The Sun.

SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1881.

Amusements To-Day.

Bijou Opera House—The Mascotte.
Bunnell's Museum—Broadway and 9th st.
Haverly's 14th St. Theatre—Commercial Drummer. Mat.
Madison Square Theatre—The Professor. Matinee.
Metropolitan Concert Hall—Concert.
Windsor Theatre—Pinafore Ale.

The President's physicians think that he has safely passed another dangerous stage on his way to recovery, and, while admitting that there is yet imminent peril, they are very hopeful as to the result. Their confidence is shared by members of the Cabinet and other visitors to the White House, and the opinion seems to prevail throughout the country that the worst is over. Still, the wisest physicians, who know the perils besetting the patient, do not venture on predictions of recovery, and the public anxiety will not be wholly relieved until more positive announcements are made.

Misdirected Benevolence.

It appears that our rich and distinguished fellow citizen, Sir CYRUS W. FIELD, and some of his compeers, propose to raise a subscription of $250,000 for the benefit of Mrs. GARFIELD, wife of the President of the United States.

Benevolence is a quality hardly lower in rank than the religious sentiment. But there is no quality of the human soul so exalted that, if left to grope in the dark, it may not take a wrong direction. Thus when the spirit of worship is allowed to range wildly in blindness, it sometimes leads to idolatry, to the worship of sticks and stones, and bats and mice, and birds, and fine clothes, and stocks, and houses.

Benevolence also often goes astray.

We think it goes astray when it proposes to put a large gift into the white and delicate hand of a living President's wife. It seems to us an insult to her. Her husband still lives, and seems likely to live, and to have the dispensation of immense official patronage. She is believed to have great influence over him. Naturally, she is expected to be grateful. At all events she is human. If, for instance, Sir CYRUS W. FIELD could by possibility be brought to resign himself into the service of the Government, and to supersede that "literary feller," JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, as Minister to England, how could she say him nay after he had been the active agent in giving her a quarter of a million of dollars?

Should the President unfortunately die, then, we say, let a million of dollars be raised for his helpless family by popular subscription in three days; but not one dollar while he lives, and while it may look like a bribe.

The New Aqueduct Veto.

Although Gov. CORNELL has on various grounds vetoed the bill, which had passed both branches of the Legislature by a considerable majority, the need of beginning the construction of a new aqueduct is none the less apparent. There can be no doubt of the danger involved in allowing so great a city as New York to depend upon a single main pipe for its water supply, especially after repeated warnings that this pipe is already doing an amount of work for which it was not designed.

Gov. CORNELL relies on an expression of opinion from members of the Union League Club, adverse to the bill, in giving the reasons for his veto. But this adverse opinion was provoked by the original form of the bill, which was afterward amended to at least partly obviate these objections. The bill provided for a work which ought to have been begun several years ago; while the inadequacy of the present water supply has year by year become more apparent. A recent report of the Chief Engineer of the water works shows not only that the aqueduct is conveying water to its utmost capacity, but that there is running to waste over the Croton dam an average of about three times as much as the aqueduct can carry. He tells us that when the aqueduct is entirely filled, and not under additional pressure, it conveys less water than when a little space is left at the top; hence to subject the aqueduct to additional pressure would be incurring a risk, never intended in the original plan. From the time the maximum discharge was first reached, to the present time, the population of the city has increased over twenty-five per cent., so that in each successive year the inadequacy of the water supply has become more and more serious, and the time is not far distant when the water in many localities will not rise above the basement, while in others it will be almost wholly cut off.

It should be remembered that the lack of water in the city is not due to any lack at the dam. Hundreds of millions of gallons run to waste there daily, so that with proper reservoirs and aqueducts at least two hundred millions of gallons per day—more than twice our present supply—can be delivered into the city in the driest season. Gov. CORNELL dwells at length, in his veto message, upon the waste of water in the city. Undoubtedly there is such waste, and all reasonable means should be taken to prevent it; but the experience of many years shows the impossibility of effectually stopping this waste without resort to a system of meters, which would be exceedingly costly, if provided for private houses, and, in addition, would be a source of constant popular grievance. Besides, the whole theory of measuring out water to the people is a mistaken one, provided there is no necessity through the failure of the fountains of supply. Such a system might do very well for a besieged city, but it would be fatal for one that has no such excuse. Not only the comfort but the reputation of such a city would be seriously injured. When the waste over the Croton dam has been stopped by bringing all the available water into the city, it will be time to scrimp the quantity allowed to citizens.

The Board of Health have urged the construction of a new aqueduct without any delay. Prof. CHANDLER lately wrote to the Governor as follows: "I believe that this bill will accomplish in the most satisfactory manner all that is required in this direction, and I fail to detect anything in the bill, as amended and now before you, to which I can object either as an expert on water supply, or a citizen and taxpayer of New York." The moment that the people of the city find themselves harassed and watched lest they use too much water in their dwellings, that moment an official premium is put upon uncleanliness. Should a pestilence be bred from an insufficient supply of water, under the exigencies of modern house construction, no one would be surprised.

