The Sun.

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1897.

Subscriptions 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

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS.—Kiosque No. 18, Near Grand Hotel.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

LOCAL NEWS.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the UNITED PRESS and NEW YORK ASSOCIATED PRESS is at 21 to 29 Park Row. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

Cuba's Reply to Cleveland.

It is now as plain as daylight that the goal of the CLEVELAND-OLNEY policy with regard to Cuba is the perpetuation of Spanish rule in the island under the guise of "reforms" guaranteed by the United States Government; that is to say, the destruction of the cause of Cuban independence.

Just as he undertook at the beginning of his term to restore monarchy in Hawaii, so now the last days and nights of Mr. CLEVELAND's official career are devoted to the preservation of monarchy in Cuba.

It is not pertinent to inquire what idiosyncrasy or perversity of personal sympathies impels Mr. CLEVELAND to employ the opportunities of his office at one time in pursuing like a bloodhound a newly emancipated people, and at another time in hammering like a tyrant's assistant armorer upon the fetters of a people not yet free. Whether the President of the United States is at heart a monarchist or not, these facts remain: He tried and failed to throw back the Hawaiian republic into monarchy; he is trying to fasten Spain's hold upon the struggling Cuban republic; and he will fail.

We print to-day the patriotic Cuban view of Mr. CLEVELAND's plan of guaranty for the continuance of monarchical institutions in the island of Cuba. It is presented with studied moderation of language but with conclusive directness and force in the statement of Señor GONZALO DE QUESADA, the Cuban Chargé d'Affaires at Washington. The Cuban patriots are fighting for freedom, not for a bogus autonomy and specious promises of administrative reform. Their war is for independence, and they are enlisted for that war. They look for aid, not to CLEVELAND and OLNEY, scheming to perpetuate the worst of monarchies by means of the guaranty of the greatest of free republics, but to the generous heart of the American people and to the instinctive sympathies of the American Congress.

The Loss of the Commodore.

The mishap to the first steamer that has ever cleared openly for a Cuban port, with a cargo of arms and munitions consigned directly to the insurgents, puts an end to many interesting speculations as to her probable course and experience.

Would the Commodore attempt to enter Cienfuegos, the port for which she had cleared, after the Spanish Consul at Jacksonville, from which port she started, had, by refusing to authenticate her papers, virtually warned her that she could not enter? Would the Spaniards turn her back as soon as she reached their waters, or allow her to enter and then seize her for bringing rifles and cartridges without the special permit which their laws require? What would our Government do on an attempt to confiscate the vessel and punish the crew?

Again, was her purpose simply to get out of our waters lawfully with her cargo, so as to land it not at Cienfuegos, but elsewhere, at a point agreed upon along the Cuban coast, as in her voyages of last spring and last summer? Or would she transfer it to some other vessel and return to Jacksonville with the statement that she could not enter the port for which she was cleared?

Such are a few of the questions which had been started. Perhaps they may be answered when the war is over. Perhaps some other vessel, such as the Dauntless, will virtually answer them soon by a similar attempt. Meanwhile one thing which she did accomplish was that of securing a regular clearance from our customs authorities, thus showing the legitimacy of the export of arms to the Cuban insurgents. Indeed, when she grounded in the river, on her way out, our revenue cutter Boutwell helped her off, and escorted her across the bar.

Clear the Way for Major McKinley!

It is within the power of Congress to render a very important service to the Administration that will soon enter into office, by promptly adopting Senator CAMERON's resolution acknowledging Cuban independence. Its passage through both houses by a great majority would aid in the enlightenment of the judgment of the President-elect. If the vote for it in each house were unanimous, as it ought to be, or were as large as the vote for the recognition of Cuban belligerency in April last, Major MCKINLEY would very surely be benefited by the lesson thus entered in the public records before the opening of his term. He would obtain a clear understanding as to the will of Congress regarding a question that is very sure to require his attention when he is in office.

Let Mr. GROVER CLEVELAND treat the resolution, after its passage through Congress, as he has threatened to treat it. Let him make yet another exhibition of his contumelious and contumacious disposition toward Congress. That is a thing the importance of which is rapidly diminishing. Congress will have performed its duty in the passage of the resolution. It will have asserted one of the most important rights which it possesses under the Constitution. It will have vindicated its authority against a presumptuous Executive. It will have set right the honor of the country. It will have furnished information to Spain and encouragement to Cuba. It will have responded to the most powerful popular demand that has existed in the United States at any time in this generation.

Let Mr. CLEVELAND be left out of sight by Congress in this case, wrapped in the rags of his own hebetudinosity.

