The Sun.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1900.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, per Month	$0 50
DAILY, per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevarde 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.

Another Word About the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

The more closely we examine the new convention offered as a substitute for the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, the more unacceptable it appears. Among the objections to the ratification of the instrument, which, as THE SUN has pointed out, while ostensibly a substitute, is essentially a revival of the most obnoxious features of the former treaty, these are insurmountable:

First, the asserted parallelism between the projected Nicaragua Canal and the Suez Canal does not exist in fact; secondly, an agreement on the part of the United States not to fortify the Nicaragua waterway would place our relatively unprotected cities on the Pacific coast at the mercy of any stronger naval power with which we might happen to be at war; thirdly, such an agreement would especially disable us in the event of a war with Great Britain, which is not only the greatest naval power on earth, but possesses in close proximity to the Atlantic entrance of the proposed canal a coign of vantage in British Honduras which she would be at liberty to fortify and garrison; finally, the agreement that Great Britain shall jointly guarantee the neutralization of the Nicaragua Canal, and the invitation to other European powers to join in such guarantee are flagrant violations of the Monroe Doctrine.

There is no parallelism between the Suez Canal and the proposed Nicaragua waterway. There might be, if we possessed as absolute control over all the entrances to the Caribbean Sea as England possesses to the single entrance to the Red Sea. Such, however, is not the case. The joint guarantee of the neutralization of the Suez Canal is farcical and worthless as against any public enemy of Great Britain, because it does not extend to the Red Sea which is the continuation of the artificial waterway, but which can be closed at any time by Great Britain through her possession of fortified ports at its mouth. This single fact is enough to demolish the alleged analogy between the Nicaragua and Suez canals, but we may add that Great Britain is also able to block, as against a public enemy, the Mediterranean entrance to the African waterway, through her possession of Gibraltar, Malta and Cyprus, and through her occupation of Egypt which involves the control of all the fortifications and military forces in the Delta of the Nile. A true parallel between the Suez and Nicaragua canals could only be presented if, while allowing the free use of the latter waterway to all powers with which we should be at peace, we should assert and exercise the right for which American statesmen have repeatedly contended, the right, namely, of fortifying the canal and of closing it in time of war against a public enemy. In the absence of such a right, the cutting of the American isthmus would prove to us no blessing but a curse.

What we have here said of the effect of our renunciation of the right to fortify the proposed canal and to close it in time of war against a public enemy is applicable to any other power on the Continent of Europe which either now has, or may hereafter acquire, a navy superior at all times, or on some specific occasion, to our own. If, through a great preponderance of force, our war vessels collected near the Atlantic entrance of the Nicaragua Canal should be overpowered by their opponents, we should have opened at our own expense a short and easy path for the latter to assault our Pacific cities. Such a danger would be greatly emphasized in the case of Great Britain, for not only would she normally be able, in the event of war with this country, to concentrate at a distance of three miles from the Atlantic end of the Nicaragua Canal a naval force much superior to our own, but she would also have in British Honduras a port of refuge and repair to which we should possess no equivalent. If the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty should be ratified, we should see immediately turned to account, by the construction of a great naval arsenal, the tremendous strategic advantage which Great Britain would enjoy through her sovereignty over British Honduras, to which under the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty she has no just title, but which she converted by force and in violation of faith into a Crown Colony while we were absorbed in our Civil War.

We observe, finally, that the Hay-Pauncefote convention, by permitting Great Britain to guarantee jointly with ourselves the neutralization of an American waterway and by inviting other European powers to join in such guarantee reproduces the worst feature of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, namely, its tacit repudiation of the fundamental principle laid down by President MONROE. There is no doubt that Mr. CLAYTON intended, in negotiating the Treaty of 1850, to disregard the MONROE Doctrine as in any sense binding. This he himself avowed, when, on becoming a member of the United States Senate, only a few years later, he was drawn into a bitter discussion with Gen. CASS of Michigan as to its origin and meaning and as to the intentions of the contracting parties.

It has been since maintained, however, by all American statesmen worthy of the name, that a regrettable departure in a single instance from the spirit and letter of President MONROE'S declaration constitutes in no wise a renunciation of his doctrine by the United States. Thus, Mr. BLAINE, when Secretary of State, in a letter to Mr. LOWELL, our Minister to Great Britain, a letter dated June 24, 1881, referred to the reports then current as to a guarantee of the neutrality of the proposed Panama Canal on the part of European powers; he proceeded to declare that an agreement between the powers of Europe to guarantee jointly the neutrality of a canal through the American isthmus would be viewed by our Government with the gravest concern. He pointed out that the United States had never offered to take part in agreements in which European powers had united, such as guarantees of neutrality touching the political condition of certain European States or touching the Suez Canal, and he asserted the long-settled conviction of this Government that any extension to our shores of the political system of Europe, no matter how plausibly disguised under a guarantee of neutralization, "would be attended with danger to the peace and welfare of this nation."

