. Willis of Kentucky, as one of a Democratic Congression, never sat in Congress, has devoted many days and months to the preparation of a bill providing for national aid and, in a measure, supervision for public schools, the bill which Senator Blair has received by Southern States. He is enthusiastically supported by a good many men whose denunciations of Federal usurpations in the South occupy many pages in the *Record*. Yet his bill is bitterly condemned by other Democrats as certain and boldest as he, as a clear usurpation, so far as it goes, of an exclusive prerogative of the States. When the State of Georgia resolved by its Legislature that its representatives in Congress urge an appropriation of Federal money for the benefit of the schools of the State, it was decided a proof that the Federal Government should in no way interfere in the use or application of that money, the resolution caused a good deal of amusement until it was pointed out that Georgia was consistently Democratic in insisting upon her right as a State to do as she pleased, argument of her schools. Here the thinking Democrats find reason to fear that the party is not at all clear about its convictions. On the vital question to the party of opposition to Federal usurpation there appears a radical difference as to what Federal usurpation is. How fair can we insist on a party being as a party to be regarded until we know just what the party's conviction is? ask the thinking men.

Some of the schemes for the improvement of the Mississippi River have been, in the opinion of many Democrats, such glaring propositions that they have publicly said they would use all their power to defeat them; and yet the country has seen ardent Democrats, who claim to be second to none in their devotion to the vital principle of resistance to all Federal usurpation earnestly supporting these Mississippi River projects. This difference of opinion as to what is and what is not Federal usurpation, will, as wise observers fear, make it difficult to formulate any clear, well-defined policy which will be accepted all around as good Democratic doctrine. But, say they, if we cannot agree upon what the Democratic doctrine is, how can we institute the reforms in this regard for which we have so long professed our desire?

It has not failed to escape notice that while there are perfectly clear views as to what constitutes Federal usurpation when it is of a political nature, the minds of many Democrats become exceedingly misty when the expenditure of Federal money, which otherwise would have to be expended by States or not at all, seems to conflict with the Democratic States right's doctrine. Many Democrats have not failed to comment on this feature as a very dangerous one, because, they claim, it has already blunted the perception of a large portion of the party respecting the Democratic doctrine. Therefore it is that these men are doubtful about securing reform and a return to the careful practices of the early Democrats, because the party seems to be divided in opinion about the abuses of this nature that ought to be reformed.

There are, too, there are the personal animosities that are not concealed as well as the cumities that are hidden. No Democrat who takes into consideration the causes that may bring about an unsuccessful Administration fails to give this matter the importance it deserves. It has been a subject of very deep regret that differences should have arisen between some of the best men in the party, some of which have been carried to the point of pronounced personal enmity, while others have led at least to the suspension of cordial personal relations. Not a Democrat who knows anything about his party can be found who doesn't know of these animosities. Take the case of Mr. Randall. There are a number of prominent Democrats in Congress who refuse even to speak to him. Mr. Bayard has been made aware that he has great cause to estrange among some of the most influential Democrats. Mr. Thurman has encountered animosities that are a great sorrow to him. Mr. Pendleton has foes in the party who are bitter to the point of vindictiveness. Gen. Bragg, who made the memorable speech in support of Cleveland's nomination, is the object of the bitter hatred of a number of the Southern members of Congress. Mr. Morrison professes to be indifferent to the animosities that he knows to exist. If the truth had been told with blunt frankness last winter, the country would have known that there existed in the House of Representatives a degree of personal animosities, bitter, implacable, that at one time threatened to explode the party and make a split inevitable. There are many Democrats who fear that it will be impossible for Mr. Cleveland to gather about him a Cabinet in which these will not be some name which has obtained the hostility of men influential enough to seriously embarrass the Administration.

