The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 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.

As to the Direct Election of Senators.

The Montana incident is no more a conclusive argument for the election of United States Senators by the people than the counting-in of HAYES in 1876 was conclusive for the abandonment of the electoral system provided by the Constitution.

It is a somewhat singular coincidence that one of the clearest and most comprehensive statements of the objections to the popular vote for Senators ever delivered in Congress was contributed by the Hon. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER, now chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which has pronounced the election of Mr. CLARK by the Montana Legislature null and void because of bribery.

Mr. CHANDLER's exposition of the subject eight years ago was tinged with delicate sarcasm, just enough to render it a characteristic product of his alert and discerning mind; but that circumstance detracted not in the least from the cogency of his reasoning or the gravity of his conclusions. He was addressing Democrats who were then clamoring for an amendment to the Constitution requiring the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. He asked those Democrats to contemplate the consequences of such an amendment.

In the first place, the extension of the system of popular elections to the choice of Senators was sure to lead to the taking possession of Federal elections in the States by Federal officials, appointed by the Federal Government; that is to say, to the centralization at Washington of the electoral machinery, a result dreaded and abhorred by all true Democrats and resisted by them with uncommon vigor in the case of the several so-called Force bills that have been proposed.

For Democrats to advocate to-day the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, and to-morrow, perhaps, the election of Presidents and Vice-Presidents by popular vote, is for them to invoke Congress to enact a national election law, to apply to all the States, *and to take complete possession of the electoral machinery therein.* How does this proposition strike the imagination of the Jeffersonians, charged, as they believe themselves to be, with the special duty of safeguarding State rights against Federal encroachment?

Then Mr. CHANDLER proceeded to discuss the alleged danger of the election of millionaires to the Senate inherent in the present method by choice by the Legislatures. We quote part of his remarks as of particular interest now:

"But, Mr. President, I do not believe that the people of the United States have hitherto suffered because rich men have found their way into this body who would not have come here if Senators had been elected by the people, which is, of course, the issue now made. Have no millionaires been elected Governors of States? Have there been more rich Senators elected to this body than have been elected Governors? The Governors are chosen by the people. They are chosen precisely as the three Senators [who had made speeches in favor of the amendment] say the United States Senators should be chosen; and yet I do not think that complaint has been made that millionaires have improperly taken possession of the Governorships; and if they have so taken possession of the Governorships, they are just as likely and just as sure to take possession of Senatorships under a system of popular elections as they are under a system where the Legislatures choose the Senators."

Having thus exposed with subtle irony the humbug of the restless cranks who believe that for every real or imaginary practical evil, a change in the United States Constitution is the sure cure, Mr. CHANDLER declared that the way to deal with corruption in Senatorial elections was to deal with it directly and adequately, and not by any such cowardly and partial method.

Eight years later, in the honest and fearless exercise of his duty, Mr. CHANDLER has put these principles into practice and to proof. As chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and therefore the chief keeper of the doorway to the Senate, he has dealt a heavier blow at bribery in Senatorial elections than any Constitutional amendment could deliver; and the Senate and the country, including all honest candidates for the United States Senate, owe him gratitude.

Japan and England.

It cannot have escaped observation that during the war in South Africa the Japanese, alone among great peoples, have expressed a wish for the speedy success of the British arms. The Mikado was, we believe, the only Sovereign who telegraphed to Queen VICTORIA congratulations upon the relief of Ladysmith, the victory of Paardeberg, and the occupation of Bloemfontein. It must also have been noticed that since the beginning of April, when the early triumph of the English began to seem assured, almost the whole of Japan's Navy has been mobilized, together with a considerable part of her Army. As to the doings of the Japanese fleet, great secrecy has been observed, no one except the British Commander-in-Chief on the China station having been invited to be present. It is understood, however, that the purpose of the naval manœuvres in the Straits of Korea was the blockade and capture of a squadron, supposed to represent the Russian fleet.

There is, in fact, no doubt that the Japanese regard a war between themselves and the Russians as inevitable; that, in their opinion, they have much to lose by delay; and that they will enter upon a trial of their strength, as soon as England's hands are left free by the subjugation of the Transvaal. Why must Japan wait for the close of the contest in South Africa? Because, while she may not need England's cooperation in order to hold her own against Russia in the Far East, it is indispensable that England should enforce neutrality upon France and Germany. It was because Russia was backed by both France and Germany that Japan felt constrained to surrender the territory acquired on the Chinese mainland by the Treaty of Shimonoseki, and she knows that it would be impossible for her to face a renewal of that combination, or even to cope with the conjoined navies of Russia and France. Now, it is almost certain that, unless England forbade it, France would place her fleet at the Czar's disposal. England will issue no such injunction, so long as she is occupied in subduing the Boer republics, and France would not obey it if she did. When, however, the subjugation of the Transvaal is completed, England's strength will be generally recognized as greater than it has been at any other time since the close of the Peninsula War. She may then count upon securing deference to her announcement that she could not view with indifference the attempt of any European Power to assist Russia against Japan in any way.

