The Sun.

MONDAY, MAY 27, 1901.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

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

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Duel in South Carolina.

The agreement of the two South Carolina Senators to resign their seats and fight out their differences before the people proceeded from a sudden impulse in which there was an element of bravado. The extraordinary challenge was given and accepted because both Senator TILLMAN and Senator McLAURIN happened to be face to face at Gaffney, and because in the heat of debate each taunted the other with suggestions of resignation. Such an arrangement at long range and in cold blood is not easily conceivable, even under the existing conditions of political excitement in South Carolina. Neither statesman was willing to back down in the presence of his constituents.

The consequences of this incident are sure to be spectacular, and likely to be instructive.

It is proper to remember that although Mr. TILLMAN is staking a full six years' term against Mr. McLAURIN'S unexpired two years of service, most of the advantages of time, place and weapon are with the elder champion. He represents a sort of Democracy which has been supposed to be invincible in South Carolina, and which no Democrat there, until recently, has dared even to assail. His hold upon the machine is stronger than that of his competitor. The traditions of the party are with him. He is a dangerous fighter anywhere, and a particularly tough antagonist on the ground he now occupies. He possesses physical energy and endurance in a remarkable degree, while Mr. McLAURIN'S health is not at this time very robust.

On the other hand, Senator McLAURIN stands in South Carolina for a new conception of the duty and interest of the Southern Democrat with regard to the larger policies of national and local development. The spirit of a new age of Southern prosperity is with him, or is bound to be with him as soon as it fully comprehends the significance of his attitude. The angle of departure was marked by him as long ago as when he voted for the ratification of the Treaty of Paris. The creed of discontent and obstruction written down at Chicago in 1896 and four years later reiterated at Kansas City is obsolete for him, so far as it hampers the progress of his State and people. In the coming contest Mr. McLAURIN holds the principles that will prevail in the long run, and the only question is whether the issue is thus directly made too soon for the good of his individual fortunes.

The joint resignation throws the field open to all candidates ambitious to sit in the United States Senate for South Carolina. A multitude of aspirants, however, will not obscure the fact that it is Tillmanism against McLaurinism—the old and the moribund against liberal ideas of hope and progress.

What Is the Aim of the Expanded German Navy?

At the time when the Reichstag was asked to sanction the proposed increase of the German Navy, the people's representatives were encouraged to believe that the Kaiser's purpose was to protect the German mercantile marine against possible encroachment on the part of Great Britain.

According to the *Saturday Review*, it is well known in the highest London circles that Kaiser WILLIAM'S reasons for wishing to create a great navy are very different. He sees that the richest and most accessible field for the development of German energy and emigration lies in South America. Over that vast and but little exploited continent, however, hangs the shadow of the Monroe Doctrine. Therein lies the supreme menace to German expansion, and Kaiser WILLIAM is preparing betimes to meet it.

There is no doubt, that of all parts of the globe fit for man's habitation and for the production of wealth on a great scale, South America is the only part that may be regarded as almost virgin. Though it comprises six and one-half million square miles, it contains only about fifty million inhabitants, whereas the single island of Java, with some fifty thousand square miles, supports a population of twenty-four millions. The *Saturday Review* directs attention to the computation that the basin of the Amazon alone, if reduced to cultivation, could accommodate five hundred million persons, whereas now barely one million subsist therein. Unquestionably, South America offers an unrivalled field to the expansion of the world for untold generations.

Moreover, many European nations have, or think they have, geographical or moral claims to profit by the unique opportunity. Great Britain is already planted in South American soil in her colony of Guiana, adjacent to which on the east Holland has a strip of territory, while, still further east, Cayenne belongs to France. The boundary between every one of these three colonies on the one hand and Brazil on the other is undetermined. As regards moral claims, Portugal stands toward the greater part of Brazil in the maternal relation, which Spain occupies toward all the other South American republics. The immigration of Italians to the Argentine Confederation has been so extensive that it now constitutes a large fraction, if not one-half, of the population. In the Brazilian Province of Rio Grande do Sul there are said to be a quarter of a million Germans, and in the Province of Santa Catarina some sixty thousand. Altogether, there are about four hundred thousand German settlers in Brazil, while, in two provinces of Chili, Germans constitute respectively a sixth and an eighth per cent. of the inhabitants. German trade, too, with all the Latin-American republics is increasing; the monopoly once enjoyed in this quarter by the British is a thing of the past.

In view of these facts, it may be admitted that the *Saturday Review* is probably right in assuming that the German Emperor surveys South America with a covetous eye. It is certain, however, that he cannot acquire a square inch of that continent without having previously beaten the United States upon the ocean. Evidently, the *Saturday Review* desires to see us beaten, for it argues that it would be bad policy for Great Britain to irritate Germany by opposing "her perfectly legitimate aims in the remaining quarter of the globe." It declares that an alliance with the United States to maintain the Monroe Doctrine would be ludicrously in opposition to British interests.

