The Sun.

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 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.

Manila and Pekin.

A little more than two years ago Commodore DEWEY, commanding less than a dozen second-class warships, was ordered out of the British port where the declaration of our war with Spain found him, and he had to do or die. The only haven where he could hope to rest for any length of time was the enemy's harbor of Manila, and for that he had to fight. If he had been defeated there, he would have slunk into some neutral port on his homeward flight.

The great disturbance now going on in China must show to many who have not seen it earlier what DEWEY actually did.

The Chinese revolt against the foreigners can be controlled only by a very powerful force. The share taken by each country in restoring order and regaining the privileges hitherto peacefully enjoyed can scarcely fail to affect subsequently that country's material interests in China. At this moment we have in the East an army of 60,000 men, a fleet of sixty ships, and a perfect harbor as a base of operations.

For years past wandering Americans have had cause to feel that, in case of trouble with the country in which they were, they might have to call upon some foreign representative for protection. Along the great Asiatic coast that day is past. Our flag is at Manila to stay.

Shall There Be an Extra Session to Repeal the Alaska Act?

An important part of the Republican platform this year, although not written into that document, is the "Act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes."

This is probably the longest law ever passed by Congress as a separate enactment. It fills more than two hundred and fifty closely printed pages. It provides not only a form of Territorial Government for Alaska, but also an elaborate code of legal procedure, both criminal and civil, for the Territorial courts. It is a notable example of the exercise, in the highest degree, of the sovereign power of Congress to legislate for territory belonging to the United States but not included in the Union of States.

The Alaska bill passed the United States Senate on May 1, after careful consideration, without even the formality of a roll call. Democrats, we infer, voted for it unhesitatingly, although the Republican majority was, of course, responsible for its passage. It passed the House on May 28, after another thorough discussion, and again without a division; there, too, the Republican majority was the responsible party. Some minor differences as to detail were adjusted in conference, and the Act was finally approved on June 6 by the Republican President. It is now law in Alaska.

The special significance of this statute at the present time lies in the circumstance that its elaborate provisions for raising revenue are directly in conflict with the explicit requirements of the United States Constitution.

This Act imposes upon certain persons and corporations doing business in Alaska excise taxes or license fees to be collected by the Clerk of the United States District Court and by him to be covered into the Treasury of the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. The schedule of excise taxes for Alaska is entirely distinct from the taxes that fall alike upon all citizens of the United States under the Internal Revenue sections of the Dingley act and the War Revenue act of 1898. It is a strictly local excise applied to this territory only. Some of the taxes imposed on persons and business concerns in Alaska are these:

Banks, $250 per annum.
Boarding houses having accommodations for ten or more guests, $15 per annum.
Brokers (money, bill, note and stock), $100 per annum.
Billiard rooms, $15 per table per annum.
Bowling alleys, $15 per annum.
Breweries, $500 per annum.
Bottling works, $200 per annum.
Cigar manufacturers, $25 per annum.
Cigar stores or stands, $15 per annum.
Drug stores, $50 per annum.
Gas plants, for heat and light, $300 per annum.
Hotels, $50 per annum.
Public halls, $10 per annum.
Insurance agents and brokers, $25 per annum.
Jewellers, $25 per annum.
Mercantile establishments: Doing a business of $100,000 per annum, $500 per annum; doing a business of $75,000 per annum, $300 per annum; doing a business of $50,000 per annum, $250 per annum; doing a business of $25,000 per annum, $125 per annum; doing a business of $10,000 per annum, $50 per annum; doing a business of under $10,000 per annum, $25 per annum; doing a business of under $4,000 per annum, $10 per annum.
Meat markets, $15 per annum.
Itinerant physicians, $50 per annum.
Pawnbrokers, $300 per annum.
Railroads, $100 per mile per annum on each mile operated.
Real estate dealers and brokers, $50 per annum.
Sawmills, ten cents per thousand feet on the lumber sawed.
Steam ferries, $100 per annum.
Transfer companies, $50 per annum.
Taxidermists, $10 per annum.
Theatres, $100 per annum.
Waterworks, $50 per annum.

We have printed only a part of the list. A glance at the industries enumerated will show that the United States Government is imposing on individuals and business concerns in Alaska taxes from which citizens of New York, Missouri or California engaged in similar industries are exempt. In no State of the Union does the United States Government collect and cover into the United States Treasury a special tax on butchers' shops, a special tax on boarding houses, a special tax on jewellers, a special tax on taxidermists, and sawmills. This is a schedule of excise duties enacted for Alaska exclusively.

It is, moreover, absolutely clear and indisputable that these license fees imposed by law are taxes of the nature of excises. All legal lexicographers and Constitutional commentators agree as to that; and in decisions of the United States Supreme Court it has been held that the requirement of payment for such licenses is only a mode of imposing taxes on the licensed business. There need be, therefore, no confusion in the mind of any reader who observes that the Alaska Act speaks of these various taxes as "license fees," rather than as excises. They are excises. They are internal revenue taxes.

Now, if Congress is restricted in legislating for the Territories by the general provisions of the United States Constitution, if its power over the Territories is not absolute and unaffected by Constitutional restraints, if Alaska and Porto Rico and the Philippines became in the Constitutional sense parts of the United States when our Government acquired them, the Alaska Act is manifestly unconstitutional.

