The Sun.

SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1893.

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.

The Princess Eulalia.

The genuine enthusiasm with which the Princess EULALIA is welcomed to New York, is first of all, a tribute to her gracious womanhood. It is an expression of the popular spirit of gallantry.

It is also an indication of the great depth to which the popular imagination has been stirred by the celebration of the discovery of COLUMBUS. Moreover, the arrival of a princess as the guest of this peculiarly democratic town, touches the romantic and poetic sentiment of the people. It is as if the fairy princess of a tale had appeared among them, so remote from our life and our social and political organization is the glamour of royalty. She comes to us from another world, a world of the fancy, while we are living in the midst of actualities. She is the heroine of a romantic drama enacted before all the people.

The popular interest so generally and conspicuously manifested in the Princess EULALIA is, therefore, an impressive proof of the complete absence of the monarchical idea as a moving force in the political sentiment of this city and this country. Kings, queens, princes, and princesses, thrones, sceptres, and royal state are unreal here. They are theatrical characters and appendages merely. Signifying nothing actual, they awaken only curiosity and stimulate imagination. They represent no political power of which the people are afraid, so thoroughly destroyed here is the system of feudalism. They have no more than a poetical significance. They are no more real to this democracy than the elves, the nymphs, the fauns, and the satyrs of fable and mythology; yet they do represent our imperishable craving for the glory and luxury of a state of existence wherein ideal wealth prevails, and toil and care are abolished.

Such a democratic greeting to the Princess EULALIA must, then, be peculiarly grateful to her, for it elevates her to the place of a heroine of the imagination, makes of her an ideal character, and expresses a genuine sentiment of romance in the people. It is not political, but purely poetical.

Before her arrival, there was a good deal of talk among social martinets about the proper way of receiving a representative of the exceedingly formal Spanish court. They would have changed democratic customs and manners to suit the emergency, training those who came into her presence as if they were to be characters in a performance on the stage, lest they might offend against the rules of courtly propriety. All that has been settled by the spontaneous course of the people. They have done far better than their would-be instructors could have taught them to do. They have behaved simply and naturally, and that is the foundation of all good breeding. They are giving the Princess EULALIA a democratic welcome, as becomes a democratic country; and she accepts it in the spirit in which it is offered. The services of the social drum-major have proved to be unnecessary on either side. The greeting of subjects to a princess is an old story. The greeting of a sovereign democracy to a princess has in it the charm of novelty.

Adlai at the Gate.

The strange combination between poesy and pork, which characterizes so much of the still life of resident Chicago, is reflected even in the names of the inhabitants. Hence it need surprise no one to learn that one of the gatekeepers of the Chicago Fair is Mr. BYRON BACON. His first name recalls the celebrated English bard; his surname is suggestive of Chicago's vast hog product. It is a taking combination. But Mr. BYRON BACON has a better claim to the notice of his contemporaries than is furnished by his name. He is the man who refused to admit ADLAI STEVENSON to the World's Fair on Tuesday, without a pass.

This is how it happened: Vice-President STEVENSON, accompanied by Director W. T. BAKER, went to visit the Fair. Mr. BAKER presented his pass and got through the turnstile, but BYRON BACON refused to let the other gentleman in. He did not know Mr. STEVENSON, and asked for his ticket. The Vice-President had forgotten it. His hotel was half an hour's ride away, and he did not care to go back for the pass. The gateman would not let Mr. STEVENSON through, because of the strict orders issued from the Bureau of Admissions. "Let this gentleman in at once," said BAKER angrily; "he is the Vice-President of the United States." Gateman BACON said that he would let Mr. STEVENSON through the gates if he gave him a personal card. The card was handed over and dropped into the box, and the Vice-President passed in. Mr. BAKER was indignant at BACON, and made a report to HORACE TUCKER. The gateman was astonished later on to find that he had been discharged for accepting Mr. STEVENSON's card. He explained that he had admitted the Vice-President at the demand of Director BAKER, and he was reinstated.

There are two lessons to be drawn from this event. The first is that the commercial atmosphere of Chicago vitiates even the strong and robust Democracy of an all-around statesman like ADLAI STEVENSON! What was he doing with a pass? Why should not he, Vice-President of the United States, pay his fifty cents, and enter the Fair grounds like an independent American freeman? Why should he accept the alms of Chicago to save half a dollar? How much more dignified and Democratic it would have been if ADLAI had handed over a circular silver coin, and thus relieved BACON, the gateman, and BAKER, the director, of their embarrassment. The ADLAI of the people's fancy is a stalwart, broad-gauge, catch-as-catch-can statesman of prairie dimensions. How different he appears when revealed in an attitude of disputation with a Chicago gateman over fifty cents, and demanding, or at least expecting, a deadhead exemption at the great Fair which commemorates the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America!