The moment the war in South Africa is over it will be for Japan's interest to enter forthwith upon the contest with Russia which, in no event, can be long postponed. Just now, as we lately pointed out, Japan's naval power in the Far East is somewhat superior to Russia's, but the disproportion will not long continue, for Russia's fleet is growing faster than Japan's, and large reënforcements are being hurried to the Pacific. If Japan could fight this year, she would have a great advantage in respect to docking facilities and of coal, for the new docks, now in course of construction at Port Arthur, can hardly be finished for a twelvemonth, and for coal Russia must depend exclusively on the supplies forwarded to her naval stations from Europe. Japan, on the other hand, has half a dozen dock yards and coal mines which yield a combustible, inferior in quality, it is true, to the Welsh product, but unlimited in quantity. It is also to be borne in mind that the instant the war breaks out, Russia will be unable to reënforce her squadrons in the Pacific, because she will no longer be permitted to use the British coaling stations on the routes thither. Her battleships would have to turn back, as did those of Spain which were on their way to the Philippines.

The Japanese undoubtedly believe that they can beat the Russians, if they can fight this summer, and if, with England's help, they can compel France to remain neutral. Should their expectation be fulfilled, Russia's southward expansion would probably be deferred for many years, for the Japanese would not be content with the acquisition of Korea, but would reassert their title to the Liao-Tung Peninsula, which they won from China, but of which Russia deprived them.

Marriage and Divorce.

A clergyman of the High Church or "Catholic" party of the Episcopal Church expresses the hope, in a letter printed in another column of this paper, that the "time is not far distant" when people desiring religious marriage "will be compelled to bring to the Christian priest a certificate of marriage already legalized by a Justice of the Peace." This agrees with the opinion we have expressed on the subject, that is, if he means that the civil marriage only should be legal.

So far as religion is concerned, however, our correspondent holds to the sacramental view of marriage, though it is expressly rejected by his Church, both in England and this country. The XXVth of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, adopted in this country also, thus declares:

"There are two sacraments ordained of CHRIST our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the LORD. Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as are grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the LORD'S Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of GOD."

The religious authority of these Thirty-nine Articles as an expression of the Anglican faith has been disputed, it is true, but their rejection of matrimony as an indissoluble sacrament is confirmed in both England and this country. Church and State in England are one. There is a Church Convocation, but practically it is without power, the Church being governed "under her Majesty," that is practically by Parliament, and by law of Parliament marriage is dissoluble for adultery in the wife and for adultery aggravated by other offences in the husband. Likewise the canon of the Episcopal Church in this country makes it dissoluble for adultery, though without such an immoral distinction between the offence in the wife and in the husband, and it allows remarriage to the innocent party to a divorce.

Accordingly, our correspondent's views of the sacramental character of marriage conflict with the law of his Church in both this country and England. Neither here nor in England, however, is an Episcopal clergyman compelled to marry again people who have been thus divorced, though by the English law a minister refusing to perform such a ceremony is compelled to permit it to be performed in his church by any other clergyman of the diocese. The sacerdotal party in both English and American Episcopalianism has long and strenuously endeavored to make marriage an indissoluble sacrament, but it is evident that in England it can never succeed in its purpose short of the separation of Church and State, or the disestablishment of the Church of England; and in this country it must be able to command a majority of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church to change the canon.

Our correspondent asserts that now "there is a pretty general conviction among right-minded people that in America we are becoming somewhat polygamous in our instincts," and his assertion seems to receive support from the declaration in the Episcopal Address to the last Methodist General Conference that "the statistics of divorce legislation indicate that the glory of the true and pure family is suffering painful eclipse." Actually, however, there is no justification for such a conviction. Polygamous tendencies are no more observable here than in countries where there is no divorce legalized; and, indeed, the tone of our American social morality is higher. Where our divorce laws have extended the causes of divorce, as in most of our States has been done, the additional causes have been recognized for the benefit of abandoned and ill-treated wives especially and with no view to interfering with the sanctity of marriage, but rather for its practical protection. That our divorce laws contribute to immorality has never been proved, and over against the assertion of our correspondent that they promote polygamy there is the assertion on the other side that really it is the prohibition of divorce which promotes practical polygamy. Our clerical friend wants a marriage and divorce law of Congress, but it is not possible, and if it was possible it would unquestionably be a liberal law, for that is the preponderant sentiment of the States.

This question, however, need not be debated, for it does not touch the matter of religious obligation as variously interpreted by the many different parties in Christendom. Undoubtedly the civil law should not interfere with the religious conscience, but neither can the Church be permitted to interfere with the State in this Republic where their separation is complete. The State having legalized the marriage, the Church must be left free to give or withhold its sanction, according to its faith.

The Anti-Mongoose Movement.

A bill which the House has passed and the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce has reported without amendment puts the mongoose into the same category of exclusion as the Chinaman. The importation of the mongoose is prohibited. If a mongoose arrives at any port of the United States after the date of the approval of this act he will either "be destroyed or returned at the expense of the owner."

We have no information as to the extent or character of the popular agitation which has preceded this action by Congress. If any anti-mongoose meeting has been held anywhere, we have not seen a report of it. This Draconic legislation will strike the mongoose like a thunderbolt from a clear sky. He will arrive hereafter at the ports of the United States and find the doors closed and the bars up. He will not know where he is at. If RIKKI-TIKKI-TAVI himself should come, he would be destroyed or returned at the expense of Mr. KIPLING.