The connection between public health and an adequate water supply is obvious; but it is not the only consideration. The manufacturing interests of the city will also suffer. The report of the Chief Engineer of the works comments upon this part of the subject as follows:

"The distinguished constructor of the aqueduct did not anticipate the great increase in the demand for water brought about by the requirements of modern life, the enormous growth of manufactures in the city, the use already of probably between seven and eight thousand steam boilers within the city limits, the steam railways in operation already consuming over one million of gallons daily, nor the provision in every house of water fittings—often including pumps—from the basement to the upper floors. New York city is now the largest manufacturing centre in the United States. Its manufactories, stores, warehouses, and office buildings have increased in a much higher ratio than the population."

In the use of elevators operated by steam engines, now so common in the newer large mercantile buildings, we have an illustration of the fact that the necessary consumption of water increases in a higher ratio than the population.

The statistics, referred to by Gov. CORNELL, of the consumption of water per head, are deceptive in the case of New York, for this city has a floating population of non-resident business men and of temporary residents at hotels and boarding houses estimated at 200,000. Besides, the population of the city, which was 1,206,577 a year ago, is 1,242,538 now, and will be 1,317,691 in 1883, and 1,397,395 in 1885, reckoning the annual increase at 2.98 per cent., as it was in a comparison of the State census of 1875 with the Federal census of 1880. It is therefore obvious that even were the water works adequate to-day, and should a new aqueduct be begun to-morrow, and pushed with the greatest energy consistent with safety, it could not be completed in season to supply the growing needs of the city. It is clear that a proper scheme of construction should be adopted at once, so that there may be no delay whatever in a matter so imperative.

High Temperatures and Great Mortality.

For the first time since summer began, we have been having this week the sort of weather which sends up the death rate of the city with a bound. As compared with the previous months of this exceptionally sickly year, June was a very healthy one; but July has opened warm and sultry, and the children in the tenement houses at once languish and die by hundreds.

On Wednesday, for instance, the number of deaths reported to the Board of Health was about two hundred, and the great cause of the mortality was diarrhœal diseases, which chiefly affected infants under five years of age. The new Street Cleaning Commissioner has been doing his best to cleanse the city, and yet as soon as the thermometer gets above eighty, the death rate among the children in the crowded wards goes up alarmingly.

Situated as the inhabitants of the tenement house districts are, with clean streets or without clean streets, they are bound to suffer in health from the consequences of great heat; and the very young among them will have the chances of life against them so long as the high temperatures continue. Of course, if the streets in their vicinity are more than ordinarily filthy at such a time as this, the evils of their condition are much exaggerated, and the mortality is especially great. Even if they are as clean as it is possible to keep them in neighborhoods so crowded, however, the death rate in our most populous wards is sure to be high, as compared with other cities, so long as the thermometer remains at eighty and above.

There are large portions of New York, it must be remembered, where more people are living on a square acre of ground than can be found in an equal space in the most crowded cities of Europe. They dwell in high tenements, layer above layer, and at all seasons breathe a close air laden with human emanations. When, in addition, this air is heated to a high degree, and the weather is such that animal and vegetable decay, quickly and easily occurring, further poisons it, only the strong or those who have become more or less accustomed to conditions so trying can stand up against the hardships of their life. The very young are likely to be soon poisoned and killed.

If anybody wishes to learn from actual experience just what is the state of the inhabitants of the tenement house population in our most crowded wards, let him join one of the health inspectors on his rounds during such a day as Wednesday, for instance. He will not then wonder that children there die off by hundreds. It will rather surprise him that any of them are left after a period of continuous heat.

Such great and crowded tenements are not adapted to a climate like ours, which gives us every summer during particular days as great heat as New Orleans and even Havana experience. They are never comfortable, and are always unfit for human habitation. It is because of them that the death rate of New York is kept high. Outside of the wards in which they are most numerous, this is at all seasons a very healthy city. And yet where are we to find the remedy for our tenement house system? The crowded wards become more crowded every year. As the city grows, the majority of the increase is among the population who have their homes in these tenement houses.

A Warning.

Lord MACAULAY had no faith in a pure democracy, or in a constitutional government, where the majority rule. He wrote a curious letter to Mr. HENRY S. RANDALL of Cortland County twenty-four years ago, which contains an admonition worth heeding, in view of the enormous growth of Executive patronage, and of the means employed to acquire and to retain it.

"Your Constitution," said MACAULAY, "is all sail and no anchor. Either some CÆSAR or NAPOLEON will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman empire was in the fifth, with this difference—that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

The plundering part of his prediction has begun; but we have no fear that the American people will not be able to stop corruption and jobbery long before any such catastrophe as MACAULAY foreboded.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Herald*, in groping about for some satisfaction to its feelings against the miserable wretch GUITEAU, thinks he would furnish a good opportunity for making the experiment of flogging as a punishment. No punishment, however awful, would be undeserved, but we have happily reached a point of civilization where any public feeling of revenge cannot be wreaked on criminals. If GUITEAU committed the crime in full control of his faculties, let him suffer the penalty of the law as it now stands; but if he was demented at the time, let him end his days in confinement. From this, with his dangerous tendencies, he should never emerge.

