The Tribune.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

BY MAIL—IN ADVANCE—POSTAGE PREPAID.

Daily edition, one year	$12.00
Parts of a year, per month	1.00
Daily and Sunday, one year	14.00
Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, per year	6.00
Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, per year	6.00
Sunday, 16-page edition, per year	2.00

WEEKLY EDITION—POSTPAID.

One copy, per year	$ 1.50
Club of five	5.00
Twenty-one copies	20.00

Specimen copies sent free.

Give Post-Office address in full, including County and State.

Remittances may be made either by draft, express, Post-Office order, or in registered letter, at our risk.

TO CITY SUBSCRIBERS.

Daily, delivered, Sunday excepted, 25 cents per week. Daily, delivered, Sunday included, 30 cents per week.
Address THE TRIBUNE COMPANY,
Corner Madison and Dearborn-sts., Chicago, Ill.

POSTAGE.

Entered at the Post-Office at Chicago, Ill., as Second-Class Matter.

For the benefit of our patrons who desire to send single copies of THE TRIBUNE through the mail, we give herewith the transient rate of postage:

Domestic.	Per Copy.
Eight and Twelve Page Paper	2 cents.
Sixteen Page Paper	3 cents.
Foreign.	
Eight and Twelve Page Paper	3 cents.
Sixteen Page Paper	4 cents.

TRIBUNE BRANCH OFFICES.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE has established branch offices for the receipt of subscriptions and advertisements as follows:

NEW YORK—Room 29 *Tribune* Building. F. T. McFADDEN, Manager.

GLASGOW, Scotland—Allan's American News Agency, 31 Renfield-st.

LONDON, Eng.—American Exchange, 449 Strand. HENRY F. GILLIG, Agent.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—1319 F street.

AMUSEMENTS.

Grand Opera-House.
Clark street, opposit new Court-House. Engagement of the Harrisons. "Photos."

Haverly's Theatre.
Dearborn street, corner of Monroe. Engagement of Fanny Davenport. "Camille."

Hooley's Theatre.
Randolph street, between Clark and La Salle. Engagement of Willie Edouin. "Dreams."

McVicker's Theatre.
Madison street, between State and Dearborn. Engagement of Lotta. "Little Nell and the Marchioness."

Olympic Theatre.
Clark street, between Lake and Randolph. Minstrel entertainment.

Academy of Music.
Halsted street, near Madison, West Side. Variety entertainment.

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1881.

JUDGE RICHARD JOHNS BOWIE, Chief Judge of the Sixth Circuit and Associate Justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, died yesterday, aged .73. He was one of the original and leading Republicans of that State.

AT yesterday's session of the Senate Republican Caucus Committee in Washington the work of rearranging the Senate Committees on the basis of a Republican majority was completed. No proposition looking to a compromise was received from the Democrats, and none will be entertained. It is now regarded as entirely assured that Mahone will vote and act with the Republicans in the matter of organization.

EMIGRATION to the States is causing much uneasiness in Canada. A French Protestant clergyman in Montreal complains that his flock is decimated and his project frustrated by the exodus; while in Toronto the agents of American railroads and the representatives of land companies in our Western States and Territories are successfully competing with Canadian railway and land agents and turning the tide of emigration largely away from Manitoba and the Northwest Territory.

THE religious matters chronicled in our columns this morning include three sermons of unusual interest—viz.: by Prof. Swing, at the Central Church, on the "Four Great Years" of President Garfield's Administration; by the Rev. Dr. Thomas, at the People's Church, on "A Progressive Orthodoxy"; and by the Rev. George C. Miln, at Unity Church, on "Truth and Freedom"; and an account of the closing exercises of the Young Men's Christian Association gathering at Evanston.

A FRIGHTFUL railroad collision occurred at Pittsburg yesterday morning. A "wild" freight train ran into a yard train on the Pan-Handle bridge, throwing several cars off the track and down to the street beneath, a distance of fifty feet. The conductor of the freight train was instantly killed, and two brakemen seriously injured. One of the engineers had a most remarkable escape, being thrown from the bridge, striking the network of telegraph wires in the street below, thence falling on a shed, and escaping wholly uninjured.

BY the erasure of cancellation marks and the alteration of dates a clever swindle has been perpetrated in the sale of District of Columbia bonds long since canceled and of course worthless. One J. G. Farnham, who in 1876 was Chief Clerk in one of the divisions under the District Board of Audit, confesses to having executed the job, but, as the offense was committed five years ago, he will by the Statute of Limitations escape prosecution and punishment for the crime. About $13,000 worth of the bonds were disposed of, and Farnham is free to admit that his only mistake was in not negotiating $100,000 worth.

THE Lenten pastoral of Archbishop McCabe, of Dublin, is especially severe upon the Ladies' Land League recently organized by the sister of Parnell. While professing the liveliest sympathy with the hopes of Ireland for a lasting reform in the system of land tenure, the Archbishop can hardly find words sufficiently strong with which to express his disapproval of the participation of women in the Land-League agitation, and, so far as he is able, he places all female Leaguers under a sort of sacerdotal ostracism,—a threatened ban which is not likely to turn from their purpose the high-spirited women whose sympathies have been enlisted in the liberation of Ireland from the curse of landlordism, and who, moreover, are quite as competent as is his Grace to judge of what a woman may and may not do without the sacrifice of her modesty.

