## THE EDMUNDS-BLAINE EPISODE.

### Another Version.

[Washington Special to the N. Y. Herald.]

The true story of the insult offered to Mr. Edmunds by Mr. Blaine, by gentlemen who were at the Arthur mansion at the time, is as follows: When Mr. Blaine was admitted at the front door, ex-Marshal McMichael was coming down stairs, and, supposing the parlor to be empty, escorted him there. The two had scarcely entered the door, when McMichael, who knew well the feeling between the two New England leaders, started with surprise, seeing Mr. Edmunds and Mr. Charles E. Miller sitting not four feet distant. It was impossible to withdraw, and McMichael exclaimed, "Gentlemen, Mr. Blaine." Mr. Miller and Mr. Edmunds arose from their seats, and the latter extended his hand to the ex-secretary, who refused it and turned away. Not a word was spoken on either side, and Mr. Edmunds took the insult with his usual coolness, treating himself and continuing his conversation with Mr. Miller, just as if it had not been interrupted. A few moments after, Mr. Edmunds asked the privilege of seeing the remains, and was quietly conducted to the upper room in which they lay. Then he was received by Mrs. McElroy in the library, on the same floor, and while he was there Mr. McMichael escorted Mr. Blaine, at the latter's request, to the death chamber. Upon his return to the hotel Mr. Blaine sent for William E. Chandler, to whom, in the presence of General Sherman, he related the circumstances, and was quite surprised to learn that they did not approve of his conduct. Both Mr. Chandler and General Sherman, on the contrary, expressed an adverse opinion very emphatically, and Mr. Blaine would not like to have their words repeated.

### Still Another.

[N. Y. Times.]

The details of the incident were described by Clayton McMichael after the ceremonies at the church were over, and as they here appear they are not likely to be denied by Messrs. Edmunds, Blaine, and McMichael.

The committee, soon after entering the Arthur residence, were introduced by Mr. McMichael to the other distinguished gentlemen present. "I hardly need introduce you, gentlemen," exclaimed Mr. McMichael, when Senator Edmunds and Mr. Blaine confronted one another. The Senator frankly replied: "Certainly not," and with a courteous bow extended his right hand. Mr. Blaine uttered no reply whatever. He simply bowed low, very low indeed, and passed on without seeming to even notice the outstretched hand. "I presume that was proper," he said sotto voce to McMichael, when he was beyond the Vermonter's hearing. "If you ask me that for my opinion," replied McMichael very deliberately and weighing every word, "I shall say no." The answer was received in silence. Blaine's nimble instinct told him that something had occurred which never ought to have occurred.

### Some Republican Opinion.

Mr. Frank Hatton, who was Mr. Arthur's postmaster-general, in commenting on the affair said: "I confess I was surprised at first when I heard of the incident, but it is not out of keeping with Mr. Blaine's character. He invited himself to the funeral, which was proper enough, perhaps, but his experience in the past should have told him that he might meet some people at Mr. Arthur's bier that had not worked for his election to the presidency. He knew perfectly well whom he was likely to meet at Gen. Arthur's house, and if he did not care to meet them he should have remained away. If he had met Mr. Edmund's on the street or at a public reception and refused to speak to him, it would have been another matter; but under the circumstances I think his conduct indefensible from the standpoint of decency."

A "distinguished republican" is quoted as saying: "Mr. Blaine should have chosen a different place to give vent to his revengeful feelings. The house of death should heal, not inflame political antipathies. Mr. Blaine should have realized the chance of meeting political enemies at the Arthur house before he went there. He should have had greatness of character enough to conduct himself in a dignified manner. The man who could with deliberation insult a man at such a time and at such a place is certainly not fit to be considered as the leader of a great political party."

A republican who worked and voted and contributed his money for Mr. Blaine's canvass in 1884 said: "It is not a wise or a discreet action for Mr. Blaine to snub so popular, so able, and so honest a man as Mr. Edmunds. It will not add to his strength in this state, nor will it increase the enthusiasm of the republican party, which now means not chism but unity."

WASHINGTON, Nov. 23.—Senator Edmunds, who has returned to Washington, was asked today about the report that Blaine had declined to accept his hand at the Arthur funeral, but he would not discuss the topic with any one.

## THE BLAINE AFFAIR.

### Some More Opinions.

A gentleman who heard the story from the persons who saw it said: "Mr. Blaine was clearly and unmistakably in the wrong. He was aware that Mr. Edmunds was a member of the senate committee, and that there was every chance of his meeting, not only Mr. Edmunds, but other persons who were equally obnoxious to him. He should have come prepared for meeting them all and meeting them as a gentleman. It would not have detracted from Mr. Blaine's dignity to have accepted the proffered hand; on the contrary, it would have been a very manly thing to do. As it was, Mr. Blaine selected a most inopportune time to give vent to personal spleen. The incident is not one to strengthen Mr. Blaine's popularity or to heal the discord and disunion in the republican ranks."

