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....3.00

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:

Foreign and Domestic. Per Copy.
Eight, ten, twelve, and fourteen page paper..2 cents.
Sixteen, eighteen, and twenty page paper....3 cents.
Twenty-two and twenty-four 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.

Haverly's Theatre.
Monroe street, between Clark and Dearborn. Engagement of John McCullough. "The Gladiator."

Olympic Theatre.
Clark street, between Lake and Randolph. "Furnished Rooms."

Hooley's Theatre.
Randolph street, between Clark and La Salle. Engagement of Thomas W. Keene. "Richard III."

Grand Opera-House.
Clark street, opposite new Court-House. Engagement of the Union-Square Theatre Company. "Daniel Rochat."

McVicker's Theatre.
Madison street, between State and Dearborn. Engagement of Miss Mary Anderson. "Evadne."

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

Lyceum Theatre.
Desplaines street, near Madison, West Side. Variety entertainment.

Criterion Theatre.
Corner of Sedgwick and Division streets. Variety entertainment.

Industrial Exposition.
Lake-Front, opposite Adams street. Open day and evening.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1881.

THE FIRE ANNIVERSARY TRIBUNE.

The great demand for THE TRIBUNE *of Sunday Oct. 9, a mammoth number consisting of twenty-four pages, issued in commemoration of the Great Fire of Oct. 9, 1871, having exhausted the extra supply laid in by the newsdealers, ample provision has been made for a large additional supply. Copies may be obtained in quantities at regular trade rates, or by single numbers in wrappers at five cents each, at* THE TRIBUNE *counting-room, southeast corner of Madison and Dearborn streets. For the information of those desiring to mail copies to friends it is proper to state that the postage for this triple number will be four cents.*

THE Governor of Minnesota has appointed the Hon. Alexander Ramsey and Congressman Washburn as the representatives of that State at the Yorktown Centennial.

A PANIC occurred in the Methodist Church at Bradford, Pa., last evening, started by a woman fainting in the gallery, and aggravated by a male idiot yelling "Fire!" By the exertions of Bishop Harris and Chaplain McCabe the congregation were at last quieted, but not until several persons had been severely crushed.

DR. TALMAGE, the famous pulpit orator of the Brooklyn Tabernacle, spoke to two immense gatherings in Chicago—in the morning at the Third Presbyterian Church, which was densely crowded, and many hundreds turned away who could not get inside, and in the evening at Farwell Hall, which was also filled to overflowing. Both discourses will be found in our columns this morning.

ST. LOUIS is suffering from a big freight blockade. Some 5,000 cars filled with merchandise fill the tracks of Eastern roads for forty miles out of the city, and goods shipped from Eastern points forty days ago have not arrived yet. The difficulty seems to lie somewhere between the Transfer Company and the Bridge Company, and between the two the merchants of St. Louis are having a hard time of it.

PROF. SWING'S sermon of yesterday at the Central Church was on the subject of the more thoughtful and more practical and valuable quality of Christian faith existing now as compared with former times. In addition to this, we print this morning accounts of other religious events of interest in and out of Chicago, among the latter being a paper from a London correspondent concerning the recent great Methodist Ecumenical Conference in London.

THE South Boston Iron Company, organized in 1809, and noted for its facilities for producing ordnance and other iron work of the heaviest description, is suffering from financial embarrassment. It is now engaged in filling a large contract with the United States Government for naval ordnance, and has claims against the Government for upwards of $500,000. The liabilities are estimated at $300,000, and it is confidently expected that the institution will be able to adjust its affairs without being compelled to suspend work.

THE latest thing in Cabinet-making, said to have been given out by an intimate personal friend who has been for several days in close consultation with President Arthur, fixes up the slate as follows: Secretary of State, Frelinghuysen of New Jersey; Secretary of the Treasury, Folger of New York; Secretary of War, Lincoln of Illinois; Postmaster-General, Sargent of California; Secretary of the Interior, Howe of Wisconsin; Secretary of the Navy, ex-Gov. Rice of Massachusetts; Attorney-General, Benjamin F. Brewster of Pennsylvania. It is further said that this list will be sent to the Senate tomorrow, and that Attorney-General MacVeagh will accept a Government retainer and remain in charge of the star-route prosecutions.

THE Republicans in the Senate will today enter a formal protest, presented by Senators Edmunds, Frye, and Logan, against the election of Bayard as President *pro tem.* prior to the swearing in of the new Senators. It is well understood that David Davis will vote for Anthony, the Republican candidate, but it is not probable that he would unite with the Republicans in an attempt to depose Bayard in the event of the latter's election. It is on the Secretaryship, however, that the Republicans will make their strongest fight, and in order to prevent the election of a Democrat to that position they will, if necessary, withdraw and break up a quorum. As a cover for the plot to keep out Miller and Lapham until after the Democrats have stolen the Senate organization, a paper is said to have been forwarded to Washington, signed by all the Democratic members of the New York Legislature, alleging that the election of these Senators was secured by means of bribery. It is, however, unlikely that this project will be successful. One or more Democratic Senators are quoted as saying that they will not support the movement to proceed to the election of Secretary before the new Senators are sworn in, even should the caucus decree such a procedure.

SENATOR BAYARD'S regard for constitutional obligations might be considered noble and touching were it possible to disconnect Democratic greed for office and spoils from the plot to capture the Senate organization before it becomes impossible by swearing in the new Senators. Mr. Bayard, the Democratic caucus nominee, says that he would for personal and other reasons prefer not to be elected President of the Senate, and that it is only a sense of the duty imposed upon them by the Constitution that prompts himself and his brother Democrats to play the game of grab. His delicate perceptions of duty, however, do not seem to impel him to recognize the justice and fairness of consenting to the election of a Republican to preside over a Republican Senate.

