The Sun.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1882.

Amusements To-day.

American Institute—51 av., bet. 45th and 46th sts.
Alcazar—Broadway and 41st st.
Bijou Opera House—The Sorcerer.
Booth's Theatre—The Lights o' London.
Big Indian Wigwam—Broadway and 34th st.
Bunnell's Museum—Broadway, cor. 9th st.
Daly's Theatre—Our English Friend.
Fifth Avenue Theatre—The Gladiator.
Grand Opera House—Rip Van Winkle.
Haverly's Theatre—Black Crook.
Madison Square Theatre—Young Mrs. Winthrop.
Niblo's Garden—Belles of the Kitchen.
New York Museum—218 Bowery.
Palm Garden—Concert.
San Francisco Minstrels—Broadway and 29th st.
Standard Theatre—Islandia.
Steinway Hall—Concert.
Thalia Theatre—Vain Wishes, &c.
Theatre Comique—McSorley's Inflation. Matinee.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Variety. Matinee.
Union Square Theatre—The Rantzaus.
Wallack's Theatre—The Honeymoon.
Windsor Theatre—Hazel Kirke.

Advertisements for* THE WEEKLY SUN, *intended to-morrow morning, must be handed in this evening before six o'clock.

Thurlow Weed's Dying Revelation.

Mr. WEED's dying revelation concerning the death of WILLIAM MORGAN is a document of absorbing interest. It clears a mystery which has overshadowed the public mind for more than half a century. His sworn testimony is so clear that, were all the parties now living, the alleged murderers might be brought to trial and convicted.

For fifty years has this secret been locked within the breast of the veteran politician. The reasons are manifest. The information was vouchsafed by a participator in the crime. It was given in a friendly spirit, to be used with care as a weapon of defence when Mr. WEED was hard pressed in a court of law. The arbitrary ruling of the Judge rendered its use unnecessary, and gratitude to the friend who proffered it made the secret inviolate.

The death of all who were nearly concerned in the disappearance of MORGAN unlocked the lips of the only man who retained the secret, and it is now given to publicity for the first time in an authentic form.

Packing Their Carpet Bags.

From Turtle Cut Inlet to the Golden Gate, from the Cheputnaticook to the Rio Grande, all over the United States, this week, men are packing their carpet bags for Washington.

There is some poetry in the idea of such a vast expanse of territory, so many carpet bags, and such a multitude of individuals engaged in packing them, all animated alike by the single impulse to get to the national capital before Congress meets and begins to provide for the expenditure of this year's surplus.

The canal subsidy men, ranging by degrees from the Hennepin size to the Nicaragua $75,000,000, are packing their carpet bags for Washington.

The railroad land grant men, who have in their dishonest possession millions and millions of forfeited acres, are packing their carpet bags for Washington, and are likely to get there quite as soon as TOM REED does.

The bogus pension claimants and agents, drawn toward the extra $100,000,000 voted last summer as little black iron filings are drawn toward a magnet, are packing their carpet bags for Washington.

The ironclad contractors, the steel men, the steal men, the builders and the demolishers, the ROACHES and the SECORS of the glorious American navy are packing their carpet bags for Washington. CHANDLER is there and ROBESON will be on hand the first of the week.

The architects, contractors, engineers, stonemasons, and bricklayers of several scores of gray granite Post Offices that would astonish even MULLETT are packing their carpet bags for Washington.

The friends of all the navigable swamps and the gurgling rivulets are packing their carpet bags for Washington.

The lobbyists, private claim attorneys, wire pullers, subsidy hunters, committee-room haunters, monopolists, overprotected manufacturers, jobbers of every sort and size—in short, all the representatives of a vast and active industry of which Gen. WALKER's imperfect census makes no mention—are packing their carpet bags for Washington.

Never before in the history of the American Congress was there so much packing of carpet bags in view of an approaching session. This is because the House that meets next Monday is probably the last House to assemble for some years wherein the jobbers will have a show. That is why in packing their carpet bags they are all cramming in their hearts and last desperate hopes along with their documents and clean linen.

An Interesting Turn.

The Democratic party has arrived at a turn in its history which philosophic observers may regard with a good deal of interest. Up to the present time the party has been substantially united upon every question of principle except, perhaps, one, and in regard to that the differences of opinion have not been pressed to an inconvenient practical issue.

In both the great political parties there have always been a good many free traders and a good many protectionists; but there is no doubt that the former class of theorists have been more numerous among the Democrats than among the Republicans. Some illustrious members of the Democracy, as, for instance, Gen. JACKSON, have been protectionists, but taking the average of Democratic opinion, as it has been expressed in the resolves of national and State conventions during the past fifty years, it has, on the whole, been protectionist in its tendency, though never so decidedly so as the average in the Whig party and in the Republican party.

