

SIDNEY ON CIPHERS.

The President of the Union Pacific Replies to Teller's Demand,

And Figures Out an Enormous Balance in Favor of the Company.

But Prudently Refrains from Mentioning the Old Debt of Seventy Millions.

The Diplomatic Blunder About the Border Explained by the Mexican Minister

A General Assortment of Washington Notes.

THE SUBSIDY ROAD.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

DILLON'S REPLY TO TELLER.

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Sidney Dillon, president of the Union Pacific, has written a long letter to Secretary Teller concerning government claims against the road. He says there is due the company a sum largely in excess of the amount claimed by the secretary of the Interior to be due the government and that any claim of the United States for immediate judgment under the Thurman act must be based either upon the rate of allowance for postal service fixed by the postoffice department, which the supreme court has rejected, or upon the allowance for that service at express rates as claimed by the company. Adopting the rates thus claimed by the company, the government is indebted to the road \$2,738,889, a sum far in excess of the amount sought to be recovered by the Interior department.

The letter is as follows:

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY CO., Boston, Mass., May 1.

To Hon. H. M. Teller, Secretary of the Interior, Washington.

SIR:—Your letter of the 21st ult., stating the claims of the government upon this company, has had the careful consideration of its directors. The purpose of the company has been and is to discharge fairly and impartially its obligations to the government, and in explanation and justification of its view that there is due the company a sum large in excess of the amount claimed in your letter to be due the government, it may be proper to state briefly the relations between the parties as they stood at two different periods, namely, under its original charter, before the passage of the so-called "Thurman act" and under the amendments made by that act. Prior to July 1, 1878, when the Thurman act took effect, the company, under its charter as entitled, for performing postal services for the government, to fair and reasonable rates of compensation, not to exceed the amount paid by private parties for the same kind of service. The government contended that, notwithstanding this provision, the postoffice department had a right to fix the compensation of the company on its own view of what was reasonable and to the same extent as it might see fit to fix the rates for all other railroads. This question has been submitted to judicial determination and the supreme court of the United States has disaffirmed the view of the postoffice department and affirmed that of the company. There is, therefore, an account for postal services to be settled, pursuant to this decision, between the company and the government, up to the first of July, 1878, and if the account is justly stated, shall leave, as we are confident it does, a very large sum of money due the company. It would be a severe and hardly just course for the government to claim that, notwithstanding the sum thus due the company (upon which the government allows no interest) it was its duty to disregard thereof to make the payments required by your letter in assumed compliance with the Thurman act, when as will be seen hereafter, the actual amounts payable to the government under that act can only be ascertained when the question of what constitutes reasonable rates for transportation of mail shall be judicially determined, and when, after that has been so determined, the sum due to the company for postal services prior to the Thurman act will be definitely fixed and the amount payable to the company. It should be added that at the date in question there was also further admitted a balance due from the government for services which we do not refer to in detail, but confine ourselves to the question of postal services. The company has caused to be stated, an account made up to July 1st, 1878, upon the principle that compensation should be fixed with reference to express service, as being most nearly the same kind of service referred to in its charter, and it results that the amount due from the government is \$1,648,991. Of this amount it is admitted by the government that at the rates attempted to be fixed as above by the postoffice department, there is due to the company \$904,101, leaving in dispute \$820,890. The question whether the standard adopted by the company is a sound one remains for judicial determination by the court of appeals, to which the cause has been remitted since it was declared by the supreme court. Some other elements may possibly be shown which, if shown, would affect the question of reasonable compensation.

Next, as to the account between the government and the company, since the Thurman act went into effect, down to the period ending December 31, 1882, to which period the account, as stated in your letter, is brought. The Thurman act prescribes no rates for postal service, but leaves the compensation therefor to be governed by

