The Sun.

TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1899.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

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.

Our Troops in the Philippines.

Our troops in the Philippines are driving the rebels before them and are evidently fast approaching the time when they will deliver the final and crushing blow. It will come in a few days at most. Though, thereafter, remnants of military opposition may remain, the main organized Aguinaldo enterprise will be defeated and its menace removed.

The conduct and management of our troops must stir the pride of every American. No better fighting than theirs has been done in modern times. They have pursued relentlessly an enemy who is bitterly contesting every inch of ground as he falls back before our onset, and are pushing forward with resistless enthusiasm to make an end of him in battle and restore order to a territory of the United States.

Gen. Otis's Campaign.

The movement of Gen. OTIS against AGUINALDO's forces has thus far progressed successfully, although the tactical operation included in its first stage could not be carried out in the way originally planned. This operation contemplated a demonstration against the enemy's centre by Gen. WHEATON's brigade, while Gen. MACARTHUR, with two other brigades, should move out on the right, with intent to turn the enemy's left and if possible to get upon his line of retreat.

In the execution of this plan WHEATON found little difficulty in driving the enemy back, advancing nearly due north from Manila along the railroad, and consequently not far from the shore. Proceeding through Caloocan and crossing the river beyond, he carried the Filipino intrenchments at Malinta. That rendered untenable Malabon, situated a few miles west, on the shore, especially as our gunboats had the place completely under their guns; and accordingly the Filipinos moved to Polo, the next important place northward.

Meanwhile MACARTHUR, with H. G. OTIS's and HALE's brigades, was occupied busily at the right with the flanking movement, intending to reach Novaliches, which is well to the east and a little north of Polo, and perhaps even to go as far north as San José, there turning west on the road that leads to Marilao, several miles north or in the rear of Polo. Had the insurgents held their ground at the latter point, MACARTHUR could then have come in on their rear, preventing their retreat along the road from Polo to Malolos, and perhaps capturing a good part of those at Polo. But the roughness of the country, it appears, broke up this plan, and MACARTHUR had to turn west along the Novaliches road, coming in a little south of Polo.

Up to that time, probably, it was not intended that WHEATON should press too rapidly against the force in his front. But when MACARTHUR had to make his junction so far south it only remained to drive the enemy back directly on the railroad and shore line. This was done most gallantly, but not without considerable loss. The Filipinos were sent through Polo and Malanday to Meicauayan, and thence to Marilao, on the direct road to Malolos, and in due time the railroad from Manila was repaired so that supplies could be sent forward.

The first thought to suggest itself is whether the insurgents left south of Manila may not take the opportunity to attack the town, or at least our line of supply. They have, in fact, made demonstrations, but any danger there is guarded against by a strong force under a skilful and experienced soldier, Gen. LAWTON.

The sum of the operations thus far is therefore that AGUINALDO, who so long occupied a bold position only a few miles from Manila, has been driven back within a few miles of his capital at Malolos. From Marilao, which MACARTHUR took with HALE's brigade, a road runs through Bonglo and other points to Malolos, with another from Bulacan, which latter point MACARTHUR has also reached. Malolos is not as near the shore as Malabon and other points which AGUINALDO has hitherto boldly attempted to hold, at the cost of having his men slaughtered by the fire of our ships. But our forces will ask nothing better than to have him risk his fate at Malolos, and only fear that he may abandon his capital and plunge into the interior, relying henceforth on guerrilla warfare.

The White Rose in Boston.

Some light is thrown upon the strange infatuation of certain Bostonians for the pretender AGUINALDO by the proceedings of a meeting of the North American Cycle of the Order of the White Rose in that town last week.

The North American Cyclers are a queer lot, even for Boston. They propose to have a dinner May 29, to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration of CHARLES II. to the English throne. A letter from a French partisan of "CHARLES VII." (Don CARLOS) was read at the meeting and a portrait of his eldest son, Don JAIME, was exhibited to the reverent North American Cyclers. Mr. RALPH ADAMS CRAM was elected Prior. He "suggested that it would be expedient to publish at least quarterly a magazine containing Legitimist news and comments upon current events, traditions, genealogical and historical notes upon legitimate Governments and their adherents." The retiring Prior was thanked "for his eminent services and loyal devotion to the cause of legitimacy."

The Anti-Imperialist League should be consolidated with the Order of the White Rose. Both societies are struggling for essentially the same noble causes, and we dare say the prospects of the various pretenders whom they worship are on an equal scale of hopelessness. It must be admitted, however, that AGUINALDO is a little tougher than most of the pretenders. The worthier are his American supporters to wear the White Rose. The greater the wrong-headedness of the adorer of pretenders the greater his fitness to adore.

To the Boston Anti-Imperialists the United States is a usurper in the Philippines and the saintly AGUINALDO is a legitimate ruler cruelly wronged. After the fighting is over, they can don the White Rose. At present it might not be safe, such is popular prejudice.

