

Announcements and Meetings.

THEATRE OF MUSIC.—Strakosch Italian Opera: "Les Huguenots." Mue. Nilsson. FOOTBALL.—"Machbeth." Mme. Janaschek. COLOSSEUM.—Day and evening: "Cydoriana of Paris by Night." DALY'S FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.—"Charity."

Index to Advertisements.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.—Eighth Page—5th and 6th columns. BANKING AND FINANCIAL.—Tenth Page—5th column. BOARD AND ROOMS.—Eighth Page—3d column.

Business Notices.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND ACCIDENT POLICY.—WITNESSES BY THE TRINITY INSURANCE COMPANY, Hartford. TO CONSUMPTIVES.—Many have been happy to see their names in favor of the "New York Dispensary."

TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

DAILY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$10 per annum. WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$3 per annum. WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$3 per annum.

New-York Daily Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1874.

TRIPLE SHEET.

There is further confirmation of the report of the capture of Coombs. Sir Garnet Wolseley has congratulated his troops on their success. A seven per cent loan of the Erie Railway Company has been opened in London and was well received.

Financial circles have for a few days past been full of rumors, favorable and unfavorable, concerning the Erie Railroad. The latest piece of news, however, is the dispatch from London announcing the successful introduction on the London Stock Exchange of the three million loan negotiated by President Watson.

We publish to-day a great variety of reports concerning the temperance cause in various parts of the country. In our own vicinity the prospect may be more hopeful than it appears; but the movement begins with much more preparation than was thought necessary in the West.

Among the clearest and most satisfactory analysis of Mr. Disraeli's Cabinet, and of the various political and personal problems which

entered into its organization, yet seen on this side of the Atlantic, is to be found in the letter of our regular London correspondent elsewhere printed this morning. Mr. Disraeli enters office under more favorable auspices than any Premier of late years has enjoyed.

There is probably no sort of political, diplomatic or other public significance attaching to the return of Minister Schenk. He is here because he has been away a long time, and because he has affairs at home which need his personal attention. He returns apparently in admirable health, but he may be excused for not a little bewilderment as to the condition of health in which he finds the party of the Administration he represents.

It appears that about \$2,500,000 have been lately paid out as "refunded duties" on fruit and silk ribbons. These two cases are familiar to the commercial public as being great scandals. The money was originally paid under a ruling which was favorable to the Government.

The review by Prof. T. Sterry Hunt of the Geological Survey of Ohio, which will be found on our eighth page, presents many features of interest. It seems as though its scientific survey had almost effected as great a gain for Ohio as that of Dr. Cox did a few years ago for Indiana, in laying the foundation for the development of its mineral wealth.

MR. GARFIELD ON THE FINANCES.

To make things seem the reverse of what they are is a task of no small difficulty. That Mr. Garfield has failed in an attempt to do this is no disparagement to his unquestioned, and in most respects very admirable, abilities. The charges which Mr. Garfield was called on to answer are such as these: That Congress is extravagant, since the cost of all branches of the Government has rapidly and steadily increased since the close of the war; that Congress is blind to the true interests of the country, since it has looked on with apine indifference while the Secretary of the Treasury has added twenty-six million dollars to the legal tender notes in circulation; that neither Congress nor the Administration comprehends the perils of the financial situation—not to multiply words, let us see what Mr. Garfield has to say on these points.

In answer to the charge of extravagance, Mr. Garfield has many words, but unfortunately they are not to the point. He relies mainly on the following table of the "Expenditures exclusive of the principal of the 'Public Debt,'" from June 30, 1865, to June 30, 1873:

Now, as an instrument for measuring the economy or extravagance with which the Government has been administered, the above table is absolutely worthless. This fact ought to be quite as well known to Mr. Garfield as it is to THE TRIBUNE and its readers. On June 30, 1865, both the Army and Navy were on a war footing, and subsequently hundreds of millions of dollars were paid to the soldiers and sailors in bounties, and all of these war expenditures are included in the early years in order to make a comparison which might show the Salary Grabbing Forty-second Congress to be a body of economical reformers! Nor is this all. In the year 1866-7 the interest on the Public Debt was \$143,781,593; in 1872-3 it was \$104,750,688, or nearly forty millions less. The decrease in the interest was due to the decrease of the principal; the decrease of the principal was due to the unexpended growth of the foreign imports, which increased the receipts from customs; the excessive growth of the foreign imports was the natural result of the speculation and extravagance arising from paper money and bank expansion. The surplus revenue, applied to the extinction of the funded debt and the consequent reduction of the interest account, were not the result of economy on the part of Congress, since, as we shall show, there was no economy, but of the extravagance and speculation of the people. Again, Mr. Garfield's figures include, in 1870, \$15,996,559; in 1871, \$9,016,795; in 1872, \$6,938,269 76, and in 1873, \$5,105,928, being the premium paid on purchased bonds. This item, being the discount at which the Government issued its interest-bearing promises, ought certainly to be excluded. It must not be forgotten that the question in dispute is the economy of Congress, not the improvement of the public credit or the reduction of the Public Debt.

