

The Sun

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1899.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, per Month, 60 Cents. DAILY, per Year, \$6.00. SUNDAY, per Year, \$2.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year, \$7.00. POSTAGE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES ADDED. THE SUN, NEW YORK CITY.

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

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

The Personal Character of Aguinaldo.

The Singapore Free Press recently printed an interesting estimate of the intellectual and moral qualities of AGUINALDO. This sketch of the leader of the Filipino insurgents might have been drawn by WILLIAM LLOYD GIBBS or EDWARD ATKINSON or E. LAWRENCE GOULD, but it is signed by one HOWARD W. BRAY, whom we take to be an Englishman in the employ of AGUINALDO, perhaps his private secretary and the author of his bombastic proclamations. Mr. BRAY says of his chief:

"He is a born leader of men, like WASHINGTON, GEORGE H. BUSH, STEPHEN A. DOUGLASS, SAMUEL JOHNSON, and the Founder of Christianity, one of the great leaders of the world, and at the critical stage of their respective country's history. He has accomplished what few have accomplished, and will go down to history as one of the world's heroes, every such man."

The truth about AGUINALDO is as well known in Hong Kong as anywhere in the world. Of the disingenuous eulogy published in Singapore by BRAY, the China Mail of May 1, 1899, remarks:

"What is most puzzling is the utter stupidity of any newspaper with any pretense to seriousness, admitting into its columns such rubbishy nonsense, blasphemous and utterly untrue, every word of it. AGUINALDO, the following has appeared as a recent estimate of him: A British agent, familiar with a swab head, but empty for all practical purposes. Timidity, verging on cowardice is his chief characteristic. He never fought a battle in his life, and it is much safer to leave his room for fear of being taken by some kind of contrivance which he has wrought."

The China Mail proceeds to recite the chief events of AGUINALDO's career with a view to exhibiting him as a selfish and avicious intriguer, showed only in a small and ignominious way, and utterly and irredeemably corrupt. It accuses him of having sold himself and his followers in the former uprising against the Spanish, for money. Instead of being a WASHINGTON, a NAPOLEON or a SALADIN, he has neither personal courage nor military ability. The China Mail goes on to say:

"In the fight with the Americans the result of his success is due to other factors than his own. He has managed to secure a report, and to have it published, which has done more to excite the public mind than any other article that has appeared in the past few months. He has done this by his side about four hundred Spaniards, deserters of whom CRISO MAXIMO is a principal officer, and their hands are plainly visible in the excellent contrived trenches around Malibon, Calumpit and Tondo, which in the possession of white men, need never have surrendered."

The truth about AGUINALDO is manifestly somewhat nearer to the China Mail's portrait than to that drawn by the absurd or dishonest Mr. BRAY. Yet a low opinion of the moral qualities of the insurgent leader is not inconsistent with an impartial recognition of his shrewdness of mind. Whether his ability is exercised at first hand, or consists simply of a knack of using to good advantage the brains and courage of others, AGUINALDO certainly has not shown himself a fool. Nor is it likely that a more charlatan could have impressed Admiral DEWEY as a person of importance.

As a further and very enlightening contribution of truth about AGUINALDO and his aims, we reprint from the Christian Advocate a letter written by Mr. DEWEY, formerly Major of the Iowa State College. The reckless statements of Senator Hoar respecting AGUINALDO's title to American sympathy drew from Dr. KNAPP this letter. It should be read by every American.

The Bear in the Forbidden Land.

The report that a Russian expedition had penetrated to the court of the Grand Lama of Thibet created some excitement in political and military circles in India, the more so because the presence of this mission at Lhasa only became known after it had accomplished its purpose and left on its return to Tashkent.

The expedition was composed of four officers and fourteen soldiers who formed the escort of the envoy, M. HONORÉ. The mission remained in Lhasa, where M. HONORÉ had several consultations with the High Lama. He and his party left after exchanging valuable presents with the rulers of Thibet.

In India it is thought likely that this incident may give an impetus to the movement, already active in military circles, for the annexation of the Forbidden Land, and looked on with favor by Indian politicians of the Forward party. In any case it is expected that some steps will be taken to prevent Russia from acquiring a preponderant influence in Thibet, and using it against the establishment of British influence in the region of the upper Yangtze, a river that has its rise in Thibet.

