The Sun.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1891.

Subscription by Mail—Post-paid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70
WEEKLY, Per Year	1 00

Postage to Foreign Countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

Two Hundred Millions.

Do the leaders of the Democratic majority in the Fifty-second House mean business? The appointment of Judge HOLMAN to his old post at the head of Appropriations would convince the country that honest and economical government is the programme of this session from the word Go.

Are the good resolutions which the Democrats of the Fifty-second Congress carried to Washington to outlast the honeymoon? There are several guarantees which would be highly satisfactory. The prompt, for example, abolition of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that costly experiment of recent years, would be a pledge of practical value.

The record of the Billion Congress should be lowered by at least two hundred millions of dollars before Speaker CRISP dismisses the Fifty-second.

A Clerical Dynamiter.

There is evidence that in a sermon delivered on Sunday last, the Rev. SAMUEL H. VIRGIN of the Pilgrim Congregational Church in this city not only preached against Governor HILL, but went so far as to propose that the Governor should be murdered. "The voice of GOD," he declared, "speaking through the public conscience, demands that he be taken to the precipices of the world and flung into the abyss of eternity."

Simply stated, this means that Mr. VIRGIN desires and advises the assassination of Governor HILL.

This political clergyman appears to lack nothing but courage to make him equal to the wretch who threw the bomb designed to fling into the abyss of eternity a man who had refused him a million.

The law provides for a clerical murderer the same punishment as for any other; but there is something supremely shocking in the frenzied language of assassination upon the lips of a Christian minister.

The Union League Club's Affliction.

The Union League Club has decided by a majority of more than two to one that it intends to remain a distinctively Republican association, and therefore wants no officers and no members who are not of that political faith and practice.

The reason for its making this emphatic declaration is that the club has been infested, to some extent, with Mugwumps. As Mugwumpery is a child of Republicanism, it is inevitable that such a household should suffer from the infliction. Every family must look after its own progeny, and the duty to which the Mugwumps have consecrated themselves requires that they should be in political company where they are not wanted. If they were wanted, there would be no occasion for their presence. Their self-denying labors would have been completed, for wherever Mugwumpery is welcome there is nothing else except Mugwumpery.

Hence the Mugwumps have remained in the Union League Club with the more pertinacity for the very reason that they are objectionable to the rest of the members. They look on the prejudice against them as lamentable evidence that their presence is necessary for the moral and political elevation of the family. They are convinced that they are the true leaven which should leaven the whole mass. Their duty may be disagreeable, but it must be performed. If people refuse to accept them as exemplars, they feel that their obligation to exhibit their moral grandeur is all the greater.

The Mugwump company, though so small when counted in the election returns, is numerous as compared with the total membership of the few clubs in which their whole force is gathered. Hence these clubs are the particular and most grievous sufferers from them. So far as the great political parties are concerned, they are of no consequence, but in such limited circles they may make themselves as prominent as their self-estimate is high; and in a strictly political club like the Union League, the strain of looking up at their moral exaltation must become painful to the rest of the members.

It is not surprising, then, that the Union League has made up its mind that it cannot endure any more Mugwumps, and that the Mugwumps already in its ranks must not be allowed to hold offices in the club which will compel a more concentrated gaze upon the brilliancy of their moral effulgence. Of course it cannot get rid of its Mugwump members, but it can show them that it is a hopelessly Republican association, irredeemable even by Mugwump example.

The Union League Club deserves the sympathy of all compassionate men, whether Republicans or Democrats, for its trial is hard. Do what it may, it will have to endure the society of its Mugwump members. They cannot be driven away. Fidelity to their principles compels them to remain.

A Great Pennsylvanian Vindicated.

We find in the columns of the *St. Louis Republic* a letter from the Hon. J. RICHARD BARRETT, formerly of Missouri, but now of New York, a man evidently of experience in public affairs; and he makes the following remarkable averment:

"The war had not been very long in progress when it was discovered that SIMON CAMERON, to whom the position of Secretary of War had been given, was found guilty of peculating in arms. Of course he was dismissed from the high office in a very summary manner."

This statement is entirely inaccurate. No such discovery was ever made. No charge of peculation in arms or in anything else was maintained against SIMON CAMERON. He was not dismissed from the office of Secretary of War in a summary manner. Nothing disgraceful was attached to him in that matter or in any other; and when he left the War Department, in 1862, he was appointed Minister to Russia, an appointment which would never have been made by Mr. LINCOLN had there been against him any such accusation as that alleged by Mr. BARRETT.

When the civil war commenced, there was not in the country any supply of arms or any means of procuring one; and yet arms, in immense numbers, formed an indispensable requisite for military operations. Gen. CAMERON took means to procure what was needed in the promptest manner. He gave contracts to every establishment that would undertake to manufacture arms of the sorts needed; and in due time the deficiency began to be made good.

