The Sun.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 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.

The Sum of It All.

After months of discussion the campaign has to be described thus:

On the trust question the Democrats rant only; they can show no remedy. They can announce no principle, such, for example, as that which they proposed eight years ago for changing the tariff. In fact, they make up no trust issue at all.

As to "imperialism," to accept the annexation by conquest of Porto Rico and Guam and to denounce it in the case of the Philippines is an absurdity which happens to be positively revolting because in the Philippines AGUINALDO is shooting down United States troops.

But the portion of the Kansas City platform which was specifically repeated from the Chicago platform of four years ago is clear and definite, and provides the only genuine issues between the Democrats and the Republicans.

The Democrats are for the free coinage of silver, or for repudiation. They are for making the Supreme Court a forum of politics instead of law, by packing it to suit their platform. And they are for taking away from the courts the power to restrain lawlessness.

Against them on these questions the Republican party is earnestly and squarely in opposition, and on no other question are the Democrats in square opposition to the Republicans.

Neither in the Kansas City platform nor in the Democratic campaign on the stump is there in truth any "new issue" at all. Free silver's the thing.

What Will Be the Outcome of Canada's Election?

As Canada's general election is to take place on Nov. 7, the struggle between Liberals and Conservatives is now at its height. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, the head of the present Liberal Government, has made a tour of the Province of Ontario, and before the voters go to the ballot box he will have made a thorough canvass of the Maritime Provinces as well as of his own Province of Quebec. What is the outlook at this stage of the campaign?

The one incident which has given the Conservatives some encouragement in Ontario is the critical, not to say unfriendly, attitude assumed toward the Liberals by Mr. JOHN CHARLTON, who undoubtedly is a man of weight in the province, and who, it may be remembered, was one of the Canadian members of the Joint High Commission. He is well known on this side of the border as one of the foremost advocates of better trade relations between the Dominion and the United States. When the Laurier Administration proposed to prohibit the exportation of logs from Canada to the United States Mr. CHARLTON stood forth as a vigorous opponent of the project, which, nevertheless, was carried out. In his address to his constituents Mr. CHARLTON proclaimed himself an Independent candidate, and although he promised to uphold Liberal principles as he should understand them, he carefully refrained from saying a good word for the Liberal leaders.

The prosperity which the Dominion is enjoying he attributed wholly to the blessings of Providence, and would not admit that the Fielding tariff or the improvement of the means of transportation had had any bearing on the national welfare.

What was most noteworthy, he expressed the opinion that Sir CHARLES TUPPER, the leader of the Conservative Opposition, is right in demanding a preference for Canada's food products in the British markets. Mr. CHARLTON held that, since Canada discriminates in favor of the British importer to the extent of 33 1-3 per cent., which discrimination is purely gratuitous and sentimental, and since Canada has "put forth great efforts, spent much money and sacrificed many valuable lives for the purpose of maintaining the cause of the British Empire in South Africa," therefore Great Britain ought to be pressed to do something in return. He urged that "under the circumstances it would have done no harm if a greater effort had been made to obtain from Great Britain some trade concession in Canada's favor." In other words, Mr. CHARLTON in his address to his constituents went out of his way to advocate the programme upon which the Conservatives mainly rely for triumph at the ballot box.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, the Canadian Liberals declare that the Dominion could not get a preference for its products in the British markets if it tried, and would not want it if coupled with the condition of reciprocity which would be certainly attached to it. Curiously enough, Mr. CHARLTON himself in a speech the other day at Delhi practically admitted this to be true. He did not expect, he said, any great degree of success from the attempt to induce the people of Great Britain to give a tariff preference in return for that which British goods received in the Dominion, for the reason that the amount of England's trade with Canada is small compared with that of her export and import traffic with foreign nations. Attention was also directed to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S assertion that he would not touch with a pair of tongs the proposal of a preference for colonial foodstuffs, unless, reciprocally, British foods were admitted free of duty to all the colonies. Mr. CHARLTON acknowledged that such a reciprocal concession would be impossible, inasmuch as it would deprive the Dominion of $8,000,000 a year in revenue, and probably be disastrous to Canadian manufacturers.

In spite of Mr. CHARLTON'S desertion, there is no doubt that Sir WILFRID LAURIER'S canvass of Ontario was a great success. This is conceded by *La Presse*, a French Conservative organ in the Province of Quebec, which sent a correspondent to report upon the outcome of the Liberal Premier's visit to Ontario. The correspondent reported that "Toronto, the old Tory city, is absolutely transformed. From what I can learn, there will be no change of figures in this province. The Liberals will keep a majority of ten to fifteen. That is the position. It is useless to beat about the bush." *La Presse* goes on to say that the Conservatives have still a chance of winning by capturing Quebec, but it is pretty clear to onlookers that, if that is the only hope of the Conservatives, they are resting on a broken reed.

This is evident from the position taken by *La Presse* itself, which says: "One may be opposed to the policy of Sir WILFRID LAURIER, but one cannot refuse to recognize the high place which he occupies in public esteem. How many French-speaking Conservatives are there," it inquires, "who are not proud of the royal homage rendered to one of ours by the Province of Ontario, hitherto so redoubtable?" The Montreal *Witness* considers Sir WILFRID LAURIER'S reception in Ontario a legitimate subject for rejoicing on the part of all the people of the Dominion without distinction of race or of religion. "He manages," says the *Witness*, "to convince the minds of the great majority of Canadians, whether of British or of French origin, of the reasonableness of his course in matters as to which the race prejudices of the people are calculated to divide them, and voluntarily they acquiesce in his acts in such cases, which, indeed, like the acts of all veritable leaders, seem to be performed in response to expressions of the popular will." The *Witness* thinks that the extraordinary welcome received by Sir WILFRID in Ontario should be regarded as the English-Canadians' reply to the French-Canadian Premier's declaration of his mission, which is, as he has said, to promote peace, friendship, fraternity and union on the part of the French and British elements in the Dominion.