Now, however, the Democrats are once more in the majority throughout the country, and they have every prospect of coming into possession of the Federal Administration; but no sooner is this prospect opened before them than the conflict upon the question of free trade or protection becomes very animated and positive. The free traders will no longer allow their views to be qualified by any consideration of party policy. They are going to proclaim them squarely, and to battle for them; and if the party should be split in two they cannot help it. The most prominent and the most energetic among these political philosophers are perhaps the fertile and hard-hitting HENRY WATTERSON of Kentucky and that vigorous and successful statesman, the Hon. FRANK HURD of Ohio. They will not tolerate any kind of compromise respecting this doctrine. They will fight it out on that line, no matter how long it may take or what may be the fortune of the war.

On the other side of the question the most conspicuous leaders are, perhaps, Mr. RANDALL of Pennsylvania and Mr. JOHN G. CARLISLE of Kentucky. Mr. RANDALL has long been known as favoring a moderate course in relation to this subject, and, as we now learn from an article in the *Louisville Evening Post*, which we reproduce this morning, Mr. CARLISLE is likewise a partisan of conservatism and a judicious tariff. This has not commonly been supposed to be his view of the matter, but our Louisville contemporary explains his ideas in a manner which seems to be authoritative and final.

We shall watch with some concern the development of this controversy in the bosom of the Democracy. No doubt it may be so conducted as to strengthen the party in the end, and establish it more firmly in the affections of the masses. That the majority of the people favor the policy advocated by Mr. RANDALL and Mr. CARLISLE cannot, we think, be safely disputed. Unwilling as they are to bear longer the burdens of exaggerated and unnecessary taxation, they are equally unwilling to approve of any method of dealing with the tariff which shall expose any important branch of American industry to destruction in the struggles of cosmopolitan competition. But this is not the point which we now wish to discuss. The prior and pressing question is whether the Democratic party will be able to maintain its substantial unity upon this question, or whether it is to be broken up by the separation of those who insist upon a radical free trade policy from those who maintain a more conservative and popular course.

Questions for the Department of Justice.

Now that the Administration is engaged in a praiseworthy attempt to purify the official atmosphere surrounding the Star route prosecutions, as Mr. GEORGE BLISS puts it, there are certain questions that ought to be answered, reaching back to the time of GARFIELD.

How did it happen that while DORSEY and some of his partners were pursued as contractors, SALISBURY, the heaviest contractor of all, BOSLER, who was associated with DORSEY, ELKINS, who was a Star route jobber, and others belonging to the same class were allowed to go without any pursuit whatever?

Is it true that almost at the door of the Grand Jury room a bargain was made with SALISBURY to settle his case by arbitration, in the expectation of recovering for the Treasury about $120,000?

Through what mysterious influence did WILLIAM PITT KELLOGG, now occupying in the United States Senate a seat to which he was never elected, escape indictment by the present Grand Jury? Did subordinates in the Department of Justice take any part, by suggestion, by hint, or by influence, to prevent an indictment in KELLOGG's case? Did KELLOGG threaten to turn over the evenly divided Senate to the Democrats if indicted?

There are several questions that will have to be answered by or for the Department of Justice before the atmosphere surrounding the Star route prosecutions can become transparently clear.

About Ignorance.

There were in the United States in 1880, according to one of the late census bulletins, 36,761,607 persons of ten years of age and upward. Of these, 4,923,451, or a little over thirteen per cent., were returned as unable to read, and 6,239,958, or seventeen per cent., as unable to write. The proportion of illiteracy may seem high for a country which boasts of its free and general education, but it is much less than that in the chief European nations, with the exception of Germany. According to the latest statistics on the subject at hand, the proportion of those unable to read or write in England is 33 per cent.; in France, 30 per cent.; and in Germany, 12 per cent.

And with us about half of the illiteracy is among the blacks, who have only recently emerged from slavery, and of whom only the young have yet been able to benefit to any considerable extent by our school system. Out of 4,601,207 colored persons in the United States in 1880 of ten years of age and upward, 3,220,878 were unable to write, and the whole number, black and white, so illiterate was only 6,239,958. In other words, while only 9.4 per cent. of the whites above that age were unable to write, the proportion among the negroes was the great one of 70 per cent.

Besides, we had in 1880 a foreign-born population of ten years and over which was enumerated at 6,374,611. Twelve per cent. of these could not write, while of the native white population only 8.7 per cent. were thus incapable. This brings what we may call our normal illiteracy down to a very low proportion as compared with nearly every other country in the world, though the proportion of illiteracy in the State of Bavaria is reported at only 7 per cent.

