

The Sun

SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1899.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, per Month, \$3.00. DAILY, per Year, \$30.00. SUNDAY AND SUNDAY, per Year, \$10.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month, \$1.00. Postage to foreign countries added. The Sun, New York City.

The Democratic Crusade of 1900.

What might be the whole Democratic Committee of the whole met at St. Louis last Thursday to consider the political situation of the country. What to do to turn out the Republicans and make the Democratic party dominant it was the purpose of the meeting to discuss.

So far as any one conclusion was defined, it seemed to be that the most promising way in which the Democrats can get themselves into power is to announce their resolve to exterminate the so-called trusts, or the great consolidations of capital that have been formed and are forming.

Consolidation is the most striking fact of modern commercial evolution. It is an invention that vies with the best of labor-saving machines in the economy of production, and it differs from the ordinary machine in being applicable to almost every sort of product. It has spread with such rapidity that to-day it covers a great if not the greater portion of the leading American industries; and if we are to keep on in our triumphant march to supremacy among manufacturing nations, consolidation, or the principle of the trust, can no more be abandoned than can steam.

Against this system the Democrats have proclaimed destruction. They promise therefore to make the campaign of 1900 as sensational in the savagery of their politics as that of 1896 was.

In 1896, with their platform for free silver, the Democracy struck first at the nation's financial credit, its good name, its honor. In 1900 the Democrats will strike at the country's business.

It won't work.

Does Canada Block the Way?

According to reports from London and Washington, the Ottawa Government, by insisting upon inadmissible conditions, has prevented the submission of the Alaska boundary dispute to arbitration. If these reports are well founded, it is possible that the expected reassembling of the Joint High Commission will not take place, and it is also possible that Lord SALISBURY may feel impelled to consider the question of how far the wishes of a British colony can be suffered to prejudice the general interests of the British Empire.

There is reason to believe that the Joint High Commission might have arrived at an agreement concerning the various subjects referred to it but for the difficulty of reconciling the conflicting views of the United States and Canada respecting the boundary of Alaska. Even with relation to this question, which affected the extent of the national domain, and, therefore, the national dignity and honor, our State Department evinced a conciliatory spirit, and, at the request of the British Foreign Office, refrained from sending troops to occupy the disputed territory. A further step in the direction of accommodation was made when Mr. CHASE, our Ambassador in London, effected an arrangement with Lord SALISBURY whereby the Alaska boundary was to be withdrawn from the list of matters dealt with by the High Commission and to be made the specific subject of arbitration.

There were two weighty reasons for such a concession on our part. In the first place, the American and British delegates to the Peace Conference at The Hague had been instructed to propose the formation of a permanent board for the adjudication of international disputes, and it was obvious that their arrangements would be seriously weakened if, simultaneously, their Governments should refuse to allow the Alaska boundary to be defined by arbitrators. In the second place, our Government was desirous of securing, in an amicable way, the abrogation or material modification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and to that end, was inclined to offer Great Britain a quid pro quo in the shape of permitting our Alaska boundary to be fixed by an impartial tribunal. It is understood that this arrangement, which, on the grounds just named, was acceptable to two of the parties interested, would have been carried out had not the third party, Canada, interposed and refused to suffer the Alaska boundary to be ascertained by arbitration, except upon prescribed conditions which would practically compel an umpire to pronounce in favor of her claim.

What is to be done? Shall our Government proceed to a military occupation of the disputed territory and shall our Treasury Department punish Canada for her interposition by the issuance of retaliatory regulations against the products of the Dominion? Such a course would, at the best, produce extremely strained relations and cause a great deal of friction, while, at the worst, it might provoke a collision of armed forces. The feeling of good will which now exists between the British and American Governments could hardly be expected to survive an outbreak of actual hostilities on the Alaska frontier, and thus all that has been accomplished during the last twelvemonth to create relations of amity between the two great sections of the English-speaking world would be, through Canada's perversity, undone in one unlucky hour.

