The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1885.

Amusements Today.

Alexander Music—2 Flowers.
Bijou Opera House—Adonis. 8 P. M.
Casino—Amorita. 8 P. M.
Comedy Theatre—Keller. 2 and 8 P. M.
Daly's Theatre—A Night Off. 2 and 8 P. M.
Eden Musee—Tableaux in Wax. 10 A. M. to 11 P. M.
Grand Opera House—Oh, What a Night! 2 and 8 P. M.
Harrigan's Park Theatre—The Grip. 2 and 8 P. M.
Koster & Bial's—Burlesque, Tom Rich. 8 P. M.
Lyceum Theatre—One of Our Girls. 8:15 P. M.
Madison Square Garden—Japanese Village.
Madison Square Theatre—Saints and Sinners. 8:30 P. M.
Manhattan Rink—59th st. and 6th av.
Mount Morris Theatre—Only a Woman's Heart. 8 P. M.
Niblo's Garden—The Ratcatcher. 2 and 8 P. M.
People's Theatre—Women Against Women. 2 and 8 P. M.
Star Theatre—The Black Hussar. 8 P. M.
Standard Theatre—Christmas Pantomime. 8 P. M.
Thalia Theatre—Lump in Vagabundia. 2 and 8 P. M.
Tony Pastor's—Variety. 8 P. M.
Union Square Theatre—Romeo and Juliet. 8 P. M.
Wallack's Theatre—Hoodman Blind. 8 P. M.
3d Avenue Theatre—Mistrick. 2 and 8 P. M.
8th Avenue Theatre—Nikado. 8 P. M.
14th Street Theatre—Evangeline. 2 and 8 P. M.

Dr. Howard Crosby on Fortunes.

The Rev. HOWARD CROSBY, D. D., writes to a socialistic paper that "it is high time that wise and impartial men should, by careful study and counsel, devise a righteous plan to curb excessive wealth for the sake of the country's peace and prosperity."

That is, the reverend reformer would fix a limit beyond which fortunes must not go. When you have accumulated so much, he would say to a man, Stop making money!

But he does not give us any hint as to what he thinks is the greatest amount of property an individual should be allowed to possess. How much shall it be, Doctor? Five thousand dollars, fifty thousand, five hundred thousand, or five millions?

You see, there is a great difference of opinion as to what constitutes a sufficient fortune. The majority of people in New York would deem themselves rich if they had ten thousand dollars apiece. With that sum well and securely invested, they would feel themselves safe against want; and has not a man so provided for, a competence?

Therefore the limit, which would have to be finally fixed by popular vote, might seem low to the Doctor, who is one of the few lucky ministers in possession of a handsome fortune. If the millions of the VANDERBILTS were taken from them by law, so also would Dr. CROSBY be compelled to give up the chief part of the property which has been handed down to him, for, unquestionably, he has much more than he absolutely needs.

Besides, as a minister of the Gospel, ought Dr. CROSBY to have any fortune at all? Count TOLSTOI's reading of the commands of CHRIST has induced him, a layman, to renounce his great possessions, give up all attempts at accumulation, and go to work as a shoemaker merely to support life and obey the injunction to labor with his hands. What one of the commands of CHRIST to His followers is more explicit than the command to abjure riches? What does the parable of the camel and the needle's eye mean? What is the lesson of the parable of DIVES and LAZARUS, and what did JESUS tell the rich man who would follow Him?

A letter from the Rev. HOWARD CROSBY, D. D., in which he should answer frankly and explicitly these questions would be much more interesting and vastly more pertinent, as coming from a preacher of the Gospel, than a letter advocating in a general way the limitation of fortunes.

Besides, such limitation is not practicable, even by graduated taxation. You must let fortunes accumulate according to the ability and opportunities of their possessors, or there must be no fortunes at all—property must be held in common, and everybody must be on the same plane as to wealth. If the State can forbid a man's owning more than a fixed sum, it can go further, and forbid his owning any property at all.

The German Friends of Ireland.

No stronger arms upheld the Union amid the shocks of the rebellion than those of our German fellow citizens, who, after their own hopes were shipwrecked in 1848, sought a new and kinder fatherland on this side of the Atlantic. From Fort Henry to Savannah and from Gettysburg to Richmond they stood shoulder to shoulder with their Irish brothers by adoption, knowing that the unity they fought for was undivorcible from liberty, and that the prize of battle was to be emancipation. They are as certain to be found on the right side now as they were then, and they cannot but watch with intense sympathy the cheering advance of Ireland toward the goal of popular self-government which Germany has by no means lost sight of, and which at an hour not distant she may make in her turn a determined and triumphant effort to attain.

