The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1876.

Amusements To-Day.

Bowery Theatre—Hush-a-by Baby.
Fifth Avenue Theatre—Our American Cousin.
Gilmore's Garden—Gilmore's Band.
Kelly & Leon's Minstrels—224 st., near 4th av.
Tony Pastor's New Theatre—Variety.
Wallack's Theatre—Mighty Dollar.

Belknapism in the Senate—The Vote of Yesterday.

Taking refuge behind a technicality that had been overruled by a majority vote of the Senate itself at the opening of the impeachment trial which ended yesterday, the Republican Senators have evaded the iniquitous facts of the case, and failed to convict the bribe-taker BELKNAP. It would have been too absurd in them to pronounce him not guilty of the high crimes and misdemeanors with which he stood charged; for his guilt had been established, not merely by his own virtual confession, but by a body of direct evidence that could not be shaken. But he has been shielded by Republican votes from the proper and just penalty of his misdeeds, under the pretext that the jurisdiction of the Senate, in impeachment trials, did not extend over functionaries who resigned office after the exposure of their criminality. He had cunningly handed in his resignation, which GRANT instantly and accommodatingly accepted, after the evidence against him had been produced; and thus, by this trick, secured for himself the paltry plea of which he has been allowed to take advantage.

The vote by which BELKNAP'S so-called acquittal has been brought about was wholly made up of Republican members, with the single exception of EATON of Connecticut; and *it embraced an actual majority of the Republican members of the Senate.* The Democratic Senators, nearly all of whom voted for conviction, were sustained by a number of Republican members; but a two-thirds majority was required. The Republican party, as represented in the Senate, is thus directly and indisputably responsible for the escape of this guilty man. They must defend and justify this infamy before the people, who will not be satisfied with the subterfuges by which justice has been defeated.

Many of them, doubtless, felt that they could not convict BELKNAP without injuring the Republican party as much as it would be injured by his acquittal. Not a few of its other high officers and leaders, including members of the Senate itself, have been guilty of offences like those with which BELKNAP stood charged. His conviction would have been an assault on GRANT himself.

The guilty Secretary has escaped conviction in a pitiful way; but no man who has read the evidence can entertain any doubt of his criminality. In his acquittal, both the Republicans and the Democrats of the country are furnished with a spectacle of dishonor which may well set them all thinking.

Profligacy and Fraud in the Navy Department.

It is estimated, upon the basis of official reports made to the committee of investigation, that more than a million of dollars has been expended every election year, by SECOR ROBESON'S order, to help the Republican ticket in districts where navy yards are located. This abuse has taken immense proportions under GRANT, and is more offensive from being in open defiance of laws passed expressly to correct it.

The acts of March, 1867, of June, 1868, and of May, 1872, provide that master workmen in the several navy yards shall be men skilled in their various duties; secondly, that no officer or employee of the Government shall require any workman in any navy yard to contribute or pay money for political purposes, and that no workman shall be removed or discharged on account of his political opinions; and thirdly, that laborers shall be employed in the several navy yards, by the proper officers in charge, with reference to skill and efficiency, and without regard to other considerations.

Experience has shown that instead of furnishing a remedy, these laws have been ignored and discarded by the Secretary of the Navy, and the system to-day is infinitely more corrupt, disgraceful, and criminal than before they were passed. ROBESON sought to strengthen himself, and to secure defenders in the Senate and House, when arraigned for his jobbery and venality, by squandering the public money in this way; and he has succeeded in this game, for now, when justly threatened with impeachment, HALE, FRYE, KASSON, GARFIELD, HARRIS of Massachusetts, and others, are justifying his excesses and vindicating him, as they did BELKNAP until he confessed his rascality.

By taking the total average in the navy yards at Portsmouth, Boston, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Mare Island for the month of October, 1872, on the eve of the Presidential election, it will be found that 9,222 persons were employed, while in 1875 there were but 4,388, or less than one-half when there was no election. About 5,000 extra men were taken on at these times, and most of them for three months, with an average pay of $3 per diem. The orders for this profligate expenditure were issued often directly by ROBESON himself, giving the names of the politicians to be employed, or through the bureaus in general terms, allowing the local managers to make the appointments. Here are specimens from the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, whom the committee regard as corrupt and unworthy of the least confidence.

"(Private.)

"BOSTON, Mass., Oct. 23, 1874.

"MY DEAR COMMODORE: I wish you would authorize requisitions for men to be employed as they may be made until the 1st of November.

"Some fifty additional men are allowed from the Chelsea district, and I suppose some more will be required in Goodrich's district.

"Pro. Administration requires the success of GOODRICH and FOST. Yours respectfully, J. HANSCOM.

"Commodore L. H. NICHOLS, U. S. N., Commandant."

"WASHINGTON, Feb. 21, 1872.

