The Sun.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1890.

London Offices of THE SUN,
230 West Strand.
All communications should be addressed to FRANK H. WHITE, 230 Strand, London W. C.

Advertisements for THE WEEKLY SUN, *issued to-morrow morning, must be handed in this evening before six o'clock.*

A Sure Sign of a Bad Conscience.

The Albany correspondent of THE SUN having reported, as other correspondents have done, the fact that in Albany Mr. GROVER CLEVELAND is believed to be concerned in the so-called HUSTED Rapid Transit bill, a reporter of the *Herald* went to see Mr. CLEVELAND to inquire about it.

"I did not gather from Mr. CLEVELAND'S manner," says the gentleman of the *Herald*, "that he was particularly pleased. He carefully wrote his denial of the statement, and this is the note he handed to me:

"'I know nothing of the Rapid Transit bill and absolutely nothing of its origin or purposes, or the persons that may be in the least connected with it. I am sure I shall not be related to it in any manner. I can say to the representative of the *Herald* that it will save him and other decent reporters trouble, and me annoyance, if they will remember that THE SUN is positively incapacitated from giving any information of any of my future movements over which I have the least control.'"

Now, the fact is that the so-called HUSTED Rapid Transit bill, as prepared and carefully printed for presentation to the Legislature, commences in the following words:

"*The Mayor of the City of New York, the Mayor of the City of Brooklyn,* **Grover Cleveland,** *one other Democrat, and three Republicans are hereby appointed the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners.*"

It takes a lively imagination to believe that the name of a man so prominent as Mr. CLEVELAND could be inserted into such a bill without his foreknowledge and consent, either expressed by himself or by persons interested in such railroad matters, and near enough to him to be taken as his representatives by the astute and money-making politicians of the other party who are engaged in getting up the measure.

This view of the case is corroborated by the incongruity and irritation with which Mr. CLEVELAND speaks upon the subject. He thus furnishes a mark and an indication of a bad conscience; and a bad and very irritable conscience he certainly ought to carry about with him in relation to the railroads of New York city.

In 1884, when GROVER CLEVELAND was Governor, a general street railroad bill was passed by the Legislature. He had been consulted about it beforehand, and previous to its final enactment some changes had been made in the bill to make it agreeable to him. While it remained before him awaiting his signature or his veto, prominent gentlemen, some of them Democrats, as we know, waited upon him to protest against the bill and to urge him to reject it. He was told that, if he gave his signature, it would open a scene of corruption in the Board of Aldermen such as had not been witnessed for years. This protest was most earnest and came from various quarters; yet after everything had been said to him, and the danger fully pointed out—a danger not merely to the city of New York, but to the Democratic party, which was responsible for his administration as Governor—he signed the bill.

This was the act through which the Board of Aldermen was corrupted by JACOB SHARP and his pals, as Mr. CLEVELAND had been forewarned; and some of the rascals who were concerned in the villainy are now in the State's prison.

The truth is that Mr. CLEVELAND had agreed beforehand to sign the bill. He knew perfectly what the provisions were, because, as we have said, he had made in them some changes of minor importance. He knew what the ultimate purpose of the bill was, because he knew the men who were waiting to take advantage of it. Yet he signed it, and the consequences followed according to the prediction.

In the obscene crowd who hung around the skirts of that infamous measure, there were private intimations and secret rumors of shameful influences brought to bear to render the signature certain. We will not conjecture whether those intimations had truth behind them or not; it is enough that GROVER CLEVELAND put his name to the bill, knowing all about it, and that he was responsible for the revolting scenes afterward enacted as the result of his signature.

No wonder that when he now reflects upon these things and upon his own responsibility in connection with them, he grows wild and vociferous at any one who may prematurely publish the fact that his name is put forward most prominently as a conscious party to another enterprise of a similar nature.

The Mysterious Murder at Trenton.

It is reported from Trenton that great public indignation exists in that city on account of the inability of the police to solve the mystery surrounding the murder of MYRA KNIFFIN. Mrs. KNIFFIN was killed late on Thursday night or early on Friday morning in her apartments on South Broad street, one of the most prominent thoroughfares in Trenton. Her husband had left the city on Thursday morning to go to a village named Broadway, in Warren county, New Jersey, whence he returned on the following day, after being notified of the crime. Miss EMMA PURCELL, a cousin of Mrs. KNIFFIN, occupied her room with her in the absence of her husband, and slept in the same bed. She is a young woman about 22 years of age, and is a typewriter in a manufacturing establishment at Trenton. On Friday morning she was discovered lying on the floor, in the middle of the room, apparently unconscious or partly so, while Mrs. KNIFFIN lay dead in the bed with a corner of the quilt over her face. This quilt gave out an odor of chloroform.