We shall not part company with ADLAI because of this misstep, when we consider the provocation which Chicago gives to similar acts of an undignified and mercenary character. It seems to be in the air of the place. But ADLAI's act was, assuredly, not such as he would have been capable of elsewhere. It was un-Democratic; and that is the first lesson to be derived from this surprising episode.

The firmness of BYRON BACON is to be commended. He did not flinch. He was not overawed. He stood firm. He was, to use a phrase of New York slang, which is deeply embedded in the literary style of Chicago, "out for the dust." The essence of his demand, the sum total of it, was fifty cents. Pay or go; such was the alternative which he presented to ADLAI. His position was awkward, but logical. BYRON BACON obeyed the rules.

But how different was the attitude of BAKER. Like other Chicago directors, he seemed perfectly willing to evade and ignore the very regulations he had assisted in establishing. He was angry because BACON balked him. The ever-faithful BACON was removed. Then he was reinstated. And, as all's well that ends well, this is probably the last we shall hear of the matter.

But underlying all is the second lesson to be drawn from this chance meeting between the Vice-President and the Chicago gateman. The dignity of the Vice-Presidency, sometimes denied and sometimes derided, seemed for once to be directly at stake. Should this high functionary be admitted, so to speak, on his face and his visiting card only, and without paying 50 cents in cash or presenting a ticket? The test was crucial, but ADLAI vindicated the importance of his office. He was admitted. It was not a spontaneous acknowledgment by BACON of the importance of the Vice-Presidency, but ADLAI passed the gate without paying. Who, after this, can think any less of the Vice-Presidency as a public trust?

Future historians, recalling this episode of ADLAI at the gate, denied admission by BACON in the face of BAKER's yeasty wrath, will honor BACON for his firmness, and condole with ADLAI on his temporary surrender of Democratic principle.

Death by Bicycle.

A child killed by a bicycle gives a long pause to consider the abuses to which those excellent machines, possessed of such unfortunate potentiality of mischief, may be diverted by reckless riders. KATE MCGLYNN, 9 years old, was crossing the Boulevard with her mother at 10 o'clock on Wednesday evening, when she heard a sudden warning to "Look out!" She jumped with the natural impulse of a startled person, not knowing or seeing what or where the danger is, and the next moment a bicycle, ridden hard by a young man named CLAUSSCHMIDT, struck her, and injured her so that she died the next day.

On the asphalt surface of the Boulevard the usual noise of a bicycle is imperceptible amidst the sounds of other city traffic. With a rubber tire, its progress becomes as absolutely silent as a ghost's. In this case we are told that the bicycle had neither light nor bell, in accordance with law. The law also says that within city limits a bicycle's speed, like that of a wagon, shall not exceed six miles an hour. Whatever the rate of CLAUSSCHMIDT's machine, it appears that he was going too fast to control it in a moment of emergency.

Our friends the bicyclists who take their airings upon the city streets, are the perpetrators of much and evidently very serious violation of a proper ordinance. Night is a great time for bicycles to be brought out for a little exercise upon the various pleasant stretches of asphalt now to be found in the city; and with the streets comparatively free, their owners are apt to be exhilarated with the same yearning for a little flying speed that animates a racing horse when his feet first strike the track. Lights and bells cannot justify the spurts they are apt to be put to in the evenings. It won't do to say that fair warning is given to pedestrians when the bell is sounded to get out of the way. Grown people, even, are very apt to do what little KATE MCGLYNN did, stop and look, perhaps make a false movement in the bewildering sense that something is coming which they are unable to understand or locate. There is a vast deal of improper use of the bicycle in New York outside of the terrible degree of the outrage that happened on Wednesday.

Of course, every man with a bicycle is morally bound to be mindful of the injury that he may inflict upon other people; but as this machine has produced a great association of men in clubs devoted to its enjoyment, and allied for its defence against conflicting interests, no effort should be spared by these organizations to promote, in and out of them, the proper respect of public rights and a proper observance of the law on the part of all who ever mount a bicycle.

Electricity in Agriculture.

About a year ago the Consuls of the United States in foreign countries were directed by the Department of State at Washington to collect and send home all obtainable information in regard to the employment of electricity in agriculture. This direction was given in accordance with a resolution of the United States Senate. A large number of reports on the subject of the inquiry have been received, and have just been published by the Bureau of Statistics of the State Department.

Most of the reports show that electricity is not employed in agriculture at all in the consular districts to which they relate. There are a few exceptions, however.

The inquiry of the State Department was twofold: first, as to the use of electricity as a power in the propulsion of farm machinery and implements; and, secondly, as to its use in the propagation of plants. Electricity does not seem to be employed as a motive power in agricultural operations in any foreign countries except Belgium and England. In Belgium Mr. A. DUMONT has a large place at Chassart, where he carries on scientific farming upon a very extensive scale. Here he runs a thrashing machine by means of an electric current, which exerts a force equal to twelve horse power, and is carried over a distance of 2,600 feet. In England, all the machinery at the Blythwood Electric Dairy, belonging to Mr. JAMES BLYTH of Stanstead in Essex, is worked by electricity. The Consul-General at London writes that this is the only example of the use of electricity in connection with agriculture that has come under his notice. In this dairy there are said to be nearly two hundred of the finest butter-producing Jersey cows in the world, and the separators and churns are worked wholly by electricity, which also furnishes light for the establishment.