"*Commodore* J. C. HOWELL, *Commandant N. Y. Navy Yard*:

"If the Monitor crew is wanted, you may employ forty men on her in addition to present force. Gen. N. H. is a large shareholder. J. HANSCOM,

"Chief of Bureau of Construction and Repair."

There are hundreds of such orders, and the commandants at the navy yards testify to the following effect:

"Commodore FAIRFAX (Kittery Yard, sworn):

"Q.—What are these orders? A.—The unnecessary number of men employed prior to election.

"Is that matter within your personal observation? A.—Yes, sir; at the Kittery Navy Yard. I was there two years, and have witnessed the constant interference on the part of Mr. HANSCOM in discharging and employing men. He often took on worthless men instead of good men.

"Q.—Did Hanscom name the men? A.—Certain men are named, and we take them on. As military men we obey without question.

"Q.—Time men are laborers, are they not? A.—Yes, sir; at the various departments, such as blacksmiths, shipwrights, and all that sort of thing? A.—Yes, sir; in the various departments.

"Q.—That is, men are taken on without any requisition from your department here, but from employing officers from Washington? A.—Yes, sir. While I was at the Portsmouth Navy Yard there was an effort made to reduce the supernumeraries of the yard. It was suggested to the Secretary of the Navy that a good deal of expense could be saved by discharging certain clerks in the yard. We only proceeded as far as the discharging of supernumeraries in the yards, taking in Portsmouth amounting to several thousand dollars a year—probably nine or ten thousand dollars in that one branch. As I was instrumental in bringing this thing about, I came very near losing my position as the executive officer of the yard. I had MORRILL (present Secretary of the Treasury) and CRAGIN against me; they told the Secretary of the Navy that it couldn't be done.

"Dr. WESTWORTH was a practising physician in Kittery, he held a position through Mr. HAMLIN for political services, and during the war. He came to me and said he had been appointed to this position, *with the understanding that there was nothing to do. It was* at $1,500 a month. He practised medicine, and I know he was secretly able to do duty. He was discharged, and for a time remained about the yard, but was afterward reappointed, and continued in the yard, not having anything more than nominal duties. He had his brother, at $4 per day, to attend to the duty.

"Q.—He was discharged? A.—Yes, sir.

"Q.—There was no necessity for the office? A.—No, sir.

"Q.—Was he afterward taken on? A.—Yes, sir. He came back about the time I left. *When I left they were all put back.*"

Similar cases may be reckoned by thousands. And where there was no pretext for employing these worthless partisans, the department ordered fine ships to be destroyed that were lying on the stocks, and had cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Take one illustration in point from the testimony of Capt. YOUNG, U. S. N., at the Kittery yard:

"A very singular thing occurred at the Boston yard, which I thought a great shame at the time. There was a lot of men taken into the yard, and I don't think there was anything particular for them to do; so they set at work breaking up the Virginia, *a line-of-battle ship that was on the stocks.* She was built of live-oak timber, and *was as sound as the first day that the timber was put into her.*

"Q.—Where and when was that done? A.—At Boston in the summer of 1873. *She was built and planked, all ready for launching,* or nearly so.

"Q.—And *then they broke her up?* A.—Yes, sir; *they cut those timbers in two, sawed them in sections, and broke her up, partly only.* The work stopped all at once. The excuse for breaking her up was that they wanted room in the ship house to build another ship. They put on board double men, and they worked in her until they got down to the orlop deck, when the men were discharged, and the work ceased. There she stands to-day, occupying as much room in the ship house as she did before they commenced to break her up.

"Q.—That was done just before an election in Massachusetts, wasn't it? A.—Yes, sir; I was so informed."

This wanton waste runs all through the department, and it was encouraged for no other reason than to purchase the support of members of Congress, who in their turn would uphold ROBESON in his frauds, and whitewash his scandalous transactions, as they have frequently done, and have just now repeated, in the face of the most conclusive proofs of his corrupt complicity with the thieves who have been systematically stealing the appropriations made for the navy.

It is easy to understand, with such a system as this going on, by which millions have been squandered for the party at one end of the line, and millions stolen at the other end, by ROBESON'S brokers levying blackmail on all the great contracts but one which he looked after himself, how two hundred millions have disappeared in seven years of Grantism, and left nothing but miserable hulks and worthless experiments to be called a navy. And this is a part of the Administration which the Cincinnati platform commended, and which HAYES has unqualifiedly endorsed!

The Regular Army Tested Again.

When Gen. TERRY made his last endeavor to communicate with CROOK, there was not an officer or soldier in his command on the Yellowstone whom he could use for the purpose. Each and all were utterly unfitted for such service, and he had to hire a mountaineer, with the promise of five hundred dollars, to undertake the perilous enterprise. SANDY, a trapper, mounted and started at night. SANDY'S success lay in large part in his ability to cover his trail. Tis a small but unanswerable testimony to the inadequacy of West Point's education to teach war against Indians, that not an officer in TERRY'S command noticed that the horse given to SANDY was shod, or reflected that the marks of his shoes would publish to any Indian who should see them, that a white courier was riding from TERRY to CROOK. SANDY returned to have the shoes taken off. If the inside of the horse's hoofs had been pared down when he was shod, as they probably were, SANDY'S second endeavor must have betrayed his character and mission as inevitably as the iron shoes would have done, since the horse's tracks would have shown the absence of the frog. The wise Indian leaves his horse the use of his frog; indeed he never touches his hoof with a tool. To him, the absence of the frog in the impression of the foot is an infallible sign of a white man. TERRY and his officers did not know how to command the simplest element of success for an attempt at communication.

