

THE HANCOCK BOOM.

HOW GENERAL WINFIELD SCOTT HANCOCK
HAPPENS TO BE THE BEST CANDIDATE.
From Special Despatch to the Boston Globe.

WASHINGTON, March 15.—The friends of Gen. Hancock are getting in some very effective work for their favorite, and if the movement in his favor continues to grow from now until June 22 as steadily and rapidly as it has grown for the past three or four weeks Gen. Hancock will be a formidable candidate for the Democratic nomination by the time the convention meets. There have been several conferences in Gen. Hancock's interest held in this city within the past few days, and Gen. Hancock's friends are much encouraged by the reports which have been received from all parts of the country. They are particularly encouraged by the reports which come up from the South, and, indeed, they seem to have good reason for their claim that the South generally is coming to regard Gen. Hancock as the strongest candidate, and that a very large proportion of the Southern delegates will support Hancock in the convention. One of the most eminent of the Southern Democrats in Congress, a "Confederate Brigadier," and a man whose name, if mentioned, would carry weight, has favored me with a very full, very interesting, and, in some respects, very important statement upon the question of the Democratic Presidential nomination, and the feeling of himself and other Southern Democrats upon it. At his request I withhold his name, but am able to give the substance of his conversation, and, indeed, so nearly his exact language that he agrees to father the subjoined report of it:

"For many reasons," he said, "I would have been glad to see the great wrong righted by the re-nomination, re-election and inauguration of Mr. Tilden. There would have been a poetic justice in that which would have rejoiced the hearts of the Democracy. For a long time I believed that result would come about; but my last hope vanished with the crushing defeat of Governor Robinson in November. After that it was hopeless to expect that those who bolted Robinson could in any event be induced to vote for Tilden.

"Besides this, it has become quite too evident that, if nominated, Mr. Tilden would lose several Southern States. The schism in Virginia is as bitter and as deep and hopeless as that in New York, with this difference, in favor of New York, that the entire Democratic vote there could be polled for any candidate from some other State who has never been mixed up with either faction and is not the nominee or tool of either, while the two wings in Virginia are divided on a question of public policy. It happens that both the readjusters and the debt-payers are opposed to Mr. Tilden. It is useless to explain why this is so; it is the facts we want to face. Virginia was not at heart for Tilden in 1876; but accepted him, when any one of the other candidates would have pleased her better, on account of the supposed necessity of nominating him to carry New York. Now it is not Virginia alone, but the entire South, which is thoroughly disgusted with New York dictation and New York leadership, which have only led the party to successive defeats.

"Many Southern men are fully ready to escape from the evil of a sectional division of parties by an alliance with the Republicans. Those of this way of thinking, and who will act accordingly if they see no likelihood of the election of the Democratic candidate, or even if that candidate is particularly distasteful to their constituencies, are numerous enough to carry with them such States as South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas. In these the party can be held together by General Hancock's popularity; but as between Tilden and Grant the latter would win. It would be easy against an unpopular Democrat or a weak candidate for Grant, Blaine, Sherman, or Washburne to give such assurances to an influential body of the leading politicians as would secure the electoral votes of five or six Southern States. You can imagine the result if the leadership of the negro vote were assumed by an even inconsiderable number of native Southerners of the Wade Hampton stripe. The evidence that this is not an imaginary but a real danger is, to my mind, conclusive. I have intercourse with hundreds of Southern men, and receive great numbers of letters, and the bulk of all I gather confirms the verity of what I have stated.

"You can easily understand how widely the situation differs from that of four years ago. Then the whites of the South were united in bonds of steel—or better call it by the law of self-preservation—to free their State from negro rule. Having accomplished that they are now free to labor for other objects. One of those which Southern men deem important is the obliteration of the sectional line which now divides parties, and which operates powerfully to the disadvantage of the South; notably so with regard to legislation which affects her material interests. Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas are especially sensitive on this point, and all the Gulf States in a lesser but still important degree.