It is most certain that when Major MCKINLEY enters into his office he will not be required to accept CLEVELAND's anti-Cuban policy, or to follow in CLEVELAND's Spanish footsteps. MCKINLEY has more respect for the Constitution, for the rights of Congress, for the voice of the American people, and for the honor of the country than CLEVELAND has ever manifested. MCKINLEY's Americanism is of the stalwart kind; his patriotism is clear-headed; his firmness of purpose bears no resemblance to CLEVELAND's narrow-minded and conceited obstinacy. We look for an honorable, enlightened and courageous Administration from MCKINLEY, not such an Administration as that of CLEVELAND, which has injured the name of the country.

We do not think the passage of the Cameron resolution through the Senate can be blocked by the machinations of a few pro-Spanish Senators. We do not believe that its passage there will be prevented by the Executive or his Secretary of State or the Spanish Minister at Washington or the growlings from Spain. Our hope in the Senate is steadfast. There should be no delay there in the performance of a pressing duty. In the list of votes for the Cameron resolution we shall look for the name of every Senator who believes in the American flag and in that for which it stands.

It is as to the action of the House of Representatives in the case that there is uncertainty. This uncertainty has grown out of rumors which have been widely circulated, and many of which are certainly untrue. At the last session of Congress the House, as well as the Senate, was for free Cuba. The resolutions calling for the recognition of Cuban belligerency were passed last year by a heavy majority in both houses, and it was the judgment of both that was held in disdain by the Executive. Are there members of the House who design to go back upon their record when the resolution for the acknowledgment of Cuba's independence is sent there from the Senate? Surely there are but few among them of whom that can be said.

There has not been very much glory for the men who are members of the present House of Representatives. The name of no one of them will be identified with any great measure of legislation that has been enacted within the past two years. The most creditable incident of the House record was the passage of the Cuban belligerency resolutions in April last. We should like to be able to say when the term of service for this House comes to an end, a few weeks hence, that it can be credited with the passage of the resolution for Cuban independence. That will be something to which every member who votes right may always point with pride. That will add lustre to the record of the Fifty-fourth Congress. That will give the term of it a place of worth and of honor in the country's annals.

An Insolvable Currency Problem.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Times*, printed, yesterday, the subjoined specimen of financial wisdom:

"This country has a currency problem of its own. It is, while preserving the gold standard, to provide a uniformly safe and sound currency, adapted to the needs of our people, expanding and contracting with the legitimate demand for it in all sections and by all classes. The problem is a plain one, and, politics apart, not a difficult one. Until we shall have solved it, we shall not have solid prosperity."

With all due deference to the *Times*, we venture to assert that, politics or no politics, the problem it propounds is not plain and is difficult. It is very much like that which the old lady submitted to her bookseller, when she asked him to furnish her with a Bible of the smallest size but printed in the largest type.

A "uniformly safe and sound" currency must, by the very terms of its description, be uniform in its volume. It must be at all times redeemable in gold at the pleasure of the holder, and if it is expanded beyond the limit at which that redeemability can be maintained, it will either be contracted by redemption, or, if redemption be refused, it will depreciate below par. This is a check upon expansion which no ingenuity can remove, and it is not desirable that it should be removed. The currency is not only a medium of exchange, but it is a measure of value, and a measure of value which can be varied by human caprice fails to fulfil its most important function.

The seekers after an expanding and contracting currency, like the advocates of free silver coinage, seek to escape the working of a wholesome and immutable natural law. They want a measure of value that shall prevent prices from falling when the supply of commodities is large or the demand for them small, and from rising when the supply is small or the demand large. The objection made to the use of gold as a standard is, that the quantity of it in market has not increased as fast as the quantity of commodities has increased, and that, therefore, as a standard, it has lowered prices. Silver, having increased in quantity more rapidly than gold, has fallen, relatively to gold, and therefore, if prices were measured in silver at the old ratio of 16 to 1, they would be higher than they are now. A currency expanding in volume as silver has expanded would bring about the same result that is sought by the free coinage of silver, and it is equally vicious in principle. Conversely, if it can be contracted at the pleasure of those who issue it, it will work mischief in the opposite direction.

Fifty years ago Great Britain solved the currency problem, as far as it could be solved, by limiting the volume of its paper money to the amount then in existence, subject to increase or decrease only by the increase or decrease of the supply of gold. Ever since then, when the kingdom has needed more currency it has imported gold, and when it had more than it needed it has exported gold. This expansion and contraction it has found sufficient for its business, and it would be sufficient for ours. It would not, indeed, prevent a fall in prices and a rise in the rates of interest when the harvests throw upon the market an excessive quantity of agricultural produce; and it ought not to. Prices and interest ought to be governed by supply and demand, and not by arbitrary meddling with the currency. Nor would it interfere with solid prosperity. No prosperity is solid that rests upon the foundation of a mutable and fluctuating measure of value, and the sooner our politicians and financiers recognize this fact, the better it will be for the country. Currency inflation may produce a temporary show of profits, but it will end, as it always has ended, in collapse and ruin.