ADVICES from Arizona report exciting events and rumors concerning the campaign against the hostile Indians. Bernard's command has been sent in pursuit of one body of redskins, with instructions to follow them into Sonora and coöperate with the Mexican forces, provided the latter are willing. The telegraph wires along the line of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé Railroad have been cut between Grant and Thomas, and the bodies of five line-repairers who had been murdered by Indians were found near Willcox, Ari. As a train on the Southern Pacific was passing Willcox last night the passengers could hear sounds of a fight between the citizens of that place and the Indians, the latter having evidently attacked the town. From another source it is learned that Arnold's command attacked the Indians, and after a battle drove them into the mountains.

IT was Parnell's turn yesterday. In a speech yesterday at Wexford he devoted his attention to Mr. Gladstone, characterizing him as the greatest coercionist and the most unrivaled slanderer of Ireland—one who had maligned the Irish people, and for whom no misrepresentation was too low or too mean to stoop to. He referred to him with fine irony as "this masquerading knight-errant, this pretended champion of all nations except the Irish," who was obliged to throw off his mask and "stand revealed as prepared to carry fire and the sword into Irish homesteads unless the people humbled and abased themselves before him and the landlords." In answer to Gladstone's charge that Parnell preached the gospel of plunder, the Irish leader said that the land had been confiscated three times over by men whose descendants Gladstone is now supporting in the enjoyment of *their* plunder by bayonets and buckshots. From the brief report given in the cable dispatches it would appear that Parnell's speech was one of his best and strongest.

MR. CHARLES S. WOLFE, the Independent Republican candidate for Treasurer in Pennsylvania, made a speech in Philadelphia defining his position Tuesday, and in the course of it paid his respects to Senator Don Cameron. The Senator, he said, had not always been so strict in supporting the party nominations as he is at present. For example, the Cameron influence was well understood to be thrown against the reëlection of Senator John Scott, who was defeated by Wallace, Democrat, the object of this move being to secure to the family the monopoly of Pennsylvania National patronage. Mr. Wolfe says that he himself, though nominated for the Legislature by a vote of three to one in 1878, was opposed by the Cameron influence. Senator Cameron himself admitted that "he had thrown all his influence and instructed all his followers to put forth, as they did actively and openly, every effort to compass Wolfe's defeat and elect his Democratic competitor." After this Wolfe may be excused for a little party infidelity. He has an illustrious example to follow.

THE swearing in of a Senator before a President has been chosen is not an uncommon practice. Indeed, it is the usual mode of procedure when the Senate is without a President and desires to choose to that office one who is just beginning a new term, and consequently is required to be sworn in afresh. The correspondent of a New York paper cites the precedents thus:

> March 4, 1841, Mr. King, of Alabama, was sworn in as Senator before any President of the Senate had been chosen, and Mr. King himself was thereupon chosen to that office; March 5, 1849, Mr. Atchison was sworn in as a Senator before any President of the Senate had been chosen, and he, too, was thereupon chosen to that office; March 4, 1857, Mr. Mason was sworn in as Senator before any President of the Senate had been chosen, and that he, also, was thereupon chosen to that office; *March 4, 1863, Mr. Foot was* sworn in as Senator before any President of the Senate had been chosen, and he was thereupon chosen to that office; and March 5, 1877, Mr. Ferry was sworn in as Senator before any President of the Senate had been chosen, and he was *thereupon chosen to that office.*

There is evidently precedent enough to justify the Democrats of the Senate in swearing in the Senators from New York and Rhode Island before proceeding to the election of officers. A simple resolution directing that the oath be administered by the oldest Senator would be sufficient, and strictly in accordance with custom. But the Democrats in the Senate are not searching for authority to justify them in doing the fair thing.

IN the full text of the complaint preferred before the Rock River Conference by Dr. Thomas against Dr. Parkhurst, the former *alleged that he had been wantonly and maliciously defamed* by the latter, who had informed a newspaper correspondent that he (Dr. Thomas) had ruined young men by his false teachings, and that he could be put *upon trial for beer-drinking, card-playing,* and theatre-going, and, in proof that Dr. Parkhurst had made such charges, Dr. Thomas submitted two affidavits. The first of these, signed by J. C. Ambrose, is as follows:

> *State of Illinois, County of Cook, to-wit:* I, J. C. Ambrose, being duly sworn, do hereby state that, on or about the 10th day of September, on the train between Lake Bluff and Evanston, I met the Rev. M. M. Parkhurst, and, when speaking of the Rev. H. W. Thomas, he used the following language, or words to the same effect: "If the heresy charge fails before the conference we can put Brother Thomas on trial for beer-drinking, card-playing, and theatre-going. We can prove these things, and expel him for them. He took beer in a saloon with some of his official members. Among them were Arthur Dixon, Mr. Turner [and a third, whose name witness could not recall]. I know what I am talking about. *I have been tracking Dr. Thomas these ten years,* and probably know more about his private life than any other man living." And, on being asked if he was sure he could prove the beer-drinking, he replied: "Yes, of course we can." I was at that time Lake Bluff correspondent of the Chicago *Times,* and the statement of his remarks as reported by me in the *Times* of Sept. 13, 1881, is correct in substance so far as it goes. J. C. AMBROSE.
>
> Subscribed and sworn to before me, R. W. Clifford, a Notary in and for the said County of Cook, this 3d day of October, 1881.
> R. W. CLIFFORD, Notary Public.