Miss PURCELL'S account of what happened in the night was simple and direct. She said that when they retired Mrs. KNIFFIN was wakeful, but she herself soon fell asleep. She was awakened by Mrs. KNIFFIN, who told her that a burglar was pushing open the door, whereupon Miss PURCELL, hearing the noise of which Mrs. KNIFFIN spoke, jumped out of bed, rushed to the front window of the apartments, and called for help. While here, she was seized from behind by a man who pressed a wet cloth over her face, and she became unconscious, and remained helpless until morning, when she was found by the other inmates of the house in the condition already described.

The theory that the murder was committed by burglars appears to have been wholly rejected by the police. A chisel, a hatchet, and other tools were found in the rooms, and the bureau drawers were pulled out and their contents scattered about; but nothing of any value was discovered to be missing. Careful watch has been kept over Dr. KNIFFIN and Miss PURCELL from the beginning; but the facts did not seem to justify any suspicion as to either until Dr. KNIFFIN attempted to commit suicide yesterday. Inquiry as to his whereabouts during Thursday night seems to have confirmed every statement that he made on the subject, but his effort to kill himself, while it may have been due solely to mental derangement caused by the excitement of the occasion, is nevertheless suggestive that he may know more about the crime than he has disclosed. As for Miss PURCELL, her relations with the murdered woman appear to have been of the most friendly character, and there is no indication of any motive on her part for giving any account of the occurrence except one in strict accordance with the truth.

The Trenton police authorities should not be criticised or condemned because they have been slow to implicate any one in this atrocious crime without adequate evidence. It is no uncommon thing, even in these modern times, to unjustly suspect men of murder. Only a few years ago all New York was ready to believe that a poor woman who was smothered to death in this city had been killed by her husband, when the truth was that the real criminal was a negro, who was subsequently hanged for the crime. It is far better that the police should frankly confess their inability to discover the criminal than to accuse any one of a murder upon inadequate proof.

At the Coroner's inquest in this remarkable case at Trenton, one of the most important inquiries will relate to the means by which death was produced. Most of the accounts agree in the statement that the odor of chloroform was distinctly perceptible in the room in which the murder was committed, but it is also asserted that the physicians are not satisfied that Mrs. KNIFFIN was killed by the administration of this anæsthetic agent. According to one account, evidences of strangulation have been discovered. It is also said that Miss PURCELL could not have remained under the influence of chloroform five hours; but, on the other hand, she says that she was not unconscious during all this time, but declares that she felt unable to move from the place where she found herself on the floor.

It is a singular fact that neither of the women appears to have made any effort to use the revolver which was in the room, although, according to Miss PURCELL'S account, they were aware of the approach of the burglars before the men actually got the door open. It seems that, owing to the alarm occasioned by a previous attempt to rob the residence, Mrs. KNIFFIN had provided herself with a revolver, which she kept under her pillow and which was found there, fully loaded, after the murder. It is strange that, after they heard the burglars trying to effect an entrance into the room, neither Mrs. KNIFFIN nor Miss PURCELL attempted to use a weapon so near at hand and which ought to have proved an effectual defence under the circumstances. But perhaps this, and many other interesting questions connected with this most mysterious murder, will be answered by the evidence at the Coroner's inquest, the interest in which is by no means confined to the State of New Jersey.

The Coming Census and the New Apportionment

The eleventh census of the United States will be taken next summer. Estimates of population made in advance of the actual count are necessarily imperfect, but they are often found not to vary much from the figures afterward officially obtained.

A few days ago the *Tradesman* of Chattanooga published figures compiled by the Governors of the twelve Southern States in answer to a query, and from these figures it appears that the present population of the Southern States is 19,489,150, against 14,638,936 in 1880.

In the twelve States mentioned below the customary decennial enumeration was made in 1885: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. Thereby the present rate of increase was ascertained.

In the four new States of South Dakota, Washington, Montana, and North Dakota, the vote lately cast for Congressmen indicates pretty closely the present population.

Thus from 28 of the 42 States which now compose the Union approximate figures are at hand. Concerning the other States, there is on file in the offices of the respective Secretaries of State information showing in round numbers the probable size of the present population. Here are the approximate and estimated figures for all the States:

