The Sun.

WILLIAM M. LAFFAN.

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1903.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 57
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.

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 Fourth Article of the Treaty.

The publication of the full text of the Hay-Herran Treaty reveals something more than a business agreement with Colombia and an arrangement of terms and conditions as to the canal.

Article IV. of the treaty is a declaration of the general policy of the United States with regard not only to Colombia, but also to all the other republics in the Western Hemisphere. After covenanting that the rights and privileges acquired by the United States on the Isthmus shall not affect the sovereignty of Colombia over the canal territory, Article IV. proceeds as follows:

"The United States freely acknowledges and recognizes the sovereignty and disavows any intention to impair it in any way whatever, or to increase its territory at the expense of Colombia or of any of the sister republics of Central or South America, but, on the contrary, it desires to strengthen the power of the republics on this continent and to promote, develop and maintain their prosperity and independence."

True and meritorious as is the statement of the disinterested and friendly intentions of the United States regarding the sister republics, from Mexico all the way down to the tip ends of Chile and Argentina, the proper place for the declaration would seem to be in the speech of a Secretary of State at a Pan-American banquet or in a President's message rather than in such a specific contract as is now before the Senate for ratification. Indeed, in both of Mr. ROOSEVELT'S annual messages to Congress the same general disavowal of aggressive intentions in Central and South America has been formulated in similar language.

The business of the present treaty is with Colombia only. Stipulations concerning her sovereignty are proper, if required by her, but they have already been made in the preceding article of the treaty. There is no objection to their repetition in general form in the first part of Article IV. It is not conceivable, however, that Colombia has been holding off in order to extract a perpetual pledge from this nation concerning its attitude toward Paraguay, Peru or Costa Rica; or even that Colombia cares whether our benevolent and altruistic sentiments concerning the rest of the hemisphere find expression or not in this particular instrument.

Article IV. looks less like a necessary concession in return for the canal rights we obtain by treaty than like an interpolated declaration, supplementary to the Monroe Doctrine and intended not for Colombia in particular, but for the world in general.

There is a place and time for everything. Such a treaty as this is a specific contract in which the statement of general truths, however obvious, but not essential to the business in hand, may be superfluous and sometimes imprudent. When a man signs a deed for record for all time, binding himself and his heirs not to take improper advantage of a right of way purchased from a neighbor, he does not think it necessary to introduce a disavowal of designs upon the land of his other neighbors or a declaration of his good will toward the entire community. However harmless the unnecessary engagement appears at the time, it may become under unforeseen conditions a source of embarrassment through a perversion by others of its meaning.

Who suggested Article IV.? Evidently not Colombia. It is not like the later style of the Secretary of State. And Mr. TELLER is in Colorado.

France in North Africa.

An article entitled "Our Frontiers in North Africa: Tripolitaine-Morocco," which appeared about a fortnight ago in the *Revue Politique et Parlementaire*, deserves attention because it is signed by M. RENÉ MILLET, ex-Resident General of Tunis, and expresses the views of M. HANOTAUX, who was formerly Minister for Foreign Affairs, and who is tolerably certain of returning to that post when M. DELCASSÉ loses it.

M. MILLET marshals a great deal of evidence to prove that for the last thirty years it has been an axiom of French-Algerian policy that France should in every possible way prevent the establishment of a European neighbor on her frontiers. It was to that end that France assumed a protectorate over Tunis, and from that time, so M. MILLET avers, the idea of French domination throughout North Africa has been regarded as a great political conception. M. DELCASSÉ, however, departed from this programme when about a year ago he entered into an understanding with the Italian Government, the purport of which was that France would not oppose the claim of Italy to a reversionary right to occupy Tripoli whenever that country should, for any reason, cease to form a part of the Ottoman dominions. M. MILLET maintains that the concession made by M. DELCASSÉ was inconsistent with his professed desire to preserve friendly relations with Italy for two reasons: first, because the boundary between Tripoli and Tunis is undetermined, it being questionable to which country the oases of Ghat and Ghadames belonged, and, secondly, because the Hinterland of Tripoli was placed by the Anglo-French arrangement of 1899 within the French sphere of influence. According to M. MILLET, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs has substituted an active, pushing neighbor for an inoffensive one, and the only hope left for the continuation of good relations between France and Italy is that the latter should guarantee the neutrality of the Tripolitaine, and agree to confine her colonizing ambitions to Cyrene.

It also follows from M. MILLET'S premises that France desires to see the present status in Morocco prolonged, and would regard the acquisition of a foothold in that country by either England or Germany as a menace to Algeria. In other words, France would protest against any attempt on the part of Great Britain to revive a treaty right which has been dormant for nearly two and a half centuries, and reassume possession of Tangiers, if the Shereefian authority should be overthrown in Morocco, and the whole country lapse into anarchy. Whether France would object so strenuously to an extension of the hold which Spain already possesses on the Moroccan seacoast is doubtful. Much depends upon the outcome of the negotiations lately undertaken with a view to establishing very intimate relations between Spain and France. In no event would Spain be regarded as a very dangerous neighbor to Algeria.