ment to make the showing complete, and also the corresponding expenses in 1840, 1850, and 1860. The following table is taken from pages 16 and 17 of the tables annexed to the last annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury. For simplicity round numbers are given for the figures below the hundreds of thousands:

Table with columns: Year, Army, Navy, Post-Office, Navy, Miscellaneous. Rows for years 1840-1873.

If there is no extravagance in Government expenditures, as Mr. Garfield assures us, how is his Committee able to report bills, as it promises to do, cutting down the appropriations over thirty million dollars from last year's figures? Mr. Dawes exposed the manner in which money was wasted in the Pension Bureau and in the maintenance of Custom-houses simply to furnish sinecure offices as rewards for political services.

It is obvious that the disposal of these millions should not be determined by the passing whim of Treasury subordinates; the Secretary does not pretend to be personally responsible for the decisions. What influences the middlemen and "Treasury lawyers" bring to bear to secure favorable decisions in these cases may be guessed. This simple statement of the facts is sufficient to indicate what may be behind.

III. In conclusion, we have to say that Mr. Garfield, like Mr. Richardson, trusts to luck to provide for the future wants of the Treasury. Mr. Garfield gives an important position in his speech to an inquiry "how deficits occur." He reviews the vicissitudes of the Treasury in 1858-63, and in 1857-61, and comes back from those instructive periods in our country's history without apprehending an iota of their significance. Those deficits, he says, occurred on account of legislation which crippled the revenues, and have been overcome only by replacing the taxes which had been removed. We should expect, then, to see him advocating increased taxation, but he does nothing of the kind.

Table with columns: Year, Estimate, Actual. Rows for years 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863.

The receipts for the two years preceding the panic of 1857 were sixty-four millions per year. Is it not the actual truth, in spite of all attempts to hush things up, that every influence which contributed to make a deficit of seventy million dollars during the Administration of James Buchanan is now in operation? A panic and consequent stoppage of industry and prostration of confidence quite as deep seated as that of sixteen years ago; an administration of the public service more scandalous than anything of which we have had experience, or could imagine; the same disposition to jump at the conclusion that the trouble is all over, and that the revenues from foreign imports will hereafter equal the anti-panic figures; the same reluctance even to breathe the word taxation; and last, but not least, the Gauls at the gate, in the shape of an outraged people deliberating what shall be done, what can be done, to make Congress something better than a nuisance. We tell the Republican majority in Congress that the present state of our finances demands their earnest attention, and that the matter cannot be disposed of by a party vote like a contested election case. The welfare of our country for the next ten years depends upon a fearless, honest, intelligent treatment of our financial disorders.

WHAT SHALL BE DONE?

It is the universal opinion in Washington that the merchants have made out their case against the Custom-house so completely that neither Jayne, nor Butler, nor all the politicians of that snug and active combination, can save the system from a thorough overhauling. The Committee of Ways and Means is said to be unanimous in condemning the abuses which have grown up under the laws of 1863 and 1867, and is expected to make a strong report in favor of reform. But we must not flatter ourselves with the hope that the victory is yet secure. Accepting the necessity of some sort of a reform, the moiety hunters will bend all their energies to prevent that reform from going deep enough to ruin them. They will tell us—they are telling us already—that without seizures we can never collect the revenue, without moieties we can never make officers alert, without inspecting a merchant's private accounts we can never be sure that his invoices are honest. They will point to the vast aggregate of penalties during the past ten years as a proof that the mercantile community is rotten to the core; and they will bid us be satisfied with a few delusive safeguards for the prevention of illegal and extra-judicial oppressions, while

we let the law stand substantially as it is. When the English people were fighting for the great principle recognized now for more than a hundred years as a part of their common law, that private papers shall not be searched to obtain evidence against their owner, they were met with this same answer, that without such process Government could not discover and prevent crime. The same reason was given in excuse for the writs of assistance which roused the American colonists to the defense of their liberties; and it is the argument of all despotic governments which exercise the power of invading private homes and violating the secrets of the post-office, that espionage and seizure are essential to the preservation of order and the enforcement of the laws. But no free people in the world submit to such proceedings or listens to such reasons—except the people of the United States.

