customs and internal revenue sections of the Tariff bill. The tax on cigarettes, which had been placed at $1.09 a thousand, was reduced to $1. It is now 50 cents. The section which admits petroleum from other countries free of duty when they admit American petroleum on the same terms was stricken out, leaving petroleum to come in free without any qualifications. Crude opium was taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list at $1 a pound. An enlargement of the paragraph relating to binding twine was made so as to permit importations made from New-Zealand hemp to come in free.

Cut stones, including diamonds, are left at 10 per cent, as in the existing law. The pearl-button schedule was made to read "One cent per line per gross." The paragraph relating to the free importation of medals of gold, silver and copper was enlarged to include trophies of all sorts, such as prize cups for competing races and the like.

The reciprocity provision of the McKinley bill is stricken out of the pending bill, but the committee decided to make their action clearer by inserting a special provision in the bill specifically repealing Section No. 3 of the present law. An amendment will probably be adopted increasing the tax on manufactured cigars from $3 to $3.50 a thousand.

Several amendments were also made to the income tax section. Section 2 was amended so that in computing incomes the necessary expenses actually incurred in carrying on any business, occupation, trade or profession may be deducted, and also all interest actually due and paid within the year by such person on existing indebtedness. The same section was further amended by striking out the provision permitting guardians to make a deduction of $1,000 in favor of each and every ward under their guardianship. Where reference is made in Section 2 to the taxation of incomes derived from the sale of live stock and farm products an amendment is made exempting from the operation of the tax any part thereof consumed directly by the family.

TO PRESERVE NATIONAL SENTIMENT.

MR. LODGE'S STRONG APPEAL FOR THE PERPETUATION OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS.

Washington, Jan. 24 (Special).—The languishing debate on the Federal Election Laws Repeal bill was somewhat enlivened this afternoon by a speech from Senator Lodge, in which the author of the defeated bill of 1890 restated to the Senate with pertinent additions the reasons which had led him, three years ago, to attempt to reinforce the present statutes, and which impel him now to defend the existing laws as a valued safeguard of free manhood suffrage. Mr. Lodge had a pile of printed slips before him at which he glanced occasionally, but his easy mastery of the subject matter of his speech and his clear and graceful style of oratory gave almost all the pleasing effects of extempore delivery.

The junior Massachusetts Senator is beginning to be recognized as one of the most agreeable and finished speakers now in public life here, and what he has to say is always listened to, not only for its argumentative merit, but because of the clearness and force of the speaker's style. Mr. Lodge's advocacy of a just and equal suffrage and of the use of the Federal power to insure fairness in elections for members of Congress is as earnest now as it was three years ago, and though his appeal for equal political rights to all classes of citizens falls on deaf ears in this Congress it will doubtless renew its potency hereafter, when the evils growing out of the abolition of Federal supervision become flagrant enough to recall to Congress a majority just and courageous enough to enforce effectively all the guarantees of an honest suffrage in National elections embodied in the Constitution.

"This bill proposes," he said, "to repeal all existing laws of the United States intended for the protection of National elections. Only two reasons are avowed in behalf of this policy. One is the unconstitutionality of National Election laws and the other is that these laws in some way interfere with local elections and with the rights of local self-government. So far as the first proposition goes it seems unnecessary to waste much time upon it. If there could ever have been any doubts upon this point the decisions of the Supreme Court have really made them impossible."

He then gave a history of the origin of the Election laws, saying they grew out of certain gigantic frauds in New-York in 1870. He briefly quoted from the official returns of registration and balloting on that occasion and analyzed the figures to show the irregularities, and continued:

"There was another feature of the New-York elections at that time, known as the naturalization frauds of 1868. Under the Supervisors law, which came in 1870 and 1871, many of the men who participated in those frauds were brought to justice, and most of them gave up naturalization papers which they had obtained illegally in 1868."

Mr. Lodge cited a number of instances of loose naturalization, some where the papers had been left at the houses of the immigrants after they had been but a few days in New-York, and said:

"The passage of the laws which it is now proposed to repeal, and the appointment of supervisors in accordance with their provisions, put a stop in large measure to the frauds which have just been described. Whatever the defects were in this legislation—and they were many—at the time, they at least produced this result. These frauds, thus brought to an end, were the work of that eminent Democrat, the late William M. Tweed. But although he was driven from the field of his political activity and died in obscurity, his throne has not been left vacant nor his sword unswayed. He has had both successors and imitators. I will take only one very recent example to prove this and to show that if these laws were needed to repress Mr. Tweed's activity, they are just as necessary to-day to curb the zeal of those who would rival him in his chosen sphere of public usefulness."

