The Sun.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1901.

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.

Why One Candidate Is Better Than the Other.

After having long stood shoulder to shoulder in opposition to the political power of HUGH McLAUGHLIN and Mr. RICHARD CROKER, SETH LOW and EDWARD M. SHEPARD have parted company. LOW is still facing in the same direction, and fighting the same fight. SHEPARD has turned, and has actually become the candidate of McLAUGHLIN and CROKER. He, therefore, is fighting against LOW and in behalf of everything that he, SHEPARD, has for years denounced.

Even though they are opposing candidates for the same office, however, there is another difference between LOW and SHEPARD not less significant.

Every sensible man knows, not only from SHEPARD'S words but from his acts in the past, that the latter would have been ready to take either the Tammany or the anti-Tammany nomination, according to the circumstances. Not a living voter imagines that if Tammany had proposed to LOW to be their candidate, he would have accepted the offer. It was Tammany or anti-Tammany with SHEPARD; it was anti-Tammany or nothing with LOW.

On the merits of the candidates as public men, independent of the ideas they stand for, Mr. LOW is a better sort of man, a more trustworthy sort of man, to make Mayor of New York than Mr. SHEPARD.

Those Who Have Nominated Him.

Mr. SHEPARD declares to be false "the charge that, if I be elected, I shall, during those two years, reverse what I have said and done in the cause of administrative and civil service reform and of the honest and efficient government of American cities." He says that if the charge were true, he should merit "a really dread condemnation. But the worst of all condemnation would surely come from those who have honored me with this nomination."

Those who have honored him with this nomination! Who are they? RICHARD CROKER and HUGH McLAUGHLIN. It is beautiful to think of Mr. SHEPARD cleaving to reform lest he incur the dread condemnation of those great reformers.

Mr. SHEPARD'S candidacy is sufficiently burlesque, but he seems determined to pile on the absurdity.

The Australian Commonwealth Has a Foreign Policy.

It was but yesterday that the Federal Government of the Australian Commonwealth went into operation, yet, already, there are indications that the new nation means to have a foreign policy of its own, which may not always accord with the wishes and plans of British statesmen. We learn that recently a Tasmanian member of the House of Representatives brought forward a motion to the effect that it is desirable and essential that the Australian Commonwealth should declare that "any attempt of any foreign Power to spread its un-British system to any part of this portion of the southern hemisphere will be regarded as dangerous to our peace, happiness and safety." The motion went on to aver that "the controlling destinies of these Southern Sea islands is sacredly vested in Australia, and that further annexations of islands therein by foreign Powers will be considered acts of hostility."

It may be said that this motion, which on its face is calculated to embarrass the British Foreign Office, has not yet been adopted by the Australian Parliament, and may not be supported by Mr. BARTON, the Premier and Minister for External Affairs in the Federal Government. That is true. Mr. BARTON may deem it inexpedient to formulate such a declaration at this time. It is none the less certain that Mr. BARTON and some of his colleagues have expressed views substantially identical with those embodied in the motion, and that public opinion in Australia is tending strongly in the same direction. Intelligent and patriotic Australians believe that the interests of their continent have been sacrificed by the mother country in the matter of New Caledonia and in the matter of Samoa, and that there is grave danger of their being subjected to similiar sacrifices in the future.

New Caledonia, it may be recalled, was discovered by Capt. COOK in 1774, and, therefore, by right of discovery belonged to Great Britain. Nevertheless, France was permitted to annex it in 1853, since which date it has been used as a convict station, to the serious annoyance of the neighboring Australian continent. The British Foreign Office has also permitted Germany to claim a part of the huge island of New Guinea, which is separated from Australia only by a strait. The prospective proximity of a German colony not unnaturally excited protest on the part of Queensland planters; and, since then, England's withdrawal from the Samoan Archipelago has also provoked remonstrance from far-sighted Australians.

The immediate cause, however, of the motion introduced in the Australian House of Representatives was undoubtedly the correspondence, which is known to have taken place of late between Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, the British Colonial Secretary, and Mr. BARTON, who, as we have said, is not only Premier but also Minister for External Affairs in the Australian Federal Government. It is known that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN sought to learn from Mr. BARTON what would be thought in Australia of a surrender of England's rights in the New Hebrides to France, in return for the renunciation of the last-named country's claim to the so-called French Shore of Newfoundland. Mr. BARTON made it distinctly understood that the Australians would not brook such a sacrifice of their national interests to those of another British colony.

