The Sun.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 23, 1903.

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 the purpose.*

Readers of THE SUN leaving the city can have the Daily and Sunday editions mailed to their addresses (which may be changed when necessary) for 70 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

## Sam Parks.

The conviction of SAM PARKS, walking delegate, for extortion, should be profitable for reproof, both to labor unions and employers. PARKS has been the typical, swaggering, bulldozing walking delegate, making all the trouble he could and making it for the benefit of his own pocket. He has had a long tether; but he has come to the end of it.

The unions cannot hold together if they tolerate fellows of the Parks stripe. And what is to be said of the employers who, in weakness or desperation, have allowed themselves to be blackmailed? For them, too, the conviction of SAM PARKS has a lesson.

## Not Impossible.

One of the ablest constitutional lawyers now alive was interviewed on Saturday just as he was sailing for England on a mission of the highest national and international importance.

Mr. ROOT was asked if he would take the Republican nomination for Vice-President were it offered to him. He is reported by the *Tribune* as replying:

"'Under the Constitution the head of the ticket and the Vice-President could not come from the same State.'

"'Then it will be ROOSEVELT?'

"'Certainly.'"

This, from the Hon. ELIHU ROOT, is surprising.

There is nothing whatever in the Constitution that prevents the Republican party from nominating Mr. ROOT for Vice-President along with Mr. ROOSEVELT for President.

There is nothing in the Constitution which makes it impossible for the President and the Vice-President to hail from the same State.

The only Constitutional restriction upon a free choice with respect to geographical location is this provision in the Twelfth Amendment, superseding part of the second clause of the first section of Article II. in the original instrument:

"The Electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves."

That would prevent the Republican Electors in New York from voting for Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. ROOT on the same ticket; but it would not prevent the Electors in every other State of the Union from doing that very thing. And if the Roosevelt and Root ticket were strong enough in the country to be able to dispense with the electoral vote of New York for Mr. ROOT, he could constitutionally be elected and could constitutionally serve as Vice-President, even if the President were also a New Yorker.

We are aware that the popular impression is strong and well nigh universal that there cannot be a President and a Vice-President from the same State. But, as we have remarked, it is surprising to find this delusion entertained by so learned and precise a constitutionalist as the Hon. ELIHU ROOT.

## Lord Salisbury.

By the death of the fourth Marquis of SALISBURY, the British Empire has lost a statesman who had been conspicuous in public life for nearly half a century. Almost from the hour when he entered the House of Commons, in 1854, he compelled the attention, though seldom the applause, of his countrymen, in the Parliamentary arena and in the great offices of State. Popular he never was, but he knew how to gain and to keep the loyalty of his party, the respect of his opponents and the confidence of his sovereign. No measure of constructive legislation far-reaching or beneficent in its effect is associated with his name; his role in politics was that of a regulator rather than a motor; his mission was to apply the brakes rather than to put on the steam. Yet, as, in his last days at Hatfield, he looked back over his long career, he may well have deemed it a sufficient achievement that he had done more than any other man except DISRAELI to rescue and reorganize the Tories, well nigh shipwrecked by Sir ROBERT PEEL; to help them to withstand the shock of the Gladstonian ascendancy and to bring them triumphantly through the nineteenth century. It may be that history will deny to him the attribute of greatness, but it cannot afford to overlook a statesman who was Prime Minister longer than any other that has held that office since the British Parliament was reformed and for whom it was reserved to play in the reign of VICTORIA the same memorable part that had been taken by his ancestors Lord BURGHLEY and Sir ROBERT CECIL in the reigns of ELIZABETH and JAMES.

King JAMES'S Minister and the prospective Prime Minister of VICTORIA entered public life under similar circumstances, for each was a younger son and for the eminence which he was to attain, had to rely largely on his personal abilities and exertions. It can hardly be said, however, that Lord ROBERT CECIL'S intellectual vigor revealed itself in youth. At Oxford he took merely a pass degree in the classics, but the quality of his mind and his leaning toward scientific inquiry were revealed by the fact that he received an honorary fourth class in mathematics. In the debates of the Union Society, however, he was frequently heard, and even then took the position from which he was never to depart, that of an unflinching Conservative and a zealous Churchman. Of use, also, to his future career, was the experience acquired when, after leaving the university, he entered on an extensive round of travel, which embraced Australasia. It should too be noted as an incident that, no doubt, had some influence on his character and attitude toward the world that, for many years after his entrance into public life, he was obliged to eke out a very narrow income by contributions to the *Saturday Review* and other newspapers. The breadth of view and the capacity of detachment from current politics which were to differentiate him so sharply from DISRAELI may be accounted for when we recall that he was by temperament and habit a student, and that, even when struggling for a livelihood, he did not lose the interest in science which was ultimately to justify his assumption of the presidency of the British Association.

