The Sun.

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1883.

Amusements To-day.

Bijou Opera House—Heart and Hand.
Booth's Theatre—Monte Cristo.
Cosmopolitan Theatre—Old Shipmates.
Daly's Theatre—[illegible]
Fifth Avenue Theatre—Patience.
Globe Dime Museum—[illegible] Bowery.
Grand Opera House—Streets of New York.
Haverly's Theatre—Siberia.
Indian Wigwam—Circus. Matinee.
Madison Square Garden—Athletic Tournament.
Madison Square Theatre—Young Mrs. Winthrop.
New York Museum—[illegible] Bowery.
Niblo's Garden—Consolidated Minstrels.
San Francisco Minstrels—Broadway and 30th st.
Standard Theatre—Miracle.
Thalia Theatre—Corsican.
Theatre Comique—Moseley's Inflation.
The Casino—The Queen's Lace Handkerchief. Matinee.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Variety.
Union Square Theatre—A Parisian Romance.
Wallack's Theatre—The Silver King.
Windsor Theatre—Rosedale.

What Was Done Yesterday in Congress.

In these closing days of Congress there is a great pressure of important business. The tariff question and the new River and Harbor bill were up yesterday, besides other things involving heavy expenditures.

The Tariff bill has been sent to a conference, as a means of avoiding filibustering.

In the Senate there was a long debate on the action of the House in directing its conferees to consider the constitutional objections to the originating of revenue laws by the Senate. It ended by the adoption of a resolution that "the conference should be full and free, and if the Senate conferees find that any limitation has been placed by the House upon the action of its conferees, the Senate conferees shall retire and report the fact to the Senate." This was supported in speeches by GARLAND and BAYARD; it was opposed by MORRILL and SHERMAN as tending to defeat an agreement on the bill. In the Senate debate there was much talk of fraud and jugglery, with a great deal of heated language.

In the House there was an interesting illustration of the state of things respecting the tariff. Mr. SAMUEL J. RANDALL declined to serve on the conference committee, explaining his ground for this action. The Chair then appointed Mr. MORRISON of Illinois to fill the vacancy, but he also declined. Mr. TUCKER of Virginia was next appointed, but he likewise declined. The Chair now took the matter under consideration, and after some time appointed Mr. SPEER of Georgia.

Among other business done in the Senate was the passage of the bill to increase the pensions of one-armed and one-legged soldiers, and of others suffering equivalent disabilities.

Among other business done in the House was that upon the River and Harbor bill, which was debated in Committee of the Whole for two hours in the day session—the debate bearing chiefly upon the report of the Mississippi River Committee. Mr. PAGE announced that he would ask the House to sit out the bill at the night session, and at a very late hour it was still under consideration.

The Demand for Sheridan's Extradition.

In conformity with the provisions of treaties between Great Britain and this country a warrant has been issued for the arrest of P. J. SHERIDAN, and it is probable that a United States Commissioner in this city will soon have occasion to pass upon the question whether a sufficient case for extradition is made out. Of the two points which may be made on behalf of the accused one relates to the correspondence of the evidence presented, in kind and amount, with that required by the terms of the treaty in order to support a demand for extradition. The other is concerned with the nature of the offence; is it or is it not included among the crimes specified in our compact with Great Britain? With the first inquiry we have nothing to do, pending the action of the judicial tribunal. The second is a proper subject of discussion.

If the prosecution cannot on the face of its papers establish against SHERIDAN such a reasonable presumption of guilt as would be deemed sufficient in the case of any other person accused of complicity in murder, the Commissioner will, of course, refuse to sanction the extradition of the prisoner, and will order him to be released. We trust that such will be the result of the judicial examination. Suppose, however, that a *prima facie* case is made out to the satisfaction of the Court, can it be plausibly argued that the crime of which the prisoner is alleged to have been an accomplice is not embraced in the extraditable offences enumerated and defined by treaty? Let us see what the text of the treaty says. According to that instrument, England and the United States are reciprocally bound to surrender murderers and those who attempt murder, provided, of course, that proof of crime is furnished sufficient for the commitment of the alleged criminal according to the laws of the jurisdiction under which he is found. There is not a word here, be it observed, about discriminating between ordinary murders and murders committed from real or pretended political motives. We must assume that if any such discrimination had been contemplated by either of the parties, it would have been explicitly set forth, for in a treaty between the United States and France it is expressly stated that no alleged criminal shall be surrendered on charges "of a purely political character."

But it may be said that the English Courts have themselves held that some discrimination between different kinds of murders may be exercised, even under the treaty with the United States, seeing that the Court of Queen's Bench granted a habeas corpus to a fugitive slave who had fled to Canada after killing his master in Missouri, in order to effect his escape. But what were the grounds on which that decision was distinctly based? An examination of the judgment rendered in that case will show that it did not violate the apparent meaning of the treaty, but, on the contrary, was in strict pursuance of it.

