The Sun.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1901.

Subscriptions by Mail, Prepaid.

| | |
|---|---|
| DAILY, per Month | 60 cts |
| 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.

Address: THE SUN, New York City.

Publication Office: No. 170 Nassau street, New York, Borough of Manhattan.

It is not to be understood that the contributors to this paper return manuscripts offered for publication, or that they will be responsible for their safe keeping while in the publication office, or at any other place in the city, or elsewhere.

## The Atlantic Navy of 1898.

We hear that Senator CHANDLER has introduced a resolution, which the Senate adopted, censuring the officers of Admiral SCHLEY's fleet during the Spanish war, with a view to justice. Secretary LONG's letter to Senator CHANDLER also published yesterday, shows that the Navy Department has not been wanting in the effort to attain it earlier.

Nearly three years have gone since the naval battle of Santiago, the peace-making conflict that brought to Spain the opportunity to strike her blows. Yet Congress has refused to give to the men of the victorious fleet deserving of special honor either thanks or promotion.

It is never too late to right a wrong. But a wrong cannot be righted too soon.

## The Flag of England.

What is the "flag of England," meaning the national flag of Great Britain? This question has puzzled a good many Americans recently, and according to one English writer, has puzzled even a good many Englishmen. The union flag, blue, with the crosses of ST. GEORGE, ST. ANDREW and ST. PATRICK upon it, ought really to be the national flag, but its use is restricted almost wholly to the army, the regiments of which have carried it as the "Queen's colors" for sixty years, and will now carry it as the "King's colors." With various devices this flag is used as the banner of certain high officials, as the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Viceroy of India and the Governor General of Canada.

The British Navy uses the white ensign, a white flag showing the red ST. GEORGE's cross, with the union flag as a canton or small subdivision in the upper corner nearest the staff, and the Royal Naval Reserve uses the blue ensign—a blue flag with the union in the corner as a canton. The use of both white and blue ensigns is governed by stringent laws.

Of course the royal standard, or, more properly, royal banner, being the personal flag of the sovereign, cannot be the national flag. The only other flag is the red mercantile flag, which is familiar to all, a red field, with the union as a canton in the corner. This probably must be taken as the British national flag; and so it seems to be accepted, the world over.

## The Tax Bills.

The State Tax Commission in its last annual report estimated that whereas all the real estate in this State, except such as was specifically exempted, endured taxation and that this taxation was laid, moreover, in a ratio closely approximating the total value of the property, seven-eighths of the personal property in the State escaped taxation altogether. Consideration of this fact, which is, of course, a matter of common observation, is undoubtedly the principle underlying the measures that have been introduced in the Legislature imposing new taxes upon corporations. At the same time, legislation in the State of New York has been conducted generally on the principle that it is not wise to shoo away the goose that lays the golden egg. The Republican party, in particular, has been the protector and guardian of the great accumulations of capital and thrift. Will it be wise for any party or for any State to gain the reputation of pronounced hostility and strong prejudice against these forms of industry? Cannot some way be found of making corporations pay their share of the expenses of government without justification for the charge that unjust and confiscatory legislation has been enacted?

For the present let us deal only with the bills that have been or are about to be introduced taxing savings banks, national banks, trust companies and insurance and title guarantee companies. It is proposed that there be placed a tax of 1 per cent. upon the capital and surplus of banks and trust companies, a tax of 1 per cent. upon the surplus of savings banks, and of 1 per cent. upon the capital and surplus of title guarantee, surety and insurance companies.

It certainly seems improper to place any additional taxation in this State upon banks as distinguished from savings banks and trust companies. The rate of taxation which these banks now endure is unequal because of the varying estimates of property made by boards of local assessors. It is said that one bank in this State was assessed in 1897 at 119.4 per cent. of the book value of its capital, surplus and undivided profits, while other banks have been assessed one-tenth of this. But it is computed that the banks of this State already pay on an average about 1¾ per cent. of their capital, surplus and undivided profits in taxes. The bank rate in this city, of course, is especially high. The banks of our State ought not to be taxed any further than they are.

