

The Sun

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1887.

For Mr. Cleveland's Renomination.

We do not hesitate to say that we are earnestly, thoroughly, and uncompromisingly in favor of renominating GROVER CLEVELAND for 1888—in a certain contingency.

This contingency would be realized in case it should become certain that the Democracy is doomed without hope to defeat and overthrow in that election.

If Democratic principles are to be stricken down and the Democratic party overthrown in that struggle, no man is so well qualified, so indisputably suitable to be the Democratic candidate as GROVER CLEVELAND.

But this contingency, we trust, will never arise. The serious contemplation of those devoted to the establishment and permanence of Democratic ideas should be turned to victory and not to disaster.

The City's Knight.

Mr. JAMES H. BAYLES may turn out to be an excellent President of the Board of Health, but he is evidently a very poor Knight of Labor.

One of the distinguishing and elementary features of that society is its adoption as a working principle of the system of "sympathetic strikes." Its chief motto is "An Injury to one is the concern of all," and striking for the sake of enforcing the demands of associated laborers, when ordered by the proper officers of the order, is part of its agreement that every man enters into when he becomes a Knight.

Mr. BAYLES will be bound perhaps to shut up the Board of Health until the strike is settled with which he is commanded to sympathize.

We fancy that his membership in the Knights of Labor was really of about the same nature as the fantastic entrance of the Mugwumps into the Democratic party.

They came in without thought or comprehension of its principles, merely to gratify a whim peculiar to themselves, and with no intention of aiding in the successful development of their own purposes.

They are no better as Democrats than Mr. BAYLES as a Knight of Labor.

Lessees and Bismarck.

The statements made by Prince BISMARCK to M. DE LESSEPS, and reported by the latter to a reporter of the Paris *Gazette*, prove, unless the Chancellor departed from his habitual sincerity, that war was truly imminent when Count VON MOLTKE predicted it.

"You may say," BISMARCK assured his visitor, "that we have had a narrow escape. It only depended on a hair whether war broke out between Germany and France."

Evidently, then, the Berlin *Post*, which twelve years before had startled Kaiser WILLIAM's subjects by proclaiming "War in Sight," was again justified in warning them that they were hanging "On the edge of the knife."

But although Prince BISMARCK did not stoop to answer the light-waved politician who asked that the solemn admonition administered two months ago, to the Reichstag and the people, was a mere electoral manoeuvre, he expressed a conviction that at all events in western Europe the war cloud had passed away.

What had caused the welcome change the Chancellor did not explain—whether it was due to the abandonment of aggressive projects which had been secretly entertained in France, or to the adoption of the septennate, which relieved Germany from the necessity of attacking a neighbor whose forces were becoming disproportionately large.

Whatever or however complex may have been the agencies, the outcome is peace, not only for the present moment, but for some time to come, so far as any provocation from Prince BISMARCK are concerned. This is clear, not only from the cordial and conciliatory tenor of the message sent to President GREY, but from the specially significant assurance that no protest would be made against Gen. BOUTANGER's vigorous military preparations.

It is doubtless true, that as regards the intentions of Germany, Prince BISMARCK, rather than his aged master, is the veritable oracle. Nevertheless, it must have been extremely gratifying to the French visitor to hear the Chancellor's pacific declarations confirmed so fully by the Emperor.

"I shall always," said Kaiser WILLIAM, "oppose to the peace of Europe, and I do not wish for it any more than France." Again, with sharper emphasis, he said: "We shall not fight as long as I live, unless we are attacked." The importance of the additional avowal, "My son shares my views," will be presently appreciated, if it be in truth the Kaiser's purpose, on the approaching celebration of his ninety-first birthday, to make his son co-regent, if not sole sovereign.

