# The Sun.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1884.


**Amusements To-day.**

Bijou Opera House—La Vie. 8 P. M.
Casino—Falka. 8 P. M.
Daly's Theatre—A Night in Venice. 8 P. M.
Eden Musee—Concert, &c. 2 and 8 P. M.
Grand Opera House—Kerry Gow. 8 P. M.
Globe Dime Museum—239 Bowery.
Koster & Bial's—Japanese Troupe. 7:30 P. M.
Madison Square Theatre—May Blossom. 8:30 P. M.
Niblo's Garden—Pygmalion and Galatea. 8 P. M.
New Park Theatre—La Mascotte. 8 P. M.
New York Comedy Theatre—Queen's Evidence. 8 P. M.
People's Theatre—Only a Farmer's Daughter. 8 P. M.
Star Theatre—Zillah, the Hebrew Mother. 8 P. M.
Thalia Theatre—Fiedermaus. 8 P. M.
Theatre Comique—Dan's Tribulations. 2 and 8 P. M.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—A Rag Baby. 2 and 8 P. M.
Wallack's Theatre—A Scrap of Paper. 8 P. M.
24 Av. Theatre—Zara. 8 P. M.
5th Av. Theatre—Skipped by the Light of the Moon. 8 P. M.
14th St. Theatre—Love and Law. 8 P. M.


**Advertising Rates.**

DAILY AND SUNDAY, 40 cents a line, ordinary advertising; large type, 80 cents; and preferred positions, 80 cents to $2.50, according to classification.

WEEKLY, 50 cents a line; no extra charge for large type. Preferred positions from 75 cents to $2.

**Subscription by Mail—Post Paid.**

| | |
|---|---|
| DAILY, Per Month | 50 |
| DAILY, Per Year | $6 00 |
| SUNDAY, Per Year | 1 00 |
| DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year | 7 00 |
| WEEKLY, Per Year | 1 00 |

THE SUN, New York City.

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


## Edmunds.

No doubt Senator EDMUNDS has a large circle of admirers, and there are also those who do not exactly admire him, but who still think he would be available as a Republican candidate for the Presidency.

Unquestionably he is an able lawyer, and for a Republican politician he is unusually independent in his opinions and acts; but he is not independent enough to satisfy the requirements of patriotism and justice. He bore a prominent part in the shameful transactions which established Mr. HAYES in the White House after Mr. TILDEN had been lawfully elected. This fact constitutes a blot which can never be wiped away from the character of Mr. EDMUNDS.

Nevertheless, there are good points about the Vermont Senator which the public have not been wont to appreciate at their full value. As becomes a philosopher, he is free from the more malignant antagonisms of partisanship. Thus, when he and that gallant old Roman of the Democracy, THURMAN of Ohio, were both members of the Senate, they maintained a cordial intimacy, notwithstanding the hostility of their political aims; and it was not uncommon to see these two foes of the arena taking their toddy together like brothers in the Senate barroom. Only men of high intellectual calibre can thus throw aside the sharp sword of controversy and indulge together in the cheering and inebriating social cup.

But is there no chance that Mr. EDMUNDS may get the Republican nomination? Not much, we should say. A statesman of Vermont in the Republican party has about as poor a show for this high distinction as a statesman from Delaware in the Democratic party. Vermont is sure for the Republicans any way, and what they are looking for is a candidate who may fairly hope to carry New York, Ohio, and Indiana. Besides, since the truth must be told, there is in the minds of politicians of the Middle and Western States, and of Republican politicians especially, an unconquerable prejudice against the promotion of any New England Yankee to the chieftainship of this grand old party of fraud and moral ideas. They would rather have a third-rate man from Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Illinois, than a first-rate man from Vermont or Massachusetts. This senseless prejudice operates powerfully in favor of Mr. BLAINE, who is only a New Englander by accident and emigration, while at heart he remains a Pennsylvanian.

Moreover, Mr. EDMUNDS has few warm personal friends who will work for him and fight for him. Nothing in his cold, logical, and rather cranky nature attaches men to his cause. Let BLAINE appear in a throng of strangers and in twenty minutes he will be the favorite of the crowd; while EDMUNDS might absorb three cocktails at the bar around which they are gathered, and not a soul of the whole lot would warm to him or long for his presence after he had gone away.

We conclude, then, that Mr. EDMUNDS will remain in the Senate. It is much the more congenial post for him, and with all his peculiarities, he is sure, as long as he continues there, to be of service to his country.

## Bismarck's Threat.

The most important news that has come to us in a long time from Berlin, is the report that Prince BISMARCK contemplates a radical revision of the Constitution of the German empire. It may be that the announcement of such an intention is made in order to extort from the Reichstag acquiescence in the reenactment of the laws against the Socialists. We incline to suspect, however, that the Chancellor would welcome any pretext for suppressing the obstacles which his plans have encountered in Parliament, and for averting the species of political revolution which otherwise might ensue on the death of Kaiser WILLIAM or on his own loss of influence under the next Emperor.

