The Sun.

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1892.

City and Country in the Empire State.

There are now thirty-four cities in New York. These thirty-four cities, according to the State census of 1892, contain 3,927,454 inhabitants. The State outside of the cities has a population of only 2,582,708.

This means that of the total population of New York 60.32 per cent. is urban and 39.68 per cent. is rural.

In 1850 there were thirteen cities in New York. These thirteen cities contained 1,549,893 inhabitants. The total population of the State, according to the Federal census of that year, was 3,880,735. The rural population was 2,330,932.

This means that in 1850, of the total population of New York 39.93 per cent. was urban, while 60.07 per cent. was rural.

This remarkable change has occurred during a period of time covered by the memory of men still young. In forty-two years the relative proportions of urban and rural inhabitants have been reversed. The percentage of people dwelling in cities has increased from 39.93 to 60.32. The percentage of people living outside of the cities has fallen from 60.07 to 39.68.

To express the same great and significant change in a different way, the rural population of New York has increased only 251,776, or a little more than a quarter of a million, during the forty-two years. The urban population during the same period has increased 2,377,651, or more than two millions and a quarter; and the urban population alone now exceeds the entire population, both rural and urban, as it was in 1850. In other words, the urban growth has been almost ten times the rural growth in the Empire State since the middle point of the century.

Curious as are the numerical coincidences of the great reversal to which we call attention, they are much less important and impressive than the general indication of drift and tendency, involving important questions of political control.

Will Not Irishmen Unite?

If it be impossible to bring about betimes a complete reunion of the McCarthyite and Parnellite factions, is it not possible to arrange a truce which shall at least prevent a ruinous division of the Irish Nationalist vote at the coming general election? This is a question which the friends of Ireland should ponder in view of certain ominous facts which we now lay before them.

In spite of the great gains made by the Gladstonians in London, the Unionists are looking forward with confidence, and even elation, to the contest for the control of the next House of Commons. There has been in this respect an extraordinary change during the last few months in the tone of their chief speakers and newspaper organs. It is not long since their more candid leaders admitted that a home rule bill for Ireland would pass the Lower House of the next Parliament, and their sole hope was that the House of Lords would throw out the measure and compel a second appeal to the constituencies. To-day they deny the likelihood of a home rule project's ever reaching the Upper Chamber; for, although they concede to the Gladstonians and Nationalists united a majority of the Lower House, they believe that it will be too small and too discordant to effect Mr. GLADSTONE's purpose.

What is the cause of this signal change of the view taken by the Unionists of their political prospects? There is only one cause: the rupture of the Irish Nationalist party and the persistent refusal of the factional leaders to subordinate their personal ambitions to the welfare of their country. By this rupture the Unionists expect to profit in two ways: First, by materially lessening the number of Nationalist members for Ireland, and secondly, through the difficulty of adjusting any home rule bill to the divergent opinions of different sections of the Gladstonians, fortified as these will be in their divergence by the conflicting views of the Nationalist factions. If Ireland is to obtain a satisfactory home rule measure, she must speak with one voice and a full voice. Thus only can she impose her will upon a party of heterogeneous materials which it has taken Mr. GLADSTONE six years to lift out of weakness into strength.

The grounds on which the Unionists believe that they can cut down the number of Nationalists in the next Parliament are sufficiently obvious. They have unlimited command of money, and they make no secret of their intention to contest every Irish constituency. We have pointed out before, and we repeat, that this programme will impose severe pecuniary sacrifices on the friends of home rule. It will compel the Nationalist candidate in every one of the eighty-five Irish constituencies carried in 1886, to pay down the statutory costs before his name can be placed upon a ballot. These statutory costs, which do not by any means represent all the permissible and necessary expenses, range from $1,500 in boroughs to $3,000 in counties. The burden thus laid upon Irish Nationalists will be, of course, grievously increased if Nationalist candidates compete against each other for a considerable number of seats. To the frittering of the party's resources must be added the frittering of its voting strength. At present a majority (17) of the seats allotted to the province of Ulster are occupied by Nationalists; of those seventeen there are some in which a Unionist is absolutely certain of election unless the Nationalist vote is to the last man united, and there are many others in which he would have a bright prospect of success if the Nationalist vote were split with an approach to evenness between two Home Rulers. There are several districts in Leinster of which the same thing may be said. Thus far we have only indicated the mischievous consequences of a disruption of the Nationalist forces, although each of the factions should in good faith repudiate any combination with the Unionist enemy. It is certain, however, that the Unionists all over Ireland will try to effect a secret coalition with whichever of the Nationalist factions happens to be the weaker in a particular constituency. Success in such a manœuvre would be shameful, but the true way to avert the shame is to arrange a truce between the Nationalist factions on the fundamental condition that in no single instance shall McCarthyite and Redmondite candidates be pitted against each other. Certain seats may be freely conceded to Mr. REDMOND and his followers, while others are reserved for Mr. MCCARTHY and his friends. It should be easy for the factional leaders to arrive at such an agreement, unless their patriotism is a sham.