An Analysis of the Budget.

The expenses of New York city all told were $46,400,000 in 1896. As authorized by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, they will be $49,400,000 for 1897, an increase of $3,000,000. The city's contribution to State taxes will be $1,000,000 less than last year in consequence, in considerable measure, of the skilful management of the State's finances under the administration of LEVI P. MORTON. The net increase of the city's expenses, therefore, for 1897 as compared with 1896 is $4,000,000, or nearly 10 per cent. more than the previous appropriation.

New York is territorially larger than it was before July 1, 1895. The population has increased since that time about 20,000 by annexation and 40,000 by normal growth. But the addition of 60,000 to the population of a municipality of nearly 2,000,000 inhabitants does not afford sufficient justification for an increase of 10 per cent. in the municipal expenses. Does, then, the increase of $4,000,000, to which we have referred, represent wasteful or prodigal expenditures, unwise investments, improvident appropriations, and bad municipal finance, or is it susceptible of explanation as arising from unusual items of necessary outlay?

The appropriations for the following important public departments of New York are actually less for 1897 than for 1896: The Street Cleaning Department, the Park Department, the Charities Department, the Bureau of Elections, and the Department of Correction. In the Comptroller's office, the operations of which become more extensive every day, with the growth of the city in wealth and population, the increased expenditure is insignificant, and remarkably so when it is considered that under Mr. FITCH's able and businesslike administration the public revenues collected by the Comptroller have been largely augmented. The Fire Department, too, an efficiently managed branch of the city Government, and the calls upon which are constantly increasing, through the construction of new buildings, will cost substantially the same as last year, the increase being merely $90,000 in a total appropriation of $2,400,000. A similar explanation applies to the small increase of expenditures in the Board of Health and in the Tax Department, the annexation of new territory in the Westchester county region having imposed additional expenses on that department as well as on the Department of Street Improvements in the annexed district, the expenses of which have been increased $150,000.

In a comparison of the expenditures of these departments for 1897 with 1896, no extravagance worthy of the righteous anger or summary rebuke of the Mugwump municipal reformers is visible, nor is there any to be found in the appropriations for the Department of Public Works under the administration of Gen. COLLIS. They were $3,270,000 in 1896; this year they are $3,500,000. There has been a small, unimportant increase in the salaries and expenses of the Judiciary in the higher courts, but a large, because unnecessary, increase of expenditures in the minor courts, through the establishment of two unnecessary tribunals in the thinly settled portion of the town, while no effort has been made to relieve the pressure on the minor civil tribunals in the congested districts. The expenses of the Register's office are slightly increased, in the interest of the most efficient and careful service until the perils incident to the occupancy of the present hall of records are passed. There is also an increase in the expenses of the Sheriff's office, though a very moderate one. In the aggregate, the appropriations for the Sheriff's office are a little less than last year, but since the service of jury notices has devolved upon the Commissioner of Jurors the expenses of the Sheriff have been decreased so far.

The increase of $4,000,000, to which we have referred, is due, first, to $1,000,000 additional in salaries paid policemen, incident to the regrading of the pay of the force by act of the Legislature. Of the increased expenditure, $1,200,000 is chargeable to the "redemption of the city debt," a certain sum being annually set aside for the liquidation of city bonds at maturity, and as the expenditure upon the public buildings and public works for which these bonds are issued increases, the city's contribution to the fund for the extinction of the indebtedness increases also. The increase in the expenses of the Board of Education is $300,000; in those of the Department of Buildings, $120,000, or about 40 per cent., and in the item of street openings the increase is $500,000, which, it is expected, the Legislature will intervene to turn into the channel of the city's bond account.

These items account for the larger share of the $4,000,000, to which we have made reference. While the city's expenditures have been increased under the circumstances and in the manner indicated, there has been a large increase provided in the city's revenues, exclusive of the proceeds of taxation. This revenue has been augmented by the Raines Liquor Tax law, and, moreover, by the diligence of the Comptroller in collections from city property. Instead of $2,500,000 of public revenue, there is to be $3,800,000, and the net city expenses, to be raised from taxation, which approximated $44,000,000 last year, will be $45,600,000 this year. Such is the budget for 1897.

Mr. Seward and Mr. Olney.