In the first place, therefore, the law authorizing the seizure of books and papers must be totally abolished; not modified, but expunged. It is a disgrace to our statute books, and not a fragment of it ought to remain. So long as it stands, in any form, it will be easy for unscrupulous officials to write fines from the innocent. To seize the private papers and account books of a suspected merchant is to punish the accused before he has been tried. The seizure itself is a penalty of the severest kind. It is not merely an inconvenience; it involves obstruction to business, damage to credit, and incalculable pecuniary loss; and the fact is undeniable that many an importer, who might have gone into court with a clear conscience and acquitted himself of any purpose to defraud the Government, has been compelled, in order to get back his books and resume business, to compromise with the informer, not because he feared the result of a trial, but because delay meant bankruptcy. No possible advantage to the public revenue through the operation of such a system will compensate for its radical injustice. It is better to lose a million through dishonest undervaluations than to make a million by the oppression of the innocent.

No amendment that can be devised will remove from this monstrous law its tyrannical and hateful character. No pruning and trimming will alter its essential unconstitutionality. Whether moieties must be abolished entirely is perhaps an open question; but that they must be placed on a new basis, if they are retained at all, admits of no doubt. As the law stands to-day, the revenue service, the detective service, and the officers of the courts are virtually in a conspiracy to encourage offenses in order to make money by them. The Custom-house clerks and inspectors are paid a handsome bonus for first convicting at undervaluations and then denouncing them. The Special Agents are paid to bribe employes of the importers to commit irregularities in their transactions with the Custom-house, in order that they may share in the consequent penalties. The District Attorney is paid to prevent the accused merchant from getting justice in the United States Court and to frighten him into a compromise. The Collector is paid to use his influence with the Secretary of the Treasury to prevent a remission; and if the unfortunate importer goes to Washington he finds in the most powerful of the Republican members of Congress the unpaid counsel of the Special Agent. Mr. Jackson S. Schultz, in his remarkable address before the Committee on Saturday, gave an explanation of some of the worst features of this rapacious organization, and we think he must have made it evident that no reform would be worth much till the conspiracy was destroyed. Secretary McCulloch declared in his official report for 1859: "The experience I have had in the Treasury Department has convinced me that the evils attending the system are greater than the benefits derived from it; and he added that the practice of 'allowing persons to purchase a fraudulent course until a result was reached which would inure to the benefit of the officers and informers, instead of checking criminal practices at the outset,' had become 'quite general.' Secretary Boutwell, in his report for 1871, urged upon Congress 'the importance of abolishing the system of shares and moieties as far as the benefits inure to revenue officers and other persons officially connected with the Government.' Secretary Richardson, who long ago declared the unconstitutionality of laws for the seizure of books and papers, has recently recommended 'the abolition of all moieties except in the case of smuggling' (which would be in accordance with the English plan). The Senate Committee on Retrenchment submitted two forcible reports to the same effect in 1872. It is the duty of officers of the customs, said the majority report, to prevent cheating in the quantities or values of merchandise that passes their inspection. 'The Government should not bribe them to be defrauded by holding up to them great fortunes for detecting the fraud. The husband who pays his harvester a meager salary for gathering grain, but offers him one-half for gleaming all that his rake passes over, should not be surprised to learn that his servant rakes slovenly.'

THE PADDOCK ELMS.

