The Sun.

SUNDAY, MARCH 27, 1892.

Subscription by Mail—Post-paid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70
WEEKLY, Per Year	1 00

Postage to Foreign Countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

No More Rotten Borough States.

Twenty-eight years have passed since Nevada in 1864 was admitted into the Union. The nature of this transaction is shown by the fact that at the census of 1860 the Territory had contained only 6,857 people, while in the Apportionment act of 1863 the number fixed upon for a Representative in Congress had been 127,391. The following census, that of 1870, gave Nevada 42,491 people; but this was still less than one-third of the Representative apportionment based upon that census. Her high-water census mark was achieved ten years later, in 1880, when her population reached 62,266, while the apportionment for Congress based on that census was 151,911. Since that time the Sage Brush State, in a reversal of all precedents at the West, has actually lost population, so that its total for 1890 was only 45,761, whereas the apportionment for Representatives based on that census has increased to 173,901. Nevada, with fewer people to-day than any Territory except Alaska, and with scarcely more than one-fourth of the number fixed by the latest Representative apportionment, for more than a quarter of a century has had not only its member of Congress, but as large a vote in the Senate as New York or Pennsylvania.

No other instance in the history of our admissions of Territories is quite so broad as this of Nevada, but there are approximations to it. In 1889 acts were rushed through Congress for the admission of Idaho and Wyoming without waiting to hear the results of the current census. When, shortly afterward, the enumeration was made known, it was found that Idaho had only 84,385 people, and Wyoming only 60,705. Under the existing Apportionment act, that of 1883, the number necessary for a Representative was 151,911, so that these two States combined did not have enough people to reach this standard. And yet at the same time Congress rejected New Mexico, although the census of 1890 showed that it contained 153,593 people, or more than Idaho and Wyoming combined, and more than the then prevailing apportionment.

What we see, therefore, is the combined population of three States, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming, amounting to only 190,851 by the census of 1890, on which the apportionment for a single Representative is 173,901. They actually have three Representatives and six Senators, so that they might, in a closely divided Senate, control the legislation of the whole country.

Other examples could be cited on this subject, fortunately less flagrant, and yet suggestive. Montana has been previously admitted on a population which in 1890 amounted to 132,159, or more than 40,000 below the new ratio for a Representative. When Dakota applied for admission, it was at first proposed to take her as a single State; but the act as afterward passed separated from the populous southern part the less settled North Dakota, which in 1890 showed only 182,119 people.

Considerations like these have suggested whether, in the projects now pending for admitting new Territories, some old blunders may not be repaired. Utah has now three different schemes before Congress: one for admitting her as a State; a second for continuing her in her present condition, although she had by the census of 1890 a population of 207,905, or more than enough to entitle her to admission; a third to give her a special kind of home rule new in our political system. The question has been raised whether it would not be better than any of these plans to divide this Territory, adding the western portion to Nevada and the eastern to Colorado. If the line adopted for this purpose should be the western boundary of Wyoming, continued southward to Arizona, a population could be added to Nevada large enough to remove the standing reproach upon the latter as a State unduly represented in Congress. Nevada would then have nearly a quarter of a million of people. At the same time the Mormon problem might find a solution on the foundation of the Constitution and laws of Nevada, and through the ability of the combined Gentile populations of the new and old portions of the State effectually to suppress polygamy.

It has been suggested further that, with a view to admitting Arizona, and yet not creating another rotten borough State, it should be rejoined to New Mexico, the two entering the Union as a single State. Their common origin and history, their similarities in population, climate, soil, resources, and other respects, would make such a union less difficult to bring about. Arizona, with its population of 59,620 in 1890, may long have a hard task to secure admission alone; but the two neighbors combined would enter as a strong State, having upward of 213,000 people in 1890 and many more to-day. A map in another column will show how it would also be possible, if desirable, to equalize more nearly the areas of the three adjoining States, as thus reconstituted, by taking a strip from the northern border of New Mexico and Arizona.

The great point is to prevent any more abuses of the system of admitting Territories into the Union. It used to be held that, with the great growth of the country to rely on, an evil of that sort would soon remedy itself, and a weak newcomer grow strong. But the history of Nevada for the last twenty years has destroyed that theory, and has shown that past blunders must not be repeated.

Will Making.

Many persons look upon the making of their wills as a proceeding not only of almost terrible solemnity in itself, but also as a special invitation to death. They put off making their wills as long as possible; sometimes they do not make them at all, dying intestate; when they do make them they assume preternatural gravity, talk in hushed whispers as if in the presence of death; and generally comport themselves as if, persuading themselves that their carelessness prevented their proceedings from being known, they could keep them secret from Death, and so not invite that impartial visitor to pay his unwelcome call. When the will is drawn up and signed they hide it away, and look mysteriously uncomfortable whenever will making is mentioned.