Our correspondent, who writes over the signature of J. S. T., has furnished the most thorough and complete exposition of the constitutional power of Congress in the control of this country's foreign affairs that has yet appeared. It is almost needless to say that the facts he has presented emphatically contradict the theory advanced by Secretary OLNEY in connection with Cuba, that the President, and not Congress, is the final authority in the recognition of foreign States. We now call particular attention to a third letter from the same correspondent which we print this morning, inasmuch as it contains an explanation of the action of Secretary SEWARD in connection with Mexico, upon which the upholders of Mr. OLNEY have mainly relied. This letter shows that Mr. SEWARD was constrained to express his opinion of the President's paramountcy against the already expressed will of Congress, in order to prevent France's recognition of the Confederacy and hostility to the Federal Government. It shows how Congress's appreciation of this fact led to its submission, after an informal reiteration of its opinion on the subject; and it also proves Mr. SEWARD's practical repudiation of his claim of dictatorship for the President, in an extract from a subsequent letter of his to Mr. BIGELOW, our Minister to France, which we will reproduce here:

"It is not the Executive Department of this Government alone which is interested and concerned in the question whether the present condition of things shall be continued in Mexico. The interest is a national one, and in every event Congress, which is now in session, is authorized by the Constitution and is entitled to direct by law the action of the United States in regard to that important subject."

This places Mr. SEWARD in his true light as a patriotic democratic American, and a statesman whose rightful place concerning Mr. OLNEY's impossible proposition is with JEFFERSON, MADISON, MONROE, JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, and JACKSON.

The System of Irresponsible Appointment.

Mr. EDWARD M. SHEPARD, one of the attorneys of the Civil Service Reform Association, makes this comment upon some very sensible remarks attributed to District Attorney OLCOTT in regard to the method of appointments to office:

"He states that the responsibilities upon him are great, as they indeed are, and that he does not think it practicable that his subordinates should be chosen to any extent by others. This is precisely what every public officer says who is hostile to this reform, and what a man like Mr. OLCOTT ought not to say.

"If the newspapers do not incorrectly report him, he has stated that he should make appointments upon the recommendations of the Republican ward associations of New York, reserving to himself a 'veto.' The ordinary respectable citizen might well inquire whether a civil service association could not by competitive examination select candidates for clerks in the District Attorney's office with as much advantage to the public as could Republican district associations.

"Mr. OLCOTT, upon further examination, will find that the law gives him the same veto for cause upon nominations made to him from the civil service eligible lists, as he has reserved to himself in case of nominations by the district associations. He has the power to reject any unfit candidate. He has the absolute power to dismiss any appointee who shall be found to be unfit."

In other words, Mr. OLCOTT ought to be contented, because he can reject any one of a lot of candidates whom he did not select and no one of whom he would select. That absolute knowledge of a man's character that comes from association with him, and that secondary knowledge that comes from relying upon the recommendation of trustworthy men, must be set aside, and the chief, in picking out his subordinates, must depend upon the blind processes of an examination which cannot be a test of capacity, although it may be a test of certain unimportant, mainly literary, attainments. The real value of a clergyman, a schoolmaster, a college professor, for whom these civil service examinations might seem more appropriate, cannot be so ascertained.

Republican ward associations may not have all the wisdom of the world, but they can find out and have to find out what a man is; and no series of questions and answers amounts to much for that purpose. Mr. SHEPARD doesn't select the people who work for him at his office or his house by any such roundabout and untrustworthy plan as a civil service examination. In fact, no man, however warm a civil service reformer he may be, ever resorts, in his private business, to that means which he extols for the selection of public servants. Private business couldn't stand such a process; but the reformers seem to think that the public business can and must.

Although the Hon. W. J. BRYAN's lecturing tour through the country has come to grief, there must still be home missionary work for him in Nebraska, where MCKINLEY carried the Boy Orator's precinct by 92 majority, his ward by 299, the town of Lincoln by 1,019, and Lancaster county by 829.

An amiable philosopher and poet of the *Nebraska State Journal* remarks that the only fault with modern teachers is that most of them pronounce "and" as though spelled "o-n-d"; and he adds this metrical observation:

"Why this is thus I do not know;
I only cuss because 'tis so."

It better becomes a philosopher and poet to discuss, or even repercuss, but the ill-treatment of this praiseworthy conjunction may be thought to justify the extension of poetic license. Is it a habit of modern teachers to say "ond"? The simplest word may be the easiest to mispronounce, just as a potato seems to be the hardest thing to boil correctly—hardest because easiest. Not infrequently the pronunciation with broad a, "ahnd," is heard. There are Southern people who believe this pronunciation to be of New England, and we have heard it used by Southerners, including at least one graduate of the University of Virginia. The truth is that few of us know how we or other persons pronounce words, and the sound meant to be indicated by the speaker may be different from what he actually utters and is always liable to be misunderstood by the hearer. In any event, if there are modern or ancient teachers who teach their pupils to say "ond," they ought to reform or be restrained.

Mr. EUGENE V. DEBS, notorious in 1894 and since as an Anarchist, now blesses the world with the information that hereafter he is to be classed as a Socialist. The Socialists seem to be playing in the toughest kind of tough luck.