There is, however, a mode of escape from the existing complication. The British Foreign Office cannot but recognize that we, on our part, have done all that can be reasonably asked of a self-respecting nation when we have consented to leave to arbitrators the definition of our national boundary. We have not sought to impose conditions upon the tribunal, but have left it at liberty to determine the law as well as the fact by formulating for itself the principles in pursuance of which its decision will be rendered. Acknowledging, as it must acknowledge, the equity of our position, the British Government might properly inform Canada that, as a colony, it cannot be permitted to subordinate to its local interests the collective welfare of the British Empire. Such a reminder was formerly administered, when the northeastern boundary of the United States was settled, the line ultimately agreed upon being as unan-

ceptable to the inhabitants of British North America as it was to the inhabitants of Maine. In the case not only of Maine but of Oregon, our Federal Government has settled boundary disputes without inordinate deference to the wishes of the denizens of the localities immediately affected, and it will be scarcely pretended that a British colony has more right to prejudice the interests of the British Empire than an American State has to prejudice those of the Union. A question of national frontier, which, under regrettable but possible circumstances, might involve two great powers in war, should be regarded as, at bottom, one of imperial concern.

It may be pronounced as an axiom that the good will of the United States is of incomparably more importance to the British Empire than is the good will of Canada. It is by no means true, however, that in the case before us, Great Britain would have to risk the loss of the one in order to keep the other. Only an infinitesimal fraction of the Canadian people are interested in the Alaska boundary, whereas almost all of them are vitally concerned in the improvement and extension of commercial relations with this country. If the British Government would announce its determination to treat the Alaska boundary as an imperial question, a name which it certainly deserves as much as did the boundary of British Guiana, the other matters which were discussed by the Joint High Commission, and which are of practical significance to the great mass of the Canadians, might be again taken up, with a fair prospect of reaching an adjustment satisfactory to both sides.

The Religious, Civil and Social View of Divorce.

We are asked the subtitled questions by an intelligent correspondent at Newark, and as they touch on a difference concerning divorce which divides the religious world we will answer them at length:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—In your editorial on 'Obstacles in the Way of Divorce' was recognized by Protestantism as a sufficient cause,' &c., and again, 'In the religious community a large part adheres conscientiously to the opinion and doctrine that the cause of civil dissolution is not a legitimate one.' Will you be kind enough to indicate the portion of scripture which is held to afford ground for divorce, and also to say whether re-marriage after such divorce is considered allowable by the same school of thought?"

The Church allows sixteen or eighteen causes for absolute divorce. Is that true? When, after the Reformation, the Protestants abandoned the Roman Catholic doctrine that marriage is a sacrament, they opened the way to the dissolution of marriage by divorce. The prime cause, of course, was made adultery, under their interpretation of the well-known words of CHRIST, but they added a second cause, or willful desertion, basing their authority for it on the teaching of ST. PAUL in the seventh chapter of the First Corinthians: "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases." It will be remembered that ST. PAUL, in this chapter, expresses a preference for celibacy and speaks of marriage rather in the way of a toleration of weakness than of commendation of the state. "I would," he says, "that all men were even as I myself, that is, unmarried. I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I."

A Protestant ordinance in 1581, in giving the two grounds for divorce, described the second as "malicious desertion, running away and abandonment, whereof ST. PAUL speaketh." Remarriage was permitted to the innocent party. Our colonial laws in this country allowed divorce for adultery, willful desertion for three years, fraudulent contract and providential absence for seven years without being heard from after due inquiry; and in all such cases the aggrieved party was permitted to marry again. This has been the prevailing American doctrine and practice as to divorce ever since, though in many of the States cruel treatment, intemperance and other causes have been added. The only notable exception has been in New York, which dissolves marriage for adultery only, while South Carolina has no divorce law at all.

The canon and practice of the Greek Church correspond to those general in the Protestant world. In Russia the grounds for divorce are adultery and desertion or abandonment, with one special cause added, viz.: in case of the exile to Siberia of one of the parties to the marriage; and remarriage is always allowed to the guiltless party. It may be said, therefore, that marriage is made indissoluble by the Roman Catholic Church only. A movement to change the canon of the Episcopal Church in this country so as to prohibit the marriage of either party to a divorce during the lifetime of the other party has been active for several years, among the High Church party more particularly, and it showed itself to be so powerful at the last General Convention that it was only defeated by a narrow majority, under the leadership of Bishop POTTER. Accordingly the canon of that Church still allows divorce for adultery and remarriage to the innocent party. A recent marriage of Episcopalians flagged by the defiance of this canon has given a fresh impetus to the movement, but as the next Triennial Convention of the Episcopal Church, by which alone any change could be made, does not occur until 1901, it is problematical what will be done.