The New Hebrides, it will be remembered, is a chain of some thirty islands lying not far to the northeast of New Caledonia, and possessing collectively an area of more than 5,000 square miles. The archipelago was thoroughly explored by Capt. COOK in 1773, and since then the inhabitants of the southern members of the group have been civilized by English and Scottish missionaries. The ownership of the islands is claimed by Great Britain, and the bulk of such trade as they have is transacted with Sydney. Nevertheless, some years ago a French military post was established in the New Hebrides on the plea that, when New Caledonia was annexed, the words "and its dependencies" were included in the proclamation. After prolonged negotiations it was conceded by France that the sole dependency of New Caledonia was the Loyalty group, and accordingly the French garrison was withdrawn from the New Hebrides. The French Government, however, has not ceased to covet the islands and has sought to acquire them indirectly, many French emigrants having been conveyed thither and settled on land claimed by the Société des Nouvelles Hébrides, which, although ostensibly a trading company, is heavily subsidized by the French Government and organized for no other purpose than the extension of French influence.

The plan, of course, is to bring about a preponderance of French residents in the New Hebrides—it will be recalled that there was a preponderance of German residents in Samoa—and then to make such preponderance a moral ground for the surrender of political control to France. The reasons for Australia's opposition to such a proceeding are sufficiently obvious. In French hands the New Hebrides not only would be converted quickly into a second convict station, but in the event of war between France and Great Britain would constitute a naval base for operations against Australia.

It is evident that the Australian colonies, now that they are well-grown and have learned the strength derivable from union, will no longer suffer England to use the islands of the Southern Sea as counters in her game of give and take with foreign Powers. Their watchword is to be henceforward "Hands off the South Pacific!" and they have not scrupled to proclaim a Monroe Doctrine of their own.

Not Politics but Morality.

The sermons preached on Sunday in so many New York pulpits, on the corrupt and unspeakably vile methods which prevail in its present municipal government, cannot be called political sermons. They are not open to the objection so justly made to the introduction of the secularism of disputed politics into the house of GOD.

The subject they discussed is moral and not political, and it belongs especially to the sphere of the Church. In the present campaign, moreover, there is no division on lines of political partisanship. No question enters into it about which there is any controversy as between Democrats and Republicans. No effect on State or national politics will be produced by the result of the election; unless it be that by the defeat of Tammany, organized especially to control the municipal government for its own peculiar aggrandizement, the Democratic party, with which nominally it is affiliated, will be raised to a higher moral plane in the estimation of the people of the whole Union; for everywhere it will be understood that the defeat of Tammany was due to a Democratic uprising against it.

The movement against Tammany is purely moral. As Justice JEROME, a Democrat, and a candidate on the ticket with Mr. LOW, said the other day, it is simply an uprising of "decency against indecency, honesty against thievery."

Never was the issue squarer, and never was there a more imperative demand on the pulpit of righteousness to cry out and warn the people to overthrow the evil domination under which New York is.

It is not "preaching politics" to denounce the partnership of this government with vice and crime, but preaching the moral law, without obedience to which society falls into rottenness.

The New Local Legislature.

After an experiment of four years, with a local Municipal Council in two branches—Municipal Assembly and Board of Aldermen—the expected public benefits from which spread of responsibility did not materialize, a return is to be made to a single Board of Aldermen for New York. Members of this are to be elected next month and party nominations to it have been made.

The new Board of Aldermen will consist of seventy-four members, and its duties are to be multifarious and important. The present "Council" has been abolished and the new Board, a local legislature as proposed, is to have the right to make, abolish, or amend all ordinances relating to the Police, Health, Park, Fire or Building departments, to grant or withhold franchises for the construction and operation of railroads or ferries; "to construct, establish, maintain or acquire by purchase or condemnation" additional waterworks where needed; to provide, with the acquiescence of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, for the acquisition of new markets, parkways, boulevards and driveways; to provide for the building of bridges over and of tunnels under any street, stream or waterway within the city boundaries and for the establishment of docks or schoolhouses. Its powers are retained as to weights and measures, the use of public streets, pawnbrokers and mendicants, firearms and fireworks, highways and fences, swimming baths, firehouses, pedlers, cabs, coaches and automobiles, and prohibition and suppression of all gaming houses and places for gaming. By section 59 of the Charter the Board of Aldermen and the several members thereof are declared trustees of the property funds and effects of the city so far as such property funds and effects are committed to their management or control.

A salutary limitation to the powers of the new Aldermen is the establishment of a "time limit" upon bond issues, requiring the assent of the legislative branch of the city government. All such motions must hereafter be disposed of within six weeks. If a majority of the Aldermen shall not vote against such proposition or franchise within six weeks, then it shall be deemed at the expiration of said period to have been passed by the requisite vote of the Board of Aldermen.

The term of service of the Aldermen to be elected next month is two years and the salary is $1,000 a year. All heads of administrative departments are entitled to seats in the Board of Aldermen after Jan. 1 and are required to attend its meetings at the demand of the Aldermen, whose power to select a sergeant-at-arms "and such assistant sergeants as are needful" for the preservation of order among its members—a cherished preogative—is retained intact.

Most and Others.