In reference to the influence of electricity in the propagation of plants, very full reports have been received from Mr. ALBERT H. WASHBURN, United States Commercial Agent at Magdeburg in Germany, and from Mr. F. M. BURTON, United States Vice-Consul at Birmingham, England. Mr. WASHBURN reviews the various experiments which have been made by scientific men in Germany since 1859, on the influence of the electric current and the electric light on plant life. As to the question whether artificially induced electric currents passing through the ground are beneficial or injurious to vegetation, he declares that it has not practically been solved up to the present time in Germany, adding that, "while it is true that some few isolated experiments have been highly favorable to electricity, those conducted on the most extensive scale have resulted in very indifferent success." As to the influence of electric light, Mr. WASHBURN mentions the experiments of Mr. C. W. SIEMENS in 1880, indicating that the effects of the naked electric light seemed to be injurious to plants, and the experiments of Mr. T. P. DE HERAIN in 1881, who also found that the direct rays of the electric light were harmful. Mr. BURTON writes that with the exception of a few experiments by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, there has been nothing done at Birmingham in the application of electricity to the growth of plants, but he sends to the State Department a copy of a paper read before the Society of Telegraph Engineers in 1880 by Sir WILLIAM SIEMENS, wherein the author describes experiments which he says go to prove "that electric light is efficacious in promoting the formation of fruit rich in bloom and aroma, and, if these results should be confirmed, the horticulturist will be able to make himself practically independent of solar light for producing a high quality of fruit at all seasons of the year."

It is to be noted, however, that although thirteen years have elapsed since this opinion was expressed, very little progress has been made in utilizing the electric light for horticultural purposes.

The results of the inquiry instituted by the State Department, by the direction of the Senate, show that up to the present time electricity in agriculture is for the most part a plaything rather than a practical agent.

A Veto from Governor Hogg.

The Hon. JAMES STEPHEN HOGG, Governor of Texas, uses a certain amount of tropical language in his veto of the bill passed by the Texas Legislature to authorize the superintendents of the State penitentiaries to receive from the Government the bounty on sugar raised by convict labor. It seems that the State of Texas has a plantation of 2,000 acres worked by convicts, and that about 1,000,000 pounds of sugar were raised on this plantation last year. Governor HOGG estimates that Texas would receive at least $20,000 a year until 1905 if the Sugar Bounty act became a law, but he refuses to sign that act because he believes that Congress was guilty of usurpation in passing the Sugar Bounty law, and that "the State would debase her dignity, prostitute her honor, and appear before civilization as a humiliated suckling holding on to the breast of the Federal Government if she were to accept the bounty."

Governor HOGG's chance medleys with metaphor and simile are not always successful, but here he gives the sincere milk of constitutional doctrine for sucklings, humiliated or otherwise:

"The express purpose of the people in framing, and of the States in adopting, the Constitution was to form a more compact Union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defence, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. The powers of the Congress were limited to the accomplishment of these ends. How can an appropriation out of the general treasury to be paid to sugar raisers aid in forming a more perfect Union? How can it establish justice? How will it insure domestic tranquillity? How can it provide for the common defence? How does it promote the general welfare? How can it secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity? If it fails to accomplish some of these purposes, then the Congress had not the power to make the appropriation. All observant men see and understand that the excuse for all such usurpation of power by the Congress, exercised invariably at the expense of the great mass of the people for the enrichment of the few who fill the lobbies around the Capitol, finds a cloak under the clause of the Constitution which authorizes that body to 'provide for the general welfare of the United States.' I cannot understand how it is to the 'general welfare' of the several States, or of the United States, or of the people of the United States, for Texas to be given a bounty by the Federal Government, for raising sugar.

"This product, it is true, is of common use among the people, and its cheapness to them is desirable. So it may be said of cotton, wheat, oats, corn, rice, hay, beef, pork, poultry, potatoes, goobers, melons, pine, rosin and all other articles of real or apparent necessity among the masses."

Here, again, is an earnest protest against sacrificing in any degree the autonomy of the State, nor should we be distracted from it by the poetical addendum, "boiled in sin":

"On another point I oppose the State's acceptance of the bounty. In the management of her own affairs she is sovereign, supreme, subject only to the control of the people within her dominions. To accept this money for sugar she would surrender the supervision and inspection of one of her most important industries to the Federal Government. For spoils she would open the way for the invasion and final destruction of her independent autonomy. For a mess of pottage, seasoned with the sacrifice of principle, boiled in sin, she would surrender her birthright."