The Court refused to extradite the slave not on the ground that the treaty impliedly recognized several kinds of murders, but because on the face of the papers the alleged crime was not a murder at all under British laws, but, having been committed upon a man who was restraining the prisoner of his liberty, was justifiable homicide. There had not been furnished, it declared, such proof as was called for by the treaty, such proof as would be held sufficient for a commitment for murder under the laws of the jurisdiction where the accused person had been found.

The English Courts have never held that the extradition treaty between Great Britain and the United States would bear any other meaning than that which is plain upon its face. If they have refused to deliver up to the French Government certain political offenders to whom grave crimes had been imputed, it was because the text of the British treaty with France did not call for such extradition. But they have never uttered a word to indicate that the perpetrator of a murder in the United States might escape extradition from British territory on the plea that his crime was of a political character. In view of the clear and peremptory pledges given us by the treaty, we should not have tolerated such an attitude on the part of British tribunals. Let us suppose, for example, that JOHN WILKES BOOTH had succeeded in reaching Canada, does any sane man believe that an English Court would have dared, with the text of the treaty before its eyes, to refuse to surrender the assassin of ABRAHAM LINCOLN on the miserable pretext that the foul deed was not prompted by private hate or greed, but by political motives? Or suppose that the scoundrel GUITEAU had escaped to England, is it conceivable that, while the British Queen was sending a message of condolence to the widow of his victim, the British Government would have declined to give up the murderer of JAMES A. GARFIELD on the ground that no other motive than a political one was alleged by the prosecution? Obviously, we would not endure for a moment such a construction of the extradition treaty between this country and Great Britain as would enable any wretched crank to kill our Chief Magistrate with impunity, provided he could get across the Canadian frontier and set up the smooth pretence that his crime was purged of turpitude by its political purpose.

Not only as a matter of law does our treaty with Great Britain offer assassins no such loophole of escape, but from a moral point of view every upright American and every true friend of Ireland ought to be thankful that none is offered to any man concerned in the Phœnix Park atrocity. To describe that appalling tragedy as a political offence, and to predicate patriotism of the ruffians whose knives mangled CAVENDISH and BURKE, is a detestable abuse of language. It is too late to represent a dastardly murder as a political demonstration, now that it has been repudiated with loathing and abhorrence by every accredited spokesman of the Irish cause, and by every honest Irishman in Europe and America. How could a crime have political objects when its direct, inevitable, and obvious result was a deadly injury to the Irish people? Ah, it may be said, but these men, though sincere enough in feeling, were mistaken in their judgment. Mistaken, yes! As GUITEAU was mistaken; for what was this infamous band of Invincibles but a gang of GUITEAUS who chose the hour of Ireland's recovered hope to blast the happy prospect of redress, and plunge pure-hearted patriots in humiliation and despair?

The Elevated Railroad Muddle.

The complication of troubles into which the elevated railroad companies of this city have got themselves is something wonderful. To describe it is difficult, and to foretell its outcome impossible.

The origin of all the mischief lies in the leases made to the Manhattan Company in May, 1879, of the structures of the New York and of the Metropolitan companies, which until then had been operated separately. Overestimating their future net earnings and greedy of every possible cent of profit, the managers of the two lessor companies secured on paper a rental of ten per cent. per annum on their own stock of $6,500,000 each, reserving an expected surplus to pay dividends on $13,000,000 of Manhattan Company stock, which was created out of nothing for the purpose and divided between them. The result soon proved disappointing. Not only was there no surplus beyond the ten per cent. rental, but there was a deficiency, and there naturally arose a dispute as to how the amount actually earned should be divided. The New York Company insisted that inasmuch as the income from its lines was enough, or nearly enough, to pay ten per cent. on its stock, it ought to have the ten per cent., and the Metropolitan ought to be content with the rest. The Metropolitan, on the other hand, contended that the superior earning power of the New York lines was an illusion produced by artful bookkeeping, and that in any event the leases were alike in terms for both companies, and both should share alike in the disadvantages as well as in the benefits of the bargain. Pending the controversy, the Manhattan Company, which was bound to pay the ten per cent., having defaulted on its obligation, proceedings were taken to annul its leases and restore affairs to the condition in which they were before May, 1879.

This started up hostilities. It was easy to annul the leases, but the stock of the Manhattan Company, which had been created to the amount of $13,000,000 expressly to represent these leases, had been distributed to the stockholders of the lessor companies, and by them sold and transferred to the outside public. The new purchasers set up a claim for indemnity in some shape, and to pacify them the proceedings to annul the leases were abandoned, and the leases themselves were modified by reducing from ten per cent. to six the dividend secured on the stock of the two lessor companies. Had this modification been permitted to stand without opposition, there was a reasonable prospect that the Manhattan stock would get some profit out of the leases, and so be worth something to its holders.