We observe a looseness in the language of the proposed statute which may lead to some interesting questions for judicial determination. The mongoose, or more properly mungoos, is only one variety of that small but lively ichneumon which seems to Congress to be an undesirable denizen of this republic. He is a native of India, although he is world-famous for his fighting qualities, combining as he does the pluck of the bantam with the tenacity of the bull terrier. The Indian ichneumon, or herpestes griseus, is clearly excluded by House Bill 6,634. But how is it about his near relative the herpestes ichneumon, or PHARAOH'S rat?

If one of PHARAOH'S rats should arrive at a port of the United States from some Egyptian or other north African port, could he be excluded legally as a mongoose, which he is not?

That is a question for the Supreme Court or the Smithsonian Institution.

Baseball.

The *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of May 19 thus describes the game between the New York nine and the St. Louisites:

"Umpire SWARTWOOD officiated, and his decisions were continually differed with by the Easterners GLEASON, GRADY & Co. were after 'SWARTY' from the drop of the flag. They registered their first kick after 'KIP' SELBACH had been called out on strikes in the first inning. The third strike served up by JONES split the heart of the plate, waist high, and SWARTWOOD very correctly called the batter out. A howl went up from the 'Joints' that would have done credit to the old Baltimore gang. SWARTWOOD succeeded in quieting all the players but SELBACH, the latter keeping up a continual war of words with him. It resulted in the official ordering him from the game."

"For the rest of the game," says our contemporary, "the Joints acted just as the Tebeauites used to." In the eighth inning, after the umpire declared a St. Louis man not out of the plate, this happened:

"It was a case of howl from every member of the visiting team. They charged on 'SWARTY' as though they were going to bury him under an avalanche of abuse. With the bunch around him HAWLEY raised his right hand and brought it down on SWARTWOOD'S face. It was a mere slap, done in the heat of passion, and, of course, earned for his 'Pinkship,' a seat on the bench alongside of SELBACH."

Now the captain of the New York nine is BUCK EWING, by nature neither a ruffian nor a bruiser. What other inference can be drawn, therefore, than that the continued ruffianism of the New Yorkers, varying from mere wrangling with the umpire to bodily assault such as is described above, enjoys practically the approval of the New York club's management and of the National League?

Pin Money in a Husband's Pockets.

An interesting question in morals and matrimonial economics is here asked; and it has been asked often:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Kindly inform a wife if when she takes small change from her husband's pocket while he sleeps he can in justice call it stealing. I am above doing anything like what you would call stealing. Man and wife are one. I can't understand why one can steal from the other. My conscience does not tell me I have done wrong. My husband claims it is stealing, while I claim I have done nothing wrong. I am very conscientious about it. My husband is a business man. He allows me $15 a week for the table, but my spending money and part of my clothing come from it. What I want to know is: Is it stealing or not? I shall watch for the answer anxiously.

"NEW YORK, May 20. A WIFE."

It is better not to take refuge in technicalities. This conscientious wife has too clean a soul to need the shield of casuistry. She would not want her husband to carry off her best silver spoons and pawn them. What is mine is thine is an agreeable, but a dangerous doctrine. The wife's case rests on stronger grounds. There is stealing in her house, but her husband is doing it. He is stealing her time, her unpaid labor, her devotion, all the strength and glory of her womanly and wifely qualities. A household must be run on business principles. There should be an allowance made to the wife for household expenses. She may save something out of it. She may have to squeeze along on it. At any rate, she is entitled to a separate allowance for clothing and other personal expenses, unless the household allowance is large enough for both purposes. It is wrong to make a woman a beggar in her own house, yet many men, and even generous but thoughtless men, seem to have no idea that married women need any money of their own.

We have heard a shrewd observer say that half the married women in New York habitually do not have car fare. Probably most married men are rather careless and ignorant than selfish in the matter. Somehow or other the man usually makes himself a liberal allowance. We have heard it said that many men habitually misrepresent their incomes, telling their wives that they make $25 a week for example, when they are really making $30 or $35. Thus they are able to have a considerable sum for their private delectation without seeming ungenerous to their wives.

These fellows are sneaks, but the so-called generous man is pretty sure to be generous to himself. How generous are the luncheons and the dinners that men of very moderate means, even clerks on rather small salaries, are able to buy themselves. They cannot resign themselves to cheap cigars. They have been known to ride in cabs, while their wives are suspending themselves from horse-car straps. O, nothing is too good for a man. The dog thinks himself a fine fellow, and prides himself on his liberality. And plenty of men are liberal to their wives, and a percentage of married women is extravagant. But take the matter so far as ordinary observation can look at it, and married men are much more likely to be economical in their wives' expenses than in their own.

A great deal of wisdom has been dropped, especially by visiting foreigners, about the extravagance and uselessness of American women. Such there are, and they are often conspicuous in the public view. The rich woman cannot be classed as extravagant, nor is she often other than active in good works, private and public. But the great majority of American married women are the wives of men of small means. The great majority cannot afford to keep servants. But whether they superintend or do the housework, they are laborers and worthy of their hire. A man's home and his children are what he works for, but his wife works for them as hard and better. She keeps home sweet for him. Her frugality, her cleverness, her knack of doing things save him a great deal of money. What money he spends upon himself will go mostly for luxuries, some of it perhaps for vices. What he gives her will be spent more usefully. Men are always girding idiotically at women's supposed extravagance in clothes, but what myriads of women can make their own clothes, and where is the man outside the tailor's shop who can do as much? We can recall only the late ROBINSON CRUSOE and the present Hon. CARL BROWNE, a Populist philosopher who likewise made him a coat of the skin of a goat. Men make more money than women, but they also waste more. They don't waste it by a long shot when they give it to their wives.

