The Sun.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1890.

London Offices of THE SUN, 480 West Strand.
All communications should be addressed to FRANK M. WHITE, 480 Strand, London, W. C.

A Cabinet Ticket.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Kansas City Globe*, has constructed for Republican use in 1892 this halcyon and vociferous ticket:

For President: JAMES G. BLAINE of Maine.
For Vice-President: JEREMIAH RUSK of Wisconsin.

This ticket would be a pretty lusty sort of platform in itself, and it would be taken to mean anything and everything, from the protection of pup seals to the development of sorghum. With this ticket the cry of the Republicans would be "Reciprocity and RUSK," and the Farmers' Alliance would be admitted at special rates. Mr. BLAINE is not much of a farmer, although he takes a good deal of interest in the cultivation of seals, but his ideas about reciprocity are calculated to fire the bayseed heart. JERRY RUSK isn't much of a farmer either, but he has a good homespun appearance and knows as much about agriculture as it is necessary for a Secretary of Agriculture to know. He can drive a hay wagon, ride a farm horse bareback, and mow for exhibition purposes, and he has a fine line of back-country stories.

As the farmers have already run away with the Democratic party in three or four Southern States, and seem to be waiting to receive the Republican party with scythes and pitchforks in some of the Western States, candidates warranted to please the farming interest are likely to be in great demand. Mr. RUSK has a boom of his own for first place, but as he holds the baby seat in the Cabinet, while Mr. BLAINE is at the head of the table, it would be no mortification to the Secretary of Agriculture to be the tail of the ticket.

To nominate BLAINE and RUSK would be to give Mr. HARRISON'S Administration a stronger endorsement than he could expect—and how pleased he would be, to be sure.

The Right of Appeal in Habeas Corpus Cases.

A case of great interest relating to the law of habeas corpus has just been decided in England by the House of Lords. In delivering his opinion, the Lord Chancellor began by telling his associates that probably no more important or serious question had ever come before them. The case arose out of the imprisonment of the Rev. JAMES BELL COX, the perpetual curate of St. Margaret's, in the city of Liverpool. Mr. COX was committed to Walton jail in May, 1887, for his contumacious conduct in disobeying the direction of the Chancery Court of York in respect to the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. Certain orders in the course of the proceedings against him were made, not by Lord PENZANCE, the Judge of the Chancery Court of York, but by a subordinate officer of that tribunal known as a Surrogate; and upon being committed to prison, Mr. COX sued out a writ of habeas corpus and sought to be discharged from custody on the ground, among others, that this officer had no jurisdiction to make the orders in question.

After argument the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice ordered the immediate discharge of the prisoner. Subsequently a surgeon named HAKES, who had been the complainant or promoter of all the proceedings against the Rev. JAMES BELL COX, took an appeal from the order of the Queen's Bench Division discharging the prisoner, to the Court of Appeal. That tribunal reversed the order of the Queen's Bench Division, and thereupon Mr. COX in turn appealed to the House of Lords.

The appeal was first heard before four of the Law Lords, but they ordered a reargument, and the court by which the judgment was finally pronounced on the 5th instant consisted of seven members—the Lord Chancellor and Lords WATSON, BRAMWELL, HERSCHELL, MACNAGHTEN, MORRIS, and FIELD. The judgment of the Court of Appeal was reversed, and it was held that under the law of England as it now exists, no appeal lies from the order of a court or Judge discharging a prisoner from custody upon the return of a writ of habeas corpus. Five of the seven Law Lords concurred in this conclusion, only two members of the court, Lord MORRIS and Lord FIELD, dissenting. Elaborate opinions were delivered by the Lord Chancellor, Lord BRAMWELL, and Lord HERSCHELL, who has himself been Lord Chancellor, and they all agreed that where a person has been discharged under a writ of habeas corpus the appellate courts have no power to interfere with the action of the court below, or do anything to restore the liberated prisoner to custody.

It was conceded even by the dissenting Judges that prior to the statute known as the Judicature act, under which judicial procedure in England was remodelled some seventeen years ago, no such thing was known as the review by way of appeal of an order discharging a person from imprisonment on writ of habeas corpus. Up to that time, as the Lord Chancellor pointed out, it was the known and well-settled state of the law that a discharge under a writ of habeas corpus was final. The Judicature act empowered the Court of Appeal "to hear and determine appeals from any order of the High Court," and it was argued that this provision rendered all orders in habeas corpus proceedings subject to review; but a majority of the Law Lords held that the words which we have quoted, when construed with reference to the other provisions of the statute, could not be deemed to relate to habeas corpus proceedings. "It is the right of personal freedom in this country which is in debate," said the Lord Chancellor, "and I, for one, should be very slow to believe, except it was done by express legislation, that the policy of centuries has been suddenly reversed, and that the right of personal freedom is no longer to be determined summarily and finally, but is to be subject to the delay and uncertainty of ordinary litigation, so that the final determination upon that question may only be arrived at by the last court of appeal." In other words, the House of Lords declares it to be the purpose of habeas corpus legislation in England to enable a prisoner to have the lawfulness of his detention inquired into at once by a Judge or court, and if he is set at liberty by the decision of such Judge or court, to make that decision absolute.