The *Saturday Review* need not entertain any misgivings on that score. In the event of a war with Germany, we should not require the alliance of Great Britain; all we should ask would be the maintenance of a strict neutrality on the part of the last-named Power. It would manifestly be for England's interest to observe neutrality. If she coöperated with Germany, her operatives would be exposed to the risk of starvation, for we should see to it that not an ounce of food staples reached them from this side of the Atlantic. Nothing would be easier than for us to confiscate the breadstuffs of the northwest provinces of the Dominion, and, of course, the granaries of the United States would be closed against the British artisan. We may safely assume, then, that, in case of a war between Germany and the United States, Great Britain would be neutral.

Our Army in China.

A real "comparison of the armies in China" is made possible by the recent publication of official reports by American officers, and by articles from foreign papers. The *Echo de Paris*, for example, printed recently a letter from a correspondent rejoicing over the departure of our troops, because they were far too free and easy, and were always pot shooting at any and every one! On one occasion, says this correspondent, three American soldiers began shooting at the French consulate at some unnamed place; the French sentry, having protested, proceeded to shoot one, to bayonet another, and then the third fled! It is hardly necessary to worry over this story, however; it will never be the cause of an "incident of international importance."

Capt. THOMAS FRANKLIN, Assistant Commissary, U. S. V., and Chief Commissary of our army in China, has made an exhaustive report on his observations in that country, comparing our commissary service with that of the other armies, which is full of interest. He says that our supplies, while more generous in quantity and quality than those of other countries, were not so well packed. The Japanese, for instance, allowed few packages to exceed 100 pounds in weight and about three cubic feet in volume; the average British package weighed about eighty pounds; their packages were wrapped in jute, the Japanese in straw. "Contrast this," says Capt. FRANKLIN, "with a case of stationery, weight 600 pounds, put up in a thin, flimsy, white pine case, which from rough handling and its own weakness has come to pieces in the bottom of a junk." As a rule, our subsistence stores were very well packed in strong cases of moderate weight and volume; quartermasters' supplies, as a rule, were very poorly put up, in cases too large and much too heavy; most of all, the ordnance stores were put up in very bulky and heavy packages.

In the matter of food, "there were none who had as excellent or abundant a supply as the Americans." The Russians' portable soup kettle was highly approved by Capt. FRANKLIN, who describes it thus:

"Upon a springless carriage was mounted an iron furnace under a semispherical boiler, water jacketed. The boiler was fitted with a tight-fitting cover and the whole was very strongly and compactly built. Into this they put all the materials for a soup or stew that they possessed, and nothing came amiss, screwed down the cover, lit the fire, and away went this perambulating soup tureen with its company. When they made camp all they had to do was 'stack arms' and then march past the soup machine, the cook opening a faucet, and each man received his ration of hot, well cooked, thick soup, the assistant cook in the meantime was chopping up a loaf of black bread with an axe, and each man got a liberal chunk."

According to the Chief Commissary, our troops kept the best policed camps; the British kept theirs fairly clean, but did so by fits and starts, while the Japanese kept their camps clean, but were not particular as to the surroundings; the camps of the Russians and French could be located from a distance by the olfactory nerves. "Had it not been for the cool weather of September," remark the Captain, "I think they would have had sickness from their inattention to camp sanitation." The Germans kept their camps very clean, but had the biggest sick report of any army.

In transportation none of the allies could touch the Americans; the Japanese had two-wheeled carts, not comparable to ours, but with their lighter equipment they kept themselves supplied. The British used pack mules, but loaded them badly, so that if the animals trotted or "cut up" the loads fell off. "In other words," says Capt. FRANKLIN, "they lash the load to the saddle, while we lash it to the mule." The other armies picked up their transport in China, except the Germans, who late in the season obtained a large number of their military baggage wagons. These did not compare with ours, being smaller, badly shaped and not so strong; their system of driving required two men to a wagon, while ours needs only one man. Count VON WALDERSEE has since reported the entire system to be a failure. The British and Germans kept their leather equipments in beautiful condition; the former, together with the Japanese, had a coolie for every fighting man; the men of the other armies were heavily loaded. Capt. FRANKLIN'S conclusion is of interest; he writes: "Altogether, the American force was better fed, better clothed, especially for the winter, and had the best transportation. Where we fell down in the eyes of the foreigners was in military appearance. Our men were slouchy in dress and rambled about clothed or half clothed or dressed in any way that their fancy dictated, but this was true of our officers, too. I am sorry to say. We seemed to lack a proper pride in our personal appearance. But the American's arms were always clean and in good order and he can shoot and take care of himself better than his more neatly dressed brothers in arms."