Badly honeycombed as the Republican party has been and is by the personal animosities of some of its leading men, there are not a few Democrats who fear that their own party is even in a worse plight, and that it will need only the opportunity of a Democratic Administration as palpably to develop that condition to the country as the Republican dissensions were developed in Garfield's few months of power. It is feared that the inevitable result that will follow any pre minence which Mr. Cleveland may give to some of these men will be the creation of factions that will imperil his Administration. Factions are already believed by many Democrats to exist in the party in Connecticut, New York, Indiana, and Ohio. Some of these are reported to be based simply on the animosities that have arisen because of personal jealousies, while others spring from differences as to the party policy on certain questions of principle. In Connecticut there is a poorly concealed line of division that separates the older and perhaps more aristocratic Democrats from the younger and less aristocratic party leaders. It is reported that if Mr. Cleveland selects a Connecticut Democrat for his Cabinet, and chooses from the Ingersolls, Hubbards, Burrs, Englishes, or from others who are regarded, or regard themselves, as the better element of the party, it will be the cause of sore, and, in the affected opinion of the Walters, Gallagers, Pankotts, Cotts, and others who represent the younger Democracy. The very distinct factions in Ohio, vulgarly known as the Mossbacks and Standard Oil factions, give no little concern to reflective Democrats. They greatly fear that whether Mr. Thurman or Hoadly, Pendleton or McLean, or any other prominent Ohio Democrat be called by Mr. Cleveland to his Administration, there will result serious factional disturbance that can hardly fail to overload the Administration.

Not is it wholly in connection with Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet appointments that the evil results of their personal animosities are apprehended. It is feared that they may prevent, or at least seriously obstruct, after the manner of all idleness, such efforts for wise legislation and the consummation of a prudent party policy as leading men are disposed to make. The Democratic party," said a long-headed old Democrat, "is or ought to be, the best political organization in the world, but there is a good deal of old Adam in it. I am sorry to say that there are many who can never forgive men in it who had rather see it fail in its purposes than successful at the hands of certain other prominent and able men. Embarrassing as Mr. Cleveland's task in other respects will be, he will find nothing more embarrassing and difficult to handle than this unfortunate and dangerous lack of perfect harmony among those who lead the party. He, and he alone, can overcome this danger; but to be able to do it will require very great qualities of mind and character. Mr. Tilden could have done it. Before him all animosities would have been put aside. Men would have laughed at their unworthy and childish passions if he was in the White House, because he would have compelled it. Courage and tact, wisdom and persuasiveness, patience and prudence, such as Mr. Tilden possesses to such a wonderful degree, are required to overcome this obstacle to a successful Administration. I think Mr. Cleveland will be astonished when he comes to learn the truth about the personal relations of some of the men to whom he will naturally look for aid. I suspect nobody has dared to tell him about the matter, but he will be long in discovering it after he comes to Washington. The very first thing he will have to do to prevent being swamped at the outset is to compel these men to put away their animosities. If he fails to appreciate this, then he has not the faintest conception of one of the greatest dangers he has got to meet."

It would be hard to find a prominent Democrat who has not heard just such ideas expressed. It is a matter of very deep concern with many Democrats. It is the subject of far more discussion than it is generally supposed, and is especially troublesome because it is one of the most delicate and difficult obstacles to overcome. The best comfort that earnest Democrats can now find is that Mr. Cleveland will prove himself strong enough to master it. But this comfort is qualified by the uncertainty that is implied in hope. This is one of the elements of doubt that arise when thinking Democrats ask whether Mr. Cleveland's Administration will be successful. Well-read Democrats recall the party difficulties that the administration between Polk and Buchanan had to encounter, and they find in the stories of the deplorable results of other personal enmities; the narrow escape from ruin to which those same causes brought the Republican party in the short Administration of Garfield; and if the certainty that for the time at least neither Mr. Blaine nor Mr. Cleveland would now be the President-elect—these considerations, in the opinion of many Democrats, justify them in looking forward to Mr. Cleveland's Administration with the gravest apprehension.

IV.

Another reason for the doubts that prevail is discovered by thinking Democrats in the difficulty of defining the true Democratic doctrine respecting the tariff, and the certainty that an attempt will be made to raise the tariff issue early in Mr. Cleveland's administration.