But trust companies now escape with very light taxation as compared with banks. Trust companies were originally founded as fiduciary institutions for the deposit of the money of estates, &c. They were not supposed to be banking institutions at all, and hence great exemptions from taxation were accorded to them. Yet at present trust companies do everything that other banks do, except issue notes. Their deposits are enormous; they do not have to maintain any reserve, and, whereas banks pay, as stated, a tax of about 1¾ per cent. on their capital, surplus and undivided profits, trust companies only pay about one-third of 1 per cent. upon this same amount. The law ought to be amended so that trust companies will pay more than they now do. It may be that a very fair law for the taxation of banks and trust companies is that urged by the State Bankers' Association last year providing for a State tax of 1 per cent. on the total capital of both banks and trust companies in lieu of all local taxation.

We are bound to say that the same considerations seem to us to apply also to the case of savings banks. The deposits in these banks in this State now amount to over one billion dollars, and they are wholly exempt from taxation. It is all right to encourage thrift by exempting its savings, but it is unfair to continue the exemption when the savings and the profits from their investments amount to such enormous figures. There is already serious complaint among savings bank depositors that the managers of these institutions allow enormous surpluses to accumulate instead of distributing a fair portion of the profits among those to whom they rightfully belong, that is, to the depositors of the present time. The money will figure to be distributed some day, and if the distribution is made later it will go to those who did not save and are not justly entitled to it. The action of the Bowery Savings Bank, the largest savings institution in our city, in recently raising the rate of interest from 3½ to 4 per cent. at a time when many other institutions declared that they would not pay the increased rate, is a measure of the justice of this protest. The auditors have to this date allowed to stockholders a surplus of 18 per cent. of their deposits, this sum practically representing the profits of the operations of the institution. Twice 4 per cent. on this surplus seems fair. It is remembered that the tax was the original not upon the depositors.

So, also, a tax of some sort ought to be placed upon the enormous accumulations of surety, title guarantee and insurance companies, provided that the tax be only reckoned upon the property or business of the companies in this State. To tax these companies otherwise would result in double taxation and might very likely produce hostile legislation in other States. We do not understand that the great insurance companies of our city would strenuously object to a certain increased tax upon their capital and surplus, so far as their property in this State is concerned. We sincerely trust that the bill as already introduced taxing these companies will be amended along this line.

## What Made John Marshall Chief Justice.

Just at this time, when the accession of JOHN MARSHALL to the great office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States has been celebrated at Albany and at Washington, it is interesting to consider the various circumstances which made his appointment possible and which contributed to his selection by the President.

While it must be conceded that JOHN MARSHALL was the greatest judge this country has ever seen, and that as JOSEPH STORY said of him, "His proudest epitaph may be written in a line—Here lies the expounder of the Constitution of the United States;'" because his opinions comprehend the leading decisions of the Supreme Court on points of law arising under the Federal Constitution, he might never have been chosen for the office of Chief Justice or have been made even a judge of the highest court of the land, had it not been for certain preceding facts and circumstances. And then the country and all generations of judges and lawyers to come would have lost the benefit of the grand and lucid opinions which marked his long career of thirty-four years on the federal bench.

Born in 1755, JOHN MARSHALL served as lieutenant and captain for six years in our Revolutionary Army, and in 1781 he resigned and began the study and practice of law in his native State, Virginia. In the years which followed, he sat often as a member of the Assembly of his State, and was one of the leading men in the Virginia Convention called to ratify the new Federal Constitution, when he was conspicuous for his powerful support of that great instrument. He became one of the most prominent lawyers of Virginia, and enjoyed a lucrative practice, but he never held any federal office, until he was sent to France in 1797 as one of the three commissioners with CHARLES COTESWORTH PINCKNEY and ELBRIDGE GERRY, all of whom were forced to return to this country in the following year. It is true that WASHINGTON offered MARSHALL the post of Attorney-General, and that ADAMS had desired to make him a judge of the Supreme Court, but it is noteworthy that until he was made Chief Justice, JOHN MARSHALL had never held any judicial office, and his example shows that experience is not always necessary to make the highest type of judge.

What we are to consider now will be the events which preceded and contributed to his selection of this great man.