THE House was not in session in Springfield Saturday, but the Senate held a short session. The most important thing before it was the report of the Revenue Committee of a substitute for Merritt's bill to tax railroad companies on their gross earnings, which substitute provides that, in addition to the taxes now required by law, and in lieu of the tax on capital stock, a tax of 2¼ per cent shall be levied on all gross earnings of lines within the State, payable every six months, and providing for necessary reports to show such gross earnings, properly verified by oath of the President and Secretary, the tax to become a lien on all the property of such railroad, with power to levy on rolling-stock, and if the company refuse to make such report the Auditor may add 1 per cent to such tax, and collect accordingly. This is a very important bill. The railroads have been greatly harassed by the action of the law taxing their capital stock, and they have been in constant hot water with the State Board of Equalization about the amount of capital stock on which they should be taxed. The question has never been settled either to the satisfaction of the railroads or the Legislature. The Senate Revenue Committee has now proposed a simple method of taxation,—substituting a small tax on gross receipts in lieu of the tax on capital stock. We think this plan will be satisfactory to the people at large. It is much simpler, and more equitable than the present method, which is difficult of execution. According to Poor's Railroad Manual, the gross receipts of all the Illinois railroads for 1879 amounted to nearly sixty-four millions of dollars ($63,-632,500), which at 2¼ per cent as proposed by the bill would yield to the State Government, omitting the Illinois Central, already taxed on gross receipts, the respectable sum of a million and a quarter dollars per year. It is not yet learned whether any of the railroads will raise objections to the Revenue Committee's amendment.

THE policy of lenient favoritism pursued by the present municipal administration in Chicago toward disreputable places of resort where liquors are sold, and the utter neglect by the authorities to enforce the ordinance requiring the closing of all saloons after midnight, bore bloody fruit early yesterday morning. At a drinking place on Wabash avenue where counterfeiters, confidence-men, and thieves congregate, George McBride was murdered in the most brutal manner by a crime-stained desperado named Harry Gilmore. The murder was the outgrowth of a protracted debauch, the victim being a young man who had gone to the saloon as the messenger of a woman who wished him to induce her drunken husband to return home. A pistol furnished by the barkeeper of the place served as the instrument of slaughter, and money supplied by the proprietor enabled the murderer to make good his escape.

THE ASSASINATION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPEROR.

The assasination of the Emperor Alexander of Russia yesterday will hardly surprise the world, though it may none the less shock the sensibilities of civilized peoples. The Emperor has been pursued by assasins for nearly twenty years; frequent attempts, and of the most deliberate character, have been made, but all proved failures. At last he has fallen by the hands of assasins. The long-cherished hatred of the man, the strong feeling of revenge for deeds of barbaric cruelty, and the widespread belief that his removal was essential to any deliverance from intolerable oppression, have all been gratified by this successful assasination. The Emperor of Russia of yesterday lies a mangled corpse in the Winter Palace at St. Petersburg; the Emperor of Russia of to-day is a fair-haired young man of 35 years of age, who enters upon his public life under circumstances which foretell a popular struggle which can only end in the obliteration of a despotism which has no modern parallel in Europe.

The murdered Emperor represented a political system from which Europe had moved away. He was an absolute despot. He shared the Government with no one. His will was the supreme law. He was the lord of life and of liberty. Russia was one vast military prison; the people were dependent upon the control of an irresponsible and absolute Government, which Government was the will of the monarch. There may have been feeble pretenses of written law, and feeble mockeries of what are called courts of justice; but the law was the will of the Emperor, and the Courts were but the executioners of the Imperial orders.

The Church is but a branch of the Imperial army. The men in arms were the military agents of the despotism; the Church was the civic, but none the less potential, subjugator of the popular intelligence and the popular conscience. The bayonet and the crozier were alike mere weapons in the hands of the Government to crush out every sentiment save that of abject submission to the requirements of the monarch. However this system may have been more or less general throughout Europe in the past, governmental despotisms, outside of Russia, have been overthrown and have passed away, and popular liberty and popular rights have become too sacred for even anointed hands to touch. In Russia, however, there has been no relaxation, and, while Alexander II. may have deferred to the judgment of mankind in some respects, the despotism of his rule was generally absolute, and far more merciless than it was when the great Catherine ruled the Empire with an iron hand.

The law of Russia was Fear. No confidence was reposed in the patriotism or the loyalty of the people. No man was trusted. All service was rendered through fear or for bribes. When men are ruled by fear they have neither love nor respect for the person that inspires that fear. Complaint was silenced by the knout, deathly exile, or brutal assasination. The policy of the Empire was the preservation of despotism by the annihilation of its opponents, and as a consequence the antagonism to this despotism, took, of necessity, also the form of annihilation of the rulers. Out of such an antagonism, both aiming at the same ends by the same means, assasination became the governing principle both of the Imperial Government and of the revolutionists.

In a land where there was no law and no courts, where suspicion was promptly followed by arrest and wholesale sacrifice of life, revolution could only be fostered in secret; its members and agents staked their lives upon the secrecy and good faith of each other, and how far this secret organization is ramified through the Russian people may be made public in the events that shall follow this murder of Alexander. His death may result in the political emancipation of Russia,—may lead to a thorough overthrow of the existing despotism,—but certainly it can add no new suffering to a nation in which each man, woman, and child holds his or her life upon the sole will of one cruel, vindictive, and merciless human being.

