The Sun.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1886.

Amusements To-day.

Academy of Music—Concert. 8 P. M.
Bijou Opera House—Adonis. 8 P. M.
Casino—Alcazar. 8 P. M.
Comedy Theatre—Kellar. 8 P. M.
Daly's Theatre—Merry Wives of Windsor. 8 P. M.
Grand Opera House—Felix McKusick. 8 P. M.
Harrigan's Park Theatre—The Grip. 8 P. M.
Koster & Bial's—Another Nikado. 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.
Niblo's Garden—The Rajah's Diamond. 8 P. M.
People's Theatre—The Wages of Sin. 8 P. M.
Star Theatre—Donna Diana. 8 P. M.
Standard Theatre—Christmas Pantomime. 8 P. M.
Thalia Theatre—Frau Directoria Strikes. 8 P. M.
Tony Pastor's—Variety. 8 P. M.
Union Square Theatre—Lea's, the Forsaken. 8 P. M.
Wallack's Theatre—Hoodman Blind. 8 P. M.
3d Avenue Theatre—Nobody's Claim. 8 P. M.
6th Avenue Theatre—Nikado. 8 P. M.
28th Street Theatre—Evangeline. 8 P. M.

Subscription by Mail—Post Paid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	1 50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	7 00
WEEKLY, Per Year	1 00

THE SUN, New York City.

Three Rotten-Borough Legislatures.

The present apportionment of the Legislatures of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut is grossly unjust.

Mr. CLEVELAND carried these States in 1884 against Mr. BLAINE, receiving in New York a majority of 1,047, in New Jersey 4,412, and in Connecticut 1,276. If the legislative districts in these States had been fairly arranged, the Legislatures of 1885 would have been Democratic. But owing to their unfair apportionment, on joint ballot the Republicans had a majority of twenty-four in the Legislature of New York, and thirteen in that of New Jersey, and eighty-one in that of Connecticut, making a total of 118 in the Legislatures of the three States, though they gave the Democratic candidate for President an aggregate majority of 6,735.

No argument is required to prove that there is something fundamentally wrong in apportionments that produce such results year after year, while, on the other hand, the election returns during a long period demonstrate that under an honest district system the Legislatures of these three States would be controlled by the Democrats about three-fourths of the time. The system that prevails in Connecticut is outrageous. The people are cheated out of their just representation in the Legislature. It is not quite so bad in New Jersey, and it is a little less vicious in New York.

The main obstacle in the way of stripping the Republicans of their ill-gotten domination in the Legislatures of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut arises out of the fact that the first steps in that direction must be taken by the very Legislatures wherein the Republicans now bear sway. How hard it is to wring power out of such hands we know by bitter experience in New York, where a peremptory mandate of the Constitution has often proved too weak to induce Republican Legislatures to redistrict the State when their party would thereby run the risk of losing half a dozen members. What, then, can be expected in Connecticut and New Jersey, whose present Constitutions leave this matter pretty much to the tender mercies of a party which, like the old Tories in the House of Commons previous to the Reform bill of 1832, perpetuates its legislative power by a sort of rotten-borough system of representation? We may fare better in New York, unless the Republicans in the present Legislature have made up their minds to defy the Constitution through another session.

Compromising the Silver Controversy.

Various reports have lately been sent out from Washington of a probable compromise in Congress between the friends and the foes of the silver dollar. They differ in detail, but they agree in assuming that the silver men are to make concessions, and consent to limit and perhaps temporarily to suspend silver coinage. We doubt very much the truth of these reports.

The Silver bill, as it originally passed the House of Representatives, authorized the free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars. It was intended to restore silver to the place which it had held in our currency from 1792 to 1873, and to put it back where it would have been but for the hasty and ill-considered legislation of 1873 and 1874. It was simply a rectification of a blunder, and no more. In the Senate, however, the bill was amended by striking out the provision for free coinage, and substituting that now in force, by which not less than $2,000,000 and not more than $4,000,000 of silver bullion is purchased monthly by the Treasury at its market price in gold and coined into dollars. The amendment was accepted by the House, and became part of the law of the land. No compromise more favorable to the gold interest can be imagined. It makes gold supreme, and keeps silver in subordination to it, and if it is not modified, gold, for the next ten years, will be our sole standard of value.

If the partisans of gold are wise they will be content with maintaining the Silver act just as it stands. This, with the President's help, they are reasonably sure of doing. In attempting more they are not only likely to be defeated, but they incur the risk of so exasperating popular sentiment outside of New England and New York that they will lose the important advantage which they now possess. The silver men have a majority both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and only a small addition to their number is needed to increase it to the two-thirds requisite for overriding the President's veto.

The Prison Population.

We have already referred to the discussion of the subject of convict labor which makes up the chief part of the report for 1885 of the Superintendent of Prisons of this State, but the document also gives statistics of the prison population that are of much interest and deserve special attention.