About all that Lord ROBERT CECIL'S birth and rank did for him in the early years of his adult life was to give him a seat in the House of Commons. In 1853 he was returned, at the age of 23, for the family borough of Stamford, which, as readers of TENNYSON remember, adjoins Burghley House, the seat of the Marquis of Exeter, the head of the elder branch of the CECIL family. His address to the electors declared him to be what, until his death, he remained, a Conservative, warmly attached to the Church of England, eager to associate religion with education and anxious for social and sanitary improvements. His first speech, which, as it happened, was on university reform, was delivered two months after he took his seat, in February, 1854, and was moderately successful. During the next two years he took a busy part in the advocacy of domestic reforms, and more than once showed that he had given careful attention to foreign affairs. Those who have been accustomed to regard Lord SALISBURY as an unwavering opponent of the extensions of the Parliamentary franchise which took place during his public life, have omitted to note the curious fact that Lord ROBERT CECIL'S first legislative proposal, launched in 1857, was that electors should not be obliged to go to any particular polling place, but should be permitted to record their votes by means of voting papers filled in before a Justice of the Peace. The proposal, we need not say, was rejected.

Another incident in Lord ROBERT CECIL'S career, often lost sight of, is his support of Mr. GLADSTONE'S motion approving of the unification of Moldavia and Wallachia. Still another fact which indicates that even Lord SALISBURY was not a miracle of consistency was his defence in 1859, when the Conservatives were transiently in office, of DISRAELI'S Reform bill, made up of "fancy franchises." This bill Lord ROBERT CECIL supported by arguments which he had set forth in the "Oxford Essays" for 1858, but, as the bill failed to meet with the approval of the House of Commons, it upset the Government.

It was not long afterward that he may be said to have made his mark, and to have convinced the House of Commons that he was of the stuff whereof Ministers are made. We refer to the extraordinary energy with which he maintained that the British Constitution had been violated when Mr. GLADSTONE, then Chancellor of the Exchequer in PALMERSTON'S last administration, undertook to paralyze the opposition of the House of Lords by including the abolition of the paper duties in the Budget bill. From that time he was always listened to, and soon became known as one of the most formidable members of the Tory Opposition, though his fondness for irony and sarcasm and his congenital inability to adopt a conciliatory tone were not calculated to make converts to his views, or to attract a personal following within the ranks of his own party.

Hitherto the incessant pressure of the *res angustæ domi*, or difficulty of making both ends meet, had forced Lord ROBERT CECIL to recognize that an accommodating temper, could he by any possibility acquire it, would be useful to him in his public life. In June, 1865, however, his native inclination to stiff-neckedness was irremediably confirmed, for by the death of his elder brother he became Viscount CRANBORNE and heir to the Marquisate of Salisbury. This was the turning point in his life, for Tories will brook from a great noble what they would not bear from a Commoner, and, after Lord DERBY'S death, there was no member of the House of Peers, actual or prospective, who, in respect of birth and intellect, could be compared with the man who was to become Lord SALISBURY. In July, 1866, he was admitted to the Cabinet under Lord DERBY'S administration as Secretary of State for India. There had never been any love lost between the son of the Marquis of SALISBURY and BENJAMIN DISRAELI, though the former had felt constrained to advocate the latter's "fancy franchises." Now that he knew himself at liberty to take an independent line, he seceded from the Cabinet, when DISRAELI, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the Reform bill which was to become a law in 1868. This proposal Lord CRANBORNE attacked with the utmost vehemence, and subjected its author to a scathing invective, the scars left by which were never healed. When, in 1868, Mr. GLADSTONE, then Premier, moved and carried the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland, Lord CRANBORNE was his most inflexible and powerful opponent, and he was to see fulfilled his prophecy that the disestablishment of the Irish Church would by no means have the effect of dispelling Fenianism, upon which Mr. GLADSTONE counted.

In April of the year last named, Lord CRANBORNE became Marquis of SALISBURY, and took his seat in the House of Lords, but he was not to become the leader of the Tories in that Chamber until the death of Lord BEACONSFIELD, which occurred in 1881. Indeed, Mr. DISRAELI, while still a Member of the Commons, strove to assure the leadership of his party in the Upper House to Lord CAIRNS, who, however, although an eminent advocate and jurist, could not cope with the prestige of one who combined great natural ability with a splendid historical name. So strained, indeed, since 1867 had been the relations between DISRAELI and Lord SALISBURY that when the former entered on his long Ministry in 1874 it was a matter of lively debate whether he would invite Lord SALISBURY to join him, or whether the latter would accept the invitation. The master of Hatfield was too strong to be slighted, and so he became Secretary for India a second time. The new Secretary, however, did not consider himself bound to loyal coöperation by his acceptance of the post, and it is probable that the sympathy exhibited by him, when he became Prime Minister in 1885, toward Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL and the other members of the so-called Fourth Party, was prompted by a recollection of his own mutinous behavior toward his nominal chief. He had not been long in office before he hotly opposed a Government measure (the Public Worship Regulation bill), and provoked Mr. DISRAELI to say of him in the House of Commons: "He is not a man who measures his phrases; he is a great master of gibes, and flouts, and jeers." It might have been supposed that a rupture was unavoidable, but both men comprehended that they were necessary to each other, and Lord SALISBURY remained in the Cabinet, without abating, however, a jot of his independence. On the contrary, when he was sent as England's delegate to the Constantinople Conference, he disregarded the instructions of Lord DERBY, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and on the latter's secession from the Beaconsfield Cabinet had the satisfaction of succeeding him in that office, and of seeing his pro-Turkish policy adopted by his chief.

