The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1881.

Amusements To-Day.

Abbey's Park Theatre—Fresh, the American.
Academy of Music—Lohengrin.
Bijou Opera House—Olivette.
Bootb's Theatre—Voyagers in Southern Seas. Matinee.
Chickering Hall—Lecture.
Daly's Theatre—Cinderella at School. Matinee.
Grand Opera House—Fritz in Ireland. Matinee.
Haverly's 14th St. Theatre—Our Babylon. Matinee.
Haverly's 5th Av. Theatre—That Man from Cincinnati.
Haverly's Niblo's Garden—Black Crook. Matinee.
Madison Square Garden—Barnum's Show. Matinee.
Madison Square Theatre—Hazel Kirke.
Masonic Temple—Mesmerism.
Standard Theatre—Billee Taylor.
San Francisco Minstrels—Broadway and 29th st.
Theatre Comique—Mulligan's Silver Wedding. Matinee.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Our School Girls.
Union Square Theatre—Felicia.
Wallack's Theatre—A Scrap of Paper.
Windsor Theatre—Humpty Dumpty. Matinee.

The Great Coming Demand for the New Testament.

The Bible is likely to receive before long an amount of attention and a kind of attention which will be without parallel in our religious history. The revised version of the New Testament is soon to be issued in England, and it seems that numerous publishers in this country are making arrangements to procure early copies of the book, and to fill the market with reprints within a few days of its receipt. It will be printed in the cheap libraries, as they are called, and in other forms, so that it can be brought within the reach of everybody.

These publishers anticipate that the most popular, the most fashionable book of the season, will be this revised New Testament. Probably they do not exaggerate the interest and curiosity with which it is awaited by all sorts of people. The demand for it is likely to be much greater than that for the most thrilling novel, and its sale may exceed that of any book within our time. It will be on every news stand and in every bookseller's shop, and thousands of men who have left their old Bibles to gather dust for many years will read anew the Gospels in their revised form.

Formerly, nearly everybody in this country was familiar with the Scripture narratives and the Scripture poetry. The Bible was a text book which no child of Protestant parents was allowed to neglect. He learned the Biblical stories in his infancy, and throughout his youth he was instructed in the Scriptures, on which he was taught to look as the indubitable Word of God. The phraseology of the Old Testament and of the New Testament became so familiar that it affected the speech of the people, and the Hebraic tone of our literature has frequently been observed by foreign critics.

The United States have been the great Bible-reading country of the world. But since the enormous foreign immigration began, thirty-five or forty years ago, an increasing proportion of our society has been without the accurate Biblical knowledge which formerly prevailed here. These foreigners and their descendants must now comprise a third of the total population of the country. Their influence is powerful in the cities especially, and in some of the Western States the Germans are gaining a numerical preponderance which will be increased now that German emigration is assuming greater proportions than ever before.

With the exception of the comparatively small number of English and Scotch immigrants, these foreigners have not been Bible readers, and have not received the Scripture training which was common in the United States. Very many of them have never looked at the book, and their children are not instructed in it. They do not regard it with the reverence inculcated by our fathers. They treat it as a work for the use of professional theologians, and not for common reading. There are millions of such people in the United States to-day. The Bible is a strange book to them; and Scriptural illustrations which were once familiar to every New England school boy suggest nothing to a very large proportion of our population.

Our free education has become more and more entirely secular, and the influences which surround an increasing share of our young people are very different from those which prevailed one or two generations ago. They are growing up without the old reverence for the Scriptures, and their phraseology is something unknown to them. The reading of the Bible in public schools, for which many Protestants have fought so bitterly, is an empty affair in these days, for the performance can have no real religious character. It is altogether perfunctory, and does not provide the children with Biblical instruction. Unless they go to Sunday schools where it is specifically used as a text book, they mature without acquiring knowledge of what the Bible contains.

The indifference with which the Bible is regarded by a large proportion of the population has also been increased by the methods adopted by the societies for the distribution of the Scriptures. They have scattered Bibles and Testaments about by the million, and made them a drug in the market. While seeking to increase the reading of the Holy Book, they have so proceeded that its sacredness has been greatly impaired in the eyes of thousands of people. They have made the Bible too cheap and too common, and thrust it upon men who were unprepared for it, who did not want it, and who regarded it only with disgust because they resented efforts to convert them. There is such a thing as vulgarizing sacred books and sacred symbols.

Now, however, we are to have the New Testament in great supply, to meet an enormous actual demand. People will buy it as they would any other book they were anxious to read. They will not need to be importuned to take a copy as a gift. When the revised New Testament is exposed for sale, therefore, we shall see a different sort of Bible reading from any to which we have been accustomed. It will come as an entirely fresh book to a large share of those who buy it, and very many of them will read it for information and instruction, without any prejudices of education either in its favor or against it. Hence we say that the Bible is now about to receive a new kind of attention, and to be brought before an entirely new audience.