"Thus, you see, there are other dangers which threaten the future of the Democracy, quite distinct from the Tilden and Tammany feud in New York. The tendency among Northern Democrats is to keep their eyes fixed on New York, and so overlook what may prove fatal rocks elsewhere. They may widen their horizon or encounter the falls of the blind.

"Then I see it given out that no candidate can carry New York who is not acceptable to Mr. Tilden; or, that if he is not nominated, he must name the candidate. These outgivings only mean mischief. In their least nefarious aspect they mean that the set of politicians who managed Mr. Tilden's campaign, both before and after his election in 1876—mismanaged it, I mean, flagrantly and grossly—must be permitted

to act as bosses for and absolutely control the destinies of the great Democratic party. They mean to realize in personal patronage and preferment on their labors (already well paid out of Mr. Tilden's private fortune, if report speaks truly) of four years ago, which proved so disastrous to us. I can understand the purely selfish object of those who clamor that Mr. Tilden must name the candidate, but I cannot imagine any considerable body of Democrats can be imposed on by a claim so impudently silly and grossly preposterous. Nothing in the least like it was ever before heard of in the annals of the party. I hope it does not typify the degradation of the Northern Democracy. The party will be infinitely better off with the Peltons, Finleys, Marbles, and Weeds in active hostility than in any position of trust or leadership.

"The other interpretation of what may be called the standing threat of the Gramercy Park kitchen cabinet is that Mr. Tilden has the power and the will to defeat any candidate but one of his own making. I do not believe Mr. Tilden means to set on foot any efforts that do not look to his own nomination. It is insulting to a man who is already under as heavy a debt of gratitude to the Democracy as it is possible for a man to be to impute to him a desire to defeat that party in revenge for his own disappointment. A patriot who has been honored with great station, and with the suffrages of a majority of his countrymen for the greatest in their gift, to be capable of such malignity would be the basest of mankind. If Mr. Tilden is capable of raising a finger to defeat the nominee of his party he is unfit to be President. It only shows the baseness of the crew around him that they can seriously put forth such stuff as this. Mr. Tilden is not in the position of a Democrat who has served his party and owes it nothing. He is under obligations to his party for high honors it has bestowed upon him. I am sure Mr. Tilden does not entertain any such traitorous sentiments. But as to the power, if he were as malignant as those who pretend to be his friends assume, no man or organization of men, without some apparent principle or issue to back up and strengthen them, could exercise any appreciable influence in taking votes away from an otherwise strong candidate. The people are not such puppets as the contrary theory would make them out. What I mean is that mere personal influence goes for little in great national contests, although forces like those I have described as operating in the South, and such as caused the bolt in New York last fall, can destroy a party's chances.

"Governor Seymour, in a recent interview in the *Post* here, has correctly stated this when he said the candidate had better not be identified with either of the warring factions, a thing just as true of Virginia as of New York. That points to the only practicable solution of our dilemma. If we can get a candidate otherwise strong, and not in any way mixed up with either the Tilden or Tammany factions, all will rally to his support. No single individual's dislikes can do harm, not even Mr. Tilden's. It is the inveterate prejudices of large bodies of voters we must avoid antagonizing.

"Now where is the candidate to be found? Personally, my choice is Senator Bayard. He is loved by the South, even where our people have been infected with greenback and silver theories. But I am convinced that I shall never see Tom Bayard in the White House if he is nominated this year—of which, by the way, there is not much danger. He is yet a young man, and I know I shall do more to secure his ultimate elevation to the Presidency by opposing his nomination at this juncture, when it would be premature and unwise. Events may not improbably bring about his candidacy under more favorable conditions.

