

Index to Advertisements. Part. Page. Col.
Amusements 4 7 1
Art Dealers 4 7 1
Advertisements 4 7 1
Automobiles 4 7 1
Bakers and Brokers 4 7 1
Business Chances 4 7 1
Carpet Cleaning 4 7 1
Dresses and Office Furniture 4 7 1
Employment 4 7 1
Financial 4 7 1
Foreign 4 7 1
Help Wanted 4 7 1
Institutions 4 7 1
Lawyers 4 7 1
Machinery 4 7 1
Marriages and Deaths 4 7 1
Miscellaneous 4 7 1
Mortgage Loans 4 7 1
Musical 4 7 1
Professional Estimators 4 7 1
Purchases and Exchange 4 7 1
Real Estate 4 7 1
Refrigerators 4 7 1
Selling Agencies 4 7 1
Social Notices 4 7 1
Tobacco 4 7 1
Traveling 4 7 1
Tribune Subscriptions 4 7 1
Unfurnished Apartments 4 7 1
Work Wanted 4 7 1

New-York Tribune. SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1910.

This newspaper is owned and published by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation; office and principal place of business, Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau street, New York; Ogden Mills, president; Ogden Mills, secretary; James M. Barrett, treasurer. The address of the officers is the office of this newspaper.

THE NEWS THIS MORNING.

CONGRESS.—Senate: Mr. Aldrich introduced a resolution providing for the creation of a budget commission; the constitutionality of the extension of criminal law from one state to another in cases in which the prosecution is according to the process of "information" was discussed. — The House was not in session.

FOREIGN.—The Navy Department received a despatch from Captain Shipley, commander of the Des Moines, telling of another engagement in which six thousand insurgents attacked the government forces at Acapulco, Mexico. — The Tribune's correspondent in London predicts that Premier Asquith will press the budget before taking up the question of reforming the House of Commons. — Paris is resuming its normal appearance, and comprehensive plans for relief and prevention of disease have been outlined; deep gratitude is expressed to America for financial aid. — Goldwin Smith fell in his home, in Toronto, and was seriously injured. — The International Court of Arbitration, at The Hague, has set the date for hearing the differences between the United States and Great Britain, growing out of the Newfoundland fisheries. — The London correspondent of the United States-Globe has reported that the United States-Globe editors were sentenced at Havana for libeling President Gomez. — The birth of a child was celebrated at Christiania.

DOMESTIC.—Senator Frank P. Flint, of California, announced that he would not be a candidate for re-election. — Officers had been found guilty by a military investigating committee and will probably give his testimony next Friday. — It was announced at Quincy, Mass., that contracts were awarded in this country for the construction of a new class of two battleships of the Dreadnought class for the Argentine Republic. — It was reported in Boston that Payson R. Aid had been found guilty by the court martial which tried his case last week. — O. H. Cheney, State Superintendent of Banks, made an address before the bankers' conference at Albany. — Eleven miners were killed by a gas explosion in the Ernest mine of the Jefferson and Clearfield Coal Company, near Indiana, Pa. — The Boston Herald reported that Edward Ford, charged with blackmailing C. L. Warriner, convicted treasurer of the Big Four Railway, was given to the jury at Cincinnati.

CITY.—Stocks were strong. — No trace was found of the \$100,000 bill lost in Wall Street on Friday. — Hatters planned to carry the decision in the Danbury, Conn., boycotting case to the United States Supreme Court. — The police declared no action would be taken against theatres to-day under the new decision. — Justice Goff set aside a verdict of murder in the first degree in a trial for murder in the first degree. — Two brothers fought a duel with revolvers; one was perhaps fatally shot. — Miss Alice Paul, the suffragette, told of her experience at the Erie jail. — Thomas M. Lynch, the water register, lost his \$3,000 job. — Housewives bought liberally of foodstuffs, but preferred the American-made goods. — All Queens Borough turned out to celebrate the opening of through trolley service to Manhattan. — The H. W. Poor house at No. 10 Lexington avenue was closed by the Charles Cook Corporation.

THE WEATHER.—Indications for today: Fair. The temperature yesterday: Highest, 35 degrees; lowest, 24.

THE WRIGHTS' NEW POLICY.