But here new complications arose in the shape of an opposition of some of the Metropolitan stockholders to the proposed reduction of their dividends and in the legal proceedings they took to prevent it. A third step toward increasing the confusion was the so-called merger of the three companies into one, with first preferred stock to represent that of the New York Company, second preferred stock to represent the stock of the Metropolitan, leaving the common stock of the Manhattan to come in third. Over this merger as well as over the modification of the leases, there have been various lawsuits and wranglings with nothing as yet finally decided. Precisely how many or what proceedings are on foot, and what decisions have been rendered in each, we shall not attempt to explain.

An effort is next to be made, we hear, to end the whole controversy by the summary method of a new combination between the New York and the Manhattan companies, leaving the Metropolitan Company to run its road independently, as it did before. How this can be accomplished without creating new embarrassments, it is difficult to see. The Metropolitan may refuse to take back its road, and may sue the Manhattan Company for its stipulated ten per cent. The Manhattan cannot pay the rent due the Metropolitan unless it withholds that due the New York Company, thus exposing itself to a suit from the New York. If both lessors resume possession of their property for non-payment of rent, the holders of the $13,000,000 Manhattan stock will become clamorous and probably sue, as they threatened to do before, for damages from the other two companies. Or, if the Metropolitan takes back its road, will the New York Company alone shoulder the $13,000,000 Manhattan stock and surrender part of its earnings to pay dividends upon it?

In some respects the New York Company has the advantage over the Metropolitan. Its road from Harlem to the South Ferry through the populous Third avenue and Bowery region is far more profitable than that of the Metropolitan, which practically begins at Fifty-ninth street in the Sixth avenue and ends at Trinity Church. By its joint ownership of the connecting structure between Chatham square and Beaver street, the Metropolitan can, however, run its Second avenue trains so as to seriously embarrass the New York Company during the busy hours of the day, and may thus compel, as it did in 1879, a favorable division of earnings.

Beside these intestine quarrels, the companies have as common enemies the owners of property along their routes, who claim millions of dollars damages, the city, which seeks to make them pay heavily in taxes, the Legislature, which has reduced their fares to five cents, and the elements of nature, which are slowly destroying their iron structures. Their astute managers have certainly a difficult task on their hands and their accomplishment of it will be awaited with interest.

What Gives the Evening Post Joy.

We find the following startling and bloodthirsty remark in the *Evening Post*:

"There is nothing in all this, however, to lessen the joy with which all civilized men will hear that everybody connected, nearly or remotely, with the Phœnix Park murders has been strung up."

Joy over a hanging! Men who can get enjoyment either from seeing or hearing of the hanging of human beings, are a sort of men we do not envy.

Some savages, we know, take delight in torturing their captives. They will dance around their prostrate victim, and the more awful his agonies the keener will be their enjoyment. It will rise at last to an almost hysterical exultation.

In the old days when hangings took place in public, the neighborhood would turn out to witness an execution as if for a fair. But because such sights were brutalizing, modern civilization requires that the gallows shall be erected in some enclosure where the hanging shall be before only a small number of witnesses, clergymen, physicians, and Sheriff's deputies.

If those witnesses should manifest joy at seeing a human being "strung up," every civilized man would regard them with abhorrence. They would be hooted out of society.

Yet the *Evening Post* says "all civilized men" will hear with joy that everybody connected with the Phœnix Park murders has been "strung up."

If our contemporary is stimulated to joy by hangings, it need not go to Dublin to see them. Two murderers are to be hanged at the Tombs on the 9th of this month, and probably the editors of the *Evening Post* can obtain the privilege of witnessing the stringing up of MAJONE and McGLOIN, and so get a taste of the joy they anticipate from hearing that the Phœnix Park murderers have been "strung up."

But we warn them to be careful while they are exulting at the Tombs, next week Friday, to conceal their delight at the spectacle, lest the decent men present fall upon them as coarse and heartless brutes.

Tall Buildings.

We have watched with some interest the proceedings in the Court of Common Pleas, where several property owners on the Fifth avenue attempted to restrain the height of the great apartment house which is now building on the corner of Twenty-eighth street. The complaint was that the building is to be altogether too lofty; that the construction of a house eleven stories high must be injurious to the adjoining property; and an injunction was asked to prevent the completion of such an elevated structure.

Judge VAN BRUNT refused the injunction asked for, and we have no doubt that his decision is in strict accordance with the law as it now exists.

But it is evident that some power must be brought into action to limit the erection of these enormous buildings. In some places they can be put up without doing any injury to the rights of people in the neighborhood; but if there is to be no law regulating them, we may soon see important streets deprived of sunlight and of ventilation to such an extent as to work serious injury to the rights of neighbors and even to the public in general.

We invite the attention of the Legislature to this interesting subject.

