The Sun.

SUNDAY, JULY 25, 1897.

Subscriptions by Mail Post-Paid.

DAILY, per Month	$0 50
DAILY, per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

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.

Sugar.

Since much popular attention is given to the affairs of the sugar company and its fortunes as affected by politics, a great many people must be wondering now whether the benefit or the favor or whatever it is called to the sugar business was greater in the Wilson tariff or in the Dingley tariff, though we say this in blame or praise of neither.

So far as we can learn the Wilson tariff provided for greater profits in sugar than the Dingley tariff.

Leaving this momentous subject to the further consideration of those for whom it has a particular fascination, we express the hope that the sugar manufacturing industry, and every other reputable industry in the United States, will straightway, under the regulations prescribed by the new tariff, make money, prosper, and be happy.

We shall be happy yet,
You bet.

The Tariff Ceases to Be an Issue.

For the first time in the history of American tariff legislation there is now unanimity among the business men of the Union in rejoicing over the passage of a tariff bill yesterday.

The Dingley bill, passed yesterday, is not satisfactory to everybody; no tariff can be made to please everybody; but practically there is no revolt against it except such as comes from academic theorists wounded in their tenderest and most vital part, their pride of opinion. The Democratic opposition in the Senate was perfunctory only. Public sentiment demanded its passage as speedily as possible, and Congress could not safely resist that unanimous popular agreement.

The tariff settlement now reached, with the general concurrence of the people, will probably be final for this generation, so far as concerns mere theory. Particular schedules may be altered under the teaching of experience, and according to the requirements of changing conditions; but the modifications, dictated by policy and expediency, are not likely to furnish issues important enough to give distinction to great national parties. Whether the duty imposed shall be a few per cent. more or less is not a question justifying the disturbance of every business interest by its violent and protracted partisan discussion in a national campaign.

For many years past the tariff has been the subject of continual controversy necessarily disastrous to business interests, without a single compensating advantage. Now, accordingly, there is general agreement that a tariff policy having been established, it is the part of business prudence to let it alone, except so far as specific changes in schedules are proved to be desirable. With that spirit prevailing, such incidental changes are likely to be discussed temperately and agreed upon according to their advisability.

It seems safe to assume, therefore, that the tariff issue as a main and primary cause of separation between national parties and different sections of the Union has now been set aside for many years to come, if not finally. Little political capital for any party is likely to be made out of it. Business, so long a bitter sufferer by futile economic discussion, will resent any new effort to revive the controversy and rip up a settlement so necessary to the repose and consequent prosperity of trade and industry. The Dingley tariff is likely to be the last general tariff bill which will be discussed in Congress for many years to come. Its passage marks the close of a long era of profitless and generally injurious debate.

By General Consent.

Twenty-five tariff bills have been passed by the Congress under its constitutional authorization to levy duties on imports, under the condition that such duties shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The first of these tariff bills was passed on the patriotic anniversary, July 4, 1789. The preamble to it recited that one of the ends to be attained by its adoption was "the encouragement and protection of manufacturers," at a time when the latent productive industries of the United States were totally undeveloped and this country was dependent upon importations for manufactured articles. The so-called Clay tariff, with protection as its distinctive feature, was passed in May, 1828, the Walker low tariff in July, 1846, and the Morrill tariff to provide for the expenditures incident to the civil war in March, 1861. The tariff of 1883 was passed on the 3d of March of that year, as the result of the recommendations made by the Tariff Commission previously appointed by President ARTHUR. The McKinley Tariff bill became a law on Oct. 1, 1890, and its ignoble, disastrous, and indefensible successor, the Wilson Tariff bill, was adopted on Aug. 13, 1894. On the final vote there were 39 Senators recorded in favor of it and 34 against, while in the House the vote was 182 to 106.

The present tariff law has been adopted on July 24, 1897, with less delay, against less resistance, and with less controversy than any similar measure ever carried through Congress.

The twenty-fifth tariff law of the United States is the work of a Congress representing in both Senate and House a much larger number of separate constituencies than any previous bill in the nation's history, and it is, in fact, the formal adoption of a tariff policy by the representatives of more persons affected by its operation than any similar bill adopted anywhere. Moreover, the hearty acquiescence with which this new law is received by the people of all parties is singular in our history. It is not the outcome of compromises reluctantly made and concessions grudgingly allowed, but is a definite and deliberate embodiment in law of a policy which now more than ever before receives national and not sectional support.

The Tariff law of 1883, for instance, had the almost solid favor of New England and New Jersey, but against it was arrayed the solid opposition of the Representatives of Maryland, Texas, Louisiana, and other States of the South. The Tariff law of 1890, highly protective to American industries and interests, was opposed by the Southern Representatives and generally supported by those of New England and the West. The Wilson bill was pretty solidly supported by the South and just as solidly opposed by New York, New England, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and other manufacturing States. The Dingley tariff, however, has been made law with support from every group of States and every part of the Union, and little of the opposition to it was vigorous; none of it was determined. More than any other it is a tariff by general consent.