The second, signed by E. B. Plumb, is as follows:

> *State of Illinois, etc.:* Edward B. Plumb, of Chicago, being duly sworn, says that in the early part of September, 1881, at the hotel at Lake Bluff, Ill., he heard the Rev. M. M. Parkhurst, when speaking of the Rev. H. W. Thomas, say: "I have known of Dr. Thomas going into beer-saloons with some of his official members [giving some names which I do not now remember] and drinking beer there, and I can prove it. I know Dr. Thomas better than any other living man, for *I have followed him for the last ten years,* and know these things and a great many more. We have been fooling with Dr. Thomas long enough, and when I spank a child I don't give him taffy." E. B. PLUMB.
> Subscribed and sworn, etc., before me.
> R. W. CLIFFORD, Notary Public.

These charges, so openly made, Dr. Thomas, in his righteous indignation, characterizes as "lies," and charges that Dr. Parkhurst knew they were false when he made them. The whole community in which Dr. Thomas has lived and labored so long will now demand, in behalf of the man whom they esteem so highly, that his traducer rise and prove his charges or confess they are vile slanders. They come from a man who has made himself conspicuous in prosecuting Dr. Thomas for his alleged utterances on dogmatic points which have long distracted abler men than him. He has not only conducted that prosecution offensively, but he is charged by a man eminently his superior in education, in ability, in manners, and in religious character, with having vilified and defamed him behind his back in a most ungentlemanly manner. It now behooves Mr. Parkhurst to substantiate his charges or to eat very humble pie.

THE Senate of the United States meets in extra session today. There have been important changes in its membership since the extra session of last spring. The two Senators from New York—Messrs. Conkling and Platt—announced their resignations May 16, the letter to the Governor of New York bearing date May 14. July 16, precisely nine weeks from the date of resignation, Warner Miller was elected to succeed Platt, and one week later lacking a day, July 22, Lapham was chosen in place of Conkling. Senator Burnside died Sept. 13, and Nelson W. Aldrich was elected his successor Oct. 5. Other changes in the printed lists of Senators were caused early in the extra session by the resignations of Senators Blaine, Windom, and Kirkwood, and the appointment of Senators to succeed them. The Senate which meets today will be composed of the following members:

(Democrats, 37; Republicans, 37; Independents, 2.)

ALABAMA.	**MISSISSIPPI.**
John T. Morgan, D.....1883	Lucius Q. C. Lamar, D.1883
James L. Pugh, D.....1885	James Z. George, D....1887
ARKANSAS.	**MISSOURI.**
Aug. H. Garland, D....1883	George G. Vest, D......1885
James D. Walker, D...1885	Francis M. Cockrell, D.1887
CALIFORNIA.	**NEBRASKA.**
James T. Farley, D.....1885	Alvin Saunders, R.....1883
John F. Miller, R......1887	Chas. H. Van Wyck, R.1887
COLORADO.	**NEVADA.**
Henry M. Teller, R....1883	John P. Jones, R.......1885
Nathaniel P. Hill, R....1885	James G. Fair, D.......1887
CONNECTICUT.	**NEW HAMPSHIRE.**
Orville H. Platt, R.....1885	Edward H. Rollins, R 1883
Joseph R. Hawley, R..1887	Henry W. Blair, R.....1885
DELAWARE.	**NEW JERSEY.**
Eli Saulsbury, D........1883	Jno. R. McPherson, D.1881
Thomas F. Bayard, D..1887	William J. Sewell, R...1887
FLORIDA.	**NEW YORK.**
Wilkinson Call, D......1885	Elbridge G. Lapham, R.1885
Charles W. Jones, D...1887	Warner Miller, R.......1887
GEORGIA.	**NORTH CAROLINA.**
Benjamin H. Hill, D...1883	Matt. W. Ransom, D...1883
Joseph E. Brown, D....1885	Zebulon B. Vance, D...1885
ILLINOIS.	**OHIO.**
David Davis, Ind. D....1883	Geo. H. Pendleton, D..1885
John A. Logan, R......1885	John Sherman, R.......1887
INDIANA.	**OREGON.**
Dan'l W. Voorhees, D.1885	Lafayette Grover, D...1883
Benj. Harrison, R......1887	John H. Slater, D... ..1885
IOWA.	**PENNSYLVANIA.**
*James W. McDill, R...1883	J. Donald Cameron, R.1885
Wm. P. Allison, R..... 1885	John I. Mitchell, R.....1887
KANSAS.	**RHODE ISLAND.**
Preston B. Plumb, R...1883	Henry B. Anthony, R.1883
John J. Ingalls, R......1885	Nelson W. Aldrich, R..1887
KENTUCKY.	**SOUTH CAROLINA.**
James B. Beck, D.. 1883	Manning C. Butler, D..1883
John S. Williams, D....1885	Wade Hampton, D.....1885
LOUISIANA.	**TENNESSEE.**
William P. Kellogg, R.1883	Isham G. Harris, D.....1883
B. Frank Jonas, D......1885	Howell E. Jackson, D..1887
MAINE.	**TEXAS.**
William P. Frye, R.....1883	Richard Coke, D........1883
Eugene Hale, R........1887	Samuel B. Maxey, D...1887
MARYLAND.	**VERMONT.**
James B. Groome, D...1885	Justin S. Morrill, R.....1885
Arthur P. Gorman, D..1887	Geo. F. Edmunds, R...1887
MASSACHUSETTS.	**VIRGINIA.**
George F. Hoar, R.....1883	John W. Johnston, D..1883
Henry L. Dawes, R....1887	Wm. Mahone, Ind. D..1887
MICHIGAN.	**WEST VIRGINIA.**
Thomas W. Ferry, R...1883	Henry G. Davis, D.....1883
Omar D. Conger, R.....1887	J. N. Camden, D........1887
MINNESOTA.	**WISCONSIN.**
*A. J. Edgerton, R. 1883	Angus Cameron, R.....1885
Sam J. R. McMillan, R.1887	Philetus Sawyer, R....1887

*Appointed by Governor.

