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.

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1885.

Amusements To-day.

Bijou Opera House—Adonis. 8 P. M.
Casino—The Pirates of Penzance. 8 P. M.
Comedy Theatre—Ixion. 2 and 8 P. M.
Daly's Theatre—A Night Off. 2 and 8:15 P. M.
Eden Musee—Tableaux in Wax, &c. 11 A. M. to 11 P. M.
Grand Opera House—Fedora. 8 P. M.
Hoyt's & Hill's—Disraeli. 8 P. M.
Madison Square Theatre—Private Secretary. 8:30 P. M.
New York Theatre—Variety. 2 and 8 P. M.
Niblo's Garden—Shadows of a Great City. 8 P. M.
People's Theatre—Hazel Kirke. 8 P. M.
Star Theatre—The Merchant of Venice. 8 P. M.
Standard Theatre—Gasparone. 8 P. M.
Thalia Theatre—Die Tochter der Fabricius. 8 P. M.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Variety. 8 P. M.
Union Square Theatre—A Prisoner for Life. 8 P. M.
Wallack's Theatre—Impulse. 8 P. M.
3d Avenue Theatre—Variety. 8 P. M.
5th Avenue Theatre—The Musketeers. 8 P. M.
34th Street Theatre—McAllister's Legacy. 8 P. M.

A Test Case.

In a little more than a week the country will have an opportunity to judge from the case of an important Federal office in New York whether the gradual substitution for Republicans of Democrats is to be expected from the Administration. The commission of Mr. HENRY G. PEARSON, Postmaster of this town, expires on March 21. Mr. PEARSON is a Republican. He has the reputation of being an efficient Postmaster. The office was put in excellent condition by his predecessor, and he has not suffered it to deteriorate. He may be said to have served the public well. Democrats of sufficient energy and intelligence to run the New York Post Office just as well are not wanting. Will Mr. CLEVELAND reappoint Mr. PEARSON, or will he appoint some Democrat in his place.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Boston Herald*, says that the President intends to reappoint Mr. PEARSON "on the ground that PEARSON is an excellent Postmaster, wholly non-partisan, and who fills his office better than any new man could." The *Utica Observer* recommends Mr. PEARSON'S reappointment for a reason which seems a little singular on the part of an influential Democratic journal: "The Independent Republicans of New York city desire his reappointment. They ask it as the vindication of their support for CLEVELAND and devotion to civil service reform."

It will hardly occur to most Democrats that it is the business of a Democratic Administration to vindicate the Independent Republicans. If Mr. CLEVELAND determines to reappoint Mr. PEARSON, doubtless it will be pleasing to the Independent Republicans; but it may fail to please a good many Democrats, who at the same time do not disparage Mr. PEARSON'S qualifications. The President's decision will be watched with great interest by the party. Mr. PEARSON'S case will be regarded as a test case.

The New Park Scheme Again.

An earnest advocate of the new park scheme again appeals to us, and we take pleasure in printing his letter, although it is more remarkable for vehemence than for logical cogency. He asserts that the city of New York has not yet reached the constitutional limit of indebtedness because, as he holds, the bonds in our sinking fund should not be included in the estimate of the city's debt.

Whether the thirty-four millions of city bonds now held by the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund must be included in the existing indebtedness of the city or not, is a pure question of law which cannot be determined until the Court of Appeals shall pass upon it; and it were arrogance in any person, lawyer or layman, to attempt to decide it upon his mere individual opinion.

It may be said, however, that while a plausible argument may be made on either side, the more conservative construction of the constitutional amendment is that which holds the city bonds in the hands of the Sinking Fund Commissioners to be part of the city debt. In any estimate of the debt the assets of the city cannot be deducted from the apparent gross total, because the word "indebtedness" means an obligation to pay, irrespective of the pecuniary resources of the person or corporation indebted. In the case of the city of Council Bluffs against STEWART, it was contended by the appellant that various items of assets including $2,000 cash in the City Treasurer's possession, should be deducted from the outstanding indebtedness of the city of Council Bluffs, thus making valid twenty-five thousand dollars of bonds which had been issued in excess of the constitutional limit. But this was not the view of the Supreme Court of Iowa. "The position of the appellant," said that Court, "confounds the distinction between an indebtedness and insolvency. A person who has outstanding obligations to the extent of $10,000 is indebted to that amount, without regard to the means which he may have for the payment of his debts when they mature. The same is true of a city." The sinking fund securities, we thus see, cannot be deducted on the theory that they are assets of the city; but it is urged that they should not be deemed part of the existing debt, because the purchase of the bonds by the Sinking Fund Commissioners is in effect a purchase by the city itself, extinguishing the debt.

