The Sun.

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1892.

Advertisements for THE WEEKLY SUN, *issued to-morrow morning, must be handed in this evening before 6 o'clock.*

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication, wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Order at Homestead.

Governor PATTISON having at last tardily and grudgingly determined to do his duty by bringing out the troops of Pennsylvania for the restoration of order at Homestead, the question enters into a new stage, and official judgment upon what has already taken place there is clearly, though not finally, pronounced.

What are the troops to do at Homestead? They are to put down the strikers' guards, their pickets, their armed forces, which they have established around the CARNEGIE mills. They are to put the mills and all the property belonging thereto into the possession of the owners, that is, the CARNEGIE Company. They are to open access to the mills to all peaceable persons who may wish to go there. They are to protect any watchmen, whether hired from PINKERTON'S agency or elsewhere, whom the company may wish to put in charge of the property. They are to afford protection to any new men whom the company may engage instead of the old workmen. In short, they are to restore the entire legal rights of the owners, and defend them by the lawful force of the State.

What does this change amount to? It amounts to a total condemnation of all that has been done there by the strikers. It amounts to a condemnation of their shutting up the avenues of the town, and allowing no one to pass through them who might not be satisfactory to their leaders. It amounts to a condemnation of the attempt made by the strikers to prevent the employment of new workers in their places, and to frighten away, or drive away, or murder any new workers who might be disposed to seek such employment. It amounts, above all, to a solemn condemnation of the dynamite bombs, the burning oil, and all the other atrocious and horrible methods and incidents employed by the strikers to destroy the PINKERTON men whom the company brought there by way of the river.

In short, it is a declaration that all the violent proceedings, all the cruel and ferocious means of death and destruction that have been brought into the case, were illegal, unjustifiable, not only contrary to law, but contrary to the dictates of good sense as well as of common humanity.

Will the strikers attempt to resist the forces of the State? We trust not. What they have already done has inflicted an injury upon the cause of organized labor, whose fatal importance cannot be overestimated; and if, they should go further in their wild and wicked resistance to the law, the result might be the end of all labor organizations for many years.

What of This?

The anarchistic press upholding the rioters' seizure of the CARNEGIE property may get a clearer view of the truth, if they will consider a reversal of the circumstances at Homestead.

In Homestead many of the workmen, we believe, own their homes, just as Mr. CARNEGIE owns the mills. Suppose that the members of the company, outnumbering the workmen, had seized upon these houses, the property of their employees, and had sworn that if the latter refused to agree to their terms, they would keep possession of them in defiance of law; and that the Sheriff, seeking to restore the houses to their rightful owners, as he was bound to do, had been turned away with threats of violence and his proclamation against riot torn down.

Would not the CARNEGIE Company have been damned by the voice of every honest citizen of the United States? Would not the entire press, depraved and honest, decent or anarchistic, blind or farseeing, fanatical or sober, have let loose its denunciation upon the outrage, upon this atrocious invasion of the rights of property and individual liberty? Would not the poltroon who presides as Governor over the State of Pennsylvania have sent the entire military of the State by the first train to see that justice was done in Homestead?

Suppose the Homestead employees themselves, after an attempt by the authorities to vindicate the law had failed, had marched to the doors of their homes and demanded entrance, and, upon being threatened with the guns of the company, had defended themselves with fury. Would not every man with a spark of spirit in his heart have said that these locked-out owners were fighting in defence of the first principle of civilized society, fighting for their sacred and inalienable rights?

There is no need of asking such questions. Of course they would. Yet this same course of action, with the actors changing sides, is what has been seen at Homestead, and which has received at least for a time the rabid vilification of certain newspapers which thought they could make a dollar out of it, and of misguided workingmen who have handed over their judgment and their loyalty to law and liberty to the keeping of venomous and demagogical leaders.

A terrible outrage has been committed at Homestead, and on every spot where these outrages have been sustained. Mr. CARNEGIE'S money or personality has nothing to do with it. He may be the Devil himself; but even the Devil must have his due. Stand by the right!

The War for Striker Sovereignty.

If there is anybody, neither crank nor fool, who is inclined to make light of the dangers inhering in that armed despotism which took possession of Homestead last week, that person should read this despatch which appeared in Sunday's SUN:

"JOLIET, Ill., July 9.—The Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers of the Fourth district, numbering 13,000 members, has received orders to hold 2,000 men in readiness, with arms, to march at any moment to the assistance of their comrades at Homestead. It is also stated that 1,000 armed members from Wheeling, W. Va., and the Mahoning Valley are going to Homestead. The members of the association here in the works of the Illinois Steel Company are eager to go to the assistance of their comrades."