Those Fruitful Despatches.

We cannot say what degree of credence should be attached to the news from Victoria in regard to the British seal patrol fleet, but since the rendezvous of the fleet is at that point, correct information regarding its character ought to be obtainable.

If we may trust the despatches, the now famous remonstrance of Mr. SHERMAN on Great Britain's neglect of her Behring Sea police duties has already borne fruit. It is known that, according to the British practice of sending a couple of gunboats to be ready for the open season, which begins Aug. 1, the Wild Swan, of 1,200 tons, or about as big as our Castine, and the Pheasant, smaller than our Patrol, have gone north. But the Victoria news says that in a few days these vessels are to be reinforced by three cruisers, two of them coming from the China station for the purpose. The Amphion and the Rainbow are named as among those that will perform this duty, and they are much larger and faster than the Wild Swan and Pheasant.

Mr. CURZON's statement in Parliament the other day showed that the highest number of British vessels employed on the seal patrol was three, for a single season, and other years only two have been so employed. We have detailed as many as twelve vessels to the task, and more recently five or six. But if it be true that Great Britain will have five vessels on duty this year, the prompt and practical response to Secretary SHERMAN's sharp complaint of neglect is noteworthy.

We may add that, in spite of some doubts and denials, and in spite, too, of England's objections to revising the sealing regulations any sooner than she is compelled to, under the Paris award, it is now very positively announced that the British and American experts will meet at Washington during the coming autumn to compare notes and to reach a common statement of facts on which the two Governments may base a revision of the rules.

On the whole, Mr. SHERMAN's diplomatic despatches, which so shocked, by their supposed rudeness, sundry British newspapers and their allies and echoes on this side of the water, seem to have vindicated themselves thoroughly. They left no doubt of their meaning or of American sentiment as to the facts they set forth.

College Presidents and Politics.

The resignation of President ANDREWS of Brown University because his free-silver views are objectionable to the trustees of the institution, and to the great majority of the parents of the students, is a proper and natural result of a contrariety of opinion as to a question of fundamental economical and political importance.

Undoubtedly, President ANDREWS, as an American citizen, has a right to hold and to express freely his political and financial opinions, but his qualifications to be the President of a college are as rightly determinable by the character of those views. If he represents doctrines in politics which are contrary to the convictions of the governors of the college, and for whose inculcation the college is unwilling to be responsible, he ought not to be the head of the institution. The college is in duty bound to refuse to allow doctrines obnoxious to it to be put forth with its authority, and such authority the teachings will necessarily have with the public so long as they are proclaimed by its President. A college President's public teachings should be in harmony with those which the school is established to inculcate.

Accordingly, President ANDREWS has simply performed a duty imperative upon him in resigning as the head of Brown University. By so doing he has freed both it and himself from embarrassment. He has taken himself out of a false position, and is now under no obligations which prevent his freedom to express his private opinions and teach his own political doctrines; and the college is no longer in any way responsible for their propagation.

When a President of a college assumes a position in politics which precipitates the college into a controversy dividing sharply the public upon whom it relies for support, the time has come for his withdrawal. The college world should be kept free from disturbance by political asperities, in order that it may be occupied solely by calm and unpartisan learning and scholarship. It is not a place proper for political controversy. That battle should be waged outside a domain wherein scholarly repose should reign.

President ANDREWS, however, is not the only college President who has disqualified himself for his place by representing and propagating political and social doctrines obnoxious to a great part of the public upon whose patronage the college depends for support. A correspondent of THE SUN not long ago pointed out very effectively the deleterious influences which have proceeded from some of our colleges of recent years, due to an un-American spirit which had been introduced into the institutions. He complained reasonably that a tone of doubt and defamation and discouragement as to the republic and its political condition had become frequent. In other words, the Mugwump spirit has infected the college communities, and it is inimical to the patriotism necessary for our national development and even preservation, and utterly alien to the American genius. It would not be tolerated in the colleges of any other country and it ought not to be tolerated here.

In this city a canvass unprecedented in its character and methods has been proceeding with a view to the political benefit of a college President. Its avowed purpose has been the subjection of a great party organization, to be accomplished by forcing on it the nomination of this college President, under the threat of disruption if he is not made the candidate. The town has been plastered with appeals for assistance in the effort, and his advocates have persistently aspersed in his interest the leaders and the party organization all discerning men know to be essential to the overthrow of forces now arrayed against the civilization of this great community. At a time when the unity of the opposition is an absolute necessity, this college President's candidacy has been pushed forward pertinaciously and vociferously for the prime purpose of rendering that unity impossible. Moreover, he owes his selection for this purpose of disintegration solely to the circumstance that he is the head of a great university.

As an individual simply this aspirant for nomination as Mayor of New York would be within his undoubted political rights in struggling to get it, reprehensible as such effort might be on the part of a citizen in the present critical political situation; but as the President of a New York university he has passed beyond the limits to which he should be held by public opinion and by the trustees and alumni of the institution itself. He is degrading the dignity and distinction of his office. When he made up his mind to enter into that battle as a leader, he should have resigned his place as the President of the university. The leader in a fight for the disorganization of a great political party which has become the generally recognized champion of civilization should not be also the representative of a school of learning supported by the enlightenment of the community.

