The Sun.

An Independent Newspaper of Democratic Principles, but not Controlled by any Set of Politicians or Manipulators; Devoted to Collecting and Publishing all the News of the Day in the most Interesting Shape and with the greatest possible Promptness, Accuracy and Impartiality; and to the Promotion of Democratic Ideas and Policy in the affairs of Government, Society and Industry.

Rates, by Mail, Postpaid:

DAILY, per Year	$6 00
DAILY, per Month	50
SUNDAY, per Year	1 00
DAILY and SUNDAY per Year	7 00
WEEKLY, per Year	1 00

Address, THE SUN, New York City.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1885.

Amusements To-day.

Pike's Opera House—Adonis. 2 and 8 P. M.
Casino—Patience. 2 and 8 P. M.
Comedy Theatre—Ixion. 2 and 8 P. M.
Daly's Theatre—The Recruiting Officer. 2 and 8:15 P. M.
Eden Musee—Tableaux in Wax, &c. 11 A. M. to 11 P. M.
Grand Opera House—Forbidden Fruit. 2 and 8 P. M.
Globe Dime Museum—290 Bowery.
Koster & Bial's—Concert. 2 and 8 P. M.
Madison Square Theatre—Private Secretary. 2 and 8:30.
Mount Morris Theatre—Fanchon. 8 P. M.
Manhattan Rink—Gillmore's Band. 10:30, 2:30, and 7:45 P. M.
New Park Theatre—McAllister's Legacy. 2 and 8 P. M.
Niblo's Garden—Minstrels. 2 and 8 P. M.
People's Theatre—My Partner. 2 and 8 P. M.
Star Theatre—Our Governor. 2 and 8 P. M.
Standard Theatre—Gesperina. 2 and 8 P. M.
Thalia Theatre—Gespenst. 2 and 8 P. M.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Variety. 2 and 8 P. M.
Union Square Theatre—A Prisoner for Life. 2 and 8 P. M.
Wallack's Theatre—Impulse. 1:30 and 8 P. M.
3d Avenue Theatre—Uncle Tom's Cabin. 2 and 8 P. M.
5th Avenue Theatre—Spot Cash. 2 and 8 P. M.
14th Street Theatre—A Bunch of Keys. 2 and 8 P. M.

The regular circulation of THE SUN *for the week ending Feb. 21, 1885, was:*

Sunday	110,850	Thursday	99,360
Monday	100,150	Friday	98,953
Tuesday	100,919	Saturday	99,979
Wednesday	99,586	Weekly	50,353
Total for the week			768,258

Mr. Manning and the Treasury.

The suggestion is made that Mr. DANIEL MANNING may be disqualified for the office of Secretary of the Treasury if he continues to be a director of the national bank with which he is connected at Albany, or if he retains the ownership of any of its stock.

"No person," says the statute, "appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or First Comptroller, or First Auditor, or Treasurer, or Register, shall, directly or indirectly, be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be the owner, in whole or in part, of any sea vessel, or purchase, by himself or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State or of the United States."

It will be perceived that the First Comptroller is included in the prohibition as well as the Secretary of the Treasury.

For many years Mr. WILLIAM LAWRENCE of Ohio has been First Comptroller. In the *Bankers' Almanac* for 1884 his name appears as President of the Bellefontaine National Bank in that State.

These facts indicate that the law has hitherto been so construed in practice as not to afford any ground for excluding Mr. MANNING from the Treasury Department.

Are Things Wrong, and if So, What is the Cure?

Some time ago a gentleman of Edinburgh gave $5,000 to be spent for the elucidation and discussion of the following problem:

"Is the present system or manner whereby the products of industry are distributed between the various persons and classes of the community satisfactory? Or, if not, are there any means by which that system could be improved?"

The liberal and inquisitive Scotchman must be gratified by the stir his money has made, though he has not yet got a satisfactory answer to his questions. Under the terms of his gift a conference has lately been held in London which lasted through two days, and the reports of the discussion occupy fifteen or twenty of the broad columns of the London newspapers. The conference was made up of delegates from chambers of commerce, trades unions, and coöperative societies, and representatives of various economic, social, and learned bodies, called together by a committee which acted in conjunction with the Statistical Society.

Sir CHARLES DILKE was the presiding officer, and many papers were read and discussed. The special question for the first day was this:

"Has the increase of the products of industry within the last 100 years tended most to the benefit of capitalists and employers or to that of the working classes, whether artisans, laborers, or others, and in what relative proportions in any given period?"