This view of the law of habeas corpus is particularly interesting, not only because it illustrates the conservatism of the English courts, but because it involves so strong an assertion of the right to personal liberty. The language of the prevailing opinions makes it plain that the distinguished lawyers who wrote them are not only convinced that Parliament did not intend to confer any right of appeal as against the prisoner in habeas corpus cases, but that Parliament would be very unlikely hereafter to change the law of centuries in this respect. It is a noteworthy fact, however, that here in the State of New York, where personal freedom ought to be valued as highly as it is in England, very much such an appeal as the Law Lords regard with such disfavor has been allowed for years. Section 2,059 of the Code of Civil Procedure, relating to the writ of habeas corpus, provides that an appeal from a final order discharging a prisoner committed upon a criminal accusation, or from the affirmance of such an order, may be taken in the name of the people by the Attorney-General or the District Attorney. In this State, therefore, the release from custody on writ of habeas corpus of a person charged with crime does not finally establish his right to be at liberty until the question is passed upon by the appellate tribunals, and in this respect our law differs from England's as just declared by the House of Lords.

This decision in the case of the Rev. JAMES BELL COX is also worthy of note because it reasserts a rule which has been somewhat questioned in respect to the right to petition different courts and Judges for release from imprisonment by means of the writ of habeas corpus. At common law, according to the Lord Chancellor, if release was refused in the first instance, the person detained might make a fresh application to every Judge or every court in turn, and each court or Judge was bound to consider the question independently, and not to be influenced by the previous decisions refusing a discharge. This statement accords with the law as laid down by our Court of Appeals in the leading case of JOAB LAWRENCE, decided in 1874, in which it was held that previous adjudications in habeas corpus proceedings are no answer to a new writ where the petitioner is restrained of his liberty, inasmuch as the decision under one writ refusing the discharge does not bar the issuing of a second writ by another court or officer.

How Long Must Ireland Wait?

If we should put faith in the assertions of some of Lord SALISBURY'S colleagues and supporters, we should have to admit that the fulfilment of the hopes of Ireland may be long deferred. *J'y suis, j'y reste*—here we are, and here we stick—seems to be the fundamental principle of the Unionist programme. It is the avowed determination of Mr. GLADSTONE'S chief opponents that the present Parliament shall live out the statutory term of seven years, and that accordingly there shall be no general election before June, 1893. Then, as the new Parliament would not assemble until the autumn, they count upon delaying the passage of a home rule bill in the House of Commons until late in the spring of 1894. As, moreover, they will control the House of Lords, the rejection of the measure by that body is resolved upon. This would involve a dissolution of the new Parliament and a second appeal to the electors, so that a home rule bill could not be definitely carried before the spring of 1895. Before that time arrives it is tacitly assumed that Mr. GLADSTONE will have ceased to figure in public life.

The confidence of the Unionists in their ability to hold the present Parliament together for the statutory term of seven years is based, of course, upon the fact that their majority in the House of Commons, although somewhat cut down by the result of bye-elections, is still not far from a hundred in a full House. But from this point of view their position is no more secure than was that of the Liberals under Mr. GLADSTONE in the spring of 1885. The latter then ostensibly possessed about the same majority which the Unionists have now, and having encountered fewer losses in the elections to fill vacancies, they had less reason to dread a revulsion in public opinion. Their foreign policy, indeed, had given dissatisfaction; they were held responsible for the failure to rescue GORDON, and were accused of exhibiting too little firmness in the defence of the Afghan frontier against Russia. Nevertheless, most of their measures relating to the home affairs of Great Britain and Ireland had been carried out in spite of the combined opposition of Tories and Parnellites, and that the Liberals had not really lost their hold on the constituencies was proved at the next general election in November and December, 1885, when they again defeated the Conservatives with ease. So that when, in the early part of that year, the Liberals were beaten on a petty detail of a bill introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the disaster came like a clap of thunder from a clear sky. The Liberal Cabinet was overthrown because it could not control its own followers, who either refused to vote or voted against it, and this state of things was due to grave, although unpublished dissensions in the Cabinet itself.