Regarding our medical department in China, a correspondent in the *British Medical Journal* wrote in high praise. "I think," he said, "that the American hospital in Pekin could hold its own with most London hospitals." "Bedsteads, bedside tables and chairs brought from America, a 'diet kitchen' at the end of the ward, with an ample cooking range, and a highly trained cook in a white apron and cap, whose life's business is cooking and who is not expected to do anything else," is his description of our army hospital ward. The excellent training and efficiency of our Hospital Corps men also on this correspondent's admiration. He did not, as a medical man, approve our rations as compared with the British; but for our medical service he had only words of praise.

Coming from a trained officer like Capt. FRANKLIN and a medical man of another nationality, these comments and criticisms, mingled praise and blame, undoubtedly reveal the facts as they existed in China in a manner worthy of belief.

Don't Knock.

Another good thing comes out of Buffalo, a town entitled to exalt its horn. Last week the Commercial Travellers' Association gave a hearing to Mr. MAURICE H. CASE, Supreme President, and Mr. CLARENCE H. LAVERY, Supreme Secretary and Treasurer, of the Order of Don't Knock, which was incorporated March 20. The charter members are Buffalonians. Every person who joins the order solemnly binds himself to pay a fine of one cent every time he is caught "knocking." The proceeds of the fines are to go to charity.

"To knock" is beginning-of-the-century English for "to backbite," to "speak ill of." It is the purpose of the new society to repress a habit which is altogether too common and springs sometimes from thoughtlessness as much as from malice. Sometimes it seems to be infectious. Let somebody in any company begin to say mean or unkind things of some absent person, and ten to one somebody else will take up the tale and add spite to spite. It ought to be as easy to speak good as to speak evil of your friends and acquaintances, but notice how a sneer, an unjust criticism, a scandalous story is rolled along from tongue to tongue, gathering venom in its passage. Some cynics say frankly that they don't scruple to "talk about" their friends because they know that their friends don't scruple to "talk about" them. A scurvy plea, as if TOM must be a sneak and a gossip because DICK and HARRY are.

The amount of suffering that is caused by tattling, backbiting and "they say," especially in small communities where everybody knows everybody and every word of depreciation or scandal is sure to reach its mark, is incalculable. You can hardly take up a newspaper without finding in it some story of desperate affray or suicide or murder, of somebody done to death by poisoned tongues. But even these positive and palpable results of "knocking" are not so sinister as the effect of it upon the hardened though perhaps unconscious practiser of it. He or she, acquiring the censorious, snooping, backbiting habit, becomes a nuisance and a curse, a mere bag of bile and jaundice, a collector of the offal of ill nature. In some cases "knocking" becomes an incurable disease, but in its earlier stages it yields readily to such treatment as the Don't Knock Order proposes. The objects of the order are thus described in its constitution:

"Section 1—To overcome in its members the deplorable habit of speaking ill of our fellows—otherwise known as 'knocking'—and by precept and example trying to induce others to do the same.

"Section 2—To better the social and moral condition of mankind by a true devotion in its members to the cause of charity in its broadest sense.

"Section 3—To keep the Golden Rule ever in the minds of its members.

"Section 4—To bind its members together in a social and fraternal manner."

And here is a little bit of the healthful creed:

"We believe that the practice of speaking ill of our fellow men, otherwise 'knocking,' is detestable, unbrotherly and uncharitable.

"We believe it our duty to conceal the imperfections of our fellows, provided their actions are not of great menace to the welfare of the community, and do all we can by precept and example to show them where they err.

"We believe that many lives are ruined daily, that many hearts are made miserable and many men and women driven to desperation by the despicable practice of 'knocking.'

"We believe that in most instances 'knocking' is done thoughtlessly, and even those who knock maliciously and with evil intent would refrain if they would but give a thought to the possible consequences of the act.

"We believe that a simple little knock unthinkingly made sometimes grows to such proportions as to be more cruel and dangerous than the plunging of a sharp knife into the vitals of the victim.

"We believe that a persistent, deliberate knocker is as vile and as dangerous to the welfare of a community as a murderer.

"We believe that many people judge others by their own standard, and that because they are not tempted or are able to resist doing some particular thing that they consider wrong, they feel themselves warranted in despising and criticising those who are weaker than themselves or whose opinions differ with their own."

Don't "knock," and don't "rubberneck" to excess.

The Brooklyn Handicap.

The old maxim that there is always room in the front ranks for those qualified to get there was shown on Saturday, by the result of the famous Brooklyn Handicap, decided at Gravesend, to be as applicable to racehorses as to competitors of the human family. Some persons thought that Conroy, the victorious three-year-old candidate, might possibly be able to capture the event, but by far the greater number of experienced turfmen and racegoers were reluctant to select him, in view of the fact that his success would necessitate the defeat of thoroughbreds better seasoned and, it was assumed, more consistent and stout-hearted. Indeed, it had long been seriously questioned whether there was, anywhere in this country, a three-year-old of sufficient merit to win this classic race. Students of form shook their heads. No horse so young had ever before acquired that distinction. Every year since 1893, with but one exception, the "Brooklyn" had gone to a runner in the four-year-old class; and previous to that time, four-year-olds, five-year-olds and horses described technically as "aged" had alternated in sharing the honor. How, then, it was asked, could Conroy, the only competitor of the three-year-old class to attempt the task in this year's field, be expected to outdo all his predecessors? How could he be counted on to defeat old campaigners like Raffaello, Standing, Banastar and Sidney Lucas?