What effect this novel treatment of the Scriptures will have we must wait to see. It is manifest, however, that we are on the eve of a period of Biblical criticism and interpretation to which there is no parallel in the past.

The Writing of Good English.

Speak English, pray! cried Mr. LABOUCHERE to the witness in court who had used a French word. It did not seem a very hard thing for a man whose native tongue was English. Write English, was our advice of a few days ago to editors of newspapers and other writers; and this does not seem a very hard thing for men who speak the English language. But the Boston *Advertiser* takes a different view of the subject. It tells the Bostonians that "writing good English is a very rare accomplishment for the reason that it is exceedingly difficult. So the writers of good English will always be rare." Now, in fact, good English is neither so difficult nor so rare; we see it in print every day. A man uses good English who properly and plainly expresses the thought that is in him through the words that rise in his mind. That is all there is to it.

We infer that the Boston editor believes in toploftical words and majestical periods. He holds that a writer of good English must necessarily be a classical scholar—learned in the languages and literature of Greece and Rome. "Given a good subject and a competent mind," he says, "it is doubtful if it could be written out to the highest advantage, with true propriety and in perfect taste, unless the writer has been trained on the simple and peerless models of the Latin and Greek classics." What nonsense this is! The English is a better language than either Latin or Greek, better at all events for these times and this country; and there are just as good thinking and speaking and writing in English as there ever were in any old language. No doubt the better education a man has the more accurately he will think and the more clearly and forcibly he will express himself; yet many writers of good English have no familiarity, in the original tongues, with the peerless models of the Boston editor; and many men who shine in their books as writers of true and idiomatic English would have spoiled their style and their wits if they had followed any ancient model or any classical method.

The Spread of Revolution in Europe.

The growth of the revolutionary spirit in European countries is the most striking and momentous phenomenon of the hour. But what equally deserves notice is the lesson suggested by the limitations, as well as the extent, of the movement.

There is enough, certainly, in recent events to alarm the partisans of absolutist principles and methods, and at first sight it might appear that the whole of Europe is honeycombed with secret societies pledged to the subversion not only of existing political institutions, but of the present social order. In France, to a superficial view, the Commune of 1871 seems rehabilitated. The anniversary of its creation has been celebrated in the city which has not yet rebuilt all the monuments it destroyed; those who were punished for supporting it have been amnestied, and compensated to some extent for their pecuniary losses by popular subscriptions; its doctrines now find zealous advocates in the Paris press, and even in the Chamber of Deputies. In Germany the Socialist party, which ten years ago controlled only a handful of electors, now counts its voters by millions, and even the tremendous engine of oppression secured by BISMARCK is powerless to stifle its propaganda, as the recent by-elections have abundantly demonstrated. In the new kingdom of Italy the southern and central provinces are sown thickly with BARSANTI clubs and secret associations, whose discontent reveals itself in violent demonstrations, which do not hesitate to threaten the life of the sovereign. Throughout the Spanish peninsula the same leaven is working, for no sooner was the CANOVAS Government overthrown than a multitude of republican, federalist, and socialist clubs, whose existence had been long suspected, sprang into open and defiant activity. In Russia, scarcely has one Czar been condemned to death by a self-appointed tribunal, which recalls the dreaded *Vehmgericht* of the middle ages, when his successor is admonished to carry out a certain programme, under the penalty of suffering a similar fate.

Now, it is true that assassinations have never yet brought about political reforms, but have had a strongly antagonistic tendency. This is clear from the history not only of Russia itself during the last century, but of the Roman empire during epochs when the assumption of the purple involved an almost mathematical certainty of violent death. It will always be possible to find men willing enough to brave such risks for the lust of reigning, and who will avenge themselves on the people for the terrors they endure by bequeathing to their successors a more elaborate and iniquitous instrument of oppression. It is not regicide, but the seething mass of popular desperation—of which regicide is an acute and morbid symptom—that is big with danger to the vested interests arrayed upon the side of despotic régimes.

There can be, indeed, no doubt that assassination, so far as it operates at all, tends to alienate popular sympathy from the cause of progress, and to stimulate a reaction. Such was the deplorable effect even of those judicial executions of CHARLES I. and LOUIS XVI., whose abstract rightfulness is now disputed by few students of history. There is absolutely nothing in the argument put forth by the Nihilists that, owing to the existence of a large standing army in Russia, pacific propaganda is out of the question. The standing military force maintained in the Northern Empire does not bear by any means so large a ratio to the population as did the 350,000 men controlled by LOUIS XVI. to the 20,000,000 of inhabitants then possessed by France. The triumph of the revolutionary spirit is as inevitable in our century as in the last, and in Russia as it was in France, the moment it acquires sufficient volume and momentum to infect the bulk of the people and the rank and file of the soldiery. The hour came when its standing army was shivered in the hand of the French *ancien régime*, and such is the gravest danger with which the Russian autocrat and the German Chancellor have to cope. That hour, however, far from being hastened, would have been indefinitely postponed by the assassination of LOUIS XVI., for no one will pretend that MARIE ANTOINETTE or the King's brother would have consented to summon the States-General.

