

KING OF SPAIN KIDNAPPED.

Everybody remembers that three years ago the little king of Spain was reported so dangerously ill with a violent contagious disease that no one but the doctor, the king's tutor and Senor Calista, the Prime Minister, could see him.

The facts of the case have just come to light. The truth of the matter is that the little king was not ill at all, but had been reported so because of the illness was sent abroad to cover his absence from public view.

The story of his kidnapping forms the most interesting tale of daring and cunning. Only a Spaniard could have carried out such a tricky scheme.

The reports of the king's illness were sent out on the day of a grand review of troops at Madrid in honor of one of the saints, at which the queen regent was to be present with the king. In consequence it was to be a most imposing affair, and all Madrid was to be there.

The queen regent was forced to send out the reports of the king's illness on the morning of the day of the parade, because she received a letter warning her of a plot which was on foot to attempt the king's life during the ceremony at the review.

The letter was postmarked Pimpóna, which was the very center of the Carlist region, and the queen regent was greatly alarmed. She submitted the letter to Father Ojiva, the tutor of the king, and it was decided to keep the boy at home and send out reports of his indisposition.

The tutor was consulting his royal pupil for his disappointment at not attending the review with the queen, who had taken in his stead his oldest sister, when a closed carriage was driven rapidly up to the palace and an officer and aide-de-camp stepped out. They announced themselves to the porters in waiting as General Episcopa and aid, sent by the queen to fetch the king to the review, and demanding to be taken to his majesty's room.

The two were immediately conducted to the tutor's room. Oliva was profoundly impressed with the genuineness of these fine officers and their message from the queen. They said she had found there was no danger, and that the troops should great dissatisfaction at the king's absence. She deemed it best he should be present, for fear of serious consequences.

The little king was dressed in his uniform in great haste and taken away by the two officers, but upon the queen regent returned and sent for his majesty. The old father was surprised and stupefied, and hurriedly explained to the queen how matters stood.

She at once realized the plot which had been plotted against her son. She was in despair and sent at once to the prime minister, who advised that the affair be kept secret to avoid the revolution that would surely take place if it became known.

The chief of police was informed of the state of affairs, and description of the carriage and two men was given him. The railways and frontier were watched and guarded. Every precaution was taken and careful search made for absolutely nothing could be learned.

Had it not been for one of the French diplomats, the king might still be in exile, Don Carlos now on the throne, or a republic established in the place of the present dynasty. At the end of the fourth day of the king's absence a famous French diplomat called at the palace with a gift for the boy king in the form of a troop of magnificent toy soldiers.

He was told by the queen that the nature of the king's malady prevented her from admitting him to his majesty's presence, but upon the Frenchman's assuring her that he did not fear contagion of any sort, the queen burst into tears and told him of Alphonso's abduction, begging his advice.

The diplomat was old in the services of foreign courts, and he was keen to a wonderful degree. He made all manner of inquiries, piled every one in the palace with questions, and then asked permission to examine every part of the great palace.

In the enormous servants' quarters he was not permitted to enter the rooms of the high chef, who was said to be ill. But upon insisting he was admitted. He found the chef was in good health, and quite confused at his visit.

The Frenchman asked him how he felt and then advised him to take the air as his apartments seemed close and stuffy. At the same time he stepped to a door at the side of the room. He was about to open it when the chef sprang at him. The diplomat whipped out a revolver and told him to back out.

He then swung open the door, and there, seated on the floor, was his majesty, the king of Spain, with dirty face and hands, eating jam tarts, of which he was extravagantly fond, and arranging some lead soldiers.

GOLD BOND STRUGGLE.

While Gallant Soldiers are at the Front, Greedy Speculators are Foreclosing a Blanket Mortgage on Their Homes.

MAXWELL'S AND SUTHERLAND'S SPEECHES

Constitutional, Legal, Political, Moral and Criminal Features of the Fraud of the Ages Discussed—Speeches of Congressmen Greene and Stark Printed Next Week.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE NOW THE STORM CENTER.