No little satisfaction will be felt over the recent change in the attitude of the Wright brothers in regard to public gifts for money making purposes. Hitherto they have been averse to giving such exhibitions. Their scruples may have sprung from a conviction that they could degrade the art of aviation by evincing a mercenary spirit. If so, few will agree with them. Accepting compensation for showing what they can do with their machines and competing for large prizes are perfectly legitimate. No one has a better right to the profits than to be secured that the men who began experimenting with the aeroplane when Lillenthal, Langley, Maxim and other pioneers, for one reason or another, had abandoned work. Other inventors and aeronauts who might never have achieved prominence but for the direct and indirect influence of the Wrights' experiments at Dayton and Kitty Hawk have within the last few months reaped handsome pecuniary harvests. The Wrights now realize that such returns could be utilized to develop still further the art to which they are devoted, and they will hereafter govern themselves accordingly. Here, no doubt, is the motive which has led them to adopt a new programme, and to promise the country exhibition flights conducted by employees who are to be trained at their school in Florida. Willard Wright, in making this announcement to a Tribune reporter last week, accompanied it with other interesting statements. He referred to the popularity which the aeroplane may win if it can be made "absolutely safe." Well, whether absolute safety will ever be feasible is open to doubt, but the Wrights evidently do not consider their machine perfect at present. Immunity from serious accident will probably depend somewhat on the skill of the pilot of a heavier-than-air machine in the future, as it does now, and it is reasonable to hope that the risks of flying

making, so it can regulate municipal corporations for the good of the whole state. The enunciation of that logical principle will probably have a far-reaching effect in New Jersey. It will come as a particularly cold douche upon some of the extreme pretensions of inherent and essential home rule which have recently been put forward. It had been declared that every municipality had a natural and inalienable right to complete home rule, so that any city could annul the excise law or the Sunday observance law or any other general statute which was for any cause unacceptable to a temporary majority of its people or of its governing body. That pretension is curiously dismissed as wholly untenable. Even when a state law is repugnant to a community, state authority is to be inflexibly maintained. "It is the very essence of government," declares the court, "that it shall operate upon those who are unwilling to be governed. The right of local self-government, if it exists, necessarily limits to that extent the powers of general government. Such a limitation is not to be implied." Of course, that is a decision under the New Jersey constitution. The constitutions of other states may permit or even require a different conception of municipal autonomy. But so far as New Jersey is concerned, there is left no standing room for those who would make every municipality a law unto itself without regard for the rest of the state.

THE DANBURY VERDICT.

The verdict given on Friday in the celebrated Danbury hat-makers' boycott case was largely a matter of form, since the United States Supreme Court had already passed on the vital point in dispute, which was whether or not a secondary boycott conducted by a labor union constituted an unlawful restraint of trade. The Supreme Court held, in dismissing a demurrer filed by the defendants, that if the facts alleged by the complainants, the hat making firm of D. E. Loewe & Co., could be established they constituted a violation of the Sherman anti-trust law. The defending labor union contended that the successful secondary boycott which it had been conducting was not punishable under the Sherman law, because that law was not applicable to efforts on the part of a labor union to interfere with the sale to outside parties of the products of a manufacturing concern with which the union was engaged in hostilities. Judge Platt, of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, instructed the jury that the facts of the conspiracy to deter persons not members of the union from dealing with the boycotted firm were too plain to be disputed and ordered the jurors to bring in a verdict of guilty, using their judgment only as to the amount of damages. The hat-makers' union will take an appeal on the ground that the verdict of \$222,000, with costs, is excessive. That amount may be reduced, but no matter what the reduction may be the important principle will remain decided that a labor union has no special rights under the anti-trust law and must face the legal penalties for practicing intimidation and similar restraints on trade and commerce just as any other corporation or organization must which undertakes to use an illegal weapon like the blacklist or the secondary boycott. One form of compulsion in restraint of trade is just as odious as another. If a labor union and a manufacturing concern disagree, each has a right to declare non-intercourse with the other. The concern is entitled to discharge its employees, if contracts do not prevent, and the employees have a right to agree not to use the articles manufactured by the employer. The two combatants may boycott each other directly, but they must fight it out fairly between themselves and refrain from drawing innocent third parties unwillingly into the quarrel. The boycotted concern is not entitled to conspire with other concerns to deprive the boycotters of employment, or to threaten or annoy other concerns which do employ them. Similarly, the boycotters must not use intimidation to discourage outsiders from handling or buying the boycotted firm's products. It is a fair law, working impartially both ways. Were blacklisting and secondary boycotting allowed one small labor dispute might spread so as to involve the whole country and entail loss, annoyance and privation on millions of people in no way concerned in the dispute and having no proper interest one way or another in its settlement.