BISMARCK has no doubt experienced continual annoyance and at times serious difficulty in carrying out the projects which he at least believed essential to the unification and stability of the empire, since the formation of a strong Clerical party deprived him of the control which he at first possessed over the Reichstag. Especially galling was the reception given at this session to his demand that the measures levelled against the Socialists, which were about to lapse by limitation, should be reaffirmed. He expected that this bill would be summarily passed, whereas, through the coöperation of the Ultramontanes with the Liberals, it was referred to a committee of which the Conservatives formed but a weak minority. This action seems to have been represented to the Kaiser as a disloyal refusal to protect him from attempts like those of HODEL and NOBILING, and Emperor WILLIAM took occasion to signify his displeasure in the plainest terms.

It is probable that when the report of the committee brings the anti-Socialist bill once more before the Reichstag, the Clericals will vote for it, for Herr WINDTHORST is careful not to give such irredrievable offence to the Imperial family as would frustrate his hope of ultimately attaining a Ministerial post in the Government, either of the empire or of the Prussian kingdom. We do not imagine, therefore, that the Chancellor will be forced to carry out his threat of constitutional revision merely for the purpose of securing a reenactment of the oppressive statutes to which we have referred. The signs are rather that, under the pressure of the Court, the Reichstag will consent to give additional stringency to the existing legislation, with a view of stifling the propagation of anarchical doctrines among German workmen. It does not follow that Prince BISMARCK may not think the hour has come for a thorough remodelling of the organic law. The machinery of readjustment is simple and easily manipulated. He has but to lay before the Parliament the changes deemed desirable, and, upon their rejection by that body, to convoke the German princes by whom the present Constitution was framed. He would doubtless find them more pliable to schemes involving the restriction of popular rights than are the elected representatives of the German people.

It is clear enough why one of the constitutional amendments mooted by BISMARCK should be thought by him indispensable to the security of the political structure of which he has been the chief architect. In the ordinary course of nature the aged Kaiser can hardly hope to survive the term of years for which the military budget has been fixed in advance. Under his successor, the Chancellor cannot count on wielding his present authority, for many reasons, but especially because the Crown Prince FREDERICK WILLIAM is much influenced by his wife, whose sympathy with Liberal opinions is undisguised. When the daughter of Queen VICTORIA becomes Empress of Germany, they who wish to apply the English system of Ministerial accountability will have a powerful supporter. Now, BISMARCK believes that a Ministry responsible to a Legislature elected by universal suffrage would be incompatible with a secret and efficient foreign policy, and with the maintenance of the German army on its present scale of magnitude.

He proposes, then, that the minimum sum to be annually spent for military purposes shall be irrevocably designated in the organic law. The other amendments suggested are designed to purge the Reichstag of revolutionists, by imposing on the Deputies an oath of fidelity to the Constitution, and to render the constituencies more amenable to Government coercion, by substituting for universal suffrage classified lists of electors, whose voting power will be proportioned, apparently, to property qualifications.

It is quite possible that if these changes are effected, the German empire will be made more durable and formidable, regarded as a consolidated fabric and a military machine. But how much will be left of the free institutions upon which the reunited nation once looked with hope and pride?

## Parson Newman and Infidel Bob.

Last Sunday both Parson NEWMAN and Mr. BOB INGERSOLL gave us their views concerning an important Christian doctrine.

The parson preached on "The Forgiveness of Our Enemies," choosing the subject for the manifest purpose of rapping the party in his church who are trying to get rid of him. The infidel lecturer spoke on "Orthodoxy," with the avowed purpose of doing what he could to destroy the Christian religion, which he stigmatized as utterly abominable.

The parson, of course, is a nominal defender of orthodox Christianity, but it is doubtful whether he did not prove himself in fact a more dangerous enemy of the Gospel of CHRIST than the infidel lecturer. For what did he do? He perverted the plain teachings of the CHRIST in order to get an excuse for assailing those who are opposed to him individually.

In the Sermon on the Mount CHRIST taught in unmistakable language that His followers must love their enemies. "For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye?" Parson NEWMAN, however, said that it is "unnatural" for us to do that. "Revenge is sweet," he continued, "and the man who canonizes his friends takes pleasure in bombarding his enemies."

Nor did he hesitate to assume that CHRIST agreed with that sentiment. "I do not like a sneak," the preacher went on; "but one who, if he hates, shows his enmity openly and strongly. CHRIST was such a positive man." That is, Parson NEWMAN says that CHRIST did not live up to His own teachings.

Thereupon the parson proceeded to declare that as for himself he was ready to pray for his opponents, because they were men possessed of devils. He thus gave the party who want to get rid of him as a religious fraud a stinging blow, and at the same time proclaimed by inference that GOD and the angels were on his side.

That is an old trick; but Parson NEWMAN played it last Sunday in a shockingly profane way.