In horse racing as in politics, when diligent search fails to reveal a new candidate of especial promise, it is customary to revert to some old standby, whose past achievements are matters of record. So, perhaps, for want of a better reason, the "talent" on Saturday swore allegiance to Banastar, winner of the Brooklyn Handicap in 1899, the Metropolitan at Morris Park, on May 4, of this year, and the Toboggan Handicap a week later; and he became a decided favorite in the betting. Banastar's performance in the Metropolitan constituted, unquestionably, the standard by which most of his followers were guided. But, throwing aside that horse's inferior race last Saturday, when he finished seventh in a field of nine starters, was not his victory in the Metropolitan somewhat overrated? One mile on a fast track in 1:42, the time in which that race was run, is far short of extraordinary; and the additional fact that that feat was accomplished "under the whip," Banastar, apparently, having fought hard to vanquish the acknowledged cripple, Contestor, was also significant to say the least. But, on the other hand, the Metropolitan marked the animal's first appearance this year, and, of course, nobody knew precisely what he might have done if urged desperately from start to finish, or how much that race would improve his condition.

So far as concerns Conroy, it appears to be undisputed that he was the "class" of the great race, and probably would have won under even less favorable circumstances than those he encountered. The exceedingly poor showing of some of the older representatives, however, has yet to be explained. How, for instance, is one to accept off-hand the miserable performances of Sidney Lucas and Raffaello, which, according to the official chart, were twenty-one lengths behind Conroy at the finish? Theretofore a heavy track, like that on which the "Brooklyn" was run, had invariably been welcomed by both of those horses, and the odds at which they were quoted by the bookmakers indicated that they were expected to give a satisfactory account of themselves.

But upsets and uncertainties constitute the life of the running turf. If favorites and second choices were not defeated now and then, horse racing would grow monotonous and the track would become deserted. Evidence that no such state of things is likely soon to exist in this country is practically conclusive when, as was the case on Saturday, between 15,000 and 20,000 people were willing to endure weather of the most thoroughly disagreeable sort in order to witness the sport.

The Monroe Doctrine and Peace.

The speeches of Vice-President ROOSEVELT and Senator LODGE at the opening of the Pan-American Exposition continue to be discussed with general approval the country throughout.

We observe that a few newspapers treat those addresses as if their tone and spirit were in some way inconsistent with the admirable message which President McKINLEY sent on from San Francisco.

Not a bit of it! A resolute determination to assert and enforce the Monroe Doctrine and a deep and genuine desire for peace with all nations go beautifully together in the same American heart.

The *Enquirer* has the honor to suggest as an exemplification of true good feeling and as a good will emulation of the existence of harmony the appointment of Messrs. CHARLES S. KURTZ, the Hon. HARRY DAUGHERTY and the Hon. GEORGE B. COX as members of the Executive committee.—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

The Hon. JOHN R. McLEAN is laboring industriously, nay, almost ostentatiously, to promote harmony in the Republican organization in Ohio. We infer that he perceives no occasion for his efforts in the other organization, the party of the Hon. TOM L. JOHNSON and the Hon. JOHN R. McLEAN.

A little jealousy between firemen and policemen is shown now and then. Perhaps rivalry in the art of life-saving is the cause. Our contemporary, the *Chief*, shows that the rivalry reaches even to musical accomplishments. May 18 Fireman JOHN MULLADY of Engine Company No. 134 published a challenge in which he expressed his readiness "to whistle a series of piccolo solos." May 25, Mr. CASSIUS R. STEVENS accepted the challenge in behalf of Patrolman DANIEL B. MCGUINNESS of the Seventy-first precinct. May the better puckerer win!

Returns from the election of members of the Virginia Constitutional Convention show that there will be 80 or 90 Democrats, 9 Republicans and 1 Independent in that body. One district is in doubt, but naturally "the prospect is favorable" to the Democratic candidate. The Virginia Democrats have shown much forbearance and magnanimity in permitting the election of 9 Republicans. Will not that number be found too large?

The students of the Woman's College in Baltimore who have had the happiness of studying calculus and the theory of equations gave a "mathematical" dinner the other night. The invitations were in algebraic form. The "decorations were parabolas and hyperbolas of daisies with a centrepiece in the form of a paraboloid." The strawberries were enclosed in coincoids of sugar. The ice cream came in parallelopipeds. All the vigor of mathematics was turned to favors and to prettiness. The young women are much more original than the young men. All the latter can do in testimony of their mathematical tools is to "burn LEGENDRE."