Yet it were better that they should draw their wills. To do so is not so serious, and most certainly it does not bring Death one instant nearer; in fact, it seems almost as if delay in making one's will, rather than making it, invited Death to come. Every one is familiar with novels, the plots of which turn on the final signing of a will by a dying person, or on the death of a person before the will could be signed. Some persons know of such cases in real life.

Here is a case in real life: A woman of wealth married a man as his second wife, and died leaving an only daughter. She left no will, so that her property went in time to that daughter. But the daughter died unmarried and under age, and her property went to her half brother, the son of her father by his first wife. The intentions of the mother had been that the property, in such a case as actually happened, should go to her sister, who was in actual need. As it was, the property passed to an outsider, who had no moral right to it and did not need it.

Of course wills are broken by the courts, but the wills that are not broken outnumber those that are by hundreds to one. We hear nothing of the wills that pass the probate clerk, but only of those that reach the Surrogate's Court. The average will is simple; if the testator would remember in his will only those whom he remembered in daily life, there would be little trouble with wills. To make one's will is a duty every one who has any property to dispose of owes to his relatives.

The Speedway and the Park.

Since the Board of Park Commissioners has decided that the new road proposed for the Central Park in what is now known as the Speedway Law shall not be built, let us consider the subject further, full as it is of still unexhausted interest.

In the first place, we desire to protest against the unwarranted vituperation which has been launched at the heads of those immediately responsible for the law by critics who have considered the æsthetic aspect of the project solely. It has been favored by many of the most respected, most public spirited, and most valuable citizens of the metropolis. Their recreation is directly associated with a great and important interest, which to every true American should be a source of national pride and satisfaction, the breeding of the American trotter. Their use of the trotter is not only full of satisfaction and exhilaration to themselves, but is delightful to others to see. It is a genuine pleasure in itself, of a peculiar value for sustaining a man's power to work and do business; and it is a dull and careless mind which does not appreciate the sight of the marvellous and beautiful development in equine motion illustrated in the trotter's gait. The natural disposition of any American community must be to provide for the daily metropolitan use of trotting horses all the facilities possible within the lines of reason comprehending the public interest at every point. The present generation of road drivers, as they are known, have seen the days when the old Harlem Lane was the stretch where they could let their horses step to the full limit of speed, and brush without restraint with the next fellow who came up alongside. Then the fun had to be transferred across the Harlem River to Jerome avenue, and there it flourished without interference or diminution until in an ill-judged moment a number of the most influential horsemen conceived the idea of establishing a special club at Fleetwood Park. This drew the great body of them away from the accustomed road. Jerome avenue ceased to be fashionable and the sport on it died. Since then they have cherished the idea of a drive such as was contemplated by the Speedway law. That was intended to give them precisely the ground for using their animals that they once had on Harlem Lane, and later on Jerome avenue.

It must be said here plainly that this notion was accompanied with little understanding of what the Central Park was intended to be or what it is in fact; and from this arose the great mistake. These gentlemen wanted to put on one side of the Central Park a road which should be wide and straight and soft, designed for their special accommodation, and comparatively useless in muddy weather, and, as such a proposition could not be entertained by any Board of Commissioners comprehending their trust, the drivers went to the Legislature, and there succeeded in getting a bill put through, intended beyond question to compel the Board of Park Commissioners to build such a road as they desired. There are two ways to make roads in our parks. One is for the Park Commissioners to make them. Their power in that respect is unrestricted so long as the Board of Estimate and Apportionment will appropriate money for their purpose. Roads made under these auspices will always be conceived and executed in the spirit and under the influence of men who make parks. The other way is to go to Albany and get the Legislature to drive a road through by enactment in accord with plans not submitted to the functionaries primarily charged with the regulation of the parks. This was the method selected, and it involved a proposition too monstrous to be tolerated by any intelligent community with a disposition to control its own affairs. If such a road as was proposed in the Speedway law were an imperative necessity, that would be another question; but if it were brought to a landscape architect on the strength of a plea for greater and better driving facilities, no expert of that sort would consider it for a second. It would be repulsive both to the sentiment and the learning of his profession.

Since this bill has been discussed in the Park Board, the attitude of the road drivers has been changed to one of request for better and more exclusive facilities for driving, with great stress laid upon the need of better protection against danger. They point to one year's record of accidents upon the East and West drives and the bridle paths contiguous thereto, which was last week submitted to the Park Board's consideration, as powerful evidence in their favor. Let us examine these accidents a little. The West side of the Park shows 126 such accidents against 117 on the East side, although the East side is known to be much more thickly frequented by vehicles than the West; and yet see the analysis. Of these 117 cases on the East drive there were:

Runaway wagons, no damage	21
Runaway wagons, damage	10
Runaway carriages, no damage	11
Runaway carriages, damage	3
Collisions, damage	29
Collisions, no damage	10
Runaways with collisions, no damage	1
Runaways with collisions, damage	4
Collisions between bicycles and vehicles	4

The collisions with bicycles produced a single injury and that was to the bicyclist. The saddle-horse accidents, of which the great majority were not on the drive proper, but on the bridle path near the drive, are:

Runaway saddle horses, no damage	16
Runaway saddle horses, damage	3

There were also four cases of "unmanageable" horses resulting in no damage, and one case of a horse frightened by a bicycle, with no damage.