We are the more glad to see Governor HOGG opposing what he believes to be paternal legislation coming from Washington, because we have not understood that he has been opposed to paternal legislation coming from Austin.

Japan and the Fur Seals.

The excitement caused in Japan by the appearance of seal poachers in her territorial waters is a useful reminder that our Government does not stand alone in efforts to preserve the fur seals from extermination. The possession of the Kurile Islands, stretching from Jesso to Kamchatka, gives to Japan an interest in the sealing operations of Okhotsk Sea as well as in those of her main coast. Last year's session of the Japanese Parliament made an appropriation for the purpose of having war ships patrol Japanese waters the present season, to expel poachers.

It is true that thus far Japan does not exercise protective rights beyond the marine league which constitutes unquestioned territorial jurisdiction for all purposes whatever. But the sympathy and interest of Japan, like those of Russia, would naturally be in establishing that broader zone of coast protection which is so desirable under the custom of the seals to swim long distances from their breeding places in search of food.

A statement made early this year in Vancouver, where it seems to have been derived from Mr. KITO, the Japanese Consul, was that the value of the seals taken last year from Japanese waters by foreign vessels had been estimated at $810,000, whereas Japanese sailors had procured only a value of $25,000. Even admitting that there may be some vagueness in this statement as to what Japanese waters are, it is still easy to see why Japan this year has felt herself compelled to adopt the policy of seal protection by the patrolling of war ships, as so long practised by the United States and Russia. It is understood that two of the Japanese companies engaged in this industry exerted a pressure on the Government, which caused the adoption of this new protective policy.

The question may be somewhat complicated, as Americans at Yokohama have been charged with fitting out vessels to go seal hunting under various foreign flags, while some Japanese are thought to be leagued with foreign poachers to make depredations in Japanese waters. Again, recent investigations indicate that thus far this year there has been little poaching there. Still, the season is not far advanced, and it is known that British and American vessels have cleared for Japan.

However, the point of most importance just now is the evidence that Japan has an interest in seal protection analogous to our own. Indeed, half a dozen years ago, when Mr. BAYARD sent around his circular letter asking the views of various foreign powers, Mr. HUBBARD made this reply: "The Japanese Government is anxious to enter into an arrangement or convention with the United States Government for the protection of the fur-seal fisheries in the waters of their northern islands." Several months later he wrote as follows: "I desire to inform the department that the Japanese Foreign Office has, in a friendly spirit of inquiry, asked if I could furnish information as to when my Government would be ready (as Japan had been ready for some time past) to resume the consideration of the proposed convention."

The United States Government is not fighting the cause of America alone at Paris to-day, but that of Russia and Japan as well, and the cause also of the South American nations that have small seal rookeries in that hemisphere.

The Seeds of Retribution.

Our Trust-destroying contemporary, the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, is informed that the Governors of thirty-seven States have answered Yea to the invitation of Governor KNUTE NELSON of Minnesota to an Anti-Trust powwow at Chicago next June. It is not clear whether the Governors are going themselves or whether they will content themselves with despatching ten commissioners each, at cut rates. Nor is it clear who is going to foot the bills, a point that has caused some discussion in Minnesota, which appears to be about the only place except the *Inter-Ocean* office where the proposed conference is regarded reverently. Minnesota is full of Populists and of DONNELLY, and hence approaches the subject of Trusts in the tragic vein.

We hope, and everybody else hopes, that the visiting Governors and delegates will enjoy themselves in Chicago, and keep out of the hands of the bunco men. Presumably the World's Fair directory will furnish the distinguished Trust smashers with passes. If, however, any Governor feels that he would rather wait until fall before visiting the Fair, we dare say that he can be absent from the Anti-Trust conference without injuring the country perceptibly. Governor FLOWER and Governor MATTHEWS seem to think that there is business enough for a Governor to attend to in his own State without whirling out to Chicago for the purpose of remarking that Trusts are naughty things. Governor FLOWER has lately signed a very stringent law against gentlemen who combine to put up the price of any article necessary to life and health, and is justified in thinking that he has done enough in the way of legislation against Trusts in this State.

The *Inter-Ocean*, which regards as a minion of Wall street every Governor who will not promise to send commissioners, unconsciously demonstrates the superfluity of an Anti-Trust conference in these words:

"There are a few persons who profit by these Trusts, but many of those who expect to gain personal advantage find themselves disappointed in the end. The Whiskey Trust has suffered vast losses, the cordage combine went to the wall, and there is hardly a day that does not bring to light fresh evidence of the unwisdom of such combinations. They are not businesslike. They have in themselves the seeds of retribution."