The career of Lord SALISBURY, since, after the death of Lord BEACONSFIELD, he became the undisputed leader of the Tory party, not only in the House of Lords, but in the country, is too familiar to need review. Having become Prime Minister, in June, 1885, he retained the post until Jan. 26, 1886, and, in July of that year, resumed it after Mr. GLADSTONE had been defeated in the general election following the rejection of his first Home Rule bill. The next general election, held six years later, gave the British Liberals and Irish Home Rulers combined a majority of forty in the House of Commons. Nevertheless, Lord SALISBURY, at the Queen's special request, and contrary to recent precedents, waited for the meeting of Parliament before resigning; but on the assembling of the House of Commons a vote of want of confidence was at once carried against him and he retired on Aug. 12, 1892. Queen VICTORIA defied custom by giving public expression to her disappointment at this turn of events. The *Court Circular* next day contained the unusual announcement that the Queen had accepted Lord SALISBURY'S resignation "with much regret." It is well known that Lord ROSEBERY, who, on Mr. GLADSTONE'S resignation in March, 1894, had become Prime Minister, was defeated in the House of Commons in June of the following year, and at once resigned. Lord SALISBURY, to the Queen's undisguised satisfaction, assumed power for the third time, on the understanding that he would make an early appeal to the country. At the general election which soon followed the Unionists returned to power with a strong majority, and have retained it to the present time, materially increasing their preponderance, indeed, on the next appeal to the constituencies, in 1900. Lord SALISBURY'S total length of service in the office of Prime Minister during VICTORIA'S reign extended over twelve and a quarter years, and, as he remained Prime Minister nearly eighteen months after the Queen's death, when he voluntarily resigned in favor of his kinsman, Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, the ultimate length of his tenure of power exceeded GLADSTONE'S by fifteen months. There is no doubt that the Queen's relations with Lord SALISBURY were not less cordial during his second and third long administrations than during his first brief experience of government. She continued to regard him as the former colleague of Lord BEACONSFIELD, and as the depositary of her favorite Minister's wisdom. Her confidence in his judgment and her admiration of his sturdy common sense grew as the years went on. His deep interest in foreign affairs and his full knowledge of them gave him a special title to her appreciation. Between him and the Queen there was never any of the tension which had existed between her and Mr. GLADSTONE. There was something peculiarly pleasing to her in the consciousness that she, as a sovereign, had for her Prime Minister a great noble. She eventually placed a portrait of Lord SALISBURY in the vestibule of her private apartments at Windsor, face to face with one of Lord BEACONSFIELD.

Incorrigibly pugnacious as he had seemed in the House of Commons, and inconveniently aggressive toward Russia as he had shown himself during the last Russo-Turkish war, Lord SALISBURY submitted in an unexpected and almost unparallelled degree to the chastening and sobering influence of supreme responsibility. If we except some trivial and ever-recurrent border troubles and the South African War, into which, there is some reason to believe, he entered with reluctance, Lord SALISBURY could say with truth and satisfaction that the British Empire had been peaceful in his time. He has not been commonly regarded as a friend of Ireland, yet Irishmen have never disliked him personally, and they well know that against his wishes the Land Purchase bill could never have become a law. Americans have good reason to regard him with good will, for, although he professed no sympathy for our democratic institutions, his far-sighted intellect convinced him that the safety of his beloved country would be powerfully furthered by the friendship of her mighty daughter-State. Hence, from a Briton's point of view, he bore much and forgave much, and, when the opportunity came, he returned good for evil. He forbore to resent Mr. CLEVELAND'S Venezuela Message, and he bade the Continent of Europe stand aloof when it threatened interference in our war with Spain. Thus was it given to him to forge an interesting link in history. A worthy descendant of the CECILS who witnessed and promoted England's first attempts to colonize America, he signally contributed by a wise forbearance and a timely demonstration to heal the estrangement which, for upward of a century, had parted the two great sections of the English-speaking race.

