

## A SITUATION REVERSED.

### CURIOUS EFFECT OF THE CONNECTICUT BALLOT DECISION.

HARTFORD, June 6.—The situation of the two political parties in the State has been practically reversed by the Supreme Court decision in the Branford case, validating the prohibition ballots, 111 in all, which were rejected by the Moderators at the State election. The original stand taken by the Democrats that the Legislature cannot constitutionally review the returns for the correction of errors is a matter of opinion and interpretation not sustained by the action of the General Assembly in the past. Both parties have on various occasions gone back of the returns, opening ballot boxes, validating votes cast at State elections, and ordering the correction of errors.

The moment that the Supreme Court decided that the "for" ballots were legal the title of Judge Morris on the face of the returns was wiped out. It will be impossible for the party to be sustained by the public in the position that Judge Morris should be declared elected Governor on the face of the returns when the decision of the Supreme Court restores 111 votes to the Prohibition column, thereby reducing the Judge's total to 85 below a constitutional majority. Every attempt of the Democrats to prop up this position will injure the prospects of Judge Morris for attaining the Governorship. The decision of the court will be accepted as final.

On this point the relative position of the parties has been reversed. The court's decision compels the counting of the Prohibition ballots which were rejected, and the Republican managers have fought for months for that result. They have been determined that the Legislature should review the returns to that extent. The logical result of this course, which has not been pressed until within three days by the Democrats, will compel a review of the Judge of Probate ballots, which has been declared by the courts to be illegal. The ballots in dispute were cast by the Prohibitionists in various probate districts in the State.

The history of the affair is without intricacies, and the proofs of the illegal Judge of Probate ballots are within reach of the Legislature at any time. In the nominations for the State election most of the Prohibitionists omitted the names of candidates for Judges of the Probate Courts, and printed the official ballot with a blank for insertion of these names by the districts after the distribution of the tickets. In East Lynn the contest was made in November that these ballots were illegal and Judge John M. Hall of the Superior Court decided against them. The phraseology of the opinions, which defines the attitude of the court toward the Judge of Probate ballots, is:

"It [the ballot] consists not merely of the paper of the prescribed size and quality, but also of the required printing thereon. No part may be omitted. If the name of the party may be omitted, so may the name of the candidate or officer. If either of the last two is left out its validity as a ballot is destroyed."

From 2,000 to 3,000 of the illegal Judge of Probate ballots were polled, none of which by this decision can be counted, although the whole of them appear in the returns submitted by the Board of Canvassers to the Legislature. The only way for their elimination will be by going back of the returns, as in the case of the "for" ballots. The Democrats will not fail to utilize this fact. It is an impregnable position for them to occupy. The Republicans, on the other hand, who have maintained that the Legislature is competent to review and correct the returns of the State election, are opposed to the review relative to the Judge of Probate votes of the Prohibition Party, and will fight every effort made to secure it. The change in the attitude of the two parties is one of the curiosities of the protracted dead-lock.

### MR. EUSTIS WILL LOSE HIS COACHMAN.

Francis John Howlett, the English coachman who came on the Umbria May 23 to this country under an agreement to serve as head stableman and coachman for six months in the employ of C. W. Eustis of Washington, has been debarred from landing and will be returned. According to Howlett's affidavit, an agreement with Mr. Eustis was made in Paris last Winter, whereby Howlett was to receive \$100 per month for his services.

The case was reported to the Secretary of the Treasury with the inquiry if it came under the proviso of Section 5 of the act of Feb. 26, 1885, which admits persons employed strictly as domestic or personal servants. The reply of Assistant Secretary Nettleton, received yesterday, states that the proviso applies only in such cases where the servants accompany their employers to this country, and directs that Howlett be debarred from landing.

C. W. Eustis, who employed the man, is a nephew of ex-Senator J. B. Eustis of Louisiana. The penalty for importing laborers under contract is a fine of \$1,000.

### A TENNIS TEA AT PLAINFIELD.

The Hillside Tennis Club of Plainfield, N. J., gave a most enjoyable afternoon tea to its many friends yesterday from 4 until 6 o'clock. Mrs. H. Augusta Schuyler received, assisted by Miss Stewart, Miss Katharine Yates, Miss Hunter of Plainfield, and Miss Edith Hartley of this city. Tea was served in the picturesque clubhouse, and the guests well filled the pretty rooms.

Among the guests were Mr. and Mrs. De Witt C. Ivins, Miss Hunter, Miss Edith Hartley, Major Robert L. Burnett, Mrs. Burnett, Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Opdyke, Mr. Streull, Miss Ginna, Mr. James P. Murray, Miss Schneely, Mr. and Mrs. George P. Mellick, Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Livingston, Mr. and Mrs. J. J. H. Poillon, Miss Jessamy Hart, Mr. Davis, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel F. Kimball, Mrs. Emma C. Fox, Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Morison, Mr. and Mrs. Finch, Miss Walz, Mr. and Mrs. R. Henry Depew, Dr. and Mrs. William H. Murray, Mrs. W. L. Palton, and Miss Miller of London.