In considering the matter it always is first suggested that a very large number of Democrats insist that the tariff ought to be one of the prominent issues. Yet it is also recognized that many of the ablest Democrats deny the policy or the wisdom of making it *per se* a matter of vital party policy. Thus right on the threshold it is seen that an embarrassment arises. This involves not only the question of what the Democratic tariff doctrine ought to be, but the more complex one of whether the party ought to make the tariff a supreme party issue. It is always pointed out, in considering this matter, that many able and pure Democrats, of whom Mr. Randall is the representative, insist that the whole subject of taxation is one of paramount importance, that the large and powerful wing of the party, on the other hand, regard one incident of taxation, namely, the tariff, as the only issue that should receive serious party consideration. Mr. Randall, and those of whom he is a representative, favor a thorough reform in the whole policy of taxation as absolutely essential. Others, of whom Mr. Carlisle, Mr. Morrison, and Mr. Hurd are representatives, insist that the tariff alone is worthy of such action as the party should stand or fall by.

This difference of opinion causes great anxiety to Democrats who hope for a successful Administration. They fear that it may be that, at the very outset, the party will be found to be radically divided on the question of what ought to constitute one of its great issues.

Still further, they notice that Mr. Randall insists that the real Democratic doctrine is hostile to all internal, inquisitorial, personal taxation, except when justified by such extreme necessity as war. On the other hand, Mr. Carlisle, and those whom he represents, insist that the true Democratic policy of to-day—whatever it may have been in the past—represents a radical tariff revision, with a view to greatly reduced rates, looking ultimately toward great freedom in foreign trade. Mr. Morrison and Mr. Hurd are believed to favor the extremest policy in this regard, and, at the bottom, though more modest in stating his ideas, Mr. Carlisle agrees with them.

In this complication Democrats confess to each other that they see entanglements from which only the wisest statesmanship can extricate the party, and there are many who despairingly confess that the outlook for them offers not much but the fear that this difference of view is radical, and must lead to permanent and therefore ruinous party divisions. They note that the difference of view is based on the deepest convictions. What then, they ask, does this portend for a successful party Administration? So great is the concern about this that not a few low tariff Democrats are now to be found who are seriously hesitating about the wisdom of attempting to commit the party to any live-or-die policy on this subject. It is recalled that last winter an attempt was made to commit the party to a radical low tariff policy. It is known that Mr. Morrison, Mr. Carlisle, and Mr. Hurd went so far as to insist that their policy of revenue reform was the one most vitally necessary; that strong were even so far as to threaten to drive out of the Democratic party all who did not assent to this view; that Mr. Morrison and Mr. Hurd and some others were credited with the expression of the desire that all Democrats who did not adopt their view of what was the true Democratic doctrine in this regard should quit the party; that nothing but a compromise prevented the hurling of this issue upon the Democratic National Convention, where it would have been certain to prove a disastrous if not absolutely disorganizing cause of contention; and that the platforms of the Democratic party in the different States reveal the vital disagreement that prevails on this subject. There is no disposition to slight this important element of doubt.

Not long ago a leading Democrat from one of the Eastern States said in the presence of other Democrats that the possibility of trouble from this source had been very greatly exaggerated. "What," was the instant reply of another, "what folly to shut our eyes to what has already happened. Was it exaggerated when it was made the sole issue on which the election of a Speaker hinged; when it nearly rent the party during the late session of Congress; when, by the greatest good fortune, that required the work of as able a body of Democrats as could be got together, it was kept out of the Chicago Convention; when, during the late campaign it was the only Democratic gospel preached on the stump in many parts of the Union; when it is certain that Mr. Cleveland could never have received the nomination had it not been believed by the revenue reformers that he was committed to their views? What, in view of these circumstances, can be said that will too strongly present the danger this matter will offer to our party when it comes into power?"

So it is seen that here the Democrats, who long for a successful Administration, find reasons for entertaining the most serious doubts. They find a question of a party divided within itself upon a question that a very large number consider vital, so vital that in the late session of Congress it overshadowed everything else. Meanwhile these men turn their eyes with some degree of hope toward the man who will be President, and in this resource find their only comfort now.

V.

Again, in discussing the question of the probability of a successful Administration, not a few leading men have been compelled to meet the doubt that arises about the extent to which the party can be relied upon to support such a policy of rigid economy and retrenchment as it has so long professed its desire to inaugurate and execute. That this is real Democratic doctrine, and that it has been most persistently preached, is beyond question. The time has now come when the party will be called upon to practise.

