The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1894.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Peace!

Poor Prof. WILSON, away in the South, recovering slowly from a tremendous strain upon his intellectuals and his political conscience, now sees his bill knocked out completely. His health was sacrificed in vain. Of the WILSON tariff not even the name remains. The car of Juggernaut has gone over the Professor.

The bill for the Redistribution of Atrocities, now before the Senate, satisfies nobody but the beneficiaries of the redistribution and GROVER CLEVELAND, who wants "a settlement." The settlement he wants is anything that will relieve him from further responsibility for tariff reform. To wind up the adventure to which he summoned the Democracy in 1887 with a ringing bugle call, he would go down on his knees to WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr., himself, if that were necessary. "War to the knife!" was the first watchword. "Peace at any price!" is the last.

And peace at what a price! The party's pledges trampled on, the Democracy betrayed, the unique opportunity rejected and forever lost, Protection unscotched, the Populist income tax adopted, the drawbridge down for the men who march under the red flag.

Mr. Cleveland's Own.

The Democratic party, under the leadership and by the direction of that distinguished convert to Populism, the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND, seems ready to confiscate one-fiftieth of the income of certain corporate investments. Here once more is the list of the corporations and companies which the new Populist MOSES is to strike for a tax of two per cent.:

"A tax of two per cent. per annum on the net profits or income above ordinary working or operating expenses of all banks, banking institutions, trust companies, savings institutions, fire, marine, life, and other insurance companies, railroad, canal, turnpike, navigation, slack water, telephone, telegraph, express, electric light, gas, water, and street railway companies, and all other corporations, companies, or associations doing business for profit in the United States."

In his message of last December Mr. CLEVELAND declared with his usual positiveness of irrefragable supersapience that "these new assessments are absolutely just and easily borne." There are several millions of persons in this part of the country who will not accept the assertion of Mr. CLEVELAND or anybody else that these assessments are absolutely or relatively just. On the contrary, they regard them as absolutely unjust and unnecessary. Of the ease with which these taxes will be borne Mr. CLEVELAND will have full opportunity to judge next fall, if the Democrats in Congress don't have an interval of reason and kill the income taxes.

These absolutely just and easily borne assessments, this special CLEVELAND tax, will make Republican voters in almost every household. This CLEVELAND tax touches somebody in nearly every home.

A Woman's Tirade Against Women.

The well-known English novelist who writes under the pseudonyme of "Ouida" is not a believer in what are called woman's rights. She thinks that women already have all the rights they need, and that it would behoove them to make the most of these rather than to encroach on the fields of activity hitherto reserved to men. We must say, however, that the article in the *North American Review*, which sets forth her ideas, is far from being an example of sober and convincing argument. Her premises are often faulty, and, even when they are sound, they by no means justify the sweeping conclusions drawn from them.

It is strange that a woman's fundamental assumption should impute intellectual and moral inferiority to her own sex. That is what "Ouida" does, for she says, "Woman in public life would exaggerate the failings of men, and would not have even their few excellencies." This, at it stands, is merely a vague assertion which would not deserve attention. But now for the specifications: "Their [women's] legislation would be the offspring of panic or prejudice." This charge is divested of all weight by the novelist's admission that men's legislation is "too often" open to the same criticism. In the absence of experiment there is no evidence that the one sex is inherently more fitted for lawmaking than the other; in the regulation of the household, which requires both legislative and administrative powers, woman is indisputably skilful. But woman, according to "Ouida," would not "put on the drag of common sense, as man frequently does in public assemblies." We can only judge of what woman would do in public life by what we see her do in private life. She is notoriously the equal of man in the power of adapting outgo to income; in other words, of making both ends meet; and this obviously requires an incessant exercise of common sense.

"Ouida" goes on to perpetrate an unquestionable libel on her sex by declaring that "there would be little to hope for from woman's humanity, nothing from her liberality." This extraordinary averment runs directly counter to the convictions of all the distinguished sociologists, with Mr. HERBERT SPENCER at their head. They all agree in ascribing the increasing altruistic tendencies of enlightened nations to the growing influence of women. Indeed, one of the chief reasons why Mr. SPENCER is opposed to the concession of political rights to women is that he fears legislation, if materially influenced by them, would be *too* humane and *too* liberal. What is "Ouida's" ground for differing with the sociologists? Woman, she says, "when she is frightened, is more ferocious than man, and when she has power, more merciless." Now, waiving the Lamarckian assumption, contradicted by WEISSMAN, that the timidity superinduced in women by age-long exclusion from war and self-defence can be inherited, we must admit that the training of the individual woman in our generation makes her timid, and that some men encourage this trait by pretending to think it charming. It is not true, however, that timid women are more ferocious than men; the fish-wives of revolutionary Paris were the least timid of their sex.

