The Sun.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1895.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to Foreign Countries added.

THE SUN, New York city.

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.

LOCAL NEWS.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the UNITED PRESS and NEW YORK ASSOCIATED PRESS is at 21 to 29 ANN street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

What the Venezuela Case Is.

A correspondent asks for a statement of the Venezuela case:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There is immense ignorance about this MONROE doctrine. Please set before us just how the MONROE doctrine is transgressed in the present instance. YOUR MASCOT.

The gist of the MONROE doctrine is in the sentence: "Any attempt by the European powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere is dangerous to our peace and safety."

There is no final knowledge on the part of any officer of the United States that this principle has been violated by England in connection with Venezuela. All that we know is that territory which for years has been in dispute between Venezuela and England, and about which very many acts of England forbid the notion that she believes her title to be unquestionable, is now demanded by England outright, chiefly because some of her subjects have gone and settled on the land. The United States has proposed to England to submit her dispute with Venezuela to arbitration. England says "No!" and that she alone will settle it, or virtually settle it by force. The United States is compelled, therefore, in defence of itself as it may be affected by European incursions in South America, to find out whether the land claimed by England is hers by right of treaty which it has not been the intention of the United States to disturb, or whether her title is of her own making since the MONROE doctrine was promulgated.

The duty of the United States to investigate this question under the circumstances is beyond question. The Commission to be named by the President will make the desired investigation.

If it is found that England's present claim is right, the MONROE doctrine or American doctrine has not been infringed. If it turns out that England has not the proper title to this land, an attempt on her part to hold it would be a direct and vital infringement of the MONROE doctrine, and it would be the duty of the United States to resist such effort with its full power.

Suppose it turns out that England has been right, and that the war flurry has been for nothing. None the less we are convinced that the overwhelming demonstration, called out by the Venezuela message, of patriotic determination to uphold the interests of the United States and the integrity of the Western hemisphere against European agression, will prove to be of incalculable value.

It is well for all the world to know clearly the true relations of the United States of North America to the sister republics of South America.

Kearsarge and Kentucky.

The Newport News Company has received the contract for building the two new battle ships, of about 11,500 tons each, the largest yet undertaken by our navy.

In this result of the bidding, there are two causes for congratulation. The country secures still another source of reliance for its heaviest war vessels, and the cost of building them is now greatly reduced.

The contract cost of the Indiana and the Massachusetts five years ago was $6,040,000 for hulls and machinery. The speed premiums, judging from the Indiana's fine performance, will add $100,000 more. The Kearsarge and her mate, hereafter to be known as the Kentucky, are to cost only $4,500,000, and there are no speed premiums. Thus the earlier pair are to cost over one-third more than the later, and yet the later vessels have about 1,200 tons, or more than one-ninth, greater displacement, and are to make a full knot more than was required of the earlier, and nearly half a knot more than the Indiana has actually achieved. It is also certain that the price of armor, proportioned to its quality, has come down.

The two new vessels will not be ready, probably, for three years, so that they have no relation to the immediate problem of defence involved in our dispute with England. The same is true, also, of any additional battle ships that may be authorized at this session. Yet if the Navy Department knows that it can get duplicates of the Kearsarge and the Kentucky built elsewhere at prices unquestionably advantageous without the usual bidding, Congress might do well to consider the acceptance of such offers. Certainly, in view of the decreased cost of building big battle ships, from two to four new ones should be authorized in the course of the session, either in the regular Navy Appropriation bill, or in a special measure, as may seem best.

Again, even if any new battle ships now authorized could not be ready for service until 1898, or the beginning of 1899, this is not true of torpedo boats. Hence it might be well to authorize at once the construction of twenty torpedo craft. These could be completed rapidly.

The Drift Toward Canadian Independence.

Intelligent Canadians have found matter for serious reflection in the announcement that Lord SALISBURY, sooner than submit to arbitration the title of British Guiana to territory claimed by Venezuela, would face a war with the United States, the brunt of which must fall upon the Canadian Dominion. "What," they ask themselves, "is Guiana to us that we must pay the whole penalty of her rapacity and folly? What intolerable vassalage is this, under which we stand to Englishmen who, on the plea of treaties with European powers, debar us in peace times from making the commercial arrangements that we need, while in war times they expose us to the scourge of invasion?" Several recent incidents indicate that Canadians are following Mr. GLADSTONE's advice, and applying common sense to figure up the price which they are called upon to pay for the barren honor of connection with Great Britain. There is more than mere coincidence in the news that Manitoba has determined to resist the attempt of the Dominion Government to compel her to repeal her school legislation; more than coincidence in the overwhelming victory of that political party in Ontario which applauds the defiant position assumed by the Manitobans toward the Ottawa authorities. No less striking and significant was the appearance on Monday, Dec. 23, at Windsor, in Ontario, of the first number of a newspaper, entitled *Independent Canada*, which puts forth a ringing declaration of principles, and advocates the immediate secession of British North America from Great Britain.