Mr. MURPHY's measure, making it a misdemeanor to manufacture malt liquors with any materials other than barley, malt, hops, and water, is likely to arouse discussion in the Assembly should it come up for action. A fine of not less than $500 is to be the penalty for using any prohibited materials, and among those specially named as forbidden are tobacco, aloes, blue vitriol, quassia, glucose, salt, bicarbonate of soda, wormwood, and tannin. After declaring that the only lawful constituent elements of ale or beer shall be barley, malt, hops, and water, it seems hardly necessary to name in the statute a few among many possible things that are not to be used, especially as it may make it seem somewhat queer to punish alike as misdemeanors the use of salt and the use of tannin, or the use of glucose and the use of blue vitriol. At all events, the implication that all these substances are sometimes employed in brewing beer does not furnish agreeable reflections.

Senator TABOR of Colorado has made himself famous, although his term as Senator only began on the 1st of February and ends on the 4th of March. His maiden speech is reported to have been the statement that on the question under discussion he was paired with the gentleman from Hampton, W. South, Carolina. But he has won his greatest glory from his princely night shirts. They are said to be worth $250 each.

There have been actresses who have won distinction on account of their wardrobes, but Senator TABOR will live in history as a bonanza king who served thirty days in the Senate and had six night shirts that cost $250 each.

Though nearly eighteen years have passed since the great war raged in Virginia, the military spirit of the ancient Commonwealth is still kept alive by an annual campaign against sundry depredating oyster dredgers. Last year Gov. CAMERON led the army and navy of the State with great success against the hireling invaders of the homes of her bivalves, yet already a new campaign on the Rappahannock has become necessary, and the Norfolk Blues and City Guard, with the Portsmouth Old Dominion Guard and the steamers Pimlico and Victoria, are at the front. Should a battle be fought some may find the bed of glory to be an oyster bed.

Earthquake shocks have been unusually numerous in this country since the beginning of the year, and the latest, which was felt in Rhode Island and Connecticut on Tuesday night, was so close at hand that the question what would be the result of an earthquake in New York may not appear untimely. There is not much reason to fear disaster from such shocks as those which have recently been felt in various parts of New England, although undoubtedly weak and cracked brick walls would be endangered by them. But a very severe shock might prove serious in its consequences. Manhattan Island has heretofore escaped damage from this source, and as earthquakes seldom occur in regions in which their power has not been felt before, it is fair to conclude that we have not much to fear from this source. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that serious earthquakes never occur in this country. It is sufficient to refer to the earthquake of Nov. 18, 1755, which overthrew brick buildings in Boston, and caused considerable damage through a large portion of New England, and to the earthquakes in the Mississippi Valley in 1811 and 1812, which caused some wonderful changes in the face of the country. Even so late as Oct. 19, 1870, there was a severe earthquake felt throughout most of New England and New York and as far west as Chicago, which was supposed to have originated in a volcanic centre northeast of Quebec.

The men who want no more than one drinking shop to every 500 inhabitants are likely to find that, difficult as it may be to secure official acquiescence in their plans, it may be harder yet to have the rule enforced. There is so much laxity in this regard now that even some liquor dealers complain of it. It takes two bureaus, the Police and the Excise, to carry out extreme measures, and between these two stools such measures frequently fall to the ground.

When the present Commissioners of Excise took office it was said that there were more than 2,000 unlicensed liquor stores in the city; and though the number is now smaller, there is a wide difference of opinion as to how much smaller it is. Sometimes the Excise Board and the police unite, and an unlicensed place is closed. More often, if the excise inspectors report the places at all, the matter is referred to the police, and nothing more is done about it. If a spy catches a liquor dealer selling on Sunday the man's license is seldom revoked. Licenses are revoked or not according as the Commissioners choose. After they are revoked the places are shut up or not according as the police choose.

Here are samples of how these things are managed: The proprietor of a big concert hall was complained of by a self-appointed guardian of the public morals. The case was tried. The proprietor swore that no beer was ever sold in his place on Sundays. The waiters testified that what he swore to was true. Everybody knew better, but the complaint was dismissed. A vile place in Hester street attracted attention by a recent murder. The Excise Commissioners said the place was unlicensed, and the fact had been reported to the police, but the police had failed to close it.

Liquor sellers who obey the laws complain of this state of affairs as unfair to them. But the great majority openly declare that under present circumstances obedience to the law is out of the question, since keeping open on Sundays and after hours at night is so generally practised that if one man closes his store while the others in the neighborhood keep their stores open the people will patronize the man they are certain to find ready to serve them.

The amendment to the Soldiers' Home bill made in the House, by which the management of the Home is practically taken out of the hands of the Board of Commissioners and put into the hands of the Governor, is a triumph for the latter. But the former cannot justly complain, in view of the developments made by the Senate investigation. It was at that time shown not only that the Commissioners held unpleasant relations with the Governor, but that they, or rather two of them, had been receiving perquisites from the dairy, the vegetable garden, and the greenhouse, amounting to hundreds of dollars, thus giving rise to ill feeling among the inmates. The interests of the latter had been neglected, and even some very ordinary means of amusement and instruction had not been supplied to them. It was also shown that vast sums had been laid out upon the grounds, apparently more with a view to furnish a pleasant driving park for Washington visitors than for any special good to be reaped by the veterans. It was evident that either the Commissioners or the Governor should be the final and responsible authority, and the House amendment vested the power in the latter, under the supervision, however, of the former, whose number it increased from three to five.

