

THE WEEKLY FREE PRESS, 5 cents per copy, 30 cents for three months, \$1.00 for six months, \$2.00 a year, postage free. Advertisements and subscriptions received at the office, 150 College Street. Full advertising rates sent on application. Accounts cannot be opened for subscriptions. Subscribers will please remit with order, names are not entered until payment is received, and all papers are stopped at the end of the month paid for. Remittances at the risk of the subscriber unless made by registered letter, or by check or postal order payable to the Publishers. The date when the subscription expires is on the address-label of each paper, the change of which to a subsequent date becomes a receipt for remittance. No other receipt is sent unless requested. The receipt of the paper is a sufficient receipt for the first subscription. When a change of address is desired, both the old and new addresses should be given.

The Free Press.

BURLINGTON, FRIDAY, FEB. 26, 1886. PUBLISHED BY THE FREE PRESS ASSOCIATION, G. G. BENEDICT, Editor. Terms—\$2.00 a year, always in advance.

The United States Senate will doubtless be glad to learn the president's reasons for removing Mr. Garland.

Some of the late Gen. Hancock's expressions regarding our soldiers were fairly epigrammatic. "Grant, he said, was 'too big hearted' for pigmy critics to appreciate; Sherman was 'dogged' and 'unshakable and true'; Robert E. Lee, 'fought like an honest gentleman,' and Phil Sheridan was 'a whirlwind with spurs.'"

The hope that the Manchester, N. H., strikers would return to work on Monday on the opening of the gates of the Amoskeag mills on Monday, was not realized, though a sufficient number of them to run the mills on a moderate scale resumed their looms. It is pretty evident that the company has the advantage in the contest.

Statistics show that a very large proportion, stated even as high as 90 per cent, of the fires occurring in this country are due to incendiarism. It is an alarming state of things when anything like such a proportion of the destructive fires in the United States can be traced to criminal causes. More attention will have to be paid to the connection between insurance and arson.

Mr. Edmunds's report on the duty of the president not to withhold from the Senate the information it requires in the discharge of its duty in cases of appointments and removals is regarded as a very strong and able document. The Albany Journal voices the general verdict of the Republican Press when it says: "Both as a declaration of the abstract rights of Congress, and as an assertion of the principles of justice, Mr. Edmunds's report is unanswerable."

The American Steamship companies do not appear to be disturbed by Postmaster-General Vilas's attempt to compel them to carry the mails for nothing. They say that if his bill passes the House it cannot pass the Senate, and if it should pass the Senate it would be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Mr. Vilas has "put his foot into it," in this matter of carrying the foreign mails, and the sooner he backs out the better it will be for the administration of which he is a member.

Mr. W. S. Gilbert, the English author, who made such a fuss over a modest check sent him by the Harpers, gets a sharp hit from the Critic. The Critic says that before the right of free stealing from French pulp rights was abridged in England, Mr. Gilbert was among those who used it most unscrupulously. "It would be interesting," adds the Critic, "to know whether he ever paid M. Denery for the use of L'Escamoteur, M. Labiche for the use of Le Chapeau de Paille d'Italie, or MM. Mellicha and Haley for the use of Le Roi Candide and Le Reveillon. It would be interesting, too, to know what MM. Denery, Labiche, Mellicha and Haley would think of Mr. Gilbert's letter if they should happen to see it."

Collector Smalley informs us that while the collections in this district are increasing he does not need to increase the force except as to what are called "navigation men" at Wind Mill Point. The force in this district is, in his opinion, ample to do the work, except during the season of navigation, when two more deputies may be required. The reduction heretofore made in the force is, he says, not temporary except to this extent, and was not intended to take the district out of the civil service rule. It is only fair to Mr. Smalley to state these facts, and to say that we shall watch with interest his efforts to reduce the expenses of his district, that we shall welcome whatever he is able to accomplish in the way of genuine and permanent retrenchment and that we hope that his expectations in that direction will be fully realized.

The death of John B. Gough deprives the temperance cause of its most eloquent and successful speaker. The temperance cause, with him, was both gospel and life. His heart and soul were given up to its advocacy. No example of greater success as a public lecturer can be mentioned; yet, as a recent lecturer in this city said, John B. Gough was not the same man on the public platform when speaking on miscellaneous topics as when fired by his all-absorbing theme of temperance. When speaking on general topics he gave the impression of a man of fair intellectual power. When speaking on temperance he was a Demosthenes in eloquence and a St. Paul in earnestness and pathos.