M. MILLET'S opposition to the acquisition of Tripoli by Italy and the high value which he places on the Tripolitan Hinterland are based mainly upon the idea propounded by the German explorer, ROHLFS, that to the master of Tripoli would belong the entire Soudan. If there ever was any foundation for the notion, it no longer exists. The entire Soudan will belong to the Power that controls the Nile and the railway from Cairo to Khartoum. In which European Power that control will be vested seems to have been settled by KITCHENER. M. MILLET'S other objection still remains valid, however, that if Tripoli should fall to Italy France would have a boundary dispute upon her hands.

The Alaska Boundary.

This Government has properly declined to submit to arbitration our title to the land acquired from Russia and recently claimed by the Dominion of Canada.

If the contents of the new treaty with Great Britain are accurately stated by the Washington correspondents, the plan of settlement now proposed can scarcely be described as arbitration.

The question is to go to a commission of six jurists, three American judges and three British. The essential factor of arbitration, the arbiter, the umpire, the supposedly neutral and impartial holder of the decisive vote, is absent from this tribunal.

The three representatives of the American case will have an opportunity to convince one or two or all of their British brethren of the soundness of our title to the territory now on the Canadian side of the *modus vivendi* line.

If they fail, not a square foot of territory rightfully ours will be alienated; the matter will simply stand where it stands to-day.

If they succeed, our friends of Great Britain will have an opportunity to withdraw Canada gracefully from its untenable claim, and at the same time to insert another very strong rivet in the friendship binding the two peoples.

Road Making in New York State.

Encouraged on all sides in their efforts to improve the condition of the highways of New York State and to secure as soon as possible the legislation necessary to accomplish this end, the good-roads advocates who assembled last week for their fourth annual convention at Albany have reason to be satisfied with their work. Through intelligent discussion, based on experience and observation, and perseverance along practical and common-sense lines, they have succeeded in gaining the support of well-nigh all good and influential citizens in this State.

The delegates to this year's convention lost no time in formulating their views and putting them in the shape of a request to the Legislature. The nature of this request, as it appears in the resolutions passed by the convention, will be as follows: First, that the State shall appropriate $2,000,000 as its share of the cost of constructing roads this year, toward which the various counties have already appropriated a similar amount; and, secondly, that the Legislature shall take the necessary steps to create a bond issue of $50,000,000, to be devoted to road building within this State. It is proposed that the responsibility for the payment of these bonds, if issued, shall be divided thus: Fifty per cent. shall be paid by the State, 35 per cent. by the counties benefited and 15 per cent. by the towns, as provided by the Higbie-Armstrong act.

The convention also recommends that a State "wide-tire law" be passed to protect roads generally from the injury done by narrow-tired vehicles, and also that the erection of signboards where they are needed shall be made compulsory by law.

The good-roads men point out that with the $2,000,000 asked for from the State for immediate use, together with the $2,000,000 appropriated by the counties, the work of building approximately 500 miles of highways, for which supervisors in the State have petitioned, may be begun at once. It is urged that this amount is absolutely necessary in order to carry out the present plans of construction, and, furthermore, it is believed to be fairly commensurate with the annual increase in the State's appropriations for road making which has taken place since 1899.

The efforts of New York's highway advocates have been greatly stimulated during the past few months by the enthusiasm manifested and the progress made by their contemporaries elsewhere in the United States. The activity referred to has not been confined to any one section of the country; it has been general. The Eastern States wherein it has been most noticeable, however, are Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. It was shown only a short time ago that since the good-roads movement was started in earnest in New Jersey the value of that State's taxable property has increased $27,000,000, and this increase has been found to be due largely to improved highway facilities. Instances were cited where new roads had been the means of attracting wealth to the extent of many millions of dollars. What is true of New Jersey is undoubtedly true, also, of other States which have spent money judiciously for highway improvements.

The thanks of the public for the excellent results which have been achieved along the line indicated are due, primarily, to the large number of good-roads organizations in this country which have labored industriously to further their purpose. Among them must be counted the various automobile clubs, whose members have spared neither money nor influence in seeking to expedite this important work. The Automobile Club of America and the American Automobile Association have been especially zealous in their endeavors to secure first-class and permanent highways, not only in the East, but throughout the Union. At the annual meeting the other day of the last-named body its retiring president, Mr. W. E. SCABRITT, emphasized the need, on the part of the association, of continuing these efforts. He said:

"We should see to it that the shameful waste of the public moneys in building our so-called 'highways' should cease. The United States Government has shown by carefully prepared statistics that the loss on account of our poor roads would within three years rebuild in the most substantial manner every highway in the United States. Surely, here is a field of endeavor full of promise. Most of the highways in our country to-day are disgraceful to our boasted civilization. The bicycle has done much for good roads; the automobile should do vastly more."

