The Sun.
WILLIAM M. LAFFAN.
SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1903.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

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

Postage to foreign countries added.
THE SUN, New York City.

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

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

The Administration Bills to Control Business.

The two anti-trust bills inspired by Attorney-General KNOX are now before the public.

One of them creates a commission empowered to probe the affairs of every corporation engaged in interstate commerce, which, under the Knox-Roosevelt theory of the power enjoyed by Congress through the interstate commerce clause, means practically every corporation in the country.

The other bill makes it unlawful to carry goods owned or produced by a corporation which, in rough terms, cuts prices. The corporation involved may offend to the value of a dollar, or it may have, or its customers may have, millions of dollars' worth of goods in transit or ready for shipment. But for that dollar's worth of offence it may pay a penalty of millions.

And what is it all for?

The Hon. GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, now one of the mightiest of trust hunters, says that no captain of industry is harming his fellow man, or is doing wrong in the eye of the law. Attorney-General KNOX maintains that monopoly is not possible in this country. Yet, an Executive demand is made upon Congress to establish a Federal policy for dealing with the country's business that is revolutionary beyond all precedent!

The Crime of Marking Down Prices.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Virginian Pilot*, thinks we were wrong in supposing that the bargain counters of the great department stores might be brought under Federal supervision by this provision in the fourth section of the Hoar Anti-Trust bill:

"Every person, corporation, joint stock company or other association engaged in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States who * * * shall give any direction to do any act for the purpose of driving out of business any other person engaged therein, or who for such purposes shall sell any article or product for less than its fair market value, or at a less price than it is accustomed to receive and demand therefor, in any other place under like conditions * * * shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor," &c.

Our Norfolk contemporary remarks concerning the effect of this provision, which makes it a misdemeanor under certain conditions to sell goods for less than the price which other dealers are charging for the same:

"As a means of attracting customers they often sell articles below the 'fair market value' and they do an interstate business. The only question would be as to whether they mark down their goods to drive their rivals out of business. This motive we do not believe could be established for the simple reason that it does not exist probably in one case in a thousand."

That question involves the whole philosophy of competition. An enterprising competitor puts down prices, sometimes even below cost, in order to attract to his own establishment the patrons of his rivals in trade. Ever since retail commerce began, this practice has been regarded not only as legitimate, but even as beneficial to the consumer. The underlying motive of competitive business is to get away the rival's customers, and thus, although not avowedly, the logical conclusion is to drive him out of business. If he is not driven out of business it is because he successfully retaliates with the same or equivalent weapons.

Now, keeping the bargain-counter inducement in view, at just what point does the process of attracting custom by marking down goods beneath the prices prevailing "in any other place" cease to be a legitimate expedient of enterprise and become a moral and legal wrong, fit to be punished with a fine of $5,000 or by a year in jail, or by both? The motive, as we have said, is to attract some or all of the rival's customers away from his counters to the counters of the marker down. If the enterprise is ideally successful the rival will indeed be driven out of that particular business, for he will have no customers left. Just how many customers, or what percentage of the rival's total clientage, is it permissible to toll away from the other establishment—or "place," as Mr. HOAR's bill puts it—without incurring guilt and criminal responsibility for an intention to drive the other establishment out of business?

We admit again what we remarked in the first instance, namely, that it might be difficult to establish the "criminal" motive of the misdemeanant and marker down. But the metaphysical subtleties involved in such an inquiry as to motive have nothing to do with the main point we made concerning the Hoar bill and the bargain counters.

The point is this: Even if the criminal motive in question, as the *Virginian Pilot* surmises, "does not exist probably in one case in a thousand," its possible existence is conceded in the bill, and is thereby made the crux of the investigation; and in any particular case where that motive is alleged, justly or unjustly, against a department store in New York selling goods to customers in New Jersey or Connecticut, the accused establishment at once becomes the subject of limitless Federal inquisition. The Attorney-General may require of its proprietors "*any statement he may think fit* in regard to the conduct of its business." We are here quoting the exact language of the Hoar bill.

Fortunately that bill is as dead already as TUBAL CAIN; as dead, even, as its great competitor and rival, the Cullom bill, for the extinguishment of monopoly, including monopoly in patent rights. But there has not yet perished with the Hoar bill all hope on the part of the trust-repressors of embodying in some form in some legislative measure the amazing new doctrine that it is one of the proper functions of Government, and of the Federal Government at that, to supervise all private business with a view to maintaining prices at "the fair market value" and preventing competitors from underselling each other.

A philosopher awaking now after a three years' sleep, and remembering only the archaic arguments for Governmental control for the prevention of monopoly and extortionate prices, would wonder what tornado of topsy-turvy had struck the twentieth-century sociologists of the school in which the Hon. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD and the Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT are the acknowledged master thinkers.