This theory, in the opinion of the Corporation Counsel, is fallacious, because it is based on the assumption that the city and the Sinking Fund Commissioners are the same entity, whereas in point of fact they are quite distinct. The Commissioners are trustees not only for the city, but also for its creditors; and they hold the fund in trust subject to certain defined duties. So the act of 1878 pledges and appropriates certain revenues and moneys to the sinking fund for the payment of the bonds of the city, and provides that "between the city and its creditors, holders of its bonds and stocks, there shall be and there is hereby declared to be a contract that the funds and revenues of the city and the funds to be collected from assessments, by this statute pledged to the sinking fund for the redemption of the city debt, shall be accumulated and applied only to the purposes of said sinking fund until all of said debt is fully redeemed and paid."

It is manifest from the above provision that it is beyond the power of the Legislature to cancel one bond of the twenty-one millions in the sinking fund held subject to such a contract between the city and its bond creditors; and, in the opinion of able lawyers, no bond whatever in our sinking fund can be destroyed by mere legislative enactment. So much for our correspondent's wish to have these bonds summarily wiped out.

Let us now see if he is more happy in his predictions as to incoming resources of the city. It is true that twenty-one millions of city bonds mature within the next three years, but this gain will be offset by some eighteen millions of water supply bonds and at least three millions of bonds to meet other contingencies connected with the actual running of the city Government, all of which must be issued within the same period.

Our correspondent again falls into the error of imagining that all the bonds which mature within the next three years form part of the sinking fund. Such is not the case. Of the twenty-one millions falling due only $5,493,518 are held by the Sinking Fund Commissioners. His further assertion that "there will be added fifteen millions to the revenue from taxation on enhanced valuations of real estate" is purely hypothetical. Nor, in our opinion, would there be any justification for such increase in the present valuations of our real estate, while the whole city is complaining of the stringency of the times and rentals are in point of fact falling. The circumstance that the money goes to the new park scheme would not make it any more agreeable to the freeholder to be forced to pay $625 a year on his house instead of the $500 he now pays.

Again, it is claimed that the recent constitutional amendment cannot affect the operation of the New Park act, because before the change in the Constitution a right had been created to have the action in regard to the new parks perfected by the issuing of bonds. This position is clearly untenable, as an examination of the act itself—chapter 522—will show. The act provides that on the final confirmation of the commissioners' report the city shall become and be seized in fee of all the lands laid out for the parks, and thereupon the city shall take possession; and it is only upon the confirmation of the report that the present leases of the various lands cease and determine. These provisions demonstrate plainly that the proceedings can be discontinued by the municipal corporation whenever authorized so to do by the Legislature at any time prior to the final confirmation by the Supreme Court of the report of the commissioners of appraisal.

As to the issue of bonds there is no mandatory provision; there is merely a permissive clause allowing bonds to be issued by the city in payment for the lands taken. Section 10 of the act provides that for the payment of the damages awarded and the expenses it shall be lawful for the Mayor, Aldermen, and commonalty to raise the amount by loan by the creation of a public fund or stock, to be called the new park fund, which shall be represented by bonds, and they are authorized to sell such bonds. But no right to have such bonds issued as between the city and the landowners has been created. The Legislature might to-day stop summarily the whole scheme, and no property owner could compel the issue of a single bond. The owner would be remitted to an equitable claim for damages by reason of the discontinuance of the project; and to obtain such damages he would first have to secure from the Legislature a special act in his favor.

In the MUNSON case it was held that, owing to the passage by the Legislature of the act providing for a special commission to estimate the loss sustained by owners by reason of the discontinuance of a proposed military parade ground, the owners were entitled to actual losses shown; and the language of the presiding Justice in that case is noteworthy. It was held by the Court that the discretion of the commissioners should be most carefully exercised, for otherwise great damage to the city might be done by awarding damages when none had been in fact sustained. "The door into the public treasury opened by the repealing act," said Judge DAVIS, "is one which, by erroneous construction, may let in such a horde of fraudulent claims that I feel justified in adding these suggestions to the extremely able opinion of my brother BARRETT." Accordingly, it is safe to assume that if Pelham Park were dropped by the Legislature, no fancy damages could be obtained by the property owners.

In conclusion, as to the probable cost of the new parks, our correspondent says that our estimate is too high, because the original commissioners under the act of 1883 placed the cost at eight millions. We differ with him in the belief that the only ground for a higher estimate is the opinion of Mr. EDSON, and the opinion of Mayor GRACE. There is good reason to believe that in the opinion of the various property owners whose lands are involved, they are worth to-day at least twenty millions and as much more as the commissioners of appraisal can be induced to award. It is true that the Corporation Counsel thinks eight millions more than their real value in the market; but would our correspondent admit that the city's estimate should be taken as the true measure of value or damage?