It is a Trojan horse that Great Britain has offered us in the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, a treaty which invites us to level at our own expense the rampart which Nature interposes between our Pacific States and European aggression. By ratifying the new convention we should place those States at the mercy of any European power possessing a stronger navy than our own, and we should deal by implication a deadly blow at the Monroe Doctrine.

If we recognize to-day the right of European States to guarantee jointly the neutralization of an American canal, with what force of logic could we deny hereafter their right to extend their power of political regulation over the continent of the Americas?

The only substitute for the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty which the American people can afford to accept is one that acknowledges the exclusive right of the United States to guarantee the neutrality of the American Isthmus Canal in time of peace, and, also, their right to close it against a public enemy in time of war.

Morgan Canal Doctrine.

Nearly all of the Washington correspondents represented Senator MORGAN of Alabama yesterday as advocating the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty for these two reasons:

1. That the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is in force and is binding upon this country.

2. That the neutralization of the canal, that is to say, the renunciation of absolute American control, is a wise and necessary measure.

Who can believe this, in view of the record of Senator MORGAN'S constant and unterrified championship of the very opposite of both these propositions?

Senator MORGAN'S position has been that all that is needed to efface the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is a declaration on our part that it no longer binds. It is not eight months since he said in the Senate:

"The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty has never been declared obsolete or abrogated, although many Senators, including myself, believe that we have a right to declare it abrogated, as having been abandoned."

A fuller explanation of his views concerning the old treaty of 1850 was offered by the Senator in his great canal speech of Jan. 22, 1897. He then declared that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was not worth the paper on which it was written. He had been speaking of the proposed Frelinghuysen-Zavala Treaty with Nicaragua, by which we should have acquired for $4,000,000 almost absolute sovereignty over a strip of territory twelve miles wide from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This treaty, so favorable to American interests, had been withdrawn from the Senate by the Cleveland Administration on the ground that it conflicted with the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was still in full force. Referring to that transaction, Mr. MORGAN said:

"We had better have confronted Great Britain with the proposition that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was not worth the paper on which it was written. *I believe that, and you all believe it.* The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is not, in the estimation of the United States, to-day worth the paper on which it is written. It is true it has not been formally revoked. Neither has either Government signified to the other that it has formally abandoned it, and it stands there now like a skeleton in the closet of the United States, *merely to alarm the children when they happen thoughtlessly to open the door.*

"The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty has been violated by the Government of Great Britain openly, notoriously, over and over again. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to what I am about to say. The gentleman who is known or is understood to be about to become Secretary of State made the first report upon this subject. That part of the report was drawn by Mr. EDMUNDS and approved by himself, the honorable Senator from Ohio, and in that report we denounced the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty as no longer obligatory upon us unless we chose to waive the infractions of Great Britain in their dealings in Central America.

"Now, there we stand. Now we are coming to a conclusion; now we intend to know whether it is so or not, and I for one, as an American Senator, do not intend to pass one single hair's breadth beyond this question until it is settled."

Does that look much as if the Hon. JOHN T. MORGAN, foremost for years in the assertion of America's case regarding the Nicaragua Canal, was of the opinion that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty binds us?

On the second point his record is equally clear and his utterances have been equally emphatic. The volumes of the *Congressional Record* teem with such declarations as these by Senator MORGAN:

"The people of the United States have discovered that a waterway through Nicaragua is absolutely indispensable *as a matter of safety to the coasts of the United States*, as well as to the commerce of the country."

"We cannot give up this canal, Mr. President, without releasing such an amount of the just power of the United States commercially and in a military sense as to weaken us almost incalculably."

"If we were to build the canal alone for the use of the Navy as a strategic movement, without building two great fleets—one for the Pacific and one for the Atlantic—it might be said, in the American sense, properly, that we could throw away the whole amount of money we put into the canal, and still make a very large earning in the advantage, of a maritime and strategic nature."

"A doctrine has gone forth—I do not know who was the author of it, but he was a great man whoever he was, and he lived somewhere between the days of MONROE and the days of Mr. HAYES. The doctrine is generally attributed to Gen. GRANT. It was couched in very terse words. I remember to have seen it used in the despatches of Mr. EVARTS. '*The canal through the isthmus of Darien must be an American canal, under American control.*'

"I believe that Mr. EVARTS, whom we all know, was the author of this true, patriotic and noble sentiment. It will never be changed while America is worthy of its glorious name. That doctrine has fast hold upon the conscience and heart of every true American under the flag of the country. There is not one man who is a true American who is willing to abandon it. *I number myself among the class who adhere to it with absolute pertinacity.*"

"I shall be found here, as long as I have a seat on this floor, contending for the doctrine that this is to be *an American canal under American control, and they cannot drive me from it.*"

That has been for years the Morgan Doctrine respecting the interoceanic canal. Does it seem likely, we repeat, that this Senator, of all men, should now be found arguing for the vitality and validity of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, or upholding the proposition that the ultimate control of the canal in time of war shall be guaranteed to Great Britain and a syndicate of other European powers?

An Awful Sin.