Another prominent republican said: "It was disgraceful. We have all been led to believe that Mr. Blaine was a great man—great in small as well as in large things—but in this instance he exhibits the petulance of a schoolboy. Mr. Edmunds emerges from it with dignity. It must have cost the Vermont senator a great sacrifice of his own personal respect to proffer his hand to Blaine at any time, but it is vastly to his credit that he had the manliness to do it at that time. It was no insult to him when Mr. Blaine rejected his display of civility. It only exhibits the selfish and the small streak in Blaine's make up; the same qualities that were exercised to such an extent upon the misguided Garfield as to lead to a break in the republican party that never has been bridged."

### A Disastrous Steamboat Collision.

LONDON, Nov. 28.—Two torpedo boats, built at Elbing for the Italian government, collided with each other off the Spanish coast, one was sunk and the other was badly damaged.



## EDUCATION IN VERMONT.

### Misrepresentations of the New York Post Corrected.

*To the Editor of the Boston Journal:*

The New York *Post* is never slow to expose the apparent or actual shortcomings of New England and the Northern States, and is especially pleased when an opportunity occurs to show that the "Blair bill" to aid southern schools is useless, even pernicious. A correspondent from St. Johnsbury, "Vermonter," misrepresents our schools and people in a late issue. He says:

"In 1840 the population of Vermont, according to the Federal census, was 291,948; in 1880, according to the same authority, it was 332,286. In 1840 there were in the State 202 public schools with 97,518 pupils; in 1885 the number of schools was 255, and of pupils the whole enrollment between the ages of five and 20 was 51,667. In the 45 years, therefore, there was a gain in population of 40,338, and a decrease in the number of school pupils of 25,851—an enormous and almost incredible loss. It is true that a large number of children are enrolled in the Roman Catholic parochial schools while our foreign-born population was very small in 1840, before the building of railroads, but no reasonable allowance on this score will account for the falling off in our public school children."

Very true, but are there not several other things to consider? First of all, while it is true that the population has increased 40,338, the number of children between 5 and 20 has decreased from 104,917 in 1840 to 99,463 in 1880, a loss of 5,454, which accounts for over one fifth of the loss of 25,851. As showing more plainly the smaller proportion of children now, let it be remarked that the number of children under 10 years in 1840 was 80,288, and in 1880 it was 68,234, a loss of 12,054.

The 97,518 in school in 1840 included, probably, very nearly all of the children in all kinds of schools and of all ages, except 4346 in colleges, academies and grammar schools. In 1885 not far from 10,000 were in attendance upon colleges, academies and in private and parochial schools. More than another fifth of "Vermonter's" "incredible" loss is here accounted for. Though incredible to him he assumed it would be credible to others.

Again, it was customary in 1840 to send children to school when much younger than is now common, even before they had reached the present lawful age, especially in summer, and the summer schools were chiefly made up of young children, so that another fifth or more is found.

Still further, in 1840 it was customary for children, or, perhaps, I should say, young men and women, to continue much longer in school than at present, and about all the young unmarried part of the population were in attendance upon the winter term, often till they were 25 years old. They went, some to study, but more perhaps to have a good, social time, and they had it. It seems to me that the loss has been fully explained, but I will add that of 7364 foreign-born children between five and 18 years of age in 1870, 5000 were not in school, not that they had never been in school and never would be, but that their parents did not appreciate the value of schooling, and were willing their children should go with little, with as much, perhaps, as children averaged in 1840.

The fact is that in 1840 all the children attended school enough at least to learn the rudiments of the common school branches, and the same is true to-day. In the year 1885-6, 71,067 scholars over five and under 20 attended the public schools an average of 17 and one-half weeks. It is not probable that the 95,817 of all ages, and in all schools save colleges, academies and grammar schools, who had schooling in 1840, attended on an average much more than one-half as much time. Their schooling was spread over more time, but they received in the aggregate much less.

The average length of the schools was 27 1-5 weeks, or 136 days in 1885, and the true average length is really much greater, as the small, short schools greatly reduced the average length of all schools, while long, small schools which would raise the length beyond the true average are not so common. What the average length of schools in 1840 was we have no means of knowing, but it was 21½ weeks in 1866, 20 in 1867, 22 in 1868, 20 in 1869 and 21 in 1870, while in 1885 it was 27 1-5, as given above. The per cent of average attendance to enrollment in 1883-4 was 66, while in New Hampshire it was 68, but the length of schools in New Hampshire was 90½ days, while in Vermont it was 127 days and the children attend more days in Vermont, 84 in Vermont and 60 in New Hampshire. Maine gave 68 per cent of attendance to enrollment, but the children attended an average of only 77 days, with an average length of school of 114 days. In Massachusetts the average attendance to enrollment was 73 per cent, and each pupil attended an average of 130 days, but the proportion of average attendance to the youth between five and 20 is about the same as in Vermont. In Connecticut the percentage of attendance to enrollment was 65, and the average length of school was 180 days, which was attended an average of 117 days, but the proportion of attendance to youth between five and 20 was much less than in Vermont. In Rhode Island the percentage of attendance of enrollment was 67.