Mr. BOB INGERSOLL agreed with Parson NEWMAN that GOD does not live up to His own teachings. "GOD should be consistent," he said at the Academy of Music on Sunday night. "If He wants me to forgive my enemies He should forgive His." And he referred to Scripture to prove that GOD is an angry and jealous Being.

But we must bear in mind that Infidel Bob is an old and bitter enemy of Christianity, while Parson NEWMAN assumes to be a follower of CHRIST and a teacher of the Gospel, with a commission sent from heaven.

## The Last Effort of the Maine Fanatics.

The prohibitory amendment to the Maine Constitution, to be voted upon by the people of that State on Sept. 8, is as follows:

"The manufacture of intoxicating liquors, not including cider, and the sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, are and shall be forever prohibited. Except, however, that the sale and keeping for sale of such liquors for medicinal and mechanical purposes and the arts, and the sale and keeping for sale of cider, may be permitted under such regulations as the Legislature may provide. The Legislature shall enact laws with suitable penalties for the suppression of the manufacture, sale, and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, with the exceptions herein specified."

We print elsewhere this morning extracts from the opinions of a number of the most distinguished citizens of Maine on the merits of the proposed amendment. The most interesting of these opinions come from men who are inclined to regard with favor the system of prohibition by statute, yet look upon the amendment of the Constitution as an unnecessary or a mischievous measure. They all come from men whose earnest interest in the cause of temperance will be questioned by nobody.

The Hon. JOHN APPLETON, the most eminent jurist in Maine, and for a quarter of a century the Chief Justice of its Supreme Court, declares his belief that the amendment is utterly useless. Ex-Gov. CHAMBERLAIN, now President of Bowdoin College, thinks that the amendment is not needed, "nor would it either supersede or execute existing laws." Bishop NEELY of the Protestant Episcopal Church is "unable to find grounds for the anticipation of great benefits from the proposed constitutional change." That veteran Republican, the Hon. JOSIAH CROSBY of Dexter, sees "no good in adopting it, but rather evil." Judge WILLIAM G. BARROWS of Brunswick, who has studied the question for twenty-five years from the bench of the Supreme Court, does not believe that it would "secure either the permanency or the efficiency of the law, or make one drunkard or one rumseller the less." The venerable Rev. Dr. HILL of Portland, formerly President of Harvard University, regards "the very proposition as decidedly mischievous," and thinks "the adoption would be a calamity." Mr. GUY C. Goss, the great shipbuilder of Bath, than whom there is no more devoted temperance worker, squarely declares that "it would not strengthen the temperance principles of the State or insure a better enforcement of the present law."

This is a very remarkable agreement of opinion among competent and perfectly sincere observers who have been looking at the question from entirely different points of view. But by far the best argument against putting the prohibitory system into the Constitution is furnished by Mr. DARIUS H. INGRAHAM of Portland. This gentleman simply reports the fact that after a trial of a third of a century for prohibition by statute there are in Maine to-day not less than 1,255 licensed liquor dealers—one rumseller for every 518 inhabitants of the State, men, women, and children.

## A Scheme of Demagogues.

The bill to create a Bureau of Labor Statistics, which recently passed the House with only nineteen dissenting votes, is a specimen of rank demagogism in legislation. There is already a Bureau of Statistics, with all the official machinery running and capable of doing the work which is proposed to be done by this project. A branch of the Agricultural Department is constantly employed in similar work.

The bill substantially creates new offices for the advantage of politicians. Like other bureaus which have been created at Washington to multiply patronage and to reward partisans, this scheme starts out with a plausible grant of money. But in a year or two it would become a costly fixture on the Treasury, with no reasonable prospect of being abolished. Any proposition to repeal it would be met with the false cry that the laboring interest alone was to be proscribed, while all other interests were protected. Yet labor is the victim of this species of legislation, for it has to pay for the music while the officeholders dance.

The Democrats are pledged to the policy of retrenchment and reform. When the Government was eighty-three years younger than it now is, and when the abuses were comparatively few as contrasted with the present time, Mr. JEFFERSON, in his first message, deprecated this evil:

"Considering the general tendency to multiply offices and dependencies, and to increase expense to the ultimate term of burden which the citizen can bear, it behooves us to avail ourselves of every occasion which presents itself for taking off the surcharge, that it may never be seen here that, after leaving to labor the smallest portion of its earnings on which it can subsist, Government shall itself consume the whole residue of what it is instituted to guard."

These are wise and wholesome words. They should be cherished by the advocates of simple and honest government. Those are bad friends of labor who seek to pack new taxes on its back.

## Not a Charitable Institution.

The Treasury of the United States is not a charitable institution.

Members of Congress have no right to give away that which does not belong to them.

There are bills pending in the Senate or the House, perhaps in both, to restore to the army, and especially to its pay rolls, sundry officers who at various times have seen fit to resign. The most conspicuous of these officers are Gen. FREMONT, Gen. PLEASONTON, and Gen. AVERILL.