The right of Canadians to agitate for their independence is rendered clear and indisputable by the admissions of distinguished British statesmen of both political parties. Some remarkable utterances to that effect are quoted in the long-headed and high-spirited newspaper to which we have referred. Thus RICHARD COBDEN said: "In my opinion it is for the interest of both England and Canada that we should as speedily as possible sever the political thread by which we are as communities connected." And again: "We have recognized the right of the Canadians to control their own fate, even to the point of asserting their independence, whenever they think fit, and which we know to be only a question of time." In a like spirit spoke JOHN BRIGHT in the House of Commons: "For my share, I want the population of these provinces to do that which they believe best for their own interests; to remain with this country if they like it, in the most friendly manner, or to become independent States, if they wish it; if they should prefer to unite themselves with the United States, I should not complain even of that." Lord JOHN RUSSELL, who, as Premier, had opposed the cession of Canada to the United States, was nevertheless constrained to acknowledge: "It is hardly necessary to say that when the majority in any of our dependencies declare by their representatives that they wish to separate from us, no attempt should be made to detain them. The faults committed by GEORGE GRENVILLE, CHARLES TOWNSHEND, and Lord NORTH can never be repeated." A similar declaration has been made by Mr. GLADSTONE, four times Prime Minister: "If the highest welfare of the colonies requires their severance, we prefer their amicable independence to their constrained subordination." Such views have been expressed also by Conservatives, and by Liberals now acting with Conservatives. In a letter to Lord MALMESBURY, Lord BEACONSFIELD, then Mr. DISRAELI, urging his Secretary for Foreign Affairs to push the Canadian fisheries question to a settlement, said: "These wretched colonies will all be independent in a few years, and meanwhile are a millstone round our necks." Finally, as lately as Nov. 6 of the present year, Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, Secretary for the Colonies, speaking at a banquet, said that he "did not suppose that the idea of compelling the colonies to remain in the empire was within the range of intelligent speculation." With these averments of British statesmen may be coupled a statement made by an authoritative representative of the Ottawa Government itself. When section 69 of the Criminal Code of 1892, relating to treasonable offences, was under discussion in the Dominion Parliament, Sir JOHN THOMPSON, then Minister of Justice, was asked on two occasions whether the advocacy of political union with the United States could be held as an indictable offence. To both inquiries Sir JOHN THOMPSON answered that such advocacy would not be treasonable or indictable so long as the friends of union with the United States confined themselves to peaceful agitation.

In view of the facts here recited, Canadian Tories will find it as impracticable, as it would be unreasonable, to suppress *Independent Canada*. The movement started by that newspaper should receive a tremendous impulsion at this time, when the people of the Dominion are awakened to the risks and penalties to which they are subjected by connection with Great Britain.

Cuba in Flames.

For days past our despatches from Cuba have brought news of fire and flame, as also of battle and bloodshed. By the torch and the sword there is devastation in the unhappy island.

In view of the new features and incidents of the war there, it seems to us that our country has a duty in the case which ought not to be shirked.

Either of the belligerents in a war is justified in destroying an enemy's property not less than in taking an enemy's life. The loss of property weakens the side that suffers it, and the destruction of property in war times has always been regarded as a legitimate means of bringing an enemy to terms. In every war, both combatants strive to destroy or to seize each other's property; and so it has been in the case of the war in Cuba. Gen. MAXIMO GOMEZ, the commander of the patriot forces there, spoke his thought upon the subject in a letter which we printed last Wednesday. "I know," he said, "that unfavorable comment is made on some of the methods we have been forced to employ in this revolution; but we cannot listen to it. No sugar crop must be made this winter under any circumstances; it is the source from which the enemy still hopes to obtain the necessary revenue." It has been GOMEZ's design from the first to carry out this policy.

During the campaign of the past week near Matanzas the ravages by fire have been of a magnitude not often seen in war, and have involved the destruction of property valued at many millions. "As we approached Canas," said the writer of a Havana letter which we printed the other day, "great clouds of black smoke rolled up from the burning cane fields; giant tongues of flame could be seen leaping skyward, and a dull roar came from our left." "The whole province of Matanzas," said another writer, "appears to be on fire, and the sky is black with the smoke of burning cane fields." The cane fields and woods all the distance between Colon and Perico were burning, and many parts of Colon were on fire. The town of El Roque was afire. Columns of smoke could be seen from Jovellanos. The sugar plantations near San Victe and La Antonia, including the largest one of them in Cuba, were burned. Dozens of plantations lying southward from Matanzas have been destroyed, and everywhere can be seen the smoke from the burning cane. Bridges have been blown up, railway depots have been burned. The combatants have fought each other in blazing cane fields during the recent operations in the west.