## Yesterday's Yacht Race.

How are the mighty fallen! That terrifying bogey which has frightened so many yachting children has turned out to be just a mortal thing of wood and metal, after all. What alarming stories of the speed and weatherly qualities of Shamrock III. we have been reading all summer! How unmercifully she did thrash that poor old Shamrock I! And how "expert" after "expert" figured the appalling amount by which she would beat that big, oversparred, flat-bowed Reliance!

All this is gone, "like an unsubstantial pageant faded," and has "left not a wrack behind." Alas, your Majesty, there is a second; and such a second! Over a thirty-mile course yesterday Reliance defeated the challenger by 9 minutes actual time and by 7 minutes and 3 seconds corrected time. The correction is subject to remeasurement. Well, never mind. Perhaps Shamrock III. is a trifle too long on the water line, but the chief trouble with her seems to be that she is too long on the course.

Her battle in the first half of the race was a noble one, and if she had not fallen upon ill luck near the outer mark she would have made a far better showing. As the yachts drew in toward the New Jersey shore the wind came free off the beach and Reliance was in a position to gain materially thereby. She was only a short distance ahead of Shamrock III. at the end of an hour and a quarter, yet she rounded the outer mark less than three-quarters of an hour later 3 minutes and 21 seconds ahead. This shows that the shift of wind helped her greatly. She then had the race well in hand, and on the run home her larger sail spread drove her along magnificently over the combing seas. She ran the fifteen miles down the wind in a few seconds over an hour and 22 minutes. That is a small fraction under an eleven-knot gait, and shows that the breeze was fine and the yacht going beautifully.

She made the beat of fifteen miles to windward in 2 hours and 9 minutes, or at almost a ten-knot speed, which is very fast sailing on the wind. Shamrock III. must be credited with showing almost equal speed in turning to windward, which is regarded as her best point. That Reliance beat her at this was the only exciting feature of yesterday's race. Little room is left for doubt that the defender will administer a substantial defeat to her opponent when it comes to reaching, for in that power and sail spread must tell.

Yesterday's race was a thoroughly fair test of the two yachts in a good breeze of from 17 to 20 knots and a sea with a moderate underrunning swell and a lively, but not large, chop on the surface. With the sea ahead Shamrock's action was easier than Reliance, but the larger boat had the power and thrashed through it successfully. Reliance's crew did the better work in handling sails, and her handling was in general such as to make Americans proud.

Sir THOMAS LIPTON is not the man to betray grief in defeat, but his feelings yesterday must have been such as to command sympathy. "To hope is denied no one," as *Carmen* wisely remarks in the opera. Sir THOMAS has liberty to hope for better luck with Shamrock IV. The Cup is still here. It is going to stay.

## The Colonial Stock.

The theory of Mr. HECKMAN of Brooklyn that 40,000,000 of our 67,000,000 of white population in 1900 were descended from the 200,000 Colonials in this country in 1688, according to the estimate of BANCROFT, is not sustained by the character of the population of our large cities.

Here are the percentages of native whites born of native parents in our thirty-eight cities of 100,000 population and over in 1900:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall River | 13.6 | St. Louis | 32.9 |
| Milwaukee | 17 | New Haven | 33.7 |
| Chicago | 20.8 | Cincinnati | 34.9 |
| New York | 21.5 | Memphis | 35.7 |
| Detroit | 21.5 | New Orleans | 35.9 |
| Paterson | 22.7 | Allegheny | 36.7 |
| Cleveland | 22.9 | Toledo | 39.6 |
| San Francisco | 24.4 | Philadelphia | 40.3 |
| Buffalo | 25.8 | Syracuse | 40.4 |
| Boston | 26 | Omaha | 41.7 |
| St. Paul | 26 | Louisville | 43.2 |
| Scranton | 26.8 | Baltimore | 46.4 |
| Jersey City | 27.7 | Washington | 48.1 |
| Newark | 29 | Denver | 49.9 |
| Minneapolis | 30.2 | Los Angeles | 52.8 |
| Pittsburg | 31 | Kansas City | 57.6 |
| Providence | 31 | Indianapolis | 57.8 |
| Worcester | 31.4 | Columbus | 59.8 |
| Rochester | 32.3 | St. Joseph | 66.8 |

In only five of these cities was there a preponderance of native whites of native parentage, and their aggregate population, native and foreign, was only about one-half the foreign born in New York alone and only about one-fifth more than the number of the foreign born in Chicago. On Manhattan Island, in 1900, the percentage of the native born of native-born parentage was only 16.9, and it must be considerably less now, for the immigration since 1900 has been greater than ever, and a larger part of it than ever has remained in New York, chiefly on Manhattan Island.