The population of the prisons at the end of last September was 2,961, of whom 876 were at Auburn, 544 at Clinton, and 1,541 at Sing Sing, and the total earnings of these convicts for the year up to that date were $376,663.97, which was enough to pay the cost of their maintenance and $3,441 besides. At Auburn and Clinton prisons, however, the expenditures exceeded the earnings by nearly seventy thousand dollars, and therefore the Sing Sing convicts, who were engaged under contract in the manufacture of stoves, boots, and shoes, not only paid their own way, but also more than made up for the loss at the other institutions.

Superintendent BAKER estimates that it takes about one hundred convicts to do the work of sixty free laborers, and reports he has obtained from those who have direct charge of the work in the prisons sustain the estimate when all sorts of labor are taken into the account; but of course the proficiency of the convicts differs according to the kind of work in which they are engaged. For instance, the instructors in the shoe shop at Sing Sing say that the convicts turn out seventy-five per cent. of the work that would be done by the same number of outside laborers, while those in the stove shop put the percentage as low as from forty to fifty per cent. During the first three months, while he is under preliminary instruction, a convict earns little or nothing; but, as the average term at Sing Sing is three years and six months, he is a profitable worker during more than three years.

The majority of the convicts are young men, the prison statistics for 1885 showing that out of 2,961 as many as 1,692 were under thirty-one years of age, and, though the most of them were unemployed at the time of their arrest, they were generally capable of industrial employment, and had received an elementary education. Those who need it are instructed in prison at evening schools, so that the Warden of Sing Sing prison reports that "it is now our boast that we discharge no prisoners from this institution, except a few very old men who say they are too old to commence their education now, who cannot read, write, or cast up the ordinary accounts of a workingman." We are told, too, that the illiterate convicts "show eagerness to be taught and industry in learning," for doubtless the study agreeably varies the monotony of their existence; but experience shows that education cannot be relied on as a preventive of crime, a large part of our young criminals having enjoyed the advantages of the public schools.

The following census of the prison population for the last ten years shows that there has been a very marked decrease in the number of convicts since 1878:

Years.	Convicts.	State Population.	Years.	Convicts.	State Population.
1877	3,549	4,779,000	1881	2,951	5,157,000
1877	3,567	4,854,000	1882	2,937	5,231,000
1878	3,478	4,929,000	1883	2,928	5,305,000
1879	3,171	5,008,000	1884	2,870	5,379,000
1880	2,936	5,083,000	1885	2,961	5,453,000

It will be seen that the prison population has been pretty steady for six years, though the population of the State has increased during that time, according to estimate, by about half a million. This is a very good showing, for since 1883, and more especially during the last two years, business has been greatly depressed. Superintendent BAKER says that "crime bears a relation to general conditions of business, to prosperity or adversity," but the statistics of those years, at least, do not seem to go far to sustain his generalization.

Bradlaugh to Have his Seat at Last.

The work of organizing the House of Commons, which must precede the formal opening of Parliament by Queen VICTORIA on Tuesday next, has been marked by one interesting incident which should definitely settle an important constitutional question. Mr. PEEL, who was made Speaker by the consent of both Liberals and Conservatives, yesterday permitted Mr. BRADLAUGH, a member elect for the borough of Northampton, to take the oath and the seat to which his constituents returned him.

A brief review of the affair will show that the result is a compromise, so far as regards the extreme ground occupied at one time or another by Mr. BRADLAUGH and by his opponents, and that the one thoroughly triumphant party is the borough of Northampton, which, by the exclusion of one of its elected representatives, has long been partially disfranchised. Mr. BRADLAUGH may be said to sneak into his seat only by retreating from the defiant position originally taken, and by disavowing through a mendacious subscription of the oath those professions of atheism which he insolently cast into the teeth of the preceding House. The popular branch of the British Parliament has numbered in the past not a few distinguished members whose opinions, as published outside of the Chamber, were irreconcilable with the beliefs postulated in the statutory form of oath. It is even probable that of late years a considerable proportion of its members would not hesitate in conversation to describe themselves as agnostics. But all of these gentlemen were aware, when they accepted a nomination to Parliament, that they took it subject to the necessity of subscribing to a prescribed form of assseveration; and when the occasion came they acquiesced in that single act of outward conformity to the creed accepted by the community.

