

The Sun

SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1906.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month..... \$0 50

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau Street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

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.

No Taintees Need Apply.

Mr. BRYAN, who resigned from the board of trustees of Illinois College because it took "tainted" money, is not going to have the expenses of his homecoming defrayed by that sort of currency. He commands the committee of arrangements to "see to it that no money is accepted from questionable sources."

Mr. BRYAN, who loves dollar dinners, prefers dollar subscriptions, but will consent to fifty dollar subscriptions; and the names must be published. But a dollar subscription may be as irremediably tainted as a million dollars of JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S.

At least, every subscription should be accompanied with an affidavit, but men's memories are short, and the bacteriology of financial taint is a new science. Would it not be better to have the bills for the Bryan home week paid by two Cantonian and impeccable statesmen, against the vestal virginity of whose modest savings the breath of suspicion and malignity has never dared to blow?

A Singular Triumph of the Law.

The monotony of life on Smith Island, Chesapeake Bay, was broken on Thursday morning by an unexpected hanging which was not a lynching. From a steamer which dropped anchor a mile from the desolate shore in the half light of dawn a boat with the parts of a gibbet in it was rowed ashore. In an hour the thing was knocked together.

A black man looking over the steamer rail saw the carpenters at work and heard the sound of saw and hammer. The gibbet was for him, but he showed no concern about his fate, chewing gum stolidly and paying no heed to his "spiritual adviser," a man of his own race, whose agitation in the performance of his duty was painful to behold.

The scaffold grew against the background of trees, a signal was given from the shore, and the handcuffed negro, a wretch who had committed the crime of horror, slumped down into a boat alongside. He landed in a group of Tangier Sound crabbers attracted by the amazing affair. The negro could not be hanged at once, because the black gown had been left on the ship. A boat was rowed out and rowed back. Then the condemned man was hauled up by his arms to the platform of the scaffold, which was short of steps, the gown was put on, also the black cap, and the "spiritual adviser" prayed. By that time the sun was well up, and it whitened the sails of a fleet of fishing boats out on the bay. Heads were bared during the appeal for mercy for the wretch's soul. The trap was sprung, the body "shot down five feet and swung around," and the law had been vindicated; for, although there was not a habitation on this part of Smith Island and the hanging had been done by stealth, it was the State of Maryland which had taken the life of the negro, and the Sheriff of Somerset county was in charge of the execution.

cluded spot. So the Sheriff and the negro and the gibbet and the proper witnesses and the black gown and cap proceeded by steamer from Baltimore to Smith Island, where the Sheriff thought that no other mortal eyes would see the law vindicated. The crabbers he had not counted on, but it was an unusual experience for them and they were glad to let the hanging go on.

Governor WARFIELD was very much pleased with the success of the innovation, and he is now in favor of having all hangings on an island in Chesapeake Bay. Why not make the island from the dredgings of Baltimore harbor, he says, and call it Execution Island? Representative JOSHUA W. MILES of Somerset has sent no congratulations to Annapolis, however. He says that the course of Governor WARFIELD was a reflection upon the law abiding people of Somerset, and he declares that "there has not been a time since the conviction of this negro when he might not have been brought to this county and hanged without the slightest fear of interference with the course of justice."

Governor WARFIELD has set a bad precedent, and it may be doubted whether the letter of the law was not disregarded. The statute provides that sentence of death shall be executed at the place of indictment, which in the case of this negro was Princess Anne. Unfortunately hangings are still public in Maryland, but the Governor had the whole State guard at his disposal to prevent mob violence at Princess Anne; and, aside from the question of proceeding fearlessly according to the requirements of the law, the hanging of LEE for his odious crime at or near the scene of it would have been infinitely more impressive and exemplary than the gumshoe method of execution which was adopted. It was as much like lynching in the manner and accessories of it as a legal execution could be, and on that ground alone it should be condemned.

Is Reaction Triumphant in Russia?

That the Czar's Government is living over a volcano nobody doubts, but how soon an eruption will take place cannot be predicted, in view of the almost absolute dearth of trustworthy information. The intentions of the revolutionary party will naturally not be proclaimed from the houseposts, and if they were we should not learn of them until long afterward because of the repressive conditions that obtain in St. Petersburg. Almost all of our news from Russia comes by way of the capital, and for the moment that city is effectually gagged. A system of strangulation equivalent to martial law has been established, one effect of which is that no statement unauthorized by the official censorship can appear in a newspaper. Telegrams are subjected to a no less rigorous supervision, and if the mails are not tampered with the bureaucracy is omitting to practise at this critical juncture one of its familiar tricks. In a word, we know nothing about what is going on in the chief centres of Russia's thought and activity except what the reactionists choose to let us know or wish us to believe.