It is not merely, however, the shrinkage of the Irish Nationalist representation at Westminster on which the Unionists are reckoning. They desire to keep alive and to inflame the existing discord in the Nationalist ranks, in the hope that the two Nationalist factions may take opposed and even irreconcilable views of the measure to be framed by Mr. GLADSTONE. If this sinister expectation is fulfilled—if the Unionists are able to say that Mr. GLADSTONE is trying to push through a bill about which Irishmen themselves are not agreed—it will be difficult, and perhaps impossible, for a Liberal Prime Minister to hold his English and Scotch followers together. The unpleasant fact must be faced that a large number of Gladstonians are mainly interested in questions relating to Great Britain, and are only friendly to home rule because Mr. GLADSTONE wants it. Among these tardy and lukewarm converts there are wide differences of opinion as to the proper scope of the concessions to be made to the demands of Ireland. They can all be made to subordinate their own individual ideas to the will of their leader by a demonstration that Ireland's demands are distinct, univocal, and peremptory. In the absence of such a demonstration, and in the presence of proof that Nationalists themselves do not know what they want, a second and fatal secession from the Gladstonian column is almost certain to take place. It was on the express ground that an immense majority of Ireland's representatives at Westminister, viz., 85 out of 103, insisted on a repeal of the Act of Union, that Mr. GLADSTONE himself became a convert to the justice and expediency of home rule. If that majority is now, upon the eve of the greatest crisis in the history of Ireland, to be cut down and broken up, Mr. GLADSTONE himself might say that the situation is profoundly altered and that he cannot afford to legislate for a country which cannot agree upon a programme.

If a separate Government for Ireland is not the outcome of the approaching general election in the United Kingdom, the responsibility will largely rest upon the friends of Ireland in the United States. They could have compelled long ago a reunion of the Nationalist factions, and if they shrank for any reason from coercion for that purpose, they could at all events have forced the leaders to arrange a truce upon some such terms as we have indicated. They can do it now; but will they? That is for them to decide, and according to their decision they will be judged by history.

Mr. Chandler on the Election of United States Senators.

The nonsense of the proposition to elect United States Senators by popular vote was exhibited last week by the Hon. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER of New Hampshire in one of the ablest and wittiest speeches which the Senate has heard in modern times. Mr. CHANDLER is pretty well known as a Republican of incandescent partisanship; but on this question we give him credit for thoroughly Democratic ideas concerning the system of government which the authors of the Constitution established more than one hundred years ago, and which the cranks flourishing at the tag end of the nineteenth century are constantly trying to change into another and radically different form of government.

Two joint resolutions have been introduced at the present session proposing a constitutional amendment requiring that the election of Senators shall be by direct vote. The first was put in by Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, a Republican, and the second by Mr. TURPIE of Indiana, a Democrat. Both resolutions were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and again by that body to a sub-committee consisting of Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. TURPIE, and Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. TURPIE have blended their two measures into a new joint resolution, proposing as the Sixteenth Amendment of the Constitution a provision that Senators shall be elected for six years by direct vote of the people, the qualifications for electors to be the same as for members of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature, and the power to appoint in case of vacancy resting with the Governor until the next Congress election. This resolution is now before the Senate; and Mr. CHANDLER, as a minority of the sub-committee of three, opposes it vigorously in the capital speech to which we have already referred.

His first objection to the change is that it will be certain to result in the adoption of a Federal election law; that is to say, in the passage of a Force bill. It may seem a little strange that Mr. CHANDLER should use this argument, but it must be remembered that he is addressing his remarks to Democratic Senators as well as to Republicans, and that some of the Democrats in the Senate are in quite as much need as their Republican colleagues of fortification against this proposed folly. With polite and delicate irony Mr. CHANDLER proceeds to brace up the Democracy of these wabbling Democrats. He informs them that the extension of the system of popular elections to the choice of Senators is sure to lead to the taking possession of the Federal elections in the States by Federal officials appointed by the Federal Government, and even to a still greater absorption of powers now resting with the States. That he is right about this no clear-headed person will doubt. His argument is as adroit as it is lucid:

"I call the attention of Senators to the fact that the amendment which is now proposed immediately extends the Federal power over popular elections in the States to an extent which the Constitution does not now permit. While the power to regulate the election of Senators by Congress is as undisputed as the power to regulate the election of Representatives, yet the election of Senators, which can now be regulated, is an election by the Legislatures of the States. If, however, this amendment is adopted and Senators are hereafter to be elected directly by the people, it follows immediately and conclusively that the powers given to Congress to make regulations are extended to the popular election of Senators, and, in my judgment, just as soon as it comes to be seen that Representatives and Senators are both to be elected by the people, there will be a demand for a Federal election law which it will be impossible to resist.