Meanwhile the opponents of the war, the opponents of the Administration, and, more than all, the opponents of CAMERON, overflowed with assertions that these contracts for arms were excessive, improvident, and far beyond the possible need of the war. This was the only accusation brought against him. No sensible man believed that there was any peculation whatever on his part; but the outcry was loud, and finally President LINCOLN deemed it advisable to give way to it. Hence CAMERON's resignation and his commission as Minister to Russia.

The outcry against these contracts was finally proved to be ill founded and erroneous. The new Secretary of War, Mr. STANTON, investigated every contract with the aid of Assistant Secretary WATSON, a man most competent for such a duty; and out of the whole number we do not think there were as many as half a dozen that were rescinded, and those were of little importance. By this investigation the charge of improvidence and extravagance was disproved, and the patriotism and fidelity of CAMERON were fully vindicated.

The Disclosure of Godkinism.

All fair-minded citizens will follow with interest, in many cases not unmingled with amusement, the painful wrigglings of the *Evening Post* to get out of the false position in which its malicious hatred of the present municipal Government has involved it. It has been charging for weeks that the two present Commissioners of Excise who belong to Tammany Hall and were appointed by Mayor GRANT have been brutally indifferent to public morals and criminally neglectful of their duty in regard to the licensing of saloons in the neighborhood of public schools. The terms "brutal indifference" and "criminal neglect," as applied to Mr. KOCH and Mr. FITZPATRICK, are the *Post's* own libel.

We exposed the other day the trick of map making by which the *Evening Post* sought to give color to its charges, and also its persistent and systematically dishonest suppression of the dates on which the licenses in question were originally granted. Until then, no reader of the *Evening Post* had any intimation, from that source, at least, that the hundreds of saloons on its maps and in its lists were not without exception originally established by the Commissioners whom it is so unscrupulously attacking. It is a step gained that we have forced this tough customer to confess to its own public that it has been deceiving them by suppressing the vital facts of the case, and to resort to revised expedients of misrepresentation.

This humiliating admission is made in the subjoined paragraph, in which the italics are ours:

"When the appalling extent of this evil association was discovered by the investigation thereupon begun by this journal, the responsibility was fixed, as a matter of course, on the city authorities by whose approval the saloons are allowed to be so located, namely, the Excise Commissioners; and the fact that under the law there is no actual renewal of liquor licenses from year to year, but that a new one has to be issued each year after thorough examination in every case, *seemed to make the present Commissioners alone answerable* for the objectionable positions of saloons."

Why, then, did not the *Evening Post* do what any honest journal intending to be just to all men would have done, namely, state the truth about the dates of the licenses and allow its readers to form their own conclusions as to whether the present Commissioners were or were not "alone answerable"?

Having thus confessed that it has wronged and slandered Mayor GRANT and his Commissioners in charging the latter with brutal indifference and criminal neglect of duty in the matter of the original location of a vast majority of all the saloons which it has specified as being, in its opinion, too near the schools, the *Post* takes refuge in the very quibble to which we expected it to resort. We understand it as complaining now that the present Commissioners have not revoked or refused to renew on the annual application those licenses first granted by their predecessors, which until now it has been representing as having been issued originally by the votes of Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. KOCH. We quote from the *Post:*

"The Excise Board now in existence is responsible for the existence of every saloon in New York city. It is directly chargeable with the responsibility for every existing infraction of the rule that says that no license shall issue for a saloon in the immediate vicinity of a school, church, hospital, or asylum. As a matter of law every applicant for a license, whether a new license or a 'renewal,' appears before the Excise Commission *de novo*. The courts have held that a license is a present right, and not a vested one. It can be taken away by the same power that conferred it, on the Board becoming satisfied that the license was unworthily and improperly bestowed."

Again:

"That a previous Board has failed to comply with the requirements of the law in granting a license should not be used as authority or excuse for present infractions of the law and be made the ground for perpetuating a public evil."

Here is an intentional confusion of terms, for the purpose of confusing the mind of the reader; and in this attempted confusion of ideas is the *Post's* second trick, a little more subtle, but not less discreditable, than that which it has been compelled to abandon.

It will be observed that in one place the *Post* speaks of infractions of the rule, and in another place of infractions of the law. There is no provision of law against the establishment of a saloon in the immediate neighborhood of a school. The law merely provides that the person to whom a license is issued shall have a good moral character and that the Commissioners shall be satisfied that "a license may properly be granted for such sale in the place proposed." The rule as to the "immediate vicinity" of schools is a mere rule of the Board governing its own practice. There is nowhere, so far as we are aware, any construction of what is meant by "immediate vicinity," except such as is supplied in personal opinion, in no case any more authoritative, legally, than GODKIN's personal opinion that anywhere within six hundred feet is "immediate vicinity." Different Boards and different Commissioners have interpreted in different ways a rule which, after all, is a mere generalization of a discretion vested by the law in the Board. The *Post's* attack on the present Commissioners, therefore, for "criminal neglect" of duty, resolves itself upon analysis into a complaint that they have not revoked or withheld licenses previously granted by their predecessors in the exercise of their own interpretation of their own rule governing their own practice under the discretion vested in them by the law.