the original charter. It prescribes by the fourth section that there shall be carried to the credit of the sinking fund therefor provided for, on the first day of February of each year, one-half of the compensation for services (including postal service) rendered for the government (not applied under section second in liquidation of interest), and in addition thereto there is to be paid into the treasury to the credit of the sinking fund \$500,000, or so much thereof as shall be necessary to meet the five per centum of the net earnings of its road, payable to the United States under said act of 1862, and the whole sum earned by it as compensation for services rendered for the United States, together with the sum by this section required to be paid, amount in the aggregate to 25 per centum of the whole net earnings of said railroad company for the year ending the 31st of December next preceding. Now, it is shown that to determine what will constitute 25 per centum of the net earnings, the amount due for postal services must be ascertained, and the question as to what is to be paid for postal services pending for judicial determination as to rates which will constitute "reasonable compensation." Any claim, therefore, of the government for immediate payment under the Thurman act, must be based upon the conjecture or upon the rate of allowance for postal service fixed by the postoffice department, which the supreme court has rejected, or upon the allowance for postal service at express rates as claimed by the company. Adopting the rates thus claimed by the company, the directors have caused an account to be stated for the entire period after the Thurman act took effect, down to December 31st, 1882, the period at which the account transmitted by you ends, which account it will furnish you if you desire. This account shows that the whole amount due for postal services during the period and upon the principles stated is \$4,650,027, deducting from this the amount of postal service as fixed by the department under the rules applicable to all other roads, (\$1,911,138), leaves the sum in dispute between the company and the government, for this period, \$2,738,889. It is to be noted that your account does not credit to \$69,398 paid in by the company in July, 1881, and referred to in your letter. This sum is stated above (\$2,738,889). It will be seen it is far in excess of the balance due the government as stated in your letter, (without taking into account the \$828,890 due to the Thurman act as above, and it seems hardly reasonable to require the company under these circumstances to pay the balance thus claimed by you until the questions in controversy have been judicially settled up. In submitting this view, the directors ask that any error of principle or detail, if such be found, may be pointed out by you and the same will receive their respectful consideration.

(Signed) SIDNEY DILLON.

The above letter has been referred to the commissioner of railroads.

THE BORDER BUNGLE.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

SPEAKERS OF REPUBLICAN DIPLOMACY.

WASHINGTON, May 3.—At the Mexican legation some anxiety seems to be felt that the attitude of the Mexican government in relation to crossing the border by United States troops in pursuit of hostile Indians should be correctly stated. It is thought that the circumstances under which orders were issued last Saturday to General Crook, notifying him to adhere strictly to the terms of the convention between the two countries, have not been fully explained, and that the impression may be created that the application of this government for a modification of the convention was made some time ago and refused at a critical moment, when Crook had crossed the border. The circumstances, as they were explained to the associated press reporter, who called at the legation to-night, are as follows: On the 29th of July, 1882, the United States government proposed a modification of the agreement of July, 1881, which was in substance that commanders of the United States and Mexican troops be authorized to change the terms of agreement when in their judgment it was advisable, so that the commander of either army might cross the border with his troops to attack hostile Indians at any time. Senator Romero, Mexican minister here, explained the terms of the proposal to his government, and on the 26th received an answer that the government signed at this city the agreement with the United States government, by virtue of which regular troops of each country were authorized to pass over the border into the territory of the other in pursuit of hostile Indians under certain limitations, which were at the time thought convenient and desirable by both contracting parties. On the 24th of April, 1883, the state department received through the legation here, a communication from the Mexican government that it was ready to consider all modifications proposed by the United States, and accept such as, in their opinion, were calculated to attain the object of that agreement, which, as they understood it, was the speedy destruction of hostile Indians. It is explained that the Mexican constitution requires the consent of the Mexican senate to passing of foreign troops through Mexican territory, the same formality being necessary for ratification of a treaty, the Mexican executive not being empowered to act in either case without the approval of the senate.

No information has been received at the legation of the crossing of Gen. Crook's forces, but it is thought they are already in Mexico and that Gen. Crook's movement was the result of a mutual agreement between him and the Mexican commander, under which, it is held, the former has been able to enter Mexico with the consent of the Mexican and co-operation of Mexican

troops. The opinion is also expressed at the legation that failure of the Mexican government to accept immediately the modification of the proposed agreement by the United States will not interfere with the success of Gen. Crook's operations against the Indians.

ANOTHER HUGH CLAIM.

An important question, concerning payment to the Pacific railroad companies for government transportation, is now before the first comptroller of the treasury, and an answer is expected at an early day. The question is whether the earnings for such transportation on subsidized lines, leased and operated by the Pacific railway company, can be lawfully withheld (as is now the practice of the treasury department) or whether the amounts shall be paid to the companies in cash. The attorney general has given an opinion that the portion of their earnings derived from government transportation on unsubsidized leased lines must be paid in cash and cannot be legally withheld. The question at issue involves a large sum.