Again, the reconnoitring party sent out by CROOK under SIBLEY, a West Point Lieutenant, was saved from destruction by the mountaineer FRANK GROUARD. The Lieutenant did not know how to fight Indians; he did not know how to save his command when cornered. That education cannot be given at West Point. The officer was brave, and so were his men. They would have fought to the death, and died without a whimper. But that is not war. It is only fine manhood. GROUARD, though, was a soldier of the best education. He declined a fight so unequal as to end in the certain destruction of the entire command, tied the horses to the trees as a blind, abandoned even food and water as impediments, and crawled quickly and silently through the trees on a rapid forty-five-mile retreat over the mountain. The Lieutenant commanding showed his good sense in placing himself and his party under GROUARD'S direction from the moment the Sioux first trailed them. He knew that he was at the end of his West Point rope—outside of his drill, his books, and his knowledge; that he was helpless; that his own scalp and those of all the men under him would dangle before sundown at the belts of the Indians. We honor him for pocketing his pride and asking his scout to save his command. And they were saved. But something was lost. Wherever in the United States this story is read, a portion of the faith that our regular army can successfully fight Indians is lost. And if the regular army cannot do that, what logic is there for its existence?

For Indian warfare the regular army is wrong from top to bottom. Neither officers nor men can scout. They do not know the country. They cannot subsist in it without a commissariat. They cannot trail. They cannot approach unseen. They cannot estimate numbers from signs left on the ground. They cannot read the language of monuments and tokens. They are not familiar with the habits of their foes. Every command now in the field has to employ and rely on large detachments of friendly Indians as guides, scouts, skirmishers, and couriers. Our infantry is obviously useless against Indian cavalry. Its Springfield musket is the best weapon in the world, but the Indians can keep out of its range in the daylight, and at night strike with effect. The carbine of our cavalry is a short-range arm. The Indians have the Winchester rifle, with which they can exterminate a cavalry regiment if dismounted; or mounted, if they can hold it long enough under fire. Our horses are wrong. They are large and slow and clumsy on rough ground, and in close fighting. Our men are wrong. The infantry is recruited from the idle poor of the cities, and almost wholly from foreigners. The cavalry, indeed, is recruited mostly with Americans, and largely from farms, and therefore is the best arm of our service.

The right material to fight Indians with is to be found only on the plains, and in Montana, Wyoming, Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Texas. It rarely enlists. It hunts buffalo for their hides, prospects the mountains for silver and gold, drives teams across the plains, herds cattle on the range, races and trades horses, drives thousands of steers up from Texas to the Eastern trunk railways, chops cordwood for Missouri river steamers, hunts deer and antelope for the market, mines in Colorado and New Mexico, drinks, gambles, fights, murders, but never runs; and in cunning, coolness, endurance, skill, and courage, is an overmatch for the best of the Indians.

Ten or twelve weeks of fighting weather remain for the Sioux war. It will go over to another year, and to other years after that, unless the men we speak of are hired to whip these savages. 'Twas so with the Modocs, when the seemingly easy job of thrashing them had to be taken off the hands of the West Pointers and regulars. Our army chiefs resist the employment of our true Indian fighting material, and for the excellent reason that the army cannot afford to make the confession that it cannot fight Indians. That confession would sooner or later be followed by an act of Congress abolishing the army as a useless institution. The army chiefs will probably let the war drag till the snow falls, then plead necessity and go into winter quarters; and go likewise to Congress for an increase of the regular army.

The Late German Census.

The last census of the German empire, taken December 1, 1875, was conducted after a new method. The tabulated report which has now been published presents the results of that experiment, as well as other impressive features of social and political significance.

This is the first time that the Italian process of recension, by which a descriptive card is allotted to each individual, instead of to each house or family, has been applied throughout the German empire. The advantages of this plan were completely demonstrated. Although for infants and illiterate persons the minutes of the census taker must still be furnished by third persons, it is found that inquiries are upon the whole more fully and accurately answered. But the chief merit of the new system is the wonderful despatch and facility secured to the labor of tabulation. Instead of each specific detail being transcribed by hand, entailing, of course, an enormous amount of quill driving and computation, a particular fact, as for instance the number of factory hands in a given district, is instantly determined by weight, all the cards relating to the subject being thrown upon nicely adjusted scales. The ratio of error, too, by this process is less than under the old scheme of enumeration. We need not point out that the usefulness of recensions is in direct proportion to their frequency, and that the Italian method, by reducing expenses to a minimum, may pave the way to an annual census.

