The Sun.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1897.

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.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines

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.

No Reciprocity with Canada.

According to a cable despatch to the Montreal newspapers, it is suggested in London that "it might not take much in the way of friendly Washingtonian overtures to Canada, to induce Canada to substitute equal tariff treatment of England and the United States for the policy of pro-British preference which is now in vogue."

If an impression exists in the Dominion that we could be persuaded to admit Canadian goods into our markets, duty free, in return for the poor privilege of competing on equal terms with British manufacturers in Canada, it is entirely unfounded. Such a proposal would be much less tempting than the so-called "commercial union" advocated some years ago, or than the "unrestricted reciprocity" subsequently urged by Canadian Liberals. Even those projects had no chance of acceptance on this side of the border, where the conviction is now widespread and deep-rooted that, if the Canadian provinces covet the privileges of interstate free trade, which are possessed by the members of our Union, they must assume like responsibilities by applying for admission to our federation.

It will be remembered that only partial reciprocity was secured by the treaty which was negotiated by Lord ELGIN, and which at the end of ten years was denounced by our Government. Under the provisions of that convention the raw products of Canada were admitted to our markets duty free, while our manufactures were barred out of Canada. The "commercial union" scheme proposed absolute free trade in all products, raw or manufactured, between the United States and the Dominion, and also the imposition by both countries of identical tariffs upon commodities coming from all the rest of the world. Obviously, the effect of such an arrangement would be to discriminate against British manufactures in our favor. The "unrestricted reciprocity" project, afterward put forward by Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT and others, also provided for the free interchange of all products, raw or manufactured, between the two countries, but left each of them to make its own tariff regulations.

Under this plan, Canada, of course, would be at liberty to discriminate against England if she chose, but she would not be bound to do so. "Unrestricted reciprocity" was, consequently, less acceptable to us than "commercial union." Now we are told that Sir WILFRID LAURIER will positively refuse to discriminate against British commodities, and that the utmost he could offer would be, in exchange for our opening a continental market to Canadian raw products, to let our manufacturers compete in the Dominion on equal terms with those of the United Kingdom.

"Thank you for nothing!" would be the appropriate answer to such an overture.

There is, as we have pointed out repeatedly, just one way in which Canadians can obtain the precious privilege of free trade with the United States, and that is by severing their connection with a European monarchy and by becoming citizens of the great American republic. That way lie dignity and prosperity; under any other political conditions the lot of Canada will be a hopeless one.

The Postponement in the Thorn Case.

"No person," says the Constitution of New York, "shall be subject to be twice put in jeopardy for the same offence."

There is a similar provision in the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

At one time it was supposed by many persons, and seriously asserted by distinguished lawyers, that this Constitutional prohibition, which is found in the fundamental law of most of the States, was a bar to the second trial of a person accused of crime, if the first trial had broken down, like the recent trial of the case of THORN in Long Island City, by reason of the illness of a juror.

This view, however, is not now entertained anywhere, so far as we are aware. Its correctness is denied by the leading text writers on criminal law, and it has been rejected by the courts in many jurisdictions. The Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Mr. Justice SHIRAS in 1894, declared it to be the law of that tribunal "that courts of justice are invested with the authority to discharge a jury from giving any verdict whenever in their opinion, taking all the circumstances into consideration, there is a manifest necessity for the act, or the ends of public justice would otherwise be defeated, and to order a trial by another jury; and that the defendant is not thereby twice put in jeopardy within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States." In the case where this doctrine was laid down, the jury on the first trial were discharged before its conclusion because the presiding Judge discovered that one of the jurymen had been a member of the Grand Jury which found the indictment against the defendant, and was therefore legally disqualified to sit on the petit jury which tried him.

There are a number of decisions by State courts of last resort upon the precise point involved in the case of THORN, affirming the proposition that the discharge of the jury in the course of the trial, on account of the sickness of one of its members, does not deprive the State of the right to bring the prisoner to trial before another jury. In a leading case on this subject the Supreme Court of Vermont has said:

"But in the event that the jury or court or prisoner in the progress of the trial become unable to proceed with the trial his jeopardy at once ceases. If it were known when the trial was entered upon that the Judge would be stricken down or die, so that there would be no competent court to finish the trial; or that the panel would become disqualified by the sickness or death of one of the jurors; or that the jury would be unable to find a verdict; or that the respondent would be unable to proceed with the trial because of sickness or escape from custody, the respondent would not be put in peril or jeopardy by such commencement of the trial."

The jeopardy, in other words, depends upon the presumption that the tribunal will continue legally organized until the end; and when that presumption ceases by reason of some occurrence on the trial, the jeopardy is shown to have been incomplete and does not suffice to raise the Constitutional barrier.