WASHINGTON, May 3.—It is understood that Secretary Polge will very soon issue a circular of instruction to the proper officers directing that money due the branch lines of subsidy railroads must be paid. It appears the Pacific railroads applied to the president to have the money paid to them under a decision of the supreme court and he referred the matter to the attorney general for an opinion. A learned opinion of Brewster is that the roads must pay. The opinion was sent to Folger and the latter will set upon it at once as above indicated. The action will result in the payment to the Central Pacific and Union Pacific railroads of a vast sum of money running away up into the millions. Ever since the Thurman act went into effect, under which the Pacific roads were charged 25 per cent of net earnings to satisfy the demands of the government in this particular the tax has been very unassafely collected.

CAPITOL NOTES.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

ROMERO'S HEALTH.

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Owing to bad health, Senator M. Romero, Mexican minister, has decided to spend the summer traveling in Europe. The secretary of the legation will remain in charge of affairs ad interim.

LOGAN'S FAVORITE.

It is understood Senator Logan is urging the appointment of A. C. Matthews, of Illinois, as commissioner of Internal Revenue.

THE REFORMERS.

Civil service commissioners Eaton and Gregory held a long conference with Postmaster General Graham to-day respecting civil service rules. Dr. Gregory made an examination of the records of the appointment division with a view to familiarizing himself with the methods of making appointments in that department. It is understood similar visits will be made by the commissioners to other executive departments.

THE HAWAIIAN MINISTER.

authorizes a denial of the published statement that the Hawaiian government had adopted laws forbidding the landing of Chinese in that country. He says his government has protected against the embarkation of Chinese and Hong Kong and other ports for the Hawaiian Islands, and has given notice that steps will be taken to prevent their landing.

CROOK'S WHEREABOUTS.

The war department has not as yet received from General Crook a reply to the telegram sent him by Gen. Sherman on the 28th ultimo, nor has any official information been received in regard to his having crossed into Mexico. The press reports that he had passed the boundary line before the cautionary telegram could have reached him are, however, fully credited at the department.

BUYING BULLION.

The treasury department to-day purchased 385,000 ounces of silver for delivery at Philadelphia, New Orleans and San Francisco mints.

IN THE STAR ROUTE TRIAL.

Bills continued to address the jury. "If Dorsey was an innocent man," said he, "why did he continue to travel in his chariot after he discovered his charge? Why did he seek to compound felony with him to prevent him from testifying instead of defying him to do the worst?" Bills admitted that the government witness Moore was not a man of the highest style, but asked if it was natural that contractors will employ men of high character to do illegal work?

Shipping News.

Special Dispatches to This Issue.

NEW YORK, May 3.—Saller, from Bremen, Weasland, from Antwerp. LONDON, May 3.—Bohemia, Bristol and Falds, from New York; Hohenzollern, from Baltimore; Prusslan, from Boston, have arrived out.

HAMBURG, May 3.—The steamer Africa, Capt. Bacholtz, New York, March 27, for Lish and Hamburg, is considered lost. LONDON, May 3.—The bark Nicola, which arrived in Bremen April 20, reports that she spoke the steamer Habsburg from New York, April 7, for Bremen, previously spoken which reported that she had a shaft disabled. The Habsburg reported all well, weather fine at the time.

A Warning to Official Thieves.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

BUFFALO, May 3.—Joseph Bork, formerly city treasurer, and lately convicted of misappropriation of the city bonds, was sentenced this morning to five years at hard labor at the Auburn state prison.

Base Ball.

Special Dispatches to This Issue.

DETROIT, May 3.—Detroit 1, Chicago 10. CLEVELAND, May 3.—Cleveland 3, Buffalo 1. NEW YORK, May 3.—New York 10, Boston 9. PHILADELPHIA, May 3.—Philadelphia 6, Providence 24.

"COME BACK TO ERIN."

Sheridan, Walsh and No. One Badly Wanted in Dublin.

England Sounds American Sentiment Before Asking Extradition.

No Demand for Their Persons Yet Made But Momentarily Expected.

True Bills for Murder Evolved by a Castle Crammed Jury.

A Lively Talk With Sheridan and Walsh and the Latter's Counsel.

To Which is Added a Variety of Old World News.

THE DUBLIN TRIALS.

Special Dispatches to This Issue.

WASHINGTON, May 3.—There is no truth in the London rumors that the United States government consented to extradite Tynan, Walsh and Sheridan. The department have not received any communication upon the subject.

NEW YORK, May 3.—The Express says the necessary affidavits to secure the extradition of Tynan, (No. 1.) have been filed in nearly two weeks. A diligent search for Sheridan and Walsh, who have been indicted in Dublin for the murders of Cavendish and Burke, were made to-day, but neither could be found.