The proportion of illiteracy would, of course, be greatest at the South, for at the South the still uneducated negroes are almost entirely gathered. But, to the discredit of that region, by far the largest proportion of illiteracy among the native whites is also found there. Let us compare the Southern States with the Northern States with respect to this native white illiteracy, the figures in the following table showing, first, the total of native whites in each State; second, the number of them unable to write; and, third, the percentage:

SOUTHERN STATES.	Total.	Illiterate.	Per Cent.
Alabama	443,327	111,040	25.0
Arkansas	284,183	57,360	25.5
Delaware	82,318	6,680	8.1
Florida	91,749	19,024	20.7
Georgia	555,908	128,792	23.2
Kentucky	914,311	208,700	22.8
Louisiana	208,650	53,201	19.8
Maryland	402,667	30,027	7.5
Mississippi	411,985	52,940	16.0
Missouri	1,244,748	137,948	11.1
North Carolina	605,284	191,913	31.7
South Carolina	295,856	66,415	22.4
Tennessee	774,411	214,904	27.8
Texas	701,889	97,498	13.9
Virginia	616,314	114,915	18.5
West Virginia	362,242	72,829	18.0
NORTHERN STATES.	Total.	Illiterate.	Per Cent.
California	374,772	7,600	2.0
Colorado	117,132	8,373	7.1
Connecticut	331,755	3,728	1.0
Illinois	1,691,214	88,519	5.3
Indiana	1,267,759	87,787	6.8
Iowa	918,723	23,690	2.6
Kansas	528,350	17,825	3.1
Maine	493,158	8,775	1.9
Massachusetts	860,160	6,069	0.7
Michigan	854,925	19,981	2.3
Minnesota	391,747	5,971	1.9
Nebraska	224,804	5,102	2.3
Nevada	22,060	240	1.1
New Hampshire	242,811	2,710	1.1
New Jersey	499,941	29,003	5.2
New York	2,742,847	59,510	2.2
Ohio	1,952,898	83,193	4.3
Oregon	60,028	3,433	5.7
Pennsylvania	2,962,158	123,246	4.8
Rhode Island	147,360	4,261	2.9
Vermont	224,591	5,354	2.4
Wisconsin	566,745	11,494	2.0

We see by this table that the proportion of illiteracy in this country would be very small, much smaller than anywhere else in the world, if it were not for the South, and that there not only are about three-quarters of the negroes unable to write, but from a fifth to a quarter of the native whites also are in equal ignorance. That lamentable, that disgraceful state of things prevails throughout the South, only the semi-Northern States of Delaware and Maryland showing anything approaching the low proportion of illiteracy common to the Northern States. Texas is better off in that respect than its neighbors, but even there the percentage is more than six times that in New York, for instance. Missouri is unusually free from illiteracy for the South, too, but it has five times as much as this State.

In New Mexico, with its "Greaser" population, 64 per cent. of the native whites of ten years and upward cannot write. That is worse than anything shown in the South, but there the case is bad enough—31 per cent. for North Carolina, 27 per cent. for Tennessee, and 25 per cent. each for Alabama and Arkansas, for instance.

It is true that the war did much to overturn the educational system of the South, but it was always behind the North with respect to popular instruction, and it is time for it to recover from the effects of the conflict which was closed seventeen years ago. To get ahead in the race, to secure the desirable fruits of civilization, it must throw off its load of illiteracy, for out of that ignorance spring many of the worst ills from which it suffers—ills political, social, religious, and industrial.

It is proof that we have been getting a good class of immigrants that only 12 per cent. of our foreign-born white population of ten years and over are unable to write. The proportion of the illiterate native whites of the South is nearly twice as large as that. Education is the great present need there.

In spite of the unmistakable protest of the people at the late elections against public extravagance, the several departments at Washington ask for larger appropriations for the next fiscal year than they got for the current year. No River and Harbor appropriations are asked for by the Secretary of War, because all of the $19,000,000 awarded for the current year has not been spent in the short time since the last session adjourned; but there is a fresh reminder of SECOR ROBESON in Mr. CHANDLER's call for $8,000,000 more for the Navy Department than it was allowed for the current year. One tidal wave does not seem to have done the business. Let us have another.

The Congress committee that is going through the form of investigating the Mississippi River improvements, while in reality on a prolonged junketing trip, has travelled 1,500 miles, visited three places where work is being done, and examined ten witnesses. The little it has found out confirms the worst that has been told of the waste of money. The veteran pilots who navigate the river unhesitatingly declare that the improvements are worthless, and want the Government to give them more lights and snag boats. They say they can then take care of themselves. If it was left to a Board of pilots to say how much ought to be spent on the stream, the appropriation would be very small; but the men who are clamoring for the money are not honest navigators.