Unquestionably the practice of the society in New York which is dominated by Episcopalians more especially, and extends its influence to the circles of fashion throughout the Union generally, justifies and demands the freest divorce rather than shows any disposition to submit to such a restriction as that advocated by the High Church party. Moreover, it does not seem probable that any party will ever be successful in effecting any considerable change in the canon until the Episcopal Church is ready to join the Roman Catholic in definitely holding marriage to be a sacrament and therefore absolutely indissoluble. By admitting that divorce for any cause is allowable, it makes marriage dissoluble, and consequently rejects its sacramental character.

There being no State Church in this country and marriage therefore being a civil contract, it seems hardly possible that various grounds for its dissolution will not be allowed by law in some of the States, at least, and these are likely to include all causes hitherto accepted as sufficient in Europe or this country. A national divorce law may be dismissed as impossible under our political system. New York taking the initiative, something like a score of States have appointed commissions on uniform divorce legislation by the States, but nothing final has been accomplished, nor does such uniformity seem practicable unless New York relaxes its law confining divorce to adultery only

by adding at least willful desertion, and thus brings itself nearer to harmony with the legislation of all the rest of the Union except South Carolina. Nor does the actual practice of many church members give any encouragement that stricter ecclesiastical law merely could prevent divorce. Without regard to even the present canon and the canon of the Episcopal Church, these people persist in getting divorced and remarried for any cause which is legal anywhere, and they do not suffer from social disapprobation. If the Church law stands in the way they pay no heed to it.

As we have said before, it is a difficult question. The agitation over it in religious bodies is likely to grow more and more earnest, but it is demonstrated that the sentiment of fashionable society, at least, tolerates the freest divorce.

Our Flag in the Sulus.

The peaceful occupation of Jolo, in the Sulul Archipelago, by the Twenty-third Infantry, who relieved the Spanish garrison there, reduces one more group of the Philippines to our immediate and actual possession. The ease and quiet with which this change was effected are suggestive. Last summer there were rumors that Germany from taxes on the Sulul Islands, and would insist on their being distinct from the Philippines and on Spain's right to cede them to her; but it is a long time since such reports died away.

The Sulus were, indeed, once distinct from the Philippines in the restricted sense that for nearly three centuries after Spain had reduced Luzon the Sultan of the Sulus still maintained his independence. Their capital, Jolo, on the island of the same name, which is the Spanish form of Sulul, Sooloo, Soloul, Suluk, Yolo and perhaps other spellings more or less known, was conquered in 1851, but only in 1877 did the Sultan acknowledge Spain's sovereignty throughout his domains. Three years later a garrison was established there, followed afterward by outposts in smaller islands, and in 1887 AROLAS gained successes against rebellious islanders.

With this conquest effected, there could be no question that the Sulus were politically merged in the Philippines. For, although Spain got little if any tribute from the islands, and formally relieved the people from taxes for successive periods, the Sulus were governed from Manila and formed part of her Philippine system. Geographically, they are clearly a part of it, a glance at the map showing that only a narrow strait separates them from Mindanao. The group stretches about 200 miles between the latter island and Borneo, and comprises about seven score islands, mostly small, which may be subdivided into three groups, appertaining respectively to the three chief islands, Basilan in the north-east, Sulul in the centre and Tawi-Tawi in the southwest. Without hesitation, our Commissioners at Paris claimed this group as part of the Philippines, and the claim was conceded.

It is a queer and picturesque addition that has thus been made to our domains. The people are Mussulmans, and used to be pirates by occupation. Their swarthy features, bright-colored and fantastic costumes, primitive farming implements, strange manners, customs and rites, and whatever else seems odd to us, will be eagerly described and depicted, now that the Twenty-third Infantry is on the spot, and that the islands are practically open to us. Jolo, also called Soong, is not only the capital but the trade centre, although apart from pearls, shells and shark fins there may be little yet to trade in. But in the forests are valuable teak and sandalwood; the plentiful fruits include coconuts, bananas, mangoes and oranges; there are wild boars and deer, and there are oxen, swine, goats and poultry. Our troops will find at Jolo good defences to man and a good water supply, while the anchorage is such as to make the access of the fleet easy.