The Emperor Alexander some twenty years ago by Imperial ukase emancipated about 25,000,000 of Russian and Polish serfs. For this he was applauded as a benefactor of his race. It is not gracious to detract from the merit of an act which has passed into history as commendable, but in the light of subsequent events this act appears more as an effort to strengthen the absolutism of the Crown, by making these serfs its grateful adherents, against the machinations of those who had never been serfs.

The young Emperor Alexander III. will be confronted at the very threshold of his reign by a popular demand for a Representative Government. If true to the past history of his family he will refuse, and will depend on the force of the immense army. How far that army will side with the people, and how far with the continuance of the present system, is a question yet to be determined. How far the stories of the personal leanings of the new Emperor towards a more liberal Government may be verified, is also a matter that must soon be made known.

There can be nothing more repulsive to the American mind than assasination as a remedy for political evils. Assasination is cowardly, brutal, and unjustifiable, under any and every circumstance, but especially so when it strikes down the head of a nation and plunges an Empire into confusion and anarchy. Such, however, has been the condition of affairs in Russia, where assasination has been made the rule of domestic warfare, that this assasination must have been universally expected by both the victim and by all as the inevitable outcome of the work of annihilation so deliberately carried on by both sides.

PARNELL AND THE ENGLISH LIBERALS.

Mr. Parnell has inflicted on the English Liberals a defeat the significance of which can scarcely be overrated, and the moral effect of which will not be lost on the party now in power in England, unless it is sadly lacking in political sagacity, blinded by prejudice begotten of irritation, or entirely controlled by half-hearted, feeble-purposed party men. The defeat of the Liberal candidate at Coventry and the election of the Tory candidate have sent a shock through the Liberal ranks, and many of those who have given a thick-and-thin support to Mr. Forster's coercion policy will pause before they continue in that course. At the general election, two Liberal candidates were elected for Coventry by majorities of 170 and 280 respectively. One of the successful Liberal candidates had represented the borough, which was considered a Liberal stronghold, for thirteen years. His election to the English Bench created a vacancy. The Liberals put forward one of their strongest candidates, a local man of large wealth and acknowledged ability. The Tories put forward the defeated candidate of last year. The Liberals were confident of electing their man, and Mr. Jennings, cabling to the New York *World* the day before the election, intimated that there was no doubt of his success. On Friday Mr. Parnell issued an address to the Irish voters of the borough. He requested them to vote for the Tory candidate, and thus show their disapproval of the all-coercion-no-remedial policy of the Liberal Ministry. The result was that the Tory candidate received a majority of 443 votes, a majority brought about by the Irish voters acting on Mr. Parnell's advice.

As we said before, the significance of this election cannot be overrated when it is understood that there are in Great Britain very nearly 2,000,000 Irish, either by birth or descent; that they reside principally in the great manufacturing towns, where nearly every male adult is a voter; that they are well organized in Home-Rule Clubs and Land-League Clubs; that many of them have been the victims of eviction and persecution; that they are, therefore, ardent in their sympathies with the Land-League cause, are devoted followers of Mr. Parnell, believing implicitly in his political wisdom (he was elected President of their central organization before the Irish in Ireland thought of indorsing his course); that in at least fifty English boroughs they hold the balance of power; that Liberal candidates could no more be elected from these fifty boroughs without the Irish vote than could the Democrats elect a Mayor in New York, Chicago, or St. Paul if the Irish voted with the Republicans. At the last general election the Irish acted zealously, faithfully, and solidly with the Liberals, as they believed that Mr. Gladstone would, on attaining power, bring in a liberal measure of land-reform and other ameliorating measures for Ireland. They sank all petty prejudices and differences, and it is to their active, zealous, unflinching, unquestioning aid that the Liberal success in the general election was largely if not wholly due. At Burnley, they supported Rylands, the Radical candidate, in opposition to Talbot, a Catholic Tory, a relative of the Duke of Norfolk, whose cause was ardently espoused by the Roman Catholic clergymen. In the London boroughs, where they are fully one-fourth of the population, they supported the Liberal candidates, and the Liberal triumphs at Lambeth, Tower Hamlets, Hackney, and Southwark were acknowledged by the Liberals themselves to be due to the Irish vote. The same is true of Liverpool and Birmingham (where the three Liberal candidates were elected), of Salford, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Durham, and other places. There are nearly forty boroughs in which the Liberal candidates triumphed by majorities of less than 100. The Irish vote if cast for the Tory candidate in these places would have resulted in Liberal defeat. In about fifty boroughs the majorities were less than the Liberal majority at Coventry; the Irish vote would have turned a Liberal triumph into a defeat in these places. Mr. Forster could not have been elected in Bradford if the Irish voted as solidly against him as they will certainly do when they next get the chance. Add to these facts that nine Liberals who represent Ulster constituencies were elected by votes which were cast by Land-Leaguers in the proportion of five to one; that the only other Irish constituencies represented by Liberals are certain to be wiped out during this Parliament, being the rotten boroughs of Mallow, Athlone, Dundalk, and the equally-corrupt constituency of Dublin, which has only 13,500 voters to 245,700 people; and it will be seen that the Liberal party of England depends for its very existence on the support of the Irish voter, and on the good-will of Mr. Parnell.