If these combinations are unbusinesslike, they will fall to pieces without any dynamite of rhetoric or legislation. If they are wicked concerns, why are not the Hon. KNUTE NELSON and his corps of Governors and commissioners willing to let the wicked persons who expect to gain personal advantage therefrom, be grievously disappointed? Surely, there need be no trumpet blasts from a band of Governors to make the walls of the unbusinesslike Jericho totter and tumble down. Still, the Fair buildings are monstrous fine buildings, and the conference will have the satisfaction, while wandering among them, of knowing that the seeds of retribution are ripening all the time for the unwise combinations.

The attempt to put taxes on sugar, tea, and coffee is likely to be defeated by the votes of Western and Southern Democrats.—*New York Tribune.*

That would simply prove that the Western and Southern Democrats were cheats, hypocrites, and humbugs when they pretended to support the Chicago platform, and advocate the election of Mr. CLEVELAND.

We trust that the President of the Salvadorian republic, who has obtained a half year's leave of absence that he may visit this country, will spend a part of the time in New York. President EZETA is a soldier, a statesman, a qualified ruler, a man of talent, and a friend of the United States, who desires to strengthen the bonds of union between the Salvadorian and American republics. Seventy years ago, when the Emperor ITURBIDE threatened to seize San Salvador, that republic boldly decreed its annexation to the United States, and, but for the fall of the Emperor before he consummated his purpose, it might to-day be under the American flag. Now, again, San Salvador, menaced by foes, has difficulty in maintaining its independence, and thus we have important interests in Central America.

We can assure President EZETA that he will be welcomed in New York, and that he will enjoy a reception worthy of his office. While we have had the pleasure of offering hospitality to distinguished personages from Europe, we have not yet been privileged to entertain any one of the Presidents of the sixteen republics lying between the Rio Grande and the Straits of Magellan. We shall be pleased to see all of them here in New York this gala year. They will be received as only the metropolis of the Western world is able to receive favored guests.

We desire a closer acquaintance and more friendly relations with the republics of the South, all of them. San Salvador is the smallest of the Southern republics; but its President is not the least among the rulers of this world. He was elected two years ago, and holds office till 1895.

The GERRY Chinese act is one of the most inhuman acts that ever were placed upon any statute book.—*Boston Herald.*

This is a very highly exaggerated statement. The act merely requires Chinese residents to register their names, as those of Americans resident in China are registered. No Chinese who obeys it will be expelled from this country or subjected to any trouble whatever. The penalty for disobeying it is far milder than the Chinese penalty for disobeying any edict. It is not a law for the expulsion of the Chinese, or that restricts any right of the Chinese, or that inflicts any wrong upon the Chinese, or that ought to disturb the Chinese, or that would disturb them in the least if they took the trouble to give heed to it.

A law of the same kind, applicable to Americans and other foreigners resident in France, was adopted by the French Chambers last month. The new French "Alien law" provides that any foreigner arriving at or living in any place in France, and desiring to engage in any industry or profession, shall, within a week, register his name at the Prefecture of Police, make a declaration of his intention, and furnish satisfactory proof of his identity, after which he shall receive a certificate, which he must retain, and which, in the event of his removal to any other place, must be visèd within two days. The provisions of the French law are fully as rigorous as those of our Chinese Registration law; and it has been strictly enforced since its enactment a few weeks ago. Any neglect to register leads to an immediate summons to the Mayor's office; and the foreigner who refuses to register is liable to imprisonment or expulsion from France. Any person employing an uncertified alien shall be subject to the penalty provided by the law.

The Americans resident in France who come under the terms of this registration law obey it without complaint, and without regarding it as inhuman or as cruel.

If Americans resident in France can thus obey the French Registration law, why cannot Chinese here resident obey the American Registration law? We did not support the GERRY bill when it was before Congress, but since it was enacted, and has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, it must be carried out.

The President has been at the pains to disavow the right of THE SUN to be taken as the organ of his views. This deserves a prominent place among the humors of politics.—*Boston Journal.*

And the *Boston Journal* accepts this statement on the authority of the *New York World*, the great fake newspaper of the nineteenth century! This deserves a conspicuous place among the humors of journalism.

Chief Justice DALY's recent decision refusing a mandamus to compel Superintendent of Buildings BRADY to reconsider his refusal to approve plans for a hotel that a citizen proposed to erect at the southwest corner of Broadway and Thirty-fifth street, was a good thing for the Building Department, and an assurance to citizens that the courts are likely to uphold Mr. BRADY in his efforts to secure safety in hotel structures. There are a number of old buildings on the plot of ground in question. A builder had leased these, and had intended to refit them as a hotel, with only the first story made fireproof. He contended that the building laws permitted such a structure to be built for hotel purposes. Mr. BRADY insisted that the whole structure, from ground to roof, must be fireproof. The case will be appealed, but, even if the higher courts override Chief Justice DALY's view, citizens at large will be satisfied that his view and Superintendent BRADY's are in keeping with an intelligent and business-like conception of how buildings designed to house many tenants ought to be built.

There seems to be a disposition abroad to regard Katcher KELLY as the CLEVELAND of baseballists.