"A Wife" should reason with her husband, show him that he doesn't give her money enough, ask him for more. If he is a sensible man, he will see that she is right. If he lacks discourse of reason, why, we suppose, that the removal of small change from a man's pocket by his wife is a mild justice, which does good to a good man, fines a niggard and directs certain small change from beer and cigars into productive industry. At any rate, the proceeds are genuine pocket money.

The first session of the Indiana Union of Literary Clubs begins in Lafayette to-day. The literature, music and art of the Hoosiers will be represented. There is a remarkable interest in these in Indiana as in many other Western States. In clubs perhaps no State is richer in proportion to its population. They are sometimes laughed at. Their tendency to dawdling, mutual admiration, mere talk and restless sciolism is condemned by sages who don't belong to them and perhaps can't get into them. But when all that can be truly said against them has been said, they are a centre of intellectual activity; and as a dissipation they are agreeable and harmless.

Congress and the President permit the American Line to change the name of the most famous of its big four.

As the Paris she sped and suffered.

As the Yale she helped to wallop Spain and set the new America a-going.

As the Philadelphia may her fortunes be even, her existence tranquil, and her revolutions not too slow.

It was a cheap argument for the Filipinos, when Senator HOAR compared them to the Boers, and likened our course in Luzon to that of the British in South Africa. The Filipinos are rebelling against as lawfully established a sovereignty as there is on earth, while the Boers are defending themselves against an invader that means to take their independence from them.

The American who, for purposes of anti-imperialism or anti-McKinleyism or simple Bryanism, uses Senator HOAR's comparison has the anti-American prejudice in the extreme.

The town of Paterson will be peculiarly disgraced if Recorder SENIOR, a veritable pillar of the law, is not kept upon the bench.

A man of the name of BROWN finished on Monday night a prodigious feat in bicycling. He rode 2,000 miles in a little less than nine days and a half, or 200 miles, two "centuries," a day. No other candidate for honors of the sort has approached it. It gives a new idea of what a man and a bicycle can do. It may even have a special scientific interest, because BROWN three years ago was pronounced consumptive. If he is so no longer, the wheel must have the lion's share of credit for the cure.

For our part, we are very much obliged to BROWN for his demonstration of physical endurance on the bicycle. But when the next session of the Legislature opens we must look for some crank to introduce a bill forbidding any man to ride two centuries a day. Man's solicitude for man makes countless nuisances.

What is the attitude of Col. MOSE WETMORE of St. Louis toward the new Tobacco Trust? Will he sell out to it, or will he slug it? If the new Trust has failed to negotiate with Col. MOSE WETMORE there is woe in store for it. He loves to hurt Trusts and help himself.

Many Kansas writers wish to establish a Kansas magazine, devoted exclusively to the contributions of Kansas writers. The project is interesting and should succeed. Probably it would find large support in other States if it was not too exclusively literary and smacked of the Sunflower soil. Kansas has many authors of talent and is singularly rich in people and things of interest. And there is about them a rich romantic luxuriance, as of the Populist imagination. It has been said that life there is barren and monotonous, and that men and women take up politics fiercely for amusement and excitement. But this was unjust, as a Kansas magazine would soon show.

Men, women, and we dare say children, too, have crossed continents and all solid parts of the world on bicycles, on horseback, on feet. Most of the water has carried canoes. Now a young fellow from Princeton has started to cross this continent on an automobile. He may not get tired at the edge of the Pacific, but keep on his way around the globe. Soon there will be no surprising the natives anywhere. They will have seen everything and called it a vanity.

An Oven and a Flag.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Who says strawberry shortcake "like mother used to make?" If this Yankee knew of a corner in New York big enough to hold an oven and an American flag she would dare make the aforesaid article and satisfy the most fastidious New England palate.

MARY ELLEN.

Room Enough.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will the admission of I. Ep take up too much space?

ALBANY, May 19. J. B. V.

Discussion About New Caledonia.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The statement in to-day's issue furnished by Georges Lascelles Latroune, a liberée (ticket-of-leave man) from New Caledonia must be highly amusing to any of your readers who have lived there.

I resided there for some years, travelling the length and breadth of the island and am in a position to assert positively that cannibalism exists no longer in New Caledonia. A white man can travel unarmed in any portion of the country as far as the natives are concerned. True, they once had a fearful insurrection in the interior, but it was speedily stamped out, and is not likely to recur, for the French Government treats the Kanakas well.

There may be a few isolated cases of "cannibalism," but they dare not practise it openly. Entre nous, the Kanaka is not overfond of "white flesh," for, as an old ex-cannibal said to me one day in a burst of confidence, "Kanaka no like to ki ki white man, he too much all same salt." However, I congratulate Georges Lascelles Latroune upon the wealth of his imagination.