There is weeping and wailing among the Hamdryades of Tremont-st., in Boston. It may seem a contradiction in terms to say that Aldermen have no bowels—they do not look it, as Punch said of Mue. Albany—but it was settled (8 to 4), after no end of talk and petitioning, and calling of Yeas and Nays, that the woodman should not spare the Tremont-st. trees, and the convenience of a street railway triumphed over sentiment. The gentle friends of the ancient trees made speeches in their behalf; while disclaiming sentiment, they spoke indirectly of associations; the defenders of the trees presented a most respectable front. Mr. Marshall P. Wilder, who is authority as to all things growing out of the ground, could not see that public convenience required cutting down; Dr. Holmes, who is popularly supposed to be descended, upon the mother's side, from Daphne, and who is acquainted with all the fine trees in Massachusetts, protested; so did the Rev. Mr. Bartol, the kindest hearted of clergymen. There was nobody over from Harvard University Law School to quote the thirty-seventh Book of the Digest, in which it is provided that those who cut down trees "shall be treated like thieves" (langui latrones). There was nobody to quote Shakespeare's "tongues in trees," or the Bible's "spreading himself like a green bay tree," or Milton's "towers and battlements, 'bosomed high in tufted trees." In fact, before that Board of Aldermen the protestants seem to have felt that the more poetry the worse it would be for them. Dr. Holmes begged the Aldermen to wait till next June, when the poor trees would be in full foliage, and when every leaf would plead; but the Aldermen evidently smelt poetry, in this suggestion, and met it with the deepest (and longest) of ears. The trees, and fine old fellows they were, it was voted must come down, and down they are. We suspect that this settles the fate of the Old South Church, which is an ugly old building, whereas the trees were really beautiful. If it should now be proposed to convert Bunker Hill Monument into a shot-tower, we promise not to be in the least astonished. Pretty soon all the antiquities of Boston will be in Drake's History, which, fortunately, is an uncommonly good one.

AN OLD STORY.

The erudite Ritson, commenting upon the proverb "As drunk as a beggar," quaintly says: "This begins now to be disused, and instead of it people are ready to say, 'As drunk as a lord, so much hath this vice' (No more's the pity!) prevailed among the nobility and gentry of late years." If we pleased to go into the antiquities of the subject, from the time of Noah down, there would be enough to say and to cite. Mohammed put it all into a nut-shell when he called wine "the mother of sins." Archbishop Laud boasts in the history of his chancellorship, that he had "reduced the number of ale-houses in Oxford from 300 to 100." As early as 1571 a Bredwell was proposed for tipplers, every one of them to be assessed 13d. per annum for his support. What is called Prohibition is no new thing, new as we think it. An act for diminishing the sale of spirituous liquors was passed in 1733 by the British Parliament, aimed specially at the gin shops and brandy shops; and so great in London was fear of a riot upon its enforcement, that an extra military force was kept in readiness. The London Magazine for October, 1733, mentions that "a surgeon-warden 'cary and chemist have been fined £100 each 'for retailing spirituous liquors contrary to 'the act,' and the popular cry at that time was, 'No gin, no king!' Strong drink is said to have hastened Addison's death, yet he was constantly warning the readers of The Spectator against inebriety; and No. 599 contains a specially good consideration of the subject. Fielding, the novelist, in his admirable essay on "The Causes of the Late 'Increase of Robbers," says, in the very spirit

and almost in the very words of modern temperance lecturers: "Thus we see the Legislature have taken the utmost care, not only 'to punish, but even prevent, this vice of 'drunkenness, which the preamble of one of the foregoing statutes calls a loathsome and 'odious sin, and the root and foundation of 'many other enormous sins, as murder, &c.'" Coming down almost to the present, we find Cobbett, in his "Advice to Young Men," saying in a time of specially hard British drinking: "I beg you to regard as paraversors of 'Scripture and as seducers of youth all who 'cite the Bible texts as an apology for the 'practice of wine drinking in England.'"

We might go on with our illustrations of inebriety, but these must suffice. There is nothing new under the sun. The vice and folly of drunkenness were as well understood in the days of Juvenal as they are now in the days of Mr. Neal Dow. "You will find the 'drunkard,' says the Roman satirist, 'beside 'some cat-throat, along with sailors, or 'thieves, or runaways.' 'You will find him,' says Mr. Dow, 'in the prison or the almshouse.'" The testimony of the Holy Scriptures we have not thought it necessary to cite, familiar as it is to all. Nor is there anything specially new in our methods of combating and mitigating the vice. Prohibition has been tried over and over again; that is regulation, for we have never had any statute anywhere which absolutely prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors. Dram-sellers were heavily fined both in Old England and New England more than a century ago; inebriates were imprisoned and fined three centuries ago; moralists have been denouncing that form of immorality almost ever since the creation; and women, doubtless, in the days of our grandmothers, pleaded with desperate and heart-broken eloquence, and besought the dram-seller to abandon a traffic which was desolating their homes. We have discovered nothing—neither a new disease nor a new remedy. It was as well understood in Dr. Johnson's day as it is now, that for some men total abstinence is the only safety.