The proposition needs no argument. The Constitution requires that *all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.* The Alaska excises are not uniform throughout the United States. They cannot be regarded as Constitutional unless Alaska is regarded as not a part of the United States in the sense contemplated by the Constitution. But if Alaska is not a part of the United States, in the sense contemplated by the Constitution, the sovereign authority of Congress to legislate for it without restraint by Constitutional provisions applying to States in the Union is as clear as daylight.

Such is the issue which Democratic theorists as to Constitutional self-extension have revived from the old slave-holding days and made a part of their modern faith for the purpose of hindering the nation in its new career, and embarrassing the Administration and the Republican party in the responsibilities which recent events have put upon them.

The Republican doctrine is as clear as crystal. It was asserted first in 1856, reaffirmed in 1860, and it is now asserted in every measure like the Porto Rico Act or the Alaska Act. The Republicans assert the full legislative power of Congress over territory acquired by the United States. They deny that the Constitution goes of itself into such territory.

We are now informed that there were at Philadelphia some Republicans concerned in framing and revising the party's platform for 1900, who thought it safer not to state this fundamental principle of ancient and contemporary Republicanism because they feared they might get the platform into a controversy with some future decision of the United States Supreme Court!

If sufficient reason for such extreme timidity was afforded by the fact that the Constitutionality of the Porto Rico tariff, already affirmed by the decision of Judge TOWNSEND in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, may be passed upon later by the Supreme Court, what do these cautious gentlemen think of the Alaska Act, for which the Republican party is already responsible?

If the Porto Rico tariff is unconstitutional, so is the Alaska Act. If they are afraid to assert a Republican doctrine because a case involving it is going to the Supreme Court, these same gentlemen ought, in the logic of their excessive prudence, to persuade President MCKINLEY, if they can, to call an extra session of Congress without a week's delay, in order that the Republican Congress may repeal the Alaska Act in season to escape a possible conflict with a possible decision of the Supreme Court.

The Ministerial Crisis in Italy.

In the closing session of the last Italian Parliament, the Ministry headed by Gen. PELLOUX tried to get from the Chamber of Deputies a ratification of the high-handed course pursued by it during the recess. We refer to the suspension by Ministerial decree of the Constitutional guarantees of the liberty of public meeting and of the freedom of the press; an act which in any other country professing to enjoy Parliamentary institutions would be regarded as a *coup d'état.* The Extreme Left, which comprehends Socialists, Republicans and Radicals, supported by the so-called Constitutional Left, headed by Signor ZANARDELLI, and assisted by Signor GIOLITTI and even by the Marquis DI RUDINI, who is a Conservative, exhausted the resources of obstruction in their determination to avert a legislative sanction of the suspensive decree. Once they frightened the President of the Chamber, Signor COLOMBO, into resigning his office. But he was presently reëlected by the Ministerialists, and new standing orders, providing a drastic mode of dealing with obstruction, were subsequently passed. The demonstrations of all sections of the Opposition, however, continued to be so violent that Signor COLOMBO shrank from exercising the powers with which he was entrusted; and the Ministers, who had been repeatedly defied to take the judgment of the country on their suspension of the Constitution, suddenly accepted the challenge, dissolved Parliament and ordered a new appeal to the constituencies.

The resultant general elections took place on June 3 and June 10, and the outcome was that the numbers of the Extreme Left were greatly increased, while their Zanardellist, Giolittist and Conservative allies retained, upon the whole, their former strength. When the new Chamber met on June 16, the Ministerialists were able to elect a presiding officer (no longer COLOMBO, for he had lost his seat) but by a majority so small that the enforcement of the new standing orders and the passage of a bill ratifying the suspension of Constitutional guarantees seemed more doubtful than ever. Under the circumstances, there was some ground for the taunt of the Opposition that the result of the appeal to the electors had been adverse to the Ministry. Such, at all events, was Premier PELLOUX's opinion, for he insisted upon resigning his office. On June 20, Signor SARACCO, the President of the Senate, was charged by King HUMBERT I. with the duty of forming a new Ministry. He may succeed, as he is supported by Baron SONNINO, lately Minister of Finance, who, for some years past, has rendered memorable services to the national exchequer, and is, beyond comparison, the greatest of Italian financiers.

The new Premier, however, will have a difficult task, unless he can increase the small majority obtained by Gen. PELLOUX through an alliance with the dissident Conservatives or with the Giolittists or the Zanardellists. It is hard to see, however, by what means, short of modifying the new standing orders, the assistance of any of these elements can be secured, for they have been all arrayed on behalf of the rights of minorities. Assuming that the crisis will be solved by an agreement to modify those orders, there still remains the question whether the Chamber will deliberately condone the suspension of Constitutional guarantees by a Ministerial decree. Should such condonation be refused, Gen. PELLOUX and his colleagues would be liable to impeachment. We presume that, if some concession is made to the claims of minorities, the obnoxious Ministerial decree will be ultimately ratified by a narrow majority, but there is no doubt that the Opposition is right in demanding a Constitutional Convention which shall declare once for all under what conditions the Statuto, or Constitution of 1848, shall be amended or suspended.

It is significant that notwithstanding strenuous efforts on the part of the Vatican to enforce the Papal injunction to abstain from national elections, the inclination of the Clericals to vote excited by the hope of overthrowing the Government proved in many districts irresistible. We shall doubtless learn by and by with tolerable exactness how large a fraction of them went to the ballot box. Should they all go, they would become a formidable factor, for it is estimated that they constitute two-fifths of the registered electorate.

The Witch Doctor.