Now, we do not question the services of these gentlemen when they were in the army, nor do we dispute the sincerity of their present desire to be restored. What we say is that Congress has no authority to restore them.

They resigned for their own purposes to take their chances in private life, and if their expectations have not been realized, the fact does not authorize them to ask charity from the Federal Government. Nor does the Constitution authorize Congress to give away the public money in charity.

The United States is not an eleemosynary establishment. No member of Congress can take the public money and give it away for the relief of individuals without violating the Constitution which he has sworn to obey and observe.

## Is Innocence Always Acquitted?

Mr. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL asked his audience a good many difficult questions in the course of his lecture on orthodoxy at the Academy of Music on Sunday evening.

"Is justice always done?" he inquired. "Is innocence always acquitted?"

We will not undertake to say that innocence is always acquitted, but we are well satisfied that guilt sometimes is, and we are under the impression that nobody knows this better than Mr. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

Through the kindness of Mr. GEORGE BLISS, our book shelves are ornamented by six portly volumes which contain full reports of the first and second Star route trials. A hasty perusal of this brief record, in which Mr. INGERSOLL's name occurs with some frequency as an advocate for the defence, will satisfy most people that justice is not always done, and that guilt is sometimes acquitted.

## The Defence of Blaine.

JAMES G. BLAINE isn't a bad man; but if he is a bad man, GEORGE F. EDMUNDS is a bad man too.

This is the argument of the *New York Tribune.*

We trust our contemporary will add daily to the list of Republican statesmen who are no better than BLAINE.

Let the good work go on!

Governor ROBINSON of Massachusetts quietly stole down to the Tewksbury almshouse the other day without telling any one who he was. He found everything in perfect order, all the inmates being happy, clean, and fat. With this report of the Governor of Massachusetts, we suppose we must bid farewell to those memorable people the Tewksbury paupers, at least until the return of Governor BUTLER.

It adds a rather unexpected interest to the chances of the Democracy in 1884 to see the sanguinary hostility manifested between the friends of the various Republican candidates.

## Another Chance for Col. Ingersoll.

WASHINGTON, April 27.—So conclusive is the proof furnished to the District Central Committee that Postmaster Conger and the r gro Carson were elected delegates to the Republican National Convention through fraudulent and corrupt means, that a new Convention is to be called and another set of delegates is to be selected. When the late Convention met Col. Robert G. Ingersoll was supposed to be the choice of a considerable majority of the delegates. The Ingersoll party carried everything until the evening recess. A change was wrought in the recess. Ingersoll and his associates were badly beaten. The city Postmaster and his negro associate carried off the honors by an unexpected majority.

Since then the air has been filled with charges of bribery. So specific were these charges that the District Central Committee yielded to the pressure. The call for a new Convention will soon be issued.

The authors of this movement are among the better men of the party, white and black. While they do not feel sure of seats for the delegates they intend to select, they are confident of showing to the Chicago Convention that Postmaster Conger and his associate were not honestly chosen. They are intent on making an exposure of the methods employed by Federal officials at the seat of Government to secure delegates contrary to the sentiment of the Republicans of the District.

Col. Ingersoll records himself on hotel registers as hailing from Illinois. He means to have a seat in the Chicago Convention from somewhere.

## THE QUESTION IN MAINE.

**Interesting Opinions About the Proposed Prohibitory Amendment.**

BOSTON, April 28.—The *Post* will publish to-morrow a review of the working of prohibitory law in Maine, together with the opinions of a large number of prominent citizens of that State regarding the pending amendment to the Constitution. Ex-Gov. Chamberlain writes:

It is a fact that there is a decided restraint upon the use of intoxicating liquors in this State, and a strong public sentiment against it. But it is not in the power of man to say how much of this is justly to be ascribed to the force of our prohibitory law, and how much to other influences, such as the advance of scientific knowledge of the hurtful effect of intoxicating liquors on the human system, and the economic effects of their use upon a community, or the advance in the tone of cultivated society as to what is gentlemanly and honorable in conduct, or of Christian and moral sentiment, and the application of these sentiments and convictions in the personal efforts of earnest men and women who are doing such powerful work in our communities. For one, I do not sympathize much with the tendency to fly to law and only law for the reform of morals. In ordinary conditions I should not expect to secure a course of reform of morals by piling law upon law and invoking higher forms of it, as if names and forms would save us. What we want is not bigger laws, but genuineness and sincerity. I do not think the proposed amendment is needed; nor would it either supersede or execute existing laws.

The Right Rev. H. A. Neely of Portland, Bishop of the Episcopal Church, says:

Looking at the question as a mere uninstructed layman, I have been unable to find ground for the anticipation of great benefits from the proposed constitutional change, and, considering that under a popular Government the enforcement of all laws is chiefly dependent upon the sentiment of the people respecting them, should not the feeling of our people have been more decidedly expressed by actual obedience to the existing laws before it can be wise or expedient to engraft such a provision upon the Constitution?

