The Sun.

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1892.

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.

Mr. Whitney's Ultimatum.

The Hon. WILLIAM C. WHITNEY went to Europe the other day, leaving behind him his opinion that Mr. CLEVELAND ought to be nominated by the Chicago Convention.

This is equivalent to saying that, at the bottom, in Mr. WHITNEY'S opinion, the Democracy is pretty sure to be defeated, and really had better be defeated, in the election of next November.

The nomination of CLEVELAND would infallibly subject the Democracy to one of the greatest political disasters that can befall a party. Even in the Southern States, divisions and conflicts would at once break out in the ranks that have hitherto been compact and orderly; and dismay and desperation would everywhere take the place of confidence and hope.

In formulating his ultimatum, Mr. WHITNEY fails to inform the public how or by what means CLEVELAND can get the two-thirds vote which will be necessary to carry the Chicago Convention in his favor. It looks as if the thing cannot be done. The Democracy does not agree with Mr. WHITNEY'S decision. It will not adopt the alternative of committing suicide as he advises.

Before the Convention.

The nine hundred delegates who will constitute the Chicago National Convention of June 21, will meet on terms of true, absolute, and Democratic equality. The vote of the delegate from Barton Junction, Vermont, where Democrats are as scarce as black cubs in the region of polar bears, will count as much as the vote of a delegate from a Democratic stronghold in New York, Boston, Chicago, Brooklyn, San Francisco, or New Orleans. There will be no discrimination in the roll call. Each delegate will stand for his own State or district, be his constituency composed of five hundred Democrats or of five hundred thousand.

More than this, the members of the Convention will, for the most part, be untrammelled by binding or explicit instructions of any sort, the excellent example of the New York Convention held in February having been followed generally in other States, and a recommendation of support for some favored candidate being substituted for the cast-iron instructions customary in many States in previous years.

But after the Chicago Convention has been duly organized, its officers chosen, its platform adopted, and its order of business prescribed, the importance to be attached to the vote of each delegate acting individually, and of each State voting as a unit, will be fixed by an inexorable rule of political logic, Democratic usage, and common sense. According to this rule the selection of a Presidential candidate will devolve upon the representatives of those constituencies in which the Democrats are in a majority or in which they can reasonably expect to overthrow their Republican adversaries. The line of battle, in other words, will be chosen by the combatants; not by those who are merely to be the lookers-on, at a safe and respectful distance.

The nomination made, there will be nothing to prevent the earnest and sanguine Democrats of Vermont, Minnesota, Ohio, and Rhode Island from exerting themselves to secure as many votes for the candidate as possible. And they will have the proud consciousness, denied to their Democratic brethren in the doubtful or Democratic States, of knowing in advance that, be their efforts game or lame, fervent or languishing, constant or intermittent, well-directed or ill-contrived, not an electoral vote will be lost from, or added to, the Democratic column in November.

It is under these circumstances, and with a full knowledge of these facts, that the largest measure of outward disturbance appears to be caused in those States which the Democrats have no expectation of carrying; whereas the representatives of the party in those States which will determine the result, are attending to matters of legislation and of organization, studying the situation, preparing for the fray, and sawing wood.

Let Congress Build Up the Navy.

The discussion of the Naval Appropriation bill in the House last week shows that some members of that body have yet to learn that expenditures for the national defence are measures of economy.

Fifty-seven years ago ANDREW JACKSON, in his annual message to Congress, declared that "the wide seas which separate us from other Governments must of necessity be the theatre on which an enemy will aim to assail us, and unless we are prepared to meet him on this element we cannot be said to possess the power requisite to repel or prevent aggressions. We cannot, therefore," he concluded, "watch with too much attention this arm of our defence, or cherish with too much care the means by which it can possess the necessary efficiency and extension." This sound Democratic doctrine was properly quoted by the Naval Committee in its appeal to the present Democratic House; and well worthy to stand by it are these words of President TYLER, which have a peculiar fitness to-day:

"It is due not only to the honor but to the security of the people of the United States that no nation should be permitted to invade our waters at pleasure and subject our towns and villages to conflagration or pillage. Economy in all branches of the public service is due from all the public agents of the people, but parsimony alone could suggest the withholding of the necessary means for the protection of our domestic firesides from invasion and our national honor from disgrace. I would most earnestly recommend to Congress to abstain from all appropriations for objects not absolutely necessary, but I take upon myself without a moment's hesitancy all the responsibility of recommending the increase and prompt equipment of that gallant navy which has lighted up every sea with its victories and spread an imperishable glory over the country."

In later years, SAMUEL J. TILDEN showed by a statement of the enormous amount of property exposed to destruction in the seaports that the protection of our coasts was a duty which Congress owed to the people. While fixed forts are required for this purpose, yet, as the House Naval Committee of 1886 declared, full security can only be assured by supplementing these forts with "a navy which can follow an enemy to every point of attack."