JOHN MOST has been sentenced to one year in the penitentiary, for advocating murder. MOST is an Anarchist; his theory condemns to death all rulers. He advises their extirpation.

Every Democrat shrinks from the thought of limiting free speech; but Justice HINSDALE, who presided over the Court of Special Sessions where MOST was sentenced, does not hesitate to say, and with truth, that "the liberty of conscience, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of the press do not need such concessions" as indifference to enemies of the State like MOST to "save to the fullest extent unimpaired those sacred rights of a free people."

Between the murder article in MOST'S paper and the article in the *Journal* entitled "Is Assassination a Good Thing?" there was little essential difference.

Sampson at Yale.

So the fanaticism that has hounded Rear Admiral SAMPSON since the day WILLIAM McKINLEY submitted his name to the Senate for promotion as the Commander of the fleet which destroyed the power of Spain in the Atlantic, has followed him to Yale University. Yale is about to celebrate her bicentennial, an event in her history identified by coincidence with a national achievement which will be ever memorable in the history of the country, the relief of Cuba. She properly takes one of the foremost figures of the war to receive the honor of a degree from her upon this occasion; and that man being SAMPSON, Schleyism rises to stop him if it can.

Well, what is SAMPSON? He is the man described in the subjoined letter:

"EXECUTIVE MANSION,
"WASHINGTON, March 12, 1899.

"MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your very considerate letter of the 9th inst., in which you express a desire that, without reference to your own interests, the other naval officers who rendered such conspicuous service in the naval campaign in the West Indies may have the advancement which you recommended for them and in which you ask nothing for yourself. I highly commend this disinterested action on your part. Let me assure you that I have the highest appreciation of your services as Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic naval forces during the Spanish war in blockading Cuba, cooperating with the army, directing the movements of the great number of vessels under your orders, and at last, after the most effective preparation, consummating, with the gallant officers and men under your command, the destruction of the Spanish fleet. It was in recognition of your services and of your great skill that I recommended you to the Senate for the advancement you had earned. Very truly yours,

WILLIAM McKINLEY."

So much for McKINLEY. But what is SAMPSON in the opinion of those in the immediate rank below him?

"There was general unanimity among the officers that if the grade of Vice-Admiral was created, there should be but one, and that this should go to the Commander-in-Chief of the North Atlantic Squadron."

This is the report of the meeting of the Santiago Captains with the President on Jan. 2, 1900. So much for them.

And what of the larger body of his brother officers under his command?

"Three cheers for our Commander-in-Chief at Santiago"

These were the words of JOHN W. PHILIP of the Texas, responded to by about sixty officers present to see the Governor of New Jersey give SAMPSON a sword.

And, under the circumstances, one thing more has to be said of him, namely, that he is an officer whose personal honor is without stain.

The spirit with which SAMPSON has been reviled was conceived in jealousy, but led by PETTIGREW of South Dakota and WELLINGTON of Maryland it has accomplished the wrong of preventing him from receiving a single mark of honor from his country. Let us be thankful it cannot dominate Yale.

Simmered Down.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Simmered down, the political pot, which is boiling so fiercely at this time, yields the following result: Graft, Vice and the Powers that Prey are praying for the election of the Squire's men, Shepard and Unger; they are yearning for the defeat of Low and Jerome.

Who, calling himself a decent citizen, can hesitate as to how to cast his vote on Nov. 5 in the light of these facts? There is no question of party in this campaign, unless it be a question of party to crime.

NEW YORK, Oct. 14. SOUTHERNER.

A Correction.

IN THE SUN of Sunday, Oct. 13, 1901, a letter addressed to THE SUN and signed "Old Sergeant Fairplay" was accidentally published. In this letter certain charges were made against Police Captains John Cooney, Stephen Brown and J. K. Price and against Policeman Henry Schill, and Wardman Coughlin and Wardman Warren Makin. THE SUN desires to correct any impression which may have been made against any of these parties by the printing of the letter referred to, and THE SUN expresses its regret at the publication which was made entirely by accident. The charges were not made by THE SUN but by some outside writer whose letter we hasten to repudiate and to disavow.

OPEN LETTER TO MR SHEPARD.

His Surrender to Tammany After Having Denounced and Exposed It.

Edward M. Shepard, Esq.:

SIR: When a wicked man turns from evil associates and still more when a good man enters the councils of those whom he has flayed from the pulpit, we seek instinctively his motive either to condemn or acquit. A plain speaker yourself, a despiser of what you call "twaddle about loyalty in the Mayoralty chair to the Democratic party or the Republican party," you will pardon a public inquiry as to the reason why those whom you have denounced rigid exactors of such loyalty have chosen you as their candidate for that chair, and why you are helping to keep in the municipal sheepfold the tiger that yesterday you deemed too fierce and ravenous to be controlled by any good man however independent.