It has become a war of desperation for both sides, as MAXIMO GOMEZ predicted it would become when he took the field, if Spain persisted in her attempt to destroy the liberties of Cuba. "We will leave to the Spanish Government," he wrote the Spanish commander, "nothing but desolate fields and ruined cities."

Hundreds of miles of Cuban territory have been licked by the flames, as they have been made wet with blood. Before the westward expedition of GOMEZ had been begun, the sugar estates in the eastern half of the island had been largely destroyed. Now it is in the richest region of Cuba that the work of war is carried on. A number of estates belonging to Americans have been ravaged.

It looks as though the prediction of GOMEZ would be fulfilled, unless the hands of Spanish madness are stayed.

The news here dwelt upon has come to us, not from the insurgent side alone, but from both sides, and a part of it from the Spanish Minister at Washington. The truth of it we do not question. It is many a year since we printed such despatches as those we have recently got from Cuba.

Meanwhile, the Spanish commander, MARTINEZ CAMPOS, seems to be impotent as against the revolution. He struggles vainly. His powerful army and navy have been unable to prevent GOMEZ's advance toward his chief citadel. We have had a report the past week that he has begun to strengthen the defences of Havana, in apprehension that he may there have to make his last stand in case Colon, or Cardenas, or Matanzas should be lost to Spain.

Cuba is in flames, and the smoke of the fires has reached Havana. The troops of MARTINEZ CAMPOS have fought in the blazing cane fields not much more than a hundred miles eastwardly from the Cuban capital. From place to place rides the revolutionary commander, armed with sword and torch, weapons both of which are acknowledged to be legitimate in war.

But is the American Government to stand unconcerned while Cuba is burning, Cuba but a few leagues from our shores? Has it not a duty to remonstrate against Spain's conduct in driving the Cubans to resort to desperate measures in defence of their liberties, and in resistance to Spanish terrorism? Has it not a duty to recognize the belligerent rights of the Cubans at war with Spain? Has Congress nothing to say in the case? Are we to wait for the fulfilment of GOMEZ's prediction of ruin?

The American people have made their voice heard for Cuba. To that voice Congress ought to give response without further delay.

Costly Education Concerning Alcohol.

From a report of the proceedings of the Board of Estimate in this city on Thursday, we make the following excerpt:

"Corporation Counsel SCOTT submitted an opinion to the effect that the Board was obliged to appropriate money to buy for the public schools text books containing information concerning the effects of alcohol, in accordance with a law enacted by the last Legislature. Mr. SCOTT said that if the money were not appropriated, the Board of Education could order the books, and the booksellers could compel the city to pay for them. When this matter came before the Board first all the members denounced the law, and asked the Corporation Counsel to tell them how they could evade it. The Board of Education estimated the cost of the books at $55,000, and the Board of Estimate decided to-day to ask Superintendent JASPER if the amount could not be reduced to $25,000."

It is exceedingly interesting to learn that a body of sworn public officers, like the members of the Board of Education, have been seeking the advice of the chief legal officer of the city, not as to what they must do in order to obey the new law, but as to the manner in which they may successfully evade its requirements!

As private citizens the members of the Board of Education may condemn the act of 1895, providing for the study of the nature and effects of alcoholic drinks, as severely and as often as they like; and even as public officers they may recommend its repeal if they deem its operation objectionable; but they have no right to evade compliance with its provisions, and if they do so, they are guilty of neglect of duty, and liable to indictment.

The Corporation Counsel took a clear and correct view of the position of the Board of Education in this matter. The statute is so worded as to require a large expenditure of money, by reason of the special directions which it contains in respect to the space which the text books in the public schools must devote to an exposition of "the nature of alcoholic drinks and other narcotics and their effects upon the human system." For students below high school grade the text books on physiology and hygiene are required to give at least one-fifth of their space to this subject, and for students of high school grade not less than twenty pages; "but pages on this subject in a separate chapter at the end of the book," the law goes on to say, "shall not be counted in meeting the minimum."

New text books will have to be procured, at great expense, to conform to these requirements. The statute reads very much as if it had been prepared in the interest of the makers and venders of text books rather than in that of the public welfare or the cause of temperance.

It ought to be modified radically.

Revenue.

The Democrats and Republicans, who met in Congress this year with their accustomed differences toward the question of taxation, are now confronted with a principle before which they must both abandon theorizing, and, practically, come together. This is the principle of American self-defence, and it has been stated with special reference to taxation by the late leader of the Democratic party, SAMUEL J. TILDEN, in his letter to Mr. CARLISLE, in 1885:

"In considering the state and management of the public revenue, the subject involves the questions whether we shall extend the surplus by reducing the revenue; or whether we shall apply the surplus to payments on the public debt; or whether we shall seize the occasion to provide for our seacoast defences, which have been long neglected. I am of the opinion that the latter is a paramount necessity, which ought to precede the reduction of the revenue, and ought also to precede an excessive rapidity in the payment of the public debt."