Aged Before Their Time.

We have looked on our navy as "new" for so many years that it comes with a sort of shock to learn that some of our warships, even though built since 1884, require large expenditure of money for alterations if they are to be kept profitably on the navy list.

Of the Philadelphia, which has recently been attached to the Pacific squadron, but has just gone out of commission, the *Army and Navy Journal* remarks:

"The proposition to dispose of the Philadelphia, or to assign the vessel to receiving ship duty, meets with the hearty approval of all officers who have had the misfortune to serve on that vessel. It is a healthy sign of the improved conditions in our naval service when a ship no older than the Philadelphia is detached from active service and relegated to the junk pile or to harbor service."

When the Brooklyn was built, she was looked on as the most powerful protected cruiser afloat, and wherever she was sent attracted professional attention. But during the last seven years naval progress has made enormous strides, and to modernize her completely will cost at least $1,000,000, and take more than a year's time. Her magazines will have to be changed, her batteries replaced with guns of newer model, the rotating machinery of her turrets changed, so that electricity may be used instead of steam, and all of her auxiliary engines will need to be renewed.

At least two other vessels of comparatively recent date, the Columbia, built in 1892, and the Minneapolis, built in 1893, are practically obsolete, and have been, in fact, failures from the beginning, owing to the enormous cost of keeping them in commission. Of the older vessels, most of which are small ships, the gunboats are not yet obsolete; but the Chicago spent two years in the Brooklyn navy yard undergoing alterations, and large sums have been spent on others of the earlier cruisers to fit them to modern requirements.

The Indiana, Massachusetts and Oregon were launched nearly nine years ago; the Iowa, seven years ago. They are becoming old, as battleships go, and when they go to the junk pile, or become targets for the guns of their younger sisters, their places must be filled. Not only must new vessels be built to increase the navy to its proper strength, but the places of time-worn ships must be filled.

The Cook and the Clergyman.

Too many lectures on cooking may spoil the broth; but they are a good sign. In all that all-enfolding science, sociology, is there a more momentous compartment than cookery? The amount of talking and writing now spent upon this compartment shows how near it is to the heart and gizzard of the world. A new cook book is published every day. The newspapers are piled high with bills of fare and recipes. Cookery clinics and demonstrations, courses on course dinners, colleges of domestic and culinary science, abound. The children learn practical housewifery and gas-range lore in the schools. Our maidens try their hands at everything from "fudge" to filets. Many men pride themselves upon their skill as *chefs* and inflict much suffering on their patient friends. If ever there was a large area of good cooking there is one now; yet there has seldom been more jeremiahing over the decadence or general low state of the art. As men interested in preserving the fading traditions of masculine superiority, we have no wish to attack the utterances of the masculine sages, but we can't help feeling that in the matter of cooking there are men and brethren and amateurs who talk too much.

Here is our distinguished reforming friend and municipal expert, the Rev. THOMAS ROBERTS SLICER. We venerate Dr. SLICER when he is slicing away at municipal corruption or waving the gonfalon of reform, but how can we follow him when he says that "many men are driven to drink by the poor cooking at home?" Anybody would think that man is naturally an abstinent and ascetic being, whom only privation, great grief, malnutrition or some severe mental or physical stress can "drive" to the flagon. The truth is that no man has to be driven thither. He runs freely and gladly. All over the world you find him stuffing himself with drinks or drugs or chewing curious roots to stupefy or exalt himself. He will take placidly all the excuses you will provide for him. He likes to be considered ill-used and misunderstood. The cooking at home is so bad that his stomach is irritated. He flies to the saloon as a refuge. He doesn't drink because he likes it. O, no! His wife is such a bad cook. Did you ever study ailourology or the science of cats, Dr. SLICER? Did you ever notice how the house cat, no matter how delicately nurtured and cream-fed, will go and forage at ash heaps? So the poor unfortunate man, victim of unscientific cooking, will rush to the rum house, pour many fingers of that which profiteth not into his inwards and gobble joyously the horrible mongrel anonymities of the free lunch. It is rather a favorite theory of the sociologists, we believe, that bad cooking is a purveyor of the ginmills. So hard it is to admit that folks drink because they like it. "I smoke," says somebody in that ancient classic, "Rollo's Journey to Cambridge," "for a cruel nervous disease."

Our next station is Chicago. Thursday the Rev. JENKINS LLOYD JONES, a famous orator and political economist of that town, spoke at a meeting of the National Housewives' Association, an institution we can never grow tired of praising. We revere the National Housewives, and we have no objection to the Rev. JENKINS LLOYD JONES when he sticks to his last, but can we approve him when he spins false conclusions like these:

"Three hundred and fifty women listened to a talk I made on BROWNING at an Evanston woman's club yesterday, and there are only thirty to listen to me talk on housewives. This attendance shows the trend of the thought of to-day. Women are nowadays occupied with discussions of BROWNING when they ought to be teaching their daughters how to bake bread."