On his way to Chicago from his communings with the red-eyed bass and Col. MOSE WETMORE, Col. BRYAN dropped a few thoughts to the eager thousands at Wausau, Wis. "My friends," said he to the Wausauites, "you have got to meet the Trust question, and the Republican cry of prosperity will not reach it."

Wont it, Colonel? Don't you wish you were sure of that? You would like to believe that, wouldn't you? You and dear knows how many other Devilfishers are going up and down the country, telling it that it is ruined, or in a fair way to be, by the Trusts. The country, cheerful, confident, happy and with money to burn, can't help laughing in the faces of the persons who are trying to frighten it into believing that the Trusts are killing it. Col. BRYAN might just as well call on Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER and say: "Sir, I must warn you against being deceived by appearances. You may think you are prosperous, but I know better. It is my melancholy duty to inform you that you are a pauper."

The cry of prosperity does reach the Trusts. The country knows that it is well off and is not to be scared by the ravings of the victims of Buncombitis.

Suppose Col. BRYAN decided to put some of his lecture receipts into life insurance. After the company's doctor has certified him to be as sound as a nut and as straight as a trivet from head to heel, an A1 and a patriarchal risk, along comes a travelling quack and witch doctor and says: "Colonel, you think you're all right and them doctors thinks so, but I tell you you're all wrong. I've looked in a crystal and I've looked in a well and I've looked in a mirror over my head at three crossroads, and I'm tellin' you you're bewitched. The Evil Eye's been lookin' at you, and you'll never be no better till you take my medicine." Would the Colonel be persuaded by the rigmarole of his fellow practitioner?

Tush, tush, Colonel; fright boys with bugs!

Roman Catholics and Politics.

The purpose of Bishop MCFAUL in urging that Roman Catholic societies should unite to "insist that our religion shall not be made an obstacle to the attainment of our Constitutional rights," has been interpreted falsely to mean that he advocates the organization of a Catholic political party. The Bishop of Trenton is too wise and too large-minded a man to make such a suggestion. He knows very well that a movement of the sort would be only hurtful to his Church.

The Roman Catholic Church has prospered more in this country during the last century than anywhere else in the world and one of the most potent causes of its remarkable growth and of the quieting of Protestant prejudice against it, at this time, more particularly, has been its abstention from active interference in politics. Of the Presidents elected, from WASHINGTON to MCKINLEY, not one has been of that faith, and of other officers of the National Government and of the States, few have been Roman Catholics; yet citizens belonging to that Church have joined in their nomination and have supported them earnestly in the electioneering canvasses and at the polls. Roman Catholics have not opposed the nomination of candidates in political conventions on the ground of a difference of religious faith, and they have not insisted on the selection of men in religious agreement with themselves, but have been as loyal to candidates who were Protestants as they could have been to Catholics. That is, they have kept their religion and their politics distinct, as they should be kept by all religious believers in a Republic founded on the principle of the entire separation of Church and State.

The interpretation of Bishop MCFAUL's address at Trenton as an effort to introduce into our politics the lamentable disturbance of a distinct Catholic party, or rather a sort of Mugwump organization ready to sell its votes for the price of political favor, has, therefore, no justification in the history of American Catholics. As a very able correspondent and a distinguished representative of the priesthood of that Church remarked in THE SUN on Sunday, however, it has suffered from misconception because of the unfortunate disposition of Roman Catholics to favor a single political party. "The great curse of the Church to-day in this land," he said discriminatingly, "is that nearly all her children vote the Democratic ticket." "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" was an accusation against it which had no other excuse than that "curse," for no Church has taken a more resolute stand against intemperance than the Roman Catholic and none has been more faithful to the Union. The services of the illustrious Archbishop HUGHES to the Union cause during the Civil War were of the highest value and were recognized as such by LINCOLN. The prevailing tendency of Roman Catholic citizens to support the Democratic party, no matter what its policies, however, has tended to segregate them in the estimation of the people as a distinct political class, made so by their religion. Actually their motive, as our correspondent said, is only blind prejudice against the Republican party, for the Democratic candidates they support so obstinately are usually Protestants. Mr. BRYAN, for instance, is no less a Protestant than Mr. MCKINLEY and the candidate for Vice-President nominated at Kansas City is likely to be as much of a Protestant as is THEODORE ROOSEVELT. Moreover, the doctrine of the Democratic party has no relation to the faith of the Roman Catholic Church which the Republican doctrine has not. Neither is religious in any respect, but both are purely political, except that Mr. BRYAN represents an assault on property which is distinctly irreligious

Already Protestant prejudice against the Roman Catholic Church is losing its old bitterness. Never before was the disposition of Protestants to accord to their Catholic brethren the full measure of civil confidence demanded by Bishop MCFAUL so general as it is now. The Christian faith is beset by a common enemy against which both Catholics and Protestants must unite if supernatural religion is to be saved. The defenders of the citadel cannot afford to quarrel among themselves under such circumstances. That they must stand shoulder to shoulder is the increasing conviction among Protestants. Consequently profound respect for the Roman Catholic Church begins to succeed the old-time suspicion of it; but the association of the Roman Catholic Church with the Democratic party only, more especially as it now is, tends to retard the working of those influences.

Of course Catholics demand that there shall be no political discrimination against them on the ground of their religious faith merely, nor is it to be wondered at if they resent the treatment of their faith as a political disability in a candidate, more especially since they have shown during the whole history of the Republic that they make no such objection to Protestant candidates; and in no instance where a Roman Catholic has occupied public office has he failed to recognize and enforce the religious equality our political system requires. But Catholics cannot expect to overcome religious bigotry with political bigotry.