What Mr. TILDEN was convinced of by the power of his own superior foresight and patriotic instincts, the public of the United States must now be convinced of by the situation evolved from Venezuela. The word of the day is "revenue." That can no longer be kept within the old formula of "sufficient to meet the expenses of the Government economically administered." We must have more than enough revenue to fill up the deficiency caused by Prof. WILSON's tariff tinkering. We must have enough to reproduce the surplus which Mr. TILDEN advised against abolishing. The paramount necessity of self-defence must be converted into a practical fact.

Whoever opposes the increase of the Federal revenue at this time is blind or inimical to the welfare of the United States. We must now have truly, and on a grand scale, a tariff for revenue only. Prohibitive Protectionists, Mugwump Freetraders, old school Tariff Smashers, Star Gazing Tax Cutters, Free Silverites and Cuckoo Freelisters must all roll up their flags and rally round the Stars and Stripes.

Let the DINGLEY bill, or some equivalent measure, pass.

Why Do They Oppose a Democratic Measure?

Why did the Democrats in Congress refuse to vote for the DINGLEY Tariff bill? Is it true, as is reported, that Mr. CLEVELAND will refuse to approve it if it comes to him? In fact it is a sound Democratic measure. The restoration of wool to the list of revenue-paying imports is a proposition which should receive the approval of every Democrat, who is willing to stand upon the Democratic national platform. Free wool is impossible under a constitutional tariff.

As for the horizontal increase of certain duties, it is entirely justified by the Democratic precedent set by the Hon. WILLIAM REDUCTION MORRISON. Horizontal addition is just as justifiable as horizontal reduction was; and besides an emergency exists now, whereas none existed in Mr. MORRISON's time.

It is curious, by the way, to find men who were eager to saddle the country with the income tax when there was no need of it, objecting to a slight and legitimate increase of duties at a moment when the exigencies of the Treasury must be provided for.

Mr. CRISP, Mr. MCMILLIN, and other speakers against the new tariff bill seem to make the mistake of confounding low taxation with taxation for revenue only. Actually it makes no difference whether the figures of the duties are high or low, provided the revenue produced is sufficient to pay the expenses of the Government economically administered. The Democrats in the Fifty-third Congress failed to produce a sufficient amount of revenue. Their successors in the Fifty-fourth Congress ought not to have opposed a Republican attempt, founded in the main upon true Democratic lines, to produce the additional revenue imperatively needed at present.

It is true that in a consistent constitutional tariff the rate of duty would be uniform. In not proposing a uniform increase in the rate on all articles, Mr. DINGLEY and his Republican associates on the Ways and Means Committee diverge from the direct highway of a tariff for revenue only; but such divergence may be pardoned in view of the emergency and the avowedly temporary intention of the changes proposed.

It is distressing to see that the Republicans seem to know better than the Democrats what a revenue tariff is.

The products and the industries of the United States ought to be well represented at the expedition to be held in Mexico next year, and at that in Guatemala, and at that in Montreal, and that in Berlin, and that in Budapest. The international industrial exposition is a modern institution which is steadily growing in favor all over the world, and is a most important agency in promoting the enlargement of commercial exchanges between all countries everywhere.

We were poorly represented at the Kioto exposition of this year, and also at the Brussels exposition; and we have never been well represented at an exposition in any foreign country. It is very different with England, which takes an interest in all industrial expositions; thus she extends her trade everywhere.

The exposition that is to be held at Moscow next year, under the authority of the Russian Government, will not be of an international character, but will be strictly Russian. Not very long ago the Sultan's Government favored a project for the holding of an international exposition at Constantinople in 1896; but the project has been abandoned, for obvious reasons. There has been an exhibition of another kind this year in the Turkish empire.

There are two countries, Mexico and Canada, adjacent to the United States, at the exposition in each of which we ought surely to have full representation.

We believe that if Asia Minor were as well supplied with railroads, which are the great modern civilizers, as is the State of Connecticut, for example, these outrages of the Turks in that part of the world would be forever ended. Hence it is pleasing news that a new section of the Anatolian railroad, running between Karahissar and Akshehr, was recently opened to travel. The first-named of these places is a manufacturing city of 50,000 inhabitants; and the other place, which is about one-third as populous, has for ages been an important station on the caravan route to Syria. By the new railroad section they will be brought closer to civilization, the influences of which must soon be seen in the changes that are sure to be wrought.

When there are railroads, and plenty of them, between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, between the Bosporus and Mesopotamia; when trolley lines unite the hundred cities of Asia Minor with each other, it will not be possible to repeat there the scenes that have been enacted during the past half year.