We see no reason to modify the forecast made by us on a previous occasion, that the Liberals are likely to retain possession of the Dominion Government, although, owing to losses in Manitoba and British Columbia, their majority in the Ottawa House of Commons may be somewhat reduced.

Is Richard Croker "Off His Base"?

The open efforts of RICHARD CROKER to provoke riotous demonstrations in the interest of BRYAN at this stage of the campaign suggest that there is foundation in fact for the theory or misgiving of prominent men in Tammany Hall that he is "off his base."

Tammany has under its absolute control a great body of voters in New York. At least, without undue presumption, it can usually guarantee to deliver at an election about three-quarters of the Democratic vote of the city, more especially when, as now, it is in control of the vast patronage and expenditure of the municipal administration. Outside of the hosts of voters who are responsive to its discipline, however, there is a body of Democrats in New York, numbering forty thousand or fifty thousand, which is independent of such authority and disdainful of it; and Tammany can never expect to succeed at an election without the help of these Democrats. If it undertakes to get along by itself alone it is bound to be left in the vocative, as has been demonstrated on several notable occasions, in 1896 and again in 1897, for example.

Inside of Tammany, too, there is an element, including some of its ablest and most powerful men, that is restive under its tyrannical domination and always ripe for revolt whenever the opportunity is promising. This discontent is now especially stimulated by former Tammany leaders who have been driven from it by the remorseless or vindictive policy of CROKER. These excluded leaders are men who in personal character and in influence with the most intelligent and self-respecting Democrats of New York are far superior to any of those who still remain under the despotic Croker authority. Their names will readily occur to everybody who understands political conditions here.

Moreover, as Mr. HENRY NICHOLS lately pointed out in THE SUN, the genuine silver men who gave vigor and intensity to the Tammany Bryan campaign in 1896 are now politically indifferent or are absolutely hostile, with a few exceptions, and with Mr. PURROY at their head, they are almost invariably bitterly opposed to the Croker domination. The return of CROKER from England to manage this second Bryan campaign in person and the arbitrary methods he has persisted in pursuing throughout its continuance have exasperated the outside opposition and added to it further and angry discontent in the Tammany ranks themselves. Tammany men write to us telling of bitter revolt against CROKER in certain districts and go so far as to forecast that because of it "CROKER is to be downed, for a fact," at this election. Unquestionably the feeling expressed by them is representative of the sentiment slumbering in multitudes of Tammany breasts.

CROKER has been regarded hitherto by conservative interests as a politician whose temperate regard for good order they could rely upon; but now, by the violence of his language and provocations he has alienated and outraged the great body of independent Democrats outside of Tammany control, without whose votes it can never expect to dominate New York. In the past Tammany has received their support because, in spite of its moral offences and the vulgarity of its methods, it has been conservative in its influence in restraining mob and socialistic violence in New York. Its ways may have been reprehensible and morally offensive, but it has accomplished the practical result of maintaining order, preserving a measure of outward decency greater than is observable in any other great capital, and holding in check elements of the population of dangerous proclivities and possibilities. When, therefore, CROKER turns his back on that long-established Tammany policy and like a veritable madman sets out to provoke to riotous demonstrations this turbulent part of his following he makes every decent and self-respecting Democrat his irreconcilable enemy.

Reenforced by the influential men whom CROKER has chased from Tammany, by the dissatisfied and even angrily hostile elements within Tammany and by the revolted silver leaders of 1896 represented by Mr. HENRY NICHOLS, this independent Democratic movement seems to be gathering a force which will threaten the domination of CROKER more seriously than it has been menaced at any time before in the history of his despotic Tammany domination, with results which will appear most strikingly at this election and may "down" him at the municipal election next year, as our Tammany correspondents so confidently forecast.

The suspicion now beginning to be so general among the more reasonable of Tammany men, that "CROKER is off his base," seems to be justified by his crazy proceedings in the present canvass.

The Slowly Disappearing Rear Tenement.

A sanitary improvement essential to the health of the people of New York in the tenement house district, so called, is the obliteration of antique, unsubstantial rear buildings used for habitation, standing on lots already occupied in part by other buildings which have a street frontage. As officially defined in the Sanitary Code, a tenement house is a building or portion of a building rented to be occupied as the home of three or more families, living independently of one another and with a common right of use of the halls and stairways.

By the tenement house inspection made by the Board of Health four years ago, before consolidation and in compliance with the Tenement House law, it appeared that the number of tenement houses at that period, in what is now Manhattan and The Bronx, was 42,909. Of these houses 2,448, or more than 5 per cent., were "rear houses," the very much larger number being in the older settled sections of town. Before the adoption of the existing building laws there was no legal obstacle to the construction of rear tenements. Most of them are very old and poorly equipped with the safeguards for life and the conveniences for health which the law requires in the case of newly erected buildings.

For several years there has been vigorous and frequent opposition to these rear tenements, deprived of light and air as they are by the construction of larger buildings. By section 1,318 of the charter it is made unlawful in this city "to erect any building on any lot whereon there is already a tenement or lodging house unless there is a clear, open space exclusively belonging thereto."

