The Sun.

SUNDAY, MAY 20, 1900.

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.

At Home.

THE SUN will be glad to see the generous subscription now being made in New York for the people of India swell to a million dollars; but the phrase, "Charity begins at home," was not uttered in a trifling spirit.

For example: Within a short while two organizations have been formed to help the families of soldiers killed or absent in the Philippines.

Sergt. DOUGLASS was murdered a few weeks ago when defending law and order at Croton Dam; but as yet the only subscription of $1,000 for DOUGLASS's family is that of ANDREW CARNEGIE.

In neither of the cases mentioned has the amount of money contributed been in any degree commensurate with the deserts of the beneficiaries.

Sympathy for the Hindoos on the other side of the world should not lead Americans to forget their own at home.

The Canteen.

It is a pity that interest in the question of the army canteen should have been revived in the form that it now assumes. It is not necessary to question the good faith of Representative BOWERSOCK and the various evangelical bodies which have protested against the army canteen and have tried to make their protest effective; but the testimony of practically every officer in the Army is in favor of the canteen, not because they approve of beer selling, but because they see how good influence the canteen has been among the enlisted men.

The army canteen, it may be repeated here, is the enlisted man's club; he maintains it, and in it may get beer, light wines and tobacco, read the papers and magazines and play cards and billiards, if his club is able to own a billiard table. He goes to the canteen when off duty, without needing a leave of absence, and in the canteen is always subject to military rule. In posts where canteens are maintained the court-martials are fewer, the discipline is better, the condition of the men is better, bank deposits are larger than in those where outside saloons alone are available.

The Proposed Preference to Canada in the British Market.

As we have pointed out more than once, the Canadian Conservatives, headed by Sir CHARLES TUPPER, demand a preference for the food products of their country and of other Colonies in the markets of the United Kingdom. That is to say, they ask that Canadian wheat, for instance, shall continue to be admitted into Great Britain duty free, while a duty shall be imposed on the same staple coming from the United States, the Argentine Republic or Russia, which three countries between them now supply the greater part of the wheat consumed by the British people. The arguments for and against this proposal were summed up the other day by the *Montreal Daily Star* on the one hand and by the *Toronto Globe* on the other:

The *Star* addressed itself to the question: "What would inter-imperial preferential trade in respect of wheat mean to the Canadian farmer?" The significance, of course, would depend upon the amount of the duty which the British Parliament would agree to impose upon wheat imported from foreign countries. The *Star* insists that the United States would have no right to object if the British duty on American wheat were made 25 cents per bushel, for that is precisely the amount levied upon foreign wheat not only by the Dingley but also by the Wilson tariff. Nobody expects, however, that the British Government would, in the first instance, impose so high a duty on the imported commodity. It is assumed by the *Star* that the British duty on wheat would be five cents per bushel to begin with and would gradually increase to 15 cents per bushel in the course of ten years. The effect of this duty on foreign wheat would be to stimulate vastly the production of wheat in the Colonies. The vacant lands of the Dominion would be rapidly taken up, and, before many years, Canada and the other Colonies would be able to produce all the wheat that the United Kingdom required to import. As, moreover, the English consumers would have to pay no duties on the rapidly increasing supplies from the Colonies, the price of wheat in England would probably never be augmented more than five cents per bushel.

How would such an increase affect the English consumer? One bushel of wheat will make flour enough for thirty two-pound loaves. Consequently, an increase of five cents per bushel would mean, at the utmost, an increase of one-sixth of a cent on a loaf of bread. Such a small fraction of a cent could not be added to the price of a loaf. Wheat often fluctuates more than five cents in the English market, without causing any increase in the price of bread. It is true that the English baker would lose a dollar on 600 loaves, but the loss would probably be counterbalanced by the abolition or reduction of some tax now paid by him, for, if the British Government obtained revenue from duties on food products, some of the taxes now imposed could be removed or curtailed. In a word, the imposition of a duty of five cents a bushel on wheat would not affect the English consumer of bread an iota, while, as regards the English baker, it would simply mean a rearrangement of taxation.

Now let us see what the increase of five cents per bushel in the price of wheat would mean to the Canadian farmer. If we assume that he has a hundred acres in wheat yielding on an average fifteen bushels to the acre, he would gain by the slight increase in price $75 a year. This is equivalent to the interest, at 6 per cent., on $1,250. It follows that a Canadian wheat farm of 100 acres would be increased in value to the extent of $1,250. Nor is this all that Canadian farmers would gain by a preferential duty on wheat. The rapid settlement of the country resulting from preferential trade would so augment the traffic of the railways that these could afford to carry freight at lower rates. What is true of wheat would prove equally true of cheese, butter and other farm products.

So much for the *Star's* argument in favor of preferential trade. On the other side, the *Toronto Globe* points out, first, that even if Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and his colleagues were willing to give Canada and the other Colonies a preference in the British market, it is extremely doubtful whether the British Parliament and people would sanction the plan. Secondly, if the plan were sanctioned, the reciprocal concession which Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and his colleagues would exact from the Colonies is one that Canada would refuse to make. As to the first point, the *Globe* reminds its readers that all the financial and industrial interests of Great Britain have been for years thoroughly adjusted to the system of free trade in breadstuffs, and that no modification of that system could be effected without a serious political conflict. The only possible condition upon which British manufacturers and operatives would accept a duty on food products would be the imposition of a duty also on foreign manufactures, which would increase the price of British manufactured goods and the wages of British workmen. In other words, the whole scheme of free trade would have to be abandoned and superseded by the protective system.