Senators Miller, Lapham, and Aldrich have not been sworn in, and will not, therefore, be permitted to vote in the election of a President *pro tem.* Senator Fair, of Nevada (Democrat), is paired with Senator Platt, of Connecticut (Republican). If Senator Davis, of Illinois (Independent), votes with the Democrats and Senator Mahone, of Virginia (Independent), with the Republicans, and all the other Senators are present, Mr. Bayard will be elected President *pro tem.* by a vote of 37 to 34. When the Senators from New York and Rhode Island are admitted the Senate will be a tie on all political questions if Senator Davis votes with the Democrats and Senator Mahone with the Republicans.

DR. THOMAS' THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT.

The trial of Dr. Thomas before a committee of the Methodist Conference at Sycamore has raised some doctrinal questions of interest to the denominational public, and among others that which relates to the true theory of the atonement. Dr. Thomas is accused by certain of his clerical brethren with believing that "the atonement was to reconcile man to God, not God to man." We do not know how important a difference this may be in the Methodist theology. From the examination of Dr. Thomas on his alleged heresies we make this extract. Question to Dr. Thomas:

> "Did you say at a preachers' meeting that Christ died to reconcile man to God, not God to man?"
>
> "I asked Dr. Bannister if the Scriptures anywhere taught that the death of Christ was to reconcile God to man."
>
> "What did Dr. Bannister say to that?"
>
> Objected to.
>
> "I did not myself express any opinion on the subject. I simply asked that question."

The Rev. J. M. Caldwell was called and placed on the stand in rebuttal of the defendant. Question by Dr. Parkhurst:

> "Dr. Caldwell, will you tell the court why you are so positive in your testimony on the words, 'The atonement was to reconcile man to God, not God to man'?"
>
> "Because the discussion awakened popular interest on the subject of the atonement, and I preached on the subject the next Sabbath, and have my manuscript still, and in my sermon I referred to that form of expression without referring to the man, explaining wherein I thought it was heretical."

It will strike the average layman, perhaps, that the quality of heresy involved in drawing such a distinction is not sufficiently awful to justify trial and expulsion. If there were no other ground of prosecution than this against Dr. Thomas, the trial would be considered by many as inconsequential. There would be no more merit in it than in the dialectic scholasticism of the Middle Ages or the endless disputes of the Homoousians and the Homoiousians, whether the Son was of the same essence of the Father, or whether He was similar, but not identical within Him—questions which racked, and almost wrecked, the Church of the earlier centuries.

The whole difference between Dr. Thomas and his prosecutors on this point may be merely one of words. He may have an entirely distinct conception of the idea of "reconciliation" from that which his prosecutors entertain. "To reconcile" means simply "to bring together again" after estrangement. Strictly speaking, there can be no separate reconciliation of one person. It is not an independent act, but a mutual interchange of feeling between two or more persons. Hence the discrimination between "reconciling God to man and reconciling man to God" is really a distinction without a difference. A sufficient defense of Dr. Thomas could be made on this ground, if on no other.

But this would be, after all, a technical defense. We should much prefer to have the sentiment argued and upheld in its broadest sense. Supposing the idea of Dr. Thomas to be that the object of the atonement was "to propitiate" man, or to give him a new understanding of the mercy and goodness of God, what could be said in defense of that view? Is there any Scripture against it?

The atonement in theology means an expiation for sin. The sin which Christ is said to have expiated by His death on the cross is, according to the common understanding of it, the sin committed in the Garden of Eden. The theology of all the churches teaches that God had foreknowledge of that sin, and the Calvinists claim ordained it from eternity. The Arminians ascribe to Adam a wider range of personal liberty than the Calvinists do; but both agree in teaching at least the foreknowledge and omnipotence of God. But foreknowledge and omnipotence involve the idea of personal responsibility. Hence the eating of the forbidden fruit by Adam may be said to have been ordered and authorized—certainly permitted—by an omnipotent power.

What was the situation of Adam when he committed, by such prearrangement or foreknowledge of his Creator, this offense for which he and his posterity were doomed to everlasting suffering? He was newly created out of dust, alone, defenseless, and inexperienced; totally ignorant of the forces of Nature, of the habits of the animals about him, of the action of the elements, of the operation of his own mind, and of the difference between good and evil. He had but one companion, his wife, who naturally had immense influence over him, and she was in the conspiracy against him, according to the Jewish account. The temptation was presented to him in the most alluring form by the Chief of all Tempters. He was unable to resist, and ate of the fruit. He would have been a god if he had not, in the opinion of the average married man. We have too much respect for the intelligence of our readers to presume that the offense was the literal eating of literal fruit. It must have been more serious than that. But whatever it was, it was followed by an awful punishment. The sentence of God was:

> Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, "Thou shalt not eat of it," cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

The penalty was, therefore, cumulative, including torture, hard labor, and death, and extending not only to the offender, but to all his unborn and innocent posterity; and the motive for it, as set forth in the Bible, is even more remarkable than the original offense and judgment. Gen., iii., 22-24, reads as follows:

> And the Lord God said: Behold, *the man is become as one of us to know good and evil:* and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the *tree of life,* and eat, and *live forever:* therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden to till the ground from which he was taken. *So He drove out the man: and He placed at the* east of the Garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

It would seem from this Scripture that previous to eating of the forbidden fruit man did not know what good and evil were; nor their difference; nor their respective natures; that he was an innocent, ignorant creature; but after eating the fruit he found out, to his sorrow, the nature of good and evil. It *seems, also, that if he had been let alone he* would have eaten of the tree of life and prevented death from entering the world. He would have become like the immortal gods. So he was expelled from the garden to prevent this result. Man rebelled and denied the justice of this frightful punishment for yielding to his wife's solicitations—rebelled at the justice or equity of it, when he had got his eyes open to the difference between good and evil. Man could discern neither the goodness nor the wisdom of the Being who inflicted the awful doom. He feared God, but did not love Him. To make him comprehend the forgiveness and compassion of the Almighty, it was necessary that there should be a further revelation. According to the same Jewish authority, Jehovah made this revelation in the person of Christ, who presented to mankind the benign aspects of a merciful religion. The spectacle of the death upon the cross of so good and great a man—sent by God as His Son—was needed to inform the world of the forgiveness of its Creator. Hence the atonement was in one sense a means of reconciling man to God.