The ministers of the Church of the New Jerusalem are holding Council in Brooklyn. The clergyman who was first heard by the Council took occasion to condemn those of his brethren who make use of the "arts of oratory" in their preaching, and went so far as to say that pulpit eloquence is an enemy of Gospel truth. He is in the wrong. What are the arts of oratory? Merely those arts by which the ideas and the language of a discourse are so ordered as to be most impressive and effective. How can eloquence be an enemy of the truth when it is but the best and most powerful method of presenting the truth? SWEDENBORG himself, the apostle of the Church of the New Jerusalem, was a man who paid great respect to the arts of presentation, and many of his works are of a high order of eloquence and in very choice language.

We cannot believe that many of the thirty-five delegates at the Council accepted the erroneous notion of the Rev. Mr. DUNHAM, though his discourse was both artistic in form and eloquent.

The Spanish caravels, the Saragossa band, the Círculo Colón-Cervantes, the Duke of VERAGUA, the Infanta; and thus it is that Spain is to the fore in New York just now. All our Spanish friends and guests, from the naval officers to the Columbian grandee and the representative of royalty, have had a first-rate time here. It has given us pleasure to entertain them, and to know from them that they have enjoyed the entertainment. Spain is a country to which we are happy to offer our salutations. Between Spain and the United States there is good friendship, which, we trust, will grow in strength evermore. Long live Spain! Cheers for the land of the CID!

What Will Henry Watterson Say to This?

From the Democrat and Chronicle.

The *Courier-Journal* says: "To clear the decks for free trade we must first reform the tariff; we must study the needs of the treasury; we must select for the tax list such articles as yield a maximum revenue with a minimum of protection. Why a "minimum" of protection? Why any protection at all? What excuse is there for violating the Constitution by retaining duties that are in the slightest degree protective, when the way is clear for raising all the money that the Government needs by a purely revenue tariff?

Col. Watterson must apologize for his suggestion or confess the Chicago platform is a falsehood and fraud.

Did Dr. Craig Really Say This?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Is it possible that a man occupying the exalted position of presiding officer of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church used the language which is attributed to him by the Washington *Evening Star*, and which I find copied from that paper in THE SUN of this morning? I think it will bear quoting again:

"God will keep up His end of the row if you give Him a chance." That was the language used by Moderator Craig in his sermon Sunday, which had direct reference to the controversies before the General Assembly.

A more irreverent and sacrilegious remark has never been made, so far as my reading extends, by either Ingersoll or Huxley; and, if the Rev. Dr. Craig really made it, he is, it appears to me, a suitable subject for Church discipline. Surely we have a right to expect that, when referring to the Deity, the Moderator of the General Assembly will speak reverently, and not seem to be seeking to make a sensation by aping the antics of an adolescent agnostic. A PRESBYTERIAN.

A Ducal Plaint.

They call me Duke Veragua,
Because that is my name;
Of course, I want to see things,
Because that's why I came;
They call me Duke, old chappie,
And slap me on the back;
They send me out sightseeing,
With Dick and Tom and Jack;

But Lerduvall, protect us!
I do not want to see
So much as these Chicagoese
Are shoving on to me!
Its slaughter pens
And gambling dens
And boulevards
And hams and lards
And miles of streets
And frequent treats
And big hotels
And Lake Front swells
And five o'clocks
And dirty docks
And carriage rides
And Western prides
And shaking hands
And tooting bands
And works of art
And busy mart
And interviews
And spareribs stews
And building sites
And burning nights
And sales of wheat
And little feet
And dinners big
And tales of pig
And heads of stock
And quarts of bock
And buildings tall
And loftier gall
And smoky heat
And cans of meat
And Board of Trade
And bargains made
And Pullmanville
And business skill
And functions rare
And gobs of Fair
And county jail
And lots for sale
And water works
And grip car jerks
And race-track tips
And poker chips
And suppers late
And whiskey straight,

And forty million things beside,
At which Chicago points with pride.
They say: "Come on, old man, come on!"
From dawn to night, from night to dawn;
"You bet we're in it with a will,
For Uncle Samuel pays the bill!"

I'm weak in body, sore in head;
I know are long I shall be dead;
But are I am will some one tell
Who is their Uncle Samuel?
I've seen so much, the great, the small,
But him I haven't seen at all.

Great Chance for the Cadets.

From the Billville Banner.

At this writing there is not a Colonel in Billville. This is a great chance for somebody to lynch a fellow and make a war record.

INCOME TAXATION IS GROSS INJUSTICE AND INEQUITY.

The Views of Congressman Walker of Massachusetts.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Noticing your editorial article of yesterday on the income tax, I wish to make the following suggestion: Taking all property in the country, productive and unproductive, the income derived from it, separated from personal skill in business, which may properly be classed as natural income, the owners are able to keep but two-thirds of it. The Government of the country, State, county, town, and school district, now take from them in taxation fully one-third of this natural income.