Heretofore the most serious obstacle to the advancement in road making has been the task of convincing a certain portion of the American people that modern thoroughfares, while much more economical in the long run than the others, would confer, indisputably, immense advantages upon our citizens as a whole, and not merely upon those able to own automobiles and fast horses. Happily, this obstacle is being rapidly overcome, and its almost complete removal seems to be a matter of only a short time.

The End of the Automobile Show.

Those who attended last week's exhibition of self-moving vehicles in Madison Square Garden do not need to be told that it was an exceedingly successful affair, one of the most successful of the many great industrial displays of which New York can boast. For the benefit of those who failed to attend, we may say that the show, the third of its kind in this city, completely eclipsed all of its predecessors on this side of the Atlantic and compared favorably with the great automobile exhibits in France. It marked the entrance of America on a magnificent scale into the forefront of what is rapidly becoming one of the world's greatest industries.

The size of the crowd that went to the Garden and the nature of the people who composed it were sufficient to insure the success of the affair as a show. How about its success as a means of foreshadowing the amount of business likely to be done by the manufacturers during the present year? The report that the exhibits represented in value about half a million dollars affords only a vague idea of the prospective net cash returns to their makers. The aggregate value of the sales for the week has been variously estimated at from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000, or more than three times the value of those effected at the New York show in 1901.

What do France's representatives in this trade think of the American automobile? Here is the opinion of one prominent French agent:

"I am confident that in three years the French will be coming to America to buy automobiles. The Americans are sometimes slow at the start, but when they do get started they always go ahead of every other nation. They are wonderful people."

Such encouragement from abroad is gratifying. Optimistic views from outside are not needed, however, to assure the people of this country that automobile making has a wonderful future in America.

Everyman and His Shirt.

The Salvation Army, whose continuous campaign of quiet work is sometimes forgotten in its noisy music on the streets, has equipped and opened a tall hotel at the corner of East Broadway and Chatham Square and given it the fine name of the Braveman. Beds, 15 cents. Rooms, 25 cents. Col. HIGGINS, S. A., said in his dedicating speech that the Braveman was not intended for the accommodation of "toughs," but for honest men out of work. The prices charged are such as will cover the running expenses of the house, which is to be self-supporting and without that odor of charity which is so offensive to the self-supporting. But unless the managers of the Braveman use the privilege of selecting their guests and of refusing all persons esteemed dishonest or known not to be out of work, their amiable expectations will be disappointed. Honest men out of work may be unable to pay even the moderate charge of the Braveman; and it will be difficult to boycott knaves and "crooks" of inoffensive behavior.

The truth is that every hotel must stand on its own bottom and justify itself economically, if it can. Philanthropy cannot lift itself by its bootstraps off the floor of business. The Braveman will have to compete with other concerns of the same class run for profit exclusively. If it offers better accommodations for the same money, its rooms and beds will be full. It must be primarily a good lodging house. According to Col. HIGGINS, "the mission of this hotel is to uplift poor unfortunate men and teach them to lead a better life." Now, neither poor unfortunate men nor any other men will go to a lodging house to be "uplifted" or to be "taught to lead a better life." They go because it suits their purse and necessities. Judging from the experience of certain other cheap lodging houses or hotels, even "crooks" on their uppers like to have a respectable cheap hotel as an address, a sort of guarantee that they are "straight," and if such a place is well kept, some frugal or miserly persons who can afford better quarters will live in it.

In the perpetual Arabian Night's entertainments of the Manhattan Bagdad, the cheap lodging houses, sordid as they look, are among the strangest and most curious objects which the HAROUNS of sociology can study. They house not merely shabby failures of the downhill grade, but adventurers, inventors and promoters with millions in their brains or dreams, men with queer ideas and monomanias, talkative men bragging of better days, silent and mysterious men who hedge their past and their present in impenetrable reserve, young men from the country husbanding their resources and planning, as all young men do when they come here, the capture of the town. The Manhattan BALZAC will find many of the characters of his Comedy in these lodging houses. That is, if the Manhattan BALZAC is not already among us in the shape of our industrious friend, Prof. BRANDER MATTHEWS, the STANLEY AFRICANUS of the Bowery.

