

available, to build and put in operation the twenty-five miles of road as specified in the franchise, it is difficult to see what the crazy outfit is driving at, unless it expects to tie up the water front of the city, or as much of it as possible in litigation. Carl-on's unmatchable audacity in laying claim in his prospectus to "eleven and one-half miles of exclusive water front franchise," and his further statement that "all railroads entering San Diego will have to pay it—the Los Angeles, San Diego and Yuma Railroad Company—tribute," can best be appreciated in the light of the following extract from Section 2591 of the Act of March 18, 1889, establishing a Board of State Harbor Commissioners for the Bay of San Diego:

"The right to construct, maintain and operate railways on said bulkhead, embankment, or seawall, shall invest absolutely in said Board of Harbor Commissioners, to be operated by them with their own engines, and at such charges as they may see fit to make, but they shall give all railroads terminating at the Bay of San Diego equal facilities for bringing ship and car together; and as long as they have no engines of their own, they may hire such engines, or temporarily a low railroad or other companies to move their cars with other suitable engines."

AN IMPORTANT NATIONAL GATHERING.

ON THIS date, April 1st, at Washington, D. C., an important gathering was to convene and be continued three consecutive days. It is in the nature of "a National Conference of the Principles of Civil Government," to be held under the auspices of the National Reform Association.

The call was signed by His Honor, Wm. Strong, late of the Supreme Court of the United States; Joseph Cook, the Rev. Francis E. Clark, D. D., President of the United Societies of Christian Endeavor; the Hon. William Windom, Secretary of the Treasury; Gen. Clinton B. Fisk; the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts; Bishop Andrews, of the M. E. Church, and many others.

If the following, which is embraced in the announcement, had been expressed and published by "Mormon" Elders, it would undoubtedly have been denounced as treasonable, and as indicating a disloyal attempt to produce the domination of the Church over the State and an amalgamation of the two branches:

"Among the principles which this association holds to be fundamental in civil government are these: Nations and governments are accountable to Almighty God and are bound by the moral law; the Lord Jesus Christ is the actual Governor of nations, and His will, revealed in the Holy Scriptures, is the supreme rule to decide moral questions in political life. These principles we hold to have been woven, historically, in the very fibre of American institutions. Our stability and our progress have been due to the power they have exerted in our national life. All the evils which have afflicted us have been traceable to our

departure from them. All our hopes for our future depend upon them. Our gravest perils lies in the fact that these principles are ignored by large numbers of our citizens, and denied by many others. The duty of the hour is to emphasize and uphold them, and to inculcate them upon the fast increasing millions of our population."

Among the subjects it is proposed to treat are the Sabbath Question, or the Nation's Relation to the Day of Rest; the Question of Marriage and Divorce, or the Duty of the Nation to the Family; the Temperance Question, or the Right Attitude of the Law Toward the Traffic in Intoxicants; the Indian, the Chinese and the Negro Problems; the School Question, or the Character of the Education to be furnished by the State to its Youthful Citizens; the relation of the nation to foreign and weaker nations as affected by our commerce and by the character of the representatives whom we send.

Those who call the conference thus tell a striking truth constantly and conspicuously exemplified:

"Underlying all these practical issues is a deeper and more radical controversy provoked by those who deny that civil government sustains any relations to God or to Christ or to the Moral Law; who deny that our laws and institutions should bear at any point the impress of the Christian religion; and who are striving constantly and of deliberate purpose to obliterate every Christian feature of American institutions and to divorce our government from all connection with religion."

It is intended to embody the views of the conference in resolutions and in that shape give them wide publicity.

TARIFF STATISTICS.

WE willingly give place today to a communication from the gentlemen who appeared as the champions of free trade in the debate upon that subject held in this city a few evenings ago. It is not our intention to enter into a tariff controversy, but we will venture a few brief observations relative to some of the statements and figures presented by the gentlemen.

They show that the increase in the value of farms in the United States from 1850 to 1860, a decade of low tariff, was 10½ per cent per annum, while from 1860 to 1880, a period of high tariff, it was only 2½ per cent per annum. But this percentage applies to a sum more than double that which the 10½ per cent does. The object of these figures and comparisons is to sustain the theory that a low tariff had the effect to enhance the aggregate value of American farms. But unfortunate-

ly for this theory, the gentlemen give figures which destroy it. They show that the increase in the value of farms between 1850 and 1860 was \$3,374,000,000, or 10½ per cent per annum, and use these figures in an immediate connection which produces a comparison favorable to their position; but further on they disclose the fact that in the next decade, viz., from 1860 to 1870, under a war tariff, and during a period which embraced the rebellion and reconstruction of the Southern States, the increase was \$2,617,758,854, or more than three-fourths what it was during the previous decade of peace and prosperity. During the next decade, however (1870 to 1880), though the tariff conditions remained much the same, the rate of increase in the value of farms was enormously reduced, being less than one-third what it was from 1860 to 1870.

Now if the rate of increase in the value of farms is governed by the tariff, while the tariff remains substantially the same, that rate of increase will not materially fluctuate. In other words, the same cause will continue to produce the same effect. But we see in one decade of high tariff an increase in farm values three times as great as that which occurs during the next decade of a similar tariff. This proves to a demonstration that the tariff does not govern the rate of increase in farm values.

Take the three decades from 1850 to 1880 and we shall find many elements which affected the aggregate value of American farms. The prosperity of the first decade invited a heavy foreign immigration, and impelled native inhabitants to spread over new territory, and thus the area of American farms was enormously augmented; and the greater the area the greater the value. A person unskilled in the intricacies of the tariff can account for the increase in the value of American farms far more easily by considering the increase in their total area, than by figuring on exports and imports. It was between 1850 and 1860 that a great portion of several States was transformed from a wilderness to cultivated fields. Kansas, Iowa, Oregon, Nebraska and portions of the South, are suggested in this connection.

From 1860 to 1870 the rate of increase in the value of farms was curtailed by the suspension of foreign immigration during the war, by the ruin and devastation consequent upon the war, and by the fact that