President ANDREWS's resignation from Brown University furnishes an admonition which our college Presidents generally may well bear in mind. They are under obligations and responsibilities and within limitations, because of their representative office, to which they should be held strictly by public opinion.

Tom Watson's Historical Style.

The Hon. TOM WATSON of Georgia, lately candidate for Vice-President of the United States on the Populist ticket along with Mr. BRYAN of Nebraska, is at present engaged in writing a new history of France, to be completed in three volumes. This interesting enterprise, undertaken, we believe, since the election of last November, has already advanced so far that the first volume is now accessible to students. Mr. WATSON is apparently his own publisher; and for the copy of the book which is now before us, we suppose that THE SUN is indebted to the historian's personal thoughtfulness and kind consideration.

This volume brings the history of France from the earliest times down to the death of LOUIS XI. What we note especially is the blithe spirit in which the Hon. TOM enters upon an unaccustomed task of almost appalling magnitude. Other men of genius have turned from the disappointments of statecraft to the consolatory occupation of historical investigation and exposition, but few with such zest and ardor. Undismayed by the experience of last year, undisturbed by recollections of the Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN's ingratitude and the Hon. MARION BUTLER's turpitude, the Hon. TOM WATSON turns his back upon BRYAN and BUTLER to make acquaintance with CHILPERIC and DAGOBERT and PIPPIN, and with a hop, skip, and jump, starts out afresh to traverse the wide and difficult field of research and constructive philosophy in which men like GUIZOT and MICHELET and CLEOPHAS BARESTE and HENRI MARTIN, besides many others, have preceded him.

The history of France from the earliest times has been written before by historians of varied accomplishments, but never before by the Hon. TOM WATSON of Georgia. He brings a new intelligence and a new phraseology to an old task. Neither HALLAM nor FREEMAN, nor again GUIZOT, was capable of presenting this picture of civilization at the time of CLOVIS:

"Murder was considered a trivial offence. A scale of prices fixed the amount which the offender should pay for killing his foes. The fine varied with the dignity or importance of the deceased. To kill one of the nobility cost $2,700; to kill a priest or Judge cost the murderer $1,080; to smash in the skull of a deacon only cost $720; to slay a common free man cost $360; and you could kill as many slaves as you pleased at the moderate price of about $100 each.

"It was certainly a very free and easy state of society when an angry Frank, suffering, perhaps, from a fit of indigestion brought on by eating too much raw cow or sour acorns, could march out into the neighborhood, split the skulls of all his enemies, fill a respectable graveyard before dinner, and then go free by paying a smaller sum of money than our taxpayers have to pay for the burial of one very common Congressman."

HALLAM, we say, lacked the imagination, FREEMAN lacked the vocabulary, and GUIZOT lacked the personal cheerfulness which, all three combined, enable the Hon. TOM WATSON to depict mediæval conditions as they have never been depicted by any of the other historians of France from the earliest times.

The Hon. TOM WATSON does not hesitate to speak boldly when he thinks he discerns evidence of corrupt personal interest:

"CÆSAR himself was one of the boldest money hunters that ever plundered a temple, or confiscated an estate, or sold a nation under the hammer of the auctioneer. It is very probable that he invaded Gaul, partly at the instance of the Roman speculators and partly at the suggestion of his own financial necessities and hopes."

Nor does he lack firmness and impartiality even when confronted with the delicate question of NERO's personal character:

"NERO was the last of the twelve Roman Emperors who were called 'the Cæsars.' He was a terrible monster of cruelty and lust, but, strange to say, had some accomplishments in the fine arts. Among other things he was a musician."

Hear him once more express himself concerning that Merovingian monarch who figures in history either as KHLOTHER or CLOTAIRE, according to the race and philological preferences of the historian writing about him, but whom the Hon. TOM WATSON, by an ingenious, if arbitrary, compromise, insists on styling "CHLOTHAIR":

"CHLOTHAIR died in full possession of the Kingdom of France, victorious over all his enemies, feared by the grandees and courted by the Bishops. Yet he had no special talents, and won his way mainly by brutal crimes and perfidious treacheries. He was a striking example of the strange good luck which sometimes attends an unmitigated rascal. I have read the story of many kings, have wondered at the way the world submits to be ruled by thieves and libertines and cut-throats, and have found in the highest circle of blue-blooded monarchs some of the blackest villains that ever lived, but it appears to me that CHLOTHAIR, in brutal lust, in coarse savagery, in robust and variegated depravity, is one of the toughest scoundrels who ever disgraced the purple."

Occasionally, in the characterization of this or that mediæval personage, we get an incidental revelation of the Hon. TOM WATSON's opinions in matters of ethics and of literary art. For example, when he is speaking of the wicked FREDEGUNDA:

"Her reign continued for thirty years. In spite of all her crimes, in spite of all her immoralities, she died peacefully in her bed in Paris, powerful and dreaded to the last. Such a life, crowned with such success and ending in such a quiet and natural death, is very demoralizing to novel writers of the soft type of CHARLES DICKENS."