Notwithstanding this provision, the enforcement of which is mandatory, and notwithstanding the replacement of many antique tenements by stores, warehouses or modern dwellings, it was shown by the June census, taken by the Sanitary Police, that the number of rear tenements in Manhattan and The Bronx on that date was 2,143; while 11 only were in The Bronx, which includes a larger area of territory than does Manhattan.

In Manhattan borough the number of rear houses has diminished only 500 in four years; but though their abandonment is slow it is steady—affording one of the reasons for the gradual decrease of the death rate in town and the subsidence in the number of causes of illness that may be traced to preventable causes. There are still more "rear houses" in the Twentieth ward of New York than in any other ward.

A Proposed Naval Programme.

The Naval Board on Construction is reported to have prepared a programme of shipbuilding to be submitted to the Secretary of the Navy for his approval. The plan calls for the construction of three battleships, three armored cruisers and twelve gunboats; the exact number of the latter class of vessels, however, has not been fixed. Secretary LONG, on the other hand, is understood to desire small gunboats rather than larger and heavier ships, holding that light-draught vessels are more needed in Philippine waters just now than the others. There is likely, therefore, to be some modification in the plan of the Board on Construction before it is approved by the Department.

While naval construction must be continued, and while a well-considered programme is necessary for the proper development of the navy, it is possible to overcrowd the shipbuilding yards; and the board's programme appears likely to do this. At present there are some thirteen vessels of large size under construction, as follows: the battleships Illinois, Maine, Missouri and Ohio; the cruisers Denver, Des Moines, Chattanooga, Galveston and Tacoma; and the monitors Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida and Wyoming. Besides these, there are seven vessels authorized last year and four vessels authorized this year for which contracts have not been awarded. These eleven vessels are battleships and armored cruisers of 12,000 tons and more. There are also three protected cruisers, for the construction of which contracts have not been made.

The armor plate question has again been opened. When bids for armor for vessels under contract were opened in August last three companies competed; but each of them made such conditions that the bids had to be rejected. None of the companies presented bids under the Navy Department's second invitation, and though attempts have been made by the Department and the companies to reach a working agreement, they have been unsuccessful thus far. If some "reasonable price" is not agreed on, the law requires the Secretary of the Navy to erect an armor plate factory.

With the prospect of armor plate remote and indefinite in the extreme if a Government factory has to be erected, it seems as if the programme for new armored vessels might be laid aside in favor of plans calling for smaller, unarmored craft, suitable for the shallow rivers of the Philippines as well as of China, and much more speedily obtainable. The large battleships and cruisers proposed by the board, while desirable in many respects, are not wholly necessary just at the present time. Besides, they could hardly be begun for a year or more. Such being the case, the plan which calls for their construction may well be laid aside for the present, until the battleships and armored cruisers now building and authorized have got their armor and can make room for their successors on the stocks.

No change of naval policy is to be expected as a result of the election; for four years and a half it is likely that the policy of building up the navy will be continued. A comprehensive shipbuilding programme, covering those years, would be desirable and might properly call for vessels of every type needed in the navy.

THE SUN has recently printed several sets of figures submitted by observers showing the great excess of pictures of MCKINLEY over pictures of BRYAN displayed in private houses. A very striking letter from the Philippines, published in the *News* of Staunton, Va., shows that if the Philippines are taken into account for this campaign, the Bryan total of campaign portraits will be increased:

"SANTO TOMAS, P. I., Aug. 14, 1900.

"The anti-expansionists at home have simply ruined all prospects of any peaceable termination of the troubles here, at least until after the election. They have discouraged our men and encouraged our enemies. Even admitting the soundness of their views, they are guilty of the highest treason, and hundreds of deaths must of a necessity be laid at their door. They (the natives) have the greatest confidence in Mr. BRYAN, and they do not hesitate to tell us that as soon as he is elected the soldiers will all be sent away, and they will run things to suit themselves.

"I was down at Calamba a few days ago and saw a large picture of Mr. BRYAN stuck up on a native's hut. They all firmly believe that he will be elected in November, and they also believe that the anti-expansionists are largely in the majority in the United States. From their point of view they can see it in no other light. You see these people have always been accustomed to living under the most despotic form of government, and for any one to criticise or disagree with the methods of the reigning power meant nothing less than instant death and confiscation of all property, and so they reason accordingly that if Mr. BRYAN'S party was not stronger than the reigning power in the United States it would be impossible for the party to exist. No argument can make them understand the freedom of speech and action under which the people at home live.

"I have been a Democrat all my life and was always a great admirer of Mr. BRYAN, but I cannot for the life of me see how a man can conscientiously be a follower of BRYAN and fight under the Stars and Stripes at the same time. ARTHUR T. PEACO,

"Co. M, Thirty-ninth Regt., U. S. Vols."

Let each Bryanite roll over in his mind Private PEACO'S question: "How can a man conscientiously be a follower of BRYAN and fight under the Stars and Stripes at the same time?"

The gall of the Hon. CARTER HARRISON, Mayor of Chicago, is stirred by the sight of the prosperity of the country. "If I were a mechanic or workingman," says this gentle Bryanite officer, "and any one mentioned the 'full dinner pail' argument to me, I would hit him a damn good punch in the face." He advises workingmen and mechanics to hit on the face anybody guilty of speaking of the full dinner pail and says he will pardon the hitter if the latter is arrested. There is a noble, intellectual beauty, a calm and orderly spirit in the Bryanite canvass. Government by assault and battery is its paramount issue.

