The Sun.

SUNDAY, JULY 1, 1894.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 65
DAILY, Per Year	6 50
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 Restoration of King George.

The income tax stands to impose upon the people of the United States a principle unheard of, we believe, in any free country, and identical with that on account of which the thirteen colonies of North America rose in revolt against King GEORGE. There is to be taxation without representation.

In every European country where an income tax exists the citizens taxed get in return special powers in politics. Their larger obligations to the State are accompanied by a larger voice in its management. Thus KRUPP of Essen, who pays an enormous income in Prussia, has the power to place in the legislature as many representatives as the twenty thousand workmen who are in his pay. This is the extreme case; but such discrimination in political status for the benefit of those who are discriminated against by special taxation is found throughout the European systems. Without that, there would be taxation without adequate representation. The income tax now in the Tariff bill is founded solidly on the principle of taxation without representation.

Is this bewildering eccentricity in our Government, this immeasurable violation of every American rule, the threat of blind socialistic fanaticism? Not a bit of it. It is a self-absorbed and coldly calculated scheme to make GROVER CLEVELAND solid with the silver men, and to lay a griping southern hand upon Northern flesh.

Why It Is Forbidden.

Our Populist-Democratic contemporary, the *Indianapolis Sentinel*, is finally driven to ask a question about the income tax, which leads it in its own words to state in the clearest manner possible the reason why such a principle is now beyond the possibility of support, consistent with the duty of a Democrat:

"Why should not the United States tax wealth wherever it may be located within its bounds? Its present taxes are taxes on consumption only."

Excluding rigidly all considerations of direct expediency, the United States, or, in other words, the Democratic majority in Congress and the Democratic representative in the White House, are forbidden to put a "tax on wealth," for the very sufficient reason that the "present taxes are taxes on consumption." The system which we have with us has been in operation since the foundation of the Government. To substitute another system for it would be a revolution for which Congress can find no authority. Indeed, the popular verdict of 1892, under which Congress is now supposed to be acting, expressly forbade this change from the old to the new, by overwhelmingly defeating the two socialistic parties which proposed it. The specific change in our taxation recommended by the Democratic party, and subsequently approved by the people, was the alteration of the protective tariff to a constitutional tariff for revenue only. Now to enact this novel and rejected principle of socialism is an outrage upon the electorate, a surprise and cheat upon the public, utterly opposed to the accepted and trusted rules of American legislative procedure.

Senator VEST has confessed in the Senate that this income tax is a "new system of taxation." The Hon. WILLIAM E. RUSSELL of Massachusetts, whose political associations unfortunately make him powerless to render the Democratic party any help in this atrocious crisis, in his address before the graduates of the Yale law school on Tuesday last, spoke of socialism as something so different from our existing institutions that, if it were to be adopted in this country, it should first enter through the door of a constitutional amendment. "Should, for example, the doctrines of socialism or populism ever prevail," said Mr. RUSSELL, "they should, because of their radical change of the purpose and principles of our Government, find expression in constitutional law."

The income tax established at this session of Congress proclaims the creed of the Democratic party and the traditional practice of the United States to be the football of any crank Executive or socialistic agitator in Congress.

The *Indianapolis Sentinel* may hug the income tax to its bosom as its own, but the moment it raises its voice to further its enactment by a Democratic Congress between now and March 5, 1897, it but repeats the trick of treachery upon the victorious organization of 1892, and upon those who trusted in its good faith and honorable purpose, which was first born to this country in the White House, and has since been fed on the life blood of Democracy.

What Is Going On in Canada.

Some of the telegrams from Ottawa and Toronto might lead one to infer that the outcome of last week's provincial election in Ontario has a good deal of significance. The news that the Dutch had taken Holland would be equally impressive. For many years the Conservatives have had no firmer hold on the Dominion Government than the Liberals have had on the provincial Government in Ontario. The recent contest at the ballot box was merely a fight between the Ins and the Outs, and the result means simply that, with the help of their patronage, the Ins have managed to retain the offices. As has been proved on previous occasions, the local success of the type of Liberalism personified in Sir OLIVER MOWATT, who has governed the Province of Ontario for twenty-two years, has no material bearing on the result of a Dominion election. The Liberals of Canada have for the moment no programme with which they can hope to attract the people—not even the programme of total or partial reciprocity; for the framers and sustainers of our Tariff bill have made gratuitously to the Canadian producers of food staples and raw materials concessions in return for which our manufacturers might have secured valuable access to Canadian markets.

The only incident of some importance connected with the late election in Ontario was the appearance in some force of the so-called Patrons of Industry—a Canadian counterpart of our Farmers' Alliance. This party, which returned fifteen members to the provincial legislature, would have been strenuous advocates of a reciprocity treaty, and, if that were recognized as unattainable, of annexation, had not our Tariff bill promised to give them nearly everything which they desire, without any sacrifice upon their part.