Sir THOMAS BRASSEY opened the discussion in a twenty-minute address, in which he gave statistics to show that the number of persons in easy circumstances, or at least above want, is increasing much faster than the population, and that English labor commands the use of capital at lower rates of interest than have yet been accepted in any other country, with the exception of Holland. Meantime the tendency has been toward the cheapening of articles of daily consumption and the increase of remuneration for labor. Statistics lend no support, he said, to "the vague impression which prevails that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer than before." To bring about a more even distribution of wealth and a more complete identity of interest between capital and labor, he looked forward most hopefully to coöperative industry, advising that a beginning be made only with the simplest forms of industrial organization, "those which require the least amount of capital and are most free from the fluctuations so painfully felt in international commerce." Other industries can be conducted by joint stock companies, in the profits of which workmen can participate as shareholders. But, first of all, the laborer must practise thrift and cultivate self-control. The rich man is not by any means the enviable being he is commonly held to be, according to Sir THOMAS BRASSEY, who was the heir to one of the greatest fortunes ever amassed in England:

"To the truly wise man a life of ease presents no allurements. He knows how hard it is to avoid giving provocation to envy and hatred. He is humbled and saddened by the perpetual consciousness of the misery around him. Taste and the sense of duty alike point to simplicity of life. Wealth, if valued at all, will be valued only as a power which it is his duty to use as a steward for the public good."

Prof. MARSHALL said that some people thought that if wealth was distributed poverty would disappear; but, in fact, if the wealth of England was divided equally, it would give only about $180 a head, and many families in Lancashire earned five times as much yearly. A delegate of the Social Democratic Federation asserted, in opposition to Sir THOMAS BRASSEY, that the English working classes were the most thrifty people under the sun, which is absurd, and declared that he had worked for twenty-five years as a single man, and had been unable to put anything in the savings bank:—proof either of his thriftlessness or his lack of skill. Miss SIMCOX answered the question propounded for the day thus:

"The chief benefit of the industrial progress of the last century has been reaped, among capitalists, by the greatest capitalists; among employers of labor, by the largest employers; in general, by the dealers in commodities, labor included, rather than by makers or producers; and among makers and producers, by those engaged in the most skilled rather than the most laborious work."

"The struggle for existence," she further contended, "has been growing fiercer between the members of every distinct class, while at the same time the prizes for exceptional success have increased in value and the penalties for absolute failure in severity." Mr. BRADLAUGH wanted "a bureau of statistics similar to that which has been in operation for years in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and legislation requiring, under penalty of forfeiture, that all uncultivated land in the United Kingdom which is cultivable at a profit should be forced into cultivation." Mr. LOWTHIAN BELL presented statistics to show that labor absorbs more of the profits of production in Great Britian than in any other country. Prof. BEESLY, speaking as a representative of the Positivists, contended that what is wanted is not the transfer of wealth from one set of persons to another, but that those who possess it should use it well. The theory must be discarded that people have a right to do what they choose with their own money, without regard to the community, and are entitled to extraordinary praise if they use any of it for the public good; and public opinion must demand that wealth be treated by the capitalist as a fund intrusted to him by society, for whose benefit he must administer it, and more especially for the particular group of laborers for which he is responsible. The larger profits made during good years, instead of being used for a reckless expansion of the business, or an increased scale of personal expenditure, are to be considered and treated as a reserve fund for providing continuous employment and a steady rate of wages in bad times. A very pretty theory, but how would it work in practice? Goods are made to supply a demand; when the demand fails off production is decreased, and consequently there is less work for the workers.

Mr. HARRIS, a member of Parliament, advocated a retaliatory tariff on American flour, saying that if England imported wheat only many new flour mills would be built. Other speakers advocated duties on wheat and meat, and Mr. PETTIFER, a workingmen's representative, declared that he had been converted to protection by an American book, which said that we would not allow our toilers to sink to the level of those in England. Mr. JOHN MORLEY contended in reply that "at the present time the United States wage receiver was not one atom better off in the majority of cases than the wage earner here; that the iron workers at Pittsburgh were much worse off than those at Wolverhampton."

Mr. SEDLEY TAYLOR favored profit sharing between employers and employed, a system now at work in many French industrial establishments, of which the French Minister of the Interior has declared himself to be a "determined partisan," and which the late Mr. FAWCETT stanchly supported, assuring Mr. TAYLOR that he regretted that his official work prevented his joining him "in an active propaganda in its favor."

The question for the second day was this:

"Would the more general distribution of capital or land promote or impair the production of wealth and the welfare of the community?"

In answer, Mr. BALFOUR attacked the theories of Mr. HENRY GEORGE, and pointed out that if the whole value of the "original properties of the soil" of England were divided equally among the population the share of each individual would be only about ten dollars per annum. "The existence of rich men may be a good thing in itself or a bad thing in itself," said Mr. BALFOUR; "but if there are to be rich men, it is not worse for the community, but better, that their riches should be invested in the land of their country." His views were assailed by representatives of the workingmen, who contended that the land was now in the hands of a limited class, and the people were practically the slaves of that class.

In general, it may be said that the workingmen's delegates were in opposition to the men of the lamp and the closet. Everybody kept his temper, but the delegates were as far apart when the conference was over as when they came together. The discussions convinced nobody, and the Scotchman's riddle remained unsolved.