With the single exception of Massachusetts no other New England State gives its youth, or rather the young of no other state take, so much schooling as those of Vermont, and Massachusetts youth get theirs when younger and largely in crowded schools. In educational matters Vermont is not behind in New England.

Let us compare Vermont with Ohio. The per cent of attendance to enrollment was 65½, and the average attendance in days for each pupil, 122. Vermont agrees very closely with Ohio in the proportion of attendance to enrollment, enrollment to youth from five to 20, but being rich she has longer schools. Her schools were large, however, most of them much too large—44 pupils—while Vermont averages 24, and for most pupils the shorter school year of Vermont would be as good or better than the longer one of Ohio.

Alabama, perhaps, is an average Southern state. But 44 per cent of her children between five and 20 were enrolled, and those enrolled attended an average of 52 days, in schools with 41 pupils each, which were kept open but 83 days. The Alabama child between five and 20 gets, on an average, 41 per cent of the schooling that the Vermont child does. The statistics are: Total attendance in Vermont, 6,665,980 days; in Alabama, with four and one-half times as many children between five and twenty, only 11,156,080 days. The schools are large, many of them mere apologies for schools, the whole expenditure for schools being less than in Vermont. Still the *Post* claims that Vermont is not any in advance in educational facilities of the States which the Blair bill intended to aid.

"Vermonter" then proceeds in this soul-stirring manner: "Turning to the statistics of illiteracy, we find that they show just about what one would expect from the figures just cited. According to the census of 1840, the number of white persons in Vermont 20 years old and over, unable to write was 2276. In 1860 the number had increased to 8016. In 1880 the number of persons, 20 years old and upward, unable to write was 12,872; 10 years old and upward, 15,837, and the number, 10 years old and upward, unable to read 12,983, or one in every 20 persons 10 years old and upward. Thus it appears that the growth of illiteracy has kept even pace with the diminution in school attendance. Are not these figures more convincing than any logic, and do they not form an arraignment more terrible than can be expressed in words?"

Statistics show what people of ordinary intelligence and observation in Vermont know, that illiteracy in our State, is an exotic, imported from Canada and Ireland, and that the schools "like the flowers of spring have nothing to do about it." While there were but 2270 20 years old and upward unable to write in 1840, many of these were of foreign birth as the figures for 1850 show. In that year there were 6240 who were 20 and over unable to write, and of these 5624 were of foreign birth and 616 were native born. These 616 included imbeciles and all the unfortunate odds and ends of humanity. In 1860 we find 13,395 who were 21 and over unable to write, 7983 of foreign birth and 933 native born. Here was an increase of 317 native born illiterates. Is it fair to say that this increase was composed of children of the foreign born population of Vermont and other States, and the result of mistakes of the enumerator in ascertaining of Canadian French, unable to speak English, the real facts? It is likely that a few of our foreign born people are not quite full fledged Yankees.

In 1870 we had 13,494, who were 21 and over, unable to write, but the place of birth is not given. There were, however, 17,706 unable to write, 10 years old and upward, 13,504 foreign born and 3802 of native birth. Many children are unable to write at 10 who afterwards learn, and the same is true to a less degree of reading. There were 15,185 unable to read in 1870 ten years old and over.

In 1880 there were, according to "Vermonter," 12,872 unable to write 20 and over, a decrease from 13,494 of 21 and over in 1870; 15,681 whites could not write at 10 and over, and of these 10,327 were of foreign birth and 5354 were native born; but these figures, when compared with those of 1870, evidently do not express the same thing exactly, and they are all that gives the conclusion of "Vermonter" a ghost of a chance of probability.

During the last 15 years Vermont, "rock-ribbed," cold and sparsely settled as she is, has been "raising men" for the entire country, and their conspicuous positions in all the walks of life is due to her public schools, better now than ever before.

X.

## LEGISLATIVE NOTES.

The number of bills introduced in the legislature was 653 of which 277 became laws.

After the adjournment the Senate voted to hold a reunion in 1888, and appointed Senator Valentine as chairman and Senator Stanley as secretary.