In Georgia the Supreme Court has gone so far as to hold that a trial Judge can properly discharge the jury in a murder case on account of the death of the mother of one of the jurors. That able but somewhat eccentric lawyer, Chief Justice BLECKLEY, however, dissented in a cogent opinion in which he said:

"The law presumes every man innocent until the contrary legally appears. When an innocent man is on trial for a capital felony, his life is in peril. The duty of preserving an innocent life is higher, both morally and legally, than that of attending any funeral whatsoever. It follows that when the mother of a juror dies pending the trial of a capital case, the true necessity which arises is absence from the funeral, not absence from the trial. The juror being set apart and dedicated to the work of delivering the accused from deadly peril, is to be regarded as if in a far country or confined in chains which cannot be broken."

The authority of Judge WILMOT M. SMITH in the case of THORN to discharge the jury on account of Mr. LARSEN's illness, and to order the trial to proceed later before a new jury, does not seem to have been questioned by the counsel for the prisoner.

The District Attorney was doubtless wise not to enter into any arrangement for continuing the trial with the eleven remaining jurors and a new juror in the box. Since the decision by the Court of Appeals in the celebrated case of CANCEMI that the defendant in a criminal prosecution triable by jury cannot lawfully waive a trial by twelve jurors, there is great uncertainty as to what other waivers may legally be made by or in behalf of the prisoner.

The Plain Facts.

The *Tribune* makes a laborious effort to justify its betrayal of the Republican party in this city and State at the late election. The facts are very clear. That pretended organ of Republicanism joined in a Mugwump assault on a regularly nominated Republican ticket, not on any ground of objection to its composition, for its candidates were beyond criticism and the best in the field by all odds. It supported a guerrilla ticket nominated by men who persistently refused to confer with the Republican party as to the selection of common candidates, although invited so to do most courteously.

When the candidate for Mayor nominated by the Republican party offered to withdraw, so that a third candidate agreeable to both sides might be substituted, the guerrilla candidate refused peremptorily to follow his example, and thus defeated his unselfish purpose to produce requisite harmony. Thereupon the *Tribune* came out flatly and joyously for the obstinate and disturbing independent candidate who was running avowedly against the party of which it professed to be the organ.

These are the facts, and it requires a few lines only to recite them, but Mr. WHITELAW REID finds it necessary to consume a column's space in the effort to explain them away. The sum and substance of the whole is that he played the part of a traitor for the gratification of his private malignity, and exposed the *Tribune* to all Republicans as a peculiarly nasty enemy of their party, against whose treachery they must be on their guard ceaselessly from this time forth, and more especially in the election of next year and the momentous election in 1900.

From the Union League Club.

We publish in another column a letter on our late New York election from Mr. ISAAC TOWNSEND SMITH, a member of the Union League Club, and the American Consul-General of Siam. Mr. SMITH's letter is an attempt to justify the Republican rebellion which gave New York, both the city and the State, to the Bryanized Democracy, and as it presents the fallacious arguments usually set up as a pretext for that wholly indefensible revolt, we give it as a curious contribution to the history of that disastrous campaign.

The first excuse for his rebellion offered by Mr. SMITH is that it was requisite because "the Republican party is on record as advocating a separation of municipal and local from national issues." There is no such record, and even if there were one, such a separation in the last campaign was impossible. The election was not merely for municipal officers, but for State officers also, Assemblymen and a Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals. As the results of the election showed, the rebellion in the party against the municipal ticket carried down also its county and its State ticket. The rebels did not discriminate against the city ticket only, but also defeated Assemblymen and Judge WALLACE, the Republican candidate for Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, by withholding their votes from them or by voting for other candidates. They made themselves responsible for the election of a Bryanite Chief Justice and did their best to turn over to Bryanism the Assembly likewise.

In separating, so far as possible, municipal elections from State and national elections, the Constitutional Convention did not and could not place the Republican party on record in favor of keeping out State or national issues from a local campaign, the Constitution having no power to determine the issues of an election, or to include or to exclude any issues.

For the very reason that Tammany Hall was shrewd in attempting to cloak its Bryanism with municipal issues only, the Republican party would have been foolish in assisting it in the effort by making its campaign on the same ground. Neither in armed conflicts nor in the contests of politics is it regarded as good strategy to allow the enemy to choose the position from which to fight with a view to its own advantage. Tammany, or the Democratic party, had been beaten last year because of its avowed Bryanism, and on that issue it could have been beaten again this year. Accordingly, the efforts of its leaders from the beginning of spring and throughout the campaign were to hide its Bryanism as a matter of immediate expediency. Obviously, sound political tactics, sound public policy, required its opponents to defeat the trick and drag forth its hidden Bryanism. The Strong administration, as every sagacious political observer knew, had brought non-partisanship into disrepute, and on that issue defeat was inevitable. That popular sentiment demanded a municipal Government, for which there should be strict party responsibility, was proved by the result of the election.