Gen. Wolseley's Situation.

The expedition undertaken to rescue Gen. GORDON appears to have been singularly misconceived from the beginning. A few weeks ago Gen. WOLSELEY was at the head of an army proceeding to relieve Khartoum, release GORDON, chastise the MAHDI, and evacuate the Soudan with vindicated colors. His force was strong enough to admit of its subdivision into separate expeditions, each having its share in a well-defined campaign, and we have learned from time to time that the enemy had been met, and, after engagements of more or less severity, routed.

Gen. GORDON's death seems to have suddenly changed the whole aspect of affairs, and in a degree which is not adequately explained. Gen. WOLSELEY is no longer the aggressive and avenging commander; he has become defensive instead of offensive, and instead of capturing Khartoum, whipping the MAHDI, and carrying GORDON off in a yacht, we find him unable to either go forward or retreat, and compelled to retire ingloriously into intrenchments and wait there during dreary and disastrous months until he is rescued. Had he lost half his army in his first battle it could not have affected him as badly as he apparently has been by Gen. GORDON's death. Such scanty news as is received shows that his situation is critical in the extreme; that he is hemmed in and powerless, that the strength and resources of the MAHDI have been greatly underestimated, and that the moral effect of the fall of Khartoum and the killing of GORDON has completely transformed the entire situation.

It is as if the whole English force had walked into a trap. Despatches of yesterday describe the Government as intimating that Gen. WOLSELEY's retreat is designed to draw the Arabs into a trap, to concentrate them at Berber, and have them all ready for annihilation by Gen. GRAHAM when he arrives there from Suakim. It would be more reasonable to explain that the MAHDI had allowed GORDON to hold Khartoum until the WOLSELEY expedition had advanced into the country far enough for his purposes, and that he had then killed him and sacked the place. He may propose now to deal with the invading force at his leisure, and, according to the opinions of those who know the Soudan, the heat of the coming months and the pestilential blasts of the desert will do for the English what the snows and frosts of Russia did for the great army that went to Moscow.

In its best aspect the Soudan expedition has assumed the proportions of a great national disaster. It is impossible to survey the situation, its colossal errors and failures, the complications it has involved, and the superhuman difficulties that obstruct its amelioration, and not be aware that the emergency is critical for England. The question is now not of the rescue of one Englishman, but of thousands, and each succeeding day reveals additional evidence that no practical relief or assistance can be extended before next autumn.

The Two Colonels.

The Hon. THOMAS PORTERHOUSE OCHILTREE, Deep Water TOM of Texas, interrupted the consideration of the River and Harbor bill in the House last week to rise to a question of the highest privilege. OCHILTREE was deeply interested in the River and Harbor bill, but he was still more deeply interested in "the highest privilege." The River and Harbor bill contained a provision for Galveston harbor which was very dear to Deep Water TOM, but the question of privilege was about a still dearer thing—himself. He told the awestruck House that one Col. R. R. ALEXANDER, formerly of Galveston and now of Hot Springs, had met him in the lobby and threatened him with personal violence.

Col. TOM had had the presence of mind to have Col. ALEXANDER arrested, but the latter was allowed to go, on declaring that he had not intended to make any threats. A state of war continues between the two Colonels, and it is expected, or perhaps we ought to say it is feared, that hostilities will be resumed by them as soon as Col. OCHILTREE's privilege as a Congressman expires. Both the distinguished Texans are understood to be bad men in a fight, and ready to give satisfaction with swords, guns, pistols, bowie knives, scythes, or boomerangs to all comers. Both are of that ruddy and sanguineous type which is usually supposed to denote suddenness in quarrel and delight in gore. Col. ALEXANDER's personal appearance is not yet familiar to the world, but he is said to be "a big, red-whiskered individual, appropriately choleric, and ready to die in his boots if necessary. This is the kind of a man he is: Once, when in an encounter, he rose up on his knees, after having been shot three times, and killed his man." No wonder he is supposed to be "a man of nerve." He means business every time, and says distinctly that he will track OCHILTREE till the difficulty between them is settled. "You see," says the man who rose up on his knees after being shot three times and killed his man, "as long as OCHILTREE is a member of the House my hands are tied. I can do nothing here in the Capitol; I can do nothing elsewhere. But it is not long before the fourth of March. OCHILTREE will then be a private citizen. I will have something to say to him then, and I will say it. He may want to get from me, but I can travel as fast as he can, and I am perfectly willing to travel to secure satisfaction."

Col. ALEXANDER little knows his opponent if he supposes that Col. OCHILTREE is the kind of man to run away. Col. OCHILTREE, like Col. ALEXANDER, is of the o'er ripe flery auburn type, and in his calmest moods weighs about two hundred pounds. And Col. OCHILTREE distinctly told the House—and it is thought that the House believed him—that he didn't raise the question of privilege for the purpose of getting the protection of the House, as he was "physically able to take care of himself against this man ALEXANDER or any other man."