No Use.

It is an impossible scheme urged upon Mr. RICHARD CROKER, that of driving the trust men out of the Democratic organization. Things can't be bettered by throwing overboard the VAN WYCK brothers, now prominent as holders of stock in the ice trust.

The number of partners in the trust business is necessarily enormous, among Democrats as among Republicans. Shares in every trust are uninterruptedly sold in Wall Street, generally at so low a price as to attract people in almost all ranks or states of life. The smelting trust, the steel trusts, the tobacco trust, the paper trust, electrical trusts in immense variety and countless industrial organizations of the kind, are purchasable by people of very moderate means. A man has not got on very far in life who cannot make himself a partner of Mr. HAVEMEYER, of the sugar trust, or even of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, as an owner of Standard Oil. The ice shareholders have been unfortunate, because their property has been the subject of great popular emotion; but as offenders against the great Democratic humbug principle of anti-trustism, they are necessarily but very few among very many.

Mr. CROKER can't change the trust question, but he can make the Democratic party still more ridiculous.

The Prohibitionist Convention.

The National Convention of the Prohibition party will meet in Chicago on Wednesday, the basis of representation in it being four delegates for each State, and one delegate additional for each 1,000 votes cast for the Prohibition Electoral ticket four years ago. The Prohibitionists put up an Electoral ticket in all the States of the country, except Louisiana, Nevada, and South Carolina, the largest vote being polled in Pennsylvania, and to that State these Prohibitionists are now turning for a nominee, Dr. SILAS SWALLOW of Harrisburg. He has twice run for office in Pennsylvania, the last time for Governor, in 1898.

Under enlightened legislative provisions, the liquor question is no longer a serious cause of political division among voters, and in nearly every State there is a local license provision which establishes prohibition in any community where a majority of the citizens declare that they desire it. In New York the Commissioner of Excise makes this reference to the practical workings of this provision in his first report to Governor ROOSEVELT:

> "The radical difference between the present and old law upon local option seems to be very satisfactory to those who desire to take advantage of its provisions. Under the old law, the privilege could be exercised only indirectly and by a vote which had no binding force. The present law gives electors the privilege of voting directly upon the various questions without having the propositions obscured or the results affected by the personality of candidates or their politics. The tendency under the new system, which enables the people to vote squarely upon the merits of the several propositions, is to recognize the propriety of the sale of liquors by hotels and pharmacists in many communities where they will not, by their votes, approve the sale by saloons and groceries."

The Prohibition party polled 260,000 votes in 1892 and 130,000 four years later. It will be no misfortune if they again lose 130,000 votes in 1900.

A good deal of comment has been caused among naval officers by the wording of the order sending Commander DELEHANTY to Manila. Mr. DELEHANTY has been on leave for some three or four years, except during the Spanish war, when he surrendered his leave and commanded the Suwanee; and while on leave has been governor of the Sailors' Snug Harbor. All the time of his leave, the Navy Register has carried him as "Governor, Sailors' Snug Harbor," as if he were holding an official assignment; and the order of June 21 in so many words relieves him "from duty as governor," and orders him to Manila. As a fact, the Department has no power to relieve him from duty as governor; it can refuse to extend his leave, and that is what it has done. Incidentally, it removes him from the governorship of a private institution.

The Hon. DAVID BENNETT HILL's boom for the Vice-Presidency has been reported again. This time it is in Ouachita county, Ark., and is said to be small but healthy. The Hon. HOPEFUL JONES of Arkansas will not be likely to foster this boom. Perhaps he will recommend Mr. HILL to take as a consolation prize the obliging offer of a Nebraska Democratic delegate to let him make the chief nominating speech at Kansas City in behalf of the Peerless.

It seems queer that the Texas Democratic Convention should rage against expansion. How can Texas Democrats who know the origin and history of their State oppose expansion? Judge JOHN H. REAGAN told the delegates that it was "nonsense to say we cannot acquire territory without making States of it," and the delegates applauded. But something must be done to quiet JOE BAILEY. He had talked for two mortal hours against expansion. He was liable to talk for two hours or weeks more. The delegates pitied themselves and their families. They let JOE have his plaything. What does a resolution against expansion amount to anyway? The Texas Democrats might just as well resolve against the annexation of Texas.

Jews and the Teachers' Training School.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* After reading in THE SUN your comment on the fact that so many of the graduates from this city's Normal College were of Jewish parentage, I attended the graduating exercises of the New York Training School for Teachers, and with your statements in mind scanned the list of names and noted the faces of the various individuals composing the class. While a few names on the programme might seem Jewish though they might suggest simply German extraction, I did not see one face that was distinctively Jewish in cast.

A NEW YORKER.

NEW YORK, June 22.

New Scientific Society Wanted.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A few gentlemen wishing to organize a scientific and educational society for the discussion of the various arts, science, travel, economics, &c., are desirous of corresponding with those young men interested in the above who wish to become members. All applicants of good moral character, between the ages of 21 and 27, thoroughly versed in any of the above subjects, will kindly correspond with the Secretary.

SAMUEL WACHTEL.

247 East Fifty-fifth Street, NEW YORK, June 23.

IN SOUTH AFRICA.