As to the Intercolonial Conference now sitting at Ottawa, nobody expects it to propose any agreement between all the colonies represented and Great Britain, binding them to admit each other's products on terms more favorable than those granted to similar commodities coming from foreign countries. It is not believed that any of the delegates is empowered to take this first and indispensable step toward imperial federation. The practical object of the Conference, so far as its promoters in the Dominion are concerned, is apparently to get Government subsidies for Sir CHARLES TUPPER's ocean cable, and for a line of fast transatlantic steamers to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to divert commerce from New York by affording a quicker means of transportation to Chicago. It was, doubtless, this scheme which Sir CHARLES TUPPER had in mind, when he talked vaguely of a blow which Canada was destined to deal at the port of New York.

The Campaign Against the Lords in England.

Lord ROSEBERY, in one of the speeches made since he became Premier, declared that while personally he was inclined to favor improving the composition of the House of Lords rather than diminishing its powers, yet both he and his colleagues would accept instructions on the subject from the Liberal party, provided, of course, the mandate were definite and peremptory. The first step toward furnishing the Ministry with authentic evidence of the opinions of their supporters was taken last week in Leeds at a conference of the National Liberal Federation. It is noteworthy that at this meeting, which was very largely attended, not a voice was raised against the demand that the legislative function of the Peers should be reduced to a nullity, and the only opposition came from those who deemed the proposed resolutions too moderate, and would prefer the summary abolition of the upper chamber.

The resolutions adopted at the Leeds conference present the case of the people versus hereditary legislators in the following form: The power at present exercised by the House of Lords to mutilate and reject measures passed by the representatives of the people in the House of Commons is pronounced inconsistent with the right of free popular self-government. That the inconsistency complained of exists is undeniable; but what is the suggested remedy? That the Government should introduce and press a measure providing that, whenever a bill passed by the Commons shall be altered or rejected by the Lords, the same bill may be reaffirmed by the Commons, with or without such alteration, and shall be then subject only to the royal assent, having received which it shall become a law.

But how is such a measure to be carried, seeing that the Lords will unquestionably decline to commit suicide by acquiescing in it? The authors of the project must have in reserve an answer to this question, although for the moment they refrain from stating it. As a last resort, they must contemplate a revolution in which, apparently, they count on the complicity of the crown and of the judiciary. They take for granted that the sovereign, acting on the advice of a Liberal Prime Minister, will proclaim the measure which virtually extinguishes the veto power of the Lords to be an act of Parliament, notwithstanding that the assent of the upper House is lacking. They also assume that all subsequent measures declared to be laws in spite of the dissent of the upper chamber will be enforced by the Judges.

We need not point out that both of these assumptions are extremely venturesome. It is very doubtful whether the sovereign, no matter what advice a Prime Minister might give, would, except under the pressure of a great popular upheaval and the threat of immediate deposition, proclaim a measure to be a law of England, if it wanted one of the three elements of assent which have been held indispensable throughout English Parliamentary history, except for one brief period under the Commonwealth. Even if the crown should prove subservient, and connive at the practical elimination of the Lords from the national legislature, as the French noblesse were abandoned by LOUIS XVI. in 1789, it is probable that many of the present Judges would have to be coerced into acknowledging that a bill sanctioned by only two of the three constituents of the lawmaking power could have the force of law.

We see, then, that unless the delegates to the Leeds conference were simply beating the air and talking for the empty purpose of seeing their words in print, what they must really intend in the last resort is a revolution. Will the British people lend themselves to a revolution for merely destructive purposes? Are they likely to accept the Leeds programme so long as it remains purely negative, and suggests no substitute for the existing second chamber, no alternative check upon the otherwise unbounded power of the House of Commons? There is in England no referendum, or arrangement for submitting proposed laws to the direct vote of the people, as there is in the Swiss Confederation. There is no written Constitution and independent judiciary, charged with maintaining its supremacy over the mere law-making function, as there is in the United States. The absence of such checks and limitations is the more significant and dangerous on account of the extreme centralization of the United Kingdom.

It is hard, indeed, for an American citizen even to conceive the stupendous powers which would be concentrated in the House of Commons were it to be left untrammelled and omnipotent through the virtual annihilation of the restraint now exercised by the House of Lords. Let us imagine that in this country we possessed no Federal or State Constitutions, no State Executives, Judiciaries, or Legislatures, and that all the lawmaking powers, now vested in the State Legislatures and the peoples of the States acting through Constitutional Conventions, were all monopolized by the Congress at Washington. Let us imagine, further, that our national Executive, in whose hands would lie the appointment of the judiciary throughout the nation, was himself dependent from one day to the next on the shifting majority of the House of Representatives, and that the sole existing check on hasty, vindictive, or ruinous action on the part of that assembly was the possible refusal of the Senate to concur. Under such conditions, what should we think of a demand for the abolition of the Senate's veto power, if this demand were unaccompanied by the proposal of a practicable substitute, such as a referendum?