NEW YORK, May 3.—John Walsh, who was seen by a Tribune reporter to-night said: "I am of course not guilty of any connection with the Phoenix Park murders. If I could have obtained a fair trial in Dublin before an impartial jury I should never have left England. But in Dublin at present on the testimony of perjured informers they could as easily find an indictment against you as against me for complicity in the Phoenix park murders. We are used to that sort of that thing in Ireland."

A World reporter asked Sheridan: "Do you regard the murder of Cavendish and Burke as a political offense?" Sheridan replied: "I do not think anybody should think otherwise. The government officials themselves admit it to be a political offense. Trevelyan, chief secretary for Ireland, in one of his speeches, said it was one of the first political offenses ever committed in Ireland and if he regards it as a political offense I am willing to accept him as sufficient authority on the subject at least. Certainly no person can be extradited from this country for a political offense."

The World reporter called on Alexander Sullivan, of Chicago, president of the Irish National League of America, and asked what action, if any, the League would take officially if a demand was made for the extradition of John Walsh, P. J. Sheridan and Peter Tynan.

"Don't see," answered Sullivan, promptly, "that any action in these cases will come within the province of the League. Whatever assistance may be rendered to these gentlemen in defending themselves, if defense be necessary, by a demand for their extradition, will doubtless come from private sources, and I have no doubt but that from private sources abundance of aid will be given them, but it will readily be seen if the league were to begin taking action in cases of this character its time and resources would be demanded in many matters entirely extraneous to its platform and not included in the principles upon which it was organized. My individual opinion is there are cases which come clearly under the head of political offenses, and England herself has established a precedent which should govern us in dealing with these cases. The Oran case is an illustrative one. In these cases it seems as though much stronger evidence should be required than that already made public to justify the extradition of these men. I think the government of the United States should not surrender upon any demand from England for the extradition of any man or any number of men on the evidence of informers, who confess themselves to be deliberate perjurers and assassins."

To a question of The World reporter: "Do you think the English government will succeed in obtaining your extradition from this country?" John Walsh answered, "I do not know what the American government may do in the matter. I thought the investigation at Paris proved my innocence conclusively. I thought when I came to this country I would be secure. I would not care at all if they would only bring the informers over to this country and try me here with an American judge and jury, but the mere fact of my being tried in Dublin will convict me, as they have the happy faculty of convicting anybody they want to. I can procure the most convincing evidence that I was in a small village in England at the time of the Dublin tragedies."

To same reporter P. J. Sheridan said: "This action of the government throws no new light on the subject. The application was made before my extradition, and as I stood then I stand now, fearless of any charge that may be made against me by England. Any time the United States courts call on me to make a defense I will be found ready."

Sheridan said, in answer to questions as to his whereabouts at the time of the Phoenix park murders, that he would state that when the proper time comes. The Phoenix park murders were called a political offense by Trevelyan and he so considered

them. No one, he said, was less concerned than himself by this new demand for him. He thought he had lately been shadowed by a man whom he took to be a detective. He does not intend to leave New York. Gen. Rizer A. Pryor, who, with Gen. Butler, has charge of Sheridan's case, said all the facts have been gone over carefully and no ground for extradition could be found.

O'Donovan Rossa said the Englishman who goes to Ireland to govern should be killed or hanged. If he could go over to Ireland now and kill one of the prominent English statesmen he would be glad to come back here and admit it.

Now that true bills for murder have been found, it is considered no longer open to the United States to refuse extradition of Sheridan, Walsh and Tynan. It is believed Tynan will turn informer.

LONDON, May 4.—The Times says: If the demand of Tynan, Walsh and Sheridan be made, it will be based on the charge of general conspiracy which must be held to wear a political aspect, but on specific criminal accusation.

DUBLIN, May 3.—James Mullett was arraigned this morning on a charge of conspiracy to murder and pleaded guilty. William Mooney also pleaded guilty to a charge of conspiracy to murder. Several other men charged with the same offense are also expected to plead guilty. Lawrence Hanlan was arraigned on a charge of attempting to murder. Dennis Field pleaded not guilty and his trial was begun.

The grand jury have returned true bills against Tynan, Walsh and Sheridan for murder, and against Fitzharris as accessory after the fact. All of these men are supposed to be in America, and it is understood the English government will demand their extradition.

LONDON, May 3.—The rumor prevails here that the United States government has consented to extradite Tynan, Walsh and Sheridan.