	1880.	1890.
Alabama	1,262,505	1,658,453
Arkansas	802,525	1,247,771
California	864,694	1,100,000
Colorado	194,327	343,919
Connecticut	622,700	680,000
Delaware	146,608	150,000
Florida	269,493	424,806
Georgia	1,542,180	2,165,541
Illinois	3,077,871	3,075,000
Indiana	1,978,301	2,400,000
Iowa	1,624,615	1,925,960
Kansas	996,096	1,540,562
Kentucky	1,648,690	2,000,000
Louisiana	939,946	1,251,340
Maine	648,936	660,000
Maryland	934,943	1,275,000
Massachusetts	1,783,085	1,981,465
Michigan	1,636,937	2,038,100
Minnesota	780,773	1,298,798
Mississippi	1,131,597	1,546,753
Missouri	2,168,380	3,000,000
Nebraska	452,402	970,645
Nevada	62,266	65,000
New Hampshire	346,991	375,000
New Jersey	1,131,116	1,550,039
New York	5,082,871	6,000,000
North Carolina	1,399,750	1,813,024
Ohio	3,198,062	3,700,000
Oregon	174,768	260,150
Pennsylvania	4,282,891	5,075,000
Rhode Island	276,531	318,284
South Carolina	995,577	1,200,000
Tennessee	1,542,359	1,800,000
Texas	1,591,749	2,214,812
Vermont	332,286	335,000
Virginia	1,512,565	1,880,560
West Virginia	618,457	800,000
Wisconsin	1,315,497	1,763,423
South Dakota	.....	400,000
Washington	.....	250,000
Montana	.....	220,000
North Dakota	.....	220,000
Totals	49,371,340	63,881,500
Territories	784,443	880,000
Grand totals	50,155,783	64,761,500

The basis of representation for Congressmen rose steadily from 30,000 in 1789 to 40,000 in 1820, 70,680 in 1840, 130,533 in 1870, and 152,000 in 1888. It will be 175,000 this year. With the additions caused by the admission of Senators and Representatives from the four new States, the Presidential electors will probably number 450 in the election of 1892, against 401 in 1888 and 1884.

The States to gain electors will be: Alabama 2, Arkansas 2, California 1, Colorado 1, Georgia 2, Indiana 1, Iowa 1, Kansas 2, Kentucky 1, Louisiana 1, Maryland 1, Minnesota 3, Mississippi 1, Missouri 4, Nebraska 3, New Jersey 1, New York 1, North Carolina 2, Ohio 2, Pennsylvania 1, Texas 2, and Wisconsin 1. The four new States will probably have 14 electoral votes, distributed as follows: South Dakota 4, Washington 4, Montana 3, and North Dakota 3.

According to the electoral vote of 1888, with Montana added as Democratic, the Democratic electoral vote would be increased from 168 to 189.

According to the electoral vote of 1886, with South Dakota, Washington, and North Dakota added as Republican, the Republican vote would be increased from 219 to 246.

The net gain to the Republicans seems likely, therefore, to be 7. This allows for the loss of 1 electoral vote in Maine, the only State in the Union to lose. By the census of 1870 it had 7 electoral votes. In 1880 it had 6. This year its quota will be 5.

Without New York's 37 electoral votes, the Republican Presidential ticket, on the basis of the new apportionment, would have 209 votes, or 16 less than a majority. Neither the 10 votes of New Jersey, nor the 12 of Virginia, nor again the 6 of West Virginia, nor the 6 of Connecticut would be sufficient to change the result.

With the 37 electoral votes of New York cast for the Democratic nominee, he would have just 226 votes, enough to win without the gain of any other State. Without the 37 votes of New York, Indiana, California, Ohio, Iowa, or Massachusetts could not in any one case furnish votes enough to turn the scale against the Republicans.

As to sectional division, the South will gain 17 electors, the West 25, the Middle States 3, and the Pacific States 4. New England will lose 1.

In a political way, the most important fact established by the figures given above is the continued and increased importance of the electoral votes of New York. Without them neither party can have any expectations of winning. New York will determine the result, and it may be added that upon the maintenance or diminution of the Democratic majority in New York, Brooklyn, and the towns of the metropolitan district, the result in the State will chiefly depend hereafter as heretofore.

The Proposed Emasculation of the Suffrage.

One point most strenuously insisted upon by the bogus ballot reformers, who propose to revolutionize politics and regenerate the franchise by a system of booths and cross marks, is the need of additional secrecy in voting; and in the paper which they have prepared to send to Albany appears the following: "Only official ballots shall be voted. The voter shall be guaranteed absolute privacy in preparing his ballot, and the secrecy of the ballot shall be made compulsory."

Their idea is, that if a voter can only be shielded from scrutiny he will cast a pure, patriotic, disinterested, and intelligent vote; and that, if the composition of his ballot be known, he will cast a corrupt, injudicious, or sordid vote, imperilling the institutions of the Government. This is a new phase of the ballot question, and from sheer novelty has attracted many who are affected by anything out of the ordinary, without so much as inquiring whether it be desirable or not.