We are quite aware that this is not a theory of the atonement which the Methodist Church is prepared to approve. But it is merely the logical development of Dr. Thomas' theory. It is the idea of atonement which has found lodgment in millions of minds, and recommends itself constantly to the favor of reflecting minds the more it is examined.

CURTIS AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

A report of the proceedings of the New York Republican Convention says: "George William Curtis' name, though low on the roll, drew the first applause." This is significant of a great change in public sentiment on the subject of civil-service reform. Mr. Curtis is not a popular man with politicians. He is more a *littérateur* than a politician; he is uncompromising, like Wayne MacVeagh, and is a kicker rather than a submissionist where a principle is at stake. But he has made a stubborn fight for a great principle—namely: the integrity of the civil service, the freedom from entangling alliances with partisan politics of the mere bookkeeping of the Government. And in this fight he has shown the very best qualities of a true reformer, demanding always complete reform, but accepting thankfully here a little and there a little, and from the vantage ground thus secured fortifying his advanced position as the basis of fresh assaults upon the enemy's lines.

Against the spoils system Mr. Curtis may be said always to have led the forces. He has been constantly at the front. He was there when his following was so small that it was counted that it might be laughed at and derided. He was called a dreamer, an impracticable, a visionary. But he knew what he wanted and "flew to his mark." He showed that Bossism was a legitimate outgrowth of the spoils system—that the ism depended upon the system and the system upon the ism, and that the ism was a disgrace to politics and the system a shame to the Government. It was a long time, however, before the blows against Bossism and the spoils system began to take effect. Political party conventions, and clubs, and societies, and other public assemblages remained silent on the subject of civil-service reform. But Mr. Curtis was never silent. There was scarcely ever an issue of *Harper's Weekly* that did not contain an article on the subject of civil-service reform; and Mr. Curtis never attended a public meeting of even a semi-political character that he did not call attention to the subject either by speech or resolution. The spoilsmen continued to laugh and sneer, but the people at last began to wake up.

The Republican Convention of 1880 with its great display of Bossism and its ludicrous exhibition of spoils-hunting in the blunt question of the Texas delegate—"What are we here for if not for the offices?"—made the people blush; the disclosure of the star-route frauds startled them, and Guiteau's pistol-shot shocked them. It was then that the people came fully to realize the horror and the shame of the office-hunting spoils system. They realized that they themselves were in part responsible for the continued existence of the abominable system because they had neglected to put a period to it.

What a change of sentiment Mr. Curtis encountered when he took his seat in the late New York Convention! His resolution demanding complete reform was not adopted but a resolution recognizing the principle for which he had so long contended was adopted. His resolution, in so many words, was not adopted, but *he* was cheered. Two-thirds of the wing of the party with which he acted were in accord with him on his radical civil-service proposition, and the other third were ready to indorse the great principle.

To the question, What is the cause of the revolution in New York Republican party politics? Congressman Hiscock replies: "To a deep conviction that government in this country must proceed from the bottom up to the top, and not from the top down, to the love of the Republic, and to the aversion to imperialism in American politics." In a word, the people have resolved that Bossism and its spawn, the spoils system, shall be overthrown—that they shall be eliminated from politics, root and branch!

If it be true that President Garfield had "highly" resolved to do what he could to bring about this consummation, it may be said that a whole term in the Presidency devoted solely to this end could scarcely have accomplished more than was wrought by his untimely death. His entire life, now photographed in letters of living light on the minds of the American people, is a lesson in the beauty of modest merit and its unsought rewards; and in his death he exerts a power more potent than that of all the self-seeking politicians of his time.

It is as true in politics as in religion that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. Since the cause of civil-service reform has its martyr it is destined to sweep onward rapidly toward the goal of triumph. Hereafter the stars in their courses will fight for it. Political parties will vie with each other in demanding that the business of the Government be conducted on business principles. Spoils organs dare no longer oppose the proposition lest they be overwhelmed with public scorn.

WINDOM AND WALL STREET.

The Boston *Globe* of the 8th of October contains the following:

> It has been given out in some circles in Boston by parties who were affected that Secretary Windom had denied giving the information about his plans which was printed in the *Globe* Thursday. We repeat that Mr. Windom said emphatically that he could not interfere in the fight between the bulls and bears; that the Treasury Department would not be used as a medium to regulate the condition of affairs on Wall street; and that the present stringency of the money market was due to overspeculation. This the honorable Secretary cannot deny, and we venture to say that nobody is authorized to deny it for him. He may be induced to change his policy, but at 6 o'clock Wednesday evening he made the statement attributed to him, deliberately and after careful consideration of the question.