Nor will the redistribution of seats mend matters for the Liberals. The representation which will be taken from the English rotten boroughs must be conferred on the great manufacturing towns and on the London boroughs, where the Irish voters are the most numerous, and the representation taken from the decaying rotten boroughs of Ireland must be conferred on the rural constituencies, where ninety-nine out of every hundred voters are Land-Leaguers. The fact is, that the Liberal party must in the future even more than in the past depend on Irish support. Mr. Parnell will have a following of at least eighty Irish members in the next Parliament; there will not be a single Liberal member from Ireland, and if some arrangement is not made in the meantime the Liberals will suffer a loss of at least forty seats in the English and Scotch boroughs. The result of Saturday's election at Coventry makes this certain.

Some of the Liberal papers have long foreseen this. Mr. John Morley, in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, has warned the Liberals that defeat and disaster in the English boroughs would be the result of a coercive policy. He pointed out to them that the support of the Irish voters was better to them than that of the Whigs, who, before this Parliament ceases to exist, will be shorn of their power, while that of the Irish voter will be increased. The Whigs may be satisfied; the Irish are certainly exasperated. They have been betrayed before by the Whigs,—O'Connell used to call them "the base, brutal, and bloody Whigs," because they always promised much and did little or nothing. Not much, to be sure, can be expected by the Irish from the Tories, but it should be borne in mind that it was the Tory Ministry of the Duke of Wellington that granted Emancipation, and it was the last Tory Ministry that passed the Intermediate Education act, the greatest boon conferred on the Irish by a British Parliament, for the Disestablishment act was passed rather to please Miall and the English Liberationists than to please the Irish, and Gladstone's Land act was a limping, halting, if not mischievous measure. Besides, the Irish leaders may come to the conclusion that it is better to trust the "open foe than the friend who lies"; that Lord Beaconsfield, not having lost his political audacity and dexterity, may after all be more safely trusted to for remedial measures than Mr. Gladstone and his Whig following; that the Tory leader may yet "dish" the Whigs by announcing conciliatory measures for Ireland as part of his policy.

There is yet a chance for the Liberals. They can yet win back the Irish, even though the Coercion act exists. By bringing in and passing a thorough measure of land-reform, and giving the Irish a fair degree of local self-government; by discarding the advice of the territorial Whigs, like Hartington and Harcourt, and acting on the advice of men like Cowen, Labouchere, and Morley; by allowing Chamberlain and Bright to have more influence in the Cabinet, and Forster and Argyll less, Irish voters in England may yet be reconciled to the Liberal party, and support its candidates with the same hearty zeal that they did at the last general election. At any rate, and notwithstanding all statements to the contrary, Mr. Parnell is master of the situation. He can unmake the Liberal party if it continues in its policy of coercion and repression. He can be a valuable ally to it if it does justice to Ireland.

GRAIN GOING TO NEW ORLEANS.

A New York dispatch says: "The attention of the Board of Trade and Transportation was called to the new danger to the commerce of New York now being developed in the transportation of grain by means of swiftly-towed barges down the Mississippi to New Orleans, whence it is shipped to Europe by steamships."

The St. Louis *Republican* makes these observations:

> That much-ridiculed revolution in the grain trade, which St. Louis has been striving to effect for years past, begins to look dreadfully real to Chicago and New York. There is no denying their alarm when the New York Board of Trade solemnly directs attention to the danger threatened its commerce. The fact is, it is not a danger threatened any longer, but an actual damage already done. Still worse, there is nothing they can do to stop the revolution. Grain can be shipped cheaper and quicker from St. Louis to New Orleans than from Chicago to New York, and that means cheaper and quicker to Liverpool, or any other foreign port.

We have printed during the last few weeks statements showing the departure from St. Louis of fleets of barges loaded with grain for New Orleans. Some of these floats contained several hundred thousand bushels, the cost of transportation from St. Louis to New Orleans being, as compared with rail freights from there to Baltimore, hardly more than one-third. Jay Gould, it is stated, has furnished most of the capital to build these barges and to operate them, and it is intended and expected to turn into St. Louis the immense grain productions of Kansas, Missouri, part of Iowa, and of the southern half of Illinois and Southern Indiana, and thence send them to the East and to Europe by way of New Orleans. The transportation from St. Louis to New Orleans being reduced to the minimum, and the facilities of handling and shipping the grain at New Orleans being increased, two results are expected to encourage the grain trade on the river. One of these is, that more can be paid for the grain at St. Louis than elsewhere; and, second, the grain can be sold in New Orleans to shippers for less than it costs elsewhere.

As THE TRIBUNE has for years predicted, the opening and maintenance of the Mississippi River route would in time become a necessity, and that time has now arrived. The exactions and confiscations by the railroad combinations have forced the relief which that route offers to the people of the West. The cost of transportation being reduced by that line, producers and shippers will naturally profit by the greater prices they can obtain. It may therefore be accepted as a fixed fact that the Mississippi River route is now and will be henceforth an ever open and rival route for grain and other Western products, especially in the winter and spring months. This competition will immediately be felt by the railways leading East, and by all the cities not located on the Mississippi River, and the diversion of trade will be not only great but permanent. How will it be met?