Some things in the Braveman will make a good many poor unfortunates not usually deemed unfortunate feel the nip of envy. Not all of us are able to treat ourselves, as the guests of the Braveman are, to shower and needle baths every morning. And many of us, be our harness single or double, must neigh or bray plaintively at this highly modern and young-century convenience:

"There is a large drying machine for drying clothes that adjoins the bathroom. This makes it possible for a man to wash his own clothes, a room being set apart for that work. While he is bathing his wet clothes are placed in the drying machine, and when he emerges from the tub or shower he will find his clothes dry and clean."

A man may be rich and not independent. Next to wearing no clothes, a happiness denied by the intemperance of this climate, the next joy may be that of washing your own clothes. Washers and ironers are notoriously spoiled and haughty. The world is at their feet and they love to kick. Besides, the accomplished, highly priced laundress is a luxury of comparatively few families. In this rich and expensive town how many men are at the mercy of laundries or outside laundresses, institutions skilled to treat a shirt as an enemy, real manglers—but it is ill jesting with a wounded heart. We are old and have been young, but we have never seen a time when laundries and laundresses were so rich and impenitent as now. They all, even the seeming-innocent colored "mammies"—confound 'em!—use some rotting acid. The newest shirt can't long survive their barbarities. Why have laundries and laundresses such a wild desire to yank the cuffs off? Why do they strive to divorce bosom from body? The life of a shirt isn't half what it used to be. Do the shirt makers give a commission to the manglers?

We wander by no pleasing road from the Braveman to Everyman and his shirt. If the managers of the Braveman or anybody else can invent a self-ironing shirt or some simple machine for ironing without tearing and maiming, their fortune will be made, their hotel crowded; and the sum of human happiness increased immeasurably.

Lieut.-Col. RICHARD H. PRATT of the Fifteenth Cavalry is entitled to promotion as the senior officer of his rank in his arm of the service. For more than twenty years Col. PRATT has been Commandant of the Indian School at Carlisle, Pa., and for all of that time has been carried on the roster of his various regiments as absent on detached service. He has done wonderful work at Carlisle, and his position and training as a soldier have helped him undoubtedly; but it is not right that he should remain on the active list of the army, while his real military work is done by another. Under the law Lieut.-Col. PRATT is entitled to promotion as Colonel; but as he is now 62 years old and has served for more than forty years, he is eligible for retirement. He should be promoted and retired at once, and the place in the army which he has not filled for twenty years should be given to an officer on the active list in more than name.

Told King he ste too much. Sir RICHARD POWELL shocks EDWARD VII.—*Cable despatch to* THE SUN.

The ruler of a limited and constitutional monarchy must have a limited constitution. A ruler by divine right like the English Bluebeard, HENRY VIII., ate by divine right, we suppose. HENRY'S pictures show that he would have been eligible to election in a Beefsteak Club or Fat Men's Club. But livers are rebellious subjects always and commit lese-majesty for the fun of it.

Too little of that comprehensive training included in the Greek sense of Music is given to American collegians. We are glad to see that the Yale freshmen are to learn the Irish jig, and the Irish lilt or leaping dance. Aside from the resulting increase of bodily agility, grace and proportion, these jigs and springs enliven him who dances and him who looks on. A freshman victory celebrated by a public dance would be greatly preferable to a freshman victory celebrated in the conventional manner by hullabaloo, riot and bonfires. Besides, the dancing mania is contagious. We may yet see the Yale dons with Dr. HADLEY at their head, the corporation, the wise and reverend graduates, and the undergraduates capering to a jig tune.

The Hon. ALADDIN ATKINSON'S experiments with mud as a fuel are interesting. If mud can be used as fuel, the world will have cheap heat and plenty of it so long as the New England branch of the Anti-Imperialist League continues in business.

This limited temperance pledge now circulating in England has its advantages.

"I solemnly undertake not to use any intoxicating beverage except at my midday and evening meals."

The old and common form used to read "except at meals." A too elastic form, for the wicked were able to make a pretence of eating early, late and often.

Nan.

From the Princeton Tiger.

There once was a man from Nantucket,
Who kept all his cash in a bucket;
But his daughter named Nan,
Ran away with a man,
And as for the bucket, Nantucket.

From the Chicago Tribune.

But he followed the pair to Pawtucket—
The man and the girl with the bucket;
And he said to the man
He was welcome to Nan,
But as for the bucket, Pawtucket.

THE FEDERAL UNION AND THE TRUSTS.

The Power to Regulate Interstate Commerce Does Not Extend to the Prohibition of What Is a Constitutional Right, Not Merely a Granted Privilege.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The new spirit of interpretation which animates the purpose of further controlling all so-called trusts is expressed in the following extract from an address by the Attorney-General of the United States:

If Congress, under its power to regulate interstate commerce, may utterly destroy a combination and forfeit its property in interstate transit, as the Sherman act provides, because it restrains such commerce, it seems reasonable to say that it can in the exercise of the same power deny to a combination whose life it cannot reach the privilege of engaging in interstate commerce except upon such terms as Congress may prescribe to protect that commerce from restraint.