Some of the Wall street stock-gamblers say that, if he used this language and made this declaration, he should be compelled to resign the office of Secretary of the Treasury, and that "some New York man having knowledge of the interests and wants of business-men should be promptly appointed in his place"! It is hardly doubtful that the Secretary made this statement, and it is even less doubtful that his language expressed his own judgment and his own purpose. What has the Secretary of the Treasury to do with the "longs" and "shorts" of Wall street? What has the Secretary to do with using the Treasury of the United States to ease the stock market for the bull speculators or in the interest of the bears? These two opposing gangs of desperate gamblers in watered stocks have carried their game to such an extent that the prices in the stock market are now nearly double what the value of the watered stuff justifies; and to keep up this inflation of prices these gamblers have borrowed every dollar they have been able to obtain. Their credit is exhausted, and the stringency of the watered stock market is represented by their inability to borrow more. They have been begging and imploring the Secretary of the National Treasury to aid them by placing the public money at their disposal. He has refused to take one step beyond his duty. He has offered to buy a large amount of 3½ per cent bonds at par, but the holders have not surrendered them. They will continue to hold them, and if a collapse of the watered stock market take place the wisdom of holding on to these bonds will be justified by the result.

The country will heartily applaud and approve Secretary Windom's language, as well as his refusal to make the National Treasury a part of the watered stock trade. If there be a panic in watered stocks these speculators may have all the glory of producing it and should bear all the consequences. The Secretary would be criminally careless of the public interests if he should use the Treasury money to interfere in the fight of the Wall street speculators in inflated, worthless stocks. Hands off!

THE TRANSVAAL TROUBLES.

The English Government seems to have a fresh trouble on its hands with the Transvaal Boers, and if the Boers don't behave will probably make short work of the refractory Dutch. A brief retrospect is necessary to understand the merits of the new issue between the Dutch Bourbons of the Transvaal and England. The late war, it will be remembered, commenced early in January last. It lasted about three months, and during that time, although the Boers were several times repulsed by the English, the decisive fights, like those at Pretoria, Drakenburg Pass, Makkerstroom, and Spitzkof, were won by the Boers. The latter battle, in fact, nearly annihilated the small British column of 300 or 400 men, and its commander, Gen. Colley, was killed. An armistice was then arranged and terms of peace discussed. On the 22d of March Mr. Gladstone announced that the Government had received a telegram from Gen. Sir Evelyn Wood stating that arrangements had been made with the Boers, who substantially accepted the British conditions. These conditions were the suzerainty of the Queen, the British control of foreign relations, the establishment of a British Resident at the future Boer Capital, and complete local self-government. A royal commission, consisting of Governor-General Robinson, Gen. Wood, and Sir John Devillier, was also appointed to consider the position of the natives, the regulation of frontier affairs, and the question how much territory should be severed from the Transvaal. In July the draft of the convention was prepared by this commission, virtually retroceding the whole of the Transvaal to the Boers. In August the retrocession was formally effected, and the Boer Government issued a proclamation announcing the establishment of the South African Republic, and its officers were elected. The convention under which this peace was made had to be submitted to the new Parliament, or Volksraad, for ratification. This ratification, it is now stated, is likely to be refused, though the convention was concluded by Paul Kruger, the ablest and most experienced man in the Transvaal. The Boers set forth their reasons for their refusal to ratify the treaty as follows:

> The Boers object to the article in the convention by which the Queen has reserved control over the external relations of the State, including the conclusion of treaties and the conduct of diplomatic intercourse with foreign Powers, and the article defining the duties of the British Resident. They also object to the article providing for complete freedom of religion and protection for all denominations; to the article declaring that no slavery or apprenticeship partaking of slavery shall be tolerated by the Boers; to the article providing for the rights of all persons, other than natives, who conform to the laws of the Transvaal; and to the article declaring that all inhabitants of the Transvaal shall have free access to courts of justice for the protection and defense of their rights.

The above explains why, in the recent debate in the Volksraad, members declared that the convention dealt with the Boers as though they were hordes of savages.

The article against slavery is really the place where the shoe pinches the Boer foot. They are determined to reëstablish slavery under the lying name of African apprenticeship, but the English will never agree to it. It is probable also that the recollection of their little victories over the small English forces has led them to underrate the power of Great Britain, and that if they hold out and threaten war they will get more. The limit of time for the ratification of the convention is the 9th of next month. The London *Times* says that if the convention should not be ratified by that time the British garrison in the Transvaal would again be nominally in a state of siege, and the communication between them and the rest of the country be suspended, and that Gen. Wood must advance to release them. Mr. Gladstone, in his recent address, though not fully committing the Government, spoke very significantly upon the subject when he said:

> In spite of expectations the Volksraad has not ratified the liberal conditions of the convention. We have been invited to reopen negotiations. It is possible that in some minor points the conditions might be modified. The concessions we made were not due to weakness or timidity. I do not know what is going to happen. I hope the convention will be shortly ratified. But this I will say: We shall remember and faithfully retain the members of the faithful native population of the Transvaal, and no less faithfully retain the dignity of the country.

The situation is so dangerous that the English Government has stopped the withdrawal of troops from South Africa, and there is little doubt that if the convention is not ratified at the specified time war will break out afresh. In such an event it will be bad for the Boers. They will not only be without the sympathy they had in the previous uprising in Holland, and in some quarters even in England, but they will lose all they have gained by the present peace and their autonomy will go to the winds. The English will not repeat the mistakes of last winter, but will pour in their troops in sufficient numbers to overwhelm the ignorant and pretentious Dutch farmers and teach them a lesson they will not soon forget by fearfully avenging the fate of their troops at Spitzkof.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* of Sept. 24, speaking of the land question in Great Britain, remarks:

> The signs, however, are multiplying that English farmers, as well as others, are not going to be cajoled into a superficial treatment of the land question now that it has been fairly raised; partly, perhaps, because they believe that less tax-rate will end in more rent, and partly because they think that tax-reform belongs properly to the larger question of county government reform. A meeting of ten hundred farmers, for instance, near Sheffield, on Wednesday night, cheered their Chairman to the echo when he protested that "*English tenant-farmers, who were always loyal, must have the same protection and the same privileges as the disloyal Irish tenant-farmers, who shot their landlords.*" In the Sheffield district it seems pretty plain that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's rate-nibbling is not giving any more satisfaction than Lord Sandon's milk cure. From Mr. Borlase, M. P., of course, it is not surprising to hear, at Padstow on Tuesday, an advice to farmers to beware of misleading Tory makeshifts, and to aim straight at "greater *security of tenure, something like free sale,* thorough and absolute compensation for unexhausted improvements, and an equivalent for fair rents in abolishing the law of distraint." The significance lies in the reception accorded to such thoroughgoing proposals by an audience of English tenantry.