The truth is that German-Americans are of all our citizens best able to appreciate the nature and the gravity of the disabilities and hardships of which Irishmen complain. They cannot but be struck by the analogy between the position of the masses of the Irish population and that of the great body of Germans, virtually disfranchised, to the kingdom of Prussia. It is true that universal suffrage nominally exists throughout the German empire, so far as elections of members of the Reichstag are concerned. Every Prussian subject has a legal right to vote for a representative in that assembly, just as Irishmen may exercise the same franchise enjoyed by Englishmen with respect to sending delegates to the Parliament at Westminster.

But of what value to the millions of hard-working Prussians is the pretended boon of representation in the Reichstag which can only discuss questions affecting the whole German empire, when at home, under the scheme of property qualification and indirect election, they practically have no voice in the Landtag or State Legislature which provides for the local interests of Prussia? Now, the sole difference between the situation of the great majority of North Germans with relation to home rule and that from which Irishmen have suffered for about a century is that the latter have no Landtag at all, whereas the former have but the ghost of one.

What Irishmen are battling for, and what with prompt and generous support from American believers in self-government they are certain to obtain, is simply an Irish Landtag. But it will be such a Landtag as the patriots of '48 aspired to, a Landtag elected by universal suffrage, and giving the Prussian people absolute control of their affairs. It will be a Landtag that will regulate taxation in the interest of the many, not the few; that will teach the bureaucrats, the police, and the army that they are the servants, not the high and mighty masters, of the people.

That is the kind of local Legislature which Irishmen contemplate when they demand a restoration of "GRATTAN'S Parliament," and it is one which Germans will yet see convoked at Berlin. When the free expression of their will is no longer curbed by an unwillingness to trouble the last days of the aged Kaiser, and when it is no longer choked by the iron hand of BISMARCK, we shall see Germans united, as Irishmen are now, in a mighty struggle for self-government.

When that hour comes and appeals for unfeigned sympathy and solid aid go forth from German patriots to their friends in America, our Irish citizens will not forget the zeal and generosity with which German-Americans responded to a like prayer from Ireland in the supreme crisis of her history.

Mr. Frye's Navy Bill.

In the bill for bureau administration which Mr. FRYE has introduced into the Senate, he seems to have hastily snatched at one or two important ideas advanced in the annual report of Secretary WHITNEY, without accepting as a whole the comprehensive plan of navy reorganization it suggests. Mr. FRYE's bill authorizes the President, in his discretion, to appoint the chiefs of the bureaus of the Navy Department from civil life, and prescribes that these officers shall "personally perform the appropriate duties of their respective offices," and shall not be assigned to any other regular and continuous duty.

This measure recognizes the fact that bureau officers are now loaded with duties. As Mr. WHITNEY has said, "It is of first necessity to separate, as much as practicable, the work of direction and deliberation from the details of execution." Illustrating his proposition in detail, the Secretary thus describes the routine work of the head of the Bureau of Steam Engineering:

"Having the charge of a multitude of shops in the various navy yards, he must look after a great variety of contracts, purchases, and so on. In addition to all this, for which of itself few men are equal, he is expected to design the most complicated machinery and give his country the benefit of the daily improvements in his art. It is needless to say that to such a task no man is equal."

But does Mr. FRYE mend the matter by prescribing that bureau officers shall only perform the appropriate duties of their respective offices? Doubtless as these offices are now constituted the many executive details involved in them are considered to be appropriate. When Mr. WHITNEY says that "the inevitable result of throwing large executive duties on any man is to disqualify him for council," he evidently looks for a reconstruction of the whole bureau system. Instead of having eight bureaus at the head of Navy Department affairs under the Secretary, he distinctly proposes to put "one person at the head of each of the three natural divisions of the functions of the department, which may be stated to be finance, construction, and personnel." Under these three heads would come "subdivisions or bureaus," one for engineering, one for equipment, one for ordnance, and so on; and they would absorb all available executive energy in details. Mr. FRYE's plan, in ignoring this proposed reconstruction, and trying to regulate the duties of existing bureaus, seems to botch the business.

Again, the appointment of civilians to the existing bureaus would not necessarily be an improvement. On the contrary, Mr. WHITNEY says that "the bureau officers are known to be able and experienced men." The real trouble is that their work is often wasted, because "the department lacks wise directing power." Mr. WHITNEY does mention the need of reenforcing the department with civilian skill, but this would be done at the head of two of the three branches which should include all the bureau work. In fact, the very names which he suggests for these two branches, finance and construction, imply civilian control. The branch of construction would not necessarily imply it under all circumstances, but it does now, since, as the Secretary says, the Government gives to its naval officers "only an elementary training" in the sciences of which the head of that branch should be a master, and in which there are masters who successfully follow their profession in civil life. For the branch of finance Mr. WHITNEY expressly says that "a person equipped with the business training requisite" might "more readily be selected from civil life," while he implies a similar selection for the construction branch by describing its functions as being "largely civil."