The Hon. GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS of Massachusetts and the Popocratic gallery of portraits of great American statesmen seems to be preparing for another joyous and crowded year, although it may trouble him to be more active than he was in the summer and fall of 1896. Quiet is not for such quick bosoms as his. He has to churn the waters into trouble, and to give a voice to the winds of things. His active intellect disengages heat rapidly. It has sometimes been felt by connoisseurs of genius that he ought to have been imported to this town; that he appears unduly foreshortened in his own State. But Boston has only just found him, and could not bear to lose him. He will grow up or down there this year, and for many other years, it is to be hoped, for a tumultuous wave of humor surrounds him, and his words and progresses give joy to all who hear or read about them. He is the first Popocratic statesman in Boston, even if there should happen to be a bigger one in Lynn or Lawrence or Oakham. Huzzah for WILLIAMS and happiness!

The curiosities of the now complete official returns of November's election are several, and they will occupy the attention of political arithmeticians for a long time to come. But of all the curiosities, none is more curious than this:

BRYAN and WATSON	152,412
PALMER and BUCKNER	132,507

That is to say, the Hon. TOM WATSON, running almost alone and forlorn, received for Vice-President 20,000 more votes than the entire poll of the Indianapolis ticket.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, is perturbed because the Hon. JULIUS STERLING MORTON has displayed some of his peculiar epistolary antics in a second letter to the Hon. SAM ALLERTON of Chicago, another famous ruralist, in regard to the shipment of Canada cattle in bond to Portland, Me., for England. "One would suppose this subject," says the *Inter-Ocean*, "sufficiently prosaic to call for sober discussion, and to exclude the cap and bells." It adds that "no criticism upon the Department of Agriculture, however serious, fails to afford opportunity for facetia." Why not? Secretary MORTON is like *Falstaff*, not only witty himself but the cause of the wit that is in other men. The Department of Agriculture is and must be a joke, and the Secretary is aware of the fact, and always bubbles over with humor. Bugs, bulletins, and employees, one and all, are suffused with humor. It is said that the proceedings open every morning with the reading aloud by a member of the staff to his fellow members and the blithesome Secretary of some of the hundreds of comic publications of the departments. Exercise in the dictation of comic letters follows. The pet gophers, crows, and woodpeckers are put through their performances; and after a comic song by some of the thinkers of the ornithology and mammalogy show, the whole staff joins in a jig, and is then dismissed to continue the comic toils of the day. Humor is the one crop which MORTON and his merry men help to cultivate.

It is touching to behold the reëmergent HOCUS SMITH risen from his gashes. If it is not he, it is some eidolon of him who expresses in the *Atlanta Journal* the fear that "President MCKINLEY" will "blight his administration" by doing something or other for protected industries. In the matter of blighting Mr. SMITH has feelings and remembrances, and his anxiety to prevent other folks from blight is affecting.

If the time table is doing its duty according to schedule, to-day is the great, the eventful day when the Popocratic State Committee of Illinois is to meet and when the Hon. JOHN P. ALTGELD's candidate for Chairman is to be "thrown down" with a mighty sound and hard, and the Hon. BUCK HINRICHSEN reëlected in triumph. The discord between the gentle Governor and his once faithful political man-of-work is one of the saddest events in recent history. It is scarcely a subject to be sung, but a most lamentable ballad of it might be cried in the streets of Chicago. HINRICHSEN a member of Congress and his patron in severe retirement! So grim is the gnashing of the teeth of fate.

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.

Abraham Lincoln's Relations to Congress in the Matter of Recognizing Foreign Governments—The Cases of Hayti and Liberia in 1862—Mr. Seward's Theory of Presidential Power and the Explanation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The letter of mine published in THE SUN of Jan. 2, citing further authorities proving that Congress, and not the President, is the final authority in foreign affairs, omitted the facts of the recognition of Hayti and Liberia while Mr. Lincoln was President.

Although Hayti and Liberia had long been enjoying their independence prior to 1862, and had been recognized by other nations, this country never formally recognized them as independent States until in 1862, when Congress passed the following act:

That the President of the United States be and he is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint diplomatic representatives to the republics of Hayti and Liberia. * * *

The President, Abraham Lincoln, approved the act, July 5, 1862. So Mr. Lincoln is on record in this instance as approving the right of Congress to "authorize" the President to appoint diplomatic representatives to foreign States and thereby recognize them.

We come now to the first break in the line of precedents on this subject.

In the spring of 1864 Mexico was overrun by a French army, which had possession of the capital, and its lawful President, Juarez, was the fugitive commander of a handful of patriots who still kept up their fight for the liberty of their country. Early in April news was received in this country that the Austrian prince Maximilian, at the instigation of Napoleon III., had been crowned Emperor of Mexico, and that he would soon leave Europe for Mexico to put himself at the head of the French troops there for the purpose of establishing his empire. On the 4th of April, Henry Winter Davis, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, offered the following resolution, which the House adopted unanimously:

Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States are not willing by silence to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the republic of Mexico, and they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America, under the auspices of any European power.