Here Mr. Lodge gave a summarized history of the doings of John Y. McKane, of Gravesend, L. I., at the last election, and said in part:

"So long, however, as these election frauds touch only municipal and State elections, they concern only the people of the State or city in which they occur. But when these election frauds touch the election of a member of Congress they become the immediate concern, not merely of those who dwell within the borders of that particular State, but of every American citizen in the United States; for the wrong done in electing one Congressman is a wrong to every man who has a right to vote for any Congressman anywhere. In National elections for Congressmen, therefore, it becomes the duty of the United States to protect its voters against such crimes as those perpetrated at Gravesend.

"This of itself is a sufficient argument—and to my mind a conclusive one—against the repeal of the existing election laws and in favor of their improvement. But there is now and always has been another side to this question much more perplexing than that which I have already stated. I refer, of course, to the application of the National Election laws to elections in the South. In the North election frauds are the dangerous but vulgar crimes of dangerous men with criminal propensities. In the South the case is widely different, for there the subject is complicated with a race question and with sentiments which are the evil legacies of slavery and Civil War. For my own part, profound as my convictions are on this question of honest elections, I have never sought to disguise the difficulties of that question in the South. The future of the negro race in the United States is one of the gravest problems to be met by the American people. It is not a problem which can be settled this year or next. It will remain with us and with our children's children for many years to come. No one doubts that the negro vote—whether Republican or Democratic, it matters not—has been suppressed throughout the South. When such facts exist we should have proper election laws. But I will go a step further, and I will put this question on a broader ground. I am opposed to the repeal of these laws because it is a direct blow to National sentiment, and to the right and authority of the Nation. If they serve no other purpose, except as an expression of National right and authority, these laws ought not to be touched.

"The present attempt is an effort to invade the domain of National authority, to break down National power, to sweep from the statute books any recognition of National rights. On this ground I oppose this bill. And I also oppose it because I believe that National elections, separate from all local elections, should be under the control and conduct of the United States, to the end that citizens of the United States, when in that capacity they exercise their highest right, might be able to do so without fear or favor."

MINOR PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE.

A BUST OF SUMNER TENDERED BY MRS. CURTIS—THE ALASKAN SALMON FISHERIES.

Washington, Jan. 24.—The Vice-President laid before the Senate a letter from Mrs. Anna Shaw Curtis tendering to the Senate a bust of Charles Sumner, owned by her late husband. An explanation was made by Mr. Hoar (Rep., Mass.) that Mrs. Curtis is the widow of the eminent orator, George William Curtis, and that the bust so generously offered by her had been presented to him by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The letter was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. Mitchell (Rep., Ore.) presented a petition for a law to protect the salmon fisheries of Alaska, and presented figures to show how the important salmon-fishing industry was being destroyed by the seines and other impediments at the mouths of streams, preventing the fish from reaching their spawning grounds.

Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.) offered a resolution instructing the Committee on Commerce to consider the expediency of authorizing the President to make suitable recognition of the gallantry and self-sacrifice of Chief Officer Meyer and the five seamen of the Netherlands steamer Amsterdam, who lost their lives in a heroic effort to save the lives of the crew of the American fishing schooner Maggie Wells.

HAWAIIAN ANNEXATION.

THE SUBJECT DISCUSSED BY SENATORS.

A WIDE DIVERSITY OF OPINION AS TO THE MEANING OF THE TURPIE RESOLUTION—NO VOTE REACHED.

(BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.)

Washington, Jan. 24.—The Hawaiian resolution reported yesterday by Mr. Turpie from the Committee on Foreign Relations was the subject to-day in the Senate of a lively discussion, which ended by sending the resolution back to the calendar unacted upon. Mr. Vest, who opposed annexation unconditionally, offered a substitute resolution, which omitted all reference to the inadvisability of annexation "under present conditions." This qualification on the committee's part was construed, as it turned out, in widely opposite ways by Senators favoring and opposing the Administration's policy. Mr. Gray tried to make it appear that the Turpie resolution was in some way a quasi-indorsement of the President's withdrawal of the treaty, and his recommendation that the annexation project be abandoned. Anti-"cuckoo" members of the committee explained the first clause of the resolution to mean that annexation would have to be postponed, not in deference to the President's programme, but because of the invincible obstacle of the Administration's unwillingness to carry on annexation negotiations. The subject of dispute was left in more or less obscurity when the morning hour expired, and the resolution went to the foot of the calendar.

MR. VEST IS NOT SATISFIED.

Mr. Vest's substitute was as follows:

"Resolved, That it is unwise and inexpedient to consider the project of annexing the Hawaiian territory to the United States; that the people of the Hawaiian Islands should be left to choose and maintain their own Government; and that any foreign intervention in the political affairs of the islands will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States."

Mr. Vest disclaimed emphatically any intention to be hypercritical in relation to the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was possible that the intention of the committee might be the same as his own. He might be mistaken, but the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations seemed to him suggestive of future annexation. It said that it was inexpedient and unwise to consider the project of annexation "at this time and under present conditions." His substitute was not amenable to that objection. The Committee resolution, if adopted, might be used as an argument by the Provisional Government and its adherents. They might say, "If we maintain ourselves for a short time longer, then the Senate of the United States has told us that it will contemplate a project of annexation."