Mr. SMITH gives as another excuse for his rebellion, that the "Republican party was largely opposed to the Greater New York charter" as it was passed. But it was a Republican Legislature which passed the charter and a Republican Governor who signed it. "Mr. TRACY was there [at Albany] in advocacy of it," says Mr. SMITH, "and was not that enough?" he asks, to justify Republicans in defeating Gen. TRACY? Perhaps so, if a Republican deserves to be stabbed by his party for supporting a Republican measure. But what effect could defeating Gen. TRACY have on the charter? It was law, and the late election was held under it. It was not an issue of the campaign. Something seems to be out of gear in the logical apparatus of the Consul-General of Siam.

Mr. SMITH wants to know if it is not plain that "the Republican machine dug the ditch" into which it fell. The Republican organization simply followed the usual course in nominating candidates in the usual way, and they were defeated only because Mr. SMITH and the rest of the Republican rebels voted against them. If there had been a Republican rebellion against Mr. MCKINLEY in the last campaign because of the "bossism" of Mr. HANNA, and he had been defeated in consequence of it, who would have dug the ditch? Mr. MCKINLEY's nomination was not less the work of the "Republican machine" than Gen. TRACY's. Both MCKINLEY and TRACY were regularly nominated candidates of their party.

Finally, Mr. SMITH puts in the plea that "the Republican party, pure and simple, all told, has never been able to carry the city on national issues, and never will;" yet it is a matter of record that the Republican party carried the city last year on national issues, and it could have carried it on no other issues. Even if his assertion were true, how could it help his case? If the united Republican party could not carry the city, how were its chances improved by dividing it?

If the pleas presented by the Consul-General of Siam are sound as arguments, the Republican party should disband forthwith and leave individual Republicans to make up their own tickets according to their varying fancies. If a city convention cannot put forward candidates and a policy for the party without tyrannical domination, neither can a national convention; there can be no party organization and every Republican must be left to go as he pleases, while the organized Bryan Democracy marches over the ruins of the Republican party to overwhelming triumph in 1900.

French Tragedy in Boston Style.

Sanders Theatre, a part of the memorial building erected by Harvard University in honor of her sons who fell in the civil war, and the place where the commencement exercises and other state ceremonies of the university are held, will be the scene this winter of a curious contest between the French department of Harvard and a body of the students associated for the purpose of improving their speaking knowledge of the French language and calling itself in print by the somewhat cumbersome title of "Le Cercle Français de l'Université de Harvard." While the origin and causes of the dissension may be rather obscure, its public manifestations have aroused interest in eastern Massachusetts and will provide entertainment and instruction during the winter for select Boston audiences.

The "Cercle Français," or French Club, has only in late years attained social eminence among the societies of Harvard. For many years it had plodded along modestly and unnoticed, like all other college literary societies, its highest ambition being the occasional production of a little comedy for the delectation of its own members. With the advent of an enthusiastic instructor of histrionic tastes, however, this was all changed. The Cercle discovered that it must make its influence felt, and proceeded to startle the university with its theatrical exploits. Its most brilliant achievement was the production of MOLIÈRE's "Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme," with an interpolated ballet which cast the efforts of the Hasty Pudding and Pi Eta clubs into the shade. Boston society saw that a new star had arisen, and forthwith took up "Le Cercle Français" and its performances. The club seemed duly grateful to the instructor through whose efforts its social transformation had been accomplished.

Accidents will happen, however, in the best of clubs. Last spring the harmony between the Cercle Français and its energetic instructor was disturbed. M. BRUNETIÈRE of the French Academy, appeared in Cambridge and lectured in Sanders Theatre. He was introduced to the audience by professors of the French department. The Cercle Français asserted that he had been invited to lecture by the club at its expense, and that he should have been introduced by the club's officers. War to the knife was declared between it and its instructors, and each side has entered upon a campaign in the enemy's country. The Cercle has invited a number of professors from other colleges and French men of letters to lecture in Sanders Theatre before Harvard University, while the French department announces at the same place a theatrical exhibition, which will wither forever the Cercle's dramatic laurels.

In a circular decorated with the seal of the university, though the motto *Christo et Ecclesiæ* seems rather out of place, the professors of the department of French advertise three performances of RACINE's "Athalie," the most ladylike play of the most feminine French poet. No attempt will be made to reproduce the play as it was given originally by the young women in Mme. DE MAINTENON's boarding school at Saint Cyr, and of course a biblical ballet cannot be introduced, but histrionic genius has found possibilities for display even in "Athalie." As the circular points out:

"The splendor of the *mise en scène*, the introduction of a large number of subordinate characters and *figurants*, and the use of vocal and instrumental music, not only in the choruses which link one act to another, but in the body of the play itself, serve to heighten the interest of the work. The tragedy will be performed by a company of students, graduates, and instructors of Harvard University and Radcliffe College."