The Mission of the Machias.

The despatch of the gunboat Machias to Livingston, in Guatemala, is due to a report of the arrest and threatened execution of several Americans who were charged with being concerned in revolutionary movements in that republic or in Honduras. The affair is still involved in some doubt, but the Department of State has sent to our representatives both in Guatemala and at Tegucigalpa for particulars, while Commander LOGAN will also be able to learn something about it.

In addition, the Machias, it is understood, will endeavor to secure the payment of an indemnity for the murder of PEARS, near Puerto Cortes, and the punishment of the murderer. A recent visit of some of Admiral SAMPSON's ships to Puerto Cortes may have had a good effect on this part of the gunboat's errand.

There is some ground for believing that countrymen of ours have recently taken part in the political disturbances of Central America. Some of them are said to have been concerned in the revolt of REYES at Bluefields against the Government of Nicaragua; but in the prevailing excitement there may be groundless suspicions of filibustering, and our Government does not propose to have any hasty court-martial sentences to be shot carried into effect against its citizens.

Is the Court of Cassation Biased Against Dreyfus?

The latest incident in the Dreyfus affair seems to justify the forebodings of those who have predicted that the transfer of the investigation from the criminal section of the Court of Cassation to the full bench would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Anti-Revisionists have been accused of knowing that a majority of the forty-nine Judges composing the supreme tribunal are predisposed against a final acquittal of DREYFUS and prefer to relieve themselves of responsibility by merely quashing the original sentence on the score of irregularity, and ordering a new trial by court-martial. The refusal of the application made by Mme. DREYFUS for the exclusion of certain Judges appears to offer some foundation for the charge.

What occurred was this. After the transfer of the investigation from the criminal section to the whole court had been ordered, Mme. DREYFUS submitted an affidavit in which she set forth that certain members of the civil section, namely, Judges PETIT, CREPON and LEPELLETIER, should be excluded from the revision inquiry, on the ground that, in the early stages of the proceedings, they had decided unfavorably on certain questions related to the Dreyfus case. The application was supported by the Procureur-Général, M. MANAU, and there seems to have been nearly an even division of opinion in the civil section, to which the application was presented, for it was only after deliberating for some hours that the Court decided to reject the petition and to affirm the competence of the Judges to whom exception had been taken. The decision is said to have been defended by M. BALLOT DE BEAUPRÉ, who has succeeded M. DE BEAUREPAIRE as President of the civil section, on the ground that, while Judges could not sit on appeal in matters involving questions previously decided by them, they are not subject to this disability when a case is referred, as it is under the new law, not to a particular section, but to the whole Court of Cassation. The distinction seems by no means sound. It is plain enough that three Judges, or even one Judge, can turn the scale in favor of a decision previously rendered in a section comprising sixteen members, but a single biased Judge might also suffice to turn the scale in the whole Court of Cassation, comprehending forty-nine members. So far as the moral effect of a decision by the whole court on the community is concerned, it is as important to avert the suspicion of bias against the accused as it is to avoid the suspicion of bias in his favor.

The sole pretext for the new law transferring the Dreyfus inquiry from the criminal section to the whole Court of Cassation was the expediency of heightening the moral effect of the decision on the community. It must be remembered that the imputations on the criminal section put forth by M. DE BEAUREPAIRE were investigated, first by a judicial commission, and, secondly, by a committee of the Chamber of Deputies. The parliamentary committee unanimously absolved the criminal section from any suspicion of unfairness, and, by a majority of nine to two, reported against the Government bill, while the two dissentients commended it merely on grounds of policy. The judicial commission, consisting of M. MAZEAU, the first President, and two Judges, had declared previously that it found no reason for doubting the good faith and honor of the Judges composing the criminal section, but it added that, in "the present state of public feeling," it might be more judicious *(plus sage)* if the adjudication of the case were transferred to the full court of the three sections, which would be presided over by M. MAZEAU. The friends of DREYFUS are likely to contend that it would be equally judicious to exclude Judges from acting in a case as to which they have already expressed opinions in preliminary proceedings. There is an apparent inconsistency in caring so much about public feeling in the one instance and so little about it in the other. It is to be feared, however, that, when M. MAZEAU referred to "the present state of public feeling," what he had in mind was not the demand of the revisionist minority for justice, but the angry and violent attitude of the Anti-Revisionists, who command a majority in the Chambers, and are backed by the army.

When M. DUPUY introduced his bill for transferring the Dreyfus inquiry to the whole Court of Cassation the inference was drawn that he had reason to believe that a majority of the forty-nine Judges composing that tribunal would refuse to pronounce DREYFUS innocent, and would simply order a new trial by court-martial. That his confidence was warranted is indicated by the refusal to grant Mme. DREYFUS's application. It is probable, however, that the anti-Dreyfusite majority in the court is not large; otherwise, it would have wished to avert suspicion by excluding the three Judges of whom Mme. DREYFUS complained. The virtual acknowledgment that the votes of those three Judges may be needed suggests the existence of a large and sturdy minority that will oppose the evasion of responsibility, and will advocate a judgment of "not guilty," if the facts shall call for it.