Such lessons, however, as may be gathered from statistics are easily deduced for Germany, where a census has thrice been taken, at regular intervals, within ten years. During the first quadrennium, which began with the returns for Dec. 10, 1867, the country was still suffering from the consequences of the war with Austria, and had subsequently, in the Franco-Prussian contest, to sustain the temporary deduction from her productive capacity of a million able-bodied men, besides the permanent loss, through death, of ninety thousand. As might have been expected, the census of Dec. 1, 1871, showed a trivial rate of increase for the preceding period, amounting to no more than 952,000, or about half of one per cent. a year. At that time the total population of the States composing the German empire was forty-one millions and some sixty thousand.

As those four years were darkened by war, so the term which has just closed with the statistics for December, 1875, has been an era of financial crisis and protracted commercial depression. After an unparalleled expansion of speculation during the first two years of the latter period, the panic of 1873 put a summary stop to every species of enterprise, deprived manufactures of capital and workmen of employment. According to the organs of the Berlin Stock Exchange, the German people had been reduced to unheard-of straits, and the most untoward exhibit was predicted from the new census. The returns, however, show nothing of the kind, but quite the contrary. The population of the German empire has been augmented since December, 1871, by one million seven hundred and fifty thousand, which is equivalent to a mean annual gain of rather more than one per cent. It is doubtless true that this remarkable increase is partly due to the vast shrinkage of emigration, and it is also probable that a failure of resources has occasioned a falling off in the number of marriages, the effect of which will first be visible in the next period. In spite, however, of these qualifications, we must conclude, in view of the statistics cited, that the severity of the commercial crisis in Germany has been grossly exaggerated.

This inference is confirmed by a glance at the figures, which announce the progress of particular States and provinces. Thus the departments of Prussia, where the gain in population is most signal, as in Westphalia, the Rhine province, and Brandenburg, which includes Berlin, are precisely those most conspicuous for the development of manufacturing and commercial enterprise. An apparent exception to this rule in Bavaria, where the district which contains the capital has advanced more rapidly than the Palatinate, notwithstanding the latter's preëminence as a productive centre, is explained not only by the great influx to Munich from all parts of the kingdom, but by a curious circumstance in the history of the last-named province. It appears that since WILLIAM PENN settled a colony from the Palatinate on the Delaware, the relations of the mother land with her offshoot have been so close, and the custom of sending forth numbers of her young men to join their kinsfolk in Pennsylvania has grown to be so inveterate, that the arrest of emigration so decisive elsewhere throughout Germany is here scarcely perceptible.

The assertion of JOHN STUART MILL that the means of supporting the burdens of life must diminish for the laboring class with the subdivision of the soil and the increase in the number of inhabitants, is not fully vindicated by the results of the German census. We are rather impelled to formulate the conclusion that the progress of population is not directly proportioned to its density, which would be sufficiently subversive of MILL'S theory, but actually moves at a relatively greater rate. Thus Pomerania and Westphalia, in respect of density of population, differ as one to two, while as regards their mean annual gain during the last four years, they vary as one to three. Again, the number of inhabitants to the square mile in Posen and in the Rhine province differed as three to seven, but the rate of increase as one to four. The tabulated returns for the several federated States point in the same direction, and we infer that the facilities for meeting the necessities of life are not contracted, but augmented, by the agglomeration of individuals within small areas, and the multiform and intense activities that grow out of it.

In the distribution of the German population we recognize the symptoms of that social change which is by no means inactive in the United States, and which has essentially transformed the British Isles. Owing to the attraction, so to speak magnetic, exercised by manufacturing centres, like Berlin, Cologne, and Breslau, through the scope and variety of their opportunities, on the working classes in rural districts and provincial towns, the latter are dwindling every day, while the great cities, casting more widely their net of railways, are continually draining a larger area. To the middle-aged citizen of Bonn, of Stettin, or of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, the decadence of his petty town doubtless appears deplorable; but the organic development of the German empire, its political strength, productive energy, and intellectual growth, are all furthered by the process of condensation.

GRANT deserves impeachment just as much as ROBESON or BELKNAP, yet it may not be advisable to impeach him. But is it safe for Congress to adjourn leaving a free opportunity for the exercise of unrestricted power in the hands of such a President?

We protest against the injustice done to Mr. JAMES GORDON BENNETT by a writer in the Boston *Herald*, who alleges that the articles advocating the nomination of Mr. MANTON MARBLE for Governor of New York, which have recently appeared in Mr. BENNETT'S paper, were dictated only by a desire to spite THE SUN! This is a preposterous idea. Mr. BENNETT cannot be actuated by such petty motives. Besides, he knows very well that there is no distinguished citizen of this State for whose talents and character we entertain a more sincere respect than for those of Mr. MARBLE; and no one to whose elevation we should contribute with more unfeigned satisfaction. This Boston writer should get more sense before he undertakes to treat such serious topics.