Mindanao is now the principal part of the Philippines remaining for us to occupy; and this is so near the Sulus that we shall not be surprised to find the Twenty-third Infantry, after getting well settled at Jolo, going over to take possession of Zamboanga, where the Spanish garrison has been besieged by the insurgents, and now information given by the gunboat Castine is that the garrison has been withdrawn.

Monaco's Man of Science.

The attractions of Monaco are soon to be enhanced by a Museum of Oceanography, now building, to contain the collections made by the sailor Prince of this smallest of independent principalities. The realm over which Prince ALBERT presides is a little over three times the size of Manhattan Island. It has an army of five officers and seventy men, coinage and postage stamps of its own, and the finest gambling establishment in the world.

The ruling passion of the Prince has nothing in common with that which draws about 400,000 visitors to Monte Carlo every year. In fact, while the beautiful park and buildings of the Casino overflow with visitors, gamblers generally, from far and near, the Prince is likely to be off on the high sea, studying with the utmost ardor its many scientific problems. A pupil of Spanish sailors, he is entitled for life in the study of the sea. "For fifteen years," he said in 1898, "I have given to oceanography all the time and all the resources I have been able to spare from the duties of my life, and I shall continue to give them while strength remains."

This season the Prince will pursue his researches in the steamer of 1,400 tons that was built for him on the Mersey over a year ago. Until 1889 he made long cruises on the Hirondele, a schooner of 200 tons, on which he travelled to the American coasts and explored depths as great as 9,600 feet with no power to manipulate his sounding lines and dredges save the arms of his fourteen sailors. Then he built the steam vessel Princess Alice, 560 tons, and equipped her with the best appliances for oceanic discovery. She served his purpose for nine years, until he ventured on still larger fields of labor requiring a more powerful vessel, and so a second Princess Alice has taken a place among the fleet vessels devoted to oceanic discovery.

On one occasion some one captain thought it fitting to lodge a mild complaint against Prince ALBERT. He had forgotten that he was in the track of steamers between North Europe and the Mediterranean, and one night he set afloat a brilliantly lighted buoy, moored to an anchor trap on the bottom. It was far out in the Bay of Biscay, and passing vessels did not understand this light at the surface and thought a disaster might have occurred. In an hour three of them had gathered like moths around a candle and almost collided. The Prince was careful thereafter not to show mysterious lights on crowded ocean highways. He has a sense

of humor that sometimes illumines reports which ordinary readers might think were otherwise exceedingly dry. The Challenger Commission gave his name to a deep basin 18,000 feet below the surface, 500 miles south of the Azores, and one day he trapped some new and interesting animals on its floor. "I may say," he wrote a while ago in a scientific paper, "that my flag floated over this colony, acquired for my country, because I flew it for twenty-four hours on the buoy which was in direct communication with the ground. Seldom has colonial expansion been achieved under conditions less dangerous to the peace of the world; and no one has yet protested against my attempts on this territory, 18,000 feet below the surface of the sea."

Prince ALBERT's long studies and years of practical field work have made him one of the most accomplished oceanographers, and his efforts embrace nearly all phases of oceanic research. In 1885-87 he gave special attention to the laws governing the surface currents of the North Atlantic partly by means of a series of floats so constructed as to follow the movement of the surface water without being directly influenced by the wind. They were launched throughout the ocean from near the Azores to the banks of Newfoundland, and up to 1892, 226 of his 1,675 floats had been returned to him. His map of the currents, made seven years ago, and based upon this work, is regarded as a valuable contribution to the science of oceanography. He invented a large part of the machinery and appliances he uses for taking soundings, trapping sea-life and so on. He has recorded temperatures at different depths in widely separated regions, ranging near the Azores and at some points in the very deep water off Portugal from 50° F. at 547 fathoms to 38.5° F. at 3,007 fathoms. He has made photographic and other experiments to determine the depth to which light penetrates into the sea, a subject that is little understood, and with his trawls and traps he has brought to light a considerable number of creatures that were new to science and has demonstrated the abundance of life on some parts of the sea floor.