Prof. ST. GEORGE MIVART, in refusing to sign the profession of faith submitted to him by Cardinal VAUGHAN, with mental reservations which would practically nullify it, has set an example of honesty which might well bring the blush of shame to many theologians who are now outwardly professing a faith which inwardly they deny.

Speaking of the clause in the confession requiring him to assent to the dogma that the Scriptures not merely "contain revelation with which there is no mixture of error," but also, "having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have GOD as their author and have been delivered to the Church as such," he tells the Cardinal:

"It would be easy, of course, by a little dexterity, to distort and evade what appears to be its real and obvious meaning. As GOD is the First Cause and Creator of all things, He is, in that sense, their Author; Author of the Decameron of BOCCACCIO, as well as of the Bible. But to make a profession with such a meaning would be, in my eyes, grossly profane and altogether unjustifiable."

Many recent Biblical critics, however, have had no such scruples of conscience. They have continued to profess adhesion to standards of faith, the Westminster Confession, for example, "by a little dexterity" or trickery of the sort which Prof. ST. GEORGE MIVART, an honest man, draws back from in horror as "grossly profane and altogether unjustifiable." Of course, as he says, GOD as the Author of all things may be called the Author of everything written, but, as all men know, that is not the sense in which these standards describe the authorship of the Bible as the Word of GOD, and to accept them with any such reservation or any reservation in the mind is flagrantly dishonest and deceitful.

Most of all is honesty, is sincerity, is absolute straightforwardness requisite in dealing with the living GOD whom a man professes to fear and worship. If he is an infidel, if he doubts, if he cannot reconcile and submit his reason to a confession of faith exacted of him, or in any way rejects it in its plain and literal sense, he is a blasphemous liar when he pretends to accept it as a condition of remaining in a ministry solemnly pledged to sustain and teach it. Moreover, he is a coward, a humbug, a time server, a seller of his soul for a mess of pottage, false both to religion and to reason. With that awful sin Prof. ST. GEORGE MIVART is not willing to load his conscience.

An Italian Will.

To the philosopher who ruminates over the efforts men make to have their ideas carried out after death the will made by the late well-known Italian caterer of this city, POMPEO MARESI, is unusually suggestive. From small beginnings, by thrift and by enterprise, this man amassed a large fortune. He had a family which he kept in comfort but with no ostentation of wealth, and it is the future of his family rather than the disposal of his money that he seems to have had most at heart. The distribution of that is put off to a time when those he cared for will be either dead or mature men and women, with their habits already formed. The testator's intent seems to have been to ward off from his people as long as possible the evils of the wealth he had so sedulously struggled to accumulate.

A very unusual provision is made for the wife. The use of the home and a modest yearly income are left to her; the income continues if she shall choose to marry again, but in that event she must leave her first husband's house. His widow's remarriage is a contingency that many a husband dwells upon with displeasure, but the general solution is to place hindrances in the wife's way when she is not left absolutely free. The daughters are apparently to stay with the mother till they marry, when they receive moderate incomes, enough to support them respectably, but not sufficient to attract suitors who care for money alone. As a further safeguard a daughter's husband is cut off from all expectations should his wife die before him without children. The son's education is planned for, the sums to be paid him are carefully proportioned to his needs at different ages and when he reaches his twenty-eighth year he will receive a sum sufficient to start him in business or else a moderate income. In forty years the capital and accumulations will be divided equally among the children, more, it almost looks, because some disposal must be made of it, than from the wish to have the fortune grow.

The purpose seems clearly to be to hold the family together and in the station in life it held during the father's life, to protect its members from want, but at the same time not to allow the family wealth to prevent them from working or trying to make their own way. When they have reached middle life, whether they have failed or succeeded in their own efforts, their father's fortune will come to their relief or to that of their children. Being Italians, among whom the old Roman ideas of "patria potestas" are still strong, it is likely that the testator's intentions will receive a fair trial.

There are some odd ethnographic peculiarities in the bequests. The daughters receive so much pin money a day, and a brother, too, is provided for by a daily allowance. That is a thoroughly Italian way of reckoning. To most Italians a given sum a year or month is meaningless till they have figured out what it makes a day, and then, whether it be one lira or twenty or a hundred, they try to live on it and save a little from day to day. A sister is to have not only an income for life but also a first-class funeral after death, a quaint bit of thoughtfulness. The legacy to an Italian church for a repast of specified viands for the priests on a given date carries one back several centuries. The will is an instructive document for the study of Italian character. There was a lot of hard sense in the man who made it.

The Chicago Trust Defiance.

Next week will be another bad week for the Octopus. The Anti-Trust Conference called by the Anti-Trust League will meet in Chicago. Really it will not be a conference, but a defiance. Conferences, where pros and cons are allowed, have been found empty. It is not worth while to waste time on plutocrats or to be polite to MOLOCH. The Chicago defiance will be composed of stern and unbending men, who have no bowels of compassion for monopoly. When the Hon. JOHN PARDON ALTGELD, the Hon. GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS and the Hon. SUCKER ROD SAM JONES wreak themselves upon expression the concussion must be dreadful.