Mr. FRYE's plan, therefore, if adopted, would apparently in no respect remedy the evils pointed out by Secretary WHITNEY, but would rather stand in the way of the much more comprehensive and intelligent system of reform outlined by the Secretary. The present bureau organization has been in operation for over forty years, and while its failures have been apparent, never until now has the exact source of those failures been pointed out, together with the true remedy. The reorganization now attempted should be thorough, and in accordance with the Secretary's suggestions.

Away With It!

Mr. FRANCIS, late Minister to Vienna, is reported as "absolutely denying that the Austrian Government objected to receive Mr. KEILEY because his wife was a Jewess, or on the ground that their marriage was only a civil contract."

It is the misfortune of Mr. FRANCIS in making this statement to contradict Count KALNOKY, the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Austria Hungary, who certainly ought to be better informed of the action of his own Government than Mr. FRANCIS can pretend to be.

Mr. KEILEY was appointed Minister to Vienna on the 29th of April last, and he embarked at New York for his post on the 7th of May. When the fact of his departure became known in Vienna, Count KALNOKY telegraphed the next day to Baron SCHAEFER, Austrian Minister here, a long despatch, which closed in the following words:

"The position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna."

Baron SCHAEFER communicated this telegram to Mr. BAYARD, and he is known to have personally reiterated the substance of the objection, making it the salient point, in conferences with the Secretary of State. There was no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. FRANCIS says "an unfortunate mistake on the part of Baron SCHAEFER" was the cause of the belief that Mr. KEILEY was rejected because he had been "wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage." The Baron was frank and honorable in his dealing with the Department of State, and what is called the "unfortunate mistake" was made by his superior, Count KALNOKY, who sought to escape responsibility for his own words by charging the exposure of them as a blunder to his Minister.

When the facts became known the Austrian Government sought to change the issue and to abandon its original position by false disclaimers, of which Mr. FRANCIS appears to have been an easy victim. But the truth could not be suppressed, and the record stands as it was made by Count KALNOKY.

The real reason for the refusal to receive Mr. KEILEY was the presence of Count ROBILANT, the Italian Ambassador at Vienna, an illegitimate son of VICTOR EMANUEL. Mr. KEILEY had severely criticised the action of that sovereign in his relations with Pope PIUS IX., and Italy declined to accept him as Minister on that account. The Austrian Government, prompted or unprompted, took up the quarrel, and continued the persecution of Mr. KEILEY on its own account.

It was inconvenient to avow the true cause of objection, and the one assigned by Count KALNOKY in the telegram to Baron SCHAEFER was adopted for want of a better excuse. That pretence became a source of serious trouble, and in attempting to retreat from it Count KALNOKY got deeper in the mire.

If the Austrian Government had acted with as much promptitude upon the announcement of Mr. KEILEY's appointment on the 29th of April as it did after he sailed from New York on the 7th of May, saying he was unacceptable as Minister near the Emperor, that would have ended the matter. But an uncandid and discreditable course was pursued, which ought to exclude further diplomatic intercourse with that Government.

This incident exposes to public view a part of the operations of diplomacy, and furnishes abundant reason, with others, for shutting up our legations. They are absurd appendages to free institutions.

Dividing the Offices Equally.

There are many queer theories in circulation about the need of having the civil service "non-partisan," and about the proper ways and means to make it so. One of these ways is to divide the offices as equally as may be between the adherents of the two great political parties. We learn from the Washington correspondent of our esteemed contemporary, the *New York Herald*, that "any other way would give cause for discontent. But, including appointments made to fill vacancies by death and resignation, it is believed by Democrats who have paid attention to the matter that this equal division is not only not yet nearly made, but will not be more than completed by the time Mr. CLEVELAND's term expires."

We think the case stands a little better than it is here represented. Another expert political statistician, the *Indianapolis Sentinel*, inclines to the belief that at least twenty thousand Democrats will have got office by the time that Mr. CLEVELAND's first year in the White House is completed. If this average is kept up, at least two-thirds of the offices will be held by Democrats on the fourth of March, 1889. The work of putting out Republicans and putting in the other fellows ought to be done with greater facility as more of it is done.

But the equal division of the offices between Republicans and Democrats is not the equal division which the latter want. The Democrats want a fair division of the Federal offices among Democrats, and only among Democrats.

When there is a Democratic Administration, let the offices all go to Democrats; and when the Republicans get into power, let their turn come. That is the way to distribute the offices equally.

Ought this City to Maintain a Naval School?

The Board of Apportionment propose to reduce the grant for the naval school which has hitherto been kept upon the ship St. Mary's, from $27,000 a year to $15,000; and the Chamber of Commerce contend that this ought not to be done. They think that this institution for the instruction of sailors should be continued at the public expense.

