

These stations are to be simply hollow posts, each having several batteries, each of which is connected with a separate "head" and arranged so that but one at a time can supply a current. The car is supplied with copper wire "brushes," and the current is transmitted by contact through the brushes passing over the heads. The rear brush strikes a head just as the front one is leaving another, thus closing the current, as it passes, in each one, turning all the voltage into the head immediately beneath the car.

There are no poles save those named, and these, compared with those at present in use, are quite unobtrusive and out of the way, and no overhead wires and in fact no wires are visible anywhere. An additional advantage is that the same motors and generators now used by the electric car companies can be used on the new system with no other change than merely adopting them.

Several trips were made at the time spoken of and they were described by the *New York Recorder* as entirely successful. The speed was easily adjusted, the car ran backward or forward and side-tracked without trouble, and, in short, we may say the foundation for if not inception of a revolution in electrical transit is concluded. From the same source we glean the following account:

"The invention is the result of a series of experiments made by Granville T. Woods, a young colored man, in fact the only colored electrician who has come forward prominently as an inventor. He made some arrangement with the American Engineering company to work out his scheme and put it into practical use. They had a misunderstanding about the transfer of some plans and Woods severed his connection with the company. Now that it has been practically demonstrated that his invention is of some value, Mr. Woods, through this counsel, Hahn and Meyers of 237 Broadway, is about to bring suit against the company for the recovery of his property, or that portion of it to which he claims he is entitled.

"C. C. Bowen, the president of the company, says that Woods has no claim whatever to the patent; that he sold his interests outright before the scheme was fully developed. Woods, on the other hand, declares that he was unfairly treated, and that while the company is in possession of the patents on his invention, they were obtained through fraud and connivance on the part of some of those interested. He also asserts that he has never received one penny in compensation for the work done, while the company is now preparing to reap a rich harvest."

PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES.

THE *New York World* is of opinion that the National Democratic Convention will drop all New York candidates, and exercise its discrimination in selecting two out of the following: Governor Horace Boies of Iowa, Gov-

ernor Robert E. Pattison of Pennsylvania, Senator John M. Palmer of Illinois, Senator John G. Carlisle of Kentucky, Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller of Illinois, Senator Arthur P. Gorman of Maryland, Governor Wm. E. Russell of Massachusetts, Governor Isaac P. Gray of Indiana, and Governor Leon Abbott of New Jersey. With a platform of tariff reform and honest money, the *World* claims that any of these can be elected President of the United States.

The speculations now being indulged in are based on the notion that neither Hill nor Cleveland is a possible candidate. In our opinion there is time yet for a reconciliation of the factional elements in New York, and combination in favor of a New York man. Cleveland, Hill or Whitney, if such a union could be consummated, would probably carry the convention and be stronger before the country than either of the other gentlemen mentioned. Gorman and Carlisle would each make a very strong candidate if New York dropped its claims for a "favorite son." In any event it must be gratifying to the Democratic party that so many strong men are found within its ranks capable of leading it in the approaching struggle for supremacy.

FREE COINAGE PROSPECTS.

THE Senate committee on finance, by a vote of seven to four, rejected Senator Stewart's free coinage bill, but the House committee on coinage, by a vote of eight to five, reported in favor of the Bland bill.

Speaking on the latter measure, *Bradstreet's* says that apparently the free coinage men have a majority in the House, and can pass the Bland bill if they press it vigorously. Also that this, rather than the Stewart bill, may form the basis of whatever action will be taken by the Senate on the question of free coinage. Political considerations, however, may interfere to check the progress of the bill. The country will, before many months, be in the throes of an election contest, and the party managers, especially those of the majority in the House, will, if they are true to the traditions of their order, endeavor to prevent any action by the House which would seem to commit their party to any decisive pronouncement on the question of free coinage.

Senator Vest of Missouri, in a recent letter to a friend, said that free coinage made an issue by Democrats in Congress meant division in his party, and that meant certain defeat. It will be remembered that Vest was himself the author of a free coinage

bill which last year passed the United States Senate. This is significant, and shows that party considerations will weigh heavily in the present free coinage controversy.

THE SUGAR BOUNTY QUESTION.

THE *Herald* has an article on the sugar question, which contains many facts and arguments pertinent to the subject of bounties and the aims and prospects of the sugar company. But one paragraph, in our opinion, calls for some further remarks. It is this:

"The sugar company has no cause to complain, and we don't believe it does complain. Its shareholders are men of intelligence and business capacity. They understand that if an industry cannot within reasonable time be made to support itself, that industry cannot possibly be made beneficial to the community; that is to say, if it is forever going to cost more to produce sugar than sugar is worth, whether the cost is met by individuals or the community, the sooner we stop making sugar the better. They didn't go into the business with the understanding that they would draw dividends from the national and territorial treasuries, but with the confident expectation of earning dividends on their invested capital, and at the same time benefitting the territory. Their confidence is not shaken, and we don't believe they will thank certain newspapers for placing them in the attitude of supplicants for charity."

The question to be decided is not whether the sugar company makes any "complaint," or whether it is an "applicant for charity." It is whether the sugar industry should receive additional aid so that it may become permanently successful. It matters not whether the company has anything to say in the controversy, either one way or the other. It is a public question of principle and expediency. If it is wrong under any circumstances to give a bounty to start or stimulate a needed industry, then no sugar bounty bill should pass. If it is not wrong, but the Utah sugar works can now be conducted without loss independent of any bounty, there should be no legislative appropriation for its assistance.

The *Herald's* statement of the case is not exactly correct. It is not claimed that "this institution cannot within a reasonable time be made to support itself." On the contrary the argument is that it will support itself "within a reasonable time," if temporary aid is afforded it. The company has had but one year's experience. In two or three years more it will certainly be able to go it alone, or demonstrate its incapacity to live without legislative support, and consequently that it is better to allow it to die.

It is not claimed by any advocate of the sugar bounty that "it is forever going to cost more to produce sugar