

cation, and because they tend, as no doubt they do, to create jealousies. They are secret, that is, the majority, but does not secrecy teach man judiciousness? "Learn to bridle thy tongue," reads Scripture, and rejoins Plutarch, "If a man thinks it is a small matter to bridle his tongue, he is mistaken." Secret societies give to one a degree of cautiousness that he could not otherwise acquire; then as such let us preserve and foster them as healthy and beneficial institutions. As to depriving the student of precious moments, the practical instruction of association with congenial persons far overbalances the moments said to be lost. They are not lost, for the time a fraternity man spends in his chapter hall enlarges his social qualities and gives him a closer insight into the minds of men than could otherwise be acquired. I acknowledge that the college fraternities create jealousies, but it is the jealousy that is met with between all institutions of similar character, it is a rivalry for the lead. Everything is done to raise the fraternity financially, socially, in the athletics, and in the studies, above the rival fraternities. It is a jealousy leading to a rivalry for the highest elevation and hence should be encouraged. No serious result has ever been recorded as arising from these rivalries, and facts have shown that even before the secret college fraternity came into existence rivalries existed between the different "sets of fellows."

Statistics show that those colleges rank among the highest where good secret fraternities exist in the greatest number and the more secret and mysterious the more popular the fraternity.

OUR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS.

WE are in the midst of another Presidential campaign. In city, town and county throughout every State in our Union the political parties are marshalling their forces for the November conflict. Public interest in the subject is already great and will steadily increase

until it becomes the absorbing topic of discussion, not only on the "forum" but by the fire-side of every intelligent home.

General interest in the selection of an executive is not confined to our own people. It is almost universal. Even in kingdoms and empires the preservation of order and stability of the government depend largely on a faithful adherence to the established rules of succession. How much more then is it essential in a republic that the executive of the nation be chosen by a fair and satisfactory method and that he be the choice of the great body of the people!

Does our present method of election guarantee both these results? That part of our Constitution referring to the election of President employs this language:

"Art. II, Sec. I, Clause 2. Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

In article XII, under amendments are the following directions:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President," etc.

It is readily seen from these quotations that our Constitution does not provide for the public at large to take part directly in the electing of a President. To illustrate this take the vote of Pennsylvania for President in 1884.

For Grover Cleveland there were 392,785 votes cast, for James G. Blaine 473,804. In addition to this the Prohibition ticket polled 15,283, and the Greenback or Butler party 17,002, making a total popular vote of 898,874 in Pennsylvania. But these votes only decided which of the political parties should compose the electoral college of Pennsylvania, or in other words, it required all this balloting to select the *thirty* "Electors" to which Pennsylvania was entitled in the choice of a President