Mise en scene, as Bostonians should know, means stage setting; while the *figurant* is a character often taken by undergraduates on less dignified stages and vulgarly known as the "supe."

To "heighten the interest" the principal parts will be intrusted to two young ladies of Boston not connected with the university, the choruses will be sung by the Boston Cecilia Society, and MENDELSSOHN's music will be rendered by the Boston Symphony orchestra under the direction of Boston's Mr. B. J. LANG.

Yet there is a discordant note in this beautiful prospectus that will jar disagreeably throughout the land. The illustrated libretto of "Athalie" by the side of RACINE's text will contain "a juxtalinear translation made expressly for this occasion" by Prof. FREDERIC CESAR DE SUMICHRAST. Has Harvard grown skeptical of Boston's knowledge of French? Or does Prof. DE SUMICHRAST fear that Boston society, for whose festivities Harvard sees fit thus to use her memorial halls, may be unable to understand the French after the school of Cambridge by Somerville.

The Sherman-Johnston Negotiations of 1865.

In THE SUN to-day Gen. H. V. BOYNTON gives an interesting account of the effort made by various political leaders of the Confederacy, at the surrender of JOHNSTON's army, in 1865, to obtain concessions of political rights through the terms of peace granted by Gen. SHERMAN. He describes the relation of this project to the attempt to found "a soldiers' party," undertaken about that time.

A striking point in this historical review is its comparison of the terms actually granted by Gen. SHERMAN with those suggested by Postmaster-General REAGAN of the Confederacy. Gen. SHERMAN's agreement would certainly have taken from the Government of the United States the authority that belonged to it. Of course, however, the stout old soldier referred his agreement to Washington, where the Cabinet, with which Gen. GRANT was summoned to confer, promptly, unanimously, and emphatically rejected it.

To the part played by Secretary STANTON in this rejection, Gen. BOYNTON gives just prominence.

The Reduction of the Finest.

We have referred already to the methods by which the Anthropological Bureau, recently established by the Police Department, hopes to prevent the members of our justly respected and highly appreciated police force from accumulating too much fat. The subject is of immense and continuing interest to all philosophical citizens.

Without undervaluing the athletic exercise by which the police force is to be reduced, it is permissible to doubt if any diminution of policemen will be approved by the community. In the heroic age the New York policeman was ample, even vast. GOG and MAGOG, fed on the Lord Mayor's richest calipash and calipee, melted into blue, and wearing their own clubs, would not have been more comfortable and imposing figures. You felt in those days that only a big and rich city could afford to keep policemen so voluminous and high-colored. Even the pilots of the Broadway stages, a fearless, original, and expressive race of men, looked almost with humility upon these magnificent masters of traffic and obeyed their uplifted hands without imprecation.

It was beautiful to watch the conflicts for the right of way between these enlarged policemen and the truck drivers. The truck driver, in the times before reform, was a person who habitually defended a doubtless amiable personality behind a palisade of language imported from Flanders. He seemed to be vexed as if by the thought that he was born too late to be a pirate of the Spanish Main, and had to content himself with breasting the waves of West street. It was his heart's delight to mock the world and cut down all folks on foot. Was he a man to be restrained by a little, thin policeman? A policeman might have had the heart of HECTOR and the dynamic arm of FITZSIMMONS, and yet have failed to touch the imagination of the warrior truck drivers. To these the dignity of mass appealed. They feared the man whom they couldn't run over; and one of those old-fashioned bulging, monumental patrolmen was no more capable of being run over than St. Peter's is. The truck driver might run over somebody else and escape for a moment, but he knew that punishment awaited him at the end of a very short lane. That policeman he might elude, but before long he was sure to come upon two policemen talking together. Passage was impossible. He had to surrender. The fat men were slow but sure.

As a matter of fact no violator of the law who had any sense of etiquette ever tried to run away from a fat policeman. As a rule criminals are thin. They worry too much. They fear a fat policeman. They see in him their deadly opposite.

It is scarcely necessary to speak again of the sense of genial security diffused by fat policemen. It is an ancient jest that policemen are hard to find. The fat policeman was impossible to lose. He was a landmark, a beacon. In a town swarming with strangers he was a convenience, if not a necessity. He basked and waddled, an ornament and a joy.

Some of the civil service machine policemen of to-day flit about not much wider or more palpable than ghosts. A good guesser would put the combined age of two of them at 24 and the combined weight of two of them at 125 pounds. Probably they have all the virtues, but they seem better fitted to be "tigers" behind a pony cart than to be the law on legs. They don't look like deterrents of crime. And yet they are very severe to boy flower peddlers, and their frown at the sight of a push cart is tremendous. They mean well, but they have not the confidence of the public, and little, wanton boys of the street put thumb to nose at their approach.

Still, the fat policemen are doomed to lean years. Space in this town is so valuable that policemen cannot be allowed to occupy more than a fair share of it.