We have had occasion to report that they do not teach the art of using good English at Yale College; and we have an illustration of the fact in an interview with the Hon. W. M. EVARTS, published yesterday in the *Times*. "We feel," says Mr. EVARTS, "that the great bulk of the money must be raised right here in our midst." Now, this is shocking English, and if an inexperienced boy of 15 should write such a phrase, it would be the duty of his teacher to rebuke him sharply; but when we find it employed by a veteran like Mr. EVARTS, the fact seems strange. However, since Mr. EVARTS became a conspicuous agent in the Electoral Fraud of 1876, it is not worth while to comment upon any verbal inaccuracies that he may fall into. Contrasted with the iniquity of that nefarious transaction, he might outrage the whole English dictionary, and the offence would be almost venial in comparison.

A test case of great importance to Western property owners is pending in one of the Missouri courts. A man who lived in the pathway of a cyclone had his house insured against destruction by fire and lightning, but nothing was said in his policy about cyclones. His house was swept away by wind, and he demands pay for it, on the ground that electricity is the motive power of a cyclone, and that, electricity being the same as lightning, the policy covered his case. Prof. TICE, the meteorologist, who was a witness, supported this opinion. Other meteorological experts are to be called by the insurance company, and a flood of weather wisdom is expected. The result of the trial will probably be to increase the business of companies that advertise to insure against cyclones in the windy West.

Dr. HOWARD CROSBY told the Senate Committee on Corners yesterday that he got all his knowledge on that system of speculation from the newspapers. A few evenings ago he told the Phi Beta Kappa Association that some newspapers didn't know the difference between a college and a circus. It is to be feared if Dr. CROSBY gets his points from such newspapers that he feels a little shaky about his commercial facts. However, he knows what a college is, and if he fails to get an idea of the difference between corners and circuses he will be no worse off than a good many other people. The one is very likely to create the other, as many gentlemen in Wall street can testify.

The truth of the old saying, that "men are but children of a larger growth," received fresh confirmation yesterday in the arraignment in one of our police courts of several bearded men, among a lot of boys, for snowballing. One of them, a man of 36, was accused of the highly improper fun of pelting a squad of policemen who were marching to their posts. This rare sport cost him one dollar. In some cases where civilians were pelted by boys, the snowballers were fined as high as three dollars. The discrimination against the men of the club in awarding bigger damages to the civilians was not explained by the magistrate. Possibly the great risk of a clubbing that the snowballer ran when he made a policeman his target was considered in mitigation of damages.

The city of Cleveland has missed an opportunity. For several years a large slice of land fronting on her famous Euclid avenue has been claimed by the Cody family, headed by Mr. BUFFALO BILL, the chief of the clan. The lawyers said that Mr. BILL had a good claim, and many inhabitants of the town looked forward to the time when he should become a great capitalist and rear a costly house that should dwarf the palaces of the Standard Oil princes that line the avenue. They hoped, too, that he would set an example to those close-fisted capitalists, and stir them up to doing something for the much-neglected city. The courts have rudely shattered these hopes by deciding that the Cody family has no standing before the law. Mr. BILL's prospective fortune fades away like a dream, and he still pursues fame behind the footlights. Worse things might have befallen him. He would not have liked Cleveland and its petroleum aristocracy; he would have pined for something genuine. But Cleveland has missed getting an illustrious citizen for one of its millionaires.

Two or three interesting cases of prayer cures have been published in the newspapers lately, and if they are not hallucinations on the part of the patients, as often happens in like reported cures, the age of miracles is not passed. But no more practical use of prayer has been reported than that of DANIEL VAN WAGNER, an inmate of the Ionia prison in Michigan. On Monday night VAN WAGNER made a very eloquent prayer in the prison prayer meeting, and within an hour made his escape. That subsequent investigation showed that the escape was carefully planned should not detract in the least from the effect of the prayer—upon the prison keepers. VAN WAGNER evidently believed that works should accompany faith. The prison officials should be admonished to "watch and pray."

Wall Street Gossip Corrected.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: A paragraph in your financial column of to-day says that Mr. Gould had asked for my help during the panicky movement of the stock market on Wednesday last. This is a piece of wandering Wall street gossip which has originated from the circumstance that Mr. Gould and I had met to discuss the situation. Mr. Gould is not in need of my help, and I desire to state that I am perfectly aware of the fact. Yours truly, J. B. KEENE.

20 BROAD STREET, Nov. 27.

PRESIDENT ARTHUR'S POLICY.