POPULAR LABELS.

The way in which mistaken popular impressions often stick is strikingly illustrated in the general credit now given to Senator John Sherman for framing the Sherman anti-trust law. Ex-Senator George F. Edmunds, of Vermont, in a letter written the other day to Mr. Charles P. Howland, of this city, tells the true story—well known at the time—of the preparation of that measure. An anti-trust bill was introduced by Mr. Sherman and after amendment was reported from the Finance Committee, of which he was a member. But when considered in the Senate it was found to be so loosely drawn as to be practically worthless, and it was referred to the Judiciary Committee for redrafting. Mr. Edmunds, who was then the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, says that "all after the enacting clause was stricken out, and an entirely different series of provisions was inserted as a result of most careful discussion and consideration."

Mr. Edmunds probably refers to himself when he says further: "These provisions were put in the very form in which they now stand in the statute 'by one of the members of that committee, and agreed upon unanimously by it and so reported to the Senate.'" The law was not taken very seriously by the Congress which passed it, and no protest was made when Mr. Sherman's name, attached to the original rejected bill, was affixed also to the radically altered substitute. As time passes the many important laws enacted by the 51st Congress. Mr. Sherman had a conspicuous part in framing and passing other measures of that Congress, like the tariff law and the silver purchase compromise law of 1890. But the measure with which he had least to do seems likely to remain (without real desert) one of the most lasting monuments to his reputation as a farsighted statesman and legislator.

TOO SERIOUS.

The Senate of South Carolina seems to be lacking in a sense of humor. It declined the other day to issue an invitation to the Hon. Benjamin Ryan Tillman to come to Columbia and advise it on the expediency of ratifying the income tax amendment to the federal Constitution recently submitted to the states, though it has since asked a Senator from another state—Mr. Bailey, of Texas—to contribute to its enlightenment. The reason alleged for this astonishing discourtesy to the Czar of South Carolina politics was that Mr. Tillman had remarked last summer that the South Carolina Senate was "owned by the corporations." The Senators evidently took the charge to heart and are now welcoming the opportunity to get even with the overcautious authority who made it. It seems to us that due allowance has not been made by the indignant Columbia legislators for Mr. Tillman's oratorical habits and temperament. The Senator became annoyed last summer at some of the restrictions of the new railroad mileage law, and in his mood of irritation he told a gathering of farmers that the law was bad because the railroads controlled the state Senate and wouldn't let it pass a better one. Just a little illustration of the Senator's genial propensity to lay all defects in legislation to the corruption of fellow politicians less Spartan than himself. South Carolina ought to be accustomed to such imputations, for they have always been the favorite seasoning to Mr. Tillman's vituperative and reckless philippics. He presumably forgot the day after the speech in question was made that he had insulted the dignitaries of the state Senate. He probably didn't even realize that he was insulting them. Shall his oratorical frivolity be thus held against him half a year later? Is South Carolina going to revoke the license of its long tolerated Thesites and take the pitchfork away from the original patentee and practitioner of pitchfork argumentation? If it starts in now to suppress Tillman, the amazing and irresponsible, it will be sinning against its own sense of the incongruous and the humorous in politics.

GERMAN VIEWS OF FINLAND.

The idea is so often expressed that criticism of Russia's course toward Finland is confined chiefly to America and Great Britain, the two countries most out of sympathy with Russian governmental principles, that it is interesting to find precisely similar criticisms made elsewhere by conspicuous authorities in a nation in which the principle of imperialism, if not of autocracy, is almost as dominant as in Russia itself and in which sympathy with Russian aims and methods is probably strongest. Seventy prominent professors in the chief German universities, with Ernst Haeckel, Karl Lamprecht and Ernst Thode at their head, have united in a public manifesto against the policy which Russia is pursuing toward Finland in striving to subvert the autonomy of the grand ducal and to reduce it to the rank of a province of the Russian Empire. The matter is so important, they declare, as to be of legitimate concern to all Europe, and, indeed, to all the civilized world, and to affect the general interest of Europe. So they re-