It is to house permanently his large collections that he is now building the museum at his capital, which will also contain laboratories for the use of men of science, and in addition, will represent, as far as our present knowledge permits, the relations between meteorology and navigation. Prince ALBERT is now 51 years old. We hope to see the success of the new Princess Alice. But her services in enlarging the world's useful knowledge must not be perverted into excuses for enlarging her owner's revenues by visits to Monte Carlo.

Mr. Bryan Right for Once.

In his speech at St. Louis to the Democrats who ate a two-dollar dinner as a testimonial against Trusts, Mr. BRYAN unconsciously spoke one bit of common sense:

"The Republican party is impotent to destroy Trusts."

So is any other party. At this moment the loudest howl against Trusts comes from Democratic States, where Democratic Legislatures have had plenty of time and inclination to destroy Trusts. They have passed laws against them and kept passing laws against them, but the Trusts continue to flourish in spite of all this fury of legislation. Texas, for instance, had a terrible Anti-Trust law, which wouldn't hold water; and now it has passed a still more terrible one, which will not hold water either. There has been, we believe, exactly one case in Missouri of a customer of a Trust taking advantage of the provision in the State law that a debt owing to a Trust shall be non-collectible. Not even by invitations to dishonesty do the Legislatures make any headway against the Trusts. Laws are piled on laws, and every Trust act is more sweeping than its predecessor and will be just as futile.

The Republican party, and the Democratic party, and every other party, is impotent against the Trusts because the Trusts arise from a business necessity. The Legislatures might as well make statutes against multiplication or the rule of three.

War Within Tammany.

Contests at this year's primary elections in Tammany Hall are already indicated, more especially in Assembly districts 9, 20, 23 and 27. They are to be for the purpose of additional enrollment with a view to wresting the control of the local organization in the districts from the present leaders.

Such contests could not have occurred before the enactment of the present primary law of March, 1898. Previously dissatisfied Democrats could only resist Tammany in their respective districts by joining or setting up "outside organizations," which rarely could do more than make a hopeless warfare against the dominant Democratic organization. The advent of membership of Tammany was made up by itself, and it prescribed the forms of primary election.

No others were recognized. The only practicable way in which to get rid of an objectionable district leader was by direct appeal to the despotic central organization, which usually disregarded it. Thus the Tammany district leader if sustained at headquarters was unmovable. Those who did not like his leadership must either put up with it or get out of fellowship with Tammany.

Since 1888 all this has been changed. A New York primary election is no longer "private business." It is a State matter, under the control of officers of the State, under rules and subject to penalties fixed by the Legislature. Naturally and necessarily the State recognizes Tammany as the only Democratic organization in this country and its primaries, the Democratic primaries for all those who have heretofore enrolled themselves or expect to enroll themselves next month as Democrats, are under State control and under laws safeguards. Therefore it is that there will be an unusual contest in Tammany primaries this year.

Circumstances seem to favor the opponents of the present Tammany leadership in the districts mentioned above. The limit of "patronage" has very nearly been reached, and the White Civil Service law is a barrier to any further enlargement of the number of available offices. The malcontents, the disgruntled, the unappeased, the disappointed are no longer compelled to make their fight against Tammany from "outside," but for all practical purposes are enrolled as members of Tammany and can participate in this year's primaries under terms established not by the Tammany leaders them-

selves, but by the State authority. Among them are many unattached Democrats who had before given up contents in the cut-and-dried primaries as utterly hopeless. Moreover, a national election is to occur next year, and there is some manoeuvring for positions with reference to the National Conventions. Some of the present Tammany leaders are much distrusted by regular or Chicago platform Democrats, and for that reason the opposition in their districts expects aid from Democrats outside of the State, and more especially at the West and South.

Whatever the results in isolated districts may be, it is not to be expected that the existing Tammany organization will be beaten generally, though the contest may be bitter enough to give it a scare. But at any rate there is to be a veritable struggle for control within Tammany, and that is novelty in the affairs of an organization in which novelties are rare.

Too Tough for the Wild Man from Borneo.