The work of enforcing the Edmunds law in Utah goes on, and spurs not even the saintly leaders of the saints themselves. The Mormons are evidently seriously talking of moving out, bag and baggage. Their official organ, the Salt Lake Herald, says in a recent issue:

During the past month, very little has been said about the purchase by Mormons of the 600 miles square of territory in Australia; but all understand that the land has been bought and paid for and arrangements are being made for chartering a line of steamers to carry a few hundreds of thousands of Mormons and their goods and chattels to the sixth continent. We did not intend to give away the Honduras scheme but the newspapers are talking about it, and now the facts might

as well be made public. However, on second thought, perhaps it will be better to keep the matter quiet a little longer, until the details are all arranged, the money paid, and two or three hundred thousand souls are in full possession of their newly acquired republic.

The politicians may go to Australia and Honduras, but the better part of the Mormon people will stay at home, and when the rest are gone there will be a chance to erect a decent State in Utah.

One hundred and fifty-eight bills have been introduced in Congress, thus far, for the erection of government buildings. The total expenditure, should these bills pass, would foot up, it is said, \$20,000,000, a large part of which would be laid out in building expensive public structures in obscure southern villages. Dover, Del., for instance with only 1600 inhabitants, wants a \$40,000 public building, and Aberdeen, Miss., with 3404 inhabitants is to have a \$75,000 postoffice. A good deal of log-rolling is done to get these appropriations through—many congressmen voting for expenditures they cannot really approve, in order to get votes for appropriations in which they have special interest, and there is danger of a heavy and needless outlay of the public money, in this way.

Mr. Cleveland has evidently made a mistake in forcing an issue with the Senate, and attempting to change the established rules and usage of the government in regard to supplying official papers called for—and some of his long-headed supporters see it. The New York World says:

The professional reform journals can best explain for themselves why they should sustain the position that the Senate is not entitled to official papers on file in the departments. No reform can be effected behind a cover. If our president acts in the premises on the best of information which he keeps to himself, he paves the way for his successor to make removals for the worst of reasons which he can keep to himself.

The New York Sun says: Whatever information is contained in the public papers of any department ought freely to be disclosed to the Senate. If such a course had been adopted, there would have been no controversy as to many of the matters discussed in the report which has just been made by Mr. Edmunds in behalf of the Republican majority of the Judiciary committee.

According to our view, the position of the administration in regard to the removals for the worst of reasons is needlessly weakened by the refusal to send to the Senate the papers for which that body has asked.

The true policy would be to let the Senators see all there is and let them make the most of it.

While organizations of working men grow more extensive and more despotic every year, it must be admitted that the strike is on the whole losing its efficiency as a means of raising wages. No trades-union can compel employers to keep their mills open, after their business ceases to be profitable; or after it comes to be accompanied with so much friction from the demands of employes, as to be an annoyance instead of a satisfaction. While occasionally manufacturers give in to the demands of their employes without standing out, in the majority of cases they can better afford a cessation of their business than can their workmen. It seems to be the verdict of experience that as a rule the strike does not pay. And whatever is accomplished by this means might be accomplished as well by boards of arbitration, without the disadvantages accruing to both parties from compulsory stoppage of business. The trouble is that the workmen in many places are too much under the influence of labor-agitators, socialists, and demagogues whose real object is not so much the amelioration of the laboring man's condition as their own personal advantage and profit. If the workmen would turn a deaf ear to these; let trades unions and Knights of Labor alone, and resort to boards of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between them and their employers it would be vastly better for all concerned.