In the spring of 1885 the Liberals were a homogeneous and harmonious body, compared with the Unionists of to-day. It is true that the Old Whigs and Radicals disagreed with regard to the scope and character of the Franchise bill and Seats bill, whose introduction was then impending, and generally with relation to the extent of the concessions which ought to be made to the hard-working masses of the population. In respect, also, of the Irish policy of the GLADSTONE Government there was a flagrant difference of opinion between Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. FORSTER, which constrained the latter to resign the post of Chief Secretary for Ireland. But these causes of discontent and disrupture seem trivial when contrasted with those which are at work in the Unionist coalition. The Tory rank and file dislike Mr. GOSCHEN, whom, for a renegade, they find too dictatorial, and the Dissident Liberals despise Mr. MATTHEWS, the Home Secretary. Even Mr. W. H. SMITH has one fault in common with the late Lord IDDESLEIGH, who, when as Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE he was the Conservative leader in the House of Commons, proved more acceptable to his opponents than to his own party. Then, again, Mr. BALFOUR'S pretensions to future leadership are irreconcilable with the hopes of Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, of Mr. RITCHIE, and of Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL. The outcome of these scarcely disguised jealousies, antipathies, and rivalries is that the Tory leaders are unable to agree upon a single important measure and concentrate their united efforts on its passage. None of them wants his competitor for party confidence to carry off all the laurels of a session, and so the nominally irresistible strength of the coalition has been frittered and lost. No one doubts that the Tithes bill or the Irish Land bill could have been carried, had it stood alone. But they could not both be passed in a single session, especially when the situation had been needlessly aggravated by the proposal to compensate liquor sellers for the withholding of licenses.

It is idle for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN to attempt to shift to the shoulders of the Gladstonians the responsibility for the miscarriage of a session, in which every one of the three capital measures brought forward by the Government has failed to pass. In a speech delivered just before he left England for this country he attributed the collapse of the Ministerial programme to the obstructive tactics of the opposition. But what better guarantees against merely dilatory and mischievous obstruction do the Unionists desire than those which they now possess? They have a majority of nearly a hundred; they have at their disposal a gag law in the shape of the "closure," and they are sure that this will be applied with rigor, because both the Speaker and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House are Unionists. Give Mr. GLADSTONE such advantages, and see if he does not pass a home rule bill for Ireland within the compass of a single session. If Mr. CHAMBERLAIN would explain to himself and others why the last six months have been wasted, he should look at home and not abroad. "The fault, dear BRUTUS, lies not with the gods, but with ourselves, that we are underlings."

The same causes which have exposed the Tory Government to derision will be no less operative when Parliament reassembles in November. The measures to which the Unionists are committed must be introduced anew and run the gauntlet of the same opposition. If those measures again fail to pass, it will be universally recognized that the Tories are incapable of governing, and they will be laughed out of office.

It Had No Terrors For Him.

The awful fate of KEMMLER did not deter CHARLES CRUMLEY from killing ROBERT MCNEILL in Twenty-second street on Tuesday evening.

KEMMLER was put to death only a few days ago in a way which shocked all Christendom; his body was buried in quicklime after it had been cut to pieces by the surgeons, and every man, woman, and child in the community was informed of the horrible particulars. Yet, all the same, CRUMLEY proceeded to invite the same fate.

He was jealous of MCNEILL, with or without cause, lay in wait for him, and shot him at the first opportunity. His passion was stronger than his discretion and greater than his fear of the law. He was determined to act as executioner on his own account and without regard to the consequences to himself. If the statutory punishment for his crime had been death by prolonged and exquisite torture, terrible beyond conception, he would have done the same.

If the accounts of the affair are true, the killing was not done by CRUMLEY in a sudden burst of rage, but after days of meditation. Since last week, according to the reports, he had vowed vengeance against MCNEILL so openly that his victim was warned of the danger and sought aid and advice to avert it. He threatened to kill the man on sight, and he kept his word, in spite of the efforts of friends to dissuade him from the crime, and in defiance of protestations by his wife and by MCNEILL that his jealousy was without foundation. When he encountered MCNEILL he rushed for his revolver and killed him before the eyes of a great crowd.

CRUMLEY is a man of intelligence, being an actor by profession, and he must have read all about the experiment on KEMMLER, which occurred so soon before he himself began to meditate on murder. He knew exactly the penalty for the crime, and yet he went about it in the face of a multitude of witnesses to testify against him. He cared for nothing except to kill the man against whom his jealousy was aroused. Society could not have kept him from the deed, except by locking him up in advance as a madman, a beast of prey. The terrors of the law were powerless to save the life of MCNEILL, and they could not have been made effectual for the purpose, though they had been tenfold increased, though the punishment for murder had been made burning at the stake or blowing up with dynamite.

If CRUMLEY thought at all on the subject, he might have calculated that his chances of avoiding the penalty for his crime were much greater than his chances of enduring it. He knew that the number of murderers walking the streets of New York in all security and prosperity is not small. But it is not probable that he engaged in those deliberations before committing the deed, much as they may be in his mind now when he is under apprehension because of it. Beforehand he thought only of vengeance. Afterward he is thinking of how he shall cheat the justice from which so many murderers have escaped.

Meantime MCNEILL is dead sure enough, and the law condemning murderers to BROWN'S death chair continues in force, with all its supposed deterring terrors.

Inevitable Railway Accidents.