The West side drive showed this record of affairs:

Runaway wagons, no damage	11
Runaway carriages, no damage	5
Runaway carriages, damage	4
Collisions, no damage	4
Collisions, damage	11
Runaways with collision, no damage	1
Runaways with collision, damage	1

The saddle-horse accidents were:

Runaways, no damage	47
Runaway, damage	1
Collisions	2
Saddle horses colliding with vehicles	8

Then there were three cases of "unmanageable" horses; one Park service horse ran away; one wheel came off; there was one simple collision between a bicycle and a vehicle; one police horse was frightened by a bicycle and knocked a boy down, and there was a collision between a runaway horse and a bicycle, in which the machine was broken.

On the East drive the runaways resulted in one case of personal injury. On the West drive, although the runaways showed six cases of riders thrown out of vehicles, there were four cases of personal injury, of which one is described as serious.

Collisions, however, are the only real test of need for more road space. Although the total accidents described stand 126 to 117 for the West and East drives, respectively, the collisions on the West drive show only 15 to 39 for the East drive. It would be better, no doubt, if the roads were larger everywhere, but in the light of the foregoing figures it can scarcely be said that there is any special need for enlarging the West drive. This is a subject, however which is at present under investigation by the Board of Park Commissioners.

The gentlemen anxious for more and different driving facilities in the Central Park still cling to the thought of a third road of some sort being built, and thereby they present a radically new proposition in the arrangement of parks. The idea of making a system of parallel roads close together is altogether novel. The space now intervening between the West drive and the Eighth avenue may be called the foundation course of the Park's west side. It constitutes the West side drive, a distinct portion of the Park, instead of revealing its line as a somewhat rural extension of the city. To destroy this border except for some extraordinary and otherwise unsatisfiable need is out of the question. The continued demand for a third road, hard or soft, as the conflicting views of its advocates would now permit it to be, is merely the survival of the old desire for a special, particular, and uninterrupted road for speeding trotting horses in the Central Park, and it is nothing else.

It should be abandoned altogether, and the effort recommenced to get a speedway, for surely such a thing should exist within reach of the great body of citizens who love to use the trotter, in some spot where the whole community will be glad to see it, and which can have the sanction and support of the most comprehending judgment and of the most elevated art.

Puritans and Mormons.

The President of Harvard College was in Salt Lake City the week before last as the guest of the Board of Education of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; and on the night of March 17 he made an address to some 7,000 people in the Tabernacle. This address, if we may judge from such reports of it as we have seen, contained much molasses for Mormons. At any rate it has made the Utah Gentiles to steam with fury. According to the report in the *Salt Lake Tribune*, Dr. ELIOT began with a comparison of the Mormons and the Pilgrim Fathers. "As I came over the plains," he is reported to have said, "I thought of that early journey when the first colonists marched under the guidance of a Christian Church, and this reminded me of another pilgrimage, though across the water. I refer to the Pilgrim Fathers. They, too, went a long way to escape persecution; they, too, suffered hardship for a principle; they, too, were fired with religious enthusiasm, and sought freedom to worship GOD." Dr. ELIOT went on to make a plea for religious liberty in Utah. President WOODRUFF and various Apostles thanked the speaker warmly. A correspondent of the *Boston News*, a publication not devoid of imagination, avers that a Harvard graduate in the audience said that "unless some one builds a fence around ELIOT and coops him in, he will knock Sheol out of Harvard;" but this is probably to be classed with the speeches which the ancient historians were so fond of putting into the mouths of their readers. Other Gentiles are reported to have suggested that Dr. ELIOT had been bribed or had softening of the brain. The *Salt Lake Tribune* told him that he had made "an egregious idiot of himself," and "given away the fact that the mistake was made when he was given any education at all." The same journal said in reply to Mormon papers which had rebuked it for attacking President ELIOT:

"The Mormon press affects to be very much incensed because the *Tribune* two days ago spoke of President ELIOT of Harvard College as he deserved to be. The *News* intimates that the cause of the article was due to the fact that President ELIOT, when he came here, made the Saints his associates. A great many other gentlemen have done the same thing, and they have received no chastisement at the hands of the *Tribune*. What we said was because President ELIOT disgraced himself and disgraced the country he came from, by his speech in the Tabernacle. The whole burden of it was to show that this people had suffered many woes because of their religious faith and because of the persecutions of the Government of the United States. Comparing the Puritans to the Saints, he said: 'They, too, crossed the wilderness, the wilderness of the sea; they, too, sought freedom to worship God; they, too, fought to subdue the wilderness.'