The National Screen Door and Window Screen Trust lived a year and has now shut up shop. "We decided," says a member of the Board of Directors, "to quit rather than build up further competition." A Trust building up competition? Col. BRYAN ought to rebuke this iniquitous theory, and he ought to boast that this Door and Screen Trust has been forced out of business by his promise to drive out all the Trusts if he is elected.

That company of sages, the Executive Committee of the New England Anti-Imperialist League, "will not meet again until the Tuesday after the election. The outcome of their information is that they believe that BRYAN will be elected." So writes the "Our Special Reporter" of the *Springfield Republican* from Boston, a gentleman whom we here salute and thank for his store of memorable tidings. The next meeting of the sages will be unusually lugubrious, even for them.

FREE SILVER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* For the benefit of a few friends and myself, all sufficiently intelligent to realize fully upon which side our "bread is buttered," will you not oblige us by publishing in as clear and concise a manner as possible an article explaining thoroughly and clearly this much-mooted "silver question." A TRUTH SEEKER.

NEW YORK, Oct. 29.

The "silver question" is found in the Kansas City plank declaring for the "free and unlimited coinage of silver" at the ratio of 16 to 1. This is the "immediate" issue of the Democratic canvass. It means that the Government shall coin into dollars all the silver offered at the mints, assigning to sixteen ounces of silver the value of one ounce of gold, although to-day an ounce of gold is worth more than thirty ounces of silver.

The monetary standard of this Government to-day is the gold dollar. The declared policy of the Government being to maintain this standard, and the Government's credit being enormous, the limited amount of paper dollars in existence and the limited amount of silver dollars coined and to be coined under the laws passed when the silver party was strong have the value of gold dollars, although the intrinsic value of the paper dollar is practically nothing, and the intrinsic value of the silver dollar is little more than 50 cents. This fictitious value of the paper and silver money could not be maintained if the Government should throw its printing presses open to the unlimited printing of paper dollars, or its mints open to the unlimited coinage of silver dollars.

If every man who brought a sheet of paper of the requisite size to the Government's press could have it stamped a dollar, the value of the paper dollar would soon sink to the market value of the paper, and if everybody who took the amount of silver that is in a dollar to the mint could have it stamped a dollar, the value of the silver dollar would soon sink to the market value of its metal, which is only a little more than half the value of the gold dollar. Free silver coinage would destroy the Government's ability to maintain the parity between the two metals, gold would disappear and the silver dollar would become the standard dollar.

The silver movement got its great strength from the Populistic debtors of the West, who, struggling under industrial depression, sought a cheap money in which their debts might be discharged. Bryan explained the silver crusade in a speech delivered in Pittsburg in 1896:

"Free and unlimited coinage of silver means that if you owe a debt, you can go out into the market, buy silver and have it coined, and use that silver to pay your debt, as you can now do with gold."

He would have announced the same principle if he had said that free silver meant that a man owing a dollar might go into the market and buy a broom, and, getting it stamped a dollar at the mint, pay his debt with it.

Consequently, with the free coinage of silver established, debts, public and private, would be paid in dollars worth half as much as they are paid in now, which would be virtual repudiation. Wages would be scaled down one-half, and there would be a financial revolution which would plunge the country into panic and bewilderment not equalled by all the combined panics of the country's history.

To an industrial nation like the United States the establishment of the free coinage of silver would be folly inconceivable; and it would be fraud. Don't touch it!

Lake Superior and Alaska.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have just been reading your article on "The Future of Lake Superior" in THE SUN of the 30th ult. It treats of one of the kinds of "imperialism" that all good Americans believe in—even though a few of them regard our proceedings in the Philippines with a jaundiced and strabismic intelligence. It suggests to me the possibilities of other regions—Copper River, Alaska, for instance, where the easily accessible spruce forests exceed in extent those marketing their products at Sault Ste. Marie, and where the volume of water is probably greater than that flowing from Lake Superior. A dam 300 feet high between the rocky walls of the lower cañon would make the river easily navigable, and afford, perhaps, 25,000,000 horse power. Rock levees from there to the sea would make that part of the river navigable for the largest ships that float. The many disappointed ones at Nome and thereabouts may for a time afford an abundant supply of cheap labor; coal, iron, brick, pottery, and perhaps copper can be produced and placed on shipboard at less cost than it can now be done at any port in the world. The dam and levees might perhaps be constructed for $50,000,000. I am "a frozen-out orange grower," so I cannot spare the money just now. Perhaps Mr. Croker might do it.

What is true of Copper River is, to a less extent, true of the Alsek River, and probably of other streams of Alaska—of the Yukon at the Ramparts, for instance. The Pacific Coast will soon be the seat of empire and some folks are going to get in on the ground floor. If Carnegie can now ship rails at a profit to the Orient from Pennsylvania, what could he do at Copper River, with fuel, ore, transportation and perhaps labor at less cost? E. E. ROPES.

ASTOR, Fla., Oct. 7.

In Case Jeffries Turns Up.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I do not know whether the Hon. James J. Jeffries, champion pugilist of the world, is going to vote for Messrs. McKinley and Roosevelt or not, but supposing that he does and chances to be at the same voting booth as the Hon. Richard Croker at the same time and should be inclined to challenge Mr. Croker's vote, would the Hon. R. Croker knock the Hon. J. Jeffries down? INQUIRER.

NEW YORK, Nov. 1.

SPIRIT OF THE CAMPAIGN.