With sorrow, but not with surprise, we see that Boston, the home of learning and the nurse of new religions, is the centre of the "lucky box" and "lucky pebble" industries. Some Bostonians believe nothing and many will believe anything. Like the old Athenians the new ones are superstitious. An astrologer, a palmist, an old "Indian varb" doctor from the Bowery, a new-fangled healer does well to settle in Boston. Let us ascribe the cause of the Bostonian interest in charlatans to intellectual curiosity or open-mindedness. Still, too many Bostonians have nothing to do but to sign petitions, write "open" letters and make speeches. Hence the Anti-Imperialist League. Hence, too, perhaps, the passion for lucky stones.

The Form of Baptism.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In reply to "A Daily Reader" query in THE SUN to day, as to the primitive mode of baptism, I submit:

First, baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the custom of the primitive church.

Second, Christ's baptism (i. e., baptism of sick persons) was recognized from the earliest times. (v. St. Cyprian's Epistle to Magnus, lxxx., 12-15, 1 *sine* 250.)

Third, Baptism by affusion, where immersion was impracticable, is expressly allowed by the teaching of the Twelve Apostles," whose date, according to the best authorities, is about A. D. 120. (Ch. vii.)

The conclusion is that while immersion was the ordinary method of baptism in the early Church, affusion was practised in certain cases. This is the most convincing proof that immersion was never considered to be of the essence of baptism, being preferred, however, probably because of the symbolism of the ceremonial. (Cf. Fosan, vi., 4; Col. ii., 12.)

NEW YORK, May 23. F. H. M.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In a sermon preached by the Rev. Adoniram Judson at Calcutta on Sept. 27, 1846, concerning the practice of immersion by the primitive church:

"Not only all churches of the Greek Church but the whole Christian world for the space of thirteen hundred years, therefore, immersion was the only valid baptism. Sprinkling or pouring was never tolerated except in cases of dangerous sickness, or want of a sufficient quantity of water, and even then the validity of the application was always disputed. Those who were thus baptized by pouring were called clinics and not Christians, and were unchilled the priesthood.

"Never, for ages, Christians and sprinkling or pouring were classed in communion, until the council of Ravenna, assembled by the Pope, in the year 1311, declared immersion or pouring to be indifferent. From that time the latter gradually crept into general use. It was not, however, admitted into England till the middle of the sixteenth century, and not sanctioned till the middle of the seventeenth, when the Westminster Assembly decided that "dipping of the person in water is not necessary, but baptism is rightly administered, by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person."

Then follow citations from Catholic and other Pædobaptist authors of acknowledged authority to sustain the above position. I also refer "A Daily Reader" to the encyclopædias and Church histories.

ELIZABETH, N. J., May 24. L. FRED SILVERS.

THE CROSS-SEAT STREET CARS.

No Standing Room!—A Question of Decency as Well as of Comfort.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Can nothing be done to prevent the continuance of the discomforting, humiliating, indecent and disgusting practice of allowing passengers to crowd in between the fully occupied seats of the cross-seated open street cars? The cross seats will accommodate four passengers with seats comfortably and five passengers with a little reasonable crowding. The space remaining between the knees of the seated passengers and the back of the forward seat by rights belongs to the seated passengers and is too contracted to permit other passengers to stand therein without subjecting the occupants of the seats to unnecessary discomfort.

Were discomfort alone the single cause of complaint I for one would be content to ignore the cause and suffer on uncomplainingly. But a question of common decency is involved and I propose to protest with all my might. What license has any person in a public vehicle to occupy the space that rightfully belongs to me? Must I accept the indignity quietly and without protest, when he not only robs me of my rights but indecently crowds his person against my own. The disgusting practice ought to be, and can be stopped, and the limitation to which street car passengers are every day and all day long subjected can be removed if public sentiment be aroused to the point of demanding a total abatement of this evil.

In my own case, I never enter a crowded open car unless I observe a vacant seat is at my disposal. As I will not be a party to the practice of standing in the narrow space to the discomfort of seated passengers, I have formed a resolution never to abandon my seat to a woman who should crowd into the narrow standing space, though I am ever ready enough to offer a seat to a lady in a closed car. In consequence, I am sometimes forced to let several crowded open cars go by before I can be accommodated with a seat; but, better a thousand times, a longer wait or the recourse to other means of travel than ever to be a party to the humiliating, indecent and disgusting practice of which I indignantly complain. I do not permit my wife and daughter to enter the open cross-seated cars at all for fear of the humiliation to which they may be thereby subjected.