The Tone of his Message on South American Affairs and Canal Schemes.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27.—The President has not had a chance to say anything officially about his South American policy. Since last December, when he discovered that Mr. Blaine, when Secretary of State, was following his own ideas rather than those of the Administration, he firmly insisted that Mr. Blaine should not compromise the Administration. Whatever may have been the policy of his predecessor in relation to the Chili-Peru troubles, his own policy was one of fair dealing and no untimely interference with either of these powers. In the message which will be read to Congress on Monday the President will make clear the difference between the policy begun by Blaine and his own. This will be of special interest, inasmuch as it is by no means unlikely that Congress may further examine into Mr. Blaine's peculiar conduct. The President of course will not refer to the Blaine correspondence, although it has mostly been made public since the latest message, but he wishes to have his own policy clearly understood and set forth in an official paper. The President will say that he has declared that the representations of the United States to Chili should be of a pacific and dignified character. He did not desire that Chili should be led to infer that there were any covert threats when Mr. Trescott asked whether the arrest of Calderon was regarded as an insult to the United States. The President will also suggest that the Monroe doctrine does not in his view extend to the prevention of commercial undertakings which are the work of private citizens. When, however, European Governments enter the American continent for the purpose of supplanting republican institutions, then it will be time enough to talk about the Monroe doctrine.

The President will not say anything about the interoceanic canal schemes, except to indicate his opposition to any schemes which will involve the name or good faith of the United States. He does not believe that De Lesseps should be driven from the Isthmus by armed force. He will express no hostility to the energetic Frenchman's plans, although he may suggest that it would be a good thing for the United States if the De Lesseps plan was met and matched by another controlled entirely by American capital. The President believes that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which gives England, with ourselves, a joint control over any interoceanic canal that may be built across Central America, should be modified, but he doubts whether such modification can be secured by bullying the British Government. If negotiations should fail, this Government could then give the necessary six months' notice, and terminate the protectorate. The President, however, does think that any canal across Central America should be jointly protected by the United States and the country through which it passes. He does not think that the treaty can in any way affect the Panama route, and that, in fact, it could only affect a route which will never be adopted, that across Nicaragua, under the grant of 1849. He believes also that the United States is at liberty to offer its sole protectorate to any canal that may be built. He will express his hope of an early and amicable understanding with Great Britain.

The President will dismiss Mr. Blaine's grand International Congress scheme with the simple suggestion that it is the policy of the United States to permit other Governments to make the first advances in this respect.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE STAR ROUTES.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26.—When the Garfield Administration was in full tide of operation in prosecuting Star route contractors, a demand was made in the columns of THE SUN for an explanation why all were not treated alike.

If it is true, as it is alleged, that henceforth Arthur will throw aside the Garfield policy in the business and have one of his own—if it is a history—adopt the old and radical theories upon a question so vital to the public welfare?

The country is prosperous. People are naturally loath to change a national policy under such conditions. There never was a more accurate statement than that of Jefferson when he declared that "all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." This is almost as true when the fate of political parties is involved as when the fate of government is staked on the issue. Democrats should not forget that the people who won for us the great victory on Tuesday knew they were not voting upon a national issue in its broadest sense, and that the verdict given would not transfer the Government wholly from one party to the other. The result was more a protest than a final decision. It was a demurrer, and not a settlement of all points in controversy upon the merits of the case.

The more reflecting elements of the party see and know this.

Religious Services in the House of Refuge.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In order to prevent the readers of THE SUN from being misled by the letter headed "Religious Services in the House of Refuge," which, over the signature of "J.," appeared in THE SUN of the 21st inst., I ask the favor of an opportunity to explain in reply to the letter as briefly as I can the merits of the Catholic cause now advocated by the Catholic Union of New York.

In the first place Senate bill No. 65, which it endeavored to get passed last session—and the Catholic societies referred to do not aim at the passage of a different bill—is incorrectly said to have for its object to "give Catholic priests the same rights in caring for the spiritual welfare of inmates of the New York House of Refuge, Randall's Island, that are allowed to Protestant ministers." The bill is general in its provisions and its tenor; the terms Catholic or Protestant are not made use of in it, but if passed its effect, so far as Catholic inmates confined in the House of Refuge are concerned, who make up 60 per cent. of the total number therein, will be to relieve them from the oppression of being compelled to attend and conform to a religious service and worship prepared by the managers themselves, as is manifest from the "Manual of Devotion" used there, and to allow them instead the enjoyment of the services of the Catholic Church, which they and their parents or guardians conscientiously believe to be eminently needed by them, and the right to which is secured to them by article first of section three of the Constitution of the State of New York: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this State to all mankind."

We ask in this respect only what has been accorded and practised for seven years past in the Western House of Refuge at Rochester, where the same chaplain, with hardly any trouble, is made to serve for both Protestant and Catholic religious services. This is managed by having a cross behind the pulpit in a central place, on which the Catholic altar stands behind curtains, which are raised during the Catholic service and dropped while the Protestant one is going on.