The residents of that part of Brooklyn immediately surrounding the Lee Avenue Baptist Church, in which Congressman J. HYATT SMITH has been preaching, and which was sold by auction on Wednesday, are somewhat exercised over the rumor that it is to be resold to a manager who will convert it into a theatre. Already some old residents say that they will move away if this is done. Undoubtedly a church is a better neighbor, or at least a quieter neighbor on week days, than a theatre. But on Sundays conditions might be reversed, especially in the afternoon, when the children are just out of Sunday school. There is little doubt that fewer Sunday afternoon naps will be disturbed if the Lee Avenue Baptist Church becomes the home of the drama.

It is now manifestly in order for the "Law and Order" people of Paterson, who are making strenuous efforts to prevent the sale of alcoholic liquors on Sunday, to procure the enactment of a statute deciding exactly what percentage of alcohol in a beverage puts it in the catalogue of proscribed drinks. The recent victory of a saloon keeper makes this desirable. He sold a beer on Sunday which an expert swore contained only 10° or 11° of alcohol by the beer scale, while lager beer contains 14° by the same scale. The expert further swore that no man could tell the difference between the two beers by appearance or smell, but expert German drinkers could tell the difference immediately upon tasting it. He also swore that the two beers are made of the same ingredients, and yet are entirely different, the beer sold on Sunday not being lager beer. This was the defence, and the jury seem to have been impressed by it, since they acquitted the beer seller.

Accounts of the queer pranks of lightning are particularly plentiful this year. Electricity does so many wonderful things that it has become popular to explain mysterious phenomena by suggesting that they are caused by electricity. It once seemed strange enough that man by his invention should be able to make the steam that had sung gently in the nose of his grandmother's teapot drive steamships across the ocean and whirl the produce of a continent to the seaboard. But the science of to-day undertakes to light the world and to drive its machinery with an agency that has not only been used to account for the existence of comets' tails and the flickering of the Northern Lights, but that, in the form of lightning, exhibits more strange freaks, and causes, probably, more terror than any other known force.

There seems to be danger that the public will entirely lose sight of the fact that Mr. WILLIAM GALE is still pegging away at his self-imposed task of walking 6,000 quarter miles in 6,000 consecutive periods of ten minutes. Mr. GALE is trudging ahead with a pertinacity worthy of a better cause. Yesterday at 1 o'clock he had completed the 1,511th quarter mile, and was in fair condition. The chances are that Mr. GALE will not accomplish what he has undertaken. If he should, the chances are that he will not make much money by it.

The American horses in England did not make a particularly brilliant showing at the Newmarket July meeting, which closed yesterday. Mr. LORILLARD'S Barrett ran well, and had the meeting lasted longer would perhaps have won a race, for on the first day he finished fourth in the race for the Visitors' Plate, on the second day he was third for the July Cup, and on the third day he was second for the Horse Heath Stakes. On this last occasion Mr. J. R. KEENE'S Marshal Macdonald was third; and his two-year-old Golden Gate was fourth in the race for the Chesterfield Stakes. Yesterday the Americans were again slow. Mr. LORILLARD'S four-year-old chestnut Mistake managed to get third place in the race for the Suffolk Stakes; but in the contest for the Newcastle Stakes Barrett was not placed.

Vice-President Arthur and the Silly Half Breeds.

From the World.

The Republican party, in the face of the severe condemnation visited upon Mr. Arthur by President Hayes and Secretary Sherman, commended Mr. Arthur and rebuked the Hayes Administration by nominating him for the Vice Presidency and voting for him in November. Did it never occur to these presumably intelligent American voters that they were confiding the tuberiance of the nation to Mr. Arthur? Yet now, when the wavering flame of a single life flickers between Mr. Arthur and the Presidency, a majority of the men who put this great possibility upon him are loudly endorsing and ratifying the most indecent and impertinent methods.

By the Constitution Mr. Arthur will be the lawful and elected President of the United States if Gen. Garfield should either die or resign or become actually unable to discharge the duties of the office of President. If Gen. Garfield should be unfortunately disabled for office even for a few months, Mr. Arthur must act as President. Who shall decide that "critical question of inability" the Constitution does not say. But it for any reason Gen. Garfield is really unable, during a week or a month or a year to do the work of the President, Mr. Arthur, and only Mr. Arthur, must do it. No member of the President's Cabinet can do the President's official work. If the President be unable to actually give directions to the heads of departments, it is clear that there can be no presumption that the President has given such directions. Is it, therefore, either wise or sensible or patriotic to seek to alarm the country about the consequences of an advent of Mr. Arthur to power, as the Half Breed Republican newspapers are daily doing? If Mr. Arthur is to be President, upon whom shall he rely? Do the Half Breed Republican newspapers wish to deter all the best men of their party from any effort to assist and support Mr. Arthur?