It is the duty of the Fifty-second Congress to do its full share toward building up such a navy. The House committee finds that, in addition to the vessels under construction, there should be nine battle ships of the general type of the Indiana and thirty torpedo boats. The prompter the preparation to build them, the sooner they will be in service. With thirty torpedo boats needed, ten might be authorized this year. They could be built for about a million dollars, and only one-third of that sum need be appropriated at the present session. The great shipbuilding firms that compete for armor-clads would probably not undertake them, and they would fall to minor works through the country. Some of them, needed for the Pacific coast, would be built there; others would be allotted to the Mississippi Valley, where Torpedo Boat No. 2 is under construction.

Besides these, a few gunboats might be authorized to take the place of the old wooden station vessels that are falling out so rapidly, while the pending bill proposes to despatch them still faster by greatly reducing the ratio of allowable repairs to original cost. Such gunboats, half a dozen of which could be built for less than one battle ship, could serve in Chinese and South American rivers, where the heavy vessels could not go, besides being vastly less expensive to maintain. They would aid in allowing the 10,000-ton ships to be laid up in ordinary times of peace, and so prove a genuine economy.

As to the battle ships, considering that the last Congress, at its first session, authorized three of these expensive craft, besides a 7,499-ton protected cruiser, which is to cost $2,725,000, and in addition a torpedo cruiser and a torpedo boat, certainly its successor should authorize one, in addition to the armored cruiser proposed. It is urged that the works at Bethlehem and Pittsburgh have as much as they can do for several years in turning out armor for the vessels already begun. But Secretary TRACY has shown that hereafter armor can be turned out faster, and that the gain by an early authorization of new vessels in designing them, in calling for bids, and in drawing contracts, is most important.

The utmost that the Fifty-second Congress may do for the increase of the navy will be backed up by the people. A wise liberality in this respect will only set off to better advantage frugality in other directions.

How the Case Stands.

The *Atlanta Journal* prints this table, apparently laboring under the delusion that votes from Republican States in a Democratic nominating Convention are the same thing as electoral votes for the Democratic candidate:

CLEVELAND.		HILL.	
Rhode Island	8	New York	72
North Dakota	6		
Minnesota	16		
District of Columbia	2		
Massachusetts	50		
Pennsylvania	64		
Nebraska	16		
	144		72

The Atlanta newspaper is somewhat mistaken in the figures of the left-hand column. Nearly half of the Massachusetts delegation is opposed to the renomination of the Perpetual Candidate, strongly Democratic districts even in Mugwump Massachusetts objecting to him; and the case is the same in Pennsylvania and Nebraska. But, granting that these 144 delegates are all for CLEVELAND, what a fatal table to his prospects is this! The bitterest enemy the man has, the shrewdest supporter of another candidate, could not have devised a surer means of exposing the structural weakness of the Mugwump candidate. The introduction of the District of Columbia delegates into the list of the CLEVELAND men is so ludicrous that only a master of irony or a particularly besotted disciple of the elephantine economist would have been capable of it. Yet the District of Columbia, with no electoral votes, will cast just as many electoral votes for the Democratic candidate this year as Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Nebraska, and North Dakota. The Democrats in those States will have no more to do with the election of the next President than the inhabitants of West Flanders or Corea. The fact that Mr. CLEVELAND gets delegates only from Republican States, while the strong Democratic districts even in those States are against him, is sufficient to establish his preposterous impossibility. Let us put the *Atlanta Journal's* table in another way:

	CLEVELAND.	HILL.
Delegates from Republican States	144	0
Delegates from Democratic States	0	72
Democratic electoral votes	0	88

This is "How the Case Stands," except that Mr. CLEVELAND hasn't 144 delegates; but we are willing to allow him 144 for the sake of the illustration. And we desire to thank our Atlanta contemporary for putting the case so plainly.

Where Does Europe End?

For many years geographers have not agreed as to the natural boundary between Europe and Asia. Various writers, worthy of attention, have considered the question with widely differing results; and that the question is not settled yet is shown in the latest edition of that authoritative publication, "Die Bevölkerung der Erde," which gives three determinations of the total area of Europe, according as one dividing line or another is accepted as the European-Asiatic boundary.

School children are usually taught that the Ural Mountains are the dividing line between eastern Europe and western Asia. This may pass as a rough definition of that boundary, though the Ural Mountains extend neither to the ice sea in the north nor to the Caspian in the south; nor are the Urals accepted by some geographers for more than half of their extent as the proper boundary. Young students, however, should not be confused by the disputes of geographers; but how does it happen that in some of the best atlases, like "Andree's Hand-Atlas," little attention is paid to the Urals as a natural boundary between Europe and Asia?