The awful disaster on the Old Colony Railroad near Quincy appears to have been due to the neglect of a party of workmen in leaving a piece of machinery on the track at a point where they were engaged in making repairs, without giving any signal of the danger to the approaching train. In the absence of details it is impossible as yet to say whether the accident was occasioned by some fault in the general management of the road or was caused solely by the criminal carelessness of the working party; but this collision suggests the essential difference between a class of accidents that good management will prevent and a class of accidents that no supervision can certainly avert.

In respect to any disaster on its line, the position of a railroad company may be viewed in two lights—in the light of legal responsibility and in the light of moral responsibility. In a legal sense the company is liable for any injury to its passengers growing out of negligence in the general management of its affairs, or caused by the neglect of its servants; but in a moral sense it may often happen that the directors and managers of the company have done all in their power to prevent the possibility of accident, and yet a disaster may occur by reason of the personal negligence of some subordinate. In these cases, although the company may be clearly responsible under the law, it does not necessarily follow that the management is to blame.

The distinction to which we would call attention can best be illustrated by example. If a railroad company builds its line of the best material, in the most approved fashion; places upon it the best locomotives and rolling stock; adopts the most careful method of selecting its engineers, firemen, conductors, trainmen, and other employees, and provides a system of rules for their guidance based upon the experience of railroads generally as to what regulations will constitute the most efficient scheme for the absolute protection of life and property, such a corporation may well be said to have done its whole duty toward the public, so far as the security of passengers is concerned. If, however, it fails in any one of these respects and an accident is the result, plainly enough the company must be held blameworthy. But if, in spite of the adoption and maintenance of all the safeguards which we have suggested, an accident occurs through the failure of some employee to observe the directions which have been laid down for his guidance, or through his personal inefficiency when suddenly confronted with a condition of danger, then the moral responsibility is obviously very different. In such a case the company has done what it could to avert the possibility of peril, but it cannot eliminate the liability of human beings to err. The chance that the best of servants may fail at the critical moment must always exist, and this chance renders it impossible for any railroad company, even with the wisest conceivable management, to make it certain that no accidents will happen on its line. Of course, very much can be done to lessen the frequency of accidents, but they will continue to occur to some extent so long as the liability to err remains an attribute of humanity.

In this sense, therefore, a certain proportion of railroad accidents must be regarded as inevitable. But railroad managers should never cease in their efforts to render such accidents fewer and fewer every year.

An Argument by Mr. Lodge.

The Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, who is stumping the First Maine district for the Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT REED, who is confined to his House, made and answered a queer query in a speech which he delivered at Portland the other night:

"Do you suppose that it is a mere accident that there have been eight thieves among Southern State Treasurers in the last three years? It is not accident; it is because there is no fair expression of public opinion."

Instead of finding in these Southern embezzlers an argument for the Force bill, Mr. LODGE might have found in them an argument against another favorite notion of his, almond-eyed reform. The trouble with the defaulting Southern State Treasurers was that they were kept in office too long. The Democratic party in a number of the Southern States has forgotten the sound old Democratic rule and practice of rotation in office. It has pampered a set of lazy aristocratic officeholders who have felt themselves under small responsibility to the people, have behaved in office pretty much as they pleased, and finally gone to the devil because there was nobody to watch them. These defaulters are an example of what the civil service of the States and the United States would be under the conditions desired by the civil service reformers. Holding their offices practically for life, civil servants under the Mongolian plan would degenerate just like those State Treasurers. Not that they would all become dishonest, but they would grow lazy, careless, insolent, and inefficient. The civil service needs to be cleaned out from time to time just as a room needs to be ventilated, swept, and dusted.

Mr. LODGE is a very clever man, but he seems to have a curious conception of a "fair expression of popular opinion." He would secure that expression by taking elections out of the hands of the people and putting them into the hands of thimble-rigging partisans. He would establish a great officeholding caste and put it in a position not to be affected by the expression of popular opinion.

Never has there been a dispute between labor and capital so simple, so intelligible, and so devoid of all complication that can in any way cloud the one single issue that constitutes the entire issue as that which the United Federation of Railroad Employees will be asked to express themselves upon to-day. There can be no misunderstanding on the part of the alliance that is asked to join in battle against the New York Central Railroad as to the nature and the purpose of the conflict proposed.

The scale of wages, the usual origin of great strikes, is not involved. The question of recognizing a labor union has nothing whatsoever to do with the affair. First and last, there may have been a little curtness in dealing with some of the labor representatives on the part of the railroad officials, but the public can congratulate itself that the mere matter of good or bad manners doesn't rise into the question at all.

The point at issue is arbitration upon discharged employees, a trial before their employer's action can be confirmed, and, of course, their return to their places in case the verdict goes against the employer.

That is the whole of it, and happily it doesn't afford the slowest intelligence the slightest room for mistake about it. When you know what you are doing, it is always much easier afterward to see what you've done.