As to the second point, the *Globe* recalls the positive assertion made by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN that the foodstuffs of Canada and other British Colonies could never expect a preference in the markets of the United Kingdom unless they, on their part, should admit British manufactures duty free. That is to say, for the sake of obtaining a preference for Canadian agricultural products in the United Kingdom the Dominion Government would have to subject its native manufacturers to free and ruinous competition with their British rivals. That is something from which even Canadian Liberals would shrink, while the violent opposition which it would provoke from Canadian Conservatives is evident from the fact that some of these strenuously object even to the tariff preference of 33 per cent., which, after July 1 of the current year, is to be conceded by the Laurier Government to British manufactures in the markets of the Dominion.

In view of these facts the demand of a preference for Canadian wheat and other food products in the markets of the United Kingdom is pronounced by the *Toronto Globe* entirely impracticable. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN could not give it if he would, and the Canadian would not accept it on the condition which Mr. CHAMBERLAIN has declared to be indispensable.

The Observance of Sunday.

Protests against the increasing tendency to neglect the religious observance of Sunday are now made by the General Assembly of the Presbyterians and they have been made by it for several years past.

On Thursday the Rev. Dr. SAMPLE, in his sermon when retiring as Moderator, instanced "the increasing desecration of the LORD'S Day" as one of the chief causes of the "marked religious decline" now witnessed in "a great majority of the Christian denominations," and on Friday the Special Committee on Sabbath Observance presented a report to the like effect, in which "the existing condition of the Sabbath question" was described as having "more threatening aspects than hopeful signs" and as presenting "more difficult problems than encouraging features." Accordingly, resolutions were recommended and adopted against "seven-day journalism," "Sunday excursions," "the rapidly increasing Sabbath employment of corporate employees," and enjoining pastors to preach sermons once a year on "Sabbath observance."

Now, unquestionably, there has been such a decline in the religious observance of Sunday, and it is increasing steadily. The tendency to observe the first day of the week as simply a day of rest and recreation, to introduce here "the Continental Sunday," as it used to be called, is obvious to every one. On the other hand, in the development of modern civilization an increasing amount of Sunday labor has become necessary, by the employees of railroads, for example, and the impracticability of keeping the day in the old Puritan fashion or as the Sabbath was kept by the Jews and is still observed by the more faithful of them, is demonstrated to every intelligence. One day in seven could not now be set apart for absolute rest from labor without disastrous damage to the machinery of modern civilization, bringing the consequence of appalling suffering to a great part of mankind. In the progress of civilization works of necessity have been multiplied greatly and all days have been made alike so far as many of the most important of these works are concerned.

Moreover, as this progress has gone on, and more especially in the last generation, theologians of the Church itself have been treating the Decalogue as a merely human document, containing laws applicable only to a pastoral tribe not yet far advanced from barbarism. The Divine authority of the Sabbath commandment is denied and consequently the universal religious obligation to obey it. Sunday, too, is not historically the Sabbath to which the commandment applies, as was indicated by the circumstance that in the early days of Christianity converts from Judaism and other Christians frequently observed both days, the one as the LORD'S Day, in commemoration of the Resurrection of JESUS, and the other as the day Divinely set apart by the Decalogue.

The new criticism of the Bible, coming from within the Church itself, raises in all logical minds who accept it, however, the question of the authenticity of all the miracles of Scripture and consequently of any other than human authority for the institution of the Sabbath of the Jews and the Sunday of the Christians. There is also now a school of Christian ministers who do not hesitate to set the example of the employment of Sunday for recreating amusements. Sunday, accordingly, has become the great day for bicycling and golf links are frequented even by members of Churches. People have no hesitation in using railroads and other public conveyances to carry them to church on Sunday, and the private carriages of rich Presbyterians are drawn up in long lines before the more fashionable Presbyterian churches while their owners are worshipping inside. Rich Jews faithful in their observance of the Decalogue invariably walk to their synagogues on the Sabbath, but these Christians impose unnecessary labor on their coachmen, hostlers and footmen. The decline in Sunday observance reprobated by the Presbyterian Assembly is illustrated not less among other people than in the conduct of Presbyterians themselves.

The General Assembly, therefore, wasted its words, and worse still, it laid itself open to a charge of an inconsistency which many people will think savors of hypocrisy, though it was rather in the utterance of merely perfunctory language. Moreover, the General Assembly treated a consequence as a cause; and it is yet to be demonstrated if it will dare to probe for that cause of the whole religious decline of which Dr. SAMPLE spoke so alarmingly.