The will of the late Commodore GARNER is a succinct and sensible document. A man is foolish who makes a will so complicated that it opens opportunities for litigation; and this is apt to happen where the testator tries to control his property for an indefinite period after his death, and meet all the chances that may occur to his heirs. A man is apt to fail in the attempt to manage his affairs after his death by an elaborate will. The GARNER orphans, now very young, will probably be among the richest people of the country when they reach the age at which they will get the income of the great estate of their father, which under successful management ought to be largely increased in the interval. Mr. GARNER left nothing to charities, but that was his own business. He was a generous, free-handed man, and probably he thought his heirs would inherit the same traits of character, and distribute their bounty for themselves.

Between now and next November GRANT will make constant trouble for the Republicans. He is the bull in their china shop. If they had repudiated him squarely at Cincinnati, they would have gone into the canvass in better shape; but that they did not dare to do, fearing his control over the officeholders, who are the nucleus of the party. But there would undoubtedly be joy in the Republican ranks if GRANT was out of the way. Yet, talk as they may about civil service reform and other fine things, their canvass is led by ZACH CHANDLER and DON CAMERON, and HAYES is no more than a puppet obedient to their wire-pulling. The contest is between reform and Grantism; and you can't change the issue. TILDEN is the champion of the one, and HAYES of the other.

The men who have known Mr. TILDEN longest and most intimately, and understand best the constitution of his mind and the nature of his ideas, are those who have most faith in his statesmanship. And they are not confined to his own party. Mr. TILDEN'S administration promises to be one of the purest, wisest, and most brilliant in the annals of the country.

There seems to be a serious effort on foot among certain Republicans to overthrow ROSCOE CONKLING as the leader of the Republican party in this State. They oppose the nomination of every man for office supposed to be in his interest, and they treat our distinguished Senator as if he was an enemy in the camp, and not the great chieftain of the Republican party in the State. But they fight against enormous odds. Senator CONKLING is not a man to parley with his foes, especially when they are of his own household. He whipped these Republican rebels at Syracuse, and he will rout them at Saratoga. What better, abler, more efficient party worker than ALONZO B. CORNELL, with his WASHINGTON head, could the Republicans nominate for Governor? The malcontents of the Republican party would find it hard to answer this question.

The death at Plymouth, N. H., on Thursday, of PETER MARTIN, one of the oldest members of the grocery trade in this city, was published with a request for the relatives and friends not to send any flowers to his funeral.

No one objects to some simple floral tribute, such, for example, as that which GEORGE WASHINGTON CHILDS, A. M., so gracefully deposited on the remains of her Grace the Duchess of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS; but this sensible old gentleman, PETER MARTIN, had no doubt heard of the outrageous lengths to which this flower business had been carried in the case of A. T. STEWART and others, and resolved to do what little he could to check it.

ZACH CHANDLER, Chairman of the HAYES National Committee, is levying assessments on the officeholders for the benefit of HAYES, with the approbation of GRANT, SECOR ROBBERSON, BOSS SHEPHERD, Measurer BABCOCK, and the rest of the White House Ring. If HAYES is elected, do SCHURZ, FENTON, and that set suppose he will dare to go back on the men who ran the White House machine for his benefit?

The Nassau street lawyer, COTTERILL, who decamped last week after perpetrating frauds to the extent of $40,000, leaving his wife and eight children destitute, was a man of bad reputation before he came here from England. When he left London to begin legal practice in this city, five or six years ago, he was under accusation of having embezzled a large sum of money—£40,000 it was stated—belonging to clients of his firm in Throgmorton street. The losers were mainly stock brokers, and the mischief he wrought was attributed to unfortunate operations on the Stock Exchange. At that time the legal organs of London took occasion to say that the fugitive would probably turn up in New York, and sneeringly remarked that several English legal outcasts had found this a congenial atmosphere. COTTERILL'S case is not the only one of the kind. Among the practitioners of law in this city are at least two other London attorneys who were struck off the rolls there less than five years ago for thieving, one of whom misappropriated $10,000 before his flight to this country, and the Old Jewry police office put up placards in London offering a large reward for his apprehension. It is time that some measures were adopted to prevent these professional outcasts of England from foisting themselves on this community and setting up as practitioners in the courts of the State. Before unknown English lawyers are admitted to practice here, their record should be obtained from the Incorporated Law Society of London, and citizenship should be a *sine qua non*. The public would thus have some protection against such men as COTTERILL.

The Cincinnati Convention adopted a resolution approving of GRANT'S administration, and then nominated HAYES for President. HAYES accepted the nomination, endorsed the platform, and now stands upon it. GRANT promptly congratulated HAYES on his nomination. This is the whole story in a nutshell, or at least the first chapter of it. The second chapter, as CHANDLER and SECOR ROBBERSON hope it will be, is HAYES'S election and the continued administration of the Government according to the ways of Grantism. But that chapter will not be.