The complaint, until recently well-founded, that women were cut off from the means of thorough self-development offered to men, was never, according to "Ouida," supported by facts. Why? Because certain princesses, like MARGUERITE DE VALOIS, Lady JANE GREY, and Queen ELIZABETH were taught the classical languages; and because such women as GEORGE SAND, GEORGE ELIOT, Mrs. BROWNING, and Mrs. SOMERVILLE managed to educate themselves. These instances, the novelist seems to think, refute "the unfortunate idea that there is no good education without a college curriculum." Well, nobody pretends that study at a university is indispensable even to a classical education. Two of the most admirable English historians of Greece—we refer, of course, to GROTE and FINLAY—were not university men; but those scholars would have been the last to make their own exceptional experience a ground for depreciating the utility of a university education to men, and inferentially to women. We cannot, all of us, whether men or women, become great historians, great scientists, great poets, or for that matter successful novelists; but we can all, whether men or women, turn to account in our several vocations the stores of general and special knowledge and the intellectual discipline obtainable through the higher educational establishments.

It may be that there is, as the late Dr. CLARKE of Boston thought, a physiological argument against woman's rights. But "Ouida" has not stated it, nor brought forward any other objections worthy of serious consideration; although it beseemed her, appearing in the ungracious rôle of decrying her own sex, to produce facts and reasonings of a most cogent kind. As it is, the anti-suffragists, when they read her tirade, may well cry, "Save us from our friends!"

The Cleveland Four Hundred.

In the Senate on Monday of last week Senator ALDRICH of Rhode Island made this statement:

"I am informed and believe that three hundred amendments have been agreed upon at the conference between the Secretary of the Treasury and some of the Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee. The Senator from Indiana the other day stated that I uttered an untruth when I made a statement similar to this."

Mr. VOORHEES, the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, then replied:

"I say again here-to-day it is not true; not one word of it. Doubtless there are amendments in contemplation. I saw the Secretary's [CARLISLE'S] statement this morning. It is merely conjectural as to what may happen, but when the Senator from Rhode Island undertakes to say what has happened, I am here to say that his statement is not correct."

Then the fiery free trader, MILLS of Texas, indignantly denied any knowledge of what was going on, and asserted his right of independent action:

"The gentleman says he understands there are three hundred amendments. He has a knowledge of what is going on in our party that I do not have; and I should like to know how he is so familiar with what is going on in the secret chamber of Democratic councils. Suppose there are three hundred or three thousand amendments, and I know nothing about them, if they do not meet my approval when they are brought before this body, I shall take pleasure in voting against them. So far as I am concerned, I am going to try to aid in making a Democratic measure; and I am going to do my best to make it a Democratic measure."

The suave PALMER of Illinois joined in denouncing the idea that any pressure from the White House could influence Democratic Senators:

"This body is not now the most popular part of the Government by a good deal; but if it should be said that the Secretary of the Treasury is prescribing the law for the government of the members of the party with which he acts, or that after the President or the Finance Committee has spoken, no Senator dare open his mouth, what would be the effect of the impression that would reach the country? It would not disgrace us, because we would be disgraced already if any Senator had parted with his right to present his opinions and act upon them."

Then VOORHEES, the Chairman, got the floor again and made this positive announcement of his own intentions with regard to further amendments:

"While on my feet I may as well as at another time say that I have made all the concessions in the direction of trusts and to the great protected industries that I shall make. I have gone the limit. There will doubtless be amendments. I am ready to make amendments, for instance in the administrative features of the measure. The administrative features as to the execution even of the income tax, I should be willing to amend; but as to interfering with its vitality, its amount, its substance, and its force, I never intend to give my consent. As to conceding anything to the sugar trust, or anything more on the subject of sugar, I shall not go a hair's breadth further."

So a debate, which as Mr. VOORHEES truthfully predicted "will be historic," ran on in the Senate. It culminated in an extraordinary and apparently alcoholic attack by Senator TURPIE of Indiana upon Mr. ALDRICH for alleging that three hundred amendments had been agreed upon in conference between Mr. CLEVELAND'S representative, the Secretary of the Treasury, and certain members of Mr. VOORHEES'S Finance Committee:

"Three lies, gross, palpable; three lies basely born; three lies of inconceivable mendacity. Is there no way of defeating the consideration of a bill, or of delaying it, except by deliberate falsehood, not only with respect to its contents, but with respect to other matters not before us, never before us? To-day the honorable Senator from Rhode Island repeats these three fables and says, in the first place, that there is a bill being prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury to supplant this one, which is to be the bill here to be considered. I did not understand the honorable Senator very exactly, but the honorable Senator from Rhode Island says again there are either three or three hundred amendments which have been agreed to by the majority of the Committee on Finance. Thirdly, that the present bill has never been considered by the committee, and is not the bill which the Committee on Finance intend to present to this body for its action. Who is the father of all these reports, which for the last ten or twenty days have been circulating? Who is the father, who is the author, who claims this paternity, except the honorable Senator from Rhode Island? He is equal to such paternity. He might doubtless claim the fatherhood of many more such things, such fictions, such falsehoods."