After all the arguments adduced in favor of the scheme, the fact remains that unless the Court of Appeals shall hold that the bonds in the sinking fund do not form part of the city debt, our taxpayers will be compelled to pay about 25 per cent. a year additional taxes in order to satisfy the claims of the owners of the new park lands.

Why Did They Change Their Votes?

A comparison of the several votes in the House of Representatives on the mail subsidy job suggests one or two interesting questions.

After THE SUN had called attention to the mischief contained in that part of the Post Office Appropriation bill which related to payment for foreign mail service, the obnoxious provision was rejected in Committee of the Whole by a vote of 105 to 97, the roll not being called. That was on February 13.

On the next day the House confirmed the action of the Committee of the Whole, striking out the subsidy business by a vote of 130 to 112. This vote put the members on record for or against the job.

Defeated in the House, the lobby engaged in promoting this precious piece of legislation turned their attention to the other end of the Capitol. Although the Senate Committee on Appropriations refused to entertain the job, the Senate itself restored it to the bill in slightly different form. Then it went back to the House, where the members again put themselves on record on March 3, the question being whether the House should recede from its disagreement with the Senate. Again the job was defeated, but by a narrow margin of four votes, its friends mustering 128 strong.

The third and final vote in the House on the subsidy job was early on the morning of inauguration day. This time the result showed that either the abstract merits of the measure or the earnest arguments of its promoters had prevailed over the objections of certain members who had stood with RANDALL and HOLMAN and BAYNE of Pennsylvania in opposing this sudden revival of the swindling old subsidy system. The House receded, by a vote of 96 to 89, and the job was enacted.

At each of the three successive votes the question was the same—simply that of opposition or aid to the subsidy measure. Yet we find that eight Congressmen who figured at first among the opponents of the job were won over to the other side during the progress of the sleight-of-hand performance that preceded the passage of the measure. Here are their names, with the record of their changed opinions:

	Vote o. Feb. 14.	Vote of March 3.	Vote of March 4.
AIKEN, S. C.	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.	Silent.
BLACKBURN, Ky.	Anti-subsidy.	Silent.	Subsidy.
BRAINERD, Pa.	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.	Subsidy.
BROWN, Pa.	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.	Subsidy.
ELLIOTT, Pa.	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.	Subsidy.
MOULTON, Ill.	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.	Silent.
PUSEY, Iowa	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.	Subsidy.
WILKINS, Ohio	Anti-subsidy.	Anti-subsidy.	Subsidy.

Of these gentlemen, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PUSEY, and Mr. WILKINS are Democrats, and Mr. BRAINERD and Mr. BROWN are Republicans. Three of them, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BERIAH WILKINS, will sit in the Forty-ninth House. Mr. BLACKBURN is in the Senate, and the rest were not reelected to Congress.

No doubt each of the eight gentlemen will be ready with a satisfactory explanation of what must otherwise seem, in view of the notorious activity of the lobby at the time, a most extraordinarily sudden change of attitude toward the worst job of the late session.

Lawyers as Statesmen.

Mr. ANDREW CARNEGIE, the rich and philosophic iron manufacturer of Pittsburgh, made an address on Monday evening before a medical college of this city, in the course of which he thought proper to give the young medicos a lot of information about lawyers and statesmanship:

"The profession of law tends to narrow man by its rules and precedents. The legist is ever looking back. He adopts new ideas slowly and hesitatingly, and becomes an encyclopædia of wise saws and modern instances, the modern instances being governed by the wise saws of the past. Hence lawyers rarely become great statesmen."

We observe, too, that our socialistic friend, JOHN SWINTON, has a very poor opinion of Mr. CLEVELAND'S Cabinet, because, with the exception of Mr. MANNING, it is composed of lawyers, whom he regards as natural enemies of human progress.

And yet the founders of the republic, the leading minds of the Revolution, and the framers of the Constitution were mostly lawyers. JAMES OTIS and JOHN ADAMS in Massachusetts, ROGER SHERMAN in Connecticut, ROBERT R. LIVINGSTON and JOHN JAY in New York, WILLIAM LIVINGSTON in New Jersey, PEYTON RANDOLPH in Virginia, JOHN RUTLEDGE and EDWARD RUTLEDGE in South Carolina, all so influential in bringing on the Revolutionary struggle and in keeping alive the zeal of the patriots, were every one of them lawyers.

The Declaration of Independence was written by THOMAS JEFFERSON, a lawyer who assuredly ranks among the great statesmen of our history. The first Continental Congress was presided over by PEYTON RANDOLPH, a lawyer. ALEXANDER HAMILTON belonged to the same profession. All the Presidents of the United States, with the exception of WASHINGTON, HARRISON, TAYLOR, JOHNSON, and GRANT, have been lawyers. It is true that MADISON studied law only in a general way, and that MONROE may not have long and actively engaged in its practice, but he was under the legal tuition of JEFFERSON. JACKSON won military fame, but he began his career as a lawyer, had a large legal practice, was District Attorney of Tennessee when that country was made a Federal Territory, and was subsequently elected by the Legislature a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State. With the exception of ANDREW JOHNSON, elected as Vice-President, all our Presidents have been either men of legal education or military men, and the lawyers count seventeen to four Generals and only one politician.