The situation is one of no little interest, the difficulties of an invasion of Thibet from the south being well known, although Dardanelles north of Calcutta and the principal British military station close to the frontier of Sikkim is connected with the rest of India by rail.

The Men from the Mountains.

The riotous, disorderly, unmanly and tumultuous proceedings of the Democratic State Convention in Louisville would seem inexorable in a nominating convention in the United States. But two causes have combined to produce in this case turbulence which is unusual even in Kentucky.

In the first place, a considerable number of the 115 counties into which Kentucky is divided are in what is known as "the mountain district," that is to say, in the eastern section, near the West Virginia and Virginia border. These mountain districts have not, heretofore, taken a very active part in Democratic nominating conventions. Democratic majorities in Kentucky, as in the neighboring State of Tennessee, come chiefly from what are known as the lowland counties, in the west or central portions of the State. This year at the Louisville convention, under the leadership of Senator GOBLET, the mountain counties of Kentucky, as they are called, were solidly organized in support of Judge REDWINE, of Breathitt county in

the mountain district, as Permanent Chairman. In the preliminary contest for control of the machinery of the State Convention at Louisville, the delegates from the mountain districts voted pretty solidly for Judge REDWINE, and they outvoted the delegates from Jefferson county, which includes the city of Louisville; Campbell county, which includes the city of Newport, and the central counties of the State generally, putting the control of the convention in the hands of the political reactionaries who in American conventions generally are found in the minority when either a Republican or a Democratic State ticket is to be put up.

The turbulence, disorder and violence of these mountain delegates form a constitutionally notorious and bloody, ruthless and implacable fiasco account, in part, at least, for the general disregard at the Louisville convention of parliamentary procedure and the ordinary amenities of political controversy.

More serious but less obvious as a cause of riot and disturbance at the Louisville Convention is the general elimination from membership in the Democratic party in Kentucky, as in other States, of the conservative forces which have hitherto preserved the consistency and maintained the dignity, even in defeat, of the Democracy of the United States.

The United States and Russia.

The announcement made yesterday in our contemporary, the New York Commercial, that the Russian Government has decided to expend a large sum of money, amounting, it is said, to \$20,000,000, in purchasing artillery from American ordnance manufacturers, will direct attention to the importance of retaining the good will of the great northern empire. The demand for improved munitions of war represents but an insignificant fraction of Russia's requirements, if she is to accomplish quickly the great industrial advance contemplated by her Finance Minister, M. DE WITTE, which the United States might further in a way profitable to both parties.

By some means or other the London Times has managed to secure a report, recently submitted to his imperial master by M. DE WITTE upon the method of promoting Russia's economic development. In this report, the Finance Minister begins by pointing out that there is so little native capital available for industrial enterprises that to refuse the cooperation of foreign capitalists in the exploitation of Russia's natural riches would be tantamount to voluntary acquiescence in industrial stagnation. Whence is the indispensable capital to be procured? This is equivalent to asking in what country can the St. Petersburg Government borrow money with which to build railways and canals, improve the navigation of its rivers, stimulate the working of its mines and encourage native manufactures. Formerly, Russia was able to place large loans in England, which she sends a large part of her surplus agricultural produce. At the time of the Afghan frontier troubles, however, culminating in the Peshawar incident, it will be remembered, brought England and Russia to the verge of war, the Russian funds were transferred to Berlin, and, subsequently, under the pressure of political combinations, to France. A notable feature of M. DE WITTE's report is the admission that he no longer finds it possible to entertain much hope of further assistance from that quarter; as he puts it, France "finds it superfluous to go any further" in the way of investing French money in Russian bonds. His conclusion is that the most pains should be taken to re-establish cordial political relations with England, such as existed in 1814, in order to gain the financial aid needed to assure Russia's industrial advance.