Hereabouts the "descendants of the 200,000 Colonials" do not cut much of a figure. Even most of the names in a list of burghers in New Amsterdam made in the seventeenth century have passed away. Even in Boston the "Colonial" names are relatively few, and statistics of births in New England generally indicate that those of this old stock who are still remaining will grow fewer as compared with the foreign stock, independently of further accessions through immigration.

Mr. HECKMAN, in assuming that "nearly 40,000,000 of our population are descended from the 200,000 Colonials" BANCROFT estimated to have been in this country in 1688, leaves out of consideration the relatively large immigration which came over in the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century before the Irish famine. The number of immigrants between 1789 and 1820 was estimated at about 250,000. Between 1820, when immigration statistics were first officially reported, and the year 1846 more than a million came over, and they were usually people of a hardy stock and of remarkable fecundity. Since 1846 have come 20,000,000 more immigrants. Since 1900 alone, if we include the whole of the present fiscal year, the aggregate immigration will be about as great as was the whole population of the Colonies at the time of the Revolution.

It is very natural, then, that descendants of the Colonials should seek to emphasize their distinction by forming societies and wearing badges to mark it. If you want to find them in large numbers, relatively, you must go to States of the South. At a meeting of the Sons of the Revolution a speaker from North Carolina was justified in boasting that the run of the people in his neighborhood were eligible to admission to it.

## How the Sultan Saves His Face.

The report that the Sultan has sent a steamer loaded with provisions to the Russian fleet at Iniada Bay is more than likely to be true, for it is a thoroughly Oriental proceeding, and from that point of view statesmanlike.

In the eyes of the Turkish populace this proceeding converts the Russians from threatening enemies into visiting guests; while to the Russians it is a hint that it is time to leave and that the provisions are for the journey home. Whether they accept the hint immediately or not, the Sultan saves his face for the time being before his own people, and gives an appearance of spontaneity to any concessions he may be called on to make with reference to Macedonia.

These he is the more likely to make if the report be true that a European conference is to be called to consider the whole subject of Turkish misgovernment; for that might mean the end of his power as a ruling sovereign.

## The Prayer of the Kentucky Mariner.

Col. HENRY WATTERSON, an illustrious marine from the old Kentucky shore, shipped on Sir THOMAS LIPTON'S yacht, the Erin, Thursday, and he contributed wind to the slack sails and hope to the quester of the Cup. In these pious words did the true Knight of the Star-Eyed Goddess breathe his good wishes to the Irish Knight:

"Sir THOMAS, may GOD grant that you have the best boat."

The winds bore the prayer away and made it vain. The illustrious Kentucky marine is no luckier in his prayers on the water than in his prayers on land; in boats than in politics. Why do the gods delight to flout the petitions of godlike men?

Mayor ROSE of Milwaukee and other residents of that city have joined in an effort to get the Democratic National Committee to designate it as the place for the Democratic convention of 1904.

Important as are the various advantages urged in behalf of Milwaukee's claim, they are almost completely obscured by the single fact that it is not conventions or political exploits which have made Milwaukee famous, but lager beer. It is the Beer City, and so fine is the brew and so extensive the reputation of the same that no self-respecting delegation, even from a temperance State, would be any more justified in visiting Milwaukee without devoting its attention to the beer than it would be in visiting San Francisco without taking a view of the Golden Gate, or Boston without seeing the Bunker Hill monument.

But is not this really an argument against Milwaukee as a convention town?

## A Corner in H₂O?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Keep on with your good work, and prevent the robbery of the people of this State of $100,000,000 to patch up the Erie Canal.

Now that Governor Odell has made such a success of the grocery business with the State for one of his customers, what would be the matter with his cornering the water supply, and if the canal steal goes through, selling the $H_2O$ to the public to fill the old ditch?

BROOKLYN, Aug. 21. ANTI-CANAL.

## Cruising Through Fish Nets.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Any movement to obtain Federal legislation in the matter of pound nets would receive the support of yachtsmen of the Great Lakes. These nets infest the waters of Lake Erie off the coast, both of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and are, I imagine, as much of a nuisance to us as to the yachtsmen sailing in the waters about New York.

Making the unfamiliar harbor of Lorraine, Ohio, last month during a heavy thunderstorm I took a yawl, drawing five feet, through two sets of these nets. The night was so black and the rain so heavy that nothing could be seen of the posts till we were in the midst of them. The painter of the dingy and the main sheet both fouled posts and only escaped being torn away by the intervention of a friendly puff that laid us over far enough to clear. Damage to paint and varnish, however, was sufficiently exasperating.

It should be as easy to obtain Federal as State legislation on this subject. A movement looking to the removal of these nets from all navigable waters would unite the salt and fresh water yachtsmen, and, if successful, would remove a cause of uneasiness to all who cruise at night in strange waters. FREDERICK C. SLEE.

BUFFALO, N. Y., Aug. 21.