A large share of the Republican newspapers talk as if they supposed it is HENDRICKS who is running for President, and not TILDEN. They seem to be disturbed about what they imagine HENDRICKS will do when he enters the White House next March as President. The voters are not as big fools as these editors take them to be.

A correspondent of the *Times*, writing from the pleasant town of Beaufort, N. C., kindly informs us that APPLETON OAKSMITH, the former slave trader, is the President of a TILDEN and VANCE club at Moorehead City in the old North State. He asks us to make a note of the fact. We do so with great pleasure. We believe in the words of Scripture and song, and well know that the vilest sinner may return, the prodigal seek the bosom of his father, and that the abandoned may reform. If APPLETON OAKSMITH is supporting SAM TILDEN, he is now handsomely atoning for the evil deeds of a misspent life, and serving the cause to which all true men are devoted. We are sorry to add that Mr. STEWART L. WOODFORD, the coadjutor of Mr. OAKSMITH in his slave-trading scrape, has not seen the error of his ways, but is supporting HAYES with all his tireless flow of words.

Both sons of STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS are working zealously for HAYES and WHEELER.—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

Of course they are. Since the older one engaged in the fraud of being GRANT'S private secretary in name, while HORACE PORTER and Measurer BABCOCK filled the office and levied divvies on every job that was going, there has been no reason to hope for honest conduct from those young men.

WOODHULL'S PRODUCTIONS.

The Alleged Source of Her Editorials and Public Lectures.

From April to October, 1873, I was for six months directly connected with Victoria C. Woodhull, and with the publication of her paper, *Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly*, either in her own office or the printing office whence the paper was issued. A large part of this time I was in her office, day and night; and quite a portion of it, she, Col. Blood, Colonel's brother George, and myself, were all in the office day and night, that is, in the suite of three rooms; so that it was as if we were all one, and I could not but be intimately acquainted with everything. I never knew Victoria to write a word. Col. Blood penned her every letter or note, however brief, and signed her name. Her great lecture at the Chicago Spiritual Convention, held in September, was printed in the office beforehand, the manuscript being in the Colonel's handwriting, and I reading the greater part of it in discharge of my function to "hold copy" for making corrections. After the whole had been struck off, and while half a dozen separate copies were lying around the office to dry, I heard her ask him in her office, what title he was going to give the lecture, and he said—as if it was not already there on so many different slips—"The Elixir of Life; or, Why do we Die?" Her introductory lecture at Chicago, instead of being printed, was copied for her in large, fair hand by George Blood, from the Colonel's manuscript, and I afterward read it, "holding copy," preparatory to its appearance in the *Weekly*. So her lecture, "Revolution or Reformation—Which?" delivered at Cooper Institute to a crowded audience, was before and printed in the office, from the Colonel's manuscript—just as her lecture in Vineland in August was in type, to be read from the printed copy.

The day before her trial was to come on, the Colonel wrote a letter for her to the press, he making two copies and I four (for the six morning papers, the *Star* only of all publishing it), with her name signed to each. When they were all finished he read her a copy; but she was very much dissatisfied, saying the letter did not at all make the point she desired; nevertheless she let it pass. I handed in the six copies, and when the editor of the *World* saw the signature he asked, "Is that Mrs. Woodhull's signature?" I had, without thinking of it, signed her name, instead of the Colonel. The long article "In Memoriam," in her paper on the death of her sister, Mrs. Brooker, purporting to be from herself, but set from the Colonel's manuscript, she did not read till it was in type and waiting to go in the "form," when she objected to it most seriously and earnestly as not what she required; but it being the last moment, she said, "Well, put it in." Her editorials, "holding copy," I read week after week, in his hand, then myself and the printers saw him writing them, right there in the printing office, compositors perhaps waiting for copy. He would dash them off so rapidly, they would be only half executed, and the compositors would not be able to read them, and would have to come to me. She frequently got the paper after it was out, and read her own editorials, laughing and enjoying the surprise of the good things—they were a surprise. Again and again in connection with her trial, her fear rose to absolute trepidation; but each time the Colonel made her defy the whole world, and when she came to read she found how brave she was.

JOSEPH TREAT, M. D.

No. 18 BOND STREET, New York.

Affirmed to before me, this 31st day of July, 1876.

DAVID W. PRICE,
Notary Public, New York county.

Under which King, Bezonian?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: If the Democratic party should nominate MANTON MARBLE for Governor and the Republican party A. B. CORNELL, which candidate would THE SUN support?

JAMES W. HODNETT,
113 East 115th street, Harlem.

MANTON MARBLE, of course. THE SUN deems it necessary to the public well-being that the Republican party should, for the present, be overthrown, turned out of power everywhere, and kept out of power till it is cured of Grantism, Robbersonism, and Belknapism.