It is true that, from one point of view, Russia might reasonably expect to find a friend in England. She has surplus grain to sell, and England is the only European country which admits it to duty free of duty. In Germany, the customs duties imposed on Russian agricultural products are almost equal to their prime cost; in France, they are actually prohibitive. England, however, is not dependent on Russian wheat; she could, at a pinch, supply all her needs by drawing a supply, somewhat exceeding the normal, from the United States, British North America, Argentina and Chili. As for the permanent maintenance of friendly relations between Russia and England, without which the former country cannot look for financial assistance to the latter, this now seems to be out of the question, the position of the two powers with reference to one another having been changed materially since the earlier years of this century. At present the interests of the two powers are essentially irreconcilable in China, in Central Asia, in Persia and, as soon as the Russians are ready to push forward from Armenia to Syria, in the Eastern Mediterranean also. Even if the East, convinced by the arguments of M. DE WITTE, were himself disposed to keep the peace with England for at least a generation, he would be unable, as experience has shown, to restrain the zeal of local officials, whose action is very often prompted by personal ambition rather than by an enlightened regard for the welfare of the State. When, therefore, M. DE WITTE advocates a good understanding with Great Britain, he is expressing a wish rather than a well-grounded hope.

There is one country rich enough to lend Russia money, and with which it would be easy for the Zar to maintain perpetual peace. Nowhere upon the surface of the globe do our interests conflict with Russia's, except in China, and even there all friction might be averted if the Zar would covenant to give us, in that part of the Chinese territory now or hereafter controlled by him, all the freedom of access that we have acquired, or may fairly expect to acquire at the hands of the Peking Government. There is no reason to doubt that, if we could obtain such a pledge from Russia, the other European powers that mean to participate in the partition of China would make to us similar concessions, in order to secure our neutrality. When we bear in mind that the bulk of our Chinese trade is with Manchuria and the province of Chihli, both of which are included in the section of the Middle Kingdom manifestly destined to pass under the sway of the Zar, we must recognize that we have much to gain and nothing to lose by cultivating the friendship which has existed between Russia and the United States since our war for independence.

If American capitalists should undertake to place a Russian loan they would signally hasten the hour when New York, instead of London, will be the centre of the world's exchange, and they would secure for American manufacturers a virtual monopoly of the already vast and prospectively limitless Russian market. It is true that we are not consumers of Russia's agricultural

staples. Neither is France; yet, so long as she is willing to afford the St. Petersburg Government financial assistance, her citizens enjoyed the lucrative privilege of supplying most of the Russian demands for manufactures. This, too, although the French cannot compete with the Americans in respect to machinery, or any of the manufactured products of iron or steel. Of steel rails and locomotives alone it is probable that Russia will require a larger quantity within the next half century than will be called for by the rest of the world combined. Every one of those rails and every one of those locomotives, to say nothing of the machinery adapted to agricultural purposes, and of the plant needed for manufacturing every kind, should be supplied by the United States.

It is not by diplomatists alone or chiefly that the commercial interests of our country can be furthered abroad. Our capitalists have it in their power, by exhibiting a readiness to accommodate the St. Petersburg Government, to secure for American manufactures in Russia a market of incalculable value.

Chinese in Our Luzon Operations.

An interesting point in Quartermaster SAWELLE's report upon the early stages of the hostilities with the insurgent Filipinos relates to the Chinese. "The almost universal good behavior," he says, "of the Chinese drivers of the buffalo carts, when under fire, led to the recommendation of their employment for service as litter bearers," and, if the experiment should succeed, as transport coolies. He received authority to hire 510, and paid them \$20 a month in Mexican money and a ration. The success of that experiment, he thinks, would "solve the transport problem of an army operating in Luzon in either the wet or dry season." He advises adding, for an advance into hostile territory, 100 coolies per battalion, and would bring them from Hong Kong, so as to decrease the chance of their desertion. He remarks that Japan employed 15,000 coolies to 24,000 soldiers in her war with China, but that was the cost of transportation she used.

Simultaneously with this testimony to the good behavior of the Chinese in a subordinate capacity, comes some from English sources as to their qualities as soldiers, the recruits for the Chinese regiment at Wei Hai Wei being praised for their physique, intelligence and obedience. No doubt their unbroken defeats in the war with Japan gave the Chinese soldiery a bad reputation, but besides being hand-lapped in drill, discipline and equipment, they were actually outnumbered by the Japanese on every important field. The soldier's profession was also derided and despised in China, and from such a feeling defeat might be expected. An English service paper says that all the testimony goes to show that the Chinese, though by education men of peace and by instinct traders, are brave, and can make excellent soldiers.