"There is no doubt," was the remark of an able Democrat, "that every member of our party believes himself heartily in favor of just such a policy of rigid economy and retrenchment as Mr. Randall and Mr. Holman have so long done their best to secure, even from Republicans. But when we look back at history a little, there are to be found some reasons for believing that vague ideas more or less prevail about the subject. This view is shared by Mr. Randall and Mr. Holman and by many others. It is largely due to the fact that Mr. Randall, when Speaker, practised, so far as he could, what he had preached, that he has incurred the strong animosities in his party that are known to exist. Mr. Holman, too, has escaped hostility from party associates, because he has known no party in his efforts to secure economy and perfect integrity in all legislation. These points have not escaped the notice of men who are thinking about the obstacles that are in the way of a successful Administration. The subject was incidentally broached by a distinguished Democrat at an informal gathering last October. The company had been talking about the proper party policy in case of success at the polls. Of course, economy and retrenchment were suggested.

Are we so sure that the party as a whole is in fact in favor of that policy?" asked this Democrat. His question surprised his hearers. That there could be any doubt upon this point had occurred to none of them. He then recalled some facts, showing, for example, three lavish expenditures of money of recent years. These were the appropriations for rivers and harbors, the appropriations for public buildings, and the pensions compiled and pressed for the Mississippi River. It was called to mind that one of these colossal appropriations of eighteen million dollars for the classified improvement of the rivers and harbors was under discussion, that all party lines seemed to have been abandoned. Democrats vied with Republicans in their zeal for the passage of this bill. Though an attack was made on it, then by them, that lasted for two days, and which prevented, beyond question, the enormous extravagance of the bill, yet this attack was made by a Republican, who stood almost alone, being supported by a handful of members, not more than half of whom were Democrats. After the bill was vetoed by the President, Republicans and Democrats labored with the zeal of common partisans, in both branches of Congress, to secure the passage of the bill over the veto.

"Do you remember," said the gentleman who was calling this fact to mind, turning to a Senator, "what Senator Thurman said in his last speech he made in the Senate, how he pleaded with Democrats to abandon the support of the monstrous river and harbor bills, because that support was in violation of all the traditions of the Democratic party, and because it would be the party's fault to charge of demagoguery and inconsistency when it attacked the Republicans for extravagance?" It was suggested that with the exception of Mr. Holman, Mr. Randall, and a few other Democrats, not only no protest had been heard against the party's lavish expenditures, but it had always found the most earnest support in the Democratic party.

It was next called to mind that the log-rolling practices, by which the enormous expenditures for public buildings were appropriated, were not confined to any party. It was admitted that, though Mr. Holman almost alone fought these appropriations with all his power, yet it was a Democratic Senator who rushed through without debate, and in an hour's time, bills appropriating several million dollars for some fifty public buildings.

It was also suggested that the most powerful and urgent appeals for colossal appropriations for the improvement of the Mississippi River came from Democrats, though many of the plans for which these large sums of money were asked were purely Republican schemes. Even now, it was said, the problem of improving that river is beyond the power of engineers to solve, and schemes ranging from the lighthouse and snagboat plan to the conception of making a colossal walled canal out of the channel are proposed, and very near to the consideration of Congress. Yet, in spite of the fact that no agreed plan of the best method of overcoming the ravages of nature has been made the basis of a demand for an appropriation, yet Congress is asked yearly to appropriate millions; and this demand is urged as much by Democrats as by Republicans.

In view of these circumstances it happens that the thinking Democrats cannot relieve themselves of some doubt about the hearty party support that will be accorded to the rigid policy of economy and retrenchment which is held to be cardinal democratic doctrine.

Are there not, then, on this account fair reasons for entertaining some measure of doubt respecting the success of the incoming Administration? is again asked by Democrats of one another.

VI.