And on Tuesday, May 8, just one week after this historic discussion, in which indignant denials, unqualified protestations of ignorance, and spirited assertions of independence of Executive influence, were varied by square accusations of falsehood, hurled against the Republican asserting that three hundred amendments had been agreed upon between the Secretary of the Treasury and certain members of the Senate Finance Committee, printed copies of the CLEVELAND Tariff bill were laid on the desk of every Senator. If Mr. VOORHEES, Mr. MILLS, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. TURPIE took the trouble to enumerate the amendments agreed upon between Mr. CLEVELAND'S representative and the Democrats of the Finance Committee, they had the satisfaction of discovering that, in one respect, at least, Senator ALDRICH'S statement was inaccurate. He charged that there were three hundred changes in the Finance Committee's bill. There are more than four hundred.

The Navy Supply Bill.

The report with which Chairman CUMMINGS of the House Naval Committee has accompanied his introduction of the pending appropriation bill for the navy, furnishes an ample explanation and vindication of that measure.

Last year's bill carried but $22,104,061.39, while the present calls for $25,280,966.27, making an increase of $3,176,904.89, at a time when retrenchment in all the regular supply bills is desirable. But Mr. CUMMINGS shows not only that this increase is of public benefit, but that the bill is in the best sense an economical measure. Indeed, when we note that, for the first time in eight or ten years, not a dollar of extra expenditure is furnished for new construction, it must be evident that frugality is the watchword.

Again, while the appropriations now proposed are larger than either last year's or those of year before last, the reductions made by the committee from the official estimates exceed by a little last year's, and by nearly a million those of year before last. And yet this year Mr. HERBERT had cut down very heavily the estimates of the bureaus before submitting them; and, as Chairman CUMMINGS well says, the Secretary's long service on the House Naval Committee had peculiarly fitted him for that task. Take, for example, the estimates of the Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks. They called for $8,567,561.66. But Mr. HERBERT cut the proposed outlay on the Brooklyn Navy Yard from $1,788,661.92 down to $140,000; then he chopped the League Island estimate of $1,331,040.33 down to $86,900; next he allowed but $110,365.77 out of $1,167,950 asked for the Norfolk yard; from that he proceeded to reduce the $1,357,807.05 of the Mare Island yard to $37,019, while the estimate of $158,484.94 for Port Royal station dwindled to $18,368.

We need not go further into detail to illustrate the point that if, after so vigorous an exercise of the pruning knife by the Secretary, Mr. CUMMINGS'S committee has still been able to lop off $2,670,313.52 from these estimates, what remains may safely be accepted by Congress as representing current needs of the navy.

But there is still another way of looking at the matter, not less suggestive. For armor and armament the estimates ask $6,500,000, and the bill actually allows $4,000,000. Even the latter amount is very large, but on examining the reason for it we find that last year nothing at all was allowed for this item, although the estimates had called for $2,000,000. We further find that Mr. HERBERT'S report, as Chairman of the House Naval Committee at that time, explained that unlooked-for delays in the manufacture of armor had occurred, so that the appropriations made in previous years would cover all demands for armor and armament, and nothing more was needed. This year, however, Secretary HERBERT reported that the facilities for making armor have been "vastly improved," so that it would probably come forward at the rate of more than 250 tons a month. "It is due to this rapid increase in the rate of delivery," he proceeds to say, "that the large item for armor and armament is presented to Congress in the estimates of this year, as the money will be needed before the end of the next fiscal year to pay for the material actually delivered."

It is seen, therefore, that this item alone, absolutely needed to fulfil contracts already entered into, makes a difference between the present bill and its predecessor of $4,000,000, and that it not only fully accounts for the entire difference between them, but covers, also, a balance of over $800,000, which would otherwise represent a greater economy in this year's bill. But can the committee safely cut down to $4,000,000 the $6,500,000 estimated for this item? Without going into the exact particulars, it may be said that tabulated statements and explanations given by the report indicate that the amount in the present bill will be sufficient until new legislation at the next session is obtained. The more rigid inspection of plates lately enforced by the Navy Department, and the time required for applying the HARVEY process to armor of different shapes, will, it is thought, delay the deliveries of armor longer than had been anticipated. This is understood to be the view of the Navy Department also.

Congress, therefore, will make no mistake in providing the very moderate amounts called for by this bill. The reconstruction of the navy is a work of the highest importance, which has been pushed on with creditable vigor during the last ten or twelve years. Fortunately even the pending measure, by diverting old appropriations for a second pneumatic cruiser and a submarine craft to the construction of four torpedo boats, is able to do its part in the work. By providing, also, for giving a modern battery and new machinery to the Hartford, it practically adds another vessel to the active list, and one around which imperishable historic memories cluster. Perhaps when the bill reaches the Senate a way will be found by which it may do still more for new construction without seriously burdening the Treasury.