The Evanston women thought that Mr. JONES might know something new and precious about the everlasting ROBERT. So they came in force to hear the Browning talk. But, without any disrespect to Mr. JONES's undoubted talents, what does he know about housewives? He is an amateur before a jury of experts. The National Housewives, and most of the rest of the innumerable clubwomen of Cook county assert, in the words of the time-honored joke, that they "know just as much about browning the hash as about BROWNING, the poet." They assert, and Mr. JONES can't deny successfully until he has made a house-to-house canvass, that their households are well ordered, their husbands well fed, well groomed, well pleased, and their daughters educated all the way from WAGNER to washing. Such is what Mr. JONES would call "the trend" of National Housewife thought in Chicago. Mr. JONES, careless of his danger, went on to say:

"When I talk on a subject like this I shut my eyes for fear I may see a housewife in the audience. The modern girls spend hours at their pianos and easels, but they are ashamed to be seen presiding over a kitchen range. Girls who go to Vassar and Smith and other colleges think it's a good joke if a cake 'falls' after they have wasted hours of labor on it, but I tell you it's no joke at all—it's an everlasting disgrace, an unmitigated shame."

Here is much waste of good indignation. Ever since we can remember we have been reading dismal or pathetic preachments, foreign and domestic, about the supreme uselessness of the American women and girls. Girls and women, and especially the former, have been painted as luxurious, lazy, selfish, ornamental, ignorant of housekeeping. Whatever of truth lay in the indictment once, there is less truth than ever in it now. The extent of feminine accomplishment is greater than ever. A whole world of athletics has arisen. The dawdling, delicate girl has mostly disappeared. Sounder sense has come with sounder bodies. Girls are trained with a view to their future position as the superintendents of households. We venture to say that if every wealthy family in New York woke up poor this morning, the resources of each impoverished house in the way of self-support and knowledge of the means of making a livelihood would be sufficient in most cases. As for the Smith and Vassar girls and the rest of the learned ladies, they are a good deal more practical than Mr. JONES supposes. It is a curious fact that a certain disinclination to marriage and a fondness for independence and their own career now noticeable in many educated young women, are often or usually accompanied by a knowledge of housekeeping. Women are growing more and more competent; but even if they were as incompetent as Mr. JONES thinks, they would be too clever to let him find it out.

Two Jacksons.

In Cleveland, the capital of the Hon. TOM JOHNSON, there will be two distinct celebrations of Jackson Day. "The Democrats of Cuyahoga county will assemble at the Hollender Hotel on Jackson Day." So say the conservatives; and they declare with good reason, so far as Democratic principles were represented by JACKSON, that "the other fellows are not Democrats." "The Democrats of Cuyahoga county will hold a banquet at the Kennard House on Jackson Day." So say the Johnsonians, and they are in the majority in Cleveland, and they have good local reason for asserting that "the other fellows are not Democrats."

To a greater or less extent the same state of things is found wherever there are Democrats. There are in reality two Democratic parties, differing widely in their notion of Democratic policies. Both are able to exalt ANDREW JACKSON as a Democratic hero and a typical upholder of Democratic principles. So there are two ANDREW JACKSONS, one the historical character, the other a creation of myth and legend, a curious figure constructed by Bryanite and Johnsonite. Socialism, anti-imperialism and bad-moneyism were no part of the genuine Old Hickory. Some of the gentlemen who are loudest in his praise are farthest from his political belief and practice.

Excellent is the plan of the Yale department of experimental psychology to collect all the American dialects by means of voice-recording machines. At last we shall be able to catch a dialect as it falls, to get the real tang and edge of it and to avoid artificial and manufactured forms supposed to be dialect. Our friends the novelists will have to add to their studies. Has there ever been a printed page of dialect in the novelists' books that was satisfactory or convincing? One trouble is there is usually too much of it, too thick a hunk of supposed Yankee, middle Georgian, eastern Tennessee. Another trouble is that no uniform system of phonetics is adopted. The forms look spurious. But the literary use of dialect is an unimportant detail, which many of us feel to be a bore. Every student of local peculiarities will be interested in a reproduction of the different American dialects. Probably all of us use unconsciously some percentage of provincial and local words or pronunciations. In old age, especially, there is often a reversion to the outgrown and discarded words, phrases or irregularities of syntax picked up in youth.

Our New Pensioner.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I present Frisby Sprouts of this city, just put upon the national pension list. S. C.

PROVIDENCE, Jan. 8.

THE NEW ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

His Personality, Attainments and Ecclesiastical Views.