"Indeed, Mr. President, it seems to me unreasonable that the amendment as it now stands for the election of Senators by the people should be adopted, and that the States should continue to possess the power to prescribe the qualifications of the voters, which power they now have, because the qualifications for electors of Representatives in Congress are to be the same as those prescribed by each State for the election of members of the most numerous branch of its State Legislature. Under that power, the state prescribes such qualifications as it pleases for electors of the members of the most numerous branch of its State Legislature, and those electors will be the electors of Representatives in Congress; and if the change proposed is made they will be the electors of United States Senators. It is clear that this is unreasonable.

"Therefore, if the joint resolution is reported to the committee or to the Senate in the form determined upon by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Indiana, I shall move to amend the same by striking out the provision that the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors in the most numerous branch of the State Legislature, and by providing that they shall have 'such qualifications as may be prescribed by Congress,' to the end that it shall be within the power of Congress, when both its Senators and its Representatives are chosen by the people, to determine who shall be the electors in the several States, and in order that the States may not be allowed to make such discriminations, that the qualifications of the electors in one State shall be different from the qualifications of the electors in another."

Follow Mr. CHANDLER's reasoning closely, and see to what it leads. It leads to the centralization in the Government at Washington of the power now exercised by each State to determine the qualifications of its voters for Federal office. The final amendment, of which he now kindly gives notice to the legitimate defenders of State rights, is the logical consequence of the first step which he so disinterestedly opposes. He is also sound in his opinion that if Senators of the United States are to be elected by direct vote of the people "we shall be brought face to face with the proposition that the President and Vice-President shall also be elected by the people; and whenever the President and Vice-President are chosen by popular elections, it will be entirely possible for one State, by enormously swelling its vote by fraudulent methods, or by other unfair means not absolutely fraudulent, to wholly overcome the exact and honest votes of other States." What is the inevitable result? "There will be of necessity a national election law which will not only fix the qualifications of the electors of Representatives, Senators, and President and Vice-President in the several States, *but will also take complete possession of the electoral machinery therein.* And our Representatives, Senators, President, and Vice-President will be chosen at elections called by Federal officials, with the voting lists made up by Federal officials, and with the count and the declaration and certificate of election made by them."

How does this picture strike the imagination of political disciples of THOMAS JEFFERSON? The warning to the party charged by principle and tradition with uncompromising resistance to the encroachments of centralization is not the less valuable because it comes from this intensely Republican source. Nor is Mr. CHANDLER's reasoning less forcible because his remarks to Democrats asleep, when they ought to be awake, are impregnated with subtle sarcasm, and full of a humorous appreciation of the strangeness of his post as a volunteer flapper to the slumbering or incompetent sentinels of Democracy.

Then Mr. CHANDLER proceeds to point out that the proposed Sixteenth Amendment would be absolutely the first fundamental change in the framework of the Federal Government during the hundred years of the Constitution's existence. The first ten amendments, simultaneously ratified in the years between 1789 and 1791, were merely negative; if they had been annexed to the Constitution when it was originally adopted, they would not have effected an iota of change in the form of government, or in the method of government. The Eleventh Amendment is of the same negative character. The Twelfth makes a slight change by requiring that the vote for President shall be distinguished from the vote for Vice-President. The Thirteenth abolishes slavery. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth, like the Thirteenth, recognize the results of the war, but do not change the framework of government. The first fundamental change, as Mr. CHANDLER argues, is in this proposed Sixteenth Amendment:

"For a hundred years we have gone forward in our national career, and this Constitution, founded with the most consummate wisdom with the fathers, has been found sufficient to carry this people from their low estate to the grandeur which they have now reached. It has proved a Constitution which was adapted to the wants of 3,000,000 people, and is ample for the necessities of 65,000,000 people, yet the Senators profess to have discovered that it is now necessary to begin the work of making fundamental changes."

"Never innovate," says the New Hampshire State-rights Republican, quoting MACAULAY, "except when some grievance is felt; never innovate except so far as to get rid of the grievance." Then he turns to the Republican and Democratic advocates of the innovation and asks them what grievance there is, what injury results from the present constitutional method of electing Senators:

"Do the Senators pretend that if there had been a system of popular elections of Senators this body of which we have the honor to be members would have contained more distinguished men than have reached it? Can there be found in the galaxy of great men belonging to any nation brighter stars than those which have illuminated the American firmament from the Senate of the United States?

"Declare, if you can, that if there had been a system of elections by the people, there would have been greater men, better men, or nobler men as its members.

"There is one exception to the general criticism which I have made of the Senators who advocate this amendment. When I say that they have indicated no injury, that they have pointed out no grievance, although you may search their speeches from one side to the other, the most to be specified, the exception that they do suggest, is that under the present system of elections rich men may improperly get into the Senate; and when they say this I take it for granted that they mean that wealthy men have so reached the Senatorial office heretofore, not that the Senators are merely apprehensive that if we do not change the Constitution these rich men will so reach the Senate; because if we have gone on for a hundred years and no wealthy man has by objectionable means yet reached the Senate, it will be safe for us to continue in the ways of the fathers until some case has happened which proves that there is real danger to the country from the invasion of the Senate by wealthy men, so that we must change the Constitution in order to prevent them from getting here."