The Amalgamated Empire, lately a portion of the State of Pennsylvania, having been established by violence, can be maintained only in the same way. Its allies in various parts of the country are therefore eager to assist it. Besides, what could be greater fun for the "army of labor" than to shoot down the watchmen whom employers, laboring under the exploded delusion that a man has a right to enter upon and enjoy his own property, might hire to protect the property? And if the State of Pennsylvania should so far forget the courtesy which it owes to the new empire at Homestead, and the respect which it owes to the glorious doctrine that the employer's property belongs to the undischargeable employee, and should dare to use force against the sovereign and most warlike Amalgamated despotism of Homestead, what a noble task or recreation to kill off the militiamen! What is the militia but a gang of hireling assassins when used for the infamous purpose of protecting the property of employers who maliciously, wickedly, and contumaciously refuse to pay such wages as their workmen exact, and manifest in other ways a spirit of insubordination to their employees? Having a shooting picnic is much more joyous than working. Besides, the sacred right of the workman to bulldoze his employer must be maintained at all hazards.

So the United States now sees armed tributary powers in the East and West and South ready to furnish allies to the central despotism at Homestead. In Chicago the Carpenters' Council and the rest of the building trades have "decided that the best thing to do is to organize military bodies." Meanwhile "we will thoroughly arm the men and constantly drill them until they become familiar with the handling of rifles," says the Secretary of the Chicago Carpenters' Council. "I am thoroughly in earnest," says Mr. HUGH MCCORMICK, State Organizer of the Carpenters' Council, "when I say that the labor organizations of Chicago should send an armed body to Homestead to protect the strikers' rights." The strikers' rights, of course, are the right to perpetual employment, the right to fix their own compensation, and, in case of a difference between them and their employer, the right to seize and hold his property, keep him and the representatives of the law out of it, and shoot at sight any persons injudicious enough to allow themselves to be employed as watchmen by him. If the employer is a corporation, all the worse, as a corporation is a minion of Shoal, with no more rights than a mad dog. As far as that is concerned, no property has rights. Strikers' rights, strikers' law, striker sovereignty must prevail. The old law of supply and demand must be riddled by volleys from the Winchesters wherewith the war lords of the militant labor despotism at Homstead have established and must maintain their power.

"We've got the works, we've got the men,
And we've got the rifles, too!"

Suppose the illustrious Mr. HUGH O'DONNELL, who seems to be the Emperor of Homestead at present, should issue a call for 100,000 men armed with Winchesters to shoot for striker sovereignty! Surely if he has the right to employ a small army, he has the right to employ a greater one. Obviously he can't enter into the question of disarmament until the State militia and the United States Army and Navy have all been disbanded.

The Punishment of the World's Infamy.

Never within our observation has the course of a public journal elicited such condemnation as has that of the *World* in relation to the Homestead anarchy and murders. Already, if we are not mistaken, that paper has begun to learn that the thoughtful and substantial people of this country, and especially of this city, are not prepared to relinquish the rights in property that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution, or to ignore and condone a brutal and cowardly crime against our liberties. There is not a man of any standing or substance in this community who has not felt his soul burn with shame and indignation at the *World's* villainy.

That reckless organ of anarchy has gone too far. It has taken steps it cannot retrace. Never will it be forgotten that to its ruffianly and inflammatory teachings the crimes of Homestead were in great part due; nor that it sought to justify those crimes, to forestall the interference of the Executive of Pennsylvania, and to incite the deluded men of Homestead to fresh outrages. This has been the *World's* shameless work, right here in New York, the citadel of our civilization and our progress.

And now it is too late to recede; there is no avenue of escape; the record is written, and it is imperishable. PATTISON may retrieve himself, but the *World*, never! Its long-deluded readers now know it for what it is.

An Enemy of Labor.

The infamous *World* calls on the Democrats of the House to "suspend the rules and pass a bill reducing the duties on iron and on all of the CARNEGIE steel manufactures at least one-half." "That," it tells the Democratic majority, "would be poetic justice, good politics, and an admirable enforcement of the Homestead object lesson upon the relation of high tariffs to lowered wages."

This pretended friend of labor wants the Democrats in Congress to punish Mr. CARNEGIE by declaring themselves in favor of a policy to reduce the wages of his workmen far below the scale against which they are now fighting. It would make the Democratic party responsible for a policy which would shut up all our iron and steel mills and lock out many thousands of operatives, and compel them to remain out until they were forced by starvation to work for less than the cheapest of the CARNEGIE workmen.

The whole iron and steel industry in this country, whether it has its seat at Homestead or elsewhere, is dependent on the tariff which the scatter-brained and anarchistic *World* would have the Democrats in Congress vote to destroy. It is organized under that tariff. The tariff is essential to its prosperity, its very continuance, on the present scale of wages. The mills cannot sell their iron and steel cheaper unless they pay less for their production. In other words, they must pay lower wages. Even with the tariff the margin of profit is now so small that the manufacture does not pay unless the production and sale are enormous. It is a very small percentage, and home competition tends steadily to make it less. Even protection cannot save the producer from that competition. It only helps him against foreign competition.