A telegram this afternoon informs us that the new Archbishop of Canterbury, succeeding the late Dr. Temple, is the Rt. Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, D. D., Bishop of Winchester. Although it is an appointment which will commend itself to Englishmen throughout the world, it is one which will probably take the English Church by surprise; and for this reason: When Archbishop Benson of Canterbury died, in December, 1896, Dr. Davidson was offered the Archbishopric by Queen Victoria through the Prime Minister, and the nomination was declined, chiefly on account of health. Consequently, since Dr. Temple's death the English Church papers have mentioned as popular candidates Dr. Ingram, Bishop of London, who is a great worker and preacher and a special favorite of King Edward, by whom he was invited to preach the coronation sermon; Dr. Moule, the scholarly Bishop of Durham, a decided Low Churchman, and Dr. Boyd Carpenter, the eloquent Bishop of Ripon. The usual translation to Canterbury is from London, but Dr. Ingram is only a young man of 45, and excessive youth (if not excessive earnestness and energy) is an impediment in the way of such an appointment as Primate of All England.

Dr. Davidson is ten years older than the Bishop of London, and has practically served a long apprenticeship for the office, having been chaplain and private secretary to two Archbishops of Canterbury. When a curate of Dartford, Kent, Archbishop Tait appointed him his secretary, in 1877, and when Archbishop Benson was appointed to Canterbury Dr. Davidson retained the office of secretary for six months. Queen Victoria not only made him one of her honorary chaplains, but also appointed him Dean of Windsor, an ecclesiastical office always held by a Court favorite. In April, 1891, he was consecrated Bishop of Rochester, and soon afterward he became "Clerk of the Closet to the Queen;" and it will be remembered that in this capacity Bishop Davidson ministered to the aged Queen in her last moments at Osborne House.

In July, 1895, Bishop Davidson was nominated Bishop of Winchester, a see which in the English Church ranks next to London. As Bishop of Winchester he has been popular among the clergy as an exceedingly broad and liberal administrator. In personal appearance Dr. Davidson is an attractive man, of medium height, clean-shaven, and with a singularly kind and sympathetic countenance. He is a Harrow boy, and a graduate of Trinity College, Oxford. During his university career he was seriously incapacitated from active work by a gunshot accident, so that he did not take a position in "honors"—a very unusual circumstance in the education of an Archbishop of Canterbury, and a manifest disadvantage in a successor of such an eminent scholar as the late Dr. Temple.

Like his predecessors in office for the last two centuries, he comes from the middle class, and not from the nobility. His father is Mr. Henry Davidson of Muirhouse, Edinburgh, and the Archbishop will, therefore, be classed as a Scotchman. In 1878 Dr. Davidson acted as secretary of the great Lambeth Conference of 100 Bishops, and although he was but a young clergyman of only four years' standing in the ministry, on him devolved in a very large measure the world-wide arrangements necessary for that great gathering. He was also secretary of the succeeding Conferences, and is consequently well known to the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in America.

The calling of the Lambeth Conference was opposed by the then Archbishop of York and by five of the English Bishops, and it is admitted by all that it was Mr. Davidson's wise and judicious conduct, as secretary, which brought about the great Conference in due time. In his account of the first Conference Dr. Davidson records the fact that the Bishop of Illinois's "great sermon" at the Conference was exceedingly wordy and that he believed that if the good American Bishop had had in his possession "the New Dictionary containing 4,000 new words, just published," he would have gone on forever! Dr. Davidson has published a history of these Conferences, and several articles in English magazines.

In 1891 Mr. Davidson married Miss Edith Tait, a daughter of Archbishop Tait, and on the death of Dr. Tait he, in conjunction with Canon Benham, wrote a biography of his distinguished father-in-law. It is in these two volumes of the "Biography of Archibald Campbell Tait" that we discern not only the literary ability of the new Archbishop, but also his keen sense of humor.

He writes: "I remember my bewilderment when, one afternoon, a few days after I had settled at Lambeth, the Archbishop rebuked me seriously for a temporary absence which had prevented him, he said, from despatching an urgent and important letter because I had not seen it. Seeing my surprise, he added: 'I have never, if I could help it, written a single letter of importance without giving it to somebody to pick holes in; for I often find the silliest people are the best critics.'"

On one occasion the Archbishop said to him, "Davidson, write and tell that man he is a consummate ass, but do it very kindly."

Those who, like the present writer, have met Dr. Davidson, have always been impressed with his manliness of character, his true sense of humor, his gentlemanlike bearing and his sincere piety; so that King Edward VII. may be credited with the selection of the right man for Archbishop of Canterbury. The appointment is undoubtedly made by the King. The Archbishop ranks next to the Royal Princes. He is expected to be present at the birth of the heir to the throne; he is usually the person upon whom falls the duty of informing the sovereign of his accession to the throne; he is the one who solemnizes the baptisms, confirmations, marriages and burials of royalty; he is the chief official at a coronation of a King or Queen; he is always the trusted adviser of the King.

