The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1881.

Amusements To-Day.

Abbey's Park Theatre—Yorick's Love.
Aquarium—Circus. Matinee.
Booth's Theatre—Uncle Tom's Cabin. Matinee.
Bijou Opera House—Olivette.
Daly's Theatre—Needles and Pins. Matinee.
Grand Opera House—Our German Boarder. Matinee.
Haverly's 14th St. Theatre—The Brook.
Haverly's 5th Av. Theatre—Splash.
Haverly's Niblo's Garden—Black Venus.
Koster & Bial's Concert Hall—Concert.
Madison Square Theatre—Hazel Kirke.
Masonic Temple—Monsieur. Matinee.
Metropolitan Concert Hall—Pain Skating.
San Francisco Minstrels—Bryant's Hall, Broadway and 27th st.
Standard Theatre—My Geraldine.
Theater Comique—Multiplex Gin de Santiago. Matinee.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Variety.
Union Square Theatre—The Banker's Daughter.
Wallack's Theatre—Forget-me-Not. Matinee.
Windsor Theatre—Two Dollars. Matinee.

Sure to Draw Down Curses on his Head.

We do not think there is any disposition on the part of the Democracy to embarrass Gen. GARFIELD directly or indirectly in the selection of his Cabinet. They understand and concede that, as the responsibility of the administration rests on him, he is entitled to very large liberty in selecting those who shall assist him in carrying it on.

On the other hand, it is impossible for him to make up a Cabinet that will satisfy the Republicans. That party is divided into so many warring factions, bitterly hating each other, that, whatever selections Gen. GARFIELD may make, curses from the disappointed are sure to fall thick and fast on his head. He has a most difficult part to perform. He now hopes to be his own successor four years hence. But before that time comes round, many who flatter him and fawn upon him now will be denouncing him in the most opprobrious terms. The shower of curses on his head is inevitable. He cannot avoid it, and it is useless for him to try to.

The Fishery Fraud.

Mr. EVARTS is represented as saying that inasmuch as the United States referred the fishery dispute to arbitration, we are bound to stand by the award, whether the frauds and forgeries, charged to have been made with the privity of the Canadian authorities, really occurred or not.

This monstrous doctrine, repugnant to good morals and adverse to the decisions of the courts since laws were enacted for the protection of society, was first held by the Electoral Commission, before which Mr. EVARTS appeared as the advocate of HAYES, and by the decision of which that pretender became President *de facto*, while Mr. EVARTS received the Department of State as his counsel fee for that service.

Eight of the fifteen Commissioners, two of them Justices of the Supreme Court, refused to go behind certificates notoriously fraudulent, and several of which were also forged, because they knew the frauds would be proven, and the certificates must necessarily be thrown out, by which the legal rights of Mr. TILDEN would have been established, in conformity with the popular vote and the votes of the electors.

Counsel offered distinctly and in detail to prove the alleged frauds, and to introduce the record of the highest court in Florida, showing that the false returns in that State for Governor and for electors had been declared void, and that the Democratic candidates had been elected legally. The partisan Commissioners, with GARFIELD as one of the most active of the infamous eight, had prejudged the case, and would listen to no reason that conflicted with their intention to consummate the great crime. That crime has passed into history as the blackest stain on the escutcheon of the republic.

It is perhaps natural that Mr. EVARTS should justify and sustain the swindling Halifax award, with the knowledge that it was procured by forged papers and by fabricated figures. He is consistent in defence of iniquity. But he does not in any way represent the sentiments or the wishes of the American people. Neither does Mr. HAWLEY of Connecticut when he speaks as follows:

"I would wait until the British Government has had time to hear whether it has been imposed upon, and I prefer that this matter shall rest for the present where I am sure it can safely rest, in the hands of our Secretary of State."

The most fitting answer to Mr. HAWLEY was given on the spot by Mr. NEWBERRY, a Republican member from Michigan:

"I want simply to say that the British Government and its officials have had notice of this matter for sixteen, eighteen, or twenty months—probably two years."

This reply silenced HAWLEY in regard to the knowledge of the British Government concerning the frauds; and he was answered in another way in regard to the second point when he suggested that "this matter can safely rest in the hands of our Secretary of State." Nearly a year ago, or to speak strictly, on the 12th of February, 1880, Mr. BLAINE had the following resolution passed in the Senate:

"*Resolved*, That the President be respectfully requested, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate any information in possession of the Government touching the alleged false statistics and fabricated testimony imposed upon the Halifax Commission and used as a basis for their award in the matter of the fisheries."

Mr. EVARTS pigeonholed this resolution. He never communicated the least information on the subject to the Senate; and, judging from his recent correspondence with the British Foreign Office, it is to be inferred that the matter was never brought to the notice of that Government. Of course Mr. EVARTS was not ignorant of the statements made by Prof. HIND and others connected with the Canadian case. He knew more even than the public did in regard to the false statistics and the simulated documents which had been used before the Halifax Commission as the means of defrauding the United States by an excessive and illegal award.