The Reform Forces Will Provide Lavishly for Funds to Prosecute the War, But Object to Plundering American Homes.

Omaha, May 17.—Next to the actual hostilities on the field of battle the question which most interests the people are the laws passed to raise money to prosecute the war. The republicans have proposed a "war measure," with an enormous gold bond deal as its foundation. The reform forces in congress propose to provide for an abundance of money without issuing any more bonds.

The difference between these two forces is not slight. It involves the cold-blooded scheme of the money power to so corner the "money market" and to so impoverish the masses as to practically Egyptianize the American people.

Amid the shouts of warriors and while the patriotism of good and true men are making them unmindful of domestic affairs, there has been a steady movement on foot to monopolize the finances of the country.

Under Cleveland's administration they worked through a \$27,000,000 bond deal. And now, covered up as a "war measure," they propose to add \$500,000,000 more to that awful crime against the people.

For these reasons the tremendous struggle going on at Washington between those who propose to take advantage of the war in carrying out their plans to further subject the American people to the money power, trusts and corporations, and those who would protect the interest of American homes and small business affairs while the patriots are on the field of battle is of tremendous importance.

The bill was rushed through Speaker Reed's half of congress with whoop, the republicans voting solidly for it, while the democrats, populists and free silver republicans voted against it.

Congressmen Green, Sutherland, Stark and Maxwell got an opportunity to make short speeches on the subject. The remarks of Judge Maxwell are here printed, and those of Congressmen Sutherland, Green and Stark will follow in another issue.

Washington, D. C.—Special.—Immediately after Wall street's proposition to congress to order an issue of \$500,000,000 gold bonds, the thirty-odd populist members of congress held a caucus in Senator Allen's rooms and by unanimous vote passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we oppose any increase of the bonded indebtedness of the United States, but we will promptly and cheerfully vote all necessary means to successfully prosecute the war by authorizing further taxation, including an income tax, and authorizing the immediate coinage of the seigniorage, anticipating the same by the issuance of silver certificates, and by authorizing an increase of the volume of legal tender notes as may be necessary."

But Speaker Reed rushed the deal through the house with scarcely any time given to discussion. It was all done under the whip and spur, but Congressman Sutherland of the Fifth district got a chance for a few minutes' talk. He said:

SUTHERLAND HITS THE NAIL.  
Mr. Chairman, on last Monday evening a caucus was held by the populist and free silver republican senators and representatives to consider our position on the proposed measure embracing the bond scheme that is now under discussion. We adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we oppose any increase of the bonded indebtedness of the United States, but we will promptly and cheerfully vote all necessary means to successfully prosecute the war by authorizing further taxation, including an income tax, and authorizing the immediate coinage of the seigniorage, anticipating the same by the issuance of silver certificates, and by authorizing such an increase of the volume of legal tender notes as may be necessary."

On January 29, 1898, I voted for resolution granting belligerent rights to the Cubans. I voted for the appropriation of \$50,000,000 to be placed in the hands of the president for national defense. I favored and voted for the senate amendment recognizing the republic of Cuba and that proposition failing, I supported the conference agreement that passed both branches of congress, that said that the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free, and demanding that the government of Spain relinquish its authority and withdraw its forces from Cuba and Cuban waters. (Applause.)

In this emergency I am willing to support the scheme of taxation provided for in the pending bill if the bond scheme is eliminated. I believe that in the struggle before us the wealth of the country should bear its just share of the burdens, and therefore an income tax should be imposed to the end that the man of millions as well as the laboring man should pay a fair proportion of the expenses of the government.

It is said "it does not appear that any tax like the one in question was ever regarded or treated by congress as a direct tax." Mr. Justice Harlan says: "The question what is a direct tax is one exclusively in American jurisprudence."

The text writers of the country are in entire accord upon the subject. (Applause.) Mr. Justice Story says that all taxes are usually divided into two classes—those which are direct and those which are indirect.

Under the former denomination are included taxes upon land or real property, and under the latter taxes on consumption (I Story Const., 560; Pollock vs. Farmers' Loan and Trust Co., 157 U. S. 676-682.)