A long-delayed despatch from THE SUN correspondent with Lord Roberts describes the fighting of two weeks ago north of Silverton in which Gen. French's cavalry was at one time entirely surrounded by the Boers whom they were trying to outflank, and two batteries of Horse Artillery were only saved from capture by a dashing charge of one of the British lancer regiments. The result of the action was that notwithstanding the British superiority in numbers the Boers after having decisively checked them retired during the night carrying off their guns the capture of which was one of Lord Roberts's aims. According to a despatch from Pretoria of yesterday morning, the Boers under Gen. Botha instead of being some hundred and odd miles to the eastward of the capital, are only some fourteen miles to the northeast in a position on Pienaars River. They appear to have made an attack on the British at some point, as they are said to have been decisively repulsed. It is quite evident that the reports of a total collapse of the Boers have to be considerably discounted when it is shown that with the great force at his command, Lord Roberts has not been able to drive them further away than the point they occupied two days ago. The value of the work being done by President Steyn and Gen. De Wet in the Free State is now apparent in its having forced Lord Roberts to detach an important portion of his army to the south and southeast of Johannesburg, in order to preserve his communications intact and to try and get the better of the Free State forces that are keeping four or five British generals incessantly on the move.

A singular incident is reported in connection with an effort that was made by a deputation from Pretoria to see President Krüger and induce him to return to the capital. It was stopped by Gen. Botha, who informed the envoy that the situation was now entirely a military one, and refused to allow him to proceed any further. An exchange of letters is said to be going on between Lord Roberts and Gen. Botha, but in relation to what is not stated. The fact that negotiations are going on at all is a clear indication that the attitude of the British Government on the matter of terms is not as rigid as it was, while on the Boer side any propositions in which Mr. Joseph Chamberlain may have a say are so suspected that they are probably demanding guarantees beyond what Lord Roberts is prepared or empowered to grant. The complications in the Far East are also, no doubt, playing their part in the interchange of communications between the two commanders.

In the Free State, the activity of the Boers is compelling the British to concentrate for the purpose of trying to inflict a decisive defeat on the force under Gen. De Wet, if they can succeed in bringing him to a stand somewhere, a thing they have been now nearly three months unable to effect.

VIEWS OF ROOSEVELT.

How He Appears to Republican Observers of the East and West.

From the Topeka State Journal.

Roosevelt was the spontaneous choice of the masses of the delegates in the convention. His nomination was forced upon him. Those who were for him were swept in the tide toward his nomination. Those who were against him were swept away with it.

Roosevelt is a typical American; he is as popular in the West and South as in the North and East. He is claimed by New Mexico and by New England. He is an all-round American. He has had a varied life's experience which is allotted to but few men who have not yet attained their forty-third year.

A graduate of Harvard at the age of 22, he went into politics quite as naturally as he went onto the ranch or into the Army. Two years after he left college he was a prominent candidate for Mayor of New York; when but 28 a Civil Service Commissioner. A few years later, in 1895 and for two years thereafter, he was at the head of the New York Police Board.

The crooks and criminals, political and legal, never received such a driving out into the open as under the reins of his administration in the office of Police Commissioner.

At the time of the blowing up of the Maine he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. His resignation of this office to enter and assist in the organization of the Rough Riders is recent and familiar history. His distinguished conduct in action in Cuba, his gallantry, his courage, his humanity and gentleness made him the pride of his regiment.

His political battle in New York State was a succession of ovations followed by the elevation to the high office of Executive of the Empire State.

His determination to cleanse political ways and byways has endeared him to those interested in honest and real reform. His independence, cleanness, fearlessness and bravery in civic as well as military life make him a hero in peace as he was in war.

He is as familiar with the West as the rollicking cowboy, and is more cultured and better equipped in a literary capacity than a typical New England professor.

As an author alone he is famous. His books on "Ranch Life in the West" and his histories covering the navies of the world and of the sea battles of this country put him in the front rank of authors and historians. His recent articles on Cromwell show that he is no stranger to the historic periods of the past. His many addresses, essays, interviews, articles and speeches are pointed, incisive and elevating.

From the Boston Journal.

Gov. Roosevelt is the leader of a new school of politics and statesmanship which is certain to dominate the future. He is a consummate type of the millions of young Americans whose most impressionable years were the years when the great Civil War was appealing with such unexampled power to the heart and conscience of the nation. It is a perfectly natural and logical fact of human evolution that the young men born of that era and of the period of stress which immediately preceded it should be the most intense and uncompromising of Americans.

Into their hands in the fulness of time the mastery of national affairs is now passing. These are the men who fought the war with Spain, as their fathers before them fought the war for the Union. Many causes have contributed to make Theodore Roosevelt the unanimous choice of his party for Vice-President, but the mightiest factor of all of them was this—that he stood to his fellow countrymen as the most conspicuous incarnation of the spirit that wrought the redemption of Cuba, and, in the face of mad opposition, is now working the redemption of the Philippines.

It is the habit in certain denationalized circles to sneer at Roosevelt and the millions whom he typifies and represents as "jingoes." Perhaps it would be better to say that it used to be the fashion to apply this word to them, for, in the unfolding of events, what was meant as opprobrium has come to be a mark of distinction.

The men who, a dozen years ago, with a foresight which the whole nation now applauds, led the way to the creation of our superb steel navy were called "jingoes" when they urged the building of the Olympia and Oregon. A little later the men who stood by Venezuela and insisted that Great Britain should submit the Orinoco grab to arbitration were called "jingoes." The same word was hurled at the men who insisted that Hawaii should be American, and that the Stars and Stripes, and not the British or the Japanese or the German flag, should float over the "Gibraltar of the Pacific." They were "jingoes," too, who denounced Weyler's tyranny and upheld the cause of Cuba Libre.

