The Sun.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1890.

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

The Knife of Eighty-eight.

We copy elsewhere a statement attributed to the Hon. CALVIN S. BRICE, concerning the attitude of Governor HILL toward Mr. CLEVELAND during the last Presidential campaign.

Col. BRICE is reported as saying, in substance, that Governor HILL had every motive, even from the personal and selfish point of view, to promote the election of Mr. CLEVELAND; and that, as a matter of fact, Governor HILL made through Col. BRICE, the Chairman of the Democratic Campaign Committee, earnest and repeated offers to do everything in his power to carry New York for Mr. CLEVELAND. With inconceivable fatuity and suicidal self-conceit these overtures from the Governor were rejected by the President, who regarded himself as greater than his party—too great to need any help from the leader of the New York Democrats.

Whether Col. BRICE is correctly reported or not, there is no doubt that the story attributed to him is very near to the truth of history. In one respect, however, it needs amendment, or rather supplement.

The Governor did more than to make repeated offers of political service in behalf of Mr. CLEVELAND. He actually rendered that service, generously and loyally, and in spite of the attitude which Mr. CLEVELAND had assumed toward him. He did everything in his power to carry New York for the unpopular candidate on the Presidential ticket; and in that direction he was able to do more than other man living could have done.

Moreover, while the Governor was working for Mr. CLEVELAND's reëlection as President, the peculiar friends of Mr. CLEVELAND, either at his instigation or with his tacit consent, were engaged in a cowardly attempt to defeat Mr. HILL for Governor. The only knife drawn in that campaign was a Mugwump blade, and it was aimed at the back of Governor HILL while he was laboring in behalf of GROVER CLEVELAND.

The knife-wielders of 1888 are the noisiest of the CLEVELAND boomers of 1890. They are the gentlemen who are now so zealous in explaining to Governor HILL the opportunities for political advancement afforded by the approaching election of a United States Senator in Mr. EVARTS's place, and likewise in explaining to the country the eminent fitness of Governor HILL to occupy that high office.

The No-Party Party.

It seems that the Mugwumps have another educational campaign on their hands. They are setting out to educate the voters of this town to revere and practise non-partisanship in its municipal affairs. The construction of a Mugwump machine out of the fragments of the People's Municipal League is the first movement in the non-partisan educational campaign. "The League," says the *New York Times*, "must have an organization of its own, complete enough and strong enough for all the purposes of conducting a municipal canvass, and then it must stand absolutely on its own independent ground of non-partisanship and business methods, or it will come to grief. Whether it can do this depends upon the extent to which the citizens of New York can be induced to separate their action in reference to municipal management from their feelings and preferences in party politics, and an important part of the League's work for some time to come must be the education of citizens to this idea."

The grandeur of this educational plan must compel admiration from the most unwilling, even if the absurdity of it is enough to make the laughless Yeddahs burst into merriment. To try to educate an American citizen, and especially a citizen of this city, which has more piping hot politics to the square inch than any community outside of Indiana, is like trying to make a prima donna of a deaf mute girl. The Mugwumps themselves, for all their squeaking and gibbering about non-partisanship, are the most rabid, violent, and bitter politicians in the country. They are hopelessly clumsy and incapable politicians, but politicians they are; and by meanness, trickiness, unveracity, and untrustworthiness they illustrate all the contemptible qualities of which they accuse manlier and smarter politicians.

A non-political machine founded as a political machine is a contradiction of terms and a patent humbug. P. M. L. machinists may brave the stale vegetables which their words attract from their audiences, and peddle non-partisanship at the cart's tail, and the doorsteps of New York may be piled a foot high with non-partisan tracts, but the people cannot be taught to distinguish the partisanship admitted and gloried in by one set of politicians from the non-partisanship falsely professed by another set. The P. M. L. machine will be an object lesson in municipal party politics which will offset all the educational efforts of the men who run it.

A party which is organized for the purpose of doing away with parties is the freshest thing the world has seen since NOAH turned sailor.

Will the Tories Dissolve Parliament?

The impression is current on this side of the Atlantic that the Tories mean to take advantage of the split in the ranks of the Irish Nationalist party, and to order a new general election before the schism can be healed. It cannot, indeed, be said that the London newspapers supposed to be acquainted with the intentions of the Ministry lend any color to the theory that Parliament will shortly be dissolved. On the contrary, they quote with satisfaction the assertion of a prominent Conservative that Lord SALISBURY will not stoop to profit by a private scandal and the political dissensions that have grown out of it. They point out, too, that the present Parliament has more than two years to live, that in it they have a large and tractable majority, and that with their opponents disrupted and discouraged no serious obstruction can be offered to their contemplated measures. Why, then, should they give up a bird in the hand for one in the bush?