We have space now but for a single extract more. It gives a good idea of the unconventional style of the latest historian of France from the earliest times, and at the same time illustrates his personal contempt for royal dignities, unsupported by moral and intellectual worth. It is a picture of a Merovingian king on exhibition:

"The people rarely saw the sovereign. He lived slothfully in his rude palace, among his wives and his concubines, losing all strength and all influence. Occasionally he came forth, surrounded by the grandees, and made a formal parade through the streets of Paris. Seated in a heavy ox cart, pulled along by a pair of huge oxen, with all the majestic leisure for which that kind of team is celebrated, we can fancy that the royal parade made an indelible impression upon the ragtag and bobtail of Paris. Bear in mind that the streets of those days were mere dirt roads, full of mudholes; remember that the cart-wheels were solid and felt bound to go to the very bottom of every soft place they struck; recollect that when a cart tilts to one side no mortal man, even though a king with hair a yard long, can stay inside the pesky thing without grabbing hold of the other side; keep all these things before you and you can imagine what fun the kings had in those ox carts and how deliriously strong was their appetite for parade."

The succeeding volumes of the Hon. TOM's history of France will be awaited with impatience by scholars and citizens generally, excepting, perhaps, the Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN of Nebraska and the Hon. MARION BUTLER of North Carolina. Those statesmen must entertain some secret apprehension that the Hon. TOM is preparing to get even with them, in some horribly ingenious way, when he comes to describe the principal demagogues of the period of the French Revolution. But by the testimony recorded by the Hon. TOM's own hand how incomparably better than the world described in this volume is the world of to-day, plunged as it is in the wrongs that, according to TOM's notion, make it cry to Populism for salvation!

Would England Insure Her Merchant Vessels in the Event of War?

A sensible article on the difficulty of supplying the United Kingdom with food in war time is contributed by Lieut.-Col. G. S. CLARKE to the July number of the *National Review*. We call this article sensible, because it discards as impracticable most of the remedies proposed, though there are objections to the suggestion which it advocates, which was made by the late Admiral Sir GEORGE TRYON, that upon the outbreak of war the State should not leave its mercantile marine at the mercy of private underwriters, who would be likely to make food so costly that the poor would starve, but should itself undertake to insure all seagoing vessels against marine risks.

The author begins by recognizing the extreme gravity of the problem, which is greatly underrated by those who confine their attention to wheat. It is true that, of the $178,500,000 expended by England in 1895 upon wheat and wheat flour, only $27,500,000 was required to purchase the amount that was home-grown. Of the rest of the money, about $100,000,000 went to the United States and Russia, our own country obtaining nearly two-thirds thereof. The value of the imported wheat and flour, however, constituted only about 18 per cent. of the total value of food products sent from outside countries to the British Isles, which in 1895 exceeded $833,000,000. Even if, therefore, it were possible by any of the three methods proposed to avert a wheat famine, there would still remain the far greater difficulty of providing the other four-fifths of the food supply now derived from external purveyors. Every one of the three suggested methods, however, of making good even the deficit in wheat that is expected to occur in war time, is pronounced not feasible by Sir G. S. CLARKE. For instance, the proposal to render England self-supporting by means of import duties is declared to be wholly beyond the scope of practical politics, for the reason that bread is the staple food only of the poorest, and no British Government in these days would dare to increase the cost of the principal nutriment of the toiling millions. That bounties would not avail to bring a sufficient additional area of land under cultivation the writer shows by pointing out that the extra area required would be nearly 7,000,000 acres, and these are not obtainable in Great Britain except at the expense of pasture lands, which, if diminished, would cut down the meat supply. Obviously, it would be just as difficult to import meat in war time as it would be to import grain. The third recommended solution of the problem is the establishment of State granaries of wheat, some proposing a reserve of twenty-five million quarters, while others think that ten millions would suffice. In the first place, wheat deteriorates rapidly in flavor and value after removal from the stack to the warehouse; but, waiving this objection, we can see that the practical effect of State granaries would be to make the buying and selling of wheat a function of the Government, which would thus revert to the ancient fallacy that the State may control the prices of commodities. Moreover, having once interposed in the case of wheat, the State would be unable to resist the demand for a like interposition in the case of those other imported food products which form, as we have seen, four-fifths of the whole.