But can we not now look back and see that these "jingoes" have won their case every time, and that what cynics and scoffers called "jingoism" then the whole nation now acclaims as patriotism? The epithet, still used occasionally by the blind or the vindictive, has really come to be a crown of honor upon the heads of the strong, the wise and the far-seeing public men of the nation.

REPLY OF THE COMPTROLLER.

He Issues a Public Answer to Jacob W. Mack's Published Charges.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is with extreme reluctance that I request the privilege of commenting publicly through your columns upon the charges against me, submitted to the Governor by Mr. Jacob W. Mack.

In any ordinary case, dignity, propriety and good taste would unquestionably demand that such charges, the nominal purpose of which is to secure the removal of an elective municipal officer by the Governor, should not be answered or tried out in the newspapers in advance of any examination thereof by the latter official. The evident purpose of Mr. Mack and his attorney, however, to secure at all cost the widest possible publicity to their ex parte statements, by advertising and readvertising them on all possible occasions, has led me to the belief that, in justice to myself, I cannot longer continue to allow their remarkable perversions of facts and law to find lodgment in the public mind without contradiction.

I am not unmindful of the extreme fairness, not to say kindness, with which I have been treated by the press in regard to this matter, and the many letters of confidence and sympathy I have received from eminent citizens and business men of all political faiths have touched me deeply; but it is unfortunately true in regard to scandalous and sensational charges of this character that many who read them when presented fail to hear of their final disposition, and it is, therefore, better sometimes to remove the mud as soon as it is thrown rather than to wait for it to dry before brushing it off.

Mr. Mack's charges, as I understand them, may be briefly summarized as follows:

> I.—That prior to the bond sale of Aug. 8, 1898, I endeavored to make use of the constitutional debt limit difficulties of the city to "bear" or depreciate the value of such bonds.
>
> II.—That these bonds were awarded improperly to a syndicate which had been formed largely through my personal efforts and those of the banking firm of which I am a member—the impropriety consisting in not accepting thirty-one separate bids submitted at a higher combined rate for amounts aggregating about two-thirds of the issue, leaving the other one-third undisposed of.

I believe the foregoing is a fair statement of all that is contained in Mr. Mack's charges in view of the two following facts:

First—That Mr. Mack in a recent public letter has definitely acquiesced in the judgment of the Supreme Court by conceding that I acted correctly in rejecting the syndicate bids that were coupled with conditions; and.

Secondly—That at no time has Mr. Mack dared to charge that I had any personal pecuniary interest, however remote or indirect, in the disposition of the bond awards, though the effort is plainly made by indirect insinuation to project that idea into the public mind. Once and for all I desire to state, for the benefit of such as may have noted this effort at insinuation, that it is as absolutely and unqualifiedly false as it appears to be venomously malicious. And now for a brief discussion of the charges that Mr. Mack does make.

On Jan. 1, 1898, the city of New York, as now constituted, came into existence burdened with a debt largely in excess of the amount limited by the constitution. It is unnecessary to enter with detail into the causes for this, the chief reason being the declaration by the Charter that the debts of the counties of New York, Kings, Richmond and that part of Queens which has been annexed should be assumed by and become a part of the common debt of the city of New York. The fact of this excessive indebtedness has never been contradicted by any competent authority, though Mr. Mack, with fine Bourbon obstinacy, still appears to regard it as a mere figment of the imagination. Soon after assuming the office of Comptroller it became my duty to ascertain just what the indebtedness of the new city was, and as this question involved a determination of a number of difficult points of law (some of which have never been passed on by the courts of this State) I requested from the Corporation Counsel an opinion in regard thereto.

When this opinion was received it was found that in classifying the various kinds of indebtedness which fell within the purview of the constitutional restriction no exception had been made in favor of the enormous liabilities of the fund for street and park openings, in spite of the fact that these liabilities were to be ultimately borne by assessments upon property locally benefited, and that the original statute of 1885 had been drawn with peculiar provisions intended to obviate this very constitutional difficulty, which was troubling the city officials in that year.

The result of including these liabilities was startling. It meant that even prior to consolidation the former city of New York had for some years been indebted in excess of the constitutional limit. In comparison with this the unfortunate fact in regard to the indebtedness of the new city was almost a trifling matter. The new city had entered into no new obligations; but if most or all of the important public improvements entered into for several years prior to consolidation had been based on invalid contracts the result would have been chaos. My best and most earnest efforts were directed toward persuading the Corporation Counsel that the liabilities of the fund for street and park openings should not be included in a statement of the city's debt. An unfortunate controversy broke out between the two departments of Law and Finance, but the original opinion was qualified in the manner indicated, and as a result of this and other opinions which follow no cloud remained upon the acts or obligations of the old city of New York.

As soon as these facts had been established it became my duty to provide funds at once for the prosecution of the contracts of the old city. No greater urgency could have existed. As the result of the stoppage of payments on these contracts pending the determination of their validity many of them had been abandoned by contractors, some temporarily, a few permanently. In the case of the work on the new East River Bridge, for example, it seemed likely, at one time, that the caissons would have to be abandoned and hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of work on the foundations for the piers would be ruined.

