

LELAND STANFORD AT REST.

The most active mind, the warmest heart and the readiest hand among all those in public life on the golden shores of the Pacific are at once and almost without warning listless and cold. With a fortune so colossal that it may be a long time before it is computed, with the faculty of a seer and the gift of a Midas—with troops of friends embracing the experienced, the capable and the cunning among mankind—the leveler could not be kept at bay, the insidious destroyer who lies in wait for great and small pushed past all the fancied barriers and restraints and thrust himself into the chamber of the multi-millionaire, the gifted statesman, the broad-minded philanthropist, as rudely and unceremoniously as though it had been the unsheltering bowel of the poverty-stricken outcast, and banished from its tenement of dust the immortal part of Leland Stanford.

The deceased was born in Water-vliet, Albany county, New York, on the 9th of March, 1824, so that he was in his 70th year. Those who are disposed to consider this as far from a cutting short, in view of the allotted span being nearly spent, do not or did not know the man as he was or rather as he was presumed to be. He looked very much younger than he really was, and no doubt, until quite lately, felt as he looked. He was signally buoyant, hale and hearty and as far as outward indications go was designed by nature for a centenarian.

Mr. Stanford began the battle of life as a lawyer in his native state, but misfortunes besieged him and he abandoned active practice and went to California in 1852, where he began mining for gold at Michigan bluff, Placer county. He subsequently engaged in commercial pursuits and in 1858 moved permanently to San Francisco, where he laid the foundation of the wonderful fortune he has left behind him. He entered the political field in 1860 as a delegate to the Chicago convention which nominated Lincoln and Hamlin. He was one of the moving spirits in the Pacific railroad scheme and became president of the Central Pacific company upon its organization. His history from that time on is well known to our readers; it was an uninterrupted series of business and political successes.

Mr. Stanford was strictly a practical man in whatever department of life he was found. As a member of the United States Senate he was conspicuous from that reason as well as by his commanding presence and his numerous deeds of kindness to those around him. He was not an orator, scarcely a speech-maker, but what he said was always earnest and convincing. His greatest deed of generosity, measured by its proportions only, was the gift of \$20,000,000 to found and equip a university bearing the name of his lamented son. He was personally well known to many of the people of Utah—during the railroad-building days and prior to that time being a friend and admirer of President Young, as he has been since of the leading men in the Church. He was always a staunch and consistent friend of the people who settled and built up this Territory, and his voice was ever ready to testify of their works and worth as citizens. The

whole West presents no name that is so well known as his; for he was broad-minded, capable and sturdy in disposition and princely in generosity and munificence. If among all the army who knew him he had one enemy, even among political opponents, such information is not in our possession. It is enjoined upon us to speak no evil of the dead; but when there is so little evil known of those who have gone before, as in the case of Leland Stanford, the admonition has no force.

THE HERETIC.

The News was favored with a call this morning from a gentleman who took part in the recent Presbyterian assembly at Washington and who voted against Dr. Briggs. As the gentleman himself has figured somewhat among those who advocate independence of thought and freedom of expression in religious circles, even at times to the verge of heterodoxy, he was asked how he could reconcile his vote in the assembly with his previously expressed ideas, and his reply was quite frank and strictly to the point. He holds that Presbyterianism as an organization is unquestionably entitled to establish its own liturgy and make its own rules of religious conduct; if these were not upheld all discipline would be at an end and the church must inevitably cease to be itself and at once become something else. No matter whether Dr. Briggs was right or wrong in his departures so far as they themselves are concerned, he was wrong in claiming the shield of the organization whose tenets he opposed. Let him enter the broad field of Christianity untrammelled by systems and rules if he will, or go into some other development of religious practice and do all the good he can; but let him not as a Presbyterian seek to propagate ideas that are not among the articles of that particular faith.

There seems to be nothing intolerant or bigoted in all that; on the contrary, it appears quite consistent and reasonable. The right to be a heretic, or a reformer, is unquestionable; but if those who are thus actuated are unable to cause the church, the party or other organization to which they may belong to adopt their views, it is proper to either cease their advocacy or put them forth as the utterances of an individual, not of those who will not have them.

REFORMS THAT DO NOT REFORM.

Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D. D., has an excellent paper in last month's *North American Review* on the subject of "possible reform of the drink traffic"—a subject that just now more than ever before is engrossing the earnest attention of public men in every walk of life. The writer thinks that any one suggesting the possibility of reforming and purifying that traffic, especially in the large cities, places himself in a position of peculiar difficulty. We do not need this statement to cause us to believe it, in the same way that we believe—or know, rather—that any other deeply

rooted and widely patronized evil resists assault upon it and causes the assailants discomfort and discouragement. It is only through the "patient diet" rather than the "powder shock" that reforms of any kind are accomplished.

The doctor points to the sterling fact, that at first the enemies of the evangel of temperance are mighty and many and his supporters doubtful and few; that ranged against him are the enormous organized forces of alcohol-producers and those engaged in the liquor-trade. Next, he says, come the professional politicians whose interests are bound up in many ways with the present system of saloon and corner groggeries. "These places are the prolific spawning beds for dickers and deals. If these things are not the offspring of the saloon, the institution serves as an excellent midwife and wet-nurse to them. The ordinary temperance reformer and temperance politician cannot be induced to look favorably on any scheme for reform. He is fur destroying the trade root and branch. Here, then, are three groups of opponents, each strong in numbers and resources, each prepared to oppose and denounce with cleverness and bitterness any movement that aims at the reformation of the drink traffic itself."

Notwithstanding these discouragements, it is along that very line that the doctor claims to (and doubtless does) see the possibility of a lasting and permanent temperance reform being worked out. He attributes the failure of temperance reformers to their attempting the impossible. In seeking to root out alcohol they do this, and they might as well, in his judgment, seek to root out the use of beef and fish. The doctor narrows down to the conclusion that in one form or another alcohol is here to stay, and he does not recognize the fact, if there be one, that any temperance movement meets the inevitableness of the use of alcohol squarely. This is undoubtedly a correct presentation of a very difficult case; and when it is said further on that the refusal of the prohibitionist to make any distinction between the moderate and the immoderate drinker and that all alike including the dealer are public enemies to be suppressed by law, and that such fanatical hatred counts for nothing, he comes very nearly striking the nail on the head again. Such advocates are pronounced the worst obstacles in the way of real reform.

The coffee-house reformer is next discussed. It is said of him that he provides the public with a good thing; for that portion of the community who wish to use coffee his plans are admirable. "But neither coffee nor kindred beverages can take the place with the multitude that alcohol in some form has taken for ages, and for a long time will continue to take." And high license and religious influences are thus disposed of:

The advocate of high license, if he gain his way, will leave the sting in the evil business itself. His system permits the trade in drink to be pushed and expanded by individual capacity and for individual gain. Nor can the religious reformer hope to achieve much by present methods. These deal with the made drunkard, while the causes which make him are too often