If, then, the producer must meet both home and foreign competition, he must get down the cost of manufacture. He must reduce wages to the foreign standard. Otherwise he will have to go out of the business, and his operatives will be without employment, unless they go into other employments and reduce the scale of wages in those by reason of their competition with the laborers already there. If the tariff on iron and steel were reduced by "at least one-half," of course they would fall in price, and not less certainly would the wages of the operatives concerned in their production fall proportionately. Men will not put their capital into manufactures if they cannot make a fair interest on it. They will shut up their mills if they cannot run them without losing money.

This demagogical *World*, this pestilent enemy of labor, would follow the Oriental method of punishing a man against whom you have a grudge by committing suicide on his doorstep.

Free trade, of course, means lower wages. The two go together necessarily. With free trade all around, however, argue the free traders, the lower wages would buy more. Everything would be cheaper, they say, for the cost of production would be less because of the lower wages paid. But to take off the tariff on one protected industry without removing it from all is an outrage on the free trade doctrine. The equilibrium of the free trade theorists is not established. If the law tends to reduce the wages of the iron operative by bringing in foreign competition, justice demands that it shall put all other producers in the same boat, so that everything he buys shall be made cheaper for him. He must have cheaper rent, cheaper food, and cheaper clothes. If he gets one dollar a day instead of two dollars, the price of all he buys must be reduced proportionately or he is the loser. Hence all labor of all kinds must go down with his, so that the cost of production generally may be decreased for his benefit. That, in brief, is the free trade theory. It is low wages, low production, and cheap prices.

The Outcome of a Week's Voting in the United Kingdom.

According to the returns received up to the end of last week, 405 seats had been filled out of the 670 comprised in the House of Commons. Of these the Unionists have obtained 217 and the Opposition 188. The net Opposition gain is 31, and, as the opponents of Lord SALISBURY only need a net gain of 35 to give them a majority of 2, they are now reasonably sure of securing a slight preponderance in the next House. That they will gain at least 4 seats more out of the 265 still unaccounted for may doubtless be taken for granted. The 188 opponents of the present Government, however, do not constitute a homogeneous body. They include 158 Liberals, 23 McCarthyites, 4 Redmondites, and 3 Laborists. The representatives of labor have already declared their intention to take a line of their own, and in view of the signs of a secret understanding between the Unionists and the Redmondites, the latter can scarcely be relied upon for unswerving support by Mr. GLADSTONE.

To counterbalance possible defection on their part and that of the Laborists, the Liberals must gain not merely 4 but 11 seats in the 265 from which returns are not as yet forthcoming. If they do this, and no more, the Liberals and McCarthyites combined will indeed have a majority over all possible opponents, but so small a one that it will be hardly possible for Mr. GLADSTONE to form a Government. But suppose that the gain of the Liberals in the remaining 265 seats is exactly proportioned to the gain made in the 405 already filled. Then they will gain not 4, nor 11 seats, but 20 seats. Such a result would give the Gladstonians a majority of 20 on a division over Unionists, Redmondites, and Laborists combined. If the counties which vote next week have as many pleasant surprises in store for the Liberals as had those which voted on Friday and Saturday, the estimate of an additional net gain of 20 seats may prove rather under than over the mark.

Let us leave out of view the Redmondites and Laborists and assume that Mr. GLADSTONE will have a sufficiently homogeneous and compact majority of 20, made up of Liberals and McCarthyites. It is not much, but it will serve. Under such circumstances both wings of his party will feel the necessity of making concessions to each other, and it should be possible to frame a Home Rule bill which will receive their united support. Of course the passage of the bill by the slender majority of 20 or thereabouts will embolden the House of Lords to reject it, but Mr. GLADSTONE has already given notice that he will not dissolve Parliament on that ground. On the contrary, he will proceed to pass two measures of peculiar value from the view point of vote-getting power. These will be aimed respectively to gratify first the wishes of the agricultural voters, who are by no means content with the Allotments and Small Holdings act conceded by Lord SALISBURY, and, secondly, the demands of the masses of the population of London for a great extension of the functions and resources of their County Council. Not until both of these bills have been carried through the House of Commons, and either approved or rejected by the House of Lords, will Mr. GLADSTONE send up his Home Rule bill a second time. Then, when the Peers again repudiate it, as they are sure to do, he will appeal to the country on the whole record of his Ministry.

It is evident from the county elections and the returns from the fifty-nine electoral divisions of London that if Mr. GLADSTONE had relegated home rule to a secondary place in his programme, and put forward most conspicuously a pledge to ameliorate the lot of the rural laborer, and to largely extend the powers of the London County Council, the defeat of the Conservatives would have been overwhelming. But he was determined to avert a second secession like that made in 1886 on the pretext that the restoration of the Dublin Parliament had not been a pivotal or even a recognized question in the preceding election. This year no man returned as a Gladstonian can pretend that he is not bound in honor to give Ireland home rule. A small majority obtained under such unequivocal conditions ought to be more workable and durable than a much larger one, secured through placing other issues in the foreground. By pushing a Home Rule bill at once on the opening of the first working session of the new Parliament, Mr. GLADSTONE will demonstrate his own fidelity to his word and irrevocably commit his followers; after which he may take up the other features of the programme upon which the triumph of Liberalism in England must ultimately depend.