## Water-and-Rag Lines on Ferryboats.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I was much interested in the letter of "Growler" in to-day's SUN, because in a recent visit to New York I had an experience similar to his.

On the Twenty-third street ferry of the Pennsylvania Railroad there are several bootblacks, who are a perfect nuisance. I employed one of them, who, after using a little water and a cloth and not a particle of blacking, demanded his fee. As we were close to the dock I did not, as I should have done, refuse to pay him till his work was done, but allowed myself to be buncoed. Some of the boat hands said I ought to enter a complaint, but it was night and it was not convenient to do so.

It seemed to me that so efficient a railroad as that might well guard its passengers against imposition. W. P. A.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., Aug. 17.

## The Hon. Wos y Gil.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The unique name of President Wos y Gil of the Dominican Republic seems to indicate that he is a native of Kentucky. What is there more probable than that it is an abbreviation (without regard for orthography) of the queried invitation, "Wash your gills," which is presumably often heard in the Blue Grass State? E. H. PARGELET.

BALTIMORE, Md., Aug. 21.

Senator George F. Hoar is entertainingly reminiscent in *Scribner's Magazine* for September, and tells capital stories of "Some Famous Judges." Capt. T. B. M. H. provides an article out of the common run, with many illustrations, about the life of military attachés. Fiction is furnished by Mrs. Wharton, Beatrice Hanscom, Marguerite Merington, Lucien Chamberlain and F. Hopkinson Smith, and there is an unusual amount of verse signed by well-known names.

## IS RELIGION WORTHLESS?

### Mr. Goldwin Smith on the Loss of Belief in the Dogmatic Supernatural.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It was your correspondent "Verus," I think, who said the other day that no religion had ever taught us anything worth knowing. In a certain sense what he said was true. Nothing that dealt with the supernatural and the unseen has told us, or could tell us, anything in the way of material or positive fact. Yet it cannot be denied that religion has played a most important part in the development of humanity. Religious ordinance was the form originally assumed by what is now moral philosophy. The primary instance of this is the religious legislation ascribed to Moses, especially the Decalogue. But the moral philosophy of Socrates and his disciples Plato and Xenophon certainly rested on religious belief—not in the Greek pantheon, but in a supreme power that made for righteousness. So did the moral philosophy of the great stoics Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus, impersonal as their deity is.

Egyptian morality appears to have been in form religious. More questionable, of course, is the influence of the Greek pantheon, with its amorous Zeus and its sensual Olympus. Yet the Greek gods were upholders of justice. The Delphic Oracle in its best day seems to have been an organ of morality. We have the story of a man who, wishing to repudiate a deposit, consulted the Oracle and received an encouraging reply. When, having paid the penalty of his crime, he reproached the Oracle with having misled him, he was told that this was his reward for the insult which he had offered to the moral majesty of the god.

In the æsthetic development of man religion has unquestionably played a great part. The Parthenon and the cathedrals, the great painters, the composers of sacred music, Dante and Milton are religious. So fundamentally is Shakespeare, though he was probably a free thinker.

No doubt there have been aberrations many and horrible, such as Moloch-worship and the Inquisition. Hardly to be reckoned among them are the crimes of the Papacy, which at bottom were crimes of secular ambition.

Nor can we overlook such an historical fact as Christendom. Even those who have most thoroughly rejected the Christian faith are still living in the penumbra of Christianity.

Then comes the question, What is the origin of religion? The tendency appears to be almost universal, showing itself independently in every member of the human race, saving perhaps the very lowest savages. There must be some rational account of it, and it is difficult to see how that account could be found in evolution or in anything disclosed by physical science. Such an explanation of the origin of religion as the apparition of dead chieftains in dreams seems to be totally inadequate. Let us be thoroughly loyal to science and embrace all its real discoveries, however subversive of our traditions. But let us ask for recognition of all the phenomena of human nature, not only those which are demonstrably physical, but also those which appear to belong to another class.

May not a man be doing what is at present premature in absolutely rejecting all religious belief and cutting himself off from the religious life of the world? May not the impetus of our parting from belief in the supernatural and the dogmatic carry us at first too far? GOLDWIN SMITH.

TORONTO, Aug. 20.

## An Anglican Who Went Over to the Roman Catholic Church.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Several years ago one of the best-known of the Ritualistic clergymen, the Rev. Basil W. Maturin, one of the "Cowley Fathers," who had been rector of St. Clement's Church, Philadelphia, became a Catholic. Of late some industrious person has been busily spreading rumors that he was dissatisfied in the Catholic Church, and statements to that effect have appeared in the diocesan paper of a High Church Western diocese.

As I had known Father Maturin very well when we were both Anglicans, I brought the matter to his attention and have received from him the following letter, which I am sure will be read with great interest by his many friends in America.