There is, then, no practical method of replenishing Great Britain's food supply in time of war, except by continuing to import commodities from her trans-marine purveyors. This is not, however, the only reason why to her a command of the sea is indispensable. The maintenance of the normal importations of food products would be of no avail to her toiling multitudes unless it were possible also to maintain the normal importations of the raw materials needed for her manufactures. Upon such raw materials she expended in 1895 more than $817,500,000. Cut off those raw materials and British workmen could earn no money wherewith to purchase food. It is well known that from 1861 to 1865 Lancashire, owing to the stoppage of some 50 per cent. of the imports of raw cotton, experienced the horrors of famine. Then, again, if manufactures stopped, exports would stop, and without exports how would Great Britain pay for her imported food stuffs, even though we assume her to be able to transport them? England's commerce, therefore, must go on, and Sir G. S. CLARKE believes that, except in the probable contingency of her war fleets being beaten at sea, and thereby disqualified for the convoying function, it would go on. We are reminded that during the wars against NAPOLEON, although after Trafalgar all the marine energies of France and the other States controlled by him were concentrated upon the destruction of British commerce, yet, as a matter of fact, the number of vessels captured did not exceed 2 per cent. of the total volume of British shipping. Commerce, then, would proceed, but, if the underwriters were left to themselves, it would proceed under conditions which would seriously enhance the prices of food stuffs. For, although in the Napoleonic wars the proportion of captures to the whole volume of shipping was small, yet the aggregate value of vessels and cargoes lost was very large. Hence the rates of marine insurance rose to 8 and 12 per cent. for vessels under convoy, and to 20 per cent. for unprotected voyages. It is to be borne in mind, moreover, that in the Napoleonic wars trade had by no means come to show the extreme sensitiveness which is now its marked characteristic, while the telegraph system, the great agent of scares, was nonexistent. Keeping these facts in view, and the incredulity current in business circles touching the efficiency and certainty of naval operations, Sir G. S. CLARKE has no doubt that at the outset of a war exaggerated premiums would be demanded, which would have the result, on the one hand, of checking trade, and, on the other hand, of raising prices to a point beyond the reach of the poor. So soon, indeed, as naval protection should manifest its efficiency, insurance rates might fall to a reasonable estimate of the risk; meanwhile, however, at a critical time underwriters might inflict upon the nation losses of the most grievous character. That is why the late Admiral Sir GEORGE TRYON advocated the transfer of marine insurance in war times from private individuals to the State. It appears that Mr. T. H. ISMAY, who certainly speaks as an expert, considers the scheme an extremely valuable one, tending, as it would, to inspire confidence among the class of shipowners whose steamers would form practically the only means of securing supplies during the continuance of war. It is pointed out that during the struggle against NAPOLEON the State exacted a charge for convoy, which produced $7,000,000 in the first year of its application. Between thus taxing the merchant for protecting him and securing him against panic insurance rates, there seems to be no wide gulf of principle. The objection has been made that a system of State marine insurance would have the effect of a bounty upon slow and ill-found steamers, but this defect is not inherent in the scheme, since it is possible to fix rates of State premiums in accordance with any classification of vessels. Compliance with Admiralty regulations would, in any case, be a necessary condition of insurance, and the vessel which selected a course in defiance of an official warning would, of course, invalidate her policy. Sir GEORGE TRYON's idea was, we are told, that the whole working of the scheme should be intrusted to Lloyds, which would charge a commission on insurances effected. War risks would be taken at low, fixed premiums on conditions laid down by the Admiralty, and the issue of State policies might terminate in six months or a year, by which time the greatest pinch would have passed, and the underwriters, having arrived at a just estimate of war risks, would henceforth carry on the business without panic.

It may be said, manifestly, of this scheme, as of the establishment of Government granaries, that it is an interference of the State with trade, and we may be sure that English underwriters would make the most of the objection.

Unfaithful to the Botanic Garden.

It is wonderful to see how the original interest in the idea of a Botanic Garden has been replaced, in those assigned to the management of the project, by a craze to gratify their own obstinacy and to succeed in the technical issue that they have raised with the city's experts in the matter of the plan.

The Botanical Society, in return for a sum of money insignificant when compared with the necessary expenditures on the part of the city, has received the honor of partial ownership of a large and beautiful city property. Millions is not too large an estimate for the value of it. Under the banner of public spirit, they have expressed a desire to see New York provided with a Botanic Garden, equipped to the highest point of perfection and correspondingly maintained in the future. The money for that purpose, not only to prepare the grounds and buildings, but to pay the attendants and the salaries of the professors and superintendents which the Society is to appoint, is to be raised by public taxation, and appropriated at the hands of public officials. And right at the very start the Society, by laboring successfully for the overthrow of the opinion of Prof. SARGENT and his associates as to how this garden should be built in order to sacrifice the least of the land's natural value, and against, also, the protest of practically the solid press of the city and of its artistic sentiment represented by the Fine Arts Federation, has affronted the entire community. It has antagonized the body from which it must get the desired money. The future interests of the garden have been thrown to the winds as recklessly as were the interests and protests of the public.

And all for the sake of jamming through certain plans, and of coming out victorious in a dispute.

As is usual in private business, the Botanical Society is being run by one or two men, to whose personal wishes their colleagues bow without serious murmur. And it seems that the entire Society doesn't contain a man sufficiently interested in the Botanic Garden to resist openly the high-handed and offensive proceedings of those now in charge of it. The real friends of the garden are at present outside of the Botanical Society.