No reasonable person defends the British House of Lords, as it is at present composed; and few modern Liberals would attempt to justify the application of the hereditary principle to legislation, even if they are inclined to tolerate it in the case of the ostensible and merely decorative executive. We find it hard, however, to believe that a people so sober-minded as is that of Great Britain will commit itself to revolution until some one has brought forward a practicable and acceptable substitute for the House of Lords, considered as the only check on the otherwise limitless authority of the House of Commons.

An Island in Extremis.

An achievement which the world hailed as one of the crowning triumphs of this century brought poverty and distress to a famous and once prosperous little island. The five thousand people of St. Helena never dreamed, in the days when most of the shipping that rounded the Cape of Good Hope invariably called at their thriving port, that the wharves of Jamestown would become grass-grown and its shops would close for lack of trade. The year round an average of four vessels a day had dropped into port to replenish their supplies of fresh provisions and water. St. Helena was the great refreshment station on the ocean highway of the South Atlantic. Europe had utilized it as the prison of her greatest enemy. The world looked upon it as a blessing to the seafarer and a convenience to trade; and the natives thought the sun of prosperity would never set upon their little volcanic rock.

But it did set on the day that the Empress EUGENIE opened the Suez Canal. Jamestown has never been herself since that day. Where were the buyers of ship's stores and garden stuff who were wont to make the long, narrow ravine in which the town is built, a scene of busy traffic? Where were the Indiamen, and the ships of America, Spain, and the Netherlands? Few of them have seen St. Helena since the new route to the Orient was opened. The number of vessels calling at the island has steadily dwindled, and Jamestown sees only one foreign ship to-day for every six that used to sail into her harbor.

At last a cry of distress has arisen, and the British public are answering the appeal for aid. The island is only a speck in the ocean, far removed from most of the interests of the world. Its people knew not what to do when the means of subsistence on which they had confidently relied proved elusive and finally deserted them entirely. Soon the population began to decrease. Many of the able-bodied men went to the Cape of Good Hope to seek employment. In spite of every effort, however, the condition of the islanders has gone from bad to worse. In August, two years ago, the distress became so great that the pangs of hunger had begun to be felt when a British man-of-war opportunely arrived and relieved the most pressing necessity.

The problem now is not merely to extend temporary relief, but to provide the natives with the means and training required to make them self-sustaining. The islanders have tried to develop their fisheries, but have failed, owing to their inexperience. But fish abound in their waters, and it is believed that the fish-curing industry may be made an adequate means of livelihood.

The "St. Helena Relief Fund" has been opened in London for the purpose of raising about $15,000, with which to buy a number of suitable boats, with nets and gear, to engage for a time the services of experienced fish curers, and to establish a school for the training of the islanders in this industry. The Government has donated the use of certain public buildings in St. Helena for this purpose.

This is not the first time that a handful of people, in some isolated corner of the world, have needed succor, and, we believe, they have never appealed in vain. The few hundred residents on the island of Tristan da Cunha found themselves in sore straits after the decline of the Antarctic whaling and sealing industry, and, two years ago, the natives of Watling's Island, where COLUMBUS first set foot on American soil, asked for aid to buy a small vessel to carry their produce to market. These little communities have not the advantage of the great variety of resources usually open to industrious men, and it is fitting, if need be, that the great world outside their narrow sphere should help them to ways of better helping themselves.

Bribe-giving and Bribe-taking.

It is discreditable to reputable merchants that they have been paying bribes to the police to enable them to violate municipal ordinances, and tipping the police to induce the patrolmen to perform their appointed duty in the protection of property.

Undoubtedly, the ordinances against the obstruction of sidewalks interfere with the convenience and even the necessities of many merchants in this crowded city, where the heavy business is chiefly concentrated in a comparatively small and narrow district in the lower part of the town, and the warehouses are not constructed, and in most cases could not be constructed, so as to avoid the use of the sidewalks for transferring and keeping goods during the hours of busiest traffic. This necessity is so well understood by the New York public that they bear without complaint the obstructions caused by it. They look on it as practically inevitable, and good-naturedly climb over the obstacles to their progress, or walk outside of them. If, then, the ordinances cannot be enforced without serious injury to business, the traders could unite to secure their amendment or mitigation, and they would have public opinion on their side. They are not obliged to submit to extortion to secure any reasonable privileges essential to the conduct of their business. They could gain them more surely by combining to resist the corrupt exactions and refusing to become guilty of bribery.

They have paid the bribes to the police in order to save greater expense which they should properly bear, and not merely to escape from the enforcement of ordinances against them which prevent the transaction of their business in the only way in which it can be done. They have been both cowardly and criminal. They have submitted to extortion and they have bought exemptions simply for the purpose of getting additional profit.