The Archbishop lives in almost kingly dignity at Lambeth Palace, and his income is $75,000 a year, exclusive of fees and perquisites. He represents in his person a long line of statesmen and ecclesiastics from the days of Augustine, from whom he is ninety-sixth in succession. He occupies a position in the State made famous by such men as Dunstan, Stigand, Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket, Langton, Cranmer and Laud.

It can hardly be expected that Dr. Randall Thomas Davidson will make a "great Archbishop," but he probably possesses those gifts so necessary at a time when the Church of England may be said to be fighting a battle with the people of England for its status as a permanent national institution.

I should add that the new Archbishop when Bishop of Rochester expressed a desire to take part in the opening of Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle; but he was advised by some of his Church friends to change his mind and withdraw the offer. When Mr. Spurgeon died Dr. Davidson followed him to the grave and gave the benediction. It will, therefore, be seen that he is a man of a liberal school of Churchmanship, or what I should call a "Broad-Church Evangelical"—in fact, of the same views as those of his distinguished predecessor, the lamented Archbishop Temple. B. D. OXON.

NEW YORK, Jan. 8.

PAY OF NAVAL CHAPLAINS.

A Plea That These Officers Be Treated as Other Officers Are.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* From an article which appeared in the *Interior* on Dec. 11 I wish to quote the following as explaining the purpose of this note: "In 1899 a bill was presented in Congress to remedy the inequality in the treatment of our navy and of our army, by making the pay of all naval officers of the line and of the sea-going staff, when at sea, equal to the pay of army officers of the same rank, and when on shore, 15 per cent. less. In the course of the passage of this bill through the House of Representatives the naval Chaplains, who were included in the bill passed by the Senate, were excluded from the benefit of its provisions."

I am convinced that if the fair-minded American voters become aware of what has occurred they will bring such pressure to bear upon their Representatives in Congress as to undo what seems to me a great wrong. Why should a discrimination be made against the Chaplains in the navy? As I understand it, it is not the question of pay which troubles them. It is the fact that a definite and distinct stigma has been placed upon them. They are marked out and set apart for a peculiar and unjustifiable slight. The practical result of this is to make their work more difficult and less efficient. The work of an individual Chaplain is hard enough at the best. The conditions of life on a great ship are not generally supposed to be particularly favorable to the cultivation of religion. So the Chaplain, if there is to be a Chaplain at all, should not have obstacles placed in his way. He ought to hold such a position as will command the respect, not only of the officers, but also of the men. But he cannot win and hold this respect if the Government of the United States places him at a disadvantage by singling him out for this sort of unjust discrimination. There may be some who are opposed to the existence of any Chaplains whatever in our national service. If this be the prevailing sentiment among the better portion of the American people, well and good; in that event, let Congress assume the full right and responsibility of abolishing that corps. But, at the present moment, that is not the question at issue. That corps has existed by provision of our national statutes for over a century, and if it is to remain as one of the coördinate branches of our naval service, I can see no earthly reason why its members should not be treated with the same kind of respect as the officers in any other department of the service. I appeal, then, to all readers of this letter to consider carefully the principle involved. Either take steps to abolish Chaplains entirely, or else bring pressure upon Congress such a pressure as shall lead it to undo this act of injustice. I do not mean by this to cast any slur upon the members of the House of Representatives. I have no reason to suppose that they intended any injustice. They probably did not sufficiently consider the practical results of the exception which they made. I believe, therefore, that when the matter is properly brought to their attention, they will not only be willing, but glad to make the amends which the case requires.

M. J. SAVAGE.

CHURCH OF MESSIAH STUDY, Jan. 8.

RICHMOND BOROUGH.

It Needs and Manhattan Needs a Better Ferry.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The taking care of the vast multitude of people from the downtown offices and business section of New York is one of the greatest problems with which the city has ever had to deal, and each day the situation is becoming more serious. Nature, however, has made provision by which the gates can be thrown open and the congested condition relieved if we will but accept nature's relief. Just at the foot of Manhattan, within fifteen minutes of the Battery, is the prettiest residential section of the vast city. With its fine elevation and beautiful views, it is most inviting and attractive.

One thing is necessary to open wide the gates which have been practically closed during the years of the great growth of the city to the north.

Large numbers of people would gladly make this beautiful Staten Island their home in preference to attempting to reach Harlem or Brooklyn through the jam during the "rush hours" taking in preference a lovely sail of fifteen minutes over the beautiful bay. If the island could be reached with the ease modern appliances make possible.