resent that the destruction or even the infringement of the political independence which was granted to Finland in 1809 would be a breach of faith and would signify the annulment of a legal situation which for generations has been regarded as unimpeachable. It would, they continue, be most deplorable for Russia to begin the development of its own constitutional system with an open violation of the constitution and with wanton destruction of the political and intellectual life of a neighboring nation which has always been loyal in its friendship. Moreover, they declare, they would have deeply to deplore the inevitable collapse of the peculiar Finnish civilization which would result from the Russian conquest—a civilization which is a very valuable part of the whole of modern civilized life. In brief, the execution of the programme of Finnish subjugation to which the Russian government has apparently committed itself would be shocking to the world, and the very announcement of the proposed measures produces a most painful sense of surprise in every civilized country. The words of these distinguished German scholars and publicists are calm and temperate and were doubtless well weighed before they were uttered. They unquestionably express with directness and force the sentiments and judgments of a large part of the enlightened world, and of a part of the world which is sympathetic and friendly toward Russia. They form an utterance which the Russian government can scarcely afford to ignore.

As the flood of the Seine subsides the center floor of relief for the stricken hatter rises. Texas expects to roll up a population of 4,500,000 when the census is taken next spring. We fear for the reason of "The Houston Post" if such a gain is reported. How will it be able to bear up under the weight of its solemn responsibility to install each and every Democrat in Texas in a state or federal office? Senator Timothy D. Sullivan will distribute socks and shoes to-day among his Bowery constituents. Considering the extraordinary frost this winter up and down the Bowery, the shoes ought to be double-soled and the socks double-lined. The franchise reforms which the Prussian government offers are a mere fraction of what is demanded and of what ought to be granted, but at least they are a step in the right direction, and every step taken, no matter how short, makes further progress easier and more sure. The court decides that no theatrical performances are permissible in this city on Sundays unless they are of a sacred or an educational character. Now then, all together, for the sacred Salome dance and the strictly educational coon song! The Central American Peace Congress goes steadily on with its work in spite of rumors of wars, and the prospect is that in the end it will win its victory. The Senate committee on public expenditures, which was intended to get to work this year to reduce extravagant appropriations, now wants to have a commission appointed to suggest economies for the future. It would be better to begin at once with the reductions. Why not try a few simple expedients, for instance, like passing no private pension laws at this session, consolidating the pension agencies, abolishing moribund ports of entry and cutting down the number of documents and other useless government publications which have to be put in storage after printing and eventually are burned or sold as junk? THE TALK OF THE DAY.

"The Miracles of Lourdes from the Medical Standpoint" was the subject of a lecture delivered before the Medical Society of this city recently by Dr. George A. Capuchin monk. "Never in the history of the organization," writes a physician, "has so much interest been shown in a lecture. The learned monk is not a physician, but a magnetic speaker, deeply impressed with the importance of his work. He was graduated at Paris for the law, devoted himself to the cause of socialism, and then entered the monastery—no one knows why. He spoke of the seven thousand miraculous cures effected at the sacred shrine, but it is doubtful whether his arguments had much effect on the learned audience except to prove his sincerity and his powers as a speaker. Hank Stubbs—Ambition ain't hardly wuth while. Big Miller—Why not? Hank Stubbs—Waal, if you are behind the procession you haffer keep bumpin' into somebody, an' if you get ahead you're liable to get telierecorded.—Boston Herald.

MEAT TOO HIGH FOR MARY.

Mary had a little lamb, She chopped it up for meat, Too bad she had to kill her pet, But then, she had to eat.

Spoonily—I am intoxicated with love for you, Miss Maryplunks—Oh, I see! And you want to try the gold cure?—Chicago News.

"It has been calculated," says "The Hebrew Standard," "that against 60,000 English-speaking Jews toward the end of the eighteenth century, there are now 3,000,000. That is to say, one-quarter of the entire Jewry throughout the world to-day are outside of Paris for the law. General himself to the cause of socialism, and then entered the monastery—no one knows why. He spoke of the seven thousand miraculous cures effected at the sacred shrine, but it is doubtful whether his arguments had much effect on the learned audience except to prove his sincerity and his powers as a speaker.

Hank Stubbs—Ambition ain't hardly wuth while. Big Miller—Why not? Hank Stubbs—Waal, if you are behind the procession you haffer keep bumpin' into somebody, an' if you get ahead you're liable to get telierecorded.—Boston Herald.

MUGGINS—THAT BOY OF MINE IS A WONDER.

Muggins—Well, to-day is his birthday, and I gave him a new knife. He's had it three-quarters of an hour and hasn't cut himself yet.—Philadelphia Record.