On the fourth of March Col. OCHILTREE will have to begin to take care of himself. We fear there is no possible doubt about him or Col. ALEXANDER. They mean war. An OCHILTREE cannot run away, and even if he could, the relentless ALEXANDER would pursue him. Historic Bladensburg, or Weehawken, or perhaps the "rapid and tawny torrent of the great Father of Waters," as Col. TOM says, must be reddened with the red blood of one or both of these gallant Texans. This ought not to be. We don't feel like asking a favor of Col. ALEXANDER, but we appeal to Col. OCHILTREE, who is as generous as he is brave, to save his own life, which is so precious to his country and to the great cause of deep water at Galveston. We don't know the politics of Col. ALEXANDER, but he may be a Democrat, and if he is it would be cruel to kill him just at the beginning of a Democratic Administration. Let him live, and let Col. OCHILTREE live too. And that both the Colonels may be spared, we entreat Col. OCHILTREE to have himself put under bonds to keep the peace. It is the only safe way.

Number 9,843 and the British Government.

The recent correspondence between JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY of Boston and her Majesty's Government has attracted the attention of everybody who knows the romantic story of Mr. O'REILLY's life. He applied last month to Sir WILLIAM VERNON-HARCOURT for information as to whether he would be arrested if he went to Montreal to lecture. We printed the other day the reply of Mr. GODFREY LUSHINGTON, Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, notifying Mr. O'REILLY in effect that he would be seized if caught anywhere on British soil.

The circumstances of Mr. O'REILLY's case, so far as they concern the British Government, are recounted in another column. They make a capital story, and we think no one can read the narrative without increased interest in the fortunes of this esteemed American citizen and admirable poet.

But what a curious dual existence! On the other side of the Atlantic Mr. O'REILLY is regarded as a British subject, an escaped convict, known as Number 9,843, a fugitive from justice, with about seventeen years of penal servitude still before him, a man to be hunted down like a criminal by the police and to be imprisoned when captured. On this side of the ocean he is a naturalized American citizen and a valued member of Boston society, where his abilities and fine moral qualities have gained for him the friendship of many of the people best worth knowing in that highly cultured community. He is a club man of distinguished popularity, an editor of ability and influence, a canoeist of uncommon enterprise, and a poet whose melodious verses combine tropical fervor of imagination with the cool common sense of latitude 42° 20′ north.

Fortunately for Mr. O'REILLY, the American phase of his double existence is that which more immediately concerns himself at present. We dare say that Number 9,843 can continue to make himself comfortable among his friends—and who is not his friend?—on this side of the Canadian line.

The Price of a Night's Lodging.

A bill is now before the Legislature to provide for the establishment of municipal lodging houses in this city. It was introduced into the State Senate by Mr. J. HAMPDEN ROBB, and authorizes the Commissioners of Charities and Correction to hire suitable buildings at which poor persons may receive "plain and wholesome food and a night's lodging free of charge." These privileges, however, are not to be extended to the same person oftener than three times a month at the same lodging house, and even then can be obtained only upon compliance with three conditions.

In the first place, the applicant for shelter must consent to be washed. In the second place, he must permit his clothing to be steamed or disinfected. Finally, he must "perform a reasonable amount of labor in return for such food and lodging," and in order to enforce this requirement the superintendent of the lodging house may detain him, but only until eleven o'clock of the day following his admission. If he refuses to do work suitable to his age, strength, and capacity, after having eaten and slept at the public expense, he becomes liable to prosecution and punishment as a vagrant.

The enforced bath is a good thing. It is well also to exact some payment from the lodgers in the form of labor. The steaming or disinfection of the clothing of applicants for admission, however, seems likely to be attended with more or less difficulty. The duty is imposed upon the keepers of the lodging houses in such terms as to make it imperative, and we infer from the language of the bill that even if a man slept at one of these establishments three nights in succession, his garments would have to be steamed or disinfected every night. As the process is evidently intended to be preliminary to the privileges of eating and sleeping, we suppose it will be carried on while the "intending lodgers," as the English would say, are in the bath tub, but unless the bath is very long, or the disinfecting process very short, there will be a considerable interval of time in which many honest people will be left without any clothes to wear. Where are they to be kept while waiting for their habiliments?

A wise amendment to the bill would be to require disinfection only in such cases as in the judgment of the superintendent seemed to demand it. He should not be obliged by law to steam the clothes of every casual.

Perhaps it would be better for Gen. LOGAN if he were at his desk in the Senate chamber at Washington. Perhaps it would be better for Col. MORRISON if he were at his desk in the House of Representatives. Neither is making any headway at Springfield, and the Hon. ELIJAH M. HAINES seems to be abundantly qualified to run both parties in the Illinois Legislature.