He knew also that the facts had been brought to the notice of Mr. DELFOSSE, the Belgian arbitrator, and of Mr. GALT, the British Commissioner, and of her Majesty's Government, without any steps having been taken to investigate the charges. It was his duty to demand an explanation and a searching inquiry. He preferred to remain passive, and by that course to sanction the outrage which had been perpetrated by a packed commission and by forged papers. He had paid the award, and was therefore unwilling to raise any question which might reflect on that act, or on the conduct of his predecessor, Mr. HAMILTON FISH, who had accepted Mr. DELFOSSE as arbitrator, after having first vehemently protested against the appointment.

Mr. EVARTS will go out of office with the suspicion that this culpable neglect of a great question, large enough in some aspects to affect the relations of Great Britain and the United States, was by no means accidental.

British statesmen are quick to scent coming trouble, and to change front when material interests are in danger. They rushed forward with superfluous professions to make terms when we were ready to assert our rights in a disagreeable way, and they sent a titled commission to Washington to capture the Administration and society by arts and by free expenditure of money through the Alabama treaty. They know Mr. BLAINE is strongly committed on this subject, not only by public policy, but by the fishing interests of New England. Hence they will strive to patch up an arrangement with Mr. EVARTS before the fourth of March, when Mr. BLAINE will succeed him.

Parnell's Obstructive Tactics.

The boldness exhibited by Mr. PARNELL and other indicted members of the Land League in leaving Dublin while their trial was going on, is not more striking than the defiant course which they forthwith proceeded to take in the House of Commons. Within forty-eight hours after the opening of the session they carried out their threat of obstructing every kind of legislation which did not directly aim to satisfy their own demands. The result is that the House, before carrying out any substantial measures of coercion or relief, may be compelled to stop and mend the defects of its parliamentary machinery.

Without pointing out in detail the differences in the rule of procedure which obtain in the British House of Commons and in other legislatures, one or two broad distinctions may be mentioned. In the former assembly there is nothing corresponding to our previous question, or equivalent to the *clôture* or summary closing of debate practised in the French Chambers. Moreover, even a motion to adjourn is debatable in the House of Commons. These facts suffice to explain to any person at all conversant with parliamentary proceedings how completely business may be blocked in the British legislature by a resolute or factious minority. A year ago, during the last session of the previous Parliament, the means of obstruction were employed so dauntlessly and persistently by the Home Rulers that, for a considerable period, all the efforts of the majority to break the deadlock were fruitless, and it seemed that the driving wheel of the British empire had been brought to a standstill. The impotent fury with which Conservatives and many Liberals regarded the interruption would have been amusing, had it not found vent in theories and proposals flagrantly inconsistent with freedom of debate. With characteristic shrewdness, however, the BEACONSFIELD Government avoided the odium of applying a drastic remedy, which might prove worse than the disease, and left to its successor the unpleasant task of inventing an efficient gag law.

There was, indeed, a standing order adopted last February, by which the Speaker was invested with discretionary power to warn a fractious member, and, if his warnings were twice disregarded, to subject him to censure, coupled with a certain penalty. But it was argued at the time that little could be expected from that order, because, in the exercise of his discretion, the Speaker would still be governed by precedents in determining whether a member was out of order. The cessation of obstruction on the part of the Irish members at that time was ascribed by shrewd observers rather to policy than to dread of the new instrument of discipline; and it was predicted by Lord SHERBROOKE and others that measures much more radical and sweeping than a mere affirmation of the discretionary power always deemed to be resident in the Speaker would be needed to prevent a repetition of the offence. Their forecast was abundantly confirmed by the action of the Home Rulers on the evening of Friday last (Jan. 7), when eighteen of them spoke on a motion for adjournment. The Speaker, being urged to interfere, admitted the extreme inconvenience of the course taken by Mr. PARNELL'S friends, but felt himself constrained to pronounce, in accordance with the precedents of the House, that it was strictly in order.