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company will be the first to feel the destructive effect of this river-barge competition. That road is not burdened either by an enormous bonded debt nor by watered capital stock. It has direct connections with the river at St. Louis, and thence westward. It has connection with several warehouses on the Illinois bank of the river, and also at Baltimore. It has direct steamer arrangements for ocean transportation to Europe. It has all the means and appliances, by the use of steel rails and double tracks and the other economies of transportation, to transact its business cheaper perhaps than any other road in the country. It has an abundance of locomotive machinery and rolling-stock, and has the great advantage of being the shortest route to the seaboard from the Mississippi. But at St. Louis it is confronted with this formidable rival route, by which the products of the Western States may be moved to any point on the Atlantic or in Europe at a great saving on present railroad freight rates per 100 pounds. What will that Company do about it? Will it cling blindly to that cutthroat fraud the "pool"? If it do, then, so far as the grain business is concerned, it may as well close its warehouses, sell off its rolling-stock, and practically abandon its Western connections. When grain can be sold at St. Louis at from three to five cents per 100 pounds more to be shipped thence by the river to New Orleans than can be obtained for it if it be shipped by rail to Baltimore, how much grain is likely to pass over the Baltimore & Ohio Road to Baltimore?

The other alternative is easily measured, weighed, and solved. If the Baltimore & Ohio Company could transport grain from the Mississippi River to Baltimore by the thousands of tons at the rate of 25 cents per 100 pounds (we speak of spring and summer routes), and this new route can move that grain at a much lower rate, what is the road to do? What will the Company say to its stockholders, and to the City of Baltimore? That it will abandon the traffic, sell its locomotives and grain trains, and tell the people of Baltimore that they can have no produce trade with the West? Or will not that Company make a virtue of necessity, and, ascertaining at what rate it can so compete with the river transportation that it can retain the traffic, reduce its own tariff to that point? If the 25 cents per 100 pounds cannot compete, let that rate be reduced to 20 cents, or 17 cents, or 15 cents; let it be reduced to whatever rate will enable that road, with its facilities, to maintain its grain business despite the extraordinary reductions in the cost of transportation made by the system of river and barge carriage. But it will not be necessary to carry grain to Baltimore as cheap as the barges can float it to New Orleans, because Baltimore can pay several cents a bushel more for grain than can New Orleans, as it will cost much more to transport produce from the latter port to Liverpool than from the former. Still there is no course left for the Baltimore & Ohio Road than to cut down its freight charges on grain from St. Louis or abandon the produce business, and it is fortunate that that Company is so conditioned financially that it can adopt this course with less embarrassment and loss than any of its trunk-line competitors.

The grain trade of Baltimore—in fact, the whole Western trade of that city—has obtained such great proportions that it cannot be permitted to be diverted by Jay Gould's scheme of cheaper transportation on the river to New Orleans. It cannot, however, be retained unless the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad meet the competition fairly and squarely by a large reduction of its own rates and give to producers and shippers counterbalancing advantages with those offered by the barges to New Orleans.

Such a course by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad will of necessity have an immediate effect upon those roads running from the West to the seaboard on more northern routes. The Mississippi River competition will directly affect every railroad running east of the Mississippi River to the Atlantic. They must all submit to a heavy shrinkage of their produce business, or they must maintain it by such reductions of rates as will enable grain-dealers to continue shipping grain by rail to Philadelphia, New York, and Boston at a profit. The competition between the Mississippi River route to the Gulf and the lake and canal route to New York and Montreal is destined to be sharp, and the trunk-line roads may as well make up their minds to submit to a reduction that will divide their ordinary charges by two, or abandon the grain-carrying business from the West to the East.

It is pleasant to remember in this connection that every penny taken from the cost of transportation is one added to the price of the grain that will be paid to the producer. There is no patriotism or sentimentality in trade. That route which will pay the farmer the greatest price will command the trade, and to this inexorable law the trunk-line railroads must submit. They must leave the producer as much as he can get by the new route, or the new route will command the bulk of the traffic of the Mississippi Valley States from the close of lake navigation in November till it again opens in April of each year.

THE DEMOCRATIC OFFER TO JUDGE DAVIS.

The Bourbons of the United States Senate sorely need the vote of Judge David Davis, of the strong Republican State of Illinois. They met in caucus and agreed to proffer him the Chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee on consideration of his voting for all their other caucus nominees. They owe him nothing, for he has steadily refused to declare himself a Democrat. Whenever he has voted with the Democratic party it has been on the alleged ground that a careful consideration of the whole subject convinced him that he could not conscientiously vote the other way on that particular question. The fact that the Senatorial Democratic caucus have determined to offer Mr. Davis the Judiciary Chairmanship shows that they regard it as necessary to hold out some inducement to Mr. Davis to vote with them on the organization. Otherwise they surely would not deprive the entire Democratic party of the high honor and bestow it upon a man who disclaims all partisanship. And this reasoning of Democratic Senators is logical. There is less a question of principle at stake in the organization of the Senate of the United States than a question of spoils. The Senate employs a lot of clerks and servants. If Judge Davis votes on the Democratic side these clerks and servants will be Democrats; if he votes on the Republican side they will be Republicans. As he claims to be devoid of partisan feeling, but confesses to Republican leanings, it becomes necessary, in order to secure his vote where no question of principle is involved, to tickle his fancy, or flatter his vanity, or promote his ambition. The Democratic caucus offer of the Judiciary Chairmanship is in the nature of a bribe to Judge Davis, and in this sense it is a gross insult, and he evidently perceived that it was an attempt to bribe him, for he declined accepting the offered Chairmanship at their hands, but he has not resented the insult.