The cause of the decline of Sunday observance and in the number of religious conversions is the decline of religious belief consequent upon the theological rejection of the authority of the Scriptures and their relegation to the domain of human literature. The talk about the trouble being with the Westminster Confession or any other creed is illogical and insincere. It comes, of course, from loss of faith in the Divine authority of the Bible and consequently in the very foundation of Christian theology, "for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST;" and that foundation for the Presbyterian Church is solely faith in the Bible. If the infallible authority of the Bible goes, all the fabric of theology tumbles to pieces and the institution of Sunday becomes human merely and Sunday observance a matter of expediency simply, to be settled according to the judgment of men as to its practical advantages.

Until, then, the General Assembly grapples with this great question whether the authority on which it founds its faith is supernatural and Divine or human only, it will not begin to deal with the cause of the religious decline, of which the neglect of Sunday observance is merely one among many more important consequences.

A Real Trust.

The organization of which so much has been heard in this city recently under the designation of the Milk Trust rightfully deserves its name. Instead of being a lawful corporation, like the American Sugar Company or the American Ice Company, it is a trust, of the Original Jacobs order.

The farmers in the territory from which this city draws its vast milk supply have for a long time been dissatisfied with the price they obtained for their product from the city milk dealers. So, to the number of several thousands and after a great deal of preliminary hard work, they organized themselves into a veritable trust called the Five States Milk Producers' Association, by means of which the disposal of their milk was placed in the hands of two or three men who, by suppression of competition, by selling or refusing to sell and otherwise manipulating prices as they saw fit or were able, are endeavoring to bring about a very considerable increase in the price of milk, to the pecuniary advantage of the members of the association and the signers of the "trust" agreement.

The success attending this effort so far seems to have been doubtful. There has been a daily shortage here of from 1,500 to 2,000 cans of milk, but this has caused no serious trouble, nor has it materially raised the price of milk. Whether it raises the price or not, or whether the farmers' Milk Trust is or is not successful, we wish to point out that here, belonging to the very people who are supposed to hold the anti-trust idea most dear and who are loudest in their demands that all such organizations shall be suppressed, there is a trust complete and perfect.

As a necessity of life ice cannot be compared with milk.

Light in St. Louis.

A spark of sanity and of fair play is to be seen in an interview with "a member of one of the strongest labor unions" in St. Louis, reported in yesterday's EVENING SUN.

The St. Louis car strikers have failed to keep other men from working on the car company's lines by riotous disorder and violence practically without limit. As a last resort they have appealed to the body of trades unionism "to suspend all labor and to refuse to do any work until the strike is settled." Settlement, of course, means the company's acceptance of the outrageous conditions the strikers seek to impose. But of this sympathetic strike which the car men hope to spread throughout the city the speaker referred to has this to say:

"A sympathy strike by a union which has no grievance would mean that the union regarded its agreement with the employer as binding on the employer only. No real union man would support that proposition for a moment."

An employer, therefore, has rights which an employee is bound to respect. Obligation is not on one side only. When trade unionism gets this idea firmly established in its mind the "question of labor and capital" will take on a new phase

---

Apparently the Hon. CHARLES AUGUSTUS TOWNE doesn't esteem his Sioux Falls prize too highly. He is willing to throw away the bauble if the Democrats want him to. He should, he ought. The Hon. JOHN McCARTHY, the silver undertaker of the Onondaga Reservation, should be nominated by acclamation and conclamation.

We have before us a copy of our esteemed contemporary, the East London *Izwi Labantu*, in English the *Voice of the People*, a journal whose pages are taller and broader than THE SUN'S, two of the four being occupied by advertisements wholly. Less than four of the thirty-two columns are printed in English; the remainder being Zulu. All advertisements are in Zulu.

We commend the facts here related to the attention of discouraged philosophers who think that the African is incapable of progress. The Afro-African appears to be getting on remarkably well.

According to Mrs. CHARLES T. COPELAND, a distinguished member of the Boston Literary Pale, Mrs. SAIREY GAMP "as a woman would not be permitted to enter a respectable house to-day." Well, they would have fun in trying to keep SAIREY out. We can see her sitting on the stoop, waving her gamp and her bottle of strong waters and quoting utterances unutterable from the divine Mrs. HARRIS. Most householders, even if as respectable as the superior respectability of Boston and Cambridge, would prefer to ask the lady in. She was a genius, but a little peculiar.

No man in the United States should know more about fads than the Rev. Dr. EDWARD EVERETT HALE. He has lived many years in Boston, their own stamping ground, and in his long life has followed many of them, good as well as foolish. It is surprising, therefore, to find him turning in his old age upon fads and upon Harvard College, where he was brought up. The other evening he told the Submasters' Club of Boston, one of the many associations of that delightful town, that "for half a century the teaching of fads had become a passion at Harvard." He saw signs of better things in the future and clearly had no disapproval of the earlier day, when he was a student himself.

What particular fads he objected to he did not state. Harvard has somehow, in spite of them or perhaps on account of them, risen to be the undisputed head of American universities since Dr. HALE's day; and has stayed there. The Submasters had been discussing Harvard's noble effort to aid the Cuban teachers just before Dr. HALE spoke, and that project may have seemed to him quixotic. So have other things seemed, for which the country has later been thankful to Massachusetts.