This one essential thing needed is a ferry system that is adequate, fully up to date, with the best modern machinery and conveniences. Staten Island has reason to expect a guaranteed fifteen-minute trip across the bay with favorable tides, and not longer than twenty minutes as a maximum time; frequent trips, all day and all-night service. It was promised, and even now I understand a proposition is in the hands of the Commissioner of Docks and Ferries, submitted to him by H. H. Rogers of the Standard Oil Company, in which he agrees to do all this and even more. He says he will operate two ferries which shall meet the wishes of the residents of Staten Island. A number of public meetings have been held, at all of which the halls were crowded to overflowing, and at each meeting resolutions were adopted unanimously asking the Commissioner and the Mayor of the city to use their influence in securing the franchise for Mr. Rogers in accordance with his proposal. If the Mayor of the city, who has promised to aid the Staten Island people by giving them modern ferry accommodations, has any doubt as to the wishes of the people or if he thinks the people of this borough are uncertain in reference to that which they demand by petitions, through committees, and resolutions adopted unanimously at public meetings, let him submit the question of granting the franchise to H. H. Rogers, according to his proposal, to the people. I admit it is expensive to hold a special election, but each can to make a mistake in a question that will determine the development of Staten Island for twenty-five years, there should be no hesitation concerning the expense. A mistake must be avoided.

Personal interests must be put aside, favorite localities cannot be considered. The best interest of the whole the welfare of the city only must be considered. The present administration will be held responsible in its action in this matter. H. H. Rogers is willing to give the service. We ask, then, why for any reason should the franchise be withheld? He does not ask an exclusive franchise; he is willing to let others operate a ferry, if they wish. Previous administrations as well as the present have made most flattering promises to the Staten Island people, up to the present these promises have terminated as they began—all promises.

BOROUGH.

The Post Office and the City.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In to-day's issue of THE SUN appears the following statement made by a member of the Rapid Transit Commission: "It was not until we found out for them that the Government knew it owned certain property adjacent to the building." A similar statement, made by another member of the commission, appeared a few weeks ago in the columns of the *Times*.

The members of the commission are in error if they believe the Federal officials in this city were not fully informed as to the exact lines of the Post Office reservation before the subway work was begun. A copy of the deed transferring the property to the Government, also a sketch showing the plot, has been on file in this office for many years and has been referred to dozens of times before the subway work was undertaken.

On May 9, 1901, the chief engineer of the commission wrote the custodian of the Post Office that "the work of the Rapid Transit Commission will necessitate the removal of the northeast corner of the vault at the Post Office at the intersection of Park row and Mail street. Will you kindly have any material stored there removed?" This communication was referred to me for consideration and reply. On May 11 I accordingly notified the commission that unless they showed a permit from the Honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, they would not be permitted to proceed with their work beside the line of the Government reservation.

Under date of June 3, 1901, the chief engineer of the commission wrote me that "on receipt of your letter of May 11, relating to proposed work of the Rapid Transit Commission in connection with the vaults of the Post Office, I had a survey made in order to show, as I supposed was the fact, that the vaults of the Post Office were located on New York city property, and that therefore the United States Government was in the same position as any other property holder occupying the streets of New York under a revocable license. On making the survey I find that, apparently, the Post Office has not been built up to the full lines of the Government property. * * * I regret that I did not answer your letter before, but the survey that we made was such a surprise to me that I deemed it best to confer with counsel of the board in the first instance.

As a matter pertinent to the limits of the Post Office property, I would state that the Government reservation projects 25 feet 11½ inches beyond the building line on Mail street side, or about 12 feet 8 inches farther than the outer edge of the present mailing platform. With the exception, therefore, of this narrow strip of surface of Mail street, i. e., about 12 feet 6 inches along the mailing platform, the Federal authorities are in no way responsible for the wretched street conditions which have existed there for several years. That is a matter which rests with the municipality of New York.

ALFRED BROOKS FRY,
Chief Engineer and Superintendent of Repairs.

NEW YORK, J. 9.

What Killed the Cow.

From the Richmond (Ky.) Pantagraph.

A cow belonging to Bud Bowlin devoured twenty-three twists of tobacco a few nights ago and died in less than an hour. Tobacco users, however, declare that she died simply because she didn't know how to spit.

A Street-Car Fantasy.

The lady in the street car
Was hanging to the strap
So strongly that the leather
Felt sure that it would snap.

"You have a pull, I notice,"
The strap said, low and sweet.
"Perhaps," she said, "but scarcely
Enough to get a seat."

L'ENVOI.

And forty seven men, as they comfortably read their papers, swore to themselves that they didn't hear the conversation. W. J. L.

ANTI-TRUST.

Notes by a Sarcastic Observer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* These are indeed the golden days for the expediency philosopher. As kings "cured" scrofula by the laying-on of hands, so legislation is looked upon by many as the specific for all ailments, or imaginary ailments, of the body politic. The process of evolution, economic laws and adaptation are not recognized, and legislative nostrums are to the front. To Hades with all else!