Of course, this is no excuse for the police in extorting and taking bribes. They are paid by the public more than the police of almost any other city to prevent violations of the law and to protect property; yet it appears that some of them are carried regularly on the pay rolls of private individuals or corporations, in order that they may render them special services inconsistent with the services they owe to the public generally. They are taught to use their places to make money by extortion, and they grow shameless in their corruption encouraged by reputable merchants. With the reputable sustaining them in their vile practices, they are the readier to prey on the disreputable who lie in wait to attack property by swindling devices, for which they should be apprehended by the police and brought to punishment for the protection of society.

A prominent man declared publicly, not long ago, that of his personal knowledge great and rich corporations paid large sums as blackmail to prevent legislative and municipal interference hostile to their interests and their rights. He gave no names; but they ought to be named, for they use their money to corrupt society, and they have no excuse for doing it. If they submit to extortion they acknowledge that they want protection to which they are not rightfully entitled. If every individual and every corporation thus corruptly approached should forthwith make public the attempt at extortion, instead of yielding to it, the blackmailing would stop. Obviously, dishonesty will pay hush money to obtain immunity; but why should honesty submit to the bleeding?

Unfortunately, the LEXOW committee is to adjourn for the summer; but its investigation ought not to be brought to an end before all sorts of these reputable bribers of the police and of the administrators of the law, these consenting victims of blackmail, have confessed to their corrupting practices. The whole system must be destroyed, root and branch, and to that end all its ramifications must be exposed, the more especially where they extend into the field of business otherwise honest and decent. Bribe-giving must be made even more disreputable than bribe-taking. The source of the corruption is the money paid, and so long as it is paid the blackmail will go on.

A Model of Irony.

We have believed that our esteemed contemporary, the *Kansas City Times*, was a Cuckoo of the Cuckoos, but we are now convinced that we have been duped by its subtle irony. Anybody who will take the trouble to let the following extract from this misunderstood Missouri journal filter through his intellectuals will agree with us that not praise but branding blame is intended. Otherwise the article would be unintelligible save in the wards of Bedlam:

"When time has moved forward until the events of to-day are recalled as memories, the struggle now pending in the Senate will be an instructive study. The Democrats, as a rule, are making an heroic contest for the preservation of the principles of the party. United, determined, courageous, they are contesting against vast odds to fulfil the pledges of the party and release the people from the thraldom of excessive and onerous taxation. It is a battle of giants, a contest of Titans. On the banners of the faithful leaders are inscribed the watchwords of the party, the phrases which imply social and political progress toward liberty, equality, and fraternity.

"Missouri is honored in the fact that one of her sons is among the leaders in the fight. Arkansas shares this distinction with her. Senators VEST and JONES have borne the burden of the day and the heat of the battle."

We hope that the professors of rhetoric in the colleges of Missouri and Kansas will put this little piece into their scrap books. It will form a most excellent exercise in a difficult sort of composition. The young men and young women in their classes will see at a glance how much more powerful and destructive is irony, delicately constructed and applied, than the most labored or passionate declamation. What a bitterness lurks in these phrases of pretended compliment. How much sharper and more effectual are the satirical adjectives "heroic," "courageous," "faithful," than "cowards," "liars," or "traitors" would be. How neat to speak of Missouri as "honored" by Senator VEST's management of the Flim-flam Tariff bill. And the "heroic contest for the preservation of the principles of the party," what a collection of whips and scorpions that is. Could the whole passage be improved in any way? It is with much doubt that we suggest merely a slight addition. After "Senators VEST and JONES have borne the burden of the day and the heat of the battle," add "and their efforts are gratefully appreciated by geniuses as diverse as the Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, the Sugar Trust, and Gen. JACOB S. COXEY." But we don't insist upon this amendment.

What Is In It?

Suppose that all the railroads should succumb to the strikers and join the American Railway Union in the attempt to coerce the Pullman Company; what would be the result?

Could they compel the company to resume work? The company has proved its unwillingness to work at the wages demanded by its former employees, by shutting up its shops. Can the American Railway Union and any amount of allies make Mr. PULLMAN open his doors and take off his coat? Can they lay a whip on his back, or stand over him with a club, or put him in jail for refusing to do as they say? Can they make him drink after they have driven him to the water?

We don't see how the strikers can help themselves by whipping the railroads into their train. In fact, no steady eye can see anything in this strike, except an unparalleled indignity to the people, and gross discredit upon the trade union name, as every trade union member professes a desire to see it esteemed.