When Mr. CARLISLE pushed through his Bank bill some years ago, he and other Kentucky statesmen scoffed at the idea that it would disturb the money markets. In point of fact, it caused violent contraction and a great panic, and the loss of $80,000,000 in a few days in the value of securities, held in part by Kentucky statesmen and their friends.—*New York Tribune.*

The contraction and panic of February, 1881, here referred to, were notoriously caused, not by Mr. CARLISLE's bill, but by the stupidity and malice of certain country bank Presidents who misunderstood its provisions. The bill authorized the issue of 3 per cent. bonds, redeemable after five years at the pleasure of the Government, and provided that from and after July 1, 1881, no other bonds should be received as security for circulation. This the rustic bankers interpreted as making it compulsory upon them to take the new bonds at once, and, partly to save money and partly to terrify Congress, they began surrendering their old bonds and withdrawing their circulation. The bill was vetoed by Mr. HAYES, and no opportunity was given for it to cause either contraction or panic; but it is worthy of remark that these same bank Presidents, who, in February, 1881, sought to convulse the finances of the country rather than be forced to take at par 3 per cent. bonds having five years to run, were early in the morning of Aug. 1, 1882, standing in line at their various post offices waiting for the chance to be the first to subscribe for 3 per cent. bonds redeemable on demand. The whole course of the bank Presidents in the matter is a convincing illustration of the small quantity of intelligence that goes to the making of such officials, and of the supreme folly there would be in giving them exclusive control of the national currency.

By all means reopen the Venezuelan business, reëxamine the claims, revise the awards, and do what can be done toward wiping out the disgrace of one of the worst scandals of Republican rule.

ELOQUENCE AFTER DINNER.

Mr. Evarts's Curious Speech at the Lotos Club Banquet.

From a Verbatim Report in the Tribune.

Well, there are a great many things to be done in the course of the next six years; and my first duty, as I feel, to the State, is to enjoy myself as well as I can. [Laughter.] It would be unworthy of a great State like this to have a Senator, open to observation by all his rivals, and to the notice of the press and of people, if I did not enjoy myself. It is well known that I possess certain faculties and appetites for enjoyment; and it would be a reproach which the State would not willingly bear if my enjoyment were quenched from the infirmities and faults of the State itself!

Other Senators may wish to spread to their admiring country men the greatness, the strength, and the virtue of their respective States. I should be but gilding the refined gold and painting this large tiger lily—the State of New York [applause]; and I shall not attempt to do that. But, in reference to the obscure and modest portion of our country men, it will be my duty to raise and ennoble, to illustrate and glorify them. And as I must begin somewhere, I shall begin with the Lotos Club. If I can succeed with them, I shall fail in nothing. [Applause.]

The great difficulty, the great embarrassment, in a vast community of so many millions, of so many diversified interests, of so many strenuous competitions, is to meet, compatible with justice and with comfort, the distribution of wealth. I do not know of any better manner in the experience of life and of philosophy than to commence the distribution by making first a large collection of wealth; and that will be my first duty, for if I am not willing to sacrifice myself as a reservoir for this distribution, how could I expect any one else to agree to it. [Laughter.] This solves at once the question of delay or of order, because if it is understood that the contributions are only as a means by which there is collected for final distribution, with no other subtraction than is naturally to be attributed to evaporation, why, I can expect a result greater than financiers, greater than political economists; for I shall have struck the law of nature which collects from the drops of rain all that supplies the rivers and the oceans. [Applause.]

It is obvious, as I stand now at the threshold of my remarks, that there is no safety for you, and there is no credit for me, except by now stopping on the threshold, and if you are at all pleased with this sight of the vestibule, you can be left to your own prodigious fancies to fill out for yourselves the temple which is to be the whole fabric of my Senatorial career. [Applause and cheers.]

THE HON. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW'S TRIBUTE TO THE ELOQUENT SENATOR.

From the New York Times.

As affording evidence of Mr. Evarts's adroitness in steering between dangerous opposing principles, he mentioned the fact that he had successfully served in the Cabinet of Mr. Johnson, "who never mixed his beverages," and had also given satisfaction in the Cabinet of Mr. Hayes, "who never drank anything but water." "If, therefore," Mr. Depew continued, "the success of this club is due to the fact, as Mr. Evarts says, that it has no principles, then it is evident he was designed by nature to be a charter member of our organization.

An Astonishing Report About Vassar.

From the Buffalo Express.

A professor in Vassar College says that the managers are really alarmed by the steady falling off in pupils during the past five years. The number now is only a little more than half that of 1875. "The cause isn't in any deterioration of the college itself," said the Professor, "for it is the same noble school as ever. The trouble is that Vassar has become a thing to poke fun at. Half the new jokes about girls are put upon Vassar students. Their doings are ridiculed, exaggerated, falsified, and the very name of Vassar is a synonym for feminine foolishness. The consequence is that girls are beginning to dislike to go there. I wouldn't be surprised to see the doors of the college shut in five years more. The newspaper paragraphers will have done it."

He Won't be Called a Drunkard.

From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil.