The programme of the defiance is very long, but it is full of venerated names. Among them are those of the Hon. JAMES RODOMONT SOVEREIGN, a master of blue-hot speech; of Gen. ADONIRAM JUDSON WARNER, the inventor of silver; of Gen. JAMES B. WEAVER, the inventor of calamity; of the Hon. JOHN JACOB LENTZ, the Aguinaldo worshipper; of the Hon. JERRY SIMPSON, a Populist in whom there is much guile; of the Hon. HELEN M. GOUGAR, the first stateswoman of Indiana; of two sociologists of renown, Prof. E. W. BEMIS and Prof. JOHN R. COMMONS, and of New York's own traveller, scholar and statesman, AMASA THORNTON. Chicago is sure of a feast of mind.

One interesting fact, if fact it be, is disclosed by the managers of the defiance. It has been said that the Hon. JOE WILLETT of Alabama was invited to talk to the defiance, and that he declined, because his speech would have to be censored. The defiance managers assert that the Hon. JOE WILLETT was never asked to make a speech. They don't know what they have lost.

Kentucky.

Two years ago, lacking a fortnight, the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, now a straight-out Democratic partisan, thus described the foundation on which has been built up the existing situation of political outrage and chaos in Kentucky:

"The people may well stand aghast before the revolutionary election bill which has, like some dread monster, suddenly emerged from the fastnesses of passion and error through which the Legislature has been threading its tortuous way. It is safe to say that the annals of free government will be sought in vain for anything approaching it in shameless effrontery and unconcealed deformity.

"In all the force bills meditated by the radicals in Congress during the dark days of reconstruction there were discernible some pretence and pretext, some lingering memory of Republican instincts and traditions. Even in the plebiscites of LOUIS NAPOLEON there was the outer display of a just electoral process and purpose. This force bill gives the voters of Kentucky not a ray of hope. It makes no claim or show of fairness. In one word, and at one fell swoop, Kentucky is to become the subject of a triumvirate, which is to decide who shall hold office and who shall not. Nominally the people are to be permitted still to go through the form of election. They are to be permitted still to vote. The ballot box is not actually abolished. But the triumvirate is in each and every case to cast up the returns and determine the result.

"Senator WILLIAM GOEBEL is the reputed author of this bill. The measure with which he has linked his name, and, for the time being, identified his fortunes, is of sweeping viciousness and far-reaching evil. But, like CÆSAR that was ambitious, he wants to be Governor of Kentucky, and he sees, or he thinks he sees, a ready chariot to bear him thither in the electoral bill that bears his name.

"Woful, though not irretrievable mistake; for, granting that with the machinery of this bill in his hands, his ambition may be, probably will be gratified, what should it profit him if he gain the rulership of the universe and lose his own soul, and along with it his good name, as the slayer of civil liberty?"

The extraordinary accuracy of this prediction is now known to all. The Goebel law became the means by which the Democrats of Kentucky could steal the Governorship in case they could not come by it honestly. GOEBEL was the candidate for whose benefit it was to be applied. He has been shot and killed, but his substitute is ready to take all that might have come to him, in the person of BECKHAM who, running on the same ticket, was defeated as the candidate for Lieutenant-Governor.

The Goebel conspiracy, or the Democratic conspiracy, extends beyond the Democratic party's organization. The Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, HASELRIGG, swore in GOEBEL as Governor, and the Clerk of the Court of Appeals, SHACKELFORD, afterward swore in BECKHAM as Governor, when neither GOEBEL nor BECKHAM had any more title to the office than the Chief of the Frankfort Police or the notorious JACK CHINN.

In spite of the fact that Governor TAYLOR has done what he has done for the purpose of preventing the final robbery of the Kentucky Governorship from his party, we offer no defence for him. He has exceeded his constitutional powers. But what is to be said of the politicians who pretend to sanctify the crime about to be committed by calling the dead GOEBEL a martyr, and to regard the enduring rights and wrongs of the case as changed by his murder?

GOEBEL'S substitute is alive and ready to profit by the fraud. Even in the dark and bloody ground of Kentucky, assassination has never yet washed a foul law clean or spotted a moral right.

Lecturing at Baltimore on foods and nutrition, Dr. G. STANLEY HALL of Clark University proposed a system of education for the young that they will heartily approve:

"Much more could be done in the education of the young by good lunches than is now accomplished pedagogically."

This is an application of Dr. ELISHA BENJAMIN ANDREWS'S theory of educational free lunches. When education is confined to satisfactory lunches school will be a joy to the tender juvenals.

The age of wonders, the beginning of which has been for many centuries deferred, would be here at last if any credence was given to the sensational story that a well-known New York public man had lost, on Tuesday night, $36,000 in playing pinochle! It never happened. It never was. It never could have occurred and all pretended authoritative contradictions of it were unnecessary.