The New Senator from Tennessee.

Gov. BOB TAYLOR, not being able to appoint himself, has appointed the Hon. THOMAS BATTLE TURLEY of Memphis to succeed the late ISHAM GREEN HARRIS as a Senator in Congress from Tennessee. Before the news of the appointment was received in Memphis there was great agitation there. "Madison street, in front of the *Commercial-Appeal* office, was thronged by an excited crowd, composed of citizens of every class of political and social character." The citizens of every class of political and social character must have been made nervous by the fear that Gov. BOB TAYLOR would find some way of appointing himself or would appoint the Hon. BENTON McMILLIN, an income tax sage. It is due to the Hon. THOMAS BATTLE TURLEY to say that he was not thrilled during these excitements of every class of political and social character in Memphis. He must have had a "tip." He "was seated in his office, in a characteristic attitude, reading a law book." There are few branches of literature more tranquilizing.

The Hon. THOMAS BATTLE TURLEY is 52 years old, and looks nearly 19 in the portrait of him which adorns the *Memphis Commercial-Appeal*. He comes of legal stock, was a private soldier on the Confederate side, is "a high-class citizen and a great lawyer." He is "a stanch, uncompromising Democrat, and an ardent free-silver man." It is not generally known that "last fall Mr. TURLEY was engaged in the consideration of the financial issue, and when the Hon. BOURKE COCKRAN delivered his great speech in Memphis in opposition to free coinage, Mr. TURLEY was selected as the man to speak in reply to the New Yorker, and counteract the brilliant New Yorker's speech."

Mr. TURLEY says that he is "as nearly a free trader as it is possible in this country to be." Presumably, then, he is a protectionist. As he takes the trouble to say that he is in favor of a tariff for revenue only, he must be a protectionist. About all the tariff-for-revenue-only men are strong protectionists in fact. It is superfluous to note that he is "thoroughly in accord with the Chicago platform."

The Hon. BOB TAYLOR's reason for appointing the Hon. THOMAS BATTLE TURLEY is worthy of a great musical and literary character.

"I have been repeatedly charged by politicians with ignoring Confederate veterans in making my appointments. This charge is and always has been false; and I propose to emphasize what I say by the appointment of THOMAS B. TURLEY, who was a Confederate private soldier. It has been usual to give the honor and glory of official position to the Generals and Colonels. I do not think the country will weep to learn that Private JOHN ALLEN of the House now has his peer in the Senate."

Gov. TAYLOR sends Mr. TURLEY to Washington with an earnest purpose. To seek to be a peer of the Hon. JOHN ALLEN is a high and serious ambition.

For Tammany Hall.

The *New York Times* has the honor of putting finally into black and white the secret political passion which has inspired the *Times*, the *Evening Post*, the Citizens' Union, and kindred Goo Goos to prepare for the November election:

"The real issue, the one uppermost in the minds of the voters and the only one about which they are greatly concerned, is the punishment of the Republican party for its sins and the flattening out of PLATT."

The "punishment of the Republican party for its sins" was introduced in forgetfulness of the pretence put forward so energetically by the Goo Goos and certain "Gold Democrats," that the New York campaign is to be on municipal issues only. The actual Goo Goo target is PLATT and the Republican organization.

The practical beneficiary of it all, should it succeed, will be, not the Citizens' Union, but Tammany Hall, the organization irrevocably bound to BRYAN and the Chicago platform. Sufficient for the Goo Goos will be the glory of "beating PLATT."

After strongly recommending the use of brakes on bicycles, the *American Cyclist* says:

"The strain of back-pedalling, of course, amounts to nothing on the level or on gentle slopes, but to hold a light wheel back by the pedals while descending a steep hill will take more life out of it than many miles of normal use. The only mechanical way of holding back is by means of a brake."

That is true. But the strain of back pedalling on machine or man is of very little consequence when the question of human safety is involved. There are many facts more vital to cyclists and other people than that concerning the wheel and its rider. All of which should be duly considered by the Aldermen before acting on the proposed laws for controlling vehicles in the city.

APOPLEXY, NOT CRAMPS.

Wet Your Head Before Your Feet When Bathing.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Under the heading, "Drowned at Coney Island—An Unidentified Man Taken with Cramps at Bahrman's," THE SUN of today gives further currency to what is undoubtedly an erroneous view of the cause of death in the many cases of sudden death in the water that are reported during the bathing season.

The true cause of death in most of these sudden cases among bathers is undoubtedly apoplexy. I had an attack of it once in Lake Ontario, in water about two feet deep, and doubtless survived because I was near shore and reached land within a few seconds after feeling the symptoms, which consisted of pains in the head that made that feature of my anatomy feel as if it were about to burst.

If I had been in deep water it is not likely that I would have lived to tell of the incident. But for the public information I wrote an account of the matter that appeared in a Rochester paper and was reproduced in THE SUN. It is several years since then, and notwithstanding the publicity the facts obtained the public continues to hear that "cramps" are responsible for the countless number of cases that take place every season.