THE lot of an editor in Turkey is not, as a rule, a happy one, because, whenever he publishes any news of which the Government does not approve, the paper is suppressed and the editor is sent to jail. This explains the following paragraph in the *Levant Herald* of Sept. 14:

> We are obliged regretfully to bury in the tomb of silence some important and interesting information received yesterday, together with the forecasts and comments which have lately appeared in our columns on the same subject. The necessity for withholding from our readers this chapter of current history is caused by the following decree from the Bureau de la Presse, issued this morning:
>
> Sublime Porte, Bureau de la Presse, Sept. 11, 1881. By superior order, local journals are absolutely forbidden to publish any article or news relating to Egyptian affairs. Signed, MEHMET.

Inasmuch as news concerning Egypt is the most interesting of any received by the *Herald,* and the Turkish Government seldom wants any of it published, interments in "the tomb of silence" to which the editor alludes must be unpleasantly frequent.

MR. BOOKWALTER, a gentleman who has hopes of being elected Governor of Ohio, and who has testified to the faith that is in him by opening a barrel, has been traveling through the State for several weeks and presenting the exigencies of his case to such persons as he could induce to listen. At Columbus last Friday the peripatetic Democrat met with a rebuff from the proprietor of a large manufacturing establishment through which the wandering Democrat desired to meander by being told that the persons who had their money invested in the business did not care to have the time of their employés taken up during working hours in listening to political speeches from the candidates of either party, whereupon Bookwalter resumed his pedestrianism in disgust. The position taken by the Columbus man is a very sensible one. When halls can be hired there is no excuse for a candidate taking the time of men for which other men pay money in which to advance his claims for office.

THE London *Pall Mall Gazette* of Sept. 24 has the following paragraph:

> The "prominent member of the Irish Revolutionary party" who is said to be in America collecting Colorado beetles for transmission to England can hardly have thought out all the bearings of this new auxiliary to dynamite which he desires to enlist in the service of his patriotic aspirations. Dynamite is not a locomotive substance, and when you have placed it in train, you know that it will obey the ordinary scientific law, and not only where it is, and you have merely to keep the proper distance to be safe. But beetles can move and multiply, and Ireland is not so remote from England that colonizing the one with beetles would not mean planting the other with beetles too. Moreover, the Colorado beetle is deeply attached to potatoes, and as long as Ireland contained a potato that country of potatoes would probably be its chosen home. Apart from the ethics of murder, a prudent practice of that operation should avoid the risk of its involving suicide.

THE Home for Friendless Boys recently opened in New York cost $300,000, and the entire amount was secured through the efforts of a Catholic priest named Drumgoole, who began the work ten years ago, and has devoted to it all his time and energy. A large proportion of the money was contributed in 25-cent subscriptions, and the absence of large amounts in the list of donors is noticeable. As a rule, too little attention is paid to the homeless and friendless boys to be found in every large city. With proper surroundings nearly all of them may be made reputable citizens, but in the absence of these surroundings the descent to crime is easy and rapid.

WILMINGTON, N. C., is feeling particularly happy just now, because last week, for the first time since 1860, a steamer cleared from there direct for a foreign port, and the prospect for the establishment of a line of such boats is good. Not only Wilmington, but every American, ought to rejoice whenever a boat is found sailing under the flag of the United States. As sailors we have not been a success.

MR. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, having succeeded in securing some free advertising by setting himself up as a newspaper censor, has gone to Europe. He should call on Mr. George Augustus Sala and enjoy a season of mutual condolence. Both gentlemen have said some very foolish things recently, and both have been roundly criticised by newspapers for their remarks.

THE end of what was once a notable lawsuit has at last been reached in Pennsylvania, the case being that of the Rev. Father Stack against the Roman Catholic Bishop of Scranton. The Bishop saw fit in 1870 to remove Father Stack from his pastorate, and the priest began an action to compel a reinstatement by his superior. The final decision in the matter is that civil courts have no authority to interfere in ecclesiastical cases of this kind. Upon entering the priesthood vows of obedience to the Bishop in all lawful things are taken, and in case the person who takes those vows is unwilling to live up to them his only remedy consists in abandoning his relations with the Church.

SPEAKING *of Guiteau's story, the Philadelphia Times* very sensibly says:

> Indeed, the instances are rare in which a murder has been planned with so clear an understanding of its character and consequences, and if there ever was a case in which the extremest penalty of the law was distinctly called for it is this, for the protection of society and as a warning to those who may be disposed to share Guiteau's political and personal ideas and motives.

"HALSTEAD M." is still being vigorously assailed by Smith R., who insinuates that all the information concerning President Arthur's policy published by Mr. Halstead was derived from Senator Jones' hired man, instead of from Jones himself, as Mr. Halstead stated. It looks as though Smith R. was jealous of Halstead M.

THE *Cleveland Chief of Police* announces that "anybody found prowling around the tomb of the late President Garfield will be shot on sight." Probably the Cleveland Chief of Police doesn't know it, but any such proceeding would be nothing but murder, and punishable as such.