Railroads liberalize and enlighten a community; they promote intercourse and enterprise; they enlarge the views of mankind; they clear away the cobwebs that cover an old country; they are the great agencies of development and education. Turkey in Asia would be transformed if it were as plentifully supplied with railroads, steam and trolley, as are many of the States of this country.

England's Grain Crop.

From the London Times.

The official estimate by the Board of Agriculture of the yields of cereal crops in Great Britain for the present year was published in the *Times* of Saturday. All three crops come out below the ten years' average, while the decline compared with last year's estimated yield is 4.46 bushels for wheat, 2.81 bushels for barley, and 4.58 bushels for oats. When we turn from the yields per acre to the estimated total produce, some startling comparisons present themselves.

ESTIMATED TOTAL PRODUCE OF WHEAT, BARLEY, AND OATS IN GREAT BRITAIN, 1890-95.

Year.	Wheat. Bushels.	Barley. Bushels.	Oats. Bushels.
1890	76,354,484	74,933,801	120,188,046
1891	72,132,203	72,320,095	112,280,261
1892	58,599,032	70,481,507	110,204,980
1893	49,247,297	59,595,477	112,887,579
1894	59,174,801	72,235,066	135,102,931
1895	37,170,257	68,560,945	122,148,628

It is necessary to remember that, while the area of wheat continues to decline, that of barley and of oats is extending. The wheat product of Great Britain this year is estimated at 37,170,257 bushels, or only 4,647,032 quarters. This quantity is barely more than half of that which we were producing as recently as five years ago. Barley yields a smaller product than it did five years since, while the output of oats has increased to a merely fractional extent. Hence no indication is afforded by either barley or oats of making good, by a larger output in the case of these two cereals, the enormous and significant decline recorded for wheat, the produce of which is now 17,000,000 bushels below even that of the year of supreme drought, 1893.

The Sun for America.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The attitude THE NEW YORK SUN has taken in the Venezuela matter is beyond criticism. It has expounded the pure American doctrine of no foreign interference allowed. Although it has opposed the Executive of the United States in other matters it is always American for Americans. A SUN READER.

Worth Millions.

From the Indianapolis Sentinel.

If nothing else should be accomplished by the Venezuelan excitement, the great reunion of Northern and Southern sentiment and the wiping from our statutes of the last vestige of civil war proscription is worth untold millions to the country. Many weary years have passed since the people of this country have felt that they were one and indivisible as they do now. It is almost worth a war to have secured that result.

THE QUESTION OF THE DAY.

A Letter from Mr. Andrew Carnegie—He Is an American to the Core.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is deeply to be regretted that THE SUN does not think permissible the suggested mode of settlement between England and Venezuela by themselves. The suggestion was that these two powers should arbitrate the whole question, with a proviso that if the title of the former to the settled territory were found invalid that it should be rendered valid by payment of a price. THE SUN holds that "neither by blood nor gold" is this to be tolerated, but the foremost and strongest champion of Venezuela does not share this view.

The President tells Congress in his ringing message:

"Any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States."

Upon this hint I spake to England through the trumpet-tongued *Times*.

The President has had to study this Venezuelan question as a statesman, and could not help realizing the conditions which surround it. British citizens have settled a part of the disputed territory, it is said to the number of 40,000. If arbitrators find, nevertheless, that the title to this territory is not valid, there would remain the question of the best practical mode of dealing with these innocent people, not one out of a hundred of whom probably ever heard of the dispute; the proportion of American citizens is probably not greater who had done so previous to this month.

Now the doctrinaire might say, let these Britons become Venezuelans; transfer them to her as so many cattle, or drive them out. But the statesman would probably deal with the problem in a somewhat different manner. If much of a statesman and nothing of a doctrinaire, he would probably conclude that these settlers were entitled to be heard upon the proposed transfer, and that their wishes should be considered. The editor of THE SUN himself, if one of these enterprising settlers, might be trusted to prefer enjoying settled government and numerous other benefits, which British rule is admitted to confer. The settlers might even resolve, rather than be turned over to another country, to fight for their right to remain under their present Government.

The statesman of the United States, and even of Venezuela, would probably reach the conclusion that rather than endeavor to conquer unwilling subjects the territory had better be disposed of to the present occupier, with whom the people there are satisfied.