It is because some geographers prefer to follow the political rather than the natural boundaries. For administrative purposes Russia has included in the European Governments of Perm, Ufa, and Orenburg a large region east of the Urals, and it has also placed the country of the Ural Cossacks, west of the mountains and properly in Europe, under the governor-generalship of Turkestan; and in some of the best atlases the boundary between Europe and Asia is made to conform to these political accidents, though the best authorities in Russia discountenance the idea, and say the boundary is liable to frequent fluctuations if it must needs coincide with the limits of administrative districts.

Most geographers now accept the eastern boundary of Europe as it is laid down on the maps of the Russian Government and as it has been described by Gen. STRELBITSKY, the best Russian authority. This boundary follows the Kara River from its mouth in the Kara Sea to its head streams in the Ural Mountains; thence south along the water parting between the European and Asiatic rivers in the Urals to the head waters of the Ural River; thence along the Ural River to its mouth in the Caspian Sea and the west shore of the Caspian to the city of Baku.

The question of the southeast boundary of Europe is a more debatable one. Some geographers, headed by RECLUS, insist that the remarkable Manytisch depression north of the Caucasus, whose almost stagnant waters flow sometimes east and sometimes west, is the natural boundary between Europe and Asia. RECLUS says that the aspects of the country and people south of the Manytisch depression are distinctively Asiatic, and he treats the whole of Caucasia, including the lofty Caucasus Mountains, as a part of Asia. Other writers regard the whole of Caucasia as belonging to Europe, while the Russians, under the leadership of STRELBITSKY, have fixed upon a line passing over the tops of the Caucasus Mountains as the proper boundary between Europe and Asia from the Caspian to the Black Sea.

It may be said that the leading German experts agree with the Russian view, and it is noteworthy that, while "Die Bevölkerung der Erde" estimates the area of Europe in accordance with all three of these hypotheses as to its southeastern boundary, it counts all the people living north of the Caucasus as European and those living south of the mountains as Asiatic.

This is a point upon which the geographies used in our schools do not agree; but our teachers may instruct their pupils that the Caucasus Mountains are a part of the boundary between Europe and Asia with the assurance that the weight of authority is in favor of this statement.

Discriminating Against the Druggists.

In the Excise bill which was passed by the Assembly on Wednesday and which will be brought up in the Senate to-morrow, there is one provision against which the druggists are kicking strenuously, and we think that their kicking is justified. The provision is this:

"A license to the keeper or keepers of a drug store permitting sales therein only upon a physician's certificate with prescription to be but once used, of strong or spirituous liquors, ale, beer, or wine, and not to be drunk on the premises, which shall be known as a druggist's license, for which the fee shall be $20. A druggist shall not be licensed under this subdivision unless he be a duly licensed pharmacist, and he shall not be granted any other license under this act."

Under this provision, if the Hon. JAMES WESTCHESTER HUSTED, the Peekskill CINCINNATUS, should be walking down Broadway upon a hot summer's day, and, blinded by the glare from his own unequalled cranium, should sink to the sidewalk and be carried thence, amid the weeping of a city, into a drug shop, and, reviving a little, should crave a finger of brandy, he might pine and die if no physician were at hand to prescribe, in mystical hieroglyphics, the proper amount of the water of life. We mention Mr. HUSTED'S case because we notice that he voted against the Excise bill, and we have no doubt that this was his reason. Doubtless he may learn to carry a physician's prescription in his pocket, but this is an unnecessary formula in Cortland township, we suppose; and, besides, his wink is powerful and persuasive wherever he is known.

But, seriously, a provision of this rigidity would be not merely an unwarranted discrimination against druggists; it would be foolish, unnecessary, and against public policy. The drug shops of New York and Brooklyn are, as everybody knows, temporary hospitals. The injured and those seized with illness or faintness in the street are carried to them, and to forbid the druggists from having any other license than one upon the precise terms allowed by the passage which we have quoted is unjust to the public as well as to the druggists.

We don't care whether this provision in restraint of druggists arises from a puritanical objection to all uttering of strong waters or a virtuous desire upon the part of saloon keepers to restrict the sale of wet goods to saloons; it ought to be stricken out or amended.

We Are Sorry for Him.

One of the incidental damages done by Dr. PARKHURST in his detective explorations is the injury which he inflicted on the young man, ERVING, whom he, his pastor and a man old enough to be his father, introduced to the infamous scenes and proceedings in which he took part.

This young man comes of a cultivated family, and his associations have always been refined and elevated. He has been accustomed to the society of ladies and gentlemen, and has been welcomed to it as a gracious, personable, accomplished, pure-minded, and well-mannered young man.

How will it be with him hereafter? What mother would be willing to see her daughter dancing with him? What sort of associations will his presence suggest?

Dr. PARKHURST'S moral obtuseness is so complete that he is not deterred by any shame from giving occasion for such imaginings by appearing in a Christian pulpit; but this young companion whom he led into the mire is a gentleman, and we are sorry for him.

In the Ninth Massachusetts.