Breckinridge, Press Censor.

The Hon. WILLIAM CAMPBELL PRESTON BRECKINRIDGE seems to divide his time impartially between snivelling at his own beautiful penitential frame of mind and abusing the Court before which his case was tried and the press that reported his trial. He doesn't dare to abuse the Court, save by indirection, but against the press he raves with the usual virulence of exposed humbugs. A reporter of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* describes him "as straightening himself up to his fullest height"—we are glad to learn that the Colonel can be straight—and uttering this:

"If you will pardon me, I will say that my experience with newspaper men during the past two months leads me to believe that they do not know how to tell the truth."

In his Apologia at Lexington he is reported as speaking of the press as "contemptible," and as excepting those who belong to it from that general and gracious forgiveness which he bestowed upon the rest of mankind, calling upon heaven, of course, as if he were on visiting terms with it.

The press has done nothing against Mr. BRECKINRIDGE except to tell the truth about him. Even if it had not told the truth, it would not become a man who practised lying and deceit for ten years, registering under false names, lying to his friends and his family, trying to lie and sneak out of his obligations to his paramour—it would not become such a man to reprove untruth. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE is too censorious for a person in his plight. He forgets that he is on the stool of penitence, not in the pulpit. He should try to make his repentance seem deep and genuine, at least until after election day. He should remember that he is the prisoner in the dock asking for mercy, not the Judge, severe and fulminant.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE'S acting seems to lack plausibility. He must beware not to reveal in his rolling and contrite eye any reminiscence of a satyr leer; and after confessing in the church and beating his breast and trying to win the brethren, he ought not to let his angry passions rise against the press. He can regard the press, if he chooses, as part of what he calls his atonement. If it inflicts pain upon him, he can revel in the pain with that godly satisfaction which he felt in making affecting virtuous homilies after he had been toying with NEERA'S hair.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE has friends who seem to regard his whiping and whimpering and posturing and queer fits of self-exaltation and self-abasement and silver-washed morality and onion-pathos, as sublime. If he has one friend of sense, that friend should say to him at once: "WILLIE, I don't mind your being a good deal of a rascal, but I do wish you wouldn't be an ass."

As the season of "mad dog" scares approaches, it is interesting to refer to the recent annual report of the Pasteur Institute in Paris. No less than 1,648 persons bitten by rabid animals were treated at the institute during the past year, and of these only four died in spite of the treatment. Out of the total number of patients, 188 were not residents of France. Spain sent the largest number of these non-residents, Greece the next largest, and England the next. Eighteen of the patients came from Egypt, and one from the United States. The number from this country would, no doubt, have been much larger but for the existence of the Pasteur Institute in this city. Every one must recall the circumstances of popular excitement amid which several dog-bitten boys from New Jersey were sent to Paris for treatment a few years ago.

Even if the PASTEUR system of inoculation had done no other good it would certainly deserve much credit for having allayed the popular fear of hydrophobia. When that disease was looked upon as utterly incurable the nervous terror inspired by the bite of a dog supposed to be rabid was sometimes as fatal in its effects as the actual malady would have been. But, as all physicians know, the hope and expectation of recovery are in themselves a curative agent of marvellous potency.

The noticeable fact in connection with Mr. RICHARD CROKER'S retirement from certain responsibilities with which he has been burdened in the Tammany Hall organization, is that it is voluntary. Instead of seeking power it has rather been forced upon him, and, instead of being divested of it, he has resigned it. The most interesting question remaining is, can Tammany find another man equal to Mr. CROKER in ability and experience, and in his extraordinary power of applying both so as to achieve the end in view?

Our esteemed New England contemporary, the *Boston Herald*, struggles out of the Populist slime with sufficient self-possession to reflect that "either DAVID BENNETT HILL is right or the balance of the Democratic party is wrong." We do not believe that, after all, Senator HILL stands alone against the income tax; but, if he does, the Democratic party is right as well as he, for surprising as it may seem to a great many emotional observers, he is the Democratic party. The rest is Populist.

The COXEY movement doesn't move these days.—*Indianapolis Sentinel.*

Doesn't it? Poor COXEY is in jail, but what of the great COXEY principle, the special plundering of a certain few by an income tax? Coxeyism is still rampant in the White House, where our esteemed contemporary keeps its eyes fixed, and in its own office in Hoosierdom.