It requires robust credulity to believe that Lord SALISBURY's course in the existing crisis will be shaped by magnanimity. We do not look for any such edifying spectacle. We believe that the Tories at this juncture will conform to the rule of conduct invariably followed by sagacious politicians, that, namely, of doing just what their opponents do not want. The Gladstonians do not now want a general election. They will, therefore, be compelled to face one. Time is needed to allay the quarrel in the Irish party and to revive the drooping spirits of the English Liberals. It follows that the Conservatives will allow no time for the purpose. No sooner will they have carried the Irish Land Purchase bill and the Tithes bill—and both of these measures are going through with a rush—than they will accept that challenge to appeal to the electors which the Gladstonians would now willingly withdraw.

Assuming that a general election will take place early in 1891, what may we reasonably expect will be the outcome? The Unionists will undoubtedly retain the 18 Irish seats which they now hold, but they are unlikely to make any gains in Ireland. Even if the two wings of the Nationalist party are not reunited, they can be trusted not to sacrifice any of their 85 Irish seats. Of the 30 Welsh seats the Unionists have but five in the present Parliament. They cannot hope to increase that number, for the Tithes bill will make the tenant farmers more hostile than they were before. Of the 72 seats allotted to Scotland the Unionists now have 26. They may possibly gain 4, but hardly more than that, the Gladstonian majorities being, as a rule, too large to be overcome. The four seats belonging to Oxford and Cambridge the Unionists have a firm grasp upon. Among the English provincial boroughs are apportioned 167 seats, of which the Unionists hold 112 in the present House of Commons. They may possibly raise this number to 120, but scarcely higher, for the remaining boroughs are Gladstonian strongholds.

We come now to the 284 seats belonging to the English counties, and to the 59 seats pertaining to the metropolitan districts, not counting the one seat awarded to the London University, which will unquestionably return a Unionist. The Tories and Dissident Liberals now have no fewer than 165 of the members representing the English counties. It was precisely in the counties that great additions were made to the electorate in 1885 by the act extending the franchise to agricultural laborers. That the newly enfranchised voters would not at once use their privilege on behalf of the Liberal party to which they owed it, was expected by those who have studied the workings of previous reform acts. A few years are needed for the new-born electors to comprehend their power, and to use it intelligently for those whose past services give token of benefits to come. Five years have now elapsed, during which the Liberals, and especially the Radicals, have prosecuted a vigorous campaign of education in the rural districts. It is incredible that the results of this prolonged propaganda will not reveal themselves in the English counties. Instead of keeping 165 county seats, the Tories will be lucky if they do materially better than they did in November, 1885, when they returned but 101 county members.

Under normal circumstances a large majority of the fifty-nine seats assigned to the metropolitan districts would go to the Liberals, from whom alone the workingmen have any sincere sympathy and substantial aid to look for. These constituencies, however, did not follow their natural inclinations in November, 1885, nor again on the second appeal six months later, because the London workingmen had been bitterly offended by Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT's course toward labor demonstrations. The wound was then fresh, and the Tories poured acid on it by setting up Socialist candidates in many metropolitan divisions and thus splitting the labor vote. The situation is now changed. The London trade unions have resolved to go into politics for the purpose of securing a legal eight-hour day. They are well aware that, although the Liberals are as yet divided on the subject, only through them is there any chance of gaining their end. The day has gone by when the London workingman could be gulled by smooth talk and side issues. He knows exactly what he wants, and means to have it. The Tories, therefore, cannot reasonably count on returning more than a minority of the metropolitan members.

What, then, is our general conclusion? It is that while the Unionists have a fairer opportunity of success just now than they will have two years hence, they must expect losses in the English counties and in the metropolis. Their chance of retaining their present majority over Gladstonians and Irish Nationalists combined is in our opinion small, and it would not surprise us if the appeal to the electors resulted, as it did in 1885, in giving Irish patriots the balance of power. Had the election, on the other hand, taken place three months ago, it is not improbable that the Gladstonians would have obtained, what they had in 1880, a majority over the joint forces of Conservatives and Irishmen. It is for the students of Irish history to say which of the two situations would be most favorable to Ireland.

The Complaint About Servants.

It is reported by one of the evening journals that families are having unusual difficulty in getting good household servants this season. The supply of domestics is said to be great enough, but the quality is described as worse than ever, though the wages demanded are higher. The large and wealthy households, employing many servants, have no trouble in the matter, but families in moderate circumstances are vexed by the servant girl question almost beyond endurance.

Very naturally, households which employ only two or three women servants are likely to have more trouble with this question than great establishments where the domestic labor is performed by so numerous a body of men and women that the duty allotted to each respectively is closely defined. In the first, more or less expert labor of different kinds is required of every servant. The cook may be called upon to act as a scullion and a laundress also. The chambermaid usually performs the functions of a table waiter, of a kitchen assistant, and a general house servant, if not of a lady's maid, in addition to the particular duties from which she gets her title. Each of them, therefore, must be something of a Jack-of-all-trades, with the usual consequence that she is master of none. Two women only are expected to render the thorough and complete service which in the greater households is discharged by at least three times as many servants, if not more.