Bryan and the Couched Tiger.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The American people have been warned of the dangers that the great American commonwealth will be subjected to in the event of William Bryan's election—the danger of free silver, of class hatred, of the destruction of our Supreme Court, and other high-handed and un-American policies, but one of the greatest dangers that would menace the country has seemingly been overlooked; viz., the removal of Tammany Hall from New York city to Washington.

Since Bryan has smoked the pipe of peace with the great Sachem of Tammany Hall, this danger, in thinking minds, has grown to alarming proportions. Since the Bryanic glorification of the mighty Croker and the exaltation of Croker's mighty machine, there is no question or doubt as to who will be the power behind the throne if Bryan is elected. The eagerness with which the many-sided candidate had defended Croker and his methods and Tammany Hall and its government of moral corruption is but a foretaste of his future position if he is elected.

It no doubt may be true that he is actuated by fear rather than love, like many other minions of Tammany; nevertheless he is under the lash of that organization, and will be as long as he can be of any service, and his election will be the opportunity that Tammany has patiently waited years for. It means new and larger fields for Tammany. It means the bursting forth and spreading of Tammany corruption, political and moral, that has hitherto been limited. It means that vice can stalk from sea to sea and from Gulf to Lake in pure, unadulterated Tammany freedom. It means that virtue and right may as well give up the ghost. It means that like a mighty octopus Tammany will fasten its slimy tentacles around our national capital and even our national life so firmly that it will take legislative axes years to get rid of its terrible power.

Can we realize the moral results or rather demoralizing effects on our national life under the power that upholds and exalts sin and shame in daring audacity on the very threshold of Almighty God's sanctuary as Tammany does?

Do we understand how much more the protection of vice throughout the country would realize in cold, hard cash to Tammany in Washington, than the protection of vice has already realized to Tammany in New York in the past?

Do we appreciate the fact that public offices will be doubled and tripled throughout the land the moment Tammany grasps the reins of national government?

Do we grasp the fact that these same offices would pay double salary?

Can we not picture the enlarging of the Treasury to hold the vast sums of tribute and extortion that would pour into Tammany coffers?

These are but a few of Tammany's peculiar methods of government. They are not fanciful or fanatical; they are not untruthful or forced; they are the actual conditions that exist and have existed under Tammany rule in New York city; they are the real and actual conditions that will exist under Tammany rule in Washington only on a great scale.

The tiger has been waiting for his prey, the National Government, for years and is using Bryan as the tree from which to make the leap, and it remains for the great and patriotic mass of American voters to keep that tiger from landing on our firesides and loved ones there around.

The time to prevent the possibility of such a national calamity is to defeat Tammany's coadjutor, Bryan, on Nov. 6, because to kick against Tammany once it is in power will mean relentless persecution, the annihilation of personal liberty, the crushing of individual ambitions, the leeching of blood money and often personal injury.

Americans, this is the issue that affects you; trusts, silver, expansion are really insignificant beside the immoral, blasting and tyrannical rule that will be inaugurated under Tammany if Bryan is elected. CHARLES A. PHELPS.

NEWARK, N. J., Oct. 31.

Bryan and the Boys Who Played Hookey in East Orange.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* You will remember that on Friday, Oct. 26, future President presumptive Bryan made one of his cyclone campaign speeches in Orange, N. J. Shortly afterward the *New York Journal* made public the following statements, and we will be obliged to you if you will publicly correct them. The *Journal* reads: "Played hookey to hear Bryan. Twenty-five young patriots of the East Orange High School punished by Republican despots." The body of the article is a stream of prevarications. Truly, we played hookey; and it was to hear Mr. Bryan and, I might add, to put a few questions to him. It was, however, a most formidable game of hookey. We went to school disposed of our books and marched in a body to Orange. We might have sent a petition to the Board of Education, but we have sent these before. There were a few questions put to Mr. Bryan, who seemed anxious to give an answer to those that suited him, but when his answers were disputed he did not care to discuss the matter. His arguments were very shallow; he did not go into the depths of any subject upon which he touched.

There were about one hundred and fifty of us, not twenty-five as the *Journal* would have it. We offer no objections to being called "young patriots." Every one who opposes Bryanism and socialism is doing a patriotic act. "Of the East Orange High School," says the *Journal*. Yes, we are, in spite of the "despots" referred to, still members of the East Orange High School. We are very well satisfied with our "Republican despots." Party strife had nothing to do with the so-called punishment inflicted upon us, for everything is Republican in East Orange this year, except the mosquitoes, none of which are Prohibitionists. The despotic punishment to which we were subjected was that we had to make up the exact amount of school time wasted in listening to Mr. Bryan. No reasonable student has any cause to kick at this, and none does. In fact, we consider ourselves very fortunate in escaping suspension for playing hookey. This is, however, a good example of Bryan's interpretation of the word "despotism." What must be his rendering of "imperialism?" F. G. M., '01.

EAST ORANGE, N. J., Oct. 31.

The Unconstitutional Disfranchisement in North Carolina.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The query of a correspondent, a few days since, as to the status of the mulatto under the infamous "grandfather clause" of the new Constitutional amendment adopted in North Carolina, shows that the iniquity of the Democracy of this State is not half understood at the North.

True, the amendment is aimed at only the illiterate negroes; and to bamboozle further the indignant moralist, they (the Democrats) point out that upward of 40,000 negroes can still vote in North Carolina under the law. They can vote in theory, but not in fact; for an equally new election law requires that every applicant for registration must be able, in addition to other requirements, to prove the day and date of his birth by two competent witnesses—defined here as meaning two qualified voters. One needs, perhaps, to understand the laxity of the negro in such a trifling event as a birth in the family, and the apathy of the whites as to the morality of the colored settlement, to see the difficulty presented by this restriction. It would puzzle many a white man to prove the day and date of his birth by two "competent" witnesses, of whom his mother may not be one.