CARINA JORDAN.

MOUNT VERNON, May 21.

IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Cape Town despatches concerning what is going on at the front have proved so generally unreliable that the report coming from there to the effect that the British have occupied Vereeniging on the north side of the Vaal and captured a large number of locomotives needs official confirmation before being accepted. If the Boers have decided to continue the struggle, as it is understood they have, it is most unlikely that they should have neglected to protect the railway bridge across the Vaal or to blow it up on the approach of the enemy. So important an incident would certainly have been telegraphed by Lord Roberts had it occurred, to say nothing of the improbability of there being any British force strong enough to cross the Vaal unsupported at such a distance, over eighty-five miles, from the main body at Kroonstad. What British forces are at present along the Vaal in front of Lord Roberts would, in the nature of things, be strong mounted patrols and reconnoitring parties.

The mishap that has befallen a squadron of Gen. Buller's irregulars is one of those incidents that may be looked for at any time, the nature of the country lending itself to surprises of isolated bodies by men well acquainted with it. There seems still some uncertainty as to whether the Boers are holding Laings Nek or not, but it should soon be known. The Paris rumor that the British had met with a defeat there is probably only another version of the disaster to the squadron of Bethune's Horse, already mentioned.

Regarding the stories of the Boers suing for peace, while there is nothing absolutely authentic about them, there are some grounds for believing that after the occupation of Kroonstad the executive chiefs of the two republics again asked the British Government, as after the occupation of Bloemfontein, on what terms it would make peace. The British reply is said to have been that only unconditional surrender would be accepted, on which the Boers decided to continue the war. The official notice issued by the Transvaal Government to the Consuls of neutral powers announcing the intention to defend the Rand mining district which includes Johannesburg, and disclaiming responsibility for injury to the persons and properties of their subjects which may occur or be necessary in the course of the defences, indicates that it has been resolved to carry on the war to the end. The disposal of the 4,000 British prisoners held by the Boers at Waterval, near Pretoria, is now an interesting question, and depends on what decision the British Government may come to in reply to the Boer proposals regarding them.

The British losses officially stated up to May 5, are 289 officers killed and died of disease; 731 wounded and 170 missing. Rank and file: 4,309 killed and died of disease; 9,843 wounded and 4,235 missing. There have besides been 416 officers and 7,203 rank and file sent home invalided, as distinct from wounded, which brings the aggregate losses of the army up to 27,196 officers and men. The numbers in hospital at the same date are estimated at over 9,000. Including the non-combatants who have been killed, wounded and died of disease, the figures swell up to some 14,000, making a total of over 41,000 casualties already during the war.

UNCLE SAM SELLS A JOB LOT.

Annual Auction of Unclaimed and Abandoned Articles at the Public Stores.

The year's collection of unclaimed and abandoned goods was disposed of at public auction yesterday in the seizure room of the United States Public Stores building, 641 Washington street. Four hundred and twenty-seven lots were disposed of for $6,721.55, which was about $2,000 short of the appraised value of the articles. Some of the 300 persons who attended the sale were evidently there for the fun they could get out of it, and the bids were made in that spirit, for they were ridiculously high in many instances.

In the crowd was a woman who said she had come to bid on a certain pair of corsets in the collection. She stayed all day, but the lot she was looking for had not been reached when the auction closed for the day, and she departed, saying she would be back to-day.

Among the curious articles sold was an elephant's tusk two feet long. It brought $40. A pair of silver cups valued at $4 were sold to "Mr. Dyer of Atlanta, Ga.," for $40 on the supposition that they were of antique workmanship. There was spirited bidding for three bottles of entomological specimens which the auctioneer referred to as bugs. A Mr. Goldsmith got them for $10. One hundred and twelve volumes of "infidel literature" were knocked down at $14.

International Farmers' Trust.

From the Washington Post.

Mr. J. C. Hanley of St. Paul, Minn., the executive agent of the National Farmers' Federation of the Mississippi Valley, the National Grain Growers' Association, the National Cotton Growers' Association and the Farmers' Alliance Industrial Union, called upon the President yesterday.

To a *Post* reporter Mr. Hanley stated that a movement is on foot to bring the farmers and grain growers of the world into an association, the purpose of which will be to get the combined farmers in all parts of the world to restrict the acreage of wheat and other crops, so as to raise the price, in the case of wheat, to $1 a bushel.

In the opinion of those who are interested in the movement for a world's association it will be quite practicable to secure an agreement to reduce the acreage and form a plan for giving universal information, and in this way double the price. In the same way it is hoped that the cotton growers can be brought together and the acreage reduced until the price ranges in the neighborhood of 10 cents a pound. Other crops will, of course, be taken into consideration, but as wheat and cotton are the main staples on which the farmer depends for a money crop, the greatest endeavors will be used in the direction of a reduction of an acreage of these.

A world's congress of farmers is to be held in Paris from the 9th to the 16th of July, at which the representatives of the various farmers' organizations and individual farmers throughout the agricultural sections of all countries will be present.

Summer Drinks.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have read with much interest the letters of "Bartender" and others on the subject of summer drinks now being discussed in your valuable journal. I quite agree with "Bartender" that "rickey" drinking is detrimental and injurious when taken too frequently, but the drinks put forth so far as substitutes cannot in my opinion be given serious consideration.