It is also said in Springer vs. United States, supra: "Our conclusions are that direct taxes, within the meaning of the constitution, are only capitation taxes, as exercised at length the decisions upon the question of direct taxes. He says: "What are direct taxes was elaborately argued and considered by the court in Hylton vs. United States in the year 1796.

One of the members of the court, Justice Wilson, had been a distinguished member of the convention that had framed the constitution. It was unanimously held by the justices who heard the argument that a tax upon carriages kept by the owner for his own use was not a direct tax.

In the majority opinion in the case of Pollock vs. Farmers' Loan and Trust company, on rehearing no discussion is had of the decisions above referred to except that of Hylton vs. United States. When the supreme court has construed a provision of the constitution, and particularly where the construction has been made by a unanimous court soon after the organization of the government and followed by such court unanimously up to the year 1894, congress and the country have a right to rely upon such construction as the law.

Pollock vs. Farmers' Loan and Trust company, supra, the chief justice says: "It is evident that the income from realty forms a vital part of the scheme for taxation embodied therein. If that be stricken out and also the income from all invested personal property, bonds, stocks, investments of all kinds, it is obvious that by far the largest part of the anticipated revenue would be eliminated, and this would leave the burden of the tax to be borne by the professions, trades, employments, or vocations."

And in the judgment (page 637) Chief Justice Fuller said: "First that . . . taxes upon real estate being indisputably direct taxes taxes on the rent or income or real estate are equally direct taxes; second that . . . taxes on personal property or the income of personal property are likewise direct taxes."

The majority of the court seem to overlook the fact that where rent is paid to the landlord, no real estate is attached to the real estate and is simply money in possession—in other words income—and therefore liable to an income tax. The second proposition that the taxes upon personal property or taxes on the income of personal property are direct taxes, if applied to many of the items in this bill, would probably result in holding that the duty thereon was a direct tax, and therefore void.

If this decision should be adhered to, our government may expect a constitutional crisis. The courts reversing the decisions of a hundred years and depriving it of the money needed to pay its expenses and preserve its credit or even pay the salaries of the judges themselves. Such an unnatural construction could not have been contemplated by the framers of the constitution. But it is said we should not criticize the decisions of the highest courts in the land. The answer is, the judges are public officials, paid out of the public treasury, and are of a public nature. If a mistake is made the judges themselves, presumably, will be anxious to correct it.

For this purpose a motion for a rehearing is filed and must state some cause for a rehearing which a sensitive judge might construe as a reflection on his ability. Yet it is not so intended, and a capable, conscientious, and fearless judge will try to correct an error if a material one is pointed out to him. The decision in question was rendered by five judges, while four judges have since come out with strong dissenting opinions. Under these circumstances it is the same in a respectful manner.

I do not question the integrity of the judges or the honesty of their purpose, but I believe a great error has been committed in overturning the unanimous decisions of the court made by able and distinguished judges and assented to by the ablest lawyers and text writers in the nation for one hundred years, and by reason of which decisions the recipients of great incomes, those most able to contribute a reasonable amount to the support of the government, are permitted to evade their just obligations and dues. With the utmost respect for the court, and believing that its members feel bound by the decisions of their predecessors, I respectfully insist that an income tax is not a direct tax and is valid, and the duty of every one who believes the construction of the constitution deprive necessary to carry on its business. (Applause.)

In the very able dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan, he says: "By its present construction the court, for the first time in all its history, declares that our government has been so framed that in relation to taxation for the support and maintenance those who have incomes derived from the renting of real estate, or from the leasing or using of tangible personal property, bonds, stocks, and investments of what kind, have privileged themselves and are accorded to those having incomes from the labor of their hands or the exercise of their skill or the use of their brains. Let me illustrate this."