Many Democrats have expressed their doubt, too, about the extent to which party support can be relied upon for reforms of certain abuses of the Republican Administration, such, for instance, as the public land frauds. That this arises from the fact that all attempts thus far to correct these abuses have received no appreciable support from the Democrats. Mr. Holman, than whom no other public man is better informed as regards the abuses of the public land trusts, has labored time and again to get the ear of Congress that he might do something to correct them. His appeals have been in vain, and he has found almost as much disposition to aid him on the Republican side of the House as on the other side. Mr. Hoadly and Mr. Cobb, it is true, trust that all that will be needed to institute the sweeping reforms that they believe to be imperative, will be to acquaint the party with the facts and to suggest the remedy. These gentlemen regard this reform as one of the most important that the party has at hand. The Chicago Convention committed the party to it, and it afforded the opportunity for powerful arraignment of the Republican party during the late canvass; yet Democratic leaders have expressed more or less uncertainty about the support which the party will give to efforts to effectuate it. Therefore another of the doubts respecting the success of the Administration of Mr. Cleveland has arisen in the minds of Democrats who are thinking about this matter.

VII.

While what is called civil-service reform—meaning thereby the letter and spirit of the Pendleton-Eaton law—is regarded by the ablest Democratic leaders as far less likely to affect the success of Mr. Cleveland's Administration than some of the other influences that are now so carefully considered, still it is admitted that the President himself may make it the cause of very serious embarrassment, if not of very great danger. Democratic leaders confess that while appointments and removals of officers will of necessity occupy a large part of the time of the President on his accession to office, the civil service by no means deserves that all-absorbing attention that some of Mr. Cleveland's supporters seem to think necessary. Mr. Thurman, who was once asked his opinion about the civil service reform, said that "while important, it could not be made a life or death measure for any party." Jefferson taught the Democratic party and his Democratic successors in the White House all that needs to be learned or carried out in this regard. Jefferson's idea was, on assuming his administration, that removals should be gradual, and at first "bottomed on some malversation or inherent disqualification." He believed, however, that attorneys and marshals of the party opposed to his election should be removed; and it was his idea to depend at first "for a just participation in the offices for his party largely on deaths, resignations, and delinquencies." But Jefferson, in speaking of this matter to his Attorney-General, asserted "that we should betray the cause committed to the care of our party were we in any permit the influence of official patronage to be used to overthrow that cause."

This, Judge Thurman suggested, went to the pith of the matter. If the administration of the Government is committed to the Democratic party, it is intended that it shall be conducted by Democrats, else the party cannot justly be held to account. This involves the removal of Republicans and appointment of Democrats, and this is believed by leading Democrats to be not only good democratic doctrine, but sound, inevitable policy, in a country governed by party. They believe that Mr. Cleveland and his party will stand or fall according to the fitness of his appointments, and not because he removes Republicans and appoints Democrats. It has not escaped notice that there is no genuine far-reaching faith in the incident known as the Eaton Civil Service law, or concern about it. Democrats assert that, if the party meets its great opportunities in other respects, it will make but little difference whether the Eaton law survives or becomes a dead letter. The spirit of it, appointment for fitness, needs no law, they say. If appointments are not made in that spirit, the party will pay the penalty.

Democrats deny that the party is committed to the Civil Service law because Mr. Pendleton was its sponsor in the Senate and Mr. Cox put it through the House under suspension of the rules in the wink of an eye. Democratic leaders know that Mr. Eaton begged a number of members to introduce the bill before he found an accomodating one in Mr. Pendleton, and that it was in response to a Republican taunt and in a spirit of bravado that the measure was rushed through the House. They realize, therefore, that there was no general, imperious public demand for such a law. They know, too, that Mr. Pendleton's course cost him his seat in the Senate; that in some parts of the country Democrats regard their representatives in Congress as having acted like those who lose their wits thus to pass a law that perpetuates in office the great body of Republican officeholders.

What concerns the Democratic leaders mostly in connection with this subject is the fear that Mr. Cleveland will be influenced by a body of men who contributed to his election, but who have no intention of affiliating with the Democratic party. They are apprehensive that Mr. Cleveland will go to the extreme length that the most strict civil service reformer urges. There, they fear, will be the danger; for if they are inclined to believe, if he should do so, he will find himself in a very few months supported only by the remnant of a disorganized party. This, they say, may be deplorable, may be wrong, but they fear it will be the truth. Mr. Cleveland may thereupon build up another party, but it would be done on the ruins of the party that elected him. There would therefore result a wretched failure for the Democratic party; and so it is that Democrats find themselves hoping that Mr. Cleveland will not imperil the success of the incoming Democratic Administration by listening to the demands of Civil Service reformers, and ignoring the suggestions of the wise and prudent leaders who know his party better than he is believed to know it.