It is manifest, from the comments of the London press on this decision, that a considerable proportion even of the Liberal party are prepared to sanction something like the thorough reconstruction of parliamentary procedure which Lord SHERBROOKE, himself a Liberal, has proposed. According to this plan, the methods of transacting business in the House of Commons would be assimilated, in all essential features, to those followed in the French Chamber of Deputies and in our House of Representatives. In other words, the same limitations of the rights of minorities and individual members—the same powers of stifling opposition to the will of the majority—which exist in the two last named assemblies are commended to the House of Commons. But a little reflection will show that the ultimate outcome of such rules, however judicious and convenient they may elsewhere appear, would be little short of revolutionary in England, and could not, in fact, be reconciled with the present conception of the House of Commons. In France and the United States, where the powers of the executive, the judicial, and the legislative departments are defined in a written instrument, and where the legislative function is itself parcelled out between two coördinate bodies, the minority of one assembly finds protectors outside of it, and does not suffer, therefore, so profoundly from limitations on the freedom of debate. Moreover, under the schemes set forth in such written constitutions, no one part can be suffered to throw out of gear the whole machinery of government, no one legislative body can let itself be debarred from doing its share of work by vexatious and dilatory action on the part of a minority. Very different is the position of the British House of Commons, which, according to the unwritten theory collected from the precedents of the past fifty years, is virtually omnipotent; supreme in legislative authority, since the day is past when the House of Lords could risk prolonged collision with it; supreme in executive control, since a Prime Minister is the exponent and the delegate of its majority; supreme in the scope of its influence over the judiciary, since every Judge on the bench is appointed by the Prime Minister, and since an act of Parliament, unlike an act of Congress, is weakened by no doubt of its constitutionality, but itself declares the Constitution. Now, the very range of the functions exercised by the House of Commons, its unique assemblage of unlimited powers, holds up peculiar temptations, and implies peculiar dangers, in the tyranny of a majority. It is just because there is nothing a majority of the House of Commons might not do, once possessed of the means of discipline and coercion tolerated in other deliberative bodies, that it is of vital and transcendent moment to the country at large that even the abuses attending freedom of debate and the rights of individual members should be dealt with most gingerly.

On the other hand, it is obvious that something must be done. A deliberative body cannot be expected to commit suicide, and the most sturdy champion of parliamentary privilege would admit that there must somewhere exist in the House of Commons a power of self-preservation. It seems to us that the right view of this matter is taken by Mr. H. CECIL RAIKES, who is quite as high an authority on parliamentary usage as Lord SHERBROOKE, and much less predisposed in favor of heroic remedies. Mr. RAIKES suggests that the fundamental inquiry whether a given case of obstruction is legitimate or not, resolves itself into a question of motive. He would simply empower the Speaker, on the application of any member, to decide whether the course taken by a given individual or group was actuated by purposes heretofore recognized as belonging to parliamentary tactics, or whether it was designed, as some of the Home Rulers have avowed their conduct was intended, to bring the whole system of parliamentary government into contempt. Even Mr. RAIKES'S suggestion, relatively modest as it is, is open to some manifest objections. No one would dream of conferring a power of inquisition into motives on the Speaker of our House of Representatives, where that officer is merely the creature of a party majority; but the case is different in England, where the Speakership is a permanent office, whose occupants for many years have been credited with impartiality. On the whole, there is ample ground for watching with keen interest the attempt of the House of Commons to solve the problem of obstruction by amending its methods of procedure.

Progress of the One-Man Power.

It seems to be the disposition of the times to concede everything to one man. The Democrats were not content without a JOHN KELLY to rule over them and to defeat their own candidates for them.

The Republican members of the New York Legislature are not disposed to elect one of their own party who has a world-wide reputation, like Mr. EVARTS, to the Senate; but prefer that Mr. CONKLING's power over them should be made apparent to everybody by electing, at his beck, some almost unknown person to this important office. For who is Mr. PLATT but an expressman of whom not one person in a thousand throughout the State ever heard before? His occupation constitutes no objection to him; but what reason is there for setting his farthing candle on a hill, while the great electric headlight of the party is obscured?

All to gratify a whim of ROSCOE CONKLING. Mr. CONKLING has great reason to be content with remaining Senator himself, without undertaking to dictate the selection of his colleague. But the tendency to hero worship everywhere appears, even in our own State Legislature.

Banished let it be, and that right speedily.

Conger.

The translation to the Senate of Mr. CONGER of Michigan deprives the Republicans in the House of their ablest and safest leader. A thorough-going partisan, alert and eager in the cause, his reputation as a man and a legislator is that of the purest. In following BLAINE or GARFIELD, the party was always liable to suffer more or less from the questionable character of their leader. But CONGER's name was open to no reproach; no stain of jobbery or trickery attached to him, and this, no doubt, was the secret of his power among his associates.

We observe that the Democratic newspapers generally describe Mr. CONGER as a man of acrid temper, but nothing could be further from the truth. He is one of the most genial of men, and his humor is simply overflowing. No gentleman ever attained his prominence in the House, compelled as such a person is to go about stopping everybody's schemes and trampling everybody's toes, who had more devoted friends than this acrid representative from Michigan. He is savage enough in fighting Democrats as Democrats, or thieves as thieves; but off his Congressional legs, he is as full of human kindness, fun, and anecdote as BOB INGERSOLL himself.

His election to the Senate removes the only candidate for Speaker who would have been likely to organize the House for the Republicans, as Mr. RANDALL did for the Democrats, against all the corrupt schemes of the lobby, which, smelling plunder afar off, is gathering its forces for a series of grand assaults in the next Congress.

An Unwise Beginning.

For several years past it has been the practice of the Judges of the principal courts in this city to refuse to grant orders of arrest in civil actions for libel where the defendant resides or does business regularly in New York.