This idea of compulsory privacy having nothing to support it, has proved most enticing to the reformers; but despite all their clamor, not one argument in its favor has yet appeared. We have yet to be informed how any real gain to honest and candid voting is to be obtained by putting a premium upon cowardice. In the conduct of the solemn and important functions of our law courts, it has not been discovered that truth and veracity are better obtained by witnesses testifying covertly behind an inclosure. On the contrary, it is found that the best and surest way of getting at the truth is to throw open the doors of the tribunal. The man who would not otherwise be believed is hardly to be credited because he is ensconced within a wooden booth. Similarly all the patriotic statesmen of the past, and all the clear-headed leaders of the present, in every political party, have united in favoring the most candid and manly expression of party spirit and conviction. In a busy Presidential contest we are accustomed to witness the spectacle of thousands of earnest, honest, and enthusiastic men rallying to the call of their respective parties, marching by thousands in the streets with emblems which attest their sentiments. Public meetings, held in city, town, or cross roads, gather hundreds of citizens to greet their political leaders and favorites, and to testify to the strength of their political convictions and their party faith. At ordinary meeting places, in clubs, on street corners, in social gatherings, and in family and friendly reunions, the citizens are never reluctant to speak with courage and candor respecting sentiments they feel, and concerning the candidates they favor or oppose. It is well that this is so. These men constitute the overwhelming body of voters—probably 95 per cent. of the whole number—and they are not ashamed to walk erect to the voting place and give testimony to the sincerity of the views which they are known to entertain.

On the other hand, there are to be found in every community a few forlorn nondescripts or floaters, who have no political ideas, and disavow any interest in the affairs of the Government. It is to their level that the bogus electoral reformers seek to reduce the great body of the electorate, by emasculating the American suffrage system so that the highest attainment of an elector shall be the ability to vote for a candidate whom he has not the courage openly to advocate, or for a party to whose membership he has not the manhood to admit that he belongs. Very little influence would be exercised in public affairs by a party leader ashamed, by his own admission, to declare his sentiments publicly to the voters, and who relied upon anonymous communications sent to them under compulsory secrecy. Little confidence could be entertained in the ability, integrity, or courage of a legislator who, on important public questions, instead of voting openly, should wish to deliver his vote behind a screen, so that neither his constituents, his colleagues, nor the general public would be able to know where he stood or how he had voted.

What the bogus ballot reformers are really seeking is not compulsory privacy, but a compulsory educational test. That secured, they want a property qualification, and, ultimately, an overthrow of universal suffrage so that the rich may vote and the workingman be disfranchised.

And the Democracy will crush their conspiracy and defeat them.

A Word of Comment.

Our valued contemporary, the *Buffalo Courier*, wants to know why we do not overhaul Governor HILL for some declarations which he made several months ago respecting the alleged corruption of the electoral franchise:

"IF THE SUN believes that our elections are pure and honest and that the votes counted record the actual political convictions of the citizens, why has it not long ago called Governor HILL to task for having painted the darkest picture of election corruption that has been painted since November, 1888?"

In our judgment the Governor was mistaken in his expressions upon this subject; and we think also that he has gone too far in certain concessions he has made to the opponents of universal suffrage; yet he has stood firm on the main question, and that is the important thing.

We do not think it is necessary to point out and condemn every error of opinion or of admission that is made by one of our friends who is yet sound on the principal point. To devote time and strength to resisting the avowed foes of universal suffrage and of true democracy is, in our judgment, a better employment than it would be to engage in unnecessary criticism and condemnation of those who may make a slip now and then, but who, after all, are always Democrats.

The bitterness of political animosity is strikingly illustrated by the Hon. JEHU BAKER'S personal delineation of the character which he attributes to the Hon. WILLIAM RUFUS MORRISON, his old-time opponent in the Eighteenth district of Illinois:

"A black-blooded, sinister-twisted, ill-compacted, and badly compounded man, without one atom of honorable feeling at bottom."

This is all wrong. Mr. MORRISON isn't that sort of a man. He is a fighter, to be sure, because he was born so, and because he is a man of earnest convictions; but he is always a gentleman; and, more than that, he is one of the best fellows in the world and one of the most agreeable companions. Brother BAKER should overcome such bad feelings and cultivate a disposition more in accordance with wisdom and charity.

The attempts of an English company to run a steamer on the upper Yangtse-kiang have been baffled in a ludicrous manner by the grave and dignified mandarins who considered the matter. The company did not take its steamer to China until the Peking authorities had agreed to let it engage in trade between Ichang and Chungking, but endless obstacles came into view when the vessel was fairly afloat.

The mandarins, after long consideration, finally decided that whereas there are thousands of junks on the upper Yangtse which would doubtless be knocked into smithereens if a steamboat were turned loose among them, therefore for ten days in the year junks should be tied up at the river banks, thus giving the steamer plenty of steerage room and a fine chance to trade. During the remaining 355 days the steamer should take a vacation and give the junks a chance.

At last accounts the English were trying to enlighten the Peking officials and the steamer "was eating her head off" in idleness.

Mr. THOMAS BAILEY ALDRICH has written a pretty "Echo Song" wherein he asks, "Who can say where Echo dwells?" We are glad to inform Mr. ALDRICH that Echo dwells in the editorial rooms of the *New York Times*, where every morning she repeats the editorials of the *Evening Post* of the afternoon before. But what a glum, shaky, life-despising, bilious old Echo she is!