In 1897 you had unmixed laudation for Mr. Low, tempered praise for Mr. George and tears for Gen. Tracy. But for our urbane Mayor, whose administration Mr. Cummings, in tendering you the succession, held up for your imitation after you shall have aided to reward Mr. Van Wyck with judicial honors, for that gentleman and for his following, which was precisely the same as is your own to-day, you had only bitter, Homeric words.

Of Gen. Tracy you said:

He has rendered great public service. It is a profound grief to me that, pure as I believe his motives, he is blind to what is clear to nearly every other citizen of New York, and that a less precious piece of public property was not chosen as the instrument for betraying the welfare of a noble city.

To-day the grief is Gen. Tracy's. He, at least, never accepted a nomination from those whom he had over and over again denounced as organized for no other purpose than to betray the city in the interest of their pockets. If he was blind to what you saw clearly, he was at all events spared the humiliation of making his acceptance an apology. If you could grieve for him then, how must he weep for you now if you who are also a precious piece of public property, are subjecting yourself not blindly but with wide-open eyes to condemnation proceedings!

You then clearly defined the position of Messrs George and Low and justified your vote for the latter, saying:

I shall not support Mr. George, and should seriously regret his defeat of Mr. Low. If there were no other reason, it would be for me a sufficient reason to oppose his election at this time, that his friends choose to make an election to the Mayoralty of New York, which is utterly unconcerned with the issues of 1896, serve as a vindication of propositions of the Chicago platform which I abhor.

While the words yet rang in our ears you stood with Mr. Croker before the public supporting Mr. Bryan who, to his infinite credit be it said, has been and is in a shifty political world the consistently honest apostle of those abhorred doctrines. "If however," you continued, "I were one of the Democrats who believed in those propositions and believe that they ought to be asserted in this election, I should vote with joy for Henry George. *For he is a Democrat through and through in the true sense of the term and infinitely removed from the detestable deviltry and insolence with which Mr. Croker threatens to destroy Democratic politics.*"

To-day you, the usufructuary of what still is, if it then was, "detestable deviltry and insolence," cannot ask any follower of Henry George or of your own old self to vote for you simply because of your campaign cry, to meet the false issue raised by yourself, "I am a Democrat through and through." You have shut that door.

You have raised that false issue, saying that Mr. Low in this campaign is a Republican partisan and, therefore, you will be a Democratic partisan. You must know unless you have esoteric knowledge, which, having, you should reveal for your honor's sake, that the Republican organization preferred a Democratic candidate for Mayor and accepted Mr. Low because the Democrats opposed to Tammany, being unable to agree upon another, agreed upon him. You say the Republicans excluded from the candidacy any one who voted for Mr. Bryan. Is it not truer to say that they stood out against one who, maintaining that the debasement of the coinage meant national disaster and dishonor, was nevertheless willing to vote for the platform and candidate holding otherwise, upon the pretext that the latter, if elected President, would have his hands tied by a Republican Congress? How many will vote for you at this election in spite of your virtuous profession, because they believe that your hands will be tied?

Of Mr. Low you said this:

The Democrats have stood for local government; Seth Low stands for local government. Democracy signifies the use of governmental powers solely in the interests of the masses of men; Seth Low stands for that. Democracy looks with hatred upon the outrageous perpetual dedication of the streets and of public franchises to private use and emolument; Seth Low stands for that. Democracy detests interference with the rational liberties of men in the social life; Seth Low stands for that. I see that he calls himself a Republican. But for this election, at any rate, and for the duties of the Mayor of New York, his Republicanism includes no one of the elements that have made the Republican organization since the 1st of January last a menace to good government, and which makes it now the ally of Tammany's betrayal of everything Democratic.

Would you be willing to-day, on your honor as a gentleman, to deny the truth of every one of those statements then uttered by you? Are not there more Democrats nominated with Mr. Low to-day than there were four years ago? Do you distrust Messrs. Grout, Cantor and Swanstrom and fancy they will help Mr. Low turn the public crib over to Republicans if those are driven out who, with perfect candor, have admitted that they are in politics for their pockets all the time? And Jerome, is he the sort of Democrat that makes you dread the access of Republicans to power in case the fusion ticket wins? Would you rather have the cadets in possession?

But Mr. Peabody says, with simple faith, that your nomination by those upon whom for years you have heaped invective and charges of public and private dishonesty has wrought the perfect work of the Citizens' Union, which, being now *functus officio*, may depart in peace. You, however, have told us to the contrary that the election by the ungodly of a good man whose hands are tied is vanity. Which of you shall we believe?