A "CUCKOO'S" VIEW OF THE CASE.

Mr. Gray (Del., Dem.), a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said that Mr. Vest entirely misconceived the scope and object of the resolution reported from the committee. He did not see that the substitute differed at all from the committee resolution, except that the substitute left out any phraseology that could, by any implication, be considered as putting the Senate alongside of the Executive in his treatment of the treaty of annexation, which he withdrew "for further consideration." The purpose of "further consideration" had been honestly entertained by the President, and had been honestly acted upon. He (Mr. Gray) challenged any one to show that that purpose had not been honestly in the President's mind. The President had sent to the Hawaiian Islands a gentleman to see with his eyes and to hear with his ears what the President could not see or hear with his own eyes and ears. He had thereby shown a zealous intention and desire to perform a great public act on due information and with a well-informed mind and conscience.

Having done so, the President had submitted a special report to the Senate with the facts and papers on which it was based, announcing his conclusion that it was not wise and expedient to resubmit the treaty under present conditions. In that respect the resolution did not differ from the substitute, except for the studious exclusion from the substitute of any language which might, by implication, refer to the President of the United States.

"Rather too much had been said," Mr. Vest remarked, "in regard to reflections on the President. The Senator from Delaware says that the substitute excludes an indorsement or quasi-indorsement of the President on account of his withdrawing the Hawaiian treaty from the Senate; and that the substitute differs in that respect from the committee's resolution."

"I did not say or intend to say," Mr. Gray replied, "that the Senator from Missouri intended any reflection on the President. I merely wished to point out that there was absolutely no difference between that part of his substitute and the first clause of the committee's resolution."

MR. HOAR GROWS INQUISITIVE.

Mr. Hoar (Rep., Mass.)—Did the Senator from Delaware state that the purposes of the committee in reporting this resolution was to indorse the President's action in withdrawing the treaty?

Mr. Gray—I did not. I stated what was my understanding.

Mr. Hoar—I supposed that the fact that the President had withdrawn the treaty and had indicated his opinion that annexation ought not to be considered was one of the facts and circumstances that might lead the committee and the Senate to say that it is not worth while for us to consider it. But if anybody claims or pretends that this resolution is intended to say that if the President were willing and ready to consider it now, we should not be ready to join with him in considering it, that would present a very serious question indeed.

Mr. Gray—For one, I do not know whether the President within the remaining years of his term would favor (under different conditions) annexation or not. I do not understand that this resolution was framed with any notion of committing the committee or any Senator who voted for it either for or against annexation.

Mr. Hoar—Does the Senator understand that this resolution is reported for the purpose of committing the committee and the Senate or anybody who voted for it either to approbation or disapprobation of the President's act in withdrawing the treaty?

Mr. Gray—I have said nothing in relation to the purpose of the committee in that respect.

Mr. Mitchell (Rep., Ore.)—Does the Senator from Delaware believe that ever since the recognition of the Provisional Government the highest international interests have required that it shall be permitted to pursue its own line of policy?

Mr. Gray—No; I do not. I am speaking in the present tense, not in the past tense.

A BELIEVER IN ANNEXATION.

Mr. Frye (Rep., Me.), another member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, avowed that he was now and always had been a very earnest annexationist. He believed now and had believed for years that the best interests of the Hawaiian Islands and the best interests of the United States of America required annexation. He should, therefore, have much preferred that the resolution had been silent on that point. But he had voted for the resolution in committee because he regarded it as a paramount duty on the part of the United States to-day to bring peace to those islands, as it was in the power of the Republic to do so. The people of the Hawaiian Islands had believed for the last six months that the Government of the United States was determined to destroy what they considered as their liberties and their rights.

Relief had come to them, to some extent, when the President sent his message to Congress. He had recently received a letter from a refined, cultivated lady living in Honolulu, in which this sentence occurred: "For three months life in this beautiful island, this paradise of the ocean, has been hell upon earth." In conclusion, Mr. Frye said:

"Let the Senate adopt this resolution, and let it be sent across this continent and across the magnificent Pacific Ocean, down to the paradise of the Pacific, and let the hearts of these people once more be assured that they are not to be attacked by the troops of their own Government."

Mr. Platt (Rep., Conn.) said that he would probably vote for the resolution, although he regretted that any allusion had been made in it to the subject of annexation. He desired it to be understood that he should be very glad to vote for a resolution or an act annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States; and so his vote for the committee's resolution must not be considered as a vote against the project of annexation.