What is wanted during hot weather is not an expensive cocktail or fancy beverage, but a wholesome, palatable drink that will refresh and cheer the jaded city man and quench his thirst without giving that languid, inebriated feeling too common with popular drinks at the present time. In this connection I beg to submit, for the information of "Bartender" and others interested in this matter, the name of a drink, which became very popular last season, namely the "Moonlight Saunter."

This drink has sufficient head to cheer without inebriating in the slightest way; it is composed of ingredients that cannot be tampered with without detection by even the uninitiated. It is an essentially "long drink" and cannot be surpassed as a thirst quencher.

NEW YORK, May 21. AUTOLYCUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Milk as a summer drink or any other season's drink is the quintessence of foolishness. T. S. Allen says it is a "summer drink to which all of us * * * once rendered loyal treaty" (whatever that may mean—I suppose that our mothers had to stand the treat). Milk is not a drink at all, and because we swallow it without cutting it with a knife and fork it is no more a drink than soup.

Sir Henry Thompson in common with a multitude of other authorities has explained that the proportion of curd and water is so arranged in milk that it has only the amount of water required by the stomach to digest the intensely nutritious curd. Let a man sweat three or four pounds of water on a hot day or seven pounds as I often have myself on a single afternoon's "pull" on the river, and then drink milk under the delusion that because he *drinks* it it is a "drink." What will happen? His system will almost instantly absorb the water from two or three glasses of milk, and there will be left within him to plague and sorely vex him a cork of the smoothest curd to dislodge which the strongest medicines may be necessary. Milk mixed with a quantity of water (all the water the system craves) is another question.

I worship sentiment in its proper place, but does it not smack of sentimentalism or misplaced sentiment for a man to talk of milk as the "drink" of our "fathers before us—yea, and of our fathers' fathers, e'en to the first syllable of unrecorded time" and then to propose a "glass of cold milk. * * * I mean, of course, after it has been properly sterilized!"

MAY 21. JOHN SUCKLING.

THE PRICE OF MILK.

A Card From No. 80 of the Five States Milk Producers' Association.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Noticing in THE SUN the only report of the milk association published in any New York paper which treated the farmers' side of the question with any degree of fairness, the undersigned, a Committee on Correspondence appointed by Greene Section, No. 80, of the F. S. M. P. A., would be pleased to state through the courtesy of THE SUN the situation as it exists in this vicinity.

On May 6 the price paid to milk producers here was reduced to one and three-quarters of a cent a quart by the Milk Exchange which price would not cover the cost of production, which condition has existed much of the time for the past ten years, resulting in financial distress to producers. One of the results is a very large depreciation in the value of farm lands and a general depression among farmers who read every day of the universal prosperity in other lines of business.

The price of milk paid the farmer for many years has averaged a little under one and seven-eighths cents a quart. The price asked by the F. S. M. P. A. is two cents a quart for six months beginning April 1 and three cents a quart for six months beginning Oct. 1. This is an average of less than two and one-half cents for all milk produced, because more milk is sold at the lesser than at the greater price. The above prices are slightly varied by the difference in freight rates. These prices are for the long haul or 32 cents freight a can.

The producers of milk believe that the consumers already pay a liberal price, enough so, that, after the freight and a fair profit are paid to the middlemen, there should be left to the farmers, who have many millions of capital invested, a little more than one-third of the amount paid by the consumer.

There is no other article of universal necessity where the difference between the price received by the producer and the price paid by the consumer is as great as milk. Milk is now being shipped to all buyers who pay the F. S. M. P. A. price. There is no strike in the milk business. The farmers ask a price for their property and sell it to any one who pays that price. We know of no law that will compel us to sell our property at the buyers' price unless it is satisfactory.

GEORGE W. LENDERSON, } Committee on
C. WINSTON, } Correspondence.

GREENE, Chenango county, May 21.

Marriage, Civil and Religious.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There is evidently so much ignorance and misconception regarding civil and religious marriages, that I shall esteem it a favor if you will allow one who has given many years to study of the question to place the matter carefully before your readers.

In the first place, marriage *per se* is simply a civil contract. Biblical scholars have called this statement in question, because in the Book of Common Prayer marriage is said "to have been instituted of God in the time of man's innocency," but no one would assert that the conditions of marriage which suited our first parents and the Adamic race would be quite in harmony with what Christians now call "Holy Matrimony"!

The affirmative law of marriage, which has come down from creation, is simply that an unmarried adult man may marry an unmarried adult woman, provided both parties are of sound mind and are both ready to enter into the contract, and are capable of carrying out the primary end for which marriage is instituted. This primary end of marriage is clearly defined in the exhortation of the office of the English Prayer Book: First, for the procreation of children; secondly, as a remedy against sin, and, thirdly, for mutual society. But, unfortunately, the woman has been regarded as property, first of her father and then of her husband, so that in all countries the marriage law has been limited by a crowd of prohibitions and regulations. No true churchman can study the conditions of marriage in various countries without being convinced that in the present day no legislative assembly could enact a marriage law which would satisfy the conditions of "Holy Matrimony" or Christian marriage.