So far, then, as a large part of Europe is concerned, revolutionary principles are not unlikely to triumph in the end, and their prospects are particularly bright in the very countries where the system of compulsory military service converts every citizen into a soldier. On the other hand, it is instructive to remark how essentially feeble is the revolutionary spirit, so far as it aims at radical interference with the structure of society, in those countries where parliamentary institutions are firmly planted and in full activity. If we turn from the vaporings of the so-called non-compromising press in France to their actual accomplishment, we find that at the recent communal elections in their stronghold, Paris, their party met with a defeat so sweeping and decisive as to make it a laughing stock. At this moment, although Socialists may practically talk and vote as they please, their movement seems to be as moribund in republican France as is the cause of HENRY V. The same thing may be said of Belgium, where the mass of the population are entirely satisfied with their constitutional monarchy; and of Switzerland, where the Nihilist refugees would seek in vain to arouse the natives against the principle of individual property, which lies at the root of Swiss society. As to Austria-Hungary (which now enjoys one of the most liberal governments in Europe), sharp as is the rivalry between Czech and German on this side of the Leitha, and between Magyar and Slav in the Transleithan kingdom, these quarrels are fought out strictly within the lines of the Constitution. Socialism can make no headway within the HAPSBURG dominions, and the eulogists of assassination would have hard work to induce one of his contented subjects to lift his hand against the Austrian Kaiser. Turning to Italy, we perceive that GARIBALDI is still faithful to his friendship for the house of Savoy, when he puts himself at the head of the agitation for universal suffrage. For if this boon, often promised but long deferred, were once bestowed, Italy would in truth become a self-governed country, and the sole plausible ground of complaint against the present dynasty would vanish. So, too, in the Iberian peninsula, let the Government restore the liberal constitution of ten years ago, and launch Spain once more on the path of progress and enlightenment, and ALPHONSO will be safe enough, and prudent men can afford to laugh at the bugbear of revolution.

We have said nothing about England, simply because Socialist doctrines have never acquired the slightest footing there. English radicals mean to have the franchise widened and redistributed, and the land laws amended, but they are perfectly satisfied with the principle of individual property and with parliamentary institutions. The inference to be drawn from a swift survey of all these facts is that Socialism, so far as it aims at a division of property, has no chance of success anywhere except possibly in Germany and Russia. But it is equally manifest that the friends of liberty everywhere—whether they choose to call themselves Radicals, Republicans, Jacobins, Socialists, or Nihilists—are reasonably sure of founding or improving sound political institutions at no distant date, provided they will not themselves beget sympathy for their opponents, and will keep their hands untainted by the detestable crime of assassination.

Bring Out the Papers.

If the Republicans are not already sick of their bargain with MAHONE, they are likely to be made so, should the discussion which was provoked by the corrupt coalition go on in the bad temper which has been recently witnessed in the Senate.

Thus far, only the political aspects of this barefaced job have been criticised. But it is well understood there are personal matters seriously affecting MAHONE, which have hitherto been kept back, that must come to light if he persists in threatening Senators with the "code" for calling the attention of the Senate to comments of the press on his trade with the Republicans.

Gen. MAHONE has offensively paraded his devotion to the Confederate cause, and declared in the Senate that "neither here nor elsewhere had he any apology to make for the part taken" therein. Gen. EARLY was far more distinguished than ever MAHONE was on the Southern side, and is known as an upright and truthful man. We are informed that he holds papers in his possession which MAHONE will not dare to ask for with a view to publicity, but which may find their way into print without his consent.

If these documents should be given to the public—and there is no reason for withholding them—Mr. HOAR and Mr. DAWES, who have been the special champions of the venal alliance, will be apt to wish, as Mr. BEECHER did on a memorable occasion, that they were dead, or at least hidden out of sight until the storm has blown over.

Deacon RICHARD SMITH's candidate has beaten Field Marshal MURAT HALSTEAD's candidate, and is Mayor elect of Cincinnati. Deacon RICHARD SMITH's candidate was a Democrat, but was recommended by Deacon RICHARD SMITH as possessing desirable qualifications of a moral nature. The result shows that the endorsement of the truly good man carries a deserved weight with his townsmen.

Another session of the Senate was spent in filibustering yesterday. Mr. MCPHERSON asked leave to present a petition from citizens of New Jersey and New York reciting the fact that MICHAEL BOYTON, a citizen of the United States, had been thrown into a British prison and denied trial, but the Republicans and MAHONE refused to depart from the caucus programme, and the petition went over. Speechmaking occupied the entire session. JOHN SHERMAN appeared prominently in the debate on the Republican side. He said he welcomed MAHONE as the forerunner of the men who would follow him and break down sectionalism.