On Dec. 2, 1799, at the opening of the first session of the Sixth Congress, which met at Philadelphia, MARSHALL took his seat as a Representative from the State of Virginia. He was at once put in the position of leader of the Federalist or the then Administration party, which was, at that time, in control of both houses. On that day he was appointed by the Speaker of the House first on the joint committee to wait on the President, and to inform him that Congress had met and was ready to receive any communications he might think proper to make. On Dec. 4 he moved that a respectful address be presented to the President in answer to his speech, and on the 9th he was again appointed on a committee to wait on the President to know when and where he would be ready to receive the address. And on the 19th of December, he announced the death of GEORGE WASHINGTON to the House, and also presented the resolutions which were unanimously adopted. His speech opened with these impressive words:

"The melancholy event which was yesterday announced with doubt, has been rendered but too certain. Our WASHINGTON is no more! The Hero, the Sage, and the Patriot of America—the man on whom in times of danger every eye was turned and all hopes were placed—lives now only in his own great actions, and in the hearts of an affectionate and afflicted people."

But what made MARSHALL famous and led to his subsequent preferment undoubtedly was his remarkable speech in the House in support of the action of President JOHN ADAMS in delivering up a British seaman who claimed to be an American citizen. THOMAS NASH, a seaman on board the British frigate Hermione, was committed to jail in Charleston, S. C., early in the year, charged with piracy and murder committed on board the frigate on the high seas. The English Vice-Admiral, Sir HYDE PARKER, wished to take the accused to the West Indies for trial, and the British consul at Charleston applied to Judge BEE, the United States judge for the District of South Carolina, to order the prisoner to be delivered up, and that judge referred the consul to the Executive department of the United States. His Britannic Majesty's Minister, ROBERT LISTON, then wrote to TIMOTHY PICKERING, the Secretary of State, asking him to lay the matter before the President and procure his orders that the prisoner be delivered up to justice. The President decided that as NASH was charged with piracy and murder committed on board the British frigate on the high seas, and consequently within the jurisdiction of his Britannic Majesty, under the Twenty-seventh Article of the Treaty of Amity with Great Britain, NASH ought to be delivered up, provided such evidence of his criminality were produced as would justify his commitment for trial, if the offence had been committed within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Secretary of State wrote to Judge BEE that the President authorized him to communicate "his advice and request" that NASH be delivered up to the consul or other agent of Great Britain, and Judge BEE ordered the prisoner's surrender. NASH was tried by court martial for mutiny and murder, was found guilty and was sentenced to suffer death, and in September he was hanged in the island of Jamaica. The action of the President created a great stir, for NASH had claimed that his name was JOHN ERICKSON ROBERTS, and he had sworn that he was "a native of the State of Connecticut, born and born in Danbury in that State." The House of Representatives called for the papers in the case and EDWARD LIVINGSTON of New York offered certain resolutions, reciting that the several questions whether the alleged crime was committed within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain, whether it came within the purview of the Twenty-seventh Article of the treaty with that country, and whether a person stating that he was an American citizen, and who had committed the act of which he was accused in attempting to regain his liberty, ought to be delivered up without investigation of his claims to citizenship or inquiry into the facts, were all matters exclusively of judicial inquiry. The resolutions ended with the conclusions that the "advice and request" of the President to the judge of the District Court was a dangerous interference of the Executive with judicial decisions, and that the compliance on the part of the judge was a sacrifice of the Constitutional independence of the judicial power.

On March 7, 1800, MARSHALL made his great speech defending the Administration, in which he claimed that the case was completely within the Twenty-seventh Article of the treaty with Great Britain, as that article provided for the surrender of a person having committed murder or forgery within the jurisdiction of one of the contracting parties, and having sought an asylum in the country of the other, on proof of guilt. MARSHALL asserted that according to the practice of the world, and the opinions of writers on the law of nations, the murder committed on board the British frigate navigating the high seas, was a murder committed within the jurisdiction of the British nation, and that NASH had been delivered up for murder and not for piracy. His second proposition was that the case was one for Executive and not for judicial decision, and that, while the Constitution provided that the judicial power of the United States should extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under the Constitution, laws and treaties of the United States, this was not a controversy between parties which had taken a shape for judicial decision, but was a national demand made upon the nation, and, therefore, not a case for judicial cognizance, that the President is the sole organ of the nation in its external relations, and that a demand of a foreign nation can only be made on him; that the President is charged to execute the law; that a treaty is declared to be a law; and that he must, therefore, execute the treaty, where he, and he alone, possesses the means of executing it. On the following day the House rejected the Livingston resolutions by a vote of 61 to 35.