It follows that the meagre information, or alleged information, forthcoming must be interpreted in the light of the motives prompting the authorities to place it at our disposal. It is a matter of financial life and death for the autocracy to convince the world that reaction has succeeded. The last great loan, arranged just before the meeting of the Duma, a loan amounting on its face to about \$400,000,000, was payable by instalments. It was agreed that the first instalment should remain on deposit with the bankers who underwrote it, to provide interest and a sinking fund not only on the new issue of bonds but also on the loans previously obtained. Of that instalment not a ruble is obtainable for the Czar's current necessities, the magnitude of which will be appreciated when we recall that there are at this moment five or six army corps in St. Petersburg and some 600,000 soldiers under arms in southern Russia, besides the large force still detained in Manchuria and Siberia. The next instalment of the loan falls due on August 1. Suppose the subscribers refuse to pay it, preferring to forfeit the sums already advanced? Such a refusal would have been inevitable had a general uprising taken place in Russia this week, or had a startling and persistent drop in the prices of Russian securities been witnessed on the stock exchanges of Paris, Berlin and London. Under such circumstances it was a matter of course that the St. Petersburg Government would strain every nerve to keep up the market price of its bonds, first by buying large quantities of its securities on its own account, and secondly, by reassuring its financial agents and the world at large as to the prospect of lasting tranquillity in Russia. If the Czar's present advisers could convey the impression that the coup d'etat of July 21-22 would prove as triumphant as LOUIS NAPOLEON'S of December 2, 1851, and could only make the impression last through the first week of August, they would find themselves possessed of funds enough to carry on a campaign of repression for some months at all events.

Bankers and investors, however, are not gullible, and they will scarcely fail to note that there is a profound difference between Russia's situation to-day and that of France at the beginning of the sixth decade of the last century. France had no agrarian question and the peasants could still be thrilled by the Napoleonic legend. So far as the urban proletariat was concerned, it looked with distrust and dislike on the majority of the legislative body, which had stopped the public works intended for the relief of the unemployed and had imposed property restrictions on the franchise. As VICTOR HUGO, an eye witness, has told us in his "History of a Crime," the Paris workmen for the most part looked with cold indifference upon the usurper's dissolution of the legislature and the arrest of many delegates. With the exception of certain Generals of the Cavaignac type, who had made themselves hateful to the Socialists by their bloody victory of the days of June, the

army was for LOUIS NAPOLEON almost to a man. The result of these conditions was that no general and vehement protest was made against the summary dispersal of the people's representatives, and the French rentes, which at first fell, and which the needy adventurers who had brought about the coup d'etat had no means of supporting, recovered with astonishing rapidity.

In all these particulars the present state of things in Russia presents a violent contrast to the situation with which LOUIS NAPOLEON had to deal. The most dangerous element of the Russian population is the peasantry, who are determined to get land at any cost and who have lost their former confidence in the Czar. Instead of offering less satisfaction to their land hunger than the autocrat, the short lived Duma promised a great deal more. That large sections of the army, not only in the southern and southeastern provinces, but even in the neighborhood of St. Petersburg itself, are honeycombed with disaffected troops cannot be doubted, in view of the facts that reached us from all quarters while newspapers and telegrams were as yet uncensored. If many of the soldiers, and especially those of the Imperial Guard, who are the recipients of special favors, still profess allegiance to NICHOLAS II, it is because they see in him not the Lord's anointed but their paymaster. Let his funds run short and he will quickly learn what their loyalty amounts to. Alike in the army and in civil life it is questionable whether the Czar has any friends at all, except the officeholders, who are in the same boat with him, and some of the great landowners who have been victims of agrarian disorder or who dread compulsory expropriation.

The disability under which the Russian people's elected representatives labor as compared with the autocracy is, of course, the lack of organization. As soon as that deficiency is remedied, wholly or in part, we may expect to see an outburst of resentment and fury from one end of Russia to the other. How much an upheaval of the kind is dreaded by the reactionists themselves may be inferred from the course pursued by the military strategists, who are evidently preparing to make a last stand at St. Petersburg. For that and many another reason we can no longer expect to get trustworthy news from the capital. When the outbreak comes, as undoubtedly it will come, we shall learn the facts only by dribbles, through messages sent by hand across the German, Polish or Austrian frontiers.