VIII.

Thus the influence of the Independent Republicans in respect to the civil service policy of Mr. Cleveland causes men to express additional doubts about the success of his Administration. For it is felt that if those men are to exercise any special influence with the President, the result will inevitably be to alienate from him able Democrats, who have been leaders in the party for many years. There exists much greater apprehension on this point than is generally suspected. It is hoped that the President will give his ear only to the party which elected him, but there are many Democrats who would be glad if they could be assured thereof.

For these reasons, and perhaps others less generally the subject of conversation among Democrats, it happens that very many of them are looking forward to the incoming Administration with hope rather than conviction, with apprehension rather than confidence, and with doubts that cause them the gravest anxiety.

Wanted—Females.

A.—LADIES' UNDERGARMENTS.
EXPERIENCED HANDS ONLY.
STEAM POWER. STEADY WORK.
DANZIG & COHEN, 113 FIFTH
110 AND 112 GREENE ST.

ARTIFICIAL FLOWERS.—Good wages, steady work; feather and flower makers; experienced hands only. MARX HELD & CO., 690 and 692 Broadway.

A.—YOUNG misses to learn to make ladies' underwear wanted. Apply at manufacturing department of H. B. MAHY & CO., entrance on 13th st.

A LADY wanted as housekeeper in boarding house; a lady with hands her business. Call after 12 o'clock at 7 Bleecker st.

BONNAZ.—Experienced operators wanted; clean paper; steady work. KURSHEEDT, 1918 5th ave.

EXPERIENCED.—Hands wanted on ladies' undergarments; none but experienced need apply.
H. COHEN, 25 Howard st.

EXPERIENCED binder on Willcox & Gibbs machine. I. BERNSTEIN & AUGUST, 304 Broadway.

EXPERIENCED bow and scarf hands. Apply all week.
MARCUS & HIRSCH, 457 Broadway.

HANDS wanted on bead work.
H. L. OPPER, 100 Mercer st.

OPERATORS WANTED on men's flannel shirts and white dress shirts; no work given out. JAS. A. LEE & CO., 434 Broome st., entrance on Mercer st. Take elevator.

SCARFS.—Ladies wanted to learn gentlemen's bows and scarfs. 32 Renwick st., near Hudson st.

WANTED—First class dressmakers who can operate and finish; also good hands on sample suits, and good, smart girl who can operate. Apply at 350 Canal st.

WANTED—Experienced hands on braiding and buttonhole machines.
INDUSTRIAL M'F'G CO., 105 South 5th av.

WANTED—Two young ladies measuring 36 bust to try on cloaks; those having experience preferred.
SELIGMAN & CO., 184 and 186 Church st.

WANTED—Good woman for general housework; references; good wages. Call after 12 o'clock at 7 Bleecker st.

WANTED—Good operators on infants' coats and cloaks. JULIA BUSCH, 12 Wooster st.

WANTED—A young girl as waitress. Apply between 9 and 10 o'clock at 235 Grand st.

YOUNG GIRLS can obtain situations free, lodging and meals at 8 cents each, at the Girls' Lodging House, 52 St. Marks place, one block east of Cooper Institute. Open day and evening.

Wanted—Males.

A YOUNG MAN that understands bookkeeping and as shipping clerk, to attend to work; $7 per week. WORK, box 151, Sun office.

A.—WANTED—Imperial Hotel, 153 Chatham st., to let for single or entire beds, 25c. a night; $1.25 weekly; new and first class; all heated by hot air.

A CANDY MAKER. Apply to
SNYDER & CO., 43 Ann st.

A GOOD cutter wanted in EHRICH'S brass foundry, 109 Rivington st.

A GOOD job paper ruler and a good job pedder. 7 Laight st.