My support of the Monroe doctrine is not less zealous than that of THE SUN itself. I did not sit in the Pan-American Conference without learning much of our sixteen sister republics, and especially of this Venezuelan dispute with England, which Mr. Blaine did his best to settle, and which, had he lived, I believe, he would have settled to the satisfaction of all. He knew the embarrassing conditions of the problem, and the suggestion I have made would have commended itself, I believe, to his practical good sense and to his statesmanship, for he was never a doctrinaire, but a statesman, whose great exertions for the cause of peace upon several occasions have never been duly recognized except by those who knew the stand he had taken, and yet he was an American of the Americans, and thoroughly believed in the Monroe doctrine, and would have been the last man to permit its violation. But in order to violate that doctrine it is necessary for a European power to do something which seriously menaces the peace and security of our country and of our republican institutions. If the continued possession by Great Britain of a small strip of territory in or adjoining British Guiana could do the one or the other, then the great republic is truly in a "parlous state," and it is strange she has not found it out long ago. Lord Salisbury's admission is practically an acknowledgment of the true Monroe doctrine. He says:

"They (her Majesty's Government) fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European State would be a highly inexpedient change."

These words are most significant.

The silver lining to this war cloud is, that the world now realizes that this country's feelings must be considered in any proposed changes of importance—especially territorial—upon this continent. In the minds of all European statesmen there will hereafter rest the valuable knowledge that the feelings of the American continent need best be given to the desires and aspirations of the power which has arisen upon this continent, even in one short century, and now holds the majority of the English-speaking race under its benignant sway. We do not need to thrust our power or our claims upon the attention of other nations; these speak loudest when we adhere upon this point most strictly to silence.

Hereafter the Monroe doctrine will noiselessly do its work, and in good time there will be upon the American continent only American nations. We only retard this irresistible movement by attempts to strain the doctrine and invoke it to cover trifles, thrusting it offensively in the face of other nations to which naturally it is unpleasant, the more so since they see how rapidly European dominion upon this continent vanishes, leaving behind all the territory of our sixteen sister republics; she is not to-day quite certain whether she has even Cuba. Britain had this republic's wide realm; she has lost it all, and the days of Canada's nominal dependence pass quickly.

Let us recognize the position of these old lands which so recently possessed the American continent, and treat them with all the patience and courtesy possible, making their exit as little distressful to them as we can. We can afford to low them out of our garden gate graciously. In this kindly policy I entreat THE SUN's cordial coöperation. "Noblesse oblige."

Yours, ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Mr. Carnegie, in his good nature, has seized upon a poor piece in President Cleveland's Venezuela message, and is feeding it to the United States, as well as to England, in the hope, apparently, that the real question aroused by Venezuela may pass out of mind. Mr. Cleveland's unreflecting assumption that any amicable readjustment of boundary between England and a South American power is of no concern of the United States, is entirely unwarranted. It won't stand a second's examination by a spirit of understanding loyalty to the United States.

If Turkey should offer to sell Constantinople to England, would not Russia protest? And would her protest be stopped at home because no treatise on the inadmissibility of such a sale could be found in the Russian archives? If Venezuela should pass into the control of a Government which would offer to sell the country to England, would not the United States protest against it, and stop it, by any method required, even if all the college professors in the country rose with one shriek to declare that the Monroe doctrine could not apply to such a transaction? And suppose no event in our history prior to the Venezuela case had produced the Monroe doctrine, would not this be the time to create it and stand by it? We should smile.

The Bagpipe Question.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* "Every Scotchman on earth," says Mr. David A. Curtis, in to-day's SUN, "believes that the world at large actually accepts Bobby Burns as a poet, when all his published work shows that he struggled in vain for a lifetime to learn the English language. Of course the struggle was vain." Further on he says: "The verdict of the Milwaukee jury that 'the dudeisack is not a musical instrument' is not only 'sound in law, morals, and music,' but it was one of unusual merit to come from a petit jury."

Before Mr. Curtis again struggles with the English language in ink he would do well to learn to avoid vulgar repetition and the meddling of tense. But, in spite of himself, he pays the Scotchmen and the dudeisack two brilliant compliments. If every Scotchman believes that "the world at large accepts Burns as a poet," that goes to show that Scotch faith and judgment are sound and solid. "The pipers," Mr. Curtis tells us, "who march with their troops to battle play with two distinct purposes. They know that the enemy hearing them must either flee for safety or lose all desire for life." Glorious pipers and good old pipes! What more can the Scotchmen desire in the line of compliments? And what splendid martial music there must be in the dudeisack, Curtis and the Milwaukee jury to the contrary notwithstanding!

Every patriot glories in the Scotchman who points with pride to Bannockburn and does not forget Glenco.

That writer in the *Saturday Review* was manifestly in error when he stated that "the only emotion that was ever aroused by the noise of the bagpipe was a burning desire for universal murder." It often aroused another emotion in the hearts of Englishmen—a lively desire to run.

NEW YORK, Dec. 28. HOT SCOTCH.

OUR REFORM MAYOR.

Is William Lysons Strong a Humbug or Not?

From the Wine and Spirit Gazette.

Nathan Klein was an inspector of excise under the old Excise Commission when it was composed of Commissioners Dalton, Murphy, and Holmes. For good and sufficient reasons that Board called for Klein's resignation. Having only the alternative of a disgraceful dismissal, Klein resigned and left the public service for the public good.