DUBLIN, May 3.—The grand jury have also found true bills against Edward O'Brien and Edward McCaffrey for participation in the murders of Cavendish and Burke.

GENERAL FOREIGN NEWS.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

LONDON, May 3.—The commons, 292 to 289, refused the affirmation bill a second reading. Owing to its rejection Bradlaugh intends to administer the oath of office to himself. The Daily News says by the rejection of the bill the forces of bigotry and intolerance have triumphed. Fifty Irish members voted against the bill. The Times says it is to be regretted the present and conclusive solution offered in the affirmation bill was not supported by a majority of the house.

Free Mason's hall, Queen street, burned to-day. All insignia, furniture and paintings were destroyed. Among the paintings were portraits of all the grand masters. The loss is mostly irreparable.

Priestgate street, Peterborough, was partially blown up last night. Great alarm was caused by the explosion, as it was thought to be the work of dynamite, but it is now believed that it was due to the ignition of gas in the sewer under the street. The houses on the street were much damaged.

A telegram has been received at Cairo from Colonel Hicks, reporting that on the 29th ult. he had an engagement with 5,000 rebels. The battle which lasted for an hour, resulted in the defeat of the rebels, with 500 killed, including the lieutenant general of Elmahdi, the False Prophet. The Egyptian losses were slight. Hicks praises the gallantry of the Egyptian troops.

The lower house of the Austrian Reichsrath adopted a bill fixing the minimum force of Austrian landwehr, exclusive of that of Tyrol, at 138,000 men, and authorizing the formation of the landwehr cavalry. The measure involves an increase of the military budget of one million florins.

The presence of Prince Bismark at the soiree given by the minister of foreign affairs further shows the groundlessness of the reports that a difference existed between the prince and the minister.

The Danish Arctic expedition has started for Greenland for the purpose of exploring that country.

LONDON, May 3.—The weekly statement of the Bank of England shows a decrease of bullion of £175,000. The proportion of the bank reserve to liability of 31 1/16 per cent.

LONDON, May 3.—Gallagher, Wilson, Turin, Ansbargh, Whitehead and Dalton, the men charged with treason and felony, in connection with the dynamite conspiracy, were again arraigned this morning. They were remanded for another week.

THE FODDER LAND.

A Huge Cattle Range Purchased in Nebraska.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

LINCOLN, Neb., May 3.—The Pratt & Ferris cattle company and the Converse cattle company, of Wyoming, have purchased twenty-five thousand acres of land in Boone and Platte counties, from John R. Clark, of this city. These lands formerly belonged to the Burlington & Missouri land grant, and will be used for cattle ranges.

Yellow Fever.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

PROHIBITED PORK.

The Method of Retaliation Pointed Out by a German Editor.

Adulterated Wine and Dyed Sox Furnished a Plan of Action.

The Interest Aroused by Minister Sargent's Report.

Special Dispatch to This Issue.

CHICAGO, May 3.—Since the publication of Minister Sargent's communication to this government concerning the prohibition of importation of American pork into Germany, public interest on the subject has been aroused afresh, and the questions involved are being urged anew in the press of this and other countries.

German Raster, editor of The Illinois Staats Zeitung, this morning, in reply to a reporter's request for an interview, said: "Had it not been for the pig headed stupidity of American pork packers, such a prohibition would never have gone into effect. The Staats Zeitung months ago urged them to have measures adopted to prevent it, but because the price of pork was just at the time high enough here not to make the German market of any great account to them, they would not take any trouble in the matter and allowed the measures there to be completed and put into force, and now they find themselves effectually cut off from that market. If you want to know how I feel about prohibition I will tell you that a few weeks before congress adjourned at the last session, I had resolutions introduced which, had they been passed, would have prevented any such legislation in Germany, but there was not time to get them through, and congress adjourned without anything being done. The resolutions were to the effect that the president should be empowered, in case any foreign country prohibited the importation of American products before the meeting of the next congress, to retaliate by prohibiting the importation of the products of that country. It would not have required any legislation by congress to have prevented the German law from being passed. A mere threat of retaliation would have been sufficient to have prevented any such laws being ever thought of. It is sufficient for this government to say, "You have prohibited importation of our pork, now we are going to retaliate by prohibiting the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish evidence enough that some of their wine is adulterated and that should be sufficient to warrant prohibition of it all. It would enough for the government to say "Some of your hosiery contains poisonous dyes and we mean to protect our people against danger from them by forbidding the importation of your exports." But if a pretext is wanted it is not necessary to institute any investigation. Their own courts furnish