The question depends upon the degree of education which ought to be given gratuitously at the cost of the taxpayers. Our view has always been that it should be confined to the simple rudiments of learning in the ordinary English branches, and that no attempt can justly be made to support by taxes establishments like the City College or the Normal College, where special education of a high and costly character is imparted. Young men or young women who desire this superior culture, should pay for it; and the money to support it should not be exacted from the taxpayers. According to this doctrine, the Board of Education should not be called upon to train sailors any more than they are called upon to train machinists, or cabinet-makers, or jewellers.

The Chamber of Commerce protest against this doctrine; and we suggest that, if they are really in earnest in their protest, they should tax themselves for the purpose. If the naval school on the St. Mary's is to be continued, those who are especially benefited by it should pay for it, and it should not be imposed as a burden upon those who do not derive any such benefit.

We learn through the columns of the *Cincinnati Enquirer* that MURAT HALSTEAD aspires to the post of Senator from Ohio, and we conclude that his chances of election are fair. We are glad of it. He would make a much better Senator than JOHN SHERMAN. He would bring life and vigor with him, and his speeches would be to the point and not be too long. But would he gain personally by changing his post as the editor of the leading Republican journal of Ohio for a seat in the Senate? Perhaps not.

JOHN G. SCHUMAKER would make the right sort of Corporation Counsel for the city of Brooklyn.

The *Inter-Ocean* is guilty of injustice toward conspicuous citizens of New York. It prints the portrait of the Hon. JIMMY OLIVER with that of the Hon. PAT DIVVER, and it confounds them! Mr. OLIVER's portrait appears with Mr. DIVVER's name, while the likeness of Mr. DIVVER bears the inscription of Mr. OLIVER! This is very wrong. Yet there is a consolation. Unlike as the two distinguished gentlemen are, both are good looking, and neither could safely bring against the *Inter-Ocean* an action for defamation on account of the error.

It seems that Governor HOADLY of Ohio is responsible as a bondsman for $60,000 of the money belonging to the estate of Archbishop PURCELL and lost by Mr. MANNIX, the assignee. The Governor will pay it like a man, and not shed a tear over his misfortune. MANNIX was a great mistake. An honest man should have been selected for such a post, and Governor HOADLY will be a great deal wiser next time.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Chicago Tribune*, has of late branched out very extensively in verse, and one of its latest effusions, we are sorry to say, is a merciless attack upon the young ladies of St. Louis. That big Missouri town, it should be understood, is in some sense a rival of Chicago, and the journalists of the two cities employ their wit in attacking each other, a favorite point with them being the ridicule of young ladies' feet. A genius of Chicago will aver that the young women of St. Louis possess enormous feet; and a genius of St. Louis retorts with the same assertion about the young women of Chicago. The *Tribune* performs this exploit in the following extravagant style:

"The St. Louis girl hung up her stocking,
She did
With its swell from the toe to the clocking
She did.
She is loved by her kind, for all maidens are sweet,
And how can a maiden be blamed for her feet?
And gifts in abundance they showered on her:
They put in a sack of the costliest fur,
A bookcase, a cot set of latest device,
Roller skates for the ride, and of coal for the ice,
A furniture set of the style of Queen ANNE,
A vase for a maiden, as big as a man,
The natural stepladder to drive in the street,
With pony and all its equipment, complete,
A little Kris Kringle, all a-foot to Worth,
A pug dog from England, the sweetest on earth,
A photograph album, an ivory comb,
An upright piano a 'Good Bless Our Home,'
A bracelet of gold, and a mat for that pet,
A couch of white satin, another of jet,
A box of kid gloves, and a lawn-tennis set,
Or any
And a score of a beautiful presents—and yet
They didn't half fill up the stocking!
Oh, no!"

This, we submit, is carrying the joke very far. As a matter of fact the St. Louis girls are just as beautiful, refined, and charming as those of any other town; and so are the Chicago girls, for that matter. As for their feet, they are elegant, of proper size, and they all turn out their toes in walking. The journalists of the two cities ought to abandon this ridiculous style of satire. There is no truth in it, and where truth is wanting imagination and humor are of very little value.

Last week's scare over gold exports was, as THE SUN pointed out, entirely groundless. The amount sent was trifling, and it was all taken by a single steamer. Now comes a cable despatch saying that £50,000 in gold is on its way from London to Halifax. This indicates that no more will be drawn from us for the present, at least.

The four Newark children who were sent to Paris to be inoculated by M. PASTEUR are to sail for home next Sunday. The assurance that they will now be safe from an attack of hydrophobia will, of course, be a source of great satisfaction to their parents. But, unfortunately, their case promises to cast very little light upon the question whether M. PASTEUR can prevent hydrophobia, for there is no certainty that the dog which bit them was rabid. On the contrary, there appears to be reason for thinking that the brute may have been suffering only from a peculiar distemper which is just now attacking dogs in New Jersey. The boys, however, have made interesting little heroes, and the promptness with which the money needed to send them across the ocean was subscribed is a gratifying proof of the keen public interest in everything which promises to relieve human suffering and make life happier and safer.