In the well-tempered game of pinochle, with 1,000 points as the goal, a "round of beer and four pretzels" is the usual sweepstakes. The man who "invented pinochle designed it, palpably, as a pastime," and a pastime it certainly is, for no other game of cards, whether of German, Mongolian, Arabic or East Indian origin, requires so much expenditure of time and thought to attain a comparatively unimportant result. Some instances have been recorded of parties of pinochle plungers who in the course of sixteen games played consecutively have won or lost as much as $1.55. A really daring and impetuous pinochle player could in an evening lose as much, or nearly as much, as 30 cents in a "squar' game," as the term in Western mining camps used to be. It is from this measure of maximum loss at pinochle that the local expression of "30 cents" originates.

IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The despatches from Gen. Buller's headquarters up to Wednesday night left the British in possession of Krantz Kloof on the road from Potgieter's Drift to Ladysmith, but their further advance was prevented for the moment, as the ground they occupied was enfiladed by the fire of the Boer guns at Spion Kop on the left rear and by those on Doorn Kloof on the right. The latter, apparently, should be one of the principal objectives of the next fighting, but it, in its turn, is said to be covered by the guns on Grobelaar's Kloof further to the eastward and north of Colenso; and beyond the line drawn from Spion Kop through Krantz Kloof and Doorn Kloof to Grobelaar's Kloof there are a whole series of intrenched and fortified positions. Roughly speaking, Gen. Buller's operations appear to be for the moment, confined to a limited circle described by the ridges and hills running from Spion Kop by Brakfontein and Krantz Kloop, then turning south to the Tugela. So far, the brunt of what fighting there has been appears to have been borne by Gen. Lyttelton's brigade, though mention has been made of Gen. Woodgate's, and there has been reference to Gen. Hildyard's brigade. The reticence of the despatches from the British side and the meagreness of detail as to the three days' fighting, together with the apparently small result, seem to explain the comparatively little importance that Gen. Schalck-Burger, in his despatch of Tuesday, attached to what had taken place up to then.

Now that Gen. Buller has unfolded his plan the Boers will be adapting their tactics to the new conditions with their customary celerity. It was evidently with an insight into the probability of a British advance by the road which Gen. Buller has selected that the Boers have constructed the batteries they have on the ridges and hills between Nelthorpe station, on the railway above Colenso, and Lancer Hill, where there is an intrenched Boer laager nine miles to the westward. Another line of intrenchments and batteries runs north from Lancer Hill to Potgieter's Farm. These works are obviously intended to oppose a sortie in aid of an advance from the southwest. The intermediate interval is bound to be the scene of severe fighting before Gen. Buller relieves Ladysmith, which, though the Boer resistance may be stubborn, should be accomplished if he is prepared to make the sacrifice of life which it will demand. The British War Office does not seem to regard Gen. Buller's success as an absolute certainty, as it has not yet ventured to express more than a hope that he will reach Ladysmith.

Turning to Sterkstroom, the Boer attack on Pen Hoek, near that place, and on Bird's Siding on Wednesday morning, does not seem to have been seriously pressed. They are said to have retired from the latter place on the arrival of reënforcements, and to have been followed by the British cavalry and mounted infantry toward Dordrecht.

The position about Colesberg continues an enigma. We are told that the Boers hold a position half way on the direct road between Rensburg and Colesberg, and that they shelled one of the British positions on Wednesday; another statement is to the effect that the Boers' position was shelled for an hour yesterday with lyddite shells, and that their guns had been unusually active lately. From this it is evident that the Boers are not seriously alarmed as yet by the movements that have been reported from time to time with the object of cutting off their retreat by Norvals Pont. The inference is that Gen. French has not made the progress the despatches would lead one to believe.

The despatches from Modder River contain no indication of the motive of Gen. Macdonald's occupation of Koodoesberg and the drift on the Riet River, beyond a hint that it was intended to screen a movement from Belmont toward Douglas, where there are still some Boers. The truth probably lies in another direction, for Gen. Macdonald's cavalry reconnoissances are said to have quite failed to get the Boers to show their strength and expose their positions in his front. Meanwhile, the Modder Camp outposts report that the Boers are pushing their intrenchments into the open plain in front of Magersfontein Drift on the Modder River. It is not believed that there is any truth in the reports recently put about, that a large force had been detached from Gen. Cronje's command to reënforce the Free State troops at Colesberg.

The Reorganization of the Staff.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The proper organization of the staff of the Army has for many years been a subject of paramount interest to the Army, and any proposed changes are, of course, followed in their development with great interest.

The consolidation of the two supply departments, Quartermaster's and Commissary, is the first and most natural step. In the Santiago campaign the Commissary Department claimed that it was entirely dependent on the Quartermaster's Department for the transportation of its stores and yet was held responsible for not getting them to the front. This complaint was founded in reason, and, were there no other reasons, should in itself be sufficient to insure the change being made.

The next step would naturally be the consolidation of the two administrative departments, Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's. They are closely related, one dealing with the orders issued from the various headquarters, the other concerned with the proper execution of these orders in all their details. The most important step, however, is the proposed detail of line officers for temporary duty in the various staff departments; and on that the future efficiency of our Army largely depends. In that way alone can the staff be kept constantly in touch with the needs of the line, and in that way alone can the staff fulfil its highest duties.