It is becoming more and more evident that the bill transferring the Dreyfus investigation from one section of the Court of Cassation to the whole tribunal was a measure of bad faith. Premier DUPUY, who introduced the bill, professed to desire a more perfect and more impartial revision; but there is reason to fear that he aimed at a revision in the interests of the enemies of DREYFUS. It is certain that he, himself, was Premier in 1894, at the time of the Dreyfus court-martial, and that he has since repeatedly defended the sentence then pronounced. It is also certain that, in the Chamber of Deputies, all the monarchists, Boulangists, anti-Semites and so-called "Rallied" Republicans, who are accused of being monarchists in disguise, voted for the bill transferring the inquiry, whereas a majority of the sincere Republicans, who care more for free institutions than they do for the army, voted against it. It follows that the Anti-Revisionists must have expected to gain something from the measure. They may have learned from M. DE BEAUREPAIRE that in the two non-criminal sections there are many Judges recruited from the ranks of politicians for political services, whereas this is not the case in the criminal section. They seem to have counted on securing friends enough in the whole court to prevent it from pronouncing DREYFUS innocent, and also to restrain it from tying down too tightly by the conditions of reference the new court-martial by which DREYFUS may be tried.

Rapid Transit.

We understand that New York is to have an underground railway and that it is to be built by private capital. THE SUN has always opposed the building of such a road except by private capital and we incline to the belief that to our efforts may be ascribed the failure of the various conspiracies to saddle an underground system upon the city treasury.

Heretofore the condition of the money market and the prevailing rates of interest have precluded the possibility of private capital being enlisted for an underground road. It was not an attractive proposition, and its repeated condemnation by THE SUN on the ground of its impracticability was fully confirmed on every occasion when it was tested. Now, however, conditions have changed. The outlook for interest upon capital makes many things possible which only a few years since were out of the question, and one of them may be an underground railway for Greater New York. Given reasonable encouragement and there is no great public project to which the courage of capital is not adequate.

Amsterdam Avenue.

"A Lifelong Reader" interested in the Amsterdam avenue question introduces figures and measurements, and very interesting they will prove to those who have not studied them. Here is his letter:

"To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In THE SUN in relation to the 'Amsterdam Avenue Four Track Fight' you have quoted as a comparison the four tracks on the Bowery, thereby attempting to minimize the danger that is threatening the people on the west side, and particularly their innocent children, by the proposed four tracks.

"Are you aware that the four tracks on the Bowery run only for nine blocks, whereas those on Amsterdam avenue run for two and one-half miles? Furthermore, have you measured the space that exists between the tracks on the Bowery, and particularly the space between the tracks for the first half section of the four tracks on that broad avenue? Have you measured the space allowed between the tracks on Amsterdam avenue?

"If four persons were caught between two running cars on the Bowery they could stand up in a cross line without the slightest danger to themselves; whereas, if one person is caught between two running cars on Amsterdam avenue he or she would be simply crushed to death, because there is not room enough for one person to stand up between a north-bound and a south-bound car.

"In consideration of these facts, do you consider your comparison a fair or an honest one?

"NEW YORK, March 27. A LIFELONG READER."

The comparison between the Amsterdam tracks and the Bowery tracks was not used to determine the merits of the question as we have presented it, but let us consider the situation further:

Amsterdam avenue is, from curb to curb, 60 feet wide. Supposing the two car lines to be running there as they have been laid out, on their four tracks, there would be 11 feet and 11¼ inches between the curb to the outside of the outermost car, that of the Third Avenue. Between the Third Avenue car, which we believe will be 8 feet wide, and the Metropolitan car, to be 7 feet 6 inches wide, there would come 1 foot 9½ inches. Between the Metropolitan cars will come 1 foot 6½ inches. The second half of the scheme is the same as the first, the arrangement of tracks being entirely symmetrical and 11 feet 11¼ inches intervening between the other Third Avenue track and the other curb.

Instead of a person caught between the cars on Amsterdam avenue being crushed to death, he would find between the Third Avenue car and the Metropolitan car only three inches less than the space occupied habitually and unconcernedly by the stalwart policemen on duty at the crossings of the Broadway railroad, and three inches more than will be found there when the larger 7 foot 6 inch cars go upon that line.

On the Bowery the space between tracks, or 5 feet 2 inches, is but 4 inches more than the space between the rival lines on Amsterdam avenue, and we can show our friend how the Bowery plan could be bettered in Amsterdam avenue while still leaving the four tracks.