People who are interested in the points of resemblance and of contrast in the careers of the two great rival figures of current English politics will not fail to note that while Mr. GLADSTONE was delivering, on Monday night, a two hours' budget speech, "without any perceptible abatement of his characteristic energy," as the London *Times* says, Lord BEACONSFIELD was on a bed of illness which was thought at one time to be his last. Not long ago the case was reversed, Mr. GLADSTONE being the ill statesman, and Lord BEACONSFIELD flaming out with all his old vigor.

The Presiding Elders of the Methodist Episcopal Church manage to make the itinerancy system generally tolerable to congregations by regarding their preferences, and the common sufferers are the clergymen, who often find themselves square pegs driven painfully into round holes. Elder B. PETTON BROWN of the Washington Conference, however, seems not to have tried to please the Ryland Chapel people with a pastor this spring. Perhaps the atmosphere of the capital is not conducive to satisfactory office filling, even in religion. Elder BROWN disregarded the congregation's choice and appointed the Rev. Dr. J. S. DEALE. They protested that they did not want Dr. DEALE, and possibly might have gained their point if they had not rebelliously declared that they wouldn't accept him. Elder BROWN stood firm, even when Dr. DEALE asked to be sent somewhere else. Then the congregation appealed to Bishop ANDREWS, who decided that Ryland Chapel must have Dr. DEALE for a pastor, no matter whether that pleased either preacher or people. Discipline must be maintained. All the trustees have resigned, and will keep on toward heaven, together with the seceding membership, in some other than the regular Methodist Episcopal way.

It is rumored at Rome that the Pope has decided to create an Irish Cardinal, and among the Catholics of Ireland there is unusual curiosity, not to say anxiety, to know on what head the red hat is to fall. Two names are heard; those of Dr. MCCABE, Archbishop of Dublin, and Dr. CROKE, Archbishop of Cashel. The former, like his predecessor, the late Cardinal CULLEN, is thoroughly English in his sympathies and politics. He holds the Land League in detestation, and in a recent pastoral went so far as to impugn the character of the Irish ladies who belong to it. For this utterance he was promptly rebuked by Mr. A. W. SULLIVAN, M. P., and the Archbishop of Cashel made haste to endorse the rebuke in a public letter to Mr. SULLIVAN. Dr. CROKE pronounced the Dublin prelate's imputations upon the virtue and modesty of the Land League ladies monstrous, said that very few people in Ireland were influenced by his political utterances, and intimated that a curb was likely to be put upon him in that respect. Such language from one Irish Archbishop about a brother Irish Archbishop has naturally attracted attention both at London and at Rome. Should the Pope now bestow the red hat upon Dr. MCCABE it will be taken as a proof of his hostility to the Irish Land League. The Rome correspondent of the New York *Tablet* writes, under date of March 16: "If a second appointment like that of Cardinal CULLEN be made, it may serve to weaken the faith of the Irish people to such an extent as to alarm the best and sincerest friends of the Church." On the other hand, the appointment of Dr. CROKE would be, under the circumstances, a virtual approval of the Land League movement. The chances are that neither of these Archbishops will enter the Sacred College at present.

The terribly destructive earthquake at Chio and simultaneously the most serious inundation of the century at Seville, following closely upon the earthquakes in Austria, and with the war clouds lowering in the East, are incidents that may disturb those who still have secret fear of the prediction that the year 1881 would be one of portents and terrors.

Yesterday a Swiss pauper made affidavit that he had been shipped to Castle Garden by the authorities of Bermenstorf, who paid his passage. Switzerland has lately claimed that her exports to the United States had largely increased; but if she includes in her estimates some of the human exports she has lately been sending us, it will be necessary to put a prohibitory tariff on these objectionable products, even if the total of her trade with us is thus greatly decreased.

If it be true that the British yielded, in their treaty with the Transvaal, to the Boer demand that Laing's Nek should not be fortified, it is a concession honorable to them and well earned by the brave farmers who held that point at all hazards as the strategic key to the level lands lying beyond. A strong fort and garrison at Laing's Nek would always be an object of fear and distrust to the Transvaal.

Gen. ARMSTRONG of the famous HAMPTON negro and Indian school got some Massachusetts people into a parlor the other evening, and told them some things they didn't know before about the New South. The change of sentiment in regard to education within twenty years, he said, was wonderful—"the most wonderful in all the history of civilization." No one of the colored teachers graduated at Hampton had encountered hostility. Everywhere the best white people welcome and encourage them. The worst opposition comes from the illiterate colored preachers of the old type. Another interesting fact mentioned by Gen. ARMSTRONG is that the Southern colleges for white youth are crowded with young fellows who are "living on hominy in order to get an education."