The Montreal movement to establish a line of steamers between that port and Mexico is rather remarkable. It would show much enterprise if the Canadians from that city, not only so far north, but some distance in the interior of the continent, should make the circuit of our entire Atlantic and Gulf coast line, and be able to carry off from Yankee competitors part of the trade of Mexico.

Secor Robeson Starts a Belt.

CAMDEN, N. J., Feb. 28.—Secor Robeson has suffered another defeat in Camden county, which probably humiliates him almost as much as the crushing blow his Congressional aspirations received in November last. It is an open secret that Robeson attributes his defeat at the polls to the influence of United States Senator William J. Sewell. The ex-Secretary, it now turns out, selected, or caused to be selected, one set of candidates for city offices who were to be voted for at the Republican nominating convention held in Camden on Feb. 19. Robeson's candidate for Mayor was J. Moore White, a contractor. The Sewell faction put up Dr. Henry H. Davis, a physician. White's adherents were well supplied with money, and the most glaring frauds were committed. In one ward, the Third, he was accredited with 923 votes, when the entire vote of the ward does not exceed 900. Despite the most desperate efforts for success on the part of Robeson's henchmen, however, Dr. Davis was nominated. The general election takes place on March 13, and on that day an independent (Robeson) candidate will be put up. This fact leaked out to-day, and prominent Republicans are bitter in denouncing a scheme which must inevitably result in throwing the whole city Government into the hands of the Democracy, simply to gratify personal pique.

Gen. Sherman Defends the Sword.

Edward W. Bok of Carroll street, Brooklyn, the indefatigable autograph hunter, lately received the following reply from Gen. Sherman, in respose to a letter requesting him to subscribe to the sentiment, "The pen is mightier than the sword."

WASHINGTON, Feb. 6, 1883.

DEAR MR. BOK: Your long letter of the 4th is received. I prefer not to make scraps of sentimental writing. When I write anything I want it to be real and connected in form, as, for instance, in your quotation from Lord Lytton's play of "Richelieu," "The pen is mightier than the sword!" Lord Lytton would never have put his signature to so naked a sentiment. Surely I will not.

In the text there was a prefix or qualification:

Beneath the rule of men entirely great,
The pen is mightier than the sword.

Now, this world does not often present the condition of facts herein described. Men entirely great are very rare indeed, and even Washington, who approached great ness as near as any mortal, found good use for the sword and the pen, each in its proper sphere.

You and I have seen the day when a great and good man ruled this country (Lincoln) who wielded a powerful and prolific pen, and yet had to call to his assistance a million of flaming swords.

No, I cannot subscribe to your sentiment, "The pen is mightier than the sword," which you ask me to write, because it is not true.

Rather, in the providence of God, there is a time for all things; a time when the sword may cut the Gordian knot, and set free the principles of right and justice, bound up in the meshes of hatred, revenge, and tyranny, that the pen of mighty men like Clay, Webster, Crittenden, and Lincoln were unable to disentangle. Wishing you all success in your efforts, I am, with respect, your friend, W. T. SHERMAN.

Malagasy Envoys About to Arrive.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 28.—The Envoys from Madagascar sailed for this country on Feb. 20 in the National steamer Spain. The gentlemen composing the Embassy are Ravoninahitriniariva, Minister for Foreign Affairs and head of the Embassy, and Ramaniraka, member of her Majesty's Privy Council, Ambassador. The Senate ratified to-day the treaty for peace and commerce between the United States and Madagascar.

An Astronomical View of the Subject.

From the Home Journal.

THE SUN has amply proved its right to a place of the first magnitude in the world of journalism. Its disk indeed is not so great in circumference as that of some of its brother orbs, but what it lacks in this respect it makes up by the brilliancy and penetrative qualities of its rays. One of the distinguishing peculiarities of these rays is that they suffer the least possible refraction, that is, they are not bent from their course, or but slightly, by intervening mediums such as party bias, the fear of the great, the fear of the little, or anything of the kind.

Tom Ochiltree's Tardy Apology.

From the Omaha Herald.

Tom Ochiltree bet that he could hit Mace and then make an apology before the heavy weight had time to strike back. Tom waltzed in, and without a word slapped the fighter across the mouth. But before he could even think of making his apology the bystanders saw a flying vision of a red-haired man going out through the folding doors in a rather unceremonious manner. Ochiltree's friends picked him up, and after they had made him presentable he was carried into Mace's presence, and explained matters, and added he was sorry—which was quite evident. Mace took in the joke, and brought down the house by adding, "I'm glad I didn't hit him very hard."

FATHER CUREI'S LECTURES.