The Hon. JOHN T. HEARD, who represents the Sixth Congress district of Missouri, faces the catechism presented to him by the Farmers' Alliance with this statement concerning the Sub-Treasury bill:

"Within the last three weeks I have been twice informed by Mr. PICKLER of Dakota, who introduced the bill, that the officers of the National Alliance were not determined as to whether they would press further this bill, or reform it."

The farmers had by all means better reform it, on the principle of the old-fashioned cure for mange—cutting the dog's tail off close up to his ears.

We wish to coöperate in remedying a wrong reported by our contemporary, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, which declares that an injustice has been done the order of California's Native Daughters in that their work toward celebrating California's Admission Day has not excited so much attention as was given to the Native Sons and the Pioneers. The Native Daughters appear to be organized in "Parlors," numbering four in all. There is the Alta Parlor, the Golden State Parlor, the Minerva Parlor, and the Oro Fino Parlor. On the night of the celebration each Parlor will give a series of tableaux concerning California.

The Native Sons, who also seem to be divided into Parlors, have adopted "suits for the celebration."

"Golden Gate Parlor will have striped coat and pants, white vest, and straw hat. National Parlor's uniform is kept a profound secret, but it is said to be something awful. San Francisco Parlor wears white coats, vests, and hats, with black pants. Niantic Parlor wears white vests, straw hats with blue bands, black coats and pants. Sequoia Parlor, white vest, straw hat, and white tie. Stanford Parlor proposes to outdress all the rest, providing cloth enough for HENRY MARTIN'S vest can be found. They will wear black coats and pants, white vests, tan kid gloves, black fob watch chains, silk hats, and silver-headed canes, with patent leather shoes and red socks."

These are beautiful suits, so far as they go, but there seems to be a striking omission. For appearance in public all gentlemen, and so, of course, the Native Sons, and the Pioneers, and the Junior Pioneers must every man of them wear a pair of trousers.

What a grand day it will be for California on Sept. 8! The only danger we can suggest seems that when the time comes for it to come off all the Native Sons may be found in the Native Daughters' Parlors.

The situation in Chicago seems reduced to this: After deciding that the Lake Front-Jackson Park site was unfit, the Site Committee, having investigated all other sites, concluded that they are all worse still, and sadly return to consider the site rejected first.

Chicago has no site fit to hold a World's Fair. She has place only for a fair such as she herself is fit to make—a Chicago fair. She should have that by all means, and let every one help.

There is one great contest which Americans of any and all conditions can watch with undivided interest and unanimous hope; the beautiful struggle of Sunol against time. Everybody, WEBB and POWDERLY included, is for Sunol.

It is Bigger.

From the Kansas City Times.

To-day we shall learn if Matt Quay's bathband is as big around as Tom Reed's sash.

The Horse Goes On Forever.

John Splan's View, in the Chicago Inter-Ocean.

The horse business never gets old or run out.

Dr. Simonson's Unique Distinction.

From the Boston Transcript.

The Rev. Dr. Leopold Simonson of Hartford is the most magnetical Volapukan in Connecticut.

Harrison at the Bargain Counter.

From the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Before leaving the city the President stopped into Wanamaker's store and made a few purchases.

THE TUCSON STAFF TROUBLES.

A Severe Criticism of a Peculiar Method of Hiring Government Officers.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 22.—The endorsement made by the President upon the papers in the court martial cases of Major Amos S. Kimball of the Quartermaster's Department, Major Albert S. Towar of the Pay Department, and Major Joseph W. Wham, also of the Pay Department, shows that the acquittal given to these officers by the court does not go upon the record quite free from official criticism.

These officers and Capt. Alonzo E. Miltimore, assistant quartermaster, were all stationed in the Department of Arizona. Major Kimball was chief quartermaster of the department, and the three others were on duty at Tucson. Major Kimball served during the civil war in the Ninety-eighth New York, and was appointed to the Quartermaster's Department in the regular army soon after the close of the war. Capt. Miltimore served in Wisconsin regiments, and at the close of the war was made a Second Lieutenant in the First Artillery, and in 1879 was transferred to the Quartermaster's Department, being an appointee under the Hayes Administration. Major Wham served in an Illinois regiment and was made a Second Lieutenant in the Thirty-fifth Infantry after the war, honorably discharged a few years afterward, and then made a paymaster in March, 1877. Major Towar was appointed to his present office in 1875 under President Grant, without having served in the war.

The charges in the various cases involved fraud and irregularities. Capt. Miltimore was accused of leasing his own house to the Government for office purposes, with an excessive charge of rent; carrying his wife and a servant on the pay rolls, needlessly or without their rendering proper service; using artifices to conceal the nature of those transactions, and was also accused of fraud in the purchase of a typewriter for office purposes. Major Towar and Major Wham were charged with making agreements for the rent of office quarters in such a way as to secure their own private quarters in the same houses nearly rent free, while drawing their full allowance for quarters from the Government. Major Kimball was called to account for not properly inquiring into what was going on, leaving his subordinates to make these improper arrangements.