In such cases it is safely assumed that the party will remain where his residence or regular occupation is, and an order of arrest cannot therefore be essential to the maintenance of any right of the plaintiff. As an agency of annoyance it may be grateful to a person who thinks he has been libelled, but the law ought not to aid men in the gratification of their resentments, and least of all before a trial has determined who is right and who is wrong.

Less than a fortnight ago Mr. CHARLES H. TRUAX became a Judge of the Superior Court of the city of New York. He has already disregarded the eminently proper practice we have mentioned by granting an order for the arrest of the publisher of an evening newspaper in this city in a libel suit. We think this is an unwise beginning for a young Judge. It is to be hoped he will do nothing further to detract from the excellent reputation which the Superior Court has acquired of late years for its intelligent administration of the law of libel.

A Practical Scheme of Taxation.

We invite attention to a statement of the theory upon which taxes ought to be levied in this State, and to the proposed bill to realize that theory, the two being printed together in another part of this paper.

The doctrine of taxation herein set forth differs considerably from that of Gov. CONNELL, who thinks that real property and personal property should be taxed indiscriminately; but we think that when the Governor has read the exposition which we now publish, he will see that deeper principles are involved in the question than he supposed when writing his message; and that the consequences of proceeding wisely or unwisely in this business may be of great advantage or of great injury to the State.

If we were allowed to give the name of the gentleman to whom this bill and the accompanying exposition are due, it would be universally recognized as that of one among the wisest, most patriotic, and most quietly influential of all the citizens of the Empire State.

The MONROE doctrine in reference to the Isthmus of Central America will no doubt receive a strong vote of confidence in Congress. Whether any practical steps will be taken to enforce the doctrine is another matter.

In the Senate yesterday, apropos of a bill to punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, Mr. MORGAN reviewed the policy of the Republican party, and justified the conduct of the South in solidly allying herself with the Democracy. The discussion of the BEN HOLLADAY claim was continued. In the House Mr. BLACKBURN secured the appointment of a committee to investigate alleged abuses of the franking privilege during the Presidential canvass. The Indian Appropriation bill was passed. One of its clauses abolishes the Indian Commission.

The bills and resolutions now introduced into the Forty-sixth Congress number nearly ten thousand. The lucky drawback to them is that the more they increase, the smaller proportion of them will be passed.

AUSTIN CORBIN begins very badly in the management of the Long Island railroads. We hope he will improve as he gets on. As far as the roads are concerned, he may have some right to do as he likes with them; but it is a pity that the people and the progress of the island should be injured.

New Yorkers may differ widely in their abstract theories of municipal government, but there is one point on which they are all agreed. That is, that such streets as we have splashed and waded through this winter are a disgrace to New York.

After a good deal of tuning up, it is announced that the European concert, in spite of all seeming discords, is now ready to begin over again.

Dakota is growing very fast, compared with its sister Territories, but Mr. BENNETT, the Delegate, not yet satisfied, proposes that Congress shall give 640 acres to every man who sinks an artesian well on the land and gets a permanent flow of water therefrom. It is very sure that this offer might be safely applied to some parts of Arizona.

JOHN SHERMAN goes back to the Senate; unless, indeed, GARFIELD, upon a reconsideration of the matter, invites him to stay in the Treasury Department, which is, to say the least, improbable. He has met his Ohio rivals and ill wishers, and they are his—captives, so to speak, of his bow and spear. JOSEPH R. HAWLEY at last goes to the Senate from Connecticut, after serving for the office as many years as JACOB SERVED for RACHEL. He has had very shabby treatment in years past at the hands of his fellow Republicans of Connecticut, and it was time they made amends. Indiana's contribution to the Senate is BEN HARRISON. In his case we shall have an opportunity to further test the truthfulness of the old proverb which says that blood will tell.

In saying that these men are going to the Senate, we assume that the Republican caucus nomination is equivalent to election. Very likely there are Republicans in all three Legislatures who would be glad to bolt if they saw any reasonable chance of success. But, as matters look now, they will probably stifle their disaffection.

The correspondence between Gen. BEN HARRISON and Col. WILL CUMBACK seems to have greatly impressed the admirers of both. Col. WILL CUMBACK having resolved not to press forward any longer for the Indiana Senatorship, announced his purpose to Gen. BEN HARRISON, whom he declared to be manly and honorable. Gen. BEN said in reply that Col. WILL's letter was very gracious, and that he would remember Col. WILL when he got to be Senator. Indianapolis thus teaches a lesson in political magnanimity to the less chivalrous tough-hides of Albany in their wrangles over a like subject.