ROME, Feb. 11.—Father Curci began his course of lectures to-day in the Sistibaldi Hall, Via Torre Argentina. The tickets were sold at the library of Mr. Bocca in the Corso. The chairs were all occupied half an hour before Father Curci appeared. The hall is semi-circular, with a stage in front. It is the headquarters of a dramatic society. It has a balcony. The hall will seat 800 persons. The curtain was dropped, and a little desk was placed in front of the prompter's box. The audience included people of every condition, creed, and nation. I saw a few monsignori, many priests, a crowd of theological students, several aristocratic ladies, a host of journalists, a score of army officers, most of the Protestant foreign Ministers, some Senators, many Deputies, and a nucleus of the liberal Catholic aristocracy, headed by the Princes Borghese and Odescalchi.

Father Curci's topic was "Country and Religion." He came from behind the curtain at 2 o'clock, wearing the garb of a Jesuit. The collar of his soutaine was buttoned at the throat. It completely covered his neck, and reached to his cheeks. He wore no skull cap. The top of his head is bald, and the gray hair above his ears was drawn forward until it concealed his temples. He combs it as Leo XIII. combs his hair. His Holiness, however, is particular about keeping the rebellious gray locks in position; even when on the throne he presses them against the sides of his forehead. Father Curci drew a roll of manuscript from his pocket, and adjusted his spectacles. He next blessed himself, and made a short prayer. He began his lecture by a quotation from Dante. In his voyage through Purgatory, the divine poet met the souls of those in punishment for the sin of envy. They were clad in sackcloth, and their eyelids were sewed together with iron threads. The poet asked them whether any soul of Latium dwelt among them. The reply was: "My brother, we are all citizens of one true city." Father Curci said that in this answer the philosophical doctrine of Christian love for country was condensed. Man in both soul and body is a citizen of the heavenly country, and only a pilgrim in the earthly country. A Christian, whose soul and destiny are immortal, can never be tied to a country narrowed by time and space. Yet man has also need of a temporal abode, and he must therefore love it and contribute to its glory and honor. Hence love of country.

The ex-Jesuit then analyzed the love of country in ancient nations, saying that it reached the highest degree in the race chosen by God as his own people. Sketching its history, he said that it was a typical history for Christians, although a reality for the Jews. The word "Jerusalem," which has a dual signification, seems to indicate a double citizenship in every man.

Father Curci then quoted Psalm 137:

By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion.

He dwelt so long on the poetical and philosophical beauty of this composition that he became tiresome. The audience became inattentive. Father Curci saw it and paused. He meditated a moment, and then said that Cicero advised orators to model their speeches to the height of expectation. He felt that his speech was below the mark, and he begged the indulgence of the audience. He made a moral application of his exegetical exposition of the psalm, and concluded by saying that only the spiritual love of our heavenly fatherland could make man a true and useful citizen of his abiding place here below. Divested of this spiritual love, love of country is like a tomb from which the angel of hope has flown. Father Curci said that were it not that he had the heavenly country in view, he would feel that he could do nothing for his neighbors, and that he would be wrapped in a mantle of selfishness.

Father Curci barely alluded to his own misfortunes. He thought that all that had happened in Italy was the result of both God's will and permission. The storm was but a passing one that was preparing a new basis for society. He had done what he could to call people back to the study and love of the Word of God. With this object in view he had published his three volumes on the New Testament and another on the Psalms. He was thankful for his audience. It had cost him dear to hear a man who had been barred from the sanctuary. Although allowed to preach in a profane place, he is not allowed to preach in a church. Although the place was profane, he could assure them that the preaching would not be profane.

Here he was interrupted by an outburst of cheers. He asked that all applause be suppressed, as he was unaccustomed to it. Again referring to himself, he said that he had hoped that God would close his life after his work on the Psalms; but as Jesus had promised to come when unexpected, his wish was unfulfilled. In excusing his monotonous delivery, he said: "I am so much accustomed to speak in churches that I can't drop the habit of half a century. It must seem queer to you to hear a sermon in a theatre; yet, as sometimes you see churches turned into theatres, you ought not to marvel at seeing a theatre turned into a church."

Father Curci has a clear and a strong voice. He is over seventy years old. He does not sleep much, and he eats very sparingly. He is an intimate friend of Cardinal Pecci, brother of the Pope, and a Jesuit. He is also on good terms with his Holiness, who highly appreciates his talents. Every one knows that even after his dismissal from the Company of Jesus, Father Curci had audiences with the Pope in one of those *petite entrées* to the Vatican known only to the most intimate confidants of Leo XIII.

The Carnival in Rome.