These cars will reasonably accommodate fifty seated passengers, besides ten more standing on the platforms. This should be their lawful limit. The officers of the street railway company will tell us that the crowding is unavoidable, and that no more cars can possibly be run than are now operated. They will perhaps take you to the crowded crossing at Fourth avenue and Twenty-third street late in the afternoon and ask you how it would be possible to operate more cars to relieve the congested state of traffic. But I for one will answer by reminding them that in years gone by they insisted as strenuously that no relief could be given the public at "Dead Man's Curve," where they recklessly ran their cable cars in a double reverse curve at unslackened speed, and I will insist that they remedy the present state of affairs as well as the former evil, which public clamor in that case forced them to do.

It is noticeable that the crowded condition of the cross-seated cars exists in the middle of the day as well as during the rush hours. Let them then first of all operate enough cars between the rush hours to accommodate every passenger with a seat, then let them relentlessly enforce the rule that no passengers be allowed to stand within the narrow space between the seats of the cross-seated open cars.

Let us start the fight in the cause of decency and in the interest of the traveling public. Let us take as our battle cry, "No standing room in cross-seated cars," and let us persistently insist until the railway company posts a notice in every cross-seated car permitting only five passengers to each cross seat and forbidding any to stand between the seats, and sternly enforces the rule.

NEW YORK, May 25. W. N. A.

AMERICAN TRADE IN AUSTRIA.

Bohemian Glass Industry Suffering From American Competition.

WASHINGTON, May 26. Consul Mahin of Reichenberg says that the Bohemian glass industry is suffering from American competition. Not only has the market of the United States been largely lost to Bohemian manufactures, but it is apprehended in Austria that America will eventually flood European markets with glass goods. In our machinery, however, commensurate progress has not been made in that market. The Consul says:

"Not one of the thousands of factories in this district contains an American machine. None is seen on a farm—in fact, not a machine of any sort is seen there—and consequently this remains a virgin field for the introduction of United States agricultural implements. There are possibilities of introducing many of our products into this district, but none equalling those for machinery. Our machines would meet with a cordial welcome, as the United States is held in high respect by the agricultural farmers. The agricultural element might not be equally open to conviction, with the prejudices of centuries in favor of the scythe and the flail as all sufficient for the harvest of hay and grain, but, as stated, the field is absolutely virgin, and the farmers' sons, who are present everywhere in the attempts to supplant time-tried machinery with something similar but largely experimental would be encountered."

Consul Hossfeld of Trieste says that fifteen years ago whole cargoes of Bosnian prunes were shipped to New York. This export has now not only been reduced to almost nothing, but California prunes actually compete with the Bosnian product in Europe. The development of our leather trade in southern Asia has been checked to high prices. It is a strange fact, he adds, that while the importation of American sole leather is on the increase, that of American tanned kid skins is increasing. The Consul has been informed by a wholesale dealer that he sells raw Asiatic kid skins to United States tanners and buys kid leather from the same person in other words, American raw skins go to America to be tanned and then returned to Austria; they pay freight, insurance, and import duty, and yet they compete successfully with the home-tanned article.

The Consul continues:

"A good market might be established in this country for our furniture, shoes, machinery, carriages, &c., if our manufacturers would consider it worth while to send energetic agents. Undoubtedly the best successful way of selling trade abroad is by mail, but in many cases no other way will do. Nor can it be denied that satisfactory business relations are established through this channel by men possessing tact and a good position to profit by the experience of others."

An Old Weather Vane.

Henry O. Whitman, a resident of Riverhead, L. I., is the owner of a weather vane that in 1728 was on top of the County Court House, which was erected in that year in Main street. On the side of the vane the following is engraved: "Old Court House vane, made in 1728." When the new Court House was built, the contractor, who had charge of tearing down the old Court House, took the vane and placed it on top of his barn. This was about forty years ago. During a gale in November, 1900, the barn was blown down and Mr. Whitman got possession of the vane.

Psychological Cures for Sleeplessness.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I observe with interest President Hyde's "Psychological Method of Inducing sleep," which seems to consist of rubbing the stomach while opening and shutting the eyes, something after the fashion of a street urchin eating a key polly.

I venture to suggest to the learned gentleman that standing on the head and at the same time wagging the left ear is also a psychological method conducive of a tired feeling "that knocks you silly."

NEW YORK, May 26. H. B. ZEUNER.

Half Parted in the Middle.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In your valued edition of this morning, May 24, you print a declaration coming from Prof. Frederick Starr of Chicago in which the parting of the hair in the middle is denounced as a sign of degeneracy. As in all the pictures of Jesus, of the Apostles, of angels, of the kings of the nations, in fact, of the dignitaries of ancient times, the hair was always parted in the middle, I beg to differ with the learned gentleman.

NEW YORK, May 26. L. E.

Strawberry Shortcake.

From the Chicago Record-Herald.