As for the invitation, "as often as once a month of the officiating chaplain" (who has usually been a Methodist) "to clergymen of the various denominations, including Catholic priests, to conduct the religious services in the chapel," it is, as regards the priests, a sham, as the managers must know, and as writers in their behalf ought to know. The former have been informed in writing long ago that the "blending of the functions of the Catholic priest and of the Protestant minister," the "preaching by the former of Protestant doctrine and a general character and forming but a part of a Protestant service, is what no Catholic priest can in conscience do, nor be permitted to do." We ask to be allowed to benefit Catholic boys and girls only. To do for them what as a Catholic priest he can and should do there.

In reply to the remainder of "J.'s" communication I ask, whence do the managers derive their authority to limit the visits of the priests to the sick Catholics only, and to deprive those that are well from the ministration of the Sacrament of Penance and Holy Eucharist, which Catholics believe are specially needed for their spiritual good?

Whence do they get the right to prohibit the distribution of Catholic books, tracts, or papers among the Catholic inmates, since such are needed to instruct them in their faith and to keep it alive in their souls?

Whence do these managers derive their authority to restrict the inmates generally, Protestant and Catholic, to the use of "good non-sectarian books and papers only," and to forbid all denominational teaching by those means?

In conclusion, the Catholics of this city cannot be satisfied with anything less than they have been asking of the Legislature. I venture, moreover, to assert that the religious teaching so complacently adopted and tenaciously held by the managers of the Refuge, and which is at best but little above mere theism, is not even in accord with the teachings and traditions of the past of the Protestant denominations, which, it is said, it is therefore strongly insisted upon positive denominational teaching of some kind or other. L. R. BOSSE,

President of the Catholic Union of New York.

NEW YORK, Nov. 25.

Officeholders who Draw Two Salaries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: It is announced from Washington that petty officials there have been detected drawing two salaries from the Government for performing the duties of two offices and that the First Comptroller of the Treasury has decided that they are only entitled to one salary. This is proper. In this city there are a considerable number of Government officials who draw two salaries. One of them is a gentleman who often acts as the President's secretary. He is an officer of the Department of Taxes of New York, and is paid by the county Government, and he is also a Government Director of the Union Pacific Railroad, for which he gets another salary.

The Postmaster's secretary gets a salary as an employee of the Post Office Department, and a second salary as an employee of the State Department. There are other officers who draw double salaries. FACTS.

Settling the Title to the Stevens Battery.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27.—A case which involved the title to the celebrated Stevens Battery was decided in the Supreme Court of the United States to-day. The claim of the plaintiffs in error, Anna A Clarkson et al., who are the heirs at law of Robert L. Stevens, is founded on a resolution of Congress, approved July 17, 1862 releasing to said heirs all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Stevens Battery. The Supreme Court, however, holds that at the date of the resolution the United States had no title to the Stevens Battery, but that the property in it had continued in Robert L. Stevens until his death, and then passed by his will to Edwin A. Stevens as residuary legatee, and subsequently became vested in the present defendants in error and in the State of New Jersey, to a which, in its unfinished condition, it was finally presented. The decree of the court below is affirmed with costs.

THE DECAPITATED OFFICIALS.

Marshal Henry Going to Fight—Postmaster Ainger on the Cause of his Removal.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27.—Ex-Marshal Henry, who was in Ohio on Saturday when the President ordered his removal, arrived here to-day. He is in a bitter mood, and when asked this afternoon what he was going to do about it, he replied with much emphasis: "I am going to fight." What and how the ex-Marshal is going to fight he didn't say. He claims to think, however, that the chief cause of his removal was his friendship for and intimacy with the late President Garfield.

Ex-Postmaster Ainger said to-day: "I believe the real reason of my removal is because I was appointed by Hayes."

A picturesque incident is described by Ainger in an interview this afternoon.

"I never considered myself more solid than I did on Saturday," said he, "when Major Parker and myself escorted the President into the rotunda of the Capitol at the opening of the Garfield fair."

"Do you believe that your removal had been decided upon then?"

"Yes, I do. I believe that the Postmaster-General had the order for my removal in his pocket then. I am especially convinced of it, because before 5 o'clock that afternoon my successor was designated."

Thomas L. Tullock qualified this morning, and received his commission as Postmaster, vice Ainger, suspended.

The public printer has appointed Avin Pearson of Chicago superintendent of the *Congressional Record*, to succeed M. D. Helm.

No selection has yet been made in regard to the vacancy in the Marshal's office. An appointment to this office will be made soon.

District Attorney Corkhill had a long interview with the Attorney-General this afternoon, and afterward remarked that he was safe.

THE TAXATION AND TARIFF QUESTION.

The Opinions of Mr. Carlisle of Kentucky.

From the Louisville Evening Post.

Mr. Carlisle is not in favor of too rapid and radical a reduction of the tariff. He is a reformer, not a destroyer. He is a practical statesman, not a visionary political lunatic.