According to your own preaching, therefore, it is clear that you have not accepted this nomination because of loyalty to the Democratic party; for that in the Mayor's chair you have pronounced "twaddle;" not because as "a Democrat through and through" you feel bound to adhere to the party organization, or at least vote for another "through and through Democrat;" for, if that were so, you would have voted for Mr. Van Wyck, or at least for Mr. George, in 1897. You cannot have accepted because you are a good man; even a better and cleverer man than Mr. Hewitt, for instance, or others out of whose experience you have taught the lesson that a good man elected to office must fail of good results "if there is malaria in the air of the community in which he lives" for there is more "malaria" in Manhattan, now that the streets are opened for the Rapid Transit tunnel, than there was even in 1897.

Why, then, were you chosen by Tammany? Why did you accept the butter tendered in its lordly dish; you who have so clearly seen the hammer and nail of Jael? Do you intend to strike down Messrs. Croker, Sullivan, Engel, Devery, *et id omne genus*? Those lambs are gamboling about their Shepard but are you sure that they are innocently licking the hand just raised to shed their blood? Meekness has not been generally their method of inheriting the earth, nor are they usually passive when knives are in the air. However you may have criticised them in the past, you never suggested they were either fools or blind to their own interests.

Your surmise, stated as the issue of the campaign, that Mr. Low stands for Republican partisanship, is pronounced by the yellow journal that favors you—alas! poor Faun! by the *Evening Post* that opposes you—as "adroit." Was it not Mr. Lowell who said: "You may break every Commandment of the Decalogue with perfect good breeding; nay, if you are *adroit*, without losing caste?" But you are the last man who would be willing to let surmise go forth as fact. Here, for instance, is one advanced lately by two very able Democratic lawyers, each independently of the other, to one of less perspicuity, who was speculating as to the meaning of Tammany's lowliness. Said they: The Rapid Transit scheme offers the greatest opportunity for "rake-off" in years. The enormous bond required precluded competition in bidding. The successful bid was correspondingly high. When the contract was secured the bond was reduced. He who dominates that contract during the next four years has the city by the throat and may spend the rest of his days *procul negotiis*. Their theory may be an erroneous surmise; but it at least rests on as firm a foundation as yours concerning Mr. Low's partisanship. As to your own motives: when one has eliminated the motive of party loyalty which in the Mayoralty chair is "twaddle," the desire of a good man to better political conditions, which you have pronounced impossible in our "malarious" environment, what remains?

When you were opposing Mr. Van Wyck, candidate for Mayor, and Mr. Coler, aspirant for the Comptrollership, you denounced with great bitterness the "subordination of Kings county Democracy to the will of Tammany Hall, or rather to the will of the English gentleman who rules Tammany Hall," saying also:

Time was when the Kings county Democracy held the first rank in this State. It was far more powerful than Tammany Hall. It made Governors, it made Presidents. There was in it enough wisdom and enough patriotism to make many of us submit to much in it that we deplored. All of that now seems to have passed. The men who once guided its destinies and who still survive cannot fail to see that *Tammany Hall proposes to supplant them with interior men who shall be mere tools of the New York-English organization.* (Remember you were speaking of Van Wyck and Croker then). How on earth any Kings County Democrat, *except one the price of whose political allegiance is a place or a bribe already promised him, can wish to see the Tammany ticket succeed passes my comprehension.* As a Democrat who has intensely desired to see an intelligent, courageous and united Democracy in Kings county, powerful through the State and powerful through the nation, *I venture to say respectfully to my fellow Democrats in Willoughby Street that the price they got for the Comptrollership was too small.* And it will not, I trust, be taken unkindly if I suggest that they look sharp to see that Tammany Hall permits that price to be paid at the polls.

You further prophesied that if Tammany had the Mayoralty for a few months it would make complete end of the Willoughby Street autonomy. Prophecy has failed. Tammany did pay the price of the Comptrollership at the polls. This year it has raised the price to the Mayoralty; and Willoughby Street carries the banner at the head of the procession, and on the banner is written Ichabod.

What was it an eminent ecclesiastic and statesman said in charging his friend to fling away ambition by which sin the angels fell? If memory serves, it was "Corruption wins not more than honesty." The issue of this campaign, if you have truly described in the past the situation that still exists, is not Mr. Low's partisanship or your own, but corruption against honesty. Justice Jerome is illustrating the situation with awful object lessons. If elected, with Mr. Low, to the District Attorneyship he is pledged to uproot, if his office has the power, the unspeakable horrors of the Red Light district and similar places. He aims to make decent that neighborhood and the thresholds of the poor; the task is arduous but he has manifested courage and zeal; he will be unhampered in his work and owe nothing to those that put him in office except the high discharge of duty. Your candidacy stands in the way; every cadet will vote for you and against him; the parents of young girls in peril from those creatures will vote for him. Did you stop to think of that when you lent your name to the perpetuation of existing conditions?