A justice of the Supreme Court is quoted as saying: "Speaking of the issue between the president and the Senate, I am confident the Senate has the right to call for all the official papers on file in the departments, and that the president has no right to withhold them. These papers are matters of public record. They contain information which the public should have the right to know, through its authorized agents. I do not think the president will be sustained in his refusal to send the papers. Of course I agree with the president that private papers and suggestions relating to appointments should not go to the Senate. But neither should they go on the records in the departments." "The mistake of the president has been the method of making the appointments. If he had removed officers simply because they were Republicans to give way for Democrats, there could have been no possible reflection on the men removed, and there would have been no question about the confirmation of the appointments. Under existing circumstances, where a man is suspected of no reasons are given he goes out with a certain reflection upon his character, because the administration has started out with the policy that only unfit men shall be removed. I think Mr. Edmunds has the law and the right on his side in insisting that the Senate should see the official papers. I think in the same way that the House has the right to call for papers from the departments whenever there is anything in the records which they deem necessary for the information of members upon legislative subjects."

Gambling in the Necessaries of Life

The extent to which gambling—or speculation, if the less objectionable term should be used—is now carried, in the necessities of life, is a matter which should cause general apprehension. That the agricultural products of the country, in particular, should be made the stakes in reckless and unprincipled gaming in the money market, is a disgrace to the American people, besides being an incalculable injury to the interests of the public. It is to this speculation in agricultural products and the staples of life that two of the most discouraging features of the present outlook are due: first, the high prices of staple articles of consumption and general use; and second, the inability to export our surplus products, as would naturally be done if it were not for the interference of the speculators. The fact that prices of many staple articles of life in this country are uniformly higher than they are in Europe, has been attributed to various causes by political economists. Few, however, have

taken into account the most important cause of all,—the influence which speculation has upon the normal value of these articles. Take the most staple articles—flour, for instance—the American market is one succession of "corners," by which the price is often kept, for long periods, above the average of this staple in European markets. As to our exports of agricultural products, it is an undeniable fact that they are steadily falling off, owing to the pernicious effect of the same influence. In the month of January of the present year, as compared with the same month last year, our exports of cotton fell off \$5,000,000, provisions \$5,300,000 and bread-stuffs \$8,500,000. And yet we have enormous amounts of these products on hand—sufficient to exceed the export values of last year by nearly half—which are tied up by the speculators where they can do nobody any good. Some means ought to be found to put a stop to this gambling in the necessities of life, by the vampires of the stock market. The gambling which tops with the ruin of the individual is bad enough, but that which involves calamity to the general public is worse.

Town and District.

An intelligent and esteemed correspondent presents in another column some considerations which lead him to favor the retention of the district system of schools rather than the adoption of the town system. Boiled down to a sentence, his argument is that the district system is preferable because it brings the management of and responsibility for the schools nearer to the people.

Suppose we grant this, and say: Carry out your agreement to its logical conclusions—the family system brings the matter of education still nearer to the people, therefore let us adopt the family system. And not with reference to the schools alone; it is well for the citizens to interest themselves and share in and act intelligently upon all matters of public concern—therefore let us adopt the family or individual system in regard to other matters now managed by the town in its associate capacity. Let each head of a household teach his own children, take care of his own poor, make himself responsible for the repair of the public road in front of his farm, and so on.

The reply of our correspondent would be: Oh, that is carrying the principle far—there is such a thing as excessive distribution of labor and responsibility, will not do to carry the method of seeing individual attention to matters of public concern to an extent which would cancel the advantages of associate effort. The care of our roads and poor is a practical matter, and the practical upshot of leaving every man to look after his own do as much or as little about it as he chooses, would be that in many cases the roads and the poor would get no care. Very true. Now, then the care of our common schools is a practical matter, and laying theories aside, in actual practice the town system when fairly tried is found to accomplish more and work better than the district system. It has passed beyond the stage of experiment. It is the system in use in many States which are decidedly ahead of Vermont in the matter of public school education; and no State that has adopted it ever thought of returning to the old district system.