The Hon. CHARLES JOSEPH BONAPARTE of Baltimore, better known as the Wild Man from Borneo, has such a gift for political loneliness and truculence of language that he would seem to be a natural colleague of the Boston Anti-Imperialists. They thought so, and elected him a Vice-President of the Anti-Imperialist League. But there are some things in the lonely and truculent line that Mr. BONAPARTE cannot stand. He draws the line at the Atkinsonian proposals and returns his Vice-Presidency with thanks. He still has flashes of his genius for being wrong, as when he speaks of Mr. MCKINLEY as agreeing "to pay Spain \$20,000,000 as the price of the (Philippines) sovereignty," and he "still condemns" the President's course, but he condemns the resolutions of the Anti-Imperialist League, too. Condemnation is his specialty.

Mr. BONAPARTE "would not, as at the present advised, recommend negotiation with the revolted Filipinos, or any attempt to organize a quasi-independent government under our suzerainty or protection in the archipelago." He says that if the United States is to own the Philippines, or to become responsible for the maintenance of good order in them, their inhabitants must be made to submit to its authority, and that an administration, modelled upon that of British India, will be necessary. Consequently he is "personally unwilling to take any part in an agitation which may have some tendency to cause a public enemy to persist in armed resistance, or may be at least plausibly represented as having this tendency."

When the most irreconcilable of the free-oscillables refuses to join the procession of the Atkinsonians, the Hon. ALADDIN ATKINSON must feel that it is about time for him to get into his oven and shut the door after him.

The Battle with the Octopus.

Being a few heroic lines commemorating the recent Bryan Anti-Trust Fight at St. Louis. In the city of St. Louis.

The stars shone silver overhead,
The Coliseum lights gleamed red
As Bryan and his hosts were fed
Preparatory to killing dead
The octopus in the arena,
Which has its birthplace in the East,
And ramifies the country o'er,
In herds of one or two or more.

A thousand grunts had gathered there,
From roundabout and everywhere,
To see two dollars' worth of fare
For man and beast and cart and team
The octopus that they had caught
At last the feast was done, and then
A third fare gone and on those men
And in the midst of din and fuss
They trotted out the Octopus.

The startled beast looked round and shied
And backed and ran about and tried
To escape the big arena walls,
But all in vain; it could not move
Those cruel hearts to tender love.
They yelled and screamed and howled in glee
As they caught the beast in their net,
Thus Chairman HAWES, who used to be
The monster's ally, said that he
Would name Champ Clark to lead the fight,
And Champ jumped in with wild delight,
And chased the beast around the ring,
And round and round like a whirlwind
The crowd, and the crowd, and the crowd,
Stepped forth and with a loud hooey,
Banged horns and hit the Octopus
A lick that doubled up the crew,
But ere he had a chance to get away
The monster slipped and got away.

Then Wetmore, Colonel Moses C.—
Oh, Moses, why such cruelty?
Was called by HAWES, and forth he came
To carry on the dreadful game.
And bravely Colonel Moses strove,
His hands and feet were all a-trove,
Then came a bull, a bush, a stop,
You might have heard a feather drop,
And then a wild tumultuous roar
That shook the roof, the walls, the floor,
And when the crowd was all a-trove,
He charged the beast and curled the boxes
Of Octopuses small and great.
In every county, town and State
On the broad Land of Freedom which
Is slave and vassal to the rich.

And Bryan bowed and bowed and bowed
And kept on howling at the crowd,
The Octopus, meanwhile, too late,
Easy as to jump 'till Arena gate,
Then Bryan caught him. How the sighs
Filled all the people with delight!
He sought to twist its tail in knots,
He batted it a hundred blows,
He merely punched it in the state,
He slugged it up and slugged it down,
Then banged it one time in the neck,
And left it on the sands, a wreck,
Then loud the people cheered and cheered,
And one or two went out and heered.