I would go one step farther, and place the staff departments, as far as all purely military questions are concerned, under the General commanding the Army. At present they are almost as independent of him as if he did not exist. The present Secretary of War has made a wise separation of the duties of his office and those of the General of the Army, but this should not depend on the Secretary of War, but should be a matter of legislation and properly defined. It certainly was not the intention of the law to create a number of independent Generals when the different staff departments were established; yet, during the Spanish war, it was not the General of the Army who was blamed for inefficiency in any of these departments, but the heads of the departments, for it was well known that the General (who should have been responsible) had had no controlling voice in their actions. R.

JAN. 26.

Nominations by the President.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 8.—The President to-day sent the following nominations to the Senate:

John M. Lenihan to be Collector of Customs at Dubuque, Ia.

Dr. Joseph A. Murphy of Pennsylvania and Dr. John T. Kennedy of Connecticut to be Assistant Surgeons in the Navy.

The Habit of Profanity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I do not doubt the good intentions of the Holy Name Society of the Albany Catholic Church which met to urge the use of means to prevent the habit of profane language; but I protest against the enforcement of the civil penalities against it. The State is a secular institution and treasonable language is the only profanity within its province. What is considered profanity by a Christian is not so considered by a Hebrew, and what is considered profane by both of them is not so considered by an agnostic. I do not object to the Church prohibiting her adherents from the use of profane language, but I do object to her overstepping her rights and demanding the enforcement of her doctrines by civil law.

I do not write this in defence of profanity, as I think there is nothing lower, nothing viler than to for a man or a woman to utter a long string of oaths. Profanity is not necessary to make language effective. It is the weapon of the coward and bully. Profane language is going out of fashion (as you have so ably expressed it), and in the same manner as the drinking of intoxicants is decreasing. Public opinion is the public conscience. When public opinion as to profanity becomes more refined, profanity will cease to be. No tirade from pulpit or legislature will stop it. Training the conscience of the rising generation to perceive the evil of profane language will help a great deal. The old veterans of profanity have been in the same old rut too long to turn out. F. M. C.

NEW YORK, Feb.

PRICE OF THEATRE TICKETS.

Too High for Play-Goers of Moderate Means—An "Endowed" Theatre Proposed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* One of the first things which strikes an old New Yorker upon returning to the city after an absence of some time is the greater expense of attending the theatre.

A few years since a man in moderate circumstances could go out of an evening, get good seats at an A1 house and enjoy the show without the harassing thoughts during the performance of "Where can I make up for this piece of extravagance?" especially if the play be poor. In those good old days it was possible to obtain the very best seat in the house, at the box office, for $1.50. By "best seat" is meant anything within eight or ten rows of the stage, or the first two rows in the balcony in some of the smaller houses. In any other part of the orchestra or first balcony the seats were only $1. Now, however, one has to "carry a sack" to go to any of the best theatres of New York, as $2 and frequently $2.50 is unblushingly asked at the box office for the same seats that in my day were but $1 and $1.50 apiece.

It is not all of us who are as young as we used to be and our hearing and sight are not so good as ten years ago, so that to get a seat near enough to the stage to get an idea of what is going on the average middle-aged person has another modern evil to contend with—the ticket speculator. It seems a shame that any of the best theatres in New York would allow such scenes as are enacted nightly upon the pavements in front of their entrances! Ladies and gentlemen, as soon as they approach, either on foot or from a carriage, are beset and jostled in a most annoying manner by this new type of extortionist, and even the poor passer-by, who has neither idea nor money to attend the performance, is pestered by these human flies until he has broken through and passed beyond their last picket lines. Should a married man of modest means desiring to take his wife to some "good play" go to the box office of almost any theatre and ask for tickets—"a couple of good seats, not more than five to seven rows from the stage"—the chances are he would be told "the house is all sold for two weeks."

As a result this man, if he would see this play before taken from the "boards," must purchase his tickets from some newsstand agent or speculator on the street at an advance of from 50 cents to $1 each. Tickets at the recent Irving-Terry visit were advertised and posted at $3, whereas they could not be purchased for $10 each.

To attend the fashionable theatres, where one sees the better class of plays and acting, will, when the next advance in prices comes, be the privilege of only the rich, as the poor cannot afford it and the middle class only occasionally by denying themselves in other ways.

The stage by all is acknowledged to be educating and improving. Would it not, therefore, be an excellent opportunity for some good philanthropists, instead of endowing already rich colleges or libraries, to build some theatres and so endow them as to employ good, strong stock companies who would perform good plays and operas at prices within the reach of the general public? Such a work would be a charity and a great benefit to the people who would like to attend a good play but cannot on account of the expense.

There are laws passed by the Legislature to govern rates of transportation, to regulate the hours of labor and the rate of wages, there is also an ordinance in this city concerning cab hire. So why could there not be some legislation to prevent theatres and playhouses from charging such prices and permitting their tickets to pass into the hands of agents or speculators but to keep them only for sale at the box office at reasonable figures? Why could not some ambitious champion of the "abused and swindled public" at Albany introduce such a bill?

It would be far more sensible than some pending there at the present time.