As we have said, the space between the curb and car is now 11 feet 11¼ inches. Instead of putting the Third Avenue cars further away from the curb, if they should be put nearer, and the distance from car to curb be reduced to 9 feet, leaving ample room for vehicles to pass pedestrians who are waiting for cars, and more room than is found in the case of many lines, 6 feet could be added to the total spacing between the tracks.

If the tracks should all be relocated so as to be equidistant, 2 feet would be added to the present space now between each track, or more than the Bowery spaces. And if the Metropolitan road should be left as it is, and only the Third Avenue altered, 3 feet could be added, leaving nearly 5 feet in the clear between Third Avenue and Metropolitan cars, or generous room for stopping places, or "refuges," with curbs and posts, such as are used in crowded thoroughfares the world over.

At the entrance to the Brooklyn Bridge, where morning and evening the stream of humanity crossing the seven tracks found there is enough to populate no mean city, the situation has been met by a bridge over the street. That system, of course, could be used at the chief crossings on Amsterdam avenue; or there could be tunnels; or, by changing the rails as indicated above, assurance against danger and worry could be obtained through "refuges"; or the four tracks could be made into three, two of them used for the downtown traffic in the morning and two of them used for the uptown traffic in the afternoon, one track serving for the reverse journey at these respective hours; or the four tracks could be interlocked, or made into two, as the honest Ford bill proposed. Of these plans, we frankly express our opinion that the refuge plan would best meet the wishes of the Amsterdam people, without hampering the enormous need of transportation and thereby materially injuring the city as a whole.

But anything is better for the city, and worthier of the Albany Legislature, than the confiscation of one of the lines of travel, that of the Third Avenue, intended by the so-called Ford amendment. That would be an outrage which no self-respecting community could countenance or decent Legislature or party perpetrate.

Sufferings of the Colonel.

Col. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN is swelling visibly with a speech celebrating the Chicago platform and threatening with high, astounding terms the Crokerians and the plutocrats. For the purpose of emitting that speech he has accepted an invitation to the Dollar Dinner which is to be held at the Grand Central Palace April 19. The Dollar Dinner is not to be, as was hoped, a Silver Dollar dinner, but a "workingmen's Jeffersonian dinner, absolutely non-partisan." Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Single Taxers, Labor Reformers, believers in gold, in silver, in paper, miscellaneous thinkers and spouters of all sorts are to be there.

Will the Colonel be present or will he avoidably miss a train? The Hon. GEORGE WARNER, Chairman of the Press Committee of the Dollar Dinner, says, perhaps too confidently, that the Colonel "is no fool. He don't dare to offend the men who will attend that dinner by declining to come. He will be there all right."

The Colonel will be there perhaps, upon compulsion, but he will not be all right. How can he be all right while he is still convulsed by suppressed oratory? How can he be all right while the Crokerians have not been solemnly rebuked, while the Chicago platform has not been vindicated and honored by means of a dinner and his great speech, still lingering undelivered in his tortured midst? He may come and make a speech, but not that speech of fire which would have singed, and, perhaps, sapped the citadel of gold. What good is it going to do him to sit at meat with workingmen and talkingmen if they don't talk and work for silver?

The Colonel's friends should rescue him from his disappointment and his pains. The Dollar Dinner has been captured by rivals in the Colonel's own line of business. Save his feelings and release his speech by giving a Sixteen Cent Dinner with one course, a speech being admitted for dessert.

It is creditable to the newspapers of New York city that since the Amsterdam Avenue bill had grafted upon it the confiscation amendment, not a word, we believe, has been uttered in the bill's defence.

For a few blissful moments Gen. SAMBO BOWLES forgets despotism and the lust of power and the wrongs of gentle AGUINALDO and becomes once more the simple pastoral poet of Agawam. Here are a few lines from one of his editorial warblings in the *Springfield Republican*:

"Come then, O sparrow! and hymn to us,—talk of the new greening meadows; prophesy what is now dim to us; scatter the snowdrifts to shadows! What are the crows in the field, or crying their caws o'er the forest,—what does the chickadee yield but his courage when need is the sorest,—what do such robins as live in the hemlocks despite of wild weather,—what can all of these give to compare with the sparrow's specked feather?"

Would that this musical mood might continue, although purists might object to the rhyming of "meadows" and "shadows" without the consent of the rhymed! Citizen BOWLES with the sparrow's specked feather is much more soothing than Gen. BOWLES with his dagger of lath.

It is an interesting fact that to-day bids are to be opened at the Navy Department for the supply to the navy of 60,000 pounds of canned corned beef and 50,000 pounds of canned roast beef. Is it not about time to start a cry of "Longism"?