We understand that Mr. PETER B. SWEENY is about to return to this city and again take up his residence here. He will resume the practice of the law. Many politicians will await his arrival with interest.

On New Year's Day a new Board of Directors will assume the management of the Brooklyn Elevated Railroad. Among the first topics these directors should consider is the demand for all-night service by that road. The Brooklyn Bridge managers were slow to yield to this necessity, but the number of passengers who availed themselves of the early morning trainsat once proved the wisdom of putting them on. The elevated railroad officials will have the same experience. Of the thousands who turn night into day in New York, a large proportion live in Brooklyn.

The Rev. Dr. TALMAGE, over in Brooklyn, was not at home on Monday, when a strange man got into his house and took possession of his best overcoat. Mrs. TALMAGE bravely confronted the would-be plunderer, and compelled him to leave the garment before she would let him go. When Dr. TALMAGE returned he complimented his wife "on saving his most comfortable winter overcoat, but expressed his regret that the thief, who resembled a broken-down minister he knew, had not been captured."

Dr. TALMAGE evidently desired that this broken-down minister should be punished as well as caught, and a natural impulse it certainly was. Yet how does this sentiment agree with the Divine Law as laid down in the Sermon on the Mount? "Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away." Perhaps Dr. TALMAGE did not remember these sublime injunctions when he was so fierce for arresting the unfortunate and thievish broken-down minister.

To the swiftly evolving literature of the Wild West Chicago now makes a notable contribution in the form of a magazine entitled "The Hog." It is a great and wondrous theme, no doubt, and the more swinishly it is treated the better it must be. For a new departure commend us to the intercoastic metropolis. The patron saint of the new periodical is CIRCE, of course.

All close students of social questions will remember that some time ago Mr. E. A. BASSETT and Miss NELLIE YOUNG, in a published communication addressed to the world at large, declared that they had terminated the relation of man and wife, into which they had formerly entered by mutual consent only, and without any legal ceremony. A reported rearrangement between the pair has evoked this communication from one of the parties, addressed to the *Minneapolis Journal*:

"Thursday morning's papers say that NELLIE YOUNG (Mrs. Bassett) is with me. Perhaps you'd like to know the question is where she. Miss Young purchased her ticket to St. Paul, and got off the train there. True, we took cars on the same train, but in different coaches. Miss Young and I have had our trials, I think, like, etc., with the addition of news agent notoriety, and now have quit by mutual consent, she going her way and I going my way. We never expect to meet again. Hoping now that the papers will give us a rest, I am, respectfully yours, "E. A. BASSETT."

It must have been a strange coincidence that led Miss YOUNG, who was going her way, and Mr. BASSETT, who was going his, to the same train, bound for the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

R. B. HAYES of Ohio traded $3,800 worth of Northern Pacific bonds in 1877 for a 640 acre farm, which he has just sold for $20,000.—*Chicago Herald.*

What did he pay for the bonds?

A Poet Complains.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In Sunday's SUN are some of my verses, written for *Goodwin's Chicago News*, but credited to the *York Gazette*, and without my name. In looking over my scrapbook I find you have copied sixteen other poems of mine, only giving me credit twice and crediting seven papers that since the pieces. Not wishing to trouble you, I never wr to before about the matter. Pardon me for doing so now. Yours t. uly, H. C. DODGE.

We are very sorry, but the fault is not ours. When we find a good poem we copy it and give credit for it to the newspaper in which we find it. In the present case we think the *York Gazette* is greatly to blame, and its editor ought to be ashamed of himself.

At the same time we congratulate Mr. Dodge on having written seventeen poems that THE SUN has copied, either with his name or without it. Very few living poets can say as much as that.

The President Going to Church.

From the Baltimore American.

Any one who happens to be on the avenue during the quarter of an hour before 11 o'clock on a Sunday morning will invariably see a handsome carriage, drawn by a dashing pair of seashrown horses, move at a rapid rate eastward. The carriage is the President's equipage, and he is on his way to church. Within the last few weeks he has been making remarkably close connections between the White House and the First Presbyterian Church on Fourteenth street. That is, he has given himself only a few minutes to reach the church before the services begin, and consequently Albert, the coachman, drives the horses at a rapid rate down the avenue. For the last six Sundays it has rained, with the exception, perhaps, of last Sunday, which was not altogether a perfect day, and therefore the carriage and its appendages have not shown to the best advantage; but to-day the weather is perfect—crisp and fair, and the carriage came out in all its executive glory. The handsome seashrown horses wore new harness and half blankets of a whitish brown color, embroidered with brown. Albert sat on the box in the new livery, with an immense black bear robe over his knees and a black sable fur cape around his neck. The carriage shone in the sun, and inside President Cleveland sat alone on the back seat, with a heavy fur robe over his knees and drawn well over his breast. He leaned back against the cushions with a contented expression on his face, and his neat gloved hands were clasped together in front of him and holding the fur robe in position. The carriage, as it rolls along the street, always attracts attention, for it is seldom that the President goes out in daytime.