Then the crowd was all a-trove,
The Colonel's aide de camp, he strove,
Stepped forth and with the money beast,
As fitting should to the feast.
But when the monster saw him, he
Began to howl and howl and howl,
Because he knew no other plan
Would save him from the cruel man.
So Belmont didn't slay the beast
As fitting should to the feast.
The Algonquin band and the Octopus
Were quite too dead to be of use,
'Till he scooped, and he got
Lights up and started on a trot,
With Algonquin after him, the crowd,
The mischief yelling long and loud,
When Algonquin caught him, he was hot,
As Algonquin always is, and not
Discreet as he should be, and so
He soon had laid the monster low.
That was the end; the Octopus
Was quite too dead to be of use,
They left him lying on the sand,
And everybody said the land
Was saved for good, and then they yelled
Because the Octopus was felled,
And the crowd was all a-trove,
With cheers the meeting was adjourned.

Excitement in England Over Sacerdotism.

P. A. Manning, M. P. in a Forum.

The past twelve months have seen a tumultuous series of militant protest against ritualism, unknown hitherto in this generation. It is not merely a struggle between two sections of the clergy, or a rally of the present-day laity; it is the outcome, as some have tried to show, of the religious hostility of the Dissenters. It has more the look of a national uprising of all who dare the claim of sacerdotism to control the lives of the people and under the shibboleth of independence and the love of liberty which runs in the very blood of Englishmen.

Where is Young O'Bryan?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—I have a son, Virgil W. O'Bryan, who left my home nearly two years ago, to return home, but has not had a word from him. He is in some place in North Carolina or Georgia. He is a young man, has an old, and I am his only help. Please say a word in regard to him; it may possibly be instrumental in my hearing from him. The crops in Texas were never so promising as they are now, and times will be better for some years. I have a son, W. D. Waco, McLennan county, Tex.

"Kosher" Beef an Army Evil.

Prof. Haupt of Johns Hopkins thinks that if the soldiers during the late war had been supplied with kosher beef, mortality among them would have been much less.

An Enormous Schooner About to Be Built in a Maine Shipyard.

BANGOR, Me., May 26.—Maine is about to produce another wonder in the shipbuilding line, a six-masted schooner. There seems to be no limit to the size of schooners. Thirty years ago the average schooner built in this part of the world was of from 100 to 250 tons register. Then, along in the early seventies they began to build three-masters slightly larger, and the size was increased gradually to about 500 or 600 tons in 1880. In the eighties there was a demand for larger vessels for the coasting trade, and the size of the three-masters went up to from 900 to 900 tons, with a coal-carrying capacity of from 1,000 to 1,400 tons.

Late in the eighties a few four-masters were built, and then, in 1888, at Waldoboro, was launched the first five-master, the Gov. Ames, of 1,080 tons net. This vessel was the wonder of her time, and it was predicted that she would prove a lamentable failure. She has been a great success, however, and not alone in coasting, for she has been ordered the Horn to the Pacific and has sailed carrying 1,050,000 lbs. of wool to Liverpool, besides making several voyages from Puget Sound to Port Pirie, Australia.

In recent years several four-masters have been built that are larger than the Gov. Ames, among them the Frank A. Palmer of Bath, of 1,822 tons, now on her way to Tammany, Fla., with cargo of wool to Liverpool, and the John B. Prescott, built at Camden, and the Nathaniel T. Palmer, built at Bath, both launched last winter. These vessels are of the five-master type, each registering about 2,245 tons, according to weather, voyage and draught. A number of five-masters of less tonnage have since been launched.

The two big fellows, the John B. Prescott and the Nathaniel T. Palmer, had scarcely been sent overseas when shipping people began to talk of the possibility of a six-master being built, the first as in the case of the pioneer five-master, the idea was laughed at, and a number of builders solemnly announced that they would not take a contract to build such a vessel. They said that a vessel of the necessary length to carry six masts would be tender that she would strain like a basket in a cross sea, and that the lighter grounding would break her in two. But there were one ship-builder and owner, Capt. John G. Crowley of Taunton, Mass., and one builder, H. M. Bean of Camden, Me., who had faith in the six-master as a good sort of vessel to build, and between them she is to be built, the first in the series that will turn out the biggest of the five-masters, the John B. Prescott, at Camden. The vessel has been taken up, she is, her shares have all been subscribed for. She is to cost \$100,000 and will be ready for launching in June, 1900.

This monster will be 315 feet long on the keel, 45 feet on top and will register about 2,750 tons net, with an estimated coal-carrying capacity of from 5,000 to 5,500 tons. Work on her construction will begin as soon as the frame can be cut and brought to Maine, and a first crew of men will be employed for a full year in her building.