And further, with consummate humor, on the same alleged danger of the election of millionaires by the State Legislatures:

"But, Mr. President, I do not believe that the people of the United States have hitherto suffered because rich men have forced their way into this body who would not have come here if Senators had been elected by the people, which is of course the issue now made. Have no millionaires been elected Governors of States? Have there been more rich Senators elected to this body than have been elected Governors? The Governors are chosen by the people. They are chosen precisely as the three Senators say the United States Senators should be chosen; and yet I do not think complaint has been made that millionaires have improperly taken possession of the Governorships; and if they have so taken possession of the Governorships, they are just as likely and just as sure to take possession of Senatorships under a system of popular elections as they are under a system where the Legislatures choose the Senators."

If there is a real danger to the country in the election of millionaires to the Senate, continues Mr. CHANDLER, the way to deal with them is directly and adequately, and not by any such cowardly and partial method. Rather than pass the Sixteenth Amendment, as proposed by Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. TURPIE, he would aim directly at the plutocrats by suppressing plutocracy, and to that end he has drawn up a proposed amendment "for the prevention of the excessive accumulation of wealth by individuals and corporations," as follows:

"ARTICLE XVI.

"The excessive accumulation of wealth by individuals and corporations shall not be allowed. Congress may enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and shall prohibit the issue by corporations of stock certificates or bonds or other evidence of indebtedness unless the sums expressed therein have been paid into the treasuries of the corporations; and shall prohibit the payment of excessive dividends."

Not that Mr. CHANDLER believed that his proposed substitute for Mr. MITCHELL's and Mr. TURPIE's Sixteenth Amendment could be adopted without difficulty. On this point he had an anecdote to tell:

"A few years ago a member of the House of Representatives, who came from a farming district, said to me that he wished to introduce some measures that would popularize him with his constituents, and he asked me if I could not draw up something for him. I told him I would think of it, and the next day I sent him this amendment, which I told him I thought would make him strong and popular with the farmers of his district.

"I supposed he would at once introduce it, but I did not see that he did. I met him a week or two later, and I said, 'Why did you not introduce that amendment? You told me that your district was wholly a farming district, and that you wished to introduce measures which would strengthen you with the farmers; and I cannot conceive of anything that would be any more beneficial to you with your constituents than that amendment.' He said: 'That is so; it would help me with the farmers; but let me tell you a little obstacle in the way of my introducing it. Every time I run for reelection there is a millionaire in my district who always gives me a couple of thousand dollars to help my canvass, and I am afraid it would hurt his feelings if I should introduce it.' [Laughter.]

"So the amendment has rested until this time, and now I offer it to my friend from Illinois as something on which we might compromise upon this question."

We call attention to this remarkable speech of the Republican Senator from New Hampshire because it gives expression in a delightfully humorous way to sound, conservative, and patriotic notions; because it is so essentially Democratic in its bearings that the party of constitutional government owes for the first time a debt of gratitude to Mr. CHANDLER; and because it comes as an effective rebuke from an unexpected source to those Democrats who either are advocating this proposed measure of centralization or are blind or indifferent to its certain consequences.

Never was a cheap humbug of cheap politics more beautifully exposed than in this instance by the Hon. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER of New Hampshire, whose disinterestedness in the matter is above question. He, at least, comes from a State where a rock-ribbed Republican plurality of 93 on the popular vote enables him to consider the proposed change without a touch of personal solicitude.

The Instructed Delegates.

Up to this day ten States of the forty-four in the Union have held Democratic Conventions, namely: Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming, two of these being doubtful and the rest Republican. In three only have the delegates been sent to the Democratic National Convention with instructions to vote for a particular candidate, namely: Kansas, New York, and Rhode Island.

The seven others refused to instruct for any one, although in each the worshippers of the Stuffed Prophet followed up their confident predictions of triumph with strenuous efforts to get the delegates nailed to his coffin. In Minnesota and Oregon the old CLEVELAND machine succeeded in getting its candidate endorsed without a great display of difficulty. In Massachusetts and Pennsylvania the Claimant's name was favorably mentioned in the platform after an exhibition of such powerful opposition that the Mugwumps must have thought themselves lucky to get anything even so perfunctory. In Nebraska and in Wyoming the resistance to the CLEVELAND attack was much more emphatic and decisive. In Indiana, where the CLEVELAND forces had manœuvred with desperation that denoted full understanding that there was to come their death struggle, they managed to wrest from the Convention a philosophical declaration that the great Mugwump incubus was the Democracy's "logical candidate" on the issue of tariff reform. The delegation to Chicago received one single instruction: to "present the name of ISAAC P. GRAY" as a candidate for President. In the foredestined situation of CLEVELAND's being regarded as "inexpedient," the delegation are to vote for the man they are already told to nominate. In other words, from all these seven uninstructing States there will go delegations, not fanatically commissioned to stuff themselves again with Mugwumpery and to anchor their party in the valley of disaster listening to the stertorous moral maxims of a candidate who would rather sit on the Democracy in defeat than lend a shoulder to it for victory, but prepared to deliberate upon the vital problem of selecting a leader whom they can hope to make President. And if the Convention deliberates the Claimant is lost.