The Forsaken Defender.

The reported condition of the Defender must be sad news for yachtsmen. She is corroding. Bronze and aluminum do not agree, and at the points of their juncture in the hull of the famous sloop there is clear evidence of decay. If the reports are correct, it may be said that the Defender is in consumption. The work that she was designed to do she did well; but there is an impression among many yachtsmen that she is still practically an untried boat. It may be that she never had a chance to display all her power and all her good points. Certainly Valkyrie III., or, rather, Lord DUNRAVEN, never gave her that opportunity, and there was nothing that was not expected in her repeated victories over the Vigilant.

There are those who believe that in a strong wind the Defender is the most wonderful craft afloat. It is a pity that she did not get a chance to cross the ocean and compete with British boats.

When the Defender went over the course on the day that DUNRAVEN sulked many people were disappointed and surprised that on a broad reach it took her nearly two mortal hours to cover the distance, fifteen miles, to the outer mark. The trouble was not with the boat; it was with the wind. The yacht wants wind and plenty of it, notwithstanding her enormous spread of canvas. A few days before the cup races she went down the bay for probably her last training test. It was a memorable spin. There was a fierce northwest wind. The yacht carried her mainsail, staysail, and jib. She stood up like a church. Indeed she might have carried her topsail, but probably it was deemed wise on board to dispense with that luxury until the weather made it a necessity. The twin-screw steamer Monmouth happened at that time to be making one of her regular trips to Sandy Hook. She chased the yacht, but the length of time that she took to overhaul her was a surprise to every one who witnessed that interesting but unequal battle between sails and screws. When the steamer at last caught up with the Defender, near the Southwest Spit, she saluted her in the usual noisy manner, and the salute was immediately followed by cheers from the passengers. They were all delighted with the yacht's marvellous burst of speed on that windy afternoon.

It is to be hoped that there is some exaggeration in the reported condition of the Defender, and that we may yet have an opportunity of admiring her under full sail.

The Three Cits.

The three Cit Assemblymen-elect who proclaimed at the Chimney Corner on Friday night their independence of party and their determination to upset things, mean what they say and all they say, no doubt; but their threats would be more serious to Republican supremacy at Albany were it not for the fact that the next Assembly is Republican by a safe and sure majority. The three Cit Assemblymen seem determined to stand up and be counted. If they persist in flocking all by themselves, there is no telling but all three will be entitled to admission to the next national convention of third-party legislators.

There was one Populist in the last West Virginia Legislature; one Populist among 96 members. There was one National Democrat in the Connecticut Legislature of 279 members. There were "three silver Republicans" in the last Kansas Legislature of 135 members. In the Massachusetts Legislature, of 280 members, there was one "Democratic Citizen." There was one Independent, so self-styled, in the last Nevada Legislature, and one "Independent" in North Dakota, among 93 members; and there was one Prohibitionist in the Georgia Legislature, the total membership of which was 219.

The three New York Cits, therefore, are assured of political companionship in any action which they may take or in any policy which they may determine to follow. How true it is that three intrepid statesmen, three political musketeers, one for all and all for one, could run the whole business of the Assembly if the voters hadn't elected 147 others!

What does Mr. G. G. WILLIAMS, the President of the Chemical Bank, mean by stigmatizing our five-cent pieces as "worthless, dirty nickel coins," and "a disgrace to our circulation"? They are not worthless, and they are no more dirty than the silver half dimes would be, which Mr. WILLIAMS proposes to substitute for them. Besides, the silver half dimes would be too small to be counted conveniently, and would be easily lost in the pocket. The nickels are good enough. Let them remain!

In a communication respecting the production of beet sugar in the United States, Mr. CLARENCE M. FENTON of Buffalo finds fault with an article on that subject, printed in THE SUN of Thursday. He remarks:

"You take your cue from an article in the *Forum* written by EDWARD F. ATKINS. I have been reliably informed Mr. ATKINS is grinding his own axe in writing this article in the *Forum*, as he is largely interested in cane sugar plantations in Cuba, and he is bright enough to see that the building up of the American beet sugar industry is going to hurt his individual business in Cuba.

"No patriotic American will deny the fact that the building up of the American tin plate industry has been accomplished in a wonderfully short space of time, and has resulted in great good to American people; and the building up of the sugar industry in America will likewise result in great good to American people.

"It is all right to talk about the universal brotherhood of man, and we ought to consider our brothers and cousins across the water in our commercial, manufacturing, and other business enterprises; but it is business and patriotism to look after our own folks at home first.

"Why don't you get on the right side of the fence and instil a little more American sentiment in your editorials? It would certainly please your readers very much better than the so-called "independent" but really Anglo-American sentiments that you continually portray."