The reluctance of CHARLES A. TOWNE to have his name on any Presidential ticket need not behead by Mr. BRYAN is superfluous concern on his part. The consent of Tammany Hall, which put TOWNE into Congress, would have to be asked, and an indignant protest would be entered by that old retainer and faithful servant of the organization the Hon. WILLIAM SWIZER. As to TOWNE's being associated with WILLIAM J. BRYAN, that gentleman would have to be consulted, and he is showed enough to see that there are no votes in the ex-Republican and ex-Populist settled in New York as a Tammany recruit.

Model Apartments for the "Gentle Poor."

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: Will you kindly give space in your paper to an appeal for better housing for a large class of our most respectable people? The model tenements built for the working classes have been a great success, both for the tenant and owner. These houses, however, have been put in unpleasant neighborhoods, and are not so desirable as the idea of worker-teachers' artist, librarian, writer, etc.

These people are as poor as the mechanic class; in many cases poorer. In order to live in a decent neighborhood, among congenial people, they are obliged to pay a large rent. Why cannot our philanthropists turn their attention to building model apartments, of from two to six rooms and bath, in quiet, respectable neighborhoods for this class of our people? The idea of national progress has been a great success, both for the tenant and owner. These houses, however, have been put in unpleasant neighborhoods, and are not so desirable as the idea of worker-teachers' artist, librarian, writer, etc.

Notice From Amendment Bob.

"We'll stand on our record," says Uncle JOE CANNON, sounding the keynote of the Republican campaign to carry the Sixtieth Congress. This is interpreted as a stand pat defiance by the leader of the House to foes within and without the party.

Protest and rebellion ring out shrilly from Madison. "The rate bill," says Amendment BOB LA FOLLETTE, "is good, but it is only a starter." And if the President is a valuable asset for Uncle JOE and the general staff in charge of the Republican Congress campaign, Amendment BOB also claims him as an ally. Listen to the following pronouncement: "I am going back to Washington next winter to urge improvements of the bill with all the steam power I have, and it is my opinion that if some of these changes are not made the railroad question will be one of the big issues of the next Presidential campaign. Just before I left Washington I had a talk with President ROOSEVELT, and he told me the rate bill needed strengthening and he would give some of my amendments study during the summer. He congratulated me on what I had done in Washington."

There is to be nothing taken for granted where Amendment BOB holds forth. He will stand on no record but his own, and if he rests he rusts. The Republican record may be good, but so far as he is concerned it is only a starter. He will invade the pivotal States, making his own dates and freeing his mind, without consulting Uncle JOE and JIMMY SHERMAN. He has a cause and a mission. The new rate bill will be known as the La Follette law when he is through with it. "The Senate steering committee," he raves, "cracked every one of my amendments on the head as soon as it came in sight." So he is going to hit every head he can reach.

The general staff may put every available man on the stump, the whole Republican majority, to point with pride at the record, but Amendment BOB will insist on being heard by any audience that will listen to his indictment of treason and turpitude. Loaded to the muzzle with all the statistics compiled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, he will be more terrible than the Republican army with banners.

Caeothics of the Bard of Burwash.

THOMAS HARDY, a novelist of genius, insists upon wearying the world with fearful and wonderful "poetry." He begets interminable dramas. And Wessex weeps and all the bright realm of its rustic stoics is veiled. RUDYARD KIPLING, whom we seem to recall as a comrade of Soldiers Three, insists on being an "eminent publicist," who communicates his great thoughts to the public in what is supposed to be "poetry." TENNYSON could compose atrocious verse when politics went to his head, but naturally TENNYSON'S worst is as far above KIPLING'S as heaven is above Burwash. The Sweet Singer of Michigan, the lamented COOGLER, JAMES BYRON ELMORE, BLOODGOOD H. CUTLER surpass immeasurably KIPLING in his didactic-political rhymes. DITHYRAMB DICKE has the elemental fire. KIPLING breaks out into a sort of prickly heat. GLIDER can write "hotter stuff" to a calf; VAN DYKE to a birdie.

than in anger, we implore him in the name of Mulsaney, Ortheris and Leogros to take his rhymes out of the orthopedic hospital, throw them into the grate and settle down to his legitimate business.