In this extract a Constitutional right in the citizens of the State to engage in interstate commerce is denied. At most, such citizens may, by the favor of Congress and not by the Constitution, be let into the privilege of such commerce on such terms as Congress may prescribe to protect that commerce from restraint.

The difference between a right and a privilege is fundamental. A right in any valuable sense can only be that which the law secures to its possessor, by requiring others to respect it, and to abstain from its violation. A privilege, on the other hand, is exemption from such burdens as others are subjected to.

The right of citizens to cross State lines with their goods is absolute. It cannot be reduced to a privilege burdened with the requirement that one entering into the enjoyment of the privilege shall first establish his eligibility thereto. Such construction of the Constitution repeals the presumption of innocence and puts the burden of proof on the citizen to purge himself of whatever imputations Congress may from time to time cast upon him.

Under this theory uniformity and constancy in the law, elements of Constitutional government, are eliminated, and there is substituted therefor the shifting permission of Congress to engage in such trade as Congress may approve, on the terms agreeable to Congress.

Socialism has for its starting point the overthrow of absolute rights of ownership in private property, as an institution. Most theories of socialism comprehend the regulation of industry and the sources of livelihood, as well as the domestic relations.

The legal zone which the Attorney-General is attempting to survey off, lying between the absolute Constitutional right to enjoy free trade among the States, and the privilege to enter upon such trade as Congress may permit, is a Constitutional myth, and at the same time it is a germ of socialism.

Congress has nothing to do with productive industry. The Supreme Court of the United States holds that the erection and maintenance of manufacturing establishments, while incidentally beneficial to the community in which they are established, are nevertheless not a public object to the aid of which money raised by taxation can be appropriated. Such appropriations of public money are condemned, and the doctrine is sound that such a use of public funds is beyond legislative power.

Neither has the Federal Government visitorial power over the States or their industry. Neither the taxing power of the Government nor the power of eminent domain can be used to promote strictly private enterprises whose purpose is private gain and which have no public character. Under no power of the Federal Government can officers thereof be authorized to visit private corporations in the States and to inspect their actions and regulate their behavior.

Even the power to visit an eleemosynary corporation is in the founder thereof and not in the Government. If the business transacted through the instrumentality of corporate forms were private, if done by or through the forms of a copartnership or under individual supervision, it is clearly private, though incorporated. The character of civil institutions does not grow out of mere incorporation. Business is not made public or private by the mere form of its government or management. A private commercial corporation is merely a limited partnership, and though its business proceeds under corporate methods, these methods make no impression upon the nature or character of the business itself. They are but different forms of agencies to manage the property. The nature of the business is the same in either case, and the behavior of its owner in its conduct cannot be supervised by the United States in any case.

The Government stands mute whether the owners of private business control its activities under corporate or partnership forms of management.

Neither is there any magic in numbers. It is immaterial to the Government whether there be two or ten thousand owners of private enterprises in one or many corporations. It is no offence to the Government that such enterprises are singly or in the aggregate financially strong and prosperous.

The right to overlook or change the methods of domestic industry is in the owners of the industry and not in the Government. The fact that they are incorporated is immaterial.

Railroad corporations are held by the Supreme Court to be merely commercial companies. They live, thrive or die and are buried, under the ægis of the State creating them. It has been held that the State may empower a railroad corporation to make charges on interstate commerce, and this right to make such charges is a part of its original corporate power.

The power to regulate commerce among the States comprehends no more than authority in Congress to keep such commerce free from obstruction, whether obstructions be interposed by the different States or by individuals. Wherever a contract between individuals in its provisions obstructs commerce, the obstructive provision in such contract may be annulled.

The proposed regulations of commerce for the first time, in their terms, contemplate that the Federal Government by its agencies may cross the divisional line between State and Federal jurisdiction, and after crossing such line, control the domestic industry of the State.

It has been held correctly that the fact that the products of a State manufactory may become parts of interstate commerce does not give jurisdiction to the Federal Government to control such products, and it has further been held that where such products are intended to be when complete shipped into other States, such intention does not introduce them into or make them a part of interstate commerce or change their character as domestic products.

It is only when products begin to move from State to State that they touch Federal jurisdiction. That jurisdiction is exhausted in keeping the commercial highways on which the movement occurs free from all forms of obstructions by whomsoever interposed.

AN AMERICAN DEMOCRAT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 24.

THE $135,000,000 CANAL.

The Straightforward Opinion of an Orange County Farmer and Taxpayer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The canal problem ought to be solved in some shape, sooner or later; and the sooner the better, for as long as it remains unsettled, so long will it be kept alive by political ambition and commercial speculation. The time cannot be any too short to get the matter where the people can reach it and send it to a finish. As one of the farmer part of our population I should be glad to vote on the proposition at the next election, once and for all; and I should say that THE SUN has shed no little light on the way to vote.