This was discovered as soon as the Roman Empire embraced Christianity. The Romans, like the Hindoos, and, in fact, like all Aryan races, were monogamists. But the legalized system of concubinage practically established polygamy. The Semitic races, such as the Jews and Arabians, have practised polygamy, while savage races have placed no restrictions on marriage except so far as pertains to property and family rights.

In the present day there is a pretty general conviction among right-minded people that in America we are becoming somewhat polygamous in our instincts, and it is against this that the Church Catholic raises its protest. The Eastern churches have been somewhat liberal in their interpretations of the law of marriage and divorce. The Roman Catholics have instituted a system of dispensations which makes divorce a luxury, as in the case of Napoleon. The Episcopal Church now feels that in order to raise the tone of society the life-long contract of holy matrimony must be maintained. The Puritans have always taken a lower position regarding the question, and this is expressed in the Presbyterian "Directory for Worship," chapter 11: "Marriage is not a sacrament nor peculiar to the Church of Christ. It is proper that every commonwealth, for the good of society, shall make laws to regulate marriage, which all citizens are obliged to obey."

It is very evident, therefore, that what we want in America is a civil law on marriage and divorce which shall prove a safeguard to public morality and secure the sanctity of family life. And it is not necessary that this law should rise to the highest conceptions of the Christian view of marriage, but it is absolutely necessary that there should be one law on marriage and divorce throughout the country. We have now one law passed by Congress which prohibits polygamy. Why should we not have one law which shall regulate marriage and divorce?

Every student of Church history knows that the Church had to tolerate such laws, although they were never indorsed by the best thought of the Church. Under the Emperors Constantine, Honorius and Theodosius Junior there were laws of marriage and divorce which differed very little from those of Dakota and Oklahoma.

But when we come to "Holy Matrimony" it is that which, according to the Book of Common Prayer, signifies "the mystical union which is between Christ and His Church;" and it is something altogether different to the marriage of a Jew, a Hindoo or a Parsee fire worshipper. It is life-long in its contract. The contract made before the altar of Christ is "until death us do part." The question is put to those about to be married as to whether they will keep this contract "so long as ye both shall live," and they answer "I will." It doesn't require much logic to prove that when this contract is broken it cannot be renewed at the altar. This is clearly defined by St. Paul, who says in Romans, vii., 2, "For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth." The supposed sanction of Jesus Christ for divorce in Matthew, v., 32, throws very little light upon the subject, for at the most it only sanctions the putting away of a wife, and not a husband, whilst according to many of the old Fathers the word "fornication" does not refer to any sin committed after marriage, but before.

The Puritans were so anxious to show that marriage was not a sacrament that they altogether overlooked the fact that holy matrimony was certainly sacramental in its character. Christian marriage is by its very mystical character altogether lifted out of the category of ordinary marriage, so that divorced persons, or even the unbaptized, have not the right to seek the benediction of the Church. It is difficult to understand why they do insist upon being married in either a fashionable church or by a fashionable clergyman. It can only be desired because of its respectability! And the sooner the Church defines what she understands by respectability in marriage the better for the purity of the national life and the good of the Church.

I hope the time is not far distant when persons will be compelled to bring to the Christian priest a certificate of marriage already legalized by a Justice of the Peace. Then Christian people will come to the church to have their nuptials solemnized by Christian vows, and being thus married "in the Lord," they will stand as representatives of the sacramental contract of marriage, which was intended to exemplify the mystical union that exists between Christ and His Church. This is the only way in which the controversy can be settled by the Church in a country where we are ruled by the people and for the people.

D.D., LL.D.

NEW YORK, May 21.

KILLING CHINESE CHRISTIANS.

The Murderous Raids of the "Boxers."

The "Boxers" of China, who head the anti-foreign movement in the northeast provinces, have changed their scene of operations since Germany threatened last month to make a naval demonstration if China did not suppress the society. Germany's warning was due to the fact that the Boxers had destroyed a great deal of mission property, killed one white missionary and many native Christians within the German sphere of influence, and collected on the surveyed line of the railroad, declaring that they would forcibly prevent track laying. Germany's protest against these outrages is doubtless the reason why the Boxers have crossed the Hoang Ho and moved into Pechili province, where they have resumed the massacre of native Christians.

They have killed seventy-three persons, including women and children, near the large and important city of Paoting-fu, the capital of Pechili and the largest place in it excepting Pekin and Tientsin. It is a very busy city in the midst of plains admirably cultivated. Pekin is only eighty-five miles to the northeast and Tientsin the same distance to the east. The fact that railroad trains run regularly between Pekin and Paoting-fu lends color to the statement that the imperial Government is conniving with the Boxers or regard their lawlessness with indifference. It would certainly seem that the Government is either powerless against this outlawry or encourages it, for the Empress Dowager's proclamation against the Boxers in February had no good result and they are now repeating their outrages much nearer to Pekin and along a railroad that might carry troops from the capital to the revolters in a few hours.

The American Board as well as missionary societies of Europe have important interests at Paoting-fu. Thus far the Boxers have done about as they pleased. When they began their raids in October last they declared it to be their purpose to exterminate all foreigners and all who are "worse than foreigners," meaning the Christian converts. The situation is becoming intolerable for missionaries in northeast China, who have not known such serious persecution in many years.