Who cares for Constitutional limitations? Who cares that Government order is controlled by ethical laws? Who cares about the lessons taught by the experience of ancient Church and State—Rome, Greece and Germany, France and England in the last half dozen centuries—in trying to regulate and control private business? Who cares for personal liberty? Who cares whether the Government turns from protector to aggressor? Who cares whether our statesmen, empowered by the Constitution, laws and ethics to do certain things, jump the bounds of restraint, and do certain other things? And who cares by what authority they do it, so long as they *feel* that it should be done?

Let us give free rein to our legislative sciolists and carte blanche to our political empirics. Let us replace the divine right of kings and popular majorities by the divine right of Congress. Let us believe that right and wrong, good and bad, are made by Presidential fiat. Let our modern Don Quixotes be supreme.

All hail to the Terrible Destroyers of economic and evolutionary laws! Dragoon personal liberty! Rip! Bang! at the Constitution! Down with ethics! On with a Quixotic rush!

By the Great Lord Harry, drink a few gallons of nerve medicine, grab your pen, bawl and bellow, and get into the swim. He is the best who brays the loudest and walks on ears the furthest, so whoop her up and stir your stumps skyward! G. H. M.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., Jan. 9.

The Mule Judicially Declared Treacherous.

From the Cleveland Leader.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., Jan. 5.—The Western Missouri Court of Appeals to-day decided that a mule is a treacherous and vicious animal, and that so well known is this fact that if a workman is injured because of those traits of disposition in the mule, the employer cannot plead ignorance of the mule's nature as a defence.

This decision was made in the case of Pete Borden against the Falk Construction Company. Borden worked for the company. He went beneath a heavy machine on wheels to hook a chain. A span of mules was hitched to the machine, and while Borden was beneath it the driver of the mules was ordered by the superintendent to go beneath the machine to help Borden. Thereupon the mules started and one of the machine's wheels ran over Borden's foot and crushed it. He sued the Falk company and obtained judgment that was affirmed by the Court of Appeals, which says:

"The mule is a domestic animal whose treacherous and vicious nature is so generally known that even courts may take notice of it. The company cannot be heard to claim that it did not know of the treacherous and unreliable qualities of this animal. It seems to us that the defendant was guilty of grossest negligence in ordering the teamster to assist Borden. Any man of ordinary prudence, under such circumstances, would have not only placed himself in front of the mules, but he would with his hands have firmly grappled and held the bridle bits of each of them."

Marie Dressler Thanks Her Friends.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* May I trespass a little further upon your indulgence and, while thanking you for the valuable space given to making known the Dressler benefit arrangements and promoting its success, be allowed to express my sincerest gratitude to all of press, public and profession who have rallied to my aid? Even a siege of typhoid has its compensations when it brings the loving remembrances and ministrations of so many about one.

I cannot adequately thank Mr. Oscar Hammerstein for donating outright his Victoria Theatre, nor Mr. Charles J. Ross, in whose kindly heart the thought originated and who with Messrs. Fisher & Ryley and Mr. John R. Considine has worked untiringly in my behalf. All who understand the worriment of stage management will appreciate my feelings toward Mr. Sam Bernard, and surely no less am I indebted to Mr. Maurice Levi for organizing and directing so capable an orchestra, nor can I forget Mr. Hugh Chilvers upon whom fell the secretarial labors of the undertaking.

I trust that all kind friends will accept this acknowledgment of letters, flowers and messages, which have been too many to reply to singly. My best wish for them is that they may never have typhoid nor need a benefit, but if they do—well—New York city will generally find me. Gratefully, faithfully,

NEW YORK, Jan. 7. MARIE DRESSLER.

Sound Advice About a Negro Policy.

From the Philadelphia Record.

Dr. Crum's nomination to be Collector of the Port of Charleston purports to be in the interest of the colored race. But that race lives in the South, and is going to stay there, and it is vastly more important to the negroes to maintain amicable relations with the white people than to have half a dozen of their number in Federal offices. Of course, the President had a right to nominate Dr. Crum, and he had a right to close temporarily the post office at Indianola, Miss. But both acts tend to irritate the white people and to create enmities between them and the colored people. Race prejudice may be lamentable, but it is a fact, and statesmen take note of facts. It is a fact not only in our Southern States, but wherever the white and the dark races come together. It may possibly be outgrown, but it can not be destroyed, and it is only aggravated by direct attack. The President is not a wise friend of the colored people.

Kentucky Society Wanted.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I observe that Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other States have "colonies," or "societies" in New York, and I would like to inquire if there is a Kentucky society here? If not, why not, for surely there are Kentuckians in New York city suitable for the foundation of a society second to none of them—and such a society as Col. Watterson might find above the reproach of his pen. KENTUCKIAN.

IRVING PLACE, Jan. 8.