Lord WOLSELEY once declared his belief that the Chinese had all the mental and physical qualities required for national greatness: "They are the men, endowed with great powers of endurance, industry and energy, they have few wants and can live on little, and that little poor food. Absolutely indifferent to death, they are fearless and brave, and when well treated and well fed make first-rate soldiers. I have seen them under fire, and found them cool and undaunted by danger. If they were provided with a small proportion of English officers, and were organized as the Egyptian Army has been by us since 1882, their army would soon be, according to my opinion, one of the best."

However, the point of interest for us just now is not the capabilities of the Chinese as soldiers, for we do not propose to hire them to fight for us, but their capabilities for doing such auxiliary work in the Quartermaster's Department as Capt. SAWELLE speaks of. On this their courage and other soldierly qualities have a bearing.

The Local Summer Political Activity.

More than usual activity appears among the local statesmen of New York and Brooklyn, both Republicans and Democrats. Rival district leaders, whose ambitions were set aside temporarily by unusual circumstances during the past three years, are again pushing the front.

In 1896, the momentous issues of the Presidential election completely overshadowed all such minor contentions. In 1897 the important municipal election, the first under the present New York Charter, was held, and again local contests received little attention. In 1898, too, the election was for Governor and State officers, for Congressmen and for a Legislature both branches of which were to participate in the choice of a United States Senator, and minor matters of district controversy dropped into relative insignificance.

This year, however, there will be in New York almost a strictly local election. No State officers are to be voted for. There is no Majority election. There is no election for members of Congress or for legislators to take part in the choice of a Senator. County officers, Judges, Aldermen and Justices of the Peace are to be elected, and, naturally, the local contests over the nominations to these offices are exciting the smallest of passions to unwonted summer activity—to strategy for the control of primaries, and to rivalry in getting up primary contests, excursions and mass meetings. Their zeal is the greater because of its long repression.

The New State Bicycle Law.

Governor ROOSEVELT's fair and considerate treatment of wheelmen and his readiness to do all in his power to increase the pleasure and popularity of cycling were strikingly exhibited by his act in signing the Collins bill, making all the ordinances of this State which relate to bicycles uniform and consistent. The new law places the riders in all parts of the State under uniform restrictions; no partiality is shown to wheelmen in any one town or city, and no rural constable may now take the first "bicycle chap" he sees to the lockup for slight and questionable reasons.

gards carrying lights and bells are also sensible and clearly defined. Riders may now "give an alarm by bell, whistle or otherwise, which may be heard 100 feet distant, when about to meet or pass pedestrians and when about to meet or pass other vehicles." Although wheels, generally speaking, must bear lights at night, the law specifies that the section of it requiring lights shall not be applicable to riders "whose light has become extinguished," or to those who are necessarily away from home without a lantern. Such lightless peddlers may proceed at a speed of six miles an hour, provided they give a signal audible 100 feet away "as often as their feet are passed over."

Another part of the law stipulates that the speed at which bicycles may travel shall not be "slower than is allowed any other kind or class of vehicle." It is to be hoped that riders will not construe this clause to mean that they will be permitted to keep pace with the automobiles in New York, which during the past few months, for some reason not apparent to a great many people, have been allowed to dash along the avenues and streets at almost express-train speed.

While giving wheelmen more advantages than they enjoyed formerly, the new ordinance contains no features which should be objectionable to the non-cycling public. The latter, whether riding or walking, are as well protected by the law's provisions as they could reasonably wish to be. It must not be inferred, if a pedestrian is knocked down by a bicyclist, that the latter will be held liable for the accident. The purpose of the law is to equalize the contrary. In granting to the riders some unusual concessions it naturally presumes that they will be discreet and cautious at all times, and will give no cause for a revocation of their present privileges.

Chinese in Our Luzon Operations.