Of our statesmen, too, the most conspicuous have been lawyers, both before and since the Revolutionary days—PINCKNEY, WIRT, HAMILTON, LIVINGSTON, DE WITT CLINTON, HENRY CLAY, DANIEL WEBSTER, SILAS WRIGHT, WILLIAM L. MARCY, JOHN C. CALHOUN, LEWIS CASS, WILLIAM H. SEWARD, SALMON P. CHASE, SAMUEL J. TILDEN—but the list is too long to undertake to give it in full here.

If lawyers do not make great statesmen, then we have had almost no great statesmen in this republic, which has been steered from the first by men of legal training.

A Virginia Youth's Curiosity.

A young friend in Virginia makes of us the following inquiries:

"Is there a book that describes the life and ways of the different grades of society in New York city? If so, where can it be had, and at what price? Would such a book be injurious to the morals of a young man? Can books be bought much cheaper from second-hand book stores?"

We are not acquainted with any book of the sort described, and since we have no distinct and fixed social grades here, it could not be written by a person of discrimination whose work would be worth attention. The surface of our society is changing all the time; people are getting richer or growing poorer; the father is little educated, but the children are polished up, and everybody is striving to get ahead. The names of most of the people who are now prominent in our more elegant or shoddy society were altogether unknown there a quarter of a century ago, and a quarter of a century hence the changes will probably be as great.

It is the same in business. Houses which once were strong are now weak or have altogether passed away, and the instances where an inherited trade of great magnitude has been kept up and increased are few. New men and new methods are steadily driving the old into the background, and the children of the successful are reaping the advantages of wealth.

Yet we have several thousand lawless and disreputable characters in New York who can very properly be classed by themselves; and it is about those, we infer, that this Virginia youth wishes to read. He wants to know about the wickedness of the great city. But he will do well to repress the desire. Many young fellows have come to New York in quest of that information, and have got it at a terrible expense.

Second-hand books are generally much cheaper than those which are fresh, but sometimes the older they are, and the more hands they have been in, the more valuable they become. Our young friend can get very cheap reading, and he should keep his thoughts from dangerous curiosity about the manifestations of human depravity in New York or elsewhere.

The illustrated papers print portraits of the President and the new Cabinet. Naturally enough, they do not all take the same view of their subjects. For instance, *Harper's Weekly* represents Judge ENDICOTT, the new Secretary of War, with gray hair and moustache, while *Puck* depicts him as about forty years old, and as gay as Col. HENRY WATTERSON of Kentucky. *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* also shows Judge ENDICOTT to be a young fellow. All these papers, however, agree in representing Mr. WHITNEY and Mr. MANNING as the handsomest members of the group, and they all give to Mr. BAYARD a sternness of expression foreign to his high-bred and genial appearance. Mr. LAMAR and Mr. GARLAND appear to be the stoutest gentlemen in the party, though they can hardly compete in that respect with the President. But it is a well looking set of men.

The explanation made by the *Tribune* of the way in which it came to understate by $30,000,000 the amount of legal tender notes in the national Treasury clears it, we cheerfully acknowledge, of the suspicion of wilful misrepresentation. It sets off against the notes $30,000,000 of certificates of deposit issued to the banks; and, in a certain point of view, it is right. On the other hand, it fails to observe that the banks owe the Treasury $9,774,141 for their own notes held by it, and $13,665,573 for Government funds held on deposit by them, making altogether $23,339,714, payment of which could be demanded of the banks at any time, and the amount deducted from that of their certificates. These, however, are unimportant details. The fact which we insist upon is that the Treasury holds $126,000,000 in gold, besides 46,000,000 silver dollars, with which to redeem $300,000,000 of legal tenders, and there is no reason whatever for anxiety about them.

There is no need of the Administration hesitating to make sweeping changes in foreign appointments from any disinclination to import so many Republicans and send so many Democrats out of the country. A few more Republicans or a few less Democrats will not make much difference in 1888. It isn't likely that the election will depend then upon the narrow plurality of a single thousand votes.