The editorial article to which Mr. FENTON refers stated the arguments and ideas of Mr. ATKINS on one side of an interesting and important subject. Mr. FENTON will do more for beet sugar in America by meeting Mr. ATKINS's arguments and exposing the falsity of his statements of fact, if false they are, and the unsoundness of Mr. ATKINS's conclusions, if unsound they are, than by accusing him of a personal interest in the discussion.

But what sort of a sugar beet can it be that demands "a little more American sentiment" in the columns of THE SUN and charges this journal with "Anglo-American" prejudices?

Section 10 of the first chapter of the Greater New York charter provides that during the year 1897 "it shall be the duty of the proper authorities of the various municipal and public corporations" consolidated into the city of New York to prepare a budget for the year 1898, as required by existing laws, "as though such municipal and public corporations were not to be consolidated into the city of New York." In other words, New York city, Brooklyn, and the other civic divisions of what is to become, on Jan. 1, the Great City, have made and are making provision for municipal expenses in 1898 as if there were to be no Greater New York.

Thus, for instance, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment has appropriated $10,000 for the Mayor's salary, though the Mayor of the Greater New York will receive $15,000. The Board has appropriated $23,000 for the salaries of the Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments, although under the provisions of the charter of the Greater New York the sum total of such salaries is to be $32,000.

The total appropriation for 1898 as provisionally agreed upon for New York, the present city, is $47,949,239, against $49,486,297 appropriated for municipal expenses this year. This is a decrease of $1,250,000. New York, therefore, will enter upon its special political partnership in the enlarged municipality with a diminished budget.

Navy Staff and Line.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The editorial article in THE SUN of Nov. 7 on the personnel of the navy discloses prophetic insight into the difficulties surrounding the subject.

The report of THE SUN's Washington correspondent on the 8th inst. shows that the board now in session for the solution of the difficulties, and the bureau chiefs who protested that their corps did not ask actual rank, do not comprehend the fundamental principles of military organization. All military organizations of civilized peoples rest on gradation of their official forces, and the grades are limited and substantially alike, while having corresponding designations in all languages. This is a philosophic truth which furnishes a key to the solution of staff rank. All commissioned officers of all corps must be classed with those grades if they have any rank. This truth is recognized in the United States Statutes. Commands spring from Constitutional authority vested in the President as Commander-in-Chief. The law of 1871 on staff rank fixed the grades of all the staff corps to correspond with those of the line, from Captain to Ensign.

The Navy Department has never executed the law; hence most of the confusion resulting. S.

NEW YORK, Nov. 9, 1897.

Does This Governor Eat Greens with a Knife?

From the Brandon News.

The Governor of Mississippi is accused of eating greens (turnip greens) with a knife.

THE LATE ELECTION.

A Plea in Justification of the Republican Rebellion Against the Party.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I read THE SUN daily and admire the force and skill with which facts and arguments are marshalled to sustain the side it advocates, but in the discussion of the issues of the late election I think it has embraced so closely one phase of the contest as to miss seeing others equally or more important, like a man turning a grindstone with his head so close to the stone as to be unable to see over the top of it.

Allow me in your independent journal to state briefly one or two points overlooked:

First—The Republican party is on record as advocating a separation of municipal and local from national issues. The party was instrumental in changing the time of national elections from State and city elections, so that on municipal questions we should not be overshadowed by outside national influences; it became a law of the State. Why, then, was the party not loyal to its own principles?

Tammany Hall was shrewd enough to go into the contest on that basis, keeping national questions out of its platform. It did not bring Bryan here to advocate its cause, as the Republican managers dragged the name of McKinley into it.

Secondly—The Republican party was largely opposed to the Greater New York charter until some important amendments could be made. The Union League Club sent a committee to Albany to remonstrate before the Governor against his signing the act. Mr. Tracy was there in advocacy of it. Mayor Strong wrote urging a delay, if only for one year, so that the amendments might be duly considered. It was all in vain. Gov. Black signed the bill and it became a law.

Now, was not that enough? Should not this outside domination have then ceased—have kept their hands off? Had they done so the Republican party would have suffered no defeat, even if Tammany had carried the election, because national issues would not have been in it.

Is it not plain that the Republican machine dug the ditch, and made it so wide that the party had not in its thinned ranks strength enough left either to jump or bridge the chasm?

All experience has conclusively shown that the Republican party, pure and simple, all told, has never been able to carry the city on national issues, and never will. Why, then, the folly of thrusting them into this important city election? Is it not plain that a municipal party composed of the best citizens, without regard to national party issues, can alone secure good government to Greater New York?

ISAAC TOWNSEND SMITH.

UNION LEAGUE CLUB, Nov. 12.