The court ordered to try the accused had Col. H. M. Black, Twenty-third Infantry, as President, with a Colonel, three Lieutenant-Colonels, four Majors, and two Captains of line and staff on the detail, and Capt. Carbaugh as Judge Advocate. They do not seem to have found much difficulty with the case of Capt. Miltimore, in regard to which their sentence was that of dismissal from the army. As to the other three officers, their verdicts were acquittal; and in Major Kimball's case they went so far as to make the verdict "honorable acquittal." It was shown on the trial, by the testimony of Capt. True, that the lowest bid received for rent of offices for the two paymasters and the quartermaster was $75 per month. What was actually paid by Capt. Miltimore's arrangement was $120; but it was urged that if his own premises had not been hired a night watchman would have had to be engaged. Major Kimball introduced evidence to show that it was not the duty of the chief quartermaster, but of the commanding officer at a station and of the local quartermaster present, to hire necessary quarters and offices.

President Harrison, however, while approving the findings in the case of Major Kimball, held that even the latter was not wholly excusable for ignorance of what was done on the part of Capt. Miltimore, in thus renting his own premises under another name than his own. Many officers, however, will insist that this is more than the customs of the service require of Major Kimball. As to Major Wham, the President holds that he was aware of the plan, if not a party to it, and that he derived some benefit from it, and therefore the approval of his acquittal is given reluctantly. Finally, as to Major Towar, the President declares that he derived an unfair advantage from arrangements made by which the Government was "to pay a monthly rental of $35 for one room in a house containing seven rooms, while the accused secured for his private use the six remaining rooms, a garden, and a stable for $10 a month, and was at the same time drawing commutation of quarters." These comments will cause no little discussion in the army.

A FEMALE CUSTOMS BROKER.

A Lady of 20 Years Who Conducts a Prosperous Business.

From the Pittsburgh Dispatch.

CINCINNATI, Aug. 13.—A modest appearing young lady came into the office of Appraiser of the Customs Bordsal yesterday afternoon, said something to that official in a low voice, received an answer, smiled her reply, and went quietly away. Beyond an attractive face and pretty wave her coming would call for no comment, especially by any one bent on business. She is Miss H. R. Groser, Cincinnati's female Custom House broker, probably the only lady in the world engaged in that business. She is a great success, and has the largest business in that line in the city, and is another example of what women can do if given an equal chance with men. The business is a most difficult one, and is about the last one that a young lady would think of engaging in. Miss Groser is decidedly young and pretty, and celebrated her twenty-first birthday in July. It is an extraordinary business in its numerous details in which she is engaged. One must know the different rates and figures, the duties on every manner of goods from every country under the sun. The bills are made out in the coin of the country from which they come, and she must reduce that to United States currency. She must be posted on the tariff laws and regulations.

Miss Groser has the patronage and confidence of the largest importing firms in Cincinnati. Their goods are consigned direct to her. She figures up the duties, pays it, and delivers the goods. She can handle a dryman to perfection, despite her demureness. Miss Groser's father was formerly a Custom House broker. He died, and her sister took up the business, but after two years gave it up. Miss Groser was too young then, but several years later determined to earn her own living, and soon received the patronage of her father's old customers. Her sharp business methods soon brought additional customers, and to-day she is the leading Customs House broker in the city.

Luminous Paint for Keyholes.

From the Chicago Tribune.

Said a Madison street druggist: "I am selling a good deal of luminous paint lately. What for? To put around keyholes. Such a thing used to be unheard of? Yes. Why is so much of it sold now? I'll tell you. The electric light of the street is the cause of it. In the good old days—more correctly speaking, in the good old nights—men who went home late o' nights had no difficulty in finding the keyholes, for the reason that there was a lamp right in the middle of the block, and it showed the hole. Now this electric light of the street is on the corner, and if your keyhole is in the middle of the block you have to fumble to find it. Somebody, I don't know who, painted his with luminous paint, and the result travelled like a piece of gossip. From that time the demand for luminous paint has been on the increase. When a man comes in here and asks in a sort of sneaking way for 10 cents' worth of luminous paint I know he is a late stayer down town and that he is going to paint his keyhole."

Sweet Male Things with Bracelets.

From the Philadelphia Press.

ATLANTIC CITY, Aug. 21.—One of the young men who delight in adorning their persons with white yachting costumes, wide silk sashes, and stunning white kid shoes, appeared on the board walk to-day with a bracelet on his wrist. Not a heavy gold band, but a ring of silver not thicker than an ordinary finger ring. It was clasped with a tiny lock, and he took more than ordinary care that the ornament should be noticed, and wore it with evident pride.

This is not an isolated case. If one will take a position on the board walk and watch closely, he will discover that one in every five men who are attired in white flannel suits will have this band of silver encircling his wrist.