I was taught, when a boy, that wetting the head before wetting the feet was recommended by a Dublin physician as a preventive of "rush of blood to the head" in the case of swimmers. I had neglected that precaution on the occasion when I came so near furnishing a case for the "crowner's quest." E. B.

ROCHESTER, July 23.

Heraldry.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I trust, in the interests of the country, that Mr. J. D. O'Connell of the Treasury Department at Washington, who wrote to you his opinions on the Cadwalader-Ryan marriage, knows more about finance than he does of heraldry. Where on earth did he discover that Mrs. Charles Cadwalader's children would be entitled to wear the O'Ryan coat of arms and crest? I do not understand that the lady claims to be the last of the Tipperary O'Ryans. If she does, who is left in Tipperary? As for the lady's royal descent, she shares that honor with every Irishman and Irishwoman born outside of Ulster. B. P. S.

NEW YORK, July 23, 1897.

The Rev. Mr. Yardley Not Insane.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* May I be permitted to speak of certain statements made in your issues of July 14 and 15 respecting the mental condition of the Rev. Mr. Yardley, the curate of Christ Church, New Haven? The fact of the case is that he is simply suffering from insomnia brought on by overwork, which has resulted naturally in temporary nervous depression, which time and the well-earned vacation he is taking will speedily cure. He is not insane, nor at any time has he been in danger of becoming so. G. BRINLEY MORGAN,
Rector of Christ Church, New Haven.

The Field for Civil Engineers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* From my own observation I can say that now, in the busy season, there are from three to five personal applications daily at every office which is known to employ civil engineers, and as many more by mail.

How civil engineering, compared with other professions, is in this regard, I am not prepared to say; but any young man choosing a profession should have these facts in mind and let them have weight in making a decision. K.

NEW YORK, July 24, 1897.

Senator Morgan's Minimum.

From the Washington Post.

It is recorded that once Senator Mason propounded a query to Senator Morgan. "How long could you talk," asked Mason, "on a subject of which you knew absolutely nothing?"

"Well," answered Morgan with a smile, "if it was a matter about which I knew absolutely nothing, I do not think I could talk more than two days."

Meeting the Demand.

From the Chicago Record.

"Gracious, Jack, what immense shirt studs you wear!"

"Well, you know how buttonholes act. I'm going to keep up with them if it takes a dinner plate."

Recessional.

RUDYARD KIPLING'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE VICTORIAN JUBILEE.

From the London Times.

God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

The tumult and the shouting dies—
The Captains and the Kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

Far-called our navies melt away—
On dune and headland sinks the fire—
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boasting as the Gentiles use
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard—
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy Mercy on Thy People, Lord!

AMEN.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

All the seacoast watering places, Newport included, will be forced to take refuge in dancing, dining, flirting, and gossiping if St. Swithin, old England's patron saint of clouds and rain, who seems to have come over to this country for a private jubilee of his own, does not soon stop the continuous downpour that he has brought with him. Golf links are spoiled, tennis lawns soaked, yachting and bathing interfered with, and every outdoor sport brought to a standstill.

In these circumstances masculine Newport has been busy with the question of a combination of the golf and country clubs, groaning over the financial depression, which makes the harbor fête look vastly like a failure for want of funds, deploring the loss of thousands to the Country Club, in consequence of the unfitness of the new polo field for its intended purpose, and then retiring in a thoroughly disgruntled temper. Horse show and dog show have been discussed, but no conclusion has been arrived at in regard to them. It is said that there will be twenty-five fully equipped coaches in Newport in August, and their owners, who are Mr. Anthony Drexel, Mr. Van Alen, Mr. O. H. P. Belmont, Mr. Eugene Higgins, Mr. Harry Payne Whitney, Mr. Arthur Kemp, Mr. Prescott Lawrence, Mr. Perry Belmont, and about a dozen others, may possibly be willing to form them into line and parade the avenue for the honor of the club and the gratification of those who enjoy the glittering distinction of places on the coach tops, as well as of the large majority who like to stand and look at them.

A great deal is in prospect, however, before a coaching parade can be arranged. The coming of a yacht fleet, which will be larger this year than ever before, and led by a Commodore who is preparing the success of the expedition and for the comfort of all concerned in the regardless-of-expense fashion which is customary with him, the water parade, the presence of the warships, and the entertainment of their officers, with the minor races and matches, and sailing and yachting on boats filled with the flower of the smart set, must be provided for before coaching.

The usual routine of luncheons and dinners has begun at Newport. Some enterprising person found leisure to count them last week, and reported twenty dinners and eleven luncheons. Why outsiders should be so anxious to magnify every trifling repast into a banquet is as puzzling as the tendency to exaggerate the grace and elegance of the women into extraordinary beauty. In point of fact, there are very few new faces at Newport this year. There is the usual galaxy of young matrons, among whom Mrs. J. J. Astor, Mrs. Canfield, and Mrs. Carroll easily carry off the palm. Of débutantes there are absolutely none, and of girls of past seasons a very moderate number. Mrs. Astor has cards out for a large dinner on the 29th, and is credited with the intention of giving a ball for her granddaughters, but no official announcement of it has been made.