Murder Trials and Yellow Journalism.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is impossible to conceive anything more degrading to the administration of justice than the libertinism of the yellow journalism of New York in the two murder cases which are occupying the public attention to a very large extent at the present moment. This species of journalism stops at nothing. Here is a man charged with murder. He is defended by counsel; twelve of his peers are hearing evidence which will either convict or acquit him; an honorable and upright Judge, assisted by the State attorneys, presides at his trial, to see that justice is done between the prisoner at the bar and the people. It is a solemn scene, or should be so. In an English court of justice nothing possibly can be more solemn. It is the recognition of the supremacy of State over the life of the individual who outrages its prerogative of safeguarding the sanctity of that of another, and a testimony to all that it will avenge its offended majesty in the person of its humblest subject. It will do so, however, through a laborious and judicial process; through the machinery which generations of lawgivers, jurisconsults, and Judges have devised, interpreted, and promulgated for the safety of society in life and property.

Nothing of all this troubles the yellow journalist. His object is sordid and mercenary. His cry is for blood. The more of it the better. It is the pabulum on which he battens. The reporters of these papers discard all semblance of responsibility in what they write. They are encouraged so to do. Their business is to carry mud rakes and rake in the slime of the earth in the shape of vile gossip, lies, and exaggerated reports of commonplace occurrences that are peculiar to every great city. They are barefaced calumniators of the reputations of our city and of our citizens also. We are the amazement of the world already with our yellow journalism; we shall soon become its laughing stock, and inevitably its scandal. There is not the slightest excuse why our judges should be placed beneath the contempt of the yellow journalist or his employer.

The functions of legitimate journalism are broad already, and are expanding.

If Thorn is guilty, his guilt will be established in a very short time. According to the laws under which he is tried he is assumed innocent until the contrary is proved. But that is a matter of opinion. What the yellow journalist practically calls for is the lynching of the man on the spot. This would seem strange to the foreign observer, considering that the longer the man is kept on the tenter hooks of this judicial inquiry the greater will be their profit. It is an anomaly, but the perversity of the yellow journalist is nowhere more discernible than in his monumental stupidity. The public, which first regarded the yellow journalism as a passing novelty, are becoming weary of it. So are the unfortunate journalists who have to prostitute their profession and professional reputation in its service.

But there is a feature of the yellow journalism which is not receiving the attention that it essentially deserves. The young are contaminated by it. No story is morally too putrescent for their filthy columns. They fill their columns with it to the exclusion of everything else. Some of these details, as they are expanded into chapters in the sanctum of the imaginative yellow journalist, are diabolically ingenious. Zola's novels are wholesome literature in comparison.

I am quite confident that the yellow journalism is steadily on the decline. It is derided and scorned. It has no future, as it has no past. It is a notorious fact that a "story" in a yellow journal, even if it be in part true, if not corroborated by the reputable journals of the city, is discredited even by their regular patrons.

A few nights ago a yellow journal brought out an extra edition with a "story" that Martin Thorn had attempted suicide. That part of the public which purchased a copy of this mockery on journalism paid two cents. Of course there was not a word of truth in it. The men who concocted it must have known it, for it seems they have almost free access to the jail in which Thorn is confined. Published it was, however, and the public had to endure the swindle as best it might. AN OLD HAND.

NEW YORK, Nov. 12.

Engineers and Doctors.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I notice in this morning's SUN that the much-worried bone of contention between line and staff in the navy is at last to be buried. This is as it should be. Hail the day!

In another column I note the headline "Doctors Needed in the Navy." Now, why draw the lines so close? Why not apply the same happy solution? for, since it becomes apparent that it is rather a question of application than adaption to qualify an officer to take charge of bridge or engine room, surely he might also learn incidentally how to saw a leg off on the way. AN ENGINEER.

NEW YORK, Nov. 9, 1897.

Straight Bryanism in Command.

From the Raleigh News and Observer.

If the Clevelands and Hills and Whitneys could control him, they would favor Bryan with a straddle platform. They know, however, that Bryan is a platform in himself, and that he is the embodiment of those principles which the money power fears. Therefore it is in their plan to spread abroad the old lies that "Bryan is not safe;" "Oh, yes, Bryan is a good sort of a man, but too extreme," and "Bryan cannot appreciate changed conditions," with the hope of weakening him as a successful leader. That is the programme that has been arranged.

The battle ground in 1900 will be the same as in 1896, the issue will be the same and the leader will be the same incorruptible, brave and manly leader who knows no discouragement in battling for the right.

The Democrats of New York will fall in line and invite Hill and Flower to come along provided they accept the "arbitrament of the national convention." If they cannot do that, they can sulk in their tents to help out the Republicans. Most of them will come along when they find that the party is in no mood for a straddle platform or unknown candidates.

The day for "straddles" and for "straddlers" has passed.

From the Denver Times.