THE Albany *Express* was so astonished by the defeat of its pets in the New York Republican Convention that it refrains from making any comments whatever on the action of that body. Speechless grief should always be respected.

THE proprietor of the New York *Mail* is still advertising for "a suitable piece of ground for the use of this journal." This is the first intimation that all the lots in Greenwood were sold.

A NEVADA paper puts forward a financial measure which has at least the merit of originality. It is that the wealthy Senators from that State pay the debt of the Commonwealth.

LAKESIDE MUSINGS.

"If there are any unbroken slates in New York I should like to see them."—*Roscoe Conkling.*

"Let me make the dynamite plots of a country, and I care not who makes the laws."—*O'Donovan Rossa.*

"Six Girls" is the title of the latest novel. It is expected that a sequel entitled "Our Broken Gate" will be issued soon.

Judge Tourgée's lecture is entitled "Give Us a Rest." If the Judge is appealing to other lecturers he ought to be supported.

Bernhardt was hissed at Hamburg recently, and, stepping to the footlights, said: "I am not accustomed to play to geese." It is evident that Sarah carries her boxing-gloves with her.

A Cincinnati paper says that President Arthur has leased Senator Jones' house, and the Senator is his guest. It is not every man who is well enough fixed to board with the President.

One of the saddest coincidences connected with the great fire is that exactly ten years from the day on which the calamity occurred the entire White Stocking nine was reëngaged for the season of 1882.

The father of Mrs. Christiancy testified in Washington the other day that previous to accepting the ex-Senator his daughter had refused twenty-five offers of matrimony. The old gentleman evidently kept an eye on Lily and the boys.

"I think it would be a good idea to call a mass-meeting of last men who left the Sherman House on the night of the big fire. There are three or four hundred of us yet alive, and the interchange of stories would be very pleasant. Incidentally, it might be well to say that the really and truly last man who left the Sherman House was yours truly."—*Long John.*

Little Bo-Peep awoke from her sleep;
Her eyes opened wide and wider;
For she found herself seated on the grass
With an old sheep standing beside her.

"Little Bo-Peep," said the good old sheep,
"How glad I am we've found you!
Here we are—rams, and sheep, and lambs—
All flocking up around you."

"You blessed sheep," said little Bo-Peep,
"I've been worried to death about you."
"We've been searching for you," said the good old sheep;
"We wouldn't go home without you."

—From "Hoboken Happenings," by Charles A. Dana.

PERILS OF TRADE.

Serious Embarrassment of an Old Boston Manufacturing Company.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

BOSTON, Oct. 9.—The South Boston Iron Company yesterday afternoon allowed some of its matured paper to go to protest. The industry was founded in 1809, and ever since that time it has done a very large amount of Government work, mostly for the Navy Department. It is claimed to be, and no doubt is, the best appointed ordnance-foundry in the United States, especially for the heavy work required by the navy and forts, and has facilities for casting and finishing anything in that line from a carronade or howitzer up to a 16-inch 100-ton steel rifled cannon. It has machinery that will turn a steamer's propeller shaft of over ninety feet in length, and can do a great variety of the heaviest kind of iron work which requires the most powerful machinery and expensive appliances to handle. Mr. William P. Hunt, the President and Treasurer of the company, has been with it some thirty-four years in various capacities, and something over ten years ago he became its President and Treasurer, which position he has held up to date, and during which time he has been practically its sole manager. In addition to what it has done for the Government, the company has all the time been doing a large amount of work for outside parties, and has had in its employ a regular working force of from 300 to 350 men. Its works are very extensive, covering some six and one-half acres of land, and it is at present engaged on Government contracts for the Navy Department amounting in the aggregate to over $200,000. In addition to this contract, on which the Government was to disburse the present month some $60,000 in cash, the company has claims against the Government aggregating about $250,000, being for work done some time back and not as yet paid for. The original capital stock of the company has never been increased from the $100,000 which its charter called for, but the company has been for years carrying property to the amount of from $1,000,000 to $1,250,000 in actual value. The liabilities of the South Boston Iron Company and of Mr. Hunt, outside of mortgage indebtedness on property, will aggregate in the neighborhood of $300,000, the greater portion of which is the company's debt, as Mr. Hunt's unsecured personal debts are said to be merely nominal. From the best information obtainable, it would appear that the Boston National Bank and the other banks that are creditors of the company and Mr. Hunt are not in danger of losing a single dollar by their indebtedness if matters are properly managed, both the company and Mr. Hunt representing property which at the lowest valuation would realize, it is said, more than double the amount of the claims against them, and this is outside of the money actually due the company by the General Government, which in itself, if it could be obtained, would go far toward paying the unsecured liabilities of the company and of its President and Treasurer. The probable result of the present condition of affairs may be a reorganization of the company on a sound basis, with a larger capital stock, possibly on a basis similar to that adopted by the Bay State Iron Company, which some time ago became embarrassed, was reorganized, and is now and has been for some time in a very prosperous condition. But in the meantime the works of the South Boston Iron Company will not be shut down, the company having work on hand and more orders ahead than it can fill in the next six months.

A RAILROAD BLOCKADE.

ST. LOUIS, Oct. 8.—It has just transpired that there is a great railroad blockade here. It is said some 5,000 cars laden with merchandise for St. Louis wholesale merchants fill the side-tracks of the Eastern roads for forty to fifty miles out, and that goods shipped at Eastern cities forty *days ago have not yet arrived here.* This has interfered with trade somewhat and much dissatisfaction exists. The railroads throw the blame on the transfer and bridge companies. The Transfer Company defends itself by saying it has 200 horses disabled by the "pink-eye." The Bridge Company asserts that the passenger traffic has been so great for some time past that it could not handle freight trains enough to prevent the blockade.