Two months later MARSHALL was nominated Secretary of War, but the nomination was postponed, and on May 13 he was made Secretary of State by JOHN ADAMS, who had at last succeeded in getting rid of TIMOTHY PICKERING.

The Federalists were then in a bad way. The Alien and Sedition laws had made the Administration very unpopular, and the pardon of JOHN FRIES and two others convicted of high treason in Pennsylvania was charged against the President as an act of weakness by members of his own party. Opposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON and other leaders of the Federal party, it became evident that JOHN ADAMS, although the strongest candidate of the party, could not be reelected. His grandson, CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, thus speaks of the dissolution of the party:

"The great Federal party which had shed so much lustre over the inauguration of the new Government, which claimed WASHINGTON as its solar orb, and a host of the best and greatest of the Revolutionary heroes as its lesser lights, sunk in obscurity and disgrace, martyrs to the false and immoral maxim, that the end will sometimes justify bad means."

Chief Justice OLIVER ELLSWORTH, of Connecticut, resigned, and the office of Chief Justice was tendered to JOHN JAY, Governor of the State of New York, who had already been Chief Justice from 1789 to 1795. JAY declined the office on account of ill health, and President ADAMS on Jan. 31, 1801, appointed JOHN MARSHALL Chief Justice, with the unanimous approval of the Senate.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, the leader of the States' rights party, succeeded ADAMS as President in 1801, and, therefore, it is certain that had not the vacancy in the office of Chief Justice occurred during the days of ADAMS, JOHN MARSHALL would never have been appointed to the Supreme Court by his great opponent, and probably never would have sat on that bench which he made illustrious for so many years.

The causes, therefore, which contributed to this happy selection, and which made it possible, were the resignation of OLIVER ELLSWORTH; the fact that the vacancy occurred in the closing days of a Federalist President and not at the opening of the new antagonistic Administration; the refusal of JOHN JAY again to accept the office, and the disposition of President ADAMS to prefer his eloquent and able defender rather than Associate Justice WILLIAM PATERSON, who had been a member of the court for eight years, and who was supported by the ultra-Federalists.

## Women and Law.

Mrs. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON argues that while the violent proceedings of Mrs. NATION would be mob law in New York, because here saloons are permitted by our laws, they are "justifiable war" in Kansas where "the women are trying to uphold the laws against the sale of intoxicating drinks."

On that theory all lynching is "justifiable war." When mobs go out and hang and burn people they accuse of atrocious offences it is not because the crimes are permitted by the laws, but because the mobs take on themselves the unlawful function of executing laws for the punishment of the malefactors, in order to make sure that the penalty is paid and swiftly. Under the pretence of enforcing law they defy law and become criminals themselves. To punish murder they commit murder.

The laws prescribe, along with the penalties, the agencies through which they are to be executed, and among those agencies is never included mob violence on the part of either men or women. The machinery of justice is fully organized in Kansas and if it is not used for the enforcement of the laws against the liquor traffic the remedy of the citizens of course is restricted in the power they have under the Constitution of the State as the source of authority. If every citizen who does not like the way in which the laws are administered should be entitled to start out to enforce them on his own account, with far worse than any he seeks to correct would result. For the civilized order of society would be overturned and the state would be worse than that of barbarism for even among savages respect for law is commanded.

That violence in law is "justifiable war" when it is used to supply omissions in the execution of law, is a doctrine we are surprised to hear from a woman of the reasoning ability of Mrs. ELIZABETH STANTON. Moreover, if, contrary to the sound generalization with which her letter to THE SUN of yesterday started out, that in this Republic where we have no King, queen or royal family to receive law is the only monarch for unfeigned reverence and obey,

Mrs. STANTON concludes her letter with the threat that unless women "scientifically have a voice in the laws" "there will be a general movement inaugurated in every state that will compel attention." What this movement is to be is indicated by her further remark that "men need not flatter themselves that women will not fight, for, if those in authority will not listen to reason, then woman's emancipation will be achieved by force." This "fight" will have to be against women rather than men, for nothing is more obvious than that "the opposition to" woman's emancipation" comes from women rather than men.