The *Evening Post* condemns Mr. Arthur because after the November election he did not manifest "a change of heart" about politics and parties. It avers that Mr. Arthur disappointed "Republican" expectations in that regard. How could that be? Had not Mr. Arthur been confirmed in his own methods by the Republican party, which solemnly nominated and elected him? The *Post*, after alleging this quite absurd "expectation," goes on to say:

"There was a very rude shock given to this expectation by the speech at the Dorsey Dinner, in which Mr. Arthur treated that person's operations in Indiana, the corruption of which he virtually confessed, as an excellent joke. The wave in which the Republican press received this escapade, coupled with the revelations subsequently made about Dorsey, ought to have stung a man of ordinary susceptibility into watchfulness and prudence at least."

But it was not Mr. Arthur. It was the Republican party itself which through its National Committee inspired and controlled the corrupt operations of Dorsey in Indiana. Mr. Arthur did not furnish the money. Who did? And who gave the dinner to Dorsey? Why was a dinner tendered to Dorsey by the Republican magnates of this city? Has not the *Post* forgotten who signed the invitation and who attended the dinner? Did Mr. Arthur say at the dinner anything that was untrue? What Republican party newspaper condemned either the deeds of Dorsey or the words of Arthur when what the latter said of the former was made public? The *World* has been unsparing in its condemnation of the partisan doings of Mr. Arthur since his inauguration as Vice-President. It has denounced his course in the Mahone coalition, in the street-cleaning business, and in the Albany deadlock. But with what face can Republican newspapers revile Mr. Arthur which dare not ask their leaders to inquire whether such Republican Vice-Presidents as Hamlin, Johnson, Colfax, and Wilson were not knee deep also in party intrigue and duplicity? In a word, is not Mr. Arthur to-day, and has he not always been, in every way as a public official quite up to the average standard of those who control and direct his party?

The *Post* further complains of Mr. Arthur that in

"The present case he has made himself one of the leaders of a faction which has quarrelled with the President. His own party, not about doctrine, or principle, or policy, but about the claims to a share of patronage and salaries, and which has poured out on him through their organs in the press abuse of almost unprecedented virulence and severity."

That is undoubtedly quite true! But how about the other faction? Has not the Administration unnecessarily insulted and provoked the quarrel? There certainly was no Government or public necessity for the removal of Mr. Merritt. He was a best collector, who make him a Consul-General in London? Nor have the Half Breed newspapers shown any Government or public necessity for one in ten of the removals made since the fourth day of last March. No "doctrine, or principle, or policy" was in dispute between the Stalwarts and Half Breeds, we are told by the *Post*. The Stalwarts do not appear to have demanded any removals. What, then, gave rise to "the faction which has quarrelled with the President of its own party?" Has the *Post* meditated on that question? Mr. Arthur did not ask for the removal of Mr. Merritt, nor did Mr. Merritt resign.

The truth is that Mr. Schurz and the *Post* and the Half Breed newspapers generally have been for years and are now simply silly in their partisanship.

A Question Arises in View of the Possibility of Mr. Garfield's Disability.

WASHINGTON, July 8.—The question has been raised whether, under the constitutional provision as to succession upon the death or disability of the President, the executive functions would not devolve upon Vice-President Arthur in case of the continued illness of the President. The question is not at present a practical one, and is not at all likely to become one, and is of too delicate a nature for the law officers of the Government to express any opinion upon it. It was to-day intimated by an official that if any such question should be presented, the English recent debates would throw light upon it. The disability contemplated by the Constitution is not a transient one, such as might be caused by illness, but a disability of a kind causing such a long suspension of executive functions as to obstruct the working of the Government. There was not the remotest probability that such a condition of affairs would present itself in Gen. Garfield's case.

THE ENGLISH LAND QUESTION.

LONDON, June 25.—The land reforms which a certain class of persons not possessing any real property in this country have long been clamoring for, must, according to all appearances, soon be granted. Curiously enough, the pressure which may be expected to bring them about will not come from the landless, but from the landowners themselves. A few years ago such a statement would have seemed preposterous; but a succession of bad harvests here has given other countries an opportunity to show what they can do toward supplying the English market with agricultural produce. It has been made clear to farmers that they cannot pay high rents and compete with Russia, Canada, or the United States. This fact is so well known that it would not be worth speaking of were it not for a consequence which threatens to uproot the real property system of England. The consequence referred to is the lowering of rents prevalent at the present moment throughout the land. Even in cases where tenants hold immediately from the Government, reductions and allowances have been made. In once instance, as recently as 1876, the rents were fixed by one of the most competent land valuators in England; but in 1873 so great was the distress, that the Government took 17 per cent. off the rent; in 1879, 20 per cent. and for last year and the present one 22 per cent. has been remitted. Even with these rebates, the farmers on these estates have been unable to make any profit, and in some instances have been unable to pay their rent. On the basis of full rents being paid, this estate only returned about 3 per cent. upon the money expended by the Government for the purchase and upon some necessary improvements. What, then, must be the effect upon a farmer who tills his own freehold, or upon the small landed proprietor whose tenants scarcely pay him enough to liquidate the charges which burden almost every estate in England? But the tenants are not really the worst sufferers in the present depression. Public opinion demands that rents should be lowered, and but few landlords have resisted. Some means must be devised to extricate both landlords and tenants from their unpleasant predicament; and as soon as the Irish land question is lulled for a time, for it is most unlikely to be settled, the English land question will present a nut still harder to crack.