Of the three instructing States one is for HILL and two are for CLEVELAND, in this way:

For Hill.	*Delegates.*	*For Cleveland.*	*Delegates.*
New York	72	Rhode Island	8
		Kansas	20
Total	72	Total	28

This list represents no electoral votes for CLEVELAND, but thirty-six for HILL, with the South still to hear from. The Democratic party seems to be holding its ground.

New York's Free Lectures.

One of the potent educational influences now at work in this town is the system of free lectures in the public schools. The second and concluding course of these lectures for the present school year ended on March 31. According to the report of Dr. HENRY M. LEIPZIGER, Assistant Superintendent of Public Schools, under whose supervision the lectures are given, they were far more successful even than they were last year. The number of auditors increased from 78,315 to 122,243. The lectures this year were given in eight public schools and in the hall of the Hebrew Institute. In each of these places there were thirty-two lectures during the season.

In the subjects chosen Dr. LEIPZIGER showed a broad comprehension of the needs of those to whom the lectures were addressed. They included physiology and hygiene, natural science, travel, and history, and were illustrated with all the means which recent improvements in the magic lantern, and in the apparatus for scientific experiments, have placed in the hands of lecturers on such topics. The Superintendent reports that the lectures on American history proved particularly attractive, and he thinks this is an indication of the great value of the course in spreading a correct knowledge of the political principles of our country, and in inculcating a deep sentiment of patriotism.

The lectures on other subjects, however, did not lack attractiveness, and in no case was there a small audience in attendance. The utmost eagerness to hear every word of the lecturer was frequently exhibited, and there was at all times a marked absence of frivolity and inattention. Under such circumstances it would have been surprising if no effect had been noticed upon the general intellectual character of the localities where the lectures were given. Dr. LEIPZIGER makes a significant remark upon this point. "In the light of the experience of the last two years," he says, "I think it can safely be said that the free lecture course is a most valuable part of our educational system. It has already stimulated much mental activity, as is shown by the fact that the circulation in several of our free libraries has increased as a consequence of these lectures."

He makes a number of suggestions for the improvement of the course next year, and there seems to be every reason for predicting that the rapid increase in the popularity and usefulness of this praiseworthy effort to found a people's university of a new kind, will continue to be manifested, perhaps with still greater emphasis, during the coming year.

We Defend Jerry Simpson.

Our esteemed Missouri contemporary, the *Kansas City Journal*, shows a singular want of appreciation for modest merit in its flings at a great Kansas statesman:

"WHEN JERRY SIMPSON was touring about Georgia and Alabama in a private car furnished to the Alliance circus by the general manager of one of the monopolistic Georgia railroads, he never failed to explain to his hearers, when making one of the patriotic speeches that were intended to deliver the Alliance to the Democracy of the South, that, in his case, there had been no effort to secure the Congressional nomination. There had been a return to the ideal conditions of the early years of the republic, when the office had sought the man and not the man the office. In fact, JERRY's display of patriotic sacrifice, as depicted by himself, was most beautiful to contemplate. He would never be found among the self-seeking.

"Doubtless the Hon. Mr. SIMPSON, in the days when he was being jeered by his opponents as the Reckless Socialist, told his constituents very much the same sweet story of his devotion to principle and his disregard of his own interests. They will therefore be somewhat surprised to learn from the despatches that this unselfish CINCINNATUS has so far forgotten the noble sentiments of his speeches that he is not only bending all his best energies to the securing of a renomination, but that he is also greatly troubled because there is a disposition shown in his district to overlook his distinguished ability and to seek another MOSES. For a man who has planted himself firmly on the platform of seeking no honors, the Hon. Mr. JERRY SIMPSON is displaying a strange disposition. Why should he worry about his own reelection if he cares only for the public and the cause he serves?"

The explanation is perfectly simple. Mr. SIMPSON regards himself as the logical candidate. He has consecrated himself to Currency Reform. He worries about a renomination because he fears lest an unconsecrated candidate should get ahead of him.

Doubtless, too, JERRY has misgivings lest the people of his district should be preparing for a life-long remorse by preparing to drop him with a hard and heavy drop.