Of course, then, it is not easy to get servants who will satisfy the requirements of the smaller households, especially where their mistresses are ladies who are content with expert service only, and are not willing to pay more than moderate wages. As soon as a woman develops into a first-rate cook, she can command high wages, and also stipulate that her duties shall be confined to cookery exclusively. A skilful housemaid, careful and trustworthy, finds no difficulty in getting a place where her duties will be less multifarious than in a family where she is one of two or three servants only; and it is in human nature that she should improve the opportunity. Hence the better a servant is, the harder it may be to keep her; and the greater her incompetence, the reader she may be to accept the situation from which, if she improves under the tuition of her mistress, she, in her turn, may speedily graduate into a larger establishment, where her acquired expertness will command greater pay for less work. That is the explanation why families employing many servants find it less difficult to satisfy their demands. They get the pick of the best in the market, as greater wealth is usually able to do.

Therefore the trouble is due to the fact that there is so great a demand for first-rate servants at good wages, coming from families which employ many servants in various capacities, where once they got along with a few maids of all work, and also from the multiplying hotels, clubs, and restaurants, with their opportunities for greater gain in the way of fees than modest households offer. It takes more servants to go round proportionately to the population; and the requirements as to service have become more exacting as wealth and refinement have increased, and domestic establishments are conducted more in accordance with the scale of grandeur kept up by people of corresponding wealth and social consequence abroad. Yet in spite of this increased demand, the average quality of domestic servants in New York is much better than it was fifty years ago, or even twenty-five years ago. It is much easier for both the rich and those in moderate circumstances to find servants who satisfy reasonable requirements.

Domestic servants are subject to criticism of a very different kind from that which other laborers are obliged to endure. They are not merely hired to do the work of their employers, but they actually live with their employers under the same roof and as part of the same household. Hence faults or peculiarities of disposition, which might not be observed in the others, in them become prominent and provocative of censure. The wonder is that under such circumstances employers and servants get on so well together.

A Reformer Surveyed from the Rocky Mountains.

THE SUN would not for a moment discredit the sincerity of motive generally pervading the consciences of the perennial reformers in politics. An honest ideal of a higher state of official business, a straightening and uncompromising purification of all roads leading to public office, and its tenure in a spirit of more disinterested patriotism than is generally supposed to pertain as things are now, is the aim always professed and often honestly held to by the hopeful reformer. But the professional mouthpieces of reform, the parties whose self-elected rôle in life is to do the working and talking for the purpose of tripping the regular party organizations, seem bound hopelessly to be the saddest sort of humbugs.

For example, the late terrible hubbub raised in this city in the name of reform, last November, when the professionals were backed up with a fanatically inflamed crowd of clergymen and women, materialized by pouring out its energies through channels of the most humiliating and heterogeneous indecencies that memory can fasten on a city canvass. Yet when it was over it turned out to have been merely a despairing effort to beat the Democratic party in the interest of the Stuffed Prophet.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Butte Daily Inter Mountain*, depicts the reformer's next move in politics:

"The New York *Evening Post*, which is edited by one LARRY GODKIN, the choicest blackguard in the United States, favors DAVID B. HILL as the next Senator from New York. GODKIN also edits the New York *Nation*, a classical Mugwump journal, which has exhausted the language of vituperation in its indignant comments upon the dishonest machine methods of the New York Governor whom it now favors for a seat in the highest legislative body in the world. And all this is because HILL is in the way of CLEVELAND for the Presidency and must be got rid of in order to give the Stuffed Prophet a chance."

This reminds us of what one of the most prominent, some might say the most prominent, Democrats in Boston said to a Southern Congressman soon after the November election: "I once thought," said he, "that I knew something of politics, but the young reformers here can give me points. If I had ever perpetrated the things they have done, I should feel an irresistible impulse to walk voluntarily into the penitentiary."

The best sort of politics in the end is straight.

Mr. Choate's Reminder to Mr. Evarts.

The speech of Mr. JOSEPH H. CHOATE at the New England dinner last week ended with this noble and patriotic sentiment:

"May we not hope that hereafter there will be no unjust laws, no unequal laws, no legislation for special interests, no *enactments for partisan supremacy*, nothing in the shape of laws but what will really subserve the true welfare of the whole people?"

Has Mr. CHOATE's respected friend, the Hon. WILLIAM M. EVARTS, read this speech? If so, it must remind Mr. EVARTS of that glorious hour in the Cooper Union when he, too, spoke like a patriot concerning the dangers of Federal interference in local affairs for the sake of partisan advantage.

Mr. CHOATE could have chosen no more delicate way to recall his senior to his duty as a representative of the Empire State, or to suggest to him the degradation and self-stultification of his present employment as a heeler of GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR in the shameful attempt to put through the Force bill.