It takes a prodigious quantity of feeding to keep the Silverites going. In Topeka 1,500 of them are to have a Jeffersonian feed, with WILLIAM JOEL STONE, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, JIM JONES and CHAMP CLARK on the bill of fare. We are informed that this banquet and all the other Jeffersonian feeds to which subscriptions are invited are planned by COIN HARVEY for the purpose of introducing the Jeffersonian five-cent cigar. Between the Octopus and that Sixteen-to-One slow burner, the faithful are likely to have a hard spring.

Mr. MORTON is a type of politician whose political ethics begin and end with a desire to rule or ruin.—*Kansas City Times.*

Unjust to the complete letter writer. The Hon. JULIUS STERLING MORTON cares not who rules or ruins the country so long as he is permitted to write letters to it.

The prophetess has spoken, and the Hon. ARTHUR PUE GORMAN must be proud and happy. The Hon. MARY ELIZABETH LEASE announces that "the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party for 1900 will be Senator GORMAN." She also says, with a grand simplicity, that she "adores Gen. MILES." So does Gen. MILES. This harmony of great souls is sublime, but almost too affecting.

The Timely Voice of Patriotism.

From the New Haven Evening Register.

The time for Democrats to line up is when peace has been won and order restored. There will then be real issues to discuss regarding the future government of those islands. At present there is nothing to discuss but law and order.

No one has proposed a substitute policy for that of the Government except a handful of anti-imperialists, who have nothing better to offer than "retreat." We do not care to climb into that particular "circus band wagon"—not much.

Cleverness in the Olden Time.

From Profitable Advertising.

There appeared in the *Pennsylvania Packet*, Philadelphia, in 1780 a unique contribution to the advertising literature of the day.

FIVE DOLLARS REWARD.

August morning, the first day,
My Apprentice Lad did run away.
His name is John Shade, I declare,
He's very apt to curse and swear.
His age, I think, does now appear
To be at least full twenty year.
His hair and complexion are both dark,
And his surly look is one good mark.
His nose is large, as they will see
Whoever brings him home to me.
His size about 5 feet 4 inches.
Had on brown coat and olive breeches,
Old hat, blue stockings, shoes one pair,
And a coarse shirt something worse for wear;
Besides took with him sundry clothes,
Light coat and breeches, pair of cotton hose,
A hat that's very large and almost new,
A linen jacket and black breeches, too.
In Arch street at the Taylor's sign,
Pray, ask for me; you may me find.
I did not tell my name at the beginning.
My trade a Taylor and my name John Reedle.
The poets, great for wit and art,
Perhaps may call me funny,
But I could bear that and some more
Could I but get my Johnny.
Whoever takes him up don't fail
To lay him fast in any gaol;
They shall be as a friend regarded
And as above shall be rewarded.

N. B.—All Masters of vessels are forbidden to carry him off at their peril.

OUR ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Composed of the Finest Material in America—Well Supplied and Healthy.

Major-Gen. Wesley Merritt in Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly.

Our army in the Philippines is composed of the finest material to be found anywhere in America. With the exception of the Tenth Pennsylvania, they are mostly Northwestern men—Californians, Oregonians, Minnesotians; there is also a Tennessee regiment and one from Kansas. This is superb material. The men are anxious to learn, very efficient in all the duties that they know of, and among the officers are some very excellent soldiers. During the time we were refitting at San Francisco I sent my staff officers out to live with the different brigades in camp, and instruct the men and the officers in their duties, and we found them always tractable, eager to learn and superior material in every way.

In fact, there was no very great difference at that time between the volunteers and the regulars. Our regulars were largely composed of new troops—that is, the recent additions to their ranks—but they had officers who were instructed and to an extent experienced. In a number of instances similar conditions prevailed in the volunteer regiments. The First Colorado Regiment was commanded by Col. Hale, a West Point graduate and a very able military man. The Thirteenth Minnesota, which regiment I applied for, was a regiment of the National Guard of Minnesota, and commanded by Col. Reeve, who was a National Guardsman of marked and superior abilities. Hale and Reeve have both since been made Brigadier-Generals on my recommendation, and now command brigades at Manila.

The question as to what effect the South Sea tropical climate will have upon American soldiers fresh from our temperate or wintry zones is important, but not necessarily alarming. My own observation in the Philippines was that so long as our men took care of themselves and followed the instructions given them in regard to clothing, food and exposure to the noonday sun or the night air, they were remarkably healthy. We had very little sickness. There are no epidemic fevers—such as yellow fever—in Manila, and the climate is cooler than that on Hong Kong or the adjacent portions of China. Personally, I had not a day's sickness, and everybody I knew who took care of himself got along very well. Such is conspicuously the case with Admiral Dewey and those on his fleet; sickness there are almost as scarce as killed or wounded. Of course, in the navy they have the advantage of living indoors and carrying their houses with them. The army is necessarily more exposed. For two weeks Gen. Greene and his brigade were in the trenches up to their middles in water the greater part of the time—that is, while on picket duty.