This was a notice to the world, on the part of the House, that the United States would never acknowledge the Government of Maximilian. It was a defiance to Napoleon III., under whose auspices Maximilian was acting. Mr. Seward, who was then Secretary of State, was greatly disturbed by this action of the House. This country was then in no condition to invite the enmity of foreign powers. It was the most critical period of our civil war, and the fate of the Union hung in the balance. After three years of continuous warfare Lee and his army still held Richmond defiantly. The Federal Government, in its distrust of Eastern commanders, had recently called Gen. Grant from the West, and invested him with the command of all its armies. He was then gathering together that army with which he commenced, soon after, the famous flank movement, attended by almost daily battles, which culminated in the fall of Richmond and the capture of Lee's army. No man could foresee the result, and the best friends of the Union held their breath in suspense. At such a time as this to provoke the enmity of France was a bold and almost desperate proceeding. The resolution of the House, unless repudiated by the Executive, would certainly be followed by the recognition of the Confederacy by Napoleon, and an alliance, offensive and defensive, between him and the Southern States. The United States must in that event fight not only the South, but France, and perhaps other nations who would be only too glad to recognize the Confederacy.

Fortunately for Mr. Seward, the House resolution hung fire in the Senate. The Administration had time to warn the members of that body against the consequences of its adoption, and while they doubtless agreed with the sentiments of the House, they discreetly laid its resolution on the table.

Under these circumstances Mr. Seward undertook to pacify the French Government by denying the jurisdiction of the House. Apparently acting upon the principle of "Inter arma leges silent," he went further and denied the jurisdiction of Congress.

On April 7, three days after the passage of this resolution by the House, he wrote Mr. Dayton, our Minister at Paris, notifying him of it, and then added: "This is a practical and purely executive question, and the decision of it constitutionally belongs not to the House, nor even to Congress, but to the President of the United States." This letter saved the country from war with France.

On the 22d of April, 1864, Mr. Dayton wrote Mr. Seward:

I waited on M. Drouyn de l'Huys yesterday at the Department of Foreign Affairs. The first words he addressed to me on entering the room were, "Do you bring us peace or war?" I asked him to what he referred, and he said he referred more immediately to those resolutions recently passed by Congress in reference to the invasion of Mexico by the French and the establishment of Maximilian on the throne.

Mr. Dayton communicated to the French Minister the contents of the Secretary's letter, and satisfied him of the peaceful attitude of our Government. Thus Mr. Seward avoided a rupture with France, but he did it at the expense of denying the constitutional powers of Congress in the face of the world.

It is hard to believe that Mr. Seward, who was one of the most accomplished statesmen of his day, was really ignorant of the powers of Congress, but, under the circumstances which surrounded him, he might have believed it was better to strain the Constitution than to acknowledge the right of the House to interfere in the foreign policy of the Government. He was placed in a most delicate position, and the course he pursued was perhaps the only means of extricating the country from the dangers which beset it.

When Mr. Seward's letter was published it excited great indignation in both houses of Congress, and Mr. Davis reported this resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Resolved, That Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States, as well in the recognition of new powers as in other matters; and it is the constitutional duty of the President to respect that policy, not less in diplomatic negotiations than in the use of the national force when authorized by law; and the propriety of any declaration of foreign policy by Congress is sufficiently provided by the vote which pronounces it; and such proposition while pending and undetermined is not a fit topic of diplomatic explanation with any foreign power.

Fortunately for Mr. Seward, the committee had looked beyond the Secretary to his superior, and its censure was directed against the President. Many of the members who were indignant at Mr. Seward were unwilling to visit the consequences of his offence upon Abraham Lincoln, and others thought it inexpedient to exhibit to the world at this critical juncture of affairs an unseemly quarrel between the Executive and the Legislature. A motion was made by Mr. Farnsworth of Illinois to lay the resolution upon the table, and it was adopted by a vote of 69 to 63, not voting, 50. Among those voting against the motion were Mr. Allison, now Senator Allison; the veteran Thaddeus Stevens, James A. Garfield, Samuel Randall, and S. S. Cox. Mr. Davis promptly tendered his resignation as Chairman of the committee, and insisted upon its acceptance, whereupon a debate ensued, the whole tenor of which showed that had the resolution been confined to a censure of Mr. Seward, it would have been adopted.