But while THE SUN would not advocate the election of Mr. CORNELL as Governor, it would nevertheless do full justice to his abilities, his high character, his unwavering fidelity to his opinions, and his services to the public. Among the Republicans of New York, where is there one who is personally more worthy of confidence and respect than ALONZO B. CORNELL?

His Royal Acquaintance.

Two young gentlemen meet on Fifth avenue, and express mingled surprise at the encounter. These cosmopolitans last saw each other on the Rue de Capucins.

"Aw, raw heah?"

"Yes, came last week."

"On the Cunardaw?"

"Yes, the Scythaw."

"Enjaw yourself in Paris?"

"Tolerable. Had good letters, you knaw. Some deuced distinguished people."

"Hunt any of 'em up? Call on 'em?"

"Yes, called on a Marquise and a Countess, and one evening I called on two Queens."

"Aw! pleasant interview?"

"Not very. The other fellaw had three Kings, you know!"

"Aw!"

Col. WILLIAM H. NEWTON, of St. George's, Del., has published a second edition of his pamphlet containing "The only authenticated copy, full and complete, of the Last Will and Testament of GEORGE WASHINGTON of Mount Vernon, embracing a Schedule of his Real Estate and explanatory notes thereto by the Testator." It is a very interesting and convenient pamphlet.

Messrs. Niven & Chamberlin have begun the publication of the Luzerne *Leader*, a handsome and sparkling weekly, in Pittston, Pa. It will do good service for Tilden and Hendricks.

A safe stand-by for the family during the season of Cholera Morbus, Summer Complaints, Cramps, Diarrhœa, and all Bowel Complaints, is Dr. Jayne's Carminative Balsam, of admitted efficacy, and if occasion should arise, easy to prove merit.—Ade.

THE GERMANS AND CARL SCHURZ.

His Absurd Position Clearly Elucidated.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: You know that as the former editor of Mr. Schurz's newspaper, for some time his associate in business, and for many years his follower in politics, I am not apt to judge either his remarkable ability, or his still more remarkable recent somersault, in any other spirit than that of kindness. But the appeals of political friends are so numerous, my convictions upon the pending Presidential election so strong, my sense of duty so plain, that I must ask for space in your paper—the quality of which so grandly outstrips all quantity—to notice the recent manifesto of Mr. Schurz.

That manifesto, though nominally addressed to Mr. Ottendorfer of the New York *Staats Zeitung*, is really intended for the whole country, and particularly for German voters.

Its extreme length—nearly five columns—speaks for the feebleness of the cause for which it pleads. I promise to be much briefer.

The amazing attitude of Mr. Schurz is simply this:

He does not pretend to be a Republican. For the last six years he has acted in opposition to that party. For the last six years he has made himself conspicuous by his demands for reform. For the last six years he has been engaged in destroying the Republican party to build upon its ruins a new party. For the last six years he has made himself prominent by his savage criticism of the rottenness of the present Administration and all its leading supporters. In the May conference of "Reformers" at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, Mr. Schurz protested against the nomination of any man in Cincinnati whose record as a Reformer was not above all doubt. He particularly protested against any candidate whose negative merit consisted in—nothing; that is to say, having done nothing, nothing can be said against him.

Mr. Schurz now astonishes the world by calling Mr. Hayes a great Reformer, whose election would insure the much-needed changes in Washington and everywhere else.

I consider this assertion an insult to the intelligence of even the least intelligent. Mr. Schurz has an undoubted right to prefer Gov. Hayes without assigning his private reasons, but he has no right to base his action upon utterly false reasons. The people of the United States have an undoubted right to elect Mr. Hayes if they like the present *régime*, and prefer to be robbed rather than give up their party prejudices. But they must put it upon the proper ground, and not upon the preposterous idea of calling Mr. Hayes a great reformer. For what is the record?

The May conference of "Reformers" demanded the nomination of Bristow, and denounced the present Administration and *all* its leading supporters.

Cincinnati answered by overwhelmingly defeating Mr. Bristow, and unanimously indorsing Grant's shameful Administration.

The Reformers demanded reform and change and purification, and Cincinnati astonished the world by coming within almost less than a hair's breadth of nominating for the Presidency a man of whose stupendous guilt as an honorless corruptionist there had just been given the freshest and most overwhelming proof; by defeating the only candidate who had a record of reform; by unanimously vindicating the national disgrace called Grant's Administration; by openly pledging the party to favor a system of tariff which plunders the many to "protect" the few, and establishes privileged classes at the expense of the masses; and by placing upon this platform Mr. Hayes, the obscurest of all the candidates.

Who, pray, was Mr. Hayes? What great public service had he ever rendered, what eminent ability had he ever shown, what reform ever accomplished, what independence of character displayed, what public or private virtues manifested, to merit the dazzling dignity of filling the place once ennobled by a Washington and a Jefferson?

The answer came—Hayes has never stolen.