Mr. Sherman (Rep., Ohio), another member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said that he had accepted with great pleasure the propositions presented in Mr. Turpie's resolution. It had seemed to cover two essential points which were absolutely necessary, not only to the quiet and peace of the United States, but to the quiet and peace of the Hawaiian Islands. The first was a notice given to foreign nations—whether of Asia or of Europe—that the affairs of the Sandwich Islands are matters in which the United States has a deep interest. The relations of the United States to those islands were peculiar. Enormous sums of American money had been invested there, in developing the islands by admitting their sugar free of duty while a duty of 2 cents a pound was imposed on all other sugar imported into the United States. In this way the islands had been benefited to the amount of at least $40,000,000. With such an interest in the islands it was right and proper that notice should be given to all the nations of Europe and Asia that they must not interfere with the local affairs of the Hawaiian Islands, or that, if they did so, their act would be a disappointment and offence to the Government and people of the United States.

NATIVE POPULATION AN EMBARRASSMENT.

The clause in the resolution as to the Provisional Government having been duly recognized he regarded as a vital point, because, if it were a de facto government, the President of the United States had no power to disturb it. The first clause as to its being unwise and inexpedient to consider a project of annexation at this time did not commit any one either for or against annexation. He was in favor of annexation, on certain conditions. If the islands were to be annexed, he should favor attaching them to the State of California. In that way they could have laws and proper government. The Constitution of the United States had not been framed for dependencies. It had been framed for States. And he trusted that the time was not far distant when every portion of the country would be within the limits of a State. He should be very glad to see Utah attached to the State of Nevada, if the people of Nevada would consent. And he would be glad to have New-Mexico and Arizona united together. And so Alaska ought either to be attached to Washington or Oregon. In that way local governments could be given to these people. Therefore (notwithstanding the first clause of the resolution) he was in favor of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands if they could be attached to California—the people of that State having very large interests in the islands. He did not think, however, that this was the time to take that step. The resolution simply said that, under existing conditions it was not advisable to consider now any project of annexation. Why? Because the Senate could not see exactly what disposition should be made of the native population.

Mr. Allison (Rep., Iowa) said that there was something in the resolution which was not quite clear to him. It seemed to be (as stated by Mr. Frye) a resolution for the purpose of composing the situation in Hawaii. If that should be the result, he would be willing to strain many points and give it the sanction of his vote. But he did not like the phraseology found in the first part of the resolution, especially since the explanation given to it by Mr. Gray. If the resolution committed the Senate in any way to the policy declared by the President he would not vote for it. If consideration of a project of annexation were unwise now, it was unwise last February when the Committee on Foreign Relations reported favorably a treaty made with the Provisional Government. The same Provisional Government that existed then existed now, strengthened and invigorated by the trials and tribulation through which it had passed, in the presence of a hostile Executive and of hostile guns of the United States. If it was the purpose of the Senate in agreeing to the resolution to quiet the situation in Hawaii, why could it not be done, he asked, without any expression of opinion on the subject of annexation? They all knew that annexation was impossible in existing conditions—conditions existing not in Hawaii, but in the United States, and that would probably exist during the occupation of the Presidential chair by Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Dolph (Rep., Ore.), another member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said that he had not favored the resolution in committee, and did not favor it now. Like the Senator from Maine (Mr. Frye), he was in favor of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

At this point of the discussion the morning hour expired, and the resolution went over without action until to-morrow. Several modifications of it were offered by way of amendment, and also went over.

IMPROVED CONDITION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Washington, Jan. 24.—The report of the condition of National banks in the United States on December 19 last has just been issued by Comptroller Eckels. A comparison with the report of October 3 sheds much light on the improved condition of National banks.

An increase of $23,000,000 is shown in loans and discounts, the aggregate on December 19 being $1,873,000,000; overdrafts—increase $5,000,000, aggregate $17,747,000; stocks, securities, etc.—increase $11,000,000, aggregate $759,000,000; due from approved reserve agents—increase $34,000,000, aggregate $212,000,000; due from other National banks—increase $14,000,000, aggregate $468,000,000; gold coin and gold Treasury certificates—increase $19,000,000, aggregate $136,000,000; dividends unpaid—decrease $1,657,000, aggregate $1,217,000,000; individual deposits—increase $38,000,000, aggregate $3,539,359,000; notes and bills rediscounted—decrease $10,000,000, aggregate $11,465,000; bills payable—decrease $7,000,000, aggregate $14,388,000; other liabilities—decrease $29,000,000, aggregate $2,973,000.

THE BIG FREIGHTER CEVIC.

A FINE ADDITION TO THE FLEET OF THE WHITE STAR COMPANY.

The White Star freight steamer Cevic arrived here early yesterday morning after a trip of almost twelve days from Liverpool. Captain Nichol, who formerly commanded the steamer Germanic, reported that the Cevic had a continuation of severe west and southwest gales, with high seas, but that she proved herself a fine sea boat. He attributes the slow passage of the Cevic to the fact that her machinery is not yet in working order. The Cevic is said to be the largest vessel of the kind. She is 515 feet over all, load-water line length, 500 feet; 60 feet beam, and is 28 feet deep; her gross tonnage is 8,335 tons, and her net is 5,462 tons. Her decks are fitted to carry 800 head of cattle, and this can be increased 250 head by carrying additional stalls. The Cevic can carry 10,500 tons dead weight.