To this, add the fact that the registrars of voters are *appointed* via the Legislature, and not chosen by the electors of the several precincts, and you will rightly conclude that the Democrats of North Carolina have left nothing to chance.

I will illustrate by a case that was related to me a few days ago, by one of these same registrars, as "a good joke." A colored man of long residence applied for registration, and being able to pass on all other points, was caught on this "age" clause. In protest, the negro exclaimed: "Why, doctor, *you've* known me more than twenty-one years!" "Yes," was the reply, "but that does not fulfil the law."

Finally, "the law" reads that the applicant for registration must answer any other inquiries to the satisfaction of the registrars.

The evident unconstitutionality of such legislation does not trouble the North Carolina Democracy, who openly threaten to impeach the Supreme Court of the State if it goes counter to their cherished plans. The only fear that possesses them is that the Federal Government will use its power to reduce the representation of the South in the Congress of the United States. In the opinion of a transplanted Yankee who has spent several years "in their midst" and in close political touch with them, a Republican Administration is not doing itself or the country justice in delaying the application of the only remedy that will hit them where they live. E. G. ALLIS.

HENDERSONVILLE, N. C., Oct. 27.

Motes and Beams.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I can see only one really practical issue in the present political campaign, and that issue is Bryanism. I look upon Bryanism, therefore, as the *paramount* issue. The other issues, created by Col. Bryan for the occasion, and kept constantly at the front by his paramountcy during the present canvass, are imperialism, militarism and trusts.

Now, where shall we find imperialism? Where shall we look for militarism? Where shall we turn for trusts?

If Col. Bryan wants to find a case of imperialism—the real, genuine original article—he need look no further than to himself. Where can a better illustration of imperialism, and the most tyrannical abuse of its power, be found than the Colonel himself furnished to his countrymen and the world, when he exercised the imperial power of an Emperor over his subjects, in forcing on the Democratic Convention at Kansas City: First, the adoption of his own individual political views in the construction of the platform, and, afterward, the nomination of himself as the candidate of the Democratic party for the Presidency.

If Col. Bryan wants to see a case of militarism that he can honestly condemn—another one of the evils that he tells his hearers is to be dreaded and, therefore, to be prevented—he need not go to Washington to find it, for we have it, in its most offensive and dangerous form, right here before our eyes, all the time, in the city of New York, where a political army, well drilled, thoroughly disciplined, and all powerful for everything that is bad in government, is under the supreme command of one man.

If Col. Bryan wants to turn his invectives on a trust that deserves execration he need not search far to find one. He need only use his eyes and ears right here in the city of New York, where the Democratic party is the proprietor and manager of an ideal, if not a typical trust, called Tammany Hall, and it is the most intolerant of trusts. S. W. B.

NEW YORK, Oct. 29.

Incitement to Riot.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It seems to me the reports of disturbances created at Republican meetings in the State, together with the instructions lately made by Boss Croker to overturn the will of the voters unless they went his way on election night, need attention. There is evidently a determination to count Bryan in at all costs. Is there no law to prevent any one who by word or action incites to riot and bloodshed like Croker's late advice given to his supporters how to act election night? Or do such men have the privilege to do things an honest decent citizen would be put behind the bars for doing? A READER.

MOUNT VERNON, Oct. 31.

McKinley First; Bryan Nowhere.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The display of McKinley and Roosevelt pictures in this city far surpasses that of 1896, or of any other campaign I ever saw. I was especially struck this morning, however, by a display I noticed on Quincy street, near Ralph avenue, a display so pronounced that I think those making it should be congratulated. Here is a row of three-story flats, twelve of them, making thirty-six flats in all, and in the windows are displayed pictures of the candidates as follows: McKinley and Roosevelt, twenty-two; Bryan and Stevenson, none. L. A. MARTIN.

BROOKLYN, Oct. 31.

Yes; They Killed Men.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I would be under great obligation if you kindly would inform me whether or not some of the anarchists in Chicago who were put on the gallows for inciting riots, did anything worse according to the law than Richard Croker is doing now. MARCUS BRAUN.

58 EAST SEVENTH ST., New York.

Prosperity Followed His Vote for Bryan.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The following true story, which has just been repeated to me, very forcibly presents the mind with which Mr. Bryan deals.

Says the Bryanite: "Sure, I was told four years ago we'd have prosperity if I voted for Bryan and I did vote for him, and we have had prosperity, and I'll vote for him again." MRS. C. SIEDLER.

NEW YORK, Oct. 31.

As to Jones (Prophet).

There was an old fellow named Jones,
Who said that he felt in his bones,
That the people who vote
Would prosperity smote
And ruin their own happy homes.

But when it came to the day
For the people to do and to say,
They voted so right
That they knocked out of sight
All the Bryans, Joneses, et cetera.
MAN-NOT-AFRAID-OF-A-GOLD-DOLLAR.

Vote of Free "Trust Slaves."

From the Chicago Record.

Of 1,900 clerks in Marshall Field's wholesale store 1,842 belong to the Republican Club and will vote for McKinley.

Bryan's "Case."

From the Medical Brief.