Many survivors of the civil war, both North and South, will remember to-day as being the thirty-first anniversary of the first day of the great battle of Gettysburg, which was the turning point in the American conflict. The battle has just by been ranked as one of the greatest struggles of modern times. At the battle of Waterloo, when the fate of NAPOLEON was forever decided, the total loss of the allied powers was 23,000 men, while that of the French was 30,000. Gen. MEADE, who commanded the Union army at Gettysburg, estimated our losses at 2,834 killed, 13,709 wounded, and 6,643 missing (mostly taken prisoners), or a total of 23,186. Gen. LEE gave no official returns of his losses, but they have been generally estimated at about 18,000 killed or wounded and about 10,000 taken prisoners. That this battle was regarded in Europe, and especially in Great Britain, as the turning point of the American civil war, will be seen from the abrupt change in the tone of the British newspapers when the result of the struggle was known. From the outbreak of hostilities between the North and South to the time of this battle London newspapers, and especially the *Times*, had been most outspoken in their sympathy for the South, and freely predicted that the Northerners would be worsted. Acting on this assurance, British newspapers said a great many things for which they afterward were sorry. Upon learning the result of the battle of Gettysburg a most marked change was observed in the tone of the British press. The *Times* began to hedge on some of its editorials and began urging extenuating circumstances, while the rest of the English journals followed suit. The sudden change from arrogant hostility toward the North to a cringing deference was as amusing as it was sudden.

The Marblehead, on arriving at Bluefields the other day, found everything apparently quiet there, and no immediate disturbance in prospect.

So far, it has not; but it must not be forgotten that a serious offence has been committed on the Mosquito Reservation against the United States, for which no reparation has yet been made. The escape of ARGUELLO, who killed an American citizen at Rama, must be a source of chagrin to the Department of State, which had not concealed its intention to call Nicaragua to account for the murder and to insist upon the prompt trial and punishment of the offender. The affair was the more serious from the fact that ARGUELLO was then the chief authority at Rama, and that the unfortunate American, after being shot, was thrust into prison, it is said, by order of ARGUELLO, and there died, whereas his life might perhaps have been saved by care and prompt medical attendance.

The appointment of a new Governor at Rama and the arrest of ARGUELLO showed the good faith of Nicaragua in the matter, and Dr. JOSE MARIA MADRIZ, the Nicaraguan Minister of Foreign Affairs, did not hesitate, in an official communication to the Nicaraguan Minister at Washington, to pronounce the killing a cold-blooded murder. Still, the subsequent escape of ARGUELLO from custody at Bluefields has justly provoked indignation, whether it was due to neglect or complicity on the part of his guards. As there was a large force of Nicaraguan troops at Bluefields, there was still less excuse for permitting his escape. Now the mortification of the State Department must be increased by the news that he is safe in Colombia, with which country Nicaragua has no extradition treaty that will secure his return for trial and punishment.

But is this the end of the matter? It certainly should not be. A prompt demand should be made upon Nicaragua, at least for indemnity to the relatives of the murdered man; and if ARGUELLO is beyond the reach of justice, that demand can be based upon the admissions of Nicaraguan officials in his case as well as on the testimony of unofficial witnesses given at the time of the shooting.

Read carefully the speech of Senator HILL on the opposite page. It has been many years since a Democratic statesman was so imperatively called upon to champion the essential doctrine of his party. The response is worthy of the occasion.

The crossing of Behring Strait on the ice, which the Earl of DUNMORE and BENJ. LAVIGNE are to attempt next winter, although apparently an adventure for amusement rather than a scientific quest, will yet have a many-sided interest.

The comparatively narrow waterway that separates Asia and America near the Arctic circle has often been studied, at least on the maps, with a view to its prospective uses for communication between the two continents. Long ago, before the problem of submarine cables had become as simple of solution as it is to-day, there was a project for a land telegraph through British Columbia and Alaska, crossing there to Siberia. It is no longer thought of, apparently.

Another project that has often been considered is that of bridging Behring Strait, and so constructing a railroad across it. Ex-Governor GILPIN of Colorado used to be interested in studying this enterprise. He considered that the valleys and plateaus of the Rocky Mountains could be followed by a line of railway up to the strait. Estimating this last as forty-eight miles wide at the point to be crossed, it would be broken nearly midway by the Promeda islands. These extend in such a way that practically the problem would be further reduced to two bridges of a little over twenty miles each on either side. Still, a twenty-mile bridge over water is no child's play, even in these days of triumphant engineering. But he believed that a depth of not more than forty feet could be relied on, with a solid bottom. Besides, a warm current from the south passing through the channel, and corresponding in some measure to the Gulf Stream of the Atlantic, keeps the strait, he held, always open, and icebergs unknown there.

It will be observed, therefore, that the theory on which this enthusiastic projector proceeded would be fatal, if correct, to the coming trip over the ice. But undoubtedly in speaking of the strait as always "open" ex-Governor GILPIN may have used the term in only a relative sense. It was open enough, he thought, to insure the safety of bridges. Exactly to what extent it is open the proposed journey may determine, and thus after all it may have a certain practical value. If people cannot go across in boats and maintain a ferry in summer, perhaps they will be all the more sure of being able to travel between the continents on sledges in winter. Then in our time may come the question whether there will be enough adventurous persons, or persons who have an uncontrollable horror of seasickness, to support a Great Northwestern Railroad to the Old World. Meantime, if the trip of the Earl of DUNMORE and BENJ. LAVIGNE proves successful, the next thing in order may be a sleigh ride from New York to St. Petersburg.