But there was nothing, after all, in the interesting interviews enjoyed by M. DE LESSEPS at Berlin, so fraught with profound suggestion as the Chancellor's reiteration of a statement made in his great speech to the Reichstag, just before the dissolution of that body. "It was not I," he tells the Frenchman prominently qualified by his diplomatic and financial achievements to take a hint and devise a business-like accommodation—"it was not I who demanded Alsace-Lorraine." Prince BISMARCK went on to explain that the acquisition of those provinces was due to the military party, and was urged solely for strategic ends. It was not, therefore, in any sense the outcome of national earth hunger, or a passionate popular desire to incorporate outlying sections of the German fatherland. The Chancellor, indeed, is quite too slow to say much about the principle of nationalities while he keeps an iron grip on Power.

"Go back," said BISMARCK in effect to perhaps the wisest and assuredly the most influential of living Frenchmen—"go back and tell the Parisians that with us the question of retaining or releasing Alsace-Lorraine is not mixed up with sentiment. It is purely a matter of business." The inference was unmistakable, and could not possibly escape M. DE LESSEPS, that when France showed good business reasons for a friendly reconveyance of the troublesome provinces, the German Chancellor would be ready to consider them.

Canada and the Fisheries.

Three interesting reports come from Ottawa, indicating that the Dominion is not wholly easy about the present condition of the fishery dispute. One is that Capt. BRYCE's fleet of revenue cruisers has just been reinforced by another new vessel. A second represents that Sir JOHN MACDONALD desires to visit Washington, to confer with the State Department upon the fishery problem. Finally, it is said that a formal proposition was sent to London some weeks ago for the appointment of a joint commission to settle the whole affair.

As to this last project, it has already been unconditionally rejected by the action of Con-

gress; and Mr. CLEVELAND, in one of his messages, formally announced that it had been rejected. The plan now credited to the Dominion is to have one member of the proposed commission appointed by Canada, one by Newfoundland, two by the United States, and a fifth by some neutral European power, for example, Germany. It is evident that this fifth member would be practically the arbitrator, as on each team in contention he would vote with the two members whose side he might favor, and thus create a majority. But whatever the intrinsic merits of this plan, the present is not the time for it. The only urgent need is to avoid a collision between our fishing vessels and the Dominion cruisers, whose domineering and perilous instructions of last year have thus far been neither recalled nor modified.

In the statement sent to the Colonial Secretary the Ottawa authorities are said to declare that the device of furnishing a touch-and-trade permit was introduced last year in order to give the Yankee fishing vessels rights as traders. In reality, as the Revised Statutes will show, this provision is a good deal older than the Dominion Government. It was made long ago, for the express object of preventing the distinction created between registered and enrolled vessels from becoming detrimental to the latter and to commercial interests. Its application to the fisheries is only one of many possible applications; and the reason why touch-and-trade permits have hitherto not been common in Canadian ports is simply that they have not been needed. Under the two reciprocity treaties port privileges of an unusual character were granted by easy-going custom to our fishing vessels; and while these vessels might perhaps have been obliged to obtain permits, had Canada been a more strict enforcer of the law, the trouble of procuring them when not required. That, however, is a different matter from ignoring them altogether when relied upon for protection.

The most extraordinary argument is the one relating to bait. It is urged that the bait used consists of small fish, the catching of bait is a catching of fish; and hence the buying of bait is the buying of something which has been caught with a view to the violation of the treaty. This logic, if correctly reported, is much mixed. The mackerel caught within the limit of the marine league are taken without bait, most of the work being now done by the larger fish, like cod and halibut, for which bait is used, and taken by American vessels in the deep sea beyond Canada's jurisdiction. However, to argue that buying bait within the limits implies an intention to fish within those limits is as far away from the truth as it could well be.

Nobody denies Canada's right to seize and confiscate any American vessel found fishing within her waters. The treaty of 1818 was made expressly in order to prevent that. The trouble is that in the multitude of arrests, finings, warnings, and other annoyances inflicted on American fishermen last year, only one vessel was arrested for committing the fundamental treaty offence of fishing in the forbidden waters. Canada says she has a right to keep out fishing vessels out of her waters under the treaty, except when they are there for wood, water, shelter, or repairs. Our country insists that Canada has no such right under privileges of trade granted to all our vessels without distinction, under acts of Parliament nearly forty years ago. What is immediately needed, therefore, is not a commission, but some steps to prevent Canadian cruisers from persecuting our vessels until these disputed matters are settled in London.