If the good doctor must have fads to rend he had better turn to the Legislature, where woman suffrage comes up every year and where this week the abolition of capital punishment was defeated in the House of Representatives by a majority of only two votes.

A proclamation by or attributed to the Hon. EMILIO AGUINALDO is in circulation in Luzon. It deals with Constitutional points. Perhaps Col. AGUINALDO may yet be accepted as the JOE BAILEY of the Philippines.

It is to be hoped that the Park Board's plan for bridging Ninety-sixth street on Riverside Drive, which is as old as the Drive, can soon be carried out. It is a matter of money, almost all of which commodity within the city's control is now claimed by the underground tunnel.

IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The relief of Mafeking, which took place on Wednesday, the 16th, appears to have been cleverly planned and executed, the relieving force having passed the Vaal River below Fourteen Streams and made a wide detour to the westward. It is probable the Boers were soon aware of its being on the march, but the paucity of their numbers prevented their offering serious opposition, threatened as they were at the same time by the expedition under Gen. Carrington, coming from the north. The failure of the Boers to capture any one of the three places they invested at the outset of the war was due to two causes—the want of an infantry force and the reluctance to throw men away in assaults so long as there seemed to be a chance of reducing the garrisons by starvation. The result has been that with the exception of Ladysmith, where the natural conditions favored the Boers in spite of the deficiencies of their organization and equipment, they had to relinquish their grasp on their prey so soon as a properly led and numerous enough force came to the relief. With the abandonment of the siege of Mafeking, the Boers are now everywhere on the defensive on a narrowing semicircle to the south from Mafeking to Laings Nek. Their attention will probably be called to the north before long, but they have already sent a force up to Pietersburg, about 160 miles north of Pretoria and to the drifts on the Limpopo on the roads leading from Rhodesia.

In the meantime they are concentrating all their available forces to meet Lord Roberts's advance to the Vaal, but whether with the intention of contesting the passage of the river or repeating the manœuvres in retreat from the Vet and Kroonstad, cannot be determined with certainty. The British cavalry seem to be moving about the country to the northwest of Kroonstad without hindrance, the Boers having only small patrols, one of which was picked up at Bothaville, close to the Vaal, on Thursday. What the future course of the Free Staters will be cannot be much longer in doubt, as President Steyn, who was at Pretoria consulting with President Kruger left there on Friday to join the burghers at the front. Some definite decision has evidently been come to which will make itself known by immediate results. The next forward movement of Lord Roberts will test the truth of the reports ascribing to the Transvaal Government the intention of suing for peace at an early date, which, however, are to some extent already discounted by the descriptions of the preparations making for the removal of the capital to Lydenburgh in the heart of the mountains between Pretoria and the Portuguese frontier.

Great unrest is reported from Swaziland, but whether there is any intention on the part of the natives to rise is not known. The Queen is said to be well disposed to the Boers. A British column is reported to be moving northward from Zululand but whether toward the Portuguese border, the Transvaal, or Swaziland, is left in doubt. There is no news of importance from the country west of the Drakensberg Mountains, but the present suspense cannot be much further prolonged as there is reason to believe that Lord Roberts has been urged to try and bring the campaign to a close as speedily as possible. Gen. Buller's advance has reached Laings Nek, having caught up with the Boer rear guard and captured some wagons and prisoners. There does not appear to have been any fighting.

Yale Despondent—Remedy Outlined.

From the Yale Daily News.

The news of the three defeats Saturday had a depressing effect on the college community. The baseball games, if won, would have relieved the dejection somewhat, but they carried comparatively little weight. It was the defeat of the track team which has led every one to a pessimistic view of Yale athletics. Something is radically wrong with Yale athletics, but where the trouble lies is the question.

In bewailing Harvard's victories over Yale we are prone to lose sight of this fact, that Harvard has advanced with great strides in athletics. It is not so much that Yale has deteriorated as it is that Harvard has improved. We have a different sort of foe to meet than we had a few years ago.

We should seek for improvement, not with the idea that we must get back that which has supposedly been lost, but rather with the aim of establishing a system which will be better than any we have ever had, for such a system is absolutely essential if we are to cope successfully with our two chief rivals—Harvard and Princeton.

How shall we perfect this system? Of course there are many forces which must coöperate; but that which plays preeminently the fundamental part is the general attitude of the college. There must be more spirit and enthusiasm and unselfish work. Personal feelings must be sacrificed for the interests of the university. There is too much of that blasé and indifferent feeling after a man has once won his "Y." "A" "Y." should stand as an obligation for future work which it generally does now, but not always, as should be the case. Hopeless indeed are the efforts of a captain when the men under him do not work with their whole heart and soul. In short what is most needed is unselfish loyalty.

$100,000 More for India Famine Relief.

A further remittance of $100,000 was cabled yesterday by the *Christian Herald* of New York to Bombay, representing contributions to the India Famine Relief Fund established by that journal. This sum will be distributed by the Interdenominational Committee of Missionaries now in session at Bombay.

Guests of a Jilted Bridegroom Ask Damages.

From the Philadelphia Press.