Benafus, the representative of Mulai Hand, the Sultan of Morocco, in the Mannemann affair in Berlin, is described as a handsome, dark skinned, black bearded, bright eyed man of middle age. His snow white hair, which he wears in a topknot, is a figure wherever he goes. Having been asked by people with whom he became acquainted for a portrait, he posed for one, assuming a unique attitude for the purpose. The picture shows him reclining on a divan, with his right hand holding his left naked foot, which rests on the right knee. The picture is in strange contrast with those of his associates in the commercial affair which brought him to Germany.

Dr. A.—How is it that you are so successful? Dr. B.—I confine myself to office practice. Dr. A.—But what's the answer? Dr. B.—People who are able to walk to the office aren't very sick—they just think they are.—Cleveland Leader.

Governor Fort of New Jersey has many strange callers at his office at Trenton, but one of his visitors last week eclipsed any

other within the memory of the attachés of his office. The caller was a woman, who traced all the way from Paterson to lay grievances before the Governor. She said that a neighbor had killed her pet cat, and that she wanted the Governor to take immediate action in the matter. But he didn't.

Wiwag—Hello, Guzzler! Are you taking anything for your cold? Guzzler—Before committing myself, I'm going to ask you merely an interrogation?—Philadelphia Record.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

"BACK TO THE FARM." To the Editor of The Tribune. It does not require a Congressional investigation to discover the causes for "increased cost of living," as they speak for themselves.

The production of the United States has increased 25 per cent in the last ten years, and the following is the increase in the quantity of foodstuffs during the same period: Corn, 20 per cent; wheat, 20 per cent; oats, 10 per cent; barley, 100 per cent; rye, 15 per cent; buckwheat, 6 per cent; sheep, 40 per cent; cattle, 2 per cent; hogs, 1 per cent; butter, 50 per cent; cheese, 6 per cent, and milk, 50 per cent. The production of foodstuffs has not kept pace with the increase in population. That is the basic cause for the increased cost of living.

The second cause is that the earning power of the people during the same period has increased 25 per cent, which means a greater demand from them for foodstuffs and a greater number who are willing to pay higher prices, having the wherewithal to do so. The third cause is that all beef and poultry are controlled absolutely by the packers, who, finding that the quantity does not keep pace with the increasing population and that the people have no money to spend, force prices up to the utmost limit that the people are willing to pay.

The fourth cause is cold storage. Destroy cold storage and the third cause would fall with it. The packers and cold storage exploit the appetites of the nation for the benefit of the packers' pockets. "Leaving the farm" for the "lure of the city" is caused by universal education, making the young generation above their parents in the matter of education. "Back to the farm," if it ever happens, which is doubtful, will never happen until the empty stomachs of the people force them there. Possibly chemistry may produce a substitute for natural foodstuffs, but until "back to the farm" becomes a reality or chemistry produces a substitute for foodstuffs, increased consumption has nothing to do with increased prices, and the tariff has very little. STEWART BROWNE. New York, Feb. 3, 1910.

REGULARITY IN EATING.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: May I, too, say a word on the subject of children's diet? I agree with "A Clergyman" in thinking your witty editorial on Dr. Hutchinson's article "delicious" as it is, and as I am an interested physician as Dr. Hutchinson should seriously advocate that children eat what they will. Whenever I have seen that method followed, and that is not seldom, it has invariably resulted in lack of appetite at meals, especially for the plainer articles of food, which taste so good when one is really hungry.

I would not, however, absolutely refuse a child "something to eat" when he comes in with appetite sharpened by outdoor play, with my dear mother's rule of "bread and butter only"—no crackers, no cakes, no jams—between meals, was a happy medium, preventing both a hungry headache and a spoiled appetite for dinner. But the child, or the grown person, either, who has just eaten cakes and candies in the pantry and at afternoon tea brings only a half-rested digestion to the most important meal of the day, although Dr. Hutchinson is contrary; neither child nor adult is apt to recognize the evil results until, as in "A Clergyman's" case, food dyspepsia teaches him the lesson too late. GOOD APPETITE, Rosebank, N. Y., Feb. 4, 1910.