Not so with Mr. BRADLAUGH. He was also aware of the legal condition attached to the occupation of his seat, but on his first appearance in the House he refused to take the oath, and asserted the right to make a bare affirmation. He admitted that he was neither a Quaker nor a Jew—was not, in other words, included in any of the categories excepted by law from the obligation of asseverating; but the oath, he told the House, would be on his lips a hollow mockery, since he totally rejected the beliefs which it implied. This demand was properly rejected, for to have granted it would have been a flagrant violation of the law. Recognizing subsequently that in his heading chase of notoriety he had made a serious tactical blunder, Mr. BRADLAUGH cynically offered to eat his words, and to go through a performance which, as he had brazenly proclaimed, would in his case be a farce. Then it was that a majority of the House of Commons, following the lead of Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, refused to permit him to be sworn, on the ground that they would not connive at rank hypocrisy and a contemptuous abrogation of the clear intent and spirit of an act of Parliament. They did not by this rebuke assert a right of inquisitorial investigation based on outside evidence; they did not assume to take cognizance of a member's opinions expressed outside of the House; but they must, they said, make note of declarations put forth in their presence for the very purpose of ridiculing and nullifying an observance prescribed by law.

Such was the ground on which Mr. BRADLAUGH's opponents placed themselves, and it unquestionably had an air of solidity, so far, at all events, as regards the term of the particular Parliament which the excluded member had been at pains to inform that the oath would, in his mouth, be a lie. But what of the rights of the borough of Northampton to its full legal share of representation in the Commons? The borough, speaking through its other representative, Mr. LABOUCHERE, did not dispute the plenary power of Parliament to define beforehand the qualifications and stipulations enjoined upon its members. However iniquitous from a moral, and pernicious from a social point of view was the prolonged disfranchisement of Catholics and Jews, the technical competence of Parliament to commit such acts of gross injustice seems incontrovertible. In like manner, that agnostics are disfranchised unless they will assent to asseverations repugnant to their conscience, may be a regrettable anachronism, but it is for the present a statutory fact.

The borough of Northampton, then, did not question the legality of the refusal to permit Mr. BRADLAUGH to affirm, in lieu of swearing. But it did contend that from the moment its elected representative waived his request to affirm, and offered to conform to the letter of the statute, the House of Commons had no right by a resolution to debar him from complying with an act of Parliament, which, as contradistinguished from a mere resolution, records the deliberate resolve of Crown, Lords, and Commons. The British Constitution, so the advocates of Northampton argued, would be sapped in its foundations if Mr. BRADLAUGH's offer to obey the letter of the law, which alone had power to limit the borough's right of representation, could be rejected at the option of a majority of a single branch of the legislature on the score of the proponent's antecedent declarations, whether made within St. Stephen's or outside.

In brief, by denying to Mr. BRADLAUGH permission to take the oath, the House of Commons, so Mr. LABOUCHERE maintained, broke the law in a far more vital point than it would have done by suffering him to affirm. For it said to the borough of Northampton, you shall not exercise the right to designate your representatives, which the Constitution gives you. In the intrinsic soundness of this position Mr. GLADSTONE eventually acquiesced, for he withdrew his opposition, when upon a second by-election to the same Parliament (that of 1880-85) Northampton again sent up Mr. BRADLAUGH, who renewed his offer to take the oath. But a majority still upheld Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE in debarring him, partly from sheer obstinacy, partly on the specious plea that during the lifetime of a given Parliament the members could not cease to take cognizance of atheistical opinions proclaimed in presence of the House. But a way of retreat was opened by the more or less open admissions on the part of some Tory leaders that a new House of Commons need not make note of words uttered before its predecessor.

It follows that since Mr. BRADLAUGH has taken the qualifying oath in the new House of Commons there is but little ground for exultation in any quarter, except in the borough of Northampton. He himself has been obliged to swallow the arrogant protestations made six years ago. On the other hand, those members of the new House who were included in the non-atheistical majority of its predecessor will suffer the chagrin of seeing that their strenuous attempts to shut out the object of their aversion have after all been brought to naught. But the borough of Northampton has vindicated the fundamental right of British electors to the last jot and tittle of the franchises bestowed on them by the letter of the law.

Is This the Canadian View of It?

A Canadian contemporary, the *Toronto World*, discusses THE SUN'S statement of the fishery question in a way which leads us to believe that its ignorance of the subject is unfathomable:

"AS BOSS TWEED might have said, What are they going to do about it? Let them denounce as they may the treaty of Washington and the Halifax award, the fact remains that it is neither of these arrangements, but the old treaty of 1818, that must govern the case within three days from this date. Will President CLEVELAND and his Cabinet deliberately and formally repudiate a solemn international treaty, now acknowledged to be in force, on the ground that on that occasion their predecessors made a bad bargain? Scarcely, we should say. And it may be that a strong belief that they must shrink from taking this extreme course is at the bottom of the indignation now exhibited by the New England fishermen and their most conspicuous advocate."