PITTSBURG, May 17.—Joseph Kovelsk, the Hungarian "King" of Homestead, met with a series of misfortunes last night when the belle of the settlement jilted him publicly just before the time set for the wedding ceremony.

Thereupon the bridegroom's friends demanded a day's pay each and their carfare in return for having come to the wedding only to be disappointed. They charged the "King" with having basely deceived them and he compromised by paying each guest his carfare.

To get even the "King" entered a suit to recover money which he paid for the girl's passage to America and for her trousseau.

Adirondack Trout Fishing Good.

From the Utica Press.

OLD FORGE, May 17.—Trout fishing is exceedingly good along the Fulton Chain this spring. A number of good catches have been made in the past few days.

Chicago Claims the Pie Championship.

From the Chicago Inter Ocean.

The pride of New York is swelling just at present because she makes and eats as many as 120,000 pies, some days. In New York the customary quantity of pie served is a one-fifth cut.

Estimates made by bakeries and others who serve pies in Chicago place the number made here daily at nearly one hundred and fifty thousand, and the number consumed at about one hundred and thirty thousand. Chicago thus leads New York by about thirty thousand. The Chicagoan wants a quarter slice.

La Follette a Candidate for Governor of Wisconsin.

From the Chicago Record.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., May 15.—Robert La Follette of Madison will enter the lists for the third time as a candidate for the Republican nomination. His friends are confident that he will win this time. He will be opposed by Henry C. Payne and his following and by Senator Spooner. Gov. Scofield will also be active in opposing his nomination.

THE MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE QUESTION.

The Episcopal Church and Divorce.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I think there is a wrong impression regarding Dr. Parker Morgan's position in refusing to marry a divorced person, although the innocent party. From what I have seen of the expression of public opinion on the subject, it seems to be taken for granted that as the canons of the Episcopal Church sanction such a marriage, the rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest merely acted on his own responsibility. This is not quite the case. Some time ago the following declaration was sent to every clergyman in connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church:

We, the undersigned, Bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, being persuaded that any canon of our Church on the question of marriage and divorce ought to be consistent with the words the priest must use when he solemnizes holy matrimony according to the service contained in the Prayer Book, do hereby declare it to be our conviction that any legislation on this subject, in the way of an amendment to our present canon, ought to be based on the following principles:

1. That the marriage law of the Church is clearly set forth in the marriage service—namely, that Christian marriage consists in the union of one man with one woman until the union is severed by death.

2. That this law does not permit the marriage of any person separated by divorce, so long as the partner is living, whether such person be innocent or guilty.

This delaration is signed by 1,524 clergy, and although neither Dr. Parker Morgan's name nor that of Bishop Potter is among them, it is well known that they are in sympathy with the declaration. Among the Bishops who have signed it I find Bishops Capers of South Carolina, Gillespie of western Michigan, Doane of Albany, Starkey of Newark, Hall of Vermont, Grafton of Fond du Lac, Hale, Coadjutor Bishop of Springfield, McLaren of Chicago, Leonard of Ohio, Horner of North Carolina, Johnson of Los Angeles, Morrison of Duluth, Nicholson of Milwaukee, Coleman of Delaware, Talbot of central Pennsylvania and White of Indiana. It was also signed by the late presiding Bishop Williams of Connecticut, and it bears the signatures of Dean Hoffman of the General Theological Seminary and several of the professors of that college. Among the signatures of the rectors or vicars of churches in the city of New York there are the following names: Drs. Dix, Van de Water, Houghton, Wesley Brown, Christian, Patey, Hughes, Vibbert, Ritchie, Johnson, Neil, Philip Brown, Van Winkle, Rich, Sill, Goodwin, Reynolds and Clendenin.

This list of Bishops and clergy indorsing the declaration was obtained a year or two ago, and therefore does not represent the exact state of feeling of the Diocese of New York since Bishop Potter officially declared himself in favor of the revision of the canons on marriage and divorce. I trust, however, that this statement will clearly establish the fact that the action of the rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest was not merely the expression of private feeling or view on the subject, but a most important act as indicating what will probably be the action of the General Convention when it next meets. There is no desire whatever to interfere with the State laws of divorce, but there is a very firm determination on the part of a very large number of the clergy to prevent the Church being made the tool of persons who for some cause or other have broken that solemn contract which they made at the altar, "until death us do part."

RECTOR OF A CITY CHURCH.

NEW YORK, May 19.

An Argument Based on the Principle of the Separation Between Church and State.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton argues very soundly that the separation between State and Church being complete by the fundamental law of this Republic, the interference of the clergy in the matters of marriage and divorce and their refusal to execute the civil laws regulating them do violence to a great principle of our political system.

Under the law of this Republic marriage is a civil contract, civilly regulated; and it is the most important of civil contracts, for it affects public morals, the rights of property and the welfare of posterity more than any other. By our inconsistent practice, however, we permit the clergy, governed by the varying laws of their churches, to officiate in the making of these contracts. Thus a contract which concerns not merely the parties married, but also all society, the title to real property and the interests of children who may be born to the union is left loosely guarded.