The following is from Chief Justice Appleton, lately of the Supreme Court:

My opinion of the utter uselessness of the proposed constitutional amendment is well known. I may hereafter give my views as to the questions proposed, but it is not expedient now.

Judge W. G. Barrows, who has just retired from the bench of the Supreme Court, writes:

I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion the prohibitory law of Maine has been, and is of great service in relegating the traffic in intoxicating drinks, as ordinarily carried on, to its proper place as a serious offence against the well being of society, like the cognate crimes committed in the keeping of gambling houses and brothels. It has been of service, also, in providing suitable and efficient means for the detection of an offence the commission of which it might otherwise be difficult to prove. So it is entitled, in some sort, to be regarded as a success. I think the proposition of the constitutional amendment is only another illustration of this mistake on the part of temperance men to which I have referred. I do not believe that it would secure either the permanency or the efficiency of the law, or make one drunkard or one rumseller the less.

This is the opinion of the Hon. Josiah Crosby of Penobscot county:

In my judgment the prohibitory policy in Maine has been a partial success, and to a very great extent an ignominious failure. In many of the country towns and villages where the temperance sentiment sounds upon a high key, it seems to operate as a restraint upon the sale of intoxicating liquors, especially upon the open public sale. In the cities I think prohibition is mainly a failure. Public opinion there does not sustain it, and any dominant political party by attempting its rigid enforcement would pass into the minority, and has already repeatedly suffered defeat. Any genuine temperance reformation will, of course, diminish the sale of intoxicating liquors. But is prohibition the cause of a genuine temperance reformation, or is it anything more than the product of a reformed public sentiment? Whether prohibition is to be a success in Maine is still, after some thirty years' experience, in my judgment a problem to be solved. As to the proposed constitutional amendment, I can see no good in adopting it, but rather evil.

Mr. D. H. Ingraham of Portland writes:

I have obtained this morning from Mr. J. L. Rackleff of the Internal Revenue Office for Maine the following statistics: Number liquor licenses, retail, issued in Maine since May 1, 1883, 1,151; number liquor licenses, wholesale, 74; number malt liquor dealers, 117; total, 1,255.

The population of Maine is 650,000. Dividing by 1,255, we have 518, one licensed liquor dealer in Maine for every 518 inhabitants.

For Portland the Assessors gave me the number of retail liquor licenses issued, 230; wholesale do., 3; total, 233.

The population of Portland is about 50,000. There is one licensed liquor dealer for every 177 inhabitants! This is so astonishing that I thought I had made a mistake till I went three times over the figures. As to the wisdom and propriety of adopting the constitutional amendment proposed, this sickening exhibit must suffice.

Hannibal Hamlin is busy on his farm, getting ready to plough, and will not stop to say a word about prohibitory amendments or anything else. His voice, not being raised, is neither for free rum nor prohibition, and must therefore be classed as a neutral power. His son, Gen. Charles Hamlin, was a member of the Legislature a year ago and voted against submitting the amendment to the people.

The Hon. D. L. Mortland of Rockland, one of the Railroad Commissioners and a leader of the Knox county bar, says:

So far as my observation has extended, I am satisfied that there has been no material diminution of the amount of intoxicating liquor consumed in this state, and if there has been any advance in public sentiment as to the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, it cannot be traced to prohibition. I am opposed to the proposed amendment, I know of no reason why it should be asked for, except that it may be considered necessary to have something in the nature of a patent or copyright on prohibition.

The Hon. Guy C. Goss of Bath, the well-known shipbuilder, says:

I believe that prohibition has been, on the whole, a success in Maine. I do not favor the proposed constitutional amendment. In my opinion it would not strengthen the temperance principles of the State or insure a better enforcement of the present law.

One of the strongest expressions of opinion against the amendment is from the Rev. Dr. Hill of Portland:

The answer to your question whether in my opinion prohibition has on the whole, been a success in Maine cannot be put into a few words without doing a great wrong, and I am at present under strict medical prohibition against writing a line more than I am compelled to. I must, therefore, be excused from trying to answer. As to the wisdom and propriety of adopting the proposed constitutional amendment I can, however, speak briefly and decidedly. I regard the very proposition as decidedly mischievous, and think the adoption would be a calamity.

Ex-Gov. Anson P. Morrill favors the amendment, and says:

That prohibition has been a wonderful success no man can doubt who is familiar with the rum traffic at the time that law was enacted in this state and at the present. It may be admitted that prohibition has not extinguished the illicit traffic in intoxicants, but that it has diminished the sale immensely, and advanced the cause of temperance vastly, no candid observer can doubt, and yet you may be told that there is as much liquor used in Maine as there was prior to prohibition.

President Pepper of Colby University and President Cheney of Bates College both believe that, on the whole, the prohibitory policy has been successful, and that the amendment ought to be adopted. Gen. Neal Dow is of course of the same opinion, and Uncle Solon Chase of Chase's Mills thinks the amendment "will do no harm."