If women should unite in demanding the suffrage they would soon get it at the hands of men who already have framed laws for the special benefit of women throughout the Union. The "divorce evil," as it is called, has resulted from the multiplication of the legal causes of divorce for the relief of wives more particularly. The great majority of divorces are granted to wives for cruelty, desertion, drunkenness and neglect to provide. Intemperance, so frequently the main cause of divorce, directly or indirectly, is made legal ground for the dissolution of marriage in most of the States and for the benefit of women more especially.

Whenever women ask for the suffrage with anything approaching unanimity they will not be obliged to resort to violence to "fight" for it; they will get it without a struggle. The opponents of the women who "have tried argument for nearly a century" are women and not men. At the time of the last Constitutional Convention in this State the forces of the woman suffragists were recruited by many women who had been before on the other side of the question, but their efforts were overcome by a far more numerous body of their sisters organized to oppose the movement. And so it is whenever the question is pushed into practical politics.

Woman suffrage is not withheld because as Mrs. STANTON alleges, "men have paid no attention" to the class of women who have been arguing for it for nearly a century, but because a far greater body of women argue that to impose on them the duty of the suffrage would be an injustice and an outrage. If, then, there is to be a fight for it the fight will have to be between women and not against men.

## The Golden Eagle Plumbers.

The size of the plumber's bill and of his bank account has been so threadbare a theme of conventional waggeries that it is necessary to say that we approach that thriving citizen in a thoroughly serious spirit. We applaud his prosperity and venerate even his young assistant, and their habit of tearing out all the pipes in the house just too soon to allow you to take a bath, and then staying away for the rest of the day or week is one of the best means of inculcating patience and humility. If the plumbers are as successful financially as they are helpful and productive morally, nobody ought to envy their deserved good fortune.

The news columns of the *Boston Transcript* disclose the existence of a combination of plumbers called the Golden Eagle. This is or was composed of certain subtile members of the Master Plumbers' Association. There were forty of them in Boston when the secrets of the order were exposed by a member who had been crowded out. Its rules apply only to contracts of a net cost of more than $500. They are exceedingly able and add chance to skill in a really engaging manner. We quote Rule 2:

"If the job has not been previously estimated, the member shall proceed to figure the cost of the labor and material in strict accordance with the long cost price list, adopted by this branch, adding to said cost five (5) per cent. for incidentals. To his sum he shall add fifteen (15) per cent. for expense account. He shall also add five (5) per cent. for the plum, to the total. He shall then furnish to the secretary, on blanks provided for that purpose, a detailed copy of the estimate, keeping a duplicate himself, and the secretary shall register the exact time said copy is received, and shall examine and verify the same. This estimate shall establish the base price for the job. The secretary shall then, in the presence of one (1) member, revolve the wheel, and register wherever the wheel stops. Twice the amount in the proper circle, opposite the number or name of the person estimating, shall be his plus number to be added to the base price already established. The secretary shall fill out a standard record sheet, showing all details of the member's estimate, and the witness shall certify with his signature before permission to quote is issued. The member having received permission to quote estimate, shall render bid in writing to his customer, keeping a duplicate for future reference."

Twenty-five per cent. on top of the long-cost price makes a very pretty bid indeed. Other rules provided for pulling the wool over customers' eyes and the freezing-out of plumbers not of the Golden Eagle. If an outside plumber bids, the Golden Eagle men are allowed to make a lower bid, and to do the work at a loss, if necessary, the loss being made good to him out of the profits which the combination is sure of from contracts for which its members were the sole bidders. Thus the Trust within the Master Plumbers' Association got the cream of the business, got practically all the contracts.

The other plumbers knew that something was the matter. Long they smelled the mouse but couldn't find him. At length prosperity brought dissension into the Trust. A member "peached." Ostensibly the combination was dissolved. Actually it still exists. It has its board of directors and its other officers and is as elaborately organized as if it were a chartered corporation. Its constitution provides for the assignment of territory to branch associations. So the ingenious order of the Golden Eagle is not confined to Boston.

In connection with the case of the cargo of Russian steel rails recently arrived at Philadelphia, it is of interest to note that one of the first acts of Congress upon a subsequent meeting in India was to impose a countervailing duty on sugar imported from countries where bounties are paid on exports of that article. An effort was made at the time that India was asking to have the countervailing duty imposed, but he refused to act, on the ground that the Indian sugar industry was partially under the domination of beet-raised sugar, mostly German. Lord CURZON on his arrival in India took the matter up, and after brief consideration the duty was imposed.