If we are to have a ship canal, as the 1,000-ton barge scheme practically contemplates, then THE SUN is entirely right that the United States should manage the affair. The Hudson River to the head of navigation is subject to the general Government; and if tidewater navigation is to be extended to Buffalo the case at once assumes importance of national character. I don't think the State of New York should bear the entire expense with no adequate return, for the convenience of the rest of the country. There is capacity enough now in the canal, or ought to be, for the expenditures made, to float all the freight necessary to keep railroads within bounds on freight rates. I am not afraid of railroads; there are too many of them; they regulate themselves in large measure. I would fear one general store in our village, but we have a half dozen, so they watch one another, and we have no fear of a trust. It takes a pretty good sized ship to carry a thousand tons; big enough to cross the Atlantic. The first ship that passed through the Suez Canal was no larger. Would Buffalo, elevators and all, would Oswego, elevators and all, be in favor of the State enlarging the canal to admit 1,000-ton vessels without breaking bulk at their ports? If not, why not? The answer is obvious. Then, if barges or ships of such burden could come from the Lakes and pass through the canal, what might not New York get out of it? Possibly the felicity of seeing these vessels, seaworthy and equipped with steam and electrical appliances, Marconi wireless contrivance, &c., sailing by like ships in the night, or the day, for foreign climes.

The Suez Canal, which cost less than would the Governor's 1,000-ton canal by many millions, shortened the route to India and beyond by 6,000 miles. We can at least not shorten our eyesight to the position the State might place itself in. Only one Governor got any name or fame out of canals. But he lived when steam and electricity didn't move the world and our limitless products. So, if the Great West must have a waterway to the sea, and by the sea to the world, let the general Government provide the ways and means. Our taxes might thus in time undergo perceptible diminution; but not from nowadays political taxation exploits conjured up at Albany. Whether we pay directly out of pocket or indirectly through corporations, "trusts," franchises or otherwise, the money would come out of the people just the same. What we pay should be determined by what we get. If administration be insufficient, extravagant or profligate, we shall have to pay for it; canal job or otherwise.

I can hardly agree with your farmer correspondent, Mr. Van Antwerp, on the canal question, as affecting farms and farm values in this State. There is no better land North, South, East or West than in New York, and none has better and nearer market for all that can be produced. Production and profit do not come altogether from railroads or canals; it is from work and what is behind work—management. New York farmers were never worth more for profit than now. Whether by railroad or canal, products of Western farms will get to market and the best markets they can find. We rejoice that New York is the great market of the country; that it affords advantage to home agriculture; but if farmers will work and half produce what they ought not to grow in competition with the West, they have themselves to scold and not railroads or canals. Last year a Western scientific farmer went through our State, and when he got home made public the statement that he wouldn't be afraid to undertake a New York farm of fifty acres, and would make more out of it than a Western farm twice the size. A pig in the pen will not get fat on husks and neglect.

ORANGE COUNTY FARMER.

CORNWALL, Jan. 24.

The Singer of the Attic Salt Licks.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A few days ago you had a slurring article in your paper in regard to the poetry of Syracuse. You said, in short, that the poetry of the Salt Licks and the Onondaga Reservation is being overtopped by other poetry. It is a base slander. We up here, spite of the salty atmosphere, find freshness, virility, inspiration, consolation, sublimation, originality, grace, beauty, sweetness, melody, genius, in the powerful poetry of Lawrence O'Shaughnessy, the Poet Laureate of Liverpool, Onondaga county, N. Y. So charmed are we by the soulful products of his divine afflatus that we are righteously indignant at the cruel thrust you made at Onondaga verse. A scintillating gem or two plucked indiscriminately from the latest products of his poetic soul and mind will convince you of your error and make you ashamed of yourself. Here is one jewel:

"May the snow come and go,
And the years pass right by
As the tides ebb and flow;
For we must all die."

What think you of that? Has Indiana sent out anything more truthful? Here is another glitterer:

"A man's but a leaf in a great forest grand,
And he flutters, and flutters, so sadly:
Oh, could we but know of the far distant land—
Man would be good and would not quarrel so madly."

Beat that if you can. Mark the second line. What a beautiful, quaint metaphor. Here you see no hackneyed figure. There is nothing commonplace about it. Parallel it if you can.

We defy you to show another that can equal this verse. It is particularly new and timely. Here it is:

"See the trust, the horrible trust;
It gobbles and gobbles each red cent;
And it's up to us that devil to bust,
Or out we'll go for not paying rent."