We are informed that an interesting meeting is to be held at the Union League Club this evening. Some time since a young gentleman named GEORGE GORDON KING was proposed for membership by Mr. JAMES C. CARTER, the well-known lawyer. He was seconded, we believe, by Mr. JOSEPH H. CHOATE and HAMILTON FISH, Jr. The Committee on Admissions desired to be informed as to the vote of the candidate at the last Presidential election, and on learning that Mr. KING voted for Mr. CLEVELAND he was rejected. It is asserted that a motion to censure the Committee on Admissions for this conduct will be made this evening by Mr. JOHN N. A. GRISWOLD, who will be supported by Mr. GEORGE JONES of the *Times* and by the editors of the *Evening Post*. The issue of this fight will be awaited with interest. We are informed that there are some four hundred members of the Union League Club who voted for the CLEVELAND electors, and they probably do not enjoy being thus sat upon by the Committee of Admissions.

The Hon. WILLIAM M. SINGERLEY of Philadelphia is well known as the proprietor of that excellent and successful journal, the *Record* of that town, and he has just won new distinction as a boviculturist. His two-year-old heifer Constance S. has given seventy-two pounds of milk in a day. This beats the *Record*, and is a thing to be even more proud of.

The Russian advance into Afghanistan is unchecked, and London yesterday was in a state of feverish excitement over the latest news from Sir PETER LUMSDEN. A general belief appears to prevail that hostilities must ensue, that the Russians have gone too far to retreat, and that once an actual outbreak occurs it will not be confined, so far as England's disposition is concerned, to an Asiatic campaign. The prevailing accounts make it appear that Russia is greatly at a disadvantage in her undertaking; but it is more than probable that no adequate or accurate estimate has yet been had of the strength of the Russian expedition or of its immediate resources. Russia has built during the last few years a great many miles of railroad and a great many military highways to the east of the Caspian, and only the Russian authorities know what she can do.

Col. WILLIAM H. BARNUM is playing the silent act with great artistic cleverness.—*Philadelphia Press.*

It isn't at all unnatural if Mr. BARNUM hasn't been heard from since the election of Governor CLEVELAND. He is not a loud-mouthed man. For instance, nobody heard much about him at the Chicago Convention, but for all that his presence there may be considered as one of these many slender threads, of which if any one had snapped, CLEVELAND never could have been elected. It was mainly owing to his energy and weight that the Committee on Resolutions was composed as it was. If it had been otherwise, the enthusiasts on the tariff would have run away with the platform according to their own impulses. Mr. BARNUM would seem to be as much responsible for Mr. CLEVELAND'S election as any other man, as much even as DANIEL MANNING.

Secretary WHITNEY should not imagine that, because he has been out for a run on Mr. TILDEN'S yacht, he knows anything particularly worth knowing about the speed of steam vessels. Private steam yachts carry very slow glasses.

The portraits of Mr. CLEVELAND in the newspapers all indicate that he must now be weighing as much as 250 pounds, if not more.

What Cleveland was Doing Down a Sewer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: I never heard of Grover Cleveland till he was mentioned for the nomination for Governor in the Democratic State Convention of 1882. There was nothing singular in this, for though he was then Mayor of Buffalo, what lawyer in New York city pretends to keep the run of the Mayors of Buffalo? Soon after he became the nominee for Governor I learned something about him that arrested my attention. A strong Republican from Buffalo visited my office on business. He was conducting large operations, which made it necessary for him to frequently visit the Buffalo docks very early in the morning. A big sewer job was being carried on by the Aldermen, which was involving the expenditure of a good deal of money, and just then another appropriation was to be called for. It was beginning to make a noise in the city. My Republican friend knew Cleveland personally. He drove one morning about daylight down toward the dock, when he caught sight of the Mayor near this unfinished sewer. He reined up his horses and asked the Mayor what he was doing there. Mr. Cleveland was pretty well bespattered with mortar and mud, especially on his boots. He told Mr. — that he had been looking thoroughly for himself into this job, and that he regarded it as a swindle, and it should have no more money from the city treasury if he could prevent it. "And now," said the Buffalo Republican, "I am going home to vote for him for Governor."

Grover Cleveland is now President. Of course, he cannot keep his eye on everything. But if he will to the utmost of his powers of vision look into the swindling jobs carried on under the Federal Government as closely as he did into swindling jobs at Buffalo while he was Mayor, he will save the people many millions of money.

NEW YORK, March 11. BUFFALO.

The Decorations of Brewster.

WASHINGTON, March 11.—Attorney-General Garland is a man of plain tastes, although he cannot be called a plain man, being used to the ways of polished society. But the wild æstheticism of the Attorney General's room, as decorated by Brewster, worries him dreadfully. He likes to do his work in a plain lawyer's office, at a solid walnut desk, in a comfortable chair, with no bric-a-brac or terra cotta or peacock blue accessories to bother him. As it is, the Attorney General's office looks like an art-furniture shop, and the new Attorney-General is just waiting a week or two before he has a push-cart engaged to cart away all the rubbish, as he calls it, and rubbish it is in its present location.

Mr. Arthur's Courtesy to Mr. Cleveland.