The result so far has been satisfactory. The countervailing duty collected during the eight months from last April to November netted to the Indian treasury close on twelve lacs of rupees, equal at the present rate of exchange of the rupee to fourteen in gold. This was over and above the amount realized from the 5 per cent. import duty which sugar, alike from bounty-giving and non-bounty-giving countries, pays on entering India.

## The Lady Who Couldn't Pay Her Fare and the Bachelor Man.

On the evening of Tuesday last, at exactly one-half of a minute, handsome and stylishly dressed woman boarded a crowded southbound Sixth avenue elevated car at 42d Broadway and Fifteenth street and after riding a block offered conductor 25¢ a new penny bill in payment of her fare. The conductor either not having the required change or being too gruff to make it refused the bill and the young woman not having other money was made to suffer the humiliation of being put off the car.

A bachelor friend and myself sitting on the opposite seat, leaned back and seeing no offer the lady had for her bill were restrained from so doing by an unpleasant cantankerous and the fear that the offer might be refused and we considered mashers. Now we think it worth while to ask what war we should have waged to pay the lady's fare, or whether the conductor had the right to make the lady leave the car after she had offered to pay her fare in good and lawful money?

NEW YORK, Feb. 2. C. D. S.

First let us justify the conductor. No law compels him to make change of anything. If the passenger does not tender him the legal fare he can put the passenger off. Custom has established $2 as the amount that the conductor can reasonably be called upon to give change for, but $5 is rather excessive.

Now as to the social question. Our correspondent and his bachelor friend saw this young woman in distress, and because of innate bashfulness, or of dread of the prejudice against too great freedom in accosting women with whom he was not acquainted, he refrained from helping her. Was he right? He wasn't.

A friendly act need not fear the frowns of conventional etiquette. If with an unaffected raising of the hat he had said to this unlucky young woman "Madame, may I not pay the fare that you yourself have not? My card here with my address will enable you to repay it," he would have broken no law of gentility, and the lady would have been at corresponding liberty to accept his offer if she so desired.

Don't be afraid of following the impulses of a kind and respectful heart; it will never carry you beyond the line of politeness!

## A New Type of Street Beggars.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The form of solicitation I now encounter on the streets is not from vicious women, but from beggars. Of these beggars, as you have said, an entirely new type has come in recently, or young men respectably dressed and of a manner of speech which indicates a considerable measure of education.

I encounter them almost nightly in the vicinity of Murray Hill. One of them who begged of me the other evening wore kid gloves in good condition and otherwise was nicely dressed and he did not have the appearance of a hard-drinking man, but was sleek, and looked healthy and well fed, yet he told me that he had had nothing to eat since morning and that he was without a cent to pay for a lodging. When I asked him how he, apparently a prosperous young man, had got into such straits, he replied that he had been stranded in New York, having failed to get the employment he expected.

Another told me that he was a professional nurse out of employment and absolutely destitute. He looked like a family servant. Still another professed to be in such dire straits that, to his great shame, he was begging for the first time in his life, though he was a brawny young fellow, with a healthy florid complexion, and his clothing was of good quality. Yet another represented himself as a reporter who had come hither from a distant city seeking employment at his profession, which he had failed to get. Evidently he was an educated man from his choice of language, but he said he had been without food since the day before and would have to walk the streets the night through if I did not give him help to pay for a lodging.

These are only examples, typical cases. What do they mean? The degradation to which they bear witness is a novel manifestation in my experience, for it is beggary among a sort of men I have never before seen stoop to such a humiliation in our country, and I encounter it so frequently of late that I am forced to believe that it is professional. The individuality of the beggars changes, but the route seems to be worked regularly by a succession of them, all of the same general character and with stories of want and woe of a close resemblance. PEDESTRIAN.

NEW YORK, Feb. 4.

## Against Expectoration in Street Cars.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I am compelled to use the Union Railway cars plying between 125th street and Third avenue to Mount Vernon every morning and afternoon, and as your board have decided that expectorating on the floors of cars is a public nuisance and detrimental to the public health, I have addressed a letter to the Board of Health asking protection for a suffering community against this indecent practice and to compel this company to obey the law, and place in their cars the notice ordered by your board, and also compel the conductors to enforce this law.