I would not impute to you the consciousness of self-serving motives, and willingly admit your high purposes in the past and your belief that your present course may subserve high purposes. But the devil whispers very softly when pure Gretchen stands by the jewel box. We are not conscious of each leaf in the forest, yet every one contributes to the colors we see. Our motives, unconfessed to self, are often those which compel us most strongly. If you can show any substantial change between the situation in 1897, when you opposed Messrs. Van Wyck and Coler, and the situation in 1901, when you are supporting Messrs Shepard and Ladd, and Mr. Van Wyck for the Supreme Court bench, other than the price obtained in Willoughby Street, you will do something to assuage the "profound grief" of your well-wishers, among whom, without the honor of your personal acquaintance and judging you only from report and your own words, was

Your obedient servant,

W. A. PURRINGTON.

NEW YORK, Oct. 12.

Shepard's Trick With the Constitution.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Permit me to call attention to one paragraph of Mr. Shepard's first campaign speech as an instance of that gentleman's indirect habit of mind. The Constitutional amendment of 1874 requires that the Mayor-elect, before taking office, shall swear that he has contributed no money or valuable thing as a consideration or reward for the giving or withholding of a vote at the election at which he was "elected to said office," and that he has "not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote."

The provision means, of course, that a candidate shall not buy a vote, and that he shall not influence a vote by a promise made to any one man as distinguished from a promise to the whole people. This is what it means, and, what is more to the point, Mr. Shepard knows that this is what it means.

Yet, in the address which he read on Oct. 12, he charged that Mr. Low had rendered himself incapable of taking the Constitutional oath by his promise, made to the whole people, that if he were elected the official heads of Murphy and Devery should roll upon the ground.

The argument was worthy of the man, whose last answer to his critics must be: Not that I lov'd good government less, but that I lov'd a good office more.

OCT. 13. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL.

Improvements in Manila.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: Here is an extract of a letter dated from Manila, Sept. 1, 1901, and written by A. H. Howe of the United States Navy, after an acquaintance of the city of nearly two years. It shows so well the progress and renovation introduced by our Government that it must rejoice all patriotic hearts to be certified of the good accomplished:

"This morning I went to Manila. The ship's painter accompanied me all day and I showed him the town, and also showed myself the improvements in Manila since six months ago. The chaotic places, as the park in front of the palace and all about the band stand by the Lunetta, have been transformed into parks planted with trees, shrubs and flowers with fine walks and grass well mown. A large statue has been erected on a high pedestal. There are also two band stands and arc lamps, and the drive is in elegant condition, being alongside the beach. It is a grand drive and the surf on the beach, the swell coming straight from Corregidor, gives one a sigh with the immense feeling of the sea. The new market by the suspension bridge has a fine sidewalk round it, and the benches for produce are almost all built.

"Six months ago, near the band stand, the Lunetta was all in a state of chaos, and a small railroad was used in grading. Now the drive is finely macadamized, well-curbed walks and fine, smooth lawns are delightful features. Also, all around the walled city the levelling of lawns and lawn-mowers have added refinement. The city is clean. Old buildings have been torn down and new ones are building. The wheeling is fine in Manila and we wish we had wheels."

In another letter he writes of the new stores built on a large scale by enterprising people from the States, thus affording the resident and the traveller the facilities of civilization.

N. M. HOWE.

NEW YORK.

Detroit Girl to Marry British Naval Man.

DETROIT, Oct. 14.—The engagement is announced of Miss Elise Dunham Tomkins, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Elliott B. Tomkins, and niece of the Rev. Floyd W. Tomkins, rector of Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, to Lieut. Charles David Cay, R.N. H. Lieut. Cay is the son of Capt. Robert Barclay Cay of the British Royal Navy, and brother of Lieut. Maurice Cay, Flag Lieutenant to Admiral Lord Charles Beresford. Lieut. Cay is now on H. M. S. Prometheus, which is stationed at Halifax. The wedding will take place in England during the coming winter.

TO SUSTAIN MILITARY COURTS.

The President Strongly Disposed to Not Interfere With Their Sentences.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 14.—President Roosevelt has indicated a strong disposition to withhold interference with the rulings of courts-martial and intends to sustain the action of all military courts except where there has been apparent injustice. In this purpose to uphold military courts he will closely follow the principle laid down by Secretary Root, that influence should not be allowed to interfere with military law. A case soon to come before the President for his action will in a measure furnish a test of this determination. It is that of Lieut. James F. Howell of the Sixth Artillery, who was tried some months ago in the Philippines on a charge of drunkenness on duty. The court found him guilty and was compelled under the law to fix his punishment at dismissal from the army. The papers in the case were indorsed by the department commander, with a recommendation for leniency on the part of the President.