"That places the people of Ohio, of Missouri, of Illinois, in the same category with the brutal Englishmen who first drove the Puritans to Holland; it makes the coming of the Mormons here a parallel case to the coming of the Puritans to New England; and draws around the Mormon people, who came here solely to be a law unto themselves, an air of sanctity.

"Again, after saying: 'They came here in the finest spirit in the hope of worshipping God according to their consciences,' he declares that 'here has already arisen the question of religious liberty.' Then he proceeds further to state what religious liberty means in Massachusetts, and carries the idea all through that some of the blessings which the churches enjoy in Massachusetts, are denied to certain religionists here; and that 'in Massachusetts there is a protection to schools which is denied the schools of this Territory.'

"His speech all the way through was a direct insult to the Government of the United States, and to the true men here who have been trying through the years to build up an American community; and instead of a certain sanctity surrounding this man because he is President of Harvard College, he deserves excoriation infinitely more on that account, because he has no business, occupying that position, to come here and make misstatements and to draw false and dishonorable conclusions. It would be easy to enlarge upon what we said before, and he would deserve it all. It is not the first time he has made a fool of himself."

We think that President ELIOT has a certain tendency, not uncommon in New England, to instruct persons who have passed the school age as to their duties; and in his peregrinations through the country he is sometimes a little unfortunate in his choice of subjects. But we are not at all sure that his comparison of the Mormons with the Pilgrims is not fair. Neither the Mormons nor the people of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay had the slightest idea of religious liberty. The emigrants to Massachusetts came to a new country for the purpose of worshipping GOD in their own manner, and raising thunder with any other form of worship. Financial and other crookedness was at the bottom of the Mormon emigration from Missouri to Illinois, but the indignation created by the polygamous practices then beginning among the Mormons, drove the colony westward, and there a theocracy was founded just as a theocracy had been founded in Massachusetts two hundred years before. Polygamy is a return to barbarism; but which is the more harmful to society, the polygamy sincerely believed in as a religious institution by the ignorant converts to Mormonism, or the consecutive polygamy practised by so many of the intelligent inhabitants of divorceful Massachusetts? The Mormon emigrants are thrifty, industrious, close, and forehanded like the New Englanders. In a general way, taking into consideration events and not individuals, and remembering that polygamy as practised by sincere Mormons, must be considered as a religious tenet, an article of faith, President ELIOT's comparison wasn't the least apposite that could have been made. The fatal weakness was in assuming that it was in illustration of religious liberty. Both the Mormons and the founders of New England were exemplars of religious despotism.

As for President ELIOT's remarks being "a direct insult to the Government of the United States," it is proper to say that very grave doubt has existed in minds to which the peculiar institution of the Mormons is as repulsive as it can be to the most zealous Gentile in Salt Lake City, as to the justifiability of the means resorted to for breaking the Mormon power. It is possible to be on the Gentile side without approving all the measures that have been taken; and it is also possible to believe that time and intelligence, and not a stretching of the authority of the Government, are the one effective way of dealing with Mormonism. President ELIOT saw, or thought he saw, that Utah was a community divided into hostile camps; and if he has made the Gentiles more furious than ever, he has only had the ordinary luck of people who touch upon ticklish subjects. In any case, we advise the Salt Lake Gentiles to spare him. Wait until he gets home, and hears from the descendants of the Pilgrims and the Puritans. There is a certain chapter in Job which will represent his sentiments when he returns to Cambridge, unless he can demonstrate that his plea in the Tabernacle of the Mormons has been garbled. "What, JOE SMITH and the sainted ROBINSON? BRIGHAM YOUNG and JOHN WINTHROP?" We already hear the accusing voices. There is an increasing area of cloudiness in Plymouth county and Suffolk county, and the eye of the Tutelar Codfish is a ruby. The chortling in Salt Lake is nothing to the chortling that will be heard in Boston.

And yet Dr. ELIOT had a good Yankee eye for business. His speech to the Harvard men of Denver contained this passage:

"We have had an accession to Cambridge in the shape of a Mormon colony. It is an excellent institution and a very desirable one. There are ten Mormons now attending the university and the preparatory schools in the neighborhood. I have been invited to be the guest of the Latter Day Saints during my stay in Utah. The nationality of Harvard becomes wider and wider each year."