THE CORPORATION TAX.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In my letter of the 25th inst. I did not assume to settle the federal corporation tax question offhand, without awaiting the verdict of the United States Supreme Court on the many complicated and interesting legal questions involved. I do mean to say, however, that in my opinion, after a careful study, the tax was intended simply as a class or privilege tax, and that had Congress not chosen income as the measure of the tax no point would have been made that the tax is an income tax. A curious and somewhat anomalous situation has been developed by the Treasury Department, arising out of its regulations and instructions which have been sent with the form of return required of the corporations involved. The Treasury Department instructs that the deductions specified in the statute shall be made from the gross profits of the corporation. Now, in view of the language of the statute, that such deductions shall be made from the gross amount of the income received within the year, this stand of the Treasury Department is surprising and may have a very important bearing on the income tax. The Supreme Court will take of this. A high official of the government is already on record with the statement that the tax is not imposed upon profits, but upon net income received.

The difference between the two positions is this: If the tax is on an arbitrary sum arrived at by making from the gross profits of the gross income received, the tax may well be an excise tax, affecting all corporations except those especially exempted. If, however, the tax is only on those corporations which show a net profit, the general class-to-wit, corporations engaged in business for a profit—is divided into two classes, those which show net profit and those which do not. It is a serious question whether this distinction may not legally destroy the tax, because it practically establishes an exemption of a great body of corporations which are not exempted by the language of the statute.

It may also be that the distinction so established may give weight to the theory that the tax is, after all, an income tax, because, being a tax on profits, it is in essence a tax upon the income of the individual holder of the stock of the corporation.

I may add that there are good authorities for each of the propositions I have indicated, and that with no doubt be fully considered and weighed in arriving at the true construction of the law. P. LEWIS ANDERSON. New York, Jan. 28, 1910.

INEBRIATES.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I note the introduction in the State Senate of a bill providing for the better care of inebriates. But why not abolish the inebriate?

If, however, this cannot be done, I suggest that an amendment be made to the bill in question providing that this new burden of taxation be imposed on the liquor traffickers, who alone are responsible for the creation of inebriates. This seems a common sense suggestion. If adopted, the only ones who would then be liable for the inebriate would be the families of the inebriate, as it is with good reason demand that the State should permit the traffic which had robbed them of their protectors. It should take his place in their care and support. New York, Feb. 4, 1910. SQUIRE.

NO RESPECT FOR OLD AGE.

From The Schenectady Union. Mighty little respect for age is shown by the 120 who are waiting against cold storage.

other within the memory of the attachés of his office. The caller was a woman, who traced all the way from Paterson to lay grievances before the Governor. She said that a neighbor had killed her pet cat, and that she wanted the Governor to take immediate action in the matter. But he didn't.

Wiwag—Hello, Guzzler! Are you taking anything for your cold? Guzzler—Before committing myself, I'm going to ask you merely an interrogation?—Philadelphia Record.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

"BACK TO THE FARM." To the Editor of The Tribune. It does not require a Congressional investigation to discover the causes for "increased cost of living," as they speak for themselves.

The production of the United States has increased 25 per cent in the last ten years, and the following is the increase in the quantity of foodstuffs during the same period: Corn, 20 per cent; wheat, 20 per cent; oats, 10 per cent; barley, 100 per cent; rye, 15 per cent; buckwheat, 6 per cent; sheep, 40 per cent; cattle, 2 per cent; hogs, 1 per cent; butter, 50 per cent; cheese, 6 per cent, and milk, 50 per cent. The production of foodstuffs has not kept pace with the increase in population. That is the basic cause for the increased cost of living.

The second cause is that the earning power of the people during the same period has increased 25 per cent, which means a greater demand from them for foodstuffs and a greater number who are willing to pay higher prices, having the wherewithal to do so. The third cause is that all beef and poultry are controlled absolutely by the packers, who, finding that the quantity does not keep pace with the increasing population and that the people have no money to spend, force prices up to the utmost limit that the people are willing to pay.

The fourth cause is cold storage. Destroy cold storage and the third cause would fall with it. The packers and cold storage exploit the appetites of the nation for the benefit of the packers' pockets. "Leaving the farm" for the "lure of the city" is caused by universal education, making the young generation above their parents in the matter of education. "Back to the farm," if it ever happens, which is doubtful, will never happen until the empty stomachs of the people force them there. Possibly chemistry may produce a substitute for natural foodstuffs, but until "back to the farm" becomes a reality or chemistry produces a substitute for foodstuffs, increased consumption has nothing to do with increased prices, and the tariff has very little. STEWART BROWNE. New York, Feb. 3, 1910.