WASHINGTON, March 11.—Mr. Arthur left his private stable at President Cleveland's disposal until he could make other arrangements. The new President utilized it by taking a rattling drive Sunday afternoon.

Forecasting a Strong Political Contest.

From the Waterbury American.

The climax of the quarrel between Mr. Hendricks and Mr. McDonald is to be reached, so the story runs, when the fight starts to elect a successor to Benjamin Harrison to the United States Senate. Then McDonald will be pressed by his faction, backed by Dan Voorhees, while the Hendricks crowd will push Gov. Gray.

Not a Deadhead.

From the Springfield Republican.

It has been usual for Presidents to accept free boxes at the Washington theatres. Mr. Cleveland declines to do so. He will not renounce play going, but will pay for what he sees.

Why He Declined.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Frank Jones is the New Hampshire man who was asked to go into the Navy Department, but refused, on account of his enormous business interests.

MID-WEEK ECHOES.

The meeting of the British Parliament marks the beginning of the London season, but although the rulers and lawgivers of Great Britain have met, and the usual dinners and receptions have already begun, the prospects of the season of 1885 are awfully gloomy. A large number of women and children are already in deep mourning, and those that are not are broken-spirited and low-hearted. The metropolis is reported to be as full as usual at this season of the year, but a heavy gloom hangs all over the country, for everything seems to be going wrong. Distress, defeat, and dynamite are the three fatal Ds working the country all at once, and there seems, so far, to be no prospect of a speedy liberation from any of them. No fresh military disasters need be apprehended in the Soudan before next autumn, but watchful idleness, combined with the pernicious influence of the climate, will cost heavily, both in money and lives. Spring and summer are, if not dead, at all events off seasons everywhere except in England. In that country innumerable branches of trade depend solely upon the six months from March till August, and the prospects of all these trades this year are unprecedentedly bad. The departure of a large number of troops, and especially of those belonging to the Household Brigade, makes a bad cut in the retail trade of London, not only on account of the absence of the men, but still more on account of the probability that their wives, sisters, daughters, and mothers will not buy anything and will not go anywhere as long as the men are away; and, as every calamity or distress occurring in any part of the vast empire focuses itself back to London, the British capital will probably have the gloomiest season the present generation has seen.

Next to the interests of trade, the biggest losses will probably be entailed upon the interests of sport, which are immense in England. Yachting, fishing, and horse racing will all suffer. Even the University boat race and the Derby will probably be but poorly attended, and still more poorly bet on, and it is a pity that it should be so, for the Derby, at all events, promises to be a very closely contested event this year. Some months ago it was mentioned in this column that Fred. Archer, the famous English jockey, and his friend, Capt. Bowling, had said that they believed Paradox, formerly known as the Casulstry colt, the winter favorite for the Derby, would probably have to lower his colors before Melton. At the time there was a good deal of sneering and head-shaking at this statement, and many people said: "Oh, well, of course Archer thinks Melton will win, because that is his mount, and Capt. Bowling thinks Paradox will be beaten, because he sold him cheap to Mr. Cloete." But the last betting news received from England shows that the British public is coming to the same opinion, for Paradox is now quoted at 7 to 1 and Melton at 7½ to 1—not a great difference three months before the race.

Among the outward manifestations of the business depression prevailing all through Great Britain, the most significant is the recent fall in the price of consols. The banking, financial, and speculative spheres all over the world look upon consols as the finest barometer for prognosticating the general state of affairs in Great Britain. And if this theory is correct, "Dear Old England" must be in a very bad fix indeed. Yesterday's consols fell nearly one per cent., which was a heavy addition to the drop which began in February last, and upon which the present Wall street boom has been principally based. Consols fell in February nearly 2¼ pounds sterling, which is an unprecedented drop in recent times. Of course this movement carried every kind of English securities down, and the foreign bankers were quick in taking advantage of the depression. The German and Hebrew speculators of New York were in the field, of course, and made big profits in arbitrating American securities between the two markets. The theory of our speculators here was that, while English consols went down, holders of them would sell out and buy American stocks and bonds, which cannot be affected either by the Afghanistan or the Soudan complications and disasters. The theory seems to have been correct so far, for our stocks and bonds continue surprisingly strong, and are steadily advancing, in spite of strikes, cutting of rates, reduction of dividends, and the rest of it. Of course it is absurd to argue with people who pretend that the English and Scotch investors will sell consols to buy Erie, Denver, Wabash, or Mexican stocks. But a belief is being widely spread that the fall in consols is a proof that war between England and Russia is inevitable, and that the United States must benefit by it. Now, if such a war was not to-day inevitable, but merely probable, the Russian and Indian securities would have tumbled much more than consols. Instead of that, up to a few days ago, and while consols were falling, the Russian securities were advancing. In fact, there was lately quite a boom in them upon the Continental Bourses. There was a fall in the Indian securities, but that was solely due to the depreciation of the price of silver, upon which the rupee paper is based. Thus it seems almost evident that the Afghan difficulties have nothing or very little to do with the decline in consols. They were sold speculatively by the bears on Gladstone's administration and the condition of English affairs in general. Consols are at all times about the safest thing to sell short, for there is no delivery of the paper and no possibility of a corner, while the Government paper of all the other countries has to be handed over on settling day, and, as in the case of Russia, the loans are many in number, small in amounts, and closely held in Germany, Austria, and France, they are very dangerous to sell short, and consequently, are seldom hammered down. To sell consols short is like selling Erie short; to sell Russians short is like selling Lackawanna or Missouri Pacific, neither of which you can borrow from anybody except Jay Gould or Deacon White, who naturally make you pay for it.