"In the large cities or financial centers of the country there are persons owning enormous incomes from the renting of houses that have been erected, not to be occupied by the proprietor, but for the purpose of being rented. Near by are other persons, trusts, combinations, and corporations, possessing vast quantities of personal property, including bonds and stocks of railroad, telegraph, mining, telephone, banking, coal, oil, gas, and sugar refining corporations, from which millions upon millions are regularly derived. In the same neighborhood are others who own net worth in real estate not invested property, bonds nor stocks of any kind, and whose entire income arises from the labor of their hands or the use of their brains."

It was contended that this was a direct tax, and the case of Hylton vs. United States, 3 Dall., 171, presented the question squarely whether or not this was a direct tax. The court held that it was not.

In the able dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan in Pollock vs. Farmers' Loan and Trust company, bank at al., 157 U. S., 648, he quotes from the diary of Mr. Justice Iredell, one of the judges who, in 1796, decided the case of Hylton vs. United States supra. It said: "This was a very important case, as it involved a question of constitutional law. The point was the constitutionality of the act of congress of 1794. If a direct tax, it could only be laid in proportion to the census, which has not as yet been taken. . . . The court unanimously agreed that the tax was constitutional, and delivered their opinions seriatim."

Mr. Justice Patterson, presented a very plausible and apparently correct explanation of the object of the term "direct taxes." He says: "The provision was made in favor of the southern states. They possessed a large number of slaves; they had extensive tracts of territory thinly settled, and not very productive. A majority of the states had but few slaves, and several of them a limited territory well settled and in a high state of cultivation. The southern states, if no provision, had been introduced in the constitution, would have been wholly at the mercy of the other states, whose congress might in such a case tax slaves at discretion or arbitrarily, and land in every part of the union at the same rate or measure—so much a head in the first instance, and so much an acre in the second. To guard, then, against imposition in these particulars, was the reason of introducing the clause in the constitution which directs that representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the states according to their respective numbers."

By the acts of congress of July 14, 1798, August 2, 1813, January 9, 1815, and March 3, 1845, direct taxes were laid upon "lands, improvements thereon, dwelling houses, and slaves, and apportioned among the states." The reason slaves were the subject of a direct tax is explained in a later case. "Slaves were proper subjects of a capitation tax, as described in the constitution as a direct tax, as property; they were by the laws of some if not most of the slave states classed as real property descendible to the heirs." (Venzle Bank vs. Wall, 3 Wall, 543.)

In Pollock vs. Farmers' Loan and Trust company, supra, the chief justice says: "The question was whether or not a tax of 10 per cent on the notes of a state bank used for circulation was a direct tax. The court held it was not, and that the tax was valid. The opinion was delivered by Chief Justice Chase, who said in substance: "In construing the term no valuable light had been elicited as to the sense in which the direct taxation was used in the constitution. That personal property, contracts, occupations and the like have never been regarded by congress as proper subjects of direct tax."

"And it is now the law as this day declared, that under the constitution, however urgent may be the needs of government, however sorely the administration in power may be pressed to meet the money obligations of the nation, congress can not tax the personal property of the country nor the incomes arising either from real estate or from invested personal property except by a tax apportioned among the states on the basis of their population, while it may compel the merchant, the artisan, the workman, the artist, the author, the lawyer, the physician, even the minister of the gospel, no one of whom happens to own real estate, invested personal property, stocks, or bonds, to contribute directly from their respective earnings, gains, and profits, and under the rule of uniformity, or equality, for the support of the government." (Pollock vs. Farmers' Loan and Trust Co., 157 U. S., 672-673.)

I have voted for both men and means to carry on and bring this war to a speedy and final termination, and shall continue to do so until victory perches upon our banners and an honorable peace is secured, but I am not willing to vote a mortgage upon this nation as this time for half a billion dollars when it is not necessary to do so.