In view of the fact that Mr. Carlisle is the most prominent candidate in the West for Speaker, his declarations on this important subject will prove interesting. The Democrats have a great opportunity. The victory just won, though of great significance, is but a preliminary skirmish which takes place upon the eve of the national battle to be fought in '84. It is Quatre-Bras, not Waterloo. It decides no national policy. Its practical effects will not be felt by the country. The Senate will remain for two years longer under the control of a Republican majority, and the White House still occupied by a Republican President. There was never so sweeping a revolution with such meagre results in a practical sense. The Democratic party has an overwhelming majority in the country; but until it acquires control of both the legislative and executive branches of the Government it is powerless to enforce its policy—it holds but a barren sceptre in its grip.

Thoughtful Democrats will appreciate the difficulties and delicacies of their position. It is to be hoped Mr. Carlisle also appreciates the responsibilities placed upon him as one of our recognized leaders. The Democrats propose to stand squarely upon the principle that the tariff should be reformed and not abolished; that it is impossible for any party to lead the country at once from high protective duties to "a tariff for revenue only," and unwise to attempt it; that we will adopt the profound and philosophic utterance of Bacon, that "political changes, like those of nature, to be beneficial, should be gradual and not violent;" that we will confer a benefit upon his party and his country, and at the same time pursue the only course which can secure his election as Speaker of the House.

Jefferson favored a judicious tariff. Jackson's messages and speeches are filled with the same doctrine. Why should the party at this day—perhaps the most critical period in its history—adopt the crude and radical theories upon a question so vital to the public welfare?

The country is prosperous. People are naturally loath to change a national policy under such conditions. There never was a more accurate statement than that of Jefferson when he declared that "all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." This is almost as true when the fate of political parties is involved as when the fate of government is staked on the issue. Democrats should not forget that the people who won for us the great victory on Tuesday knew they were not voting upon a national issue in its broadest sense, and that the verdict given would not transfer the Government wholly from one party to the other. The result was more a protest than a final decision. It was a demurrer, and not a settlement of all points in controversy upon the merits of the case.

The more reflecting elements of the party see and know this.

Religious Services in the House of Refuge.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In order to prevent the readers of THE SUN from being misled by the letter headed "Religious Services in the House of Refuge," which, over the signature of "J.," appeared in THE SUN of the 21st inst., I ask the favor of an opportunity to explain in reply to the letter as briefly as I can the merits of the Catholic cause now advocated by the Catholic Union of New York.

In the first place Senate bill No. 65, which it endeavored to get passed last session—and the Catholic societies referred to do not aim at the passage of a different bill—is incorrectly said to have for its object to "give Catholic priests the same rights in caring for the spiritual welfare of inmates of the New York House of Refuge, Randall's Island, that are allowed to Protestant ministers." The bill is general in its provisions and its tenor; the terms Catholic or Protestant are not made use of in it, but if passed its effect, so far as Catholic inmates confined in the House of Refuge are concerned, who make up 60 per cent. of the total number therein, will be to relieve them from the oppression of being compelled to attend and conform to a religious service and worship prepared by the managers themselves, as is manifest from the "Manual of Devotion" used there, and to allow them instead the enjoyment of the services of the Catholic Church, which they and their parents or guardians conscientiously believe to be eminently needed by them, and the right to which is secured to them by article first of section three of the Constitution of the State of New York: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this State to all mankind."

We ask in this respect only what has been accorded and practised for seven years past in the Western House of Refuge at Rochester, where the same chaplain, with hardly any trouble, is made to serve for both Protestant and Catholic religious services. This is managed by having a cross behind the pulpit in a central place, on which the Catholic altar stands behind curtains, which are raised during the Catholic service and dropped while the Protestant one is going on.

As for the invitation, "as often as once a month of the officiating chaplain" (who has usually been a Methodist) "to clergymen of the various denominations, including Catholic priests, to conduct the religious services in the chapel," it is, as regards the priests, a sham, as the managers must know, and as writers in their behalf ought to know. The former have been informed in writing long ago that the "blending of the functions of the Catholic priest and of the Protestant minister," the "preaching by the former of Protestant doctrine and a general character and forming but a part of a Protestant service, is what no Catholic priest can in conscience do, nor be permitted to do." We ask to be allowed to benefit Catholic boys and girls only. To do for them what as a Catholic priest he can and should do there.

In reply to the remainder of "J.'s" communication I ask, whence do the managers derive their authority to limit the visits of the priests to the sick Catholics only, and to deprive those that are well from the ministration of the Sacrament of Penance and Holy Eucharist, which Catholics believe are specially needed for their spiritual good?