These remarks do not refer to the great landowners, who hold large tracts of land, which have cost them nothing, and which are for the most part unburdened with charges. It will make but a slight difference to them whether agricultural rents decline a little or not. Most of them own either valuable minerals, as Lord Dudley does, or constantly improving urban property, as the Dukes of Westminster and Bedford do in London. But the smaller landowners whose possessions are purely agricultural, arable land and pastures, must suffer enormously. Up to the present, their rents have just proved sufficient to enable them to live and to pay rent charges such as allowances to younger sons and daughters and the like. A shrinkage in rents like the present contracts their incomes by one-half; and the fall in the price, which must undoubtedly come before long, will prevent any sale. Many farms are only paying one or one and a half per cent. upon the money expended in their purchase. Very often this purchase money was partly raised upon mortgage, the mortgagor paying probably 4½ or 5 per cent., so that in such a transaction there is an ample margin for annual loss. Many persons unacquainted with the facts might think that now, while money is so cheap that three per cent. consols are selling over par and will probably go to 105, it would be possible to refund mortgages at a lower rate and thus make a considerable yearly saving. But this supposition, plausible as it seems, is met by the unpleasant fact that, except in the case of a large mortgage, the gain made by refunding would be swallowed up by the legal and other expenses of getting a new mortgage.

The remedy for the land difficulty will probably be found in the adoption of cheaper and more expeditious modes of transferring and otherwise dealing with land. But, as a rule, landowners have been opposed to any changes of this sort, and they still adhere to the old notion that property in land has elements of sanctity in its very nature which do not belong to property in other things. Historically, we may say that the fact that the owner of a plot of ground should have a more sacred property than a man who owns a house built upon it, but in this practical, common sense nineteenth century one cannot perceive any reason for the continuance of such a distinction. It is almost impossible to prove a really clear title to land in England, and in order to prove a fairly satisfactory one the expenses of search are enormous. Whether it will ever be possible to procure a cheap and effective registration of transfers and other deeds affecting real property, remains to be seen; but all attempts to gain this end have up to the present time been failures. Most of the evils of the English land system are usually traced to the system of entail, which, with primogeniture, is thought to be the source of all manner of evils. But no greater mistake could be made. There was once a time, a very brief space of time, too, during which an entailed estate could not be alienated, but that state of affairs has passed out of existence for some four centuries. At the present day all that a tenant in tail has to do to cut off the entail is to enroll a deed; and, strangely enough, it is from this very non-existence of entails, in the popular sense of the word, that many of the burdens which now hamper the possessors of landed property arise. It has always been thought advisable that a young man should not have complete control over his estates. It was felt to be a great temptation for a young spendthrift to have such a property in his broad acres that he should be able to sell them or give them away to unworthy associates. Two recent instances will suffice to show how wise this precaution was. When the late Marquis of Hastings, unfettered by the ordinary safeguards which the law generally provides, became entire master of his property, he soon made duke and drabs of it. Had the system of entail prevailed in his case, this would have been impossible. Again, the position of the young Earl of Shrewsbury, whose elopement with Mrs. Mundy caused so much talk, affords another instance. Unfortunately, his father died a few years ago, before the coming of age of the young man. Hence he is tenant in tail of many broad acres. As soon as he comes of age, he can at once bar the entail, and then he can settle the lands of Ingestre upon Mrs. Mundy, as he has threatened to do, or upon any other person who may catch his boyish fancy for the time being. Of course, were entails to exist in the ordinary acceptation of the phrase, any such alienation would be utterly impossible.

The ordinary manner of settling land is as follows: When the eldest son comes of age, or is about to be married, his father, who as a rule has only a life estate, joins with his son and casts off the entail. The property is then settled upon the son for his life, and after his death it is entailed upon his son. The same process is gone through for every generation, and the tenant for the time being has only a life estate, and cannot alienate or waste the estates. But when the estates are thus settled it is usual to make certain charges upon them. Provision has to be made for the widow and for younger children. Perhaps even it is thought advisable to mortgage a certain part in order to purchase some fields which belong to another. All these charges upon the estate do not press the owner too hardly in good times; but during an era of agricultural depression, such as that which at present prevails, the landowner has not much left after he has paid his charges in full and only received a moiety of his rents. So it will be seen that the inability of the tenants to pay high rents is fast driving the landlords into bankruptcy, and they will probably be obliged to seek some such haven as that afforded years ago in Ireland by the Encumbered Estates Court.