## WILY AND HONEST JOHN SHERMAN.

WASHINGTON, April 27.—Before starting for Ohio last week Representative McKinley had a long conference with Senator Sherman. He was put on the Sherman slate for delegate at large, but went out to Ohio and began to talk for Blaine. When his name was proposed in convention he tried to withdraw, and, being Chairman, modestly refused to put the question, and so forth. But the Blaine howlers wouldn't listen to his withdrawal. And so he stuck, while John Sherman smiled in his sleeve. He didn't laugh in his sleeve, because no man ever saw John Sherman laugh. Only on rare occasions does he show his teeth in smiling.

Charley Kurtz is one of the liveliest getters-around in Ohio. He is a Sherman man. Two weeks ago he was in Washington. He struck the Senator's bank account for expense funds, and during the last fortnight has done more travelling in Ohio than any circus agent. In many a county did he put on the sly scheme of "howl for Blaine, but select Sherman delegates."

One of the Sherman delegates from Cincinnati is William B. Smith, known locally as "Policy Bill," who made a fortune running policy shops in Cincinnati, 4-11-44 being a popular religion in Buckeyedom. The colored people have a "policy festival" there whenever their favorite gig comes out. Smith has plenty of leisure for politics, and also plenty of money. He is ramrod for Sherman, and so we have another indication that "the business interests" are demanding the nomination of the Ohio financier.

## THE THREE UTICA CANDIDATES.

**The Political Talk in the Mohawk Country Easy to Understand—And Here it Is.**

SYRACUSE, April 29.—Could Arthur carry New York? He could not unless he received the support of the Edmunds and Blaine men. However it might be with the former, after what transpired at the Utica Convention he could hardly expect to get the full vote of the Blaine wing of the party in this State.

Could Edmunds carry New York? His managers at Utica compelled the friends of Arthur to submit to a humiliating bargain that would solely benefit Edmunds. The Arthur men are galled by the yoke and restive under it. The admirers of the Plumed Knight in this State will be slow to forgive the cynical Vermonter for the foul blow dealt him at Utica.

Could Blaine carry New York? The keynote of his opponents at Utica was, "Anything to beat Blaine." This sentiment will meet him at Chicago. It would lie in his path all through the campaign if he were the candidate, and embarrass him in a very peculiar manner in this State.

The great mass of the Republican party admit that they cannot succeed in the election without New York. Will either Arthur, Edmunds, or Blaine meet the emergency? The strong probability is that they will destroy each other at Chicago. Then we may look out for a stampede.

## THE JEANNETTE INVESTIGATION.

**Melville's Treatment of Collins and his Opinions of his Brother Officers.**

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Engineer Melville was examined by the Jeannette investigating committee to-day. He said that trifling events seemed to irritate Mr. Collins. He would misconstrue jokes about the mess table, and interpreted orders and regulations as having a personal reference to himself. He suddenly ceased to bid his fellow officers good morning at the breakfast table. The Captain reproved him for this, and he afterward saluted the Captain each morning, but none of the other officers.

One day Mr. Melville heard Collins say to Capt. De Long: "Captain, I wish the officers would try to treat me as courteously as I try to treat them." Capt. De Long picked him up rather sharply, asking, "What is the matter with you? If you have any particular charge to make against any officer make it now, and I will have it investigated."

The next day the Captain told the witness that Mr. Collins complained that he (Melville) was always singing Irish songs and making Irish jokes to make game of his countrymen. The witness went to Collins, told him he did not think his conduct was manly, and added, "Now, from this time forth you keep to your side of the ship and I will keep mine." The witness never sang Irish songs or made Irish jokes in Mr. Collins's presence, nor did he ever speak to him except when required by the necessities of the service to do so.

Capt. De Long was dissatisfied with the way in which Collins took care of his instruments, and once said to him, "Collins, if you go on smashing instruments in this way we won't have enough to last us three months." He heard the Captain say that it was unfortunate that Collins had not compared his instruments with standard instruments before leaving home, since if the instruments were lost the records would be comparatively valueless. Finally the charge of the principal instruments was turned over to Lieut. Chipp.

The witness, in the twenty-three years of his life in the navy, had never sailed in a vessel where there was so little quarrelling as on the Jeannette. The officers and men did their duty. Capt. De Long was courteous and careful of the feelings of his officers.

Mr. Melville expressed these opinions of some of his comrades:

Chipp was a first-class man in every respect. He was one of the prides of the service, but usually very reticent.

Danenhower's character was first-rate. I consider him the most attentive man to his duty I ever saw.

I cannot say too much for Ambler. He was the gentleman of the ship, without any reservation.

Newcomb was rather rough for his years, and I desired to have as little to do with him as possible. He was neither useful nor ornamental. I had no ill feeling toward him, although I found it necessary to reprimand him several times during the retreat.