"DRIVING THE COLD IN."

How This Misconception About Preserving Ice May Have Started.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: The housewife's notion, to which your correspondent, L. Cortambert, refers, that "ice lasts longer in a refrigerator exposed to the heat than in one that is not," may have arisen from the misconception that ice wrapped in flannel or packed in salt hay lasts longer, because the warmth of those materials "drives the cold in," and ignorance of the fact that they, being non-conductors of heat, protect the ice from the influence of surrounding temperature, which, otherwise, would quickly reduce it to water.

The intelligent housewife who does not value an idea as she does a spinning wheel, because of its antiquity, ought willingly to remove her refrigerator from the heat to a cool cellar or darkened hallway, and by noting the difference in its consumption of ice for a single week be convinced that there are theories worth testing besides those of her great-great-aunt, who "brought up" her grandmother.

BROOKLYN, June 27. CORDELIA BEADE.

Pullman Houses and the Strike.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: The impartiality of THE SUN in dealing with labor questions has been a subject of remark, but do you not think that the Pullman Company, when reducing wages, should have made a corresponding reduction in the rents of the houses in which their workmen are quartered? I understand from excellent authority that this was not done, and should you not in a spirit of fairness mention this fact?

NEW YORK, June 29. FREELAND JEWETT.

We have no information in regard to the rents of houses at Pullman, and, what is more, we have expressed no opinion upon the dispute between Mr. Pullman and his employees. All that we have commented upon has been the attempt of the American Railway Union, an organization that has no connection with Pullman, to paralyze the transportation business of this country, with which it has had no quarrel. That is the only feature of the episode of which we can speak from knowledge, and, irrespective of any complication whatsoever at Pullman, it stands out clear for the condemnation of every citizen of the United States.

A Protestant Against the A. P. A.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: The Rev. Chas. H. Eaton recently remarked, apropos of the A. P. A., that "we have no right to organize in secret against a class of believers, even though we may have the smallest sympathy with their form of worship." Upon this, Mr. W. K. Howe writes to THE SUN asking if the A. P. A. "has not just the same and just as good a right to 'organize in secret' as any of the other secret societies." Undoubtedly it has; but it has no right to "organize in secret against a class of believers." The emphasis in Mr. Eaton's sentence is not on the words "in secret," but upon the words which follow them. Religious belief is free in this country, and no body of men have any right to organize for the purpose of terrorizing men of different faith by a boycott. It makes but little difference whether they organize for this unmanly, un-American purpose in secret or openly, although, as their purpose is such an ignoble one, the secrecy in which they envelope themselves is perhaps appropriate. I am a Protestant of the deepest dye, but I like manliness and fair play and hate intolerance and deeds that are done in the dark.

CHAS. W. THOMPSON, 45 Broadway.

Negro Catholics in the South.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In regard to Mr. Wood's article in THE SUN of to-day I would like to say that I was born and raised a Catholic in the Southern city of New Orleans, which is also one of the strongest Roman Catholic cities in the United States, and during thirty years' residence there it was and still is a common sight to see colored and white citizens side by side, both at the confessional box and communion rail, to say nothing of the seats throughout the church. And the same applies to many other cities in the State of Louisiana. SOUTHERN CATHOLIC.

NEW YORK, June 29.

Stranger than Fiction.

From the Rodin Courier.

They were wed on a June day as cool and cool
And none had a scornful word to say:
It wasn't remarked of him, he's a fool,
Or that she had thrown herself away.

For a Wasting Cough, or any Throat or Lung Trouble, use at once Dr. Tarrant's Expectorant.—Adv.

A DEMOCRAT STANDS FAST.

Declares His Determination to Hold to the First Principles of His Party.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: If the income tax becomes a law, in spite of Senator HILL's gallant fight against it, it will be the crowning iniquity of the Cleveland Administration, and will bury the Democratic party for at least twenty years, so far as the control of national politics is concerned.

I am 60 years of age, and a life-long Democrat, as was my father before me. I have never voted any other but the Democratic ticket, and my income is not such that the income tax is likely to touch it. But if this bill becomes a law, through the votes of a Democratic Congress, I will never vote the Democratic ticket again, but will vote for any respectable Republican who will pledge himself to do his best to secure its repeal. And I am only one among a good many thousand loyal Democrats who will do the same thing.

After the peculations and extravagances of the Harrison Administration, the Democratic Congress had the finest opportunity ever offered to establish the party firmly in power for a long series of years by wise, prudent, and economical legislation; but our representatives have simply frittered away their chance, which will not return to them in this generation. I am disgusted with and ashamed of my party, and I am preparing to bid it farewell forever. G. R. J.