The *Evening Post* knows, or ought to know, that the Board of Excise can lawfully revoke and cancel a license only when it has been obtained by fraud, or when the person holding it is shown to have violated some provision of the Excise law. In the matter of revocations it deals with persons, not places. For the present Board to attempt to-day to revoke a license which a previous Board had originally granted and in the case of which no violation of the law had been proved, merely on the strength of the *Post's* idea as to what constitutes "immediate vicinity," would subject the Commissioners at once to the attention of the nearest court of record.

Godkinism has never been more thoroughly exhibited than in this matter. It is quite of a piece with its other efforts to mislead the public that the *Post* should publish in three or four different places the statement that "the present Excise Commissioners have issued 2,067 liquor licenses for saloons established since these Commissioners took office," and at the same time should suppress the equally accessible and far more interesting fact that under their administration there are to-day in New York 247 licensed drinking places less than there were on May 4, 1889, when the present Board was organized.

The Major Shorn.

Major JONES of the *St. Louis Republic* was one of the original promoters of the MILLS movement. So confident was the Major that an alliance between himself, the Mugwump free traders of the East, and the remains of the CLEVELAND Administration would prove irresistible, that early in the canvass he bet his whiskers on Mr. MILLS's election. Every person who has ever seen and admired the Major's whiskers will understand the powerful, and, toward the last, the desperate efforts which Major JONES made to elect Mr. MILLS as Speaker.

The Democrats of the House held the interests of the party above the integrity of Major JONES's whiskers, and on Tuesday morning, Dec. 8, the Major stepped out of the Riggs House barber shop in Washington in a condition of facial nudity which would have prevented Mr. MILLS himself from recognizing him. No wonder the *St. Louis Republic* took this gloomy view that morning of the situation:

"The noblest Democrat in the United States, the purest patriot, and one of the ablest statesmen that we can boast of, has been sacrificed by tem, clan and faction rings, combinations and corruptionists."

The wail is not merely for MILLS; it is for MILLS plus the whiskers. But our unfortunate friend has lost something besides his whiskers and his confidence in the patriotism of the American people and the future of this republic. He has lost what was to him infinitely more precious, namely, his faith in the disinterested consecration and personal loyalty of the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND. In his wail for MILLS and the whiskers, Major JONES does not forget to mention the circumstance that his candidate for Speaker was "publicly repudiated in the crisis of the contest by the one man whose battle he was fighting, and who should have been anxious to extend all the help in his power."

The reproach which Major JONES, in the intensity of his grief, hurls at the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND is unmerited and unjust. Mr. CLEVELAND worked for MILLS to the end, and repudiated him publicly only just so far as he thought necessary for the protection of his own exalted and unselfish aspirations.

Nevertheless, we fear there will never be a return of the happy and halcyon days when the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND was telegraphing to St. Louis, on the morning after a Democratic victory with which neither CLEVELAND nor JONES had anything more to do than Mississippi tumble bugs have to do with the market price of Cambodian white elephants, "Give my compliments to Col. JONES. His work and mine, I think, are bearing fruit."

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Atlanta Constitution*, calls upon Congressman TOM WATSON of Georgia to resign, on account of his being the Alliance candidate for Speaker instead of supporting Mr. CRISP. Our contemporary doesn't yet understand the lofty ambition of TOM WATSON. Mr. WATSON expects to be President of the United States yet, and he will not resign anything meanwhile. As the leader of the Alliance people in the House he will wield an immense voice if the Speaker doesn't turn a stony eye upon him.

Philadelphia is again trying to get excited with vast projects for new steamship lines, new docks, rapid transit, a bourse, and so on. Why will she attempt to throw off the placidity that so well becomes her and make herself uneasy with a desire to be modern and improved? Rest is better than rapidity. Philadelphia wears a laurel and bears a bun that nothing can take away from her. What are docks and steamships to her? She is the peanut centre of the United States. Isn't that honor and greatness enough? We are ashamed of Philadelphia. Stratford-on-Avon will be howling for the establishment of soap factories next.

There are not now so many "abandoned farms" in the New England States as people who have heard of them, without examining the facts regarding them, may think there must be. Official reports about the abandoned farms of Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire have recently been made by the Boards of Agriculture of these States. There were only 406 of them in Vermont last spring, and a good many of these have been taken up since that time. There were 966 of them in Massachusetts at the same period of the year, not a few of which have been purchased and brought under cultivation since then. There were 1,442 of them in New Hampshire two years ago, but hundreds of buyers have gone to the State and made selections from them within these years. We have not at hand yet the official reports on the subject from the other New England States, but we are sure that there are far fewer abandoned farms in Connecticut, Maine, and Rhode Island than there were in Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire in the early part of this year. Moreover, it appears from several of the reports of the State Boards of Agriculture that many of the farms classed in them under the head of "abandoned" were not, in reality, abandoned at all, in any proper sense of the word, but were merely for sale or were left to lie fallow by their owners for reasons satisfactory to themselves.