The Stock Exchange was jubilant yesterday over the election of Mr. De Goicouria as Vice-President of the New York Athletic Club. His victory was overwhelming, and was mainly due to warm support from the Stock Exchange, as predicted a week ago in this column. It is pleasant to see that young and energetic gentleman installed in the Vice-President's chair, but the contest has not been one likely to redound to the credit of either party. There is an old and exceedingly true proverb which seems never to have taken full hold of the souls of our clubmen. No matter what petty disputes may harrass and vex the club they should never be allowed to come outside, much less to be the laughing stock of the public and the tonic served up for funny articles in the newspapers. The club is merely an enlarged family circle, where each member, no matter what his small grievances may be, jealously keeps them from the public gaze. If this is not done by our amateur athletes they will prove themselves to be mere amateur club men.

Mr. John W. Mackay arrived in the Oregon on Sunday, and gave his junior partner, Mr. James Gordon Bennett, leave of absence to take a cruise on the Namouna through the West India Isles. Mr. Bennett was not slow to avail himself of his holiday, and started off early on Monday morning. Before doing so, however, he felt that he must show his shaking-up powers, so he shook Mr. Habberton out of the *Telegram* because the circulation was increasing so fast that the *Herald* was becoming a mere tender to it, and reinstated the old plodders of the past.

A London contemporary is authority for the statement that a young doctor has made a great professional success in that metropolis by his politeness. He was consulted by a lady who suffered from cold feet. "The reason of your cold feet, madam," said the young doctor, "is that they are not large enough to hold blood sufficient to heat them." Since then all the pretty girls in London swear by him, and some of our young doctors might do a good business these hard times by profiting by his example.

* * *

A Frank and Proper Confession.

From the New York Times.

The "clamorous South" thus far exists in the imagination of the Northern editor.

THE NEW PARKS AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: You printed a letter from me some time since in regard to our new parks, and an editorial reply. I wish briefly to answer the reply.

1. You assume that the new parks will cost twenty millions. The Commissioners who laid them out, after careful consideration, placed their cost at eight millions. No reason is shown why they are not correct. Mayors Edson and Grace have chosen, for their own purposes, to puff the cost to twenty millions, and this is the only ground for this exaggeration.

2. You assume that the city's bonded debt is nearly $127,000,000. Please let me have your fair attention for a moment. Of this $127,000,000 of bonds the city's money has purchased, before maturity, over $34,000,000, and the city now holds them. This was done by its Commissioners of the Sinking Fund. Now, the question is, does the city owe these purchased bonds? The facts are that by a law of 1878 the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund were authorized to invest any surplus of cash in the purchase of the city's bonds; but in such case the city was to continue to pay interest (raised by taxation) into the sinking fund till the bonds should become due. This interest, as a part of the sinking fund, was pledged to the other bond creditors. When the bonds should mature the payment of interest would cease, and the bonds be cancelled without any further payment. All that the city can be said to be indebted on these bonds, therefore, is the interest, and not the principal. It is not even indebted to itself or to its sinking fund for the interest, any more than it is indebted for its salaries and other things which are annually put in its tax levies. To say, therefore, that the city owes the principal of these thirty-four millions of purchased bonds is utterly absurd, false, and ridiculous.

3. You assume that bonds cannot be issued for the cost of these parks. This is based on the idea that the city actually is indebted in the amount of the bonds it has paid.

It ignores the fact that many of these bonds are to mature this year and in the next two years, and are then to be cancelled without further payment.

It utterly ignores the fact that in the next two years there will be added over twenty-three millions to the cash in the sinking fund. And, also, that during the same time there will be added fifteen millions to the revenue from taxation on enhanced valuations of real estate.

These, together, make over sixty millions over the Constitutional limit for which bonds may be issued by the time they will be required. Do, pray, prick this bladder, windpuffed by the Mayors, and let out its gas.