But to offset these hardships our troops in the Philippines were well supplied. I heard no complaint of the commissary supplies; and, moreover, by means of the bamboo which grows in great profusion in that country the men made themselves cots, raised above the ground—an important precaution not to insist upon by the doctors—and in that way escaped much discomfort and sickness. After the fall of Manila, when the reaction had set in, there was rather a lower average of health—perhaps the men became less careful of themselves. Yet while I was in Manila—up to September—there was very little sickness—not a greater percentage than would be found among the same number of men anywhere.

In brief, from what experience and knowledge I have, I am inclined to be as optimistic as ever regarding our flag in the Philippines. I think the present excitement and occupation of the troops is a very good thing, and keeps them from becoming homesick. After peace was established, and it appeared nothing more was to be done, a good many of the men wanted to come home. Of course, those who wanted to come home were louder in their clamors than those who were willing or desired to stay. I have noticed that a great many of the regulars in this country have asked to join the regiments ordered to Manila, as being a particularly desirable service. That in itself is a good sign. It is an indication that we may become very good colonists after a little experience; and we have the advantage of some very useful object lessons in what the English have accomplished and are now at. It is difficult to sympathize with those who foresee insuperable obstacles in the way of our establishing a military government on the lines already laid down.

England and the United States.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In your editorial in Sunday's paper, entitled "The Most Striking Manifestation of St. Patrick's Day," there is a brief reference to what I said in my lecture in St. Joseph's Church, Hoboken, that might readily enough be misunderstood by those who did not hear the lecture or read a full report of it.

I do not see how it can be regarded as a "striking manifestation" that men of Irish blood should hurrah vigorously for the Stars and Stripes and rejoice in the triumphs of America, whatever form these triumphs may take. But your article would seem to suggest that the sentiments uttered at the various celebrations to which you refer may be taken to indicate that Irishmen look more leniently now than formerly on the fake professions of friendship for this country by England. I don't know how far this inference may be justified in the matter of the speeches at the banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick here or in Brooklyn, although, in my judgment, the speech of ex-Congressman Fitch at the first-named was about as little in place as the sarcasm of Mr. Choate in presence of the same body a few years ago; but as for my own speech, no such inference is warranted.

I am enthusiastically in favor of retaining the Philippine Islands, but at the same time I have no faith whatever in England's profession of friendship for America. "I shall always distrust whatever is marvellous," says Voltaire. Now, this new-found love of England for us is the most marvellous thing in the history of nations. Since the founding of the republic English newspapers and English politicians have reviled our politics and our public men with unparalleled bitterness. Why, as recently as Dewey's victory Cunningham Grahame, a member of the House of Commons, asserted, and happened, that it was English gunners whom Dewey had bribed to desert by offers of $500 a month who did the work. And the English actually believed it until Capt. Crowninshield, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, showed that of the 1,455 men in Dewey's command on that fateful day thirteen only were aliens, and of these thirteen not one was a gunner.

But why, after all, should we blame them for reviling us, when the very first thing that Ambassador Choate does is to ridicule the attitude of his own Government on a question of such grave national concern as the Venezuelan boundary dispute, by describing it as "twisting the British lion's tail for the mere sport of hearing him roar." Mr. Bayard was censured by both branches of Congress for telling a cheering multitude in England that "Americans are a headstrong and violent people who need a strong man to govern them." Is Mr. Choate's studied slur on his country less grave than was Mr. Bayard's? What is the matter with American Ambassadors to England? An American is a *persona grata* in England if, like Bayard and Choate, he ridicules his own country; if he doesn't, he is a *persona non grata*.

As to the question of European intervention against us, which England claims to have foiled, and asks as a *quid pro quo* that we form an alliance with her, William R. Stead says:

I have the highest official authority, both British and French, for saying there never was any proposal from M. Hanotaux, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, for intervention.

Count Cassini, the Russian Ambassador at Washington, says:

At no time was there a purpose on the part of the great powers to intervene against the United States.

Secretary Hay was asked on his return from England:

You mean to state positively that there was no combined or individual attempt on the part of Germany, France or Russia to humiliate the United States by taking sides with Spain?

And he replied: "I certainly do. Nothing of the kind occurred."

For what, then, are we to thank England? Against whom are directed the frowning guns at Esquimault, Vancouver, Bermuda, Jamaica, Quebec? Against us, of course. Has England dismantled these fortifications? Not at all. She has given us taffy, and a section of our people—but only a section—are swallowing this taffy. My argument was that those who favor anti-expansion are putting us on a level with England by declaring that we are carrying fire and sword into the Philippines. When Admiral Cornish, following the declaration of war by England against Spain, captured Manila in 1762, Gen. Draper, at the head of 2,000 Sepoys, gave the city "over to pillage for three hours, outraged women and robbed and murdered the inhabitants in the very streets." Compare that with the heroic and humane behavior of our troops in putting out incendiary fires while the Filipinos are firing on flags of truce and mutilating shockingly the bodies of our soldiers, as in the case of Surgeon Harry Young of the 13th Artillery Division.