Among men of honor there is no factional struggling for the Presidency.—*Utica Observer.*

Factional struggling for the Presidency has always been rigorously shunned by all honorable statesmen. In 1880 JOSEPH MCDONALD of Indiana might perhaps have been nominated for President, but like a Roman he refused to break through the delegation which had been elected for HENDRICKS. In 1884 no ambitious citizen of Ohio could be found to head the attempted betrayal of JOHN SHERMAN. In 1888 WILLIAM MCKINLEY launched the whole force of his indignant determination against a movement to use him for the same purpose. In New York in the same year Governor DAVID B. HILL was a candidate for the Presidency, and was barely beaten in the preliminary arrangements for his party's delegation to the National Convention. But once beaten in his own State, his mouth was never opened but to plead for the election of the successful candidate, GROVER CLEVELAND. Factional struggles for the great office of President were beneath any of these honest partisans; they were men of honor.

No doubt the removal of Lieutenant TOTTEN from New Haven to a new post of usefulness will be a relief to the Yale Faculty. The eccentric performances of this warrior, mystic and calculator of doomsday dates, while hardly a scandal to the University, has been sufficiently ridiculous to make the Faculty very uncomfortable. They never knew what the Lieutenant might do or say next: whether he would appear on the campus in white ascension robes, or sound the trump from the front steps of the College chapel. We suppose the Faculty took steps to get rid of the excellent gentleman as a feature of the University; and to that extent Lieutenant TOTTEN's prevision of the imminent end of things was correct.

At least a hundred towns must already have been set up within the bounds of those Oklahoma reserves which were opened to settlement this week, and in which never a town stood before. Last Tuesday morning there was not a human being living on the spot which, before Tuesday night, was the town of Okarche with nearly 2,000 inhabitants, and laid out in 6,800 lots, all of which have been taken by this time. We do not know of any of the other towns out there that have grown as big in so short a time; but we learn that the town-lot boomers are busy in every county. Old towns like Kingfisher and El Reno, which were founded more than a year ago, or away back in 1890, don't amount to anything in the eyes of the shanty builders who have got into the new lands this week.

A few days ago the memory of PESTALOZZI, the Swiss educational reformer, was especially honored at a meeting held in this city, and on Thursday last the birthday of FROEBEL, the German founder of the kindergarten system, was celebrated at a public meeting in Chickering Hall. The labors of these two worthy schoolmasters are truly deserving of very high praise. They have been advantageous to generations of children, and have influenced the methods of schooling in all the countries of the civilized world. The Pestalozzian system is full of suggestions that are of the highest value to educators everywhere, and many of its features are visible in several of the important institutions of New York. The FROEBEL kindergarten system also is rich in suggestiveness and has been more widely applied in the United States than in any other country. Honor, then, to the progressive pedagogues, to JOHN HENRY PESTALOZZI (1746-1827) and to FREDERICK FROEBEL (1782-1852).

What is a Logical Candidate?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is quite unique in our party politics to describe one as a "logical candidate." We have had candidates who have been desired and urged by a State Convention, and candidates not desired and urged. Of the last description is Cleveland in New York.

Logic is the science of the form of thought, or of formal thought. It requires a beginning, a postulate, a principle, an hypothesis, a conjecture, or a theory, as a starting point of the syllogism or demonstration.

One of the Indiana Democratic resolutions, intended as a contrivance to side-track Cleveland in favor of Gray, takes as an hypothesis that Cleveland's tariff message is to be the *only* issue presented next November by Democrats as an opposition party, and affirms that on it Cleveland would be a candidate proper in the sense of scientific thought.

In the first place, the hypothesis is a supposition not proved, or provable. What was done and said by the Indiana Convention shows that the Billion Dollar Congress is to be the issue, and not Cleveland's Administration. If the canvass, next summer and autumn, could turn on Cleveland's tariff message, then he might be called a logical and a losing candidate. But it won't!

The speech of Chairman Turpie said as much, and the last resolution described Cleveland as possibly an *inexpedient* candidate.

NEW YORK, April 22. V.

Let Chicago Turn Honest Now.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your proposition that Chicago shall proceed with the Fair project on the basis of the solemn engagement made by that city to meet and provide for all expense is right to the point. It is the substance of the whole matter.

The effort to make the United States Government put its stamp of approval on conspiracy, chicanery, and false pretences is an insult to the country.

That the Federal Government is not in favor of these methods should be demonstrated to all concerned, both as a much needed lesson and an assertion of self-respect and as an example to all who seek to deceive it and use it as a tool. C. C. M.

BROOKLYN, April 22.

A Few Queries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Do all good American hogs go to Chicago when they die?

If Dr. Parkhurst is Mr. Hyde, who is Dr. Jekyll?

If Murat Halstead goes as Minister to France will he still accent his first name on the "rast?"

Who is Abe Slupsky?

Is the Cleveland boom air in motion or fat at rest?

Is a Mugwump a responsible being?

Could stock in a revival of religion in New York city be floated there?