In some of the Southern States, however, the amount of land that has been abandoned or that has lain untilled for years is very great. Here, for example, is a report issued by the Virginia Board of Agriculture, which says that in that State there are 15,000,000 acres of land suitable for crop growing which are not tilled and which are a burden to the owners. "Most of this land," we are assured, "is for sale at low prices, and all of it would produce splendid crops, profitable to industrious farmers." As it is in Virginia so is it in the adjacent State of North Carolina and in other States as far west as Arkansas.

It is these Southern States that send out the loudest invitations to farming immigrants who possess at least a small capital.

The Emperor of Austria gave a State dinner the other day at which beer was passed around in tankards after the soup. The Shah of Persia is said to be nursing himself with a quart of brandy a day, and has a tile in his fez most of the time. Now, if the Emperor of Austria would only teach the Shah to like beer, and to substitute it for brandy, what a blessing the change would be for Persia and her potentate. We are not sure that Col. SHEPARD's first duty is not with the Shah rather than with the Sultan.

The "Russian influenza" is the name now given by foreign medical journals to the epidemic that is prevalent to an alarming extent in Austria and Germany, as well as in the country of its origin, and that also exists in New York and other American cities. The ravages of the epidemic have been very severe in the famine-stricken regions of Russia, and it has advanced westward from there in the opinion of German and Austrian doctors who have been making a study of it. But there is now something to be feared, or to be guarded against, that may be even a worse evil. Advices have recently been received in Berlin from Russia that a malady resembling the Asiatic typhus has made its appearance in the province of Kazan, on the Volga, where millions of people are starving; and there is, of course, danger of its spreading westward. Public warnings of this danger have been given in Austria and Germany, and we have a report that the Governments of these countries are about to establish a strict quarantine along their eastern boundaries.

Now, we have in these times a large immigration from famine-stricken Russia, in which a peculiarly dangerous form of influenza and a still more dangerous form of typhus are widely prevalent, and, therefore, it behooves the medical authorities at this port and at other American ports to be on their guard.

If the Rev. Dr. TALMAGE's Tabernacle is indebted to the Brooklyn Presbytery and cannot be got to pay the amount due; if the Tabernacle is heavily indebted to the contractor for the mason work upon it, and has been brought before a Brooklyn court on that account; if the Tabernacle is head over ears in debt, as a Brooklyn clergyman declares it to be; if, at the same time, the Rev. Dr. TALMAGE is drawing an enormous salary from the Tabernacle, surely a Talmagean sermon on the subject ought to be preached in the Tabernacle, and an appropriate text for it can be found in the words, "Pay that thou owest." It will be observed that the initial verb of this text is in the imperative mood.

We can hardly believe that the Mexican filibuster GARZA has again found refuge in Texas. We are unwilling to believe that Gen. STANLEY's cavalry force on the Rio Grande can fail to arrest this audacious and defiant outlaw if he again sets foot on American soil.

Brooklyn is waking up. The Brooklyn Union Elevated Railroad Company has determined to run all-night trains on its main branch from the Bridge to East New York, and now the late worker or reveller, and the New York young man who has to see his Brooklyn girl home from the theatre or ball, need not fear that he will be left out in the remote and extensive suburbs of our growing sister city without means of returning to his home the same night. Brooklyn is to be congratulated on these occasional signs of metropolitan growth.

The two millions of Russians in the Czar's military service have an advantage over some other millions of their fellow subjects in the fact that they will not be permitted to perish by starvation.

The parishioners of an Ohio clergyman are trying to reduce his salary and force him to resign because he will not give up smoking. They say that he smokes too much, while his sermons do not smoke at all, being "not of the JONATHAN EDWARDS style," for which they long. They do not complain because his cigars are strong or rank, but they think that even the mildest cigar is a vice, and especially when smoked by too mild a theologian. If this smoking parson can only be induced to feed his flock with the sincere milk of Edwardsism, they will soon find out that his torch of tobacco is really only a prefiguration of a theological Chicago. He smokes for a sign.

Daniel Webster and Slavery.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mr. George Ticknor Curtis has shown plainly enough that Daniel Webster could have had no sympathy or purpose in common with Garrisonian Abolitionists. These favored disunion as preferable to observance of Constitutional obligations against which they had conscientous scruples. They regarded the Constitution as a league with hell for the oppression of the negro. But the Garrisonians represented only the extremest among anti-Slavery men and women who were identified with both Whig and Democratic parties, who attempted only the restriction of slavery in the States then sheltering it, and its exclusion forever from new territory.