The people of Vermont ought to realize, if they do not, that our Green mountain State is not keeping up, much less keeping to the front, in the matter of education of the masses. The district schools are not holding their own, much less improving. They are not as good, take the State through, as they were 25 years ago. This is a mortifying fact; but it has got to be acknowledged. The decline in large part owing to the obstinate retention of the district system. That system may be all right theoretically; but practically it too often fails to secure the very objects for which it exists. With some exceptions, which only prove the rule, the district meetings are neglected by the citizens. The district committees are chosen with too little care. The district school teachers are too often selected from considerations of relationship or friendship rather than of fitness. The schools are run in the way that will cost the least money. The schools and the school children suffer from want of attention and care. These are mortifying facts. Now then it is found in practice that the concentration of care and responsibility upon one town committee secures better results than where the care is divided between a dozen or more district committees. The citizens lose no control. Every citizen has his voice and vote in the choice of the school board. He has the opportunity to choose the best men in the town instead of the best in a small district, to look after the schools, and the satisfaction of knowing that their office is of consequence enough to command their careful attention and service. He finds them as ready to listen to his suggestions and advice, if he is an intelligent friend of the schools, as the old district committee were, and perhaps more so; and he finds that his own interest in the school which his children attend increases rather than diminishes, because the school is better; and it is far easier than before to secure attention to well grounded complaint or sensible suggestion.

Two causes stand in the way of the immediate and general adoption of the town system. One is the average Vermonter's dread of innovations. Our forefathers had this system—therefore it is good enough for us. But the forefathers of our commonwealth, if they could return to us, would say: "The world has moved since we were here. Our example ought not to stand in the way of the march of improvement. There is no reason why you should not use improved systems and methods in education, as well as the railroads and telegraph and friction matches, of which we knew nothing in our day." Moreover the town system is a very slight innovation. It is simply adopting in regard to the schools the system of town management which has always been in vogue and works well in other matters of public business.

The other fear is that the schools will cost more under the town system. The schools as a rule ought to cost more, under whatever system is adopted. More money should be spent on the district schools where the district system is retained, better teachers engaged, the schools kept open longer in the year. But if the taxpayers of the community are determined that they will spend no more on the schools, then we tell them that they

can get more for their money under the town system than under the district system. Proof of this is abundant. Take for a single instance the town of Hinesburgh in this county. It is geographically broken up into districts by the hills, to a far greater extent than most towns. But a number of years ago it adopted the town system, and experience has satisfied its citizens that the town system is the cheapest as well as the best. The common schools in Hinesburgh cost no more than they used to—in some years they have cost a little less—while they are noticeably better than they were under the old system. The citizens do not find their rights and privileges curtailed but rather the contrary. Above all the great right, the right to secure for and offer to every child the advantages of a good common school education, is far better secured.

We respect our correspondent's years and his judgment on many matters; but in this matter he is behind the times, and out of harmony with the most intelligent, experienced, and faithful friends of common school education, the country over.

A Few Words with a Brother Republican.

A correspondent whose sincerity we should be sorry to doubt, and who has generally been a good Republican, though if our recollection is not at fault, he has been known to break through party lines when he thought he had sufficient occasion to do so, writes us in severe criticism of Senator Edmunds's position in the last national campaign. He even likens the senator's course to that of George William Curtis, and asks whether he can be any better trusted to sustain the Republican party in future than Mr. Curtis can. Our correspondent has evidently been lending his ear to some of the back-biters of the senator. Assuming, however, that he is willing to do justice to a prominent public servant, and that he desires to sustain the Republican party, as the party which represents the best purposes and instincts of the American people, we invite him to take a little broader view of this subject than he seems to have taken.

To begin with, his comparison of Mr. Edmunds to Mr. Curtis, is astonishingly wide of the truth. Mr. Curtis went into the national convention as a delegate and representative of the Republican party and participated in its proceedings, without protest, to its close, and he was bound by every precedent and principle of honor in party action to accept its result. He went away from the convention to strike hands with the enemies of his former party, and to do his utmost up to the election to defeat the Republican nominees. He supported and voted for the Democratic ticket. He takes the side of Mr. Cleveland up to this day in all controversies, and he desires and is at work for the permanent overthrow of the Republican party. He is no longer trusted, and it is not possible that he ever again can be trusted in the Republican party, or influential in its councils. Senator Edmunds, on the other hand, violated no pledges and betrayed no trusts. He did not plotting with Democrats or Independents. He showed most distinctly during the campaign his sense of the duty and importance of sustaining the Republican party. He voted its ticket, and he is to-day one of the main-stays and most efficient mount-pieces and agents of the Republican party in its resistance to the schemes and measures by which the Democracy hope to maintain permanent control of the government. The cases of these two men are diametrically opposite. Only extreme ignorance or bitter prejudice can associate them.