ROME, Feb. 6.—The carnival this year is not to be compared with former carnivals. The fête has not improved since Rome passed from under pontifical rule. If either Goethe, Bruys, or La Place were to write about the carnival now they would find little to praise and nothing to admire. The proverbial good nature of the Romans is no longer shown. Several persons have been wounded on the Corso by the use of arms in self-defence against missiles of the worst kind. Cabbages, carrots, and stones have taken the place of nosegays and bonbons. This year the rain made the Corso a muddy lane. It was hardly amusing to have a bouquet picked from the mud and thrown into your face. The carnival was literally an abomination. Nearly all respectable persons gave it a wide berth. A little fine weather toward the end of the season, however, brought back a modicum of the old mirth, and we saw a few tableaux. The funniest were illustrative of the ostracism of the *barberi*. One represented a *barbero*—a real horse—chained to a platform, in the caricature of a man striving to head the procession. Men representing the Prefect and Mayor struck at him and tried to push him back. Another tableaux represented the *barbere vincitore*, or winning horse. The winner was next to the drummers, and was followed by all the other runners in full regalia, only instead of horses they were all donkeys. A big feather between each pair of asinine ears created great amusement. A third tableau represented the *anticamera del Cardinale*. It caricatured an ordinary Cardinal with his *gentiluomo*, surrounded by servants. A banner above him bore the words—

CARDINAL GRAVINA IMITATING JULIUS II.
MOTTO—*Fuora i Barbari*.
Rome Delivered A. D. 1883.

Gravina is the Prefect who forbade the use of the *barberi*, this year. The motto "*Fuora i Barbari*" meant *Fuora i barberi*. The word *barbari* means "strangers," and is a play on *barberi*, or "horses that run."

Aside from these caustic tableaux there was a representation of the wonderful progress of medical science. It was an enormous pump worked by steam. A man dressed like a physician of the olden time expatiated on the wonderful curative power of the machine. A car drawn by four horses was filled with beautiful girls, dressed like real flowers. Another car contained a sham harem, and a third an aeronautic party, with a huge balloon. The balloon broke loose in the Corso, and came near lifting some of the party into the air. A Spanish masquerading party, with full-fledged Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, was greatly admired.

In moments of sunshine the Corso showed something of its old life, although there were neither infantry, dragoons, nor *barberi* in the procession. There was really more fun in the Rioni than on the Corso. Among the funny characters in the Rioni, one caused excessive mirth. It was a General on horseback, with a wooden leg and a huge wooden sword. He stopped at every inn and ordered drinks for all the boys. This funny General was a popular character, nicknamed "Manazzia la Rocca." He plays the Polichinelle, followed by little ones bearing dishes of macaroni.

There have been few carnival balls. Neither Ambassadors nor Princes have thrown open their houses to dancing parties. Yet Rome has more Ambassadors, Consuls, and representatives of foreign nations than any other city in the world. The suppression of the *barberi* chilled the carnival. There were no soldiers to keep the Corso clear. Very few were disposed to honor the season.

Not Anti-Monopoly Bills.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: I read in to-day's SUN that four bills are to be introduced in the Legislature to-day at the request of the Anti-Monopoly League. This organization did not send those bills to Albany, nor has it examined or discussed them. Some days since drafts of what I presume are the same bills were sent me by a gentleman of this city, with the suggestion that they should be introduced in the Legislature under the auspices of the League, and that they be submitted to the New York League at its next regular meeting, about a week hence. I naturally declined to take part in any such scheme. None of the bills had been examined by our committees which have charge of legislative measures. Three of them dealt with interests foreign to those which the League was organized to promote. That on free passes I enclosed to one of our sound est lawyers, who has given attention to this special subject, and he returned it to me with the opinion that, as proposed, it was unconstitutional. These bills are evidently designed either to secure crude legislation or for the promotion of some private interest.

HENRY NICHOLS,
Secretary National Anti-Monopoly League.

NEW YORK, Feb. 28.

SCITHETS IN A COURT ROOM.

Star Route Attorneys Use Language which they Afterward Retract.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 28.—An undignified scene occurred between Messrs. Ingersoll and Merrick in the Star route trial to-day. Merrick protested against Ingersoll's caustic attitude toward the witness Rerdell, and when Ingersoll said he did not wish to be interrupted, Merrick said he would continue to interrupt without regard to the wishes of counsel.

Mr. Ingersoll (warmly)—I do not want the regard of counsel, and would consider his regard as an insult.

Mr. Merrick (running quickly toward his opponent)—I never give my regard to a puppy.

Mr. Ingersoll (involuntarily picking up a heavy inkstand, and red with anger)—You are a dirty dog.

The Court, pounding vigorously upon the desk, finally restored order. Mr. Merrick began to explain that he had been pressed beyond the limits of human endurance, but the Court, interrupting, said the language was inexcusable under any provocation.

Mr. Merrick expressed his sorrow. No man had a greater respect for the Court, and he would bow with submission to it.

The Court thought it was due to the Court that the remark be retracted.

Mr. Merrick said that he would do it, by direction of the Court, but pleaded the provocation given, and hoped the other counsel would be asked to retract.

Mr. Ingersoll said that so far as he was concerned he would willingly ignore any remark. But he wanted it understood that no man could abuse him without resistance on his part. Said he: "I would do it at the day of judgment if I were assailed by the Almighty. I would defend myself with my little puny power." But no man was small enough or little enough for him to oppress or abuse. No man should come more than half way in an offer of compromise.