The religious theory of marriage is something with which the State has nothing to do, and as you explain to-day, there is, indeed, no such theory which receives common religious assent. You might as consistently turn over to the clergy any other civil function and recognize them as civil Magistrates for all purposes, specially privileged to act under the governance of their consciences according to the obligations of their varying creeds and canons, and thus build up a theocracy in the conflicting laws, in place of a purely civil government.

Take the instance of the marriage which the Rev. Dr. Parker Morgan refused to solemnize the other day, not under the law of his Church, which authorized it, but under the dictation of his mere individual whim. As it was a marriage made legal by the law of the State, the State should assert its sole power in the premises and leave no opportunity for such individual eccentricity to resist the civil law.

That is, the State should cut itself entirely loose from the Church and wipe away completely this, the only vestige of the old domination of the Church remaining in this Republic. The clergy should have no legal functions with respect to marriage, though, of course, acting under the differing theories of their churches as to the contract, they should still be free to ratify or to reject religiously the only legal civil marriage. No minister should be permitted to solemnize a marriage with his religious rites except on the strength of an official certificate that previously it had been civilly and legally performed by an officer of the State, thus making the religious marriage a purely voluntary act wholly within the discretion of the parties, but giving it no legal force.

The Roman Catholic Church recognizes no divorce for any cause. The Episcopal Church allows divorce for the cause of adultery only and remarriage to the innocent party only. In England, where the State Church is the Episcopal, adultery is made a cause of divorce against the woman only, the wife being able to get the divorce only when the adulterous husband is proved to have committed other offences also against the marriage relation. Both in England and this country a party of the Episcopalians has long taken the Roman Catholic ground that marriage is a sacrament, and, therefore, wholly indissoluble, but neither the Thirty-nine Articles nor the canons of the Episcopal Church of this country recognize it as such. Nor is it at all probable; it is hardly possible, that such a movement to revolutionize Episcopal doctrine could ever succeed in England against the British Parliament, with its power over the State Church. Here the High Church or sacerdotal party is more confident, though hitherto it has been steadily unsuccessful in its efforts to get the Episcopal canons changed in accordance with its sacramental theory, borrowed from the Church of Rome. The question will doubtless come up again at the next triennial convention of the Episcopal Church at San Francisco in October of next year. But whatever happens, the question as to the proper civil attitude toward marriage and divorce will not be affected. Our civil law has settled the question already and finally for there is no possibility of any reversal of the decision by the American people, making marriage dissoluble as a civil contract. Except for the Roman Catholic Church, the whole body of religious sentiment, too, agrees with the civil decision, even of that of the Episcopalians as their canons are. The Presbyterian Church, representing Protestantism generally, asserts that marriage is not "peculiar to the Church of Christ." It is an institution which existed long and generally before the rise of Christianity, in paganism no less than under the old Jewish dispensation, and it exists now beyond the pale of Christianity and is maintained there for substantially the same social reasons and with similar measures of protection. It is true that Mohammedanism, for instance, allows polygamy, but so also was it allowed under the Jewish law.

As you wisely conclude your article to-day, therefore, the churches and religious systems being in so great disagreement as to the religious law of marriage it is necessary that the State, even apart from its obligation in a Republic where State and Church are separated completely, should step in and decide the matter for itself. Having decided what constitutes legal marriage and what are the causes for which the marriage may be dissolved legally, it should consistently proceed to take the institution in its hands solely, so far as concerns its civil legality, and relieve our political system from the anomaly of the interference of the Church with the State in this single matter.

This will not deprive the churches of their power to make laws of their own on the subject, with which to govern the obedient consciences of their own members, but it will shut out the ministers of a hundred and one differing religious sects from exercising functions touching marriage which rightfully and consistently belong to the civil authority only in a Republic in which the separation of Church and State is absolute.

AN EPISCOPALIAN.

NEW YORK, May 18.

The Rev. Dr. Parker Morgan and His Attitude Toward Divorce.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The manly and straightforward action of the rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest yesterday will receive the indorsement and approval of a very large majority of the bishops and clergy of the Episcopal Church. It is, moreover, one of the most important incidents of our present Church history, because Dr. Parker Morgan's action is not in harmony with the canons of our Church, but simply expresses, beforehand, what will be undoubtedly the resolution of the General Convention of the Church next winter.

To the surprise of almost every one Bishop Potter entirely changed front at our last Diocesan Convention. Up to that time he had been a consistent supporter of our canon 13 on marriage and divorce. But at the last Diocesan Convention the Bishop said: "No legislation, whether ecclesiastical or civil, which touches only the terms and conditions of the contract itself will do a work which must needs be done before it is entered into. We may reiterate with the utmost solemnity 'Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder.'" And it is now understood by the clergy of this diocese that at the next General Convention Bishop Potter will be among those who will vote for the rescinding of canon 13, which allows a minister of the Episcopal Church to marry the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery.

It was this condition of things which undoubtedly influenced Dr. Parker Morgan, and not, as has been stated, any rule or canon of the Church to which he belongs. The lady in question was "the innocent party," and it would have been perfectly lawful for the rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest to solemnize the marriage. But Dr. Morgan took the right course. In the statement which must be signed by the contracting parties for the Board of Health the gentleman applying for a legal marriage and also the lady in question must have declared in the presence of two witnesses that she was a widow. Such conduct must call down upon the parties very severe condemnation from all right-minded people. But in addition to this it is evident that the rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest had decided, as very many of his brother clergymen have also decided, not to marry a divorced person under any circumstances.