Q.—Was it in any way possible to rescue De Long? A.—If I could have seen the exact spot where De Long was, and could have travelled night and day to him, I do not believe I should have been able to rescue him.

## PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS.

**Mr. Hewitt Reasserts his Charges Against Chandler—The Cattle Bill.**

WASHINGTON, April 28.—The Senate to-day passed the bill consolidating the Bureau of Military Justice and the corps of Judge Advocates of the army.

The bill to establish a Bureau of Animal Industry and to extirpate contagious cattle diseases gave rise to a long debate. The Senate agreed to except Texas fever from the diseases included within the meaning of the act.

Mr. Wilson of Iowa had read a letter from the Commissioner of Agriculture saying that the exclusion of American cattle from England for at least one year would probably be immediately decided on by Parliament. It was understood that the cattle men of England were determined to keep out American beef. The Commissioner added that there was never a time when it was more important to ascertain the real condition of the cattle of America than now.

An amendment striking out the section providing for the slaughtering of diseased cattle at Government expense was agreed to. The appropriation to carry the bill into effect was reduced from $250,000 to $150,000. Debate on the bill will be resumed to-morrow.

In the House, Mr. Hewitt reiterated the statement made by him on last Friday that Secretary Chandler had received $200,000 for the sale of condemned vessels, and had not yet turned the money into the Treasury, as required by law. He said it was deposited with the Treasury to the credit of the Secretary of the Navy, and he could draw out the whole of it at any time on his mere check without vouchers. He imputed no intention on the part of the Secretary to do any dishonest thing. But the issue was whether a great officer of the Government had obeyed the command of the law. He asserted that the Secretary had not.

Mr. Calkins of Indiana defended Secretary Chandler. He said the law required only that the net proceeds be covered into the Treasury. The net proceeds of the sale could not be obtained until all expenditures had been settled for, and this had not yet been done.

At the evening session speeches were made by Messrs. Wolford of Kentucky and Van Eaton of Mississippi in favor of the Morrison tariff bill, and by Messrs. Storm and Lawrence of Pennsylvania in opposition to it.

## OUR DIPLOMATS AND CONSULS.

**Secretary Frelinghuysen Protests Against Reducing the Appropriations for Them.**

WASHINGTON, April 28.—The President sent to the House to-day a communication from the Secretary of State with regard to the proposed reduction in the appropriation for the consular and diplomatic services, and the changes proposed in those services. The Secretary says the most important duty of a diplomat is to seek to avoid issues by procuring a satisfactory settlement before a subject of formal discussion is presented. The successes of diplomacy are, therefore, not noised abroad, and are usually known but to a few.

He says the policy of requiring our representatives abroad to exercise consular and diplomatic functions at the same time is inexpedient, partly because it is looked upon by many foreign Governments with disfavor, as manifesting a want of proper respect for them, and partly because the duties of consuls differ widely from those of diplomatic officers, and each class of duties requires the undivided time and attention of a single person. He adds:

With an unprotected coast, without an effective navy, with a population energetic in commerce and fond of travel, pushing themselves into all countries for purposes of trade, pleasure, or instruction, or as missionaries pursuing their labors among a hostile population, with a national and necessary policy forbidding European political intervention on this continent, with a system of government regarded by many other countries with disfavor, and with a production greater than we can consume, which must seek foreign markets, it is vitally important to secure a sufficient and well compensated diplomatic and consular service.

The Secretary says that our consular agents and many of our diplomatic representatives are now underpaid. He recommends that no substantial changes be made until a well-digested plan is prepared for the simplification and improvement of our present system, which he says needs remodelling in order to expedite business.

## Gen. Joe Hawley Looking for a Boom.

WASHINGTON, April 27.—Gen. Hawley is a Presidential candidate in earnest. He is superintending his own boom. Short and pithy biographical sketches, with what is intended to be a likeness of the distinguished Connecticuter, born in North Carolina, begin to appear in the country newspapers. The General is proceeding on the assumption that the fittest survive, and that, under the present situation, it means him. Stress is laid on his birth in the South, as though it gives him the advantage over all rivals. Joe is everybody's friend. When Blaine has wanted him he has only had to say so. But Joe considers himself Blaine's equal now. He is seriously setting up the claim of heirship to Blaine's votes. Joe has decided to have Secretary Lincoln run for Vice-President on his ticket. The Hawley boom will fairly begin to boom within the next thirty days.

## Brother Flower Gaining.

*From the Philadelphia Times.*

"How will Mr. Flower affect your vote along the St. Lawrence if he should be the Democratic nominee for President?"

The Hon. Charles B. Skinner: "If Mr. Flower should be nominated for President we could do nothing against him in that district. He was brought up there, and has been of so much help to the people in assisting them in all sorts of ways, diverting money for the public benefit, &c., that he would carry that district, overwhelmingly Republican as it is."