Please do me the justice to state that for the last eleven months past I have not drank of intoxicating drinks sufficient to render me intoxicated, nor in any wise used drink as a daily habit for a much greater time. Of late I appear to have had little use for it. I am not a prohibitionist, as its tendency is to monomaniism. If the foregoing was cut up into texts I see quite a variety in the subject, viz. Politics, riches and poverty, sickness and health, liberty and slavery, happiness and grief, slander and protection, libel and truth, and, as the last four are factors of law, I hereby affirm that I will prosecute any person from and after this date who charges me with drunkenness, unless positive dates and facts can be made to sustain the charge.

DAVID TOZZETIX.

THE TREATY WITH HAWAII.

Some Facts About its Practical Operation During the Past Seven Years.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22.—The Nicaragua job has received its quietus in the Senate, and the so-called reciprocity treaties with Spain and Mexico are in a moribund condition, from which they are not likely to recover. The renewal for another term of seven years of the one-sided commercial treaty with the Sandwich Islands is still actively worked by the representatives of Hawaii and of the San Francisco beneficiaries.

That pretended "reciprocity" treaty was negotiated in 1876 after many years of strenuous effort on the part of the Hawaiian Minister and special agents sent from the islands to assist him in humbugging the Administration of President Grant and the Congress of the period. It was to continue in force for a term of seven years, after which it could be terminated by either Government giving twelve months' notice of its desire to withdraw from the contract. As the seven years' term expired in October, 1883, the United States is of course at liberty to give the notice of withdrawal from a treaty which it should never have made, and which has signally failed to benefit the people of the United States, particularly the citizens of the Pacific coast, for whose especial benefit the treaty was urged upon the favorable consideration of the United States Government.

The remission of duties on sugar and rice imported into San Francisco from the Hawaiian Islands now amounts to $4,000,000 annually. In the annulment of the treaty this sum would be paid into the United States Treasury. We are practically giving an annual bonus or subsidy to the sugar and rice planters of Hawaii of $4,000,000 per annum. As the grades of sugars imported from Hawaii would be subject to a duty of nearly three cents a pound under the existing tariff, from which they are freed by the treaty, it was plausibly argued that the consumers of sugar upon the Pacific coast would receive at least a part of the remitted duty on the lower cost of the free sugar to the consumer. The exact reverse of this proposition is true. All grades of Hawaiian sugars cost consumers in California and Oregon two cents per pound more with the treaty in force than is paid in the States east of the Rocky Mountains for taxed sugars of similar grades. By a combination between the refiners of San Francisco and the planters of Hawaii, no sugars are shipped from the islands except to the refineries—managed by one company in San Francisco—the absolute control of the sugar market of the Pacific States, while it gives to the Hawaiian planters a bounty of $60 upon every ton of sugar they send to San Francisco.

While the reciprocity treaty has thus utterly failed to lower the cost of Hawaiian sugars to the consumer in the United States, it has not fulfilled the promises that it would give our manufacturers and merchants a monopoly of the import trade of Hawaii. The treaty stipulates that no similar treaty shall be entered into by Hawaii, but it failed to provide that the Hawaiian tariff on imports from other countries should not be lowered during the continuance of the treaty, and the reciprocity treaty was quickly followed by a reduction of the Hawaiian tariff to a charge of ten per cent. *ad valorem* on sugar machinery and other articles in which England and Germany could compete with the United States. The admission of sugars into the United States duty free naturally gave a great impetus to the making of sugar and the setting up of new sugar mills, and as it cost less to import the mills from Glasgow and pay the ten per cent. duty, thirty-six mills were imported from Scotland against four from the United States. Portable railways, steam ploughs, and other machinery used on the plantations all came from Great Britain, all paid for by the bonus of remitted duties by the United States. Fully $3,000,000 has been invested in British machinery by Hawaiian planters as one of the fruits of this wonderful system of reciprocity. We are supplying this machinery to British, German, and Chinese sugar planters of Hawaii at a ten per cent. duty, while our own planters of Louisiana are prohibited from importing similar machinery except at their own cost, and paying a duty of sixty to eighty per cent. *ad valorem.*

It is true that exports from California to the Hawaiian Islands have increased since the treaty went into operation, but the gross sum of all our exports is less than our loss by remitted duties. While the duties on imports from Hawaii which should have gone into the Treasury amounted in the last six years to $13,717,436, our total exports to the islands in the same time amount to but $13,033,317. The remitted duties have actually paid for all that was sent to the islands, with nearly $700,000 over. The exports, which were nearly all from California, consisted of provisions, lumber, animals, &c., which they could not import from Europe or China.

Hawaiian representatives interested in a renewal of the treaty claim that it has helped ship building and ocean transportation upon the Pacific coast. A few small steamers have been built for the island trade and for Hawaiian account. These are included in the exports quoted above. Transportation between San Francisco and the islands is entirely controlled by the sugar monopoly of Honolulu and San Francisco. No sugar is allowed to be shipped from the islands to California except in the vessels of the monopoly, while no sugar can be shipped to Portland, Oregon, or any port except San Francisco. So absolute is this monopoly of transportation that the steamers of the Pacific Mail Company calling at Honolulu, on the way to and from Australia, are not allowed to carry passengers between Honolulu and San Francisco.

