

again acquires the pound-rate privilege at Washington, notwithstanding that it is still published "primarily for the purpose of advertising" its editor's ideas. No wonder the Republicans in Congress are so shy of an investigation of the Post Office Department.

When the New York Times tells its readers that the Democratic party "was sick unto death" for "four years, from 1896 to 1900," implying that it fell sick under the leadership of Bryan, having theretofore and under Cleveland's leadership been of sound and disposing mind and memory, the Times displays the same symptoms of malignant groverclevelanditis with which the Brooklyn Eagle suffers. If the editor of the Times were to examine his political almanacs he would find that the Democratic party fell deathly sick under the leadership of Cleveland. We have advised our readers of the affliction in this respect under which the Eagle suffers (vol. vi, p. 785); but the Eagle's symptoms were more localized than are those of the Times. The Eagle pointed only to Illinois, where it found Democracy in fine feather in 1892, but observed that it began to droop in 1896 and has continued to droop ever since. The Times, however, implies that Bryan demoralized the Democracy of the whole country in the years running from 1896 to 1900. Yet the fact is, and all political almanacs prove it, that the Democracy was demoralized in 1894 not only in Illinois but all over the country; not in 1896 under Bryan, mind you, but in 1894 under Cleveland.

After our disclosure of this fact with reference to Illinois and in answer to the Brooklyn Eagle, the daily Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., came to the Eagle's support. In its issue of April 2d it pointed out the unwisdom of relying upon political almanacs, and went behind the statistical returns to show that really it was not Cleveland's fault that the Democratic party became so sick in 1894. We

are very much at one with the Banner regarding statistics in general, although for election returns we have never been able to find a satisfactory substitute. But when the Banner undertakes to explain why its party collapsed in 1894, it begs the question; or, as it would doubtless prefer to express it (in keeping with its "suppressio veri" and "expressio falsi"), it is guilty of a "petitio principii." The point the Eagle made, the point the New York Times makes, the point Mr. Cleveland himself made in a public speech about a year ago, was this: that the Democratic party was in healthy condition until Mr. Bryan took it in hand in 1896, and that from that time on it has been sick. Our answer is that the Democratic party was sicker in 1894, under Cleveland, than in 1896 under Bryan. It is a transparent evasion to meet that answer, as the Banner assumes to do, with any explanation whatever, either good or bad, of why the fact was so. The issue is the fact itself, not the reason for it.

But the Banner's reasons are exceedingly poor. It explains the 1894 reverse in Illinois on the ground that under Altgeld the people of this State had become strongly antagonistic to Cleveland. But that couldn't have been so, let us remind the Banner, if Cleveland had commanded their confidence. Moreover, the collapse of 1894 was not confined to Illinois. It was general. Even New York and New Jersey voiced their condemnation of Cleveland in that fateful year. The Banner may amuse itself at explaining this; but the more it explains the plainer it makes it that it was Cleveland who demoralized the Democratic party.

Thus far the Nashville Banner shows no symptoms of groverclevelanditis. It honestly admits that the collapse did occur in 1894. But now some symptoms of the malady that has attacked the Eagle and the Times begin to appear in the Banner. Possibly this

may be attributed to its method of ignoring election statistics and roaming around its editor's brains for facts. That is convenient, no doubt; but with reference to reputation for veracity it is somewhat risky. Of 1896 the Banner says: "But as bad as the reverse of 1894 may have been, it was nothing compared with the crushing defeat of 1896, when Bryan had obtained full control of the Democratic party." The fact, however, is quite otherwise. We are obliged to go to election statistics to prove it, and therefore cannot hope to convince the Banner; yet the election statistics do testify most impressively that at the elections of 1896 the Democratic party regained to a considerable extent its Congressional losses of 1894. In the Congress elected in 1894, under Cleveland's leadership, the Democrats had only 93 Representatives; in the Congress elected in 1896, under Bryan's leadership, the Democrats had 130 Representatives. In the former, the Republican majority was 74; in the latter, it was only 24. And in the Congress elected in 1900, also under Bryan, the Democratic representation had risen to 153 and the Republican majority had fallen to 20. We fear that the Nashville Banner, like the Brooklyn Eagle and the New York Times, may indeed be suffering with an attack, temporary we trust, of groverclevelanditis.

#### DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT.

In considering the present situation in Democratic party politics, it is folly to deny the fact of an irrepressible conflict inside the party. Without entering at this time upon any discussion of the causes and merits of this conflict, we may say, with no possibility of a reasonable contradiction, that upon the whole Grover Cleveland personifies one side of it and William J. Bryan the other, and that it is absolutely irreconcilable.

In contrasting Cleveland and Bryan in that way we do not mean to be understood as intimating that the conflict is personal. It is in fact the least personal of any