The action of the Rev. Dr. Evans of the Presbyterian Church in Forty-second street is questionable only in the matter of good taste and feeling, because the parties could easily have sent for a Magistrate who would have performed the ceremony at Delmonico's. But the constitution of the Presbyterian Church clearly allows the marriage of divorced persons. Section 5 in chapter 24 of the Confession of Faith reads: "In the case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce and after the divorce to marry another, as if the offending party were dead." According to existing standards the canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the articles of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church are identical. But there seems to be a determination on the part of the Episcopal Church to change the existing canons on marriage and divorce and Bishop Potter of New York has already declared himself in favor of this change, and it is evident that the abrupt action of the rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest was caused by his conviction that in the interests of morality it will be safer for the revised new canons of our Church to make it unlawful for its ministers to legalize a marriage of a divorced person under any circumstances.

NEW YORK, May 17. D. D., LL. D.

Change in the Episcopal Divorce Canon Opposed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your editorial in to-day's SUN on "Church and Civil Law of Marriage and Divorce" suggests a few observations on the present canon of the Episcopal Church and the changes proposed in the same.

While understanding thoroughly the claim of a portion of that Church's clerical and lay members that it is the "Anglo-Catholic" Church, the fact remains that it is legally called a Protestant Church and that the great majority of its members undoubtedly so consider it and call themselves "Protestants" as stoutly as does a Presbyterian or a Methodist. Considering the fact that the colonial divorce legislation in this country was based solely on the Protestant belief regarding marriage and divorce and that, at the close of the colonial period with the end of the Revolution, the Protestant Episcopal Church definitely took form here in America as a national body, it would seem that the present canon was based entirely upon Protestant foundations, and that, while it does not recognize any cause for divorce but adultery where remarriage is permitted, the remarkable direction to refer persons married outside the Church's discipline to the Bishop seems to have been purposely put there in order that he may use his discretion in admitting such persons to the sacraments upon due investigation.

Undoubtedly the canon was adopted as a *via media*, for while recognizing adultery alone as cause for divorce, there are numberless meritorious cases of divorce granted for causes other than that and while a minister of this Church would not be permitted to remarry, at the same time he is not permitted to repel from the sacraments persons remarried who have secured divorces for such causes as desertion or abandonment, cruel treatment, &c., until he has referred the matter to his Bishop for adjudication. The high churchmen and "Anglo-Catholics" (a type of churchman unheard of until comparatively recent years) would repeal the present canon and forbid the remarriage of divorced persons entirely, thus adopting the rule of the Roman Catholics. While with strange inconsistency the same type of churchmen are continually asking for a closer union with the Greek Church, which, they claim, is an older and purer Catholicity than the Roman Church, none of them seems to advocate the very sensible canon of the Greek Church upon this subject as a substitute for the present Episcopal canon.

Priestly interference with the individual and the State was supposed to have been destroyed at the Reformation and free American Commonwealths seem hardly the soil in which to revive mediævalism. Undoubtedly in a country like this it is true of this subject (marriage and divorce), as of almost everything else, that a man or woman's social environment will very quickly decide as to whether a divorce (on whatever ground granted) and subsequent remarriage were justified and right or whether such proceedings were wrong and scandalous. The parties to such a marriage will very soon feel the decision of people whose friendship is valuable to them in the community. What has the Episcopal Church to gain by prohibiting remarriage after divorce? With six or seven hundred thousand communicants in this country and possibly two and a half millions of nominal adherents, probably eight or nine tenths of the number believe that remarriage after divorce for any good cause is permissible or else are entirely indifferent to the subject. Do the clergymen of that Church, who signed a memorial to the last General Convention to change the canon as described, suppose that their canon, if adopted, is going to make all these people converts to their way of thinking or, infinitely less, to have any appreciable effect on the seventy or more millions of people in the United States, the overwhelming majority of whom care absolutely nothing about the Episcopal Church and its teachings? Hardly. Better let well enough alone and if any change is made let it be in the direction of more liberality on the part of the Episcopal clergy in recognizing the law of the State wherein they minister. People who get wrongful divorces and make scandalous remarriages are not much given to church going, and the society they move in will, it is pretty safe to assume, take care of their cases. If it doesn't, canons passed by General Conventions and castigations from the pulpit by Bishop or priest won't help matters, even from the point of view of the extremists among them, for the people to be reached will not be there to listen.

The present canon is admirably suited to its purpose for, while holding the Church to its conservative position, it gives enough latitude to permit the worthy person remarried after a divorce for cause other than adultery to be admitted to the sacraments and full membership, thus upholding the distinctly Protestant character of this Church. Where a minister is in doubt he is to refer the matter to the Bishop who can make the inquiry and admit such persons, if he deems right. Many ministers admit such persons without a question, where they know them. Probably in every parish in the country there are some people who know of such instances and can testify to their justice and fairness.