To Regulate the Liquor Traffic.

The most effectual method yet devised for the practical regulation of the liquor traffic seems to us to be the high license system, which is working so successfully in other States than this; but we are not aware of any Divine decree that makes opposition to high license or doubt as to its advisability a heinous and unpardonable sin.

Yet the *Evening Post* treats the members of the Assembly who voted on Tuesday evening against the third reading of Mr. CLEVELAND's High License bill, as if they had just earned leading infamy. In this world and eternal damnation in the world to come. It names in particular seven of them from this city, of whom it declares that "they were nominated," but now, because they do not agree with the *Evening Post* as to high license, that narrow-souled Philistine newspaper would forthwith consign them all to social disgrace, political ruin, and religious condemnation. "They have betrayed their trust," it cries, "upon the question which of all others is the crucial test of this session."

Now, a fair-minded man who favors a trial of the high license plan, can fall to see that he would be conscientiously opposed, and on grounds which are deserving of great consideration. It is undeniable that it involves an interference by the State with private interests and enterprise, and a discrimination between individuals which may reasonably be regarded as of doubtful propriety, however serious may be the evils which it is proposed to curtail by legislative act. The practical working of high license, too, might possibly tend to the concentration of the liquor business of a city like New York, for instance, in the hands of a combination of rich brewers and distillers, the only persons of which it did not gain control being those run by individuals of large or very considerable capital. That is a possible consequence of high license which we have never overlooked. We can, therefore, easily understand how a legislator might oppose and vote against Mr. CLEVELAND's bill on grounds of principle, and in so doing display praiseworthy courage and political consistency.

It is also a question whether the State can license fees between the vendors of distilled and fermented liquors. Both of them are intoxicating, the only difference between them in that respect being in the proportion of alcohol which they respectively contain. In the fermented liquors the alcohol is more diluted than in the distilled, but a man can get drunk on either, and as a matter of fact, men do get drunk on both, and while they are temperately consumed neither produces any intoxication.

We also agree wholly with those who contend that it is no part of the business of the State to concern itself directly with the moral reformation of society, and to interfere with the liberty of men so far as concerns the gratification of their appetites or their choice of business, unless in their actual exercise of it they offend against the liberty and rights of other people. The Legislature at Albany is not a moral reform association to which Heaven has committed the salvation of the people of this State.

But high license is to be defended on what seem to us tenable grounds. Experience elsewhere indicates that it can be enforced better than any other license system which has yet been tried, and that it is therefore more just because it protects the licensed vendor against the competition of the unlicensed. It also yields a far greater revenue to the State, and if licenses are to be imposed

on the liquor business at all, is it not as sound in principle to make them high as to make them low? The discrimination between classes of liquors we do not find it easy to defend.

But, whatever our own opinion on this matter, we see no good reason for assailing the motives of the members of the Assembly who voted on Tuesday evening against reading the High License bill to a third reading. There is a great deal to say on their side, and very much that deserves respectful consideration.

It Looks Like a Striking Bill.

The Hon. WILLIAM C. TRATHAGEN, who represents the Tenth district of this city in the Senate at Albany, has introduced a bill to authorize the building of a bridge across the East River at Blackwell's Island.

This bill is entirely unnecessary. A previous Legislature did the work, and did it well. The charter for such a bridge exists in full vitality, and, what is more, Congress has added thereto the weight of its sanction, giving to the company created by the charter the authority to carry the bridge over the navigable waters of the river. Dr. BARNETT, through whose efforts the charter was obtained, granted an interview to the head of the company, a responsible and energetic citizen, and the arrangements for providing the capital and building the bridge are well advanced toward the realization of the project.

Senator TRATHAGEN's bill does not look well. It wears somehow the appearance of a striking bill. It ought to be beaten, and if nevertheless it should get through the Legislature, we trust it will be promptly vetoed by the Governor.