But Mr. Edmunds has enemies and opponents outside of his long-time opponents, the Democracy. If our friend does not know how this happens so to be, we will tell him. Our senator long ago earned the very distinct dislike of some of the great corporations by his opposition to monopolies and his insistence on regarding the interest of the people and of the public treasury rather than the interest of the corporations. The Pacific railroads long ago felt the weight of his opposition to their plans of plunder of the government, and would have been glad to secure his defeat at the time of his last election. The time was not, however, a propitious one for their purpose, and they had to witness his return to the Senate. Since then he has earned the opposition of two other tremendous monopolies—the Western Union Telegraph company and the Bell Telephone company, by opposing them in the interest of the public. These great concerns control newspapers, Congressmen, lawyers and agents. They have plenty of money, and one of their agents was indiscreet enough, a few months ago, to mention the fact that they stood ready to spend money in order to defeat Mr. Edmunds's re-election. Every intelligent observer of public affairs must have expected, under the circumstances, to see what we have seen—scurrilous misrepresentation and slander of the Senator in various newspapers, false statements continually telegraphed about him from Washington, and a canvass of calumny inaugurated, wherever it could find hearers. With this opposition other elements have combined. Mr. Edmunds had the dislike, and we might say hatred, of Mr. Blaine, long before the last National campaign. This broke out in the heat of the canvass, in that most uncalculated and unwise attack made upon Mr. Edmunds by Mr. Blaine, through his agent and spokesman, William Walter Phelps. Mr. Edmunds has always said that he cared nothing about that attack; but he would have been more than human if he had quite forgotten it. While thousands of Mr. Blaine's best friends shared none of the spirit that prompted it, at the time, and now wish all such bygones to be bygones, indications are not wanting on the part of some of the headstrong and thick and thin supporters of the Maine statesman, of an intention to keep all such old sores open and to pay off Mr. Edmunds and others who did not come up to the measure of their expectations in the last national canvass, no matter at what cost to the Republican party of the future.

Without such outside opposition there is no reason to believe that any serious opposition to Mr. Edmunds in his own State would have lifted its head. The people of Vermont respect his honesty, ability and independence. They recognize the prestige which accrues to our little State from the possession of such a powerful representative in the national legislature; and however his course in the last campaign may have failed to suit some of them, in some of its features, they

have had no reason to doubt and do not doubt his entire soundness in the Republican faith, and his absolute loyalty to the great party, with the support and maintenance and brilliant record of which he has had so much to do. But with these outside enemies, and prompted in part, no doubt, by them, the friends and followers of a prominent aspirant to the senator's place, have seen, as they thought, their opportunity. They began many months ago a canvass of calumny—distorting facts, misrepresenting the senator's motives, charging to him results, for which he was not responsible, decrying his services, and professing to doubt his party loyalty, even while he has been all these months past doing his utmost by voice and vote and counsel to sustain the Republican organization, working with, and trusted by, the truest and ablest Republicans in Congress, and put forward by them as the spokesman and leader of the Republican cause. Our friend has heard a good deal of criticism of the Senator. We want him to understand that it has been for a purpose; and that not a patriotic or public purpose, but a purpose of private advantage and personal ambition. This purpose has been disclosed, if there was any room for doubt about it before, by the open newspaper abuse of Mr. Edmunds into which it has broken out, in certain quarters.

Another thing is worthy of note—that is that these home enemies of the senator, aware of their weakness before the people have made an alliance with the boss of the spoils Democracy of Vermont; have been rendering him distinct assistance in some of his partisan schemes connected with the allotment of the spoils; and are to have the help of Democratic votes when it comes to the election.

Here then is the situation. Here is a prominent man, born among our hills, identified with our State from his early manhood, who stepped to the front at the first organization of the Republican party; and who, for twenty years, has been one of the most prominent and effective supporters of Republican principles and a main stay of the Republican organization. He has been placed and kept by his associates in the Senate in the highest positions of influence and honor in his gift. He occupies such positions to-day, not by any seeking of his own, but by the free choice of the men on whose shoulders rests the support of the Republican party in Congress. Does our friend suppose that they do not know their man? They know him, and the country knows him. Our friend cannot name the statesman who has done more in the past or is doing more to-day to sustain the party which embodies and represents the great principles of freedom and honesty of elections, protection of American industry, reform of the civil service, retrenchment and economy in public expenditures, sound currency, and eradication of the blot of Mormonism. His absolute integrity is denied by none. Placed where he could have made millions in the last twenty years, by simply agreeing to absent himself from the Senate when votes on jobs and subsidies, and steals from the treasury were to be taken, no man has ever charged him with making a cent by his public action. Such a charge would be folly in the face of the facts that he is always in his seat, always on the alert, always an effective opponent of all schemes of government plunder. No lobby-agent dare approach him. He is a man of devouring industry; of remarkable readiness and strength in debate; strong at all times, but if possible firmer and stronger in times of trouble and reverses to his party than when it is in the full tide of success.