## Can Congress Force a Texan to Read Tom Ochiltree's Speech?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I received by last mail a copy of the speech of the Hon. Thos. Porterhouse Ochiltree delivered in the House of Representatives on return of the Lasker resolutions to that body. I returned said speech to the honorable gentleman without reading it. Now, what I want to know is this: Can the aforesaid gentleman force resolutions through Congress to compel me to read his speech? If Congress can compel Germany to eat our hogs, and Prince Bismarck to transmit to the German Reichstag such resolutions as the aforesaid Thomas see proper to have passed, can he not force me to read his speech? I am a law-abiding citizen, and fear that I have done something that may cause Congress to declare Texas out of the Union again. Let me know, and relieve a troubled mind.

J. B. KNOX.

CANBY POST OFFICE, Texas, April 22.

## Mr. Tilden in Maine.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Having taken some pains to find out who is the favorite among the Democrats of this vicinity as a Presidential candidate, I will inform you of the result of my labors. I have interviewed 125 of the leading Democrats of this city, and find 123 in favor of Tilden, three in favor of Cleveland, one for Hendricks, and one for Gen. Plaisted. As second choice Cleveland is largely the favorite; but the Democrats of this vicinity are almost as a unit for the ticket of 1876.

C. B. KASSON, City Marshal.

BIDDEFORD, April 25.

## GREAT FIRE IN GLEN'S FALLS.

**Two Opera Houses, the Union Hall Building, and a Fine Church Burned.**

GLEN'S FALLS, N. Y., April 28.—Not since the great conflagration in May, 1864, has Glen's Falls been so panic-stricken as it was this morning. Both opera houses, the Presbyterian church, and Gildersleeve's Union Hall building have been burned. The fire was first discovered in the south end of the reconstructed Union Hall building on Glen street a few minutes after 6 A. M. An alarm was sounded, and the Fire Department promptly responded, but, through the breaking of a hose and lack of force of the water, some time elapsed before effective work could be done. Meanwhile the fire spread to the north and communicated with Little's Opera House, and great sheets of flame were soon shooting through the roofs and windows of both structures. The strong wind fanned the flames into fury and carried burning brands to the adjacent buildings. The fire spread to Warren street, in the rear of the Glen's Falls Opera House, and that building was soon on fire. The flames thence extended to the front of the building, which was used as stores, and to the Presbyterian church adjoining. The destruction was so rapid and complete that at 10 o'clock nothing remained of the two opera houses, the Presbyterian church, and the Union Hall building except the broken walls and burning timbers.

It became evident at about 7 o'clock that the fire appliances of Glen's Falls were unequal to the emergency, and appeals for aid were sent to Sandy Hill and Fort Edward. The appeals were speedily answered, the Paris and Wait hose and steamer being despatched from Sandy Hill, and the Satterlee and Durkee hose and the Relief hand engine from Fort Edward. At least 100 willing helpers from each village accompanied the apparatus and did effective service. At 10:30 the fire was under control, but not until it had destroyed nearly $200,000 worth of property, and laid in ruins the handsomest and most valuable business block in the town and the most expensive of the Protestant churches. The residents on Warren, Church, Maple, Ridge, and Pearl streets were kept busy throwing water on the burning brands which fell on their roofs, and the firemen found it necessary to direct their attention to the dwellings and business houses on Warren street to subdue the fires that were constantly starting. The fire, which originated in a vacant room, is thought to have been the work of an incendiary.

The Union Hall building was three stories high, and cost about $8,000; insurance, $4,000.

Little's Opera House was built in 1869, and cost $20,000. It was three stories high. The Glen's Falls Opera House was the most valuable business building in the place. It was erected in 1871, and cost about $50,000. It was insured for only $10,000. The building fronted on Warren street, was three stories high, and extended back about 100 feet from the street. The opera house proper would seat 1,600 persons, and was in the rear.

The Presbyterian church was erected in 1867, and has been improved at various times since. It cost about $40,000, including the organ and furnishings, and was insured for from $10,000 to $12,000. The church spire ignited about 8¼ o'clock. When it was seen that the church was doomed, Prof. Farr tolled its death knell on the bell in the steeple. The tones were particularly mournful, in view of the surroundings, and the eyes of many of the parishioners were dimmed with tears. At 9 o'clock the spire was blazing. Above it the faithful town clock tolled the last requiem. Six strokes sounded and the hammer stopped. A few minutes later the spire fell into the street, and subsequently the roof fell. The handsome edifice is a heap of blackened ruins. The church of this society was destroyed in the great fire of May 31, 1864.

## SHOOTING A POLICEMAN.

**Then Barricading Himself in his House and Temporarily Defying the Police.**

TROY, April 28.—John Gernott left his home on Green Island this forenoon in quest of his rowboat. In his search he crossed a farm in Watervliet owned by Daniel Norton, a man of very violent temper. Norton abused Gernott for trespassing, and, calling John Grady and Michael Carroll to his assistance, assaulted him. Gernott escaped as soon as