Among these Daniel Webster must certainly be counted. Repeatedly he professed his opposition to the extension of slavery, though when the compromise measures came up he waived slavery prohibition against the new territory acquired from Mexico on the ground that the character and population of this new territory made slavery impossible, and that it was "needless to reënact a decree of God." This expression sufficiently denotes Mr. Webster's opposition to slavery, and it also shows his unwillingness to resort to extreme or unnecessary measures for its extinction. Where Daniel Webster most grieved many thousands throughout the North, was in his support of the Fugitive Slave law, making all Northern States a hunting ground for slaveholders, and requiring every citizen on demand of a United States Marshal to aid in returning fugitive slaves to their masters.

By very many Northern anti-slavery men and women this law was considered of doubtful constitutionality. The strict letter of the bond was that such fugitives from service "shall be returned" to those to whom such labor or service shall be due. This power was not among those directly delegated in the Constitution to the Federal Government. It therefore came under the provision of the Constitution reserving such powers to the States and to the people. This was States rights doctrine, long held in the South for the preservation of slavery. But it was also generally accepted in the North, thoroughly by the Northern Democracy, and in scarcely lesser degree by Northern Whigs.

It was the desperation of Southern slaveholders thus fenced in and unable to extend their peculiar institution that led them into the aggressive policy that proved slavery's downfall. The drastic fugitive slave law, placing the power of returning fugitive slaves to their masters without the jury trial that the Constitution requires, was the first of these aggressive measures. To this Mr. Webster agreed. He died two years after the adoption of the compromise measures and before any further aggressions by slavery were attempted. To assume that Mr. Webster would favor a repeal of this earlier compromise of 1820, forbidding the introduction of slavery into Kansas and Nebraska, is not warranted by his known hostility to slavery. Over the Territories the Federal Government is given exclusive power by the Constitution. It is the belief of many warm friends of Daniel Webster that had he lived the policy of Abraham Lincoln would have been his. Mr. Lincoln, like Mr. Webster, was originally a Whig. Yet when delivering his first inaugural Mr. Lincoln reaffirmed the strong States rights declaration which the Republican platform of 1860 affirmed. Upon that platform, had Daniel Webster lived through the war and reconstruction eras, it is certain that he would have been one of the most powerful supporters of the Constitutional powers of the Government. This is the thought most beautifully expressed by the poet John G. Whittier in "The Lost Occasion," written in 1881 as amends for the severer judgment in "Ichabod," written thirty years before. W. J. F.

ROCHESTER, Dec. 3.

Hell.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A few days ago you published an editorial on hell, giving various theories in regard to it, and statistics as to the number of people likely to go there.

While it is not pleasant to think of being in hell, or having one's friends there, the old-fashioned hell, with all its terrors, is a very powerful protection to morality.

When a man knows that others will treat him exactly as he treats them, he is very careful, but if he thinks the other man cannot treat him in like manner he may take advantage of his weakness. The law of the land protects the weaker from such injustice, but there are many cases in which the wrongdoer may hope to escape the penalty of the law, yet will be restrained by the fear of a hell from which there is no escape.

When the Society for Ethical Culture began to teach morality the writer thought it would have a good influence on people who were prejudiced against the Church; but when one of its leaders said that in certain cases suicide (which is a crime by the laws of the State) was justifiable, he decided that it was dangerous.

People who profess liberal ideas should take care that their liberalism does not lead them to countenance what is wrong.

It is praiseworthy to care for a small-pox patient, but it would be wrong to take him where others would be exposed to the disease.

If a man lowers his standard of morality to countenance wrong he will soon find that he must either admit himself to be wrong in his first act or else he must countenance many other wrongs in order to be consistent.

Men have not yet learned that to do right toward others is one's duty to himself. They have not yet reached that state of perfection at which punishment becomes unnecessary. There is still reason for the existence of hell. They who do right have no cause to argue against it. M.

A Rare Bird.

"Skipley's partners got onto what he was doing, and he had to make himself scarce."

"Ah! It's his scarcity, then, that led his partners to offer $10,000 for the capture of so worthless a person."

SLUPSKIANA.

The Name and the Fame that Fill the Land.

☞ Correspondents consulting THE SUN upon matters relating to the name and fame of Col. Abe Slupsky are requested to be as brief in their communications as is consistent with the clear statement of what they desire to know. We also beseech them to be patient if they are not answered at once. In due season and to the best of its ability, this department, although overworked, hopes to fill every proper order for information concerning the statesman whose sudden and splendid reputation gilds the last years of the dying century. Merely frivolous inquiries will be a waste of the trifler's time; and we have on hand a large stock of silent contempt for the benefit of those enemies of the cause of School Reform who think they can strike at Slupsky through the columns of THE SUN.