It is said that MEYERBEER'S "The Prophet" has been done into Volapük and sung at an Australian theatre. As far as catching the words is concerned, it makes no great difference to the mass of opera goers whether an opera be sung in Basque or in Choctaw, but if Music is to be wedded to Volapük, is there any lawful impediment? Yet it will occur to minds of quick apprehension that it will be a waste of energy for Volapük to wrestle with Italian and German for the post of official language of music. What should be demanded of this macadamized tongue is that it become the only authorized vehicle for the publication of tariff reform statistics, of Government reports, of civil service reform pamphlets, of HENRY WANTWIT BLAIR'S speeches, of the letters of posing statesmen great abdominally rather than mentally.

And then the study of Volapük will be substituted for capital punishment.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Boston Herald*, prints an able article upon "The Revival of the Family." The family has been considered a useful institution by most countries, but New England, or at least the pure race of it, has about given it up. The spectacle of people babbling about IBSEN'S twaddle, or ducking their heads into the murky pools of theosophy while their race is dying out, is one to make the high gods boohoo!

Some British experts in African matters are now urging all intending missionaries to acquire some knowledge of medicine before they start, as they can add much to their influence by prescribing for the physical ailments of the natives. Explorers are not quite of one mind as to the value of their medical practice in helping them through the country. Capt. BINGER, for instance, says that on his recent journey from the Upper Niger to the Gulf of Guinea he found it extremely dangerous to try to cure the natives of their complaints. If the medicine had a beneficial effect they thought he was a sorcerer and regarded him with awe and dislike, and once or twice when his drugs failed he considered himself in danger of being killed and eaten. Fortunately, in most regions the natives regard the successful white doctor as a great and good man who deserves to be well treated, and many explorers like THOMSON, ARNOT, HOLUB, and others have seen the time when their great reputation as pill dispensers was almost their only resource.

The Hon. MURAT HALSTEAD, whose learned and able denunciations of ice water as the great American vice have given him high rank in the scientific world, may be pleased with these summer days, but the butcher, the milkman, and the rest of us are becoming mildly excited as to whether the stern ruler of the inverted year will ever settle down to business. For the punishment of those who are little better than the wicked and who are looking forward to the iced drinks that sting the brain but cool the coppers, the delay in icing the lakes may be all right. But Winter's contract calls for a certain amount of ice every year, and now is the time for him to proceed to business.

The question of the removal of Brother GERONIMO, the eminent Apache philanthropist, from Alabama to western North Carolina continues to agitate the bosoms of two or three sister States. The anxiety of various communities not to have GERONIMO among them would touch his heart deeply if he knew the facts. Yet he has no reason to be discouraged. He is more popular than civil service reform.

"I know," writes Dr. HOLMES in the *Atlantic*, "a most excellent clergyman, not far from my own time of life, whom I would pit against any old Hebrew rabbi or Greek philosopher of his years and weight, if they could return to the flesh, to run a quarter of a mile on a good level track."

This must be the Rev. Dr. ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY, who was graduated from Harvard College nearly sixty-four years ago. His prowess as a runner is known to comparatively few, but it has been great, and good for the mile as well as the quarter. Dr. PEABODY'S is the dearest of Harvard names to the men of his college, but his swiftness of foot is probably unknown to most of them.

The Sultan has received Mr. HIRSCH, the new American Minister, with cordial distinction. But everybody knows that the Sublime Porte has been off its hinges since Gen. LEW WALLACE left Stamboul. Nobody can take Gen. WALLACE'S place in the Sultan's affections. "But I'll be hanged," says the General, "if I'll live on coffee and cigarettes all the year around for any man from Constantinople to Cow Run."

The Duke of CONNAUGHT, who as plain Prince ARTHUR visited this country twenty years ago, is coming again this year. The question of precedency between him and Prince RUSSELL, Markis of Montana, has, we are happy to say, been settled satisfactorily by the courtesy of the latter. "To the son of CONNAUGHT'S mother," says the Markis with true Castilian courtesy, "I shall cheerfully yield what is due to the son of the son of Tippecanoe." Hurrah for harmony!

"Smoke," sadly remarks our valued contemporary, the *Chicago News*, "is unnecessary." Certainly, it is unnecessary that there should be anywhere such a pall and plethora of it as are to be found in Chicago and its as yet unannexed subterranean fumiferous rival.

In the language of Lord CASTLEWOOD, "dooverseesnshweather?

SILK AND SUGAR.

Arguments For and Against a Duty on Raw Silk—Strong Pleas For the Duty on Sugar.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 7.—The first to appear before the Ways and Means Committee this morning was F. W. Cheney of South Manchester, Conn., President of the Silk Association of America. While the Senate bill, he said, made an average reduction of 10 per cent. on the duty on silk, it was acceptable to him.