JESSE ALBERT LOCKE.

VENTNOR, Isle of Wight, Aug. 11.

DEAR MR. LOCKE: You ask me if there is any truth in the rumors which you say are very persistent in America that I am inclined to return to the Church of England.

I am sure such rumors cannot have their origin from any of my American friends who have known me or heard from me since I became a Catholic, and how any persons can take it upon themselves to say such things merely because they imagine them or wish them to be true, I cannot imagine. If they say them in order to influence others from doing as I have done I think their conduct can only be characterized by a very ugly word.

However, as you ask me I will answer you. There is absolutely not one fragment of truth in such statements. I could not imagine any conceivable circumstances inducing me even to consider for a moment such a step. In fact, I have found in the Catholic Church all that I desire, and the question has for the last six years ceased to be a "question" with me any more. I am perfectly happy and at peace in the Roman Catholic Church. From the day I made up my mind and went to Beaumont to be received, the English Church melted before my eyes, and, as a Church, has never taken substantial form again. As Newman said, "I went by, and lo it was gone; I sought it and its place could nowhere be found." B. W. MATURIN.

ST. MARY'S CHURCH, London, July 25.

## The Ideas of a Southern Manufacturer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* No one who reads your journal regularly, as many of us do, questions the English written day by day, because we know that it is above reproach and that no other publication in the language equals it.

We admire you for publishing so much pro and con about lynching.

Instead of being abused, the negro is liked in the South the ordinary man is employing him every day, to both their benefits. In a way he solves the labor question here to our benefit.

We have no strikes, because the employer and employee understand one another and know that our climate is made for both and that Northern conditions do not suit either.

If either whites or blacks assault women they will be lynched. The conditions here are somewhat different from the States North and West, but "due process of law" means that our women shall not go into court to testify where we can shorten the process. Study the ethics all you please; the result will remain the same.

CHARLES E. HINCKLEY.

KNOXVILLE, Tenn., Aug. 20.

## Pat Morris's Flag a Sinecure.

*From the Whitestone Herald.*

Patrick Morris's big Irish flag was the sinecure of all eyes—the admired of all admirers. Whose heart would not burst with enthusiasm at such a display of patriotism?

## The Scouts of the German Savings Banks.

*From The Week's Progress.*

In Germany workingmen are visited at their homes on pay day by savings bank officials to collect their savings for banking.

## The Cause of Things.

With a vast unrest in his heaving breast
And his knees uplifted high,
He lies on his bed with a throbbing head
And attributes his pain to pie.
But the apple pie was less at fault
Than the man's inordinate greed of malt.

Sallow and ill, with a giant pill
In his hand, and a look of fright,
In his easy chair hear the victim swear
At the lobster he ate last night.
But an innocent lobster you need not fear
If you don't combine champagne and beer.

"Peaches and cream brought a dreadful dream,"
Said the man to his wife, next day;
"Call me a brute if I eat more fruit,
I'm in really a dreadful way."
"But don't you remember," the wife replied,
"Those high balls and green chartreuse beside?"

Contractors say they'll tear Broadway
They'll ditch it and infure trade;
It's ruin or rule, and the man's a fool
Who fancies they're afraid.
But how long borne will the nuisance be
With men of nerve on the R. T. C.?

T. N.

## GOLD HUNTERS DESTITUTE.

### Rushed Into the Tanana District With Insufficient Provisions.

TACOMA, Wash., Aug. 22.—Despatches from Dawson say that Harry Bratnober, who left the Tanana country three weeks ago, has arrived there bringing news that many Americans are destitute on the upper Tanana River and are in danger of starvation. Word was immediately sent to Capt. Perkins, commanding Fort Egbert, with the request that a Government relief expedition be sent to the district at once. Bratnober estimates that fully 200 persons are in urgent need of assistance.

P. A. Rettig of Seattle, William Kruhm of New York and Henry Behrens of Baltimore were rescued from starvation by Bratnober after they had subsisted on wild berries for seventeen days. The men had given up hope and had lain down to die just before they were discovered.

The famine is the result of miners stampeding to new diggings and carrying insufficient provisions. Many miners returned from the district before the famine overtook the camp, but others remained to prospect further, in hopes of securing paying gravel. Capt. Perkins has telegraphed the Washington authorities and an expedition will be organized at once to carry relief to the miners.

## NEW DOMINICAN CONSUL.

### Senor Galvan Takes the Office Vacant Since the Revolution.

The consulate of Santo Domingo, in this city, which has been closed for three months, will be reopened to-morrow. Señor Manuel Galvan, who arrived here on Thursday from Santo Domingo, has been appointed as the Consul-General and Chargé d'Affaires of the Dominican Republic by President Wos y Gil.