At the first session of the present Congress provision was made for the appointment of a commission, to consist of two naval officers, an army officer, and two civilians, to select a site for a new dry dock on the Pacific coast.

It was well understood that the dry dock implied the probable establishment of a new navy yard, and that it must be far enough north to meet the needs of the States of Washington and Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, as the California coast is already provided for by the Mare Island yard.

The report of this commission has been laid before Congress. It shows that after a careful examination the site chosen was the one at Port Orchard, behind Bainbridge Island, in Puget Sound. There fourteen fathoms of water can be had, with a sheltered harbor, plenty of timber and even of coal not far distant, and an abundant supply of fresh water, while the approaches can easily be defended. A navy yard at that site would also be a nucleus of defence for all Puget Sound, and an offset for the British station at Esquimault.

The point to note is that last year a naval commission, consisting of Capt. MAHAN, Commander CHESTER, and Lieut.-Commander STOCKTON, after a like investigation, fixed on this same site of Port Orchard. With the double recommendation Congress should go ahead and provide for the dry dock and navy yard at once.

The principal obstacle to the success of any gas-law policy in the Senate is the character of the gentleman who sits in the Vice-President's chair.

We have spoken of the extraordinary measures adopted by Brazil to attract immigrants from Europe, and of Brazil's rivalry with other South American republics in the work of stimulating the growth of population. The foremost competitor among all these republics thus far is Argentina, which has drawn about 800,000 settlers from Europe this year, one-third of whom were brought across the Atlantic at the expense of the Argentine treasury. The Government agents find employment for them in the fields or in the mines or in the cities, and thousands of them are engaged in constructing docks and other public works in Buenos Ayres, for which the Government appropriated $10,000,000. It is from Italy that nearly all the immigrants are obtained, and the Italians in Buenos Ayres now outnumber all other foreigners, and even the natives. Argentina has plenty of room for millions of Italians, and Italy can spare millions of her people.

In the lines subjoined, the *New York Times* pretends to give its honest estimate of Mr. GROVER CLEVELAND's character as a public man:

"It has always been characteristic of CLEVELAND in his public career that he does not undertake to manage the people or his party by the tricks and wiles of the politician."

You really believe that has always been Mr. CLEVELAND's characteristic, do you? What, then, did you believe when you said of one of the acts of his earlier public career?

"This is about the cheapest and scurviest trick, even of this low-priced statesman."

Have you changed, or has Mr. CLEVELAND?

Merry Christmas is a "back number." We are now looking forward to a Happy New Year's Day. After that, we shall give heed to the ways and works, the wiles and whims of mankind during the revolving days of 1891.

The United States Fish Commission steamer Albatross, under Lieut.-Commander Z. L. TANNER, is about to resume the work of deep-sea dredging, selecting for this purpose the portion of the Pacific between the Galapagos Islands, on the equator, and the Isthmus of Panama. This is an interesting and valuable branch of scientific research, in which the Challenger and other vessels of the British service and the Blake, Hassler, and others of our own, have been of great service. The Albatross has made very extensive contributions to this subject, having investigated the eastern Pacific through a large part of the distance from Sitka down to Acapulco, as well as the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico. She is well adapted for her task, and her approaching voyage should yield good results.

If the programme drawn up before Christmas is followed, Mr. HOAR spent last night before his mirror, practising in his nightshirt the great speech on the Force bill which he will deliver to-day.

It is an important contract that has been made by the Government of the republic of Colombia for the building of a railroad from Buenaventura northward to the Gulf of Darien, southward to the Ecuadorian frontier, and eastward to the navigable waters of the Amazon. It will open up extensive regions that are sparsely inhabited, establish rapid communication between many cities that are isolated, give new markets for the products of the interior, bring Colombia into closer relations with this country, and form a branch of a desirable highway across the South American continent. We apprehend, however, that the Colombian Government will find hard work in maintaining the liberal guarantees that it has given to the railroad builders.

THE TESTIMONY OF COL. BRICE.

He is Reported as Saying that Mr. Cleveland was the Cause of His Own Defeat.

From the New York Press.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 27.—Chairman Calvin S. Brice of the Democratic National Committee, when here the other day, confided to a distinguished Democratic Senator a bit of political information which is of peculiar interest. Seeking to explain why Gen. Harrison, and not Cleveland, was elected in 1888 Col. Brice is reported to have said:

"Governor Hill did not knife President Cleveland. Cleveland knifed himself. In effect, he committed political hari-kari. Governor Hill came to me and offered to do anything in his power to carry New York for President Cleveland. He impressed me as being perfectly honest and sincere in the matter. I am of that opinion still. Why should he not have wanted Cleveland to win?

"Aside from party reasons, and Hill is a Democrat, he would want Cleveland to succeed for purely personal and selfish reasons. If elected President again he would be out of Hill's way. Defeated he would be a dangerous rival to the Governor. Hill made all manner of overtures. I went to see Mr. Cleveland, and urged him to meet Hill half way, quarter way, or any way at all so he met him.