Britton Richardson, Secretary of the same association, advocated the imposition of a compound duty on silk. He said that about one-half of the silk consumed in this country was of American manufacture. The great obstacle which the American manufacturer had to contend against was undervaluation of imports. He did not believe that any duty could be laid on raw silk high enough to protect the silk growers of this country without crippling the manufacturer.

Philip Walker, chief of the silk bureau of the Department of Agriculture, submitted specimens of cocoons and silk produced from those raised in the United States. He dwelt upon the importance of building up the silk industry in the United States. If we could produce all our silk it would add $15,000,000 to the income of the farmers. The Agricultural Department had come to the conclusion that all the raw silk needed in this country could be produced if there was a duty of $1 per pound on raw silk.

Mr. John Dymond, President of the Sugar Planters' Association of Louisiana, said that free sugar from the Sandwich Islands did not affect the price of sugar in this country, and was not, therefore, detrimental to the sugar industry of the United States. The cost of labor in Louisiana is four times that of labor in Cuba—$1 a day in Louisiana. The industry is being extended in Louisiana, sugar makers leasing more land every year for the growth of cane. Louisiana produces, he said, one-eighth of all the sugar consumed in the United States.

Gov. Warmouth, who was introduced by Mr. Dymond as "the most enterprising planter in our State," was the next witness. He said it was strange to find representatives of protected interests in the North and West crying aloud for the free breakfast table, which does not mean free pork to us. "I speak feelingly upon this subject," he said, "because I have conducted some political campaigns in my State. Everywhere I went I was met with Representative So-and-so's speech from Pennsylvania and Ohio and Michigan, in favor of a reduction of 50 per cent. of the tariff on sugar. I must say that in the face of these speeches I have not been as successful in converting my Democratic friends as could have been desired. Excuse me for indulging in this lecture. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKinley—Is the sugar crop of Louisiana increasing?

Gov. Warmouth—Yes, 30,000 tons heavier last year than before. If you want friends in Louisiana you must not touch the sugar tariff. We cannot stand a reduction of half a cent a pound. It would be ruinous to the industry, and without sugar the city of New Orleans would be depopulated and the streets grown with grass.

Mr. McKinley—Will you increase your acreage if we reduce the tariff 50 per cent.

Gov. Warmouth—Yes, sir.

Mr. McKinley—For how long?

Gov. Warmouth—Until I'm busted.

Mr. McKinley—And how long will that be?

Gov. Warmouth—Not a great while, I assure you.

Gov. Warmouth said that if the committee could guarantee to the planters that a succeeding Congress would not disturb it, he would be glad to accept a bounty of two cents a pound on the sugar he raised. He wanted, however, to stand upon the same ground with other protected industries.

Gov. Gear—But you don't stand on the same ground with them. You do not produce anything like enough to supply the demands of the country.

Gov. Warmouth—But we did fair to, if we are given the encouragement extended to other industries. What we want is to be let alone. Every year for the past fifteen years, especially in every Democratic Congress, a proposition has been introduced in Congress to put sugar on the free list. The consequence is that capital is afraid to invest, and the progress of the industry is therefore slow.

Mr. Flower—And yet you are worse scared about what this Republican Congress is going to do.

Gov. Warmouth—I am not afraid that this Republican Congress will interfere with any industry of the country.

Mr. Flower—Have you read the Senate bill?

Gov. Warmouth—Oh, that was a Presidential year. [Laughter. The Mills bill was introduced to elect Mr. Cleveland, and I have no doubt that the Senate bill was instrumental in bringing about the election of Mr. Harrison.

Representative Peters of Kansas argued strongly for the retention of the duty on sugar and for a suitable duty on raw silk.

Mr. Seney T. Oxnant of Grand Island, Neb., made an argument in favor of protection to the beet sugar industry, predicting that within twenty years beet root would outstrip the sugar cane and sorghum in the production of sugar.

Prof. Wiley of the Agricultural Department spoke of the importance of fostering and encouraging the sugar industry of the United States. In answer to a question whether he considered the beet or sorghum as the more promising, he said that the beet was, by all means, the most promising. It was beyond the domain of experiment. All that was necessary was for the farmers to grow the beet and for capitalists to establish factories. While he was hopeful of sorghum, he admitted that that problem was a more difficult one.

In secret session the Chairman was instructed to report to-morrow his administrative bill.

CAST OUT THE SCORNER.

Col. Shepard Cites Scripture for His Purpose for Once in a Way.

From THE SUN *of Sunday.*

There was a monkey and parrot time in the business office of the *Mail and Express* at 9¼ o'clock yesterday morning, in the course of which General Manager Frank Gray, a stalwart six footer, administered physical discipline to one of his associates. In other words, there was a scrap, and Mr. O. K. Harroun got licked.