The banner Democratic district in Massachusetts is the Ninth Congress district, where the Mugwump CLEVELAND promoters were powerless to prevent the election of HILL delegates to the National Convention, or the passage of resolutions declaring that with HILL as its candidate the Democracy will triumph in the coming Presidential campaign.

In 1889 RUSSELL received for Governor in this district 12,163 votes, against 5,952 for BRACKETT, the Republican candidate. The Democratic plurality was 6,211, the largest in any district of the State. In 1891 RUSSELL'S majority over ALLEN was 6,667 in the Ninth. Governor RUSSELL'S majority over ALLEN in the whole State last year was only 6,467. The Ninth district, therefore, elected him.

As the *Boston Journal* remarks, with disinterested acumen, it is puerile folly to pretend that Senator HILL has no strength among the Massachusetts Democracy.

Major SINGERLY calls the tariff plank of the Pennsylvania platform a "straddle." The plank calls for the revision of the tariff, "with due regard for the rights of American labor and the preservation of our manufactures." This is protection. According to the school of tariff reformers to which Major SINGERLY and his Mugwump associates belong, American labor has no rights in the making of the tariff schedules. American manufactures are not entitled to consideration in the arrangement of the taxes. The resolutions of the Pennsylvania Democrats may seem to Major SINGERLY to be a straddle. They seem to us to stand perpendicular, with both feet planted firmly on the great and time-honored Democratic principle of protection.

The Dame PARTINGTONS of the Canadian militia, who talk of trying one of their officers for treason in advocating the annexation of the Dominion to the United States, may not fully appreciate what they are undertaking. The offender, it seems, is not only a subaltern in the militia, but a candidate for the Dominion Parliament, so that his course is thought the more intolerable. Undoubtedly, in advising that Canada shall join her fortunes with her great and thriving neighbor, he is looking at what he conceives to be the interests of the former, and not concerning himself about the latter. What is more, thousands of his countrymen think as he does. They are not proposing to betray Canada to the United States. They see that the tide of emigration to the States from Canada is enormous, and wonder whether instead of being depleted in this way it is not worth while for the Dominion to cast in its lot with Uncle SAM'S. The superserviceable zealots who try to repress the discussion of this question have a hard task before them. An opinion crowded down in one place comes to the surface in another. But they had better be prompt with their trials by court martial, because in such matters the heresy of to-day often becomes the history of to-morrow.

It is hard to tell from our Oklahoma despatches whether there are ten thousand or twice ten thousand boomers there eager to join the grand rush for land that will begin to-morrow, when the 4,000,000 acres of the Cheyenne and Arapahoe reserves are to be opened for settlement. Our despatches have told of the hordes that were encamped all around the reserve last week, of the horsemen who were galloping from everywhere to join them, and of the long lines of wagons that were wheeling along all the roads that lead to Oklahoma. There are certainly enough people on hand to take every quarter section of the reserves that is worth taking, and to buy every town lot that can be got on very easy terms, and to start all the hotels, law offices, groceries, and lumber yards that will be needed for the rest of the century.

The present boom is the third of the great Oklahoma booms, and it surpasses both of its predecessors in bigness. It is not as wild as the first boom was; pretty good order has been preserved ever since it began; the "sooners" have been restrained in some measure; and the sharps who want to grab more land than the law allows will not have as good a show to-morrow and the ensuing days as they had at the time of the opening of the other Oklahoma reserves. We wish we could say that there is a prospect that all the fraudulent practices of former times, by which both the Government and the homesteaders suffered, and in which public officials connived most scandalously, will be rendered impossible this week; but that is something which, to our regret, we cannot say.

We are also apprehensive that the thousands of black people who have gone to Oklahoma for homes will not get fair play and will have hard times.

Now we learn by the European papers that the malady known as "black small-pox" has become epidemic in those parts of Russian Poland from which many people are coming to this country. We have had quite a number of cases of a very malignant kind of small-pox in the city during the present month, and it is now of the utmost importance that the Quarantine doctors and the Health Board should be on the guard against this new peril as they have been on the guard against typhus fever brought here by the Russian immigrants. In opening our gates to the world, we must be ever vigilant in protecting our own people.

We learn from the British medical journals that other epidemics are alarmingly prevalent in western Russia, engendered by the famine, and that there is reason to apprehend their spread in other countries of Europe.

HE CAN CARRY NEW YORK.

Why Republicans Oppose the Nomination of David B. Hill.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* He is a better organizer than even Samuel J. Tilden was. The Democrats now have the best organization in the State of New York that they ever had, thanks to David B. Hill. The State is in a good condition financially. This is largely due to the wise administration and the vetoes of David B. Hill.

The Republicans refused to redistrict the State, although such refusal was a violation of the State Constitution. The Republican minority usurped the rights of the Democratic majority. David B. Hill secured the rights of the majority by legal means. Knowing what was right he demanded it, and insisted that the Democracy should have their rights; and he accepted nothing less for them.