JAPAN'S INDUSTRIAL ACT.

In Time She Will Make for Herself All That the World Makes for Her Now.

Fred G. Turner of Tokio, Japan, said yesterday: "Recently several iron and steel plants have been erected near Tokio, which are owned by the Government. It is the intention of the Government eventually to build all of its own warships, and even make its own guns. For years the Government has been sending educated young men to the manufacturing centers of the United States and Europe to study the industries of those countries, and now Japan is beginning to reap the benefit of that wise policy. The Japanese are willing to learn, and they are observant and intelligent scholars. The Government, who, at the expense of the civilized world for the purpose of making objects of study, have sent to the United States methods of manufacture and doing business, and they were plenty put in force."

"I know personally at least a score of young men, graduates of the United States, who have spent from three to six years in the large cities of the United States with no other object than to learn and to do some of the work with the Carnegie Company of this city for several years, and when they didn't learn about the iron and steel business they learned about worth knowing."

"I have long known to get a large order for steel rails from the Japanese Government. Japan stands in urgent need of transportation facilities in the interior of the country, where, up to date, the only style of carrying freight is on men's backs, and the Government has decided to build a railway line that will be 100 miles and another 25 miles in length. With European methods of filling the earth and dead-end work, the volume of the agricultural products of Japan can be increased enormously. There is not a single factory in the country. It is not satisfied with booming the industries and training a few men to increase the commerce of the kingdom. They are looking for a way to agriculture, which is in a most advanced state, and they are looking for a way to do it. If the prosperity is to last on a solid basis."

The Views of the Rev. Mr. Savage in 1894.

From the Congressionalist, Oct. 4, 1892.

The Rev. Mr. Savage not long ago, in an address to the Unitarian Club of Boston, declared that a single letter he had so demolished the belief of the orthodox denizens of the Unitarian Church, that enough in the way of foundation to the old faith was left to support it. Mr. Savage says: "We are gradually drifting away from the idea that the Bible has any special significance or authority. We are no longer so much interested in the Bible as we were in the days of the Rev. J. L. Hatch, another Unitarian clergyman, who said: 'Jesus of Nazareth, as given in the New Testament, is offensive to me in the extreme.'"

St. James' street, London, and permanently cured. See today's instruction column, or Bryan's, W. 14th St., N. Y. City.

PROHIBITION TAKES UP WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Beginning of a Significant Side Movement in Politics at the West.

WASHINGTON, May 27.—The Prohibitionists of Iowa in their State Convention on Wednesday, attended by delegates from eleven other States, declared unequivocally for woman's suffrage as the second of their platform plank, constitutional prohibition being first. Thereby they have brought into the canvass for Governor, which takes place this year in that State, a new question, which is certain to be of importance in the great trans-Mississippi territory in which for so long a period prohibition was the rallying cry for radicals until superseded by "free silver."

Iowa shares with Kansas the claim to prominence as the pioneer prohibition State in the West. Prohibition was adopted by constitutional convention in 1856, and in 1858, seven years before that the Prohibition statute, which the Constitutional amendment was intended to buttress and reinforce, had been adopted as the law of the State, and is in effect there to-day. Iowa adopted its first prohibitory law in 1855; it did not cover older and native liquor, but it did cover the distillation of beer. In 1882 a prohibitory amendment to the State Constitution was adopted, but it was held invalid by the courts, and in January, 1884, statutory prohibition was enacted, though it has since been modified by the "Sixty-first law," applying to towns of less than 5,000 population, and in 1887, 1888, and 1890, of the voters at the last previous election have signed their consent.

While there is some desultory opposition among Prohibitionists in Iowa to this law, the fact that it is yielding a considerable revenue to the State, where under positive prohibition there is no distillation, except for medicinal purposes, and that the revenue is being used for the benefit of the State, has not been a factor in the minds of the more radical Prohibitionists, who have totally forsown allegiance to it, having joined themselves with the Populists through advocacy of free silver. At the last National Convention of the Prohibition party, held in Pittsburg in 1890, the twenty-five Iowa Prohibitionists, five Kansas, and one Nebraska, and ten Colorado delegates voted solidly for the adoption of a free coinage