It seems that Col. Shepard engaged Mr. Harroun recently to take a desk in the business office and assume the title of comptroller. The new comptroller began work on Friday. Before the day was over it was apparent to General Manager Gray that he and the comptroller held different notions as to the work in hand and as to their respective authority. Not far along in the day Mr. Harroun overestimated his importance and authority.

When Mr. Harroun arrived at the office yesterday morning, Mr. Gray remonstrated with him, and in the course of the gentleman to come to an understanding they came to blows, as a result of which the comptroller was pitched out upon the cold sidewalk by force of arms applied to his collar and the broadest part of his trousers.

Mr. Harroun departed with statements to the effect that he would have Mr. Gray arrested.

From the Mail and Express Yesterday (Amen Corner).

CAST OUT THE SCORNER, AND CONTENTION SHALL GO OUT; YEA STRIFE AND IGNOMINY SHALL CEASE.

From the Mail and Express Editorial Column.

MR. FRANK S. GRAY HAS CEASED TO HAVE ANY connection with the *Mail and Express*.

Mr. Abbey Doubts Our Mary's Engagement.

From the Chicago Tribune.

"I don't believe there is a word of truth in it," said Mr. Abbey, speaking of the reported engagement of Mary Anderson to Antonio Navarro. "Such reports have been circulated time and again. If Mary Anderson had any intention of retiring from the stage I certainly should know something of it. She is under contract to me to play next season, and I know of nothing but illness that can prevent it. The contract was for this season. She was too ill to play and I filled the dates I had made for her with the Gaiety Company. The same contract is now in force covering next season, and I certainly have every reason to believe that she will keep her part of it. She is now booked for the full season."

Patti's Confession.

From the Chicago Tribune.

The girls came out first dressed like a troop of Athenian maidens in flowing drapery. During the applause Mme. Patti confided a bit of interesting information.

"They are wonderfully supple," she said. "They wear no corsets, do they?"

"No, ma'am," replied Mr. Kayzer, with a faint blush.

"Well," the madame went on, "that is all good for those young girls, but when one is as fat as I am one has to wear 'em."

A Touching Reunion.

Poet—Well, what do you want, calling me up at this time of night?

Poem—I am one of your poems.

Poet—Oh, no, you're not. I never saw you before.

Poem—Really, sir, I am. I'm "Springtime, do not Daily on the Way." You wrote me last year.

Poet—Yes? What has changed you so?

Poem—Alas! I have been copied by all the country papers on the continent. I could not help it. It is they who have brought me to this low estate.

Poet—Poor fellow! You have suffered. Come in. You shall have the best waste basket in the house. My long-lost offspring, enter.

Teaching the Boy.

"Now, Johnny, in writing a letter put the date first. Go to the blackboard. Now write as I tell you. 'New York—January—you haven't spelled January right, John—only one n; yes, that's right. January fifth—Eighteen eighty-nine—there you are. Now what do you do next?'

"Rub out the 1889 and put 1890 instead."

True to His Oath.

"Tar me, but do not feather me," cried the Oklahoma man.

"Why not?"

"I belong to the Audubon Society."

An Evergreen Chestnut.

"Didn't she look spruce in her furs?"

"Very—and what a fine balsam bough she gave you as she passed."

Missed a Good Chance.

Kind Gentleman (picking up boy)—That was an awful hard fall, my young man. Why didn't you cry?

Small Boy—I didn't know anybody was looking.

LETTERS ON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS.

What Jefferson Davis was Indicted For.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I yesterday wrote you a short screed about Jefferson Davis's treatment of his bondsmen, dated at Belleville.

Let me add that Jefferson Davis was captured in Georgia on the 10th of May, 1865. Not long afterward, in that same year, if I am not mistaken, he was indicted in the District of Columbia for the crime of high treason, it being at first held by some public men that the Commander-in-Chief of the rebel armies was constructively present with all the insurgents who prosecuted war in the Northern States and in the District of Columbia; but, as a matter of fact, Davis had not committed high treason in the District of Columbia, and the doctrine of constructive treason was abandoned by the Government, and it was advised that he should be indicted in Virginia, which was done at the May, 1866, term of the District Court of the United States at Richmond.

The indictment was made under the act of Congress of July 17, 1862, and was not for high treason, but was for levying and carrying on war against the United States. Justice Stephen J. Field, in the Chapman case, determined at San Francisco, held that participation in the rebellion after the passage of that act was punishable with a fine of $10,000, or by imprisonment for ten years, or both.

Hence it was that if Davis had been convicted under the indictment he might have been fined $10,000, or imprisoned for ten years, or both; a preposterous punishment in any view of the case. J. W. S.

810 WALNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 2.

The Rapid Transit Cable Company.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* As a few articles recently published in the newspapers, referring to the Rapid Transit Cable Company, might convey an incorrect idea of the object of the company, I trust it may be agreeable for you to give this communication the space in your journal that is necessary to preclude this possibility.