Mr. Bryan's unusual behavior toward the party which nominated him is an interesting psychological study to physicians. * * * Mr. Bryan has a touch of paranoia, as experts call it. He is the supreme Boss and the most dangerous crank the country ever produced. His earnestness, sincerity and determination give him a delusive appearance of honesty which passes with the multitude, and the force of his will enables him to impress and hypnotize the susceptible and unstable, while it silences the clear-sighted but weak men of his party.

Mr. Bryan's very crankiness attracts the mentally diseased, men of dissatisfied and impractical turn of mind, who believe things can be bettered by simply turning them upside down. Revolutionists, innovators, crack-brained reformers and the like will vote for him. Also a great many intelligent men, under the influence of party prejudice and affiliation. But these will be fewer than ever before. The force of regularity has lost much of its power to blind men and govern them like machines.

Sir Henry Irving on the Drama.

Sir Henry Irving made the speech at the opening of the new Grand Theatre at Woolwich the other day. The London *Daily News* quotes him as saying among other things:

"The acted drama holds the mirror up to nature. I say the acted drama, because Shakespeare, when he talks of showing the very age and body of the time, its form and pressure, obviously means this to be done through the medium of the stage. Well, there is a great variety of drama, and you constantly hear that this or that play is good, bad or indifferent, and some times a legislator rises in the House of Commons and implores that body or the Government, or both, to intervene to save the playgoing public from some terrible corruption on the stage. People will dispute till doomsday about the moral influences of the drama, because any representation of human nature is sure to be the signal for alarm to everybody who thinks that men and women ought to be trained without any knowledge of life.

"Dangers there are, of course, in all exercises of the imagination. A great novelist has written a book to show the vicious influence of music. In the infancy of painting it was the firm belief of religious teachers that art would corrupt the world if it were not severely limited to sacred subjects. You remember the scandal that befell the painter in Browning's poem when he turned away from painting angels, and produced lifelike portraits of citizens. They were greatly delighted at first—at least some of them were—and then it was decided that this gift of portraiture was dangerous, and Fra Lippo Lippi was bidden to return to the angels.

"Well, the dramatist cannot always be drawing angels and the actor cannot always be playing them. Public opinion in regard to the stage is governed on the whole, I believe, by a robust common sense, which rejects the notion that the theatre, if allowed to exist at all, shall be a place where human nature must not be exhibited. No doubt there is a point where freedom becomes license; but I think you will find that it is not the license of the Lord Chamberlain. The theatre to-day does so much to brighten the lives of the people that it is entitled to the support of all the elements of sound citizenship. [Cheers]."

An Extradition Fund.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Would it not be a good plan following immediately upon the reëlection of Mr. McKinley on Nov. 6 to raise a fund for the purpose of sending that traitor and enemy of his country, William J. Bryan, to the Philippines? There he could join his friend, Aguinaldo, and give full vent to his vapid and peace disturbing utterances, without annoying a people who are absolutely sick and tired of hearing his name mentioned.

BROOKLYN, Nov. 1. O. I. VAN TASSELL.

A New Richmond Institution.

From the Richmond Times.

The Home for Needy Confederate Women will be formally opened in Richmond to-day. A substantial brick building on Grove avenue was purchased and furnished, and to show that such an institution is needed the ladies have been overwhelmed with applications. It is a sorrow to them that they can not accommodate all who have applied. It is a monument of love and comfort and hospitality, a Southern home in which Southern women will be entertained by Southern women.

HUNTING MANIA FOR OLD FIDDLES.

Where Does the Supply Come From and How Long Will It Last?

From the Musical Courier.

When we look back to the time these fine instruments of the great masters were made, over two hundred years ago, we must involuntarily wonder that there are still so many left as really are. Through the reverence created for the Italian school of violin making many writers alleged that only Italians made the first violins, and that the art was handed down by the great masters to only a few pupils, whose works later resembled their masters' very closely, and many were bought as such.

This may be so in a few instances, but very few, and taking it for granted it were so, how many violins could all the makers have made that are the recognized masters of the Italian school to-day? This is better left to the imagination of the reader.

Since the alleged extinction of the Italian school many good imitators have lived in other countries and very close to the old masters have been their productions. This has stimulated the taste for "fine fiddles" to the present day, but up to fifty years ago America could show very few masterpieces, as the knowledge in this art was then in its infancy and Europe contained the best resources.

Within the last years mentioned, however, music in America has wonderfully developed, as has violin playing; the latter creating the demand for fine fiddles. Now begins the "hunt!"

Through some renowned violin soloist introduced here on a concert tour, the pupil amateur player and fancier hears and probably sees the specimen of an old master—which in several instances the soloist actually possesses—and as time goes on his desire to also possess an "Italian" violin becomes a craze! The teacher or "professor" is then consulted and the "hunt" is commenced. In some cases, if the party wishing to buy is blessed with the "necessary cash" to purchase a masterpiece, several thousand dollars would not be questioned and it is bought. It now becomes a paramount question: "Where does the supply come from and how long can it last?" There are of course instances, and in most cases in Europe, that artists and fanciers die, or collections are broken up and sold on account of the death of the owner, when track of some specimens could be kept, and in this country, with the rapid stride in music, the love for the violin, in this instance in particular, has advanced so quickly that it also educated the idea for fine violins enormously. What was the result? The few legitimate dealers were not always able to find them, *i. e.*, the original specimens, so the teacher or "professor" took it upon himself "to hunt" for one for the pupil or fancier.