The available cash balance, including the gold reserve, as stated in the report of the secretary of the treasury, on April 28, 1898, was \$218,814,956.53. The chairman of the ways and means committee estimates the war expenses to be \$1,500,000,000 per day. This being so, there is enough money in the treasury without touching the gold reserve to conduct the war for nearly five months. The estimate of the same chairman as to the income from the revenue bill under consideration is \$90,000,000 per annum, and this probably is too low by many millions. Hence, the revenue from that source for five months would exceed \$40,000,000, sufficient to prosecute the war for nearly five months at least. A fair income tax, placing the net income at \$2,000, it is estimated, would produce one hundred millions or more. And there are many other sources of revenue that have not been touched upon in this bill. A bond issue at this time is not only unnecessary, but it will withdraw money from circulation and business nerves, and doing some definite and comparatively simple duty. One man will have certain motions, to which he has become accustomed by years of drill, to perform about a particular gun. Another will control the machinery for operating the turret. Another will be required to hoist ammunition through a certain tube.

When a modern warship goes into battle the strain of the ordeal will be mitigated for most of her company by the necessity of performing some definite and comparatively simple duty. One man will have certain motions, to which he has become accustomed by years of drill, to perform about a particular gun. Another will control the machinery for operating the turret. Another will be required to hoist ammunition through a certain tube.

But there is one man on whom all the various strains of simple responsibilities will converge with a force that will test to the utmost the strength and coolness of his nerves. He will stand in a steel barrel lined with push buttons and speaking tubes, and one false movement of his finger, one mistaken order in the swirling rush of battle, will send his ship to the bottom, and his crew, himself and perhaps his reputation with it.

The man in the conning tower will occupy a tiny circular dungeon with a wall of steel from two to ten inches thick, according to the type of vessel. In this central ganglion will converge all the nerves of the ship. A little steering wheel, a compass and a speed indicator will give control over the movements of the vessel. Speaking tubes or telephones will communicate with every important station. The elevation and direction of the main battery guns will be recorded, and the captain, if he choose, may fire them himself by pressing a button.

Here the man upon whose cool judgment the issue of the battle, the safety of the ship and the lives of the crew depend, will stand peering through a narrow slit at the strip of sea and sky in which the enemy is dimly visible through a haze of gray smoke. The air is trembling with clamorous sounds, from the sharp rattle of the rattings to the booming of the main battery guns. Shots from machine guns patter on the walls of the conning tower like the hammering of rivets in a boiler. Heavier rapid fire projectiles strike with an impact that makes the structure quiver, and glances of fire from one of them or a shell from a great gun, landing fairly, may plow through the steel shield and exploding by the resistance end the careers of the master of the conning tower and his companions.

The possibility of such a climax must always be present to his mind, but it must never for an instant distract his attention or cloud his judgment. One mistaken order in time of peace sent the Victoria and 500 men to the bottom. A single slip in time of war may cause the ship to lose an enemy's ram, may blow her up with one of her own torpedoes, or launch her broadside against a friend.

The feelings of a man under such a terrific strain would be worth the analysis of a psychological novelist if he had any feeling. But can he feel at such a time. The demand for attention and judgment must be so imperative, the tension on all the mental faculties so acute, that there can hardly be time or capacity left for any other feeling to arise in the mind. But after it is all over, well, a lady captain would have a good cry, and we imagine that the most phlegmatic man will breathe pretty fast as he smokes his cigar.

About Bees.  
I am not sure which has the greater influence in preventing swarming—the improved ventilated gable cover or the deep bottom board; but that such has a powerful influence is unquestionable. This season I ran over 200 colonies. In the same apiary, and while a big proportion of these were utilized in queen-raising, a good number also of the choicest colonies were run for extracted honey and for the production of first-class drones. The season was magnificent one; and while these colonies were powerfully strong in three-story ten-frame hives, not 5 per cent swarmed during the entire season.—H. T. Jones in Gleason's.

As I have said once or twice already in these columns, our "big double-deckers" at the outyard are the ones that went right on minding their own business, piling in the honey, and not swarming, while the single-story colonies scarcely made a showing. Indeed, I believe that the best solution of the swarming problem, whether at the home or at the outyard, is big colonies in two-story Langstroth hives. In some cases, at least, it may be better to have three stories. If other localities are like our own, I would guarantee that there would be very much less swarming, and more money in the pockets of bee-keepers at the end of the season.—Gleanings.