Mr. Boutwell, later Secretary of the Treasury, who had voted to lay on the table, said:

The resolution which the House has laid upon the table is peculiar in its language on that point. It is that "Congress," not this House, but that "Congress has a constitutional right and an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States, as well in the recognizing of new powers as in other matters." If the resolution had stopped there I presume there would have been no gentleman upon this floor disposed to question the propriety of the resolution, supposing that there were facts existing, or supposed to exist, upon which the resolution could be properly based. * * * I admit that the manner in which the Secretary of State expressed his opinion as to the rights of this House in respect to foreign affairs was not agreeable to me; I should be glad in some proper way to protest against it, but I do not see how we are justified, even upon the language which he saw fit to employ in arraigning the President for the neglect of the constitutional duty enjoined upon him, to obey the will of Congress in reference to our foreign policy.

The friends of the resolution were far more severe in their strictures. That sturdy old commoner, Thaddeus Stevens, thus voiced his indignation:

If we are mere nobodies in this matter, if we are mere mischief makers, then let our lord and master in the chair of state rule and control us, and let us ask the pardon of the world for endeavoring to interfere somewhat in one of the most vital questions which can ever affect this nation.

Mr. Cox said:

Let not this House by its vote cringe before the executive power. Let it stand up in its own self-defence and for its own privileges, for its own self-respect and its own dignity. Let it emulate something of the dignity and self-respect of the old parliamentarians of England when men dared go to the Tower, when men were drawn and quartered because they criticised the royal prerogatives which were unconstitutionally exercised.

Mr. Davis, replying to the charge that the resolution assailed the President, said:

Well, sir, I am ready to assail the President or anybody else who stands across the broad track of republican principles. A shout will go up from one end of despotic Europe to the other when it is known that the House of Representatives has confessed that its resolves are vain breath before the dictation of the President, and that the President is the United States as Louis Napoleon is France.

Although the resolution was defeated the Administration made a narrow escape, and Mr. Seward received a most salutary lesson on the constitutional powers of Congress. This is evident from his letter to Mr. Bigelow, Mr. Dayton's successor, dated Dec. 16, 1865:

It is not the Executive Department of this Government alone which is interested and concerned in the question whether the present condition of things shall be continued in Mexico. The interest is a national one, and in every event Congress, which is now in session, is authorized by the Constitution and is entitled to direct by law the action of the United States in regard to that important subject.

Mr. Seward, therefore, by his last utterance on the subject, takes rank with the authorities which recognize the right of Congress to dictate the policy of our foreign relations.

From this review of precedents it seems clear that the right of Congress to control the regulation of our foreign relations cannot be successfully disputed.

I am aware that some law writers have laid down the proposition that the Executive alone has the management of our foreign relations in time of peace, but they have failed to support the doctrine by reason or precedent. The correct statement of the law may be found in "Rawle on the Constitution," a book published in 1825, the author of which was United States District Attorney, a leading member of the Philadelphia bar, and Chancellor of the Bar Association of that city. He had the advantage of constant intercourse with the framers of the Constitution, and had weighed well the arguments of Hamilton, Madison, and their compeers. On page 184, he says:

The power of receiving foreign Ambassadors carries with it among other things the right of judging in the case of a revolution in a foreign country, whether the new ruler ought to be recognized. The Legislature indeed possesses a superior power, and may declare its dissent from the Executive recognition or refusal, but until their sense is declared, the act of the Executive is binding.

The power of Congress on this subject cannot be controlled.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 2. J. S. T.

MISTLETOE OR ANY OLD THING.

If the Girl Doesn't Object It Is All Right to Kiss Her, but You Mustn't Tell.

From the Morning Oregonian.

The large number of wagon loads of mistletoe which have been sold in this city for holiday "business" has evidently aroused great expectations on the part of the young men, and probably great apprehensions on the part of the young women, all of which it is devoutly to be wished may be realized. A gentleman who would not have his name mentioned for the world has written to inquire if there was no other plant, sprout, or flower under which it is admissible or permissible to kiss a lady. This depends. Under proper conditions, the lady being willing, it is permissible to perform the rite of osculation under any kind of greenery or in the absence of any. Kissing "under the rose" (sub rosa—in private) is also permissible, as is shown by the following true tale:

A rather shy young man at a Christmas party saw other young men kissing young women under the mistletoe without ruth or remorse, but, although he kept a bright lookout for a chance, he could never catch the one he was trying to kiss within any reasonable distance of the mistletoe bough. Finally, he found her alone in a secluded place, and, there being no mistletoe handy, he seized a rose from a vase, and, holding it over her head with one hand, seized her with the other, and, after a lively tussle, succeeded in kissing her.

The noise of the scuffle attracted the attention of some of the other men, who caught him in the act and commenced to lecture him on the impropriety of his conduct. His reply was: "If you may kiss a lady under the mistletoe, why may not I also kiss her under the rose?" There being no good reason advanced, the subject was dropped; but the next day a local paper, mentioning the incident, stated that the man asked: "If you kiss her under the mistletoe, why may I not also kiss her under the nose?"