If you speak to the conductors about it it is only to be abused and insulted by them and also to receive from the party so offending insult and the fear of receiving bodily harm. I am not a crank nor a kicker. The nuisance is unbearable as well as very dangerous to health. SAMUEL W. JONES.

NORTH EIGHTH AV., New York, Feb. 1.

## Good Word for the Police.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It was most gratifying to read in one of your papers of Friday Magistrate Flammer's words of praise to Policeman Haley. In these times when one hears so much of the bad police it is very encouraging to us to feel that we are not believed to be all "black sheep." Hoping that this may come to the eyes of the magistrate.

FEB. 2. A YOUNG POLICEMAN.

## The Crisis in the French Wine Trade.

*From the London Field.*

The crisis in the French wine trade, which has caused so much consternation in the southern departments, where the bulk of the French wines are made, is to a great extent explained by the publication of the figures relating to the vintage last autumn. The total production of wine was, exclusive of Corsica and the African colonies, 1,515,434,850 gallons, and this was nearly 50 per cent. in excess of the large yield in 1899, and had not been approached since 1875, when, just before the appearance of the phylloxera, the record total of 1,886,310,000 gallons of wine were made throughout France.

This great increase was due not so much to the replanting of about 50,000 acres in vines, bringing the total area of vineyards up to about 4,300,000 acres, as to a more abundant yield of existing vineyards, the average per acre being about 350 gallons, as against 250 gallons in 1899, but, despite or rather because of, this increased yield, the estimated value of the crop is not put at more than half a million in excess of the £50,000,000 attributed to the wines of 1899. The increased yield was not confined to any one part of France, and it was only in five departments that there was any decrease, and this a very small one, while in one or two there was a rise in over forty million gallons.

## HOW TO BETTER SOCIAL CONDITIONS.

### As Easy as Rolling Off a Log, Thinks This Social Philosopher.

[illegible]

## THE FAMINE IN CHINA.

The two Provinces of China which the Reuter's despatch from Pekin mentions as being afflicted by suffering from famine are Shansi and Shensi, in the mountainous region of the north Province of Pekin, [illegible] the two provinces, Kansu and Shensi, [illegible] Chihli proper and the [illegible] north central part of China.

The famines that occasionally afflict parts of China are caused by drought, inundations, the [illegible] of locusts, or, mainly, by the overflow of the Yellow River, in which the population constantly encroaches [illegible] and crops being swept away. The famine now covered several [illegible] The wretched inhabitants are driven from school districts. After the famine of 1877 over a million people starved to death.

China is a rich country [illegible] with rainfall. The regular [illegible] and the periodical inundations are [illegible] for a larger average harvest than [illegible] west Europe. The average [illegible] The chief is more than [illegible] The interior usually has enough to [illegible] the largest factor in the great [illegible] of agriculture in the Provinces of Yangtze and Yellow rivers. But [illegible] in the northern part [illegible] the northern begin to [illegible] make Mongolia deficient [illegible] are periods of drought and [illegible] of inundation and of drought are [illegible] in the north the terrible famines [illegible] confined to that part. [illegible] has not the present famine.

The effects of famine are [illegible] Fuh. The first is the rapid [illegible] extremely slow methods of [illegible] the river region. Before [illegible] largely came into power the [illegible] imperial highways, paved with [illegible] known many of the cities. But [illegible] nothing has been done to repair [illegible] and they are now in such a state [illegible] they are so impedimenta to [illegible] been abandoned from sheer [illegible] State, also, has failed to keep the [illegible] repair so that they are now [illegible] Pekin depends for its supplies [illegible] the Grand Canal and yet parts of [illegible] disrepair that portages have [illegible] the sides where freight is hauled [illegible] be reembarked farther on. [illegible] China may be suffering from food shortage. China has plenty, but it is impossible [illegible] port food into the famine-stricken districts in time avert disaster.

The other fact that aggravates famine is the inadequacy of relief measures. Both the Government and private benevolence establish soup kitchens anywhere and everywhere and large donations of clothing are made to those that are destitute. But there is no systematic relief. Aid often fails to reach those who most need it, and relief measures are abandoned if the fund set apart for that purpose happens to become exhausted. It has been the history of nearly every great famine in China that at the very height of distress the helpless are left to their fate and perish by tens of thousands.