The London *Field* finds that English yachtsmen, after keeping very quiet for thirty years, are "again taking an interest in the cup won at Cowes by the America in 1851." This authority has been asked several times about the conditions of the challenge for its return, and "feels pretty sure, if it were made certain that two or three single-handed matches with the same vessel could be sailed for the cup, that some British yachtsman would make a challenge." So it seems that the long championship at yachting which America has enjoyed is now to be put to the test again. This fact, as well as the actual flight of time recorded by the almanac, shows that a new generation of British yachtsmen are on deck, who do not understand why their predecessors were so wary. It might be hard to say where all the yachts the America beat now are; but the victor, very much altered, still exists. After a long career in yachting, she was put to trade and coasting uses, like a racer made to tug at a cart, and then was recovered to her old vocation. It would be queer if Gen. BEN BUTLER, her owner, should close his career as lawyer, warrior, Congressman, and aspirant for the Massachusetts Governorship, by becoming America's representative sportsman in an international yacht race.

Washington's Numerous Costly Swords.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: I read with enjoyment your remarks on my "Washington Sword" resolution, but, really, this sword has peculiar historical remainscences touching it. I am assured it was worn by Washington when he resigned his commission at Annapolis. It is one of the five swords left by Washington to his nephews, and which were given with the patriotic expressions in his will, to be found in Irving's "Life of Washington," volume 5, page 399, I think. This is the sword which George Lewis got, and which is now the property of Mr. Napier Lewis of Baltimore.

Two of these five swords your State has bought, and this one was traced by the State Librarian in 1873, Henry A. Howes, Esq., to the hands of Mr. Lewis, and is so referred to in the State Library Catalogue of that year, the printer giving the name Lieut. Henry Davis for Lieut. Henry Lewis's, United States Navy, corrected in ink by the Librarian. WM. PINKNEY WHYTE.

SENATE CHAMBER, Washington, Jan. 8.

Let Everybody Read It—And Read the Whole Book!

From the Inter-Ocean.

Mr. Dana of THE SUN performed a grand work when he responded to the *Inter-Ocean's* request for a Christmas sentiment. Judging from the multitude of editorial references to it, we infer that more people have read the twenty-fourth chapter of Job than ever read it before.

Mr. Phelps's Successor.

Assistant District Attorney Daniel G. Rollins, who was recently designated by the Judges of the Court of General Sessions to fill the vacancy in the office of District Attorney, created by the death of Benjamin K. Phelps, pending the appointment of a successor by Gov. Cornell, found in his mail yesterday morning his commission from the Governor to be District Attorney of the city and County of New York from the 1st inst. until the 1st of January, 1882. The time covered by the commission is the last year of Mr. Phelps's third term of office.

Mr. Rollins was born in Great Falls, N. H., in 1842. His father was the late Judge Daniel G. Rollins of the Probate Court of Strafford County in that State. Mr. Rollins was educated at Dartmouth College, and after his graduation there in 1861 passed through the Harvard Law School. In 1866 he was appointed an Assistant United States District Attorney in this district by District Attorney Daniel S. Dickinson. He served subsequently under District Attorneys Samuel G. Courtney and Edwards Pierrepont. The late District Attorney Benjamin K. Phelps was an Assistant United States District Attorney at that period. When Mr. Phelps became District Attorney on the 1st of January, 1872, he appointed Mr. Rollins his senior assistant. Mr. Rollins was then practising law as the partner of Hiram Harriatt. Mr. Phelps had great confidence in Mr. Rollins's ability as a public prosecutor, and, in the latter years of his administration, intrusted to him all of the more important prosecutions in the Courts of General Sessions and Over and Terminer.

Mr. Rollins went before Chief Justice Davis of the Supreme Court, at short noon, and was sworn into office. On his return to the District Attorney's office, he reappointed Assistant District Attorneys Joseph Bell and George Lyon, and Recorder Smyth administered the oath of office to them.

It was said yesterday that Mr. Rollins would reappoint Assistant District Attorney Dudley S. Phelps, the younger brother of the late District Attorney, and that he would name two gentlemen to fill the vacancies made by his own promotion and by the resignation of Assistant District Attorney William Herring, which, it is understood, took effect on the 1st inst. Mr. Herring is interested in mining in Arizona, and he spent much of last year there.

The Range of a Debate on Vagrancy.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 11.—A bill for the punishment of vagrancy in the District is being seriously discussed by the Senate. It has been under consideration since Thursday of last week, but there are as yet no signs of reaching a vote. There seems to be wide differences of opinion among Senators upon the drawing up of a vagrancy act, but the difficulties of the situation are earnestly grappled with. In discussing the subject to-day, Mr. Morgan (Ala.) delivered a long speech, in which he described the origin and growth of the two parties, analyzed their motives and principles, explained why the South had become solid, and denied that it was the outgrowth of any feeling of resentment toward the North. No action was taken on the bill, which went over for further discussion.

Gen. Hawley Nominated for Senator.

HARTFORD, Jan. 11.—The Republican Legislative caucus for the nomination of United States Senator met to-night, and was a full one. Senator Hammond of Killingly moved the nomination of Gen. J. R. Hawley. The Hon. Lyndle Harrison, speaking for the people of New Haven city and county, seconded the nomination. No other name being presented, Gen. Hawley was nominated unanimously by acclamation.