The *Toronto World* seems to imagine that the three-mile limit clause of the treaty of 1818 is what the American fishermen dread and protest against. As matter of abstract right, the old American interpretation of the inshore fishery clause in the treaty of 1818 is well worth contending for; but the practical value of the inshore fisheries to Gloucester and Wellfleet and Portland skippers is a thing of the past. Our codfish and halibut fisheries are on the ocean banks, miles outside of Canadian jurisdiction. The schooners which go into British waters in the winter after herring buy the fish of the Canadians who have seined them. They are purchased just as squid for bait are purchased by the American fishermen from the coast people of Newfoundland, and any Canadian interference with these commercial transactions would simply be to deprive Canadians of their means of livelihood. The mackerel taken in the Gulf of St. Lawrence are no longer plentiful enough to make the Gulf attractive or very profitable waters for American fishermen. In changing their habitat, the mackerel have changed the international aspects of the fishery question.

What are we going to do about it? Well, if Congress takes the sensible view of the matter, we are going to give the brave toilers of the sea who sail from Cape Ann and Cape Cod and Cape Elizabeth the same protection in home markets as is afforded to other American industries of equal importance. This will be done by declining to be involved, under the guise of reciprocity, in another arrangement whereby we give so very much more than we get.

The House Coinage Committee.

A despatch from Washington to the *Inter-Ocean*, regarding the new Committee on Coinage, contains one statement which must have emanated from a very hasty writer:

"Next to CURTIN of Pennsylvania, the greatest disappointed man is WARNER of Ohio, who fully expected to have a place on the Coinage Committee. WARNER charges that he was kept from Coinage and Banking and Currency at the direction of the Administration."

We would not undertake to criticise this correspondent's assertion that Mr. WARNER'S disappointment over the act of Speaker CARLISLE is second only to Mr. CURTIN'S. It may even be greater. But it is wholly improbable that Mr. WARNER has made any such charge against the Administration.

He knows, as well as anybody, that Mr. CLEVELAND has repeatedly declared that his conception of the President's duties forbids his interference, while occupying that office, with any function of Congress. The President is not responsible for what Congress does, and he does not propose to direct or to change its course of conduct. How unlikely it would be, then, that Mr. CLEVELAND should seek to influence a single member of Congress, and least of all the Speaker of the House, who makes up the committees.

Mr. WARNER could not have made such a foolish charge as he is credited with by the *Inter-Ocean's* correspondent.

But this fails to explain why the prudent and impartial Speaker, himself in accord with the prevailing sentiment, has so constructed the Committee on Coinage that the majority of its members should be opposed, in their views respecting silver, to the majority of the House.

He probably did it to please the President. Though, of course, he undoubtedly did it without the President's solicitation.

"A small body of wealthy men, who are organized to influence legislation in a way that will seriously injure the whole country and be of advantage only to themselves." Such is the description given by the *New York Times* of the great army of debtors and others who are in favor of silver money. It strikes us that the description fits much better the small body of bankers and bondholders who are clamoring for the maintenance of the gold standard in order to secure the extra 25 per cent. which that standard adds to the value of their claims.

The *Tribune-Republican* of Denver avers that when President CLEVELAND saw a list of the officeholders whom he had removed he exclaimed "My God! have I made so many removals?" Is not this one of those "falsehoods daily spread before the people in our newspapers," of which the President has so recently complained? The Tribune-Republican describes him as swearing, when it is widely reported and believed by many that he is a deeply religious man and never uses profane words under any circumstances. Is not that the truth?

In the whole record of political violence and reckless injustice, it would be difficult to find a worse case than the act of the Ohio House of Representatives in expelling the Democratic members from Cincinnati in order to put JOHN SHERMAN'S return to the United States Senate beyond all danger of defeat.

If the people of Ohio do not turn the rascals out at the next election, they are not the sort of people we have always taken them for.

After explicitly charging that a number of mine owners, bullion brokers, newspaper editors, and speculators are lavishly spending money in the bribery of Congressmen and journalists on behalf of silver coinage, the *Commercial Advertiser* now acknowledges that it has no proof to sustain the charge beyond the fact that an attempt was made to "sound" it some weeks ago, with reference to its course upon the silver question. The whole thing appears to have originated in the exuberant imagination of some one of its boyish editors.

It appears that all the acts of the deposed Republican Postmasters, as related to the Senate by Postmaster-General VILAS, constitute enough to bring those officeholders under the description of offensive partisans and subject to the modern partisan's punishments.

This shows a very happy state of affairs. VILAS is happy because he has put the doctrine of offensive partisanship, which he loves, into practice. The Democrats are happy because the Republicans have been bounced. That is the real point.

THE SILVER QUESTION.