"Gen. Hancock is, by all odds, the man for the emergency. He has no embarrassing record on the financial question—which is one of the all-important requisites. His nomination will be the best possible answer to the bloody shirt—this being the second indispensable requisite to real availability. And then General Hancock's grand civil record splendidly answers the objections that are urged in some quarters against military candidates. His whole career is of a kind to excite enthusiasm in a political canvass. The independent vote seems to be peculiarly attracted to him. I notice various independent newspapers out for him. A good many Greenbackers seem to be turning their eyes toward him. All those things count, for there is such a thing as the independent vote, and we want to capture it. I don't see why Hancock should carry his own State, where 80,000 votes went to a third ticket, so that the Pennsylvania Republican Governor was in a minority of 70,000 on the total vote. Such a State can only be fairly classed as doubtful, and sagacious politicians will make a fight for it. That State has a Democrat in the Senate, and elected a State ticket in 1877. I understand the Tilden-Randall clique, who are rushing on a defeat in a hopeless effort to capture the State Convention, talk that Pennsylvania is hopelessly Republican. Such talk is sinister, and ought not to commend the leaders who urge it against those who actually have carried the State for the Democracy, and who earnestly mean to do it again. Senator Wallace is one of the most useful men in the Senate; no one is more trusted and counseled with by his colleagues, and the abuse and defamation heaped on him are atrocious. It speaks well for the Senator and his friends that they do not retort in kind upon Speaker Randall.

"Hancock's nomination would save us Virginia, because he is the favorite of the readjusters. You doubtless noticed that the readjuster members of the State Committee announced at their recent meeting that they would support Gen. Hancock, but would not support Tilden. A number of Mahone's most trusted lieutenants are strong Hancock men. The nomination of Gen. Hancock would insure us a solid South, and without exciting jealousy at the North. And he must have great popularity at the North, unless your old soldiers and their descendants have feelings toward their military men very different from those which actuate ours. Why, I

only need to read between the lines of *Times*, to find in their studious silence about his candidacy, or equally studied depreciation, that he is the man they really fear. They do their best to create the impression that Tilden's nomination is certain, knowing that men naturally try to get on the strong side. All the Republicans want Tilden set up again. But when an honest Republican gives me his frank opinion in private conversation he almost invariably says: 'Hancock is the one of your candidates who would give us the hardest race.'

LUTHER.

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE.

From the Baltimore American.

The recent decisions of the Supreme Court affirming the validity of the Federal election laws are of far-reaching significance and importance. As Judge Field, in his dissenting opinion, expressed it, their effect is to confirm the assertion by Congress of a power which is "destructive of the independence of the States in matters over which their authority has never been surrendered." According to the law as interpreted, it is now competent for the Federal authority to degrade the States "to the level of municipal corporations existing at the will of Congress." This is the doctrine of centralization as advanced by the radical wing of the Republican party in its most ultra form. That it should have received the indorsement of the highest judicial tribunal in the land must be a matter of profound regret for every man who appreciates at its full value the fundamental principle of correlation between the State and Federal Governments, upon which our whole political system is based. Hereafter, unless the election laws are repealed, it will be within the power of the General Government to interfere in the most arbitrary manner in all the elections for members of Congress and to punish violations by the election officers not only of Federal but of State laws. The effect of the decision does not stop even here, for, as Judge Field remarks, "If the Federal Government may punish a violation of the laws of a State it may also punish obedience to them and exercise a supervision over the legislation of the States, subversive of their reserved powers."

Judge Field, supported by Judge Clifford, made a strong protest against the decision of the majority; and his dissenting opinion is a clear and able presentation of the theory which has been maintained by the Democratic party from the beginning, that the enforcement of legislation is unconstitutional and void. It is not encouraging to reflect that the Republican members of the court indorsed unanimously the stalwart view of the case and that a tribunal which should be above all political considerations has again divided on a partisan issue according to the party predilections of its members. The decision of the court, however, does not end the matter. An appeal may still be taken to the people, and among the questions to be submitted at the Presidential election next Fall will be the paramount issue whether the centralization, which is proceeding so rapidly under the lead of the Republican party backed up by a partisan Supreme Court, shall be checked or not. For more than ninety years the United States have grown and prospered without the laws which are now to be enforced and which the Republicans claim to be necessary to the purity of our elections. The Federated States have survived three wars; they have grown from thirteen feeble colonies to thirty-eight States, covering a larger cultivated territory than any other power in the world; they are to-day more prosperous, happier, stronger than any other people. Yet at this day—at the beginning of the last decade of the first century of their existence—their sovereignty is denied and it is sought in a time of profound peace to bind upon them the shackles of a Federal authority, the exercise of which, even under the interpretation of the doctrine of States' rights enforced by the war, can only be justified by armed revolt. If this decision of the Supreme Court be not nullified by the repeal of the enforcement laws, the autonomy of the different States is destroyed and the title "United States" applied to this country becomes an absurd misnomer. Under the ruling of the Court we are, in fact, no longer a Federation of States, but a strongly centralized Republic divided for convenience into thirty-eight dependent provinces.