How homely. You must confess your inability justly to criticise that verse. Do you retract your foul slander of our fair city? If not, your appreciation of poetry is defective. G. M.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., Jan. 22.

For Beauty and Tidiness.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will you ask for information as to methods employed by improvement societies for getting rid of advertising signboards that so disfigure country roads. Another condition of things that you may see a way out of is the unsightliness and untidiness of the banks of railroad tracks. The banks of the Erie road on the Newark branch are for some distance out of Jersey City a succession of rubbish heaps, old cans, papers, &c. When one considers that each tin can holds sufficient stagnant water to breed thousands of the malaria-spreading mosquito, it is not only an offence to the eye but a menace to public health. Is there no way that railroad officials and property owners can be impressed with these facts?

JAN. 20. W. M. A.

A Sad Mistake.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Duffy Pluff was stabbed in the head Thursday night by a Hartford woman, who said she hadn't seen him.

G. L. DICKINSON.

HARTFORD, Conn., Jan. 23.

John Bull Protests to His Partner

Oh, William, stop bombarding,
Oh, Billy, please be nice,
Stop calmly disregarding
My excellent advice.
Please be a little wiser,
Be good and come away,
Oh, Billy, be a Kaiser,
Not a fireworks display!

Oh, heavens! what's that roar there?
What are you shelling at?
That little speck on shore there?
A fortress! It's a cat!
Your head, my friend, is swelling,
With all this blamed pow-wow,
Oh, William, dear, stop shelling
That doubtless neutral cow!

I do not mind blockading
To gather in your debt,
But all this cannonading
Has got my nerves upset;
I'm down here, willy-nilly
To help your gunning sport,
I'm ——, oh, confound it, Billy,
That hen is not a fort.

I don't see what I came for,
Nor how to get away,
Nor why I lent my name for
This German holiday!
Bill's wild bombarding habit
Is —— Damn! He's at it still,
Oh, Lord! he's killed a rabbit!
I'll leave you, Cousin Bill!

T. Y. O.

THE OLD STEVENS HOUSE.

A Historian's Account of the Historical Mansion at Astoria.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I notice in your issue of last Sunday, 17th January, a view and description of the Stevens house at Astoria, L. I., containing some errors and omissions.

Col. Stevens, who, by the way, was born in Boston, and not Salem, purchased the old Hallet house and a large part of the estate which overlooked the cove, Hallet's Cove, as it was called until the inhabitants changed its name to Astoria in the hope of some pecuniary benefit from old John Jacob, who had a house in the neighborhood—a hope in which it is pleasant to record they were disappointed.

Thompson, in his history of Long Island, says that Petrus Stuyvesant granted in December, 1652, at New Amsterdam a plot of ground at Hell Gate upon Long Island, called Jarks's farm, to William Hallet, and the premises were confirmed by the Sachem on Dec. 5, 1654. These patents were renewed by Gov. Nicolls in 1668 and by Gov. Dongan in 1688. The consideration in 1664 was "fifty-eight fathom wampum, seven coats, one blanket and four kettles." The annual quitrent in that of 1668 was 2 shillings. Col. Stevens purchased the place some time near the close of the eighteenth century. The old house stood on the top of a hill, from which there was an extensive view of the East River or Sound, which before the channel was freed from its many obstructions was most picturesque, with its ever-changing, whirling, eddying currents. In the rear of the mansion was a large orchard and within it the graveyard of the old Hallet family; and there were also a few stones to the memory of some Indian personages. There was a long row of russet apple trees on the lane which led to the house which were no doubt planted in the Dutch period, and there were Seckel pear trees, yielding a luscious fruit not to be had nowadays, and cherry trees of great size, variety and yield. And there were other trees, which were giants even in the Hallets' days.

Game abounded here in the first half of the century—duck, plover and snipe on the shore and the Sunswick marshes nearby. Bass ran in great numbers, delighting in the swift-running water; the blackfish were unequalled in size and firmness; no lobsters like those which hung about the Hell Gate rocks; no oysters finer than the East River natives. To-day all this is in the heart of Greater New York.

Col. Stevens greatly improved the place and changed its appearance. The hill was cut into two wide terraces and banks which fell to the river side. On the foot of the lower bank he set out a row of Norway pines, which were long a landmark to the river traveller; and the terraces were planted with shrubs of great variety, which he brought over from France and the Windward Islands in his vessels, which traded with these ports—the Lombardy poplar, the mulberry, great box trees from Europe and a variety of cacti and palms. It was the fashion then to improve the new-made nation, and every variety of foreign product for use or ornament was attempted by our patriotic sires. To this place he gave the name of Mount Bonaparte. An artillery officer himself, he had a great admiration for the young Corsican, whose fame was then worldwide. Later the name of Bonaparte was dropped, but the country seat always held the name of the Mount.