In a word, it now seems possible that the Gladstonians and McCarthyites combined may have a majority of twenty over all possible opponents, in which case they will probably be able to carry a Home Rule bill through the House of Commons.

The Tariff Isn't In It.

Our valued West Virginia contemporary, the *Wheeling Register*, still thinks that we are now engaged in an ordinary canvass, such as we have seen many of, preparatory to electing a new President.

"The tariff, too," says our contemporary, "is a great issue." We do not deny that in other elections the tariff has been a great issue; and we presume that it may be important in elections that are to come; but in the election of 1892 the tariff is of no importance, and we may in truth say it plays no part at all.

The supreme duty of this canvass and this election is to beat the Force bill and Negro Domination; and that is a duty in which Free Traders and Protectionists, however radically divided in economic ideas and convictions, can join heartily and earnestly in performing.

Moreover, it is a duty of such moment and such urgency that no idea should be permitted to enter the canvass which can have the slightest tendency to disturb the force of absolute harmony among Democrats. Let them be united, and stand united to the end. No Force bill, no Negro Domination! After that question is settled, the tariff may be taken up; but meanwhile it had better be ruled out altogether.

Let Them Beware!

When the principle of Free Trade becomes identified with the cause of Anarchy and the destruction of the right of property, as its leading advocates among us are frantically tending to identify it, all thought of its continuing to receive serious consideration will have to be abandoned for many years to follow.

This country is not ready for such a combination yet. Down with Anarchy! Let law and order reign.

The journals that we receive from the Southern States of the Union have borne evidence within the past few days that the Fourth of July was widely and enthusiastically celebrated in these States this year. It seems to us that there was an unwonted measure of patriotism in the celebration of Independence Day among our Southern fellow citizens in many places.

Our esteemed free trade friend, the *Chicago Herald*, which is striving with all its might to rivet together the protective system and the Homestead anarchy and bloodshed, lays bare a very interesting fact about the steel billets that have caused the trouble.

The tariff on these billets is $8.96, or enough to make the price of an imported billet, if this tariff were really the "tax" some economists consider it to be, almost $30.

But our iron industry is so great and extended that competition, wholly American, has lowered the price of billets to $22, on the strength of which fact the CARNEGIE Company made its reduction in wages. The tariff might be "$100 a ton," says the *Herald*, without affecting the price of American billets. The tariff, or protection, doesn't enter into the question at all.

For the consumers of iron it is pleasant to know that the price of steel is less than it used to be. For the laborers, we are sorry that this is the case, as their wages have been forced down in consequence. But we can suggest only one remedy, and that is not certain: The entire iron industry might be consolidated into a trust, able to control the output and regulate the price. Then production would be more enlightened and steadier, and though the feelings of the anti-monopolist cranks would be shocked, wages also would in all probability be steadier and more satisfactory.

Whether an author should "write down to the level of his readers," is a question that seems to interest our esteemed contemporary, the *Hartford Courant*. We can assure the *Courant* that no great author ever "wrote to the level" of anybody but himself, and that all great authors have written up to their own level. It was thus that the great Greek authors wrote—ask HOMER, PLATO, ÆSCHYLUS, and the rest of them. Thus it was that the great authors of Rome wrote—ask any of them. At a later period, DANTE wrote thus, as also SHAKESPEARE and others, including BACON. Among modern authors, inquire of GOETHE, or CARLYLE, or HUGO, or any other of them. Interrogate any meritorious author of our own time, and hearken to his reply that he always writes up to his level, and could not write otherwise without writing himself down a jack. As for the writers for magazines and papers, we say the same thing about them. The writers of the *Hartford Courant*, for example, write their level best, we suppose.

It would be improper to infer from these remarks that there are not writers who "write down to the level of common people," to quote the *Courant's* words; there are plenty of such writers, and let it be kept in mind that this level is the level of these writers. It may be a pretty fair level, too, a level away up toward the upper bumps of the soul. The common people know some things. Lots of them know a good thing when they see it. How many of them do we meet all the time who "know a hawk from a hand-saw," and like to read the play of SHAKESPEARE from which the words here quoted are taken, a play that stands on the very highest level; like also to peruse a daily paper which aims to keep itself and its readers up to the level of the high-water mark.

Let the *Courant* study up this subject, and we feel sure it will come to the conclusion that THE SUN'S philosophy of it is correct.