At present the Government has other things to attend to and has probably neither funds nor machinery with which to put relief measures in force. The horrors of Chinese famine are augmented by the dire poverty of the masses of the people with whom existence is always a question of intense struggle and who have nothing with which to tide them over periods of distress.

## Rosenthal-Paderewski Musical Duel.

*From the Berlin German Times.*

Curious comment has been aroused in European musical circles by the announcement that Paderewski has cancelled his widely advertised tour through the large cities of Germany. Of course it had been known that he would not play in Berlin, for an earlier experience there had taught him that the critics of the German capital bear him no overwhelming love.

The mere cancellation of dates in the other cities would have caused no surprise in a country where Paderewski is not regarded as an up-to-date player, but it now transpires that Moritz Rosenthal, knowing the German critics on his side, had arranged a series of recitals, to take place on the evenings before the Pole's appearance, in the same cities, and in the same halls. It is rumored that also through Holland and Russia, Rosenthal intended to extend similar delicate attentions to Paderewski. The latter must have been made aware of the impending cyclopean duel, for his withdrawal came at the eleventh hour, when all arrangements had been completed by his antagonist.

Rosenthal, finding himself bound to give thirty or forty concerts in Germany and Holland, has decided to keep his engagements, but his tour will be like Don Quixote's famous fight against the windmill.

## Century Dispute in Advertisements.

*From the Pall Mall Gazette.*

It is all to the good that whatever controversy still remains with regard to the new century should be banished to the advertisement columns. Here are two from to-day's *Times*:

TO the ENGLISH PUBLIC and the PUBLIC ABROAD.

A widespread hazziness about the beginning of the Century should be dispelled. A Century is a series of one hundred consecutive years and must therefore begin with a year and end with a year. The 20th Century could not begin on the 1st of January, 1901, because the tenth decade ended with the 31st of December, 1900, and so terminated the 19th Century. The 1st of January, 1900, inaugurated the 20th Century, and its first birthday will be on the first of next month, Dec. 26, 1900.

A Wide spread hazziness about the beginning of a street should be dispelled. A street may be a series of one hundred houses, and must therefore begin with a house and end with a house. The twentieth house could not be Number 20, because the tenth house is Number 9, and so terminates the 1st decade. Number 0 is the first house, and the second house is Number 1.

This advertisement is dated 28.12.00, which means the 27th day of the eleventh month of the ninety-ninth year of the century.

Could any greater evidence of national wealth be imagined than that two controversialists should in this way pay the price of their emotions?

## Genuine Cognac Hard to Find.

*From the Lancet.*

There is no doubt that it has of late years been increasingly difficult to obtain good brandy, and for this reason, among others, whiskey has in this country largely taken its place. It ought, however, to be thoroughly understood that whiskey cannot properly be substituted for brandy in all cases. Fine brandy contains in addition to alcohol a number of highly volatile ethers which have a strongly stimulating effect and which are eliminated without any known ill effects and without causing the slightest derangement to the digestive system. It is much to be regretted that the *fin champagne* which was sent from France till about the year 1870 is now practically unobtainable. These liquors were not only pleasant to the cultivated palate, but, given judiciously, were most useful in many cases of sickness. Unfortunately nothing has yet taken their place.

## Ohio Clergyman Who Wont Support His English Mother.

*From the London Daily Mail.*

The Medway Board of Guardians at their meeting severely commented upon the conduct of the Rev. G. W. Bekey, congregational minister, Rosalind street, Toledo, Ohio, U. S. A.

He was informed by the guardians that his mother, an aged, infirm widow, had become an inmate of the workhouse owing to poverty.

His reply was that being now an American citizen he had no legal responsibility to contribute to his mother's support.

## "One More Night Under Victoory."

*From the London Daily Chronicle.*

To a weary leader writer, in the small hours of yesterday morning, a cabman gave utterance to what we all dimly felt as we laid our heads on our pillows. Dropping his fare, the cabman leaned down from the box. "What was the latest about 'ere?" he asked. "Very bad, but no worse," was the answer. The cabman reflected a moment. Then he seized the reins. "Well, anyhow, there's one more night under Victoory," he said.

## Labouchere on Balliol.

*From London Truth.*

Sir Alfred Milner is a Fellow of Balliol, and all Fellows of Balliol are more or less prigs, united by a bond of mutual admiration.