What We Are All Talking About.

Whistler will give an exhibition of his pictures in New York this fall. Among the works to be exhibited is his famous portrait of Carlyle, and it is highly probable that the picture will remain in the United States as the property of some collector. It is some years since Whistler has made a considerable exhibition of his work in this country, though some months ago the Grolier Club exhibited a collection of Whistler etchings and a few little things in oil.

In the course of the concert at Brighton Beach last Monday night, just as the orchestra was about to begin the overture to "Tannhauser," a party of gentlemen entered the pavilion, incidentally making considerable noise, and the auditors, turning round in their seats to ascertain the cause, added to the confusion. Mr. Seidl also turned, with an annoyed look, but this immediately vanished, and in its stead a pleasant smile spread over his face, and he politely bowed in the direction of the group of gentlemen. The orchestra, following his lead, grasped their instruments and played a brilliant fanfare, while the newcomers took their seats. The audience looked mystified. Mr. Seidl said something to the orchestra, who substituted for the number on the programme a magnificent march and rendered it most impressively. Then the concert went on as usual. While the people were leaving the pavilion many expressions of wonderment were overheard as to the cause of the unusual interruption. It was stated that Herr Xaver Scharwenka, the distinguished Polish composer, and his friends had caused the interruption and that in his honor the orchestra had played his arrangement of Chopin's "Funeral March."

The Editor's Awful Plight.

From the Troy Press.

"Armed Outlaws in Our Midst" is the title of an Albany Union article. We fear the editor has been eating cucumbers.

MUSN'T WASH THE STREETS.

Mr. Gilroy Limits Mr. Beattie to the Use of the Broom.

Commissioner of Public Works Gilroy yesterday wrote to Street Cleaning Commissioner Beattie protesting against the steam fire engine adjunct to street sweeping, and the use of the flushing process in cleaning the city's thoroughfares. Commissioner Beattie has latterly had one of his gangs equipped with an old Amoskeag engine, borrowed from the Fire Department, and they have been washing the streets as well as sweeping and scraping them. West street has been so cleaned, as well as South Fifth avenue, and Nassau street, and some streets near Essex Market.

Commissioner Gilroy's objection to the continuance of the practice is based on a report from Horace Loomis, Engineer in charge of Sewers, who says that it results in choking the sewers and filling the catch basins with mud and organic matter that will become offensive and dangerous. The added expense of removing the dirt from the sewers as compared with the cost of removing it directly from the streets is also justly considered by the critics of the Department of Public Works to be an item of importance.

Of course the first effect of the report of Engineer Loomis was to recall the fact that he was chosen Commissioner of Street Cleaning to succeed James S. Coleman, but soon fled from the task, taking a long vacation to recover from the work and worry that he found in the office. Then he returned to the peaceful place that he had before—that of Engineer of the Sewers—in whose defence he now rises up as though inviting contact with the turmoil of the Street Cleaning Department that he had previously turned away from.

Commissioner Beattie's surprise at the reception of the letter was undisguised. But he would not listen to any suggestion other than that Mr. Loomis had the good of the service of both departments at heart and was well disposed toward his successor in handling the municipal broom. He ordered the use of water for street cleaning purposes stopped at once and referred Commissioner Gilroy's letter to Superintendent Whalen for investigation. Mr. Whalen reported that he had examined the sewers in the streets that had been flushed and compared them with others in other streets. He could not discover any such results as Mr. Loomis had complained of.

Commissioner Beattie said that his own official observation of the process of flushing would not support Mr. Loomis in his assertions. "I watched the operation in Nassau street the other night. After sweeping the street clean and taking up the dirt, the water was used to loosen up that in ruts and crevices, a particularly useful and necessary service. But the loosened dirt is not washed into the sewers. The brooms are used again and the dirt piled up and removed. Nothing but water goes into the sewers."

'TIS A GREAT RACE.

The City of New York Reported to be Gaining on the Teutonic.

News of the transatlantic tussle between the steamship City of New York of the Inman line and the Teutonic of the White Star line reached this port yesterday on three ocean-crossing craft. The Normannia of the Hamburg-American line was the last of the incoming trio to see the racers. They were then over twelve miles apart, the City of New York leading. The Teutonic was directly astern of the Inman ship, and both were apparently using all the steam they were capable of generating.

The City of Berlin of the Inman line passed the City of New York at 6:43 o'clock on Thursday morning, or about twenty and a half hours (actual time) after she passed the Sandy Hook lightship. The City of Berlin was then 372 miles from the lightship. The City of New York was going at the rate of about 18¾ knots an hour. Nineteen minutes later, or 368 miles east of the lightship, the City of Berlin met the Teutonic. The racers were then about eleven miles apart. The Britannic of the White Star line also passed them. When the Normannia spoke the City of New York she was 385 miles from Sandy Hook. It was then five minutes of 8 o'clock. At 8¾ the Normannia passed the Teutonic, over twelve miles astern. As there was only twenty minutes, or about six miles, difference between the racers when they were timed off the Sandy Hook lightship on Wednesday morning, the City of New York had gained about twenty minutes on her White Star competitor when the Normannia passed her. The Trave passed the Teutonic at noon on Thursday, but saw nothing of the City of New York.

