

## UNCLE SAM'S NEW CLOTHES.

THE UNIFORM FOR THE ARMY AND WHAT IT IS LIKE—A GREAT CHANGE FOR THE BETTER.

In a general order, issued under date of July 27, 1872, the War Department adopts a number of changes recommended to be made in the army uniform by the Board which lately sat in New York, and is preparing descriptions and diagrams for distribution, so that the army may be completely equipped in its new dress before Christmas. These changes have been made with the several purposes of increasing the comfort of the wearer, making the dress more serviceable, and greatly adding to the appearance of the soldiery, all of which have long been needed.

## THE PRESENT UNIFORM

Of our army is a compound of shreds and patches, something having been added here or taken away there, at the whim of somebody or anybody having the ear of the Secretary of War, for the last quarter of a century. The present reform was carried out on the idea of preserving all that was good in the old uniform and making it better by addition or subtraction as each case might require. The faces of the Board and the War Department were turned against any radical transformations, or the tendency of a large class in the service to change for the mere sake of changing, and the amendments proposed to the present regulations concerning uniform dress and equipments by the present board do not go as far as the recommendations of Generals Sherman, Sheridan and Augur, who constituted a board for the like purpose four or five years ago.

**THE DOUBLE-BREADED FROCK COAT,** Heretofore sacred to officers above the rank of Captain is now to be worn by officers of all ranks, this improvement on the despised single-breasted being accomplished by the united efforts of the "liners." The coat is a little shortened in the skirt, and the cuffs are to be ornamented with gold stripes upon the upper side. The undress sack coat which worked its way into service during the late war, is now recognized, with the addition of some simple ornamentation, and as officers are now forbidden by law and orders to wear brevet uniforms the insignia of brevet rank may be worn on the coat collar instead. The unsightly

**FROCK COAT OF THE ENLISTED MAN,** for refusing to draw which, at the cost of their men, the Colonels of a whole division of nine months troops were court martialed and dismissed, in the late Army of the Potomac, gives place to a neatly fitting basque, handsomely faced with the colors of the several arms on the breast and skirts, and liberally ornamented with buttons. The brass shoulder scale disappears in favor of a cloth shoulder strap of slightly appearance and useful in keeping cross-belts in place. For fatigue and other purposes a smart navy blue blouse, plaited on the breast and gathered in by a waist belt, is provided in place of the present slouchy nondescript.

The trousers of all generals and their staff officers are to be dark blue with trimming of any kind. Regimental officers are to wear light blue, with wide, welted stripes, the color of their respective arms of the service.

## THE ANTIQUATED STOCK

Disappears from the nomenclature of the army, and that utter desolation and abomination—the black felt hat—is retained on the list, merely for officers to "knock about" in at their option. General and staff officers are to wear the French chapeau, with ostrich plume, on dress occasions; mounted corps a black felt helmet, with gold trimmings and hair plumes, and marching corps a dress cap, with upright plume of cock's feathers—red for artillery and white for infantry. Foot soldiers will wear pompons instead of plumes. Mounted troops may wear genuine troopers' top boots and sashes, and epaulettes are abolished for all but general officers.

## THE OFFICER'S BLACK LEATHER BELT

Is enriched by gilt banding and braiding, and the small, straight, staff sword prescribed for the present infantry pattern. Gilt Russian shoulder knots are to be worn by all except general officers, and staff officers and regimental adjutants are to wear an aiguillette with the right shoulder knot. Whenever shoulder knots are not worn, the pres-

ent shoulder strap is to be displayed. Ornaments likely to draw the fire of sharpshooters may be left off in the field, and soldiers' overcoats may be worn by officers in actual service, but the

## BUTTONS, STRIPES AND SHOULDER STRAPS

Are not to be dispensed with. General officers retain the "cloak overcoat," but others are to wear double-breasted coats with movable capes, or soldiers' coats, as above mentioned. The enlisted force of "Old Probabilities" are to appear as cavalry on occasions of ceremony, but with distinctive insignia and ornaments of their own.

## Among

## MINOR CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS

are the introduction of felt saddle cloths and the promise of fabrics for the soldier's uniform adapted to different temperatures, with many beneficial modifications of the various kinds of equipments and accoutrements. A check is put upon the eccentric dandyism and foppery that to some extent crept into both regular and volunteer service during the war, by forbidding the wearing of anything but the strict regulation dress on duty, and so banish those wonderful make-ups that have so often in the past left the beholder in doubt as to who and what they had within the range of their vision. A strict construction of this rule will put into uniform the many officers on bureau duty at Washington or stationed at the military establishments in other cities and towns, and who now, like the generation of British officers since Waterloo, affect to prefer to be in "mufti" to appearing in regimentals.