The new steamer's engines are triple expansion and of 3,500 horsepower. She has twin screws and carries four pole masts and one funnel. Her builders were Harlan & Wolf, of Glasgow.

On her maiden trip the Cevic brought only 3,000 tons of cargo, and the vessel stood well out of the water as she came up the Bay yesterday. The bridge seemed loftier than that of the Majestic or Teutonic, of the same line.

The Cevic brought here, in addition to her cargo, two horses—the stallion Pride of Hatfield and the filly Beatrice, both consigned to the Merchants' Dispatch Company, and a pack of twenty-five hounds, consigned to W. F. Francklyn.

PASSENGERS AND MAILS TRANSFERRED.

Emil Boas, general passenger agent of the Hamburg-American Packet Company, said yesterday that the steamer Normannia, which came back to port on Tuesday, would probably sail for Europe to-day. He said the Normannia would probably be sent to the shipyard of Harlan & Wolf, at Belfast, for repairs to the steamer proper, while the decorations will no doubt be attended to at Hamburg. The Normannia will carry no passengers, the company having transferred them to the steamers Saale, Majestic and New-York, which sailed yesterday for Southampton and Liverpool. If instructions are received from abroad ordering the steamer to Belfast no cargo will be carried.

About thirty of the Normannia's passengers will sail on the steamer Fulda, which goes to the Mediterranean on Saturday. A few passengers asked for the return of their money, but some will sail on the steamer Dania, which belongs to the same company. Temporary repairs were made to the Normannia yesterday, and Kädich, the first officer, was said to be improving. The mail of the Normannia was forwarded by other steamers.

TRAVELLERS KILLED BY DYNAMITE.

San Antonio, Tex., Jan. 24.—A stick of dynamite which some unknown person had placed in the smoking-car stove on the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad at Marcos, Tex., exploded this morning as the train was leaving that place. Edward Binding, a travelling agent of the City Brewery of San Antonio, and J. C. Heidelman, a wealthy merchant of Austin, were instantly killed and six other passengers in the car seriously injured.

A DEAD TELEPHONE PATENT

THE BELL "RECEIVER" SOON TO BE PUBLIC PROPERTY.

PROSPECT OPENED FOR INCREASED COMPETITION—REPORTS ABOUT A BIG PHILADELPHIA COMPANY—OBJECTIONS TO THE EXISTING MONOPOLY.

The coming of February is awaited with intense interest by the sufferers from the Bell Telephone monopoly, whose name is legion. It is hoped on all hands that before long powerful competitors will enter the field, bringing down the high charges of the monopoly company and giving better service to the constantly growing community which is dependent upon the use of the telephone in the conduct of business. The magneto-telephone of the American Bell Telephone Company—the instrument commonly known as the "receiver"—becomes public property by the running out of the patent on January 30. The doors will then be open to competition, and with the immense sum of idle capital waiting for an attractive investment, and with the immense dissatisfaction which exists as to the present telephone management, it is widely hoped that a new and reasonable telephone service will be at the command of the public.

Already, it is said, steps are being taken to form rival companies, now that this important patent of the Bell company is about to expire. A special dispatch from Philadelphia received in Wall Street recently declared that a syndicate of wealthy capitalists had been formed to operate a system of telephones throughout the United States. The name of the company will be the Clamond Telephone Company. If report is true there will be no question as to the powerful nature of the new opposition. Among the men interested in the new scheme are said to be prominent officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad and friends of the Philadelphia Traction Company. Such people never lack the command of capital, and when they take hold of an enterprise it usually "means business." Names have not been mentioned as yet, but the men who will now compete with the Bell company are said to be not only able to secure all the money needed, but include among their number practical electricians and engineers. The system to be used is said to be now in use in Berlin and in London, and is used by the French Government in all public departments. The utmost confidence is expressed in the efficiency of the system, and the promoters of the scheme will not let any grass grow under their feet in pushing a fight against the old monopoly.

PROSPECTIVE COMPETITION.

It is confidently believed by financial men that more than one new concern will now compete for public patronage in the telephone field. The officers of the Bell Telephone Company say that it is strongly intrenched behind other patents than the "receiver" patent, which soon will expire, so as to be able to defy competition. This sort of talk is regarded as natural in the circumstances, but it does not discourage the men who now have an opportunity to supply cheap and satisfactory telephone systems. Many electricians regard the receiver patent as a highly important one, and its large gives electrical talent an excellent opportunity to devise new systems which will break the Bell monopoly. Perhaps no field of practical research is so well tilled as that of electricity, and people are confident that even if there were not now new telephone systems ready to be placed on the market, it would not take long for clever electricians to devise one. The confidence with which the Clamond Telephone Company is about to enter business proves that the self-satisfaction of the Bell people may lack a sound foundation. The prospect of profitable competition is now so bright that it is safe to believe that before long the indifference of the monopoly will be disturbed seriously.