"Oh, well, what do you expect?" said CANR. "Accidents" will happen in the best of families. The important thing is to have a coroner with proper views."

Something new in insurance—Cleveland Plain Dealer. Something for the benefit of the policyholders?

Will that Ohio court be found guilty of contempt of Three Cent Tom JOHNSON?

I think it will be a quiet campaign.—Lieutenant-Governor DEWEY of Massachusetts. Quiet! And all the mouths of Mr MORAN unmauled and Tom-TOM LAWSON beating himself into a fury until the eardrums of heaven are split!

Much has been written about the wonderful beauty of your women. I failed to see it.—The Gleaner of Baroda.

A subtle and delightful potentate and Panzer than the Hitopadesha and the Parvater chatantra combined. He walks like he is just about to take the bait and gives an opinion which every sapient married man who has travelled in foreign parts will appreciate. Judicious Gaskwar!

Indiana Republicans are not all in sympathy with the well enough alone tariff policy of Uncle JOE and the other big chiefs. SMILEY N. CHAMBERS, who was United States District Attorney under President HARRISON, says that "the country demands tariff revision and the Republican party should be about it." Mr. WILLIAM COYNE, delegate to the last national convention, says he is "absolutely convinced of the necessity of revising the tariff," and that "of all the fool expressions floating around the worst is 'stand pat.'" Interviews with business men in Indianapolis show a general sentiment for some kind of revision. The Hon. CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS has not permitted himself to be interviewed, but it is intimated that he is for free but-ter milk.

The reluctance of CHARLES A. TOWNE to have his name on any Presidential ticket need not behead by Mr. BRYAN is superfluous concern on his part. The consent of Tammany Hall, which put TOWNE into Congress, would have to be asked, and an indignant protest would be entered by that old retainer and faithful servant of the organization the Hon. WILLIAM SWIZER. As to TOWNE's being associated with WILLIAM J. BRYAN, that gentleman would have to be consulted, and he is showed enough to see that there are no votes in the ex-Republican and ex-Populist settled in New York as a Tammany recruit.

Model Apartments for the "Gentle Poor."

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: Will you kindly give space in your paper to an appeal for better housing for a large class of our most respectable people? The model tenements built for the working classes have been a great success, both for the tenant and owner. These houses, however, have been put in unpleasant neighborhoods, and are not so desirable as the idea of worker-teachers' artist, librarian, writer, etc.

These people are as poor as the mechanic class; in many cases poorer. In order to live in a decent neighborhood, among congenial people, they are obliged to pay a large rent. Why cannot our philanthropists turn their attention to building model apartments, of from two to six rooms and bath, in quiet, respectable neighborhoods for this class of our people? The idea of national progress has been a great success, both for the tenant and owner. These houses, however, have been put in unpleasant neighborhoods, and are not so desirable as the idea of worker-teachers' artist, librarian, writer, etc.

Notice From Amendment Bob.

"We'll stand on our record," says Uncle JOE CANNON, sounding the keynote of the Republican campaign to carry the Sixtieth Congress. This is interpreted as a stand pat defiance by the leader of the House to foes within and without the party.

Protest and rebellion ring out shrilly from Madison. "The rate bill," says Amendment BOB LA FOLLETTE, "is good, but it is only a starter." And if the President is a valuable asset for Uncle JOE and the general staff in charge of the Republican Congress campaign, Amendment BOB also claims him as an ally. Listen to the following pronouncement: "I am going back to Washington next winter to urge improvements of the bill with all the steam power I have, and it is my opinion that if some of these changes are not made the railroad question will be one of the big issues of the next Presidential campaign. Just before I left Washington I had a talk with President ROOSEVELT, and he told me the rate bill needed strengthening and he would give some of my amendments study during the summer. He congratulated me on what I had done in Washington."

There is to be nothing taken for granted where Amendment BOB holds forth. He will stand on no record but his own, and if he rests he rusts. The Republican record may be good, but so far as he is concerned it is only a starter. He will invade the pivotal States, making his own dates and freeing his mind, without consulting Uncle JOE and JIMMY SHERMAN. He has a cause and a mission. The new rate bill will be known as the La Follette law when he is through with it. "The Senate steering committee," he raves, "cracked every one of my amendments on the head as soon as it came in sight." So he is going to hit every head he can reach.