It does not seem to us to be a proper thing to denounce those excellent and intelligent women who are opposed to female suffrage, as "traitors to their sex." Yet at least two of the feminine advocates of an unsexed ballot have thus denounced the antis in public speeches. The language is harsh, unfair, unwise, and offensive. There can be nothing gained by it. It surely injures those who use it, while at the same time we should suppose that it must intensify the antagonism of those to whom it is applied. The antis merely entertain an opinion different from that of the pros upon a question which is yet under debate and upon which there ought to be full freedom of judgment. They are certainly on the conservative side. They entertain the views which have been entertained by nearly all women since the beginning of time. They are apprehensive that evil may come to their sex through the very serious political innovation which is advocated by the suffragists. They do not desire any change in their relations to the State. There is no reason why their should be scolded or maligned or held up to scorn for that.

When women engage in a public debate upon any subject they ought to set an example of that courtesy which, unhappily, is not always displayed by contentious men.

"I do not think that women have shown themselves as capable as men in intellectual work, neither in art, literature, science, nor music."—WALTER BESANT *in the Ladies' Pendant.*

No? But there is one thing certain, and that is that, judging from this sentence, many of them can write better English than Mr. BESANT.

JOHN BROWN, familiarly known as "Old JOHN BROWN of Ossawatomie," was born upon this day of the month of May in the year 1800. His birthplace was Torrington, Conn.; he was of Mayflower stock. He was executed at Charlestown, Va., in the 60th year of his age. In boyhood he became imbued with that hatred of chattel slavery which was the master passion of his whole life; and in the prime of manhood he began to form plans for its abolition. While he was yet young his family removed to Ohio. After his school days were over, he learned the trade of tanner, at which he worked for twenty years; then he became a trader in wool; then he engaged in farming in the northern part of this State; then he resumed the wool business in Ohio, by which time he was over 50 years old and had four stalwart sons.

When the struggle over slavery in Kansas began in 1854, Brown's four sons went there, and soon afterward he joined them, and took part in the irregular warfare which had begun between the anti-slavery and pro-slavery parties. He was engaged in the combat at Black Jack and in other like affairs; and it was after a desperate fight with a superior force at Ossawatomie that he acquired the sobriquet which clung to him until his death. In 1858, after the Free State party had triumphed in Kansas, he formed a plan to strike at slavery in Virginia with a few fighting men whom he drilled in Iowa. In July of 1859 he went to Virginia for the purpose of "looking around." He rented a farm near Harper's Ferry, where was the arsenal which he desired to seize. Twenty-two of his sympathizers, white and black, secretly joined him there, and boxes of arms were furtively conveyed to them. In the night of Oct. 16 his force captured the watchmen at the arsenal, took possession of it, seized the bridge crossing the Potomac, and took supplies from the houses of a number of residents, who were told that his object was to free the slaves "by the authority of God Almighty." Next day bodies of Virginia militia marched into the town, besieged the arsenal, and fought its occupants. Lives were lost on both sides. By nightfall, Brown had got out of the arsenal and had taken refuge in the engine house, where there was another fight.

In the night a body of United States marines, under Col. ROBERT E. LEE (subsequently Gen. LEE of the Confederate States), arrived, battered in the door of the engine house with artillery, and overpowered the small garrison, at the head of which Brown fought until prostrated by a sabre stroke, after which he was twice bayoneted. He was imprisoned, tried for conspiracy, convicted, condemned to death, and hanged at Charlestown on Dec. 2. His body was delivered to his widow, by whom it was conveyed to his farm at North Elba, N. Y., where it was buried.

Two of his sons had been killed while fighting by his side, one in Kansas, the other at Harper's Ferry. We believe that the two others are yet living.

There will be a number of new and attractive features at the Chautauqua Assembly this summer, and provision has been made there for the prosecution of sundry studies that have been overlooked in past years. It seems to us that the new programme is the best that has been drawn up since the Chautauqua system was invented. Especially interesting is the practical course provided for the "Boys' Club," organized last year, the chief aim of which is to interest its members in natural science, camp life, fishing, woodcraft, and other outdoor pastimes and studies. Particular commendation must be given also to the methods of the "School for Physical Education," the principal of which will be provided with twenty-four assistants this year. We do not think there has ever been such a worthy body of professors at the Assembly as there will be when it is opened in July; and we are sure there will be high instruction for those people who may be able to hear their discourses upon philosophy, science, history, literature, pedagogy, the arts, sociology, and other subjects.

The Chautauqua Assembly has been a success every year of the twenty-one years of its existence; and we are happy to know that the prospects for the Assembly of 1894 are most excellent.

A BLAST FROM CONNECTICUT.

The Democracy of That State Refuses to Surrender to Communism—A Noble Protest.

From the New Haven Evening Register.

It is sound as a general proposition, that the political organization of the States participating must abide by the deliberate judgment of a national party convention. Otherwise the principle of secession is still in force, with its inevitable results in the form of party disorganization and individual distress. What a Federal Congress does, whether as the achievement of compromise or conviction, in defiance of the orders of a National Convention reinforced by popular approval, not only need not be accepted as a party obligation, but should not be. Congresses are elected to carry out the will of the people, not to substitute their own will for it. These two propositions are to be kept clearly in mind in determining whither the present Congressional leadership is carrying the Democratic party, and whether it is wise for the several State organizations to follow that leadership. The difference is exactly the difference between victory and defeat.