IMPROVING THE MISSISSIPPI.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 11.—Congress is about to be assailed again in the interest of the various schemes for the improvement of the Mississippi. The levee plans call for $1,800,000 to start with, and it is estimated by the friends of this undertaking that the whole ultimate cost of the system, completed, without reference to the expense of keeping it in good repair afterward, will not be much under $100,000,000.

On the other hand, Capt. John Cowdon proposes to accomplish the same purpose by an outlet through Lake Borgne, at the same time draining and reclaiming about forty million acres of overflowed lands, which are rich beyond computation. Capt. Cowdon declares that he can demonstrate the value of his plan at a cost of $250,000. That is all he asks. Why should he not be heard? Is the lobby enlisted for the great levee job so powerful that all discussion must be suppressed?

Cowdon knows more about the Mississippi River than any other man, and Congress will do well to weigh his representations with care before they begin to vote away the public money in annual blocks of millions for a purpose which may not be attained at all, or may possibly, as Cowdon insists, be attained for a hundredth part of the expenditure proposed.

THE CRAPO RESOLUTION.

Congress Urged to Take Action in Opposition to the De Lesseps Scheme.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 11.—The House Committee on Foreign Affairs had under consideration to-day the resolution introduced by Representative Crapo (Rep., Mass.) declaring that the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus, under a charter granted by any European Government, was hostile to the established policy of the United States. There were present Señor Jerez, the Nicaraguan Minister; Capt. Eads and his counsel, Mr. A. Thorndike Rice, editor of the *North American Review*; Admiral Ammen, Capt. Phelps, and Capt. Webb of New York. Mr. Rice was the principal speaker. He said that he had recently been in France, and his feelings had been aroused by the scorn and indifference with which the idea of American interests and American interference was met. The passage of the Crapo resolution would say to the supporters of the Panama scheme, "We, the United States of America, propose to safeguard the interest and to control the commerce of our own State. Any one assuming this control, or any portion of it, does so at his own peril." If such a resolution were passed and communicated to the French Government, it would then devolve on that Government to define officially its present and future attitude toward the Panama project, and perhaps, in deference to a friendly power, some restraining influence might be applied by the French Government calculated to discourage the enterprise of De Lesseps. He believed it was time that the official and popular American views of the situation were forced upon the French public, which had been kept in singular ignorance of them. He read an extract from a letter to Admiral Ammen from a gentleman in France, referring to the subsidizing of the Paris press to the extent of $400,000, and stating that Mr. Noyes, the American Minister, while left entirely without instructions on the subject, had, in his private capacity, denounced the scheme, and that it was time that the views of the American Government were officially made known.

The Chairman asked Mr. Rice whether he had any information as to what M. de Lesseps would do in the event of the United States protesting against his scheme.

Mr. Rice replied that he had always understood M. de Lesseps's position to be that the matter was entirely outside the province of the United States, and that no regard would be paid to United States interference.

Admiral Ammen, Capt. Phelps, and Mr. Eads expressed similar views. Señor Jerez thought that the policy of the United States was a just one, as the canal would practically be a part of its coast line. Capt. Webb promised to submit his views at the next meeting of the committee.

A SCENE IN THE SENATE.

Mr. Edmunds Maintaining Order while Speaking on the Holladay Claim.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 11.—While Senator Edmunds was speaking to-day on the bill for the relief of Ben Holladay, he was manifestly annoyed by Senator Conkling's loud talking. Conkling and Cameron had drawn their chairs together, and had their heads almost in contact. Conkling's voice could be heard even in the gallery. Edmunds finally stopped short, looked around, and said: "Mr Conkling, don't talk so loud!" Conkling bowed and continued his conversation in a whisper. Edmunds seemed to be nervous. A few minutes after the two Massachusetts Senators began to buzz together. Edmunds again stopped, and, turning around, shook his long finger warningly and solemnly at the two offenders. Mr. Hoar began to write vigorously, and Mr. Dawes retired to the cloak room. Mr. Edmunds then finished his speech without further interruption.

The principal feature of today's debate on the bill was that while the opposition to the bill came chiefly from Mr. Edmunds (Rep., Vt.), and although Mr. Voorhees (Dem., Ind.) was its chief advocate, Mr. Conkling, in his remarks, presented the claim as the object of Democratic partisan hostility. He said that the hostility of a Democratic caucus and of Democratic platforms to the Holladay case had been manifested in the delay which had kept a man with an honest claim dangling before Congress for years.

The remark was made apropos of a resolution offered by Mr. Cockrell (Dem., Mo.) calling upon the Postmaster-General for copies of the papers relating to Holladay's contract. The resolution was nevertheless passed by the Senate, and the bill went over.

Hayes's Naval Notions.