It seems that there are a number of Mormon students at Cambridge, and others at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston. Our esteemed contemporary, the *Boston Journal*, has interviewed some of them, and they all say that Dr. ELIOT is a gentleman and a scholar. "President ELIOT came to me," says a Harvard Mormon, a former professor in Brigham Young College, "before his departure for the West, and inquired about my people, the schools, the great canals, the educational system, and other features, and spoke of his intention to stop at Salt Lake." The need of that visit may be judged from these assertions made by a correspondent of the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

"President ELIOT might with propriety have prefaced his address at the Tabernacle the other evening with a brief sketch of Harvard College. A representative Mormon and a man high up in the Church, on returning from the gathering at the Tabernacle, in comment upon President ELIOT's remarks, asked where Harvard College was. He said he had never heard of the school before. He lamented the fact that in the announcement of the address, made in the Tabernacle on Sunday, it had not been more fully explained; for he knew that ninety-nine out of one hundred of the people there, and even ANGUS CANNON himself, had never heard of Harvard or President ELIOT before."

Well, they've heard of him now. Advertising pays. He can't look for much Gentile trade from Salt Lake City at present, but the Mormons ought to stand by the Puritans, and his success in attracting students is well known. The Mormon colony at Harvard may grow so that the students of the university will have to be divided into Gentiles and Mormons, just as the students of the old University of Paris used to be divided into nations. We hope that the study of consecutive polygamy will open the eyes of the Harvard Mormons to the evils of simultaneous polygamy.

The Obligations of Honor.

The discussion of the obligations of honor among gentlemen, now going on as a consequence of the DRAYTON and BORROWE controversy, is a far better way of settling the important and delicate questions involved than an old-fashioned duel would have been. In these days the duel has lost its heroic character in the opinion of mankind, but the sentiment of honor to which it owed its origin still remains; and the welfare of society requires that the feeling shall be conserved in all its essential delicacy.

Honor is the sentiment of self-respect. It is the higher and unwritten law which is more binding on the consciences of men than the legal requirements of the State. It is of a distinctly religious character, its essence being the obligation to follow right and truth for themselves, and not simply because of any human penalties for their infraction. It regards the spirit rather than the letter of the law; and it establishes an ideal standard of duty by which the individual measures himself and his fellows.

This sentiment of honor already prevails in the world, and by it alone the world will be governed when the golden age of the millennium comes. Its requirements will be the only statutes of the perfect society of which we dream. All men will do right simply because it is right. Even now the order of society depends on the obedience of its members to this principle. Without it the whole business of the world would be thrown into confusion. It is the basis of the confidence that makes possible the dealings between men. They could not go on with any safety without a feeling of mutual trustfulness. The laws for the collection of debts would not avail for the protection of creditors, if by them alone men were held up to their obligation to keep their promises. Oaths and bonds are not sufficient substitutes for confidence in the honor of men. Society could not hold together if there was not this trust, if the sole safeguard was in the enforcement of the penalties of the law. Nobody's property could be made secure if the only deterrent from thievery were fear of legal punishment.

The question at issue between Mr. DRAYTON and Mr. BORROWE, therefore, concerns a fundamental principle of society, which cannot be settled by a mere duel between the men. It must be decided on its merits and by society itself. If the honor of either has been assailed, it can be vindicated by society only and not by the individual himself; and if dishonor belongs to either, upon the head of which it shall lie will be determined by public opinion and not by the outcome of a personal combat.

The original issue between the two men has been superseded by another which is wholly apart from it, and touches a question of honor purely and altogether outside of mere immorality. It is whether confidence has been betrayed, and not whether marital rights have been invaded. The original ground of dispute has disappeared, and in its place comes up the new question whether honorable obligations have been fulfilled. The subject for discussion accordingly has been put on a higher elevation.

Moreover, the law of the State provides no remedy in damages and no penalties of any kind which meet such a case. The judgment can be rendered and the punishment administered by public opinion only. The court of honor, before which the case must be tried, is all society. By whom confidence has been betrayed is the question for decision. That it has been betrayed is indisputable. As to that there is no disagreement.

The question of fact must be decided, and meanwhile the discussion of the general subject to which it has given rise should go on. Thus an affair so wretched in its beginning may be made in its end to furnish lessons profitable for the public. Sensitiveness to the obligations of honor affords the best test of the moral soundness, and the truest measure of the moral elevation of an individual or a society.

THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

Labor Organizations Advocate the Bill to Keep Out Improper Immigrants.

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Representatives of several organizations who have given the immigration question a careful study appeared before the Senate and House Committees on Immigration in joint session to-day and advocated the bill of Representative Stone of Pennsylvania to restrict improper immigration into the United States. They were O. R. Cochran of Alleghany, Pa., President of the Junior Order United Association of Mechanics; John P. Eberhardt, President of the Window Glass Workers' Association of America; John D. Carey of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, and A. D. Wilkins of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics.