There is no doubt that immigration to this country would be restricted if Congressman STUMP'S bill for its restriction should become a law. This bill provides that the Captains of all immigrant-carrying steamships shall be compelled to certify that every immigrant brought here is able to take care of himself or herself, and will not become a public burden while resident in the United States. It further provides that the steamship companies shall be held to pecuniary responsibility in the case of such immigrant.

There is not a doubt that if Mr. STUMP'S bill should be adopted and enforced, we would very soon see an end to the complaints against excessive immigration. It is true that steamship companies make large profits by carrying immigrants, but we apprehend that they would not be willing to incur the responsibilities to which they would be held under the STUMP bill.

We regard the provisions of this bill as impracticable and undesirable. It would set up a barrier, not only against immigrants from Russia and Italy, but also against many of those from Ireland and Germany.

All through the present session of Congress we have looked for a good and proper immigration bill from Mr. CHANDLER, who has made a thorough study of the whole subject of immigration, and who is eminently competent to draw up such a measure as should be enacted. Congress ought not to adjourn until it has given us a law of this kind. It is needed.

Both Protestant and Catholic clergymen have already raised their voices against the execution of the profane project of making the "Passion Play" a feature of the Chicago Exposition. We are not surprised at this demonstration against a project which is an insult to the pious sentiment of the Christian people of the United States, and which, if carried out, would undoubtedly make irreverent spectators scoff at the awful scenes that are to be caricatured. Even in Chicago itself, where hardly any person dares to utter a word against any device of the Exposition boomers, however fantastical the device may be, there are pulpit remonstrances against the production of the "Passion Play" as one of the drawing shows of the Fair. The language of that able Methodist divine, the Rev. Dr. MURRAY of Chicago, has been especially emphatic, and we do not wonder that his hearers were horror-struck when he told of the hiring of a strolling company to enact the passion of CHRIST on the stage of a Chicago playhouse, "for revenue only," as he said. Why, this uncouth blasphemy is intolerable. It must not be tolerated by a Christian community. All the preachers in Chicago ought to thunder against it; and, if it be forced upon them, they should close up their churches and fly from the sacrilegious place.

Meanwhile, it is alleged by the Chicago papers that the "Passion Play Association" has been incorporated by the State of Illinois, that its headquarters are in Vienna, and that it is made up of theatrical managers and financiers, who are to raise a fund of $800,000. We warn this Austrian association that it will lose money by attempting to carry out its project in the United States.

Brilliant Scene in Philadelphia.

From the Philadelphia Record.

A red-headed girl wearing red suspenders and red shoes caused people to shut their eyes on Chestnut street yesterday.

THE FORCE BILL OF 1890.

Substance of the Bill Which Failed Then, but Would be Revived if Republicans Won.

In answer to many requests we reprint the following from THE SUN of June 17, 1890. It gives the substance of the Federal Election or Force bill passed by the Republican House in the Fifty-first Congress. The bill as reported made seventy-six printed pages.

The principal features of the measure are as follows: Chief Supervisors of Elections in judicial districts are charged with the execution of the law, which is to apply to Federal elections in cities of 20,000 inhabitants and upward, and in entire Congressional districts, exclusive of such cities, upon application to the supervisor of 100 voters, or in counties and parishes forming a part of a Congressional district upon application from fifty voters. The supervisors are to guard, scrutinize, and supervise registration and every act or incident connected with registration and plans for ascertaining who are legal voters. Upon notice from the Chief Supervisors the United States Circuit Courts are required to open for the purpose of transacting registration and election matters.

The supervisors are to be appointed by the Circuit Courts—three in each election district or voting precinct, only two of whom are to be of the same political party. These supervisors are to attend all registrations in their districts, challenge persons, personally inspect and copy the original registration books and papers, attend elections, and detect and expose the improper or wrongful manipulation of the lists. In case of failure of local election officers to put the statutory oath to a challenged voter, and to pass at once upon his qualifications, then the supervisors are to apply the test and receive and deposit the vote, making a list of all such challenges. They are also to personally inspect ballot boxes before elections, keep independent poll lists, and enclose rejected votes (endorsed with the name of the voter) in envelopes. In addition to these duties, the supervisors are required to make—in towns of 20,000 people and upward—a thorough house-to-house canvass before election, to inform voters upon inquiry where and in what box to deposit their ballots, and to scrutinize naturalizations.

In canvassing the votes the State laws are to govern, except: All ballots are to be counted by tens, first by an inspector of election and second by a supervisor, the local election officers and the supervisors keeping separate tally sheets, which are to be compared and the result publicly announced. Ballots deposited in the wrong box are to be counted. Returns are to be made by the supervisors in duplicate to the clerks of the United States Circuit Courts and to the Chief Supervisor, who is to tabulate and refer them to the United States Board of Canvassers of the Congressional vote, which is to be appointed by the United States Circuit Court, and consisting of three citizens of the State and persons of good repute, not more than two of whom are to be of the same political party. The Board is to convene on Nov. 15 each even year, and is to declare and certify the result of the election, and send one return to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, one to the Governor of the State, and one to the proper Chief Supervisor of Elections. The Clerk of the House is to place upon the roll of members elect the names of the persons declared elected by the United States canvassers, in case there is a difference in the result reached by them and by the State election officers. A penalty of between $1,000 and $5,000 is provided in case the Clerk neglects this duty.