Whence do they get the right to prohibit the distribution of Catholic books, tracts, or papers among the Catholic inmates, since such are needed to instruct them in their faith and to keep it alive in their souls?

Whence do these managers derive their authority to restrict the inmates generally, Protestant and Catholic, to the use of "good non-sectarian books and papers only," and to forbid all denominational teaching by those means?

In conclusion, the Catholics of this city cannot be satisfied with anything less than they have been asking of the Legislature. I venture, moreover, to assert that the religious teaching so complacently adopted and tenaciously held by the managers of the Refuge, and which is at best but little above mere theism, is not even in accord with the teachings and traditions of the past of the Protestant denominations, which, it is said, it is therefore strongly insisted upon positive denominational teaching of some kind or other. L. R. BOSSE,

President of the Catholic Union of New York.

NEW YORK, Nov. 25.

Officeholders who Draw Two Salaries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: It is announced from Washington that petty officials there have been detected drawing two salaries from the Government for performing the duties of two offices and that the First Comptroller of the Treasury has decided that they are only entitled to one salary. This is proper. In this city there are a considerable number of Government officials who draw two salaries. One of them is a gentleman who often acts as the President's secretary. He is an officer of the Department of Taxes of New York, and is paid by the county Government, and he is also a Government Director of the Union Pacific Railroad, for which he gets another salary.

The Postmaster's secretary gets a salary as an employee of the Post Office Department, and a second salary as an employee of the State Department. There are other officers who draw double salaries. FACTS.

Settling the Title to the Stevens Battery.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27.—A case which involved the title to the celebrated Stevens Battery was decided in the Supreme Court of the United States to-day. The claim of the plaintiffs in error, Anna A Clarkson et al., who are the heirs at law of Robert L. Stevens, is founded on a resolution of Congress, approved July 17, 1862 releasing to said heirs all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Stevens Battery. The Supreme Court, however, holds that at the date of the resolution the United States had no title to the Stevens Battery, but that the property in it had continued in Robert L. Stevens until his death, and then passed by his will to Edwin A. Stevens as residuary legatee, and subsequently became vested in the present defendants in error and in the State of New Jersey, to a which, in its unfinished condition, it was finally presented. The decree of the court below is affirmed with costs.

NEWS OF UNCOMMON FRESHNESS.

An Oregonian Goes Around the World in Less than Eighty Days.

From the Portland Standard.

Rufus Mallory, who returned a few days since from a trip around the world, was last evening interviewed by a *Standard* reporter, to whom he furnished the following synopsis of his voyage: He left Portland May 31, and sailed from San Francisco on the steamer Oceanic June 6, arriving at Yokohama on the 25th. Spent a few days there and visited Tokio, the capital of the Japanese empire. From Yokohama he went to Shanghai, on the way touching at Kobe and Nagasaki. From Shanghai he went by way of Hong Kong to Singapore, to visit which place was the object of his journey.

Finding that he would make the trip home more quickly by going ahead than by turning back, he took passage on a French steamer from Singapore to Naples. The steamer called at Colombo, where "balmy breezes blow softly o'er Ceylon's isle," and then at Aden, in Arabia, then at Suez, and through the Suez Canal to Port Said, and across the Mediterranean to Naples. He passed Ismailia the day the battle was fought near by, but did not take a hand. He had intended to cross Egypt and have a look at the Pyramids and Sphinx, but Arabi Pasha had all the rolling stock of the railroad corralled, so he went straight to Naples, arriving there Aug. 31.

During the time spent in Italy he ascended Vesuvius, visited Pompeii and Herculaneum, and stayed several days at Rome. From the Eternal City he went to Pisa, as everybody does, to see the leaning tower, and after viewing the landscape from the top of it went to Venice and stood upon the Bridge of Sighs, and had a sail in a gondola; thence passed on to Florence, and thence to Milan and over the Alps by the pass of St. Gothard, preferring that route to going through the tunnel.

He next visited Metz, and thence to Paris and on to London. Spent ten days in this immense city, and saw as much of it as was possible in that time. From London to Liverpool and thence home is an every-day trip. The steamer Alaska, on which he took a passage from Liverpool to New York, was no ordinary affair, however, as her rate of speed was from 425 to 435 miles per day.

From reading Jules Verne one is led to suppose that it is a great feat to go round the world in eighty days, but the time spent by Mr. Mallory in actual travel was less than that, and he is confident that he can make the trip in seventy days.

$10,000 Damages for a Rat Bite.

From the Atlanta Constitution.

The Rev. George W. Baker and his wife, Mrs. Caroline H. Baker, have instituted suit against Mr. W. A. Huff, proprietor of the Markham House, for $10,000 as damages for several bites from a rat which Mrs. Baker received while a guest of the Markham, in June last. In the petition, which is filed by Mr