The Montpelier correspondent of the Boston *Journal* says truthfully: "Governor Ormsbee has impressed every one most favorably by his administration of the executive office. He has proven himself able, dignified, conservative and level-headed."

Rev. George W. Perry, pastor of the Universalist church at Rutland, has been appointed State geologist to succeed Dr. Cutting at Lyndonville. Mr. Perry has always taken an active interest in the study of natural science, and conducted no little original research in various departments.

It has been a short session, only 30 days having been occupied. The total expense of the session will be about $40,000, a little less than $1000 per day.

### Recent Patents.

Among the patents recently granted are the following to Vermonters: D. Willard Dudley, Mount Pelier, assignor of one half to W. N. Peck, Calais, fertilizer; John H. Fremier, Rutland, sand and water feed mechanism for stone sawing machines; H. C. Cole, Wallingford, shovel; N. D. Stanley, Essex Junction, tire upsetter; W. S. Wardwell, Richmond, garter, reissue; Orlando E. Williams and J. R. Brewster, Windsor, assignor of one-third to D. L. Spaulding, Windsor county, guage for saws.



## Insurance.



### NOTICE.

The annual election for Trustees of the Farmers and Mechanics Savings Institution and Trust Company will be held at the Banking House of the Merchants National Bank of Burlington, Vt., on Wednesday, Dec. 8, 1886, at 10 o'clock a. m.

C. W. WOODHOUSE, Treas.
Burlington, Nov. 8, 1886.—265,1d&2w4t



## Legal Notices.

### Francis Clark's Estate.

STATE OF VERMONT, } To all persons
DISTRICT OF CHITTENDEN, } concerned in the estate of Francis Clark, late of Burlington in said District, deceased,

GREETING:

At a Probate Court, holden at Burlington, within and for the District of Chittenden, on the 15th day of November, 1886, an instrument purporting to be the last will and testament of Francis Clark, late of Burlington, in said district, deceased, was presented to the Court aforesaid, for probate, and it is ordered by said court that the 40th day of December, 1886, at the Probate Court rooms in said Burlington be assigned for proving said instrument; and that notice thereof be given to all persons concerned, by publishing this order three weeks successively in the Burlington Free Press, a newspaper printed at said Burlington, previous to the time appointed.

Therefore you are hereby notified to appear before said court, at the time and place aforesaid and contest the probate of said will if you have cause.

Given under my hand at Burlington, in said district, this 15th day of November, 1886.

JENNIE STACY, Register.
21,w3w

### John and Mary Hamilton's Estate.

STATE OF VERMONT, } The Honorable
DISTRICT OF CHITTENDEN, } the Probate Court for the District of Chittenden.

To all persons interested in the estate of Joan Hamilton and Mar. A. Hamilton formerly of Burlington in said District

GREETING:

Whereas, said court has assigned the 11th day of December 1886 next for the settlement of the account of Hiram S. White, late guardian of said John and Mary A. of their respective estates, and ordered that public notice thereof be given to all persons interested in said estate, by publishing this order three weeks successively previous to the day assigned, in the Burlington Free Press, printed in Burlington, in said district.

Therefore, you are hereby notified to appear at the Probate Court rooms in Burlington, on the day assigned, then and there to contest the allowance of said account if you see cause.

Given under my hand this 18th day of November 1886.

22,w3w JENNIE STACY, Register.

### Stephen S. Morgan's Estate.

STATE OF VERMONT, } To all persons
DISTRICT OF CHITTENDEN, } concerned in the estate of Stephen S. Morgan late of Colchester in said district, deceased.

GREETING:

At a Probate Court holden at Burlington, within and for the District of Chittenden, on the 23rd day of November, 1886, an instrument, purporting to be the last will and testament of Stephen S. Morgan late of Colchester, in said District, deceased, was presented to the court aforesaid, for probate, and it is ordered by said court that the 4th day of December 1886 at the Probate Court Room in said Burlington, be assigned for proving said instrument; and that notice thereof be given to all persons concerned, by publishing this order three weeks successively in the Burlington Free Press, a newspaper printed at said Burlington, previous to the time appointed.

Therefore, you are hereby notified to appear before said court, at the time and place aforesaid, and contest the probate of said will, if you have cause.

Given under my hand at Burlington, in said District, this 23rd day of November 1886.

JENNIE STACY, Register.
22w3w



## Assignee's Sale.

The undersigned, assignee of the estate of Alexis T. Smith, an insolvent debtor, offers for sale the Wheeler farm so called in New Haven. Said farm contains about 200 acres of land and will be sold in parcels if desired. A part of said farm is excellent meadow land lying on a branch of Little Otter creek, and a part is covered with wood and timber. Time can be had for payment of part of the purchase money.

Bristol, Nov. 12, 1886.

HENRY B. WILLIAMS, Assignee.
26,wtf.