THE QUEEN'S DRAWING ROOM.

HOW HER MAJESTY AND THE LADIES OF HER COURT ARE ATTIRED.

London Correspondence New York Times.

Fashion and the upper ten have been greatly flattered. Her Majesty held a drawing room on Friday. She is only going to "receive" once more this year, it is said. Blood and mammon, therefore, crowded Buckingham Palace, and will do so again, to fall off a little when the Prince of Wales takes up the running for his royal mother. Her Majesty, according to a semi-official modiste, wore a dress and train of black *poult de soie* and terry velvet, embroidered in black silk, and a long white tulle veil, surmounted by a coronet of diamonds. She also wore a necklace, brooches and ear-rings of large opals and diamonds, the ribbon and star of the Order of the Garter, the Order of Victoria and Albert, the Crown of India, Louise of Prussia, St. Catherine of Russia, St. Isabella of Portugal, etc., and the Saxe-Coburg and Gotha family order. The Princess of Wales appeared in a dress of prune-colored velvet, with pearl embroidery, train of Brussels lace, and no end of pearls and diamonds. She looked thin, I thought, and by no means strong in health. I saw her arrive. The Duchess of Connaught was resplendent in white satin, trimmed with duchess lace and white roses. She wore a tiara of diamonds and a profusion of pearls. If the imperial stone is really to be manufactured wholesale by the chemist, these royal ladies replace it in their crowns and coronets? Will it be set aside, being no longer worth a large sum of money? Do they prize it for its beauty? In the daytime there are other stones that eclipse it, undoubtedly. It is at night, when it radiates the glare of lamps, that it is supreme in its beauty

and color. The dresses at the drawing-room were richer and more magnificent than ever. Gold brocade was in high fashion. The modiste aforesaid awards the palm to the dress worn by the Countess of Clarendon, of which the coloring was Pompadour; it consisted of a close train and Directoire coat-bodice of Louis XV. brocade, lined with pale blue satin and bordered with point d'Alencon, over a petticoat of ivory satin duchesse, with gathered front, trimmed with flounces of point d'Alencon and lisse, studded with pale shaded roses to match the brocade of the train, which was ivory and pale pink; tiara of diamonds and diamond ornaments. Lady Julia Wombwell wore a dress of old gold colored broche, trimmed with satin of the same color and old point lace; a train of dark green and gold broche velvet, trimmed with old point lace and bouquets of gold mulberries and foliage frosted with gold. Some of the elderly ladies in the enforced low-necked dresses of the court looked cold and miserable. The queen will have everything done as it was done in the Prince Consort's time, and no amount of criticism or appeal will induce her to modify the low-necked dress of presentation. But this is no reason why the Princess Louise should enforce the same silly regulations upon Canada. So firm is the queen in maintaining her reminiscences of Prince Albert's day that she discards a new railway on one of her royal journeys and travels one hour longer than necessary because it was the track she used when her husband was alive.

National Debts of the World.