This caused the young man to be joked by his friends; but, after all, one of the prouderest and most satisfactory places to kiss a lady is a short distance below the nose. There is a whole lot of humbug about this mistletoe racket, anyway, as it has a tendency to create an impression in the minds of the unsophisticated that kissing is like Christmas—in order only once a year.

Florida Streams Clogged with Hyacinth.

From the Florida Times-Union.

Steamboat men are still complaining of the water hyacinths in the St. John's River. They say that every stream emptying into the river is completely blocked with the plants, and it is impossible for small steamers to go up the streams after rafts of logs. In many localities logging camps have been abandoned, as the timber cannot be floated after it is cut.

Genuine Evidence.

From the Washington Evening Star.

"One of the great objections to whiskey," said the man of abstemious habits, "is the fact that in this era of adulteration it contains so many foreign substances."

"Young man," replied Col. Stillwell, "yoh have just given utterance to one of the most impressive truths that I know of. Why, suh, last night I saw a man pouring watah into it!"

Col. Cole's Modest Disclaimer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: You have unwittingly given me a credit in your issue of Dec. 31 last to which, I regret to say, I am in no wise entitled, in saying that I earned my rank and title of Colonel in the civil war and rose from the rank of private to the command as Colonel of the Tenth Regiment of New Jersey Volunteers. I served as a private soldier only in that regiment. My commission as Colonel was issued to me by Governor Morton on Jan. 7, 1865, while I was his private secretary. The colonels and other staff commanders of the Tenth New Jersey Infantry Regiment were older and more capable soldiers than I have ever been, and the honor is all theirs. Very truly yours, ASHLEY W. COLE.

Twenty-five "War Correspondents."

From the Key West Equator-Democrat.

Some of the New York dailies are being systematically robbed by a lot of fake newspaper correspondents. In the last seven weeks twenty-five war correspondents have left New York for the insurgent camp, but not one of them has arrived there; yet some of them are writing letters from the rebel camp while they are "loafing" in Key West or having a good time in perfect security, on some of the adjacent keys. How long will this thing continue before their papers will catch on?

The History of One Year.

From the Adams Freeman.

Again appears that great yearly editorial of THE SUN, a document always interesting and of deep thought and profound logic. It is a feature each New Year in the greatest American newspaper, therefore the world's best journal, and should be read, aye, studied, by every student of current history. Other papers have these annual articles, though there is really but one series, that of THE SUN.

Boston Rigors.

Queen Lil arrives. "Now tell us, Aunty,
Just what you think of our Bacchante."
"Well, enfin," the shivering Queen replied,
"Without my clo's I should have died.
I ain't no judge, but, 'pears to me,
Boston's too cold for such as she."

LAURENCE NELSON.

HYPNOTIC EXAMINATION.

A Test to Which a Man Suspected of Murder Was Subjected.

From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

GALVESTON, Dec. 29.—William Hanson, who was arrested yesterday on suspicion of having murdered Samuel Martin, a labor leader, whose body was found in the bay with 100 pounds of iron tied about the neck, was hypnotized to-day, and questioned in detail about the crime. While in the lethargic state he confessed that Martin had reason to be jealous of him; that Mrs. Martin intended to get a divorce and become Mrs. Hanson, but he denied all knowledge of how the murder was committed, and repeated the story he told the police when arrested.

Hanson was hypnotized by Prof. Laska, a peripatetic lecturer who came to Galveston a few days ago to give exhibitions of his proficiency in hypnotism. Laska was sent for by the Chief of Police this morning. He had never seen Hanson. He said he would be glad to try his hand on the suspected man. Then Hanson was asked if he would agree to the arrangement. He expressed willingness to be put to any test. The professor and the prisoner were then introduced. Laska said he would like to see what sort of a subject Hanson was. He began work on him, and in a few minutes Hanson seemed to be wholly under the professor's control. To prove the suspected man was not shamming a woman's hat pin was jabbed into Hanson cheek. The subject did not flinch, and when the hat pin was pulled out of the flesh no blood flowed from the wound. Then the man's arm was put in a cataleptic state, and the most powerful detective on the force was asked to bend it. He did not succeed. Then Laska awakened Hanson, told him he was a fine subject, and, after consulting Chief Jones and learning that the police wanted the test made at noon in the presence of more witnesses, the professor said:

"Mr. Hanson, I'm going away; you will be asleep when I return at 12 o'clock."

The Chief of Police and half a dozen detectives and reporters remained in the room with the prisoner after the hypnotist departed. Shortly before noon Hanson seemed to become drowsy. He lay down and apparently was in a deep slumber in a few moments. Laska returning, the detectives were told to awaken the prisoner. They tried to do so by shaking and slapping him and by shouting in his ears, but without avail. The hypnotist rubbed the prisoner's face many times, instructed him to keep soundly, and then said: "When you open your eyes you will see