WHY SECTIONALISM IS KEPT UP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The real purpose of the fencing match now going on in the Senate, ostensibly to save a few offices for the Democrats, after surrendering the political power of the body to their adversaries, is to freshen up and keep alive the sectional issue. The leaders of both sides repeat, of course, their oft-repeated declarations that the people are sick and tired of this, and that they themselves want to put an end to it. But while we know this is true of the people, we know that the reverse is equally true of these politicians and of the monopoly interest which controls them, and which, under the mask of the sectional issue, has succeeded the slave interest in the actual control of the Government. It is, moreover, obviously the interest of the Republican politicians to keep the sectional issue alive, because the section they represent is the stronger, and it therefore insures their control. The Bourbon Democrats also want it because it secures them the control of the Democratic organization, and no party leaders are willing to give up an issue which will enable them to control either the Government or their own party.

The action of the old pro-slavery leaders of the Democratic party in organizing the unconstitutional Electoral Commission to count out Mr. Tilden, the representative man of the anti-slavery Democracy, after the people had overruled them in nominating and electing him, and then joining the Republicans in denouncing him, and conspiring with them to lose the great State of New York to the Democracy to prevent his renomination and reelection, shows how desperately these men cling to power over the party organization.

The sectional issue in some form is a necessity to them. They belonged, for the most part, to the opposing party till that issue was made, and they are now in sympathy with the monopolies which have succeeded the slave power in the actual control of the Government under the mask of the sectional issue, and which own so many of the so-called Democratic organs. Hence the object of these old Bankites is plainly the same as that of the Republicans, their ostensible opponents, but real allies, to divert public attention from the recent flagrant manifestations of power by their masters over the Government, which is consolidating the people.

JACKSON DEMOCRAT.

WASHINGTON, March 31, 1881.

The Builders and the Plumbers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your editorial of the 2d inst. on the new Plumbing bill lately referred to the New York and Brooklyn delegations in the Assembly does injustice to the intelligent builders of New York. They are very generally opposed to the bill. You make it appear that the opposition comes from what you term the jerry builders who are concerned in cheap plumbing rather than its excellence and usefulness. The intelligent, practical builders of New York are opposed to giving the Board of Health the supervision of the fitting up of plumbing or the licensing or registration of plumbers as provided for in the bill now before the Assembly, for the following reasons:

The Commissioners of the Board of Health have not sufficient practical knowledge of plumbing or technical knowledge of hydraulic engineering to qualify them to examine and give certificates of capacity and ability to persons to work at the plumbers' trade and to fit up plumbing work as work should be fitted up in New York. They are in favor of a law by which the engineers of the Water and Sewer Departments of the city of New York will have the examination and appointment of inspectors of the plumbing of buildings. They ought to be practical plumbers, instead of the officers now known as Croton police, and they ought to do the work now imposed on those officials, of looking after and stopping the unnecessary waste of the Croton water, in addition to the inspection of plumbing and an examination from time to time as the work progresses without additional expense to the taxpayers.

The builders of New York do not favor defective work of any kind. They desire the protection of the people against the knavery or ignorance of plumbers or any other mechanics in any branch of the construction or erection of buildings in this city. Work much of ability and intelligence should receive certificates from the engineers, whose special instruction and experience ought to qualify them to pass on the merit of candidates applying for licenses.

The builders of New York are opposed to defective plumbing, drainage, and ventilation, to any unnecessary waste of water, are in favor of the appointment of officials with power to stop the waste of water, and to examine and control all plumbing work, to the end that all waste may be stopped and the plumbing of buildings be done in a workmanlike and scientific manner. This would subserve the health of the city, and protect the people against incapacity, ignorance, and defective plumbing and drainage in their dwellings.

CORNELIUS O'REILLY,
President of the Builders' Association of the city of New York.

Legislation in Connecticut.

HARTFORD, April 5.—The bill prohibiting steam oyster dredging on natural oyster beds was passed in the Senate today. It had previously passed the House. The Senate passed a bill regulating the practice of medicine, requiring itinerant practitioners to pay a license of $25 a day.

Gambling Hells Afloat.

From the St. Louis Republican.

The gamblers are already planning to circumvent the law just adopted by the Missouri Legislature making gambling a felony. The law, they say, does not reach to the middle of the river. It has been suggested that a pool be made up and a boat chartered for short trips up and down the river, to leave every night and return by morning. As soon as the boat would get away from the levee Faro, keno, and roulette tables would be brought out, and the merit sport in gambling. Passengers would be charged, say, $1, a part of which would be returned in checks that would be good at the gambling tables. There would be a bar and restaurant on board, and everything to make things comfortable. Some of the biggest gamblers in town have been talking about the matter. Something will be done, and just now this seems to be the only thing to do. If one of these boats should be rigged up, it may give a start to river gambling again. At present all the regular boats on the river have very strict rules about gambling; but if it were profitable boats could be easily found to go into it.

THE VACANCY IN THE SUPREME COURT.