The *New Castle Graphic* has the impudence to present to its readers in the Shenango and Neshannock valleys the subjoined picture as an authentic likeness:

From the New Castle Graphic.

COL. ABE SLUPSKY.

We say impudence, rather than ignorance, for it is inconceivable than any person, intelligent enough to edit a western Pennsylvanian newspaper, should print in good faith this burlesque portrait, supposing that the bold, sly, and wicked physiognomy truthfully represented the features of a man who has consecrated his genius to the elevation of the common school system. This latest of the many bogus portraits of Col. Abe now in circulation is an adaptation and distortion of the *St. Louis Republic's* pretended portrait, printed some time ago in THE SUN and here reproduced in order that the two faces may be compared:

From the St. Louis Republic.

COL. ABE SLUPSKY.

The St. Louis portrait is obviously the basis of the New Castle caricature; and we may add that while the former is not so insulting to Col. Abe as the latter, it is scarcely more satisfactory to the noble ideal which the friends of School Reform have formed of their champion's personal appearance.

1. What does Col. Abe Slupsky do for a living?
2. Is he Democrat, Republican, Farmers' Alliance, Mugwump, or Prohibitionist; or is he for Slupsky only, first, last, and all the time?
3. How much does he weigh? TARIFF REFORM.

1. He is a public trustee.
2. He has generally acted, we believe, with the Republican party; but he is greater and better than that party, and is first, last, and all the time for School Reform.
3. Physically, about one hundred and forty-seven pounds; morally and intellectually, many tons.

1. Who discovered Col. Abe Slupsky?
2. Did the Colonel receive his military title on the battlefield, or is it his by courtesy merely?
3. Will the School Reform movement as represented by Col. Slupsky furnish a plank in the platform of any party in the coming Presidential canvass?
4. Was Col. Abe born great, did he achieve greatness, or did he have greatness thrust upon him? D. J. COLLINS.

1. Who discovered Napoleon Bonaparte?
2. Colonel is the Spanish *coronel* and the Latin *columna*—the man at the head of the column. The title is Col. Abe's by the unwritten laws of leadership.
3. Whether Col. Abe Slupsky will consent to sacrifice his own inclinations and take the field in person next year for the sake of School Reform is a question yet to be answered by the course of political events.
4. All three.

The *Kansas City Evening Times* reports the unimportant rumor that Col. Abe Slupsky is about to remove from St. Louis to Carthage, Jasper county, Mo. This would be a great honor to Carthage and the Carthaginians, but it would neither hasten nor retard the progress of School Reform. The headquarters of that movement are wherever Col. Abe may happen to be. We have no information corroborating the *Times's* story, which is of the sort frequently started by the local boomers of enterprising Western towns.

The *Cleveland Plain Dealer* is authority for the interesting announcement that Col. Abe Slupsky is a teetotaler. We have never doubted it, but the positive testimony of so careful an investigator as the *Plain Dealer* disposes of some of the current libels respecting Col. Abe's habits. It is worth noting that another statesman who has devoted much attention to educational matters is likewise a teetotaler; but there ends the parallel between Col. Abe Slupsky and the Hon. Henry W. Blair of New Hampshire. In intellectual quality the two statesmen are no more alike than a forty-carat diamond is like a dish of hasty pudding.

COLONEL ABE.

Where did he fight 'neath the Stripes and the Stars?
What is the record he has brought from the wars?
Where are the scars of this son of Mars?
They still inquire about Slupsky.

What do we care what his shoulder straps are?
Whether he was or never was there?
That fame reaching far and that name like a star
Are enough for the friends of Slupsky!

E. L. G.

Honor to a Great Public Benefactor.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Now that the courts of New York have decided that the will of Samuel J. Tilden shall be broken, and his money devoted to purposes other than he plainly intended, will the inhabitants of New York longer delay to honor the memory of its greatest citizen by erecting a monument or some public testimonial? He gave much of his time and means to purify the Government of the city and State, and by precept and example taught fidelity to public trust. There are patriotic people all through the country who would be glad to honor the great Democrat to whom New York owes so much. Will she be recreant to her duty? Very truly yours,

DEC. 10. J. O. W.

Didn't Write the Lamentations With a Big L.

From the Boston Herald.

Congressman Jerry Simpson's autobiography in the new Congressional Directory reveals the fact that his front name is just Jerry, and is not an abbreviation of Jeremiah, as might be supposed. He desires it understood that he is not the author of the lamentations.

A Paradoxical Situation in Arkansas.

From the Kansas City Journal.

Arkansas has not a dollar in her State treasury, but all the State officials are at home and accounted for.

AFFAIRS IN SAMOA.