Instructive Facts from India.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Just as we were leaving New York, a mail from England was brought on board for me, in which I found a letter from a correspondent at Bombay, a native financier of the first rank, full of details as to the commercial and financial condition of India, very interesting in themselves, but with which I will not now trouble your readers. My correspondent, however, enclosed a tabulated return of the silver coinage of India, which may be valuable at Washington just now, and I accordingly summarize it for you:

In 1841, when the British Indian empire embraced 616,000 square miles of territory, the Indian mints coined £2,814,893. In 1852, with 776,000 square miles, they coined £4,240,496. During the two years of the great mutiny, 1857 and 1858, with 856,000 square miles, they coined £10,779,293 and £12,551,402. Under the impulse given by our civil war to the cotton productions of India, the Indian silver coinage went up in 1866 to £14,597,049. This figure was surpassed in 1878, the year of the last great famine, when, with an area of 860,000 square miles, British India coined £16,180,326 of silver. In 1880, the year of the last Afghan war, the silver coinage of India reached £10,256,967. But it fell in 1882 to £1,156,275, and it is perhaps worth noting that in 1881 this amount was nearly reached in England, which in that year (si ver being legal tender only for sums under £2) coined no less than £997,128 of silver. In 1884 India coined £3,663,401 of silver, and monometallic England, in 1883, coined £1,274,328 of the same metal, against no more than £1,403,713 of gold. In all this there does not seem to be much reason for the cry of an "overcoinage of silver" in India. Very truly yours,

WM. HENRY HURLBERT.

STEAMER ETRURIA, AT SEA, Dec. 24.

GEN. HALLECK AND GEN. LEW WALLACE.

Gen. Hamilton Defends the Honor of a Faithful Servant of the Union.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have seen an article recently in your paper in which it is said to be suggested by Gen. Lew Wallace, that Gen. H. W. Halleck proposed to betray his country. I know Gen. Halleck well. He was a true patriot. Gen. Lew Wallace lost the right road at the battle of Shiloh. But any man who had such a brilliant imagination as to write "Ben Hur, a Tale of the Christ," may be excused for having an imagination so brilliant as to make such an unchristian and infamous charge against a dead man more than twenty years after the event he is said to write of. Yours truly,

SCHUYLER HAMILTON,
Major-General.

NEW YORK, Jan. 12.

A Card from John M. Francis.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I cannot believe you would knowingly misrepresent me. I therefore beg leave to correct the erroneous statement in THE SUN'S article of the 9th instant under the heading, "Mr. Francis in a Dilemma." Referring to the Kelley case, and the alleged interposition of Italy to influence the decision of Austria in the matter, THE SUN concludes its comments by saying: "Both Kalnoky and his subordinate agree in saying that Mr. Francis's report was imaginary, and even 'impossible.'" Now, the facts are, as you will see by perusal of the correspondence, that I did not report either of these officials as saying that the Italian Government had in any way interfered in this business. In my report of an interview with Mr. Szogyenyi, June 16, I accurately represented him as saying: "That a friendly Government, a near neighbor [Italy], had objected to him [Kelley] as the United States representative to *its* court, and its views had found earnest expression here [Vienna] since the President had named him as United States Minister to Austria." This does not say or mean that the Italian Government had interfered to secure the rejection of Mr. Kelley by the Austrian Government. The "expression" of the "views" referred to at Vienna consisted in the publication, with approving comment by the newspapers of that city, of articles from the Italian press. The fact was mentioned in the same conversation with Szogyenyi, as such "expression." But Mr. Bayard erroneously construed my report to imply that Szogyenyi in effect declared the Italian Government had interfered by *its* "expression" against Mr. Kelley for the Austrian mission! Representing the case in this light to Count Kalnoky through our *Chargé d'Affaires*, Mr. Lee, the former said I must have been mistaken, and Szögyenyi verified the assertion of his chief. They assumed that Mr. Bayard had accurately construed my language; they spoke from his interpretation of it, not from my report itself. But I object to being held responsible for the erroneous deductions of Mr. Bayard or the mistaken conclusions of THE SUN based thereon. Others must bear the load of any blunder they may have been in this Kelley business. I can hardly conceive how any one in the State Department at all acquainted with the comity that prevails in diplomatic and international intercourse could have believed it possible that Italy had interposed to prevent the reception by another Government of a Minister sent to it by a third and friendly power. You will, I have no doubt, see from this that if anybody is in a "dilemma" it is not your obedient servant,

JOHN M. FRANCIS.

Civil Service Reform—A Sound Platform.

From the Scotland Neck Democrat.

We prefer a Democrat to a Republican of equal character.

No honest and true Republican asks to be retained, and none other should be retained. In the South a sweep with a clean broom is demanded by all Democrats.

Turn the rascals out.

They Begun at the Foot of the Ladder.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Senator Davis is one of the most popular men, being a self-made man, as the following reminiscence shows: In 1861 a dinner party was given in New York city. Henry G. Davis sat at one end of the table, Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania sat at the other, and Gen. W. T. Sherman at the head. The General began a reminiscence of his life by saying:

"When I was a Lieutenant"

"Come, now, Sherman," interrupted Mr. Davis, "were you ever a Lieutenant?"