They say he is a politician. I presume he is. The Republicans ought to know, for every time they have met him in political battle they were his.

David B. Hill can carry New York. He has always carried it. With the best organization the Democracy ever had, he can carry it again. Knowing this, the Republicans advise Democrats to nominate some Western man.

David B. Hill is a Democrat. He is a clean man. He is a man of good character. He is a man of good habits. He is a man of great natural and legal ability. He can carry New York. He is a worker. He is a fighter. No other man can carry New York without his assistance.

Would it not be wise for those self-styled Democrats who are reviling him now to pause and consider? The national Democracy should also consider. A little foresight is better than a great deal of sight from the rear. If the next President is a Democrat, he will be elected by Democrats. He must be a man that can carry the Democratic States. He must carry New York. David B. Hill can carry New York.

A DEMOCRAT FROM 'WAY BACK.

BIPARIUS, April 16.

A Kentucky View of a New York Question.

From the Franklin Favorite.

When Mr. Cleveland ran for Governor with Hill for Lieutenant-Governor of New York we are told that Cleveland received more votes than Hill, and with Cleveland men this is evidence of his ranking popularity.

It is equally true that in 1888 Mr. Cleveland received more votes than he got for Governor and was beaten. It is true also that Mr. Hill, in every race for Governor, has gotten more votes than Cleveland received either for Governor or President.

It is just as true that when Cleveland was a candidate for President and was defeated by 13,000, Mr. Hill was elected Governor by over 20,000.

It is true again that Mr. Hill received more votes in 1888 than any candidate ever did for Governor, and quite as true that while Mr. Flower was elected Governor in 1891 by nearly 50,000 majority, he did not get as many votes by over 20,000 as did Mr. Hill in 1888.

If our friends can find evidence of Hill's weakness or Cleveland's strength in these facts we welcome them to the task.

The Alger Boom.

From the Chicago News.

This is not his year, and there is not a remote probability that the endorsement that his home folk have given him will have the effect of resuscitating his boom. That interesting political bantling expired some time ago, and it ought in decency to be laid away.

From the Boston Daily Advertiser.

Let us hope that Gen. Alger is satisfied with the "endorsement" which his alleged Presidential boom received at the hands of Michigan Republicans in convention assembled. It is safe to say that President Harrison is entirely satisfied with it.

From the Cleveland Leader.

No one even in Michigan can take his candidacy for the Presidency seriously.

Cleveland Badly Wanted in Missouri.

From the Kansas City Journal.

What the Republicans of Missouri need is the assistance of a few speeches from Grover Cleveland.

The Vision of Benjamin.

There riseth a cloud before me,
And though my good friends assure me
There can be nothing in it,
I pause for a minute
To reflect,
Mayhaps, to suspect,

From the dark Plattonian shore,
With Dudleyous threat'nings dire,
I see its McKinleyous core
Bursting with Blistering fire;
Clarksonian thunders arise
In mutterings, heavy and deep,
Quayandering over the skies
With dreadfully devious sweep;
The Millerous lightnings illume
The Hattonized edges of cloud,
While Blaineotous shadows engloom
The blue of my sky in a shroud.

Am I to be Dudleyed out of my prize?
McKinleyed clean to the bone?
Am I to be Quayed before my eyes,
Blaineoxled out of my own?

A CRITIC OF BUTLER'S BOOK CRITICISED.

The Veteran General Comes Back Upon an Abusive Assailant.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have purposely left my "Book" to make its own way with the reading public, and to take care of itself as well as it may do without defending any portion of it as regards the criticisms upon its many imperfections, for two reasons: First, because if the "Book" cannot take care of itself nobody can take care of it, for it carries its own verification of every important fact with it in the notes and appendices. Secondly, because there has been no suggestion of intended or actual falsification of any of its historical statements thus fortified. Indeed, the kindliness with which it has been noticed by the leading press of the country has left it untouched in a far greater degree than I could have hoped.

For nearly the third of a century I have been personally the target of a few ignorant, irresponsible, mercenary news writers, whose malevolence has exhausted the vocabulary of vituperation to misrepresent myself and my action, which has been poured upon me, so unnoticed by me that some of them have complained that I seemed to be covered as with a duck's back on which dirty water made no impression.

One writer, however, who has devoted his criticism of the "Book" to the task of showing my ignorance of the affairs which are dealt with in it, and of the English tongue, in which I have set them forth, I think deserves to have his motives and his deficiency in knowledge of the subjects of which he writes exposed, and especially of English, which it seems is not his native tongue.

"Larry" Godkin—I know him by no other name—who has taken part in a newspaper called the *Nation*, and also has something to do with the New York *Evening Post*, published in those two papers the same abusive matter; and the fact that it was put in the latter newspaper, once edited by William Cullen Bryant (what a fall is there), leaus me to ask a few lines in THE SUN in which to deal with him.