Representative Stone said that the State Department should have supervision over immigrants, instead of the Treasury Department, and that the United States officers on the other side of the water should examine immigrants to ascertain the fitness and condition of persons intending to migrate to the United States. It was the pauper criminal and those who would organize secret associations at which the bill was aimed. He was opposed to placing any power in the hands of the steamship companies in handling immigrants. In his opinion the present manner of examining immigrants on this side of the water was utterly incomplete and useless. It was impossible to properly tell whether an immigrant landing here was a convict in his native country, or who were the desirable and who the undesirable.

Mr. Eberhardt said that the foreigners and their immediate offspring now in this country numbered 21,500,000, equal to the population of the countries of Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and Sweden. In New York city, eight out of every ten persons were foreigners. Out of the 700,000 immigrants landed last year the greater portion were of the lowest class and furnished material for criminality. If the immigrants would speak the truth, the present law would be sufficient to carry into effect its purpose. He had been assisted in examining immigrants at the New York Barge Office, and those who came here under contract to work, were posted as to what answer they should give to questions. He cited an instance where a Belgian immigrant landed and had a ticket for a small isolated town in Connecticut. When asked how he heard of the town, the immigrant said that there was an industry at the place with which he was familiar and he was going there to work. The immigrant had never heard of Philadelphia.

O. R. Cochran said that his association was opposed to the admission of immigrants who were morally unfit for citizenship, and the association endorsed and approved Mr. Stone's bill, which came nearer suiting the people than any other measure. Mr. Cochran favored the examination of immigrants on the other side of the water, and said that it was but perfectly natural for the heads of countries abroad to give certificates of character to the bad class of their people and keep the better element at home. One essential point, said Mr. Cochran, would be to require every immigrant to furnish proof that he had sufficient means for a livelihood for at least six months.

Mr. Cochran called attention to a section of the bill providing an inspection of immigrants by United States officers abroad thirty days before sailing, and urged that it should be changed to ninety days. It was suggested that certificates of identification might fail in the purpose of identifying the immigrants on this side as having passed the examination abroad, and a German editor of a Washington weekly, who was present and opposed the measure, incidentally remarked that photographs of persons could be furnished the Government officer on this side for further identification.

Assistant Secretary Nettleton to-day directed Commissioner Weber at New York to permit the landing, subject to future examination, of the forty immigrants debarred from landing by Deputy Commissioner O'Beirne because they did not have at least $10 each and a ticket to destination.

PRESIDENT ELIOT EXPLAINS.

He Does Not Uphold Mormonism or Polygamy, but Pleads for Religious Freedom.

SAN FRANCISCO, March 26.—President Eliot saw the despatches from the East concerning the agitation caused by his address to the Mormons. When asked if the report of his speech was authentic he said that the account of his remarks was made up of disconnected sentences from the speech which he actually delivered. He received a despatch from a Boston newspaper last night asking him about the speech as reported in the Salt Lake *Tribune*, which was a less condensed report than that contained in the despatch which created the alarm.

"My position briefly," he said, "was this: The Mormons are no longer violating the law by practising polygamy. Therefore they stand in precisely the same position under the law as those who worship according to any faith. It does not follow that I believe in their religion when I say they should have the same rights as other religions. I am not a Roman Catholic, for example, but I would not deny the Roman Catholics or any other sect their rights. The Mormons have fully and sincerely abandoned polygamy. That was all in their religion which violates the law, and since they have abandoned it they should be placed upon the same footing as other faiths. Polygamy is no more an issue in Utah to-day than is the bloody shirt in national politics."

Dr. Parkhurst's Detective Efforts.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: THE SUN makes a true remark when it says that even if Dr. Parkhurst succeeds by his detective efforts in shutting up the particular resorts of vice visited by him he will have "simply scattered a few of the sinners to pursue their evil courses elsewhere."

The experience of those who have studied the effort made in past years to eradicate such resorts in certain neighborhoods of the town has demonstrated that the effort was actually harmful to the morality of the community. In every instance it has merely resulted in scattering the vicious among flats in districts that previously had not suffered the taint of their presence. Owners of real estate, physicians, ministers, and those who have been interested in such efforts at reformation will confirm this disheartening truth.

The very latest previous effort to rid the community of certain resorts of an immoral character simply resulted in driving the disreputable characters over to Brooklyn, and now they infest the neighborhoods around the bridge. This is a fact known to observers for weeks past.

ARGUS.

New York, March 26.

Talmage, That's All.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In a sermon preached last Sunday by Bro. Talmage, and published by a syndicate of newspapers, we find the following remarkable statement: "Alexander the Great, after his death, remained unburied thirty days, because no one would do the honor to shovel him under." Is this an interpolation of the genial reporter, or a recent discovery of the higher criticism, or history forgotten by the general reader, or blooming mendacity, or what?

GENEVA, O., March 22. S. M. WILKESON.

SHOOTING UNDER WATER.