The offer was the equivalent of saying: "We will give you one of the best Chairmanships at our disposal, provided you will vote to give us all the other Chairmanships and the control of all the patronage of the Senate." In another view, it was a proposal to barter off the Chairmanships. The Democrats said to Judge Davis: "If you will give us the power by your vote to seize all the Chairmanships of the Senate, we will give you one of the best of them." The worst thing about it all was that of necessity the bargain is public,—open to all the world; as much so as if, in broad day in front of the Exchange, a lot of thieves should accost an honest man in the street and say: "If you will help us rob the bank yonder we will give you a quarter of the money." The Democrats are not a marjority of the Senate (assuming that Mahone will vote against them), and yet they get together in caucus and parcel out the Chairmanships, as if they had the power to elect the persons named; and then in order to gain the power of election they offer the best of the Chairmanships to a man who denies that he is politically affiliated with them,—offer it to him on condition of receiving his vote, for in no other contingency had they anything to offer.

In view of this state of facts, we do not clearly comprehend how Judge Davis can announce his purpose to support the Bourbon caucus nominees for the Senate Committees.

VILAS, OF WISCONSIN.

On the occasion of the formal election of a successor to the late Senator Carpenter by the Wisconsin Legislature Thursday, the vote stood as follows:

Angus Cameron (Rep.)	97
William F. Vilas (alleged Dem.)	27

The vote for Vilas was less than one-third, and hardly more than one-quarter, of that for his Republican opponent. Why was this so? Vilas is an able man. He is one of the best lawyers in the State. As an orator he is confessedly without a rival in Wisconsin. He was a good soldier, is personally unobjectionable, and has hosts of friends. Other things being equal, he would make a stronger Senator than Cameron, because an abler and more eloquent man, and would fill Mr. Carpenter's shoes in point of ability more nearly than perhaps any other man in the State. But other things were not equal. Mr. Vilas is not sound on the main question. His political associations are not of the right kind; and, if elected, he would represent and enforce views of public policy which the people of Wisconsin do not believe in and have most emphatically condemned. That is the reason why, when it came to a vote between him and Angus Cameron in the Legislature, the latter had a majority of nearly four to one.

Now, it is true that Mr. Vilas, who in the past has been regularly obscured on account of his political associations, and now is entirely out of the line of promotion, has no mental or moral tie which should bind him to the State-sovereignty Bourbon party for one moment. All the Democracy he has he got by inheritance. His father was a Democrat before him. So he sentimentally imagines he is a Democrat. He has inherited the name and party prejudices. That is the whole logic of his position. But he had so little real knowledge of or affection for the fundamentals of the Democratic party that when the War broke out he sprang to the defense of the Union, and as a brave and patriotic soldier did his best to stamp out the pestilent heresy of State supremacy, which constituted all that was ever genuine or vital in the Democratic party. If he had been a Democrat by principle, and not by inheritance, he would have remained at home, joined the Golden Circle, disseminated Copperhead tracts, and decorated the corner-groceries with his cussing of the War. Instead of that, he acted on his convictions, worked with sword and voice for the triumph of Republicanism,—anti-slavery principles. When Col. Vilas came back from the work of shooting and crushing Southern Democracy, covered with honor and reputation, he ought to have gravitated into the Republican party, where he properly belonged and had earned a right to be. He owed that much to consistency. As a Nationalist he fought: how could he become a State-supremacy Democrat when he honorably ceased to fight, there being no longer any occasion for his services? If he had deserted, or been drummed out, we can understand why he should have gone over to the Democracy, but as he came back with flying colors there was no excuse for such conduct. Family memories overcame him. He gave to a lower consistency what belonged to his honor as a soldier. Heredity overcame the scruples which he could not help but feel, and he almost convinced himself that he believed in those noxious Democratic principles of State supremacy which his father had instilled into him in his youth, but which he had fought nobly to put down. So he became a Democrat by prejudice, while he remained a Republican in principle. Still he believed in Republican doctrines or he would not have fought to preserve and establish them.

Mr. Vilas was quite a young man when he made this fatal mistake. If he had been older, he would have been wiser. He saw too late that he had blundered. When Gen. Grant came back from his foreign tour, and was entertained in Chicago, who but the eloquent Col. Vilas was selected to make the welcoming speech. Being a gallant soldier and also an alleged Democrat, it was felt that he was indeed a *rara avis*, and could not be spared from so unique an occasion. So he was brought down from Wisconsin, like a white swan, to give distinction to the feast. And he did it. His speech was one of the most eloquent and appropriate that even Gen. Grant had ever listened to. Col. Vilas himself was so overcome by it that, report says, he would have voted for Gen. Grant for President if he had been nominated. But he refused to vote for another brave soldier, who was an abler statesman and a less ultra Republican than Grant. When Garfield was nominated, the brave, the witty, the accomplished, the patriotic Vilas slipped back into the Bourbon party-by-prejudice, where he no more belongs than in the Ku-Klux Klan or the White League of Louisiana.

There is a lesson and a moral for young Democrats of National feeling and sentiment in this pathetic tale. To all such THE TRIBUNE disinterestedly says, Don't be a Bourbon because your father was; or, if you must follow in the footsteps of your mistaken ancestors, move to Texas or to Missouri, where there is some chance for a young Bourbon to grow up with the country.

FOX AND GEESE IN THE SENATE.