His full name is WILLIAM TRILL COLEMAN. He lives in San Francisco. He is a great merchant, a zealous and thorough Democrat, intimate with every department of public affairs, and worthy the hearty confidence of every American patriot.

If WILLIAM TRILL should be nominated next year as the Democratic candidate for President, he would be a man of immense force of character, ardent feelings, and clear and positive views. A Republican in politics, the bent of his mind was always to independent action, and it was not certain from the manner of his voting at one election that he would vote for the candidate of the same party at the next. In 1884 he was an energetic opponent of Mr. BLAINE and a partisan of Mr. CLEVELAND, and very probably his vote was given to Mr. HEWITT in November; but he was always governed by his own ideas and not by party orders. To him more than to any other man, we believe, the party which he supported reduced the price of gas in this city. His death leaves a void among the active men of the metropolis which will not soon be filled.

If any citizen knows any strong reason why Mr. BARNETT should not be nominated to the Corporation, should not be appointed Circuit Judge, let him hurry up and present the same in Washington without delay, or else forever after hold his peace.

There is a serious weekly publication in Baltimore called the *Mirror*. Once in a while it is facetious. For instance, in a recent issue there appears a statement that a cable letter in THE SUN charged as follows:

"The funds of the National League are expended by Mr. PARRELL in an improper manner."

What our correspondent said about Mr. PARRELL and the funds was this:

"No man knows what he does with the funds, no man has seen a receipt book, and with all the glumness of GRAY'S was issued to the date of his death for accepting gifts from the Parliament of Ireland. O'Connell was tortured with brutal accusations after he received a popular mandate in 1847, but so perfect is the confidence of his race in PARRELL that no man on either side of the Atlantic has ever even asked an audit of a trust, and no reproach has been put upon him, except by the enemy, for his acceptance of a personal honor from the Government."

There is no reason why our esteemed Baltimore contemporary should not be facetious at times. But it should never fall to hold the *Mirror* up to truth.

YOUNG BENJAMIN LEVANT killed his father on Sunday last, and his mother on Monday. He was a young man of about twenty years of age, and was a member of the *Knights of the Ku Klux Klan*. He was a member of the *Knights of the Ku Klux Klan*, and was a member of the *Knights of the Ku Klux Klan*.

We do our best, but occasionally some silly typographical accident will defeat us.

A valued correspondent of ours in Charleston, S. C., who does not seem to be extravagantly fond of the Hon. HENRY WOODRUFF GRADY, calls our attention to a report that when Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS visited Atlanta some time ago Mr. GRADY delivered an address of welcome beginning with this sentence:

"This is the greatest day since the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST."

Our correspondent advises us to look up this speech, and at some future time, on the right occasion, bring it out to kill GRADY with. This we decline to do. Instead of keeping it in reserve for such a purpose, we bring it out now, and if it kills GRADY we shall be sorry. GRADY is a good fellow, full of poetry and friendship, and rather enthusiastic and free spoken on many occasions, but all his faults are not his. We know whether he spoke this sentence about JEFFERSON DAVIS or not, and we don't care much. Something must always be forgiven to the excitement of the moment and to the zeal of an ardent soul. Moreover, if a friend falls into a little transgression, is it a reason for killing him? We think not, and we refer to Brother GRADY the assurances of our distinguished consideration.

Gov. HILL of New York needs to be reminded that he is not the President of the United States, and that he is not the President of the United States, and that he is not the President of the United States.

Have you forgotten the case of the Hon. JOHN CLEVELAND, who was appointed Secretary of the Treasury in 1862, and who was appointed Secretary of the Treasury in 1862, and who was appointed Secretary of the Treasury in 1862?

There appears to be a deeper and more extended religious feeling among the students of Harvard College since the attendance at morning prayers ceased to be compulsory.

It is a suggestive fact that the nomination of Lieutenant-General SHELDON as the Democratic candidate for President, has been seriously considered in certain influential quarters. The conclusion has been that SHELDON would be a very popular candidate, but that it was doubtful whether he would accept. The hard luck of Brother BLAINE with TRUMBULL SHELDON has made other politicians cautious.