All ballot boxes are to be clearly inscribed with their nature, and boxes are to be kept in plain sight and open to inspection. Bribery or attempted bribery of voters or election officers is made punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than five years or both. Like severe penalties are provided for false registration and voting repeating, coercion of supervisors or voters, improper conduct of election officers, false canvassing, ballot-box stuffing, fraudulent ballot distribution, resistance to a supervisor's lawful commands, breach of the peace at registration or election, intimidation, and almost every kind of election fraud.

It is not necessarily to be supposed that the Republican revolutionists would revive the Force bill absolutely as it passed the House in 1890; but certainly the main and worst features of that bill would be in their new bill, with additional sections more infamous yet, where the experience of two years' disappointed malice might show them to be needed to secure the perpetuation of Republican misrule.

WHY PRACTISE AT SANDY HOOK

When Uncle Sam Owns a Perfectly Safe Proving Ground in Monmouth County?

Steamship men have been discussing with considerable interest the accident to the schooner Henry R. Tilton, which was sunk on Saturday by a ten-inch shell from a gun at Sandy Hook. The schooner was four miles out at sea when the big shell, weighing 500 pounds, and measuring ten inches in diameter and five feet in length, passed through her hull. The vessel sank so quickly that the crew had not even time to find out just where she had been hit.

Seafaring men were considering yesterday what might have happened if it had been a crowded excursion steamboat or an ocean steamer instead of the little schooner that was hit. So many dire possibilities presented themselves in such consideration that the calculators were horrified. Why Uncle Sam should continue his dangerous practice in the worst spot possible is a question to which a satisfactory answer is not easily obtainable. The argument that Saturday's misdirected shot was the first of a thousand to go astray was considered a pretty poor excuse by sailormen, who thought that the possibility of even one serious accident ought to have weight.

The Government owns a long strip of woods in Monmouth county, which would be a much safer place for rifled gun practice than the sea off Sandy Hook, where thousands of vessels are constantly passing. Mr. Vernon H. Brown, agent of the Cunard line, said that he had frequently thought of the danger associated with the firing at Sandy Hook.

"To do the shooting on Saturday of all days seems extremely careless," he added. "That no terrible accident has occurred as yet is fortunate, but it strikes me that so long as the proving grounds remain where they are the chance of accident is very great."

Herman Oelrichs of the North German Lloyd line said he had been surprised to hear that such practice was indulged in. He had not known that such chances had been taken.

The officers who have charge of the proving station are not inclined to underestimate the possibility of danger. Capt. Heath, who is the commanding officer at the station, went down from Governor's Island yesterday morning to make a thorough investigation of the accident. He fully appreciates the danger existing in the present practice.

Nevertheless the Government has continued to let the tests be made from Sandy Hook, disregarding the advice and warnings of the officers there. The latter are, of course, powerless to do anything without orders from headquarters at Washington, and Capt. Heath admitted that he would have to keep on firing his great guns, in spite of the recent experience, until his orders were changed. Probably the political effect of a really serious accident would stir up the authorities to making the change desired. Why they should be so obstinate at present is a mystery. Enough timber could be sold from the strip in Monmouth county to pay for the expense of moving. No other objection seems to exist.

Kisses in Indianapolis.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* THE SUN of July 1, in an able article on what girls of various cities say when kissed, says the Indianapolis girl exclaims "Ah, there!"

Speaking from experience, I make bold to say this is an error. The Indianapolis girl under the circumstances cited says nothing and gives inward thanks.

Yours for the right. HOOSIER.

CAPE MAY, N. J., July 8.

THE ANARCHISTS AT HOMESTEAD.

Opinion of a Democrat of Brooklyn.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Outside of the series of masterful and convincing editorials which have appeared in THE SUN since the commencement of the deplorable occurrences at Homestead, Sunday's article must be considered as sufficient to set all questions to rest—excepting, of course, to the hopelessly prejudiced. It points out clearly to all property holders, no matter how insignificant, what might just as well occur to the small agriculturist as to the millionaire; to the slenderest intellect your parallel must be conclusive.

To support the Pennsylvania strikers is to advocate a policy antagonistic to every principle of democratic government. A certain journal, which, to the disgrace of New York, has championed their cause, heads a communication, "Chicago Anarchists Denounce Carnegie," and straightway in the same column emulates those red-handed enemies of law and order by doing likewise, to the intense gratification, doubtless, of hordes of alien laborers, who invariably form the backbone of anarchy and the aggressive element in labor strikes, whether in this country or in Europe. It is the sentiment of every true American citizen that the Chief Executive of Pennsylvania be no longer derelict to his duty, but at once call into action the civic and military resources of the State, in order to restore the vast property to the citizens to whom it properly belongs, and then afford adequate protection to all who desire to earn their bread conformably to the scale of wages fixed by their employers, for that is the inalienable right of those who take the places of the dissatisfied.