Officers can don their new trappings as soon as they please, and must report themselves as fully equipped by the first day of next December.—*Cincinnati Times.*

## A NEW GAME.

The British aristocracy is looking up! It has invented or discovered a new game, and has gone in for it with a fresh enthusiasm which shows how groundless are the charges sometimes brought against it of being worn out and effete. The new game is called "Polo," and is simply the old game of hockey, which is much played at by vulgar little boys under another name, and with, in one respect, an important variation as to the mode of playing it. The players of Polo are mounted on horseback, and the game may be presumed to be proportionately elevated. Last Tuesday six officers of the Life Guards and six officers of the Ninth Lancers, another "crack" regiment, played a match at Polo in Windsor Park in presence of the Prince and Princess of Wales and a distinguished gathering. It was an extremely pretty sight, and as near an approach to a tournament of old as modern habits and circumstances will permit. The knights were not clad in mail, but in flannel jerseys, buckskin breeches, and gaiters, and with natty little caps on their heads. They were armed, not with lances, but with long hockey-sticks, with a straight hock at one end and a leather loop, through which they could pass the hand, at the other. They were mounted on stout, active little ponies, which had their fore-legs banded, as a precaution against ugly blows with the hockey-sticks. The combatants were distinguished by different colors, one side having caps and jerseys of white and red, and the other of purple. The Blues turned out a squadron of guardsmen, with shining breast-plates and waving plumes, to keep the ground; the band of the regiment in its rich uniform of white and gold, was also present, and there was a resplendent trumpeter in cloth of gold, with a silver trumpet, to summon the knights and sound the onset. The umpire threw the ball, a wooden one into the midst of the ground, and at once the game commenced. First the ball was driven close up to the guards' end, then right away to the lancers. Now the horsemen, or pony-men, clashed together over it with a rattle of sticks and shouts of battle; now they suddenly opened out and scattered here and there in chase of the ball. Another rush would bring them all together in a heap, hopelessly entangled, as it seemed, and the ball, by an adroit stroke, would be sent flying through the air, and off raced the cavaliers pell-mell after it. Hockey sticks were shattered to splinters in the melee; one of the players, (the Marquess of Worcester, the Duke of Beaufort's son,) had his

head cracked by an accidental blow, but went on playing as soon as he had wiped the blood from his face; and before the end of the game some of the ponies began to limp and to look as if they thought that they, at least, had had enough of this kind of fun. It was a brilliant afternoon; the meadow where the encounter took place is backed by the grand old glades of Windsor forest, and the troopers in their glistening helmets and halberds, the snowy tents pitched for the Prince and Princess and their suite, the long lines of four-horse drags and carriages, and the rainbow-tinted assemblage of fair ladies, attired in the richest and gayest style of art, gave variety and animation to the scene. Yesterday the Blues and Lancers played another match at Woolwich, before a more "mixed" body of spectators. People in thousands flocked down to Woolwich to see the new prodigy; and it is certainly very kind of lords and gentlemen of high degree to exert themselves in this vigorous way, and in such hot weather, for the amusement of the masses. Now, that we have hockey on horseback, it is suggested that there should be croquet *a cheval*; and there is no saying how far the new principle of equestrianizing popular pastimes may be carried.—*London Cor. N. Y. Times*

## THE MODERN CRIME OF LARGE FAMILIES.

It is time public attention was called to the question of large families. There can be no mistaking the prevailing sentiment in our populous cities in reference to these encumbrances. When modern people marry it is not often with the hope and expectation of bringing up large families of healthy boys and girls to swell the population and increase the pride of the State. Your fashionable lady dreads maternity as involving anxiety, pain, toil and self-denial—evils to be kept at as great a distance as possible. The husband makes his calculations upon financial grounds, and perhaps also upon considerations of his wife's comfort. The thought of having to provide food, attention, clothing and education, for a large family is enough to make any man pause before he ventures upon matrimony, two or three or at most four children are regarded as about the extreme limit which can be afforded by way of offspring, and every addition to that number is esteemed in the light of a domestic calamity. The sight of a dozen or more children in one household is a rarity. The unhappy and prolific parents are looked upon as curiosities with perhaps a mixture of pity and contempt. Their trials and sufferings in bringing up the tribe creditably, providing them with wholesome food and respectable clothing, and educating them so as to fit them to occupy decent positions in society, may be the subject of gossip among less favored or more fortunate mothers, but very little real sympathy is extended to them in the arduous battle of life. To many, indeed, they doubtless appear in the light of something like criminals, and if, owing to the severe strain imposed upon them in the effort to accomplish their task, and at the same time keep up appearances and pay their way honestly, they sink into a premature grave, the verdict of a highly civilized society is practically "served them right."