In July, 1898, I offered for sale $12,688,992.36 of bonds, every dollar of which represented these liabilities of the old city of New York, and conversely not a dollar of which represented any new obligations. By the sale of these bonds the form of the debt only was changed. Instead of land damage liability or liability on contracts, for the payment of which there were no funds in the City Treasury, there was substituted indebtedness evidenced by funded obligations, the proceeds of which, when deposited in the City Treasury, wiped out the old contract indebtedness. The validity of these bonds depended, therefore, upon the validity of the liabilities on account of which they were issued, and the validity of these liabilities depended upon the constitutional ability of the former city of New York to become indebted at the times when they were entered into. The indebtedness of the new city had nothing to do with the issuing of these bonds. The new city was indebted in excess of the constitutional limit, but that did not prevent it from changing the form of a debt originally validly created by the old city.

Of this elementary legal proposition which was and is perfectly familiar to every lawyer who has examined the subject, Mr. Mack and his learned counsel appear to be entirely ignorant; for he still persists in arguing from my public declarations in regard to the indebtedness of the new city of New York, (such as my letter to Gov. Black urging a legal separation of the county from the city debts) that I could not lawfully have issued these bonds in behalf of the old city if the new city were indebted in excess of its constitutional limitation.

Is this really ignorance, or something worse? A few days prior to the date for the opening of bids for these bonds I was informed that reports were in circulation calculated to deter intending bidders from buying these bonds on account of their alleged invalidity. I had previously worked extremely hard in convincing large financial interests and their counsel in regard to their unimpeachable character. It was my first bond sale, and I was intensely interested in its success. So far from "bearing" the bonds, I had consistently given my best efforts towards "bulling" them so as to secure the best price possible.

On this point the testimony of some of the best-known and most reputable bankers of this city and of their attorneys will be forthcoming. Fortunately, moreover, the official correspondence of the Department of Finance will bear witness to the same fact. On hearing these rumors I immediately set about, through my banking firm, to organize a syndicate which would make an unconditional offer at a fair price for these bonds. It was an extremely difficult undertaking in view of the large amount of the issue and the short time remaining before the opening of the bids; but it succeeded, and in place of the bonds going at about par (as had been predicted) there were three syndicate bids very close together and approximating 105.

And now as to the award. The courts having decided that the highest bid (that of Vermilye & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co.) was invalid by reason of its conditional character and therefore equivalent to no bid at all, that of the Produce Exchange Trust Company became the highest bid for the whole issue. There were bids for fractional amounts at higher rates; but the aggregate bids of these individual bidders (including also those submitted at a lower rate than the syndicate bid) were only enough to take up about two-thirds of the issue.

Two questions, therefore, presented themselves. *First,* Did section 182 of the Charter, when read in connection with section 171, confer any discretion upon the Comptroller to reject the highest bid for the whole issue in order to favor individual bidders for parts thereof, when the aggregate of such bids was not sufficient to take up the whole issue? *Secondly,* If such discretion existed, was it good policy to adopt such a course?

I was advised by eminent counsel that section 182 conferred no discretion whatsoever upon the Comptroller; that his duties in such a case related merely to matters of arithmetic and that the whole issue advertised for sale must be disposed of to the highest bidder therefor, if there was one, to the exclusion of bids for portions thereof, unless the latter should, in the aggregate, take up the whole issue and net a larger sum to the city treasury.

Under section 146 of the Consolidation Act Comptrollers of the former city of New York were empowered with the consent and approval of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund to decide "what, if any, part of the said proposals shall be accepted." Section 182 of the Charter, however, omits this provision, though in other respects following section 146 of the Consolidation Act nearly word for word. This change in the law would be sufficiently clear even for a layman; but the advice of counsel (to say nothing of the unbroken practice of the Department of Finance for the last twenty-five years) made my duty plain.

I have already trespassed too far upon your indulgence, but if space permitted I could with confidence show that even if section 182 of the Charter conferred upon the Comptroller the discretion which Mr. Mack seems to assume, the disposition of the bond awards of Aug. 8, 1898, was, nevertheless, in view of all the circumstances of the sale, the only disposition that could have been made by any sensible business man intent upon serving the city's best interests.

When the city offers something for sale and invites sealed proposals, with deposits liable to forfeiture accompanying the bids, good faith demands that an award shall be made to whomsoever offers to pay the highest price for that thing and not a fraction of it. The credit of a city is always affected injuriously when it fails to dispose of the whole of an issue of bonds. The exercise of a Comptroller's discretion in regard to such a matter is fraught with danger, embarrassment and frequent injustice. In regard to this particular sale, more than any other in the city's history, an urgent necessity existed for realizing at once on the whole issue, so that payments long past due on contracts could be made without further delay, work recommenced on public improvements where it had been abandoned, and a stop put to the bringing of suits by contractors against the city for damages.

These are a few of the considerations which would have prompted me to act precisely as I did act, even if legal authority had existed for acting otherwise.

You will confer upon me a favor by giving this letter such publicity as may seem to you proper.

BIRD S. COLER, Comptroller.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE, June 25.

NEW USES FOR PEAT.

Peat Bogs All Over the World Will Now Have Enhanced Value.

The investigations into the properties of peat, which Mr. Zechörner of Vienna has been making for the past twelve years have apparently shown that there are possibilities of utilizing it never before realized. At the Exibition in Vienna last year one of the buildings was furnished from top to bottom with the products of peat. The carpets on the floors, the curtains at the windows and the paper on the walls were all derived from this substance.