As polygamy was practised by some of the early Christians of the Apostolic age it is difficult to see how marriage could then have been regarded as a sacrament. The only Apostolic injunction on this subject I can recal is in reference to this very fact—"A Bishop should be the husband of one wife." A great deal of clerical bad language has been used by the Bishops and priests of the Episcopal Church among the extremists on this subject, but it really to a calm observer seems far less edifying to see clergymen married, widowed and married again and sometimes the third time repeating the process, with the Church's blessing, than to see persons divorced for good cause marrying a second time where such marriage is likely to fulfil its obligations and ends. One of the most prominent Bishops of the Church, now dead, was a widower three times and had four wives, the last of whom survived him. It is really difficult to see how such a spectacle helps "the sanctity of the home," a phrase which is so often in the mouths of the howlers about the "abomination of divorce." Respectfully yours, one born and bred

MAY 18. A CHURCHMAN.

SHAVING.

Earnest Advocacy of the "Once-Over" System.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* While it is generally admitted that tonsorialism of to-day is vastly superior to what it was at the beginning of the century, or even a quarter of a century ago, yet many erroneous ideas are still prevailing among the barbers, and especially so throughout the shaving community, as to the proper method of shaving. This lack of knowledge has caused much dissatisfaction and is also the result of so many ruined faces so apparent to-day.

This annoyance is largely due to the fact that the custom of "twice-over shaving" is still persisted in. This is not necessary, as a clean shave can be secured just as good and with better results with the "once-over" method, providing it is done with precaution and with that aspect in view. This method permits the skin to retain its smooth and healthy condition and renders it less liable to the inoculation of germs or disease.

While the "twice-over" method is to the contrary for the reason that the first time over is generally done very carelessly with the impression that the remainder will be gotten at the second time over, which usually is taken against the grain, and thus the natural oil is shaven out of the skin, which causes it to become irritated and inflamed to the extent that even a smooth shave is almost impossible without a renewed irritation.

In spite of its inferiority it is commonly practised. It should not be tolerated by the shaving public, and can only be overcome by them as it is universally practised by the barbers.

Consequently it is absolutely necessary for the shaving public when entering a chair to particularly request the barber to "only shave once over clean," and if this is done I venture to say the past burden will be a future pleasure.

CHARLES J. PLONSKE.

ST. PAUL, Minn., May 16.

Mr. Del Mar on Philippine's Money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mr. Posey S. Wilson's jocose letter seeks to convey the impression that in my "History of Money in America" I advise that the Mexican dollar, or some overvalued coin, should be made a legal tender in the Philippines. Nothing that can be tortured into this meaning appears in that work.

What does appear is an expression of regret that our present monetary system is being introduced into the Philippines, because it may carry some of our precious gold dollars too far away to render them serviceable at home.

This is a point that demands very serious consideration. The Philippine problem is no light matter. In many ways it affects the welfare of vast multitudes, not only in the Philippines, but also in the United States. It is not a subject for merriment. Rather than treat it jocosely, especially at the present moment, it seems to me it were better not to treat it at all.

NEW YORK, May 18. ALEXANDER DEL MAR.

Dr. Shaffer and the State Hospital for the Crippled.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* When I wrote to THE SUN, under date of April 23, denying its statement that "all surgical and medical officers of the hospital except the surgeon-in-chief shall tender their services gratuitously," I based my assertion upon a copy of the act incorporating the New York State Hospital for the Care of Crippled and Deformed Children, which was formally sent to the managers by the proper authorities when the act was signed, under which the Board of Managers had been appointed, had taken their oath of office and entered upon the discharge of their duties. It was not until yesterday that the board learned that the copy under which they were acting was not a true transcript of the act, and that some kind friend had introduced a clause during its passage through the Legislature without the knowledge of those interested and certainly without my consent, which provides that the surgeon-in-chief shall receive a salary.

I have written to the Governor and to my colleagues on the board stating that I absolutely decline to receive any salary, and I shall be glad if you will permit me to say this in your columns and thus relieve me from an embarrassment which I am sure you will appreciate. I am also pleased to state that a fund of nearly $5,000 (in which I have had the privilege of joining) has been raised from private sources as supplemental to the money appropriated by the State.

NEW YORK, May 18. NEWTON M. SHAFFER.

Men Who Helped to Save Dora Murray.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* You published in THE SUN of May 17 an account of the rescue of a young lady from a burning building at 211 East Thirty-third street on the night of May 16.

I would like to say credit was given where it did not belong; that is to say, those who assisted Officer Miles to whom all credit is due were two men, Daniel Thompson and Thomas Sullivan, the only ones being in the room who did assist the officer to climb from one window to the other.

There cannot be too much said as to the bravery of Officer Miles in his daring climb from one building to the other. MYLES DOUGHERTY.

The Best.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Is there a chance for Holly Turnipseed, a prominent farmer of Richland county, South Carolina, blossoming in your garden? C. P. R.

NEW YORK, May 18.

For the Sergt. Douglass Fund.

THE SUN received for the family of Sergt. Douglass yesterday $1 from "Cash."