The Normannia made a very quick voyage from Southampton, coming within an hour of the record from that port, held by the Columbia. She took a northerly course and averaged 18.91 knots an hour. Her time was 6 days 16 hours and 55 minutes, equal to a little more than a run of 6 days from Queenstown. But for high head-winds and tumultuous seas she probably would have broken the record. She passed one big iceberg and several small ones off the Banks. Her daily runs were 383, 458, 480, 476, 486, 462, and 300 miles. She brought 1,092 passengers, 428 of whom came in the cabin.

Brooklyn's New Elevated Road.

Thomas F. Miller, Hassan H. Wheeler, and Howard F. Forker, the committee appointed by the Supreme Court to consider the application of the Atlantic Avenue Railroad Company to build and operate an elevated railroad on Atlantic avenue in Brooklyn, between South Ferry and the city lines, have submitted a report favoring the application.

The committee thinks that the proposed structure will not be an objectionable sight, as claimed by some protesting property owners, and that it will not only be a great convenience, but will help to improve trade in many sections of the city.

The structure is to be substantially like that of the Union Elevated Railroad on Flatbush avenue. Two tracks will first be erected, and provision will also be made for the addition of a third track, east of Flatbush avenue, for rapid transit. The span east of Flatbush avenue will be twenty-seven feet, and from Flatbush avenue to South Ferry twenty-four feet. It is thought that there will be no further opposition to its construction.

A Letter of Voltaire's.

Speaking of the statue of Voltaire, a French paper has unearthed a letter of his upon precisely that subject, addressed to a friend, and here is the lesson which the philosopher gives:

"Enjoy life while you can, despise all the rest. I think I have already told you that I am not *dignurque sumimate vultus*. I am no longer the possessor of what might be called a face. I look like a baked apple on the top of a crane's neck. It would never do to carve out that.

"Some little time ago the Duchess of Brunswick begged so hard of the King of Prussia to send her his statue, made after the fashion of Louis XIV. in the Place des Victoires, that his Majesty was unable to refuse her. He got himself sculptured in this fashion, astride on a turkey cock, and instead of four slaves around the base there were four monkeys grinning. You will admit that after all it ill becomes small folks to be vain. But if you wish, I will send you one of the monkeys of that statue, and you can put my name at the foot of it.

"My dear sir, let us esteem only health and repose. All the rest is smoke, and I have already spent too much of my life in running after smoke. I wish you a genuine happiness, if there is such a thing.

"VOLTAIRE."

Cardinal Gibbons and True Statesmanship.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The press railroad strike reveals quite vividly the sagacious policy of his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, during the discussion at Rome few years ago respecting the reciprocal relations, rights, and duties of the employer and the workingman, as well as the advisability of tolerating or condemning such organizations as the Knights of Labor.

Apart altogether from the merits or demerits both of the question at issue and the respective parties thereunto, Americans of all classes cannot but gratefully perceive the lofty wisdom of eliminating from such an organization the most delicate and ignitable of forces, namely, the religious element.

If it had not been for Cardinal Gibbons's far-seeing discretion and enlightened patriotism in causing those industrial and economical combinations of a domestic character to be let adjust themselves, the unpleasant result is obvious.

A recorded Roman judgment would now be invidiously introduced into this distressing yet wholly American conflict, to the sorrow of all peace loving men, but, of course, to the bitter vexation of the censured party of the second part, namely, maintaining itself aggrieved by "foreign aggression," and all that sonorous high dudgeon.

In such regretable event, the unearthly comeliness of religion must inevitably be subjected to unkempt misapplication. Why, you, I, even we, might not take the liberty of thanking the American Cardinal, through THE SUN, for the timely hint, and, in the interests of the timely, judicious, little rise, the Holy See's politic previdence so conducive of the sovereignty of the people—the Papacy, and the best interests of the welfare sake of practical Christianity and sound harmonious citizenship. HUGH FLATTERY.

NEW YORK, Aug. 21.

Hang the Flags at Half Mast!

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Would it not be well to suggest that the vessels in the harbor should half mast their flags during the Ericsson ceremonial? From the proper or vessels, especially this country is due, as they owe their origin to him. Very truly yours,

W. C. CUCHER.

A careless diet, or change of diet, often produces in summer weather an obstinate diarrhœa, or some serious bowel affection, which, if you would treat rationally, try at once Dr. Jayne's Carminative Balsam, a safe remedy for such attacks, and equally effectual for cramps, cholera morbus, dysentery, and summer complaints.—*Adv.*

ELECTRICAL.

The idea, suggested some time ago, of utilizing electricity for