The National Democratic Convention was explicit in its tariff utterances. It declared a tariff for protection only, which disregards revenue, to be unconstitutional, as well as a fraud and a delusion. It was not a scientific declaration in the sense of recommending a schedule of percentages, but a concise declaration of a principle. It properly restricted itself to a statement of principle, expecting a Democratic Administration to shape its legislation in absolute obedience to it. That is to-day the guiding principle of Democratic tariff reform, so far as responsible party commands go.

The first departure from the instructions given by the Democratic national organization was made by President Cleveland himself when he recommended in his annual message a tax upon incomes derived from corporate investments. There was no authority for this recommendation either in any official utterance of the national Democratic party or in its most remote traditions. It was a purely gratuitous contribution to the agitation for reform. A second departure was taken when the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives reported a deficiency instead of a Revenue Tariff bill, and included in it its arbitrary construction of President Cleveland's gratuitous income tax recommendation. This departure was ratified, in the full bloom of its inconsistency, by the House majority. A third departure from explicit instruction has now been taken by the Senate.

The question now becomes, what are the several States of the Union to do about it? What especially is Connecticut to do about it? For years this little State has divided with New York, New Jersey, and Indiana the honor of being the Northern and Eastern stronghold of the national Democracy. Her voice has been powerful in the councils of the party; her influence has been felt in the shaping of official utterances; her preferences have been weighty in selecting Presidential standard bearers; her loyalty to Democratic traditions and Democratic principles has carried dismay into the camp of the enemy. Is Connecticut ready to surrender its convictions and its honor to the irresponsible compromises of men, who have defied the order of the people? Is Connecticut Democracy so constituted that, for the sake of temporary advantage and delusive harmony, it will accept as its creed a tariff faith that was never preached from a Democratic pulpit, and which is almost wholly a policy of accidents? Is it inclined to stand by the flag that brought it victory, or to desert it for one that presages defeat? 'Tis useless to attempt to beg the question; the parting of the ways is abrupt. Either the Connecticut Democracy must burn its bridges behind it and take its leadership from Congress, or it must be true to its history and take its leadership from the people officially and formally assembled.

The present national leadership is leading us away from the tried and accepted standards of Democracy. It is leading us into an unholy combination with the cranks and whizzbubs of the Populist party. The Democracy of Connecticut should protest against this alliance, at the cost if necessary of temporary defeat—yes, even of premeditated self-imposed defeat. The income tax is but a suggestion of the fatal errors an alliance with Populism will carry the Democracy into. It is but the inch conceded to the ell that will be demanded. The renunciation must be made now, when the orders of the last National Convention are ringing in our ears. The situation rises above internal factional quarrels; above the ambition of deserving men. It concerns the vitality of the party, its power for good in the future, its respect for its own traditions. If we are on the threshold of a reorganization, which seems to be true, let the reorganization proceed along the lines of old-fashioned Democracy, not along the lines of new-fashioned Populism. Let us stick to Jefferson here in Connecticut, no matter what States join the rabble of Coxey's following, for after all Coxey is but the full fruitage of the Populist idea that the business of the Government is to support the people. The Democratic idea is that it is the business of the people to support the Government.

MUST TRY AGAIN.

The Democratic Movement Brought to Failure—View of an Honest Democrat.

From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

TACOMA, April 30.—Following is an authorized report of an interview with Henry Watterson:

"And the Wilson bill?"

"What Wilson bill? Ah, yes; I think there was a bill. Ah, yes, to be sure, the Wilson bill; but then that died-a-born'n', didn't it? And now we have the Voorhees bill, or the Harris bill, which is it? Anyhow, it is not worth remembering, because whatever is done to-day will be undone to-morrow, and in no event will any Democratic hope or promise be fulfilled. We shall have to do the whole thing over again. In six short months the good work of twelve long years has been squandered. The tremendous driving power of a great principle, twice approved by overwhelming popular majorities, has been dissipated, and the courage and discipline of a great advancing and conquering army has been lost, because Grover Cleveland did not know what he was about when he wrote his message in 1887. It is a sad end to many campaigns of education, nobly fought. It was not thus when the Convention of 1892 rose upon its feet and brushed aside the protectionist gibberish represented as tariff gospel by its Platform Committee, substituting by a two-to-one vote a decisive tariff-for-revenue-only declaration, that the confident and triumphant legions of Democracy looked to see the outcome. But God is just, and, though somewhat paralyzed, the Democratic hand is strong enough to pick its foe flat and try it again."

The Sun.

From the Sidney, N. Y., Record.