All taxes are income taxes, and are and must be paid from incomes, and nothing else. It is a recognized principle that the same thing shall pay but one annual tax. If a man has received $100, or $100,000, either he has it or he has spent it. If he has it, he is taxed for it as property; if he has spent it, it is not destroyed. Some one else has it, and is taxed for it as property. If he has it still, it is both income and property, and he is doubly taxed.

Attempting to tax a man because he has had a thing, but has it not now, is one of those exercises of arbitrary power clearly prohibited by the Constitution, and repugnant to every sense of right. Again, attempting to do so is one of those acts which are the most corrupting to public and private morality that the Government can do.

The very existence of a man's business, in a large number of cases, depends on his security in the possession of the secrets of his methods, which are as much his invention and property as those of the author, which are secured to him by copyright, or the ideas of the mechanic, which are secured to him by patent; and a man will fight for them as for his life. The bread for his own mouth, and for his children's, depends upon them. In defending himself, he defends the best interest of all other men from the attempt of the Government to violate a natural right secured by the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

All taxes on persons who are strictly capitalists—that is, men who only draw interest on rents, and do no business, and of whom there is not one in this country where there are hundreds in England—is purely and simply double taxation: taxes being collected first on their property out of the income derived from it; and then another tax is collected on the total income, one-third of which the Government has already taken in taxes.

Again, has not Smith as good a right to have $5,000 as his neighbor Jones, and shall the Government put clogs upon, and hindrances in the way of, Smith's honest effort to get what it protects Jones in having?

Taxing Smith, who has not so much property as Jones, in excess of Jones, is putting the money Smith earns into the hands of Jones.

When the Government puts two taxes on Smith's $2,000 because he has earned it this year and saved it this year, and taxes but once the $5,000 Jones has, because he earned it ten years ago, it actually takes exactly five-sevenths of Smith's tax and gives it to Jones to add to his $3,000 which he already has in excess of Smith's capital.

Again, every well-informed person understands that the income per thousand derived by a capitalist from his property, generally decreases as the volume of his property increases. Men having the care of, and investing, only $50,000, usually average to get from their creditors nearly double the income on each $1,000 that the man will average to get who has $500,000 to care for. The rate of taxation per thousand being the same on the property of both, the rate of taxation on the income of one is nearly double that on the other. Furthermore, $50,000 is much more easily concealed from the tax gatherer.

But the great injustice of the income tax is most clearly seen in its effect upon the laboring classes, in discouraging enterprise. It is for the interest of the wage class to have as many different industries and as many employers as possible competing for their labor.

To a new industry or a young man beginning in business, secrecy as to profits is absolutely necessary to success. A revelation to the public of his profits upon his small or borrowed capital, turns the eyes of all men upon his enterprise, enabling those stronger in capital and credit to rob him of the result of his skill in discovering and supplying the wants of the consumer, by taking the business he has just built up, after years of struggle and sacrifice, out of his hands, just as it begins to be profitable, and, in many cases, the bread from the mouths of his children.

From my experience in business, and my knowledge of the practical working of the income tax of war times, I do not hesitate to say that the damage done to the business of the country by the attempt to enforce such a tax would be a hundred fold more in amount than the Government could possibly collect by it.

WORCESTER, MASS., May 25. J. H. WALKER.

TAX ON DISINFECTION.

Uncle Sam Wants $900 Duty on an Importation of the Health Board's.

The new portable disinfecting apparatus of the Health Department stands on the pier at the foot of East Seventeenth street, but it will not formally become the property of the local authorities until the Government gets 45 per cent. duty on it. The health authorities say this is too much, and they will debate the question with the Federal authorities. The machine cost $900, and $200 was spent in transportation. It was built especially for the department by a firm in Chemnitz, Germany. It resembles a boiler on wheels with a big smokestack. A red cross on a white background is painted on the machine in several places.

The disinfection is accomplished by live steam. The machine will be drawn by horses.

Was the Democratic Canvass of 1892 a Huge Lie?

From the Post-Express.

The *Boston Herald*, which is one of the papers that have no political principles except loyalty to the Administration, has delivered this opinion on the subject of tariff reform: "We need a tariff that will reform the abuses of the present system, while it does not fail to be considerate of the interests of invested capital. There is no need to produce a radical disturbance of business, and we do not anticipate any such thing as impending. Business will be all the better for the prevailing of rational ideas on this point." This is a plea for the continuance of the protective system, and the indications are that the policy which it outlines will prevail. But on any such policy the Democratic party must stand condemned.

The great issue in the recent Presidential canvass was made against protection; and it was denounced on various grounds:

1. It was declared in the Democratic platform to be unconstitutional.

2. It was defined in the same document as robbery, and it was described by the Democratic candidate as stealing and pocket picking.