Commissioner Ide on the Workings of the Treaty—The Von Pilsach Affair.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 11.—Henry C. Ide, ex-United States Land Commissioner to the Pacific station of the three treaty powers in Samoa, is in Washington. He is on his way to Vermont, having served as Commissioner for eight months. Regarding Somoan affairs and the workings of the treaty Mr. Ide said to THE SUN reporter to-day:

"Certain changes in the treaty terms should be made, the time for amendments as provided by the treaty, being close at hand. In the first place the absurdity is manifest of making the unanimous decision of the three land Commissioners, two of them lawyers in their own countries, possibly subject to reversal by the Chief Justice, and he a Swede appointed according to the treaty by the King of Sweden. The office of President should either be abolished or filled by a man of tact and discretion, able to harmonize the contending nationalities of Samoa. By a peculiar construction the treaty makes all customs revenues belong, quite improperly to the municipality of Apia, instead of being apportioned equitably to the whole country. The tax is assessed per capita on the entire native population, man, woman, and child, and is accordingly a great hardship to large families. It should apply to men only. Possibly a provision for the election of a King of Samoa may relieve the restless desire of the Samoans for change, and tend to the peace of the country.

"The work of the Land Commission was limited by law to two years. Over 3,700 claims had been filed by Oct. 1, when the doors closed. It is practically an impossibility to deal with all of these cases in the time allowed. So far the work of the Commission has been harmonious and the judgments satisfactory to both natives and foreigners. Now the actual truth is that with some such amendments and with discreet men in the offices, there is no reason why a success should not be made of the Government of Samoa, its independence preserved, and with that the incalculable value of harbor rights to the United States. There is the one stopping place in support of the great traffic between the United States and Australia, which is to be greatly augmented by the completion of the Nicaragua Canal, while all the South and west Pacific is already absorbed by England, France, Germany, or Holland. That gone, the United States would have no Pacific coaling stations or harbor rights, except through the courtesies of some European power which could give or withhold them."

Mr. Ide also gave the following version of the Von Pilsach affair exploited in the letters from Robert Louis Stevenson in the London *Times*:

"Portions of the chiefs of Samoa are opposed to the existing Government of Malietoa and support Mataafa. Mataafa represented Malietoa during the war with the Germans in 1887, and while Malietoa was held a prisoner, Mataafa being ambitious to be the King, established headquarters at Malie, about six miles from Apia, where he was surrounded by the chiefs friendly to him. The significance of this location is that Malie is the place where the kings are crowned and from which they take the name 'Malietoa.' Mataafa has already assumed the kingly name. Were it not for the naval support given King Malietoa by the treaty powers, by the terms of the treaty of June 14, 1889, it is doubtful whether he could maintain his position in the presence of his rival. Six chiefs of Manoud being captured, however, were tried by the Government for treason as adherents of Mataafa. They were sentenced to six months' imprisonment with the provision of daily exercise in the open air. Fears of a rescue from this terrible doom were entertained. It is charged that Baron Von Pilsach, the President or King's adviser under the treaty, representing the three treaty powers, advised that dynamite be placed under the prison and exploded if attempts were made to rescue the prisoners, with the effect of blowing into atoms prisoners and rescuers alike. Arrangements were completed, it is charged, in accordance with this fiendish plan. But the expected attack did not occur, and the next day the prisoners were deported from the country. Public sentiment in Samoa was wrought up by this incident, and Mr. Stevenson and other citizens addressed Baron von Pilsach with a remonstrance. His replies were regarded by those who addressed him as decidedly insolent and evasive. When the King refused to take his advice in the matter of currency his influence became impaired and he tendered his resignation in a heat of passion. That was in October last, after the Samoan decree declaring Mataafa and his adherents rebels and their lands forfeited. His resignation has not been acted on by the three powers, but it is doubtful if he will be or ought to be kept there."

AN INSANE MAN IN A GREENHOUSE.

He Attacks the Son of Its Owner and Shoots Him in a Struggle.

MALDEN, Mass., Dec. 11.—For some time an unknown man has been seen in the grounds of the residence of James C. Newton. About ten days ago Charles Newton, aged eighteen, met him in the greenhouse and asked him what he was doing there. The stranger whipped out a revolver and threatened to kill Newton, but the young man ran away. Last Saturday night while Newton was crossing the back yard a shot was fired at him. The bullet whistled close by his head. He fired two shots at a man he saw running away, but without apparent effect. The police were called in and kept watch till yesterday without result, when the watch was discontinued.

This morning young Newton went to the greenhouse to fix the fires, and had hardly entered when he was pounced upon by the stranger, who exclaimed: "Now I have you, and I mean to kill you!" The man had a revolver in his hand and tried to point it at Newton's head. Newton clinched his assailant and fought desperately in an endeavor to prevent the use of the revolver. The intruder finally threw young Newton to the ground and, pointing the revolver at his breast, fired. The prostrate man threw up his right arm at the same time and received the bullet there. The would-be murderer, not knowing where the bullet had taken effect, said: "There, if that don't fix you I'll stay around until I do, if it takes till Christmas." He then made his escape out the back door, leaving the revolver, a 32-calibre bulldog, on the floor.