The Knights of Labor Said to Control the Committee on Labor.

From the Albany Times.

G. M. W. Powderly presented the names of seven members of the House to Speaker Carlisle as members of the House Committee on Labor, and the latter replied that he had already made the seven named members of that committee. They are also Knights of Labor, and, there being thirteen on the committee, form a majority.

A Good Service.

From the Lancaster Intelligencer.

THE SUN has performed a good service in writing up a history of the powerful organization known as the Knights of Labor, which is destined to wield a great influence in any future complications arising between labor and capital.

OPENING THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. Van Wyck's Plan to Give Lands to Severalty to Indians and the Surplus to Whites.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 29.—On the day Congress adjourned for the holidays Mr. Van Wyck introduced into the Senate a bill to organize the entire Indian Territory, including the portion commonly called the Public Land Strip, into a Territory to be called Oklahoma.

The bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, is the most sweeping measure ever proposed for the settlement of the Oklahoma problem. It contains twenty-two sections and occupies sixteen printed pages. It not only creates a temporary government for the whole of the new Territory which it constitutes, but it provides for the allotment of homesteads to the Indians in severalty, and for the opening of all lands not so occupied to white settlers.

Section 1, in defining the new Territory of Oklahoma as including all the land lying between the States of Kansas, Colorado, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas and the Territory of New Mexico, adds that nothing in the act shall be construed as impairing the rights of person or property now belonging to the Indians of the Territory under the laws and treaties of the United States.

Section 2 provides for a Governor of the Territory and prescribes his duties. Section 3 provides for a Secretary of the Territory; sections 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 for a Territorial Legislature and its functions, and for township, district, and county officers, much according to the usual method of organizing new Territories. Section 5, in giving the right of suffrage and of holding office to male citizens of the United States, 21 years old, and to those who have only made each of their intention to become citizens, and "to those who shall have been bona fide residents of said Territory for 60 days previous to the time of the first election," also declares that "the Legislative Assembly shall not at any time abridge the right of suffrage or to hold office on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, of any resident of the Territory."

Sections 9 to 15, inclusive, make the customary provisions for a District Court, Judge, clerk of court, attorney, marshal, and Delegate to Congress. But in section 16 we come upon this provision, which greatly limits the operation of the act that has gone before:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with the local governments of any of the Indian tribes which may now be provided for by the laws and treaties of the United States, or which may exist in conformity therewith.

It is well known that the Cherokees, Creeks, and other tribes had local governments, comprising legislative and judicial as well as executive officers. If these are not to be interfered with, the Legislature created under Mr. Van Wyck's bill would apparently be limited in its full authority to the lands thrown open to the whites; and thus an interminable division of power and clashing of interests might be created.

In section 17 we find both the famous unassigned lands of the Creeks and Seminoles, ceded by them to the United States in 1866, and hitherto the only lands styled Oklahoma, and the Cherokee Land Strip, formally opened to the settlement of the whites under the homestead laws. As an accompaniment to this provision, the existing cattle leases of the Cherokee strip are declared "void and contrary to public policy." Section 18 creates a Commission of five persons, to be appointed by the President, two from the army and three from the Interior Department, to negotiate with the Indians of the Territory for setting them on lands in severalty, and for purchasing all lands that may then remain unoccupied. This Commission, however, must submit its action to Congress for final judgment.

Section 19 makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by six months' imprisonment or $1,000 fine, or both, for any person, for himself or any company, association, or corporation, to directly or indirectly procure any persons to settle upon said lands with a view to their afterward acquiring title to said lands from said occupants." Section 20 repeals and declares null the act of July 27, 1866, granting lands within the new Territory to the Atlantic and Pacific Railway Company. Section 21 makes six per cent. the usful rate of interest in the Territory, and declares void contracts for a greater rate. The final section gives effect to the act when the executive and judicial officers provided for shall have been appointed and qualified.

From this review it is evident that Mr. Van Wyck accepts in good faith, as the policy of the new Interior Department, its declaration that "there can be no harm in recognizing the gradual current, slowly tending in the direction of civilized occupation and use of Indian territory," and aims to seasonably provide for a consummation of this policy. Facing it for granted, as he may perhaps safely do, that the Oklahoma lands project will before long be opened for settlement, he proposes to have a government ready for the new settlers. Looking to the future and to a respective Indian citizenship, he first creates the whole Indian country into an ordinary Territory, and then provides for excepting the Indian settlements, in order to accommodate the plan to existing Indian rights and treaties.