Col. Stevens was Major-General of artillery of the State of New York and in command of the defences of the city in 1812. He built the fort on the river side at Hallet's Point, at what was called Pot Rock, near the wild water swirl which was called the Pot. This water work was called after him, Fort Stevens. This was commanded by a round tower on high ground in the rear.

Col. Stevens died at Rockaway in the summer of 1823, and was buried in his family vault at Hallet's Cove. His remains, with those of his immediate family and many others—French and other foreigners who, consigned to his care, died in New York—were later removed to Greenwood. His widow continued to reside here in summer until her death in 1846. The estate then passed to Byam Kerby Stevens, one of the sons of Gen. Stevens. He married the daughter of Albert Gallatin, the celebrated financier and diplomatist. Mr. Gallatin died of the cholera here in 1849.

There have been great changes in the last quarter of the century and hardly a vestige of the beauty of the place remains. The pines are down, the terraces have disappeared; the orchard, the fruit trees and shrubs are things of the past—a past which will have no resurrection. The new Blackwell's Island bridge will have its abutment not far away and the cove will make an admirable basin for commercial purposes.

I will not trouble you with any mention of the family which this Boston officer founded in New York in 1783. Intermarrying in the old Knickerbocker families of Bayard, Morris, Lloyd, Schermerhorn, Rhinelander, Nicholson, Rutgers, Crosby, Livingston, Cornell, as well as with the old New England stock of Weld and Otis, his descendants are numerous to the fourth generation.

The first wife of Col. Stevens was Rebecca Hodgson of Boston. His second wife, Lucretia, daughter of John Ledyard of Hartford, was the widow of Richardson Sands, a younger brother of the liberty boys, Joshua and Comfort Sands. The children by both these marriages lived together with their parents in summer in the old Long Island home. JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS.

NEWPORT, Jan. 23.

A Democratic Newspaper on Leader Richardson's Case.

From the Terre Haute Gazette.

In the reported intention of Representative Richardson to retire from the House, there is a promise of more aggressive and competent minority leadership in that body. This is something that sensible men of both parties would be glad to see, not merely for the good of the Democratic party, but because it is a well-settled principle of politics and government that an effective opposition is necessary to keep the majority in check. Mr. Richardson's leadership has failed to do this in the House. Representative Williams of Mississippi, who is the probable successor of Mr. Richardson, is young, aggressive and capable, and may do better than Mr. Richardson has done; he could hardly do worse.—*Public Opinion.*

But a more potent reason for the retirement of Representative Richardson from public life was given by THE SUN in its exposure of his connection with the "Committee on Distribution," and its plan for selling the "Messages and Papers of the Presidents"—a scheme pronounced by a Federal Judge in New York to be permeated with fraud.

Congress owes it to the country to make an end of this nefarious business by publishing a large edition of these messages for distribution throughout the country by Senators and Representatives. Private sale of public documents is a scandal and an outrage.

America at Shakespeare's Home.

From the Stratford-upon-Avon Herald of Jan. 9.

We are glad to announce that a movement is now on foot in America for erecting a Shakespeare memorial in the town of Stratford-on-Avon. Our cousins across the sea have done something to show their interest in the great dramatist by placing windows in the parish church, and one by erecting a handsome drinking fountain in Rother street, but these evidences of their love and admiration of the poet do not seem to be sufficient. Their aim is to erect a memorial which shall be worthy of their great country, and of which every American visitor shall have reason to be proud. A Shakespeare Memorial Association has just been founded in New York, among its promoters being gentlemen distinguished in art and literature, and arrangements are being organized to make an appeal to every American citizen who takes an interest in the poet's works or birthplace. That this interest must be a very general one is proved by the vast number of Americans who visit Stratford-on-Avon every year.

From the same newspaper, same date.

"Florodora" found its way to Stratford on Monday last, and two representations were given of this vivacious musical comedy on the evening of that day and on the following Tuesday at the Memorial Theatre.

A Critic's Thought and His Afterthought.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Permit an admirer of your general accuracy and scholarship to say that Virgil wrote "*Non omnia possumus omnes*," not, as you have it in a leading article in your issue of Jan. 22, *Non omnes possumus omnia*. Apart from the question of scansion you will observe that placing "omnia" next to "non" makes it, as Virgil intended, the emphatic word, "We can't all do everything." CANADIAN READER.

P. S.—A new light has dawned on me. THE SUN is more subtle than all the beasts of the field. The transposition is intentional so as to throw the emphasis on the "omnes," and gently lead up to the ensuing remark that, though we can't all do everything, it would be rash to assert the same of Prof. Harry Thurston Peck. C. R.

OTTAWA, Jan. 23.

The surest and best of Blood Purifiers is Jayne's Alterative.—*Adv.*