There are two suns whose beams illuminate our republic. One is situate 94,000,000 miles from our globe, animating life with its rays, bedding forth the beauteous promises of spring. Another Sun, also, beams forth its rays upon our earth. It nourishes our intellectual forces, unfolding the beauties of the mind. It is a Sun that shines by day as well as by night. We have carefully weighed these words. They are not printed for effect. We mean just what we say, and we can readily prove it. As a medium of news, prompt, concise, and accurate, it leads all, while in the matter of editorials, it towers as far above its colleagues as a Gulliver among Lilliputians. The Sun ought to find a foothold in every American home.

Foreign Notes of Real Interest.

A detective superintendent of the London police bears the appropriate name of Ferrett.

Coxey is spoken of by the London *Daily News* and the *Pall Mall Gazette* as an Ohio Congressman.

The Bank of England will be 200 years old next July, and the event will perhaps be celebrated in some way.

Mr. Levi P. Morton has gone from London to Tunbridge Wells, in the south of England, to take a course of the waters there.

The London Stock Exchange has an orchestra, composed of members of the Exchange, accounted one of the finest amateur musical organizations in the city.

Five war ships were sold out of the service by the British Admiralty two weeks ago, being unfit for further employment. One was a wooden battle ship built sixty years ago. Three of the others were also wooden ships, and one was an iron troop ship.

It is suggested in France that "the beautiful and patriotic features" of Joan of Arc, the new patron saint of the nation, whose memory is being honored in various prominent ways all over the country just now, be put on the next edition of French postage stamps.

NEW TREATY WITH NICARAGUA.

American Delegates from Bluefields Look for Final Settlement Soon.

NEW ORLEANS, May 8.—The agents who were sent to Washington by the Americans at Bluefields are now in this city on their way home. Mr. B. B. Seat, United States Vice-Consul at Bluefields, expects the matter will be arranged by a treaty between Nicaragua and this Government, which will be permanent and to the advantage of American residents. He said:

"As matters now stand the property of an American is of uncertain value. He does not know when the Nicaraguan Government will interfere with him. No mere verbal assurance nor any agreement by the Administration with the residents is wanted by the Americans interested in Nicaragua. How soon the treaty will be effected I cannot say. The United States has never been bound by the treaty of Managua, and does not dispute the rights of the Nicaraguan Government to assemble troops in the reservation. Nicaragua is sovereign of that country. I believe, though, all the differences will be settled in due course of time, and that this Government will not neglect its people in that part of the world."

Speaking of probable war and another revolution, Mr. Seat says there is no doubt there will be more trouble between Nicaragua and Honduras. He said that it would be impossible for the people of those countries to live one year without trouble. Everything is in an unsettled state.

Other Bluefields Americans are of the opinion that the colony there has been very shabbily treated by this Government, and are disposed to lay all the blame on Secretary Gresham. They say that Gresham's attention was called to the fact that the vested rights of Americans had been attacked, and that the privileges purchased of the Mosquito Indians by the American Mahogany Company for $10,000 had been seized by the Nicaraguans. The American banana plantations are all on fifty years' leases, granted by the Mosquito Government. Gen. Lacayo was asked to guarantee these leases, but refused, leaving the Americans under the impression that the leased lands would be confiscated unless the United States interfered in their behalf. The opinion was also expressed that the State Department was a little jealous of the navy, and that Secretary Gresham only ordered Minister Baker to Bluefields when he discerned that Capt. Watson of the San Francisco might win some laurels.

FATHER MALONE'S 73D BIRTHDAY.

Protestant Clergymen at Its Celebration in the Amphion Theatre.

The seventy-third birthday of the Rev. Sylvester Malone, pastor of the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul in Williamsburgh, and Regent of the University, was celebrated yesterday by services in the church in the morning and exercises in the afternoon at the Amphion Theatre by the children of the schools connected with the church. From early in the morning the venerable priest received congratulatory telegrams and flowers. Father Malone was the celebrant of the mass in the morning, the Rev. H. A. Gallagher of St. Michael's was deacon, and the Rev. Hugh Ward of St. Malachi's sub-deacon. The Rev. Fathers Kellaher and Hartnett were the attendants. Father Malone, in his sermon, said that in the almost fifty years he had served as a parish priest he had endeavored not only to imbue the young with religion but with patriotism.

Fully 3,000 persons were present at the exercises in the theatre. The parochial schools, under the charge of the Sisters of St. Joseph, furnished the entertainment. Father Malone's address was responded to by an avalanche of flowers. Many Protestant clergymen were present and Catholic priests from all over Brooklyn, Long Island, and from this city and New Jersey. Dr. McGlynn was also there. Father Malone's golden jubilee, when he will have been fifty years a priest, will be celebrated in August.

EDWIN BOOTH MEMORIAL.

Services at the Grave of the Tragedian in Mt. Auburn Cemetery.