"Yes, Davis," he replied, "I was a Lieutenant about the time you were a brakeman on a freight train."

"Well, boys," observed Cameron, "I don't suppose either of you ever cut cordwood for a living; as I did."

Hurrah for Frisbie Hoar!

From the Boston Journal.

When during the last half century has the Presidential office been held by a man more capable than Mr. Hoar of filling it with credit to himself or advantage to the country, or by one better equipped than he for its practical duties? Certainly the country might go further and fare much worse than by placing such a statesman as Mr. Hoar in the Presidency.

Our esteemed comic contemporary, the *Judge*, appears this week for the first time under its new management. The chief cartoon is an attack upon Congress for Tariff Tinkering and Silver Jobbing, and the statesmen who figure most conspicuously in it are Mr. Evarts and Mr. Logan, Republicans both. We congratulate the *Judge* upon the impartiality of its satire, and predict for its new conductors a successful and profitable career.

THE LOBBY REPORING.

The First Effect of the New Rules.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13.—The change in the rules of the House has greatly encouraged the lobby, who had either been driven away from Washington or were compelled to live on short commons while they infested the capital, by the stern course of the Committee on Appropriations. All the most notorious organs of jobbery were loudest in their demands for this change, and were also most vehement in denouncing Mr. Randall, Mr. Holman, and other members of the committee who had defeated their schemes of plunder. It was most unfortunate for the Speaker, for Mr. Morrison, and for the combination by which this policy was adopted, that some of their principal backers in the press should have been in the past, as they are now, identified with the projects of spoliation, against which public sentiment has strongly revolted.

The Eads job of a railway to supersede transportation by a ship canal involves many millions, and has been carefully nursed, watching for an opportunity for several sessions of Congress. The managers of it are strongly persuaded that their chance has come, and they are shrewdly preparing to make the most of the changed condition in the House. Hitherto the passage to the Treasury has been blocked and guarded in a way that excluded the lobbyists in this or in any other large speculation.

The Mormons are rich, and are inclined to expend some of their wealth in preventing hostile legislation. They know very well that behind the moral crusade which is now conducted against them, the covetous eyes of Gentiles are directed against the valuable property which Mormon industry and patience have created in the deserts of Utah, and they are trying to save it by the sinews of war.

The bill which passed the Senate a few days ago flagrantly violates some of the most sacred principles imbedded in the Constitution and laws, but as it professes to be aimed at the overthrow of polygamy, only seven votes could be mustered against it. The fear of being stigmatized as defenders of Mormonism explains why Senators failed to defend the first obligation to which they are bound by oath.

It is understood that a vigorous lobby has been employed to defeat this bill in the House, or at least to remove its most ruinous conditions. This fact and the character of some of the agents engaged in the service will not help the opposition. If the Mormons had been wise, they would have allowed the case to stand on its abstract merits, which are far stronger than the advocacy of hired traffickers in legislation. Polygamy is rapidly declining under influences which are destined to crush out the evil, unless it be strengthened by intolerant persecution. Mr. Edmunds ought not to forget that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.

Mr. Cox, Chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the House, is disposed to amend the law so as to require incumbents appointed heretofore without examination to undergo the tests now required to enter the service. If this amendment should be adopted, and executed with impartiality, the dry bones in the departments would be shaken with the force of a violent earthquake. They have felt very comfortable under the system invented for their benefit, and have been enthusiastic advocates of the system which keeps incompetency in office with a permanent tenure, and makes scholastic attainments requisite for practical affairs.

Any bill that will eliminate the odious and incongruous features of the existing law will command a large vote in the House, and if the vote were secret its repeal would be certain by a decided majority of both parties. The hypocrisy which upholds this scandalous sham is the worst feature of the whole fraud.

Now that the Republicans are out of power, but still holding about six-eighths of all the offices, they propose to cut down the emoluments of the few places likely to be filled by Democrats in this district and elsewhere. Bills have been introduced in the Senate to fix salaries for the Recorder of Deeds and Register of Wills here at about one-half of the fees now yielded by those offices. This axe of reform was never raised during the days of Grant, Hayes, and Arthur, when every place of value was made an instrument of partisanship.

Mr. O'Donnell Wants to be Reappointed.

ALBANY, Jan. 13.—Nearly all the knowing ones among the Democratic politicians up here are asserting to one another under their breath that Railroad Commissioner John O'Donnell is not to be reappointed. His term expires in just a fortnight. Although he is just now conspicuous on account of his action with reference to the elevated railroads during the engineers' strike, his performance of duty is thought not to have been sufficiently remarkable to save him. He is working very hard for reappointment, pushing Anti-Monopolists and others before the Governor, and developing a boom for himself with a great deal of the ability for political finesse for which he used to be famous. He will naturally leave no stone unturned that may help to keep him where he is.