"But he would not. He was imbued with the idea that he was greater than his party. He believed that he had been the cause of the Democratic victory in 1884. He believed that he and he alone could repeat it. He was the great leader, and it was the duty of all Democrats, big or little, blindly to follow his lead. He refused to be placed under the slightest obligations to Hill, and ignored him entirely. The consequences are only too well known."

An Independent Democrat's Views.

From the Lyons Evening Courant.

THE SUN, the fairest and ablest Democratic newspaper in the city of New York, though never noted for attachment to ex-President Cleveland, comes out squarely against the "Stuffed Prophet," and declares that he is unworthy of a place among the great leaders of the Democracy. The occasion of THE SUN's criticism is the ex-President's speech at the recent banquet given by the Tariff Reform Club of that city. Its criticism is not more severe than just, and, tearing the hypocritical robe of pretence and egoism from the parochial statesman, it presents him in his real personality—a man without the courage of his convictions and a politician of the ward stamp. THE SUN is a progressive Democratic newspaper, and reflects the sentiment of the intelligent and honest classes of its party. Cleveland was the creature of circumstances, begotten by chance, and that he has outlived his usefulness becomes more apparent as time proceeds.

Bror 'Lijah Meets Bror 'Possum.

From the Washington Post.

Mr. E. W. Halford, Private Secretary to the President, had never seen an opossum, so far as he knew. A few days ago he heard that one of the colored attendants of the White House had secured one of these animals. It is not surprising that Mr. Halford was curious to see the animal. He asked to have it sent to him so he could see it. It was sent in—not alive, but dressed—and duly inspected. Then it was brought out by one of the colored doorkeepers, who had a grin on his face to think that Mr. Halford had never before seen a 'possum. The animal was wrapped up with loving care and taken away by its venerable colored owner, and the President's Private Secretary was a wiser man.

Billroth Still Inoculating.

From the London Standard.

VIENNA, Dec. 14.—Prof. Billroth in his lecture to-day denied that he had left off inoculating with Dr. Koch's lymph, and added: "I was, and still am, of the opinion that Dr. Koch is one of the greatest men of our century; but it is impossible to form an opinion as to the efficacy of his method until several years have passed. Before it can be taken into practical use the same time may have to elapse as between the first discoveries of Volta and Galvani and their application to telegraphy. I myself waited five years before making known my method of inoculation with iodoform in cases of caries of the joints, and even then I spoke of it with the greatest caution. I should like to ask political newspapers to abstain from publishing anything about Dr. Koch's method for at least a year."

Pardonable Curiosity.

From the St. Johnsbury Republican.

THE SUN, brightest and raciest of all newspapers, has this mysterious announcement in its prospectus for next year: "THE SUNDAY SUN will print the novel of the year by the coming man of English fiction, the writer of 1891, who, with the publication of this astonishing novel, will have arrived." For goodness' sake, who is he? Won't THE SUN tell us?

No Two-cent Poet, This!

From the Atlanta Society.

Dr. Lyman W. Denton of Minneapolis is in the city and contributes to *Society* the charming little poem, "Life," which appears this week. Dr. Denton is a poet who has received $1,000 for three poems from the *Atlantic*, and he is a writer of high standing in the West.

A Modern Poem.

From the Boston Hub.

Mrs. Kendal's daughter, Dorothy, has written a poem. The young woman's eye seems to be better than her ear, for the lines look very well. There is something in her philosophy, also; but as for melody!

The sea was dark and cloudy
The win was blowing fiddy
And then I saw my darling
Coming in the distance
I kissed him, he kissed me

Next week I was on the beach
I was married to my darling
And we kissed each other like of old
We were so happy when we thought
Of olden times when we were young

Years past, and we were happy
Like before. But one dark
Night, my love was ill.
She had the whopping cof
And when the doctor came
Alas she was dead.

Then Harry on his knees he went
And prayd that he should follow her
He died, and after many years
He met and they p.ayed
In heaven and thought of
Olden times when they met on the beach
And kissed each other when
Not married.

THE NAME THAT MEANS VICTORY.

Pertinent Observations by a Western Democrat and Old Cleveland Man.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: At the present time it looks as if there would be only two candidates before the National Democratic Convention for the Presidential nomination, Gov. Hill and Mr. Cleveland, both of them from the State of New York.

It is believed by the friends of both these gentlemen that Gov. Hill will have the New York delegation in the Convention. Ordinarily this would control the decision of the Convention as to rival candidates from this or any other State. But in recent years Democratic policy has not been shaped according to time-honored usage. Extraordinary methods and policies have come into vogue. We even hear the singular battle cry in some quarters that "Defeat with Cleveland is better than victory with Hill." I cannot agree with this sentiment. Democratic victory to me, and to the great masses of the Democracy, is always preferable to defeat in any form.