REGULARITY IN EATING.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: May I, too, say a word on the subject of children's diet? I agree with "A Clergyman" in thinking your witty editorial on Dr. Hutchinson's article "delicious" as it is, and as I am an interested physician as Dr. Hutchinson should seriously advocate that children eat what they will. Whenever I have seen that method followed, and that is not seldom, it has invariably resulted in lack of appetite at meals, especially for the plainer articles of food, which taste so good when one is really hungry.

I would not, however, absolutely refuse a child "something to eat" when he comes in with appetite sharpened by outdoor play, with my dear mother's rule of "bread and butter only"—no crackers, no cakes, no jams—between meals, was a happy medium, preventing both a hungry headache and a spoiled appetite for dinner. But the child, or the grown person, either, who has just eaten cakes and candies in the pantry and at afternoon tea brings only a half-rested digestion to the most important meal of the day, although Dr. Hutchinson is contrary; neither child nor adult is apt to recognize the evil results until, as in "A Clergyman's" case, food dyspepsia teaches him the lesson too late. GOOD APPETITE, Rosebank, N. Y., Feb. 4, 1910.

THE CORPORATION TAX.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In my letter of the 25th inst. I did not assume to settle the federal corporation tax question offhand, without awaiting the verdict of the United States Supreme Court on the many complicated and interesting legal questions involved. I do mean to say, however, that in my opinion, after a careful study, the tax was intended simply as a class or privilege tax, and that had Congress not chosen income as the measure of the tax no point would have been made that the tax is an income tax. A curious and somewhat anomalous situation has been developed by the Treasury Department, arising out of its regulations and instructions which have been sent with the form of return required of the corporations involved. The Treasury Department instructs that the deductions specified in the statute shall be made from the gross profits of the corporation. Now, in view of the language of the statute, that such deductions shall be made from the gross amount of the income received within the year, this stand of the Treasury Department is surprising and may have a very important bearing on the income tax. The Supreme Court will take of this. A high official of the government is already on record with the statement that the tax is not imposed upon profits, but upon net income received.

The difference between the two positions is this: If the tax is on an arbitrary sum arrived at by making from the gross profits of the gross income received, the tax may well be an excise tax, affecting all corporations except those especially exempted. If, however, the tax is only on those corporations which show a net profit, the general class-to-wit, corporations engaged in business for a profit—is divided into two classes, those which show net profit and those which do not. It is a serious question whether this distinction may not legally destroy the tax, because it practically establishes an exemption of a great body of corporations which are not exempted by the language of the statute.

It may also be that the distinction so established may give weight to the theory that the tax is, after all, an income tax, because, being a tax on profits, it is in essence a tax upon the income of the individual holder of the stock of the corporation.

I may add that there are good authorities for each of the propositions I have indicated, and that with no doubt be fully considered and weighed in arriving at the true construction of the law. P. LEWIS ANDERSON. New York, Jan. 28, 1910.

INEBRIATES.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I note the introduction in the State Senate of a bill providing for the better care of inebriates. But why not abolish the inebriate?

If, however, this cannot be done, I suggest that an amendment be made to the bill in question providing that this new burden of taxation be imposed on the liquor traffickers, who alone are responsible for the creation of inebriates. This seems a common sense suggestion. If adopted, the only ones who would then be liable for the inebriate would be the families of the inebriate, as it is with good reason demand that the State should permit the traffic which had robbed them of their protectors. It should take his place in their care and support. New York, Feb. 4, 1910. SQUIRE.

NO RESPECT FOR OLD AGE.

From The Schenectady Union. Mighty little respect for age is shown by the 120 who are waiting against cold storage.

People and Social Incidents.

AT THE WHITE HOUSE.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 5.—The President this morning received the 114 members of the New York Republican Association of New York State, who came to Washington to the guests of Senator DePece. A. C. Bunnell, editor of "The Daily Advertiser" and secretary of the association, assisted Senator DePece in introducing the members to Mr. Taft.

Representative Bartholdt told the President that bills appropriating \$80,000,000, including \$20,000,000 for public buildings in the District of Columbia, had already been introduced, and doubtless an additional \$20,000,000 would be asked. His opinion on the decision regarding the advisability of an omnibus public buildings bill has been reached. J. Milton Turner, of St. Louis, former Minister to Liberia, asked the President's support for a bill which provides for the classing of persons of mixed Indian and negro blood, now enrolled as full-blooded negroes, with the colored Indians and those of Indian and white blood, so they may share in the distribution of the tribal property.