The reason given for the likelihood of his failure is that he is accused of having coquetted with both political parties last autumn, offering the Democrats Anti-Monopoly aid and giving the Republicans even better help in another way. It is further said that even now he is standing like a Colossus with a foot on either party, looking to the Governor for renomination, and to the Republican Senators for votes to confirm the nomination. He used to be a Republican, but was appointed to his present place as an Anti-Monopolist, when the party of that ilk had some shape and substance. The Democrats are alleged to be prepared to show that, in spite of his achievement the other day, he has not borne his share of the labors of the Railroad Commission, but has left it to Commissioners Rogers and Kernan.

Jekyll's Island.

From the Atlanta Constitution.

The descent of Mr. W. K. Vanderbilt on our Southern coast may mean the capture of our outlying islands by Northern capital. Mr. Thomas Carnegie (not Mr. Andrew Carnegie, as is erroneously printed) is already intrenched on the southern end of Cumberland, in the ancient home of the Greenes. He has retouched the incomparable avenue of live oaks, and between gneiss at a cost of $50,000, and is said to have spent $150,000 in restoring the mansion and grounds. There, amid his orange groves and live oaks, he has a home worthy of a prince. Jekyll's Island, which Mr. and Mrs. Vanderbilt rode two thousand miles to see, is one of the smallest on the coast, measuring about seven miles in length and averaging two in width. Its climate is perfect. St. Simon's on the north and Cumberland on the south shelttering it from boisterous winds. It fronts Brunswick, and stands high and clear above the sea. The growth is live oak and palmettos. Oranges thrive on the island and the grass is luxuriant. Jekyll's was the point selected by the slave ship Wanderer for landing its cargo of slaves. I have heard men tell of visiting the island that year, and seeing hundreds of wild Africans ducking and scurrying amid the long grass. A force of canoes departed thence rapidly from Jekyll's to neighboring islands with the news. But one of the Wanderer was captured less than a hundred slaves were found there. Jekyll now belongs to Mr. John Du Bignon, and is used mainly for grazing. If Mr. Vanderbilt buys it, a wonderful transformation may be expected.

Our American Ballet.

From the Providence Journal.

Then the ballet came bouncing in. In the front row were the pupils of the American Ballet School. The great North American heard the audience inundated with an overwhelming sense of the national pride when the twelve lupils came galloping down toward the footlights like so many frisky young colts. Most of them were in the vicinity of 15 years old, and they were industriously earnest. In the matter of breadth they were not worth considering seriously. They stood in two neat and correct little rows, and burst into twelve queer little smiles that looked like twelve infantile copies of the dear and familiar old ballet girl smile. Which has been handed down for decades. Then they placed their twenty-four arms akimbo, and at a bang of the leader's baton their white boots began to fly about in the most reckless and astonishing manner. The boots or slippers seemed to have no connections whatever with the enthusiastic young girls, but hobbed about in the air as though quite unacquainted with their owners. After it had danced its little dance and been overwhelmed with applause, the school courtesied joyously out of sight, and the professional ballet came dancing down. There was a great deal of expert dancing, but the spectators missed the lithe, lissome, and coy flinging about of slippers which characterized the dancing of the pupils.

John Sherman Re-elected Senator.

COLUMBUS, Jan. 13.—The Senate and House met in joint session at noon to-day and elected John Sherman to the United States Senate. It required 74 votes to elect. Sherman received 84 votes, and Allen G. Thurman 62.

Senator Sherman will arrive in the city at 2½ P. M. to-morrow, and will be met by a legislative committee and escorted to the Capitol, where he will be presented to the members. In the evening a general reception will be given in the Senate chamber.

Becky Jones.

From the Albany Argus.

Mrs. Wilsey, sister of the famous Miss "Becky" Jones, is very ill at her house in Saratoga avenue, and the latter is proving, in her constant visits at her bedside, that she possesses other Christian virtues than silence under persecution.

Mr. William E. Marshall has just published a fine line engraving of Gen. Grant—a large and important plate 16 by 22, and executed in this famous engraver's best style. It is issued in various grades of printing by his publishers, the Messrs. Hubbard of Philadelphia.

WEDDING IN WASHINGTON.

Marriage of Ex-Minister Foster's Daughter to the Rev. Mr. Dulles.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13.—The marriage of Miss Edith Foster, daughter of the Hon. John W. Foster of Indiana, formerly Minister to Spain, to the Rev. Allen M. Dulles of Detroit, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, was solemnized this evening at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. The attendance was large and fashionable. Among the prominent persons present were Postmaster-General and Mrs. Vilas, Chief Justice and Mrs. Waite, Senators Harrison and Voorhees, Señor Valera, the Spanish Minister, and all the members of the Spanish Legation; Señor Romero, the Mexican Minister; Mr. Cheng Tseo Ju, the Chinese Minister, and representatives from all the other foreign legations.