The shortcake, the shortcake,
The berry and the cake,
The shortcake rises to meet the knife,
With its lower layer soggy
And the top a crispy brown,
And the boarders cease as they hear the call
To be fretful and cross and surly
With hope at one another and prepare to gulp it down.
The shortcake, the shortcake,
It's here again, and oh
The boarder lifts the cover
Of his piece and looks below,
To discover with despair
The old, old conditions there—
It's always short of berries and it's always long on dough.

SOUTH DAKOTA DIVORCES.

The Supreme Court Decision From the Point of View of a Sioux Falls Lawyer.

From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader.

The three cases lately decided by the Supreme Court of the United States which have caused considerable comment in the newspapers of the country have recently been officially reported and a reporter called upon Park Davis for his opinion in relation to these decisions. The reporter asked Mr. Davis what he thought about the correctness of the report of these cases sent out by the Associated Press. Mr. Davis replied that the report was entirely misleading and created a wrong impression.

"There were three cases in which a divorce granted in each of three different States was attacked," said Mr. Davis. "These cases went to the Supreme Court of the United States upon what is called a Federal question based upon the clause of the Constitution of the United States which provides that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the records and judicial proceedings of every other State. This is the only ground upon which cases of this kind can reach the Supreme Court of the United States.

"In the first of these cases, Atherton vs. Atherton, the divorce was granted in Kentucky in favor of the husband on the ground of desertion by the wife. She was then living in the State of New York. The service upon the wife was constructive service made in accordance with the laws of Kentucky. There was no question but that the husband was a bona-fide resident of Kentucky. Afterward the wife brought suit in New York for divorce from bed and board, the custody of the child and support on the ground of cruelty of the husband. The husband set up his Kentucky divorce as a bar to this action. The New York court found that the wife was not personally served in the Kentucky action and that she did not appear therein and decided that the Kentucky divorce was inoperative and void against her. This decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeals of New York. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed this decision, holding that inasmuch as the husband was a bona-fide resident of Kentucky, full faith and credit should be given to the judicial proceedings of that State in this case.

"The New Yorks courts had held by a long line of decisions that even though the proceedings in divorce cases in other States against a non-resident were regular and valid as to the plaintiff, yet if the absent defendant had no actual notice and did not appear in the action, the divorce was inoperative as to the defendant, thus producing the anomaly in such a case of a husband if he be the defendant without a wife. This doctrine the Supreme Court of the United States completely overturned, holding the marriage tie when thus severed as to one party ceases to hind the other. A husband without a wife and a wife without a husband is unknown to the law.

"In the second case, Bell vs. Bell, the divorce was granted in the court of Common Pleas in Pennsylvania in favor of the husband. Later the wife brought an action for an absolute divorce on the ground of adultery in the court of New York, where she resided. The husband appeared and set up his answer the proceedings in the Pennsylvania court by which he obtained his divorce, which proceedings recited the jurisdictional facts of residence in Pennsylvania for the statutory period of one year and constructive service in accordance with the statutes of Pennsylvania. Upon the trial of the divorce case the New York court found that the husband was not a resident of Pennsylvania, nor was the wife such a resident at the time of the granting of the Pennsylvania divorce and declared the divorce inoperative. The Supreme Court of the United States affirmed this decision and held: 'No valid divorce can be decreed by constructive service by courts of a State in which neither party is domiciled.'

"The third case, Streitwolf vs. Streitwolf, was a North Dakota divorce case. Practically the same question was decided in this case as in the Bell case, namely, the court permitted inquiry to be made into the jurisdictional question of the residence of the plaintiff in the divorce case at the time the action was brought and divorce granted, and it appearing that the plaintiff was not a bona-fide resident of North Dakota, the divorce was declared void and the Supreme Court affirmed the decision notwithstanding the record affirmatively showed such residence, thus excepting from the operation of the constitution this jurisdictional question of residence.

"The practical result of these decisions is: First—The question of actual bona fide residence of the plaintiff in divorce cases brought against absent defendants is a jurisdictional question, which may be inquired into in another State notwithstanding the affirmative recital of residence in the decree, and is not within the provisions of the constitution that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the records and judicial proceedings of every other State.

"Second—In the absence of actual fraud in other respects the question of jurisdiction is the only one in the record that can be attacked in another State.

"Third—The doctrine heretofore held in New York and two or three other States, that a divorce may be valid in favor of the plaintiff and inoperative as to an absent defendant, without actual notice, who has not appeared in the case is overruled by these decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In view of these decisions there need be no fear in relation to the validity of Dakota divorces in any State in the absence of actual fraud if the bona fides of the residence is unassailable and the proceedings are in strict accordance with the statutory provisions of the State."

FUNERY IN DIET.

The Rich Man Not So Much Better Off Than the Poor One in Eating.

From the Lancet.

Of course, the wealthy man pays a good deal more for his breakfast, luncheon, and dinner than does the poor man, but is lives physiologically and physically speaking any better for it? We doubt it.