An interesting point in Quartermaster SAWELLE's report upon the early stages of the hostilities with the insurgent Filipinos relates to the Chinese. "The almost universal good behavior," he says, "of the Chinese drivers of the buffalo carts, when under fire, led to the recommendation of their employment for service as litter bearers," and, if the experiment should succeed, as transport coolies. He received authority to hire 510, and paid them \$20 a month in Mexican money and a ration. The success of that experiment, he thinks, would "solve the transport problem of an army operating in Luzon in either the wet or dry season." He advises adding, for an advance into hostile territory, 100 coolies per battalion, and would bring them from Hong Kong, so as to decrease the chance of their desertion. He remarks that Japan employed 15,000 coolies to 24,000 soldiers in her war with China, but that was the cost of transportation she used.

Simultaneously with this testimony to the good behavior of the Chinese in a subordinate capacity, comes some from English sources as to their qualities as soldiers, the recruits for the Chinese regiment at Wei Hai Wei being praised for their physique, intelligence and obedience. No doubt their unbroken defeats in the war with Japan gave the Chinese soldiery a bad reputation, but besides being hand-lapped in drill, discipline and equipment, they were actually outnumbered by the Japanese on every important field. The soldier's profession was also derided and despised in China, and from such a feeling defeat might be expected. An English service paper says that all the testimony goes to show that the Chinese, though by education men of peace and by instinct traders, are brave, and can make excellent soldiers.

Lord WOLSELEY once declared his belief that the Chinese had all the mental and physical qualities required for national greatness: "They are the men, endowed with great powers of endurance, industry and energy, they have few wants and can live on little, and that little poor food. Absolutely indifferent to death, they are fearless and brave, and when well treated and well fed make first-rate soldiers. I have seen them under fire, and found them cool and undaunted by danger. If they were provided with a small proportion of English officers, and were organized as the Egyptian Army has been by us since 1882, their army would soon be, according to my opinion, one of the best."

However, the point of interest for us just now is not the capabilities of the Chinese as soldiers, for we do not propose to hire them to fight for us, but their capabilities for doing such auxiliary work in the Quartermaster's Department as Capt. SAWELLE speaks of. On this their courage and other soldierly qualities have a bearing.

The facts about Mr. FELIX AGUINALDO's position in the view of all honorable men are stated with force and candor by the Saranac Press, a newspaper very friendly to Admiral Schley, and avowedly devoted to the Baltimore American would call the "Schley cause."

We have not much idea that Mr. FELIX AGUINALDO will wish when he reads this stirring rebuke from one of his countrymen, under the pen of the Orthopedic Hospital, to profit by the efforts of our honorable contemporary in Saranac.

A definite agreement between the Hon. RUSSELL A. ALDEN and the Hon. POTATO PRICKS as to what they are really agreed upon ought to be added without delay to the articles of association.

THE CHURCH AND DIVORCE.

Fault Found with a Clergyman's Appeal to Newport Society. To the Editor of the Sun—Sir: I hear praise of the Episcopal clergyman who preached upon divorce at Newport yesterday as a signally courageous character, because he "talked out" to the very people in whose society he lived, and in whose presence he was surrounded by wives and husbands and swarms of wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

in the view of all honorable men are stated with force and candor by the Saranac Press, a newspaper very friendly to Admiral Schley, and avowedly devoted to the Baltimore American would call the "Schley cause."

We have not much idea that Mr. FELIX AGUINALDO will wish when he reads this stirring rebuke from one of his countrymen, under the pen of the Orthopedic Hospital, to profit by the efforts of our honorable contemporary in Saranac.

A definite agreement between the Hon. RUSSELL A. ALDEN and the Hon. POTATO PRICKS as to what they are really agreed upon ought to be added without delay to the articles of association.

THE CHURCH AND DIVORCE.

Fault Found with a Clergyman's Appeal to Newport Society. To the Editor of the Sun—Sir: I hear praise of the Episcopal clergyman who preached upon divorce at Newport yesterday as a signally courageous character, because he "talked out" to the very people in whose society he lived, and in whose presence he was surrounded by wives and husbands and swarms of wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

In the eye of the Church these people who have swapped husbands and wives are living in adultery, or in simple concubinage. Their divorces have no standing according to the doctrine of the Church, and in obedience to the command of Christ, and their remarriage, therefore, are purely adulterous unions. They are polygamists who have taken new husbands and wives while their only lawful partners in marriage, in the view of the Church, are still living.