BOOKBINDERS.—A steady man to take charge of a sheet room in a bookbindery; a steady man will find steady employment. THOS. KELLY, 368 Broome st.

BANK BOOK binders wanted. JOHN SAWYER & SONS, 9 and 11 Thames st., corner New Church.

COMPOSITORS.—Two thirdsmen on reprint copy; steady work; commence Friday morning.
WM. C. GUNN & CO., box 186, Sun office.

EXPERIENCED cutter on boys' shirt waists.
WHITEHOUSE & BLAIN, 327 Canal st.

GOOD bricklayers wanted. 70th st., east Madison av.

REELERS on straw braids in ladies' hat factory.
JOS. SCHULTZ, 119 Mercer st.

TO BUTCHERS.—Wanted, young man for the above business; one who understands pork. 2 300 Third av.

TINSMITH wanted, good jobber. 330 Hudson st., corner of Charlton st.

WANTED—Immediately, 5 more young gentlemen and 2 more young ladies to learn telegraphy; we are placing more calls for operators than we can possibly fill; salaries range from $25 to $125 per month; now is the time to learn; every graduate obtains a situation. Call or address, with stamp, Metropolitan Telegraph Institute, 232 Pearl st., 4th floor, opposite City Hall Park.

WANTED—A young man to engrave coffin plates for a wholesale undertakers' goods establishment in New York state; may be allowed store space for production of other work in his line for his own benefit. Apply, with reference, care P. O. box 1,473, New York city.

WANTED—A good foreman horseshoer; steady man; no other need apply; steady work if suited. Address E. T. HUMPHREYS, 101 Shore Road, Port Richmond, S. I.

WANTED—A dry miller to grind dry paints; steady employment to a good man.
S. A. WOOLSEY, 185 Hudson st., Jersey City.

WANTED—Bright boy in wholesale suit house to learn the business; salary $150 first year. Address, with name, SUITS, box 172, Sun office.

WANTED—A first-class mechanical draughtsman accustomed to general work. Address with references, A., box 186, Sun office.

WANTED—Four or five first class non-union bench moulders accustomed to light malleable work. Address EDWIN VERITY, Secretary, Troy, N. Y.

WANTED—First-class label engraver. Address, with full particulars, the RUSSELL & MORGAN PRINTING CO., Cincinnati, O.

WANTED—Experienced salesmen for the preserved fruit and jelly business who can drive. 227 East Twentieth st.

WANTED—Two good roofers at 1,455 3d av.
FRED. BRANDT.

WANTED—An engineer to run a Baxter engine. Apply to C. SELIGMANN, 92 Walker st., up stairs.

WANTED—A metal spinner accustomed to lamp work. Apply at 240 Plymouth st., Brooklyn.

WANTED—An assistant shirt cutter; $9 per week. 113 Greene st., top floor.

WANTED—Horseshoers; one or two good doormen. 23 West 43d st.

YOUTH wanted in a wholesale house; must be good writer and correct at figures. Address
G., box 76, Station A.

Amusements.

METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE.
Dr. L. DAMROSCH.....Director of the Opera

FRIDAY, JAN. 9.	NASANIELLO. MASANIELLO, HERR ANTON SCHOTT
SATURDAY, JAN. 10, 8TH GRAND MATINEE.	LES HUGUENOTS. Joint appearance of FRAU MATERNA, FRAU SCHROEDER-HANFSTAENGL, and HERR ANTON SCHOTT.
MONDAY, JAN. 12.	Last appearance but two of FRAU SCHROEDER-HANFSTAENGL. LES HUGUENOTS.
WEDNESDAY JAN. 14.	Last appearance but one of FRAU SCHROEDER-HANFSTAENGL, DER PROPHET. FRAU SCHROEDER-HANFSTAENGL, FRL. BRANDT, and HERR A. SCHOTT.
THURSDAY, JAN. 15. GRAND EXTRA Performance.	LOHENGRIN. HERR A. SCHOTT, FRL. M. BRANDT, and FRL. A. KRAUS.
FRIDAY JAN. 16.	Farewell appearance of FRAU SCHROEDER-HANFSTAENGL, LA JUIVE. FRAU SCHROEDER-HANFSTAENGL, FRL. BRANDT, and HERR A. SCHOTT.