Mr. Zechörner's investigations have proven that though the fibres of the reeds and grasses of which peat is composed become altered in their physical and chemical character they do not undergo any anatomical change. Nothing in the vegation that is capable of fermentation or decay is left, but the fiberous structure remains intact.

It is this fibre which Mr. Zechörner has been utilizing in various manufactures. The fabrics made of them are found to have the toughness of linen and the warmth of wool. The fibres themselves are very durable and elastic, are non-combustible and non-conductors of heat. It is said there is no textile fabric that cannt be woven from them. Blankets made of them and used as coverings for horses and cattle are found to excel in warmth and cleanliness the coverings heretofore used. Several qualities of paper have been made. In fact, the variety of uses to which this new raw material has been put indicate possibilities that may make the peat bogs of Ireland and of other countries much more valuable than they have ever been before.

For some years a great deal of peat has been used in England as stable litter in place of straw. The peat industry for heating purposes is more valuable now than ever before. Perhaps the peat deposits in Holland are more extensively worked than elsewhere. Denmark also has a large peat industry and the works at Sparkjaer produce annually about 15,000 tons for local consumption at a profit of 90 cents a ton. In many places in Germany peat is the only substance used for heating. It is found available for this purpose wherever its cost is not materially increased by transportation. It is also turned to account as a fertilizer and as building material, being used as a filler between walls in reservoirs and ice houses.

The principal use of peat is still as fuel. One-seventh of Ireland is covered with peat bogs and there are large tracts of peat lands in Scotland, England, Sweden, Russia and France. There is as yet no peat industry of any importance in North America, though there are peat deposits of considerable thickness extending nearly as far north as the Arctic Circle.

The Friars in the Philippines.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A statement is published from "a high official of the Government" concerning the friars in the Philippines to the effect that, owing to their unpopularity, the hatred borne them by the natives, &c., the friars must be got rid of in some way. Catholics who are well informed on Philippine affairs know very well that the friars have been the best friends that the natives of the Philippines have had. When I say "Catholics who are well informed" I mean those Catholics who read publications issued under Catholic influences.

The friars in the Philippines may have rich possessions, but no fair-minded person should dispute their right to hold them. If there are any missionaries who desire to obtain a foothold in our new Eastern possessions let them go there and begin as the friars began a few hundred years ago and take the rough and uncultivated land and work it, and water it with their sweat, that those who come after them may reap the harvest. To demand that the friars relinquish their possessions in the Philippines would be similar to a demand that Trinity Church relinquish its property with its increment.

M.

Cheap Living.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Permit me to make a few comments on Mr. A. R. Brasher's letter on "Cheap Living" in your issue of to-day. For the sake of simplicity I will refer seriatim to his ninety-eight-cent dinner for six and now ask:

1. What are the component parts of his "Creme de Crecy Soup"?

2. By what means did he get the olives he served to his friends; they do not figure in the account rendered; possibly his groceryman presented them to him, since Mr. B. is otherwise such a heavy purchaser.

3. What cut of beef did Mr. B. buy to have 20 cents' worth suffice for six people?

4. Where did the bread come from for the bread sticks, seeing that no bread is accounted for in Mr. B.'s detailed statement?

5. Was the butter—four cents' worth: that is, about a fourth of a pound—sufficient for table, all the cooking and the making of the "pastry"? If so, how was it apportioned?

6. Where, on Waverley place, is that first floor in a respectable house? Myself, and dozens of friends, who have looked for apartments in the neighborhood mentioned, have found them, without exception, higher, worth for worth, than in the good sections of Harlem.

These questions are asked by one who has found that while living expenses are not immoderately high in New York, $1,800 per annum is not too much for a family of two—possibly with one child—to get along on with ordinary comfort.

It is evident, moreover, from Mr. Brasher's statement, that he gives but slight consideration to the main point, the quality of his food supplies, for at the prices stated by him none but inferior articles can be purchased.

Just as some individuals have a mania to exaggerate the cost of all things they buy, with an idea of self-glorification, so are others possessed of the opposite tendency; and I fear that with the latter Mr. Brasher must be classed.

E. R. D.

NEW YORK, June 20.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* After reading Mr. A. R. Brasher's letter in last Wednesday's SUN, I have no hesitation in writing him down a "Molly."

He is evidently a woman-man, whose partner of his "joys and sorrows" (very little of the former I should say) is the bread winner, while "Molly" tends house and studies the rise and fall in the meat and vegetable market, and worries if lemons should fetch more than a cent apiece, &c.

The guests at that wonderful dinner, of which Mr. B. gives the ménu, must have been glad when they were able to make their adieux, and make for the nearest restaurant and a square meal.

As I cannot believe that any woman can be happy with a "Molly" for a husband, Mrs. Brasher has the sincere sympathy of

A MANLY MAN'S WIFE.

JUNE 22.

Fifty-two Reasons for Hard Republican Work in the East.

From the Topeka State Journal.

Ex-State Treasurer Atherton's statement that he "can call the names of fifty-two men in our county (Russell) who voted for Bryan in 1896 who will vote for McKinley and the straight Republican ticket from top to bottom this year," is interesting but not surprising to men who have kept in touch with the "plain, common people." The most of the fifty-two men he has in mind, Mr. Atherton says, are farmers.

A Hundred and a Half.

From the Indianapolis Press.

"How much did you pay for that horse?" asked the ice man.

"Seventy-five dollars a front foot," answered the real estate man.