Interesting Experiments to Test the Submarine Ordnance and Projectiles of Whose Success Ericsson was Confident.

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Two important series of trials of sub-aquatic projectiles, one undertaken by the navy and the other by the army, are now at hand.

The torpedo boat Destroyer, built for Capt. Ericsson to carry his submarine gun, was towed the other day by the Nina from the Erie basin to the Brooklyn yard, where she will have the long expected test of her offensive power. For this purpose she is put into the timber dry dock, which, when flooded, will furnish a novel appliance and scene for her performances.

The theory of the submarine gun, as originally designed by Ericsson, was that the most effective way to attack an ironclad, in harbor defence, is to strike it below the belt. As is well known, the heavy protective plates which the big fighting ships carry form only a zone around the hull a few feet in breadth above and below the water line. The belt is only carried as far below as is necessary for contending with another vessel or with a fort, and it is also usually thinner forward and aft than amidships, or, perhaps, is wholly confined to the latter region, so as to be thicker over the vital parts. Ericsson accordingly proposed to fire a heavy charge of gun cotton or other high explosive from a tube fixed about ten feet below the surface, which would bring it beneath the armor of an ordinary cruiser.

The first question to suggest itself was, of course, the method of keeping water out of such a sub-surface gun. Naturally, for cruising, and whenever the gun is not in use, there must be a fixed plug or valve at the mouth of the tube, but that is only a part of the device necessary. Besides the outer and permanent valve, raised in firing, Ericsson devised a thin inner valve to stop the water from rushing in, and yet capable of being broken by the projectile in going out. This being accomplished, the next necessity was to guard against having the firing pin of the percussion lock, which ignites the explosive charge of the shell, strike the inner valve so hard as to explode prematurely in the gun. The device employed for this purpose was a spiral spring pressing against a piston connected with the valve, and so graduated as to allow the resistance of the latter to be overcome and yet not to explode the charge. Evidently an inner valve and a piston were to be sacrificed at each shot. On being free from the gun the projectile was to pursue its way through the short range for which it was intended and explode on striking the enemy's hull.

In this country only dummy shells were fired from the Destroyer's gun, Ericsson holding that he ought not to be put to the expense and risk of using loaded projectiles, and the Government declined to accept the invention. Accordingly the device was sent to England. There, in the trial, a couple of dummy projectiles were fired, but did not take the right course, the assertion being made that the water was too shallow. Then a loaded projectile was fired which blew up the gun, the statement of the friends of the weapon being that an improperly constructed detonator, made in England, had been used. After Ericsson's death, some of those associated with him revived the device, and, it was said, developed it in such a way as to give renewed confidence in its ultimate success. Congress, in the act of June 30, 1890, authorized the Navy Department to contract with the Ericsson Coast Defence Company for one 16-inch submarine gun and six steel projectiles, to be placed in position on board the Destroyer for a thorough test of the system. The work under this contract having been greatly delayed by the failure of the sub-contractors to complete the gun, the Ordnance Bureau of the navy undertook it, and presently we shall have the result. The matter was spoken of in Commodore Folger's last report:

A further consideration of the subject of submarine artillery, which has been rendered possible by the approaching completion of the experimental 16-in gun, induces the bureau to the belief that it will prove a valuable and important adjunct to our defensive armament, particularly when mounted on board of vessels intended especially for ramming. It seems probable that the chances of the ram being able to reach her antagonist with destructive effect will be quadrupled by the addition of this weapon to her means of offence.

Quite as interesting in its way may be the trial of the aerial sub-aquatic projectile. This is to be used from land as well as from a vessel, and accordingly is to be tried at Fort Wadsworth under the supervision of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications. The muzzle velocity is described as 548 feet. The projectile is first thrown into the air, and when it strikes the water it is supposed to continue its forward progress beneath the surface. For this purpose it is fitted with an ingenious device, connected with rudders or flps. The course of the projectile, provided that the calculations are correct, should take it against the ironclad at a point below the belt armor, there to be exploded by a percussion cap. The various elements entering into accuracy of fire, taking together the double course through the air and the water, must demand a high degree of ingenuity; but with the success that has attended ordinary torpedo warfare it would be hazardous to say that this ingenuity will not be forthcoming.

THE PROPOSED GOETHE MONUMENT.

How Much Money Did the Kunstlerfest Yield?