The gold standard press of the country would doubtless be very well pleased to make it appear that Tammany had compromised with them in the New York election, but the facts are unquestionably against them. It was a clean-cut victory for the Tammany Democracy, and the Tammany Democracy has been, is to-day, and undoubtedly will in the future be allied with the national party platform, including the free coinage of silver. So far as bimetallic interests are concerned, the triumph of Tammany is the greatest victory won since the Chicago Convention.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

A few cards have been issued for the early teas and receptions of the winter, which are always the most enjoyed and the most fully attended. Mrs. Anson Phelps Stokes will be at home on Nov. 27 for a large reception to introduce one of her younger daughters, Miss Mildred Stokes, to the fashionable world—and other cards are out for days at home. For the first assembly Mrs. Cadwalader Jones and Miss Euretta Whitney called a meeting a few days since to consider plans and arrangements, and it has been announced for Dec. 16. The Patriarchs' Association being now extinct, and subscription balls, with the exception of the assemblies and Tuesday evening dances, having been voted undignified and unsuitable by the very smart set, notwithstanding that they are conducted with the utmost refinement and propriety by the ladies who have them in charge, invitations to the first assembly will be largely sought for by the young and light hearted who love the swing and go of acres of polished floor and the freedom of unlimited space.

There are private houses, it is true, which are beautiful and fascinating in all their dancing accommodations, but how many of them will be opened this winter for dancing functions is still uncertain. Mrs. Astor, Mrs. Stokes, Mrs. Sloane, Mrs. Henry Sloane, Mrs. Harry Payne Whitney, Mrs. Gerry, Mrs. Bayard Cutting, Mr. W. K. Vanderbilt, and Mrs. Frederic Gallatin have handsome ballrooms in their luxurious houses, and if only half of them have the spirit of hospitality and self-sacrifice that the giving of a ball entails, there will be quite enough gayety, with the inevitable dinner dances, which are always chic and exclusive enough to make every young girl burn with the desire to be invited, and the season is not likely to be so very dull after all.

The Flower Show, at that spacious palace of art, beauty, glitter, and show, the Astoria Hotel, has been so dwarfed by the other attractions of the place that although the most extensive orchid houses and conservatories in the country have been robbed to swell the enormous number of lovely blooms on exhibition, yet they hardly divert the eye from the ornamentation of the walls, ceilings, and furniture. The great ballroom is banked with chrysanthemums, which in a smaller space would be beautiful exceedingly, but although under ordinary circumstances the chrysanthemum is a somewhat aggressive and haughty-looking flower, the great masses of color that they show make but little effect in so vast a space. Still the Flower Show has been a success, if only as an excuse for throngs of people to wander through the corridors and rooms of the new hotel, and will doubtless net a handsome sum for that valuable charity, the Loomis Sanitarium for Consumptives, in whose behalf it was organized and arranged.

The drawing rooms of Mrs. John Lowery's well-known house in Thirty-fifth street were decorated with great taste on Thursday for her marriage with Mr. James Speyer. Ferns and smilax veiled windows and were festooned over doorways, while a wealth of roses and palms filled every available space. As invitations to the wedding had been only oral, there was but a small assemblage, embracing principally cousins and aunts. Nearly all the handsome daughters of the late William R. Travers were present, including Mrs. Duer, Mrs. Wadsworth, and Mrs. Heckscher, as were also Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Loomis, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Prince, and Mr. and Mrs. William R. Travers. The bride was handsomely and suitably attired in silk of a delicate shade, with masses of lace, and several costly diamond ornaments. Mr. and Mrs. Speyer have issued cards since their marriage, and will be at home after their return from their Western trip at their new house, 257 Madison avenue.

Many other weddings have taken place during the week, but none of special interest except that of Miss Alice Townsend Martin to Benjamin P. McAlpin at St. Peter's Church, Albany. The bride, who was one of the prettiest of the bridesmaids at her cousin's (Lady Craven) marriage in Grace Church a few years since, looked extremely well and had a charming troop of bridesmaids, all Albany girls. All the smart set of the State capital were there, and there were handsome presents from Mr. and Mrs. Bradley Martin and the Countess of Craven.

The engagement has been announced of Miss Elizabeth Duer, daughter of Mr. Edward Duer, to Carroll Hervey of Baltimore. Miss Duer is a great-granddaughter of President Martin Van Buren, her mother having been Miss Anna Van Buren, a daughter of the President's son. Tall and good-looking, John Van Buren was one of the best-known wits and raconteurs of his day, and was extremely attractive to women. Soon after Queen Victoria's accession and before her marriage, he dined at her right hand at Windsor Castle, and it was said at the time so delighted her with his wit and repartee that it was not deemed advisable by her political advisers that she should see too much of him. Mr. Van Buren, however, was ever afterward known by the sobriquet of "Prince John" among his friends in this country.

The marriage of Miss Eileen O'Donnell to the Count de Seyre is announced to take place at St. Matthew's Church, Washington, on the 24th of the present month. A small gathering of intimate friends and a wedding breakfast at the home of the bride's aunt, Mrs. Acosta, will follow the church ceremony. Mr. and