No new company ever entered the contest for popular favor with a more generous reception than that which the public will accord to new schemes of the telephone. The high charges of the existing companies alone assure a welcome to competition. The charges are universally recognized as far beyond a reasonable return on capital which is not supported by close patents. The telephone has become as necessary to modern business as are the telegraph, the cable and the railroad. The big dividends paid by the Bell company are evidence of the immense profits wrung from the business world, and no one except the friends of the monopoly pretends that its charges are not far in excess of the cost of maintenance and of interest on the plant. Only because the Bell patents have heretofore held competition bound hand and foot has the company been able to exact such high rates for its service.

POOR SERVICE.

But not content with reaping immense profits from a service costly to subscribers, the Bell Company furnishes a service which is responsible for an immense amount of daily profanity. Every business man knows how unsatisfactorily the telephone works as now managed. In striving after profits the monopoly doubtless secures the cheapest grade of labor available. Instances will recur to every one who has used the telephone of the annoyances constantly suffered. There is often delay in getting an answer to a call; other subscribers "cut in" on the wire when it is already in use, and in many cases it is impossible to secure a connection when it should be furnished instantly. "Central-everything-four is busy." How many times that aggravating response is talked over the transmitter when one calls up a number, when subsequent investigation proves that there was never one on hand to respond to the ringing of the bell at the other end of the wire! Every one knows, too, how often a long wait follows repeated calling up of the central office, forcing the assumption that the central office operators are either "skylarking" or that there are not a sufficient number on hand properly to attend to business. The company is left to choose one of two horns of a dilemma, for the service is such as decidedly to discourage the use of the telephone.

There is little doubt among electricians that, with the inducements now offered for competition in this field of electric invention by the expiration of the Bell receiver patent, there will be many improvements devised on the existing instruments. Progress in devising better systems will be stimulated by the rivalry now in prospect, and it is confidently hoped that the telephone of the near future will far outrank the present instrument in efficiency and utility. A monopoly never voluntarily assumes fresh expense to benefit its victims. Only when capital as powerful as its own enters the arena and takes business from it does it use some of its extortionate profits to improve its service. Not only then is the public likely to see new companies war upon the Bell monopoly, forcing charges down to more reasonable levels, and removing the present cause of complaint of service, but rivalry will stimulate invention and the practicability and availability of the instrument will probably be vastly increased in the future. Public opinion may be relied upon to help new ventures in the telephone business with a cordiality and effectiveness which will make the battle half won when ones it is begun against the monopoly now without rivals.

THE DECISION ON TAXATION.

OUT-OF-STATE CORPORATIONS WILL HAVE TO PAY A GOOD ROUND SUM TO THE CITY—HOW THEY HAVE BEEN EVADING THE LAW.

The text of the Court of Appeals' decision in the case of the Thurber, Whyland Company against Edward P. Barker et al., in which the Tax Department's methods of taxing foreign corporations were sustained, did not reach the Corporation Counsel's office yesterday. First Assistant Corporation Counsel David J. Dean, who argued the case both in the General Term and at Albany, was sure, however, that the official report would be found to fulfil the expectations of President Barker, of the Tax Department. Mr. Barker said yesterday that under this decision he expected still further to swell the list of nearly 2,500 taxable foreign corporations doing business in this city now on the department's books, and to send up their assessable valuations to $50,000,000, which might bring a revenue to the city from this class of taxable property of something in the neighborhood of $1,000,000.

Assistant Corporation Counsel Dean said yesterday that the extent to which the scheme of eluding New-York City taxation was carried on by companies and corporations doing business here under the pretence of being amenable to the laws of New-Jersey and Connecticut, would be realized in a degree when it was known that a concern was established in Jersey City expressly to furnish these corporations with a "home office" and all needed facilities for keeping up appearances over there. The head of this concern advertised it as the "Corporation Trust Company, of New-Jersey." "We will attend," says the advertisement, "to every legal requirement under the law of New-Jersey, subsequent to organization, and provide and maintain an office for New-Jersey corporations, rooms for directors' and stockholders' meetings, fire-proof safe compartments for stocks and transfer books, at Greene and Grand sts., Jersey City, five minutes from Cortlandt-st. ferry—P. O. Box 17—local and long distance telephone 394, Jersey City."

Mr. Dean laughed reminiscently as he read this advertisement. "I took this bid for patronage with me to Albany when I argued the Thurber, Whyland case," he said, "and read it to the judges in my argument. 'Here,' I said to their Honors, 'you have the whole paraphernalia. This Jerseyman will furnish the "home office" for these corporations, with board-room, blanks and stationery, clerks to make up the returns, and "resident directors" thrown in when required.'"