Godkin has been writing against me for nearly a quarter of a century. He has had one motive which would fairly stimulate him to personal abuse: Before the *Nation* appeared I advised as strongly as I could against there being paid to him from the funds raised by the anti-slavery people of Massachusetts a large sum of money with which to establish a newspaper, which he promised should be used as an advocate of the cause of the newly emancipated slaves. I am told that he got the money upon that representation. I believed fully that he would not do as he agreed to, but would make a paper for his own aggrandizement or profit; and those who are old enough to know the course of the paper will determine for themselves whether I was right. Since then he has pursued me with that vindictiveness which belongs to small men of little minds. Under such circumstances I refrain from noticing anything in his criticism of the "Book" in the flippant style of comment, and will give a few instances to show how little he knows concerning the matters of which he writes.

I state in my "Book" that I was cast ashore upon Frying Pan Shoals, and owing to the incompetence and negligence of the Captain I was obliged to take the command of the steamer in my own hands and to adopt such methods as were usual in endeavoring to save a ship in such condition. Godkin says:

"It looked for a time as if they were likely to get out of the Frying Pan into the fire of the rebels at Fort Macon, but the seamanship of Gen. Butler saved them. The ship, 'drawing eighteen feet of water,' ran upon the sandy shoal. The Captain was a traitor or an imbecile. Butler assumed command and ordered him to 'get your deep-sea lead and come forward with me!' So the Captain *shouldered* the hundredweight of metal and ten-score fathoms of line and went forward. We put behind us the question what need of sounding since they had the land aboard (*sic*) at a draught of eighteen feet. But why the deep-sea lead? The lightest of hand leads, nay, a fishing line and a sinker might have sufficed. We admonish the doubting reader that though the Corinthians of Marblehead indulge in irreverent mirth, there lies therein a mystery of the deep sea."

The account in the "Book" is as follows:

"Turning again to the Captain of the vessel, I said: 'Captain, what depth of water have we under us?'

"'I don't know.'

"'Well,' said I, 'get your dipsy lead (deep sea) and come forward with me. We seem to have struck forward.'

"We went forward together and met the mate, and upon sounding found we were in fourteen feet of water. We were on a sand bank which seemed to be quite a round bank, just *above* the foremast. The vessel drew eighteen feet of water."

Godkin says: "We put behind us the question what was the need of sounding." He evidently doesn't know the answer; but I shall not deal with all he doesn't know, for the sum of that is infinite. I will tell him: When a vessel is aground and is to be got off it is quite as necessary to know how *little* water is under the vessel as *how much*. We knew we had less than eighteen feet, but how much less we had and what was the formation and character of the land under the ship must be determined with great accuracy, and can only be determined by the use of the dipsy lead. Godkin ought to know that Captains of seagoing steamships do not shoulder or carry a dipsy lead or any other. The leads are in charge of the first officer, and when needed by the Captain are produced by him. What is known technically as a *deep-sea* lead is of many hundred pounds weight, sometimes thousands, and entirely impossible to be used by hand. The dipsy lead is one weighing twenty-five or thirty or more pounds, and is used, dropping it on the bottom, to determine the solidity and form of the shoal; and by putting tallow upon the bottom of the lead, for which there is a receptacle, it will bring up with it a portion of the bottom, and upon examination of it, and comparison with the bottom as shown by the chart, will aid in determining the position and bearings of the vessel from the points of land in sight. Now, by sounding I determined that at the bow of the ship there was more than eighteen feet of water. Coming aft every few feet, I found that the lead did not go down into the sand, showing it to be compact, and the action of the lead showed that we were on a bank, the rolling side of which was toward the bow, which bank shelved off toward the stern of the vessel after we had passed the foremast.

Now a curious little misprint had occurred in the book which will show how little Godkin knew of what he was criticising. My "Book" says: "We were on a sand bank which seemed to me to be quite a round bank just above the foremast."

My "Book" was written from dictation, and the stenographer in transcribing read the word abaft above. Abaft the foremast means just a little toward the stern. This mistake was not detected by me on hearing the proof read, or by the proofreader, who didn't happen to know any more about navigation than does Editor Godkin, who himself did not detect the error. What did Godkin suppose was meant by a ship being on the sand *above* the foremast?

These soundings determined us, when reported to the naval officer who came to our assistance, to endeavor to lighten the ship and force her ahead to get her off the bank, which we fortunately did do and were saved.

I submit whether I knew what I was doing or what I was talking about in what I said of the position of the bottom of my ship.