But if the choice of the Democracy of New York State is to be ignored or overridden by the outside friends of Mr. Cleveland, let us point to some other considerations which may have weight with at least those Democrats who prefer a Democratic victory with Hill to defeat with any man, no matter what may be his individual pretensions. Let us, then, look over the field.

I believe every candid Democrat will admit that whoever the nominee of the National Democratic Convention may be, he will receive the electoral votes of the Southern and border States. These, under the new apportionment, are:

Alabama	11	Missouri	17
Arkansas	8	North Carolina	11
Delaware	3	South Carolina	9
Florida	4	Tennessee	12
Georgia	13	Texas	15
Kentucky	13	Virginia	12
Louisiana	8	West Virginia	6
Maryland	8		
Mississippi	9	A total of	159

To win the next Presidential election we must secure 223 of the 444 electoral votes. To the 159 votes of the foregoing Democratic States we must add 64 more votes to be successful. Where are we to get them? Instinctively every Democrat turns to Indiana, 15, Connecticut, 6, New Jersey, 10, and New York, 36, a total of 66; and we must have every one of these States or we are defeated. Therefore the questions before the next Democratic National Convention resolve themselves into two: "Which candidate is the stronger in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana?" and, "What platform will help most to gain a Democratic victory in these States?"

The personality of the two candidates is so well known, they have both been before the public so long, that the candidacy of each of them is largely independent of a platform. Mr. Cleveland is the conspicuous champion of free trade as expounded by Mr. Mills of Texas and the New York Reform Club. Gov. Hill is for revenue revision and reform on the lines of the National Democratic platforms of 1884 and 1888. The issue in 1892 in the four doubtful States, if Mr. Cleveland be the nominee, will be reciprocity versus free trade. If Gov. Hill is the nominee it will be revenue revision with reciprocity versus the McKinley bill and the Force bill.

Should Cleveland be the nominee there might be a campaign of explanation in the three Eastern doubtful States urging that he was not in favor of free trade right away; but it would be an explanation that would not explain. It would be a losing fight from the start. The unquestionable attitude of Mr. Cleveland before the American people in 1890 is that of Mr. Mills, who is a declared free trader. His name is as closely identified with free trade in the popular mind as McKinley's name is identified with the McKinley bill. No campaign of education can obliterate this fact.

Now, free trade may or may not be a good thing in the long run, but if voted for in 1892 it would precipitate a financial, manufacturing, and commercial panic in this country unequalled in its history. It would dissolve credit, paralyze trade and all industry, and bankrupt the people. The list of the States that would suffer more than others would include New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Does any sane man think that the people of these States would deliberately vote wholesale disaster upon themselves? Would even the theoretical free trader himself imperil his property and investments by casting a vote for his ideal when it came to the test? I think not. No sooner would the great manufacturing, commercial, and financial interests of these States begin to realize that their property and business were endangered by the possibility of a free trade victory, than Democrats and Republicans alike in all the walks of life would combine for the public safety to prevent the calamity. Even to-day the shadow of the possibility of such a contest is projected across the business interests of the nation.

Gov. Hill's candidacy in these doubtful States will restore confidence; it will give assurance to every business man who is alarmed at the prospect of Cleveland's nomination that the conservative element of the Democracy is in control, and that the land is not to be given over to dreamers, experimenters, and fiscal revolutionists.

Now, as to the doubtful State of Indiana. It has ever been, since its admission to the Union, a political battle ground. The voters in both parties are like the trained soldiers of an army. They revere their leaders as a veteran reveres his successful commander. Party strength is closely balanced. Victory is won or defeat sustained by a small margin of votes. If there has been a slight Democratic preponderance heretofore, it is thought the recent marvellous development of natural gas and the industries built up by it have neutralized this advantage. Gov. Hill has not one irreconcilable political enemy in the State. Mr. Hendricks was the idol of the Democracy of Indiana. He led them for years in victory, and suffered with them in defeat. He was known by sight by nearly every Democrat in the State. He was to Indiana what Seymour and Tilden were to New York, and yet every friend of Thomas A. Hendricks of Indiana has just cause for being an enemy of Grover Cleveland of New York. The friends of Gov. Gray in Indiana and of Senator Voorhees are not admirers of Mr. Cleveland. In no State of the United States, not even in his own State of New York, is Mr. Cleveland more generally disliked, and for cause, by the members of the Democratic party. In a State like Georgia or Texas, with an overwhelming majority, this would not be important of itself, but in Indiana, where a few hundreds of votes may confer victory or defeat, it is an important factor.

To sum up, then, briefly:

No Democratic candidate, whoever he may be, can receive the suffrages of the Republican West, the Northwest, the Pacific slope, and New England, except Connecticut, in a Presidential year.

Any Democratic candidate can secure the 159 electoral votes of the Southern and border States.