Miss Schurz and Mr. Windmoller respectfully submit as the result of the "Kunstlerfest" held in December:

	Receipts.
From 811 tickets of admission	$4,045 00
" 75 boxes, inclusive of extra tickets	3,920 00
" privilege of wardrobe, Thompson & Ball	300 00
" privilege of supper, F. Marest	900 00
" privilege of souvenir, L. A. Jackson	805 00
	$9,970 00

	Expenditures.	
For rent of music hall and incidentals, Morris Reno	$1,359 00	
" scenery to J. H. Young and L. W. Seavey	1,240 00	
" flowers, Siebrecht & Wadleigh	895 00	
" music, Rietzler, C. Ettinger, and O. Young	569 00	
" ballet to Carl Marwig, costumes of Voegtlein, decorations	512 11	
" advertisements, "Meta Volkman"	285 63	
" expenses picture gallery, I. N. Mills, stationery, E. L. Jenkins	318 95	
" unlevra, calcium lights, cartage, postage, &c	428 43	—5,528 17
Net proceeds		$3,841 83
Cash on hand of centennial fund		357 41
Interest		8 74
Total		$4,208 06
Paid centennial deficit, including legal advice		2,143 33
Cash on hand		$2,064 73
Further subscriptions have been received toward the expenses of erecting a monument to Goethe:		
By Mr. Wm. Steinway	$1,000 00	
" " Oswald Ottendorfer	1,000 00	
" " Jacob H. Schiff	100 00	
Total to date	$5,064 73	

Further contributions will be gratefully received.

LOUIS WINDMUELLER, Treasurer.

NEW YORK, March 25, 1892.

As soon as a sufficient amount is secured well-known artists will be asked for designs; the best chosen, the monument will be placed as the Park Commissioners may designate, to form a lasting ornament to the city.

Prosperous Condition of the Clothing Trade.

From the Clothier and Furnisher.

Now that the rush of the spring season is over manufacturers can strike a balance on their stock books. The result is that they find a comparatively small stock on hand. The city business was not particularly brisk, although the sales were steady, but the large trade done on the road has swelled the total to a considerable figure. In fact the trade for this spring has been larger than last year. This means that in spite of the hard-times cry from the South the season has been satisfactory, and the small stocks now on hand will not be slaughtered, as the nearby and city buyers have bought but very little up to date, and by the time their wants are supplied there will be but little left to sell.

Foreign Notes of Real Interest.

In Paris the word which has succeeded to *chic*, *pschutt*, and *fin de siècle* is "Alcoolisme," the effect of France's Russianization.

For the first time in Jewish history the J—ws sang the 100th psalm to the tune of "Old Hundred" at the laying of the corner stone of the Hampstead Synagogue.

In German literary publications during 1891 theology held the first place. Out of 18,875 literary productions, 1,753 belonged to the province of theology, and 1,731 to literature proper (novels, poems, and dramas).

Labouchere says that when he was an attaché at Frankfort, accredited to the Grand Duke of Hesse, he once refused champagne at a state supper. "Take it," said a chamberlain next to him. "If you don't care for it, I will take it. We are only allowed one glass."

Last year Detaille was rejected as a candidate for member of the Academy of Fine Arts for having been among the painters who agreed to exhibit at Berlin. This year the Academy has receded from its former attitude and has elected Detaille as the successor of Meiler. He got 20 votes against 13 for Carolus Duran.

Antoine Juritch, living at Dresnika, is said to be 130 years old. He still works in his vineyard and goes to church every Sunday, although it is a two hours' walk away. His eyes are good, and his eyebrows grow so that they have to be cut to prevent them from obscuring his sight. His mother died at the age of 120, but his father died young.

It is best to break up a catarrhal cold in its early stages by using Dr. D. Jayne's Expectorant, and thereby save yourself much risk and misery.—*Adv.*

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

There is a temporary let-up in the dulness and prosiness that has enveloped society like a London fog since the coming in of Lent. Dinners have become a little less solemn, and occasionally a bon mot is uttered, at which society smiles, grimly perhaps, but with sufficient emphasis to show that it approves.

Mrs. Whitney on Thursday awakened the echoes of her white and gold ballroom with harmonies from Paderewski's magical fingers, which, like the "swan's notes best in dying," seem to grow in force and expression as the time draws near for them to cease. Her dinner of four and twenty, which preceded the entertainment for the Thursday Evening Club, was one of several given the same evening, and, with two theatre parties, interfered seriously with the attendance at the Mi-Careme fête at Sherry's, though nothing could have been prettier than the palms and roses, the ribbon streamers, and the picturesque groupings of growing plants in the old ballroom, where youthful waiter girls in caps and aprons poured tea, ladled punch, and served delicate fees on still more delicate porcelain. The Venetian gondola heaped with flowers, through the windows of which looked Mrs. Van Rensselaer Cruger and Mrs. Elliott Roosevelt, assisted by Miss Grace Potter, Miss Eleanor Duer, and other pretty girls, was so attractive that it ought to have been surrounded by admiring swains, ready to empty their pockets in the cause of charity. But no swains were there, and but few pockets were emptied. Dancing, too, for which the Hungarian band played temptingly, was at a standstill, while Sherry's kitchens and cellars, spacious confectionery and pastry manufactories, and, above all, the steam apparatus from which ice cream was rol