Washington advices indicate a purpose on the part of the Democratic Senators to propose that, if the Republicans will concede to them the Chairmanships of the Committees, they will permit the Republicans to proceed with the organization of the Senate. This is very much such a proposition as if Senators Pendleton and Burnside were discussing a canvasback duck at Welcker's, and the former should propose to divide the fowl by taking all the meat and giving the bones to the latter. The Committees constitute the meat of the Senate organization, and the Chairman of each Committee is the carver who reserves the tidbits and the *bonnes-bouches* for himself. The appointment of the attachés to the Senate—the clerks, Sergeants-at-Arms, doorkeepers, messengers, etc.—is a very insignificant perquisit as compared with the power and prestige that go with the Committees. It is the Committees that shape legislation; report bills or pocket them; recommend or strangle the Executive nominations; and the Chairmen are recognized as the leaders.

But there is still another consideration, not so generally known to the public, which increases the impertinence and impracticability of such a proposition as is credited to the Democrats. The Chairman of a Senate Committee is a luxurious aristocrat. The traditions of the Senate are peculiar. For instance, the Vice-President is the dictator over the restaurant on that side of the Capitol. He has the appointment of the restaurateur, and it is the only patronage that attaches to what is nominally the second office in the Government. So the Chairman of a Senate Committee is supreme in the apartments and appurtenances presumptively set aside for the Committee. The desk, the easy chair, and the lounge are all his. No other member of the Committee ever dreams of disputing with the Chairman the exclusive possession and enjoyment of these privileges. The committee-room is the Chairman's domain. There he transacts what private business he may have. If he be of a social turn he has his sideboard and entertains his friends there. Even lady visitors are said to be welcomed by the fortunate Chairman, while the desolate associates must either remain in their seats or seek consolation in the common cloak-rooms. The Clerk of the Committee, paid out of Government appropriations, is really a clerk or private secretary to the Chairman. The Chairman selects him, and, as a rule, either confers the place upon some relative or makes the choice on account of the personal service the clerk is expected to render him. The clerk is designed to be useful in the preparation of the Chairman's speeches, the writing of the Chairman's letters, and such other duties as may contribute to the Chairman's convenience and comfort.

Even if the influence of the Chairmanships of the various Committees over public affairs were to be left out of the question, is it reasonable to suppose that the Republican Senators with the slightest prospect of controlling these desirable places will yield them to their opponents in exchange for the crumbs of the organization? What is the appointment of a doorkeeper, or even of a barber under the name of messenger, as compared to the manifold privileges, and comforts, and perquisits which attach to a Committee Chairmanship? The Senate is a body of men who have an abiding sense of the comforts of life, and who do not ascetically turn up their noses at a suggestion of the *dolce far niente* in Senatorial existence. All the members are thoroughly familiar with the advantages that belong to the Chairmanship of a Committee. Hence the probable willingness of the Democratic Senators to give up all the other elements of organization if they can secure the Chairmanships, but hence also the strong improbability that the Republican Senators will accept such terms if they are in a position to control the coveted Chairmanships for themselves.

A GREAT circular panorama of the battle of Gravelotte has been completed and placed on exhibition in Berlin. It represents the moment when the Prussian Corps of Guards and the Saxons, having pressed round by forced marches to the extreme right of the French position, are moving forward to the storming of St. Privat. The spectator is supposed to be standing on one of the first of the villages shattered and burnt by German shells, around him being charred rafters and all the débris of war. The landscape is true to nature in all its details, and of many of the combatants correct portraits are given. The artist is Prof. Hunten, a painter of battle scenes who was born in Paris in 1827, became a pupil of Camphausen at Dusseldorf, and went through the campaigns of 1861, 1866, and 1870.

SPEAKING of the new Secretary of the Interior, ex-Senator Kirkwood, the New York *Tribune* says:

> When he comes to develop his Indian policy we have no doubt that it will give earnest support to all practical efforts to help the Indians to become responsible, self-sustaining, property-owning citizens. Such a policy will unquestionably have the indorsement of President Garfield. The action of Congress, however, will be needed to carry it into effect. President Hayes found the obtuseness and indifference of Congress a stumbling-block in his way when he sought to introduce new methods in the Indian service. Public sentiment is now so emphatic in favor of applying civilizing processes to the savages that Congress will soon be spurred up to action. Mr. Kirkwood has made a good beginning in his conference with the representatives of the Colorado Utes, who want to back out of their agreement for ceding their old reservation and moving to a new one, and set up the pretense that they only bargained to sell the mountain lands. The Secretary told them that their contract was fairly made and fully understood and agreed to by their Chiefs and head men, and that they would have to abide by it. At the same time he assured them that if the new lands set apart for them were not satisfactory, and a better location could be found in either Utah or Colorado, the Government would allow them the fullest liberty of choice and deal with them in a liberal spirit. He thus showed them that, while the Government insisted that they should fulfill their part of the contract, it was willing to do more than carry out its own part. Here is a mingling of firmness, justice, and generosity that speaks well for both the head and heart of the new Secretary.

AN exchange remarks:

> Probably the final solution of the South African troubles will, sooner or later, be found in the formation of a Confederacy embracing all the civilized States in that region. This proposition was made in England before the outbreak of the Transvaal war, but met with little encouragement, owing, perhaps, to the prevalent English opinion that all people enjoying the blessings of British Colonial rule ought to be content with it till the end of time. There are civilized inhabitants enough in South Africa to form a strong, self-governing Republic. According to the latest statistics the population of Cape Colony is 682,000; of Natal 370,000; of the Orange Free State, 37,000; and of the Transvaal 120,000, taking no account of the savage tribes. Here, then, are 1,008,000 people of European ancestry, about half of them English-speaking, who could soon be welded together into a homogeneous nationality if they had the tie of common political interests. There would be at first some jealousy between the Dutch and English elements, but it would not be as serious a matter as it is now if the Dutch did not feel that they were under foreign rule. The early English and German settlers of Pennsylvania managed to get along amicably together, and the Dutch and English are less diverse in language and customs. There is room enough in South Africa for a prosperous agricultural population of four or five millions. Land is ridiculously cheap. An English traveler who has just published a book about the Transvaal says he was offered 1,500 acres of fine grazing land in exchange for a wagon.