I stated in my lecture that Irish-American soldiers are fighting as much in behalf of liberty now in the far-off countries of Asia as when they fought in the swamps of the Chickahominy and at Antietam, Fredericksburg, Malvern Hill, and the Wilderness to put down the rebellion and to govern the slaveholders against the slaveholders' consent. Irish-Americans will now, as ever, assist and share in the triumphs of their adopted country in every field; but they must be American triumphs only, and not Anglo-American triumphs. They don't want any alliance with England, and consider it a duty to frustrate any effort looking to such an unholy combination.

NEW YORK, March 10. J. M. WALL.

THE CRISIS IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

The Ritualistic or Sacerdotal Movement Opposed to Its Essential Protestantism.

Prof. Goldwin Smith in the Self-Culture Magazine.

Ritualism properly so called has its source, not in the desire of a basis for the Church independent of the State, or in any special theory or creed, ecclesiastical or theological, so much as in an emotional craving for sensuous worship, Church ordinances and priestly ministrations. It is traceable in some measure to the decay of intellectual belief, which leaves a void in the religious nature to be filled by æsthetic emotion. Social fashion also plays its part, so far as the wealthy classes are concerned; ritualism is the thing furthest removed from the vulgarity of dissent. The present ascendancy of the party is largely to be ascribed to the progress of rationalism, which has deprived the more masculine minds of interest in the affairs of the Church, thereby leaving her to the more emotional and aesthetic.

Ritualism is distinctly ecclesiastical and sacerdotal, not Biblical. It even appears to welcome, to a surprising extent, what is rather absurdly called the Higher Criticism. The principles implicitly accepted in "Lux Mundi" would, if pushed to their consequences, cast doubt on the whole theory of inspiration and leave the Church very little of a Scriptural basis.

The Ritualist clergy have introduced the mass with all its paraphernalia, with the elevation and adoration of the Host and the reservation of the elements. They have introduced the whole system of which the mass is the cornerstone, including the obligatory confessional. They have sued to Rome for recognition, but received in reply the usual intimation, courteously and lovingly conveyed, that if they will admit themselves to be heretics and their orders to be a fiction they can be received into the true Church through the gate of penance.

The legal and historical case is as clear as possible against the Ritualists and in favor of Sir William Harcourt and the Protestants. The State Church of England is unquestionably Protestant. The sovereign is its head and the crown is expressly limited to Protestants by the act of succession and the coronation oath. It is forfeited by marriage with a Catholic. No one can read the Anglican liturgy and ordinal without seeing plainly that the intention was to exclude transubstantiation and the mass. When the question as to the validity of Anglican orders was submitted to the Pope he at once pointed out that the ordinal did not even pretend to confer the miraculous powers. History points the same way. The man whom the Ritualists are now canonizing declared on the scaffold that "he had always lived in the Protestant Church of England." Disabilities were imposed by law on Catholics for the purpose of guarding against them the Protestant State Church, and were strenuously upheld to the last by the Anglican Bishops and clergy. Nor is it possible to deny that the Protestant members of the Church, including the bulk of the laity, have a very palpable grievance in the perversion of its endowments and authority to the destruction of Protestantism, the repeal of the Reformation and the reannexation of England to the dominion of the Pope. At the same time the Ritualist may with reason protest against the submission of the religious consciences he makes to a secular assembly like Parliament, including men of all religions and of none. The obvious remedy is disestablishment. Of this the difficulties are very great, so closely is the national Church bound up with the general institutions and life of the nation. But the difficulties will have to be faced if peace and decency are to be restored.

Of the Bishops, almost all are unwilling to assert the law against ritualism. Most of them probably are ritualists themselves. It is only natural that they should favor a movement which exalts their own authority, while the pastoral activity of the Ritualists, which is undeniably great, affords a ground for protecting them independently of the theological question. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, was formerly, as one of the essayists and reviewers, in alliance with the rationalistic section, and his elevation to the episcopate was opposed upon that ground. His position appears now to be changed. He tenders, as a compromise, consubstantiation, which, it is suggested, was held by the Protestant Luther. But there is not the slightest warrant for consubstantiation in the Anglican Prayer Book, nor has the doctrine ever been embraced by the Anglican divines, and while Luther's consubstantiation was a way out of transubstantiation, Archbishop Temple's is a way into it.

In the cities the ritualist clergy have deservedly made way by ministerial energy and self-devotion. For the urban population also their æsthetic ritual has its charm. Among the rural population they do not appear to gain ground. "Hodge" is not æsthetic or historical. He prefers the meeting house to the church, and he dislikes, on social grounds, the interference of the parson with his affairs.