We are not incorporated under the General Railroad Laws of the State of New York, but under "The General Manufacturing Act," for the purpose of manufacturing, selling, and letting devices in a cable traction system for operating elevated, surface, and underground railways.

Sequent to the completion of this system, which would eliminate the great objection to the existing elevated and underground railways—the steam locomotive with its noise, fire smoke, and cinders—its merits have been discussed and recognized by many large property owners and those who have a special interest in the subject of city transit, and their opinion is most important to us, as we believe no plan for city transit could or should be contemplated that would not be acceptable to those who are legislating for the public's welfare, and without prejudice to interests of property holders. Thus it will be seen that, while it is within our province to assist to the adoption of an improved method of operating city railways, it does not come within the scope of our charter to construct them.

As to the implied connection of our company with the Manhattan Railway Company, I can only account for the same by a failure to discriminate between a representative and the personal interest which two or three associated with that company hold in ours, and which in no way influences the management of our own affairs. CONSTITUS TIBBS, President.

Kunker Pot.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I notice in THE SUNDAY SUN, page 22, in "Odd Yankee Local Names," in the fifteenth paragraph, to wit: "There is a place in New Marlborough called Kunker Pot. This is said to be an Indian name, but inquiry fails to reveal what it signifies." If you will accept the true explanation, here it is

The New England Indians were subdivided into small tribes, and many were baptized and converted sufficiently to make good (fairly good) servants and slaves. They got family names and tribal residences. Kon Ka Pot was the name bestowed upon the Stockbridge Indians, hence the corruption to Kunker Pot. This family of Kon Ka Pots were connected with the Delawares or Lenni Lenapes. In interchange of visits numbers of this family always made a resting place at the Great Meadows, Warren county, N. J., and were made welcome by my wife's grandfather, Daniel Vielt. My mother-in-law has told me often of them. This Stockbridge tribe was removed by the United States Government in 1856, to a reservation near Green Bay, Wisconsin, and the name can be found there yet. E. J. P.

That Fine Theological Question.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The letter of "Lex," under the above caption in a recent issue of THE SUN, is a somewhat nebulous commentary on Mgr. O'Reilly's unassailable explication of beatification. It tends to befog a singularly lucid statement. The word "enjoin" expresses with exactitude the precise nature of the pontifical act of beatification, or even its complement—that of canonization.

In formally sanctioning the public *culte* of a given saint, the See of St. Peter, whereunto that function has for many centuries been exclusively reserved, does assuredly enjoin the organic body of Catholics universally that the particular servant of God in question is henceforth entitled to honor and reverence; that all Catholics may safely tender such honor and reverence, and that no true Catholic may impeach their right to tender such homage, known as *dulia*, in contradistinction to *latria*, the supreme worship paid unto God alone. If I may offer this inferior culte to a given saint, and if you may not impugn or traverse my action, am not I protected in my right, and are not you enjoined against controverting my right? If this be so, does not your "fine theological question" forthwith dissolve itself into vapor? By beatification loyal catholics are juridically reassured as to that which in all good faith may without hesitancy be done; while their adversaries, whether within or without the organic unity of the Church, are officially advised as to that which may not without senseless and perilous temerity be seriously gainsaid.

Obviously the writer's misconception of the situation arose from his having mistaken the idiomatic sense of the term "enjoin." It does not normally mean a peremptory mandate of positive-negative force, i. e. binding under sin Catholics, one and all, in every variety of time, place, and circumstances. Beatification enjoins finality upon a momentous question, which had hitherto been fluctuating in the whirling eddies of elaborate debate and exhaustive investigation. The ultimatum is a directive authorization of the final judgment reached on the subject matter at issue, sounding the knell of legitimate controversy, and relegating the matter once for all in the category *res judicata*. (It is the theological analogue to the familiar extinguisher of the logicians in philosophic argumentation—*caput quæstio*.

If in a beautiful garden you admire one or more flowers, which your sight or smell so gratefully appreciate that you call them "my flowers," you do not feel authorized to dictate to other visitors, depreciate their flowers, and ventilate crude theories *de connubiis floarum*, which upset the whole Linnæan theory and all known systems of artificial botany. Now the titanic and Gyptic of the saints are the gardens of the Church, open to all the sons of men. You can admire and choose ad libitum; but to plant a bud or root therein is a privilege reserved to the Pope. On any such bud, once planted, it is not competent to any Catholic to offer adverse criticism, because beatification has enjoined him not to do. If you praise the garden, so much the better for yourself, and vice versa. But if you and this entire sublunary planet should go topsy turvy it matters nothing.

Neither does it matter a little how this may suit the caprice of the Jesuits, irreverently introduced by "Lex," or of the street arab