"Quite a few," as the English say of the fair sex, and two or three brave men attended the last dance at the Casino, but their amiability hardly met with the reward that it deserved. The Nourmahal brought, a few days ago, Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Astor and Miss Willing, who have a fishing trip to Bar Harbor in contemplation before settling down at Newport for the summer, but the weather during the early part of the week was a little unfavorable for such amusements. Mr. Perry Belmont has arrived at By-the-Sea with the Hon. Richard Ivor Guest and the Hon. Richard Grosvenor as his house party. These gentlemen have shown a preference for tennis and golf, and are to be seen every morning at the Casino nets, which has caused no little surprise in the golfing community.

Bar Harbor has been struggling with the elements ever since the summer began. First it had cold winds from the mountains, which made fires a necessity. Then sea fogs came drifting in day after day, taking bicyclists and buckboarders by surprise and enveloping them in complete obscurity before they were out of the sunshine. Of late they have been sharing St. Swithin's tender attentions with the rest of the Atlantic shore, and have had all they want of marine grandeur and waves breaking on a rockbound coast. A great deal has been said about the rivalry between New York, Philadelphia, and Boston in managing social affairs at Bar Harbor, but in point of fact that rivalry, if it ever existed, has passed long ago into obscurity. Now that Mr. Johnston Livingston has been made President of the Mt. Desert Reading Room, which is the centre of power and influence at Bar Harbor, Mr. Montgomery Sears and Mr. Gardiner Sherman of Boston Secretary and Treasurer, and Mr. De Grasse Fox of Philadelphia one of the Governing Committee, honors are too evenly divided to make contentions possible.

Although Bar Harbor has a very large cottage society, where refinement and luxury are as prominent as at Newport, yet hotel life is not quite dead, and the Malvern, the Belmont, and the St. Sauveur have a large contingent of pleasant people from all the large cities. The Saturday evening dances at the Kebo Club show off to advantage the number of pretty girls and available men that Bar Harbor has to boast of. Among them are Miss Margaret Lee of New York, Miss Sturgis and Miss McMichaels of Philadelphia, Miss Sedley of Staten Island, Miss Chanler, who comes over from Northeast Harbor; Miss Augusta McKim Davies, the Misses Van Rensselaer, and the clever young forester, Miss Beatrix Jones.

Men are dropping in for the golf tournament, which opens this week. Among them are Arden Robbins, who won the championship last year; Harry Leeds, Edmund Pendleton, and Martin Van Buren. The diplomatic colony promises to be larger than Newport's this year. The Austro-Hungarian Minister and Baroness Hengelmüller are at the Bamboo. Mr. Constantin Brun of Denmark is occupying the Clover cottage, and Maurice Trubert of the French Embassy, musician, poet, and bachelor, is expected shortly. Señor Almeida de Brandao, Secretary of the Brazilian Legation, is also an acquisition to the ranks of single men. He is young and good-looking, but is, alas, only a bird of passage, as Newport is his ultimate destination.

In a few days Mr. H. McK. Twombley's and Mr. W. D. Sloane's party, which includes the ladies of their families and a few friends, will start for Alaska in their private train. They propose to go as far north as Juneau, whence a trip up the Yukon River as far as the Klondike mines, of which such fetching fairy tales of golden fields and glittering veins are told, could be easily accomplished. But, except as an object of curiosity and for purposes of scientific research, a gold mine could have but few attractions for Mr. Twombley's party. As the expedition will cover several weeks, beautiful Vinland at Newport will not be opened this summer, and Mrs. James A. Burden, Jr., will preside as chatelaine over Elm Court.

Southampton, that village of windmills and long distances, is by no means the scene of wild gayety that correspondents represent it to be. It is simply a colony of rich and respectable people, whose dainty cottages dot the roads and fields, and who enjoy the stretches of stubby grass, into which old ocean sends up its salt lakes and ponds, and over which the ocean breezes sweep with a life-giving power unknown elsewhere. Golf in the morning, golf in the afternoon, golf as long as daylight lasts, is the chief interest of the men, and their scarlet coats crop up here and there and everywhere along the roads and lanes. The women's links are crowded also, but the women have other points of vantage, and are to be found at Mr. Chase's sketching classes, and absorbed in the study of whist at the various cottages during the morning hours. Saturday and Sunday see a little spurt of gayety at the Meadow Club, where a dinner and a dance are given; but Shinnecock and the golf links are so much more fascinating to husbands and brothers than any indoor festivities that tea at the clubhouse is the leading rendezvous for all. On Sunday morning the little church on the dunes, otherwise the sand hills, where the grass grows and wild roses bloom as cheerfully as if they had a foundation of solid earth for their nourishment, makes the nearest approach to a display of dress and fashion that is to be seen at Southampton. All the world and his wife are there. The women look chic and attractive, but there is no very great show of beauty, and, as at Newport, the married belles far outnumber and outshine the girls.