This state of affairs has brought ones more to the surface the old cry of protection. Free trade is so entirely a tenet of the English statesmen of the present day, that it seems almost absurd to suggest any possibility of a return to protection. Yet at a recent election to fill a vacancy in the House of Commons, protection, in the modified shape of reciprocity, was made a plank in the platform, and the opponent of free trade was triumphantly returned. Nor was this in an agricultural district, where protectionism might have influenced the voting, but in a manufacturing district.

The present system of life estates has another drawback, which has been brought before the public eye in very vivid colors of late. A landowner becomes involved, and his creditors oblige him to seek refuge in the Bankruptcy Court. He may be the owner of thousands of acres of land, which, were he possessed of the fee simple, would be amenable to the jurisdiction of the court, and be liable to be sold for the benefit of his creditors. But the bankrupt has only a life estate, and [illegible] or her takes the whole property [illegible] when the unfortunate creditors [illegible] to wait for their money. A recent case [illegible] as an illustration of this. The late [illegible] Newcastle owned 34,467 acres [illegible] rent roll of $365,500, one might think human ingenuity could scarcely invent a means of becoming insolvent with such a princely income. The fault, however, succeeded in involving himself heavily, and became insolvent. Being a Duke and a landowner, he was not liable to have the same measure meted out to him as an ordinary tradesman would have received, and on his death his son inherited this large estate. The Duke of Hamilton is another recent instance of this unfair discrimination between real and personal property. He is the owner of 157,384 acres in England and Scotland, most of which was derived from Crown grants. His income was $702,500, quite sufficient apparently for the most extravagant of mankind. But the Duke has long since been sold up as much as was possible in the present state of the law, and his great estates are in the hands of trustees, who make him an allowance. These two instances illustrate two points which will be very prominently brought out in the coming land agitation. They show the evil effect of life estates upon the interests of creditors; and they furnish a ready argument to the land reformers, who will not fail to point out that the very property which is not amenable to ordinary legal process is just that which ought to be most so, being acquired, not by purchase or inheritance from a purchaser, but at the expense of the people themselves. Many of the anomalies mentioned would be removed by the abolition of estates for life, but, curiously enough, this life interest exists in dealing with personal property, to the law of which it is proposed to assimilate the law of real property. "There is," say the land reformers, "no difference between real and personal property. There is nothing sacred in the ownership of land. There is no reason why they should not be both governed by the same rules." But the most ardent land reformer would never suggest that a life interest in personal property should be made illegal. It would seem a hideous interference with the liberty of alienation to say that a husband could not leave a sum in consols or Government bonds in the hands of trustees with directions to pay over the interest thereon to his widow during her life, and on her death hand over the interest or principal to some other person. This is a hard nut for those who insist upon the similarity of property in in reality and personality to crack. It may be difficult to see why one's boots and the mud which adheres to them should be subject to different codes, but even in such a case it is clear that the supply of boots during the existence of our planet is practically unlimited, while the amount of mud in the world is a fixed quantity, except perhaps in the streets of New York.

In the case of primogeniture, the difference between real and personal property is still more apparent, and, although it does not inflict such evils upon the community at large as life estates do, it works at times considerable mischief. In England when a man dies intestate, his real property is inherited by his eldest son, to the exclusion of every one else except his widow, who is entitled during her lifetime to her dower; but the personality is divided in equal shares among all the children. Of course, a man can always make a will, and leave all his property just as he wishes, nor is it at all probable that the French system, founded upon the civil law, under which the father is obliged to divide his property among his children alike, will ever be adopted in England. Indeed, the whole history of the English statute book points to a diametrically contrary enactment, for it has always been its tendency to give a person the largest possible power of disposing of his own. It is worth observing that the unfairness of primogeniture never seems to occur to the mind of an Englishman in a concrete case, although he may inveigh against it in the abstract. Thus, should a testator possessing 100,000 acres of land leave it all to his eldest son, no one would pass a remark upon it, but should he leave $100,000 to one son and nothing to the others there would be an immediate outcry against the unnatural father. A case which has often been quoted as exemplifying the unfairness of the distribution of English real property will bear quoting once more as an illustration of this: A husband spent his wife's fortune in buying a house; he died intestate, and the house was claimed by a nephew as heir-at-law. The widow, with whose money the house had been bought, was left a beggar, and had to seek a livelihood as a domestic servant.