The question who should fall heir to the tarpaulin and pea jacket of the veteran seaman, Richard W. Thompson, during the last two months of Hayes's expiring tenancy, has always been of the very slightest public importance. Routine convenience, nevertheless, demanded that somebody should be appointed, for the purpose of going to navy headquarters, daily or occasionally, to perform the task locally known as signing the mail.

Hayes naturally blundered in this simple business, as he had blundered in the assignment of Col. Getty to duty according to his brevet rank, a day or two before. Having appointed Mr. Alexander Ramsey to be acting Secretary of the Navy for ten days, he then, in palpable violation of the statute, tried to reappoint him for ten days more. The officers of the Treasury declined to recognize him, and refused to honor his signature, thus putting Hayes in a ludicrous and humiliating position. Then, Hayes blundered again by trying to appoint another member of his Cabinet to fill the aching void; and there also he failed. Finally he sought a new appointment, and, glancing over the country to see where he would be most likely to find a nautical expert, his eye rested, of all places, on the backwoods of West Virginia.

Major Nathan Goff, Jr., sometimes called Gen. Goff, has probably achieved already his principal place in history as the last member of the Fraudulent Cabinet, for, though Hayes is said to have expressed an eagerness to use this appointment for dovetailing his own into the next Ohio man's Cabinet, yet as Gen. Garfield's managers give out that he will appoint no unknown men, this of course settles the case of Major Goff.

The only special use, therefore, of Mr. Goff Jr., seems to be to emphasize Hayes's notion that the head of the navy should be taken by all means from the interior. This notion is one of the very few wholly original with Hayes. Nobody else ever had it, and Hayes could not have borrowed it from "Pinafore," because that work was not known here when Hayes appointed the Hon. Richard W. Thompson.

The first appointment of Secretary of the Navy was that of George Cabot of Massachusetts—a State then of leading maritime importance. His successors were Benj. Stoddert and Robert Smith, both of Maryland; and after them came Jacob Crowninshield of Massachusetts. It may be suggested that at first all the States were seaboard States, so that the Secretary of the Navy had to be taken from one of them. But after the first four incumbents the States of the interior joined on rapidly—nevertheless, without their being considered better versed in marine affairs than those of the seashore. The successive Secretaries of the Navy continued to be Paul Hamilton of South Carolina, William Jones of Pennsylvania, B. W. Crowninshield of Massachusetts, Smith Thompson of New York, S. L. Southard of New Jersey, John Branch of North Carolina, Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire, Mahlon Dickerson of New Jersey, James K. Paulding of New York, George E. Badger of North Carolina, Abel P. Upshur of Virginia, David Henshaw of Massachusetts, Thomas W. Gilmer of Virginia, John Y. Mason of Virginia, George Bancroft of Massachusetts, and so on.

All this time men from the interior had been filling the other posts in the Cabinet, and had been themselves Presidents and makers of Cabinets. And even if, out of so many, one child of the prairies had been chosen to the control of the navy, it would not have been strange. But it was reserved for Hayes to discover not only that a Secretary of the Navy might most wisely come from an interior State, but that he ought not to come from anywhere else. His selection of the old salt of the Wabash might have been accidental; but, following him up with the young tar of the Kanawha indicates design.

Some effort has been made to show that Mr. Goff, Jr., probably has special personal qualifications for his post. But the only one mentioned is that he has "a face as smooth as a boy's," and after Ancient Mariner Thompson's cool change from Hayes's Cabinet into the Chairmanship of the Chagres Canal, which Hayes had been opposing, it could not have been a display of cheek that Hayes was looking for as the special trait of his successor. Hayes is really the founder of a wholly new notion of navy control; and very likely originated Mr. Thompson's famous theory of infusing Western blood into the navy.

HOW THE PUBLIC LANDS GO.

Acres by the Hundred Thousand Taken Up for a Road Never Built.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 10.—Mr. Schurz to-day transmitted to the Senate papers and correspondence relating to lands granted to Oregon, the Willamette Valley and Cascade Mountain Wagon Road Company. Mr. Schurz, in his letter accompanying the papers, says, that maps now on file in the General Land Office show the total length of the road to be 448 miles, entitling the company to an aggregate of 861,440 acres of land. One hundred and seven thousand eight hundred and ninety-three acres, he says, have been patented to the company, and other selections amounting to 416,600 acres are now pending, for which the company demand patents. It appears that in March, 1878, a letter was addressed to the Interior Department by Elisha Barnes and others of Princeville, Oregon, alleging a total failure on the part of the company to comply with the act of Congress by the construction of any road whatever over the greater portion of the route, and a very limited and partial compliance upon the remaining distance. The records and files of the General Land Office, however, showed that duly executed maps, purporting to show the line of survey, location, and construction of portions of the road, had been placed on file to the effect that portions of the road so represented had been completed, examined, and accepted in accordance with the terms of the granting act.