BROOKLYN, July 10. H. C. M.

Opinion of a Workman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I wish to commend in the most emphatic manner possible the stand you have taken and the courage displayed in your editorials on the Homestead riot. Such manliness, patriotism, and good sense are seldom found in journals or statesmen. The question now is not one of unionism or non-unionism, high wages or low wages, high tariff or low tariff, but a question whether a man shall control his own or not. The rioters at Homestead, although disclaiming it, are practical Anarchists, flying the black flag of piracy, and they should be put down. The Sheriff of Allegheny county is unfit for his place and Governor Pattison is a coward. I am now 50 years of age, and have been a workman all my life, yet I have never found it necessary to resort to force or intimidation to maintain my place or procure remunerative employment. Respectfully, W. S. WHITMORE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 10.

Shall Madness Rule?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The ground you have taken on the Homestead matter is admirable. No paper has rung out such sound doctrine. There is a taint of madness getting hold of some of the American people, and we are bound to go as old Rome did if sound doctrine is not preached. Thank God, you have spoken as a brave and sound thinker. AMOS M. KELLOGG.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, July 10.

Will Senator Palmer Tell Why Harrison Shouldn't Try It?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your editorials on the Homestead affair have set us all to thinking. If Senator Palmer be right in saying the employee has a right to the situation he occupies, and should therefore maintain his position by force, why should not President Harrison arm all his officeholders with Winchesters to prevent the Democrats taking the offices and the bread from Republican mouths next March? JAMES ADAIR.

234 BROADWAY, July 11.

More Important Than the Election.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have just read your editorial on "A Record of Shame and Danger," and I thank you sincerely for it. Indeed, I have read all of your editorials on this Homestead matter with especial pleasure, for it is not often my fortune to agree with you as I do now. Few newspapers have the courage that you show in this emergency, and fewer still have the ability to say what they dare to say as you say it.

You are doing a work immensely more important than electing or defeating a man who wants to be President. Yours very truly,

NUTLEY, N. J., July 10, 1892. H. G. PROUT.

Every Decent American Citizen.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your course respecting the labor troubles at Homestead is grand and patriotic, and will meet the cordial approbation of every decent American citizen.

I trust you will earnestly bring to the attention of the public the fact that no young man is permitted to learn a trade unless by the grace of the labor unions. Yours truly,

32 BURLING SLIP, July 11. J. H. T.

Words of Wisdom and Calmness From an Experienced Democratic Source.

From the New Haven Register, July 9.

The situation at Homestead is such, and the annihilation of the regular machinery of government is so complete, that all discussion should be wholly in reference to the present fact and in disregard of what led up to it. Consideration of causes must be postponed until order has been brought out of chaos. Other elements of society than those which were directly in the original disagreement have become involved in the conflict, and the responsibility for its speedy termination has been transferred, therefore, to the constitutional authority of the State. Something more is now at stake than the interest of the Carnegie mills on the one hand and the interest of the strikers on the other. There is the good name of the State of Pennsylvania, and the nation, and, as well, the existence of sound business principle.

At first the offer of the strikers to protect the property of the company, together with their assurances of desired peace, made a favorable impression upon the casual observer. It all seems fair enough, but when it is seen that their real object is not so much to protect the works from injury as it is to see that the places of employment they wanted are not taken by strangers, and that there is yielded to their care a share of the responsibility that belongs to the owner of the property, and to no one else, the first impression is speedily changed into a conviction that such a sacrifice of corporate rights cannot be permitted at any cost. And this is true regardless of the causes that provoked the existing situation.

We have here the whole principle of the rights of capital and labor. There can be no question, on the one hand, of the rights of the employed in this and in every other instance to quit work the moment their relations with their employers become unsatisfactory. We will go even farther, and yield to them the right to persuade other men not to take their places. But here those rights stop abruptly, for, on the other hand, their employers are at liberty to employ whom they please at a rate of compensation determined upon by them. They have a right to stop work when they please, and the State is under obligations to protect their property from hostile attack. The rights of the laborer cannot be admitted, unless the rights of the employers are admitted at the same time, for in the recognition of this principle lies all order and law. It is, therefore, plainly impossible for the Sheriff, to whom has been entrusted the care of the mills, to yield to the strikers the perfectly preposterous rights they are demanding.

We confess to a great deal of sympathy with the strikers in this contest, for reasons given in previous comments, but no amount of sympathy for them or distrust of Carnegie should for a moment blind one to the specious nature of the demand made of the Sheriff by the men. It is a demand that cannot and should not for a moment be considered. Its concessions would be a death knell to business security and the first step toward real anarchy.