Would a saloon without a side door be a success in your town? A LADY SUBSCRIBER.

WASHINGTON, April 21.

A Card from W. B. Dickerman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The use of my name as an officer or member of the Road Horse Association has not been asked or authorized. I am heartily in favor of any legitimate movement for the improvement of the drives and roads in both city and country, but this cannot overshadow every other public question in my political creed. Very respectfully yours,

NEW YORK, April 22. W. B. DICKERMAN.

THE ANTI-HILL MOVEMENT IN ONEIDA.

Bitter Disappointment to the Promoters of the May Convention.

UTICA, April 22.—There was bitter disappointment for ex-Mayor William R. Grace, E. Ellery Anderson, and their friends in the anti-Hill movement on Tuesday night. After flooding the county of Oneida for many days with appeals to the faithful to assemble en masse in Utica to take action on the coming May Convention, the proposed mass meeting dwindled down to what is designated as a conference.

This took place on Tuesday at Bagg's Hotel. The whole number in attendance did not exceed sixty, two-thirds of whom were from the city of Utica and the rest from Rome and ten or twelve of the twenty-six towns comprising the county. And it is doubtful, if the fares had not been advanced to these out-of-town delegates or conferees, whether the conference would not have been made up wholly of Utica representatives.

A glance at the list shows that of the sixty or thereabout present, very few genuine Cleveland men were to be found, perhaps ten or more, the rest being disgruntled Democrats, disappointed aspirants for place, and chronic kickers. This is not an exaggeration, as any well-informed Democrat or Republican of the county will admit on the inspection of the following list:

DISAPPOINTED APPLICANTS FOR PLACE.

P. F. Bulger, for City Judge of Utica and Mayor; fall Republican and spring Democrat, also Cogswhall Democrat, opposed Cleveland in 1884; is against Hill for refusal to sign the city court act, making him eligible for the office of City Judge.

T. E. Kinney, for Mayor spring of 1892; for Comptroller 1887, 1891, heretofore bitterly anti-Cleveland.

William F. Ryan, for School Commissioner.

Seth W. Smith, for Supervisor and Superintendent of Poor.

A. J. Stebbins, for Chairman County Committee.

J. Frank Rogers, for City Judge—a chronic office seeker.

John Redmon, for Mayor.

M. J. Dolan, for Alderman Eighth ward.

Timothy Coughley, for Charity Commissioner.

Joseph P. Davis, for delegate to State Convention.

James G. Preston, for place at Albany.

Charles H. Ballou, for place at Albany.

Henry Martin, for Mayor.

C. C. Snyder, for City Judge and other offices.

Isaac Tripp, for attorney to the Excise Board; employed by the Reform Club of New York.

George Fulmer, for reappointment for Police and Fire Commissioner.

J. C. Greenman, for appointment for Police and Fire Commissioner.

Adrian Lee, for Sheriff.

James B. Dugan, for member of Assembly and delegate to the State Convention.

F. H. Grogan, for Overseer of the Poor, Rome.

Thomas Rowan, for Alderman in Rome.

W. B. Crouse, for member of Assembly; twice denied.

Henry F. Miller, for reappointment as Excise Commissioner.

A. R. Hager, for Recorder, city of Rome.

J. Harry Kent, place at Albany.

Edward Cronin, for Supervisor, Utica.

C. H. Dunning, for City Attorney of Rome; former Republican, supposed to have returned to his first love.

Thomas C. Wilds, for Supervisor of Rome.

All of the above were seekers for appointment or nomination at the hands of the regular Democratic organization, and through disappointment openly opposed the Democratic ticket of their respective wards and towns at the spring election of 1892.

DISGRUNTLED DEMOCRATS.

Dr. Matthias Cook, action brought against him and other Oneida county officials by a Democratic Attorney-General for receiving illegal fees.

J. B. Brady, didn't get clerkship of Excise Board of Utica.

John F. Hammill, unsuccessful applicant for canal patronage.

Edward McGough, dropped from City Committee and supported the Republican ticket at the spring election of 1892.

W. J. Kinney, brother of T. E. Kinney, defeated candidate for Special City Judge.

Edward Callahan, failed to secure appointment for a friend from Democratic Mayor.

Joseph Tessy, Dishler Democrat; failed to secure patronage from Democratic Mayor.

William Townsend, denied reappointment as manager of State Asylum.

Gen. R. U. Sherman; Gov. Hill accepted his resignation as Fish and Game Commissioner when he did not expect it, after the Governor had removed his game protector, Drew.

Charles Graham, removed as section superintendent on Erie Canal.

Joseph A. Ackroyd, clerk of Graham's, and Coggeshall supporter.

George P. Russ, the only Democrat ever defeated for Mayor of Rome, spring of 1891; was defeated for Alderman this spring in a ward with 200 Democratic majority.

William Gilfoil, dismissed from the police force of Rome.