BOSTON, May 8.—The dedication of the Booth Memorial at the grave of Edwin Booth at Mount Auburn took place to-day. The Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale made an address and read passages from the Bible. The Lord's Prayer was then repeated and a benediction by Dr. Hale closed the services. There were present besides Edwina Booth Grossman, daughter of the deceased actor, and her husband, Joseph Jefferson, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Miss Jefferson, Mrs. Ole Bull, Sara Jewett, Mrs. Field, two of the granddaughters of Joseph Jefferson, and Mr. and Mrs. Elwell.

The stone work of the monument was designed by Stanford White, and is in the form of an Athenian monolith. On the face of this is a bronze by F. Edwin Elwell, which represents Mr. Booth at the prime of life, and is said by his daughter to be an excellent portrait.

Women's Part in Affairs of State.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Apropos of the discussion of the woman suffragist movement, now so graphically and interestingly reported in THE SUN, it might be of interest to all concerned to know that, while the present movement has some new features in it, the right of women to take part in affairs of State was conceded them some centuries ago.

I find in Jennings's Anecdotes of the British Parliament that women sat in council with the Saxon Witas, and that in the great council at Beconcell, A. D. 694, abbesses sat and deliberated, and five of them signed the decrees of the council along with the King, Bishops, and nobles. In the reign of Henry III., 1226-1295, and of Edward I., 1275-1307, four abbesses were summoned to Parliament, viz., Shaftesbury, Berking, St. Mary of Winchester, and of Milton. Also, that in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Edward III., 1361, the Countesses of Norfolk, Ormond, March, Pembroke, Oxford, and Athol were summoned to Parliament.

In view of these facts I see no reason why, if women were admitted into the councils of Kings a good many centuries ago, they should be held incapable of taking part in the councils of a President in the nineteenth century.

BENEDICT J. O'DRISCOLL.

WASHINGTON, May 7.

Let Us Hear from Those Who Paid the Income Tax.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* THE SUN deserves hearty thanks for its sturdy fight against renewing the income tax. When connected with the United States Treasury, and afterward editorially with various financial journals, I became familiar with the matter and was active in promoting repeal of the tax.

There are many still living who suffered injustice from that tax. Doubtless many still live who remember the practical workings of the income tax enacted during the civil war, and can state particulars of the many wrongs it wrought. Every one who can give the facts in his own case or in that of any one else should send word to THE SUN, promising that his name be reserved if desired. A. R.

Mrs. Cahill's Literary Style Admired.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Whatever the faults of dwellers about the corner of Washington and Horatio streets, at least one of them is mistress of an excellent English prose style. Mrs. Kate Cahill's defence of herself and her sons in THE SUN of May 5 is that of a woman who knows how to frame her thoughts in fit and simple words. Her letter is mostly in monosyllables, and it contains few words of more than two syllables, while there is scarcely a word used inexactly or in other than its most familiar sense. Her vocabulary may not be large, but it is exact and sufficient. Only a person of considerable force and sense could have written such a letter, and not one practiced writer in ten could have said better what Mrs. Cahill had to say. Mrs. Cahill's style exemplifies the best of THE SUN's own teachings in the art of expression. Respectfully, READER.

NEW YORK, May 7.

Yacht Money Prizes.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* *In re* Mr. Smith's eloquent plea in favor of making the prizes for yachts sums of money instead of cups—why not do as the Irish Yacht and Rowing Club's committees do—the winner of a race to have the option of taking his prize in money or plate. That would, in the opinion of the writer, be a satisfactory way of settling the question. RUDOLPH FITZPATRICK.

NEW YORK, May 7, 1894.

Mr. John Stewart Explains.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The interview published in your issue of the 4th inst. represents me as being unfriendly in my criticism of Dr. Wylie.

As I had no intention of conveying that impression, kindly publish this as a correction. The differences of opinion seeming to exist is trivial, and will be amicably adjusted without delay. Very truly yours, JOHN STEWART.

Lieut.-Col. Frank White.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* J. H. W. writes that Lieut.-Col. Frank White is alive. Will he be so kind as to send me his address? The White he speaks of is not the one wanted. J. R. C., P. O. box 1,802, New York city.

While waiting for a cough "to go as it came," you are often sowing the seeds of consumption. Better try at once Dr. Jayne's Expectorant, a sure cure for all coughs and colds.—Adv.

FUNERAL OF JOHN JAY.

Many Distinguished Men Attend the Services in Trinity Chapel.

Funeral services were held over the body of the late John Jay in Trinity Chapel, in West Twenty-fifth street, yesterday morning. The body was conveyed from the Hotel Savoy, where Mr. Jay died, to the church shortly before 10 o'clock, at which hour the services began. The coffin was carried up the main aisle by the pall bearers, Dr. James M. King, Charles E. Whitehead, Carl Schurz, Seth Low, William M. Evarts, Abram S. Hewitt, Chauncey M. Depew, Henry G. Marquand, Charles A. Peabody, John Bodgwick, Benjamin D. Silliman, John