MERCHANTS OF KINGSTON DINE.

Kingston, N. Y., Jan. 24 (Special).—The Kingston Board of Trade held its second annual dinner at the Academy of Music here to-night. There were covers laid for over two hundred. Marshall P. Wilder, the humorist, contributed toward the entertainment.

OSCAR HOFSTADT'S SPEECH.

PRACTICAL PROTECTION ILLUSTRATIONS.

SHOWING HOW THE WILSON BILL THREATENS WORKINGMEN—THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

At an enthusiastic meeting of voters of the XIVth Congress District in Columbia Hall, Tenth-ave. and Sixty-seventh-st., last evening, Oscar Hofstadt, the dealer in foreign and domestic woollen cloths, delivered the following speech in favor of Protection and on the importance of the coming special Congress election:

At a meeting in Bradford, England, consisting of the merchants, manufacturers and the workmen, held during the month of January, 1891, some four months after the enactment of our McKinley law, resolutions were adopted stating that on account of the McKinley bill the manufacturers found themselves embarrassed in their business, and asking the manufacturers, merchants and workingmen to pledge themselves with each other that they would so adapt themselves to circumstances as to show these Americans, these Yankees, that they could not build a wall around their country high enough to be insurmountable to the Yorkshire men.

Mr. Wilson, in giving out for publication his report, with the handiwork of his committee, that had been in secret session in the basement of the Capitol for some months, must have gone to these resolutions and taken an entire sentence out of them and embodied the same in his report, for he says, "The American woollen manufacturers will no doubt find themselves somewhat embarrassed in the beginning, but they would soon adapt themselves to circumstances."

Now, I can show you how that worked in England and all the other foreign countries. They screwed their prices down to enable their New-York friends to continue the sale of their qualities, at the same price as formerly, by giving up a large share of their profits and taking the balance required out of the wages of their workmen, giving some very clear illustrations, and how they protested, "It is a shame and an outrage that your people over there pass laws to make us manufacturers in Yorkshire pay your whole blanked McKinley duty." The same thing was done in the hosiery districts of Chemnitz. What better illustration do you want than the protest of the potato raisers of Bermuda before the Wilson committee, who wanted duties reduced in order that their American agents, who were selling the potatoes for all they could realize for them, would not need to make such large deductions for duties, and could send them more money to Bermuda? (Applause.)

A DISADVANTAGEOUS PROCESS.

Now, how is this adapting to circumstances likely to work on our people in this country? Is it not likely that the American manufacturers will come upon our markets, find themselves undersold by the representatives of foreign countries, and in order to compete they will have to go home and be compelled to go through with processes of adaptation to circumstances? Mr. Wilson advises that which I have just illustrated was being done three years ago in Europe.

On Monday last I was asked by a Democratic friend, "Have you read Bourke Cockran's speech?" I told him I had, and as I perused paragraph after paragraph I felt like a friend of mine who lately told me that he was invited to a dinner with some wealthy friends of great taste, and that as course after course was being served he found nothing to eat, but plenty to feast his eyes upon in the beautiful floral decorations, silver and finest linen. All he could take away with him from that dinner was not in his stomach, but was the favor which he could take home to his bachelor apartments and hang up in his room as a souvenir. All I could see from that grand effort of floral oratory that at all resembled business was the proposition of Mr. Cockran that if we received in the balance of trade in favor of the United States $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 worth of goods, we were better off than receiving that amount in money.

The balance of trade of the United States represents the profit. It is the same as though a co-operative manufacturing concern (he speaking) looked around and found the first object calling his attention a dozen of chairs had made several thousand dollars' profit in a year, which was the balance of trade in favor of that firm. His customers, after the first of the year, however, instead of remitting him in money, had remitted him in these chairs, made by some one else. Would that be a good profit to divide with his co-operative partners? They would be without work, having that stock on hand, and would be only occupied in selling the chairs made by some one else, while their own co-operative workmen were idle. Would such a payment to the United States of $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 worth of goods be a good profit for the United States to divide among its copartners, its people? Does it not show that just so many men as it would take to make these $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 worth of goods would be thrown out of employment, and that then the people will indeed have to follow Mr. Wilson's advice and adapt themselves to circumstances, which will mean that there shall be ten good men looking for every poor job, instead of two or three good jobs looking for every good man.

DEATH KNELL OF COMBINED LABOR.

And if these are the circumstances to which we will have to adapt ourselves, does it appear likely to you that labor will continue to be able to assert itself? Does it not mean the death knell of combined labor? Don't these new circumstances mean that a man will no longer feel that a man is a man, whatever his own occupation? Don't such new circumstances mean that many good men and true shall no longer be able to provide for their families a good share of the comforts of life? That they, even if they have work, will hardly receive more than is needed for the necessities of life? Does not adapting yourself to new circumstances mean with many a good brother and sister, son or daughter, who has been taking care of the orphan child of a deceased brother or sister, or of their aged parents, that they shall no longer find themselves able to do so, and shall, with breaking hearts, be compelled to see these orphan children, these aged parents go forth into some orphan asylum or home or poorhouse, to live upon the charity of others?