A recent number of the *Frankfort Zeitung* gives the national debts of the leading countries of the world for the year 1879, as compared with 1865. The general result is a frightful degree of increase, and it shows that a conservative people we of the United States are in the average, and how much more capable of securing our own interests by self-government than other countries are through the adventitious control of self-constituted rulers. In the period of fifteen years between 1865 and 1879 the debt of Great Britain has been reduced 3.8 per cent., but still stands at \$3,007,470,000, with a deficit of \$50,000,000 to be met by the present chancellor of the exchequer. The debt of France has increased 48.4 per cent., and is now greater than that of any other country, touching within a fraction of \$4,000,000,000. The debt of Russia has increased 188.5 per cent., and is still growing rapidly, through the operation of causes over which the imperial government has practically no control. The debt of Spain has increased 150 per cent., and now amounts to \$2,499,000,000, virtually an unmanageable sum for that impoverished kingdom. The debt of Italy has increased 123.2 per cent., is nearly \$2,000,000,000, and compels a rate of taxation so enormous as to keep the people in a state of chronic discontent. The debt of Turkey has increased 421.7 per cent., and of the Turkish provinces 1040 per cent., proving all these countries to be bankrupt. The debt of Germany has increased 71.6 per cent., but is still maintained within very moderate limits. Portugal owes \$392,700,000, having increased her debt 106.2 per cent. The debt of the Netherlands has only been augmented 5.7 per cent., but that of Belgium has increased 148.7 per cent., that State, however, having available valuable assets to show for it, in the shape of the purchase of railroads and telegraph lines.

The debt of Greece has been increased 158.8 per cent., and the country is about insolvent. The debt of Sweden has increased \$66.7 per cent., and that of Denmark 7.9 per cent., and that of Norway 176.3 per cent. Switzerland has increased its debts from \$714,000 in 1865 to \$6,664,000 in 1879, an increase of 833.3 per cent., incurred in the construction of great public works such as the St. Gothard Tunnel. The reduction of the debt of the United States since August, 1865, has been \$761,319,350, or 27.6 per cent. In that year the public expenditures of this country were \$1,217,704,199, of which more than half was raised by taxation. In 1879 the expenditures were reduced to \$266,947,883. In all the European countries named above, however, the public expenditures have largely increased in the course of the fifteen years, those of France rising from \$449,820,000 to \$567,392,000, Great Britain from \$321,300,000 to \$406,980,000, Russia from \$245,616,000 to \$511,700,000 and Germany from \$151,606,000 to \$314,398,000. The aggregate of all annual expenses of the European countries named, and including also Austria-Hungary, has risen from \$1,898,288,000 in 1865 to \$2,788,646,000 in 1879, an aggregate increase of 46 per cent. The increase in net ordinary expenses of the United States from 1865 to 1879 has been only 23 per cent., while the same expenses in Germany have increased 107 per cent. in the same time, yet Germany is the most frugal government in Europe. The steady reduction of the debt in this country and the constant solicitude of the people to prevent an inordinate increase in the average running expenses of government are facts upon which our citizens can reasonably congratulate themselves. They show that self-government is not merely a name, but a thing of reason and judgment.

Major Hershberger, of Chambersburg, now 69 years of age, is applying for a pension. He served with the regular army as a private and non-commissioned officer for fourteen years, and was appointed when holding the rank of Sergeant Major at the cavalry school, Carlisle Barracks, as Drillmaster at West Point. This was on the 29th of December, 1841, and he remained there until September 18, 1848. During his service at West Point among the cadets he drilled were Generals McClelland, Grant, Burnside, McDowell and Pope, distinguished Generals of the Union army in the late war, and Generals Stonewall Jackson, A. P. Hill, Longstreet, Pickett, Lee and Garnett, all leading Generals of the rebel army.

The Pittsburg *Chronicle* states that the Standard Company is buying up every barrel of oil they can get hold of, and storing it away in anticipation of falling off in production, when they will be prepared for the increased prices.

THE CZAR'S BODY GUARD.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE FAMOUS FINLAND REGIMENT.