The remaining sixty-four votes necessary for victory must come from New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana, or not at all. To lose any one of these States is to lose the election.

Wisdom unerringly points to David B. Hill as the man who can carry these States, also the Southern vote, if any man in the Democratic party can do it.

The writer is a Democrat. He voted for Grover Cleveland twice for President. He worked for him in both canvasses. He respects Mr. Cleveland's courage and convictions, but he feels that 1892 is not the time for Democrats to consider anybody's personality in determining the choice of a party candidate. The Democratic National Convention will not assemble to bestow a medal, but to pick out a victorious leader. IOWA.

No, Indeed.

"Do you think if Porter were called on to decide this controversy about the Census of Hades he would underestimate it?"

"Not by a long shot. It is not a Democratic stronghold."

THE QUESTION OF POLICE MATRONS.

They are Necessary—They Should be Appointed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In your issue of yesterday Police Commissioners Voorhis and Martin are quoted as giving certain reasons why police matrons are not required in the station houses of this city, and it is stated that the demand for the more complete separation of the women prisoners from the men and the appointment of police matrons is made on account of a sentiment only, and not to remedy any existing or recognized evil. As the arguments of the Commissioners are given at length and may seem convincing to persons who do not know the facts, I hope that you will allow me to answer them also at length.

The Commissioners say, as I understand, that the men and women in the station houses are practically kept separate at present, which is true to the extent that they are kept in separate cells—that is, they are not actually in personal contact. This is, however, as far as the separation goes, except in a few station houses, where they may be kept in cells opening on different corridors. Usually, every man and boy in any station house can hear every word uttered by every woman in it, and in some of the station houses every man and boy can also see every woman in it, if she places herself at the grated door of her cell. The only separation is physical; so far as all other means of contamination are concerned, they are at the command of every vile woman imprisoned in a station house.

The statement is made that it would "demoralize the force" to have matrons on duty at the station houses, but it is impossible that the Commissioners realize what is implied in such a statement, which is, as the Grand Jury have just said in their presentment on this subject, "an insult to the entire police force of the city." It is incredible that the Commissioners can mean what they seem to mean, for their words condemn themselves for retaining in the service of the city men whom they do not believe could be trusted to behave with common respect, even when on duty, to women appointed to an official position in the same building they occupy. Do the Commissioners mean that the women who are now employed in the station houses "demoralize the force"? And if they do not, why should matrons holding a commission from the department do so?

The Commissioners say that the present system is generally satisfactory, but this is certainly not the truth, as their two colleagues have lately voted to try the experiment of a change, and almost every important newspaper in the city has supported, during the last year or two, the repeated demands made by charitable societies for the appointment of police matrons, while the Legislature has passed two bills making their appointment mandatory.

The Commissioners say that no evil results follow from the present system. They forget that one of their own officers pleaded guilty in June last to attempted assault on a young girl of 15, while a prisoner in a station house, and they ignore the constant moral injury to all men and boys brought within sight and hearing of degraded women in the station houses.

The Commissioners say that the argument against designating certain station houses to receive women, and so saving the expense of matrons for all the precincts of the city, is that then the demoralizing spectacle would be seen of drunken women being carried at night long distances through the streets to the special station houses set apart for them, and again taken the next morning long distances to the courts.

This would be a strong argument could it be shown that this evil does not now exist, in addition to those which would be remedied by the designating of special station houses for women. As a fact, however, drunken women are now carried at night long distances to certain station houses, as from Fourteenth street to Mercer street, near Third street, and they are also taken long distances from certain station houses to court, as from Eighty-eighth street to 125th street, and the added distances which it would be necessary to traverse in order to put women where they would be out of the sight and hearing of men and boys, and be under the care of matrons, could well be disregarded in view of the great advantages to be gained.

The Commissioners use a strange argument to prove that police matrons are not needed in saying that in fact there are women employed in the station houses to do many things which matrons would be called upon to do. The women referred to are those hired by the policemen themselves to make their beds in the station houses. As I have been informed by police officers, they are not under the control of the Police Board; they are not selected by any process of examination; no one is responsible for their character or good conduct; they have no recognized position in the Police Department; yet by rule 526 the Police Board directs that these women shall be called upon to search women prisoners and to care for certain of them under certain circumstances. If it is found necessary to have women perform certain duties in regard to certain prisoners, then, without question, the women who perform these duties should be in the employ of the city and should be responsible to the Police Board—should, in other words, be police matrons.

The Commissioners' argument that the women prisoners are often too bad to be cared for by women, can only be answered by the counter argument that the worse they are the more horrible it is that they should degrade themselves in the presence of men.

An experienced officer is quoted in your article as saying that women could not manage the "fighting drunks" who are brought to the station houses, that it takes three or four officers to get one of them into a cell, and that they object very much to being handled by the officers, and the conclusion is drawn that matrons would have still more difficulty with them. As a fact, the matrons would have much less difficulty; the "fighting drunks" would be more manageable by a woman than by a man, for women, even the lowest, often do resent the indignity of being forcibly handled by a man, while all other women would be much less excited if left to the care of one of their own sex.