The Court said it regarded the occurrence as an altercation between counsel, not aimed at the dignity of the Court. Upon the question that had precipitated the altercation the Government counsel seemed to have been in the right, but after the quarrel had begun language had been used by Mr. Merrick that should not have been used in court. But he had now withdrawn the epithet, and the other counsel had done the same.

Mr. Ingersoll wished to show that while Rerdell was working for the Government he was soliciting and receiving funds from Dorsey for alleged legal expenses, but the Court refused to go into that subject. Ingersoll then said he was through with the witness, and the other lawyers asked Rerdell a few questions in behalf of Brady, Vaile, and Miner.

On redirect examination Rerdell said he told Vaile before he borrowed money of him that he was in communication with the Government, and was trying to get out of the case. Mr. Merrick told him to state his reasons for becoming a Government witness. Rerdell said the first fact was the argument of his counsel in the last trial; then Dorsey, as if suspecting him, came to the jail and threatened him with those letters. Again, his wife told him of the condition of his office, and upon inspection he saw that some one had "gone through it." Convinced that he had been deserted and that it was Dorsey's purpose to get him out of the way, he then and there resolved to go over to the Government, and in pursuance of that resolve went to see Mr. Woodward.

News from Rome.

ROME, Feb. 6.—The Propaganda has directed Monsignore Sylvestre Sembratowicz to go to Vienna and oversee the proposed reforms in the Slavo-Ruthenian Roman Church. One of the most important of these reforms is the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar. The Ruthenian and Slavo-Catholics still use the Julian Calendar in their liturgical services.

Monsignore Racine, the new Bishop of the new Canadian diocese of Chicoutimi, has had a long audience with the Pope.

Monsignore Rotelli, Apostolic Delegate to Constantinople, departs from Naples on the 11th. He has dropped the title of Bishop of Montefiascone, and has assumed that of Archbishop of Farsalia. This prelate wears a full beard in conformance with the Oriental custom. It made him conspicuous during his late visit to Rome.

The Marquis Pacca, brother of the late Cardinal, and nephew of the companion of Pius VII. in exile, is dead.

Don Giulio Grazioli, Duke of Lante, is about to wed Mlle. Maria Lavazzi, daughter of the Marquis Lavazzi.

The Predicatori, including all the priests and monks delivering courses of sermons in Rome, were received by His Holiness this morning. He directed them to insist upon the sending of children to the Catholic schools.

The first through international express train from Paris to Rome brought a load of French excursionists.

Father Kleutgen, the Jesuit theologian, termed by Leo XIII. in a letter, "Princeps Philosophorum," is dead. He was a foreign member of the St. Thomas Academy. He died in the Tyrol, 72 years old.

The Baron Wedel Jarlberg has been nominated Cameriere di Cappa e Spada by the Pope. He is a Swedish convert, formerly attached to the Swedish court.

The reconciliation of the Count d'Aquila with King Humbert is not approved by Francis II. of Naples, his nephew. The Count seems to have been prompted by a lack of money. A long time ago he applied for a portion of the allowance granted to his family after the invasion of Naples. He was told to give evidence of his attachment to Italy, and his application would receive favorable attention. As he has now done so, he will soon get an allowance.

Depretis, the Italian Premier, was 70 years old on Jan. 31. He has been a member of Parliament since the time of Charles Albert.

Bellotti Bon, the great actor and author of many theatrical works, committed suicide in Milan recently. He was pecuniarily embarrassed. He leaves a family.

The new Polish Bishops will be nominated at a Consistory on Feb. 26. No Cardinals will be nominated.

Mary Anderson's Unusual Costume.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer.

It may interest you to read about the wonderful new costume which Mary Anderson brought out a few nights ago as *Galatea*. Talk of high art in stage dressing, nothing in that way could exceed the garment in question. It was designed by Frank Millet, and we are, I suppose, to expect something remarkable when a man artist turns costumer.

Miss Anderson and others who have appeared as the statue turned to life, have managed to at least be white like marble, but never before has cloth been made to look so stony. Mr. Millet gets all the praise, and that is not right, for every woman knows that it was far easier to design the costume which turns Mary into statuary than to realize it in cloth. An exquisite Greek tunic falls over her tall, slender figure in a perfection of graceful drapery, and a kind of heaviness suggestive of marble. This curious effect is produced by weighting the fabric with metal at various points, by shirring and staying in just the right spots, and by fastening certain portions to her body and legs with concealed bands.

Not only was she a statue when posed as marble on the pedestal, but when moving about the stage every attitude was perfectly statuesque. The costume seemed incapable of being thrown out of artistic and beautiful lines. Her face, neck, arms were whitened; her wig was quite like cut stone, and her feet were in stockings that fitted each separate toe. If she wore anything at all underneath the drapery, it was not enough to conceal any movement of her limbs. She looked very hard some, though a trifle too bony; and, to my mind, the exposure of a portion of her side below the arm was just