What, then, is the bounden duty of the Church and of every Bishop and probyter of the Church? Is it not to denounce those religiously spurious divorces and remarriages and to put covered the most flagrant instances of getting rid of wives and husbands and swapping wives and husbands by means of divorces obtained on trivial and flimsy grounds. For myself I can see nothing courageous in his sermon; it appears to me to have been rather a timid and faint attempt to do a truckling appeal to official Church authority in the name of the Episcopal Church concerning marriage and divorce.

AMERICANS AND FILIPINOS.

Dr. Seaman A. Knapp's Patriotic Reply to Senator Hoar.

My attention has been called to the letter of Senator Hoar in your issue of April 8. It is due the American people that the facts should be correctly stated, whether they favor the retention of the Philippines or the reverse, and it is not in harmony with the spirit of our race to allow great questions to be settled by arrogant assertions from any source, however exalted. Allow me to state the case of the United States as the Aguinaldo Government, as I understand it, from some personal knowledge of conditions in the Philippines.

The assumption that we are trying to impose Government on the Filipinos without their consent cannot be maintained in the light of the following facts, perfectly authentic and easily proved: (a) Aguinaldo and his voluntary following represented at the commencement of hostilities less than one-tenth of the territory of the Philippine Islands, and never had even nominal control over more than two-sevenths. The people of the other nine-tenths of the territory were opposed to him and his ambitious schemes. (b) Over 90 per cent. of the property interests in the one-tenth of territory which he proclaimed his own were not in his hands. He had no authority to tax or to porters were opposed to him and his plan of government. They had no faith in his sincerity.

2. Aguinaldo was a fugitive in Asia, and before he was allowed to return and organize a following he signed a written agreement with the officials of the United States Government, consisting of four articles, two of which I recall: (a) That he would, in all material respects, be obedient to the authorities of the United States in the Philippines. (b) In case the United States elected to hold the Philippines, that he would do all in his power to bring about the harmony with this policy. He was stated to me by a responsible official who was present when this agreement was signed.

3. Arms and ammunition were furnished him under the terms of this agreement.

4. With American arms and support, it was easy for Aguinaldo and his followers to overthrow a peaceful and law-abiding government of personal and real property. I examined maps and plans of 130,000 acres of improved real estate in provinces adjacent to Manila which had been confiscated by him, and this was but a small portion of the real estate thus seized. In addition to wholesale confiscation foreign owners were not allowed to visit their estates in the country without paying heavy tribute for the privilege.

5. The high-toned declarations for free government which Aguinaldo has made in the past, and which he has used to influence American public opinion, in reality his government has not only not constituted a naval power.

At a recent date the number of enlisted men and of apprentices was over 3,000, below the authorized strength, so that recruiting will now be vigorously pushed. Officers for sea duty do not appear to be very plentiful, but any lack can be made up by reducing the number on each ship.

If, also, our international affairs remain as peaceful as they are now, it may be practicable to lay up some ships, in addition to the few already sent to the reserve. On the other hand, some are approaching completion and will soon require complements, while after a year or two a need of more officers and men may be seriously felt, as we shall then have added a considerable number of battleships, and especially of torpedo boats, to the fleet in commission.

The Navy Department has been able to combine economy and efficiency, of late, through the lack of any pressing calls upon it in our peaceful relations with other countries. It will not fail to call attention, however, to the need of providing an adequate personnel in the future.

While the summer is usually not the best season for recruiting all the enlisted men for the navy that the law allows, the new provision for appointing 100 warrant machinists, with excellent pay, may be an encouragement to enlistments. The indications from the examinations already held are said to be that all these coveted places will go to men now in the enlisted service. The general effect should be to raise the standard of the engine-room force by giving such prospects of promotion and higher pay.

The facts about Mr. FELIX AGUINALDO's position in the view of all honorable men are stated with force and candor by the Saranac Press, a newspaper very friendly to Admiral Schley, and avowedly devoted to the Baltimore American would call the "Schley cause."