During the present session of Parliament, a land scheme has been proposed which met with much favor in the House of Commons. The pressure of other business prevented any sensational discussion or action, but before long measures will have to be taken. Mr. Gladstone approved of the scheme, but thought that members of the House of Lords should be excepted from its effects. Indeed, any sweeping land reform would shake the upper House to pieces, for its principal *raison d'être* is the territorial influence of its members. The extreme antipathy of that body to a thorough land reform was shown by the desertion of Mr. Gladstone by the Duke of Argyll upon the introduction of the Irish Land bill. The Peers and other landowners have schemes of their own by which the interests of the landlords can be benefited, but that they may not be very beneficial to the public at large may be surmised from what occurred to them a few years in the case of the Marquis of Salisbury. This nobleman, who, since the death of Lord Beaconsfield, is the head of the Conservative party, is descended from William and Robert Cecil, the favorite Ministers of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. He is the owner of 20,122 acres of land in England, exclusive of his valuable London estates. Almost all this property is derived from crown grants made from the sequestrated estates of the Church. Every visitor to London knows the valuable property on the south side of the Strand, where Cecil and Salisbury streets record the name of the owner. Some time ago it was proposed to cut a new street from Tottenham Court road to Charing Cross, and the Metropolitan Board of Works had a bill introduced into Parliament with this purpose in view. The Marquis was offered the actual value of his property, plus the usual ten per cent. and adequate compensation to the leaseholders was promised. This did not suit his views, and he stipulated that in addition he should be allowed to repurchase the frontage sites along the new street without competition. So great was the influence of Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords that this proposal was accepted, and the Board of Works, who expected to pocket themselves, or rather the ratepayers, by selling these sites, were obliged to withdraw the bill. Public opinion, however, was so strong on the subject that the Marquis was obliged to withdraw his demands.

The Melancholy Lot of Clerks.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The "Pushing Clerk's" remarks in this morning's SUN struck me as being far wide of the actual facts. Worth, industry, and capacity do not signify much in commercial circles. Unless you have influence, which signifies everything, you may work ten hours a day nine months in the year, and fourteen hours the other three months, only to find at the end of the year your position very uncertain if they have not made as much as they expected to; and if they have made money they do not offer to raise your salary. If you ask them to, they kindly inform you they can get plenty to work for $6 or $8 a week. What can you do? You have worked hard, faithfully, and hoping for what never comes. If there is any credit given it is to some one else. He gets the credit while you do the work. If you do a little more than others, they wonder how you can afford it, and go over the cash book to see if everything is all right. If you dress shabbily, neither principals nor employers will notice you on the street. Will a "Pushing Clerk" inform me what I am to do? The above is not my experience alone, but that of thousands of others.

A CRUSHED CLERK.

NEW YORK, July 8.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The 20-year-old clerk, with a salary of $2,000 a year, is a lucky fellow. I am 23, and have been in the office of a large wholesale house for more than two years. I am quick and thorough, correct and careful, and do a large amount of office work daily. The mistakes I make are so few that absolutely for a year they can be reckoned on one hand. Yet my salary is but $14 per week, which is not enough for a young man who has been well brought up to live upon in this city and live well. Possibly, were I to suggest an increase of pay my employer, who can praise me very modly, might say that it could find a dozen men as good as myself to step into my place and at a lower salary.

Possibly he would be right.

JAMES WARD.

A Southern Reader's Opinion.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I see a statement quoted to the effect that in the last fifteen years of slavery the south raised 46,675,501 bales of cotton, while in the first fifteen years of free labor she has raised 56,526,526 bales.

The ever hands and moneyed men down here, who own the lion's share of the land, do not permit the negroes to raise half enough corn and meat for their own support. They thus their profit in selling to the negroes corn and meat brought from the Northwestern States. The poor black man is a heap worse off in this respect than he was before the war.

SENEX.

COTTERVILLE, Miss., July 4.

Rural Perils.

You may talk of the dangers of cities,
And prate of their dirt and disease;
But scenes so delightfully rural
Have perils much greater than these.
Your street cars and high running railroads
Have all fewer victims, I ween,
Than daily and hourly are slain by
The murderous mowing machine.

Consumption may gather its thousands;
Malaria, too, is a foe;
Pneumonia can do its work neatly,
And Bright's disease sold in is slow.
But out in the wheat and the oat fields
A slaughtering devil we find,
That loves to run over poor mortals,
Their bodies to reap and to bind.

The sea has its dangers, undoubted,
And many are those of the land;
As men become plenty, their perils
Increase upon every hand.
Quite fatal the drop of the scaffold,
Where halters are stretched by the law;
But worse, and more deadly, the shed roof
That shelters the circular saw.

You may talk as you please of your sunstrokes,
Of small pox and cholera scares,
Of dynamite and all explosives—
All these are but feeble affairs.
If you would see death and destruction,
The worst that you ever have seen,
Come out to the beautiful country,
And wait for the threshing machine.

A miserable headache, languor and melancholy, generally settle down in a bilious liver, indigestion, or costiveness. Dr. Jayne's Sanative Pills will be found a sure remedy for these ailments, stimulating the liver and producing regular evacuations.—Adv.