WASHINGTON, April 5.—The Supreme Court usually adjourns about the first of May, which comes this year on Sunday. The present term will therefore probably close on Monday, the 2d of May, though it has not yet been officially announced. This fact disposes of the alleged urgency for the confirmation of Matthews, because in the short time before this recess but few docketed causes will be heard, and the preparation of opinions will mostly engage the Judges for the remaining four weeks.

Matthews cannot be confirmed without a large vote on the Democratic side, to obtain which extraordinary efforts and profuse promises have been made by his authorized friends. He is warmly supported by Mr. Pendleton, Mr. Beck, Mr. Voorhees, Mr. Lamar, and some others, for reasons which they may be required to explain hereafter.

Judge Field is the only member of the court who has forgotten the proprieties of his position to enlist as a champion for Matthews. The fellow feeling that attaches friends of corporate power may explain this unbecoming zeal on his part, much more to be honored in the breach than in the observance.

The quarrel between Conkling and the Administration may perhaps give Matthews some support that he otherwise would not have got. This possible accession, however, is yet to be tested by the turn of events. Blaine openly proclaims that the line must be drawn on the nominations now before the Senate, perhaps with the single exception of Chandler, who may be offered up as a propitiatory sacrifice.

That is to say, in view of his certain rejection, Chandler may be withdrawn. Blaine has no special love for Matthews, and Garfield was known to be wholly indifferent to his fate until this complication with Conkling changed his views. Now he proposes to test the sense of the Senate on that and other nominations, so as to ascertain the strength of Conkling's following, and to mark every Senator for proscription who fails in fealty to the Administration.

Of the nine members of the Judiciary Committee, seven at least are distinctly committed against Matthews, including Mr. Edmunds, who is absent in Florida. Conkling is acting Chairman, and whenever a report shall be made on the nomination it will certainly be adverse. Beyond that point no safe prediction can be ventured until there is a show of hands disclosing the strength of the contending factions.

GORHAM AND RIDDLEBERGER.

WASHINGTON, April 5.—The Democrats of the Senate have pretty well determined that, come what may, they will not consent to the election of Gorham and Riddleberger as Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, if continued resistance can prevent that consummation.

These two candidates are regarded as representing a corrupt bargain, by which the Republicans procured control of the committees. Gorham was the negotiator of this coalition, and his reward was the nomination for Secretary.

Riddleberger is the recognized lieutenant of Mahone, who appeared publicly on the floor of the Senate to aid in furnishing references, when the latter made his recent speech. He is the author of the bill by which one-third of the State debt was repudiated, and the payment of the remaining two-thirds was made insecure and uncertain.

Therefore the present situation will not be materially changed at the regular session if the Republicans adhere to these caucus nominees. It is not a question whether what is called "a constitutional majority," obtained by the casting vote of the Vice-President, shall prevail, but whether a venal trade shall be carried out by the consent of one-half of the Senate.

Opposition can easily be overcome by the Republicans putting up candidates who are not tainted in any way with this foul jobbery, and who deserve public confidence. Until they adopt this wise course, the Democrats will prevent the completion of the contract.

THE FISH QUESTION.

The Wonderful Things that have been Done in the Way of Fish Culture.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In THE SUN of the 1st inst. a correspondent who signs himself "Fisherman," heads his communication "Fish Culture and Nonsense." The heading is good; but he furnishes only one-half of his heading. He says "it is impossible to stock any waters with fish that do not belong there naturally." Where has he slept for the past ten years that he has not awakened to the fact that the United States Fish Commission has introduced the German carp into ponds and lakes where it has thrived? Does he not know that the salt water smelts have been bred in fresh water, and the California salmon also? If he had taken the pains to attend the late meeting of the American Fish Culture Association he would have learned of these facts and others which he is probably unaware of. Does he not know that the salmon and the shad have been restored to the Connecticut River after the former had been absent for twenty years? Does he ever hear that, notwithstanding the increase of population and consequent increased demand, the shad are holding their own in the Hudson, the Delaware, and the Susquehanna Bays? Do these facts look like "growing tropical plants in Alaska?"

It is sad to see an angler turn up his nose at fish culture, and I incline to think your correspondent an angler, not a fisherman, although he signs himself "Fisherman." Many men do not make the distinction between an angler and a fisherman. He also elevates his nose at liver-fed trout. This is the fashion, but the tests which have been applied prove it erroneous. Liver is good for a man's breakfast, and is also good for a trout. Two years ago several gentlemen, at the request of Mr. Blackford, sat down in a restaurant and ate trout from many localities, wild and tame, which were marked by absence of heads, fins, tails, &c., and the verdict was in favor of some liver-fed trout, they not knowing what kind they were eating until their verdict was given and the record shown. This verdict is a matter of record in an angler, who remembers the trout tasted in camp after a hard tramp, when he was hungry enough to eat a bear. The writer has eaten them there, with great zest, when half burned and half raw, and called them delicious, but his better judgment tells him that they could not have been as good as those cooked at the restaurant on April 1, when his appetite was gone and he could pick at them. "Fisherman" does not strictly adhere to his heading, for he talks sense in his last paragraph about protection. He says: "Let us alone and we will protect ourselves." Protection should go hand in hand with fish culture.