To-day, Thursday, Jan. 8—A SPECIAL MATINEE at 1, FOR THE ACTORS' FUND, in which Wallack's Theatre Company, Union Square Theatre Company, Madison Square Theatre Company, and Daly's Theatre Company will appear.
*** Sale of seats now progressing at Daly's Theatre.

HARRIGAN & HART
NEW PARK THEATRE,
Broadway, corner 35th st.
MONDAY EVENING, Jan. 5,
Mr. EDWARD HARRIGAN'S
New Local Comedy,
McALLISTER'S LEGACY.
Five new songs by Mr. DAVE BRAHAM.
MATINEES TUESDAY AND FRIDAY.

NIBLO'S GARDEN.
POOLE & GILMORE, Proprietors and Managers.
Reserved Seats (Orchestra Circle and Balcony), 50 cents.
FOR ONE WEEK ONLY.
The famous Wallack's Theatre success,
LADY CLARE.
Misses Harriet Jay, Cora Tanner, Louise Dillon; Messrs. Pitt, Arnott, Greenwood, Mackey, etc.
MATINEES WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY.
Next Week—HARRISON and GOURLAY. SKIPPED.

UNION SQUARE THEATRE.
SHOOK & VOLLMER.....Proprietors
Every evening at 8. Saturday matinee at 2.
Enormous Success. Standing Room only.
THREE WIVES TO ONE HUSBAND,
the funniest of all farce comedies,
preceded by the exquisite little drama,
ONE TOUCH OF NATURE.

TO-NIGHT.
TO-NIGHT.
BAL MASQUE, OR L'OPERA
and
CARNIVAL
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN.
TO-NIGHT.
TO-NIGHT.
Procession will start precisely at 11 P. M.

14TH ST. THEATRE. Corner 6th av.
Sunday evening, Jan. 11, Prof. CROMWELL will illustrate, to the delight of his audience,
PARIS and the LOUVRE.
Monday evening, Jan. 12—Return of the great drama,
THE WORLD AGAINST GOLD.
With AGNES BOOTH and Messrs. Maubury and Overton in the cast.

5TH AV. THEATRE. "WE, US & CO."
Fifty per cent. better than 'Tourists.'"—Journal.
THE TOWN'S LAUGH. SECOND WEEK.
One huge laugh from beginning to end.
W. A. MESTAYER, TERESA VAUGHN, and their Company of Comedians in their greatest success,
WE, US & CO. AT MODISTE'S.
TO-NIGHT AT 8. SATURDAY MATINEE AT 2.

CASINO. Broadway and 39th st.
Last week of Strauss's Most Successful Opera Comique, PRINCE METHUSALEM.
Second week of Audran's Opera Comique Company.
Farewell Souvenir Performance, Saturday, Jan. 10, Matinee and Evening. Admission, 50c.
Monday, Jan. 12, APAJUNE, by Carl Milleker.

PEOPLE'S THEATRE, Bowery, cor. Spring st.
HARRY MINER.....Sole Proprietor and Manager
THE DEVIL'S DISCIPLE.
Sunday, Jan. 11—GRAND SACRED CONCERT by GILMORE'S FULL BAND and CONCERT COMPANY.
MONDAY, JAN. 12—THE WILLIAMS and CAPT. MISHLER.

KUSTER & HIALT'S. ADMISSION, 25c.
VASSAR GIRLS' THE ONLY LION, Wee Sandman, Caron Brothers, Marcus Sisters, Pauline Harvey.
Sunday next—MARIE VANONI.
Monday next—Stockwell's Museum—THE SONS OF THE SOUDAN. THE BEDOUIN ARABS.

MADISON SQUARE THEATRE.—At 8:30.
Evenings at 8:30. Saturday Matinee at 2.
DO YOU KNOW..... THE FUNNIES?
THE PRIVATE SECRETARY. THE PRIVATE SECRETARY. COMEDIES.

STANDARD THEATRE, 1,283-1,287 Broadway.
Every evening at 8. Matinee