Besides, down below all this, your article is based on the theory that the amendment applies to this Park act. It does not, and your own argument proves it. You say that in a somewhat similar amendment in regard to towns the Court of Appeals held that on its adoption "all uncompleted action by towns toward the issue of bonds in aid of a corporation fell to the ground, unless by operation of law, or in pursuance of some valid agreement, a right to have such action perfected by the issuing of bonds had been created." You have quoted this decision correctly. Of course, the converse is true; *i. e.*, the bonds may be lawfully issued, if by operation of law or in pursuance of some valid agreement a right to have such action perfected by the issuing of bonds has been created. So far we agree, and the Court so says. Now, that there is a valid agreement is clear to me, but the argument and citation might be too long for the terse columns of THE SUN. But that a right was created, not only by operation, but by express enactment of law, to have the action in regard to these parks perfected by the issuing of bonds cannot be and has not been denied. No one has said or can say that this is not so. No answer to this has yet been attempted. The act, in so many words, confers the right to issue the bonds, and, therefore, the amendment has no application.

4. The opinion you cite of Judge Davis was in a case where the act expressly authorized a discontinuance in the discretion of the Commissioners, and also provided a definite and absolute action had been taken. That case has no application to this. In the matter of Munson (29 Hun.), it was expressly held that in case of repeal the land owners would be entitled to the damages they had sustained.

Judge Miller of the Court of Appeals said (69 N. Y. p. 3,223): "There is nothing in the act itself that indicates that its requirements are absolute and of a mandatory character." Again, "The Commissioners were vested with a discretionary power."

But here the great ground of opposition to the Park act was, because it was mandatory and absolute.

How irrelevant to quote such cases as authorities applicable to this!

5. I say that the Legislature has a clear power to pass an act cancelling the thirty-four millions of bonds (and it ought to), provided it shall provide for an equivalent to the interest upon them till they shall mature. This would make good the pledge. If the same amount as the interest shall be paid into the sinking fund, it does not add to it, as a security, that such sum shall be called interest. No one will dare to say that the principal of these paid bonds is pledged to the other bond creditors of the city. It is only the interest. Such interest is now raised by taxation, and the same amount would continue to be raised in the same manner. Sir, I can hardly have patience with such nonsense. But taxpayers are timid, and the Mayor seems to think that he can frighten them till his ends are accomplished, for it is not likely that they will take the trouble to look into the law on the subject.

NEW YORKER.

BRAVE JACK HUSSEY.

Contributions from the Poet Geoghegan and Other Citizens.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Dr. Campbell's letter in last Monday's issue of your valuable journal, wherein he advocates the raising of a fund for the benefit of the intrepid Capt. Jack Hussey, should strike a chord in every heart that appreciates noble self-sacrifice or admires disinterested heroism. The world lavishes its choicest gifts and pays its highest homage to men who destroy human life in the waging of successful war, and why should there not in this nineteenth century, that boasts so much of its superior enlightenment, be at least substantial recognition of the man who saves human life at the imminent peril of his own?

For over twenty years I have known Capt. Hussey, during that period he has saved nearly two score human lives, and also the lives of many horses. Many of these gallant rescues were in winter, when a plunge into the ice-bound river was like a dash into death. Not a few of Capt. Jack's gallant exploits in this neighborhood came under my own observation, and I and thousands of others on the east side have seen him jump into the East River on his humane mission in frigid January with the recklessness of the small boy leaping from the pierhead in scorching July.

Capt. Hussey has received medals, crosses, and complimentary resolutions; but it is, I think, full time that those testimonials of his daring and humane deeds assume a more substantial form. The snow of age is now whitening his hair. Let not the frost of indifference touch his heart. The action of THE SUN in opening its columns for the furtherance of this worthy purpose is in accord with a high sentiment that only needs awakening to produce a satisfactory result. I enclose $5 for the fund and will I could make it fifty times as much.

542 GRAND ST., March 11. WM. GEO. HEGAN.

A BROOKLYN MAN'S CONTRIBUTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: I know that Capt. Jack Hussey is a poor man, with a wife and family. I enclose $2 for the Hussey fund.

FRANK RYAN, 670 Henry st., Brooklyn.

Counterfeit Cents in Circulation.

WASHINGTON, March 11.—The Treasury Department has received from the Assistant Treasurer at New York specimens of counterfeit one-cent pieces, which are believed to have obtained extensive circulation in New York and vicinity. The counterfeit is made solely of copper.

No Such Law as this Exists.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Was not a law passed some time ago compelling all pawnbrokers to notify one who had pawned an article at the expiration of one year from the date of pawning or, should they sell the property, compelling them to allow so much of its value? J. F. M.

A Great Newspaper and a Great Cow.

From the Evening Bulletin.

Mr. Singerly, the proprietor and editor of the *Philadelphia Record*, also has a Holstein cow that gave seventy-two pounds of milk last Saturday.

A Very Good Authority.

*From the