The *New York Times*'s Boston correspondent asserts that the name of Gov. HILL was applied more than to the matter, but that he did not return to the President—Boston *Journal*.

THE GREAT BRIDGE DISASTER.

BOZON, March 17.—Testimony that was given to-day and more that will be put in tomorrow tends to show criminal negligence on the part of the Boston and Providence Railroad respecting the condition of the bridge which caused Monday's disaster. Two gentlemen have already appeared as witnesses, and have warned the officers of the road that the bridge was palpably defective and dangerous. One was called a crank for his pains, and the other was advised to walk if he thought the bridge wasn't safe.

The witness who testified on this point to-day was Harlan W. Brook of West Roxbury. The first time he noticed anything wrong about the bridge, he said, was in 1882, when in driving beneath it he saw on one of the upright blocks that ran from the top stringer to the bottom stringer, through them both, he should say, one of the nuts hanging down an inch and a half or two inches from the top of the upright block.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

Subsequently he saw the nuts had not been replaced, and reported it again. He saw the same young man again. The young man said he was borrowing too much trouble, and that he would not report it to the superintendent's office.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

He testified that he reported the defect to the superintendent's office more recently. He was directed to immediately report the defect to the superintendent's office more recently.

THE RAGING MISSOURI.

Many People Driven from Their Homes by the Raging Missouri.

BISMARCK, Ark., March 17.—The water began rising at an early hour yesterday, and at 3 o'clock the morning showed a rise of six feet. A gorge formed at Washburn, forty miles north, and at 7 o'clock the Missouri had risen twenty feet at that point, which necessitated a fall here. When the Washburn gorge breaks the immense amount of water held above will surge down, sweeping everything before it, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

At this point in 1881 occurred an overflow of the river, which was the worst since the building of the dam. The water was six feet above the dam, and the people living on the low banks will be driven to their homes, and many will be killed.

ONE OF SEVILLA'S HUNDRED WILLS.

Sevilla, March 17.—The announcement in THE SUN yesterday that Jose Sevilla, a wealthy Peruvian, had left half a million dollars to found a home and school for children in New York set a good many people to talking. Sevilla was a well-known man to bankers and brokers down here. He had lived in New York ever since the war of the rebellion, and had been a successful speculator up to a year ago, when he returned to Peru.

Ex-Mayor Grace, who is named as one of the trustees of the fund, said yesterday that he had known Sevilla thirty years. Sevilla was a lawyer by education, but made his start in life as a labor agent, by importing Chinese into Peru. He was a half-breed, Spanish and Indian mixed, and a man of ability, and intelligent in American securities. He was worth \$1,000,000 when he died, and it was about all invested here. He is supposed to have left a large stock of American securities, and gold in a safe deposit vault, but where that vault is he never revealed.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

Mr. J. H. Condit said last night that a member of the board of directors of the fund contemplated the founding of a school somewhat on the plan of the Girard College.

SECRETARY ENDICOTT DENIES IT.

He says he has not resigned and has no misunderstanding with the President.

BOSTON, March 17.—Secretary Endicott, who is visiting Mr. George Peabody, a relative in Salem, was interviewed by a representative of THE SUN to-day with respect to his reported resignation. The Secretary said that there was no misunderstanding between him and the President, and that their relations to-day are as harmonious and pleasant as they ever were.

"What has really happened," he said, "is that a number of inefficient and unfaithful officials in the Bureau of Prisons, and all other branches, have been removed in the interest of the public service."

The Secretary said that he recommended Dr. Baxter to be Surgeon-General because he believed that he was a competent and efficient officer of the office, and because he was the next officer in order of seniority. Dr. Baxter had been in the position since the beginning of the war, and was one of those who, by act of Congress, was incorporated in the general salary list of the office.

The Secretary said that he recommended Dr. Baxter to be Surgeon-General because he believed that he was a competent and efficient officer of the office, and because he was the next officer in order of seniority.