Decided in the Negative.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* After the dinner of the Clothiers' Association a few of us met and considered whether Mr. Low was or wasn't. It was unanimously decided that he wasn't.

NEW YORK, Jan. 8. PURITAN.

Butter, Butter.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I know you have your troubles; but think of me—mine is such a sad tale.

After nine years of married life we have gradually given up the more frivolous things, such as dancing, &c., but dine out more than ever, averaging, say four nights a week. And after a man is 50, what he grows just the least bit anxious for his comforts—so to speak.

Personally I have no taste for liquor, though my kind friends have it on the table wherever I dine, but I am very fond of butter, which, I regret to say, is not served at course dinners.

Much as I should like to please my wife, I cannot keep on eating dinners where butter is not served. What can I do? Surely, some of the high priced staff of THE SUN, who devote hours to the subject of pie, can suggest a remedy. To emphasize my points permit me to put it in verse:

BUTTER.

When I'm invited out to dine
You'd always hear me mutter:
"I trust my host will recollect
I'm very fond of butter."

I sometimes eat of oysters,
But never soup or fish;
The right accompaniment
If I've butter on my dish.

I'll take a bit of roast beef
If I've bread and butter, too,
But if the butter's missing
The roast for me won't do.

I eat the birds and salad,
Yet always pass the cheese,
But like the crackers that attend,
With butter—if you please.

Now, if you read this poem of mine
And want me to your supper,
Just "cut" the lobster, sweets and wine,
But try and have some butter.

NEW YORK, Jan. 7. A. P. H.

CITY CIVIL SERVICE RULES.

State Civil Service Commission Approves Several Amendments.

ALBANY, Jan. 9.—The State Civil Service Commission to-day approved a number of amendments to the New York city civil service rules requested by the city administration. One amendment provides that no person who has held a place on the preferred eligible list under the Charter shall be eligible for reinstatement for any period after date, thus avoiding a two years' period of eligibility for reinstatement which has heretofore existed. The amendment will apply only to such persons who have received permanent appointments and who have been removed for no reason of misconduct or negligence.

The municipal commission is empowered to extend the period of reinstatement in the case of persons who have resigned to enlist in the army or navy in times of war.

Another amendment suspends, so far as it applies to the next examination for patrolmen, the rule providing that no person who has entered an examination for a position in the classified services and failed shall be admitted within nine months to a new examination for the same position.

The employment, under special exemption, of Edward S. Cole as an expert under the Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity, to measure the water waste in New York city, at a salary of $1,800, is permitted by the commission.

The crews for the three steam dumpers in the Department of Street Cleaning are placed in the non-competitive class, as well as the position of master-at-arms in the nautical school under the Department of Education, and the two chaplains in Bellevue and allied hospitals.

COUNTERFEIT COIN IN MANILA.

Customs Officers Trace It to a Chinese Firm and Seize About $50,000 Worth.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9.—Advices received at the War Department from Manila are that the authorities have discovered the sources from which counterfeit Mexican money has been introduced into the Philippines. The customs officers have traced the counterfeit money to a well-known firm of Chinese money changers and captured boxes containing about $50,000 worth of spurious coin, which was shipped to Manila from China in the steamship Rubi and consigned to the firm of Rip & Co., who have done a large business in money changing.

The boxes were received at the customs house, and when Lee Cheng Onn called to get them Collector Shuster had the boxes opened. The top layer of each box consisted of good American money, but beneath the American dollars were thousands of Mexican pesos of excellent imitation. The coin was confiscated and an investigation begun.

The authorities have not yet succeeded in ascertaining the firm in China by whom the shipment was made, but they are satisfied that they have discovered the channel through which the counterfeits have passed into circulation.

ADJT.-GEN. CORBIN MANDAMUSED

To Show Cause Why Certain Lieutenants Should Not Receive Higher Rank.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9.—A writ of mandamus, issued by the District of Columbia Supreme Court, was served on Adjutant General Corbin to-day at the War Department requiring him to show cause why First Lieut. Frank B. Edwards and Second Lieut. Henry M. Doughtery of the Artillery Corps should not receive higher rank in the army in accordance with the Act of Congress of 1901 providing for the appointment of lieutenants.

The writ of mandamus is the result of agitation begun in the army several months ago by a number of lieutenants, who contend that they have not the rank to which they are entitled and that some officers have a higher standing on the lineal list than is justified under the law. Secretary Root was made a party to the petition, but being absent from the city could not be served.

The papers in the case were to-day referred to Judge Advocate General Davis, who will prepare the necessary reply and appear in court in defence of the War Department.

THE TAX ON SAVINGS BANKS.

Comptroller Recommends That Securities Be Taxed at Their Market Value.

ALBANY, Jan. 9.—A change in the law passed last year at the instigation of Gov