EX-POSTMASTER-GENERAL KEY, of Tennessee, is kind enough to speak favorably of all the members of the new Cabinet. He says Blaine is the "brainiest man in it"; that "Bob Lincoln is a fine young fellow"; that "MacVeagh is a smart chap"; that "James is a man of great executive ability"; and that "Windom is a careful, prudent man." Judge Key speaks with moderation, it will be observed. He himself went into the Hayes Cabinet because he was the only living "Old-Line Whig," and it is natural that he should look upon men with inferior qualifications somewhat condescendingly.

IT was regarded as an objectionable circumstance that the lobby at Washington on behalf of Stanley Matthews consisted of two Democratic editors,—both relatives.—Mr. Watterson, of the *Courier-Journal*, and Mr. McLean, of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*.—*Chicago Tribune.*

Will you kindly mention, since you are at it, how related Wash McLean and Stanley Matthews are? We think it possible they once belonged to the same fire company. If so, does that make John R. McLean and Henry Watterson first or second cousins?—*Cincinnati Commercial.*

Cousins germain, you booby! Don't you know enough to know that?

SENATOR DAVIS has a very curious way of conferring on the country a "respit from discord" and a "rest from sectional strife," by voting to confer the organization of the Senate and its committees on the Southern Bourbons. Judge, your pretexts are a little too thin.

THE Nashville *American* discovers that the ambitious young men of the colored race aspire to be preachers.

"GATH" says that in the East public life is a conflict of persons, and in the West a conflict of appropriations.

PERSONALS.

New views of Ireland—Terror-scopic.

Maine has twelve ex-Governors living. Prohibition doesn't seem to be so much of a success, after all.

"Dr. Collyer says that 'if George Eliot goes to Hell she will change the climate.' This is important if true."—*Bob Ingersoll.*

The English Government sometimes displays excellent judgment. The Boyton recently arrested as a Land Leaguer is a brother of Capt. Boyton, the swimming nuisance.

Mr. Charles A. Dana, of the New York *Sun*, who has been visiting Cuba for the past month in company with his daughter, sailed for home last Saturday.

The New York *Tribune* says Postmaster-General James is a cheerful worker, even when surrounded by bores. This is the first intimation that the *Tribune* staff had called on the General.

"I see that Mr. Forepaugh offers a prize of $10,000 for the handsomest woman in America to travel with his show. This might be better than writing books,—but no, I will not keep some poor girl out of a chance to get rich."—*Gail Hamilton.*

She is rosy, bright, and fair,
And she cuts her curly hair
Like a mop.
But I love her, that I do,
From her dainty little shoe
To her crop!

—*Chicago Ballad.*

A Kentucky paper recently stated that a prominent citizen was "greatly troubled with insomnia." After the editor got out of the hospital he decided to never again use anything but plain language in writing of his fellow-townsmen. Kentuckians are not troubled with education, but they shoot straight and take explanations afterwards.

To make soup a l'Argonaut: Take a pail of water and wash it clean; then boil it till it is brown on both sides; pour in one bean; when the bean begins to worry prepare it to simmer. If soup won't simmer it's too rich; pour in more water; dry the water with a towel before you put it in; the drier the water the sooner it browns. Serve hot.

Riding in a railroad car. Husband—"You are quite comfortable, dear?" Wife—"Yes, love." Husband—"The cushions are easy and soft, ducky?" Wife—"Yes, darling." Husband—"You don't feel any jolts, pet?" Wife—"No, sweetest." Husband—"And there is no draught on my lamb, is there, angel?" Wife—"No, my ownest own." Husband—"Then change seats with me."—*Horrid Ohio Editor.*

Out of the casement she leaned and smiled
Waving her pretty white hand;
Her yellow hair was tangled and wild—
The sun was over the land.
"Good-by!" she laughed, as she flung him a rose,
"May your Fates be ever bland!"

He pressed the little flower-band to his lips,
His eyes were passionate-dark;
He looked at her mouth, like the wild rose pips,
He heard her voice sweet as a lark.
"Good-by, dear little one!" soft and low,
He said, "may the grim Fates bark

"To a voice like yours!" then he turned away
With a restless sigh from her face;
And over the sun crept a cloud of gray,
And the Summer lost its grace.
And he went away o'er the hills afar,
And the maiden sobbed in her place.
—*Dyspeptic Poet.*

Into the basement he heaved the coal,
Clubbing himself the while;
He fired the anthracite through a hole,
And slowly lowered the pile.
"Ain't it nice?" she cried from the kitchen-door.
Said Jim: "I should rather smile."

He pressed a grimy old hand to his lips,
His eyes were plugged up with dust,
He looked at her mouth—his left boot slips
And then he the coal-dealer cussed.
"Gosh darn this marrying!" soft and low
He said; "May I lose my place

"If I ever allow my sons to wed
Any girl with a baby-face."
And over the street sailed a "soaked" snowball,
And his plug-hat had lost its grace;
And he went away o'er the back-yard fence
But the small boy won the race.