Good God! Has it come to this? Is a man entitled to the Presidency because, forsooth, he is merely honest? Has this simple quality become so rare in our republic as to require such reward? And can there be a more pitiable commentary upon the party in power than that it "points with pride" to its candidate because he at least has never stolen?

Now, far be it from me to detract any of the merit attached to this rare Republican attribute. But the question is not that of *personal* honesty. I think Grant is personally honest, that is, has never himself stolen anything. Yet we all know that almost everybody around Grant steals or has stolen. There can be no reform without *political* honesty, very great ability, courage, and independence of character. Has Mr. Hayes ever shown any of these qualities? I think I can say that his political record is entirely familiar to me, and he certainly has made such familiarity a very light task. If Mr. Schurz will show out a single act in that record manifesting a spirit of reform, or point to but a solitary utterance of independent thought, nay, of any new political thought at all, I will confess that I am wrong. But four years of dull mediocrity in Congress, and five years of mediocre dulness in the Gubernatorial chair stare us in the face without a single act of reform, without a single thought or utterance of ability, without a single vote of independence to redeem the long record of obscurity—with nothing to justify it but pretended personal respectability.

I say pretended, because I for one doubt, nay deny, the respectability of any man in public place, who, like Mr. Hayes, has never failed to support the present scandalous Administration, for years directly by votes and acts, for other years by silence or by speech, but always zealously. If, according to Burke, he who, without interference, looks on while under his very eyes wrong and robbery are committed, becomes an ally of the robbers, how much more guilty of wrong is he who has followed the present military party, under the lead of Grant, on its gloomy march to personal government and centralization over roads fraught with wrong and fraud, crime and corruption, violated laws, and broken honor, national shame, a disgraced Cabinet, a polluted Bench, and a prostituted Presidency? If Mr. Schurz will show but a solitary vote which Mr. Hayes ever declined to give for his party, or but a single word of protest against any of the many wrongs committed by that party, I shall consider him right and myself wrong. But not otherwise.

Four years ago Mr. Schurz must have been entirely of my present opinion. Mr. Hayes then stepped out of the Governorship and ran for Congress in one of the districts of Cincinnati. The people, however, little dreamed of his great destiny, for they defeated him badly. It was a strong Republican district and a most humiliating defeat. There was, perhaps, but one consolation for poor Mr. Hayes. Carl Schurz, then at the very zenith of that fame which, I fear, is now fast fading, contributed his powerful share to defeat him. Is Mr. Hayes different to-day from what he was four years ago? Hardly. Yet Mr. Schurz professes to-day that Mr. Hayes is fit to be President, fit for the most difficult task of reforming this Government, when four years ago he did not think him fit to go to Congress. I followed Mr. Schurz four years ago; can I follow him now? Can anybody who is not blind, and deaf, and dumb, or not without understanding? Can all the sophistries in the world explain Mr. Schurz's change?

Mr. Hayes is but the figurehead put up by Cameron, Morton & Co. to secure a continuation of their power. *They* certainly have nominated him. *They* have the undisputed leadership of the party. *They* have the absolute conduct of the campaign. *They* move heaven and earth to elect him. If he is elected, it will be mainly through *their* efforts. He is now under the greatest obligation to them for his nomination; he would then be under still greater obligation for his election. Mr. Schurz praises the honesty, the scrupulous honesty of Mr. Hayes. How can he then hesitate a single second to recognize these obligations? How, is an honest man, hesitate to pay them off? But this is not all. Mr. Hayes, if elected, will find in Cameron, Conkling and Morton not only the absolute masters of his party, but also the leaders of the majority in the Senate, without whose consent he cannot even form his Cabinet, can make no appointments, carry no measures—in fact, have no administration at all. What, then, must the position of poor Mr. Hayes most plainly be? Already groaning under obligations for the past, he is *bound to solicit* their aid for the future. He will have to depend upon them just as much after his inauguration as he had to depend upon them for his nomination and election. If he is an honest man, he is bound to them and belongs to them for what they have done in the past; if he is a prudent man, he doubly belongs to them for what they may do in the future. As long as the world exists, the creator controls the created, the superior the inferior.

In the face of all this, Mr. Schurz pretends to believe that the election of Mr. Hayes would insure an entire change from the present Grant Administration, a complete departure from the leading men and measures and management of the party. Has Mr. Hayes given any reason for so extraordinary an expectation? Mr. Schurz's idea of reform certainly means the utter political destruction of the "machine," of Grant and Cameron, and Morton and Conkling, and Babcock and their hundreds of thousands of office-holding or office-expecting followers—in one word, of every "machine" politician. Are they all blind, that they should so zealously work for their own destruction?

Now the question raised by Mr. Schurz is plain. Somebody must be fooled. Who is it? Mr. Schurz on one side or the hundreds of thousands of machine politicians and thieves, from members of the Cabinet down to gaugers and penitentiary inmates, who all justly cry for poor Hayes? I ask again, who is most likely to be fooled in this bargain?

Is it possible that Mr. Schurz cannot see all this himself? Or does he really