

first of a number of plans for removing certain specific causes for discontent and ended finally with this general statement: We recommend all citizens who have the good of the nation at heart to support for office only candidates of individuality, force, and strength of character, and that it be our constant aim in national affairs to make our name stand out in history for all that is fair, just, and noble in purpose.

Every true American, also, would do well to heed this general resolution proposed by the wise citizens of our imaginary nation of frogs, for the evil indicated exists and it can be wiped out only by independent action on the part of men who will work and labor for the good of their country. Abraham Lincoln, without doubt the noblest example of the kind of men who *should* occupy public office, recognized this evil and expressed himself in this way:—"If this government of ours is ever utterly demoralized it will come from this incessant wriggling and struggle for office, which is a way to live without work." A half century and more has passed since our great president uttered these words and yet can we say that the condition of affairs is any better to-day than it was then? When we consider what kind of men often hold our county offices, men who have previously failed in everything they undertook, when we think what money can do toward sending a man to Congress and how commonly we hear the question as to the degeneracy of the United States Senate discussed, we must conclude that if there has been any progress whatever, it has been in the wrong direction. Everything else of this age is advancing with gigantic strides. Shall our political life be the only thing that lags behind? The American people require a high standard in the conduct of their national heroes, who, unless they live up to it, are unmade as quickly as they are made—especially if they have a tendency toward unpopular transactions in real estate. Why not employ a like standard in reference to our public officers?