There is nothing, however, in the facts which we have stated to discourage the advocates of temperance. On the contrary, it should be encouraging to them that the common sense of the race has always been upon their side and of their mind. It would be better for the world, doubtless, if moral warfare could become no longer necessary; but this the constitution of our nature and our endless heritage of infirmity forbid us to hope for. It would be better if the contest with evil could always be persistent and steady, instead of spasmodic and intermittent; but this the infinite variety of human interests seems to render at least improbable. Society is like a leaky ship; only hard labor at the pumps keeps us afloat. Much which we are complacently ready to dismiss as fanaticism breaks our peace and will not down at our bidding, simply because the world needs impromptu protest to save it from cold indifference, to keep its eyes open to its own best interest and its feet in the paths of social progress.

The prevalent belief at Washington appears to be that Mr. William E. Dodge and Mr. Jackson S. Schultz have made an end of the spy and moiety business. Merchants will do well not to be too sanguine. Evils of this sort are too profitable to be easily. The one thing which alone seems to be thus far settled by last week's work in Washington, is the absolute innocence and good fame of an old and eminent New-York house, which had been shamelessly slandered and blackmailed. Readers of THE TRIBUNE have invariably been told that the house of Phelps, Dodge & Co. had done nothing to forfeit the confidence of the community or of the Government. It is, nevertheless, a satisfaction to find their vindication at last so universally accepted. The one point on which they fatally failed was in not making fight at the right time. If, profiting by their example and fate, New-York merchants can now seize the golden opportunity, act together, and make use of the information in their hands, they can crush out the whole system which bred and fattened such famous scoundrels as Jayne.

On the third page of THE TRIBUNE to-day is printed a report of a lecture delivered at Cooper Institute, last Saturday night, by Prof. Chaudes. The subject of this lecture, "Health and Health Laws," is one which ought to commend itself to every thoughtful person. The statements relating to the causes of disease in cities are particularly deserving of attention, even if they were not pointed by the appalling information that one-half the deaths among children in this city might be prevented.

The week opens upon the same stagnant condition of business which gentlemen at Washington have succeeded in bestowing upon the country for the last two months. Until they can be coaxed or driven into doing something which shall give the business community a definite knowledge of what the volume of the currency is to be, no revival need be expected. Men will not buy or sell cloth till the length of the yard-stick is fixed.

PERSONAL.

Ex-Gov. Henry A. Wise is recovering from his dangerous illness. The Rev. Robert Laird Collier of Chicago has started upon a European trip. Jay Cooke is to be succeeded by Gen. Negley in the management of the National Soldiers' Home. The Hon. Alexander H. Stephens is still confined to his bed, and the prospect of his resuming his place in the House of Representatives during the present session is not very bright. Another old member of the Assembly has been discovered. He is 80 years old, lives at Scott, Portland County, and his name is John Gillett. The date of his membership is not given. Prominent members of the Republican party at Buffalo have telegraphed to Mr. Sherman S. Rogers, who is now in Europe, asking if he would accept the appointment of Judge of the United States District Court, in place of the late Judge N. K. Hall. Mr. Rogers is warmly commended by the local journals of both political parties. Mr. J. F. Christie, an officer of the U. S. Senate, has received \$115 in subscriptions not exceeding \$5 each, in aid of the fund for the purchase of a portrait of the late John P. Hale, to be hung in the State House at Concord, New-Hampshire. Mr. Christie suggests that a portrait or statue of Mr. Hale be placed also in the National Gallery at Washington. Mr. James T. Fields of Boston has been delivering six lectures at the Publicy Institute, in Baltimore, to crowded houses. His last lecture was attended by the largest audience ever gathered into the great hall of the Institute with the single exception of Prof. Tyndall's. Mr. Fields' subjects were: "Charles Lamb and his Work in Literature," "Bygone Smith and his Work in Literature," "Christopher North, with personal recollections," "Alfred, Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, in 'Literary and Artistic Life in London, Twenty-five years ago,'" and "Fiction and its Eminent Authors." The gold medal that Congress voted to Mr. George F. Robinson, who saved Secretary Ward's life when the latter was attacked by the assassin Payne, is now on exhibition at Washington. It is of solid gold, three inches in diameter and three-eighths of an inch thick. On one side is a picture of the recipient, with wreaths of laurel and oak gathered about his head, and the following words around the edge: "To George F. Robinson, awarded by the Congress of the United States, March 1, 1871, for his heroic conduct on the 11th of April, 1865, in saving the life of the Hon. Wm. H. Seward, the Secretary of State of the United States." On the reverse side is a representation of Mr. Seward lying on his sick couch, with Robinson and Payne in a struggle beside it.