The rock on which ritualism was pretty sure to split was the confessional. In the exercise of this most perilous function the Roman Catholic priest is safeguarded by his celibacy. He is, moreover, limited and guided by the strictest and most authoritative regulations. To the Ritualist confessional these securities are wanting, and nothing can be more alien and repulsive to British sentiment than the interference of the spiritual director in the home.

The upshot is an explosion of the old Protestant, or, at least anti-sacerdotal, feeling, for which, in this age of religious indifference, we were hardly prepared. A crisis in the history of the Anglican establishment is apparently at hand.

Vassar College's Danger from Fire.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It's a good thing that our legislators have been stirred to action by the Windsor Hotel calamity; but let them not confine their good work to hotels. There are other institutions that demand instant attention.

Take Vassar College, with its more than 600 young women students. Right through the centre of the immense structure are the huge elevator shafts, offering the exact draught needed to turn the whole interior into a roaring furnace within five minutes after the breaking out of a fire. In the fifth story are rat-traps of rooms, without so much as a single rope. Looking out of one of the little windows to the stone flagging far below, there isn't a protuberance to which a cat could cling for two seconds.

Think of the awful consequences of a fire in Vassar College. Probably a hundred of the young women would be roasted to death around the elevators, while more than that number would meet a more merciful death in leaping out of the windows to the stones below. Then, when scores of homes throughout the Union were in mourning, perhaps a few fire escapes would be put on the outside walls, where now there isn't one.

I asked one of the students the other day what would be the consequences of a fire within the building. She shuddered and replied: "Windsor Hotel over again."

If any one thinks this picture overdrawn, let him inspect Vassar College for himself.

MARCH 27. VISITOR.

Squire Jones's Sabbath-Keeping Hen.

From the Marshall Gazette.

Prompted by maternal instinct, one of Squire W. T. Jones's hens made a nest and proceeded to deposit therein an egg daily until she had laid nineteen. This part of the proceedings was quite natural, but it was a little strange that on the three Sundays which intervened she did not visit her nest. She put in full time six days of the week, but rested on the seventh.

A Missent Invitation.

They sent him an invitation,
They asked him to come and dine
On hummingbirds' wings
And other rare things,
And to drink all the best brands of wine.

They sent him an invitation,
They asked him to come and eat
As much as he could
For his appetite's good,
Of fish and of fowl and of meat.

They sent him an invitation,
They asked him to come and feed
On dainties galore
From the sea and the shore,
From the soup to the cardamom seed.

They sent him an invitation,
They asked him to come and sit
With the rich and the great
From over the State,
And do what he could to be IT.

They sent him an invitation,
They asked him to come and be
A part of the throng
That was moving along
In union and harmony.

They sent him an invitation,
They asked him to come and say
Whatever he thought
Of what could be wrought
By doing the thing in this way.

And his answer came back promptly,
Just as promptly as could be:
"I'm a man of the party platform,
And you can't ten-dollar me."

W. J. L.

NOT ENTITLED TO PASSPORTS.

Naturalized Citizens Who Return to Their Native Country to Live.

WASHINGTON, March 27.—A circular to diplomatic and consular officers, elucidating the law governing the issue of passports to American citizens, was issued to-day by the State Department. The document discusses the matter of issuing passports to naturalized citizens who return to the country of their origin, the regulation of which has frequently perplexed the department and been the occasion of much diplomatic correspondence, especially with Austro-Hungary and Germany, the Governments of which insist upon returned natives performing the military duties, to escape which, in numerous instances, the individuals in question came to this country. The circular says:

"This Government does not discriminate between native-born and naturalized citizens in according them protection while they are abroad, equality of treatment being required by the laws of the United States. But in determining the question of conservation of American citizenship and the right to receive a passport, it is only reasonable to take into account the purpose for which the citizenship is obtained. A naturalized citizen who returns to the country of his origin and there resides, without any tangible manifestation of an intention to return to the United States, may therefore be generally assumed to have lost the right to receive the protection of the United States. His naturalization in the United States cannot be used as a cloak to protect him from obligations to the country of his origin while he performs none of the duties of citizenship to the country which naturalized him. The statements of loyalty to this Government which he may make are contradicted by the circumstances of his residence and are open to the suspicion of being influenced by the advantages he derives by avoiding the performance of the duties of citizenship to any country. It is not to be understood by this that naturalized American citizens returning to the country of their origin are to be refused the protection of a passport. On the contrary, full protection should be accorded to them until they manifest an effectual abandonment of their residence and domicile in the United States.

"A condition precedent to the granting of a passport is that the citizenship of the applicant and his domicile in the United States, and intention to return to it with the purpose of residing and performing the duties of citizenship, shall be satisfactorily established. One who has expatriated himself cannot, therefore, receive a passport. But, even where expatriation may not be established, a person who is permanently resident and domiciled outside of the United States cannot receive