The inquiry raised by Mr. Barnes's letter induced the department to investigate the matter, and subsequently (Aug. 16, 1880,) Mr. W. F. Prosser, a special agent, was instructed to make a proper investigation and report the facts for such further action as might be deemed necessary. Mr. Prosser's report sustains the allegations of Mr. Barnes, and in presenting it Mr. Schurz says: "That in view of all the facts presented and of the magnitude of the grant and the manifest want of most ordinary good faith on the part of the grantee in securing and presenting the evidence for its appropriation, both the agent and the Commissioner of the General Land Office recommend the resumption of the lands, so far at least as have not been patented, or provisions for such other measures of compliance with the terms of the granting act as shall assure the good faith of the beneficiary, before authorizing further patenting of the granted lands." Mr. Schurz, in conclusion, submits the matter for the action of Congress, and says until that is determined upon he will suspend further proceedings.

He Says he Wants to be Honest, but he Must Have Bread.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: I have been a thief a great many years, associating with thieves and burglars of all sorts, and never have I had what I could call a hard time until those few months just past; and why? Simply because I tried to become honest.

You might think it strange that a man should have a hard time in trying to be honest. But such is the fact, and such has been my case, as I can prove. In the first place I must give you to understand that I am a married man, with a wife and two children, whom, by the laws of both God and man, I am supposed to protect. Now, how can I, a mere man, shield and protect my young, when I have not the wherewith to buy bread, and when a rumselling landlord tells me we must go unless I produce my rent?

It is very good to be honest if one can, and I would give my right arm, if by doing so I could become honest. But when all seem unwilling to give me employment, I can't help but think it is fate that makes me a thief. What would you do, sir, if your children should cry to you for bread and you had none to give them, and if those good people of New York should refuse you work? Would you let the children starve? I guess not. Neither would I, and I will not now.

My wife is a very good woman, always willing to help me, and would be at work at the present time, but for sickness, having had a baby only one week ago. She has been my only friend—stood firm when all left me. Now it is my turn, and I will find the bread, come what may. Fate savage, and go I must; if to prison, then so be it.

NEW YORK, Jan. 8. J. F.

The Question of J. McC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Could you inform the public, anxious to know by this time, who this "J. McC." is that attempts to free Ireland by writing such flaming bombasts in THE SUN, and uses such phrases as "Furbish your arms!" "Cheer is at the gates of Rome!" "Now is the time to strike the blow!" "Armageddon of nations!" and so on? Is this "J. McC." an Irishman, or a friend to Ireland? Has he taken part in any wars or battles? Is he a general, or does he hold any military rank or title? Could we find him in case of war? Would he be willing to lead a regiment, or is he merely a blusterer? In fact, who is he? T. C.

BROOKLYN, Jan. 11.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: The numerous letters in THE SUN signed "J. McC." have at length tempted me to ask Who is he? In my opinion he must be either a very great man or a very small one. The projects he advances for freeing Ireland from the tyrannical yoke of England are wonderful, if they were only possible. Still with such a leader as the unknown they might blow up London, Birmingham, and a few other small cities and towns. Of course it would be a fine beginning to destroy thousands of helpless women and children with the aid of gunpowder, dynamite, and gun cotton. It would greatly help the cause of freedom. Those attempts may be the leader at the first attack, but this would be expecting too much. That he has never been a soldier I feel sure, for no man who has ever fought men in the field could advocate such methods. Arran, where is he?

NEW YORK, Jan. 10. AN EX TYRANNICAL TROOPER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: As the target of "J. McC.'s" broadside of angry adjectives in to-day's SUN, grant me a few words in reply. A man of didactics and adjectives walks on stilts. My "pointless irony" clearly tumbled him. Mac means well, but his legs are too short for his horse. In Irish affairs he's either too young or too old. My identity is not called for; life is, Hannah, his role. Unity and fraternity must be the only text-day. Sinn and sinners must be squelched. The mud showers of thirty years ago were 'a do. If "J. McC." would help us, school is open. The sidewalk is out of doors. After his last effusion, Mac need not unmask.

FONTENOY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: The English army of occupation in Ireland has divided its forces into small garrisons, *echelonned* in cities, towns, and villages, in order to strike terror and to oversawe the symptoms of rebellion. Those movements are favorable, in a military point of view, to those who have skill, genius, fortitude, resolution, organization power of concentration, and ability to conduct a revolutionary movement, that shall prevent the scattered military elements from concentrating their forces. The Land League meetings have shown that it is easy to assemble in a district 5,000 or 10,000 men. Every isolated detachment of British soldiers could be easily captured or destroyed by a series of night attacks, extending over the entire surface of Ireland. The nights in winter, in Ireland, are long, dark, and dreary; they can be utilized for plans of universal revolution! Let the drum of human liberty be heard by Irishmen, Boers, Basutos, Natalese, Afghans, Kaffirs, and the people of India, to summon them to arms; then shall liberty live, and tyranny die! J. McC.

NEW YORK, Jan. 11.

Dying in the