I hope "Fisherman" will not feel aggrieved at this letter, but will take pains to inform himself of what has been done. He is a little behind the progressive age. He will be surprised to learn that fish culture has actually accomplished things which he now seems to think impossible. SALVELINUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It seems strange that a man of thought should have written such a communication as "Fish Culture and Nonsense," which appeared in THE SUN of April 2. That he is a thinking man is shown from the fact that he selected THE SUN for the purpose of conveying his ideas to the masses. His letter was doubtless written during a fit of indigestion caused by a dish of liver-fed trout from a tadpole pond. If he had properly investigated the subject, he never would have declared that "it is impossible to stock any waters with fish that do not belong there naturally," or "when there are no trout in a stream you may rest assured that it is because there is nothing, or not enough, in it to feed them." He would also have learned that "trout raised in ponds are utterly worthless," and that "it may be easy enough to keep up a supply of fish food in a pond, but until it becomes possible to keep up that supply constantly in rivers and streams in which it is not produced naturally, every attempt to carry on extensive fish culture must be looked upon by all sensible men as a mere fad."

If "Fisherman" will brush up in history a little, and refer to the age of Julius Cæsar and Cicero, or Cato and Pompey, and dine at Romanus or Brown and learn, he will discover that with their keen appetites for the luxuries of the table, none were pronounced more toothsome than the finny productions of artificial fish ponds.

Dealers in fish in New York can direct him to scores of breeders from ponds whose fish are in as great demand by epicures as those from natural streams. The writer, when young, hooked, has caught and ate fish from off the Scottish Rocks, and from the Isle of Wight to the numberless lakes in Northern Canada, and paled past fish from mountain streams down to the tidal waters of the Canal, never a whit more delicious fish than those from artificial ponds formed from springs, in which the fish were properly fed.

German writers, from Stephan Dandolo down, give voluminous testimony of the value and importance of artificial fish culture. Big and gray-headed seth Green, who has made the subject a life study, says that one acre used for raising carp is worth $10,000 for any thing else.

Even in Central Park, in artificial ponds made where cabins used to nestle, and which are supposed with English Crokers, many kinds of edible fish, first placed there to supply food for ducks and other kinds of fowl, increase so rapidly that they often have to be scooped out to prevent their smothering each other.

If Fisherman will take the trouble to investigate the subject, he will never again write that extensive fish culture is nonsense. ANCIENT ANGLER.

BROOKLYN, April 5.

Irishmen and the Church.

From the Tablet.

Dr. McCabe had better understand that the time is past and gone when the people of Ireland will quell their natural instincts to the glorious heritage of freedom at the dictation of any Bishop, or even of the Pope himself, for in this age no Catholic of intelligence, or a moiety of it, will accept the doctrine that rests upon a servile submission to foreign usurpation. Rome claims our fidelity and obedience as Catholics, but interferes with our political views or aspirations for freedom is simply a claim upon our manhood, an abuse of our fidelity and devotion that even the Irish, faithful and docile as they are to the Church, will no longer tolerate. It is time that the Irish Bishops would speak out and tell his Holiness that Dr. McCabe does not represent the views of the Church in Ireland, and that free submission to the grinding despotism of England is not an article of faith.

Fined for Smoking Opium.

From the San Francisco Post.

Three young men at Marysville were convicted on Tuesday of smoking opium, and fined $10 each. These are the first convictions under the State law passed at the last session of the Legislature.

COL. GEORGE BLISS'S DEFENCE.

His Views on Street Cleaning—Direct Charges Against the Integrity of Mayor Grace.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Passing over your pleasant but incorrect tribute to my influence and my bank account, permit me briefly to reply to your personal appeal in this morning's SUN:

1. I admit that the streets have been this winter and spring extremely dirty.

2. I believe this is attributable chiefly to the nature of the winter, next to the defects in the law, and finally, to the defects in the Street Cleaning Department. If you will refer to your own columns for ten years past you will find that every spring there has been a howl about dirty streets, and that the loudness of the howl has been in direct proportion to the severity of the winter then closing. With snow on the ground the streets cannot be cleaned, while to carry the snow away would cost millions. The same is true in Paris, as the French papers of a year ago show.

3. Any one can clean the city under the proposed bill, except when we have such a winter as the last. It takes down all the barriers unwisely put up heretofore, allows an unlimited amount of money this year and a million a year in future, and provides for proper boats and other appliances. I have tried to secure these things for some years, but have been opposed by those who are now the most abusive in favor of the proposed Senate bill. The present chief champion of the latter only last year put into a bill, which he insisted the Legislature ought to pass, an express limitation to $550,000, and the year previous made an elaborate argument to prove the impropriety of intrusting the street cleaning to the Mayor!