Young Newton says he knows no reason why an attempt on his life should be made by any one. His assailant is short and stout, with full black beard, and looks like an Italian.

A CRANK AT THE WHITE HOUSE.

He Gave His Name as Thomas Henry Mercer Hogg, and He Wanted to See the President.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 11.—A man giving his name as Thomas Henry Mercer Hogg was arrested a few days ago at the White House while endeavoring to gain an audience with the President, and he has been adjudged insane by a board of physicians. Failing to gain admission to the Executive Mansion, Hogg wrote a letter to Mr. Harrison, which reads as follows:

Mr. Benj. Harrison, President of the United States.

DEAR SIR: What I, Thomas H. M. Hogg wishes to speak to you about is from the time signified the declaration of my intention to become a citizen of the United States of America I have not had the protection of a citizen in Fordham, the state of New York and in the city of New York, and in Bayonne, Jersey state, and in Homestead the state of Pennsylvania the time I came here was in Oct. 1889, their is a number of persons after me the same as in England and Ireland ever since 1882 and I cannot get a stop to the same and me to injoy the privileges of a citizen of the United States.

THOMAS HENRY MERCER HOGG,
Brickmyer, 100 D. Street, N. W.

He enclosed a letter addressed to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, which he requested to be forwarded to that official. Hogg is about 28 years old. He had $121 in currency in his pockets when taken into custody. He could not be induced to tell where he lived, but it is supposed, from papers which he had about him, that he came from Fordham, N. Y.

The "Shark-biting" Question—More Interesting Evidence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Having spent some years on the east coast of Africa, washed by the Indian Ocean, and many in the immediate vicinity of Wall street and Capel Court, I have had opportunities to become acquainted with the habits and customs of different species of sharks.

An ounce of fact is worth a ton of report, and upon the biting question of water sharks I give you the following of my own experience, seen of my own eyes:

In February of 1886 a coolie ship (*i. e.*, a vessel carrying East Indian laborers), with several hundred coolies on board, was blown ashore on the coast of Natal, S. E. Africa, and many of these poor fellows sought to save themselves by jumping overboard, in the hopes of swimming ashore through the surf. A few succeeded, but many were drowned; and now to the point at issue.

While the men were struggling in the water a perfect school of sharks was hovering around. It was noticed that no one of a man was able to swim the sharks would approach, but not attack him; but no sooner did he lose the power of motion than several would immediately attack and literally tear him to pieces.

The vessel was close on shore, and early morning, and revolting sights of this nature continued all through the day. This was witnessed by many people from the neighboring town and villages, myself among the number.

I have had other opportunities of judging the subject, and, while no naturalist, I am of opinion that the shark is illadapted for seizing or biting any active body in the water, such as an expert swimmer, and further, that, like the king of beasts, it has in some way acquired a record as a dangerous and daring enemy to which its true nature does not entitle it, but that sharks will and do bite and devour human beings when they have lost command of the reason which impels them to take advantage of their superior power of rapid movement when attacked to defend themselves, the foregoing experiment testifies. Very truly yours,

NEW YORK, Dec. 8. LOUIS M. BAMBERGER.

PROBATE OF THE NEWCOMBE WILL.

Surrogate Ransome Overrules Motions for a Stay and a Postponement.

The will of Richard S. Newcombe, to which his daughter, Mrs. Ida Florine Lederer, had filed objections, was admitted to probate yesterday by Surrogate Ransom. Mrs. Lederer has decided to appeal and to bring an action for a portion of the estate, as if her father had died intestate. The case will be similar to that of Mrs. Laura S. Appleton to recover an interest in the site of the Plaza Hotel, and her guardian, Ira Leo Bamberger, has retained Col. E. C. James, also counsel for Mrs. Appleton, to proceed in this action.

Mrs. Lederer, who was disinherited after her marriage to George W. Lederer, made two motions before Surrogate Ransom to transfer the case to the Court of Common Pleas. She said that some other Judge should sit in the case, as Surrogate Ransom had been a close friend of her father, and had been one of the pall bearers at his funeral. Another ground of her motion was that the evidence would be conflicting, and should be submitted to a jury. The Surrogate denied her motions, and she appealed. She asked for a stay of the probate proceedings pending an appeal from the last decision of the Surrogate on her motion, but the Surrogate refused the stay.

Peter A. Hatting, representing her guardian, presented an affidavit to the Surrogate yesterday morning when the case came up, stating that Col. James was engaged in the Plaza Hotel case and was not prepared for this trial. Besides they had an important witness in California.

Mrs. Ida M. Newcombe, the widow, made an affidavit in opposition, in which she says there could be no witness in California familiar with the facts. She averred that Mr. Bamberger, the guardian of her