When Gen. Wos y Gil overthrew the Government of President Vasquez, the latter's brother, who was Consul-General in this city, immediately resigned, leaving the affairs of the consulate in charge of the Spanish Consul-General.

## ADMISSION TO CITIZENSHIP.

### The Education in English That Ought to Precede Naturalization.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In your issue of Aug. 17, T. J. Regan takes exception to the action of Judge Gregory of Albany. In reply I would say that the Judge should be commended for refusing naturalization papers to immigrants who are ignorant of the English language. This refusal should have been made a quarter of a century ago. Had it been done, there would not now be the unrest which is so apparent.

Take any immigrant who is fairly educated in the language and ways of his own country. What does he know, or can he intelligently learn, of our laws and customs in a dozen years?

The average American-born schoolboy, educated in our public schools, at 16 years of age knows more and is better qualified to become a voting citizen than the immigrant of a dozen years' residence. And yet we have deemed it best—and very wisely so—that our boys should wait until 21 years of age before voting. Before that time they cannot be supposed to have formed good, healthy, intelligent ideas of citizenship. Yet we admit these immigrants, the majority of them the most illiterate from all quarters of the globe, and long before they know or can distinguish a from z they are full-fledged citizens.

It is an insult to the educated youth of our land. It is not too much for the privilege of a residence in this fair land that one should wait even twenty-one years before seeking to become a voting citizen. Beyond claiming the protection which the glorious Stars and Stripes afford to all, let them bide their time and study our language and customs, and, if need be, walk along with the American-born youth until 21 years of age. Not until then are they fitted for that citizenship which comes by the ballot.

What is to be done with the struggling mass which is being poured into our cities by the thousands, and which to-day is a menace to our Government?

Take the statistics of our hospitals, charity organizations, asylums and prisons, and, believe me, the majority of inmates of these places are the immigrants and their numerous progeny who have failed to assimilate.

Through ill-advised agencies they have swooped down on us, and with united voice declare: "Here we are, here we stay, and if the gold is not forthcoming in the street we must be cared for in one way or another, and all the same we are going to have a voice in running the Government." It is true these same dreamers fill our public parks, and lounge on the best seats, as though they had a mortgage on them, and only begin themselves as election day draws near, or the cold drives them elsewhere.

Let us welcome with outstretched arms all those who seek a refuge from oppression, who are willing to abide by our laws, seek means of employment away from the crowded cities, learn to till the soil, and, above all, wait for that citizenship which comes from an intelligent understanding of the underlying principles of government.

It is not the fault of the immigrant, but of the politician, that naturalization is so easy. We have made unwise laws. It is time they were changed or amended if we would save ourselves from governmental ruin, and Judge Gregory, having seen the cloud which darkens the horizon, has started on the right track.

A DESCENDANT OF OLD HOLLAND.

NEW YORK, Aug. 18.

## The Bad Spellers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am inclined to think from my experience that the matter of spelling touches a tender spot in many more people than one would suppose. For instance, I have a friend who never in his life wrote a letter that was not impeccable in that respect, yet he is about the worst speller possible. The fact is that he consults a dictionary when he is not quite sure of a word, and no doubt there are thousands like him in that respect.

I am a fairly good speller, but not a first-class one. There are about twelve words in common use that I have been trying for many years to spell correctly, but without success, and, in fact, nearly always have to consult a lexicon when I have occasion to write them. One of them is "weather," and another is "whether," and so on.

Another strange thing is that I am almost always right when asked by some one how to spell a word, but when writing myself I am often in doubt, and although I may be correct at first, the more I dwell upon a word the more doubtful I become about it until, at length, it seems all wrong.

A man who is not sure of a word is very culpable if he does not consult a lexicon. To be quite unable to spell correctly is much more common than one would suppose. It is the skeleton in the closet with many people, but no one knows it save themselves. Let me add that I have acquaintances who are first-class spellers but are not by any means of an intelligence above the average. T. J.

NEW YORK, Aug. 21.

## Foreign Notes of Real Interest.

The Château de la Muette, next to the Bois de Boulogne, is about to be torn down. It was bought by the Regent Orléans in 1716 and presented to Louis XV., who kept many of his favorites there.

Mr. H. Jenner-Fust, captain of the first Cambridge cricket eleven that played against Oxford, is still living, at the age of 97 years. The match was played in 1827, and he is the sole survivor of the players on both sides.

Two Englishwomen have received from Heidelberg the first honorary degree of Doctor of Theology granted by a German university to a woman. They are the twin sisters, Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis and Mrs. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, who discovered the Sinaitic palimpsest and have done important work in Bible research.

Medical fame is not lasting unless a man succeeds in attaching his name to some disease. Only five years ago England was celebrating the centennial of Jenner's discovery of inoculation for smallpox, and now the Jenner Institute of Preventive Medicine has voted, on Sir Henry Roscoe's motion,