4. I don't think any Mayor ought to have the powers proposed to be given in the Senate bill. The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the city. He should supervise all its departments, but not be charged with the details of any department. There should be a Street Cleaning Department, whose executive officer should be removable, like any other head of a department. The Mayor should have over it just the power he has over other departments; no more, no less. What that power should be the McCarthy charter should settle before it passes.

5. I don't think Mayor Grace is the man to have the powers given by this bill. I am not aware that he has done anything publicly since the press of the city so uniformly denounced him last November except to insist that the Democratic fragments should not avail themselves of Republican aid to organize the Board of Aldermen. I know that in private he has sought to buy a Republican Commissioner to vote for a Democrat by offering to secure the creating for the Republican of an unnecessary office. I know, too, that he has interfered to prevent the reduction of expenses in a city department because it would affect Democrats. I am told and believe that he has sought to use his office for the personal benefit of business friends and associates. I believe that his relations to transactions connected with the city Government before he became Mayor are not such as to commend him to any one who knows them, and the public may soon know them.

6. I do not think the Senate bill accomplishes what it pretends to seek. It does not give undivided responsibility. It provides for a superintendent of street cleaning, who does everything with the approval of the Mayor. If anything goes wrong the Mayor will say, "Of course I could not look into details. I acted on the representation of the superintendent;" while the superintendent will say, "I am a mere clerk. I acted under the Mayor." In my opinion the thing is a sham and a fraud. If I would have is a superintendent of street cleaning, who should be the autocrat of the business. If he fails, let him be removed like any other head of a department, like the Comptroller or the Commissioner of Public Works. The only question is who should appoint him and who should determine whether street cleaning should be done by contract or otherwise. I would give that power to a body composed of more than one officer—say the Mayor and President of the Board of Health, or these two officers, with the Comptroller added. But when they have acted, and relied on being the superintendent of street cleaner, let him be independent of them or any one, but subject to removal by the Mayor if he fails or misbehaves.

Your reference to possible future "new made graves" is gloomy and poetic, but has little pertinency. While in January and February less than a thousand loads of street dirt were removed, over 50,000 loads have been removed in the last month, and all the accumulation will be removed long before any new force can get to work. Indeed, the Senate bill, as is now admitted—though it was not discovered till I pointed it out—leaves an interregnum which may be sixty days after its passage, during which street cleaning would be impossible.

SUN space is precious, but I venture to ask this much of it. GEORGE BLISS.

The Freedom of the Deaf-Mute Press—A Case for the Legislature.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will you please find place for this complaint? It is simple, but worthy of notice. There is a deaf mute newspaper published in Brooklyn. It is not an impure newspaper. Its editorial tone is strong in denouncing frauds perpetrated upon the mutes.

At the School for Improved Mutes, at Broadway and Forty-fourth street, the pupils like the paper, for it is simple, mild, inventive, witty, and comprehensive. On the 30th ult. one of the pupils—a pay pupil—had a bundle of the newspapers. He sold some fifteen out of twenty-five at two cents each. But the Principal, D. Greenberger, ordered the pupil to pay back the money so collected and send the bundle back to the publisher. The Principal also threatened to expel the pupil.

Now, Mr. Editor, can you tell me if such a Principal has any right to "gag" the press? The school is sustained by an annual appropriation from the State. And the pupils live in the city, and attend school as pay pupils. The Principal allows other papers to be sold and read by the pupils. Is there no redress, besides THE SUN, where the publisher can find redress? As I do not sail under false colors, I sign myself, yours as ever,

BROOKLYN, April 4. W. A. BOND.

An Alleged Substitute for Quinine.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Poor men, who have to do daily work for their daily bread, are as liable to be attacked by malaria as rich men. To them the high price of quinine is a serious matter. Druggists charge two cents a grain for small quantities, the cost price being something over $3 an ounce. Most malaria patients must take at least fifteen grains of the drug daily, while the attack may last for several weeks. Few working people can afford to spend $2 a week for medicine. If a remedy has been found as efficacious and much less expensive, that is good news.

Such a remedy is believed to have been found in iodine, a medicine which, like quinine itself, is a purely vegetable product.

The discovery is said to be due to Dr. Nonodnitchenski, an eminent Russian physician, who announced in a medical journal that "when given boldly in doses of ten to twelve drops of the tincture in half a glass of sweetened water every eight hours, I claim will never rank second to quinine in the treatment of Malarious fevers." Dr. Grinnich, an Englishman, finding himself called upon to treat a number of patients in a malarious district, happened upon one patient who had the misfortune of quinine. He was far from his base of supplies, and obliged to act quickly. The statement of the Russian doctor came to his mind. Something impelled him to try iodine. The first widow cured was and a half miles from the lady, who was a widow, the second was a little third, and fourth lived about the same distance from each other; so the iron, in turn, had charge of each of the real houses, and is now happily married with her fifth husband within seven miles of her original home.

The very best thing to do with a cold or a bad cough is to get rid of