In this election on January 30 you have the opportunity of stating to the members of Congress and the Senate that you don't want to adapt yourselves to these new circumstances; that you don't want these new circumstances ramming down your throats; that you want good circumstances fifteen months ago, and that you are now revoking the power of attorney given them then. Make your Congressmen and Senators see that they are the men who will now have to adapt themselves to these new circumstances. (Applause.)

Mr. Hofstadt then dwelt upon the promises of the markets of the world, showing by figures that when Mr. Cleveland declared that he would open this market to the markets of the world it meant indeed that he would open this market, coveted by the world, to all the manufacturers of the world. He showed how McKinleyism was patriotism and Americanism, and urged them to vote for Lemuel E. Quigg, and send to Washington the mightiest protest yet sent there, one that would ring in the ears of every Democratic Congressman and Senator. He urged the Republicans present to go home to come out and vote, and said that if they did their full duty victory would be theirs. (Applause.)

A SURPRISE FOR THE HAGENBECK LIONS.

The Hagenbeck people, at Tattersall's, were amazed yesterday to learn that their lions, tigers, dogs and other animals had quit them bag and baggage and were cavorting around the upper part of the state. The astounding part of the performance was that the daring Darling and the cool and masterful Philadelphia had not discovered that their pets had cut and run. But it is no wonder, for the animals are still at Tattersall's, doing their pleasing and astonishing tricks to the satisfaction of New-Yorkers. What really happened was that a press agent's imagination ran away and cavorted over the State in a way to make Black Prince think that his life is dull and monotonous. A Utica paper published on Monday an announcement that the Hagenbeck lions were coming to Utica and would be shown there on Tuesday.

It may be remembered that a press agent took a toothless and declining lion one day and put him in a barn. Into the barn was thrown some horseflesh. The lion was then prodded and jabbed and poked at and hauled around by the tail until he howled for mercy. Thereupon it was announced that the terrible beast was devouring a herd of horses and would not allow a man even to lean up against the building. There was another lion, if she may believe fiction, and this one broke his leg, so that it was necessary to perform a surgical operation on it. These are the lions which are now advertised at Utica as the Hagenbeck show. As the Hagenbeck company is not travelling through the State with stuffed animals on "exhibition at ten cents to all," the company's lawyers will get an injunction against the people who are using its name.

A MAD DOG CAUSES MUCH ANXIETY.

Lancaster, Penn., Jan. 24.—Four persons from the vicinity of Intercourse, this county, have been taken to the Pasteur Institute in New-York to be treated for hydrophobia, having been badly bitten by a dog known to be suffering with the rabies. The same dog bit a number of animals in that section, and there is much alarm in the community over the probable development of the disease.

HOW ANIMALS ASSUME DIFFERENT COLORS.

Professor Edward B. Poulton, of Oxford University, England, lectured on "The Meaning and Use of Colors of Animals—Colors for Concealment," yesterday afternoon in the Library Building, Columbia College, to an enthusiastic audience. Professor Poulton illustrated his remarks by seven series of beautiful stereopticon views in colors. Particularly interesting were those in which he first threw the animal or insect on the screen in its natural condition and colors, when the background was plain, following it by another, which showed the same object in the same position, after assuming the appearance of its surroundings for the sake of concealment. Not only do certain animals adopt the color of things about them, but change their habits and the requirements of their nervous system. Thus a Malay butterfly was shown, which imitated the appearance of a dead leaf on a twig, even to the extent of a transparent spot on its wings, to represent the hole nibbled by insects. A certain spider, a class of careful workers, spins a slovenly web, so that its own body may have a proper surrounding for imitating particles blown in by the wind. Certain fishes stand upright in the water to represent rushes.

There are two theories advanced to account for animals having this power. The first, of which Professor Poulton is a warm supporter, is natural selection; the second theory, advocated chiefly by Herbert Spencer, is that organisms acquire the power by experience and use and transmit it to their descendants.

The next lecture will be on January 31, on "Colors for Warning and Signalling."

THE TANGLE ON THE TURF

EFFORTS TO AID THE NEW MOVEMENT.

NEED OF CONCESSIONS FROM THE CONEY ISLAND JOCKEY CLUB.

Horsemen are still busily discussing the tangle in turf affairs. It is the earnest desire of all classes of honorable turfmen and of the public that the efforts of such representative men as James R. Keene, J. V. Donner, Dr. G. L. Knapp, August Belmont, Perry Belmont and Colonel W. P. Thompson for the purification of the turf shall succeed, and everybody in any way associated with racing has entire confidence in these men. Some persons, however, are inclined to disagree with a part of the details of the plan described by Mr. Keene at the mee