Upon examination by the Judge Advocate of the Army the proceedings were found correct and they were so reported. Both Gen. Miles and Adjutant-General Corbin concurred in the suggestion that there be no deviation from the principle laid down by Secretary Root, and they recommended that the action of the court-martial be approved. It now remains for the action of President Roosevelt. It is certain that strong influences will be brought to bear to save the young officer, as he comes from an influential Iowa family. He was appointed to the army July 18, 1898, from Iowa and assigned to the Sixth Artillery. He had had no previous service in any of the Volunteer regiments, but since entering the service and up to the time of the offence for which he was charged his record was good. Senator Allison, who is said to be interested in his case, will probably make a strong appeal for him, but in view of the disposition of the War Department officials and the President to insist upon the approval of the action of courts it is thought that his dismissal will stand.

There are other cases which will go to the President for lenity. They are the cases of Lieut. Townley of the Marine Corps, and Capt. Read of the Commissary Department of the Army, both of whom were tried in connection with irregularities in the Philippines and found guilty. As yet Secretary Long has not acted upon the Townley case, as he is waiting to see what disposition is made by Secretary Root of the Read case.

In connection with the principle laid down by Secretary Root it has just come to light that it is proposed to adopt stringent measures to improve the personnel of the army. A careful investigation has disclosed the fact that there are officers in the army who have maintained their present positions simply by reason of avoiding any gross errors which might call for their trial. Secretary Root is determined to get rid of dead timber, and one of the measures under consideration for accomplishing this is to make the examination by army boards on promotion more stringent than they have been in the past. Officers are constantly being ordered before boards for examination for promotion, and the records show that seldom if ever are any officers rejected. It is now proposed to make the examinations more stringent, and as part of the examination an officer's general fitness will be also inquired into. Failure to pass examinations for promotion under the law means that the officer must leave the service, so that such a system, it is thought, will naturally induce greater study and activity on the part of officers who might otherwise be content to remain on the lists and wait for time and seniority for promotion.

HOW TO WIN OCEAN POOLS.

A Successful System Presented to the Public by a Distinguished Public Man.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir*: In your issue of the 10th inst., describing a poker game upon the Oceanic during her last voyage to New York, the article concludes with an account of the luck of one passenger in winning the pools sold on the "run of the ship," and that, at least, one person accused the officers of this ship with being in collusion with the winner of the ship's pools.

Upon two or three transatlantic voyages I have heard the same charge made against the ship's officers. In July, 1885, or 1886, I crossed on the Cunard liner Bothnia. Pools were sold each week day of the ten-day passage, and all pools but one were won by three gentlemen who joined fortunes in buying the fortunate number at the auction sale. During that voyage the statement was repeatedly made in my presence that these parties were doubtless standing in with the captain of the ship or with some of the other officials. Not accepting the statement as being founded on reasonable grounds, the last pool sold upon the outward voyage was won by the writer, who believed he had solved the method employed by the syndicate, and merely outbid them for the numbers he desired.

Returning upon the steamer Scythia in November of the same year, I determined to put my theory into practice. The voyage, as I recall it, owing to very heavy storms upon the Irish coast, occupied something like twelve or thirteen days, and owing to the heavy gale no pools were sold during the first three days. It was my fortune to win the pool sold between Liverpool and New York, the system employed being something as follows:

Computing as carefully as possible the run of the ship as indicated by the log, multiplying that by 24, hours on the westward passage, afforded a tolerable basis of calculation. Taking that as the lowest number, I purchased, regardless of the auction price, that number and the ten subsequent numbers, outbidding every one for their possession. The passage being tranquil, but little variation was made in the run from day to day. But the writer had the satisfaction of each day seeing posted the number of miles for which he held the winning ticket. Perhaps it would be more explicit to state that, taking the first winning day's run as a basis, each subsequent number up to ten was purchased. Such universal good luck, as it was ascribed by many, was the subject of much comment in the smoking room, and the rumor reached my ears that I was supposed to be in collusion with the ship's officials.

A Mr. Amidon, who at that time was a hatter upon Fifth avenue in New York, and a Mr. Crane, of Lynn, Mass., who, I believe, was a manufacturer of shoes, were fellow passengers. They laughingly suggested one evening that they were satisfied that the reason the ship had not gone down in the heavy gale was because of my luck, and if we had foundered, they were very sure that none of them, with me on board, would have gotten wet, that if they could have me for a partner their business fortunes would be permanently established. I told them I was very willing to divide my holdings, and explained to them the system of purchases. The last three pools sold were divided with them, each putting in one-third of the capital and drawing one-third of the pool money.

Though having crossed several times since, I have refrained from attempting to put my theory into practice, but always find some willing to believe that the officers of a great transatlantic liner will falsify the records for a share in some plunder secured from innocent and unsuspecting passengers. During the last day's voyage upon the Scythia the smoking room was run at the expense of the writer, bills for refreshments were settled by the lucky pool winner, who upon his arrival in New York found himself possessed of several hundred dollars more money than when he bade good-by to the green shores of Ireland. During the last day I explained to my friends in the smoking room fully and freely the method or system pursued by me in the purchase of the pools, and I doubt if any gentleman left the ship with a suspicion against the officials or the integrity of the individual who was so fortunate as to have been the winner of nine successive pools, each of considerable value.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 11. CONGRESSMAN.