Finally, the demand for police matrons is made in the name of common decency, to protect the women prisoners from further self-degradation, to protect the men and boys from contamination, to protect the police force from temptation. It is made because women prisoners in the station houses are usually degraded and irresponsible, not because they are sometimes merely unfortunate. These latter are probably in but little danger, but that thousands of drunken women should each year be left for hours under the care of men, and practically in company with men and boys, is an outrage against common decency which should not be continued in this city. Respectfully, JOSEPHINE SHAW LOWELL.

DEC. 27.

There's a Heart Beating for This Young Man.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Through your paper I return my heartfelt thanks to a young man—yes, more than that, a gentleman, and bravery was pictured in his beautiful brown eyes—at the corner of Thirteenth street and Sixth avenue at 15 minutes of 8 P. M., on the east side of the street. Thirteenth street was completely blocked, and as we were in the act of passing a United States Express wagon came rushing on at full speed.

This young man, who wore an ulster cape overcoat and a brown derby hat, a pair of sporting boots, and a dark cravat with a horseshoe and whip interwoven in the pin, which showed that he was no coward, stepped up and jumped in front of us women and children to save us, and with the quickness of a cat slapped the horse on the nose with an open hand, and saved us from being run over. This man had to take the abuse of the driver, who had an upraised whip crop to strike this man, who saved us and also saved a lawsuit for the express company.

In addition, I am a lady of means and an only daughter, and if I can find out the whereabouts of this young man I will reward him, and he will not know from whom it comes.

NEW YORK, Dec. 27. C. F. A.

Congressmen After Canvasback and Redheads.

NORFOLK, Va., Dec. 28.—Congressmen Lind, Blanchard, Enloe, Maish, Bynum, Robertson, Pierce, and Grimes arrived here to-day and were joined by W. P. Webb, Third Vice-President of the New York Central Railroad. Later in the day, with a party of gentlemen from this city, they took a special train over the Norfolk and Virginia Beach road for the Princess Anne Hotel, whence they will take private conveyances for Currituck Sound, about twenty-eight miles south of the hotel, to shoot redhead and canvasback duck, now swarming that body of water. The weather is all that could be wished for the sport, clear, cold, and dry, with a stiff breeze from the northwest that will keep the birds in motion and greatly increase the chance for large bags. The return is to a certain extent will depend on the luck of the party with the guns and birds.

National Beverages.

From the Epoch.

The Esquimau
Drinks melted snow;
The Teuton's cheer
Is lager beer;
'Tis very French
This "Absinthe Quench";
The Briton hale
Goes in for ale.
The Irishery
For red-eye fire
When Yankees thirst,
May I be cursed
If they don't call
For one and all,
Except the first
And worst.

THE LANDS OF THE RED MAN.

He Has Sold Large Tracts to the Government, but Has a Hundred Million Acres Left.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 28.—The purchase of 1,850,000 acres of the Crow reservation in Montana adds another great tract to the many that have recently been acquired by the Government from the Indians.

These include 9,000,000 acres of Sioux lands in the Dakotas; 4,000,000 acres of Chippewa lands in Minnesota; 941,000 in the Pottawatomie, Iowa, and Sac and Fox reservations; 1,600,000 in the Fort Berthold reservation; 650,000 in the Lake Traverse or Sisseton; 1,[illegible]000 in the Cœur d'Alene. Here we have 16,[illegible]000 acres, which the Crow purchase will bring up to 18,286,000. Only a short time ago, the Creek and Seminole titles to the Oklahoma lands were acquired, amounting in round numbers to 1,888,000 acres, so that the aggregate is 20,124,000. We need not add the 1,095,000 acres given up by the Southern Utes in Colorado, because the agreement with them is sharply opposed in Congress, and if ratified they will occupy other lands in Utah.

At all events we have an acquisition within a period of two years for general settlement of areas about equal in the aggregate to the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut. Still, the Indians have plenty of land left, since with these cessions there would remain to them in round numbers 100,000,000 acres, so that what has been acquired within two years was only about a sixth part of their landed possessions. What they still have, excluding Alaska, amounts to about 156,000 square miles, for a population of about 250,000. Accordingly, if the severalty allotment system should be carried out, we must expect a still greater acquisition of lands by the Government, which will buy the surplus. The largest allotments are those of 160 acres each to heads of families. It is true that the lands of the five civilized tribes and three others in the Indian Territory, one tract in Nebraska and those in the State of New York, are excepted from the severalty allotment law; but as, exclusive of the Indians living on these excepted lands, the total Indian population is less than 180,000, it remains true that a large part even of existing reservations will doubtless be opened to white settlement. As is well known, negotiations are now pending for the acquisition of over 6,000,000 acres in the