A WOULD-BE THEATRE-GOER.

NEW YORK, Feb. 1.

THE CHORUS GIRL.

Her Rapid Development Into a Personage of the First Importance to the Stage.

From the Washington Chorus Girl.

If Lydia Thompson's famous cluster of golden-haired ringlets could be lined up against a group of the chorus girls of this fin de siecle age they would look like a handful of Confederate money. The ensemble singers of to-day would also pale the lights of Arnold and Bolossy Kiralfy's famed luminaries—the pioneers of the glorious era of pink tights.

For the chorus girl has developed more than her calves. She no longer merely fills gaps on the stage and gaps in silken hose. She is something more than a hosiery model. She is the power, the volume, the ensemble, the picture. She is to comic opera, burlesque and extravaganza what the man behind the gun is to the fighting machine that conquers territory for stay-at-home politicians to mouth over.

It the prize package of the Thompson or Kiralfy forces could reappear upon the scene to-day she would starve or take in plain sewing. She certainly could not secure an engagement. She would find that the fleshings of to-day are cut on more liberal and more symmetrical lines; that voices are cultivated instead of filled; that the standard of measurements of Kiralfy is not the standard of the present producers of the fantastic in amusements; and that she is not only not in the period, but out of the picture.

It is not getting too wise to remark that the "merry, merry" of almost any comic opera organization that might be mentioned contains at least one girl who is a prima donna in all but name—and salary. There are many Edna Mays, Alice Neilsens and Mathilde Previlles hidden in the group back stage, with their lights burning fiercely out in the constant endeavor to light the gloom of their despair while waiting for the golden opportunity.

There are in the chorus many refined women possessed of rich cultivated voices, who are there to be gilded with experience and varnished with poise. They are building and waiting for the night when the curtain is held because the usual occupant of the immediate centre of the stage is indisposed, or not disposed, or has trekked with a bag of money in the guise of a husband, or has given notice because her salon de robe is a few inches shyer than the angel's friend. It is then that the girl at whom this bouquet is aimed steps demurely forward and becomes an IT.

Applications for Postage Stamp Books.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 8.—Announcement was made in THE SUN several days ago that the Post Office Department had arranged to issue two-cent stamps in book form, charging 25 cents, 49 cents or 97 cents each. It was stated at the time that no books would be on sale before April. Notwithstanding this, applications for books are already reaching the Department. A Postmaster in Ohio asks for his share "without delay," as there is "a good demand for the books" in his town. Another official in the Middle West asks for order blanks in order that his supply may not be delayed.

Chicago Phonetics.

The Senate of the University of Chicago has vetoed the action of the Administrative Board of the University Press in deciding to adopt for use in the university publications the National Educational Association's list of twelve words in the abbreviated phonetic spelling.—*Chicago news item.*

O Doctors, lernd in menny things,
No dout it's just az wel
That yu ar met by others who
Reject yore wa tu spel;
Perhaps tha no no more than yu;
Perhaps not quite az much.
But tha ar more conservativ
And rather keep in tuch

With what iz old, than what iz nu,
Because they ne that what
Iz nu and hithertu untride
Ma posibly be not
The proper thing; and so tha stand
Stif-nekt agenst yore plan
Tu drop the old and make the nu
Conspikuus in the van.

That it iz sumwhat ruf on yu,
We must admit, but then
Yu've got tu go a littel slo—
The conquests ov the pen
Ar never quick az ar the soard's,
And time alone can tel
The triumf ov yore efforts tu
Adopt nu wase tu spel.

But yu wil get thair, never fear;
It's bound tu kum, for we
Ar forjing onward tu the frunt
With wundrus energy.
And when we cough, we'll cof, gadzooks;
And if we're tough, we're tuf;
And when we're through, we're thru; and then
Enough wil be enuf.

And phthisic wil be tizzik then.
And so wil debt be det,
And sigh wil fal awa tu si,
And al the rest, yu bet
Wil take a tumbel tu themselves,
And speling by yore act
Wil in good time bekum tu be
A grand fonetic fact.

WILLIAM J. LAMPTON.

THE AMERICAN CANAL.

The People Begin to Understand What the Pending Proposition Means.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your masterly editorial to-day on the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty did not, unfortunately, treat of the uses of the trans-isthmian canal in times of peace.

The case seems to be as follows:

We have an Atlantic empire and a Pacific empire. Our Atlantic empire thrives because there our nineteenth-century civilization is based on up-to-date transportation. Our Pacific empire is stunted because it has to base nineteenth-century civilization on eighteenth-century transportation methods. Its distances are so great that it cannot do business with the civilized parts in steamships. An isthmian canal will give our Pacific empire command of modern transportation, put a proper foundation under the structure of its commerce, and start a growth there comparable to that of our middle West, which has followed the great development of rail-and-water transportation in the building of railroads and deepening the Great Lake channels.