King Alfred's Millennium—901-1901.

King Alfred's dead; that splendid King
We'll never see him more.
Death accosted him in long time agone.
His days on earth are o'er.

He always said that he would die.
Sure as he was alive
And so one day, to keep his word,
He ceased to survive.

So intellectuous," said his realm
"None such in London town."
Translated ancient manuscripts
And read them upside down.

He's gone the way of all the earth;
Let's move on his demise
Let's emulate his royalty,
With him resuscitate.

BRITONS INSPECT N. Y. CENTRAL.

One Wants to Ride on Empire State Express Locomotive—Forbid.

The visiting officials of the Northeastern Railroad of Great Britain were entertained at luncheon yesterday by General Passenger Agent G. H. Daniels and some of the officials of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad. The luncheon was at the Transportation Club at 1 o'clock. The guests were General Manager George S. Gibb, General Traffic Manager Philip Burtt, Chief Locomotive Superintendent W. Worsdell, Chief Engineer C. Harrison, Docks Engineer T. Newell and Secretary Norman T. McDonald of the Northeastern, and Col. H. G. Prout, editor of the *Railroad Gazette*, and Angus Sinclair, editor of *Locomotive Engineering*.

The British railroad men went up to White Plains and back on an observation locomotive in the morning to look at the Central's automatic block signal system and expressed some doubt as to whether the automatic machine was less likely to get out of order than the human machine. The visitors are going to Buffalo in the Empire State express this morning. One of them had a great longing to go on the locomotive as far as Albany. He learned that he had asked the one thing which his hosts could not grant; they told him that the strain on the attention of the engineer of the Empire State was too great to risk taxing it further by the presence of a third man in the cab.

LIBRARIES WANT HALF MILLION.

Increase of 67 Per Cent. Over City's Appropriation Last Year.

The estimates for the maintenance of the Public Library system in the five boroughs were considered yesterday by the Board of Estimate. The amount asked for last year was $299,662.30, while this year $503,298.70 was applied for. George L. Rives and Henry E. Howland appeared for the New York Public Library and the Free Circulating Library, now the distributing branch of the Public Library. It was explained that the increases for these institutions were wanted for the payment of the 10 cents per volume which was to be allowed, and to make up the loss of the cutting off of private subscriptions consequent upon the transfer of the libraries to the public system. Representatives of the different libraries in the other boroughs submitted statistics of increased circulation in support of their applications for more money.

AN AGE OF DOMINANT MIND.

This the Beginning of a Cycle of Invisible Forces.

From the Westminster Review.

Tyndall, Haeckel and Huxley all did a work which had to be done. But that work was limited to chemical and biological demonstration. It was science, but science of the old school. Just as the reign of a man of genius like Goethe makes thousands of intelligent men appear like pygmies, so the revelations in the domain of light and sound, electric transmission and mental suggestion make the discoveries of Darwin and all his contemporaries appear trivial in comparison. The simple fact that thought can be transmitted, as well as electric currents, without wires, is enough to stupefy the conservative mind. Even now, efforts are being made to develop an independent action of mind and will outside of the body, so that while the body is sleeping or reposing in one place the mind, or double, may visit a friend or a locality, at a great distance, and return with the knowledge which it went to seek. Indeed, several schools of hypnotism claim this faculty for some of their pupils. What this means may be conjectured if we consider for a moment the possibility of a mind gifted in this way setting to work to discover the secrets of some great chemical business or political intrigue. We are at the beginning of a cycle of invisible forces; the coming age will be one of invisible action. The submarine torpedo boat typifies the development of the century. Life as well as destruction will be dealt out by invisible forces and invisible methods. This is preeminently the age of mind, as the past century was the age of matter. So far as we know, electricity is the soul of visible form. What we call brain waves have an analogy to electric waves.

It is no exaggeration to say that the discoveries and inventions of the past ten years have made child's play of every known system of philosophy. Never again will any man be able to build up a philosophical system which will stand the assaults of the new science for the space of a single year. No one reads philosophy now, because the simple but amazing facts disclosed during the past five years render the dreams, the speculations, and the guesswork of the past absurd. The little that we now know in a practical way is more than all the philosophers of the past knew, from Aristotle to Leibnitz. The absurdity of the old systems may be summed up in the positivism of Auguste Comte, which aimed at hard-and-fast rules of life and conduct, as if such things could ever be in a world in its infancy. Every fresh discovery delivers a blow at the old and fixed formulas; every disclosure of mental power bids defiance to some stereotyped belief. But the most wonderful feature of the present is that we are being startled by the seeming impossible. Some of the most successful inventors of the present day would have passed for madmen twenty years ago. The so-called dreamers are now the men of action; they are the ones we swear by. They have pro