FISHERMEN FOR NAVAL RESERVES.

Admiral Sampson Would Get Such Recruits From Our New England Ports.

BOSTON, May 22.—Admiral Sampson in an interview has declared for a naval reserve made up of fishermen.

"For a good many years," the Admiral said, "I have been deeply in sympathy with any proposition for the enrollment of our hardy coast fishermen as a naval reserve. These men know the sea better than naval militia men know it. They are toughened, rough-and-tumble, capable, courageous fellows, who may be instructed readily in the requirements of the places they would be called upon to fill in case of trouble. We are going to have war some time or other and I think it's a first-rate idea to have physically capable and intelligently trained sailors ready always for emergency duty.

"I don't wish to say a word against the personnel of the naval militia, but rather to indicate that the chief fault with it is that the several organizations are not under immediate Government control. A young, strong, rough and ready fisherman of Gloucester or Salem or other port on our New England coast could be developed in winter to a very valuable reserve man with three or four months' work on board ship in the Caribbean."

WAR REVENUE TAXES.

Proposed Investigation of the Question of Reducing Them.

WASHINGTON, May 22.—At the meeting of the House Committee on Ways and Means tomorrow Chairman Payne will present a resolution authorizing the committee to sit during the recess to consider the matter of reducing the war taxes. The purpose is to investigate the question of reduction in an orderly and thorough manner. The committee may not meet until after the election.

The Administration will take no steps toward a repeal of the War Revenue act. There has been some doubt on this subject up to this time, as the pressure has been great from druggists and brewers especially to have the act repealed, but the Cabinet advise against such a repeal, and no attempt will be made to get Congress to act on the matter this session.

APRIL PAY FOR TEACHERS.

$1,300,000 Turned Over Yesterday to the Board of Education.

Warrants for $1,300,000, representing one-twelfth of the annual appropriation of the Board of Education, were delivered by Comptroller Coler to the City Chamberlain yesterday and subsequently turned over to the Treasurer of the board. By to-morrow or Thursday, it was said yesterday, the 15,000 odd checks for teachers' April pay will have been signed and the money will be ready for payment.

Lord Curzon's Thanks Cabled From India.

The Committee of One Hundred on India Famine Relief which cabled $30,000 to India on Monday, received yesterday additional contributions of $1,806.70, and the following cable messages.

SIMLA, May 22, 1900.

Mr. William E. Dodge, Chairman of Committee of One Hundred, New York:

Many thanks for your splendid contribution.

CURZON, Viceroy.

AHMEDNAGAR, May 22.

William E. Dodge, Chairman:

Cholera bad in some districts. Mortality and distress increasing. Relief most urgent in native States. Grain prices not rising. ROBERT A. HUME.

Mr. Hume is chairman of the Interdenominational Missionary Relief Committee.

Punished for Calling Men "Scabs."

From the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

LITTLE ROCK, Ark., May 18.—"The use of the term 'scab,' applying to an employee of a property under the protection of this court, is itself very near contempt and must be stopped."

Such was one of the dicta of the United States Court at noon to-day as Judge Williams assessed punishment against Guy Miller and Pink Wilson on the charge of contempt of court. After hearing the evidence and listening to the arguments of counsel the Court assessed Miller's punishment at six months and Wilson's at thirty days' imprisonment in Pulaski county jail.

Wednesday Guy Miller, his brother, Eugene Miller, who is still at large, and Pink Wilson, boarded a street car. W. C. Byrd, a conductor, and W. E. Morgan, a motorman, both non-union men, were on the car, although not on duty just at that time. The testimony showed that the Millers called the men "scabs," and demanded that they get off the car as they did not want to ride with them. A difficulty ensued, brought on by the Millers, and one of them kicked the conductor viciously.

Judge Williams held the fact that Morgan and Byrd were not on duty at the time had nothing whatever to do with it, as they were employees of the Little Rock Traction and Electric Company and as such entitled at all times to the protection of the Court.

Sued for Praying for a Lightning Stroke.

From the Philadelphia Times.

STROUDSBURG, May 19.—The Rev. E. E. Dixon, a prominent Methodist clergyman of this borough, will be called upon to defend in court an answer to a prayer offered calling for Divine vengeance on a brewery. Capitalists recently erected a large brewery in the Rev. Mr. Dixon's parish. It caused much comment and was made the subject of a vehement prayer from the minister, in which he called upon God to strike with lightning the new brewery being erected in that place.

Shortly after, during a violent storm, lightning struck the brewery, partially wrecking it, and knocking from a ladder two sons of another Methodist minister who were at work on the building.

No one was killed and the brewery was not burned, but the prayer created so much comment that the capitalists, who are prominent in social circles, decided that they were engaged in a legitimate calling and should not be made the target of pulpit imprecations, as it injured the social standing of themselves and families. Lawyers who have looked up the case say the men have a first class cause of action and it is stated the case will be fought to a finish.

The Rev. Mr. Dixon claims he cannot be held responsible for an act of Providence which brought the subjects into unenviable notoriety, and the question promises to be one of the most novel ever tried in a Pennsylvania court.

Anti-Concussion Uniforms.

From the Palmer (Mass.) Register.

The gun club has adopted Royal Purple sweaters. They are loud enough so that the report of a gun is not noticeable.