The foundation and support of this exacting and profitable monopoly and combination is the $4,000,000 subsidy from the United States Treasury, paid in remitted duties under the shallow device of a pretended reciprocity treaty. That the treaty should have been continued for one day beyond its allotted term is a marvel to every one who understands its workings. Even its supporters know that it is a fraud upon the people of the United States, and fear the advent of an Administration which may see it as it is and speedily denounce it. Hence their desire to obtain a renewal for another term of seven years before the close of the present Administration.

PARSON NEWMAN'S NEW CHURCH.

It will be Supported by two Rich Women, and the Poor will Worship There.

From the San Francisco Chronicle.

The Rev. Dr. John P. Newman is to establish a church in San Francisco, one to be run independently of ecclesiastical control, and with an especial view to bringing into the brotherhood of Christ the unregenerate in the lower walks of life. Since the advent in this city of the "Political Parson" it has been known to a few that one purpose of his visit to this city was to secure a congregation in San Francisco, and that in this effort he would have the cordial support of two of the wealthiest families on the Pacific coast—the Stanfords and the Crockers. Every precaution, however, was taken to keep the intention a profound secret from the general public. A number of the most confidential friends of the Stanfords were approached by a *Chronicle* reporter, and one was found who had information on the subject, coupled with a willingness to impart it.

"The rumor is on a solid foundation," said the gentleman in question, "and in the course of a very short time Dr. Newman will have an independent congregation in San Francisco. It will be entirely non-sectarian, and will be conducted under broad and liberal views of Christianity. The patrons of the church will be the wives of Leland Stanford and Charles Crocker, and they have two objects in view: First, both ladies are warm admirers of Dr. Newman and his religious views, and now that he is without a charge are anxious to secure for him pleasant, serviceable, and remunerative work for the remainder of his days; second, they are anxious that poor people and people of moderate means in San Francisco shall have an opportunity to become members of a congregation to be presided over by one of the eminent divines of the land, without extra cost, and consequently all the seats in the new church will be free. Their intention is to build or purchase an elegant house of worship at some eligible point in the Western Addition, and then pay the entire expenses, including a very handsome salary to the pastor. No expense will be spared to make the church beautiful to the eye, and the services will be of the most attractive character. While the house of worship is being erected, or sought for, services will be held in some public hall or vacant church. Mrs. Stanford and Mrs. Crocker will have the hearty support of their husbands in this matter, Senator-elect Stanford being especially warm in its favor."

"Parson Newman will undoubtedly have a church in San Francisco," remarked another prominent resident, "and it will be run under the patronage of Mrs. Leland Stanford. It will be organized as an independent, non-sectarian church, but in my opinion it will gradually but steadily develop into a congregation of Spiritualists. It is openly charged in New York that the parson is fast drifting into spiritualistic circles, and some of the papers declare that he is already an ardent believer in all the alleged phenomena of spirit mediums. Just here, in my opinion, is the milk of the cocoanut and the explanation of Mrs. Stanford's determination to establish an independent church for Mr. Newman at her individual expense.

"Since the death of her son and only child, Mrs. Stanford, according to current reports, has sought consolation through the agency of spirit mediums. It is said that meeting the Rev. Dr. Newman at one of these seances, and finding him a believer in spiritualistic manifestations, Mrs. Stanford persuaded the reverend gentleman to remove to California, promising him a large and remunerative field of labor on the golden shore of the Pacific."

BOYLE O'REILLY'S ESCAPE FROM WEST AUSTRALIA.

Twenty-two years ago John Boyle O'Reilly enlisted in the Prince of Wales's regiment, the Tenth Hussars. He was then about 19 years old. A well-educated boy, of ardent temperament, and sincerely devoted to the Irish cause, he did what he could in the regiment to promote the revolutionary movement that began in 1863. His connection with the Fenian insurrectionists was discovered, he was arrested, tried, and convicted of high treason, and he was sentenced in July, 1866, to imprisonment for life. This sentence was afterward commuted to penal servitude for twenty years. O'Reilly spent about a year in the English prisons, working in the chain gangs. In November, 1867, he was transported to West Australia in the convict ship Hougoumont, crowded with felons. For about thirteen months he worked at road making near Bunbury in the penal colony, associating with convicts and ticket-of-leave men. Various accounts of the manner of his escape in February, 1869, have been printed. The true story was not known until Mr. O'Reilly had been in this country for ten years or more, when time had removed all danger of inculpating certain friends who risked much in assisting him to freedom.