The thanks and acknowledgments which the Emperor Alexander has returned to the soldiers of the Finland Regiment of the Guard, who, by the latest accounts received, have lost ten killed and forty-seven wounded from the effects of the explosion, were certainly no more than the courage and presence of mind they displayed upon this one occasion deserved. But this was not the first time he was greatly indebted to the loyalty and courage of this regiment. On the 24th of December, 1825, the Emperor Nicholas, who had up to this time inhabited the little Anitchoff Palace in the Nevski Prospect, took up his quarters with his wife and family in the huge Winter Palace on the Isaac Square. On the day following he received a secret communication from the Sub-Lieutenant Rostoffor which might well make him exclaim, "What a beginning of a reign!" A plot was ready to break out in the Winter Palace itself, and the regiment of Grenadiers of the Guard that was on duty about his person had been canvassed for days to join it. No sooner, however, had he read Rostoffor's letter than he saw that not a moment was to be lost in getting rid of this armed band of conspirators who were his guard and might very likely be his assassins, even if the revolt were precipitated by his so doing. The manœuvre was carried out by Alexis Orloff, Nicholas' right hand man, with consummate ability and corresponding success. A numerous detachment of the Finland Regiment of Guards was sent for from their barracks in the dead of night; their superior force overpowered the Grenadiers, who left the Winter Palace without a show of resistance, the newcomers taking their places.

This change—and curiously enough, if reports from Vienna are true, a similar change of the Guard was made a short time before the explosion, two sotnias of Cossacks making way for the Finland Regiment—was not carried out one moment too soon; for the next day the shell burst. And when the revolt had fairly begun it was to this same Finland Regiment that Nicholas entrusted the care of his family. Taking the little Grand Duke Alexander by the hand, he said, "I confide my son to your care; it will be your duty to defend his life." The rough Finns, it is said, were moved to tears. They took up the child, then only seven years old, in their arms, passed him from rank to rank, and swore to form a rampart of their bodies behind which he should be safe. All this must have come back to the Czar to-day, the baby Czarevitch of 1825, when he thanked the Finland Regiment for their devotion to his person and house upon their latest exhibition of loyal bravery.

A Thrilling Incident in a Methodist Preacher's History.

Many years ago the writer had a conversation with a Methodist preacher in the town of Clinton, La., who told him that he was one of the preachers sent by the Methodist conference to preach to the people of Texas. He said he went alone on horseback, by way of the Red River; that the first day after crossing the Mississippi he was overtaken by a horseman, armed with a rifle, pistol and hunting knife. He was clad in a suit of dressed buckskin, and was also going to Texas. He found him to be an agreeable, intelligent traveling companion, well acquainted with the geography of the country through which they passed. Neither asked the other his business, and they journeyed together several days, until they reached a new town in Texas, filled with rough characters and desperate men, many of whom had fled from justice in other States. Here he concluded to preach his first sermon. Notice was posted to this effect, and at night the log court house was filled with an audience of men solely.

THE PREACHER

said he gave out a hymn, and the audience all joined in singing it, and sang it well. But when he took his text and attempted to preach one hooted like an owl, another brayed like a jack, a third barked like a dog, and he was compelled to stop. He did not like to be thus thwarted in his purpose, and he again attempted to preach, but was prevented by the same disturbance. At this juncture the preacher's traveling companion, whom he did not know was in the house, rose in the center of the audience and said:

"Men, this man came here to preach to you; you need preaching to, and I'll be d—d if he shan't preach to you! The next one that disturbs him shall fight me—my name's Jim Bowie."

After this announcement, the preacher remarked, he never had a more respectful audience, such was the influence this man exercised over the minds of these desperate characters. This was the preacher's narrative, and so characteristic was it of Bowie that there can be no doubt of its entire truthfulness. James Bowie devoted his life to the achievement of Texan independence—was made a colonel in her service, and with Travis and Crockett, heroes all, yielded up his life in the ill-fated Alamo. Mrs. Dickerson and a negro man, the sole survivors of this massacre, said that

at the time of the attack on the fort Bowie was confined to his bed by fever. He ordered a number of loaded rifles to be brought to his side, and had the door so barricaded that but one Mexican could pass through at a time. Here he lay and fired upon them until he shot nine. His body was riddled with bullets, and, as if they feared him even after death, they repeatedly

THRUST THEIR BAYONETS INTO HIM.