Herein I will venture to say that I know of many instances personally where the teachers and alleged connoisseurs would "hunt" up some old violin, immaterial where, and possibly find a good specimen of a later make than the Italian works, a good imitation, for instance, and knowing very well that the demand for fine violins was in its infancy, would dispose of the violin as "such" or "such" an Italian work, and the deluded purchaser, ignorant of the deception, is happy at heart in at last possessing "one of those fine makes"—his friend also becomes inspired, and the case is repeated, possibly with the connivance of a disreputable dealer. I also know that many so-called leading musicians in this country have become real estate owners through the help of this lucrative channel!

What other result did this "hunting" after old violins bring? Teachers or "professors" found it so much more profitable to sell violins to their pupils than to teach them, that many have established themselves as "dealers in fine old Cremona fiddles and their appurtenances!"

Commenting on musicians who have within the last fifteen years found it so lucrative to deal in "old fiddles" rather than follow their career as violinists, I will venture to illustrate some cases. In New York city, Chicago and Boston I have met certain violinists who, having experienced the results obtained through their influence when teachers, have sold violins as "Cremonas" with an effrontery that would make the old legitimate dealer blush with shame, causing, in fact, many other such musician dealers to spring up like mushrooms all over the country. Their systems of influencing the craze for Italian violins, of course, vary. The same applies as to how they became "connoisseurs." In one large Western city I have seen and carefully examined a display of "old fiddles," purporting to be "this" or "that" (the dealer or expert formerly was a violin player and teacher). The unsuspecting public and lovers of the fiddle see the unique display of decrepit has-beens of certain alleged makes in all forms of disability. Marks and tickets to lure the innocent to the extraordinary chance to buy are displayed for attraction with marvellous prices attached, emphasizing also in particular the alleged specific Italian make.

For the sake of philanthropy the whole lot ought to be distributed among the poor for kindling a breakfast fire and so save many an unsuspecting innocent "old fiddle hunter" his good money. But, still, in this very place you will find the "hunter" after the impossible, and later probably prove one of the kind who, after having made the purchase, will not admit that he has been duped, even when abundantly proven to him.

Vuillaume, who had the opportunity to see, handle or repair and buy the finest specimens of Italian masters, was an absolute authority in that line, and so recognized. His knowledge in knowing where the finest specimens were was so great that many unfortunate competitors, also artists, fearing his presence at a sale, would afterward denounce him for intrigue, when later it was discovered the violins were bought for Vuillaume at any price. Why? Simply, the people wanted them and he had to "hunt" for them.

But these opportunities are over, excepting perchance some of our wealthiest fanciers don't hesitate on price. I read a comment not long ago of a celebrated "Strad" having been sold. The "Wilhelmj Strad!" Here is an example for the "old violin hunter." If violins on that order of the Italian masters can be had and you can pay for them, by all means do so. But how many "Strads" are there existing like that one? I am proud to say I have handled many of the well-known "Strads" in conjunction with my father during his sixty years' activity among violins, both from Europe and this country, and will candidly say never could one of the "grand old masters'" works surpass the "Wilhelmj Strad." I am speaking from the point of a perfect example of "Strad."

Perfect in workmanship, detail of finish, finest preservation, and most remarkable of all, its tone! Never have I heard a "Strad" or any other "old Italian master violin" that had the resistance for tone production, quality of tone even throughout its register and combined with brilliancy. I understand $10,000 was paid for it. That price is not too much when an article of the same kind cannot be duplicated.

These violins have unquestionably inspired the great "hunt" for others, but, alas! where are they? Under the lock and key of some collector or wealthy amateur.

GEORGE GEMUNDER.

A Plan for the Pole.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I see that efforts are still being made by enterprising Americans to get possession of the North Pole with the laudable design of placing "Old Glory"—the grand United States flag on it. Now I am one who would like to see an American have the honor of "getting there" first.

For a small compensation I will furnish any person or company a "recipe," or plan, for getting that pole.

First—They can have the flag on the pole within six months after leaving the port of New York, San Francisco, or any other ports north of those latitudes.

Second—It will be less expensive than other Arctic expeditions of the past.

Third—It will be less dangerous, with possibly no loss of life.

Fourth—The news of the event will be only second in importance to the capture of Pekin and relief of the world's ambassadors.

Fifth—The scientific knowledge gained will be more positive and sure.

Sixth—It will be a noted world event, and the man who accomplishes it will have great and distinguished honor.

Submitting all for the consideration of the many readers of your widely circulated and valuable journal, I am MOSES H. SYDENHAM,

Editor the *Central Star of Empire.*

KEARNEY, Neb., Oct. 27.

A Plan to Bring Together All Religions in Worship.

From the Outlook.

The New York State Conference of Religion, which is to meet in this city Nov. 20-22, will be notable at least for the demonstration which it will give that a common worship may be shared by religious men widely differing in theological doctrine and ritual forms.

"The Possibilities of Common Worship" is one of the topics to be discussed at the conference, but the discussion will be in part removed from the region of theory to the line of practice. A sub-committee, consisting of Dr. Newton of All Souls' (Episcopal) Church, Dr. Gottheil of Temple Emanu-el and the Rev. Thomas R. Slicer of All Souls' (Unitarian) Church, has prepared a manual of common worship, which is now in press. It contains selections from the Jewish, Christian and ethnic Scriptures, prayers selected from Jewish offices, and from Christian liturgies, ancient and modern, as well as from private sources, together with hymns from a wide range of authorship.

This conference professes to differ from such bodies as the Parliament of Religions by its direction to the practical side of things, where unity is found among those who differ in theory. Its forthcoming book of common worship is an earnest of such a profession.