W. J. Brown, wasn't reappointed bridge tender.

Luke Hill, his son, defeated for Alderman in Utica at last charter election.

William E. Rothmund, spring Democrat and fall Republican; a ward heeler of the most pronounced type, from whose control the ward organization has been recently taken.

All the above openly opposed the regular Democratic candidates for Supervisor in this year's spring election.

CHRONIC KICKERS.

Miles C. Comstock and Dwight D. Winston, both of whom have been for years engaged in every independent movement sprung upon the people of Oneida county, under whatever auspices. Mr. Comstock, however, at this conference, protested against sending a contesting delegation, as such action would tend to make a split in the party.

CLEVELAND DEMOCRATS.

Thomas W. Allanson, Homer T. Fowler, Ezra P. Hodges, Austin Noyes, Thomas Hodges, N. Curtis White, Alexander McKenzie, C. F. Marklove, Patrick McGinness, William A. Douglass, George Hatfield, H. I. Fay William Atwood, A. J. Shields, James Burns, and Messrs. Gallagher, Couchman, Fields, Bentley, and Tracey.

Those not specifically mentioned were unknown heretofore, taking little or no part in politics, a few being Post Office employees under the Cleveland Administration, excepting Alderman Hackett, who is a Republican.

At this conference the position was taken that at the caucuses to be hereafter called and held only those who had been enrolled could participate, thus creating in the country districts a machine the like of which has never been known.

THE FOLLIES OF TAXATION.

As Presented by the New York State Board of Assessors.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* When the "Greatest Show on Earth" was in winter quarters at Bridgeport a few years ago, a number of monkeys were confined in a large circular cage in the centre of one of the animal houses. To prevent constant fighting between the quarrelsome family the cage was divided by wire partitions into some twenty small compartments. When the daily rations were distributed it was noticed that instead of eating his own portion each monkey would thrust his hand through the wires and fish as much as he could reach from his neighbor's dish. The result was that, after a great deal of biting and scratching, considerable food was scattered and wasted, and since while a monkey was stealing another was robbing him, the result of their dishonesty was a loss all around.

Believers in the Darwinian theory of the origin of species will probably find confirmation of their views in the recent recommendations made by the New York State Board of Assessors in favor of a stringent "listing law" for collecting taxes on personal property under oath. The notion that the general wealth of this State can be increased by setting a greater number of assessors to work, with a system of spies and penalties for failure to make returns of property, to tax everybody on their intangible property, is worthy of our simian kindred.

Suppose that the "listing law" is passed. While the farmer, whom the State Assessors pretend to be anxious to benefit, was getting a little more taxes from the merchant or the capitalist who is so wicked as to save money and loan it out on mortgages, the latter would shift the tax by charging a slightly higher price for their goods, or higher interest on the mortgage. And the greatly increased cost of assessing and collecting taxes would probably soon convince even the State Assessors that systems of taxation founded on a supposed antagonism of interests between real estate and personal property owners were wasteful and injurious. Yours very truly, J. WHITMAN GRAHAM.

NEW YORK, April 22.

American Women.

From the Chicago Times.

"What impressed me the most in America? The women," said Harry Furniss, *Punch's* famous artist. "They are simply dreams of delight and beauty. They are so beautiful, so refined-looking, dress so neatly, that I have not yet got over wondering at them. Then the next thing was the equality of people. When I was in Washington I was taken to call on the President, Mr. Blaine, and others of your notable public men. I went to the senate and House of Representatives and no one said anything. Why, such a thing would be impossible in England. If you came over there I wouldn't dream of taking you to see Parliament or the Prime Minister. It would be impossible, you know. But here you walk in and out and it's all right."

Senator Hill's View of It.

From the Courier-Journal.

WASHINGTON, April 18.—As far as Mr. Hill himself is concerned, he will not admit the possibility of his own defeat before the convention. In conversation with his most intimate friends, he expresses absolute confidence that he will get the Presidential nomination.

Indiana's Candidate.

From the Chicago Herald.

Governor Gray is entitled to the unanimous and hearty support of the Indiana Democracy. He is a sound Democrat, a courageous leader, a safe counsellor, and a sagacious politician.

Consecrated it to Innocuous Desuetude.

From the Indianapolis Sentinel.

The phrase "logical candidate," as applied to Mr. Cleveland, has been, perhaps, a trifle "overworked."

Jerry Simpson.

Lo, the poor statesman,
Whose untutored mind
Sees currency in haystacks
And credit in the wind!

RETURN OF THE ALLIANCA.

Her Experience in the Fever Stricken Ports of Brazil.

The steamship Alliança of the United States and Brazil Mail Steamship Company's line arrived in port yesterday from Rio Janeiro, Santos, and other Brazilian ports. The ship's passengers and crew narrowly escaped a hard time with the yellow fever, which has so long been raging in Brazil. As it was, Howard F. Appleton, a freight clerk