This method seems cumbersome, unjust, and perilous. A better way of going to work would apparently be to extinguish forthwith by purchase the existing right of the Creeks and Seminoles to present occupancy of whites on the Oklahoma lands ceded by them in 1866. This right, which is unquestionable, Mr. Van Wyck's bill wholly ignores, and it asserts instead that "full compensation" has already been given for these lands, and that they can be lawfully opened now. Nothing is not by honest dealing in such a matter, and there are signs that the consent of the Creeks and Seminoles to white settlement on lands no longer theirs, can be had on fair terms. For the remainder of the Indian Territory, Gen. Sheridan's scheme of severalty occupation is as liberal to the red man, both as to the amount of land conceded for homesteads, and the purchasing price for the remainder, that it would be more likely to succeed than any other designed for the same purpose.

With such preliminary negotiations well under way, it would become clearer whether the part of the Indian Territory thus to be opened to the whites should have a separate government of its own or be assigned to some adjoining State of Territory.

The Senator Changed His Mind.

From the Boston Post.

What the Republican Senators will do with the bulk of the President's nominations is still a subject of active speculation among the politicians who gather at the hotels of an evening. The *Post* correspondent was listening to a discussion of the question not long since, when one of these very Senators stepped up and joined the group. "In my judgment," he remarked, "the best thing we can do is to do nothing. I came here three weeks ago with the idea of demanding from the President an explanation why he had removed a certain officeholder of high grade during the recess. I supposed I should be performing a public service by so doing. Before reducing my demand to writing, however, I resolved to go to a member of the other House, whom I knew to have been intimate with the gentleman deposited, and see what he thought of my project. I opened the conversation with the question:

"'You know T——, whom the President relieved of his office during the recess?'

"'Oh, certainly,' was his answer.

"'You know him well?'

"'As well as I ever know any man, drunk or sober.'

"'Drunk?' I exclaimed, in dismay. 'Do you mean to tell me that he ever drinks to excess? I supposed he was the most exemplary of men.'

"'Well, you can judge for yourself.'

"He took from his pocketbook a sheet of paper.

"'Do you recognize that signature?'

"It was unquestionably T——'s, but so tremulous that it might have been taken for the work of a palsied hand. I glanced at what went before. It was a promissory note for $2,000, dated about three months back, and payable on demand.

"'Where did you get this?' I asked.

"'He gave it to me.'

"'What for?'

"'To take the place of a bank check he had given me the night before to pay off a debt, as he hadn't the funds to meet it, and was afraid I would give him trouble.'

"'Was the debt a valid one?'

"'One thousand of it was for two loans of $500 each, made at various times within a year, to keep him out of the Sheriff's hands; the rest was for losses at poker, all played away in one evening.'

"'This gentleman,' the senator added, in conclusion, 'was the man for whose suspension I was going to call the President to account. The office he held was one of great dignity, and its occupant was morally bound for the good name of the public service, to set an example of conduct which all the world could approve. I have no criticisms to pass on the social glass or upon card playing as an amusement. But if a man makes a set of himself, borrows money right and left, gambles away $1,000 more than he owns, gives checks on banks where he has no funds and redeems them with notes which he does not pay, the Senator who exposes his cause when the President transfers him to private life is not likely to display himself to advantage in the eyes of the public. I should have acted innocently and ignorantly in this case had I persevered in my purpose. But my narrow escape has taught me a lesson. The President, as I afterward learned, knew all the facts in T——'s case, but did not care to disgrace him before the world unless compelled to by some righteous friend. Some of my senatorial brethren are likely to be bitten just as I came near being, if they carry suspicion of the President's motives too far."

Mr. Evarts Congratulates Mr. Beck.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Nathaniel Page of Washington said to me: "Just as I was leaving Washington I met Senator Beck. In talking about his silver speech, on which I congratulated him heartily, he said that the first man to tender him congratulations in the Senate was Wm. M. Evarts, and that the New York Senator had assured him that it was exactly in the line of a speech which he himself intended to make in the Senate at an early day."

POOR OUTLOOK FOR SHIPOWNERS.

Many Idle Ships Rusting and Rotting at British Docks.

LONDON, Dec. 29.—The prospects of English shipowners are but little improved and the outlook for Scotch shipping is as bad as ever. A tremendous amount of capital is tied up in Scotch wharves in the shape of steamships which are rusting and rotting for lack of employment. In the Leith docks alone fifteen steamers are lying idle. Some of them have not been in commission for many months. All of them have been laid off because they could not earn enough for their own maintenance out of the low rates to which freights have been forced by keen competition. These fifteen vessels have an aggregate capacity of 12,627 tons and they are worth $1,500,000.

This is only one example of the condition of the ocean-carrying trade in Scotland. The figures would have to be multiplied many times to represent the total tonnage and value of the steamers lying idle in all the Scotch ports. The overproduction of steam freighters is generally assigned as the cause of this state of affairs, but that is not its only cause. Close competition in the past has stimulated ingenuity in the construction of vessels and engines with a view of economizing fuel and labor. Great strides have been made in this direction by the inventive mechanics of the Clyde. The result is that vessels which were considered almost perfect a few years ago cannot now compete with new craft.