President Taft will make an address at the D. A. R. Hall on the afternoon of February 15, under the auspices of the George Washington Memorial Association. The President will be accompanied by General and Mrs. Taft. The meeting is to be held in the afternoon, and then walked back to the White House. President Taft attended the Gridiron dinner this evening.

The President was compelled to decline an invitation presented by Dr. W. I. Chamberlain, introduced by Senator Keane, to the annual dinner of Rutgers College at New Brunswick, N. J. The President's callers included Senators Keane and Foster, Representatives Parsons, Ponderstein, Fish, Hanna, Cowles, Calder, Smith, of Michigan; Stemp, McKinley, Bartholdt, Sherley, Sturgis, Hubbard and Gardner, of Massachusetts, and Frank A. Vanderlip, of New York.

The President, accompanied by Captain Butt and General Edwards, rode seven or eight miles into the country, and then walked back to the White House.

President Taft attended the Gridiron dinner this evening.

THE CABINET.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 5.—Mrs. George W. Wickham entertained at luncheon today in compliment to the niece of Mrs. Taft, Mrs. Harriet Anderson, and Miss Katherine Anderson, inviting to meet them Mrs. W. R. Gherardi, Mrs. Henry B. Spencer, Miss Marion Crosby, Miss Mary Carlisle, Miss Mary Hopkins, Miss Olive Martha Phillips, Miss Olga Roosevelt, Miss Sophy Johnson, Miss Marion Wise and Miss Schroeder.

The Secretary of the Navy and Mrs. Meyer entertained guests at supper on the Dolphin to-night, following the navy yard dance. Mr. and Mrs. Meyer will have as house guests next week Mr. and Mrs. F. R. Appleton, Miss Madeline Appleton and Miss Heloise Meyer, of Boston, who are coming to Washington to attend the army and navy reception at the White House next Tuesday evening.

THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 5.—The Italian Ambassador and Baroness Mayor des Planches went to New York to-day to attend a dinner, with the Italian Chamber of Commerce as hosts. The ambassador and the baroness will sail for Italy on February 24. The Austrian Ambassador and Baroness Feneclmüller entertained at dinner this evening in honor of the Japanese Ambassador and Baroness Uchida. The guests included the Danish Minister and Countess Moltke, Baroness Elizabeth Rosen, daughter of the Russian Ambassador; Lieutenant Colonel and Mrs. James, of the British Embassy; Richard C. Keeney, United States Ambassador to Austria; Representative and Mrs. Dwight, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas P. Gaff, Mrs. Townsend, Mrs. Robert Patterson, Mrs. Stokely, Mrs. Wadsworth, Mrs. Totten, Representative Gillett, Gist Blair, Henry Du Pont and Baron Louis Ambroz and Count Felix von Brussele-Schauberg of the Austrian Embassy, were planned. The French Ambassador and Mme. Jusserand went to Baltimore this afternoon to be the guests of ex-Attorney General and Mrs. Bonaparte, who gave a dinner in their honor to-night.

The Chinese Minister and Mme. Chang were guests of a musical this afternoon at the home of Miss Ethel Foster, with the British second secretary and Mrs. Esmond Ovey as hosts. Mr. von Stumm, German attaché, and Miss Constance Hoyt, whose engagement was recently announced, were the guests of the American Embassy, with the British second secretary and Mrs. Esmond Ovey as hosts.

The French military attaché and Countess de Chambrun entertained a number of guests at dinner to-night.

IN WASHINGTON SOCIETY.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 5.—Mrs. Sherman left Washington today for Utica to pay a short visit to her mother, Mrs. Babcock, who is in delicate health. She will return here next week. The Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. McVeagh were the guests of honor at a dinner given to-night by Miss Mabel Boardman.

Mr. and Mrs. Lutz Anderson entertained their guests at dinner to-night. Mr. and Mrs. Edson Bradley had three hundred guests at a musical to-night, when Mme. Gabrielle Le Jeune gave the musical programme and Rita Sacchetto danced. Preceding the musical was a dinner party, when Mr. and Mrs. George Marshall Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Ben All Haggis, Miss Bonnie Esler and Mrs. Shipman, of New York; Mr. Burdett of England; Mrs. Roscoe C. Bulmer and others