Now does our friend really suppose that the Republicans of Vermont are not aware of these facts, or that to any considerable extent they can be made to forget them? This supposition would be simple slander. We tell him that the people of Vermont are proud of the position and influence held by the representatives of Vermont in the national councils. They know how Mr. Edmunds has contributed to that position and influence. They are not going back on him for a single instance of lukewarmness, which was shared by half of the party. They have not lost faith in Republican principles or hope of a restoration of the party to its old place of control. And they see with perfect distinctness that there is no surer road to continued defeat than to pull down the strong men, the experienced and able leaders, who are now maintaining those principles and that organization at the front.

There was a gathering at Montpelier last fall of 1500 representative men of Vermont, the great mass of them of course Republicans. There had been no effort to call friends of Mr. Edmunds to that gathering; but a good deal of effort to rally his opponents there. All understood the situation. Did any man have a heartier reception there than Senator Edmunds? Does not our friend know that if the question of the senator's re-election had been put to that body, it would have voted to return him, 10 or 12 to 1. It would have represented the people by its vote. Has anything happened since to impair their confidence in Mr. Edmunds? Nothing whatever. The still hunt of slander has broken out into open attack—that is all. This will have less effect than the former process, for it is more easily met. Our friend will find that the people of Vermont can not be made either the dupes or tools of a combination of monopolists, corruptionists, wire-pullers and Democratic bosses. This will become plain enough to all before the meeting of the Legislature. It is already plain to the men of both parties, best situated to gauge the currents of popular opinion. It has been recently expressed by some of the longest headed and best informed Republicans in various parts of the State; and within a week one of the most wide-awake Democrats in Vermont, who keeps as thoroughly posted in regard to what is up in both parties as any man that can be named, uttered in the hearing of the writer of this article the prediction that if Mr. Edmunds is alive at the next session of the Legislature there will be but two candidates before it—for the senatorship—one of them Mr. Edmunds and the other the Democratic candidate whoever he may be; and that the latter will receive only the usual party support.

So much for some of the home aspects of this subject. There are other considerations relating to the welfare of the party at large which we may consider hereafter.

If you are nervous or despondent try Carter's Little Nerve Pills. Dyspepsia makes you nervous, and nervousness makes you despondent; either one renders you miserable and these little pills cure both.

Washington Canards.

One of the latest inventions of the Washington penny liners who have been employed to start stories derogatory to Senator Edmunds, was that the senator at the request of Justice Field of the Supreme Court, had agreed to hang up the confirmation of the appointment of Mr. Franks as United States marshal for the district of California until the end of the session. This was made up out of whole cloth. Justice Field desired, instead of opposing, Franks's confirmation. Of course he made no request of Mr. Edmunds and the latter made no agreement. The appointment was not hung up; but has been confirmed.

Of the same sort were the statements recently telegraphed from Washington representing Mr. Edmunds as criticizing Mr. Sherman for opening the discussion of the right of the Senate to official information from the president and his cabinet, and exhibiting "jealousy" and "ill-temper." There was not the remotest foundation for these stories. Mr. Edmunds has never felt, much less shown, any jealousy of Mr. Sherman. The two senators have generally been in hearty accord, especially in matters affecting the interests of the party they represent; and they are so in this matter. Mr. Edmunds, in anything he has had to say about Mr. Sherman's course, or about his recent speech, has not criticized him, or it; but quite the reverse. The relations of both our Vermont senators with their brother senators have always been exceedingly pleasant and friendly, for they have the respect and confidence of all, and never to a greater extent than to-day.