Such a canal bears a like relation to the prosperity of our nation as a whole as the Sault Ste. Marie Canal bears to that of the Great Lake region. It is just as essentially a part of our internal transportation system as the Sault Canal, the canal in the Ohio River at Louisville, or the Hudson River. Like them, it must and will be a national highway, to be used without cost or unnecessary restrictions by our domestic trade. If this use cannot obtain, it will fail to bear its full fruit, and our Pacific empire will remain stunted. The growth which will follow commercial freedom is illustrated in the Sault Canal, which, since it was made free, has developed a business of 25,000,000 tons, an increase of twelvefold in eighteen years, and more than three times the tonnage of the Pacific coast, foreign and coastwise included. The Sault Canal has been the most successful public work ever constructed except the Erie Canal. If begun under proper auspices, the Nicaragua Canal will measure its success with these. Like these, it will build empires and shape history. But a treaty which lays the whole cost on us, and at the same time compels us to make it free to all the world in order to make it free to our domestic trade and leaves what will be our most vital artery of sea-borne commerce exposed to the tourniquet of one hostile warship, is not good statesmanship or good sense.

Mr. Hay should have taken advice from some expert on transportation before he exposed himself to the ingenuity of a British diplomat; for if there is one thing on which the British are posted better than another it is transportation and its effect on modern life.

Lord Pauncefote won a great diplomatic victory over Mr. Hay. He secured for his country, so far as he could, the free use of the Nicaragua Canal, without loading it with one cent of expenditure or an iota of responsibility. He knew the substance from the shadow and got what he wanted. At the same time he placed the canal under British domination to run with British control of the sea.

The Nicaragua and Suez canals are not parallel cases. The Suez Canal is not part of the British coastline as any isthmian canal between the Atlantic and Pacific is of ours; or, if the Suez Canal is deemed a British waterway, then Britain controls it by her navy. Do we want a treaty which will compel us to measure navies with Great Britain?

NEW YORK, Feb. 7. CHAUNCEY N. DUTTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your article on the American Canal to-day delighted me, especially with regard to fortifying the approaches. We should not "surrender in advance the right to fight at our own canal in defence of our own interests." Neither should we "guarantee the use of the canal by our enemies in operations against ourselves."

Who is the other party to this treaty?—the nation that maintains a line of fortifications along the southern border of Canada, intended only as a menace to the United States.

Now, as a prerequisite to ratification of this treaty, let all those forts be removed. And certainly we should never give away any part of Alaska. On the contrary, we ought to have retained the whole line of Pacific coast up to latitude 54° 40'. EDWARD HOWE.

NEW YORK, Feb. 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It seems to me that the problem presented to Secretary Hay in connection with the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was very simple.

The treaty was obsolete, having become so by the direct violation of its principal condition by Great Britain. As a matter of courtesy only were we required to ask Great Britain to cancel it.

All that common sense required of Secretary Hay was to ask the question through Ambassador Choate. We should, naturally, owing to England's professions of friendship and desire for our good will during her disastrous Boer war, expect that her answer would be a pleasant acquiescence to our desire to cancel the treaty. If, on the other hand, her answer was unfavorable, two courses would be open for us: either to abandon the canal or go ahead and construct it and ask England: "What are you going to do about it?" To this her answer would either be that she would consider it an unfriendly act or she would drop the subject as being a considerably larger contract than her Boer war.

Instead of pursuing this simple means of reaching the desired end, our astute Secretary of State gets up another treaty, where none was wanted or required, which, if confirmed by the Senate—which heaven forbid!—would prevent our fortifying the canal, and would virtually make England a partner, without risk or expense, in our private enterprise.

The new treaty should not pass, and the Secretary of State should begin to learn a few American sentiments. Evidently, he has lived too long in England and has also become hypnotized. F. D. L. PRENTISS.

NEW YORK, Feb. 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In certain sections of the Canal Treaty it is provided that the canal shall be "free and open" to vessels of war of all nations, in war no less than in peace, and that it shall never be blockaded and no right of war shall be exercised within it.

This means that if we were at war with any great naval State its ships of war would have the opportunity to use the canal to our disadvantage, and, though we built it, we should be powerless to prevent their exercise of the right.

If that is what we are to get in place of the already really abrogated Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, better let the treaty stand for what it is worth. If that is to be the price of our building the Nicaragua Canal, better let it go unbuilt.

The true treaty for Mr. Secretary Hay to have spent his time in negotiating is a treaty with Nicaragua, which of itself would have abrogated the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty by making Nicaragua a part of the territory of the United States by annexation. Then the canal, being wholly in our own territory, we could do as we pleased about it without consulting England or making any concessions to it. LAW.

NEW YORK, Feb. 7.

FOR ENLARGED CANALS.

State Commerce Committee to Present a Bill Authorizing the Work.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the State Committee on Commerce yesterday a sub-committee was appointed to draft a bill to be introduced in the Legislature to carry into effect the recommendations of the Governor's Canal Committee. The sub-committee consists of the Hon. John D. Kernan of Utica, Charles A. Wardle of Catskill, G. H. Raymond of Buffalo and Frank S. Gardner, Secretary of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation. The Executive Committee also adopted a resolution protesting against Congressman McClellan's bill for the acquirement of the New York State canals by the Federal Government.