Plain food is, on the whole, more acceptable to the economy than are rich morsels; it is very questionable whether from the strictly nutritive point of view champagne and oysters are after all is health an advance upon ginger beer and cockles, whether turtle is preferable to calf's head, or caviar to salt herring roe, or plovers' eggs superior to the ordinary eggs of the farmyard bird. But there is a vast difference between the price of champagne, say at 10 shillings a bottle, and ginger-beer at a penny a bottle, and between oysters at three shillings sixpence a dozen and cockles at 3d. for a penny, and between turtle soup at ten shillings six pence a pint and calf's-head soup at six pence a plateful.

We shall be pretty correct in stating that the man who buys common eggs instead of plovers' eggs and calf's head instead of turtle, and a pigeon instead of a partridge, is the gainer, at any rate from the economically nutritive point of view. In other words, the price of an article of food by no means sets forth its food value and the difference represented between the price of champagne and ginger beer, between a dozen of oysters and cockles, is, in the price paid for pleasing the palate, which extravagance is probably the penalty of a mental rather than of a bodily demand.

But perhaps it is akin to subscribing diamonds for souls in the cream organ. Luxurious foods are, strictly speaking, creature comforts, while plain foods are bodily necessities. It must be admitted, however, that man, as a feeding animal, and not as a reasoning creature, is apt to be guided by his appetite, and there is no doubt that, if only there must be a limit to the appropriation of food by the body, and this limit may be reached just as easily by means of good, plain and wholesome food as by food of a rarer sort.

According to this view there must be great physiological extravagance going on from day to day. In the matter of beverages the same sort of extravagance occurs. Enormous prices are given for a particular choice wine, but here, again, it is practically certain that the human economy gains little or nothing by it.

Does the man who drinks a claret of choice vintage at, say 10 shillings a bottle, derive any material advantage over the man who drinks his shilling bottle of vin ordinaire? It is doubtful. In any case, the prices asked for wines at the hotels are so enormously high and the wine offered is so often bad that this fact alone accounts for an increasing demand for whiskey as a dinner beverage. There is obviously considerable physiological sin and wantonness committed in the choice of food and in the quantity consumed.

Nothing the Matter With Kansas and Nebraska.

From the Memphis News.

No idle man is safe in Kansas or Nebraska now. He is likely to be taken up, guarded and pressed into service in the harvest fields.

GAVE HIS LIFE FOR ONE OF HIS CREW.

Details of the Death of Lieutenant-Commander Roper of the Gunboat Petrel.

WASHINGTON, May 26.—The Navy Department has received by mail full details of the death of Lieutenant-Commander Jesse M. Roper, commanding the gunboat Petrel, who was suffocated on that vessel while trying to save the life of a member of his crew. In addition to telling how Commander Roper died, the official reports show that other officers and men displayed great gallantry. Lieut. McKean and Naval Cadet Lewis particularly. The fire was discovered in the sail room of the Petrel early on the morning of March 31. Commander Roper and a number of enlisted men attempted to enter the sail room, but were driven back to the berth deck by gas and smoke. In describing how Commander Roper met his death, the executive officer of the Petrel says:

"Upon learning that one of the men, Seaman P. Toner, still remained below and was apparently unconscious, Lieutenant-Commander Roper, in spite of the earnest remonstrances of Lieut. McKean, again went into the sail room, determined to rescue Toner, being immediately preceded by Naval Cadet J. E. Lewis, the latter being desirous of making the rescue and relieving his commander of such hazardous duty. These officers were immediately followed by Jno. Kessler, landsman, and C. Flaherty, gunner's mate, third class, it appearing that those in the passageway had been overcome by the smoke and gases. A Gatling seaman was lowered in a bowline and passed up Kessler, Flaherty and Toner, although partially overcome himself. Lieut. McKean, on the sick list at the time, was then lowered with a bowline around him. He brought up first his commanding officer and afterward Mr. Lewis, being himself overcome and having to be carried on deck. He was assisted in this work below by Private L. F. Thies, United States Marine Corps, and Seaman T. Cahey. While these rescues were being made other men were with difficulty restrained from following their shipmates into the smoke and gas-filled passageway.

"Though Lieutenant-Commander Roper did not meet his death in action against the enemy, his end was even more glorious, as he gave up his life, fully realizing the danger he went into, in order that a member of his crew might live, a hero's death."

In another report the executive officer says: "I deem it fitting that the gallant conduct of Naval Cadet Lewis, in endeavoring to save life at the risk of his own and to relieve his commanding officer of such hazardous duty, should be appropriately recognized. He fearlessly and unhesitatingly exposed his life and that he is alive is undoubtedly due to his youth and vitality. In a similar manner it is deemed that appropriate recognition should be given Lieut. J. S. McKean, who, though sick and relieved from duty in consequence, yet after seeing the fatal consequence of going down into the smoke and gases, nevertheless unhesitatingly proceeded below and, a