In the list of absconders printed early in 1869 in the official *Police Gazette* of West Australia there appeared this paragraph:

2.—John B. O'Reilly. Registered number, 9,843. Imperial convict; arrived in Colony per convict ship Hougoumont in 1868; sentenced to twenty years 9th July, 1866. Description—Healthy appearance; present age, 25 years; 5 feet 7¾ inches high, black hair, brown eyes, oval visage, dark complexion; an Irishman. Absconded from Convict Road party, Bunbury, on the 18th of February, 1869.

The man to whom Boyle O'Reilly owed his liberty was a good Catholic priest, the Rev. Patrick McCabe, "whose parish extended over hundreds of miles of bush, and whose only parishioners were convicts and ticket-of-leave men." He was a scholar and gentleman of rare accomplishments, "almost always in the saddle, riding alone from camp to camp, and sleeping in his blanket under the trees at night." "He was an ideal disciple of Christ," says Mr. O'Reilly, "who labored only for his Master. He was the best influence, indeed, in my time he was the only good influence on the convicts in the whole district of Bunbury." We continue the quotation from Mr. O'Reilly's own narrative:

One day this remarkable man rode to my hut, and we walked together into the bush. I had then made all my plans for escape, and I freely told him my intention. "It's an excellent way to commit suicide," he said; and he would not speak of it any more. As he was leaving me, however, he leaned from the saddle and said: "Don't think of that again. Let me think out a plan for you. You'll hear from me before long."

He went away and I waited weeks and months and never heard a word. I was not compelled to work with the criminal gang on the roads, but had charge of their stores, and carried the warder's weekly report to the Bunbury depot. Finally, one day on my way with this report, I came to a plain known as the Race Course. As I crossed it I heard a *coo-ee*, or bush cry, and saw a man coming toward me. He was a big, handsome fellow, with an axe on his shoulder. He came to me with a friendly smile. "My name is Maguire," he said; "I am a friend of Father Mac's, and he's been speaking about you." Seeing my hesitation, he drew a card from his wallet, on which Father McCabe had written a few words to me. Then I trusted him.

This was in December, 1868. Some American whalers were expected to touch at Bunbury in February for water. After two months of suspense, news came to O'Reilly of the arrival of the barks. Maguire announced that he had arranged with the Captain of one of the whalers, the Vigilant of New Bedford, to cruise for two or three days just outside of Australian waters, and take the fugitive on board from a small boat. On the night of Feb. 18 O'Reilly waited until the warder had visited his hut, put on a pair of freeman's shoes, as the trackers could easily discern the mark of a regulation convict's boot, and struck into the bush:

About 11 o'clock I came to the old convict station, and lay down behind an old gum tree at the roadside. In half an hour or so two men rode up, but they passed on; they were farmers, probably, or maybe a patrol of mounted police. Shortly after, I heard horses coming at a sharp trot. They halted near me and I heard "Patrick's Day" whistled clear and low. In an instant I was with them—Maguire and another friend, M——. They led a spare horse. I mounted at once, and without a word we struck into the bush at a gallop. For hours we rode on in silence.

They reached the shore, found a small boat ready for them, and pulled about forty miles along the coast to the point where they expected to meet the New Bedford whaler. No one had thought to bring food or water, and for twenty-four hours or more the sufferings of the party were intense. At 1 o'clock on the third day they made out the Vigilant, under full sail, steering north. They pulled toward her with light hearts:

She was steering straight toward us, so we stopped pulling and waited for her. But we were bound to be wofully disappointed. When she was within two miles of our boat she fell off several points, as if to avoid us. Every one stared in amazement. Maguire kept saying that Capt. Baker had given his word as a man, and he could not believe that he would break it. One of the men stood up in the boat and gave a loud hail that must have been heard on board. No answer. Again he hailed, and we all joined in the shout. No answer. It only seemed that the Vigilant turned a point further from us. At last she came abreast of our boat. She was then about three miles distant. Maguire hoisted a white shirt on the end of an oar, and we shouted again. But the Vigilant passed on, and left our boat to its fate.

They landed on the beach, and O'Reilly's friends went back to Bunbury, promising to return in a week, and leaving him hiding in a secluded sand valley close to the shore. He climbed a tree and caught an opossum, and also captured a few kangaroo rats. These animals supplied him with food. After three days O'Reilly, still believing that Capt. Baker must be cruising for him somewhere off the coast, resolved to make another attempt to board the whaler. The rowboat was too heavy for him to pull alone. Six or seven miles further up the beach he found an old dory, half buried in the sand. He dug the dory out, launched it, made it watertight by plugging the cracks with paper bark, and put to sea alone:

Before night I had passed the headland, and was on the Indian Ocean. I knew there was a current going northward. Next morning I gave up pulling, and sat down to watch and wait. It was very hot. The sun flamed above, and the reflection from the water was scorching. That day, toward noon, I saw a sail. It was the Vigilant—there was no other vessel there. She drew near to me, so near that I heard voices on deck. I saw the men aloft on the lookout, but they