CABLE POOL AND TELEGRAPH POOL.

Judge Blatchford Refuses the Injunctions Asked for by the French Company.

Judge Blatchford of the United States Circuit Court denied, yesterday, the motion made on behalf of the French Cable Company for an injunction restraining the telegraph consolidation and the closing of the offices of the American Union Telegraph Company, with which the cable company had contracts, that, as it alleged, the consolidated companies could not carry out.

Judge Blatchford says he cannot regard it as an open and doubtful question that the consolidation agreement was valid, whether considered with reference to the general principles applicable to it, or to the statute of New York, or the act of Congress. As to the alleged violation by it of special rights of the plaintiff, he says there is nothing before the Court to enable it to measure, with the least approach to accuracy or otherwise, than by the merest fancy or conjecture, the extent or the pecuniary value of these rights, which extend at most only to unconsigned messages, or to measure the pecuniary amount of any damages, either past or probable in the future, from the violation of those rights. On the other hand, it distinctly appears that the controlling reason operating with the American Union Company to sell its property was the great disadvantage in pecuniary results of continuing its business as an independent company in comparison with the advantages to its shareholders of becoming stockholders in the Western Union Company. When to this is added the fact that by the pooling or joint purse arrangement existing between the plaintiff and the other two cable companies, it makes no pecuniary difference to the plaintiff whether all messages are sent over the plaintiff's cables or over the cables of one or both of the other two cable companies, it is plain that the injury to result to the American Union Company from preventing the carrying out of the consolidation agreement is far greater than any possible injury to result to the plaintiff from a contrary course; and that therefore the case is not one for equitable interference in that regard. In respect to the prayers of the bill for injunctions, touching the agreement of Dec. 18, 1880, the rescision and cancelling of that agreement remove all ground for any injunction regarding it.

Of certain specific prayers for injunctions against the Western Union Telegraph Company, to prevent the diversion to other cable lines of business which the American Union Company was furnishing under contract to the plaintiff, Judge Blatchford says: "The plaintiff has now, in its pooling arrangement with the other two cable companies, the practical benefit of a full performance of the agreements in respect to unconsigned messages to the same extent as if every message that goes over any cable of either of said other two companies were to go over its own cables. If hereafter damage is shown to result to the plaintiff from the sending by the Western Union Company of unconsigned messages over some cable other than a cable of the plaintiff or of said other two cable companies, it may be proper to ask the interference of a court of equity. In such case the question of the existing mutuality of the said agreement will come up for consideration with the questions whether said agreements belonging to a class of which specific performance will be decreed, and what control the Court could have over the plaintiff to compel it to observe the agreements on its part."

The American Bible Society Attacked.

From the Independent.

The revision will demonstrate how utterly unnecessary is this enormously rich, expensive, and respectable, but not lively, corporation for the production and sale of Bibles. By the time it shall have made up its multitudinous mind what it is going to do about it, it will have ceased to be of any considerable practical importance to the public, whether it does anything about it or not. The demand for copies of the revised version will have been amply supplied, in the way of business—by publishers making a profit on their work and paying interest on their capital, and allowing compensation to the retailer and the book agent—with books as cheap, as elegant, as accurate, and as durable as can be furnished by the huge charitable society, with its immense capital in free gifts; and its army of book agents, salaried by the churches, and its high-toned piety, which is quite too spiritual to permit it to do business on business principles or conform to the divine constitution of human society.

The revision will make it plain by practical experiment that the American Bible Society is the principal existing hindrance to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. In the course of a few months the revised New Testament will be found on sale in every considerable village, and even in every small village, in the United States, in great varieties of style and price, and tens of thousands of families, who never have seen a Bible society's "colporteur" want for book peddlers, will have had it offered for sale at their doors with the earnestness of men and women whose livelihood depends on their finding customers. If, then, any person shall be moved by curiosity to ask the bookseller, or the newsvender, or the country grocer, or the "colporteur," "Why did you never have Bibles to sell before, such as we wanted to buy for our children, and our new married couples, and for gifts in Sunday schools, and for a pastor's gifts among his people?" the truth will come out that the keeping of the Bible away from the ready access of the people in Christian regions was the result of the settled and obstinate policy of the Bible Society, by which "alarming destitutions" were created, that should figure impressively in the annual report, and that could be supplied only by large contributions to the society or its auxiliaries.

If the children of light were wise in their generation (which they are not), the effect of the automatic production and circulation of the revision would lead the churches, in answer to petitions for a little more money in behalf of manufacturing and trading corporations that do not manufacture and sell for profit but only for the glory of God, to say respectfully, but firmly: "Not another dollar. You have had more than is good for you already. Henceforth, if Bibles and tracts are wanted, we will give money to missionary societies, or to committees organized for the purpose, wherewithal to go into open market and buy what they want. And then, if you can furnish the best goods at the lowest price, you will get our money,