It Is an Alien Mob.

From the Philadelphia Times.

The lawless thousands who have taken violent possession of the property of their employers at Homestead are not Americans, with very few if any exceptions. Their revolutionary methods and anarchistic actions are entirely unlike American methods and actions, and if Americans dominated the insurgents, they would have avoided the utterly lawless and inexcusable attitude in which they have placed themselves.

Of the four or five thousand locked-out operatives of the Homestead works, fully 75 per cent. are foreigners—Swedes, Hungarians, Poles, &c. Many of them are aliens in law as well as in fact, and they are strangers to our liberty that is so wisely conserved by law as to assure protection to person and property. They misinterpret our freedom as the liberty of license, and when they strike or come in conflict with employers, they assume that their conviction of the justice of their cause warrants them in taking violent possession of the property of others and holding it to coerce submission to their terms.

It is this alien element—alien to the genius of our free institutions as well as often alien in law and in fact—that now threatens the peace of most of our industrial communities.

Comments of Law-abiding Citizens on the Anarchy at Homestead.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have just read your editorial in to-day's paper headed "Let Every Man Look at Pennsylvania," and cannot refrain from expressing to you my sincere appreciation, nay, admiration, for the strong, forcible, and sensible manner in which you speak of the conduct on the part of two arrant political cowards. The country is to be congratulated that the Nestor of the American press deals such trenchant blows at one of the great crimes, if not the greatest, of the present century. Such democracy has the old-time ring, and such editorials vindicate the dignity of American journalism. It is certainly high time that the best men of the United States come together in council and deliberate upon ways and means to preserve the institutions under which we have prospered, and the liberty which is endangered by the cowardly conduct of officials and the outrageous and inhuman conduct of men and women who seem to have forgotten not only the first principles of Christianity, but also the first duty of true American citizens. If the right of ownership and protection for that which you own is denied to the American citizen, then it is a question of very short duration when we will sink back into a state of anarchy worse than that which obtained in France, with this difference, that there it had some warrant and show of reason, while in our country it has absolutely none. We have boasted from time immemorial that we were a nation of law-abiding, orderly, and peacefully disposed citizens, and if the conduct of these deluded men in Pennsylvania is to be upheld for any reason whatsoever, especially that of politics, then, indeed, are we approaching a state that is not only deplorable in its immediate results, but disastrous for all time to come.

No one sympathizes more with the wage earner than I do. I have, in and out of season, advocated the amelioration of their condition and their improvement. I have no sympathy with those that would oppress any one; therefore I the more persistently frown upon their conduct when it not only destroys the forms of good government, but destroys their own chances of handing down to their descendants the inestimable boon of American institutions. The walking delegate and the cowardly politician ought to be relegated to the rear ranks; then common decency and common sense would receive a chance. SIMON WOLF.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 8, 1892.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I want to express the gratitude which I think every right-minded man in the community ought to feel for the stand you have taken toward the Homestead labor trouble, and especially for your courageous utterances in this morning's issue.

Ours is a land of labor. We are all workmen here, and here, more than anywhere else, labor should be surrounded with every possible protection against imposition of any kind. That those who work with their hands have a right to combine in any way to better their condition, and to resist demands from any source that may be unjust, is a self-evident proposition.

But by the same token, capital is entitled to protection against wrong of any kind, and the law should make the palace of the millionaire as safe as the cottage of the poorest.

Any other condition not only tends toward breaking down the institutions under which we live, but it operates directly against the chance which every boy here, rich and poor alike, has to achieve wealth or fame, or both.

The curse of the hour is the blatant demagogue—such as the glittering ass from Illinois, whom you so vigorously flay this morning, and such as, alas, too many of those in control of our newspapers—the curse of the hour, I repeat, is the blatant demagogue, who is not only too cowardly to denounce wrong when committed by labor, but who is sufficiently despicable to try to curry favor with the working man by approving and applauding such wrong.

It is a good thing—it is a healthy indication—that one newspaper, at least, has the courage to fling out the danger signal in the face of what has taken place and is now going on at Homestead, and every good citizen who sees the signal is grateful to the man who stands behind it. Many feel the gratitude who make no expression of it, but I put mine on paper and send it to you. T.

NEW YORK, July 9.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Now you are beginning to talk. Until the property at Homestead is restored to the peaceable possession of its owners, our Government, and every man, woman, and child living under it is in disgrace. Such a state of affairs can hardly be imagined in darkest Africa. Property rights, life, and liberty are swept out of existence by a howling mob, and is basically, vicious, partisan press incites and applauds.

It would not be right for the employees of the World to take possession of its property, and pitch its staff-leaves adrift from the top windows, but there would be a sort of grim justice in the act, of which they would have no right to complain. E. W. VANDERHOOF.