When the present reform Excise Board was appointed, and so soon as they were duly installed in office, Isaac Wallach called upon Mayor Strong and requested the reinstatement of Nathan Klein. The Mayor, though fully apprised of the reasons for the dismissal of Klein from the Excise Board, cheerfully acquiesced, and wrote a letter addressed to "Charles H. Woodman, Excise Commissioner," requesting the appointment of Nathan Klein, which letter, in order that there should be no mistake or misunderstanding, he signed, "Wm. L. Strong, Mayor."

Excise Commissioner Woodman, on receipt of the Mayor's mandate, looked up the record of Klein, and, in language more emphatic than elegant, declined to appoint Klein, saying that "he would be d—d rather than appoint a man to the service of the Board who had been forced to resign for good cause."

The Mayor was then officially made acquainted with the record of Klein. He had been foiled by Mr. Woodman, but he was not disheartened. When his new Police Justices had been appointed, "the Mayor of the city of New York" renewed his efforts in behalf of the discredited and dismissed Nathan Klein, who had been driven from the Excise Board "for the good of the public service," and insisted that he be appointed a police court clerk. This time his Honor was more successful. The Board of Police Magistrates proved more subservient to his wishes than was Excise Commissioner Woodman, and Nathan Klein was promptly appointed a police court clerk, despite his previous forced retirement from public office "for the good of the public service."

And yet this "reform" Mayor insists that he cannot and will not interfere with the heads of departments in the exercise of their powers!

Excise Commissioner Woodman, when interviewed in regard to the case, said: "The record showed that Nathan Klein was dismissed from the department for good reasons. Mayor Strong requested his reappointment, but I refused to appoint a man who had been dismissed for cause. The Board of Excise afterward, with my vote in opposition, certified the man to the Civil Service Board at Albany as a fit and proper candidate for appointment. The matter was held in abeyance by the Civil Service Board for several weeks. After a long delay an order was made placing most of our employees in the competitive class. Meanwhile Nathan Klein had secured an appointment as clerk in one of the police courts."

This statement of Commissioner Woodman is interesting as exposing the "virtuous" Joseph Murray, the President of the Excise Board, in his true light. The Mayor did not succeed in inducing Commissioner Woodman to do an act which plainly involved an injury to the public service, but evidently had no trouble in making Joseph Murray do his "dirty work." The issue of the certificate by the Excise Board to Nathan Klein for examination before the State Civil Service Board in law had but one meaning and that was that Murray and Harburger considered the man a proper candidate for employment in the department from which he had been dismissed for good and sufficient reasons.

Home Defences.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* You are doing good service in shaking up our people from their stupid and sluggish indifference concerning their power to defend themselves from foreign aggression, and it is to be hoped Congress will "get a move on," and order gun factories and shore defences to be worked to full capacity, with night and day shifts of workmen. In the cry for ships and forts, however, a third point of equal necessity, seems to be entirely overlooked, viz., the fact that we are practically without soldiers for the first fighting line, to hold off our enemies for six months until our army of volunteers is organized. Our 30,000 effective regulars have no reserves to call in to strengthen their weak battalions, and are scattered from Portland, Me., to San Diego, Cal. England, with her 75,000 regulars on the home establishment, always keeps organized an army corps for foreign service (the only corps in her army), completely equipped horse, foot dragoons, and train, ready to march at tap of drum, 35,000 strong, and with her unlimited transportation can place them at Montreal within a fortnight after issuing orders. In Canada they are backed up by 40,000 militia, certainly the equal of ours, making a force of 75,000 men ready to jump with all four feet on our northern border. To face this array we might scrape together 5,000 regulars and 20,000 New York and Pennsylvania National Guard, who would be wiped from the face of the earth by the British regulars alone. Our people seem to regard the National Guard as an army, fulfilling all the functions of a trained professional force, whereas it is only a makeshift for a temporary purpose, such as breaking up mobs and riots. No one can expect them to hold the field for over a month, and they were never intended for battle or invasion. At Queenstown, in the last war with Britain, they stood on their State rights and refused to go across the Niagara River and save our sorely pressed regulars from defeat by Brock. Their name, National Guard, is a silly misnomer. They are State guards, and were never intended for persistent and serious campaigning. If used on for this work they will prove a broken reed. There are millionaire privates in the ranks as well as bank tellers, clerks, fathers of families, &c., and they will not and cannot be expected to carry a gun during a campaign, lasting for months perhaps, in the snow and ice of winter. Does any sane man think that a civilian, if those daily walk of life is absolutely removed from a military atmosphere, can once a week rig himself out in uniform, drill on an armory floor (and nicety of drill is the beginning and end of their military aspirations), and be a dangerous antagonist for the seasoned professional soldiers?