Of course, it is of no use to try to follow up all the falsehoods emanating from the Washington bureaus of correspondence. If intelligent readers will only remember that just now there is a set of remarkably fertile liars among the Washington correspondents—as well as some honorable and truthful ones—and that in consequence of Senator Edmunds's prominence in public and party matters, their inventive genius is especially exercised upon him, it will be enough.

ATKINS & CO.'S ATTACK ON SENATOR EDMUNDS.

It has the Opposite Effect From that Intended. (Special despatch to the Boston Advertiser.) The publication of the interview of the Boston Advertiser's Washington correspondent with Hiram Atkins, in which the latter declares a political war on Senator Edmunds, has made a great sensation all over Vermont, and the general opinion of Republicans and Democrats alike is that it has put an end to the chances of a successful movement against Senator Edmunds. Mr. Atkins's frank announcement sets the matter at rest. If there is one thing above all the rest which the Republicans of Vermont will not do, it is to render aid and comfort to Hiram Atkins. Their antagonism to him is more than political; it is personal, caused largely by his copperheadism during the war and the character of his newspaper then and since.

As an illustration of the effect of Atkins's announcement, a leading Republican of Addison county, who has been in important positions, told me on the other side yesterday that he felt hard toward Mr. Edmunds on account of his conduct during the presidential campaign, but if there was a combination between certain Republicans and Hiram Atkins to beat him, he should see that it did not succeed. "No honest Republicans," said he, "can afford to act in concert with Hiram Atkins, and they will not. I shall support Mr. Edmunds from this time on."

I am able to contradict the report which has been so industriously circulated in Vermont to Mr. Edmunds's injury, that he refused to speak for the Republican ticket during the last presidential campaign. The truth is that he left it to the Republican national committee to say whether it would be prudent for him to make any addresses. The committee decided it was not and that is the reason, and the sole reason, why Mr. Edmunds did not take a more active part in the campaign. Mr. Edmunds did not "stink in his tent," as has been alleged. He was earnest for the success of the Republican ticket and voted for it on election day. But the national committee decided that it was not expedient that he should speak, on account of his unfavorable opinion of Mr. Blaine, written in 1880, which was in the hands of a third party.

It was reported last evening that Mr. Smalley had telegraphed to Mr. Atkins to "take the bull by the horns," and deny the interview. Smalley's secretary, who is absolutely essential to the success of the combination, and Mr. Atkins, has completely "given the thing away." There is no better reason for the Republicans of Vermont to stand by Senator Edmunds than that Hiram Atkins is eager for his defeat.

CROP PROSPECTS.

Fair Indications for Next Year's Yield in All Departments. CHICAGO, Feb. 25.—Returns from the winter wheat fields are almost uniformly good. The present are as favorable as those seen in early in 1885, when the crop was unexceptionally good. The utter disappearance of the snow covering is the only serious menace to the grain crop, and with another general fall of snow the outlook could hardly be better. The latest reports from California, Oregon and Washington Territory are generally more favorable than at the same time last year. Out of 20 counties of Kansas 18 report crops in good condition. Reports from Ohio are uniformly favorable. In Southern Illinois two counties report a most excellent outlook, but the remaining counties make a very good showing. From Central Illinois the returns are uniformly good. The returns from Kentucky and Missouri are generally of a glowing character and in the former state the outlook is considered brighter for a good crop than before in many years. Michigan reports do not indicate any larger yield than last year, are generally favorable. Tennessee reports indicate an average yield.

The acreage in all the States, with the possible exception of Michigan, will show a falling off from last year. Reports indicate that the stocks of old wheat in Dakota, Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee and Illinois are pretty well exhausted, while considerable wheat is still held in the farmers' hands in Minnesota, Iowa and Michigan.

For Commuting Sentences.

ALBANY, N. Y., Feb. 24.—The governor signed a bill to-day providing for the commutation of the sentences of convicts for good behavior, which affects nearly 5000 prisoners of a higher grade. The direct purpose of the bill is to bring under one central control, discipline in prisons and penitentiaries, and it will result in the abolition of corporal punishment, substituting the more effective principle of a hope of reward. By its provisions society is more largely protected from a recurrence of second offenses.

Boys are hard on clothes. Buy the "E. C. & Co." clothing for them. See advertisement.