Let us try Godkin's knowledge upon certain other statements of facts in the "Book" which he criticises:

"He (Butler) tells us he voted for Jefferson Davis in the Charleston Convention, with intent to preserve the Union and ward off that very secession which Greeley long afterward justified, advised, and did all he could to incite.' After reading this, one instinctively glances ahead to see whether the next paragraph will not reveal Stanton as the *de facto* Confederate Secretary of War. He does not say this, but, what is almost as interesting, he tells us that he himself left the Douglas Convention at Baltimore and went with the Breckinridge men for one reason, 'because I would no longer sit in a convention where the reopening of the African slave trade, made piracy by every law of God or man, was advocated and applauded.' The epoch-making character of the "Book" is sufficiently attested by these *revelations*. Comment could add nothing to their significance. Next in value to the nuggets of pure gold in the form of *hitherto unknown facts* in history," &c.

I do not think it is necessary to say that it was well known that I voted for Jefferson Davis in the Charleston Convention with intent to preserve the Union and ward off secession. I never have heard it doubted before by anybody who knew anything.

I suppose it was a revelation to Godkin that Greeley had "justified and advised and did all he could to incite secession." The foregoing quotation which Godkin makes from my "Book" is from page 142; and in the same sentence I refer as authority for my statement to an editorial of Greeley quoted on the same page and in the next preceding sentence; so that he had before him the evidence upon which I made that statement. I quote the following from editorials of Mr. Greeley published in the *Tribune* in 1860 as they appear in the "Book:"

(Dec. 8, 1860.)

"We again avow our deliberate conviction that whenever six or eight contiguous States shall have formally seceded from the Union, and avowed the petty unanimous and earnest resolve of their people to stay out, it will not be found practicable to coerce them into subjection; and we doubt if any commerce can be found to direct and provide for such coercion. One or two States may be coerced; but not an entire section or quarter of a Union. If you do not believe this wait and see.

(Dec. 17, 1860.)

"But if ever seven or eight States send agents to Washington to say 'We want to get out of the Union,' we shall feel constrained by our devotion to human liberty to say 'Let them go.' And we do not see how we could take the other side without coming in direct conflict with those rights of man which we hold paramount to all political arrangements, however convenient and advantageous."

(Dec. 24, 1860.)

"Most certainly we believe that governments are made for the peoples, not peoples for governments; that the latter derive their just power from the consent of the governed; and whenever a portion of this Union large enough to form an independent self-subsisting nation shall show that, and say authentically to the residue 'We want to get away from you,' I shall say—and we trust self-respect if not regard for the principles of self-government will constrain the residue of the American people to say—go."

(Dec. 28, 1860.)

"Nor is it treason for the State to hate the Union and seek its disruption. A State, a whole section, may come to regard the Union as a blight upon its prosperity, an obstacle to its prosperity, and be fully justified in seeking its dissolution. And in spite of adverse clamor we insist that if ever a third or even a fourth of these States shall have deliberately concluded that the Union is injurious to them, and that their vital interests require their separation from it, they will have a perfect right to seek such separation, and should they do so with reasonable patience, and due regard for the rights and interests of those they leave behind, we shall feel bound to urge and insist that their wishes be gratified, their demand conceded."

It will be observed that these utterances were made by Mr. Greeley after secession had become a pronounced and vital question.

Another of the revelations which Godkin finds of a fact "hitherto unknown to history" is that "I left the Baltimore Convention because I would no longer sit in a convention where the reopening of the African slave trade, made piracy by every law of God or man, was advocated and applauded." It was not unknown, however, to those who know anything about the political history of their country. I made that speech in open session of the Convention, where it attracted very much attention, in reply to a speech in favor of opening the slave trade by Mr. Gaulding of Georgia. It can be found in almost all of the principal newspapers of that period. I doubt not. Mind, I do not aver that Godkin knew anything about it, because I do not believe that his mind and memory are capable of retaining any event of history, but that all historical events of a few years' standing would be a revelation to him. If the "Book" is epoch-making it is because the events related were at epochs in the history of our country.

Let us turn to Godkin's next criticism, by the use of the word "*sic*," of my knowledge of the English language in the phrase which I certainly used, and as surely sustained by the most irrefragable evidence in regard to the party concerning whom I used it—"reckless, consciousless (*sic*), and impudent liar."

Godkin thinks I misused the word consciousless for conscienceless. Not so, Godkin. I will explain that word so that I think you will understand it. By "consciousless" liar I mean one who lies so often and intensely on all occasions that he is not conscious, *i. e.*, not aware, of his lying in a given instance, because of his telling the truth so little. Now if I were to describe the falsifying attainments of "Larry" Godkin I should say that he was a reckless, consciousless, and impudent liar, but I should have to add the word conscienceless also, because I have no belief that he has a conscience, or if he *has* it is worn out.