It is time some one commenced to talk about the increase of the army to 50,000 men, with provision, without increasing the number of officers and non-commissioned officers, for augmenting it, by at once trebling the privates, and so have 150,000 men for our first line, and stop chattering about our magnificent amateur soldier militia facing British regulars in greatly superior numbers.

As for our harbor forts and guns and field artillery, 10,000 regular artillerymen should form their trained personnel, likewise ready to be expanded to triple strength. We might as well build battle ships and rely on the naval reserves to man them as to build costly and complicated sea coast defences and expect them to be served by tailors, barbers, bank clerks, counter-jumpers, and millionaires dressed for the nonce in uniform. The organization of regular coast and field artillery troops on a decent basis, on score of numbers, should be begun at once. Time is precious. Delay is dangerous. An old soldier of twenty-eight years' service writes this out of the fulness of his heart.

HENRY WILSON, Rosebank, N. Y.

A Question in Cigar Etiquette.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* What is the correct thing to do when you ask a man for a light: to take his cigar and hold it while you light your own, or to let him hold his cigar while you light by it? SMOKER.

Hon. and Jr.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I observe in THE SUN of the 26th an editorial reference to the "Hon. Nelson Dingley, Jr.," who represents a district in Maine in Congress. Are we to infer from that that Mr. Dingley's father, or grandfather, or uncle, who is, or was, also Nelson Dingley, is living and is entitled to the prefix "Hon."? If a man's son, bearing his name in full, acquires a title when the father does not have, is the adjunct "Jr." in order if the title be used? And to go a little out of the course, is the adjunct "Jr." necessary to the father's name? Isn't it sufficient if the younger some carry the adjunct? If I am wrong in my conclusions, would it be correct to say, for example, "Gen. John Smith, Sr., and Col. John Smith, Jr."? CITIUS.

BOSTON, Mass.

Mystery of a Valuable Office Cat.

From the Commercial Appeal.

Our friend Jim Lambert, editor of the *Natchez Democrat*, is much distressed over the mysterious disappearance of the office cat. The animal will chew up anything from a treatise on hog cholera to a Presidential message. It is rumored that the feline was stolen by Bill Broome and Tom Campbell of the *Vicksburg Commercial Herald*.

No Trash in It.

From the Inland Ocean, West Superior, Wis.

The ancest, most readable, and most entertaining Sunday newspaper is THE NEW YORK SUNDAY SUN. It has no room for trash, and that speaks volumes for a Sunday newspaper.

From the Chronicle, Oskaloosa, Iowa.

THE NEW YORK SUN is the best newspaper in the world. THE SUNDAY SUN is better, in our judgment, than any of the magazines.

An excellent magazine is the *Atlantic Monthly*. It prints no wood cuts or chromos, but lives on the well appreciated merits of old fashioned literary excellence. We congratulate the editor and publishers on the value, variety, and ever fresh interest of their pages.

Rough, wintry, changeable weather produces catarrhs, coughs, disorders of the lungs, &c., which Jayne's Expectorant promptly cures if faithfully administered.

If bilious, take Jayne's Painless Sanative Pills.—Adv.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

The Patriarchs' ball on Monday night passed off quietly, and without any of the solemn pageantry that has for several years attended this time-honored function. There were no dignitaries, no diplomats from Washington, no Duchesses' Row, very few crowned heads, and not half the glitter of jewels that one sees at the opera every full night. A profusion of flowers, mingled with Christmas emblems, all most admirably arranged, adorned the staircase and the ballrooms. Fair faces in fresh French dresses floated by in the dance, and very recent matrons, such as Mrs. Lanfear Norrie, Mrs. Lorillard Rolands, Jr., and Mrs. W. Thayer Robb, came prominently to the front, somewhat eclipsing the "married belles" of more years' standing.

It was not a débutantes' ball by any means, as very many of the season's buds were absent. Miss Belle Neilson looked stylish and handsome in white satin and chiffon, while Miss Katharine Duer, Miss Bessy Davis, Miss Bishop, and Miss Soley made a noticeable group in the cotillion. Mrs. Henry Sloane was undoubtedly the most richly dressed woman present, and wore pale pink brocade with bands of black velvet and white chiffon sleeves on which a shower of pink roses seemed to have been rained down. Diamonds in profusion fell over the bodice and sparkled on her neck and in her hair. Mrs. Samuel Colgate, in black velvet and pearls, was also a figure to be admired, and in the matter of point lace and diamonds Mrs. James P. Kernochan and Mrs. Kountze made the most conspicuous display. Taken for all in all, it was a pretty ball, and like a private entertainment.

The Ladies' Assembly on the 9th of January, which is to take place at the Waldorf Hotel, will probably partake of the same features as the Patriarchs', and as the roo