NEW YORK, June 29.

Dobbs Ferry and the Sons of the American Revolution.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In your edition of Sunday, June 24, appears a letter from a correspondent who denies that any of the events commemorated by the monument dedicated at Dobbs Ferry June 14 occurred at or near that spot. The inscription records, in chronological order, four events, the first and fourth as having occurred in that neighborhood, and the second and third as having occurred in the house before which the monument stands. The house is commonly called the "Livingston Mansion," although it did not come into possession of the Livingston family until after the Revolution. The inscription on the monument is as follows:

WASHINGTON'S HEADQUARTERS.

Here, July 6, 1781, the French allies under Rochambeau joined the American Army.

Here, August 14, 1781, Washington planned the Yorktown campaign, which brought to a triumphant end the war for American independence.

Here, May 6, 1783, Washington and Sir Guy Carleton arranged for the evacuation of American soil by the British.

And opposite this point, May 8, 1783, a British sloop-of-war fired 17 guns in honor of the American Commander-in-Chief, the first salute by Great Britain to the United States of America.

As to the first statement, Irving's "Life of Washington" says: "Washington * * * marched to Dobbs Ferry, where he was joined by the Count de Rochambeau on the 6th of July. The two armies now encamped: the Americans in two lines resting on the Hudson at Dobbs Ferry, where it was covered by batteries, and extending eastward toward the Neperan or Sawmill River; the French in a single line on the hills further east." See also "Washington's Writings," by Sparks; "Washington's Itinerary," by Baker, &c.

As to the second statement, Lossing's "Field Book of the Revolution" gives a picture of the Livingston Mansion and says: "It was the headquarters of Washington when he abandoned an attempt to capture New York city, changed his plans, and marched his army to Virginia." The date of this change is fixed by Washington's diary, in which, under date of Aug. 14, he explains that "matters having now come to a crisis," &c., he had to abandon the idea of attacking New York, &c. The suggestion of a Southern campaign for the relief of the Carolinas had been broached at the Wethersfield conference May 22, but was opposed by Washington. The Yorktown campaign could not have been planned then, as both Washington and Rochambeau "were as yet ignorant of the arrival of Cornwallis in Virginia." (See Irving's "Life of Washington" and other authorities.) Your former correspondent is painfully erratic for a critic, in some of his statements. He says, also: "The news of the departure of the French fleet for the Chesapeake Bay reached Washington at his headquarters July 30." "The American Revolution," by John Fiske, and other authorities say that that news reached Washington Aug. 14, precisely the date on which he, according to his diary, made the extraordinary change in his plan of campaign.

As to the third statement: Lossing's "Field Book of the Revolution" says: "There (at the Livingston Mansion), at the close of the war, Washington, Gov. Clinton, and Gen. Sir Guy Carleton met to make arrangements for the evacuation of New York city by the British." This is corroborated by "Washington's Itinerary" by Baker; "The Magazine of American History," volume V., local histories, &c. The date, May 6, is fixed by Irving's "Life of Washington," "Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution," Sparks, &c. Washington's headquarters at this time, however, were at Orangetown (Tappan), across the river and some distance in and, and his correspondence is dated thence, but the obvious convenience of the Dobbs Ferry rendezvous sufficiently explains its selection for the place of actual meeting.

As to the fourth statement: While a beautiful little rivulet flows through the "Livingston house," it is not claimed that Carleton's sloop-of-war swam uphill and anchored in the front yard. She was simply out in the river at the anchorage which has been chosen as conveniently as might be to the place of conference. The firing of the salute to Washington after the personal interview in the "Livingston house," and Washington's visit to the sloop, "bring home" the salute to this spot fairly and legitimately.

If the authorities here quoted are not to be believed, a great many people will have to revise their historical creeds, and will thank your former correspondent for calling attention to the unreliability of authors who have been accepted as credible for decades past.

Much more might be said in answer to your former correspondent's letter, but, realizing the truth of what Oliver Wendell Holmes so delightfully terms the hydrostatic paradox of controversy, I forbear.

EDWARD HAGAMAN HALL,
Office of the Registrar of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.
NEW YORK, June 29, 1894.

A. P. A. IN CANADA.

Defeated in the Late Election.

From the Toronto Globe.

The defeat of the Protestant Protective Association is perhaps the most significant feature of yesterday's election. We fought it from the hour of its appearance in the politics of this country. We will confess that there were times when it appeared to us that the agitation was extremely formidable, that it would achieve a temporary success, and that there would be nothing left but to await in patience the inevitable return to reason, humanity, and mutual confidence between citizens. As the *Globe* is a Liberal journal, there has been a disposition in some quarters to regard its opposition to the P. P. A. as actuated mainly by a desire for the safety of the Ontario Ministers and the maintenance of its majority. Now that the Government is safe and its majority assured, we desire to repeat our assertion that the establishment of the order in this country is unveiled for, that its methods are unwise, that its agitation can serve no good end; that its insistence upon secrecy in the discussion of public questions is essentially wrong, and that the attempt to proscribe Catholics either from public office or private employment is unjust, and if carried out would be destructive of all hope of completing the national edifice which we have begun to build in Canada. With no desire to exult over a defeated opponent, we are bound in truth to say that this is by far the least defensible of the Protestant associations with which the people of Ontario are acquainted, and that the agitation of 1893 and 1894, for which the P. P. A. is largely responsible, is one of the worst manifestations of sectarianism that has appeared in recent years.