The general staff may put every available man on the stump, the whole Republican majority, to point with pride at the record, but Amendment BOB will insist on being heard by any audience that will listen to his indictment of treason and turpitude. Loaded to the muzzle with all the statistics compiled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, he will be more terrible than the Republican army with banners.

Caeothics of the Bard of Burwash.

THOMAS HARDY, a novelist of genius, insists upon wearying the world with fearful and wonderful "poetry." He begets interminable dramas. And Wessex weeps and all the bright realm of its rustic stoics is veiled. RUDYARD KIPLING, whom we seem to recall as a comrade of Soldiers Three, insists on being an "eminent publicist," who communicates his great thoughts to the public in what is supposed to be "poetry." TENNYSON could compose atrocious verse when politics went to his head, but naturally TENNYSON'S worst is as far above KIPLING'S as heaven is above Burwash. The Sweet Singer of Michigan, the lamented COOGLER, JAMES BYRON ELMORE, BLOODGOOD H. CUTLER surpass immeasurably KIPLING in his didactic-political rhymes. DITHYRAMB DICKE has the elemental fire. KIPLING breaks out into a sort of prickly heat. GLIDER can write "hotter stuff" to a calf; VAN DYKE to a birdie.

STATE AID TO SHIPS.

Policy by Which England's Maritime Supremacy is Maintained.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—The Cunard line is building two steamships that will be the greatest in the world, and without the aid of a single penny. Further advantageous contracts with the British Government enable the Cunard people to pay 2 1/2 per cent. interest on the paper loan without affecting their own funds. Mr. "Boothman" may call this what he likes, master stroke or high finance—the fact exists that the funds of the British Government are building these new steamships, and the mail contracts with this transatlantic line cover the amount of interest on the so-called loan. Mr. Boothman grasps the situation thoroughly, although there may be room for argument about the technical term "subsidy."

The Germans pride themselves on the fact that their steamers are not subsidized. This appears to be backing in the market, but all the intense activity in German maritime progress is due to Government fostering and to the far-sightedness of that really great man Emperor Wilhelm. The Kaiser has created the German merchant marine of to-day. In every way German shipowners receive encouragement from the Berlin Government. All obstacles irritating and hampering to marine progress are done away with and assistance and encouragement are given in every way possible.

There were long headed men in the British Government who saw even before 1850, and Britain was at that time protectionist to the core, that the maritime salvation of the United Kingdom lay in the prompt acceptance of steam power on the North Atlantic. An experimental steam service was started to the Isle of Man, then a longer service across the Ocean to Rotterdam and Hamburg; then a still longer one to New York. The first of these lines was a State aided affair. Not one of them would have come into being without the fostering care of the royal Government. In 1853 the subsidy of the Rotterdam and Hamburg steam packets was abandoned, and the British Government awarded an Atlantic mail contract calling for a subsidy of \$425,000 a year to Samuel Cunard and his associates. This was the beginning of the present Cunard line. The sum paid to this company in its early days, amounting to about 25 per cent. per annum on the cost of the running plant, and subsequently increased to \$550,000, to \$750,000, and to \$850,000, was intended to establish firmly in English hands the transatlantic traffic, and it accomplished the desired result.

Great Britain went further. Another liberal subsidy was offered for a steamship line to the West Indies, the establishment of the Peninsular and Oriental, now a glory and bulwark to the British Empire. William Wheelwright, the American Consul at Guayaquil, came home with the idea of opening a steamship line to the West Indies and South America and broached the subject to a number of merchants. They acknowledged the attractiveness of the scheme, but declared the idea could never be put into effect because of the opposition of the British Government. Congress would not grant a subsidy. Mr. Wheelwright then went abroad and put his hobby before the English merchant marine, and he had a hearing in London and the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, now one of the most powerful steamship corporations in the world. In the year when the United States withdrew its protection from the Atlantic steamship enterprise and left it to the competition of the free market, the British were steadily increasing ship subsidies, and extending their steam lines from Great Britain to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West Indies and to 1850-51 granted \$3,000,000 to her ocean steamships. In 1850-51 she was expending \$4,000,000 for her steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$5,000,000. The example of maritime protectionism, offered by the British Government, was followed by the United States. In 1850-51 she was expending \$2,000,000 a year for twenty-six steamships, and in 1851-52 she was expending \$3,000,000 a year for a line to the West