The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Dr. Dulles of Philadelphia, father of the groom, assisted by the Rev. Dr. Bartlett, pastor of the church. The bride entered the church, leaning on the arm of her father, and followed by her four bridesmaids, viz.: Miss Foster, sister of the bride; Miss Dulles, sister of the groom; Miss Burbank and Miss Nordhoff. The bridal party was preceded by six ushers, and after passing up the aisle was joined at the chancel by the groom and his brother, the Rev. J. H. Dulles, who acted as best man.

After the ceremony a reception was held at the residence of Mr. Charles Nordhoff, 1,731 K street. Extensive preparations had been made for holding the reception at the residence of the bride's father, but the building was so seriously damaged by fire last night that it was found necessary to change the plans.

DR. SMITH'S LUCRATIVE OFFICE.

The Republican Senators May Confirm Some Honest Democrat for Health Officer.

ALBANY, Jan. 13.—Frank Smith, a son of Health Officer Smith of New York, came here to-day to learn if the Republican Senators really have the cruelty to think of confirming some man that may be nominated for Health Officer by Gov. Hill. Dr. Smith has held the office for five years. It is worth $100,000 a year to him. He has relied upon the Republican Senators not confirming Gov. Hill's candidate for the office, but the Republicans are not disposed to defend Smith, as they say he doesn't contribute to their campaign fund. If an honest Democratic doctor should be nominated for Health Officer they say that they may confirm him. First, however, they purpose passing a bill transferring the Health Officer's fees to the State, and putting him upon a salary. This action, they say, would take the Health Office "out of politics," and they could tell their constituents that they gave nothing to the Democratic party when they confirmed a Democrat as Health Officer.

Mr. Frank Smith, however, doesn't want his father disturbed. He will oppose any reform bill that may touch the Health Officer's fees. His friends begin to hint that the father may be more liberal to the Republican party in future campaigns, if permitted to continue in office.

A DOCTOR SPREADING SMALL-POX.

He is Now in Jail, and it is Feared that the Contagion May Break Out There.

CHICAGO, Jan. 13.—"Doctor" Bertholdi, the alleged physician who failed to report cases of small-pox at 2,513 Halsted street which he was attempting to treat, is now in the county jail, and the 300 prisoners are to be vaccinated. When he heard that a warrant was out for his arrest he fled to Washington Heights, near this city. There he obtained lodgings with a family named Hill, where he was arrested. Since then Mr. Hill's two children have been stricken with small-pox, and the disease, it is said, owing to Bertholdi's criminal carelessness, may get into other families. A child in the family of Mr. Hankes, at 2,513 South Halsted street, was stricken with the small-pox, and Bertholdi was called in to treat it. Instead of reporting the case to the Health Department, that precautions might be taken to prevent it from spreading, the "Doctor" attempted to take care of the patient himself. The result proved fatal to the family. The other six children were stricken, one after the other, and four of them died. The malady spread to the immediate neighborhood, and cases are now reported at 2,507 and 2,521 South Halsted street, a few doors from the Hankes residence, and at 2,524 Lime street and 2,474 Archer avenue, not a block away.

ALLEGED BRIBERY IN OHIO.

The Charge that Money was Used to Elect Payne Senator to be Investigated.

COLUMBUS, Jan. 13.—Mr. S. K. Donavin's charges against members of the Ohio Legislature of two years ago, that they accepted bribes of money to vote for H. B. Payne for Senator, were taken cognizance of this afternoon in the House of Representatives by the unanimous adoption of a resolution introduced by the Hon. Thomas A. Cowgill of Champaign county, former Speaker of that body, for an investigation of the charges against D. Baker, P. Hunt, W. A. Schultz, and M. Zeigler. Representatives Baker, Hunt, Ziegler, and Schultz rose in their places and denounced Donavin's charges as false in every particular, and said that they courted an investigation.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13.—Senator Payne, when asked what he had to say about the specific charges of S. K. Donavin, that members of the Ohio Legislature had been bribed to vote for him, replied: "I don't care to have anything to say about the wretch, nor do I feel called upon to take any notice of him."

Mr. Evarts Getting Light on the Silver Question and Taking Lessons in Oratory.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13.—The Hon. William Maxwell Evarts is the only member of the Senate who has heard all the speeches that have been delivered in that body on the silver question. When a Senator takes the floor to deliver an address on this subject, Mr. Evarts always takes the seat of some other Senator as near to the speaker as he can get, and listens with the most absorbing attention from the first word to the last. The pages bring in the cards of visitors to him, but he invariably sends out word that he is engaged, and when a Senator comes over to whisper in his ear he motions him away. Not even will an invitation to luncheon tempt the junior Senator from New York from his post, but he stays by with a persistence that amazes the other Senators and gratifies whoever is