There can be no hesitation in saying that this state of things ought not so to be. "Children are the heritage of the Lord." "The fruit of the womb is his delight." "Happy is the man that has his quiver full of them." Parents who beget and bring up large families of healthy children make the State a debtor to them. Large families in a healthy state of society are the home of virtue. They are the germ and source of national strength, and as soon as they begin to be depreciated in public estimation—as soon as the possession of a large family is looked upon as a source of weakness and affliction to a man, just so soon may the word "Ichabod" be written over the portals of that State or city. There may be a fictitious glare of wealth, excitement, population, pleasure, but the real pride and glory are departed.

The evil, so far as the crowded cities of this continent are concerned, equally at least with those of the old world, is an admitted one, and it is patent that means are not unfrequently taken to prevent a natural and healthy increase of offspring—means which ought not to be so much as hinted at, except for the purpose of stigmatizing them as they deserve. There is too much reason to believe that many persons ab-

stain from marrying because of the dreaded expenses and labor of bringing up large families; and, no doubt, a great stimulus is hereby given to evils of a social character, which need not be further particularized—evils which are peculiarly characteristic of highly refined and civilized communities. It is high time, therefore, that public attention should be directed to this subject, and that all legitimate means should be taken to create or at least favor a counteracting sentiment, before the cankerous blight has attacked that bulwark of morality and social order, the marriage institution itself. Every attempt to invade the sanctities and responsibilities of home life or the marriage tie will, we are convinced, for some time to come at least, be resisted to the utmost by the good sense and wholesome prejudices of the American people as a whole; but if it should become a general thing for respectable married people to look upon a "quiver full" of children in the light of sorrow and a crime, instead of a pride and blessing; if it shall ever come to pass that Christian women, from motives which will not bear the scrutiny of the Allwise, pray to be spared from the burden of child bearing and child training; if these poisonous sentiments should spread from the centres of social refinement over the country at large, then, upholders of the marriage relation, look out. The next step of the assault will be against marriage, the citadel of purity and the home affections, and some of the darkest eras of human experience, followed by the lurid flames of retribution, will repent themselves in history.

There is one practical suggestion tending towards the strengthening of a healthier tone of public feeling in reference to this question of large families which I do not remember to have met with, at any rate in the form in which I propose it, but which I cannot help thinking is deserving of some consideration, if our statesmen and politicians can afford the time in these days of party conflict to entertain any questions of a really practical and humanitarian character.

Unquestionably the great burden and anxiety of large families fall most frequently upon the mother. It is difficult for persons of moderate means and large families to procure domestic help, and the luxury of good boarding schools is far beyond reach. Why, then, should not the State, as an interested party, provide boarding schools, both preparatory and otherwise, at which children can be educated and taken care of, at a cost to the parents of very little, if any more, than would suffice for the expense of their board at home? If such schools existed under proper management, and parents could feel that in sending their children there they were placing them under kind treatment, such as would secure at once their happiness and mental progress, and were not sacrificing their own honorable and proper pride, many would no doubt gladly avail themselves of such an opportunity, and the dread of large families would, to multitudes, be taken away.

I do not intend on this occasion to do more than merely make this suggestion, in the hope that it may set some wiser people than myself thinking. There are many reasons why the State should take this matter in hand, and I can think of no sound reason to urge against it. Difficulties would of course be encountered, but where are they not met with? The question is, Is the evil under discussion to be attacked in a practical manner, and how? Ought the having of a large family to be regarded as a social crime, or as nature stamps it, an honor? Has the State an interest in the welfare of its citizens and the proper training of its youth?—*Edward T. Bromfield in New York Citizen.*

A Paris letter records the demolition of a noted resort, called "The Flying Louse," the last of its kind in Paris. Vagabonds of all sorts found an asylum here. Four sous was the price of a night's lodging in a large room, a straw mattress, a large tub in the center for ablutions, and the circumambient air to dry with, but neither chair table nor towel. Some fragments of looking-glass were stuck on the walls, but which could not gloss the human form divine. The beds were in rows, and fastened to the walls. The locataires were received from 9 p. m. to 2 a. m.; after that one more sous was charged; at 10 a. m. the hotel must be cleared. Sixty persons were received a night.