3. It was reprobated by a certain class of thinkers as immoral and unchristian.

4. It was condemned by a certain class of thinkers as unphilosophical.

5. It was attacked by doctrinaires in political economy as the worst possible form of taxation.

6. It was criticised by the most moderate of all its opponents as no longer necessary.

Now the enemies of protection won the election. They have the President, a majority of the Senate, and a majority of the House of Representatives; and if they are honest men, their duty is clear, easy, obvious. They should abolish protection; and if their theories are sound, they will confer a great blessing on the country in doing so.

If protection be unconstitutional, we should get rid of it; if it be robbery, we should get rid of it; if it be immoral, we should get rid of it; if it be unphilosophical, we should get rid of it; if it be vicious taxation, we should get rid of it; if it be unnecessary, we should get rid of it. If the party in power does not deal with it as a system embodying any or all of these evils, then the canvass of 1892 was a huge lie.

Scribner's for June is remarkable chiefly for containing the end of Mrs. Burnett's "The One I Knew Best of All" and the beginning of Robert Grant's "Opinions of a Philosopher," a sequel to his "Reflections of a Married Man." The number contains an interesting account of "Life in a Logging Camp," a short story by T. R. Sullivan, poems by Edith M. Thomas, Anne Reeve Aldrich, and H. C. Bunner, and two articles on subjects in natural history.

How about the prudence of allowing a cough to run on, reaping the pulmonary and bronchial organs, when that approved and speedy remedy, Dr. D. Jayne's Expectorant, can be obtained from any apothecary?—*Adv.*

TRUSTEE WEEKS'S METHOD.

His Treatment of the Davies Estates, from Which He Is Said to Have Made $200,000.

Fresh evidence of Francis H. Weeks's singular financiering methods as a trustee came to light yesterday in the discovery of his treatment of Fannie, Bettie, and Mary Davies.

The law firm of De Forest & Weeks became custodian of the property of these three young women in 1873. It consisted of real estate, including lots in 125th street and Eighth avenue, which they had inherited respectively from Mrs. Margaret Douglas, their great grandmother, Harriet C. Cruger, their great aunt, and their mother, Mrs. Elizabeth M. Davies. The share of each was valued in 1873 at $80,000. As they were all minors, Robert De Forest was appointed guardian, and he served until ten years ago, when they became of age. Some time after that Lawyer Weeks induced each to execute separate deeds of trust giving him authority to hold the property and control the money realized if the property should be sold. It was sold some years ago for $250,000, and Trustee Weeks advanced the $250,000 on about thirty different mortgages as security.

It has been discovered that in all but four of five instances these mortgages were made in Weeks's name. He paid the interest on the mortgages to the young women when he felt like it, and when he delayed he explained plausibly that the delay was due to the difficulty of collecting the interest from those who had borrowed on the mortgages.

Miss Mary Davies died some years ago. Miss Bettie married Dr. E. H. Foster. MacGeph of London, and Miss Fannie married a Southerner, but the two married women permitted Lawyer Weeks to retain control of the mortgages. Now they have discovered through their lawyers that Weeks had not recorded the mortgages for years, and that in all but three or four cases he either assigned or sold the mortgages to others. The assigned mortgages were not recorded until the present month. Only the few mortgages that were made out in the name of the real owners remain in Assignee Welling's hands. It is estimated that Weeks realized $200,000 on the mortgages he sold. Until his flight he kept on paying the interest on the mortgages he had disposed of, thus concealing from the heiresses the fact that they had been swindled out of their property.

A lawyer who is retained by some of Weeks's victims said yesterday that he had good reason to believe that Weeks is now in Europe. The sailors on the yacht Montauk, which Weeks used to own, say that Weeks remained near the city for fully a week after his failure. He was in hiding in the house of a friend, preparing to skip to Europe. He finally sailed under an assumed name.

It has been learned that Weeks holds $35,000 life insurance, distributed as follows: Mutual Benefit Insurance Company, $10,000; Mutual Life, $10,000; Connecticut Mutual Life, $10,000; United States Life, $5,000 and $10,000; New England Mutual Life, $10,000; Connecticut Mutual, $10,000. The insurance policies are not included in the list of securities in the possession of the assignee.

CHILDREN'S DAY IN BROOKLYN.

Gov. Flower Reviews a Contingent of the 65,000 Sunday School Army.

The sixty-fourth anniversary of the Sunday School Union of Brooklyn was celebrated yesterday, and the town was in gala attire. The principal feature was the parade of the Sunday school children, and between 60,000 and 70,000 of them marched and countermarched before the admiring gaze of three times as many spectators.

There were twelve divisions. Each school was mustered in its own church, and the children were marched to a central church appointed for its division, where they united with other schools in singing anniversary hymns and listening to brief addresses. Then the children marched to their parading grounds. Military bodies could not have been better handled than the battalions of gayly attired, bright eyed, and rosy-cheeked children upon whom half of Brooklyn smiled with p