There is but one hopeful indication for the shipowners. The returns from the Clyde shipbuilding district prove that there has been less building this year than last by thirty-five per cent. If this rate of decrease is maintained, the greatest cause of the depression in freights will disappear. The number and tonnage of vessels afloat will again be proportionate to the amount of freight to be carried, and rates can be raised to a profitable point.

Three Leaders of the House.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 28.—Speaker Carlisle is putting the finishing touches on the committee lists. The men who have advised and assisted him in the work, and who possess his confidence more closely than any other two members of the House, are Morrison of Illinois and Willis of Kentucky. Intellectually Mr. Carlisle is greater than either of his friends, and, so far as sound judgment and wise discretion go, he is safer to intrust with authority than either. Mr. Carlisle is modest, however, almost to diffidence, and naturally seeks somebody to lean upon. There must be something in the law of opposites, or he would not have taken to Morrison.

Mr. Carlisle is patient, courteous, and conservative; Morrison is impatient, brusque, and radical. Carlisle entertains no hostile thought toward men whose views clash with his own; Morrison treats his opponents as Apaches, and would exterminate them on sight. Carlisle takes broad views of public questions; Morrison sees but the one idea that has lodgment in his own mind. Carlisle often hesitates between two opinions; Morrison never has out one. Yet the positive, confident, dogmatic Illinois man exerts wonderful influence over the accomplished speaker.

Morrison is in his sixty-first year, but looks easily ten years younger. His dark hair and close-cropped beard have only begun to show a silver tinge, and his frame is touch, wiry, and elastic.

Carlisle is ten years Morrison's junior, but no one would ever think it. He is tall, slender, and smooth-shaven. His struggling brown hair is very thin, and he will soon be conspicuously bald.

Mr. Willis is the youngest of the trio by several years. Morrison is his senior by eighteen years, and he is eight years younger than Carlisle. He is small and slight in stature, with a shiny bald head and a close-trimmed brown beard sprinkled with gray. In his quiet manners, courteous and modest demeanor he resembles Carlisle, and the two men are much alike in mental habits and political thinking. Both man were school teachers in their younger days. Neither is a college graduate, but both are men of more scholarly tastes than Morrison, who cares little for books. Willis is a growing man in the House. His assignment to the Chairmanship of the River and Harbor Committee put him in a place where his fairness and integrity stood the test of criticism, but it was not a position in which a Representative could make an enduring reputation.

No Administration Leader.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 29.—As the winter wears on President Cleveland will see more and more clearly that he made a serious mistake in taking from the Senate the man who would have become the stalwart champion and defender of his Administration. Mr. Bayard was the one man fitted by training and natural inclination to become the leader of the Administration party. He has no successor. When the silver debate and the civil service discussion are forced, as they will be, by the Republicans, the policy of the Administration will have no supporter who can cope with Edmunds, Evarts, Hoar, and Ingalls. The President's silver policy has not more than five Democratic Senators pledged to its support. The fight on the Administration in the Democratic ranks will come from the combined Western and Southern States. No Eastern State except New Jersey is represented in the Senate by a Democrat. Only three other Northern States—Ohio, Indiana, and Nevada—send Democratic senators. Even these serious disadvantages might be overcome were one of these senators a great leader, but such is not the case.

Characteristic of the Man.

From the Cleveland Leader.

Roscoe Conkling is very kind to women in distress, and the enormous charge which he puts upon his services to great monopolies and millionaires becomes nothing if the business is done for a poor woman. Not long ago a highly cultured and intelligent woman of Washington found herself, by the death of her husband, reduced to poverty, and she was forced to go to work in the departments, though her husband had been very wealthy and had left her a fortune. He was a widower, with several children at the time she married him, and after his death the property fell into the hands of the children, and she could, from some technicality or other, not get a hold upon any of it. She applied to the lawyers here at Washington, and they advised her, as it was a case which came under the jurisdiction of the New York courts, to go there and consult New York lawyers. She had not much money, but she went to New York, and was walking down Broadway feeling very much worried and entirely at sea as to where she could find a lawyer who would give her the proper advice and still not charge her more than she could afford to pay. As she passed the Western Union building she saw upon the steps Roscoe Conkling and another gentleman talking. She had seen Conkling often in Washington, but had never been introduced to him. He had also noticed her as she passed by this day. He looked up, and their eyes met, and she unconsciously smiled a recognition. Senator Conkling at once left the gentleman to whom he was talking and held out his hand. He said: "Madam, I do not remember where I have met you but I see from your face that you are greatly worried about some thing, and I want to offer you my services if you think I can be of any use to you."

The lady replied that he could be of great use to her, she was in trouble, and she needed the advice of a lawyer. Senator Conkling then made an appointment with her for a meeting at his office within half an hour. She came, and he heard her story, understanding the case almost intuitively,