The appeal to prejudice, to passion, to ignorance, has been made in vain. The mass of the people have shown themselves vastly superior to some of their would-be leaders. They listened quietly to the blare of the ecclesiastical trumpet and the beating of the sectarian drum, and then went to the polls and voted as if the noise and clamor had never reached their ears. We congratulate Ontario upon the magnificent steadiness it has displayed under most trying circumstances.

Eugene Field's Preference.

From the Chicago Record.

We think we prefer the horse to the bicycle; the one makes pretty fair eating and the other doesn't.

The midsummer number of the *Quarterly Illustrator* is of unusual interest, containing, as it does, nearly 400 admirable engravings of drawings and paintings by 160 artists, with accompanying articles relating to art and artists by Julian Hawthorne, George Parsons Lathrop, Charles de Kay, Mrs. Champney, Alfred Trumble, Alex. Black, and others. Among the artists contributing to its illustrations are Miss McChesney, Hy. Sandham, Wells Champney, Victor Perard, J. C. Nicoll, and Lyell Carr. There are many interesting portraits, too, of English and American painters and some living pictures posed for the camera.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

New London last week was to both yachtsmen and landsmen the most lively as well as the most interesting place on the Atlantic coast. The old-time watering place has a conservative character of its own, and a modest unwillingness to be photographed, paragraphed, and made generally conspicuous, which keeps it rather in the background in the long array of country places. Like Newport, it objects to being called a "resort," and for the greater part of the summer its cottage owners live their own lives of ease, luxury, and enjoyment, apparently quite indifferent to what is going on elsewhere. Among them are Mrs. C. Lawrence Perkins, Mrs. Bernard Rhinelander and her daughters, Mrs. Lansing, Mr. and Mrs. H. G. McVickar and their venerable father, the old Commodore of the New York Yacht Club; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Remsen, Dr. and Mrs. Appleton of Boston, the Gordon Norries, Charles Sackett, Mays and Colemans of Baltimore, Col. E. H. Wright and Mr. Rowland Keasbey of Newark, and Mr. Slater, owner of the new yacht Eleanor. All these cluster around that ancient ruin, the Pequot House, which absolutely refuses to burn down, in spite of the devout wishes of its owners and neighbors that it would do so; and further up on the Waterford road are the superb places of Mr. Chapin and Mr. Rumrill, which command an unequalled ocean view, and whose fields, meadows, gardens, and vineyards are cultivated to the very highest perfection of agricultural and horticultural skill.

Only twice in the year do the people of New London rouse themselves to any degree of excitement. One is at the Collegiate rowing matches in June and the other at the annual visit of the New York Yacht Club in August. This year, the Seawanhaka Yacht Club has added a new interest to racing week by its novel and successful two days' race from Oyster Bay to New London. Nothing prettier in her long record of yachting events was ever seen than the rush of the small boats, unimpeded by steamers or big craft, toward New London light, the goal they were making for. In addition to this there has been a yacht race between Yale and Harvard, the boats starting from the Pequot landing in a stiff breeze, and returning with Yale's deep blue flying triumphantly from the flagship's mast.

Then came the intercollegiate rowing matches, which brought a concourse of Yale, Harvard, and Columbia adherents and well wishers, and kept the place alive with hoarse college cries and yells of applause and acclamation until well into the night. There were not as many steam yachts, either from New York or Newport, as have been seen on previous years in the harbor, but Mr. Oliver Belmont took a party down from Newport on his four-in-hand, and Mr. Perry Belmont, with a party of five of his friends, driving from New York to Newport, stopped for a few hours to get a glimpse of the scene. Mr. Cruger, Mrs. Frederick Kernochan and Miss Kernochan, the Misses Cross, Miss Redmond, the Misses Morgan, and many other pretty girls from New York were among the spectators, while Boston sent Crowninshields, Hookers, Appletons, Thayers, and Lymans to float and flaunt the crimson until Yale's triple victory paled it.

The departure of Commodore E. D. Morgan and his family for foreign waters on the flagship May, although it has been severely criticised as a want of loyalty toward the club of which he is the head, which celebrates this summer the fiftieth year of its existence, will add greatly to the prestige of the New York Yacht Club during regatta week at Cowes and also at the previous trials of speed between the Vigilant as opposed to Lord Dunraven's Valkyrie and the crack flyer