"Larry" makes his last charge upon my military conduct by falsification of the record and assuming that I did not know what the record was:

"Foreseeing, or perhaps foreordaining, the charge that he was then seeking one of the vacant Major-Generalships in the regular army, 'which,' as he says, 'I never thought of or desired,' his enemy has embodied in the Official Records, now published, a pretended letter to Lincoln, dated May 17, 1864, in which he is made to say: 'Do you think that I have done enough to entitle me to one of the vacant commissions in the army, to date from May 16, 1861?' Lincoln is made to answer on the next day: 'As to the Major-Generalships in the regular army, I think I shall not dispose of another, at least until the combined operations now in progress under the direction of Gen. Grant, and within which yourself and command are included, shall be terminated.' Gen. Butler should, in justice to himself, see that these wicked interpolations are excluded, if the whole edition of the Records has to be recalled. Such a commission, dating from May, 1861, would have outranked Sherman, Sheridan, and Meade."

I again reiterate that I never sought any commission in the regular army, nor thought of having any. This mendacious critic is as ignorant of anything in regard to the army as he well can be, and his capacity is very large in that direction. He was ignorant that the commission I then held was the oldest, and therefore made me outrank all the Major-Generals of the United States army then in the field, and entitled me to the command of the whole armies when Lieut.-Gen. Grant was not present. I could get no new one that would give me the like rank unless it bore the same date as the one I then held. It appears over and over again that Grant left me in command of all the troops when he left Virginia to go North and to Washington, because I was the senior officer.

On the 16th of May, 1864, my commission was three years old, and as the troops called out in May, 1861, under the President's proclamation were for three years, a question was suggested whether, when those volunteers went out of the army, my commission would not expire by the same limitation. Desiring that question settled, I wrote a telegram, dated May 17, 1864, to the President, in which I suggested the question, and expressed the hope that my present commission would be extended during the war, but if not, that I wanted some vacant commission in *the army* which would take its place, of the same date as the one I then held, and saying that I wanted it to last only during the war.

I think both my own telegram and Lincoln's telegraphic reply are entirely creditable to myself. The President's telegram contains a promise that he will keep me at my post if he can, and then he heartily thanks myself and my officers for all that we had thus far done.

I will print the two telegrams as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, IN THE FIELD, May 17, 1864, 1:30 P. M.

(Received 7:35 P. M.)

His Excellency, A. Lincoln, President of the United States:

On the 16th of May, 1861, I was honored by your kindness with a commission as Major-General U. S. Volunteers. I have heard that such commissions expire by limitation in three years. I by no means desire to quit the service till the war is done. Do you think that I have done enough to entitle me to one of the vacant commissions in the army, to date from May 16, 1861; otherwise I should prefer my present one, if you think me fit to hold either, and I can hold on to it.

BENJ. F. BUTLER, Major-General Commanding.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 18, 1864, 7 A. M.

Major-Gen. Butler, Bermuda Hundreds, Virginia:

Until receiving your despatch of yesterday the idea of commissions of volunteers expiring at the end of three years had not occurred to me. I think that no trouble will come of it. At all events I shall take care of it so far as in me lies. As to the Major-Generalships in the regular army I think I shall not dispose of another; at least until the combined operations now in progress under the direction of Gen. Grant, and in which you and your commission are included, shall be terminated. Meanwhile on behalf of yourself, officers, and command, please accept my hearty thanks for what you have done thus far.

A. LINCOLN.

It will be seen that Godkin has left out all that related to the purpose of the correspondence, making the pretense that the telegrams had been found "by mining." They were real telegrams, copies of which were in my possession, which had been published in the records, and which were before me when I wrote.

I said that the intention of this article was to criticise my critic. Haven't I shown him, in addition to his other false comments, to have garbled a record in trying to prove a false allegation?

He then turns to the more congenial occupation of criticising my English, stopping to notice that a blunder is made in the "Book" in printing fifteen thousand million instead of fifteen hundred million, which any schoolboy would know was a mere printer's blunder. The first number would almost enumerate Godkin's life-long lies.

He says that the composing room has made me talk learnedly about "terminal annuities" in several places. I suppose Godkin thinks I should have used the word terminable. I used the word "terminal," knowing what I was talking about as the proper word to be used in dealing with that branch of the financial system. The words "terminal annuities" are used in describing annuities, which, at the time of their making, have terms fixed at which they shall *terminate*. Terminable annuities are those which, under certain conditions, *may be* terminated, and terminal is the word I deliberately chose and shall retain.

He also says I speak of "courtileges." Of course he could not tell the truth. The word courtilege occurs but once in the "Book," and then in giving the answer of the French Consul to an inquiry addressed to him, and it is exactly the proper word to use to express the extent of the legal right of the occupant in the house or castle in which he dwells. The word is used exactly as a matter of speech; the Consul was correct in so using the word as matter of law. The word first appears in our English law, "courtilege," in Statute 2 Westminster, cap. XLVII., sec. 7, where it is spelled precisely as I have spelled it.

I shall not trouble you any further now or hereafter as to what "Larry" Godkin may write. If his falsifications concerning me become unbearable I shall be at liberty to apply to the criminal law to restrain him.

BOSTON, April 15, 1892. BENJ. F. BUTLER.

Would this Method Prevent Vice?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I believe that crime and vice are cur