Thus lived and died this remarkable man. Travis, the chief in command, and his subordinates, Bowie and Crockett, were heroes in the true sense of the word. Patriotism will mourn their fate, and memory bedew their graves with her tears as long as generous blood courses through the veins of American freemen. There are several relatives of James Bowie now residing in California, and one, a noted lawyer, several years ago, took offense at an article published in a San Francisco journal, which reflected somewhat upon the character of his kinsman. The writer of this article was well acquainted with James Bowie, and always held him in high esteem, both as a companion and a patriot.

The Ute Reservation.

The reservation which the Utes are to surrender is about half as large as the six New England States. It will be criminal folly if any further treaties are made setting apart tracts of the public domain for Indian tribes. Such contracts cannot be observed. They have been made only to be broken, and all the violations of treaties have been on the side of the strong and against the weak. No part of this country can be kept a wilderness to furnish hunting grounds for nomadic tribes. We might as well talk of keeping a public cow pasture in the heart of a great city as to attempt to preserve vast tracts of country from the foot of the white man, while towns, cities and States grow up around such reservations. The treaty-making policy should have been abandoned when the Union was formed. It was justifiable only in the early infancy of the country. The idea that Europeans were intruders on this continent, and must buy the right to live here, was a fallacy. In this world of ours no people own a country any longer than they can hold it by force. This may be bad in morals, but it is true, and the history of all lands and all ages proves it. Most of the existing treaties with the Indians must be annulled. We shall do this by negotiations, not by war. The red men must become tillers of the soil. They must have farms, not hunting grounds, allotted to them. They must be taught to cultivate the earth and earn their living. Their absurd pride, or laziness, must give way to necessity. They must learn that he who will not work has no right to live on the proceeds of other men's labor. It will take time to accomplish this, and the people must be patient with the Indians, for it is not altogether their fault that they regard themselves as children to be supported by the Government. They have been taught this vicious nonsense till they have become fully imbued with it.—*Washington Post*.

Bad Reading for Boys.

"The dime novel, which, by the way," remarks the *Catholic Review*, "has curiously enough been supplanted by the blood and thunder boy's paper, was bad enough, and the boys' papers are much worse; but the daily papers teach lessons of vice with a force and directness which was beyond the power of either the dime novels or the boys' fiction papers. The most impressionable boy of to-day is inclined to skepticism on the subject of Indian fights and the exploits of herculean burglars; but the pathetic incidents which surround the imprisonment of the picturesque murderer, who is visited every day by sympathizing friends, his every word and gesture being chronicled by admiring newspaper reporters, make the youth cry out, 'This is fame indeed!' The newspapers are photographs from life, while the novels are only 'after life.' The boy soon learns to read the latest divorce report, told with much piquancy by the expert 'filler of space,' and to revel in all those details which, in a book, would entitle it to be stopped in the mails as obscene literature. It is amazing that people can be so careless as to allow their children to read the details of crimes which they would blush even to name in ordinary conversation."

The Year 1881.

The year 1881 will be a mathematical curiosity. From left to right and from right to left it reads the same; 18 divided by 2 gives 9 as a quotient; 81 divided by 9 and 9 is the quotient. If 1881 is divided by 209, 9 is the quotient; if divided by 9, the quotient contains a 9; if multiplied by 9, the product contains two 9s: 1 and 8 are 9; 8 and 1 are 9. If the 18 be placed under the 81 and added, the sum is 99. If the figures be added thus, 1, 8, 8, 1, it will give 18. Reading from left to right is 18, and reading from right to left is 18, and 18 is two-ninths of 81. By adding, dividing and multiplying nineteen 9s are produced, being one 9 for each year required to complete the century.